




# INVESTMENT OVERVIEW

## 2014 Community Impact Report

Travis County Health and Human Services & Veterans Service  
Research & Planning Division



JANUARY 2015

# INVESTMENT OVERVIEW

## 2014 Community Impact Report

Travis County Health and Human Services & Veterans Service  
Research & Planning Division

### County Executive

Sherri E. Fleming

### Project Leads

Courtney Bissonnet Lucas

Korey Darling

Lori Axler Miranda

### Research & Planning Division

Lawrence Lyman, Division Director

Lori Axler Miranda

DeAnna Ball

Courtney Bissonnet Lucas

Tara Carmean

Rachel Coff

Korey Darling

Amber Joiner-Hill


Brook Son

Sandra Valenzuela

Elizabeth Vela

### Questions or Comments?

For questions or for more information, please contact the Research & Planning Division at [HHS\\_R&P@traviscountytx.gov](mailto:HHS_R&P@traviscountytx.gov).



# TRAVIS COUNTY

## HEALTH and HUMAN SERVICES & VETERANS SERVICE

### PURPOSE

#### Who we are:

A Department of Travis County that serves the community under the guidance of the Commissioner's Court

#### What we do:

Address community needs through internal and external investments and services

#### What we strive to accomplish:

Maximize quality of life for all people in Travis County

- Protect vulnerable populations
- Invest in social and economic well-being
- Promote healthy living: physical, behavioral, and environmental
- Build a shared understanding of our community

### VALUES

#### We value helping people.

- We provide accessible, person-centered services with respect and care.
- We work to empower people through our service to them, always honoring the strengths and differences of the individuals and families of Travis County.

#### We value the accountability and integrity of our staff.

- We value the diversity of our staff and the experience each of us brings to TCHHS/VS.
- We honor our collective service to the public, including the careful stewardship of public funds.
- We value the quality services we provide to the community in a spirit of shared responsibility.

#### We value cooperation and collaboration in the community at large and within TCHHS/VS.

- We are interdependent and connected.
- We treat one another with respect and value effective communication and teamwork.
- We honor our partners in the community and engage with them to more efficiently and effectively serve our clients.

# Table of Contents

Introduction.....	5
Appendix A.....	15
Appendix B.....	16
Endnotes.....	18

# Introduction

The Travis County Commissioners Court, through Travis County Health and Human Services & Veterans Service Department (TCHHS/VS), annually invests nearly \$16 million in community-based social service programs. These Department investments align with and supplement our direct services to meet the critical needs of local residents. Community-based organizations are frequently geographically and culturally embedded in the communities they serve and are often best positioned to provide needed services.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMUNITY CONDITIONS

Community conditions impact social service providers and the individuals they serve. Economics, demographics, as well as social structures and systems, all influence the level of need within a community and the resources available to successfully address community needs. Community conditions help determine service delivery approaches that are most effective in addressing community needs and issues. These conditions also inform stakeholders of progress toward community goals and a particular program's contributions in advancing those goals.

Most social service programs described in this report serve Travis County residents who are in or near poverty. Some programs assist vulnerable populations, such as those experiencing abuse and neglect, irrespective of their income. Current conditions elevate the need for social services for Travis County residents:

- The Travis County population continues to grow rapidly. According to the most recent U.S. Census Bureau population estimates available, 1,120,954 people lived in Travis County in 2013. The county has grown by 28% over the past 10 years (since 2004), reflecting the addition of 242,077 residents. This is faster than the rate of growth in the state overall (Texas grew 18% between 2004 and 2013). The county population in areas outside the City of Austin has grown even more rapidly, up 43% since 2004. In 2013, more than one-quarter of county residents (26% or 293,297 people) lived in a city or village other than Austin or in an unincorporated area, compared with 23% of residents (204,485 people) in 2004. Still, the trend observed in the early- and mid-2000s of an increasingly higher share of county residents living outside of the City of Austin appears to be leveling out. The residential split has been relatively stable, with 74% of the county population inside of Austin and 26% of the county population outside of Austin since 2009.<sup>1</sup>
- The most recent poverty data was collected in 2013. These data estimate that about 16% of Travis County residents (176,920 people) live in poverty. Looking at a five-year trend, the 2013 poverty rate reflects a decrease in poverty compared to the preceding years (18% in 2012 and 2011 and 19% in 2010) and matches the poverty rate from 2009.<sup>2</sup>

- The poverty rate among children is higher than the overall poverty rate for Travis County. 2013 data indicate that 22% of children under age 18 (55,554 children) live in poverty.<sup>3</sup>
- In June 2014, there were 45,057 SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) cases in Travis County with 101,069 people (about 9% of all Travis County residents) receiving benefits. The 2014 average SNAP monthly enrollment of 44,629 (based on half-year data) reflects a decrease in cases, compared with average monthly enrollment for the four previous years which ranged from 46,428 (2010) to 51,692 (2012).<sup>4</sup>
- In 2013, close to 155,000 households in Travis County experienced a housing cost burden, which is defined as spending 30% or more of household income on housing costs; approximately 73,000 of those households experienced a severe housing cost burden (i.e. spending 50% or more on housing costs). Renters were more likely to be cost burdened than owners.<sup>5,6</sup>
- The 2014 Austin/Travis County Point-In-Time Count, conducted on January 25, 2014, provided a point-in-time snapshot of the Austin area homeless population, at a total of 1,987 homeless individuals. Seventy-seven percent (1,539) of these individuals were sheltered at the time of the count and 23% (448) were unsheltered.<sup>7</sup>
- National, state, and local unemployment rates follow an improving trend line, with Travis County consistently outperforming the state and nation. The unemployment rate for Travis County began the year at 4.6% in January 2014 but dropped to 4.1% in September. This is the lowest unemployment rate for Travis County since 2007 and remains lower than the state (5.0%) and national (5.7%) September 2014 rates.<sup>8</sup>
- In 2013, 18% of the Travis County population (or 202,261 people) lacked health insurance. Travis County's proportion of uninsured residents was higher than that of the U.S. (15%) but lower than that of Texas (22%).<sup>9</sup>
- National figures indicate that 20% of children<sup>10</sup> and 19% of adults<sup>11</sup> have some type of diagnosable mental health or addictive disorder. Applying these rates to the Travis County population, an estimated 52,000 children and 146,000 adults were living with some type of mental illness in 2013.<sup>12</sup>
- The older adult population in Travis County has increased in number and share during recent years and is projected to comprise a larger percentage of the total population in the coming decades. In 2013, there were 91,108 older adults (aged 65 and older) living in Travis County, comprising 8.1% of the population;<sup>13</sup> by 2020, a projected 125,024 older adults will make up 10.4% of the county population.<sup>14</sup>

## CLIENT DEMOGRAPHICS

Service providers collected client demographic data, when possible.<sup>a</sup> Overall, demographic data were provided for 68% to 99% of 72,969 total clients, depending on the demographic category.<sup>b</sup> Of clients with known demographics, 54% (39,382) were female and 46% (33,080) were male. Over one-half (51%, or 36,211) of these clients were White, 25% (17,371) were Black or African American, and the remainder were of another race. In terms of ethnicity,<sup>c</sup> 43% (30,189) of clients were Hispanic or Latino. Children and youth ages 17 and younger accounted for 42% (29,327) of clients. Twenty-one percent of clients (14,720) were ages 40 to 59, and 20% (13,789) were between 25 and 39 years of age. Close to one-half (42% or 20,765) of clients had incomes below 50% of the Federal Poverty Income Guidelines (FPIG), and 28% (13,975) of clients had incomes between 50% and 100% of FPIG. (See Appendix A for specific guideline income levels.)


## CLIENT LOCATION BY ZIP CODE

When possible, the contracted service providers also documented the ZIP code where clients resided when they entered the program.<sup>d</sup> Service providers collected residential information for 97% (79,316 of a total 81,389 clients<sup>e</sup>) of all clients, including clients with ZIP codes within Travis County (89%), clients with ZIP codes outside of Travis County (3%), and clients who were homeless<sup>f</sup> at entry into the program (6%); the remainder (3%) represent clients with unknown ZIP codes.

- 
- a Client demographic data may be unreported for reasons such as protection of client privacy and difficulty obtaining data (e.g., due to services delivered via outreach or at large-scale events). Clients enrolled in programs that do not collect income information were classified as “unknown” in the income level category.
  - b Please note that clients participating in more than one program are counted multiple times in the summary of contracted service providers’ data.
  - c For the purposes of tracking reported client data, TCHHS/VS has adopted demographic categories used by the U.S. Census Bureau. The U.S. Census Bureau considers race and Hispanic origin to be two separate and distinct concepts. Hispanics and Latinos may be of any race. Therefore, clients reporting their race, such as White or Black or African American, may also be Hispanic or Latino. Programs that collect race and ethnicity data in a single demographic category are encouraged to report Hispanic or Latino clients as “Some other race” in the race category.
  - d Client ZIP code data may be unreported for reasons such as protection of client privacy and difficulty obtaining data (e.g., due to services delivered via outreach or at large-scale events).
  - e Client demographic and client ZIP code totals do not match as there were a small number of programs that collected either demographic or ZIP code data but not both.
  - f The number of homeless clients served is likely underrepresented as some agencies reported the last known permanent ZIP code of the client, rather than noting that the client was homeless at entry into the program. At least one agency requires clients to provide a ZIP code to receive services; these clients may meet the definition of homeless but were able to provide a ZIP code at entry into the program.

Of clients with known ZIP codes, 21% of clients resided in the East area (17,049 clients) of Travis County. The Northeast (19% or 15,436) and Southeast (18% or 14,541) areas also had sizeable shares of clients. (See Appendix B for ZIP code classification map.)

Areas of Client Residence, 2014




## INVESTMENT BY ISSUE AREA

The following chart does not represent total TCHHS/VS investments and services. It only shows the percent of funding devoted to each issue area for the social service contracts included in this report. These contracts are a subset of the Department's broader investments of general funds in both purchased and direct services. The Department also makes grant-funded program investments.

Public Health contracts accounted for the greatest share of the TCHHS/VS investment reflected in this report, at 29% of the total investment, closely followed by Behavioral Health contracts (28%). Child and Youth Development (17%) and Workforce Development (13%) contracts also comprised sizeable shares of the total investment. The Department's investments represented varying percentages of each contracted program's total budget. Investment percentages ranged from 0.6% to 100%, constituting an average of 23% of a program's total budget. Actual investment percentages for each social service contract are provided on each program's page.

## Investment in Issue Areas for Social Service Contracts, 2014



## FUNDING SUMMARY

The 2014 Funding Amount reflects 9-month funding (January 1 through September 30, 2014) unless otherwise noted.

Agency Name	Program Name	2014 Funding Amount
<b>Behavioral Health</b>		<b>\$4,502,023</b>
Austin Child Guidance Center	Children's Outpatient Mental Health & Evaluation Services	\$76,007
Austin Travis County Integral Care	Expanded Mobile Crisis Outreach Team	\$1,000,000 <sup>i</sup>
Austin Travis County Integral Care	Main Mental Health Interlocal	\$1,058,291
Austin Travis County Integral Care	Substance Abuse Managed Services Organization	\$978,679 <sup>ii</sup>

Agency Name	Program Name	2014 Funding Amount
Austin Travis County Integral Care	System of Care Managed Services Organization	\$898,780 <sup>ii</sup>
Capital Area Counseling	Low Cost, No Session Limit, Outpatient Counseling	\$12,881
Communities In Schools of Central Texas	Care Coordination Program for Youth and Family Assessment Center	\$296,212
LifeWorks	Counseling	\$70,939
Out Youth	Youth Development	\$9,660
Workers Assistance Program	Youth Advocacy, Creating Lasting Family Connections	\$32,627
YWCA Greater Austin	YW Counseling & Referral Center	\$67,947
<b><i>Child and Youth Development</i></b>		<b>\$2,755,940</b>
African American Youth Harvest Foundation, Inc.	African American Youth Resource Center and Conferences	\$282,000
Any Baby Can, Inc.	Any Baby Can, Inc.	\$134,654
Austin Community College District	Teacher and Director TRAC	\$56,758 <sup>ii</sup>
Austin Independent School District	Travis County Collaborative Afterschool Program (TCCAP) Expansion	\$322,172
Austin Independent School District	Travis County Collaborative Afterschool Program (TCCAP) Ongoing	\$408,600
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Texas	Mentoring	\$46,693
BookSpring	Reading is Fundamental (RIF) Elementary School Program	\$9,845
Boys & Girls Clubs of Austin & Travis County, Inc.	GREAT Futures Initiative	\$150,000
Child Inc	Early Education and Care	\$156,585
Communities In Schools of Central Texas	Dropout Prevention	\$75,000
LifeWorks	Youth Development	\$54,421
Pflugerville Independent School District	After the Bell	\$69,159

Agency Name	Program Name	2014 Funding Amount
River City Youth Foundation	Dove Springs Youth Services	\$33,812
Seedling Foundation	Seedling's Promise Mentor Program – Del Valle Expansion	\$50,000 <sup>iii</sup>
The Overton Group	Early Childhood Spanish Language Program	\$25,000
Workforce Solutions Capital Area Workforce Board	Child Care Local Match	\$223,741 <sup>ii</sup>
Workforce Solutions Capital Area Workforce Board	Continuity of Child Care System Services	\$500,000
Workforce Solutions Capital Area Workforce Board	Quality Child Care Collaborative	\$157,500
<b>Food and Transportation</b>		<b>\$327,429</b>
Capital Area Food Bank of Texas	Food Bank	\$43,325
Capital Area Food Bank of Texas	Mobile Food Pantry	\$19,312
Capital Area Rural Transportation System (CARTS)	JARC	\$56,250
Capital Area Rural Transportation System (CARTS)	Rural Transit	\$98,066
Caritas of Austin	Community Kitchen	\$95,985
Sustainable Food Center	Grow Local	\$14,491
<b>Housing Continuum</b>		<b>\$620,480</b>
Austin Tenants' Council	Telephone Counseling & Mediation Program	\$18,636
Blackland Community Development Corporation	Blackland Transitional Housing	\$6,976
Caritas of Austin	Best Single Source Plus	\$196,875
Foundation for the Homeless, Inc.	Interfaith Hospitality Network	\$9,983
Green Doors	Supportive Housing Program	\$24,734
Green Doors	Veteran Permanent Supportive Housing Program	\$25,000 <sup>v</sup>
Green Doors	Veterans Transitional Rental Assistance Program	\$29,201

Agency Name	Program Name	2014 Funding Amount
LifeWorks	Housing	\$105,080
Texas RioGrande Legal Aid, Inc.	Legal Assistance Program	\$130,256
The Salvation Army	Pathways and Partnerships	\$73,739
<b>Planning and Evaluation</b>		<b>\$246,122</b>
Austin Independent School District	Austin/Travis County Mentoring Advisory Council	\$15,000
Children's Optimal Health	Fitnessgram Mapping for Del Valle ISD	\$35,000 <sup>i</sup>
Community Advancement Network	CAN	\$52,322
Ending Community Homelessness Coalition, Inc.	ECHO	\$50,000
Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources	Evaluation Services	\$58,800
Workforce Solutions Capital Area Workforce Board	Austin Opportunity Youth Collaborative	\$35,000 <sup>vi</sup>
<b>Public Health</b>		<b>\$4,550,919</b>
AIDS Services of Austin	Food Bank	\$46,875
AIDS Services of Austin	Mpowerment/The Q Austin	\$101,250
AIDS Services of Austin	Non-Medical Case Management	\$145,453
Austin/Travis County Health and Human Services Department	Public Health Interlocal	\$3,062,893 <sup>ii</sup>
City of Austin Animal Services Office	Animal Services	\$1,115,472 <sup>ii</sup>
Planned Parenthood of Greater Texas, Inc.	Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program	\$22,201
The Wright House Wellness Center, Inc.	Case Management	\$56,775
<b>Safety Intervention Services</b>		<b>\$247,104</b>
Austin Children's Shelter	Emergency Shelter Program	\$36,902
CASA of Travis County	Child Advocacy	\$63,750

Agency Name	Program Name	2014 Funding Amount
Catholic Charities of Central Texas	Immigration Legal Services	\$7,729
SafePlace	Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Services	\$138,723
<b><i>Supportive Services for Community Living</i></b>		<b>\$638,367</b>
The Arc of The Capital Area	Case Management and Advocacy Services	\$73,242
The Arc of The Capital Area	Guardianship Case Management	\$15,000
Easter Seals Central Texas	Developmental and Clinical Solutions	\$92,431
Easter Seals Central Texas	Employment Services and Supports	\$48,375
Family Eldercare, Inc.	Money Management and In-Home Care Services	\$95,576
Helping the Aging, Needy and Disabled, Inc.	Homemaker/Personal Attendant	\$17,137
Meals on Wheels and More, Inc.	Congregate Meals	\$122,564
Meals on Wheels and More, Inc.	Meals on Wheels	\$138,620
Vaughn House, Inc.	Community Rehabilitation	\$35,422
<b><i>Workforce Development</i></b>		<b>\$2,033,327</b>
American YouthWorks	Travis County Metro Parks Project	\$62,475
American YouthWorks	Workforce Development	\$191,229
ASCEND Center for Learning	Workplace Competency	\$32,707
Austin Area Urban League	Essential Office Skills Training	\$34,330
Austin Independent School District	Adult English Language Learners Program	\$81,113
Capital IDEA	Long-Term Training	\$675,000
Goodwill Industries of Central Texas	Ready to Work Plus	\$103,079
LifeWorks	ABE-ESL	\$24,937

Agency Name	Program Name	2014 Funding Amount
Skillpoint Alliance	STEM/Youth College & Career & Adult Workforce	\$432,339
Travis County ESD 4	Travis County ESD 4 Fire and EMT Academy	\$96,000 <sup>ii</sup>
Workforce Solutions Capital Area Workforce Board	Rapid Employment Model	\$300,118

- i. Funding from September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014
- ii. Fiscal year funding (October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)
- iii. Funding from March 1 through December 31, 2014
- iv. Funding from January 28 through December 31, 2014
- v. Funding from January 1 through June 30, 2014
- vi. Funding from April 1 through December 31, 2014

## PERFORMANCE

The social service contracts included in this report have a wide range of goals, objectives, services, and performance measures. In 2014, most programs met the targeted range of performance across both output and outcome measures. Meeting the targeted range of performance means that the performance measure meets or exceeds at least 90% of the contractual performance goal.

Programs falling short of performance goals were often the result of basic operational issues, such as staffing shortages and turnover or funding cuts. Changes in client populations also impacted performance, including clients requiring additional time in a program, thus reducing new client enrollments. Also, for programs serving smaller numbers of clients, even minor changes can lead to highly volatile performance results. Economic conditions have, in many cases, increased demand but may also create challenges in achieving goals. Significant programmatic or performance measure and methodology changes that occurred in 2014 may have contributed to unexpected performance variance. Further, establishing appropriate 9-month goals proved challenging for many agencies more accustomed to 12-month goals. Please note that performance measures reflect the entire program's performance, and not the share of the program funded by TCHHS/VS.

# Appendix A

## 2014 Federal Poverty Income Guidelines

Most TCHHS/VS contracts require programs to serve participants with household incomes at or below 200% of the Federal Poverty Income Guideline (FPIG) level. Some programs have chosen to follow a more stringent threshold. The following table presents the federal poverty thresholds by household size and income.

Household Size	Income Limits by Household Size				
	50%	100%	125%	150%	200%
1 person	\$5,835	\$11,670	\$14,588	\$17,505	\$23,340
2 persons	\$7,865	\$15,730	\$19,663	\$23,595	\$31,460
3 persons	\$9,895	\$19,790	\$24,738	\$29,685	\$39,580
4 persons	\$11,925	\$23,850	\$29,813	\$35,775	\$47,700
5 persons	\$13,955	\$27,910	\$34,888	\$41,865	\$55,820
6 persons	\$15,985	\$31,970	\$39,963	\$47,955	\$63,940
7 persons	\$18,015	\$36,030	\$45,038	\$54,045	\$72,060
8 persons	\$20,045	\$40,090	\$50,113	\$60,135	\$80,180

*For families/households with more than 8 persons, add \$4,060 for each additional person.*

Data source: "2014 Poverty Guidelines," Office of The Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, January 22, 2014, <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/14poverty.cfm>.

## 2014 Austin Median Family Income Guidelines

The Blackland Community Development Corporation and Foundation for the Homeless contracts require participants in their programs to have a household income at or below 50% of the Austin Median Family Income (MFI) level. Other programs may also use Austin MFI guidelines when measuring client incomes. The following table presents the median family income limits established by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA).

Household Size	Income Limits by Household Size		
	30% (Extremely Low)	50% (Very Low)	80% (Low)
1 person	15,850	26,400	42,250
2 persons	18,100	30,200	48,250
3 persons	20,350	33,950	54,300
4 persons	23,850	37,700	60,300
5 persons	27,910	40,750	65,150
6 persons	31,970	43,750	69,950
7 persons	36,030	46,750	74,800
8 persons	40,090	49,800	79,600

Data source: "Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, TX MSA FY 2014 Income Limits Summary," U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, <http://www.huduser.org>.

# Appendix B

## ZIP Code Classification Map

ZIP codes located within Travis County are classified into one of the following eight descriptive categories: Central, East, North, Northeast, Northwest, Southeast, Southwest, and West. These categories were designed to provide a frame of reference when locating ZIP codes on the map and are used to highlight client concentrations across geographic areas.


Descriptive categories are loosely based on Multiple Listing Service (MLS) categories. Occasionally, a ZIP code spans multiple MLS areas. For such ZIP codes, categorization was based on where the bulk of the ZIP code area was located. For example, if a ZIP code spanned the West, South, and Southwest areas, but the majority of the ZIP code area was located in the West area, it was classified as “West.”

A number of ZIP codes are located in Travis County and an adjoining county. These ZIP codes were classified by where the area found inside Travis County lines was mostly located. For example, a ZIP code area may be located in the West area of Travis County, but the majority of the ZIP code area outside of Travis County may be in the Southwest area. In this example, the ZIP code would be classified as “West.”

Please note that the 78616 ZIP code has a miniscule portion of its area within Travis County boundaries and thus is not included on the ZIP code classification map.


# ZIP Code Categories

Travis County, 2014



Note: This map was created using City of Austin shapefiles. ZIP code categories are loosely based on Multiple Listing Service (MLS) categories.

Created by: Travis County HHS/VS Research & Planning Division, 2014.



# Endnotes

- 1 U.S. Census Bureau Population Division, Subcounty Resident Population Estimates: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2009, Texas, <http://www.census.gov/popest/data/cities/totals/2009/SUB-EST2009-states.html> and U.S. Census Bureau Population Division, Subcounty Resident Population Estimates: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013, Texas, <http://www.census.gov/popest/data/cities/totals/2013/SUB-EST2013.html>.
- 2 U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Travis County, B17002, <http://factfinder2.census.gov>.
- 3 U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Travis County, C17001, <http://factfinder2.census.gov>.
- 4 "Texas TANF and Food Stamps Enrollment Statistics, Food Stamp Cases and Recipients by County," Texas Health and Human Services Commission, accessed November 7, 2014, [http://www.hhsc.state.tx.us/research/TANF\\_FS.asp](http://www.hhsc.state.tx.us/research/TANF_FS.asp).
- 5 U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Travis County, B25070, <http://factfinder2.census.gov>.
- 6 U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Travis County, B25091, <http://factfinder2.census.gov>.
- 7 Ending Community Homelessness Coalition (ECHO), "2014 Count Report," accessed October 24, 2014, <http://austinecho.org/about-homelessness/homeless-data/>.
- 8 "Unemployment Rates and Labor Force (LAUS)—United States, Texas, County, TRACER Texas Labor Market Information, accessed November 11, 2014, <http://www.tracer2.com/cgi/dataanalysis/labForceReport.asp?menuchoice=LABFORCE>.
- 9 U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Travis County, Texas and U.S., C27001, <http://factfinder2.census.gov>.
- 10 "Children's Mental Health Services in Texas: A State of the State Report," Children's Hospital Association of Texas, May 2006, <http://www.childhealthtx.org/Children's%20Mental%20Health%20in%20Texas-State%20of%20a%20State%20Report.pdf>.
- 11 "The NSDUH Report: Substance Use and Mental Health Estimates from the 2013 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Overview of Findings," Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, September 4, 2014, <http://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/NSDUH-SR200-RecoveryMonth-2014/NSDUH-SR200-RecoveryMonth-2014.htm>.
- 12 U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Travis County, B01001, <http://factfinder2.census.gov>.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 "Texas Population Projections Program," Texas State Data Center, 2014, Scenario 0.5, <http://txsdc.utsa.edu/Data/TPEPP/Projections/Index.aspx>.