

Texas State Document **Industrial Mix: Understanding the Region's Changing Economic Base**

Analyzing the economy is sometimes like looking at a city where the population's average weight is 150 pounds. Does that make it a great place for starting a health club or should the government be planning a food-aid program? A lot would depend on whether the population's average height was five feet or six feet. Similarly, it's not enough to know how much employment a region has. As anyone who lived in the "Oil Patch" during the past decade can testify, it's equally important to know what type of industries are doing the employing. An area's proportional mix of industry types affects the local tax base, wages, and demands on local infrastructure. Some industries in a county require sophisticated telephone systems while others need close access to shipping. These are issues affecting business and government alike.

The Basics: What You Need to Get By

noitoune

When planning a long car trip, it's usually a good idea to take your car's gas mileage into account. Maybe you invest a little time into finding out what the road conditions are like and where the gas stations are located. Planning on a new diet? You need some bas c information on calories, fat, and other nutritional considerations if you really want to shed a few pounds. In either case, you don't have to be a certified mechanic to enjoy your vacation and you don't need a medical degree to change your diet. The same is true when evaluating the economy. You don't have to be an economist but there are a few basic facts about industrial composition that you should know before you make any decisions or plans.

Just keep a few facts in mind. First, percentages are used to compare different size counties and industries. So just because the Manufacturing industry in one county represents 50% of all jobs in the economy and only 25% in another, it doesn't necessarily mean that the first county actually has twice as many jobs. It is a measure relative to other indus-

> tries in the same county and economy. Second, an industry may actually lose jobs, but still increase it's percentage of industrial composition. This can happen when an area's overall economy loses jobs faster than a specific industry.

Depository Dallas Public Librar Snapshot: Those Who Served

JUN 29 1995

It is easy to overlook the presence of veterans in our region although the Census shows that nearly one of ten persons in the region was a veteran in 1990. Over half of men age 65 and older were veterans. Two of ten men under the age of 65 were veterans. As seen on page 8, a third of the region's veterans were from the Vietnam Era, World War II veterans were the next largest group, with the region's share lower than the State's. This was not the case in the non-CMSA counties where World War II made up the largest group and exceeded the State average. There were approximately the same number of Korean and post-Vietnam veterans, each representing one of ten veterans.



More than four of ten of Austin County's veterans had served in WWII only, constituting the largest group in the County. This was the second highest percentage of WWII veterans among all of the counties in the region. While not a large presence among veterans in general, the County also ranked second in its share of WWI veterans at 0.6%. Less than two of ten veterans served in Vietnam only, among the lowest percentages in the region.

BRAZORIA

Brazoria County ranked third in its share of post-1975 veterans at 13.9%. This was higher than the average for the region or the State. With over three of ten veterans having served in the Vietnam Era, this group made up the largest group, followed by WWII veterans. The County had the third highest percentage of male veterans under age 64 and female veterans 65 years and older

The **BIG** Picture

Both in 1992 and 1972, the Services industry was the largest employer in the H-GAC region. It was also one of the fastest growing. Twenty years earlier, employment in the second and third ranked industries (Retail Trade and Manufacturing) outnumbered employment in the Services industry. By 1992, the Services industry employment easily surpassed the combined employment of the next two largest industries, Retail Trade and Government. While the Services sector grew fast, it wasn't the fastest. Honors for the fastest growing industry during this period go the Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing sector which has more than tripled in size since 1972. Employment growth in the Mining industry and State and Local Government also exceeded the region's average. The slowest growing industries included Manufacturing, the Military, and the Federal Government.

Geographic Differences

The H-GAC region consists of 13 counties, of which eight (Brazoria, Chambers, Fort Bend, Galveston, Harris, Liberty, Montgomery, and Waller) make up the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA). The non-CMSA counties include Austin, Colorado, Matagorda, Walker, and Wharton. In general, the non-CMSA counties account for a small portion of regional employment. However, the non-CMSA counties do have industrial characteristics distinct from those of the region as a whole and require separate examination to fully understand them.

The geographic areas differ in two principle ways: relative size and growth. Relative size reflects the importance of an industry to a region. In 1992, the Government sector accounted for more than two of ten jobs in the non-CMSA counties and only one of ten jobs for the region. Therefore, the Government sector may be considered more important to the economies of the non-CMSA counties compared to the region. Industrial growth indicates the changing characteristics of the area's economy. Since 1972, the Government sector has declined statewide, remained stable for the region, and increased in the region's non-CMSA counties.

Regardless of the geographic area, the Government, Services, and Retail Trade sectors provided over half of all jobs in 1992 in the non-CMSA counties, the region, and the State. This combination has seen little variation since 1972, suggesting that relatively "small" numeric changes define some of the dramatic shifts in the economy in the last two decades. Industries: Then and Now

ndustries: Then and Now

The following takes a brief look at the ten major industries as defined by the Standard Industrial Classification codes (see Technical Files, page 5). These industries do not include farm employment but do include government jobs. Because of disclosure reasons (see Technical Files)

(continued on page 4)



Which came first?



This variation on the chicken and the egg occupies much of the time of crime experts and philosophers alike: does a high crime rate mean a high rate of law enforcement officers per person or does a high rate of officers per person mean a low crime rate? So that you may join the discussion, the maps show crime and law enforcement data for 1992 based on figures from the Texas Department of Public Safety and the F.B.I.

Austin County had the lowest crime rate per 100,000 population in the region and was fifth in the number of officers per 100,000 population. Although Galveston ranked highest in its law enforcement rate, it had the highest crime rate as well. Colorado County's crime rate placed it sixth in the region while having the third lowest law enforcement rate.



At 35.7%, Vietnam era veteran's were the largest veterans group in Chambers County. However, WWII veterans came in a close second with nearly three of ten veterans from that time period. This placed it well above the CMSA average of 23.2% and even higher the State's average (26.6%). Overall, Chambers County had a smaller share of 65 and over veterans compared to the region and the state.

Colorado County ranked last in post-1975 era veterans in the region but first in WWII veterans. Almost half of the County's veterans served during WWII. The county also had the highest percentage of WWI veterans at 0.7%, over three times the state average. While Vietnam era veterans were the second largest group in the County, the County ranked next to last in the region.

Over four of ten veterans in Fort Bend served during the Vietnam Era making it the largest group in the County. This was the highest share in the region and surpassed to the State average of 31.1%. As in most CMSA counties, WWII veterans were the second largest group of Fort Bend veterans at 17.1%. However, this was only two-thirds of the State average and the lowest share in the region.

C

H

COLORADO

BE

Regional View, Spring 1995

page 5), Matagorda employment is not included in Services and Transportation/Utilities, and Waller County was excluded from Agriculture and Mining.

Agricultural Services, Forestry, Horticulture, and Fishing. The first thing to understand about this industry is that it is not farming. These are non-farming jobs in agriculture services such as soil preparation and



griculture, Forestry, Fishery Services Veterinary services. The industry has enjoyed among the highest growth rates since 1972, but with marginal

impact, since the industry is such a small percentage of the total industrial composition. Agriculture Service in non-CMSA counties was proportionally three times the size of the region's, yet was still less than 3.0% of the counties' industrial composition. Matagorda County had the highest percentage in the region at 4.0%.

Mining. The Mining sector consists of the metal, coal, oil and gas, and nonmetallic mining industries and only represented 4.0% of the region's jobs in 1992. This, of course, was not a result of other industries gaining jobs at a faster rate but rather a loss of a

third of the jobs in the Mining sector. While the Mining sector in 1992 still made up a



larger part of the industrial composition for the region and the State compared to 1972, this was not the case in the mon-CMSA counties.

Overall, Mining in the non-CMSA counties is less than half its 1972 size, both in number of jobs and relative to other industries. Matagorda witnessed the most dramatic drop among the non-CMSA counties. Although all counties in the region suffered losses in the Mining sector since 1982, the sector has increased its share in some CMSA counties, such as Galveston and Harris, when compared to 1972.

Construction. The Construction sector may never again be what it was, in 1982. But some counties are finding it better than it

was, in 1972. Construction in Austin, Brazoria, Fort Bend, Galveston, Matagorda, and Waller counties provided a larger percentage of jobs



Disclosure When using government statistics, you will eventually come across disclosure problems. Data will not be available in order to protect the privacy of individuals and

businesses. If there is only one business in a county's mining industry, then any statistics about the mining industry would actually be characteristics of that business. You may want to find out about that business but would you want others to find out the same kind of information about you? Disclosure protects individuals and businesses that are required to provide data to the government.

The decennial census is perhaps the most recognized case. The IRS and other federal agencies have gone to court to access individual Census data and have always lost. By not distributing individual information, the Census Bureau and other government agencies improve participation in their data programs. In the case of the employment data presented in this issue, some county data was not included in the industry comparisons because of disclosure. However, estimates are included in the county's total employment.

G counted for nearly six of ten veterans in Galveston County. The County ranked below the region's average for V Vietnam veterans and somewhat above average for WWII veterans. 5 Overall, Galveston T County residents were more likely to be veter-ans or currently serving in the Armed Forces than any other county in the region.

Veterans from the Viet-

nam and WWII eras ac-

Harris County had the second highest share of post-1975 veterans in the region at 14.1% which place it above the State average.. More than a R third of the veterans served during the Vietnam era and slightly less than a quarter during WWII. At 20.4%, the County ranked lowest in the region for male veterans under age 65.

R

Mapmaker, Mapmaker, Plot Me a Map

In the last issue of Regional View, we introduced the concept of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and how such a system is useful for creating maps and analyzing data. At the Houston-Galveston Area Council, GIS is being used to support many agencies in public planning and compliance projects.

As an example, the Transportation Planning Department uses GIS to help the Texas

Department Of Transportation (TxDOT) keep track of roadway projects and determine where new projects may need to be planned in the future. Currently, H-GAC staff are creating a Congestion Management System (CMS) that will use the analytical and mapping capabilities of GIS to identify

roadways and intersections where traffic management problems are developing. GIS will allow planners and

engineers to both identify problems before they occur, and help them "try out" different proposed solutions by computer simulation.

In the Community and Environmental Planning Department, GIS is being used to store information about where certain industries are located and the type of chemicals and other effluents they produce and discharge into our streams and bays. Data from water quality monitoring sites is stored in the system, as well. By combining the two types of data in a GIS, planners can identify probable sources of mea-

sured pollutants and map out the physical course that those pollutants traveled, between their likely origin and the physical location where they were detected, In the Data Services Department, GIS is being used to help many banks respond to mandates of the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA). Banks are responsible for ensuring that they fairly and equitably serve their communities by making loans available to all who qualify. But with thousands of clients, it is usually very difficult for such institutions to know where their accounts are located and which aroups are being serviced most, or least. GIS allows an "electronic pin map" to be created that superimposes dots, representing individual accounts, on shaded areas that show income, ethnicity, or other demographic characteristics. From the maps, banks can determine which community areas, if any, they may need to concentrate on, in the future.

With digital maps of city blocks, zip codes, legislative districts, census tracts, school districts and other types of boundaries available, it is increasingly possible to map many types of data useful in market analysis. Data can be mapped against telling backdrops of demographic information. Acquiring such information used to be terribly expensive and time-consuming, but with GIS technology, those considerations have been substantially reduced.

If you would like to get more information on H-GAC's Geographic Information System, or the services and maps it can provide, call the Data Services Department at 713/627-3200.



TECHNICAL FILES

S.I.C.

Codes

The Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) is the statistical classification standard underlying all establishment-based federal economic statistics classified by Industry. In other words, it is a coding system used by the federal government to describe industries. The system is hierarchical with 11 divisions subdivided into two-digit major groups. The twodiait groups may be broken down into three-digit groups or four-digit industry code. For example: the Malt Beverages Industry Code is 2082 under the three-diait aroup 208 Beverages, which is under major group 20, Food and Kindred Products in the Manufacturing Division. The industries compared in this issue are all at the division level.

More than six of ten veterans in Liberty county served during the Vietnam or WWII eras. The County's share of WWII veterans (32.0%) was the highest among the CMSA counties and surpassed the State average of 26.6%. Liberty also ranked high in the percentage of veterans who served between the Korean and Vietnam eras, again exceeding the average for Texas.

Matagorda's share of post-1975 veterans was higher than the region's and State's average. As with most CMSA counties, WWII veterans were the largest group at 30.8% followed by those of the Vietnam era with 28.4%. Matagorda, along with Galveston, had the highest percentage of female veterans under the age of 65.





Regional View, Spring 1995



WALKER

had among the highest percentage of veterans who served in WWII, Korea, and Vietnam. It also had the highest share of veterans who served between WWII and Korea, surpassing the State's 10.3% average at 13.6%. Males under the age 65 were more likely to be veterans in Montgomery than any of the other region's counties except for Galveston.

Montgomery County

Unlike most CMSA counties, Vietnam veterans outnumber those from WWII in Walker County. The County ranks second in the region in its share of Vietnam veterans at 38.6 %. Walker is second only to Galveston in its share of male veterans 65 years and older and second to Waller for female veterans 65 years and older.

counties through the 70's and 80's, despite the industry's smaller slice of the economy. Matagorda County experienced a decline in the number of Construction jobs, but the industry grew as a percentage of the incustrial composition. Nonetheless, these are exceptions to the rule since, overall, Construction's share of jobs in the region and the state is smaller than in 1982 or 1972.

Manufacturing. The Manufacturing Industry share of regional jobs declined by a third

from 1972 to 1992 for the region and the State. In 1972, the region's Manufacturing sector was on a par with the State's but fell below the



State average by 1992. Furthermore, the region is losing Manufacturing jobs at almost four times the rate of the State average. As for the non-CMSA counties, the Manufacturing sector has posted mixed results since 1972. The Manufacturing sectors of Matagorda and Walker counties represent a smaller portion of the areas' jobs than in 1972. Austin, Colorado, and Wharton counties have all seen their Manufacturing sectors' expand their share of the economy's jobs.

Transportation and Public Utilities. This industry has been declining gradually as a share of industrial compo-

sition. In the non-CMSA counties, this sector lost three of ten jobs since 1982. While the number



of jobs in the Transporta-

tion and Public Utilities sector has grown since 1972, the growth has been tepid and well below the average growth rate for the economy as a whole. The Transportation sector increased its portion of the industrial composition for Chambers. Fort Bend and Waller counties from 1972 to 1992.

Wholesale Trade. The percentage of jobs represented by the Wholesale Trade sector



from 1972 to 1992. The decline is the result of iob losses in the industry during the 80's. Individual counties in both

the CMSA and non-CMSA increased the slice of their Wholesale Trade Sector. Austin, Brazoria, Chambers, Fort Bend, Montgomery, Walker, Waller, and Wharton all grew relative to other industries since 1972. Furthermore, unlike other industries that were larger in 1992 compared to 1972 but smaller compared to 1982, six of the counties showed a steady increase since 1972.

Retail Trade. The Retail Trade Industry's share of the economy has remained stabled

from 1972 through 1992 for the region and the State. The region's share of the industry is somewhat smaller than the



State's and the region also has slower growth than the State. The non-CMSA counties, however, have seen a gradual decline of their Retail Trade sector during the same period. Chambers, Colorado, Matagorda, and Wharton counties have lost Retail Trade Sector jobs since 1982 after increases during the 70's.

Financial, Insurance, and Real Estate (FIRE). While the FIRE industry posted



modest growth increases from 1982 in the region, the industry represents a smaller share of the region's jobs in 1992 than in 1972. The industry

managed average growth during the 70's, and only maintained it's size proportionally to the other industrial sectors by 1982. The largest FIRE sectors in 1992 were found in Austin, Galveston, and Harris counties.

Services. In 1992, Services was the largest of the sectors for the State and the Region and the second

largest for the non-CMSA counties. But what some may find surprising is the Services sector was the largest in



1972 for all three areas as well. The difference between 1972 and 1982 is that in 1972, Services represented two of every ten jobs in the region and in 1992 it represented three of ten jobs. Fort Bend, Harris, Liberty, and Montgomery counties Services sectors saw the greatest increase in their share of industrial composition. Among the non-CMSA counties, Wharton had the largest Services sector while Harris had the largest among the CMSA counties.

Government. The Government sector includes the military as well public education

Regional View, Spring 1995



employees. This sector has increased by a third in the number of jobs in the region, a fourth for the State, and more than a third for the non-CMSA counties. Yet, the Govern-

ment sector's share of all employees has declined since 1972 for the State and the region. For the State, this reflects a loss of federal and military spending since 1982. However, the region had a much smaller portion of military and federal civilian employees compared to the State. Furthermore, the region has been adding jobs to the federal sector (both military and civilian), while the State has lost jobs since 1982. State and



Local Government accounts for most of the Government sector with the non-CMSA counties having twice the percentage of the region as a whole. Walker County has the highest percentage of Government employees with more than four of ten employees working for the government.

What Does It Mean

This discussion of industrial mix covers only the tiniest tip of the iceberg. And it is rare that any one factor is responsible for a change in the economic base. Subsequently, why would any individual business or governmental unit bother with understanding industrial mix? Because you can't change or avoid an iceberg if you don't know it exists.

by Industry B <th< th=""><th>Distributio Employme</th><th>n of nt</th><th>Hor.</th><th>-isa-</th><th></th><th>5</th><th>Uring To.</th><th>"ation/</th><th>le Trad</th><th>ade</th><th></th><th></th></th<>	Distributio Employme	n of nt	Hor.	-isa-		5	Uring To.	"ation/	le Trad	ade		
Austin 1972 2.5% 1.1% 8.8% 6.5% 6.4% 5.1% 2.3.7% 8.6% 2.2.7% 1.3 1992 3.4% 1.5% 10.4% 9.5% 4.6% 7.0% 18.3% 7.9% 22.7% 15.5% 16.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 1.5% 7.9% 22.7% 15.5% 16.5% 16.5% 16.5% 16.5% 16.5% 16.5% 16.5% 16.5% 16.5% 6.5% 5.5% 1.3% 19.6% 4.0% 22.4% 12.5% 12.	by Industry	1	Ag. Sen.	Mining	Construc	Manufact	Transpo	Whole	Retain	FLAT	Service.	Gove.
Austin 102 1.2.% 3.0.% 9.8% 12.7% 5.1.% 2.1.% 13.4% 10.3% 20.9% 12.7% <th1< td=""><td></td><td>1972</td><td>2.5%</td><td>1 1%</td><td>8.8%</td><td>6.5%</td><td>6.4%</td><td>5 1%</td><td>23.7%</td><td>8.6%</td><td>22 5%</td><td>12.0</td></th1<>		1972	2.5%	1 1%	8.8%	6.5%	6.4%	5 1%	23.7%	8.6%	22 5%	12.0
Factoria 1992 3.4% 1.5% 0.4% 9.5% 4.6% 7.0% 18.5% 7.9% 2.3.3% 11 1972 1.2% 3.1% 9.4% 26.9% 4.7% 2.0% 15.0% 4.7% 16.5% 16 1992 1.3% 1.7% 12.6% 2.0% 3.8% 1.7% 4.2% 22.4% 13.1% 9.6% 1.3% 1.96% 4.0% 2.0% 1.5% 1.4% 1.3% 1.96% 4.0% 2.0% 1.5% 1.3% 1.96% 4.0% 2.0% 2.4% 1.1% 2.6% 1.4% 3.0% 1.2% 6.6% 1.1% 1.1% 1.7% 1.6% 6.5% 1.3% 1.96% 4.0% 2.6% 1.1%	Austin	1982	1.2%	3.0%	9.8%	12 7%	5.4%	5.7%	18 4%	10.3%	20.0%	12.6
Instruction Instruction <thinstruction< th=""> <thinstruction< th=""></thinstruction<></thinstruction<>	Austin	1992	3.4%	1.5%	10.4%	9.5%	4.6%	7.0%	18.5%	7.9%	23.7%	13.6
Brazoria 1982 0.9% 3.8% 11.5% 26.4% 4.4% 2.6% 14.8% 4.9% 18.0% 12 1992 1.3% 1.7% 12.6% 20.6% 3.8% 2.7% 15.7% 4.2% 22.4% 1 Chambers 1992 2.3% 9.2% 17.6% 24.6% 3.2% 2.4% 13.1% 2.6% 12.5% 1 Value 1992 2.3% 9.2% 17.6% 24.6% 3.2% 2.4% 1.1% 2.6% 1.1% 2.6% 1.1% 2.6% 1.1% 2.6% 1.1% 1.1% 2.6% 1.1% 1.1% 2.6% 1.1% 1.1% 2.6% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.2% 6.6% 2.6% 2.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%		1972	1.2%	3.1%	9.4%	26.9%	4.7%	2.0%	15.0%	4.7%	16.5%	16.4
1992 1.3% 1.7% 12.6% 20.6% 3.8% 2.7% 15.7% 4.2% 22.4% 15 Chambers 1972 3.1% 9.7% 6.5% 6.5% 5.5% 1.3% 2.6% 12.5% 12 1992 3.8% 5.9% 5.8% 17.6% 24.6% 3.2% 15.4% 3.9% 16.6% 11.6% 4.6% 4.5% 2.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 12.6% 13.4% 7.7% 10.6% 6.9% 6.2% 2.0% 4.5% 19.1% 1 192 1.7% 2.5% 8.2% 11.0% 4.3% 3.9% 14.7% 6.8% 3.0% 14.7% 6.8% 3.0% 14.7% 6.8% 3.0% 14.7% 6.8% 3.0% 14.7% 6.8% 3.0% 14.7% 6.8% 3.0% 14.7% 6.8% 8.2% 14.7% 6.8% 8.2% 15.6% 6.5% 7.7% <t< td=""><td>Brazoria</td><td>1982</td><td>0.9%</td><td>3.8%</td><td>11.5%</td><td>26.4%</td><td>4.4%</td><td>2.6%</td><td>14.8%</td><td>4.9%</td><td>18.0%</td><td>12.8</td></t<>	Brazoria	1982	0.9%	3.8%	11.5%	26.4%	4.4%	2.6%	14.8%	4.9%	18.0%	12.8
1972 3.1% 9.7% 6.5% 5.5% 1.3% 19.6% 4.0% 20.7% 22 Chambers 1982 2.3% 5.2% 17.6% 24.6% 3.2% 2.4% 15.4% 2.6% 12.5%	Druzonu	1992	1.3%	1.7%	12.6%	20.6%	3.8%	2.7%	15.7%	4.2%	22.4%	15.0
Chambers 1982 2.3% 9.2% 17.6% 6.2% 3.4% 13.1% 2.6% 12.5% 15.4% 1992 3.8% 5.9% 5.8% 17.6% 6.2% 3.4% 15.4% 3.9% 19.0% 11 Colorado 1982 2.0% 13.4% 7.7% 10.6% 6.8% 6.2% 2.0% 4.5% 26.6% 11 1972 1.1% 3.7% 7.0% 11.7% 4.8% 4.7% 12.8% 5.6% 12 1972 1.1% 3.7% 5.5% 23.6% 3.3% 1.6% 18.2% 10.0% 19.1% 17 Fort Bend 1982 0.8% 1.2% 6.6% 13.6% 7.3% 2.2% 16.4% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 6.8% 2.2% 17.9% 6.8% 2.2% 17.9% 6.8% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% </td <td></td> <td>1972</td> <td>3.1%</td> <td>9.7%</td> <td>6.5%</td> <td>6.5%</td> <td>5.5%</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>19.6%</td> <td>4.0%</td> <td>20.7%</td> <td>23.1</td>		1972	3.1%	9.7%	6.5%	6.5%	5.5%	1.3%	19.6%	4.0%	20.7%	23.1
1992 3.8% 5.9% 5.8% 17.6% 6.2% 3.4% 15.4% 26.6% 11 Colorado 1982 2.0% 13.4% 10.3% 7.4% 4.6% 4.8% 6.3% 22.4% 4.5% 26.6% 11 1992 4.5% 4.7% 7.7% 10.6% 6.2% 22.0% 4.5% 26.6% 11 1992 1.7% 3.7% 5.5% 23.6% 3.3% 1.6% 1.2% 0.0% 11.7% 4.8% 4.7% 1.6% 1.2% 0.0% 11.7% 4.8% 4.7% 1.6% 1.2% 0.0% 1.1% 1.2% 0.0% 1.2% 0.0% 1.2% 0.0% 1.2% 0.0% 1.2% 0.0% 1.2% 0.0% 2.2% 11.0% 1.2% 0.0% 2.2% 11.0% 1.2% 0.0% 2.2% 11.0% 1.2% 0.0% 2.2% 11.0% 1.2% 0.0% 2.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	Chambers	1982	2.3%	9.2%	17.6%	24.6%	3.2%	2.4%	13.1%	2.6%	12.5%	12.6
1972 1.4% 10.3% 7.4% 4.6% 6.3% 22.4% 4.5% 26.6% 11 Colorado 1982 2.0% 13.4% 7.7% 10.6% 6.9% 6.2% 20.0% 4.5% 19.1% 5 Fort Bend 1982 1.1% 3.7% 5.5% 23.6% 3.3% 1.6% 12.4% 7.0% 11.7% 4.8% 2.0% 13.1% 172 1.1% 3.4% 2.8% 12.2% 9.0% 19.1% 15 1992 1.7% 2.5% 6.6% 13.6% 7.3% 2.2% 15.6% 7.7% 10.8% 23.6% 2.2% 11.6% 6.0% 23.6% 2.2% 11.6% 0.4% 23.6% 2.2% 11.6% 0.4% 23.6% 2.2% 11.7% 8.8% 5.3% 2.2% 11.7% 8.8% 5.3% 2.2% 11.7% 8.8% 5.3% 2.2% 11.1% 4.4% 3.7% 16.6% 3.5% 2.3% 16.6% 3.8%		1992	3.8%	5.9%	5.8%	17.6%	6.2%	3.4%	15.4%	3.9%	19.0%	18.8
Colorado 1982 2.0% 13.4% 7.7% 10.6% 6.9% 6.2% 2.0% 4.5% 19.1% 5.6% Fort Bend 1972 1.1% 3.7% 5.5% 2.6% 3.3% 1.6% 12.4% 7.0% 11.7% 4.8% 4.7% 15.8% 4.8% 25.6% 11 Fort Bend 1992 1.7% 2.5% 8.2% 11.0% 4.3% 3.9% 14.7% 6.8% 30.7% 16 1992 1.7% 2.5% 8.2% 11.0% 4.3% 3.9% 14.7% 6.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 17.8% 2.2% 18.7% 3.6% 6.3% 2.6% 5.5% 3.7% 15.6% 3.7% 18.6% 5.1% 18.7% 12.3% 18.7% 12.3% 18.7%		1972	1.4%	10.3%	7.4%	4.6%	4.8%	6.3%	22.4%	4.5%	26.6%	11.6
1992 4.5% 7.0% 11.7% 4.8% 4.7% 15.8% 4.8% 25.6% 12 Fort Bend 1982 1.2% 5.4% 6.6% 3.3% 1.6% 15.4% 7.0% 17.4% 2.1% 1992 1.7% 2.5% 8.2% 11.0% 4.3% 3.8% 14.7% 6.8% 30.7% 14 1992 0.7% 0.6% 5.0% 17.3% 8.2% 2.2% 15.6% 7.7% 17.8% 2.4% Galveston 1982 0.8% 1.2% 6.6% 8.8% 5.3% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.36% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.36% 2.2% 11.3% 1.5% 6.6% 8.5% 3.7% 6.4% 5.5% 3.7% 1.5% 8.6% 23.6% 2.2% 11.3% 1.5% 8.6% 5.3% 2.2% 11.8% 10.8% 1.2% 1.5% 1.6% 5.1% 1.8% 1.6% 5.1% 1.8% 1.6% 5.1% </td <td>Colorado</td> <td>1982</td> <td>2.0%</td> <td>13.4%</td> <td>7.7%</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td>6.9%</td> <td>6.2%</td> <td>20.0%</td> <td>4.5%</td> <td>19.1%</td> <td>9.6</td>	Colorado	1982	2.0%	13.4%	7.7%	10.6%	6.9%	6.2%	20.0%	4.5%	19.1%	9.6
Fort Bend 1972 1.1% 3.7% 5.5% 23.6% 3.3% 1.6% 1E.4% 7.0% 17.4% 21 Galveston 1992 1.2% 5.4% 6.6% 24.7% 3.4% 2.8% 12.2% 9.0% 19.1% 1 Galveston 1982 0.7% 0.6% 5.0% 17.3% 8.2% 2.2% 15.6% 8.0% 2.04% 2.2% 1992 0.3% 1.2% 6.8% 8.8% 5.3% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.3% 2.2% 11 9.0% 2.3% 2.2% 11 15.1% 8.5% 2.2% 11 9.1% 12.5% 6.5% 7.7% 15.1% 8.5% 2.2% 11 9.1% 12.5% 6.5% 7.7% 15.1% 8.5% 2.2% 11 12.3% 12.5% 6.5% 7.7% 15.1% 8.1% 12.3% 17.6% 15.5% 8.0% 3.0% 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 17.6% 15.5% 8.0		1992	4.5%	4.7%	7.0%	11.7%	4.8%	4.7%	15.8%	4.8%	25.6%	12.3
Fort Bend 1982 1.2% 5.4% 6.6% 24.7% 3.4% 2.8% 12.2% 9.0% 19.1% 14 1992 1.7% 2.5% 8.2% 11.0% 4.3% 3.9% 14.7% 6.8% 30.7% 16 Galveston 1982 0.8% 1.2% 6.6% 13.6% 7.3% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 2.2% 17.9%		1972	1.1%	3.7%	5.5%	23.6%	3.3%	1.6%	15.4%	7.0%	17.4%	21.5
1992 1.7% 2.5% 8.2% 11.0% 4.3% 3.9% 14.7% 6.8% 30.7% 14 1972 0.7% 0.6% 5.0% 17.3% 8.2% 2.2% 15.6% 7.7% 17.8% 24 1992 1.3% 1.2% 6.6% 18.6% 5.3% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 24 1992 0.4% 3.5% 8.2% 14.9% 7.3% 8.2% 15.6% 8.6% 23.6% 22.2% 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 24 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 24 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 24 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 22.2% 11.9% 1.992 1.7% 1.0% 7.5% 1.1% 1.4% 1.5% 7.5% 1.1% </td <td>Fort Bend</td> <td>1982</td> <td>1.2%</td> <td>5.4%</td> <td>6.6%</td> <td>24.7%</td> <td>3.4%</td> <td>2.8%</td> <td>12.2%</td> <td>9.0%</td> <td>19.1%</td> <td>15.7</td>	Fort Bend	1982	1.2%	5.4%	6.6%	24.7%	3.4%	2.8%	12.2%	9.0%	19.1%	15.7
1972 0.7% 0.6% 5.0% 17.3% 8.2% 12.6% 7.7% 17.8% 2.2% Galveston 1982 0.8% 1.2% 6.6% 13.6% 7.3% 2.4% 16.6% 8.0% 23.6% 22.8% Harris 1992 0.3% 1.2% 6.8% 8.8% 5.3% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 22.2% 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 22.2% 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 22.2% 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 22.2% 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 22.2% 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 22.2% 17.9% 8.2% 12.9% 12.9% 13.6% 17.7% 15.1% 8.6% 23.9% 16.6% 8.1% 12.0% 5.5% 3.7% 18.1% 12.9% 10.3% 11.3% 4.5% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 10.7% 17.3% 8.3% 2.2%		1992	1.7%	2.5%	8.2%	11.0%	4.3%	3.9%	14.7%	6.8%	30.7%	16.1
Galveston 1982 0.8% 1.2% 6.6% 13.6% 7.3% 2.4% 16.4% 8.0% 20.4% 2 1992 1.3% 1.2% 6.6% 8.8% 5.3% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 2 Harris 1982 0.5% 7.1% 9.1% 12.5% 6.5% 7.7% 15.1% 8.6% 23.9% 1 1992 0.7% 4.4% 6.9% 8.9% 6.4% 6.4% 5.9% 21.3% 1 1972 1.8% 10.8% 7.2% 6.3% 5.5% 3.7% 16.6% 5.1% 5.9% 21.3% 1 1992 1.4% 15.0% 7.5% 12.1% 4.4% 3.7% 18.6% 5.1% 5.1% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 1.8% 3.0% 18.1% 4.3% 30.0% 14 14.9% 9.0% 0.0% 5.2% 28.3% 6.3% 0.0% 17.5% 18.3% 17.9% 8.8% 2		1972	0.7%	0.6%	5.0%	17.3%	8.2%	2.2%	15.6%	7.7%	17.8%	24.8
1992 1.3% 1.2% 6.8% 8.8% 5.3% 2.2% 17.9% 8.0% 23.6% 22.2% 11 1972 0.4% 3.5% 8.2% 14.9% 7.3% 8.2% 15.6% 8.5% 22.2% 11 1982 0.5% 7.1% 9.1% 12.5% 6.5% 7.7% 15.1% 8.6% 23.9% 5 1992 0.7% 4.4% 6.9% 8.9% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 5.5% 3.7% 16.6% 5.9% 21.3% 15 Liberty 1982 1.4% 15.0% 7.5% 12.1% 4.4% 3.7% 18.6% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.4% 16 1972 3.2% 8.4% 6.4% 6.7% 5.0% 5.1% 20.3% 6.2% 20.4% 17 1992 6.1% 4.1% 14.9% 9.0% 0.0% 5.2% 28.3% 6.3% 0.0% 16.4% 3.7% 17.6% 18 12.3% 12.3% </td <td>Galveston</td> <td>1982</td> <td>0.8%</td> <td>1.2%</td> <td>6.6%</td> <td>13.6%</td> <td>7.3%</td> <td>2.4%</td> <td>16.4%</td> <td>8.0%</td> <td>20.4%</td> <td>23.2</td>	Galveston	1982	0.8%	1.2%	6.6%	13.6%	7.3%	2.4%	16.4%	8.0%	20.4%	23.2
1972 0.4% 3.5% 8.2% 14.9% 7.3% 8.2% 15.6% 8.5% 22.2% 11 Harris 1982 0.5% 7.1% 9.1% 12.5% 6.5% 7.7% 15.1% 8.6% 23.9% 6 1992 0.7% 4.4% 6.9% 8.9% 6.4% 6.4% 15.5% 8.6% 23.9% 16 Liberty 1982 1.4% 15.0% 7.2% 6.3% 5.5% 3.7% 21.6% 5.1% 18.6% 5.1% 18.7% 16.7% 17.2% 13.7% 12.1% 4.4% 3.7% 18.6% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.2% 16.6% 18.7% 11.3% 2.8% </td <td></td> <td>1992</td> <td>1.3%</td> <td>1.2%</td> <td>6.8%</td> <td>8.8%</td> <td>5.3%</td> <td>2.2%</td> <td>17.9%</td> <td>8.0%</td> <td>23.6%</td> <td>24.9</td>		1992	1.3%	1.2%	6.8%	8.8%	5.3%	2.2%	17.9%	8.0%	23.6%	24.9
Harris 1982 0.5% 7.1% 9.1% 12.5% 6.5% 7.7% 15 1% 8.8% 23.9% 8 1992 0.7% 4.4% 6.9% 8.9% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.8% 8.0% 3.18% 11 1972 1.8% 10.8% 7.2% 6.3% 5.5% 3.7% 21.6% 5.9% 21.3% 15 1992 1.8% 3.7% 6.2% 11.3% 4.4% 3.7% 18 6% 5.1% 20.3% 11 18 3.7% 12.1% 4.4% 3.7% 18 6% 5.1% 20.3% 15.1% 20.5% 11 1992 1.8% 3.7% 6.2% 20.4% 1 14.9% 90.0% 0.0% 5.2% 28.3% 6.3% 0.0% 16 1992 1.7% 3.0% 8.1% 8.0% 3.2% 5.1% 19.3% 17.5% 15 19.3% 14.4% 17.6% 17.7% 3.3% 14.4% </td <td>Hamle</td> <td>1972</td> <td>0.4%</td> <td>3.5%</td> <td>8.2%</td> <td>14.9%</td> <td>7.3%</td> <td>8.2%</td> <td>15.6%</td> <td>8.5%</td> <td>22.2%</td> <td>11.2</td>	Hamle	1972	0.4%	3.5%	8.2%	14.9%	7.3%	8.2%	15.6%	8.5%	22.2%	11.2
Liberty 1982 0.7% 4.4% 6.9% 8.9% 6.4% 15.5% 8.0% 31.8% 11 1972 1.4% 10.8% 7.2% 6.3% 5.5% 3.7% 21.6% 5.9% 21.3% 15 1982 1.4% 15.0% 7.5% 12.1% 4.4% 3.7% 18.6% 5.1% 18.7% 15 1982 1.4% 15.0% 7.5% 12.1% 4.4% 3.7% 18.6% 5.1% 18.7% 15 1992 1.4% 3.7% 6.2% 11.3% 4.5% 3.0% 18.1% 4.3% 30.2% 16 1972 3.2% 8.4% 6.4% 6.7% 5.0% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.5% 15 1992 6.1% 4.1% 14.9% 9.0% 0.0% 5.2% 28.3% 6.3% 0.0% 16 1992 6.1% 4.1% 14.9% 9.0% 0.0% 5.2% 28.3% 6.3% 0.0% 16 1972 1.1% 2.9% 12.3% 8.9% 4.1% 3.5% 18.3% 12.3% 17.5% 18 1992 1.7% 3.0% 8.1% 8.0% 3.2% 5.1% 19.1% 8.8% 22.2% 14 1992 1.7% 3.0% 8.1% 8.0% 3.2% 5.1% 19.1% 8.8% 22.2% 14 1992 1.7% 3.0% 8.1% 8.0% 3.2% 5.1% 19.1% 5.4% 15.5% 36 1982 0.8% 1.7% 3.4% 11.4% 2.2% 4.0% 19.1% 5.4% 15.5% 36 1982 0.8% 1.7% 3.4% 11.4% 2.2% 4.0% 19.1% 5.4% 15.5% 36 1992 1.0% 0.5% 3.5% 6.6% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 45 1992 1.0% 0.5% 3.5% 6.6% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 45 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 3.3% 4.9% 4.3% 4.6% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 5.0% 18.4% 47 Walker 1982 1.9% 3.8% 4.4% 6.2% 4.6% 4.9% 19.3% 5.3% 26.5% 17 1992 3.3% 4.9% 4.3% 4.6% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 5.9% 24.0% 16 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 22 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 5.6% 19.7% 5.9% 24.0% 16 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 4.8% 1.8% 2.6% 20.9% 4.2% 17.7% 38 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 4.8% 1.8% 2.6% 20.9% 4.2% 17.7% 38 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 17 1992 3.3% 4.9% 4.3% 4.6% 4.8% 4.5% 4.4% 4.6% 19.7% 5.9% 24.0% 16 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 17 1992 3.3% 4.9% 4.3% 9.7% 4.5% 4.6% 4.9% 19.3% 5.3% 23.1% 10 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 15 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 15 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 15 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 15 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 15 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 15 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 15 1992 0.9% 6.8% 9.0% 13.2% 6.2% 6.9% 15.3%	Harris	1982	0.5%	7.1%	9.1%	12.5%	6.5%	7.7%	15 1%	8.6%	23.9%	9.0
Liberty 1982 1.4% 15.0% 7.5% 12.1% 4.4% 3.7% 116 % 5.9% 21.3% 11 1992 1.8% 3.7% 6.2% 11.3% 4.4% 3.7% 116 % 5.1% 18.7% 15 1992 1.8% 3.7% 6.2% 11.3% 4.5% 3.0% 18.1% 4.3% 30.2% 16 1972 3.2% 8.4% 6.4% 6.7% 5.0% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.5% 19 Matagorda 1982 4.0% 8.1% 12.0% 5.8% 4.3% 2.8% 20.8% 6.2% 20.4% 15 1992 6.1% 4.1% 14.9% 9.0% 0.0% 5.2% 28.3% 6.3% 0.0% 16 1972 1.1% 2.9% 12.3% 8.9% 4.1% 3.5% 18.3% 12.3% 17.6% 11 1982 1.3% 7.8% 9.5% 10.0% 3.8% 3.7% 17.9% 8.8% 22.2% 14 1992 1.3% 7.8% 9.5% 10.0% 3.8% 3.7% 17.3% 8.8% 22.2% 14 1992 1.0% 0.6% 4.7% 8.6% 2.7% 1.7% 17.3% 4.4% 17.0% 42 1992 1.0% 0.6% 4.7% 8.6% 2.7% 1.7% 17.3% 4.4% 17.0% 42 1992 1.0% 0.6% 4.7% 8.6% 2.7% 1.7% 17.3% 4.4% 17.0% 42 1992 1.0% 0.6% 3.7% 1.4% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 44 1972 1.5% 3.6% 3.7% 1.4% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 44 1972 1.5% 3.6% 3.7% 1.4% 1.8% 2.0% 20.9% 4.2% 17.7% 32 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 1992 0.0% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 11 1992 0.3% 4.9% 4.3% 9.7% 4.5% 4.6% 4.5% 4.4% 20.0% 5.3% 22.8% 22 Non-CMSA 1982 0.6% 6.8% 9.0% 13.2% 6.2% 6.9% 15.3% 8.3% 23.1% 10 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 15 1992 0.1% 6.4% 15.0% 5.7% 5.9% 16.6% 7.7% 20.1% 19.2% 5.3% 5.6% 10.9% 5.6% 19.7% 22.5% 16.0% 5.8% 5.5% 5.1% 17.0% 7.5% 28.5% 16.0% 5.6% 5		1992	0.7%	4.4%	6.9%	8.9%	6.4%	6.4%	15.5%	8.0%	31.8%	11.0
Liberty 1962 1.4% 15.0% 7.5% 12.1% 4.4% 3.7% 18.1% 5.1% 18.1% 18.7% 11.3% 3.7% 18.1% 3.7% 18.1% 4.3% 20.2% 11.3% 3.7% 18.1% 4.3% 20.2% 11.3% 3.7% 18.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 1.3% 1.3% 1.3% 1.3% 1.3% 1.3% 12.3% 1.3% 12.3% <th12.3%< th=""> <th12.3%< th=""> <th12.3%< t<="" td=""><td>Liborty</td><td>1972</td><td>1.8%</td><td>10.8%</td><td>7.2%</td><td>0.3%</td><td>5.5%</td><td>3.7%</td><td>216%</td><td>5.9%</td><td>21.3%</td><td>15.9</td></th12.3%<></th12.3%<></th12.3%<>	Liborty	1972	1.8%	10.8%	7.2%	0.3%	5.5%	3.7%	216%	5.9%	21.3%	15.9
Matagorda 1.3% 3.7% 0.2% 11.3% 4.3% 5.0% 5.1% 20.2% 11.3% 4.3% 2.3% 8.4% 6.4% 6.4% 6.7% 5.0% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 6.3% 0.0% 11 1992 6.1% 4.1% 14.9% 9.0% 0.0% 5.2% 28.3% 6.3% 0.0% 11 1172 1.1% 2.9% 12.3% 17.6% 18 Montgomery 1982 1.3% 7.8% 9.5% 10.0% 3.8% 3.7% 17.3% 8.8% 22.2% 14 1972 1.7% 3.0% 8.1% 8.0% 3.2% 5.1% 19.1% 6.7% 30.3% 14 1972 1.7% 3.4% 11.4% 2.2% 4.0% 19.1% 5.5% 35% 4.6% 1.3% 2.0% 16.3% 4.4% 17.5% 1.3% 4.4% 17.5% 3.9% 2.0%	Liberty	1962	1.4%	15.0%	1.5%	12.1%	4.4%	3.7%	18 6%	5.1%	18.7%	13.3
Matagorda 1982 6.4% 6.4% 6.7% 5.0% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 5.1% 20.3% 6.2% 20.4% 14 1992 6.1% 4.1% 14.9% 9.0% 0.0% 5.2% 28.3% 6.2% 0.0% 14 1972 1.1% 2.9% 12.3% 8.9% 4.1% 3.5% 17.9% 8.8% 22.2% 14 1992 1.7% 3.0% 8.1% 8.0% 2.7% 1.7% 17.3% 4.4% 17.7% 3.6% 3.2% 5.1% 19.1% 5.4% 15.5% 36 1982 0.8% 1.7% 3.4% 11.4% 2.2% 10.7% 5.6% 18.4% 4.3% 18.5% 4.4% 12.9% <td></td> <td>1992</td> <td>1.0%</td> <td>0.1%</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>0 70/</td> <td>4.5%</td> <td>5.0%</td> <td>18 1%</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>30.2%</td> <td>10.8</td>		1992	1.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0 70/	4.5%	5.0%	18 1%	4.3%	30.2%	10.8
Matagoriua 1002 6.1% 11.% 14.2% 5.0% 4.3% 2.6% 20.8% 6.2% 20.4% 11 1992 6.1% 4.1% 14.9% 9.0% 0.0% 5.2% 20.8% 6.3% 0.0% 16 1972 1.1% 2.9% 12.3% 8.9% 4.1% 3.5% 18.3% 12.3% 17.6% 19 1982 1.3% 7.8% 9.5% 10.0% 3.8% 3.7% 17.9% 8.8% 22.2% 1 1992 1.7% 3.0% 8.1% 8.0% 2.7% 1.7% 17.3% 4.4% 17.0% 4.4% 1992 1.0% 0.6% 4.7% 8.6% 2.7% 1.7% 17.3% 4.4% 17.0% 4.4% 1992 1.0% 0.6% 3.7% 1.4% 1.4% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 4.4% 17.6% 18.9% 20.9% 18.4% 4.4% 1992 0.0% 6.2% <t< td=""><td>Matagorda</td><td>10972</td><td>3.2%</td><td>0.4%</td><td>0.4%</td><td>0.7% E 00/</td><td>5.0%</td><td>0.0%</td><td>20.3%</td><td>5.1%</td><td>20.5%</td><td>19.3</td></t<>	Matagorda	10972	3.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7% E 00/	5.0%	0.0%	20.3%	5.1%	20.5%	19.3
Montgomery 11%	Matayorua	1002	6.1%	1 1%	1/ 0%	0.0%	4.0%	5.0%	20.0 /0	6 20/	20.4%	10.0
Montgomery 1982 1.3% 7.8% 9.5% 10.0% 3.8% 3.7% 17.3% 18.8% 22.2% 14 1992 1.7% 3.0% 8.1% 8.0% 3.2% 5.1% 19.1% 6.7% 30.3% 14 1992 1.7% 3.0% 8.1% 8.0% 3.2% 5.1% 19.1% 6.7% 30.3% 14 1972 1.0% 0.6% 4.7% 8.6% 2.7% 17.3% 4.4% 17.0% 4 1992 1.0% 0.5% 3.5% 6.6% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 42 1992 1.0% 0.5% 3.5% 6.6% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 42% 1972 1.5% 3.6% 3.7% 1.4% 1.5% 2.0% 4.2% 17.7% 36 1982 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.9% 19.6% 2.9% 19.6%		1972	1 1%	2 9%	12 3%	8.0%	1 1%	3.5%	18 3%	12 3%	17.6%	10.5
Workgontery 1002 1.07% 3.07% 6.07% 5.07% 17.7% 17.7% 22.2% 1 1992 1.7% 3.07% 6.17% 17.7% 17.7% 6.7% 6.7% 6.7% 6.7% 10.7% 17.7% 17.3% 6.7% 10.7% 4.4% 17.0% 4.4% 17.0% 4.4% 17.0% 4.4% 17.0% 4.4% 17.0% 4.4% 17.0% 4.4% 15.5% 3.6% 5.1% 1.7% 17.7% 17.3% 4.4% 17.5% 4.5% 4.4% 17.5% 4.4% 17.5% 4.4% 15.5% 3.6% 5.1% 5.6% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 44 47 1852 1.9% 3.8% 4.3% 4.6% 1.8% 2.6% 20.9% 18.4% 47 Walker 1982 1.9% 3.8% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 20.5% 17 19.3% 5.9% 20.5% 17 19.2% 20.5%	Montgomery	1982	1.3%	7.8%	9.5%	10.0%	3.8%	3.7%	17 0%	8.8%	20.0%	14.0
1972 1.0% 0.6% 4.7% 8.6% 2.7% 1.7% 17.3% 4.4% 17.0% 4.4 1982 0.8% 1.7% 3.4% 11.4% 2.2% 1.7% 17.3% 4.4% 17.0% 4.4 1992 1.0% 0.5% 3.5% 6.6% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 44 1992 1.0% 0.5% 3.6% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 44 1972 1.5% 3.6% 3.7% 1.4% 1.5% 0.9% 16.3% 5.0% 18.4% 41 1982 1.9% 3.8% 4.3% 4.6% 1.8% 2.6% 20.9% 19.6% 22 1972 2.3% 8.8% 4.4% 6.2% 5.1% 5.6% 19.3% 5.3% 26.5% 17 1992 0.9% 11.9% 5.0% 6.2% 5.1% 5.6% 19.3% 5.3% 2.6% 1.6%	monigomery	1992	1.7%	3.0%	8.1%	8.0%	3.2%	5.1%	19.1%	6.7%	30.3%	14.8
Waller 1982 0.8% 1.7% 3.4% 11.4% 2.2% 4.0% 19.1% 5.4% 15.5% 36 1992 1.0% 0.5% 3.5% 6.6% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 44 1972 1.5% 3.6% 3.7% 1.4% 1.5% 0.9% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 45 Walker 1982 1.9% 3.6% 4.3% 4.6% 1.8% 2.0% 2.0% 4.2% 17.7% 32 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.9% 19.6% 2.9% 1972 2.3% 8.8% 4.4% 6.2% 5.6% 19.7% 5.9% 24.0% 16 1982 2.9% 11.9% 5.0% 6.2% 5.6% 19.7% 5.9% 24.0% 16 1982 0.8% 4.3% 9.7% 4.5% 5.6% 18.9% 2.16% 16 18.3%		1972	1.0%	0.6%	4.7%	8.6%	2.7%	1.7%	17 3%	4 4%	17.0%	42 1
1992 1.0% 0.5% 3.5% 6.6% 1.8% 2.0% 16.4% 4.3% 18.5% 4.4% 1972 1.5% 3.6% 3.7% 1.4% 1.5% 0.9% 16.3% 5.0% 18.4% 4.4% Walker 1982 1.9% 3.8% 4.3% 4.6% 1.8% 2.6% 20.9% 4.2% 17.7% 36 1982 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 22 1972 2.3% 8.8% 4.4% 6.2% 4.6% 4.9% 19.3% 5.3% 26.5% 17 1982 0.0% 0.0% 6.2% 5.1% 5.6% 19.7% 5.9% 24.0% 16 1992 3.3% 4.9% 4.3% 9.7% 4.5% 5.6% 16.9% 22.8% 16 16 4.3% 23.1% 16 16 16 16.3% 8.3% 23.1% 16 19.2%	Waller	1982	0.8%	1.7%	3.4%	11.4%	2.2%	4.0%	19.1%	5.4%	15.5%	36.7
Walker 1972 1.5% 3.6% 3.7% 1.4% 1.5% 0.9% 16.3% 5.0% 18.4% 4.4% 1982 1.9% 3.8% 4.3% 4.6% 1.8% 2.6% 20.9% 4.2% 17.7% 3 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 25 Wharton 1982 2.9% 11.9% 5.0% 6.2% 5.1% 5.6% 16.9% 5.9% 24.0% 16 1982 2.9% 11.9% 5.0% 6.2% 5.1% 5.6% 16.9% 6.2% 28.0% 16 1992 0.6% 6.5% 8.0% 15.0% 7.0% 7.3% 15.8% 8.2% 21.1% 16 1992 0.6% 6.8% 9.0% 13.2% 6.2% 6.9% 15.3% 8.3% 23.1% 10 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8%	anor	1992	1.0%	0.5%	3.5%	6.6%	1.8%	2.0%	16.4%	4.3%	18.5%	45.4
Walker 1982 1.9% 3.8% 4.3% 4.6% 1.8% 2.6% 20.9% 4.2% 17.7% 33 1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 2.0% 2.9% 19.6% 24 Wharton 1982 2.3% 8.8% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 24 Wharton 1982 2.9% 11.9% 5.0% 6.2% 5.1% 5.6% 19.7% 5.9% 24.0% 13 1992 3.3% 4.9% 4.3% 9.7% 4.5% 5.6% 19.9% 6.2% 28.0% 16 16 16 16 17 16 16 16 16 16 16 17 16 1		1972	1.5%	3.6%	3.7%	1.4%	1.5%	0.9%	16.3%	5.0%	18.4%	47.5
1992 0.0% 0.0% 4.4% 17.6% 1.9% 2.3% 20.2% 2.9% 19.6% 2.9% 1972 2.3% 8.8% 4.4% 6.2% 4.6% 4.9% 19.3% 5.3% 26.5% 11 1982 2.9% 11.9% 5.0% 6.2% 5.1% 5.6% 19.7% 5.9% 24.0% 12 1982 2.9% 11.9% 5.0% 6.2% 5.1% 5.6% 19.7% 5.9% 24.0% 12 1992 3.3% 4.9% 4.3% 9.7% 4.5% 5.6% 18.9% 6.2% 2.1% 16.1% 1992 0.6% 3.5% 8.0% 15.0% 7.0% 7.3% 15.8% 8.2% 21.6% 13 1992 0.6% 6.8% 9.0% 13.2% 6.2% 6.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 12.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8%	Walker	1982	1.9%	3.8%	4.3%	4.6%	1.8%	2.6%	20.9%	4.2%	17.7%	38.3
Wharton 1972 2.3% 8.8% 4.4% 6.2% 4.6% 4.9% 19.3% 5.3% 26.5% 17 1982 2.9% 11.9% 5.0% 6.2% 5.1% 5.6% 19.3% 5.9% 24.0% 16 1992 3.3% 4.9% 4.3% 9.7% 4.5% 5.6% 16.9% 6.2% 28.0% 16 1992 0.6% 3.5% 8.0% 15.0% 7.0% 7.3% 15.8% 8.3% 23.1% 10 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 12 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 12 1992 2.1% 6.2% 5.8% 6.6% 4.5% 4.4% 20.0% 5.3% 25.3% 28.5% 21.6% 15 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 12 192 3.1% 2.1%		1992	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	17.6%	1.9%	2.3%	20.2%	2.9%	19.6%	29.9
Wharton 1982 2.9% 11.9% 5.0% 6.2% 5.1% 5.6% 19.7% 5.9% 24.0% 13 1992 3.3% 4.9% 4.3% 9.7% 4.5% 5.6% 16.9% 6.2% 28.0% 11 1972 0.6% 3.5% 8.0% 15.0% 7.0% 7.3% 15.8% 8.2% 21.6% 13 Region 1982 0.6% 6.8% 9.0% 13.2% 6.2% 6.9% 15.3% 8.3% 23.1% 10 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 12 1972 2.1% 6.2% 5.8% 6.6% 4.5% 4.4% 20.0% 5.3% 22.8% 22 8% 22 8% 22 8% 23.1% 15.9% 5.3% 15.9% 5.3% 19.8% 15.8% 19.8% 15.8% 19.8% 15.8% 19.7% 24.9% 16.6% 7.7%		1972	2.3%	8.8%	4.4%	6.2%	4.6%	4.9%	19.3%	5.3%	26.5%	17.8
1992 3.3% 4.9% 4.3% 9.7% 4.5% 5.6% 16.9% 6.2% 28.0% 16 1972 0.6% 3.5% 8.0% 15.0% 7.0% 7.3% 15.8% 8.2% 21.6% 10 1982 0.6% 6.8% 9.0% 13.2% 6.2% 6.9% 15.9% 8.3% 23.1% 10 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 12 1972 2.1% 6.2% 5.8% 6.6% 4.5% 4.4% 20.0% 5.3% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 22.8% 21.8% 10.8%	Wharton	1982	2.9%	11.9%	5.0%	6.2%	5.1%	5.6%	19.7%	5.9%	24.0%	13.6
1972 0.6% 3.5% 8.0% 15.0% 7.0% 7.3% 15.8% 8.2% 21.6% 15.3% Region 1982 0.6% 6.8% 9.0% 13.2% 6.2% 6.9% 15.3% 8.3% 23.1% 10 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 12 Non-CMSA 1982 2.2% 7.4% 7.0% 8.9% 4.4% 4.6% 19.7% 6.1% 19.8% 15 1992 3.1% 2.2% 7.4% 7.0% 8.9% 4.4% 4.6% 19.7% 6.1% 19.8% 15 1992 3.1% 2.2% 7.4% 7.0% 8.9% 3.0% 4.4% 19.7% 6.1% 19.8% 15 1992 3.1% 2.9% 6.7% 8.8% 3.0% 4.4% 19.7% 6.1% 19.8% 15 1992 3.1% 5.2% 5.9% 16.6% <td></td> <td>1992</td> <td>3.3%</td> <td>4.9%</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>9.7%</td> <td>4.5%</td> <td>5.6%</td> <td>16.9%</td> <td>6.2%</td> <td>28.0%</td> <td>16.7</td>		1992	3.3%	4.9%	4.3%	9.7%	4.5%	5.6%	16.9%	6.2%	28.0%	16.7
Region 1982 0.6% 6.8% 9.0% 13.2% 6.2% 6.9% 15.3% 8.3% 23.1% 11 1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 11 1972 2.1% 6.2% 5.8% 6.6% 4.5% 4.4% 20.0% 5.3% 23.1% 11 1972 2.1% 6.2% 5.8% 6.6% 4.5% 4.4% 20.0% 5.3% 23.8% 22 1982 2.2% 7.4% 7.0% 8.9% 4.4% 4.6% 19.7% 6.1% 19.8% 15 1982 3.1% 2.9% 6.7% 8.8% 3.0% 4.4% 10.6% 7.7% 20.1% 19.8% 15 1982 3.1% 2.9% 6.7% 8.8% 3.0% 4.4% 10.6% 7.7% 20.1% 19.2% 10.8% 10.8% 5.3% 5.1% 17.0% 7.6% 28.5% 16.0%<		1972	0.6%	3.5%	8.0%	15.0%	7.0%	7.3%	15.8%	8.2%	21.6%	13.1
1992 0.9% 4.0% 7.2% 9.4% 6.0% 5.8% 15.9% 7.6% 30.5% 14 1972 2.1% 6.2% 5.8% 6.6% 4.5% 4.4% 20.0% 5.3% 22.8% 22 1982 2.2% 7.4% 7.0% 8.9% 4.4% 4.6% 19.7% 6.1% 19.8% 15 1982 3.1% 2.9% 6.7% 8.8% 3.0% 4.4% 19.7% 6.1% 19.8% 12 1992 3.1% 2.9% 6.7% 8.8% 3.0% 4.4% 19.7% 5.6% 19.7% 24 1992 3.1% 2.9% 6.7% 8.8% 3.0% 4.4% 19.7% 5.6% 19.7% 24 19.2% 24 192 3.0% 5.4% 10.8% 5.3% 5.1% 17.0% 7.6% 28.5% 16.0% 2 1982 3.0% 5.4% 10.8% 5.3% 5.1% 17.0% 7.6%	Region	1982	0.6%	6.8%	9.0%	13.2%	6.2%	6.9%	15.3%	8.3%	23.1%	10.5
Non-CMSA 1972 2.1% 6.2% 5.8% 6.6% 4.5% 4.4% 20.0% 5.3% 22.8% 21 1982 2.2% 7.4% 7.0% 8.9% 4.4% 4.6% 19.7% 6.1% 19.8% 19 1992 3.1% 2.9% 6.7% 8.8% 3.0% 4.4% 19.0% 5.6% 19.7% 24 1992 3.1% 2.9% 6.7% 8.8% 3.0% 4.4% 19.0% 5.6% 19.7% 24 1972 2.7% 6.4% 15.0% 5.7% 5.9% 16.6% 7.7% 20.1% 19.2% 3.0% 5.4% 10.8% 5.3% 5.1% 17.0% 7.6% 28.5% 16.0% 2		1992	0.9%	4.0%	7.2%	9.4%	6.0%	5.8%	15.9%	7.6%	30.5%	12.6
NOn-CMSA 1982 2.2% 7.4% 7.0% 8.9% 4.4% 4.6% 19.7% 6.1% 19.8% 11 1992 3.1% 2.9% 6.7% 8.8% 3.0% 4.4% 19.7% 5.6% 19.7% 24 1972 2.7% 6.4% 15.0% 5.7% 5.9% 16.6% 7.7% 20.1% 19.2% 3 Texas 1982 3.0% 5.4% 10.8% 5.3% 5.1% 17.0% 7.6% 28.5% 16.6% 2		1972	2.1%	6.2%	5.8%	6.6%	4.5%	4.4%	20.0%	5.3%	22.8%	22.3
1992 3.1% 2.9% 6.7% 8.8% 3.0% 4.4% 19.0% 5.6% 19.7% 2 1972 2.7% 6.4% 15.0% 5.7% 5.9% 16.6% 7.7% 20.1% 19.2% 3 Texas 1982 3.0% 5.4% 10.8% 5.3% 5.1% 17.0% 7.6% 28.5% 16.0% 2	Non-CMSA	1982	2.2%	7.4%	7.0%	8.9%	4.4%	4.6%	19.7%	6.1%	19.8%	19.8
Texas 1982 3.0% 5.4% 15.0% 5.7% 5.9% 16.6% 7.7% 20.1% 19.2% 3.0% 5.4% 10.8% 5.3% 5.1% 17.0% 7.6% 28.5% 16.0% 2		1992	3.1%	2.9%	6.7%	8.8%	3.0%	4.4%	19.0%	5.6%	19.7%	24.6
IEXAS 1982 3.0% 5.4% 10.8% 5.3% 5.1% 17.0% 7.6% 28.5% 16.0% 2	Tarres	1972	2.7%	6.4%	15.0%	5.7%	5.9%	16.6%	7.7%	20.1%	19.2%	3.2
1000 2.0% 5.4% 10.0% 5.0% 5.4% 47.0% 5.5% 10.0%	Texas	1982	3.0%	5.4%	10.8%	5.3%	5.1%	17.0%	7.6%	28.5%	16.0%	2.1

While Vietnam veterans usually easily outnumber WWII veterans in CMSA counties, this is not the case for Waller. At 29.9 %, Vietnam veterans can barely claim to be larger than WWII veterans with 29.3%. The County's share of Korean only veterans is the second highest in the region. While females 65 years and older were more likely to be veterans in Waller than any other county in the region, veteran status among males the same age was the second lowest in the region.

Over a third of the veterans in Wharton served in WWII with a little more than a quarter serving in Vietnam. Wharton had the highest percentage of veterans who served only in Korea at 17.1% exceeding the average for both the region and Texas. Overall, males 65 years and older where less likely to be veterans than in any other County in the region.



HARTO

The 1990 Census included questions about the individuals' veteran status. Persons who served in the military Reserves or the National Guard and were never called to active duty are not classified as veterans. The region as a whole had a somewhat smaller percentage of veterans compared to the State which

Distribution of Veterans by Time Period of Service

hose Who Served

	Vietnam Era						Korean			
Area	Post- 1975	Only	and Korean Only	and both Korea and World War II	to Jul. 1965 Only	Korean Conflict Only	& WWII no Viet- nam	World War II Only	World War I	Other Service
Austin	7.4%	18.6%	0.0%	0.3%	12.2%	15.4%	2.0%	43.3%	0.6%	0.2%
Brazoria	13.9%	34.4%	0.6%	0.7%	12.8%	13.1%	2.1%	21.5%	0.0%	0.9%
Chambers	8.2%	35.7%	0.8%	0.1%	13.5%	11.4%	1.4%	28.4%	0.1%	0.5%
Colorado	3.4%	20.9%	0.5%	0.8%	10.2%	15.1%	1.9%	46.5%	0.7%	0.1%
Fort Bend	10.9%	44.0%	1.2%	0.8%	12.2%	12.2%	1.0%	17.1%	0.0%	0.6%
Galveston	11.6%	31.7%	1.0%	0.8%	11.4%	13.3%	2.5%	26.6%	0.1%	0.9%
Harris	14.1%	33.5%	0.8%	0.4%	12.0%	13.5%	1.9%	23.2%	0.1%	0.5%
Liberty	9.2%	29.7%	0.5%	0.1%	13.4%	11.9%	2.3%	32.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Matagorda	13.7%	28.4%	0.5%	0.7%	10.9%	13.4%	0.4%	30.8%	0.4%	0.9%
Montgomery	9.7%	34.0%	1.1%	0.8%	13.6%	12.7%	2.0%	25.5%	0.1%	0.4%
Walker	16.5%	38.6%	2.1%	0.5%	10.4%	8.4%	1.7%	21.2%	0.1%	0.4%
Waller	9.4%	29.9%	0.4%	0.2%	13.1%	15.6%	1.9%	29.3%	0.0%	0.3%
Wharton	6.7%	26.6%	0.3%	0.1%	11.9%	17.1%	2,1%	34.3%	0.2%	0.7%
Region	13.2%	33.7%	0.8%	0.5%	12.1%	13.3%	1.9%	23.8%	0.1%	0.6%
Non-CMSA	11.0%	29.9%	0.9%	0.4%	11.6%	12.5%	1.7%	31.2%	0.2%	0.6%
CMSA	13.4%	34.0%	0.8%	0.5%	12.1%	13.3%	1.9%	23.2%	0.1%	0.6%
PMSA	13.5%	34.1%	0.8%	0.5%	12.1%	13.4%	1.9%	23.1%	0.1%	0.5%
State	13.5%	31.1%	1.9%	1.5%	10.3%	12.0%	2.4%	26.6%	0.2%	0.7%

may be related to the size of the military's presence in the region. Only 0.2% of the region's population was serving in the Armed Forces in 1990 compared to 2.1% for the State. The Census also shows that both men and women 65 years old and over were more likely to be veterans than their younger counterparts.

Census data may differ from the Veterans Administration data on the benefits-eligible population, since factors determining eligibility for veterans benefits differ from the rules classifying veterans in the census. Note that the period of service categories shown in this report are mutually exclusive.

CMSA Counties: Brazoria, Chambers, Fort Bend, Galveston, Harris, Liberty, Montgomery, and Waller. PMSA Counties: Chambers, Fort Bend, Harris, Liberty, Montgomery, and Waller.



The Houston-Galveston Area Council is a voluntary association of local governments and local elected officials in the 13county Gulf Coast Planning region. Organized in 1966, it provides a forum for the discussion of area-wide concerns and promotes regional cooperation through comprehensive planning and services to local governments.

Regional View is published quarterly by the Data Services Department of the Houston-Galveston Area Council. It is available without cost. Inquires and suggestions should be addressed to: Region View, Houston Galveston Area Council; 3555 Timmons Lane; P.O. Box 22777; Houston, TX 77227; (713) 627-3200.

Editor: Michelle Kretzschmar

Houston-Galveston Area Council P.O. Box 22777 Houston, TX 77227-2777

Bulk Rate U.S. Postage PAID Houston, Texas PERMIT NO. 3411