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## Appendix H: CDBG-MIT Grant Agreement Specific Condition

Because hurricanes, tropical storms, large-scale flooding, and severe storms can have such a huge impact on the entire systems of a state, Texas considers mitigation to encompass many eligible activities to be responsive to these types of hazards. Some of these mitigation activities include, but are not limited to, drainage, wind proofing, elevation, buyouts, hardening and strengthening of critical infrastructure, sheltering, evacuation, communications, and planning.

Following the State of Texas CDBG-MIT Action Plan approval on March 31, 2020, HUD issued a grant agreement to the State of Texas, which included several specific conditions. According to HUD, the condition being responded to in this appendix was imposed based on the risk posed by the complexity of the Texas MIT grant and the use of a methods of distribution and competitions to award funds to subrecipients. Among other things, the state of Texas is required to "submit a substantial action plan amendment upon the award of CDBG-MIT funds through its method of distribution and/or competition process, that identifies the entities that have received funds and the amount of each award. The substantial amendment shall also include data to identify protected classes, racially and ethnically concentrated areas, and concentrated areas of poverty, within the HUD-identified and grantee-identified most impacted and distressed areas (MIDs) that were eligible for consideration under the MOD or competition and provide a meaningful analysis that describes how those identified populations and areas may be impacted by those newly funded activities." ${ }^{456}$.

The State Mitigation Competition comprised 140 eligible Texas counties as identified by HUD for DR4223, DR4245, DR4266, DR4269, DR4272, and DR4332. The GLO received 290 applications for a combined $\$ 6.5$ billion for approximately $\$ 1.2$ billion in available funds. Applicants were given the competitions and eligibility parameters in the Action Plan approved by HUD on March 31, 2020, application workshops, guides, FAQs, and other technical assistance via the GLO Mitigation webpage. Most of the technical assistance after the action plan approval was done virtually due to the COVID 19 situation in Texas during the remainder of the application phase. No jurisdiction was required to submit an application. Project selections were not limited beyond general CDBG-MIT eligibility criteria. The competition itself was divided into 6 subsets for 2015, 2016, and Harvey (2017) by HUD MID and "State" MID area. Applications were considered against an objective set of competition criteria that was published in this Action Plan in November 2019. Eligible applicants had full autonomy under the CDBG-MIT program in prioritization and selection of projects, service areas, and budgets within caps to best serve their mitigation needs as they saw fit. All eligible activities were allowed under CDBG-MIT and HCDA Sections 105(a) (1-5), 105(a) (7-9), and 105(a)(11) as long as the activity mitigated and addressed the current and future risks related to each competition's identified disaster risks. Because the allocation among the multiple competitions assured HUD's $50 \%$ requirement for HUD MID areas, potential applicants to each portion of the competition were considered equally within their designated competition.

[^0]Due to the very diverse geography, sheer size, and localized needs, Texas always looks to our local officials to know the best use of limited recovery funding and now these mitigation dollars. Applicants were encouraged to apply for up to $\$ 100$ million per application for the Hurricane Harvey State Mitigation Competition with the possibility of multiple applications across all competitions. The assumption is that the issue being addressed is substantially solved, if not remediated, with the award.

Texas proximity to the very active Gulf of Mexico makes the entire mitigation eligibility area at a great risk of damage from hurricanes and rain events. Texas, due in part to our large population, never receives enough funding to fully recover between events so damage is often compounded from year to year. In this appendix, GLO completed an analysis comparing the eligible mitigation area to the State of Texas further detailed in Section 3.4 of this Amendment. In this comparison the eligible area and the whole state were very similar with a few distinctions. Median household income in the eligible counties is $\$ 50,014$-approximately $\$ 7,000$ less than the statewide average of $\$ 57,051$. Median value of owner-occupied housing units in the eligible counties is $\$ 116,388$ roughly $\$ 35,000$ less than the statewide median value of $\$ 151,500$.

The demographic differences between the state and eligible areas are minimal. The largest divergence is within the Hispanic or Latino population, which is currently at 38.9 percent for the state and 35.8 for the eligible area. Slight differences also exist among the percentage of Black African Americans- 12 percent for the state, 13.5 percent for the eligible area-and White, NonHispanic or Latino, where the state rate is 42.9 percent, and the eligible area is 44.3 percent. The minority population of the 140 eligible counties is approximately 55.7 percent-less than two percentage points lower than the statewide rate. Though there were such minor deviations in the comparison between the State of Texas and the eligible mitigation area the most statistically sound comparison for purposes of this analysis was to compare the projects awarded to the eligible competition area.

The GLO also reviewed the HUD Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAP) Mapping tool which showed that nine (9) mitigation projects are overlapping with a total of 34 R/ECAP census tracts. The GLO designed fully objective criteria to administer the State Mitigation Competitions' award process. These criteria were developed in order to be responsive to the CDBG-MIT requirements in the Federal Register notice. Criteria were designed to address risks in the eligible areas for the CDBG-MIT allocations. In addition to risk, the criteria were designed to prioritize LMI populations, socially vulnerable beneficiaries, local capacity for recovery while considering local contributions to mitigation activities. Almost 30 percent of the score came from the LMI and SoVI portion of the application. While the program areas included in this Action Plan do not define eligibility based on protected class status, the state - through its history of disaster-recovery work - has documented correlations between adverse impacts, household income levels, and certain protected classes. Therefore, in prioritizing both disaster risk mitigation and benefit to low- and moderate- income households, the state reasonably anticipates that program areas outlined in this Action Plan will effectuate a significant positive impact on protected class populations.

The State Mitigation Competition awardees received $\$ 1.149$ billion in 108 awards. This program represents 27 percent of the $\$ 4.3$ billion allocated to the State of Texas for CDBG-MIT.

In the analysis of the resulting awards, out of 140 eligible counties applicants within 67 counties submitted project applications. Of these 67, projects within 47 counties received awards. Seventythree of the 140 eligible counties did not have an applicant submit an application. One hundred (100) percent of the projects awarded meet the benefit to low- and moderate- income individuals national objective.

Following the successful implementation and execution of the state's CDBG-MIT funding competitions, the state has contracted with 108 communities impacted by the 2015 and 2016 floods as well as Hurricane Harvey in 2017 for the completion of these mitigation projects. To comply with the HUD Grant Agreement Specific Condition laid out above the state is providing the following:

- Awardee Project Service Areas
- R/ECAPs and Awarded Project Service Areas in the State of Texas
- List of Awarded State Mitigation Competition Projects
- NOTE: Ordered by Counties with the Highest dollar amount of Projects Awarded.
- Protected Classes Compared by Awarded Projects and Total CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
- Awarded Projects: Ordered by Counties with the Highest dollar amount of Projects Awarded.
- Meaningful Project Analysis
- Table of Project Protected Classes Statistics
- Project Service Area Map by County
- Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group by County
- Population and Poverty by Block Group by County
- MIT Eligible Counties with No Awarded Projects
- Table of Protected Classes Statistics by each CDBG-MIT Eligible County
- Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group by each CDBG-MIT Eligible County
- Population and Poverty by Block Group by each CDBG-MIT Eligible County

The table for protected classes statistics for each awarded project and/or each CDBG-MIT Eligible county provided specific data summaries for the five (5) of the seven (7) protected classes (see table below). In conducting a data assessment and review for this Specific Condition, no pertinent data is available to identify the protected classes of Color and Religion at a relevant level of analysis.

| Protected Classes |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Race | ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |
| National Origin | ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |
| Sex | ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |
| Familial Status | ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |
| Disability | ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |
| Color | No Data Available |
| Religion | No Data Available |

To analyze and identify racially and ethnically concentrated areas ${ }^{457}$ and concentrated areas of poverty ${ }^{458}$, the R/ECAP map as well as Racial and Ethnic Makeup Maps and Poverty Maps by county are provided.

All project descriptions provided in the analyses are summarized as of the current contract agreements. As design and construction activities are completed, deviations from the scopes provide here may be updated to reflect on the ground conditions. No scope changes will be allowed that would impact the application score.
${ }^{457}$ ACS 5 year, 2019, Table: B03002, https://api.census.gov/data/2019/acs/acs5/groups/B03002.html
${ }^{458}$ ACS 5 year, 2019, Table: B17010, https://api.census.gov/data/2019/acs/acs5/groups/B17010.html

## Awardee Project Service Areas



## R/ECAPs in the State of Texas



Awarded State Mitigation Competitions Projects

| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-1177-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Galveston | Galveston | 46,385 | \$ 54,309,999.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0874-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Dickinson | Galveston | 13,130 | \$ 49,272,945.54 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical <br> Storms and Tropical <br> Depressions, Riverine <br> Flooding, and Severe <br> Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0816-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of La Marque | Galveston | 15,105 | \$ 48,904,004.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0817-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Texas City | Galveston | 29,935 | \$ 14,965,447.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-1141-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | Galveston County Water Control and Improvements District (WCID) \#1 | Galveston | 11,710 | \$ 8,107,920.79 | Infrastructure Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical <br> Storms and Tropical <br> Depressions, Riverine <br> Flooding, and Severe <br> Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0812-APP | 2015 Floods (State MID) | City of La Marque | Galveston | 15,105 | \$ 7,493,145.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Severe Coastal Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-0829-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Hitchcock | Galveston | 7,325 | \$ 3,598,615.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding |


| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-1140-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Pasadena | Harris | 49,315 | \$ 47,278,951.21 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0881-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Baytown | Harris | 22,355 | \$ 32,394,113.86 | Infrastructure Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0922-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | Harris County - Community <br> Services Department | Harris | 11,185 | \$ 10,000,000.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Riverine Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-1092-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | City of Houston | Harris | 6,970 | \$ 8,183,191.89 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Storms |
| CDR17-1155-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Galena Park | Harris | 11,125 | \$ 5,482,123.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-0991-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | City of Jacinto City | Harris | 10,625 | \$ 5,319,717.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Storms |
| CDR17-0933-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Jacinto City | Harris | 10,625 | \$ 5,319,717.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1185-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | City of Baytown | Harris | 11,180 | \$ 3,236,049.01 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Riverine Flooding, <br> Severe Coastal <br> Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-0984-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Kingsville | Kleberg | 24,575 | \$ 36,311,929.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-1056-APP | Harvey (State MID) | Kleberg County | Kleberg | 24,575 | \$ 10,000,000.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |


| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being <br> Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-1157-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | City of Kingsville | Kleberg | 24,575 | \$ 7,293,111.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding, <br> Severe Coastal <br> Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-1029-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Seguin | Guadalupe | 25,520 | \$ 37,861,885.50 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements; Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0986-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Marion | Guadalupe | 1,050 | \$ 9,946,174.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1063-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Rosenberg | Fort Bend | 33,455 | \$ 47,585,955.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1209-APP | Harvey (State MID) | Austin County | Austin | 10,995 | \$ 36,937,293.90 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1111-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Wallis | Austin | 1,290 | \$ 5,748,125.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements;Infrastru cture Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1131-APP | Harvey (State MID) | Town of San Felipe | Austin | 710 | \$ 3,209,122.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1023-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Kenedy | Karnes | 3,340 | \$ 43,040,879.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1201-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | City of Clute | Brazoria | 7,145 | \$ 9,881,420.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Riverine Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-1031-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Freeport | Brazoria | 12,025 | \$ 5,991,468.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0939-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | City of Freeport | Brazoria | 12,025 | \$ 5,931,626.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Severe Coastal Flooding, and Storms |


| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being <br> Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-1133-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | City of Sweeny | Brazoria | 3,650 | \$ 5,398,293.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-1130-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Oyster Creek | Brazoria | 1,070 | \$ 5,291,898.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0838-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Brazoria | Brazoria | 3,045 | \$ 4,311,537.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0959-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | City of Brazoria | Brazoria | 3,045 | \$ 3,176,375.00 | Infrastructure <br> Improvements | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding, <br> Severe Coastal <br> Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-1073-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Mathis | San Patricio | 4,910 | \$ 22,830,172.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1152-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | San Patricio County | San Patricio | 8,370 | \$ 15,435,182.60 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-1020-APP | Harvey (State MID) | Caldwell County | Caldwell | 35,490 | \$ 17,618,764.00 | Public Facilities | County-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1018-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Uhland | Caldwell | 1,215 | \$ 11,851,660.80 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-0894-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Martindale | Caldwell | 1,340 | \$ 6,678,027.21 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-0957-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | Jasper County | Jasper | 12,643 | \$ 14,807,627.97 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements Infrastructure Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |


| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-1062-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Jasper | Jasper | 7,586 | \$ 11,258,023.51 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-1065-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | Jasper County | Jasper | 190 | \$ 4,194,643.56 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-0948-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Kirbyville | Jasper | 2,330 | \$ 3,356,625.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1021-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Smithville | Bastrop | 2,635 | \$ 12,966,041.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0824-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Elgin | Bastrop | 8,090 | \$ 10,940,981.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0823-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | City of Elgin | Bastrop | 8,090 | \$ 4,899,840.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Storms |
| CDR17-1003-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Bastrop | Bastrop | 3,905 | \$ 4,240,329.20 | Infrastructure Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1057-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Premont | Jim Wells | 2,650 | \$ 13,115,995.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1055-APP | Harvey (State MID) | Jim Wells County | Jim Wells | 1,950 | \$ 9,650,296.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-0902-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Alice | Jim Wells | 4,125 | \$ 6,942,192.60 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements Infrastructure Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-0836-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Cameron | Milam | 5,404 | \$ 14,125,469.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |


| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries |  | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being <br> Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-0674-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Buckholts | Milam | 470 | \$ | 4,479,940.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1016-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Rockdale | Milam | 5,380 | \$ | 4,417,469.03 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-0987-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Milano | Milam | 445 | \$ | 4,317,323.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0919-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | Hidalgo County | Hidalgo | 397,800 | \$ | 9,962,444.40 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Riverine Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-0883-APP | 2015 Floods (HUD MID) | Hidalgo County | Hidalgo | 397,800 | \$ | 9,858,499.20 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Storms |
| CDR17-1210-APP | 2015 Floods (HUD MID) | City of Penitas | Hidalgo | 4,550 | \$ | 4,379,172.40 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-1142-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | Deep East Texas COG | Newton | 6,710 | \$ | 9,008,688.00 | Communications Infrastructure | Area-Benefit | Riverine Flooding, <br> Storms, and <br> Tornadoes |
| CDR17-1136-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Newton | Newton | 1,890 | \$ | 6,646,990.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0958-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | City of Newton | Newton | 1,890 | \$ | 4,457,650.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-1048-APP | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) | Newton County | Newton | 4,168 |  | 3,650,657.85 | Infrastructure Improvements; Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Riverine Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-0997-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Yoakum | DeWitt | 5,300 |  | 8,143,545.20 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |


| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being <br> Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-1135-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Yorktown | DeWitt | 2,020 | \$ 6,183,237.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-1188-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Yoakum | DeWitt | 5,300 | \$ 4,960,187.10 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1161-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Cuero | DeWitt | 3,570 | \$ 4,286,994.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-1110-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | City of Eastland | Eastland | 3,415 | \$ 9,999,140.72 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements;Infrastru cture Improvements; Buyouts or Acqusitions | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1026-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | Eastland County | Eastland | 6,625 | \$ 9,805,900.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0896-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Vidor | Orange | 10,503 | \$ 15,801,291.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0622-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of West Orange | Orange | 3,374 | \$ 3,790,353.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-1053-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Refugio | Refugio | 2,447 | \$ 12,112,636.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions and Riverine Flooding |


| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-1052-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | Refugio County | Refugio | 1,396 | \$ 6,910,131.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical <br> Storms and Tropical <br> Depressions, Riverine <br> Flooding, and Severe <br> Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0828-APP | Harvey (State MID) | Calhoun County | Calhoun | 1,535 | \$ 11,305,233.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1024-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Seadrift | Calhoun | 1,535 | \$ 4,850,939.04 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-1214-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Iola | Grimes | 379 | \$ 10,934,297.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1104-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Bedias | Grimes | 310 | \$ 3,965,736.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements;Infrastru cture Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-0965-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of El Campo | Wharton | 10,129 | \$ 14,840,316.83 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1061-APP | Harvey (State MID) | Sabine County | Sabine | 10,458 | \$ 11,180,882.62 | Flood Control and <br> Drainage <br> Improvements; <br> Infrastructure <br> Improvements | County-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical <br> Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1068-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Pineland | Sabine | 872 | \$ 3,080,000.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1012-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Hallettsville | Lavaca | 2,059 | \$ 9,882,441.85 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical <br> Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0911-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Moulton | Lavaca | 869 | \$ 4,298,611.68 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |


| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries |  | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being <br> Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-1010-APP | Harvey (State MID) | Gonzales County | Gonzales | 12,380 | \$ | 6,071,588.57 | Communications Infrastructure | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-0963-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Gonzales | Gonzales | 7,130 | \$ | 3,778,467.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements; Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1014-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Nixon | Gonzales | 2,530 | \$ | 3,592,211.82 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1113-APP | Harvey (State MID) | San Augustine County | San Augustine | 8,445 | \$ | 4,100,000.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | County-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1112-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | San Augustine County | San Augustine | 2,315 | \$ | 3,960,000.00 | Public Facilities | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding, <br> Storms, and <br> Tornadoes |
| CDR17-1042-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of San Augustine | San Augustine | 2,315 | \$ | 3,472,500.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1027-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Ivanhoe | Tyler | 1,185 | \$ | 11,472,116.80 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1199-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Ganado | Jackson | 1,755 | \$ | 7,190,056.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical <br> Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0888-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of La Ward | Jackson | 190 | \$ | 3,280,106.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | : Hurricanes, Tropical <br> Storms and Tropical <br> Depressions, Riverine <br> Flooding, and Severe <br> Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-1058-APP | 2015 Floods (State MID) | City of Raymondville | Willacy | 8,695 | \$ | 10,000,000.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Storms |
| CDR17-1212-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | City of Buffalo | Leon | 2,095 | \$ | 9,628,000.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding |


| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being <br> Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-0992-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Hempstead | Waller | 6,305 | \$ 9,395,324.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1060-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Goliad | Goliad | 1,890 | \$ 9,353,554.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1156-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Caldwell | Burleson | 1,030 | \$ 5,094,852.00 | Flood Control and <br> Drainage <br> Improvements; <br> Infrastructure <br> Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1069-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Snook | Burleson | 415 | \$ 4,150,000.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0968-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Sour Lake | Hardin | 1,906 | \$ 9,071,196.29 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1086-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Brenham | Washington | 10,185 | \$ 5,001,643.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-1085-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | City of Brenham | Washington | 6,915 | \$ 3,400,594.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Riverine Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-0950-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Palacios | Matagorda | 3,485 | \$ 5,014,832.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-0974-APP | Harvey (State MID) | Matagorda County | Matagorda | 995 | \$ 3,111,098.00 | Infrastructure Improvements; Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1079-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of New Waverly | Walker | 1,335 | \$ 6,601,843.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |


| Application ID | Competition | Awardee | County | Beneficiaries | Amount (\$) | Activity | Benefit Area | Hazard Being <br> Addressed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CDR17-1070-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Madisonville | Madison | 4,350 | \$ 6,525,000.00 | Infrastructure Improvements; Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-0900-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Lexington | Lee | 1,300 | \$ 6,393,661.50 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-1115-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Shepherd | San Jacinto | 2,805 | \$ 4,200,000.00 | Flood Control and Drainage Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |
| CDR17-0993-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | City of Trinity | Trinity | 2,730 | \$ 4,028,986.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Storms |
| CDR17-1071-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | Town of Tenaha | Shelby | 1,455 | \$ 3,875,691.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding, <br> Storms, and Tornadoes |
| CDR17-1105-APP | Harvey (State MID) | City of Beeville | Bee | 4,260 | \$ 3,844,490.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | Area-Benefit | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding |
| CDR17-0990-APP | 2016 Floods (State MID) | City of Zavalla | Angelina | 770 | \$ 3,600,000.00 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Riverine Flooding, and Storms |
| CDR17-1202-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Anahuac | Chambers | 2,326 | \$ 3,548,091.09 | Infrastructure Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding |
| CDR17-1006-APP | Harvey (HUD MID) | City of Daisetta | Liberty | 740 | \$ 3,366,142.00 | Flood Control and <br> Drainage <br> Improvements;Infrastru <br> cture Improvements | City-Wide | Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions |













City of Galveston: South Shore Drainage Project - \$54,309,999 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Galveston, benefitting $56.27 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $45.64 \%$ greater than Galveston County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $26.01 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Runoff in the city generally flows from south to north towards the bay. Elevations range from approximately 1 to 18 -feet above sea level. As a result, the South Shore improvement and service areas experience frequent flooding, inundation of storm sewers, and ponding in streets due to the flat topography, inadequate system capacity, and tidal backflow. This frequent flooding also impacts access to evacuation routes and critical lifelines. The South Shore Project will reduce longterm risk of damage to and loss of property, suffering, and hardship for residents within the designated improvement and service areas by increasing the capacity of the existing storm drainage system.

Upon completion of the South Shore Drainage project, the city will have the capacity to effectively control rainwater produced in a 100-year event within the city's right- of-way and eliminate ponding/flooding of private property within the boundaries of the project improvement area. This project will also significantly reduce flooding in the project service areas adjacent to the improvement area, reduce flooding on the city's major evacuation route along 61st Street, provide critical access to community lifelines, and increase the city's resiliency to flooding from future events. In addition, at least one lane of emergency vehicle access will be available during a 25 year storm event.

## Drainage Improvements

- Replace and upgrade existing storm sewer system using the city's updated drainage criteria that now require a 25 -year storm drainage capacity, using a total of 9,019.5 LF of storm sewer.
- Storm drain connections to side streets, leads and 84 inlets at appropriate spacing, as well as restoration of 32 SY of pavement. Storm inverts will vary from a depth between 10 and 25 feet below the existing ground.

Pump Station

- Construct an outfall pump station on the English Bayou end of the storm drain system.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Galveston is a community of 50,241 residents in Galveston County $(332,885)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Galveston is $\$ 49,319$, $32.74 \%$ less than Galveston County's median income of $\$ 73,330$, and $5.44 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Galveston has an AMFI of $\$ 62,835$ according to ACS 2019. This is $80 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 78,800$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in the city of Galveston was $20.52 \%$, compared to Galveston County's poverty rate of $13.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The Regional Assessment of Fair Housing shows that the City of Galveston has two of the three Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty for Galveston County. The two Census Tracts are 7246 and 7247. These two tracts are in the northern end of the island near Broadway and are not directly covered by the work in this application. The project maps show that the Galveston R/ECAP areas would benefit from the evacuation route secured by the project at the $61^{\text {st }}$ street bridge, and the low-lying areas as you approach the bridge. The application indicates that flood water flows from South to North; heading toward the bay side of the island which would possibly impact these areas with flood waters.

The city of Galveston's population is $30.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Galveston County's $24.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Galveston is $48.50 \%$ white alone, less than Galveston County's white alone percentage of $57.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Galveston is $16.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Galveston County (12.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Galveston is $0.30 \%$, greater than Galveston County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Galveston is $2.80 \%$ Asian alone, less than Galveston County's percentage of $3.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

The City of Galveston is a diverse city, and it is almost evenly divided between racial and ethnic minorities ( $47.9 \%$ ) and people who identify as White not of Hispanic or Latino origin (48.5\%). However, this demographic has a plurality in the population. These percentages are generally maintained in the 2020 Census, with Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino origin making up $45.8 \%$ of the population, and with the White not of Hispanic/Latino origin being $45.8 \%$. There was growth in both the Black or African American population, and the White not of Hispanic or Latino origin populations.

The households in Galveston are comprised of $34.80 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Galveston County's $52.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Galveston that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $10.60 \%$ this is less than Galveston County's percentage of $21.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Galveston's households are $5.40 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Galveston County's percentage of $5.70 \%$ and less than the eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.40 \%$ is within the city of Galveston, which is less than Galveston County's $1.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Galveston, $34.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $25.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Galveston's households are $6.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $5.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Galveston's households are $18.70 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Galveston County at $12.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Galveston are $7.70 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Galveston County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $6.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Galveston $22.40 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Galveston County, which is at $34.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Galveston that have one or more people of 65 or older is $30.30 \%$, which is greater than Galveston County's $27.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's 24.5\%.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Galveston is $16.90 \%$ which is greater than Galveston County's $13.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The housing in the project area is mixed. There are larger homes near the water, and smaller beach style houses running the length of 59th street. There are commercial properties largely along 61 st and Seawall Boulevard between 59th and 61st Street. Closer to the water around Victory Avenue, there are older, smaller homes and some are in need of repair. As one goes from 61st down Seawall Boulevard, there are numerous apartments, condominiums, and hotels. There are many neighborhoods with generally smaller beach style homes. Near the coast on the Gulf, there are larger homes that are usually elevated and well-cared for. As the application says that the North end of Galveston Island will use this point for evacuations.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1177-APP |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Galveston |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.64\% |  | 56.27\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$73,330 |  | \$49,319 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 13.20\% |  | 20.52\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 332,885 |  | 50,241 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 82,003 | 24.60\% | 15,147 | 30.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,882 | 75.40\% | 35,094 | 69.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 190,948 | 57.40\% | 24,358 | 48.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 41,105 | 12.30\% | 8,292 | 16.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 785 | 0.20\% | 169 | 0.3\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 10,840 | 3.30\% | 1,414 | 2.8\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 110 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 282 | 0.10\% | 23 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 6,812 | 2.00\% | 838 | 1.7\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 300,084 | 90.10\% | 43,419 | 86.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 294,597 | 88.50\% | 42,616 | 84.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 5,487 | 1.60\% | 803 | 1.6\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 32,801 | 9.90\% | 6,822 | 13.6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 163,877 | 49.20\% | 25,301 | 50.4\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 169,008 | 50.80\% | 24,940 | 49.6\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,438 | 100\% | 20,756 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 63,396 | 52.20\% | 7,231 | 34.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 26,386 | 21.70\% | 2,196 | 10.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,874 | 5.70\% | 1,125 | 5.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,298 | 1.90\% | 298 | 1.4\% |


|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1177-APP City of Galveston City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 19,680 | 16.20\% | 5,227 | 25.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,541 | 1.30\% | 153 | 0.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 14,218 | 11.70\% | 3,929 | 18.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4,265 | 3.50\% | 1,071 | 5.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 31,488 | 25.90\% | 7,173 | 34.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 7,188 | 5.90\% | 1,306 | 6.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 15,585 | 12.80\% | 3,888 | 18.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 7,506 | 6.20\% | 1,593 | 7.7\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 42,046 | 34.60\% | 4,650 | 22.4\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 33,140 | 27.30\% | 6,298 | 30.3\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 327,847 | 100\% | 47,701 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 43,303 | 13.20\% | 8,040 | 16.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Dickinson: Flood Mitigation \& Diversion Project - \$49,272,945.54-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Dickinson, benefitting 52.93\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $36.99 \%$ greater than Galveston County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $18.52 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

This drainage project is comprised of building two large storm sewer systems which facilitate and improve the drainage of flood waters from several bayous within the city of Dickinson. They will convey the water to Dickinson Bayou more quickly, allowing faster draining of the residential area of the city.

- Construct a large channel south of Dickinson Bayou just to the east of I-45 to convey water from Dickinson Bayou to Hughes Road. It will be over excavated to provide floodplain/detention storage.
- Construct a large storm sewer including box culverts below Hughes Road all the way to the east and outfall into Dickinson Bayou further downstream.
- Reconstruct Hughes Road after the construction of the box culverts. It will be over excavated to provide floodplain/detention storage.
- Construct a large storm sewer including box culverts beginning near the intersection of FM 1266 and Deats Road to pull water from West Gun Bayou. The storm sewer is intended to proceed southwest under Deats Road to Nichols Street and then under Nichols Street to FM 517. The storm sewer would then proceed west to the area of Nebraska Street and then south to Dickinson Bayou.
- Reconstruct all roadways under which the storm sewer in \#4 is proposed.
- Construct storm sewer connections from west of the railroad corridor to provide drainage enhancements to the area along State Highway 3 and areas draining to Bensen Bayou.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 13,130 within Galveston County $(332,885)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The City of Dickinson has an AMFI of $\$ 85,213$ according to ACS 2019. This is $108 \%$ of the HUD Galveston County MFI of $\$ 78,800$. Galveston County is within the Houston, The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $13.30 \%$, which is greater than Galveston County's poverty rate of $13.20 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $38.22 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than Galveston County's $24.60 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $43.50 \%$ white alone, less than Galveston County's percentage of $57.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $14.31 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is greater than Galveston County (12.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.06 \%$, which is less than Galveston County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $1.75 \%$ Asian alone, less than Galveston County's percentage of $3.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.17 \%$, greater than Galveston County $(0.000 \%)$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $1.99 \%$ two or more races, less than Galveston County, which is at $2.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is a majority minority population with $52.53 \%$ being racial or ethnic minorities. The City of Dickinson was a majority White not of Hispanic or Latino origin with $55.8 \%$ of the community according to ACS 2019. In the 2020 Census population date, there is no majority on demographics. The Black and African American residents represent $10.6 \%$ of the population while the Hispanic or Latino origin community is $37.2 \%$ for a total racial and ethnic minority population of $47.8 \%$. The White not of Hispanic or Latino origin fell to $45.6 \%$ from $54.8 \%$ in ACS 2019. The balance is $2.5 \%$ Asian population and two or more races at $3.4 \%$.

While the community is racially diverse, when you break down the demographics, nine of the eleven block groups that are entirely or partially within Dickinson have a majority of one race that exceeds the White not of Hispanic or Latino percentage of Dickinson at $54.8 \%$. Six of the eleven exceed $60 \%$ of the population by either White not of Hispanic or Latino origin or of Hispanic or Latino origin. The Deats Nichols project is adjacent to Census Tract 7208 Block Group 1 that appears to be outside the Dickinson limits but has a $97.3 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin and Black or African American population.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $83.47 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Galveston County at $90.10 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $48.57 \%$ male, less than Galveston County ( $49.20 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $51.43 \%$ female, greater than the $50.80 \%$ of Galveston County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $29.24 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $25.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $9.53 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, which is greater than Galveston County's percentage of $5.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $13.39 \%$
occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Galveston County at $12.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $7.56 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Galveston County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $39.08 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Galveston County, which is at $34.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $26.65 \%$, less than Galveston County's $27.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's 24.5\%.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $14.05 \%$, greater than Galveston County's $13.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

As part of our review, we looked at the recent survey by Dickinson residents. This survey was a written survey form with a response to the Dickinson government. These drainage projects are consistent with the respondents' desire to improve drainage in the community. In fact, $72 \%$ of those that had an opinion wanted drainage. Another highly supported activity is bayou development with a $70 \%$ support. We do not know the race or ethnicity of the respondents, but this project appears to be consistent with the survey results and while there might be a small disruption during construction for residents on Deats, Nichols and Nebraska, overall, the project does not appear to place a burden or provide a benefit to any one demographic in the city despite any population anomalies by Census Tract Block Group.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0874-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Dickinson |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.64\% |  | 52.93\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$73,330 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 13.20\% |  | 13.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 332,885 |  | 32,894 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 82,003 | 24.60\% | 12,572 | 38.2\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,882 | 75.40\% | 20,322 | 61.8\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 190,948 | 57.40\% | 14,310 | 43.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 41,105 | 12.30\% | 4,708 | 14.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 785 | 0.20\% | 19 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 10,840 | 3.30\% | 576 | 1.8\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 110 | 0.00\% | 56 | 0.2\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 282 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 6,812 | 2.00\% | 653 | 1.99\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 300,084 | 90.10\% | 27,856 | 84.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 294,597 | 88.50\% | 27,456 | 83.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 5,487 | 1.60\% | 400 | 1.2\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 32,801 | 9.90\% | 5,038 | 15\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 163,877 | 49.20\% | 15,976 | 48.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 169,008 | 50.80\% | 16,918 | 51.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,438 | 100\% | 11,527 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 63,396 | 52.20\% | 5,366 | 46.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 26,386 | 21.70\% | 2,144 | 18.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,874 | 5.70\% | 780 | 6.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,298 | 1.90\% | 392 | 3.4\% |


|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0874-APP City of Dickinson Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 19,680 | 16.20\% | 2,010 | 17.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,541 | 1.30\% | 279 | 2.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 14,218 | 11.70\% | 1,341 | 11.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4,265 | 3.50\% | 410 | 3.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 31,488 | 25.90\% | 3,371 | 29.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 7,188 | 5.90\% | 1,099 | 9.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 15,585 | 12.80\% | 1,543 | 13.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 7,506 | 6.20\% | 871 | 7.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 42,046 | 34.60\% | 4,505 | 39.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 33,140 | 27.30\% | 3,072 | 26.7\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 327,847 | 100\% | 31,954 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 43,303 | 13.20\% | 4,488 | 14.0\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of La Marque: Wastewater Treatment Plant \& Lift Station Resiliency Plan - \$48,904,004Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of La Marque, benefitting 53.99\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $39.72 \%$ greater than Galveston County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $20.89 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

During hurricanes and resulting flood events, the city of La Marque's wastewater collection and treatment system experiences serious infiltration and inflow (I/I) and/or power outages. In these events, the city's lift stations are not able to pump the additional I/I, causing wastewater to backup into homes, overflow into ditches, and increase the risks to human health and safety.

In addition, the city's only wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) is overwhelmed to the point it causes unauthorized discharges into Galveston Bay, thereby posing a threat to the environment and to the public. The project will make significant improvements to the city's lift stations and WWTP, thereby mitigating flood risk to the entire wastewater collection system.

The City of La Marque Harvey HUD MID project will accomplish the following:

- Convert the city's 21 lift stations to self-priming pumps which will be elevated to eliminate the impact of floodwaters.
- Increase the capacity of the lift stations to keep up with I/I and eliminate the backing up of wastewater into residences and eliminate the overflow into City ditches.
- Add an emergency backup pump at each lift station to operate during times of power outages to eliminate back-ups and overflows.
- Elevate and/or enclose the existing WWTP walls to raise it above the 100 -year flood plain elevation to reduce the potential for inundation during hurricanes/flood events.
- Increase the WWTP capacity by 2.25 million gallons per day to handle the flows from the lift stations during flooding events and to prevent backups and overflows.
- Elevate the new WWTP above the 100 -year flood plain to reduce the potential for inundation during hurricanes/flood events.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

La Marque is a community of 16,627 residents in Galveston County $(332,885)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of La Marque is $\$ 53,964,26.41 \%$ less than Galveston County's median income of $\$ 73,330$, and $3.47 \%$ greater
than the MIT eligible area's median income of \$52,155. La Marque's AMFI is \$66,908 according to the ACS 2019. This is $85 \%$ of the HUD AMFI of $\$ 78,800$ for the area. La Marque is in Galveston County which is part of the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of La Marque was $16.40 \%$ compared with Galveston County's poverty rate of $13.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of La Marque's population is $31.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Galveston County's $24.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of La Marque is $34.80 \%$ white alone, less than Galveston County's white alone percentage of $57.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of La Marque is $30.10 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Galveston County (12.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for La Marque is $0.00 \%$, less than Galveston County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of La Marque is $3.20 \%$ Asian alone, less than Galveston County's percentage of $3.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

La Marque is a majority minority community that has a diverse population. The White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population is a plurality at $34.8 \%$. Hispanic or Latino origin residents are close behind at $31.1 \%$, followed closely by the Black or African American Community at $30.1 \%$. The total percentage of racial and ethnic minorities in La Marque is $61.2 \%$. The area above IH 45 has a higher percentage of protected classes living in these homes, and this is where some work will take place (CT 7228 Block Group 1 is $71.3 \%$ and Block Group 2 is $68.2 \%$ ).

In the city of La Marque, $33.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $25.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. La Marque's households are $7.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $5.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$.

In La Marque $34.60 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is equal to Galveston County, which is at $34.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within La Marque that have one or more people of 65 or older is $30.80 \%$, which is greater than Galveston County's $27.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's 24.5\%.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of La Marque is $17.30 \%$ which is greater than Galveston County's $13.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

La Marque has many different types, sizes, and styles of housing. There are older homes and plenty of new homes still under construction. To ensure equity, the lift stations should be consistent in appearance regardless of the style of neighborhood. The existing wastewater plant has housing nearby, but there is a large park that separates most of the housing from the wastewater plant.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of La Marque |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.64\% |  | 53.99\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$73,330 |  | \$53,964 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.20\% |  | 16.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 332,885 |  | 16,627 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 82,003 | 24.60\% | 5,163 | 31.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,882 | 75.40\% | 11,464 | 68.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 190,948 | 57.40\% | 5,782 | 34.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 41,105 | 12.30\% | 5,013 | 30.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 785 | 0.20\% | 3 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 10,840 | 3.30\% | 524 | 3.2\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 110 | 0.00\% | 6 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 282 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 6,812 | 2.00\% | 136 | 0.8\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 300,084 | 90.10\% | 15,397 | 92.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 294,597 | 88.50\% | 15,271 | 91.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 5,487 | 1.60\% | 126 | 0.8\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 32,801 | 9.90\% | 1,230 | 7.4\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 163,877 | 49.20\% | 8,184 | 49.2\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 169,008 | 50.80\% | 8,443 | 50.8\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,438 | 100\% | 5,960 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 63,396 | 52.20\% | 2,686 | 45.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 26,386 | 21.70\% | 1,006 | 16.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,874 | 5.70\% | 488 | 8.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,298 | 1.90\% | 221 | 3.7\% |


|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0816-APP City of La Marque City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 19,680 | 16.20\% | 785 | 13.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,541 | 1.30\% | 52 | 0.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 14,218 | 11.70\% | 652 | 10.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4,265 | 3.50\% | 202 | 3.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 31,488 | 25.90\% | 2,001 | 33.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 7,188 | 5.90\% | 425 | 7.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 15,585 | 12.80\% | 915 | 15.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 7,506 | 6.20\% | 570 | 9.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 42,046 | 34.60\% | 2,063 | 34.6\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 33,140 | 27.30\% | 1,836 | 30.8\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 327,847 | 100\% | 16,510 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 43,303 | 13.20\% | 2,864 | 17.3\% |
| 'Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Texas City: Citywide Drainage Improvements Project - \$14,965,447 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Texas City, benefitting $55.10 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $1.12 \%$ greater than the City of Texas City's LMI percentage of $54.49 \%, 42.61 \%$ greater than Galveston County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $23.38 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Texas City has experienced both storm surge and torrential rains and has borne the brunt of hurricanes, and tropical storms over the past 20 years and more. During Hurricane Harvey alone, it received over 28 inches of rain. The combination of surge and rainfall almost overwhelmed the city's infrastructure, and resulted in significant flooding, causing injury, damage of housing stock, as well as unsafe and unsanitary environmental conditions. All project improvements will increase the resiliency and functionality of the drainage system in Texas City to reduce flooding by moving water to Moses Lake.

The drainage improvement project encompasses the following components:

- Increase pumping capacity at two rainwater pump stations for discharging rainwater runoff out of the most concentrated population in the city and increasing safety for residents.
- Construct a concrete liner and reconstruct the drainage ditch at $34^{\text {th }}$ Street to improve conveyance.
- Reconstruct undersized storm sewer in the 7th Avenue area which outfalls into the 34th Street Ditch.

All improvements are components of the larger city drainage system, and the addition of these facilities will increase the capacity to respond to major rain events.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 29,935 within the city of Texas City, a community of 48,569 residents in Galveston County $(332,885)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Census Tracts $7220.01,7220.02$ and 7723 have AMFIs of $\$ 83,019, \$ 60,885$, and 40,556 , respectively according to ACS 2019. We were unable to get the Census Tract 7219 Block Group 3 AMFI, but Texas City's AMFI is $\$ 58,540$ according to ACS 2019. HUD's Galveston County AMFI is $\$ 78,800$. Galveston County is part of the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $21.30 \%$, equal to the city of Texas City which is at $21.30 \%$, greater than

Galveston County's poverty rate of $13.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $32.44 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than the city of Texas City's population percentage of $29.00 \%$, greater than Galveston County's $24.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $42.03 \%$ white alone, greater than the city of Texas City's percentage of $38.00 \%$, less than Galveston County's percentage of $57.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $20.66 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than the city of Texas City, which has $28.20 \%$, greater than Galveston County (12.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.17 \%$, less than the city of Texas City, which is at $0.20 \%$, less than Galveston County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.99 \%$ Asian alone, greater than the city of Texas City at $0.80 \%$, less than Galveston County's percentage of $3.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.26 \%$, greater than the city of Texas City at $0.20 \%$, greater than Galveston County $(0.000 \%)$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.19 \%$ some other race alone, less than the city of Texas City, which is at $0.20 \%$, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $0.10 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $3.27 \%$ two or more races, less than the city of Texas City at $3.40 \%$, greater than Galveston County, which is at $2.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is 1.7\%.

The work appears to be taking place in Census Tracts 7220.01, 7220.02, 7223 and 7219 Block Group 3 based on a windshield survey of the identified project locations. Combing the demographic data for these areas provides a diverse demographic makeup. There is no majority of any single demographic according to ACS 2019. The Black or African American population is $18 \%$, the Hispanic or Latino origin population is $31.8 \%$, and the White not of Hispanic of Latino origin is at $43.5 \%$. Reviewing the most current 2020 Census data, the population shifts to a majority minority population of $53.2 \%$. Again, there is no single demographic that is a majority, but the White not of Hispanic or Latino origin is $41.9 \%$ of the population in the area.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $89.74 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than $92.30 \%$ in the city of Texas City, less than Galveston County at $90.10 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $34.22 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of Texas City at $36.20 \%$, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $25.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $11.52 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than the city of Texas City which is at $11.10 \%$, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $5.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $13.48 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the city of Texas City at $14.70 \%$, greater than

Galveston County at $12.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $7.05 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than the city of Texas City who is at $6.80 \%$, greater than Galveston County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $34.36 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than the city of Texas City at $32.50 \%$, less than Galveston County, which is at $34.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $30.46 \%$, greater than the city of Texas City at $30.30 \%$, greater than Galveston County's $27.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $17.73 \%$, less than the city of Texas City at $18.30 \%$, greater than Galveston County's $13.20 \%$,and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

In conducting the windshield survey, the 7th Avenue project appears to be in a low-income neighborhood. Other than the 7th Avenue project, it does not appear that many people will be disrupted to complete construction of the projects.

There is no housing directly around Pump Station A. Pump Station B and the 34th Street Ditch have apartments and commercial properties nearby. There is also park space in the ditch area. The 7th Avenue neighborhood generally has smaller wood or brick houses that are in a dense, small lot neighborhood. The houses are close together and vary in quality, materials, and size. There are similar houses on both sides of the project. The end of the project (after Somerset Avenue) and the continuation of the project runs in an alley between two streets of houses. Other than the 7th Avenue project, it does not appear that many people will be disrupted to complete the projects.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | Texas City |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0817-APP City of Texas City Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 38.64\% |  | 54.49\% |  | 55.10\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$73,330 |  | \$48,839 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.20\% |  | 21.30\% |  | 21.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 332,885 |  | 48,569 |  | 39,476 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 82,003 | 24.60\% | 14,083 | 29.0\% | 12,806 | 32.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,882 | 75.40\% | 34,486 | 71.0\% | 26,670 | 67.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 190,948 | 57.40\% | 18,444 | 38.0\% | 16,591 | 42.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 41,105 | 12.30\% | 13,718 | 28.2\% | 8,156 | 20.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 785 | 0.20\% | 90 | 0.2\% | 67 | 0.2\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 10,840 | 3.30\% | 377 | 0.8\% | 389 | 1.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 110 | 0.00\% | 95 | 0.2\% | 101 | 0.3\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 282 | 0.10\% | 99 | 0.2\% | 76 | 0.19\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 6,812 | 2.00\% | 1,663 | 3.4\% | 1,290 | 3.27\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 300,084 | 90.10\% | 44,808 | 92.3\% | 35,983 | 91.2\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 294,597 | 88.50\% | 44,208 | 91.0\% | 35,424 | 89.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 5,487 | 1.60\% | 600 | 1.2\% | 559 | 1.4\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 32,801 | 9.90\% | 3,761 | 7.7\% | 3,493 | 9\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 163,877 | 49.20\% | 22,527 | 46.4\% | 18,681 | 47.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 169,008 | 50.80\% | 26,042 | 53.6\% | 20,795 | 52.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,438 | 100\% | 17,414 | 100\% | 13,786 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 63,396 | 52.20\% | 7,162 | 41.1\% | 5,868 | 42.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 26,386 | 21.70\% | 2,257 | 13.0\% | 1,957 | 14.2\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,874 | 5.70\% | 1,043 | 6.0\% | 917 | 6.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,298 | 1.90\% | 218 | 1.3\% | 251 | 1.8\% |


|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | Texas City |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0817-APP City of Texas City Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 19,680 | 16.20\% | 2,909 | 16.7\% | 2,283 | 16.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,541 | 1.30\% | 312 | 1.8\% | 283 | 2.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 14,218 | 11.70\% | 1,746 | 10.0\% | 1,316 | 9.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4,265 | 3.50\% | 561 | 3.2\% | 480 | 3.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 31,488 | 25.90\% | 6,300 | 36.2\% | 4,718 | 34.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 7,188 | 5.90\% | 1,930 | 11.1\% | 1,588 | 11.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 15,585 | 12.80\% | 2,555 | 14.7\% | 1,859 | 13.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 7,506 | 6.20\% | 1,178 | 6.8\% | 972 | 7.1\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 42,046 | 34.60\% | 5,653 | 32.5\% | 4,737 | 34.4\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 33,140 | 27.30\% | 5,277 | 30.3\% | 4,199 | 30.5\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 327,847 | 100\% | 47,087 | 100\% | 38,257 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 43,303 | 13.20\% | 8,629 | 18.3\% | 6,784 | 17.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Galveston County Water Control \& Improvements District \#1: Water System Improvements Project - \$8,107,920.79-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Dickinson, benefitting 54.82\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $47.74 \%$ greater than the City of Dickinson's LMI percentage of $37.11 \%, 41.89 \%$ greater than Galveston County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $22.76 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The Galveston County Water Control \& Improvement District \#1 provides water and sanitary sewer service to the city of Dickinson. The improvements will mitigate potential damages that will occur in future flood events, and protects the community's health, wellness and safety by providing reliable facilities for water pressure and delivery service during natural disaster events such as the severe riverine flooding experienced during Hurricane Harvey. They will also improve the efficiency of the water plants' operations and will therefore provide savings on operations and energy costs.

The project encompasses the following improvements:

1. Construct new water booster station facilities at each water plant above the floodplain Falco and Hollywood Booster Stations. The improvements will also provide more efficient booster pumps and reduce the power required for pumping operations.
2. Install and elevate natural gas emergency generators at each water plant to mitigate potential damages associated with flooding and to provide backup power in the event of a power outage.
3. Upgrade/Upsize existing water distribution line between the two water plants and create a water system loop for redundancy/resiliency.
4. Inspect, rehabilitate, and re-paint existing ground storage tanks at each water plant.
5. Rehabilitate and re-paint the elevated storage tank at the Hollywood water plant.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 11,710 within the city of Dickinson, a community of 20,754 residents in Galveston County $(332,885)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Census Tract 7209 has an AMFI of $\$ 64,988$ and Dickinson has an AMFI of $\$ 85,213$ according to ACS 2019. This Census Tract of 7209 is $83 \%$ of the HUD Metro FMR area and the City of Dickenson is $108 \%$ of the HUD Metro FMR area. Dickinson is in Galveston County which is within the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD Metro FMR area which has an

AMFI of $\$ 78,800$. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $13.30 \%$, equal to the city of Dickinson which is at $13.30 \%$, greater than Galveston County's poverty rate of $13.20 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $41.41 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than the city of Dickinson's population percentage of $34.30 \%$, greater than Galveston County's $24.60 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $46.05 \%$ white alone, less than the city of Dickinson's percentage of $54.80 \%$, less than Galveston County's percentage of $57.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $9.55 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is greater than the city of Dickinson, which has $7.20 \%$, less than Galveston County (12.30\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.09 \%$, less than the city of Dickinson, which is at $0.60 \%$, less than Galveston County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $1.65 \%$ Asian alone, less than the city of Dickinson at $1.70 \%$, less than Galveston County's percentage of $3.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.04 \%$, greater than the city of Dickinson at $0.00 \%$, greater than Galveston County $(0.000 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$ some other race alone, equal to the city of Dickinson, which is at $0.00 \%$, less than Galveston County's percentage of $0.10 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $1.21 \%$ two or more races, less than the city of Dickinson at $1.40 \%$, less than Galveston County, which is at $2.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The physical work is taking place in the most diverse census tract in the City of Dickinson. It has a small population of 499 people. The demographic make-up is $27.9 \%$ Black or African American, $37.3 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, and $30.1 \%$ White not of Hispanic or Latino origin. The work is being performed at two locations: the existing water tower location and the maintenance area for the water district. We do not know the exact location of the pipe, but there are neighborhoods between the two facilities that may be impacted during construction. There appears to be a right-of-way in between the facilities. The refreshing of the sites should be beneficial to the adjacent community, and the project should benefit the entire service area overall.

The City of Dickinson in the 2019 ACS had a $44.6 \%$ racial and ethnic population. The 2020 Census data has moved Dickinson to a racial and ethnic minority population of $48.2 \%$. Over the same period, the White not Hispanic or Latino origin population went from $54.8 \%$ to $45.6 \%$. Dickinson does not have any majority populations.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $80.62 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than $84.80 \%$ in the Galveston County Water Control and Improvements District (WCID) \#1, less than Galveston County at $90.10 \%$ and less than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $24.96 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of Dickinson at $26.20 \%$, less than Galveston

County's percentage of $25.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $7.01 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18 , less than the city of Dickinson which is at $5.80 \%$, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $5.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $10.84 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the city of Dickinson at $13.50 \%$, less than Galveston County at $12.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $5.94 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than the city of Dickinson who is at $7.80 \%$, less than Galveston County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $39.16 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than the city of Dickinson at $31.00 \%$, greater than Galveston County, which is at $34.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $27.14 \%$, less than the city of Dickinson at $27.30 \%$, less than Galveston County's $27.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $12.43 \%$, greater than the city of Dickinson at $12.40 \%$, less than Galveston County's $13.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The Hollywood plant is located at Hollywood Street near Highway 3. On Highway 3, most of the structures are commercial. The Hollywood plant has an elevated water tower, and there are small houses across the street from the plant. There are additional houses nearby, but only one or two are closer than across the street. The houses are generally smaller but well maintained for the most part.

The Falco plant is in a more mixed area - although both plants are close together physically. One must approach the plant from the neighborhood, as the company has the Falco entrance fenced off from Timber Road. Timber Road has some larger houses, but only on the opposite side of the street from the plant. The neighborhood around the Falco plant has mixed housing with some new construction present.

The Falco plant is more than a water storage tank, it also has front loaders and trucks in an open shed. Falco road runs into some of the offices of the WCID \#1 which calls itself "The Water Company."

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | City of Dickinson |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1141-APP |  |  |
|  |  |  | Galveston County WCID \#1 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.64\% |  | 37.11\% |  | 54.82\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$73,330 |  | \$66,875 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 13.20\% |  | 13.30\% |  | 13.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 332,885 |  | 20,754 |  | 21,643 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 82,003 | 24.60\% | 7,112 | 34.3\% | 8,962 | 41.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,882 | 75.40\% | 13,642 | 65.7\% | 12,681 | 58.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 190,948 | 57.40\% | 11,363 | 54.8\% | 9,967 | 46.1\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 41,105 | 12.30\% | 1,496 | 7.2\% | 2,067 | 9.6\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 785 | 0.20\% | 118 | 0.6\% | 19 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 10,840 | 3.30\% | 358 | 1.7\% | 358 | 1.7\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 110 | 0.00\% | 9 | 0.0\% | 9 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 282 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 6,812 | 2.00\% | 298 | 1.4\% | 261 | 1.21\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 300,084 | 90.10\% | 17,591 | 84.8\% | 17,735 | 81.9\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 294,597 | 88.50\% | 17,104 | 82.4\% | 17,449 | 80.6\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 5,487 | 1.60\% | 487 | 2.3\% | 286 | 1.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 32,801 | 9.90\% | 3,163 | 15.2\% | 3,908 | 18\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 163,877 | 49.20\% | 10,890 | 52.5\% | 10,893 | 50.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 169,008 | 50.80\% | 9,864 | 47.5\% | 10,750 | 49.7\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,438 | 100\% | 7,881 | 100\% | 7,637 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 63,396 | 52.20\% | 4,285 | 54.4\% | 3,904 | 51.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 26,386 | 21.70\% | 1,527 | 19.4\% | 1,513 | 19.8\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,874 | 5.70\% | 362 | 4.6\% | 605 | 7.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,298 | 1.90\% | 162 | 2.1\% | 349 | 4.6\% |


|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | City of Dickinson |  | Harvey (HUD MID)CDR17-1141-APPGalveston County WCID \#1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 19,680 | 16.20\% | 1,168 | 14.8\% | 1,222 | 16.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,541 | 1.30\% | 67 | 0.9\% | 151 | 2.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 14,218 | 11.70\% | 979 | 12.4\% | 808 | 10.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4,265 | 3.50\% | 245 | 3.1\% | 320 | 4.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 31,488 | 25.90\% | 2,066 | 26.2\% | 1,906 | 25.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 7,188 | 5.90\% | 461 | 5.8\% | 535 | 7.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 15,585 | 12.80\% | 1064 | 13.5\% | 828 | 10.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 7,506 | 6.20\% | 615 | 7.8\% | 454 | 5.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 42,046 | 34.60\% | 2,445 | 31.0\% | 2,991 | 39.2\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 33,140 | 27.30\% | 2,148 | 27.3\% | 2,073 | 27.1\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 327,847 | 100\% | 20,744 | 100\% | 21,628 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 43,303 | 13.20\% | 2,579 | 12.4\% | 2,688 | 12.4\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## City of La Marque: Drainage Improvements - \$7,493,145 - Addressed Risk: Severe Coastal

 Flooding, and StormsThis project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of La Marque, benefitting 53.99\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $39.72 \%$ greater than Galveston County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $20.89 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

With these grant funds, the city of La Marque will improve its wastewater collection system, which consists of sanitary sewer manholes, pipes and lift stations. The upgrades will minimize the inflow of floodwaters into the wastewater collection system, protect resident's homes from sewage backup, and ensure the wastewater treatment system will operate within acceptable range during flood event. Mitigating the effects of sewage overflow into the streets and resident homes are paramount to the effectiveness of the stable collection system.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

La Marque is a community of 16,627 residents in Galveston County $(332,885)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of La Marque is $\$ 53,964,26.41 \%$ less than Galveston County's median income of $\$ 73,330$, and $3.47 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. La Marque's AMFI is $\$ 66,908$ according to the ACS 2019. This is $85 \%$ of the HUD AMFI of $\$ 78,800$ for the area. La Marque is in Galveston County, which is part of the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of La Marque was $16.40 \%$, compared with Galveston County's poverty rate of $13.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of La Marque's population is $31.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Galveston County's $24.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of La Marque is $34.80 \%$ white alone, less than Galveston County's white alone percentage of $57.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of La Marque is $30.10 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Galveston County (12.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for La Marque is $0.00 \%$, less than Galveston County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of La Marque is $3.20 \%$ Asian alone, less than Galveston County's percentage of $3.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of 5.0

La Marque is a majority minority community with a diverse population. The White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population is a plurality at $34.8 \%$. Hispanic or Latino origin residents make up
$31.1 \%$ of the population; followed closely by the Black or African American Community at $30.1 \%$. The total percentage of racial and ethnic minorities in La Marque is $61.2 \%$. Census Tract 7230 in La Marque has a population of 3,540 residents, with a majority being Black or African American at $51.8 \%$, Hispanic or Latino origin at $25.3 \%$, and White not of Hispanic or Latino origin at $18.7 \%$.

The households in La Marque are comprised of $45.10 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Galveston County's $52.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in La Marque that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $16.90 \%$ this is less than Galveston County's percentage of $21.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of La Marque, $33.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $25.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. La Marque's households are $7.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $5.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$.

In La Marque $34.60 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is equal to Galveston County, which is at $34.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within La Marque that have one or more people of 65 or older is $30.80 \%$, which is greater than Galveston County's $27.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of La Marque is $17.30 \%$ which is greater than Galveston County's $13.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

La Marque ISD was taken over at the request of the state by the Texas City ISD. The La Marque High School has a heavier concentration of Black or African American students than the Texas City High School in the same district. Texas City ISD is looking at a plan to limit concentrations of minorities in one school as part of a GLO/HUD grant to reduce the weather impacts of future storms. La Marque High School is part of this process. A new La Marque middle school is being constructed, utilizing bond funds.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | 2015 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0812-APP |
|  |  |  | City of La Marque |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.64\% |  | 53.99\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$73,330 |  | \$53,964 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 13.20\% |  | 16.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 332,885 |  | 16,627 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 82,003 | 24.60\% | 5,163 | 31.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,882 | 75.40\% | 11,464 | 68.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 190,948 | 57.40\% | 5,782 | 34.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 41,105 | 12.30\% | 5,013 | 30.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 785 | 0.20\% | 3 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 10,840 | 3.30\% | 524 | 3.2\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 110 | 0.00\% | 6 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 282 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 6,812 | 2.00\% | 136 | 0.8\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 300,084 | 90.10\% | 15,397 | 92.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 294,597 | 88.50\% | 15,271 | 91.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 5,487 | 1.60\% | 126 | 0.8\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 32,801 | 9.90\% | 1,230 | 7.4\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 163,877 | 49.20\% | 8,184 | 49.2\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 169,008 | 50.80\% | 8,443 | 50.8\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,438 | 100\% | 5,960 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 63,396 | 52.20\% | 2,686 | 45.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 26,386 | 21.70\% | 1,006 | 16.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,874 | 5.70\% | 488 | 8.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,298 | 1.90\% | 221 | 3.7\% |

2015 Floods (State MID)

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | 2015 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0812-APP |
|  |  |  | City of La Marque |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 19,680 | 16.20\% | 785 | 13.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 1,541 | 1.30\% | 52 | 0.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 14,218 | 11.70\% | 652 | 10.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4,265 | 3.50\% | 202 | 3.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 31,488 | 25.90\% | 2,001 | 33.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 7,188 | 5.90\% | 425 | 7.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 15,585 | 12.80\% | 915 | 15.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 7,506 | 6.20\% | 570 | 9.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 42,046 | 34.60\% | 2,063 | 34.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 33,140 | 27.30\% | 1,836 | 30.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 327,847 | 100\% | 16,510 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 43,303 | 13.20\% | 2,864 | 17.3\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Hitchcock: Wastewater Treatment System Improvements - \$3,598,615-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Hitchcock, benefitting $54.47 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $40.97 \%$ greater than Galveston County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $21.97 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Hitchcock experiences heavy rains, floods and hurricanes that flood the city, which results in damages to the public infrastructure and housing. Heavy rain events in this area particularly impacts the wastewater system by overflowing the lines, disrupting sewer service, and exceeding permitted flows. The wastewater treatment plant is approximately 40 years old and is easily impacted with the increasing number of floods and rain events. The activities planned aim to increase the reliability of wastewater delivery and treatment during high rain events resulting from hurricanes and tropical storms/depressions.

The following improvements will improve treatment of wastewater and reliability of the wastewater delivery.

- Replace the existing manual screen with a self-cleaning bar screen.
- Increase the belt press size to improve the manageability of the solids encountered, especially during high flows.
- Replace the stormwater clarifier and the two final clarifier mechanisms.
- Automate the operation of the distribution gates between the final and storm water clarifiers.
- Improve power distribution to the aeration basin aerators.
- Structural repairs and coating protection.
- Install a SCADA monitoring system for the wastewater plants and the lift stations.
- Replace pipes at Jackson Street, for a total of 4,200 linear feet.
- Replace pipes at Delesandri Drive, for a total of 2,400 linear feet.
- Rehabilitation of manholes at 21 locations citywide.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Hitchcock is a community of 7,800 residents in Galveston County $(332,885)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Hitchcock's AMFI is $\$ 65,750$ according to the ACS 2019 compared with the HUD AMFI of $\$ 78,800$. Galveston County is part of the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD FMR Area for income purposes. The median household income of Hitchcock is $\$ 57,829,21.14 \%$ less than Galveston County's median income of $\$ 73,330$, and $10.88 \%$ greater than the eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Hitchcock was $21.10 \%$, compared with Galveston

County's poverty rate of $13.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. Hitchcock contains one of the three R/ECAPS identified in Galveston County: Census Tract 7237. This Census tract will benefit from these improvements though the actual work is not in the tract itself. The project is a citywide benefit as it upgrades the wastewater facility for the city as a whole. The Census Tract in ACS 2019 had a $32.7 \%$ poverty rating and a $69.8 \%$ racial and ethnic group concentration.

The city of Hitchcock's population is $27.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Galveston County's $24.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Hitchcock is $46.90 \%$ white alone, less than Galveston County's white alone percentage of $57.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Hitchcock is $24.20 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Galveston County (12.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Hitchcock is $0.30 \%$, greater than Galveston County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively.

Hitchcock is a majority minority city according to ACS 2019 at 52.1\%. The Hispanic or Latino demographic makes up $27.8 \%$ of the community. Black or African American residents account for $24.2 \%$ of the city. And the White not of Hispanic or Latino Origin is at $46.9 \%$. The community has had a slight increase in people classified as White not of Hispanic or Latino origin with an increase in raw numbers from 3,207 in the 2017 ACS to 3,619 in the 2019 ACS data.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $93.1 \%$ in the city of Hitchcock, greater than $90.1 \%$ in Galveston County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Hitchcock is $49.20 \%$ male, equal to Galveston County ( $49.20 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Hitchcock is $50.80 \%$ female, equal to the $50.80 \%$ of Galveston County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Hitchcock, $33.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $25.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Hitchcock's households are $9.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Galveston County's percentage of $5.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$.

In Hitchcock $36.00 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Galveston County, which is at $34.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Hitchcock that have one or more people of 65 or older is $26.80 \%$, which is less than Galveston County's $27.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Hitchcock is $14.30 \%$ which is greater than Galveston County's $13.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The project is a citywide benefit and does not seem to benefit or burden any demographic groups at the expense of any other.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0829-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Hitchcock |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.64\% |  | 54.47\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$73,330 |  | \$57,829 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 13.20\% |  | 21.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 332,885 |  | 7,800 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 82,003 | 24.60\% | 2,173 | 27.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,882 | 75.40\% | 5,627 | 72.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 190,948 | 57.40\% | 3,659 | 46.9\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 41,105 | 12.30\% | 1,891 | 24.2\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 785 | 0.20\% | 27 | 0.3\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 10,840 | 3.30\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 110 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 282 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 6,812 | 2.00\% | 50 | 0.6\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 300,084 | 90.10\% | 7,389 | 94.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 294,597 | 88.50\% | 7,262 | 93.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 5,487 | 1.60\% | 127 | 1.6\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 32,801 | 9.90\% | 411 | 5.3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 163,877 | 49.20\% | 3,835 | 49.2\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 169,008 | 50.80\% | 3,965 | 50.8\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,438 | 100\% | 2,837 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 63,396 | 52.20\% | 1,308 | 46.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 26,386 | 21.70\% | 512 | 18.0\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,874 | 5.70\% | 95 | 3.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,298 | 1.90\% | 47 | 1.7\% |


|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Galveston County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0829-APP City of Hitchcock City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 19,680 | 16.20\% | 477 | 16.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,541 | 1.30\% | 7 | 0.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 14,218 | 11.70\% | 423 | 14.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4,265 | 3.50\% | 117 | 4.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 31,488 | 25.90\% | 957 | 33.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 7,188 | 5.90\% | 280 | 9.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 15,585 | 12.80\% | 460 | 16.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 7,506 | 6.20\% | 158 | 5.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 42,046 | 34.60\% | 1,022 | 36.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 33,140 | 27.30\% | 759 | 26.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 327,847 | 100\% | 7,800 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 43,303 | 13.20\% | 1,119 | 14.3\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Galveston County: Project Service Areas



## Galveston County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category




## Galveston County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Pasadena: Flood Mitigation Project - \$47,278,951.21 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Pasadena, benefitting 65.37\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $19.52 \%$ greater than the City of Pasadena's LMI percentage of $54.69 \%, 36.43 \%$ greater than Harris County's LMI percentage of $47.91 \%$ and $46.36 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The Vince Bayou and Cotton Patch watershed are contiguous and combine in the Houston Ship Channel during severe coastal flooding events caused by hurricanes and stalling tropical storms. The project represents a strategy to mitigate and relieve some of these impacts during hurricanes and tropical storms that occur frequently in the upper Texas gulf coast.

The Vince Bayou portion of the project will separate disparate exposure of storm water distribution from the Little Vince Bayou branch of Vince Bayou, create additional storage through detention along Little Vince taking advantage of existing freeboard in the existing channel, and reduce current major floodplain losses in Armand Bayou.

This project will encompass the following activities:

- Close the upper reaches of Little Vince Bayou with storm sewer boxes and create detention for these increased flows along the existing channel
- Install 5,900 LF of trench protection system at the Cotton Patch Bayou
- Rehabilitate over 9,000 linear of existing corrugated galvanized metal pipes (CGMP) through grout injection of haunches, restoration of invert and cementitious coating at the Harris Storm Sewer and Queen Storm Sewer.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 49,315 within the city of Pasadena, a community of 153,350 residents in Harris County $(4,646,630)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. This is a diverse area that has a range of AMFI from a low of $\$ 31,362$ to a high of $\$ 58,624$. This is $50 \%$ and $97 \%$ of the Pasadena ACS 2019 AMFI and $40 \%$ and $74 \%$ of the HUD AMFI of $\$ 78,800$, respectively. Pasadena is in Harris County which is located within the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $22.2 \%$, greater than the city of Pasadena which is at $17.70 \%$, greater than Harris County's poverty rate of $16.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $84.01 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than the city of Pasadena's population percentage of $70.50 \%$, greater than Harris County's $42.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $11.39 \%$ white alone, less than the city of Pasadena's percentage of $24.00 \%$, less than Harris County's percentage of $29.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $3.88 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is greater than the city of Pasadena, which has $2.30 \%$, less than Harris County $(18.60 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.02 \%$, less than the city of Pasadena, which is at $0.20 \%$, less than Harris County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.40 \%$ Asian alone, less than the city of Pasadena at $2.00 \%$, less than Harris County's percentage of $6.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.05 \%$, greater than the city of Pasadena at $0.00 \%$, less than Harris County $(0.100 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.02 \%$ some other race alone, greater than the city of Pasadena, which is at $0.00 \%$, less than Harris County's percentage of $0.20 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.24 \%$ two or more races, less than the city of Pasadena at $1.00 \%$, less than Harris County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The area is heavily Hispanic or Latino origin, with few White not of Hispanic or Latino origin and 555 total Black or African Americans out of an estimated 36,068 residents. The identified Census Tracts (Census Tracts $3220,3228,3229,3230,3231,3235$ ) are estimates because they represent where the projects were physically marked but may not fully reflect drainage patterns. This is especially important because this area was identified in the Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Harris County, City of Pasadena, City of Missouri City, City of Galveston, Harris County Housing Authority, and Galveston Housing Authority (AI) as potential R/ECAPs. The current list within Harris County of R/ECAPs has three of these Census Tracts classified as meeting the standard (3220, 3230, and 3231).

In looking at the estimated areas, (the AI shades the Census Tracts but does not identify them by number) none of the Census Tracts still qualify under the definition used in the AI of having a $40 \%$ poverty rate. We have used a lower rate previously in Texas, but if using the HUD and AI definition, the highest percentage of residents below poverty is $33.6 \%$ in the 2019 ACS five-year average. However, there is a concentrated area of minorities in this area with the lowest total of racial and ethnic minorities being $88.7 \%$, and the highest being $94 \%$.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $67.15 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than $73.40 \%$ in the city of Pasadena, less than Harris County at $73.90 \%$ and less than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $29.23 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than the city of Pasadena at $25.60 \%$, greater than Harris County's percentage of $27.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $12.56 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse
or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than the city of Pasadena which is at $8.40 \%$, greater than Harris County's percentage of $7.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $9.64 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the city of Pasadena at $9.90 \%$, less than Harris County at $13.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $4.58 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than the city of Pasadena who is at $4.60 \%$, less than Harris County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $4.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $51.64 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than the city of Pasadena at $43.90 \%$, greater than Harris County, which is at $38.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $21.07 \%$, less than the city of Pasadena at $22.20 \%$, less than Harris County's $21.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $9.88 \%$, less than the city of Pasadena at $10.80 \%$, greater than Harris County's $9.20 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The housing in this area of North Pasadena is generally smaller with wood siding. Many of the older tract looking homes are of a similar style. In the Cotton patch area, the houses are in small residential lots with open car ports and generally are in relatively good repair. The streets are fairly narrow, and there is parking on the street. There are a lot of neighborhood streets like this in this area.

When driving near the pipe repairs on Harris Street, there is a large neighborhood off Strawberry that sits on the Little Vince bayou which has been channelized with concrete. The bayou meets at the neighborhood in a three-way intersection. At this point of Harris, most of the street is commercial buildings, although neighborhoods are behind the buildings. Based on the site visit and the Census data, this area appears to be low income.

The pipeline work near Gary/Laverne/Doris is an open area between neighborhoods. It appears to be a natural drainage area for the neighborhoods. The houses in the immediate area around the project work site are mixed, but generally are smaller with brick and wood. The streets are narrow, and the open area cuts the neighborhood into two parts without many streets crossing between the neighborhoods. A few blocks away near Fresa Road has mixed housing with some larger homes and then many MHUs mixed in. Based on the site visit and the Census information, this area appears to be low income.

In the Little Vince Bayou area with the detention pond, we followed the bayou through the neighborhood to the extent we could. The detention pond is in a large open field that buffers between the more commercial areas on Morning Glory and the residences. This is a mixed housing area. Many of the lots are residential in size, but there are larger lots and bigger houses scattered through the neighborhood. There is a mix of brick and wood houses. Some have deferred maintenance issues, but overall, the neighborhood is in good repair.

It appears that the drainage patterns would include many of the identified R/ECAP areas, or areas adjacent to these areas, given they are all located in North Pasadena and are within the Vince Bayou and Cotton Patch areas. The drainage issue would likely meet one of the AI goals in which is Fair Housing Goal number 8 that says, "prioritize City development incentives to support infrastructure upgrades, blight relocation efforts, and commercial development in underserved neighborhoods."

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | City of Pasadena |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1140-APP City of Pasadena Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.91\% |  | 54.69\% |  | 65.37\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$61,705 |  | \$55,039 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.20\% |  | 17.70\% |  | 17.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 4,646,630 |  | 153,350 |  | 38,100 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,995,115 | 42.9\% | 108,092 | 70.5\% | 32,006 | 84.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,651,515 | 57.1\% | 45,258 | 29.5\% | 6,094 | 16.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,374,905 | 29.6\% | 36,751 | 24.0\% | 4,339 | 11.4\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 863,044 | 18.6\% | 3,586 | 2.3\% | 1,480 | 3.9\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 8,105 | 0.2\% | 252 | 0.2\% | 9 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 321,392 | 6.9\% | 3008 | 2.0\% | 151 | 0.4\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 2,441 | 0.1\% | 25 | 0.0\% | 19 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 11,171 | 0.2\% | 32 | 0.0\% | 6 | 0.02\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 70,457 | 1.5\% | 1604 | 1.0\% | 90 | 0.24\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 3,431,901 | 73.9\% | 112,539 | 73.4\% | 26,218 | 68.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 3,362,166 | 72.4\% | 110,429 | 72.0\% | 25,586 | 67.2\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 69,735 | 1.5\% | 2110 | 1.4\% | 632 | 1.7\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,214,729 | 26.1\% | 40,811 | 27\% | 11,882 | 31\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 2,309,012 | 49.7\% | 76,797 | 50.1\% | 18,762 | 49.2\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,337,618 | 50.3\% | 76,553 | 49.9\% | 19,338 | 50.8\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,605,368 | 100\% | 48,019 | 100\% | 11,169 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 752,622 | 46.9\% | 24,081 | 50.1\% | 5,365 | 48.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 358,930 | 22.4\% | 12,070 | 25.1\% | 3,087 | 27.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 97,517 | 6.1\% | 2900 | 6.0\% | 701 | 6.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 42,890 | 2.7\% | 1429 | 3.0\% | 418 | 3.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics


City of Baytown: East District Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase II - \$32,394,113.86-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project serves an area of 22,355 beneficiaries within the city of Baytown, benefiting 52.29 percent LMI persons therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's beneficiary LMI percentage is 3.54 percent greater than the LMI percentages of the city of Baytown, 9.14 percent greater than Harris County, and 17.08 percent greater than the MIT Eligible counties (50.50 percent, 47.91 percent, and 44.66 percent respectively).

Most of Baytown's East District Wastewater Treatment Plant is located within the 100-year flood plain. This project will protect city assets and prevent potential damage from future flooding events and protect operational safety to serve the community. The sum total of these efforts will bring the major process areas of the plant above the $500-\mathrm{yr}$ flood plain level by at least one foot and protect the plant in the future against severe damage such as that seen during Hurricane Harvey in 2017.

To increase flood resiliency of the East District Wastewater Treatment Plant, the city of Baytown will execute the following:

1. Construct new two-story dewatering and chemical storage buildings.
2. Add a protective wall around the treatment units.
3. Raise vulnerable pump stations above the flood elevation.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that essentially required the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by hurricanes and flooding. The impacted areas were able to prioritize and select local project they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by future storms. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 22,355 within the city of Baytown, a community of 76,635 residents in Chambers County and Harris County $(4,646,630)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The City of Baytown median income ( $\$ 57,270$ ) is 7.7 percent lower than Harris County $(\$ 61,705)$ and 8.9 percent greater than the MIT Eligible Area $(\$ 52,155)$. Baytown has a higher AMFI at $\$ 71,944$. This is $91.3 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for both Chambers and Harris Counties. Both Chambers and Harris Counties are within the Houston-The WoodlandsSugarland TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $16.00 \%$, equal to the city of Baytown which is at $16.00 \%$, less than Harris County's poverty rate of $16.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

Baytown is a majority minority city with 64.2 percent of the community being Black or African American or of Hispanic or Latino origin. This compares with 61.9 percent of the population of Harris County for the same demographic. The project area is majority minority and LMI at greater
percentages than Harris County as a whole. The poverty rate for the area is slightly higher than Harris County as a whole.

In examining trends for Baytown as a whole, the 2010 Census identified a Black or African American population of 15.1 percent and a Hispanic or Latino population of 43.4 percent. In the recently released 2020 redistricting data, Baytown had an increase to 16.3 percent and 49.5 percent demographic population respectively. Correspondingly, the White not of Hispanic or Latino population dropped by 9.9 percent to 28.8 percent in 2020.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is 84.2 percent for the project service area of this project, 81.8 percent for the city of Baytown, 73.9 percent for Harris County, and 82.5 percent for the MIT eligible area.

Married-couple families with children for the project service area are 19.6 percent, 21.6 percent for the city of Baytown, 22.4 percent for Harris County, and the 22.3 percent MIT Eligible Area. In the project service area, housing with a female householder is 31.8 percent, 27.7 percent for the city of Baytown, 27.9 for Harris County, and 26.8 for the MIT Eligible Area. Households with children in the project service area is 41.1 percent, 38.5 for the city of Baytown, 38.0 percent for Harris County, and 36.5 percent for the MIT Eligible Area. Nearly 13 percent ( 12.9 percent) are disabled in the project service area with 12.2 percent for the city of Baytown, 9.2 percent for Harris County, and 11.1 percent in the MIT Eligible Area.

At the time of application, Baytown was a community of 76,635 residents and the project serves 36,143 (47.16 percent) of those individuals.

While the city of Baytown is within two counties (Harris County and Chambers County), the project is wholly within the Harris County portion of the city.

Based on the observations from the AFFH project review for this project, there are a few houses in the immediate area of the project site. The only potential burden of the project would be felt during construction by the very few residents located near the plant with construction traffic as the ingress and egress is to a light on Highway 146 and Ferry Road. The negative impacts of this project are not substantial on any protected class or any residents when compared to the benefit for continued wastewater support for residents during weather related events for the large service area. The location of the project already has the same general use, and it does not appear to impact local residents significantly for the benefit provided.

In conclusion, this city of Baytown area-benefit east district wastewater treatment plant phase II project will have a positive impact on a variety of protected classes in the service area while also benefiting the 52.29 percent of LMI persons across the project service area.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | City of Baytown |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0881-APP City of Baytown Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.91\% |  | 50.54\% |  | 52.29\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$61,705 |  | \$57,270 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.20\% |  | 16.00\% |  | 16.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 4,646,630 |  | 76,635 |  | 36,143 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,995,115 | 42.9\% | 36,052 | 47.0\% | 15,689 | 43.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,651,515 | 57.1\% | 40,583 | 53.0\% | 20,454 | 56.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,374,905 | 29.6\% | 24,360 | 31.8\% | 14,649 | 40.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 863,044 | 18.6\% | 13,219 | 17.2\% | 4,649 | 12.9\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 8,105 | 0.2\% | 44 | 0.1\% | 23 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 321,392 | 6.9\% | 1,384 | 1.8\% | 240 | 0.7\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 2,441 | 0.1\% | 14 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 11,171 | 0.2\% | 62 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 70,457 | 1.5\% | 1,500 | 2.00\% | 893 | 2.47\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 3,431,901 | 73.9\% | 62,686 | 81.8\% | 30,416 | 84.2\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 3,362,166 | 72.4\% | 60,804 | 79.3\% | 29,437 | 81.4\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 69,735 | 1.5\% | 1,882 | 2.5\% | 979 | 2.7\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,214,729 | 26.1\% | 13,949 | 18\% | 5,727 | 16\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 2,309,012 | 49.7\% | 38,459 | 50.2\% | 17,216 | 47.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,337,618 | 50.3\% | 38,176 | 49.8\% | 18,927 | 52.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,605,368 | 100\% | 26,474 | 100\% | 12,305 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 752,622 | 46.9\% | 11,966 | 45.2\% | 5,483 | 44.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 358,930 | 22.4\% | 5,711 | 21.6\% | 2,412 | 19.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 97,517 | 6.1\% | 1,814 | 6.9\% | 856 | 7.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 42,890 | 2.7\% | 1,108 | 4.2\% | 491 | 4.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics


This project provides an area benefit within the Harris County - Community Services Department, benefitting 79.39\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $65.71 \%$ greater than Harris County's LMI percentage of $47.91 \%$ and $77.77 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The Cloverleaf Stormwater Drainage Improvements will serve a portion of the Carpenters Bayou watershed. With these funds, Harris County will improve roadside ditches, construct a trunk line and a 109 acre-feet stormwater detention facility north of the San Jacinto Funeral Home \& Memorial Park, for an approximate combined 50yr Level-of-Service. The proposed trunk line alignment will run along Nancy Rose Street beginning with its headwaters near Victoria Street, turning eastward along Hillsboro Street, and out falling into the proposed detention facility north of the San Jacinto Funeral Home \& Memorial Park. The proposed detention basin will provide approximately 109 acre-feet of potential storage for mitigating conveyance impacts from Cloverleaf drainage improvements. The use of a stormwater trunk line will serve as a centralized drainage "artery" and for allowing lateral tie-ins from roadside ditch connections, before safely out falling into proposed detention basin.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 11,185 within Harris County $(4,646,630)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Census Tract 2331.01 has an income of $\$ 32,950$, Census Tract 2331.02 has an income of $\$ 36,215$, Census Tract 2331.03 has an income of $\$ 57,500$, and Cloverleaf has an income of $\$ 50,913$ according to ACS 2019. These are $41.8 \%$, $46 \%, 73 \%$, and $73 \%$ respectively of the HUD AMFI for Harris County. Harris County is in the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $16.20 \%$, which is less than Harris County's poverty rate of $20.6 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The Census tracts are all over $30 \%$ in poverty (2331.01-30.7\%, 2331.02-39\% and 23301.0341.1\%) according to ACS 2019.

The project beneficiary area is $86.68 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than Harris County's $42.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $10.63 \%$ white alone, less than Harris County's percentage of $29.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $1.75 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than Harris County (18.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible
area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.22 \%$, which is greater than Harris County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.06 \%$ Asian alone, less than Harris County's percentage of $6.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.10 \%$ some other race alone, less than Harris County's percentage of $0.20 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.55 \%$ two or more races, less than Harris County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Cloverleaf appears to be one of the Racial and Ethnic Concentrations of Poverty (R/ECAP) areas identified in the Regional Assessment of Fair Housing for Harris County, Galveston, Missouri City, Pasadena, Harris County Housing Authority and Galveston Housing Authority. This Regional Assessment is being utilized to discuss Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing issues in the participating jurisdictions' requests for mitigation funding. The overall plan is detailed and has identified areas in need of Fair Housing for the participating jurisdictions.

The area has a concentration of ethnic minorities. Census Tracts 2331.01 (79.5\%), 2331.02 ( $89.1 \%$ ), and 2331.03 ( $89.4 \%$ ) are all Hispanic or Latino origin majority populations. The Cloverleaf area has a majority minority population with the Black or African American population equaling $11 \%$, and a Hispanic or Latino origin population of $72.5 \%$. Census Tract 2331.03 is identified as a R/ECAP specifically, although the entire area has concentrations and near poverty income levels. Interestingly, Census Tract 2331.03 has the highest income in the area according to ACS 2019.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $70.70 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Harris County - Community Services Department Harris County at $73.90 \%$ and less than Harris County - Community Services Department the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $19.12 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Harris County's percentage of $27.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $9.39 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, which is greater than Harris County's percentage of $7.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $4.94 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than Harris County at $13.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $2.32 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it less than Harris County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $4.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $49.31 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Harris County, which is at $38.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $13.76 \%$, less than Harris County's $21.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $9.17 \%$, less than Harris County's $9.20 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The housing in the area is older. The Regional Assessment of Fair Housing describes this area as densely populated. The houses are generally small and are constructed with wood siding. There are also some MHUs in the community. The quality is mixed with some in need of repair and others being well-maintained. Further from Hillsboro where the detention pond and the end of the Trunk Line are to be located, the houses seem to be a little larger. There are existing open drainage ditches in the community.

Harris County in the Regional Assessment of Fair Housing identified in Disaster Harvey Goals Number 2 that they would "consider strategic investments to prevent and/or mitigate future damages related to natural disasters, particularly flooding events." One of the metrics and milestones was to prioritize drainage and wastewater management infrastructure improvements, especially where there is a concentration of low income people and/or minority concentrations. This project meets that metric and milestone.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) CDR17-0922-APP Harris County - CSD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.91\% |  | 79.39\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$61,705 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.20\% |  | 16.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 4,646,630 |  | 17,123 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,995,115 | 42.9\% | 14,843 | 86.7\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,651,515 | 57.1\% | 2,280 | 13.3\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,374,905 | 29.6\% | 1,821 | 10.6\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 863,044 | 18.6\% | 299 | 1.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 8,105 | 0.2\% | 38 | 0.2\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 321,392 | 6.9\% | 11 | 0.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 2,441 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 11,171 | 0.2\% | 17 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 70,457 | 1.5\% | 94 | 0.55\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 3,431,901 | 73.9\% | 10,040 | 58.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 3,362,166 | 72.4\% | 9,873 | 57.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 69,735 | 1.5\% | 167 | 1.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,214,729 | 26.1\% | 7,083 | 41\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 2,309,012 | 49.7\% | 8,781 | 51.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,337,618 | 50.3\% | 8,342 | 48.7\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ ( ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,605,368 | 100\% | 4571 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 752,622 | 46.9\% | 2,250 | 49.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 358,930 | 22.4\% | 1,280 | 28.0\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 97,517 | 6.1\% | 668 | 14.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 42,890 | 2.7\% | 455 | 10.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) CDR17-0922-APP <br> Harris County - CSD <br> Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 307,314 | 19.1\% | 779 | 17.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 22,587 | 1.4\% | 151 | 3.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 208,753 | 13.0\% | 427 | 9.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 36,478 | 2.3\% | 22 | 0.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 447,915 | 27.9\% | 874 | 19.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 118,023 | 7.4\% | 429 | 9.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 210,467 | 13.1\% | 226 | 4.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 74,188 | 4.6\% | 106 | 2.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 610,507 | 38.0\% | 2,254 | 49.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 338,867 | 21.1\% | 629 | 13.8\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 4,624,525 | 100\% | 17,123 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 426,349 | 9.2\% | 1,570 | 9.2\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov <br> ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Houston, benefitting 65.96\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $17.95 \%$ greater than the City of Houston's LMI percentage of $55.92 \%, 37.68 \%$ greater than Harris County's LMI percentage of $47.91 \%$ and $47.69 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The Alief Parks Area Flood Mitigation Project will reconfigure existing city parks to detain stormwater and reduce flood risk in surrounding areas located in the 100-year floodplain. Detention facilities will be installed in two different parks, Boone Park and Hackberry Park, and will together be able to detain 40 acre-feet of stormwater. The proposed improvements will also improve recreational spaces and deliver additional park amenities, such as wetlands habitat and other vegetation that will slow the movement of stormwater and improve stormwater quality. The improved detention at the city parks will complement and enhance conveyance improvements planned for future years in the City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Alief Forest North and Alief Forest South neighborhoods.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. This has been a targeted area for improved infrastructure in Houston planning. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 17,935 within the city of Houston, a community of $2,310,432$ residents in Harris County $(4,646,630)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Three Census Tracts make up the majority of the beneficiary area where the work is being completed. Census Tract 4528.02 has an AMFI of $\$ 44,698$, Census Tract 4529 's AMFI is $\$ 48,281$, and Census Tract 4530's AMFI is $\$ 46,632$ according to ACS 2019. These are $57 \%, 61 \%$ and $59 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Harris County of $\$ 78,800$. Harris County is within the Houston - The Woodlands - Sugarland TX HUD FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $20.60 \%$, equal to the city of Houston which is at $20.60 \%$, greater than Harris County's poverty rate of $16.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $64.11 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than the city of Houston's population percentage of $45.00 \%$, greater than Harris County's $42.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $4.56 \%$ white alone, less than the city of Houston's percentage of $24.40 \%$, less than Harris County's percentage of $29.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $10.97 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than the city of Houston, which has $22.10 \%$, less than Harris County ( $18.60 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The population in the project benefit area is $19.79 \%$ Asian alone, greater than the city of

Houston at $6.70 \%$, greater than Harris County's percentage of $6.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.58 \%$ two or more races, less than the city of Houston at $1.40 \%$, less than Harris County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The targeted area is a majority minority area with people of Hispanic or Latino origin and Asian demographics being the largest percentage of residents. The poverty areas are relatively high-in the $18 \%$ to $28 \%$ range-but not to a concentration of poverty level from a national standard. There are R/ECAPs in Harris County and Houston, but this project does not meet the tests. The area is a concentrated minority area; however, the demographics of Hispanic or Latino origin are $65.4 \%$, Asian only at $20.7 \%$, Black or African American at $8.7 \%$ and White not Hispanic or Latino at 4.6\%.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $45.77 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than $70.70 \%$ in the city of Houston, less than Harris County at $73.90 \%$ and less than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $49.56 \%$ married couple families, less than the city of Houston at $38.30 \%$ greater than Harris County's $46.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $23.33 \%$, greater than the city of Houston at $17.40 \%$, greater than Harris County's percentage of $22.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $9.41 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than the city of Houston's percentage of $6.70 \%$, greater than Harris County's percentage of $6.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $4.84 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than the city of Houston at $2.70 \%$, greater than Harris County's $2.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $26.50 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of Houston at $31.60 \%$, less than Harris County's percentage of $27.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $11.36 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than the city of Houston which is at $7.70 \%$, greater than Harris County's percentage of $7.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $5.52 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the city of Houston at $15.90 \%$, less than Harris County at $13.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $2.45 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than the city of Houston who is at $5.40 \%$, less than Harris County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $4.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

The project beneficiary area is comprised of $14.52 \%$ households that are occupied by a male with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of Houston at $23.30 \%$, less than Harris County $(19.10 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $17.6 \%$. The project beneficiary area's
households are $0.86 \%$ occupied by a male householder with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18 , less than the city of Houston at $1.30 \%$, less than Harris County, which is at $1.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $1.4 \%$. The project beneficiary area has $5.52 \%$ of households that are occupied by a male living alone, which is less than the city of Houston $16.40 \%$, less than Harris County's $13.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage $11.8 \%$. The project beneficiary area has $0.86 \%$ households occupied by a male householder with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , less than the city of Houston at $2.70 \%$, less than Harris County, which is at $2.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area, which has 2.7\%

In the project eligibility area, $48.14 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than the city of Houston at $33.00 \%$, greater than Harris County, which is at $38.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $24.97 \%$, greater than the city of Houston at $20.90 \%$, greater than Harris County's $21.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $9.32 \%$, less than the city of Houston at $9.50 \%$, greater than Harris County's $9.20 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The area has a large commercial section, but in looking at the Census information: it is primarily a low-income area. There is some crime in the area according to neighborhood reporting in the Houston Crime Statistic Website, but residents were in both of the parks that border the drainage project at dusk during the site visit. According to ACS 2019 data, $38.7 \%$ of residents in this project area are renters, and of those, $56.7 \%$ have rents that are unaffordable by HUD standards.

Houston conducted an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing and identified the AliefWestwood area as a target for a Complete Community action plan. This project appears to be working toward that objective. In addition, Action item number 26 identified the need to protect households in areas that consistently have flooding. The Action Item was actually to buyout homes in these areas. However, the impediment that this action is designed to "correct is imbalanced distribution of amenities, services, and infrastructure between neighborhoods" this was Impediment 9 in the 2015 AI. This project may help with the infrastructure balance. Action Item 27 is to create a Stormwater Master Plan. The same impediment mentioned above is the reason for this Action item. Even if it is not already in the discussed Stormwater master Plan, it accomplishes the goal for the Alief neighborhood.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | City of Houston |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) CDR17-1092-APP <br> City of Houston Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.91\% |  | 55.92\% |  | 65.96\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$61,705 |  | \$52,338 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.20\% |  | 20.60\% |  | 20.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 4,646,630 |  | 2,310,432 |  | 20,151 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,995,115 | 42.9\% | 1,038,872 | 45.0\% | 12,918 | 64.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,651,515 | 57.1\% | 1,271,560 | 55.0\% | 7,233 | 35.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,374,905 | 29.6\% | 564,044 | 24.4\% | 919 | 4.6\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 863,044 | 18.6\% | 510,455 | 22.1\% | 2,211 | 11.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 8,105 | 0.2\% | 2,840 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 321,392 | 6.9\% | 155,246 | 6.7\% | 3,987 | 19.8\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 2,441 | 0.1\% | 819 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 11,171 | 0.2\% | 5,923 | 0.30\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 70,457 | 1.5\% | 32,233 | 1.40\% | 116 | 0.58\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 3,431,901 | 73.9\% | 1,632,701 | 70.7\% | 9,698 | 48.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 3,362,166 | 72.4\% | 1,601,906 | 69.3\% | 9,224 | 45.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 69,735 | 1.5\% | 30,795 | 1.3\% | 474 | 2.4\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,214,729 | 26.1\% | 677,731 | 29\% | 10,453 | 52\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 2,309,012 | 49.7\% | 1,153,417 | 49.9\% | 10,074 | 50.0\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,337,618 | 50.3\% | 1,157,015 | 50.1\% | 10,077 | 50.0\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,605,368 | 100\% | 858,374 | 100\% | 5,143 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 752,622 | 46.9\% | 328,997 | 38.3\% | 2,549 | 49.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 358,930 | 22.4\% | 149,138 | 17.4\% | 1,200 | 23.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 97,517 | 6.1\% | 57,601 | 6.7\% | 484 | 9.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 42,890 | 2.7\% | 23,604 | 2.7\% | 249 | 4.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | City of Houston |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Houston |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 307,314 | 19.1\% | 200,138 | 23.3\% | 747 | 14.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 22,587 | 1.4\% | 11,229 | 1.3\% | 44 | 0.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 208,753 | 13.0\% | 140,912 | 16.4\% | 284 | 5.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 36,478 | 2.3\% | 23,301 | 2.7\% | 44 | 0.9\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 447,915 | 27.9\% | 271,638 | 31.6\% | 1,363 | 26.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 118,023 | 7.4\% | 66,447 | 7.7\% | 584 | 11.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 210,467 | 13.1\% | 136,452 | 15.9\% | 284 | 5.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 74,188 | 4.6\% | 46,018 | 5.4\% | 126 | 2.4\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 610,507 | 38.0\% | 282,908 | 33.0\% | 2,476 | 48.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 338,867 | 21.1\% | 179,215 | 20.9\% | 1,284 | 25.0\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 4,624,525 | 100\% | 2,295,183 | 100\% | 20,151 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 426,349 | 9.2\% | 217,317 | 9.5\% | 1,878 | 9.3\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov <br> ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Galena Park: Water Plant Improvements Project - \$5,482,123 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Galena Park, benefitting 60.22\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $25.70 \%$ greater than Harris County's LMI percentage of $47.91 \%$ and $34.85 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Galena Park has two water plants that operate in tandem to provide safe drinking water and adequate water capacity for fire protection throughout the city. Excessive flooding prevents city staff and operators from access to the plants due to flood waters blocking ingress and egress of major arterial streets that leads to the city's water plants. To mitigate, the city will fortify and harden both water plants from excess leakage, and capacity, while adding Supervisor Control \& Data Acquisition (SCADA) remote monitoring equipment and fortify and harden two water plants located: Plant (1) 301 Stewart Street and Plant (2) 1902 Keene Street, to reduce excess leakage and capacity improving effects of stormwater impacts.

This project mitigates against stormwater impacts for existing water plants to provide safe drinking water and adequate water capacity for fire protection throughout the city.

- As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlighted-essentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Galena Park is a community of 10,983 residents in Harris County $(4,646,630)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Galena Park is $\$ 48,533$, $21.35 \%$ less than Harris County's median income of $\$ 61,705$, and $6.94 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Galena Park has an AMFI of $\$ 50,105$ according to ACS 2019. This is $64 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 78,800$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Galena Park was $29.40 \%$, compared to Harris County's poverty rate of $16.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. Census Tract 2337.01 is one of the three Census Tracts within the boundaries of Galena Park, but not all of Census Tract 2337.01 is within Galena Park. Galena Park comes close to the definition of concentrated poverty as it had an ACS 2019 poverty index of $36.7 \%$; however, it does not reach the HUD definition of a R/ECAP area. Along with this poverty level, it is highly concentrated with racial and ethnic minorities which made up $90 \%$ of the population in 2020. This compares with the poverty rate for all of Galena Park of $29.1 \%$ in 2019.

The city of Galena Park's population is $81.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Harris County's $42.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Galena Park is $9.30 \%$ white alone, less than Harris County's white alone percentage of $29.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Galena Park is $9.30 \%$ Black
or African American alone, less than Harris County (18.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Galena Park is not only majority minority, but the Hispanic or Latino population is $81.6 \%$ Hispanic. Interestingly, there are an equal number of Black or African American and White not of Hispanic or Latino origin at 1,019 each or $9.3 \%$ each in the City's demographics. The benefits of the project should be the same for all people who utilize city water regardless of location in the city or demographic.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $67.1 \%$ in the city of Galena Park, less than $73.9 \%$ in Harris County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in Galena Park are comprised of $57.90 \%$ married couple families, which is greater than Harris County's $46.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Galena Park that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $28.10 \%$ this is greater than Harris County's percentage of $22.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Galena Park's households are $6.50 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Harris County's percentage of $6.10 \%$ and greater than the eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $4.60 \%$ is within the city of Galena Park, which is greater than Harris County's $2.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Galena Park, $23.50 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Harris County's percentage of $27.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Galena Park's households are $7.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Harris County's percentage of $7.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Galena Park's households are $5.90 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than Harris County at $13.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Galena Park are $3.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than Harris County and less than the eligible area, which are at $4.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Galena Park $50.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than Harris County, which is at $38.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Galena Park that have one or more people of 65 or older is $21.70 \%$, which is greater than Harris County's $21.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Galena Park is $7.90 \%$ which is less than Harris County's $9.20 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

As a citywide project, it will benefit all water users in Galena Park. The homes are varied in all the neighborhoods in the community. Near Main and 19th the homes are larger. Around the high school - which is in the middle of the main neighborhood -- the houses have a higher finish-out as well. As one nears both sides of Holland Avenue, the houses become a bit smaller,
and some houses have brick or wood facades. Most are reasonably well maintained. Approximately $34 \%(1,011$ of 3,003$)$ of the housing in Galena are rental properties.

Water Plant 1 is located near Stewart and 3rd Street. It is near the middle school and is surrounded by a fire station and a church. There are houses nearby, but most are across the street. The Galena Park food pantry is next door as well. The plant takes up a fairly large portion of the block. Water Plant 2 is located near the train tracks at the north end of the city, and it has a water tower inside the fenced compound. There is a neighborhood that runs adjacent to the plant to the east. That neighborhood is composed of smaller wood sided homes in mixed condition to the west is an elementary school.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1155-APP <br> City of Galena Park City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.91\% |  | 60.22\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$61,705 |  | \$48,533 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.20\% |  | 29.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 4,646,630 |  | 10,983 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,995,115 | 42.9\% | 8,911 | 81.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,651,515 | 57.1\% | 2,072 | 18.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,374,905 | 29.6\% | 1,019 | 9.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 863,044 | 18.6\% | 1,019 | 9.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 8,105 | 0.2\% | 34 | 0.3\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 321,392 | 6.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 2,441 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 11,171 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 70,457 | 1.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 3,431,901 | 73.9\% | 7,476 | 68.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 3,362,166 | 72.4\% | 7,369 | 67.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 69,735 | 1.5\% | 107 | 1.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,214,729 | 26.1\% | 3,507 | 31.9\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 2,309,012 | 49.7\% | 5,553 | 50.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,337,618 | 50.3\% | 5,430 | 49.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,605,368 | 100\% | 2,860 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 752,622 | 46.9\% | 1,656 | 57.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 358,930 | 22.4\% | 805 | 28.1\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 97,517 | 6.1\% | 187 | 6.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 42,890 | 2.7\% | 131 | 4.6\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1155-APP <br> City of Galena Park City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 307,314 | 19.1\% | 345 | 12.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 22,587 | 1.4\% | 25 | 0.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 208,753 | 13.0\% | 119 | 4.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 36,478 | 2.3\% | 37 | 1.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 447,915 | 27.9\% | 672 | 23.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 118,023 | 7.4\% | 223 | 7.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 210,467 | 13.1\% | 168 | 5.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 74,188 | 4.6\% | 110 | 3.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 610,507 | 38.0\% | 1,438 | 50.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 338,867 | 21.1\% | 620 | 21.7\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 4,624,525 | 100\% | 10,983 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 426,349 | 9.2\% | 873 | 7.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## City of Jacinto City: Drainage Improvements - \$5,319,717-Addressed Risk: Storms

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Jacinto City, benefitting 78.45\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $63.74 \%$ greater than Harris County's LMI percentage of $47.91 \%$ and $75.65 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

During heavy rainfall events in Jacinto City, ponding and street blockage create unsafe conditions for emergency access and hinder residents from leaving their homes in the case of an emergency. To minimize the risk of future flooding and impacts from storms, the city will replace/re-set the storm sewer and upsize pipes to help to relieve storm water. The city also will replace old and small inlets to aid in quicker water release from streets during heavy storm events and increase the ability of the storm sewer to function properly.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Jacinto City is a community of 10,667 residents in Harris County $(4,646,630)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Jacinto City is $\$ 41,875$, $32.14 \%$ less than Harris County's median income of $\$ 61,705$, and $19.71 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The Jacinto City AMFI is $\$ 47,521$ according to ACS 2019 which is $60 \%$ of the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD FMR Area of which Harris County is a part. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Jacinto City was $24.20 \%$, compared with Harris County's poverty rate of $16.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. There are many R/ECAPs in Harris County, but Census Tracts 2334 and 2335 do not appear to qualify for that designation despite the higher concentration of people of color.

The city of Jacinto City's population is $86.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Harris County's $42.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Jacinto City is $9.30 \%$ white alone, less than Harris County's white alone percentage of $29.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Jacinto City is $3.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Harris County (18.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Jacinto City is predominately Hispanic or Latino origin whether looked at as a Census Tract, Block Group, or the overall population with the lowest percentage of this demographic in any of those areas being $79 \%$. The project appears to benefit most of the city and does not benefit one group over another or benefit one group to the detriment of others. There are neighborhoods between I/10 and Market Road Street that may not directly benefit from this project, but they are a smaller
part of the community, and the improved drainage system will indirectly benefit that part of the community.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $62.30 \%$ in the city of Jacinto City, less than $73.90 \%$ in Harris County and less than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Jacinto City, 19.30\% of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Harris County's percentage of $27.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Jacinto City's households are $5.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Harris County's percentage of $7.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Jacinto City's households are $6.20 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than Harris County at $13.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$.

In Jacinto City $37.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than Harris County, which is at $38.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Jacinto City that have one or more people of 65 or older is $25.60 \%$, which is greater than Harris County's 21.10\% and greater than the MIT eligible area's 24.5\%.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Jacinto City is $10.90 \%$ which is greater than Harris County's $9.20 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Census Tract 2335 will receive the largest amount of the work, which will directly benefit residents there. It has a slightly higher concentration of Hispanic or Latino origin population compared to the City as a whole. It has a higher AMFI than the other tract or the City as a whole, but is still below the Metropolitan Statistical Area income.

The homes located to the south of Market Road Street and west of Holland are generally smaller middle-class homes in a typical grid neighborhood structure. The project map indicates that most of the work will be completed on the main feeder roads here. Some homes are in need of repair, but generally the homes are well maintained.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0991-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Jacinto City |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 47.91\% |  | 78.45\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$61,705 |  | \$41,875 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 16.20\% |  | 24.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 4,646,630 |  | 10,667 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,995,115 | 42.9\% | 9,274 | 86.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,651,515 | 57.1\% | 1,393 | 13.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,374,905 | 29.6\% | 989 | 9.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 863,044 | 18.6\% | 378 | 3.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 8,105 | 0.2\% | 20 | 0.2\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 321,392 | 6.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 2,441 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 11,171 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 70,457 | 1.5\% | 6 | 0.1\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 3,431,901 | 73.9\% | 6,763 | 63.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 3,362,166 | 72.4\% | 6,648 | 62.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 69,735 | 1.5\% | 115 | 1.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,214,729 | 26.1\% | 3,904 | 36.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 2,309,012 | 49.7\% | 5,272 | 49.4\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,337,618 | 50.3\% | 5,395 | 50.6\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,605,368 | 100\% | 3,211 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 752,622 | 46.9\% | 1,615 | 50.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 358,930 | 22.4\% | 661 | 20.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 97,517 | 6.1\% | 249 | 7.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 42,890 | 2.7\% | 130 | 4.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) CDR17-0991-APP City of Jacinto City City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 307,314 | 19.1\% | 728 | 22.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 22,587 | 1.4\% | 6 | 0.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 208,753 | 13.0\% | 526 | 16.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 36,478 | 2.3\% | 131 | 4.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 447,915 | 27.9\% | 619 | 19.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 118,023 | 7.4\% | 160 | 5.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 210,467 | 13.1\% | 200 | 6.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 74,188 | 4.6\% | 91 | 2.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 610,507 | 38.0\% | 1,197 | 37.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 338,867 | 21.1\% | 823 | 25.6\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 4,624,525 | 100\% | 10,572 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 426,349 | 9.2\% | 1,150 | 10.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Jacinto City, benefitting 78.45\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $63.74 \%$ greater than Harris County's LMI percentage of $47.91 \%$ and $75.65 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Jacinto City's wastewater treatment plant site is located next to Hunting Bayou. When Hunting Bayou overtops its high banks and floods the wastewater treatment plant, this impacts the city's ability to effectively treat wastewater. Hardening the plant by building a stormwater holding tank will help the city reduce the probability of the Wastewater Treatment Plant overflowing during storm events. The project will further increase the lifespan of the Wastewater Treatment Plant and improve the city's ability to treat wastewater effectively during high flow events leading to Inflow and Infiltration and high water on the site. These improvements will contribute to the health and safety of the citizens by reducing the risk of exposure to raw sewage.

Through the project the city will:

- Build a stormwater holding tank to the wastewater treatment plant
- Replace/rehabilitate structures within the plant

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Jacinto City is a community of 10,667 residents in Harris County $(4,646,630)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Jacinto City is $\$ 41,875$, $32.14 \%$ less than Harris County's median income of $\$ 61,705$, and $19.71 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The Jacinto City AMFI is $\$ 47,521$ according to ACS 2019 which is $60 \%$ of the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD FMR Area of which Harris County is a part. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Jacinto City was $24.20 \%$, compared with Harris County's poverty rate of $16.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. There are many R/ECAPs in Harris County, but Census Tracts 2333,2334 , and 2335 do not appear to qualify for that designation despite the higher concentration of people of color.

The city of Jacinto City's population is $86.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Harris County's $42.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Jacinto City is $9.30 \%$ white alone, less than Harris County's white alone percentage of $29.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Jacinto City is $3.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Harris County (18.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Jacinto City is predominately Hispanic or Latino origin whether looked at as a Census Tract, Block Group, or the overall population with the lowest percentage of this demographic in any of those areas being $79 \%$. The project appears to benefit most of the city and does not benefit one group over another or benefit one group to the detriment of others.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $63.30 \%$ in the city of Jacinto City, less than $73.90 \%$ in Harris County and less than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Jacinto City, 19.30\% of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Harris County's percentage of $27.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Jacinto City's households are $5.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Harris County's percentage of $7.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$.

In Jacinto City $37.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than Harris County, which is at $38.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Jacinto City that have one or more people of 65 or older is $25.60 \%$, which is greater than Harris County's $21.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Jacinto City is $10.90 \%$ which is greater than Harris County's $9.20 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The closest Jacinto City houses located on Serpentine are across the Hunting Creek from the wastewater plant. These houses in Jacinto City are smaller, generally well-maintained homes with open car ports. Heading South on the street, the left-hand side backs up to the Hunting Creek. In this area, there are some homes in need of repair. The homes are generally physically screened from viewing the wastewater treatment facility by a row of trees along the banks of Hunting Creek.

Census Tract 2333 Block Group 2 homes are a tract style development with many smaller homes that are constructed of wood with some brick on homes or small brick homes in the neighborhood. When touring the plant, we were limited from going to the back of the plant to see the interaction between the neighborhood and the plant.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0933-APP <br> City of Jacinto City City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.91\% |  | 78.45\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$61,705 |  | \$41,875 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.20\% |  | 24.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 4,646,630 |  | 10,667 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,995,115 | 42.9\% | 9,274 | 86.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,651,515 | 57.1\% | 1,393 | 13.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,374,905 | 29.6\% | 989 | 9.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 863,044 | 18.6\% | 378 | 3.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 8,105 | 0.2\% | 20 | 0.2\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 321,392 | 6.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 2,441 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 11,171 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 70,457 | 1.5\% | 6 | 0.1\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 3,431,901 | 73.9\% | 6,763 | 63.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 3,362,166 | 72.4\% | 6,648 | 62.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 69,735 | 1.5\% | 115 | 1.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,214,729 | 26.1\% | 3,904 | 36.6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 2,309,012 | 49.7\% | 5,272 | 49.4\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,337,618 | 50.3\% | 5,395 | 50.6\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ ( ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,605,368 | 100\% | 3,211 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 752,622 | 46.9\% | 1,615 | 50.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 358,930 | 22.4\% | 661 | 20.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 97,517 | 6.1\% | 249 | 7.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 42,890 | 2.7\% | 130 | 4.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0933-APP <br> City of Jacinto City City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 307,314 | 19.1\% | 728 | 22.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 22,587 | 1.4\% | 6 | 0.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 208,753 | 13.0\% | 526 | 16.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 36,478 | 2.3\% | 131 | 4.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 447,915 | 27.9\% | 619 | 19.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 118,023 | 7.4\% | 160 | 5.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 210,467 | 13.1\% | 200 | 6.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 74,188 | 4.6\% | 91 | 2.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 610,507 | 38.0\% | 1,197 | 37.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 338,867 | 21.1\% | 823 | 25.6\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 4,624,525 | 100\% | 10,572 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 426,349 | 9.2\% | 1,150 | 10.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Baytown: Texas Avenue Drainage Improvements - $\$ 3,236,049.01$ - Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding, Severe Coastal Flooding, and Storms

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Baytown, benefitting 69.68\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $37.87 \%$ greater than the City of Baytown's LMI percentage of $50.54 \%, 45.44 \%$ greater than Harris County's LMI percentage of $47.91 \%$ and $56.02 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Baytown will increase the size of the storm sewer system and inlet locations. These improvements will help convey more flow downstream ahead of extreme event storm surge and store more flow during the surge itself. The project will provide significant enhancements including upgrading, extending, re-aligning and relocating the storm sewer system across 67 acres. Construction will take place in the area around Texas Avenue, Pruett Street, Whiting Street and Sterling Avenue.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 11,180 within the city of Baytown, a community of 76,635 residents in Chambers County and Harris County $(4,646,630)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Census Tract 2543 Block Group 4 has an AMFI of $\$ 58,125$, and Census Tract 2544 Block Group 1 has an AMFI of $\$ 56,106$ according to ACS 2021. Baytown has a higher AMFI than the two Census Tracts at $\$ 71,944$. This is $91.3 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for both Chambers and Harris Counties. The Census Tracts are $73.8 \%$ and $71.2 \%$ of the HUD county income levels. Both Chambers and Harris Counties are within the Houston-The WoodlandsSugarland TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $16.00 \%$, equal to the city of Baytown which is at $16.00 \%$, less than Harris County's poverty rate of $16.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $66.38 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than the city of Baytown's population percentage of $47.00 \%$, greater than Harris County's $42.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $19.44 \%$ white alone, less than the city of Baytown's percentage of $31.80 \%$, less than Harris County's percentage of $29.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $11.98 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than the city of Baytown, which has $17.20 \%$, less than Harris County ( $18.60 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$, less than the city of Baytown, which is at $0.10 \%$, less than Harris County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project
benefit area is $0.09 \%$ Asian alone, less than the city of Baytown at $1.80 \%$, less than Harris County's percentage of $6.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$, equal to than the city of Baytown at $0.00 \%$, less than Harris County $(0.100 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$ some other race alone, less than the city of Baytown, which is at $0.10 \%$, less than Harris County's percentage of $0.20 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $2.10 \%$ two or more races, greater than the city of Baytown at $2.00 \%$, greater than Harris County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The direct project area (Texas Avenue) is not a street with single family or multifamily housing, and is more commercial in nature-although there is nearby housing in established neighborhoods. The 11,180 beneficiaries for this project are a total of $14.6 \%$ of Baytown's population.

While the project benefits nine Census block groups, two Census block groups stand out as more concentrated with racial and ethnic minorities than the majority minority city of Baytown. Census Tract 2543 Block Group 4 has a total concentration of $78.1 \%$ and Census Tract 2544 Block Group 1 has a total concentration of $73.8 \%$. For comparison, Baytown as a community is $64.2 \%$. The concentration of the Hispanic or Latino origin population in these three areas is $66.6 \%, 66.9 \%$ and $47 \%$, respectively.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $74.37 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than $81.80 \%$ in the city of Baytown, greater than Harris County at $73.90 \%$ and less than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $42.57 \%$ married couple families, greater than the city of Baytown at $45.20 \%$ less than Harris County's $46.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $21.61 \%$, greater than the city of Baytown at $21.60 \%$, less than Harris County's percentage of $22.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $6.17 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than the city of Baytown's percentage of $6.90 \%$, greater than Harris County's percentage of $6.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $2.27 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than the city of Baytown at $4.20 \%$, less than Harris County's $2.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $31.87 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than the city of Baytown at $27.70 \%$, greater than Harris County's percentage of $27.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $8.74 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than the city of Baytown which is at $6.20 \%$, greater than Harris County's percentage of $7.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $15.35 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than the city of Baytown at $13.90 \%$, greater than Harris

County at $13.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $7.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than the city of Baytown who is at $5.80 \%$, greater than Harris County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $4.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $42.76 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than the city of Baytown at $38.50 \%$, greater than Harris County, which is at $38.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $22.82 \%$, less than the city of Baytown at $23.80 \%$, greater than Harris County's $21.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $15.73 \%$, greater than the city of Baytown at $12.20 \%$, greater than Harris County's $9.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

Baytown has a 2015 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI) in effect at the time of application. Impediment number 6 within the 2015 AI is that "Quality Infrastructure and facilities are limited in some areas of the city." Baytown has an action step to "use CDBG to improve infrastructure in the older low-to moderate-income neighborhoods."

Based on the surrounding housing and historic style buildings, Texas Avenue qualifies as an older area of the community despite sparse housing in the actual work areas. Baytown has identified 11,180 beneficiaries of which 7,790 are LMI. The infrastructure improvements will directly benefit the local residents by improving drainage on this major artery street.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | City of Baytown |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) CDR17-1185-APP <br> City of Baytown Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.91\% |  | 50.54\% |  | 69.68\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$61,705 |  | \$57,270 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.20\% |  | 16.00\% |  | 16.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 4,646,630 |  | 76,635 |  | 15,913 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,995,115 | 42.9\% | 36,052 | 47.0\% | 10,563 | 66.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,651,515 | 57.1\% | 40,583 | 53.0\% | 5,350 | 33.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,374,905 | 29.6\% | 24,360 | 31.8\% | 3,094 | 19.4\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 863,044 | 18.6\% | 13,219 | 17.2\% | 1,907 | 12.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 8,105 | 0.2\% | 44 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 321,392 | 6.9\% | 1,384 | 1.8\% | 15 | 0.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 2,441 | 0.1\% | 14 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 11,171 | 0.2\% | 62 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 70,457 | 1.5\% | 1,500 | 2.0\% | 334 | 2.10\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 3,431,901 | 73.9\% | 62,686 | 81.8\% | 12,151 | 76.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 3,362,166 | 72.4\% | 60,804 | 79.3\% | 11,835 | 74.4\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 69,735 | 1.5\% | 1,882 | 2.5\% | 316 | 2.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,214,729 | 26.1\% | 13,949 | 18\% | 3,762 | 24\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 2,309,012 | 49.7\% | 38,459 | 50.2\% | 7,958 | 50.0\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,337,618 | 50.3\% | 38,176 | 49.8\% | 7,955 | 50.0\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,605,368 | 100\% | 26,474 | 100\% | 5,206 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 752,622 | 46.9\% | 11,966 | 45.2\% | 2,216 | 42.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 358,930 | 22.4\% | 5,711 | 21.6\% | 1,125 | 21.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 97,517 | 6.1\% | 1,814 | 6.9\% | 321 | 6.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 42,890 | 2.7\% | 1,108 | 4.2\% | 118 | 2.3\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Harris County |  | City of Baytown |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1185-APP |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Baytown |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 307,314 | 19.1\% | 5,351 | 20.2\% | 1,010 | 19.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 22,587 | 1.4\% | 439 | 1.7\% | 118 | 2.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 208,753 | 13.0\% | 3,245 | 12.3\% | 556 | 10.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 36,478 | 2.3\% | 750 | 2.8\% | 157 | 3.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 447,915 | 27.9\% | 7,343 | 27.7\% | 1,659 | 31.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 118,023 | 7.4\% | 1,643 | 6.2\% | 455 | 8.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 210,467 | 13.1\% | 3,686 | 13.9\% | 799 | 15.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 74,188 | 4.6\% | 1,526 | 5.8\% | 375 | 7.2\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 610,507 | 38.0\% | 10,205 | 38.5\% | 2,226 | 42.8\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 338,867 | 21.1\% | 6,294 | 23.8\% | 1,188 | 22.8\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 4,624,525 | 100\% | 76,054 | 100\% | 15,814 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 426,349 | 9.2\% | 9,281 | 12.2\% | 2,487 | 15.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov <br> ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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City of Kingsville: Citywide Drainage System Improvements - \$36,311,929 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Kingsville, benefitting 52.19\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $5.24 \%$ greater than Kleberg County's LMI percentage of $49.59 \%$ and $16.85 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Kingsville Drainage Master Plan was amended in the year 2020 to include five additional sites, encompassing all areas of the city. Given the scope of the work needed, external funds are required to accomplish these activities. The project aims to increase community resiliency by reducing economic loss from flooding, protecting public investment in communityowned facilities, minimizing environmental impacts of hazards, reducing obstacles to a timely and safe evacuation of hazard areas, preserving public and private emergency response capability, and minimizing disruption to utilities.

Collectively, these drainage improvements will more efficiently move water from residential neighborhoods and businesses to outflows where it can discharge to Santa Gertrudis Creek and San Fernando Creek, and ultimately to Baffin Bay.

- Reinforce 9,000 feet of concrete pipe and 23,100 feet of culverts with 130 inlets added
- Install 65 junction boxes and 6,900 feet of curb and gutter to drain water from the road surface
- Surface repairs, including flex base with geogrid for soil stabilization and either a 4 " hot mix asphalt or concrete pavement surface.
- Replace impacted sidewalks for pedestrian safety
- Install concrete headwalls at the ends of drainage pipes and culverts to prevent erosion

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Kingsville is a community of 25,605 residents in Kleberg County $(30,974)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Kingsville is $\$ 42,452$, $2.92 \%$ less than Kleberg County's median income of $\$ 43,730$, and $18.60 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Kingsville's AMFI is $\$ 47,475$ according to the 2019 ACS as which is $82.4 \%$ of HUD's AMFI for Kleberg County of $\$ 57,600$. Kleberg County is not within a recognized HUD MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Kingsville was $29.70 \%$, compared with Kleberg County's poverty rate of $26.10 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Kingsville's population is $74.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Kleberg County's $72.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Kingsville is $17.00 \%$ white alone, less than Kleberg County's white alone percentage of $20.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Kingsville is $3.40 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Kleberg County ( $2.90 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The city of Kingsville is $2.60 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Kleberg County's percentage of $2.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. In the city of Kingsville, $1.80 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Kleberg County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Kingsville is a majority minority community with $72.1 \%$ of the population belonging to the Hispanic or Latino origin demographic. There is a nearby military base that might impact the population in that service members may transfer in and out and claim a permanent residence elsewhere.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $91.90 \%$ in the city of Kingsville, less than $93.50 \%$ in Kleberg County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in Kingsville are comprised of $35.20 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Kleberg County's $39.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Kingsville that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $14.90 \%$ this is less than Kleberg County's percentage of $16.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Kingsville's households are $5.20 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than

In the city of Kingsville, $32.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Kleberg County's percentage of $29.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Kingsville's households are $9.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Kleberg County's percentage of $8.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Kingsville's households are $13.20 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Kleberg County at $12.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Kingsville are $7.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Kleberg County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $6.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Kingsville $35.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than Kleberg County, which is at $35.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Kingsville that have one or more people of 65 or older is $23.30 \%$, which is less than Kleberg County's $25.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Kingsville is $13.70 \%$ which is less than Kleberg County's $13.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Collectively, it appears that these drainage improvements will more efficiently move water from residential neighborhoods and businesses to outflows. These outflows discharge into the Santa

Gertrudis Creek, the San Fernando Creek, and ultimately into Baffin Bay. In this area, the housing is varied as these projects cover large parts of Kingsville.
The projects are in varied areas of Kingsville. Some houses are smaller wood style houses with some in need of repair, and other sites have multi-family projects or commercial areas. Texas A\&M Kingsville campus has a project along with a few small residences on the other side of the street and additional commercial properties as well. There are also nicer brick homes and open land in the projects too. One project has a large estate on the other side near the University, and others run near public schools. There is a MHU park near one of the projects. Some projects are in the central business district with commercial property, fast food restaurants, HEB, small retail shops, and service stores.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Kleberg County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0984-APP City of Kingsville City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 49.59\% |  | 52.19\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$43,730 |  | \$42,452 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 26.10\% |  | 29.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 30,974 |  | 25,605 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 22,574 | 72.9\% | 19,181 | 74.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 8,400 | 27.1\% | 6,424 | 25.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 6,255 | 20.2\% | 4,351 | 17.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 910 | 2.9\% | 880 | 3.4\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 12 | 0.0\% | 12 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 695 | 2.2\% | 676 | 2.6\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 64 | 0.2\% | 49 | 0.2\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 464 | 1.5\% | 456 | 1.8\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 28,959 | 93.5\% | 23,732 | 92.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 28,676 | 92.6\% | 23,521 | 91.9\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 283 | 0.9\% | 211 | 0.8\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,015 | 6.5\% | 1,873 | 7.3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 15,656 | 50.5\% | 13,195 | 51.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 15,318 | 49.5\% | 12,410 | 48.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 10,955 | 100\% | 9,214 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,328 | 39.5\% | 3,240 | 35.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,839 | 16.8\% | 1,376 | 14.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 611 | 5.6\% | 478 | 5.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 421 | 3.8\% | 337 | 3.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Kleberg County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0984-APP City of Kingsville City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,756 | 25.2\% | 2,492 | 27.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 239 | 2.2\% | 239 | 2.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,696 | 15.5\% | 1,467 | 15.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 470 | 4.3\% | 374 | 4.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,260 | 29.8\% | 3,004 | 32.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 939 | 8.6\% | 907 | 9.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,369 | 12.5\% | 1,217 | 13.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 728 | 6.6\% | 643 | 7.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,859 | 35.2\% | 3,230 | 35.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,789 | 25.5\% | 2,151 | 23.3\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 30,046 | 100\% | 24,806 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,190 | 13.9\% | 3,393 | 13.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Kleberg County: Drainage Improvements Project - \$10,000,000 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Kingsville, benefitting 52.19\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $5.24 \%$ greater than Kleberg County's LMI percentage of $49.59 \%$ and $16.85 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The project will rehabilitate major drainage channels and outfalls which do not drain from the city adequately, causing major flooding within the city during heavy storm events. Improvements will include the rehabilitation of three major drainage ditches and their outfalls, one outside of city limits to the southwest and the other two outside of city limits to the northeast. Even though the projects are occurring outside of city limits in mostly undeveloped rural spaces, the benefit to Kingsville is citywide as these drainage ditches and outfalls are the paths that water drains away from the city during floods and heavy storms events.

The project will be accomplished by the following:

- Corral Street: Ditch grading, concrete ditch lining, culverts, pavement and driveway repair, outfall structures, and erosion controls of approximately 23,500 linear feet
- Kenedy Street: Ditch grading, underground storm sewer, pavement/driveway repair, inlets, outfall structures, and erosion controls of approximately 12,100 linear feet
- Johnston Street: Ditch grading, culverts, erosion control, and outfall structures of approximately 12,200 linear feet

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Kingsville is a community of 24,575 residents in Kleberg County $(30,974)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Kingsville is $\$ 42,452$, $2.92 \%$ less than Kleberg County's median income of $\$ 43,730$, and $18.60 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Kingsville's AMFI is $\$ 47,475$ according to the 2019 ACS as which is $82.4 \%$ of HUD's AMFI for Kleberg County of $\$ 57,600$. Kleberg County is not within a recognized HUD MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Kingsville is at $29.70 \%$, greater than Kleberg County's poverty rate of $26.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Kingsville's population is $74.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Kleberg County's $72.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Kingsville is $17.00 \%$ white alone, less than Kleberg County's white alone percentage of $20.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Kingsville is $3.40 \%$ Black or

African American alone, greater than Kleberg County (2.90\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The city of Kingsville is $2.60 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Kleberg County's percentage of $2.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. In the city of Kingsville, $1.80 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Kleberg County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Even though the project benefits one city in an entire county, that city represents $86.5 \%$ of the population of the county, so it is almost a countywide project from a beneficiary view. Kleberg and Kingsville are Hispanic or Latino Origin jurisdictions with $73.4 \%$ and $72.1 \%$, respectively. The city as a whole seems to be benefitting by reducing potential flooding, so it does not favor or burden any racial or ethnic group over another.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $91.90 \%$ in the city of Kingsville, less than $93.50 \%$ in Kleberg County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Kingsville is $51.50 \%$ male, greater than Kleberg County ( $50.50 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Kingsville is $48.50 \%$ female, less than the $49.50 \%$ of Kleberg County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Kingsville, $32.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Kleberg County's percentage of $29.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Kingsville's households are $9.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Kleberg County's percentage of $8.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Kingsville's households are $13.20 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Kleberg County at $12.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Kingsville are $7.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Kleberg County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Kingsville $35.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than Kleberg County, which is at $35.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Kingsville that have one or more people of 65 or older is $23.30 \%$, which is less than Kleberg County's $25.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Kingsville is $13.70 \%$ which is less than Kleberg County's $13.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Kingsville has mixed housing throughout the community, and there are many multi-family units throughout Kingsville. In the center of Kingsville, there are older wood sided homes, many with repair needs. In the northwest area near the University, the homes are larger brick homes. In the southwestern portion of the city, there are more tract style brick homes. There are pockets of larger brick homes off Caesar and nearby streets. In the Southeast, there are small new-lot tract homes east of the highway. The home size, quality, and type vary based on location within Kingsville, as would be expected.

Even though Kingsville is substantially the same ethnicity, same race or ethnicity people can discriminate based on national origin, family status, and of course the most common Fair Housing complaint being filed currently is for people with special needs which cuts across all races and ethnicities.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Kleberg County |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Kleberg County |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide (City of Kingsville) |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 49.59\% |  | 52.19\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$43,730 |  | \$42,452 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 26.10\% |  | 29.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 30,974 |  | 25,605 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 22,574 | 72.9\% | 19,181 | 74.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 8,400 | 27.1\% | 6,424 | 25.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 6,255 | 20.2\% | 4,351 | 17.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 910 | 2.9\% | 880 | 3.4\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 12 | 0.0\% | 12 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 695 | 2.2\% | 676 | 2.6\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 64 | 0.2\% | 49 | 0.2\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 464 | 1.5\% | 456 | 1.8\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 28,959 | 93.5\% | 23,732 | 92.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 28,676 | 92.6\% | 23,521 | 91.9\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 283 | 0.9\% | 211 | 0.8\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,015 | 6.5\% | 1,873 | 7.3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 15,656 | 50.5\% | 13,195 | 51.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 15,318 | 49.5\% | 12,410 | 48.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ ( ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 10,955 | 100\% | 9,214 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,328 | 39.5\% | 3,240 | 35.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,839 | 16.8\% | 1,376 | 14.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 611 | 5.6\% | 478 | 5.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 421 | 3.8\% | 337 | 3.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Kleberg County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1056-APP Kleberg County |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide (City of Kingsville) |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,756 | 25.2\% | 2,492 | 27.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 239 | 2.2\% | 239 | 2.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,696 | 15.5\% | 1,467 | 15.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 470 | 4.3\% | 374 | 4.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,260 | 29.8\% | 3,004 | 32.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 939 | 8.6\% | 907 | 9.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,369 | 12.5\% | 1,217 | 13.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 728 | 6.6\% | 643 | 7.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,859 | 35.2\% | 3,230 | 35.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,789 | 25.5\% | 2,151 | 23.3\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 30,046 | 100\% | 24,806 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,190 | 13.9\% | 3,393 | 13.7\% |
| 'Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Kingsville: Citywide Wastewater Collection System Improvements - \$7,293,111 Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding, Severe Coastal Flooding, and Storms

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Kingsville, benefitting 52.19\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $5.24 \%$ greater than Kleberg County's LMI percentage of $49.59 \%$ and $16.85 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Due to several major flood events, Kingsville's sanitary sewer system needs upgrades and repairs. Existing sewer infrastructure is unequipped to handle the increased inflow due to rain from storms and hurricanes. Kingsville will install a new 3-pump lift station on Business 77B near a current water detention area to pump the stormwater to Tranquitas Creek and rehabilitate nine existing lift stations, including well and pump repairs, and valve checks. Additional improvements include repairing 78 manholes throughout the city to make the sewer system more resilient during flooding events. These activities constitute a significant undertaking to improve the efficiency of operations of the sewer system in Kingsville, enhancing the ability of the system to rebound after a major event.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Kingsville is a community of 25,605 residents in Kleberg County $(30,974)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Kingsville is $\$ 42,452$, $2.92 \%$ less than Kleberg County's median income of $\$ 43,730$, and $18.60 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Kingsville's AMFI is $\$ 47,475$ according to the 2019 ACS as is $82.4 \%$ of HUD's AMFI for Kleberg County of $\$ 57,600$. Kleberg County is not within a recognized HUD MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Kingsville was $29.70 \%$, compared with Kleberg County's poverty rate of $26.10 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Kingsville's population is $74.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Kleberg County's $72.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Kingsville is $17.00 \%$ white alone, less than Kleberg County's white alone percentage of $20.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Kingsville is $3.40 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Kleberg County (2.90\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Kingsville is $0.00 \%$, equal to Kleberg County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.00 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Kingsville is $2.60 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Kleberg County's percentage of $2.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. In the city of Kingsville, $1.80 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Kleberg County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Kingsville is a majority minority community with $72.1 \%$ of the population belonging to the Hispanic or Latino origin demographic. There is a nearby military base that might impact the population in that service members may transfer in and out and claim a permanent residence elsewhere.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $91.90 \%$ in the city of Kingsville, less than $93.50 \%$ in Kleberg County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in Kingsville are comprised of $35.20 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Kleberg County's $39.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Kingsville that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $14.90 \%$ this is less than Kleberg County's percentage of $16.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of Kingsville, $32.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Kleberg County's percentage of $29.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Kingsville's households are $9.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Kleberg County's percentage of $8.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Kingsville's households are $13.20 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Kleberg County at $12.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Kingsville are $7.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Kleberg County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $6.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Kingsville $35.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Kleberg County, which is at $35.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Kingsville that have one or more people of 65 or older is $23.30 \%$, which is less than Kleberg County's $25.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Kingsville is $13.70 \%$ which is less than Kleberg County's $13.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The areas with the sewer main line replacement have smaller, older, largely wooden housing intermixed with brick housing. The Lott Street, and 10th Street areas from Ragland to Santa Gertrudis generally have smaller homes, with some in need of repair. This project is also adjacent to the Fire Station and at least one school facility. The project on $14^{\text {th }}$ street appears to be main thoroughfare for Kingsville with shopping, gas stations, food choices and other retail lining almost the entire project site. There are neighborhoods on either side of the street behind the retail.

The replacement from Santa Gertrudis to East Corral is in an industrial area and would run through agricultural fields to the wastewater treatment center where there are nearby MHU and travel trailer facilities.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Kleberg County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1157-APP City of Kingsville |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 49.59\% |  | 52.19\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$43,730 |  | \$42,452 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 26.10\% |  | 29.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 30,974 |  | 25,605 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 22,574 | 72.9\% | 19,181 | 74.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 8,400 | 27.1\% | 6,424 | 25.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 6,255 | 20.2\% | 4,351 | 17.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 910 | 2.9\% | 880 | 3.4\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 12 | 0.0\% | 12 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 695 | 2.2\% | 676 | 2.6\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 64 | 0.2\% | 49 | 0.2\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 464 | 1.5\% | 456 | 1.8\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 28,959 | 93.5\% | 23,732 | 92.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 28,676 | 92.6\% | 23,521 | 91.9\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 283 | 0.9\% | 211 | 0.8\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,015 | 6.5\% | 1,873 | 7.3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 15,656 | 50.5\% | 13,195 | 51.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 15,318 | 49.5\% | 12,410 | 48.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 10,955 | 100\% | 9,214 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,328 | 39.5\% | 3,240 | 35.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,839 | 16.8\% | 1,376 | 14.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 611 | 5.6\% | 478 | 5.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 421 | 3.8\% | 337 | 3.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Kleberg County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1157-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Kingsville |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 2,756 | 25.2\% | 2,492 | 27.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 239 | 2.2\% | 239 | 2.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,696 | 15.5\% | 1,467 | 15.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 470 | 4.3\% | 374 | 4.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,260 | 29.8\% | 3,004 | 32.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 939 | 8.6\% | 907 | 9.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,369 | 12.5\% | 1,217 | 13.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 728 | 6.6\% | 643 | 7.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,859 | 35.2\% | 3,230 | 35.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,789 | 25.5\% | 2,151 | 23.3\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 30,046 | 100\% | 24,806 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,190 | 13.9\% | 3,393 | 13.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Kleberg County: Project Service Areas



## Kleberg County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group
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## Kleberg County: Population in Poverty by Block Group
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Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Seguin: Citywide Drainage Improvements Project - \$37,861,885.50 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Seguin, benefitting 53.76\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $67.38 \%$ greater than Guadalupe County's LMI percentage of $32.12 \%$ and $20.38 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Seguin experiences flooding during local heavy rainfall events and due to impacts of hurricanes and tropical storms. The flooding and extreme runoff results in road closures, flooding of homes, damaged infrastructure and severe erosion that must be repaired to reduce risk of damage to public and private buildings. The City of Seguin's four priority drainage areas will greatly improve the safety of their 25,520 residents.

Walnut Branch Drainage Improvements

- Land acquisitions to expand the existing detention ponds near Interstate 10 and Huber Rd (north basin) and Fleming Drive (south basin)
- Build bridge crossings on San Antonio Avenue at Walnut Branch and William Street at Walnut Branch and replace low water crossing further downstream
- Construct a small drainage system on Aldama at Kingsbury for a neighborhood access road

North Heideke Street Drainage Improvements

- Create an underground storm water conveyance system on the northern end of downtown Seguin bound by North Austin and Heideke Streets. The storm drainage system will allow for conveyance of stormwater runoff from the street channel to an underground conveyance system and increase the storm drainage network for a total of 6,700 LF.

Mays Creek Drainage Improvements

- Replace culverts at State Hwy 46, County Road 725, River Oaks Dr, and County Road 402 to the appropriate size for a total of 5,650 LF
- Construct an additional driveway to ensure residential safety by allowing two ingress/egress points during flooding

North Guadalupe Street Drainage Improvements

- Install a regional detention basin via land acquisition near Guadalupe Street and FM 78
- Install a new storm drain system that will include a storm trunk line along $8^{\text {th }}$ Street to West New Braunfels Street, a storm drain branch to extend east and west along West New Braunfels, a branch with inlets will extend east from $8^{\text {th }}$ Street along Collins Avenue to Guadalupe Street, and a smaller branch to extend west along Kingsbury Street, for a total 11,175 LF

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Seguin is a community of 28,894 residents in Guadalupe County $(158,966)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Seguin is $\$ 49,039$, $34.17 \%$ less than Guadalupe County's median income of $\$ 74,496$, and $5.97 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Seguin's AMFI is $\$ 49,039$ according to ACS 2019. This is $68 \%$ of HUD's AMFI for Guadalupe County which is $\$ 72,000$. Guadalupe County is in the San Antonio-New Braunfels TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in the city of Seguin was $18.30 \%$, greater than Guadalupe County's poverty rate of $9.50 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Seguin's population is $51.20 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Guadalupe County's $37.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Seguin is $39.00 \%$ white alone, less than Guadalupe County's white alone percentage of $50.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Seguin is $6.70 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Guadalupe County (7.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The city of Seguin is $2.00 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Guadalupe County's percentage of $1.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Seguin is a relatively racially diverse community, although the Hispanic or Latino origin is the majority of residents at slightly over $50 \%$. The total White not of Hispanic or Latino origin is 39\%.

Approximately $32 \%$ of the residents live in rental properties in the City. Of those, $44.8 \%$ of the renters have unaffordable rents as defined by HUD.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $92.30 \%$ in the city of Seguin, less than $92.80 \%$ in Guadalupe County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Seguin is $46.60 \%$ male, less than Guadalupe County (49.50\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Seguin is $53.40 \%$ female, greater than the $50.50 \%$ of Guadalupe County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in Seguin are comprised of $41.70 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Guadalupe County's $58.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Seguin that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $14.80 \%$ this is less than Guadalupe County's percentage of $25.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Seguin's households are $5.10 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Guadalupe County's percentage of $4.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$.

In the city of Seguin, $33.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Guadalupe County's percentage of $22.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Seguin's households are $10.60 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Guadalupe County's percentage of $6.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Seguin's households are $16.00 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Guadalupe County at $10.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Seguin are $7.70 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Guadalupe County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are

In Seguin $33.20 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Guadalupe County, which is at $39.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Seguin that have one or more people of 65 or older is $32.80 \%$, which is greater than Guadalupe County's $27.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Seguin is $14.90 \%$ which is greater than Guadalupe County's $12.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The overall project is beneficial to the community as a whole. The Tyson Chicken Plant looks to be on higher ground than the neighborhood behind the Alma Street project.

The I-10 drainage field is basically in a non-residential area; this should not impact housing negatively. The eleven-acre retention areas is currently in an open field and could be an excellent candidate for use as recreational areas for the nearby neighborhood.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Guadalupe County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1029-APP City of Seguin City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 32.12\% |  | 53.76\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$74,496 |  | \$49,039 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.50\% |  | 18.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 158,966 |  | 28,894 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 60,278 | 37.9\% | 14,797 | 51.2\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 98,688 | 62.1\% | 14,097 | 48.8\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 80,056 | 50.4\% | 11,273 | 39.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 12,055 | 7.6\% | 1,949 | 6.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 281 | 0.2\% | 9 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 2,587 | 1.6\% | 571 | 2.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 166 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 372 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 3,171 | 2.0\% | 295 | 1.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 147,537 | 92.8\% | 26,837 | 92.9\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 143,323 | 90.2\% | 26,657 | 92.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 4,214 | 2.7\% | 180 | 0.6\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 11,429 | 7.2\% | 2,057 | 7.1\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 78,619 | 49.5\% | 13,474 | 46.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 80,347 | 50.5\% | 15,420 | 53.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 54,110 | 100\% | 10,173 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 31,766 | 58.7\% | 4,245 | 41.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 13,813 | 25.5\% | 1,505 | 14.8\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 2,210 | 4.1\% | 521 | 5.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 963 | 1.8\% | 117 | 1.2\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Guadalupe County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1029-APP City of Seguin City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 7,973 | 14.7\% | 1,975 | 19.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 939 | 1.7\% | 269 | 2.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 4,872 | 9.0\% | 1,197 | 11.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,351 | 2.5\% | 440 | 4.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 12,161 | 22.5\% | 3,432 | 33.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 3,318 | 6.1\% | 1,077 | 10.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 5,837 | 10.8\% | 1,625 | 16.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 2,955 | 5.5\% | 783 | 7.7\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 21,371 | 39.5\% | 3,375 | 33.2\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 14,719 | 27.2\% | 3,336 | 32.8\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 156,604 | 100\% | 28,129 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 19,991 | 12.8\% | 4,201 | 14.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Marion: Citywide Water and Wastewater Improvements - \$9,946,174-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Marion, benefitting 51.43\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $60.11 \%$ greater than Guadalupe County's LMI percentage of $32.12 \%$ and $15.16 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city is currently dependent upon the pressure provided by Canyon Regional Water Authority (CRWA) at the delivery point and the ground storage tank. The CRWA delivery point is dependent upon power being available and the plant producing the water at a rate sufficient to meet daily demands. The 300,000-gallon ground storage tank provides approximately 12 hours of water for the city's residents if the power fails.

The city of Marion owns and operates its own wastewater treatment plant and collection system. The city experiences large influxes of inflow and infiltration during storm events, such as during Hurricane Harvey. In a prolonged storm event, the sanitary system will overflow, creating multiple health and safety hazards.

The city of Marion's project will build an elevated water storage tank and rehabilitate the wastewater collection system.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Marion is a community of 970 residents in Guadalupe County $(158,966)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Marion is $\$ 40,625,45.47 \%$ less than Guadalupe County's median income of $\$ 74,496$, and $22.11 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Marion's AMFI is $\$ 53,194$. This is $74 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Guadalupe County. Guadalupe is in the San Antonio New Braunfels TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Marion was $12.30 \%$, compared with Guadalupe County's poverty rate of $9.50 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Marion increased to $14.9 \%$.

The city of Marion's population is $49.00 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Guadalupe County's $37.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Marion is $42.20 \%$ white alone, less than Guadalupe County's white alone percentage of $50.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Marion is $7.90 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Guadalupe County (7.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Marion is a majority minority community with $56.9 \%$ of the community identifying in the racial and ethnic demographics. Marion appears to have grown slightly in 2020 and remains a majority minority community. The projects in addition to the water tank and wastewater system cover almost the entire community, so no demographic group appears to be unduly benefited or burdened by the project.

In the city of Marion, $37.50 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Guadalupe County's percentage of $22.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Marion's households are $10.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Guadalupe County's percentage of $6.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Marion's households are $18.60 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Guadalupe County at $10.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Marion are $11.60 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Guadalupe County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $5.50 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Marion $24.80 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Guadalupe County, which is at $39.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Marion that have one or more people of 65 or older is $35.90 \%$, which is greater than Guadalupe County's $27.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Marion is $25.10 \%$ which is greater than Guadalupe County's $12.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The neighborhoods are largely composed of smaller wooden houses in a rural style. The wastewater treatment plant receiving upgrades is located between the High School baseball and football fields. The new water storage tank is planned to be built directly across from the City Hall building. Apart from this, the projects are evenly scattered throughout the community.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Guadalupe County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0986-APP City of Marion |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 32.12\% |  | 51.43\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$74,496 |  | \$40,625 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.50\% |  | 12.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 158,966 |  | 970 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 60,278 | 37.9\% | 475 | 49.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 98,688 | 62.1\% | 495 | 51.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 80,056 | 50.4\% | 409 | 42.2\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 12,055 | 7.6\% | 77 | 7.9\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 281 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 2,587 | 1.6\% | 4 | 0.4\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 166 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 372 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 3,171 | 2.0\% | 5 | 0.5\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 147,537 | 92.8\% | 915 | 94.3\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 143,323 | 90.2\% | 900 | 92.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 4,214 | 2.7\% | 15 | 1.5\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 11,429 | 7.2\% | 55 | 5.7\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 78,619 | 49.5\% | 464 | 47.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 80,347 | 50.5\% | 506 | 52.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 54,110 | 100\% | 387 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 31,766 | 58.7\% | 162 | 41.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 13,813 | 25.5\% | 42 | 10.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 2,210 | 4.1\% | 20 | 5.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 963 | 1.8\% | 5 | 1.3\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Guadalupe County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0986-APP City of Marion City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 7,973 | 14.7\% | 60 | 15.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 939 | 1.7\% | 2 | 0.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 4,872 | 9.0\% | 34 | 8.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,351 | 2.5\% | 12 | 3.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 12,161 | 22.5\% | 145 | 37.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 3,318 | 6.1\% | 39 | 10.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 5,837 | 10.8\% | 72 | 18.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 2,955 | 5.5\% | 45 | 11.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 21,371 | 39.5\% | 96 | 24.8\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 14,719 | 27.2\% | 139 | 35.9\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 156,604 | 100\% | 970 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 19,991 | 12.8\% | 243 | 25.1\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Guadalupe County: Project Service Areas



## Guadalupe County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| category or no |
| population are blank |

Population by Category



## Guadalupe County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



City of Rosenberg: Channel Improvements and Flood Mitigation Project - \$47,585,955 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Rosenberg, benefitting 56.66\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $112.84 \%$ greater than Fort Bend County's LMI percentage of $26.62 \%$ and $26.87 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

This project will benefit the city of Rosenberg by providing flood mitigation in the form of channel improvements and slope paving, culvert crossing improvements, storm sewer improvements, right-of-way acquisition, and regional detention. The overall benefits to the project area include:

- Reduction in water surface elevations along the flooding sources of Dry Creek, Theater Ditch, Rabbs Bayou, Graeber Road, and Theater Ditch North.
- Reduction in overall floodplain area within the project area.
- Improved access along major and minor roadways due to reduced water surface elevations.

Dry Creek

- Phase 1: Channel improvements between Louise Street and Airport Avenue.
- Phase 2: Concrete lining through Cambridge Village to Louise Street and an extra culvert at Louise Street.
- Phase 4: Trapezoidal channel improvements from Mockingbird Lane to FM 2218, including acquiring ROW for an ultimate 250 ' easement.
- Phase 5: Flowline improvements upstream of 1st Street, concrete lining from 1st Street to Cambridge Village, extra culverts at 1st and 4th Streets, and concrete lining from Airport to Mockingbird Lane.

Theater Ditch

- Deepen and slope pave the entire length of the ditch, providing a maximum increase in depth of approximately 1.2 feet at the upstream end.
- Replace the bottom of the existing ditch with concrete-lined 16 -foot bottom width and 4 foot tall vertical walls.
- Replace the existing culverts at Avenue N and Avenue $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{Laurel}$ Lane to improve conveyance through the road crossings and lower the upstream water surface elevations.
- Construct an additional culvert crossing at Avenue O/Leonard Avenue where a new road crossing is proposed.

Rabbs Bayou

- Trapezoidal channel improvements along the entire length of the main channel within Rosenberg.
- Replace culvert at Lane Drive, Wilson Drive, and Westwood Drive/Pecan Park Drive.
- Construction a 22-acre inline regional detention pond adjacent to the railroad track to lower peak flows to allow for improved drainage conveyance from the upstream drainage area within the city and to address the capacity issues resulting from the restrictions created by the existing culverts underneath the Railroad Tracks.

Graeber Road

- Construct a new storm sewer trunk system draining south to Dry Creek to alleviate the flooding issues near the intersection of Graeber Road and Avenue N.
- Right-of-way acquisition of the run of storm sewer from Airport Avenue to Dry Creek through the undeveloped tract of land south of Airport Avenue.

Theater Ditch North

- Concrete line the ditch from the upstream end near Avenue N down to US-90A to improve conveyance.
- Improve the existing culvert crossing under Avenue I/FM 1640.
- Improve the culvert crossing under Old Richmond Road and the railroad tracks located near the intersection of Old Richmond Road and Eighth Street to alleviate drainage issues in the area surrounding Theater Ditch North.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Rosenberg is a community of 37,059 residents in Fort Bend County $(765,394)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Rosenberg is $\$ 52,138,46.66 \%$ less than Fort Bend County's median income of $\$ 97,743$, and $0.03 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Rosenberg's AMFI is $\$ 56,889$ according to the ACS 2019. This is $72 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Fort Bend County which is $\$ 78,800$. Fort Bend County is within the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Rosenberg was $16.50 \%$, greater than Fort Bend County's poverty rate of $7.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of 15.47\%.

The city of Rosenberg's population is $59.40 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Fort Bend County's $24.50 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Rosenberg is $22.80 \%$ white alone, less than Fort Bend County's white alone percentage of $33.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Rosenberg is $14.30 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Fort Bend County (20.10\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The city of Rosenberg is $2.30 \%$ Asian alone, less than Fort Bend County's percentage of $20.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

In any demographic review whether by Census Tract, Block Group, or entire community; Rosenberg is a majority minority community (73.7\%) and the largest demographic of that majority is Hispanic. The White not of Hispanic or Latino origin community is the second largest as a percentage of the population ( $22 \%$ ). This is followed by the Black or African American population (14.3\%). Rosenberg is $59.4 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin. In the project areas, the highest concentration of the Hispanic or Latino origin demographic is $77.8 \%$. Given the scope of coverage for the projects and the distribution within the Census Tracts, it appears that the projects are representative of Rosenberg's overall demographics.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $80.70 \%$ in the city of Rosenberg, greater than $71.10 \%$ in Fort Bend County and less than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Rosenberg is $49.20 \%$ male, greater than Fort Bend County (49.10\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Rosenberg is $50.80 \%$ female, less than the $50.90 \%$ of Fort Bend County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in Rosenberg are comprised of $45.20 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Fort Bend County's $66.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Rosenberg that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $19.80 \%$ this is less than Fort Bend County's percentage of $34.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of Rosenberg, $27.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Fort Bend County's percentage of $20.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Rosenberg's households are $10.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Fort Bend County's percentage of $5.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Rosenberg's households are $10.90 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Fort Bend County at $8.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Rosenberg are $4.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Fort Bend County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $3.70 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Rosenberg $41.00 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Fort Bend County, which is at $46.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Rosenberg that have one or more people of 65 or older is $21.90 \%$, which is less than Fort Bend County's $23.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Rosenberg is $11.10 \%$ which is greater than Fort Bend County's $7.20 \%$,and equal to the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Overall, the housing quality in Rosenberg is relatively high. The housing is very mixed in both size and quality throughout the project areas. Near the proposed detention area, many of the homes are brick homes with wood siding. Some homes are tract style, some have the earlier modern look of the 1970's, and others are large entry homes in the style of the 1990's. Directly across the street
are apartments. Other project areas are comprised of older, wood shingled/siding style homes. In general, these homes are still in relatively good shape. There are large neighborhoods in Rosenberg, and many have large homes on traditional residential lots. The area appears to be a fully developed mature community that is well cared for by the residents through the upkeep of their personal property. There are areas with MHUs and apartments. Additionally, it is important to note that the City Hall/Court complex is in a target area. The project area includes schools as well.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Fort Bend County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1063-APP City of Rosenberg City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 26.62\% |  | 56.66\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$97,743 |  | \$52,138 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 7.80\% |  | 16.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 765,394 |  | 37,059 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 187,500 | 24.5\% | 22,008 | 59.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 577,894 | 75.5\% | 15,051 | 40.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 253,263 | 33.1\% | 8,439 | 22.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 153,972 | 20.1\% | 5,286 | 14.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,713 | 0.2\% | 58 | 0.2\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 153,245 | 20.0\% | 861 | 2.3\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 396 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 1,559 | 0.2\% | 90 | 0.2\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 13,746 | 1.8\% | 317 | 0.9\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 543,878 | 71.1\% | 30,310 | 81.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 531,455 | 69.4\% | 29,922 | 80.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 12,423 | 1.6\% | 388 | 1.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 221,516 | 28.9\% | 6,749 | 18.2\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 375,912 | 49.1\% | 18,232 | 49.2\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 389,482 | 50.9\% | 18,827 | 50.8\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 237,883 | 100\% | 12,059 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 157,327 | 66.1\% | 5,448 | 45.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 82,226 | 34.6\% | 2,392 | 19.8\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 8,498 | 3.6\% | 690 | 5.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 3,081 | 1.3\% | 287 | 2.4\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Fort Bend County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1063-APP <br> City of Rosenberg City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 24,571 | 10.3\% | 2,582 | 21.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 2,891 | 1.2\% | 340 | 2.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 15,214 | 6.4\% | 1,806 | 15.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,501 | 1.5\% | 289 | 2.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 47,487 | 20.0\% | 3,339 | 27.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 12,895 | 5.4\% | 1,217 | 10.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 20,230 | 8.5\% | 1,317 | 10.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 8,748 | 3.7\% | 596 | 4.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 110,576 | 46.5\% | 4,949 | 41.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 55,396 | 23.3\% | 2,641 | 21.9\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 760,164 | 100\% | 36,919 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 54,825 | 7.2\% | 4,080 | 11.1\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Fort Bend County: Project Service Areas



## Fort Bend County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
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## Fort Bend County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 130 Block Groups)10-25 percent ( 56 Block Groups)
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This project provides an area benefit within Austin County, benefitting 53.50\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $34.92 \%$ greater than Austin County's LMI percentage of $39.65 \%$ and $19.79 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

This project will deliver significant drainage improvements throughout the southern portion of Austin County, including the cities of Sealy, Wallis, and San Felipe. This area depends heavily on Allens Creek for its drainage needs; however, Allens Creek has a limited capacity to accommodate large volumes of floodwater. In the past five (5) years the south end of Austin County has been impacted by six (6) flood events, including four (4) declared flood-related disasters. The Austin County Allens Creek Watershed project will deliver the following improvements:

- Create a diversion channel between Sealy and Wallis that will allow excess flood waters to be diverted into the Brazos-River-Authority-owned reservoir, located within the Brazos River floodplain.
- Increase storage and capacity within dedicated drainage corridors upstream of the diversion channel.
- Build ten small, localized projects draining the waters away from the city of Wallis.

The project will include land acquisition and consists of two sectors: the north sector, which includes the southern portion of the city of Sealy as well as the undeveloped areas between Sealy and Wallis, and the South sector, which roughly corresponds to City the Wallis.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 10,995 within Austin County $(29,764)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The AMFI for Sealy is $\$ 68,103$ and for Austin County it is $\$ 78,195$ according to ACS 2019. This is $83 \%$ and $95 \%$ respectively of HUD's Austin County AMFI of $\$ 82,000$. Austin County is within the Austin County TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $10.80 \%$, which is equal to Austin County's poverty rate of $10.80 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $30.22 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than Austin County's $26.80 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $57.87 \%$ white alone, less than Austin County's percentage of $62.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $9.84 \%$ Black or African

American alone persons, this is greater than Austin County (8.70\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.12 \%$, which is greater than Austin County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.45 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Austin County's percentage of $0.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$, equal to Austin County ( $0.000 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.23 \%$ some other race alone, greater than Austin County's percentage of $0.20 \%$ and greater than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $1.27 \%$ two or more races, less than Austin County, which is at $1.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

In reviewing the project map provided in the application, there are very few population centers other than Sealy in the project area. Sealy is the largest city in the area and has a larger minority population ( $49.3 \%$ ) than the County ( $34.7 \%$ ) or the identified block groups ( $39 \%$ ). The total work areas according to ACS 2019 had a racial and ethnic majority of $39 \%$. The entire project area has a higher racial and ethnic minority population than Austin County.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $88.01 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Austin County at $89.50 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at 81.20\%.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $58.46 \%$ married couple families, less than Austin County's $61.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $23.36 \%$, less than Austin County's percentage of $23.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $4.41 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Austin County's percentage of $4.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.80 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than Austin County's $1.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $24.04 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Austin County's percentage of $21.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $4.99 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, which is greater than Austin County's percentage of $4.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $13.30 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Austin County at $12.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $7.55 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Austin County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $32.29 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Austin County, which is at $32.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $32.75 \%$, less than Austin County's $33.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $13.37 \%$, less than Austin County's $13.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The windshield survey focused on the Sealy and San Felipe area as the rest of the area has a low population, is rural with agricultural uses, or consists of smaller communities. Where the detention pond is being proposed in Sealy, the neighborhood has apartments and retail buildings with housing nearby. The location for the detention pond is an empty lot, so no one should be removed from their homes for this part of the project. The tributary runs behind some neighborhoods that have tract style and larger brick homes. The tributary also runs by Sealy High School and a local hotel. As it crosses under the local streets and moves toward I-10, there is a small neighborhood with smaller houses and some MHUs. The closest building at this point, however, appears to be the Sealy Police Department.

The creek is in open land as it goes to I-10. When it crosses under I-10, it runs into a large retail area again with a hotel, but there are few houses there. There is a bridge to Walmart by the hotel over the creek. It goes under Highway 36 and comes out at the train trestle discussed in the project. The train trestle does act somewhat as a dam, collecting debris even in non-flooding conditions. Still there is no housing at this location, although there are some houses on the opposite side of the street away from this flood point. After the trestle, the drainage area and the creek almost instantly become rural and agricultural land. There are a few rural and agricultural houses as it continues, but mostly there is limited population after this point. We did not follow the creek through the most rural parts of the area. Since we are mainly concerned with impacts to population centers, and the creek ran through private fenced property no windshield review was conducted.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Austin County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1209-APP Austin County |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 39.65\% |  | 53.50\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$66,206 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.80\% |  | 10.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 29,764 |  | 24,870 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 7,989 | 26.8\% | 7,516 | 30.2\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 21,775 | 73.2\% | 17,354 | 69.8\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 18,515 | 62.2\% | 14,393 | 57.9\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,600 | 8.7\% | 2,446 | 9.8\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 30 | 0.1\% | 30 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 111 | 0.4\% | 111 | 0.4\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 57 | 0.2\% | 57 | 0.23\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 462 | 1.6\% | 317 | 1.27\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 26,649 | 89.5\% | 22,028 | 88.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 26,510 | 89.1\% | 21,889 | 88.0\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 139 | 0.5\% | 139 | 0.6\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 3,115 | 10.5\% | 2,842 | 11\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 14,682 | 49.3\% | 12,126 | 48.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 15,082 | 50.7\% | 12,744 | 51.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 11,301 | 100\% | 9,534 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,963 | 61.6\% | 5,574 | 58.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,696 | 23.9\% | 2,227 | 23.4\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 470 | 4.2\% | 420 | 4.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 172 | 1.5\% | 172 | 1.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Austin County |  | Harvey (State MID) <br> CDR17-1209-APP <br> Austin County <br> Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,411 | 12.5\% | 1,248 | 13.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 101 | 0.9\% | 58 | 0.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,031 | 9.1\% | 911 | 9.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 337 | 3.0\% | 295 | 3.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,457 | 21.7\% | 2,292 | 24.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 476 | 4.2\% | 476 | 5.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,388 | 12.3\% | 1,268 | 13.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 813 | 7.2\% | 720 | 7.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,651 | 32.3\% | 3,079 | 32.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,782 | 33.5\% | 3,122 | 32.7\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 29,488 | 100\% | 24,747 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,006 | 13.6\% | 3,309 | 13.4\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Wallis: Wastewater and Drainage Infrastructure Project - \$5,748,125-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Wallis, benefitting $61.78 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $55.82 \%$ greater than Austin County's LMI percentage of $39.65 \%$ and $38.34 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The existing wastewater and drainage infrastructure in Wallis are not adequate for heavy rainfall events and flooding. The impact of flooding on the residents of Wallis includes threats to public health and safety from the floodwater itself, damage to residential and commercial properties and overtopping of roadways that can inhibit residents and first responders from traversing the streets. In addition, the floodwaters can overwhelm storm and sanitary sewer systems.

Since much of the city's wastewater system consists of clay pipe constructed in the early 1950's, stormwater infiltration of the system can cause pipe failure, resulting in surcharges to surface waters during storm events. Surcharged manholes during storm events allow purging of wastewater from the system into surrounding areas. This is a public health risk as it directly exposes residents to wastewater.

The stormwater drainage mitigation efforts will provide relief from flooded streets, yards, and homes during minimal events; in areas that are not mapped as flood areas. The primary danger due to these high waters comes from poorly navigable streets, limited first responder access and damage to public and private infrastructure. Additionally, providing for better drainage and less ponding and flooding of low areas will reduce the amount of submerged land area and reduce the amount of time that pathogens, mosquitos, and pests can thrive and put lives and welfare at risk. The project includes the following citywide wastewater and drainage improvements:

- Replace 29,380 linear feet of existing pipe
- Repair 40 existing manholes and construct 34 new manholes citywide
- Construct temporary shallow surface storage ( 2 to 4 feet) that will take some of the pressure off the discharge ditches. The three sites near the center of town are 3, 12 and 22 acres
- Storm sewer improvements include:

1. Construct four separate drainage ditches with easements totaling 9,700 linear feet, which help route water either to and from the storage area or to one of the county outfalls at the edge of the city jurisdiction
2. Replace 9,820 linear feet of culverts throughout the entire town

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Wallis is a community of 1,571 residents in Austin County $(29,764)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Wallis is $\$ 42,188,36.28 \%$ less than Austin County's median income of $\$ 66,206$, and $19.11 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Wallis’ AMFI is $\$ 49,788$ according to ACS 2019. This is $61 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Austin County which is $\$ 82,200$. Austin County is in the HUD Austin County, Texas Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate in the city based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates of Wallis was $14.80 \%$, greater than Austin County's poverty rate of $10.80 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Wallis's population is $42.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Austin County's $26.80 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Wallis is $47.40 \%$ white alone, less than Austin County's white alone percentage of $62.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Wallis is $9.00 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Austin County ( $8.70 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. Wallis is $0.80 \%$ some other race alone, greater than Austin County's percentage of $0.20 \%$ and greater than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. In the city of Wallis, $0.70 \%$ of the population is two or more races, less than Austin County, which is at $1.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Wallis has similar demographic totals between the racial and ethnic minority population, and the White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population. However, Wallis is a majority minority community according to the 2019 ACS with $51.1 \%$ of the community being racial and ethnic minorities.

The households in Wallis are comprised of $54.50 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Austin County's $61.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Wallis that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $24.90 \%$ this is greater than Austin County's percentage of $23.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Wallis's households are $2.60 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Austin County's percentage of $4.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.50 \%$ is within the city of Wallis, which is equal to Austin County's $1.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Wallis, $22.10 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Austin County's percentage of $21.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Wallis's households are $1.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Austin County's percentage of $4.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Wallis's households are $18.60 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Austin County at $12.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Wallis are $11.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Austin County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Wallis $32.80 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Austin County, which is at $32.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Wallis that have one or more people of 65 or older is $33.40 \%$, which is less than Austin County's $33.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Wallis is $15.50 \%$ which is greater than Austin County's $13.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

In the Marek groups of streets, there are both drainage and wastewater projects. Marek is a dirt street, and it has limited and mixed wood and brick housing of various sizes, a church, and agricultural property. The lift station on Marek was also reviewed as a project in Harvey. In the Birch group of streets there is limited housing on the side streets, and some public property. On Rogers Street, the houses are smaller and wood. One detention pond is planned at the end of Rogers where a field currently exists. There are also wastewater projects here and a lift station that is near a group of MHUs.

On Bowers and Dubose, there are larger homes. This area has both drainage and wastewater projects. Closer to the retention pond here, the houses are more mixed in quality and materials. The detention pond is currently in a field behind the houses. The drainage project is targeting the streets, and the wastewater project appears to be planned for an alley type property between houses. In the Becky Lane grouping of projects, the houses are brick ranch style homes. The adjacent detention pond is on vacant land. In the Norcross area, there is little to no housing present. On Legion, there is sparse housing, but it does include Wild Olive Ranch, and this is a large property. On the Houston and Austin Streets in the same area, the housing is mainly brick and of mixed size and quality. Janicek and Westgate have fairly new ranch and tract style housing built on average size city lots.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Austin County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1111-APP City of Wallis |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 39.65\% |  | 61.78\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$66,206 |  | \$42,188 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.80\% |  | 14.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 29,764 |  | 1,571 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 7,989 | 26.8\% | 662 | 42.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 21,775 | 73.2\% | 909 | 57.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 18,515 | 62.2\% | 744 | 47.4\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,600 | 8.7\% | 142 | 9.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 30 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 111 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 57 | 0.2\% | 12 | 0.8\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 462 | 1.6\% | 11 | 0.7\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 26,649 | 89.5\% | 1,471 | 93.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 26,510 | 89.1\% | 1,471 | 93.6\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 139 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 3,115 | 10.5\% | 100 | 6.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 14,682 | 49.3\% | 784 | 49.9\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 15,082 | 50.7\% | 787 | 50.1\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 11,301 | 100\% | 607 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,963 | 61.6\% | 331 | 54.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,696 | 23.9\% | 151 | 24.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 470 | 4.2\% | 16 | 2.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 172 | 1.5\% | 9 | 1.5\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Austin County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1111-APP City of Wallis City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,411 | 12.5\% | 126 | 20.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 101 | 0.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,031 | 9.1\% | 96 | 15.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 337 | 3.0\% | 13 | 2.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,457 | 21.7\% | 134 | 22.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 476 | 4.2\% | 8 | 1.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,388 | 12.3\% | 113 | 18.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 813 | 7.2\% | 68 | 11.2\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,651 | 32.3\% | 199 | 32.8\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,782 | 33.5\% | 203 | 33.4\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 29,488 | 100\% | 1,553 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,006 | 13.6\% | 240 | 15.5\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the town of San Felipe, benefitting 52.11\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $31.43 \%$ greater than Austin County's LMI percentage of $39.65 \%$ and $16.69 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

During heavy rains, the roadways in San Felipe become impassable for emergency vehicles and residents. The disruption of access and the ponding of water upstream of the culverts impact a large majority of the community's residents.

The project will involve the construction of drainage improvements throughout the Town of San Felipe to eliminate or mitigate known flooding areas. Construction will include:

- Clear and grade existing roadside ditches and the major area outfall ditch.
- Remove and replace inadequately sized roadway culverts to accommodate and provide adequate flows to the receiving streams.
- Improve street elevations and crown roadway surfaces to shed water into the roadside ditch system.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

San Felipe is a community of 766 residents in Austin County $(29,764)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of San Felipe is $\$ 39,674,40.07 \%$ less than Austin County's median income of $\$ 66,206$, and $23.93 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. San Felipe's AMFI is $\$ 42,500$ according to ACS 2019. This is $52 \%$ of the HUD Austin County AMFI of $\$ 82,000$. Austin County is within the Austin County TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the town of San Felipe was $12.20 \%$, greater than Austin County's poverty rate of $10.80 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The town of San Felipe's population is $14.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Austin County's $26.80 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of San Felipe is $53.10 \%$ white alone, less than Austin County's white alone percentage of $62.20 \%$
and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The town of San Felipe is $31.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Austin County ( $8.70 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. . In the town of San Felipe, $1.30 \%$ of the population is two or more races, less than Austin County, which is at $1.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

There is a discrepancy between the racial and ethnic minority population information provided in a summary by San Felipe and the 2019 ACS. The 2019 ACS Census data shows a Black or African American population of $241 / 31.5 \%$ and a Hispanic or Latino population of $108 / 14.1 \%$. This compares with San Felipe's Fair Housing Analysis of a minority population of $56.4 \%$. The discrepancy could be from the year of Census Data used by San Felipe. Our review shows a slight majority of White not of Hispanic or Latino origin, but the city is overall a racially and ethnically diverse community.

The town of San Felipe is $54.40 \%$ male, greater than Austin County (49.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. San Felipe is $45.60 \%$ female, less than the $50.70 \%$ of Austin County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in San Felipe are comprised of $41.10 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Austin County's $61.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in San Felipe that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $14.20 \%$ this is less than Austin County's percentage of $23.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the town of San Felipe, $34.50 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Austin County's percentage of $21.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. San Felipe's households are $5.70 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Austin County's percentage of $4.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. San Felipe's households are $13.90 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Austin County at $12.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in San Felipe are $11.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Austin County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In San Felipe $27.20 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Austin County, which is at $32.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within San Felipe that have one or more people of 65 or older is $45.30 \%$, which is greater than Austin County's $33.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the town of San Felipe is $17.80 \%$ which is greater than Austin County's $13.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

There is not a high number of impacted houses in project areas, but this is to be expected as the Town has 389 residences. The houses in San Felipe vary in upkeep, size, and quality. Most houses are traditional style residential houses and have a typical size and finish for rural Texas. A few houses are larger and are on large lots.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Austin County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1131-APP Town of San Felipe City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 39.65\% |  | 52.11\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$66,206 |  | \$39,674 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.80\% |  | 12.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 29,764 |  | 766 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 7,989 | 26.8\% | 108 | 14.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 21,775 | 73.2\% | 658 | 85.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 18,515 | 62.2\% | 407 | 53.1\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,600 | 8.7\% | 241 | 31.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 30 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 111 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 57 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 462 | 1.6\% | 10 | 1.3\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 26,649 | 89.5\% | 714 | 93.2\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 26,510 | 89.1\% | 709 | 92.6\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 139 | 0.5\% | 5 | 0.7\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 3,115 | 10.5\% | 52 | 6.8\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 14,682 | 49.3\% | 417 | 54.4\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 15,082 | 50.7\% | 349 | 45.6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 11,301 | 100\% | 316 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,963 | 61.6\% | 130 | 41.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,696 | 23.9\% | 45 | 14.2\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 470 | 4.2\% | 9 | 2.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 172 | 1.5\% | 9 | 2.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Austin County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1131-APP <br> Town of San Felipe City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,411 | 12.5\% | 68 | 21.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 101 | 0.9\% | 14 | 4.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,031 | 9.1\% | 37 | 11.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 337 | 3.0\% | 10 | 3.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,457 | 21.7\% | 109 | 34.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 476 | 4.2\% | 18 | 5.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,388 | 12.3\% | 44 | 13.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 813 | 7.2\% | 36 | 11.4\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,651 | 32.3\% | 86 | 27.2\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,782 | 33.5\% | 143 | 45.3\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 29,488 | 100\% | 766 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,006 | 13.6\% | 136 | 17.8\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Austin County: Project Service Areas



## Awardee

Application ID
Austin County CDR17-1209-APP City of Wallis CDR17-1111-APP Town of San Felipe CDR17-1131-APP
Total Benefs
10,995 1,290


## Austin County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population
- Black or African American Population

Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance

- 0-1

Population by Category



## Austin County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Kenedy: Citywide Water Treatment Plant - \$43,040,879 - Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Kenedy, benefitting 52.25\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $12.67 \%$ greater than Karnes County's LMI percentage of $46.37 \%$ and $16.99 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Kenedy has endured the failure of its water treatment plant four times during four disaster events. Residents, evacuees, and businesses have been forced to go without water for periods of time and to boil their water in direct relation to natural disaster storm events.

To resolve this issue, the city has identified a water source capable of producing "out of the ground" fresh water. The location of the water source is far enough away from coastal areas that any storm system reaching the site should have dissipated and only have minimal impact. Due to the extensive length of the transmission line in conjunction with the installation of a third elevated storage tank, the city would have access to an additional five days of water, thereby permitting enough time for storage tanks to properly refill and maintain TCEQ required pressure and flow rates.

The project includes the following:

- Build new system on a different power grid than the city of Kenedy, which will enable the wells to continue to produce and pump water.
- Install generators to provide a back-up power source to pump water that currently does not exist.
- Install a new strategically placed 1 M to 2 M gallon elevated storage tank that will provide enough reserve water to handle a single day of $100 \%$ demand in the event of a power outage.
- Install a new water transmission line

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Kenedy is a community of 3,384 residents in Karnes County $(15,545)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Kenedy is $\$ 41,926,25.30 \%$ less than Karnes County's median income of $\$ 56,127$, and $19.61 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Kenedy's AMFI is $\$ 69,861$ according to the ACS 2019 which is $102 \%$ of Karnes County HUD based AMFI of $\$ 68,200$. Karnes County is not in a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in the city of Kenedy was $16.40 \%$, compared with Karnes County's poverty rate of $18.60 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate
of $15.47 \%$. According to the ACS 2019 five-year average, the Kenedy poverty rate increased to $22.3 \%$ while Karnes County's poverty rate decreased to $17.7 \%$

The city of Kenedy's population is $83.50 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Karnes County's $54.70 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Kenedy is $9.00 \%$ white alone, less than Karnes County's white alone percentage of $35.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Kenedy is $2.70 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Karnes County ( $6.40 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Kenedy is $0.30 \%$, greater than Karnes County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Kenedy is $4.50 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Karnes County's percentage of $1.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

The Kenedy community is $83.5 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin. The proposed area where the new well is being constructed is majority White not of Hispanic or Latino origin, although we were not able to get an exact address for the location. We do not have an accurate count of the racial and ethnic make-up along the right of way that runs generally along the railroad easement from the well site to Kenedy. However, both Census Tracts 9702 and 9703 in Karnes County that contain the rail right of way are $62 \%+$ Hispanic or Latino origin. This project should benefit the entire population of Kenedy with minimal negative impact to any particular demographic.

In the city of Kenedy, $32.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Karnes County's percentage of $25.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Kenedy's households are $6.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Karnes County's percentage of $5.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Kenedy is $14.70 \%$ which is greater than Karnes County's $13.40 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The pipeline from the new wells to Kenedy runs for 20+ miles along a Union Pacific Railroad right of way. The housing in this area varies - including mainly agriculture uses along the way. Near the water plant in Kenedy, the housing is generally larger brick housing on larger than average lots. This is likely because the water plant is on a higher elevation than most of the community. There are houses immediately adjacent to the plant that are currently in operation. These houses are not screened from the plant. The houses are smaller, and many are wood as you get a few blocks from the water plant in the impacted neighborhood.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Karnes County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1023-APP City of Kenedy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 46.37\% |  | 52.25\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$56,127 |  | \$41,926 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.60\% |  | 16.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 15,545 |  | 3,384 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 8,506 | 54.7\% | 2,824 | 83.5\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 7,039 | 45.3\% | 560 | 16.5\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 5,572 | 35.8\% | 303 | 9.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 997 | 6.4\% | 93 | 2.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 19 | 0.1\% | 11 | 0.3\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 161 | 1.0\% | 153 | 4.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 290 | 1.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 13,873 | 89.2\% | 3,087 | 91.2\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 13,800 | 88.8\% | 3,087 | 91.2\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 73 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,672 | 10.8\% | 297 | 8.8\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 9,147 | 58.8\% | 1,745 | 51.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 6,398 | 41.2\% | 1,639 | 48.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,282 | 100\% | 1,072 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,153 | 50.3\% | 393 | 36.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 711 | 16.6\% | 183 | 17.1\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 172 | 4.0\% | 36 | 3.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 78 | 1.8\% | 26 | 2.4\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Karnes County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1023-APP City of Kenedy City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 852 | 19.9\% | 292 | 27.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 66 | 1.5\% | 42 | 3.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 661 | 15.4\% | 248 | 23.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 230 | 5.4\% | 76 | 7.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,105 | 25.8\% | 351 | 32.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 230 | 5.4\% | 74 | 6.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 675 | 15.8\% | 214 | 20.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 401 | 9.4\% | 63 | 5.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,156 | 27.0\% | 325 | 30.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,446 | 33.8\% | 253 | 23.6\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 12,633 | 100\% | 3,325 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,688 | 13.4\% | 490 | 14.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Karnes County: Project Service Areas



## Karnes County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Karnes County: Population in Poverty by Block Group
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This project provides an area benefit within the city of Clute, benefitting 61.23\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $5.99 \%$ less than the City of Clute's LMI percentage of $65.13 \%, 48.22 \%$ greater than Brazoria County's LMI percentage of $41.31 \%$ and $37.11 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

This project is part of a recommended comprehensive Clute and Lake Jackson Drainage Plan to implement drainage and storm sewer system management interventions to reduce flooding and water surface elevations in the overall drainage area. The plan included neighboring Lake Jackson and the Velasco Drainage District in the planning process, which will increase future overall resiliency and maximize beneficiary impact on residents and communities. The project will include storm sewer system upgrades and ditch improvements for three sites: Flag Lake Drive \& Brazoswood Shopping Center, Plantation to Pin Money and Ditch A from Dixie Drive to Cosa Verde.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 7,145 within the regional drainage plan developed with the city of Lake Jackson, but the application is from the city of Clute, a community of 11,590 residents in Brazoria County $(360,677)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Clute has an AMFI of $\$ 66,095$ according to ACS 2019. This is $63 \%$ of the HUD Brazoria County AMFI of $\$ 104,200$. Brazoria County is within the Brazoria County TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $10.84 \%$, less than the city of Clute which is at $17.70 \%$, greater than Brazoria County's poverty rate of $9.20 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $49.78 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, less than the city of Clute's population percentage of $55.80 \%$, greater than Brazoria County's $30.60 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $42.43 \%$ white alone, greater than the city of Clute's percentage of $30.60 \%$, less than Brazoria County's percentage of $47.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $5.07 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than the city of Clute, which has $11.90 \%$, less than Brazoria County ( $13.60 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $2.26 \%$ two or more races, greater than the city of Clute at $1.60 \%$, greater than Brazoria County, which is at $1.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Clute is a majority minority community with a $68.5 \%$ racial and ethnic minority population. The Hispanic or Latino origin demographic is a majority of the Clute population; this demographic accounts for $56.6 \%$ of the residents. This compares with the regional drainage planning partner Lake Jackson -- that has a $32.9 \%$ racial and ethnic population, or Brazoria County that has a $44.2 \%$ racial and ethnic minority population. Clute is down stream from Lake Jackson toward the Gulf.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $86.49 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than $84.00 \%$ in the city of Clute, less than Brazoria County at $86.90 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $47.04 \%$ married couple families, less than the city of Clute at $43.40 \%$ less than Brazoria County's $57.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $22.53 \%$, less than the city of Clute at $22.70 \%$, less than Brazoria County's percentage of $27.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $6.57 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than the city of Clute's percentage of $7.50 \%$, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $2.64 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than the city of Clute at $2.70 \%$, greater than Brazoria County's $1.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $28.99 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of Clute at $30.10 \%$, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $21.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $5.78 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than the city of Clute which is at $7.70 \%$, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $15.53 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than the city of Clute at $14.00 \%$, greater than Brazoria County at $11.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $7.77 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than the city of Clute who is at $5.40 \%$, greater than Brazoria County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $5.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $34.97 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the city of Clute at $38.50 \%$, less than Brazoria County, which is at $40.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $23.41 \%$, greater than the city of Clute at $19.50 \%$, less than Brazoria County's $23.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $11.24 \%$, less than the city of Clute at $12.20 \%$, greater than Brazoria County's $9.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

Much of the direct area around the improvements is commercial/retail in nature. There are larger neighborhoods within the drainage area with brick ranch style housing on standard city lots. The area is fairly densely populated, but it appears that there will be no relocations to achieve the plan. The area identified as "Ditch A" runs behind neighborhoods and has an open area surrounding it; so, the work in this area should minimally impact the residents. The drainage on Dixie Drive is in front of businesses like a funeral home, pharmacy, Ollie's, Kroger and other food or retail stores. There may be disruptions during construction here since the work is on and around a major city street.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Brazoria County |  | City of Clute |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) CDR17-1201-APP City of Clute Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.31\% |  | 65.13\% |  | 61.23\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$81,447 |  | \$56,768 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.20\% |  | 17.70\% |  | 10.84\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 360,677 |  | 11,590 |  | 14,588 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 110,463 | 30.6\% | 6,462 | 55.8\% | 7,262 | 49.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,214 | 69.4\% | 5,128 | 44.2\% | 7,326 | 50.2\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 170,272 | 47.2\% | 3,542 | 30.6\% | 6,190 | 42.4\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 49,226 | 13.6\% | 1,381 | 11.9\% | 740 | 5.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,288 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 23,803 | 6.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 46 | 0.3\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 21 | 0.0\% | 21 | 0.2\% | 21 | 0.1\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 542 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 5,062 | 1.4\% | 184 | 1.60\% | 329 | 2.26\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 313,259 | 86.9\% | 9,734 | 84.0\% | 12,768 | 87.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 309,011 | 85.7\% | 9,614 | 83.0\% | 12,617 | 86.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 4,248 | 1.2\% | 120 | 1.0\% | 151 | 1.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 47,418 | 13.1\% | 1,856 | 16\% | 1,820 | 12\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 182,333 | 50.6\% | 5,632 | 48.6\% | 7,133 | 48.9\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 178,344 | 49.4\% | 5,958 | 51.4\% | 7,455 | 51.1\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,523 | 100\% | 4,350 | 100\% | 5,447 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 70,124 | 57.7\% | 1,889 | 43.4\% | 2,562 | 47.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 33,701 | 27.7\% | 989 | 22.7\% | 1,227 | 22.5\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,254 | 5.1\% | 328 | 7.5\% | 358 | 6.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,164 | 1.8\% | 118 | 2.7\% | 144 | 2.6\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Brazoria County |  | City of Clute |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1201-APP |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Clute |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 18,657 | 15.4\% | 825 | 19.0\% | 948 | 17.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 1,536 | 1.3\% | 19 | 0.4\% | 19 | 0.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 13,203 | 10.9\% | 692 | 15.9\% | 785 | 14.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,050 | 2.5\% | 79 | 1.8\% | 133 | 2.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 26,488 | 21.8\% | 1,308 | 30.1\% | 1,579 | 29.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 6,182 | 5.1\% | 333 | 7.7\% | 315 | 5.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 14,161 | 11.7\% | 610 | 14.0\% | 846 | 15.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 6,068 | 5.0\% | 236 | 5.4\% | 423 | 7.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 48,709 | 40.1\% | 1,674 | 38.5\% | 1,905 | 35.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 28,952 | 23.8\% | 849 | 19.5\% | 1,275 | 23.4\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 348,786 | 100\% | 11,443 | 100\% | 14,436 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 32,597 | 9.3\% | 1,395 | 12.2\% | 1,623 | 11.2\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Freeport: Wastewater Treatment Plant Project - \$5,991,468 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Freeport, benefitting 67.19\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $62.66 \%$ greater than Brazoria County's LMI percentage of $41.31 \%$ and $50.46 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The project includes constructing a new Wastewater Treatment Plant in-kind to the east of the existing plant. The improved design includes a full geotechnical investigation and foundation design to prevent the type of foundation damage that has occurred at the existing plant.

The project includes the following:

- Construct a new 1.6 MGD steel package Wastewater Treatment Plant to replace the existing plant.
- Construction of a foundation that is engineered for the soil conditions and possible flooding that could occur on site.
- Install new mechanical components in the proposed steel package plant for an operational facility complete in place.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability or residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. The need for increased wastewater infrastructure appears to be repeatedly included in planning and mitigation documents for many years.

This Wastewater Treatment Plant project is expected to reduce the risk of failure of the steel package WWTP as a result of a storm or hurricane event. The foundation settling makes the plant susceptible to further failure during a severe weather event. Mitigating the risk of failure of the plant during a major storm is critical for the city to protect their wastewater treatment capabilities during a major storm; protecting all residents, businesses and industries served by the city.

Freeport is a community of 12,147 residents in Brazoria County $(360,677)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Freeport is $\$ 38,462$, $52.78 \%$ less than Brazoria County's median income of $\$ 81,447$, and $26.25 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Freeport has an AMFI of $\$ 46,951$ according to ACS 2019. This is $45 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 104,200$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Brazoria County, TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Freeport was $24.30 \%$ compared to Brazoria County's poverty rate of $9.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Freeport increased to $25.6 \%$ while Brazoria County's poverty rate decreased to $8.7 \%$.

The City of Freeport has a higher racial and ethnic population than the county ( $76.6 \%$ compared with $45.4 \%$ ) . The City of Freeport has a significantly higher LMI population with a $+25.9 \%$ increase over the county, and $16.9 \%$ higher poverty rate too.

The city of Freeport's population is $63.00 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Brazoria County's $30.60 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Freeport is $18.30 \%$ white alone, less than Brazoria County's white alone percentage of $47.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Freeport is $13.60 \%$ Black or African American alone, equal to Brazoria County (13.60\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Freeport is $2.70 \%$, greater than Brazoria County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.40 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Freeport is $1.00 \%$ Asian alone, less than Brazoria County's percentage of $6.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The City of Freeport has the highest percentage of racial and ethnic minorities in Brazoria County's major communities and is a majority minority city.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $87.20 \%$ in the city of Freeport, greater than $86.90 \%$ in Brazoria County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Freeport, $33.40 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $21.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Freeport's households are $17.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Freeport's households are $14.50 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Brazoria County at $11.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Freeport are $2.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than Brazoria County and less than the eligible area, which are at $5.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Freeport $49.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Brazoria County, which is at $40.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Freeport that have one or more people of 65 or older is $15.20 \%$, which is less than Brazoria County's $23.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Freeport is $11.40 \%$ which is greater than Brazoria County's $9.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The wastewater treatment facility is located across the river from housing. Freeport has mixed housing, but generally it is tract-style housing within neighborhoods built on standard city lots. With that being said, larger housing does exist in the city as well. It appears that this project is a citywide benefit and will benefit the majority minority population without placing an undue burden on any segment of the population because of the location away from housing.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Brazoria County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1031-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Freeport |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 41.31\% |  | 67.19\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$81,447 |  | \$38,462 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.20\% |  | 24.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 360,677 |  | 12,147 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 110,463 | 30.6\% | 7,649 | 63.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,214 | 69.4\% | 4,498 | 37.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 170,272 | 47.2\% | 2,218 | 18.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 49,226 | 13.6\% | 1,647 | 13.6\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,288 | 0.4\% | 330 | 2.7\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 23,803 | 6.6\% | 122 | 1.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 21 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 542 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 5,062 | 1.4\% | 181 | 1.5\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 313,259 | 86.9\% | 10,636 | 87.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 309,011 | 85.7\% | 10,594 | 87.2\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 4,248 | 1.2\% | 42 | 0.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 47,418 | 13.1\% | 1,511 | 12.4\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 182,333 | 50.6\% | 6,255 | 51.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 178,344 | 49.4\% | 5,892 | 48.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,523 | 100\% | 4,001 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 70,124 | 57.7\% | 1,604 | 40.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 33,701 | 27.7\% | 998 | 24.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,254 | 5.1\% | 259 | 6.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,164 | 1.8\% | 82 | 2.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Brazoria County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1031-APP City of Freeport City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 18,657 | 15.4\% | 803 | 20.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,536 | 1.3\% | 124 | 3.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 13,203 | 10.9\% | 580 | 14.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,050 | 2.5\% | 156 | 3.9\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 26,488 | 21.8\% | 1,335 | 33.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 6,182 | 5.1\% | 692 | 17.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 14,161 | 11.7\% | 580 | 14.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 6,068 | 5.0\% | 113 | 2.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 48,709 | 40.1\% | 1,971 | 49.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 28,952 | 23.8\% | 607 | 15.2\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 348,786 | 100\% | 12,141 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 32,597 | 9.3\% | 1,383 | 11.4\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Freeport: Stormwater Inflow Improvements - \$5,931,626 - Addressed Risk: Severe Coastal Flooding, and Storms

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Freeport, benefitting 67.19\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $62.66 \%$ greater than Brazoria County's LMI percentage of $41.31 \%$ and $50.46 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Freeport will mitigate the risk of public health hazards associated with sewage overflows, accommodate stormwater surges in a responsible manner, promote an environmentally sound method of wastewater collection and treatment and mitigate negative community aspects of improper sewer disposal. By upsizing mechanical components, rehabilitating and replacing sanitary sewer lines, manholes, and improving service laterals within this project, it will mitigate the risks of future flooding by reducing the stormwater inflow into the sanitary sewer system. The project will rehabilitate the existing sanitary sewer system to improve resiliency against future storm and flood events.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. The need for increased wastewater infrastructure appears to be repeatedly included in planning and mitigation documents for many years.

Freeport is a community of 12,147 residents in Brazoria County $(360,677)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Freeport is $\$ 38,462$, $52.78 \%$ less than Brazoria County's median income of $\$ 81,447$, and $26.25 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Freeport has an AMFI of $\$ 46,951$ according to ACS 2019. This is $45 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 104,200$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Brazoria County, TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Freeport was $24.30 \%$ compared to Brazoria County's poverty rate of $9.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Freeport increased to $25.6 \%$ while Brazoria County's poverty rate decreased to $8.7 \%$.

The City of Freeport has a higher racial and ethnic population than the county ( $76.6 \%$ compared with $45.4 \%$ ). The city of Freeport also has a significantly higher LMI population with a $+25.9 \%$ increase over the county, and a $16.9 \%$ higher poverty rate too.

The city of Freeport's population is $63.00 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Brazoria County's $30.60 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Freeport is $18.30 \%$ white alone, less than Brazoria County's white alone percentage of $47.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Freeport is $13.60 \%$ Black or African American alone, equal to Brazoria County (13.60\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Freeport is $2.70 \%$, greater than Brazoria County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.40 \%$
and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The City of Freeport has the highest percentage of racial and ethnic minorities in Brazoria County's major communities and is a majority minority city.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $87.20 \%$ in the city of Freeport, greater than $86.90 \%$ in Brazoria County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in Freeport are comprised of $40.10 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Brazoria County's $57.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Freeport that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $24.90 \%$ this is less than Brazoria County's percentage of $27.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Freeport's households are $6.50 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and greater than the eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $2.00 \%$ is within the city of Freeport, which is greater than Brazoria County's $1.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Freeport, $33.40 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $21.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Freeport's households are $17.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Freeport's households are $14.50 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Brazoria County at $11.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Freeport are $2.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than Brazoria County and less than the eligible area, which are at $5.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Freeport $49.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than Brazoria County, which is at $40.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Freeport that have one or more people of 65 or older is $15.20 \%$, which is less than Brazoria County's $23.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Freeport is $11.40 \%$ which is greater than Brazoria County's $9.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The North Improvements are in a what appears to be a mixed income area, with a small wooden/brick housing community. There is also larger and nicer apparent in-fill housing in the area, and the City has a very large park nearby. There are a few houses near the canal levees that are newer and higher end. The southern project has slightly larger homes but is similar in nature to other neighborhoods. The work will be done in the alleys that run between the houses. The alleys are mainly grassy areas or dirt, and appear to be used on an infrequent basis so it should not interrupt the community significantly. Based on Census data and a visit to the site, the areas appear to be representative of the community's racial, ethnic, and economic makeup.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-0939-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Brazoria |  | City of Freeport |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.31\% |  | 67.19\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$81,447 |  | \$38,462 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.20\% |  | 24.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 360,677 |  | 12,147 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 110,463 | 30.6\% | 7,649 | 63.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,214 | 69.4\% | 4,498 | 37.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 170,272 | 47.2\% | 2,218 | 18.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 49,226 | 13.6\% | 1,647 | 13.6\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,288 | 0.4\% | 330 | 2.7\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 23,803 | 6.6\% | 122 | 1.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 21 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 542 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 5,062 | 1.4\% | 181 | 1.5\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 313,259 | 86.9\% | 10,636 | 87.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 309,011 | 85.7\% | 10,594 | 87.2\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 4,248 | 1.2\% | 42 | 0.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 47,418 | 13.1\% | 1,511 | 12.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 182,333 | 50.6\% | 6,255 | 51.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 178,344 | 49.4\% | 5,892 | 48.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,523 | 100\% | 4,001 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 70,124 | 57.7\% | 1,604 | 40.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 33,701 | 27.7\% | 998 | 24.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,254 | 5.1\% | 259 | 6.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,164 | 1.8\% | 82 | 2.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Brazoria County |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0939-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Freeport |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 18,657 | 15.4\% | 803 | 20.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 1,536 | 1.3\% | 124 | 3.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 13,203 | 10.9\% | 580 | 14.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,050 | 2.5\% | 156 | 3.9\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 26,488 | 21.8\% | 1,335 | 33.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 6,182 | 5.1\% | 692 | 17.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 14,161 | 11.7\% | 580 | 14.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 6,068 | 5.0\% | 113 | 2.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 48,709 | 40.1\% | 1,971 | 49.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 28,952 | 23.8\% | 607 | 15.2\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 348,786 | 100\% | 12,141 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 32,597 | 9.3\% | 1,383 | 11.4\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Sweeny: Flood Mitigation Project - \$5,398,293-Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding, and Storms

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Sweeny, benefitting 56.99\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $37.95 \%$ greater than Brazoria County's LMI percentage of $41.31 \%$ and $27.60 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city's location, low elevation, and flat topography places the community at serious risk to significant rain events, storms, and riverine flooding. With these funds, the city will replace the existing sanitary sewer trunk line to significantly decrease the infiltration and inflow into the city's collection system. The city also will install new permanent emergency generators at the three remaining lift stations without emergency power, the FM 1459 Lift Station located in a rural area of the city, the FM 524 Lift Station located in an industrial area of the city, and the San Bernard Lift Station located in the area of San Bernard. Installing these generators will allow all lift stations on the collection system to continue operations in the event of an extended power outage.

Additionally, the city will improve a caliche road that provides access to the wastewater plant. The road will be elevated and hardened using stabilized subgrade and flexible base material to allow access to the plant during flood events. The existing bridge near the plant entrance will be reconstructed at a higher elevation, a new earthen berm will be constructed around the plant site to protect it from flooding, and a new pump station will be installed inside the plant to discharge any stormwater within the berm area.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Sweeny is a community of 3,739 residents in Brazoria County $(360,677)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Sweeny is $\$ 62,763,22.94 \%$ less than Brazoria County's median income of $\$ 81,447$, and $20.34 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Sweeny's AMFI is $\$ 69,393$ according to ACS 2019.This is $67 \%$ of the Brazoria County AMFI of $\$ 104,200$. . The HUD AMFI is part of the Brazoria County, TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Sweeny was $16.40 \%$, greater than Brazoria County's poverty rate of $9.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Sweeny's population is $25.80 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Brazoria County's $30.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Sweeny is $60.30 \%$ white alone, greater than Brazoria County's white alone percentage of $47.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Sweeny is $13.90 \%$ Black or African

American alone, greater than Brazoria County (13.60\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

The City of Sweeny has a racial and ethnic minority population that is $39.6 \%$ of the community. Sweeney has a larger Hispanic or Latino origin population compared to the Black or African American population. The City of Sweeny created an item on the City Council agenda to "make sure everyone was aware" of the Brazos County NAACP Town Hall meeting titled "Road to Repair" on June 17, 2020 to "address race tension currently being experienced throughout the nation."

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $93.00 \%$ in the city of Sweeny, greater than $86.90 \%$ in Brazoria County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Sweeny is $50.80 \%$ male, greater than Brazoria County (50.60\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Sweeny is $49.20 \%$ female, less than the $49.40 \%$ of Brazoria County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of 50.4\%.

The households in Sweeny are comprised of $45.00 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Brazoria County's $57.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Sweeny that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $12.90 \%$ this is less than Brazoria County's percentage of $27.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Sweeny's households are $1.40 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $0.00 \%$ is within the city of Sweeny, which is less than Brazoria County's $1.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Sweeny, $31.90 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $21.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Sweeny's households are $9.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Sweeny's households are $20.60 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Brazoria County at $11.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Sweeny are $19.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Brazoria County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $5.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

The city of Sweeny is comprised of $21.70 \%$ households that are occupied by a male with no spouse or partner present, greater than Brazoria County $(15.40 \%)$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $17.6 \%$. The city of Sweeny's households are $8.20 \%$ occupied by a male householder with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Brazoria County, which is at $1.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $1.4 \%$. Sweeny has $12.60 \%$ of households that are occupied by a male living alone, which is greater than Brazoria County's $10.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage $11.8 \%$. The city of Sweeny's
households are $1.20 \%$ occupied by a male householder over the age of 65 with no partner or spouse, which is less than Brazoria County at $2.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.7 \%$.

In Sweeny $31.40 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Brazoria County, which is at $40.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Sweeny that have one or more people of 65 or older is $41.60 \%$, which is greater than Brazoria County's $23.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Sweeny is $16.00 \%$ which is greater than Brazoria County's $9.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

There are nice neighborhoods around the City Hall area, with large brick homes and some homes having large lots. However, during the site visit to Sweeny, the neighborhoods seem to have mixed housing in most places. Other than the area near the City Hall, the neighborhoods were blended with larger homes near smaller homes. Most were well cared for and looked similar to many rural towns in Texas. On the ground observations found older stock housing being predominate in the community, but new stock housing also mixed in regardless of demographics.. The projects should not negatively impact nor disproportionately benefit any residents in Sweeney.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1133-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Brazoria |  | City of Sweeny |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.31\% |  | 56.99\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$81,447 |  | \$62,763 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.20\% |  | 16.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 360,677 |  | 3,739 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 110,463 | 30.6\% | 965 | 25.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,214 | 69.4\% | 2,774 | 74.2\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 170,272 | 47.2\% | 2,255 | 60.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 49,226 | 13.6\% | 519 | 13.9\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,288 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 23,803 | 6.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 21 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 542 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 5,062 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 313,259 | 86.9\% | 3,503 | 93.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 309,011 | 85.7\% | 3,477 | 93.0\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 4,248 | 1.2\% | 26 | 0.7\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 47,418 | 13.1\% | 236 | 6.3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 182,333 | 50.6\% | 1,898 | 50.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 178,344 | 49.4\% | 1,841 | 49.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,523 | 100\% | 1,432 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 70,124 | 57.7\% | 644 | 45.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 33,701 | 27.7\% | 185 | 12.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,254 | 5.1\% | 20 | 1.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,164 | 1.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Brazoria County |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1133-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Sweeny |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 18,657 | 15.4\% | 311 | 21.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 1,536 | 1.3\% | 117 | 8.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 13,203 | 10.9\% | 180 | 12.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,050 | 2.5\% | 17 | 1.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 26,488 | 21.8\% | 457 | 31.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 6,182 | 5.1\% | 132 | 9.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 14,161 | 11.7\% | 295 | 20.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 6,068 | 5.0\% | 277 | 19.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 48,709 | 40.1\% | 449 | 31.40\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 28,952 | 23.8\% | 596 | 41.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 348,786 | 100\% | 3,653 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 32,597 | 9.3\% | 585 | 16.0\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Oyster Creek: Wastewater Collection System Rehabilitation Project - \$5,291,898 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Oyster Creek, benefitting 67.76\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $64.02 \%$ greater than Brazoria County's LMI percentage of $41.31 \%$ and $51.72 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Oyster Creek's existing sanitary sewer system experiences significant infiltration \& inflow of stormwater into the collection system during periods of heavy rainfall and flooding due to hurricanes, tropical storms, tropical depressions, thunderstorms, and riverine flooding.

The introduction of stormwater into the sanitary sewer system results in surcharges in the collection system, overloading the system's lift stations and wastewater treatment plant. This system overload can result in manhole overflows, polluting the environment with raw sewage. When the wastewater treatment plant experiences hydraulic overload, inadequately treated wastewater is discharged into the receiving waters, posing a threat to the environment and any of the public who may come into contact with the untreated wastewater. Flooding in Oyster Creek during extreme weather events results in significant negative environmental impacts and threatens public and private property and assets.

The project is a citywide wastewater collection system rehabilitation mitigation effort which will include the following:

- Rehabilitation of approximately 50,400 LF of sanitary sewer lines
- Rehabilitation of approximately 131 manholes
- Reconnection of approximately 600 sanitary sewer services

The improvements will benefit every resident of Oyster Creek, improving the resiliency of the community's wastewater collection system to withstand the impacts of the identified risks. This work will encompass $95 \%$ of Oyster Creek's sanitary sewer system.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Oyster Creek is a community of 1,236 residents in Brazoria County $(360,677)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Oyster Creek is $\$ 41,198,49.42 \%$ less than Brazoria County's median income of $\$ 81,447$, and $21.01 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Oyster Creek's AMFI is $\$ 39,402$ according to ACS 2019. This is $37.8 \%$ of the HUD Brazoria County AMFI of $\$ 104,200$. Brazoria County is
the only county within the HUD Brazoria County TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Oyster Creek was $22.50 \%$, compared with Brazoria County's poverty rate of $9.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The ACS 2019 poverty rate for Oyster Creek was $31.3 \%$ while Brazoria County's poverty rate decreased to $8.7 \%$.

The city of Oyster Creek's population is $27.00 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Brazoria County's $30.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Oyster Creek is $60.80 \%$ white alone, greater than Brazoria County's white alone percentage of $47.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Oyster Creek is $8.70 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Brazoria County (13.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

The racial and ethnic minority community makes up $35.7 \%$ of the population. The Oyster Creek Capital Improvements Plan includes adherence to Section 1.4.3 Impact of Projects of Protected Classes. That section of the plan provides an Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing policy to ensure that protected classes receive the benefits of capital improvements, and are not unduly burdened with necessary, but undesirable capital improvements. The wastewater system improvement project follows this as most of the community is included, and therefore the project does not benefit or burden any demographic over another.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $94.6 \%$ in the city of Oyster Creek, greater than $86.9 \%$ in Brazoria County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Oyster Creek is $54.90 \%$ male, greater than Brazoria County (50.60\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Oyster Creek is $45.10 \%$ female, less than the $49.40 \%$ of Brazoria County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Oyster Creek, $27.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $21.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Oyster Creek's households are $6.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Oyster Creek's households are $12.60 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Brazoria County at $11.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Oyster Creek are $6.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Brazoria County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $5.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Oyster Creek 31.10\% of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than Brazoria County, which is at $40.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Oyster Creek that have one or more people of 65 or older is $23.60 \%$, which is less than Brazoria County's $23.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Oyster Creek is $19.60 \%$ which is greater than Brazoria County's $9.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Many of the areas that are receiving work from the projects - most of the roads in the community - have a significant number of MHUs or small wooden houses. FM 523 has many commercial areas and accesses many neighborhoods. It also has a few scattered houses as well. There are manholes along the river and throughout the neighborhoods. There are streets - like Baldwin Road - that have mixed levels of housing. The Cactus, Elm, and Yaupon streets have larger brick style homes.

Brazoria County had a racial issue raised regarding a potentially faulty jury summons process that has since been corrected. The popular press on the internet has not noted any other issues regarding racial or ethnic overtones in the community.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Brazoria County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1130-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of O | Creek |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-V |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 41.31\% |  | 67.76\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$81,447 |  | \$41,198 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.20\% |  | 22.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 360,677 |  | 1,236 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 110,463 | 30.6\% | 334 | 27.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,214 | 69.4\% | 902 | 73.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 170,272 | 47.2\% | 752 | 60.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 49,226 | 13.6\% | 108 | 8.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,288 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 23,803 | 6.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 21 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 542 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 5,062 | 1.4\% | 42 | 3.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 313,259 | 86.9\% | 1,169 | 94.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 309,011 | 85.7\% | 1,169 | 94.6\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 4,248 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 47,418 | 13.1\% | 67 | 5.4\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 182,333 | 50.6\% | 678 | 54.9\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 178,344 | 49.4\% | 558 | 45.1\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,523 | 100\% | 501 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 70,124 | 57.7\% | 149 | 29.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 33,701 | 27.7\% | 58 | 11.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,254 | 5.1\% | 61 | 12.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,164 | 1.8\% | 21 | 4.2\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Brazoria County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1130-APP <br> City of Oyster Creek City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 18,657 | 15.4\% | 152 | 30.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,536 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 13,203 | 10.9\% | 127 | 25.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,050 | 2.5\% | 28 | 5.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 26,488 | 21.8\% | 139 | 27.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 6,182 | 5.1\% | 34 | 6.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 14,161 | 11.7\% | 63 | 12.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 6,068 | 5.0\% | 34 | 6.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 48,709 | 40.1\% | 156 | 31.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 28,952 | 23.8\% | 118 | 23.6\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 348,786 | 100\% | 1,222 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 32,597 | 9.3\% | 239 | 19.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Brazoria: City-wide Wastewater and Sanitary Sewer Improvements - \$3,176,375 Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding, Severe Coastal Flooding, and Storms

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Brazoria, benefitting 64.86\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $57.01 \%$ greater than Brazoria County's LMI percentage of $41.31 \%$ and $45.23 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Brazoria will improve the municipal wastewater treatment and sanitary sewer collection system by repairing damages to the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) from the 2016 Flood and installing appropriate flood proofing to prevent future damages. The Wastewater Treatment Plant portion of the project is located at the end of Windsor Road near Country Road 797. Additionally, the city will replace sewer trunk lines and manholes to reduce the amount of infiltration and inflow into the collection system and prevent further damages to the collection system. Construction will take place in the area around S. Indiana Street, W. New York Street, and S. Oregon Street.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Brazoria is a community of 3,078 residents in Brazoria County $(360,677)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Brazoria is $\$ 53,516$, $34.29 \%$ less than Brazoria County's median income of $\$ 81,447$, and $2.61 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Brazoria has an AMFI of $\$ 61,667$ according to ACS 2019. This is $59 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 104,200$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Brazoria County, TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Brazoria was at $17.30 \%$ compared to Brazoria County's poverty rate of $9.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Brazoria increased to $18.7 \%$ while Brazoria County's poverty rate decreased to $8.7 \%$.

The City of Brazoria is one of the lowest median family income areas in Brazoria County. The City of Brazoria runs along the Brazos River and is less than twenty miles from the Gulf of Mexico coastline. This causes it to be severely impacted by any flooding that occurs in the region. The non-white population in the community is $41.8 \%$, and the wastewater project will benefit all the people in the City of Brazoria. Further, during our windshield survey of the impacted areas, it appeared that the streets included in the project for additional drainage and repair generally have smaller homes in what looked like middle-class neighborhoods with generally well-kept homes. The town appears to be a racially and ethnically diverse community without large pockets of segregation from our physical observation,

Brazoria County had a racial issue raised regarding a potentially faulty jury summons process that has since been corrected. The popular press on the internet has not noted any other issues regarding racial or ethnic overtones in the community. Furthermore, the NAACP in Brazoria County and the Brazosport LULAC Council did not identify any particular issues on their web pages that were causing concern within the community. The Columbia-Brazoria ISD has about the same racial make-up as the community for persons of color. Niche website ranks the Columbia High School in Brazoria as the $360^{\text {th }}$ most diverse public high school in Texas (out of 2,049 ), and has an overall and student achievement accountability rating of B.

The city of Brazoria's population is $26.30 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Brazoria County's $30.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Brazoria is $58.20 \%$ white alone, greater than Brazoria County's white alone percentage of $47.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Brazoria is $13.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Brazoria County (13.60\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Brazoria is $0.80 \%$, greater than Brazoria County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.40 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Brazoria is $0.40 \%$ Asian alone, less than Brazoria County's percentage of $6.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

The city of Brazoria is $47.60 \%$ male, less than Brazoria County (50.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Brazoria is $52.40 \%$ female, greater than the $49.40 \%$ of Brazoria County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in Brazoria are comprised of $48.20 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Brazoria County's $57.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Brazoria that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $16.40 \%$ this is less than Brazoria County's percentage of $27.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Brazoria's households are $8.50 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and greater than the eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $6.70 \%$ is within the city of Brazoria, which is greater than Brazoria County's $1.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Brazoria, $28.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $21.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Brazoria's households are $8.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Brazoria's households are $12.70 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Brazoria County at $11.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Brazoria are $6.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Brazoria County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $5.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Brazoria 32.70\% of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than Brazoria County, which is at $40.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Brazoria that have one or more people of 65 or older is $34.80 \%$, which is greater than Brazoria County's $23.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Brazoria is $16.70 \%$ which is greater than Brazoria County's $9.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The City of Brazoria poverty rate is almost twice that of the Brazoria County average. The City of Brazoria has one of the highest poverty rates within Brazoria County's larger communities.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-0838-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Brazoria |  | City of Brazoria |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.31\% |  | 64.86\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$81,447 |  | \$53,516 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.20\% |  | 17.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 360,677 |  | 3,078 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 110,463 | 30.6\% | 811 | 26.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,214 | 69.4\% | 2,267 | 73.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 170,272 | 47.2\% | 1,792 | 58.2\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 49,226 | 13.6\% | 417 | 13.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,288 | 0.4\% | 24 | 0.8\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 23,803 | 6.6\% | 12 | 0.4\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 21 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 542 | 0.2\% | 13 | 0.4\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 5,062 | 1.4\% | 9 | 0.3\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 313,259 | 86.9\% | 2,893 | 94.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 309,011 | 85.7\% | 2,857 | 92.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 4,248 | 1.2\% | 36 | 1.2\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 47,418 | 13.1\% | 185 | 6.0\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 182,333 | 50.6\% | 1,465 | 47.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 178,344 | 49.4\% | 1,613 | 52.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,523 | 100\% | 1,145 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 70,124 | 57.7\% | 552 | 48.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 33,701 | 27.7\% | 188 | 16.4\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,254 | 5.1\% | 97 | 8.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,164 | 1.8\% | 77 | 6.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Brazoria County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0838-APP City of Brazoria City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 18,657 | 15.4\% | 169 | 14.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,536 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 13,203 | 10.9\% | 149 | 13.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,050 | 2.5\% | 67 | 5.9\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 26,488 | 21.8\% | 327 | 28.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 6,182 | 5.1\% | 97 | 8.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 14,161 | 11.7\% | 145 | 12.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 6,068 | 5.0\% | 73 | 6.4\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 48,709 | 40.1\% | 374 | 32.7\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 28,952 | 23.8\% | 398 | 34.8\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 348,786 | 100\% | 3,078 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 32,597 | 9.3\% | 513 | 16.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Brazoria: Citywide Flood Control and Drainage Improvements - \$4,311,537-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Brazoria, benefitting 64.86\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $57.01 \%$ greater than Brazoria County's LMI percentage of $41.31 \%$ and $45.23 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Brazoria's flat topography and location between two major rivers causes frequent flooding, especially during severe weather events. The City has identified the prevention of flooding by creating and improving an efficient and effective drainage system as its most essential mitigation need.

This project will make improvements to the existing drainage system, which will result in increased movement of storm water through the drainage channels that will ultimately be discharged into the nearest rivers. The planned mitigation actions will effectively mitigate future flooding during major storm events by providing an efficient drainage system throughout the entire community. The project will consist of:

- Ditch regrading of $83,500 \mathrm{LF}$ ( 15.8 miles) (approx.)
- Street drive and culvert replacement of 12,600 LF (approx.)
- Pavement restoration of 8,000 LF (approx.)
- Ancillary activities i.e. erosion control, seeding and restoration

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Brazoria is a community of 3,078 residents in Brazoria County $(360,677)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Brazoria is $\$ 53,516$, $34.29 \%$ less than Brazoria County's median income of $\$ 81,447$, and $2.61 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Brazoria has an AMFI of $\$ 61,667$ according to ACS 2019. This is $59 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 104,200$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Brazoria County, TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Brazoria was at $17.30 \%$ compared to Brazoria County's poverty rate of $9.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Brazoria increased to $18.7 \%$ while Brazoria County's poverty rate decreased to $8.7 \%$.

The City of Brazoria is one of the lowest median family income areas in Brazoria County. The City of Brazoria runs along the Brazos River and is less than twenty miles from the Gulf of Mexico coastline. This causes it to be severely impacted by any flooding in the region. The non-white population in the community is $41.8 \%$, and the application states that the flood control and
drainage projects will benefit all the people in the City of Brazoria by allowing flood waters to dissipate more quickly.

The town appears to be a racially and ethnically diverse community and is without large pockets of segregation. The town is $58 \%$ White not of Hispanic or Latino origin. The projects are distributed throughout the city, so short of a door-to-door survey to the contrary, it appears that town residents of all demographic populations will benefit and be burdened equally by the project. There are newer, larger, brick ranch style homes included as well as commercial sites in the project areas, but they seem to be the exception and not the rule.

The city of Brazoria's population is $26.30 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Brazoria County's $30.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Brazoria is $58.20 \%$ white alone, greater than Brazoria County's white alone percentage of $47.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Brazoria is $13.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Brazoria County (13.60\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Brazoria is $0.80 \%$, greater than Brazoria County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.40 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Brazoria is $0.40 \%$ Asian alone, less than Brazoria County's percentage of $6.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of 5.0

As this project covers most of the City, the housing is very mixed. Off Masonic Oak Drive, there are many MHUs. Near Red Oak, there are mixed houses, but most are smaller, rural style homes with wood siding. Around Burnett, there are also mixed houses with varying size, materials, and quality. There are commercial spaces and a park there too. There are some MHUs around Milam Street. In the Avenues C to I area, there are ranch style brick homes on traditional residential lots. Nearby on Magnolia/Pecan/Camelia/Yaupon, the homes are larger, well maintained on larger lots. Around New York, there are older homes. Just a few streets over on Elm/Smith/Front, the homes are newer and well-kept. At the Brazos/Tanner project site, the homes are smaller but well kept.

The households in Brazoria are comprised of $48.20 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Brazoria County's $57.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Brazoria that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $16.40 \%$ this is less than Brazoria County's percentage of $27.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of Brazoria, $28.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $21.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Brazoria's households are $8.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Brazoria County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Brazoria's households are $12.70 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Brazoria County at $11.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Brazoria are $6.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Brazoria County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $5.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

The city of Brazoria is comprised of $14.80 \%$ households that are occupied by a male with no spouse or partner present, less than Brazoria County (15.40\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area of $17.6 \%$. The city of Brazoria's households are $0.00 \%$ occupied by a male householder with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Brazoria County, which is at $1.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $1.4 \%$. Brazoria has $13.00 \%$ of households that are occupied by a male living alone, which is greater than Brazoria County's $10.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage $11.8 \%$. The city of Brazoria's households are $5.90 \%$ occupied by a male householder over the age of 65 with no partner or spouse, which is greater than Brazoria County at $2.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.7 \%$.

In Brazoria $32.70 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than Brazoria County, which is at $40.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Brazoria that have one or more people of 65 or older is $34.80 \%$, which is greater than Brazoria County's $23.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Brazoria is $16.70 \%$ which is greater than Brazoria County's $9.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Brazoria County had a racial issue raised regarding a potentially faulty jury summons process that has since been corrected. The popular press on the internet does not note any other issues with racial or ethnic overtones in the community. The NAACP in Brazoria County and the Brazosport LULAC Council do not identify any particular issues on their web pages that were causing concern within the community. The Columbia-Brazoria ISD has about the same racial make-up as the community for persons of color. Niche website ranks the Columbia High School in Brazoria as the $360^{\text {th }}$ most diverse public high school in Texas (out of 2,049 ) and has an overall and student achievement accountability rating of B. The City of Brazoria poverty rate is almost twice that of the Brazoria County average. The City of Brazoria has one of the highest poverty rates within Brazoria County's larger communities.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-0959-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Brazoria |  | City of Brazoria |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.31\% |  | 64.86\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$81,447 |  | \$53,516 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.20\% |  | 17.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 360,677 |  | 3,078 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 110,463 | 30.6\% | 811 | 26.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 250,214 | 69.4\% | 2,267 | 73.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 170,272 | 47.2\% | 1,792 | 58.2\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 49,226 | 13.6\% | 417 | 13.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,288 | 0.4\% | 24 | 0.8\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 23,803 | 6.6\% | 12 | 0.4\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 21 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 542 | 0.2\% | 13 | 0.4\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 5,062 | 1.4\% | 9 | 0.3\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 313,259 | 86.9\% | 2,893 | 94.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 309,011 | 85.7\% | 2,857 | 92.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 4,248 | 1.2\% | 36 | 1.2\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 47,418 | 13.1\% | 185 | 6.0\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 182,333 | 50.6\% | 1,465 | 47.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 178,344 | 49.4\% | 1,613 | 52.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 121,523 | 100\% | 1,145 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 70,124 | 57.7\% | 552 | 48.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 33,701 | 27.7\% | 188 | 16.4\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 6,254 | 5.1\% | 97 | 8.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,164 | 1.8\% | 77 | 6.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Brazoria County |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0959-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Brazoria |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 18,657 | 15.4\% | 169 | 14.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 1,536 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 13,203 | 10.9\% | 149 | 13.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,050 | 2.5\% | 67 | 5.9\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 26,488 | 21.8\% | 327 | 28.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 6,182 | 5.1\% | 97 | 8.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 14,161 | 11.7\% | 145 | 12.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 6,068 | 5.0\% | 73 | 6.4\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 48,709 | 40.1\% | 374 | 32.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 28,952 | 23.8\% | 398 | 34.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 348,786 | 100\% | 3,078 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 32,597 | 9.3\% | 513 | 16.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Brazoria County: Project Service Areas





## Brazoria County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

## Population by Category




## Brazoria County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty

| $\leq 10$ percent (103 Block Groups) |
| :---: |
| 10-25 percent (48 Block Groups) |
| 25-45 percent (25 Block Groups) |
| $\geq 45$ percent (2 Block Groups) |

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Mathis: Citywide Water System Improvements Project - \$22,830,172-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Mathis, benefitting 67.11\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $62.88 \%$ greater than San Patricio County's LMI percentage of $41.20 \%$ and $50.26 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Hurricane Harvey left the city of Mathis without power, destroyed a portion of the existing raw water pumping facility pier, and rendered the rest of the pier unsafe to be used. In addition, the sanitary sewer system was overwhelmed via Inflow \& Infiltration (I\&I).

This project will increase resiliency to the city of Mathis water treatment plant and provide sanitary sewer improvements to the city's water management. The city of Mathis will demolish and reconstruct the pier for access to two water pumps, emergency generators, and sewer line improvements to mitigate against damage and system failure caused by future flooding events. Improvements to city water supply and sewer lines to mitigate against damage and system failure caused during flooding events.

The city of Mathis will:

- Demolish and reconstruct the existing raw water pumping facility pier located on Lake Corpus Christi.
- Emergency Generator Improvements: to maintain the supply of water:

1. Install generator on site of Lake Corpus Christi Pier to keep raw water pumps operational.
2. Install generator located at the Water Treatment Plant to keep service pumps operational.

- Sanitary Sewer Lines: To improve the efficiency of moving wastewater to the wastewater treatment plant, the existing sanitary sewer line will be removed and replaced for increased capacity.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Mathis is a community of 4,826 residents in San Patricio County $(67,008)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Mathis is $\$ 31,818$, $43.74 \%$ less than San Patricio County's median income of $\$ 56,556$, and $38.99 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Mathis' AMFI is $\$ 36,344$ according to ACS 2019. This is $55 \%$ of the HUD AMFI of $\$ 66,600$ for San Patricio County. San Patricio County is in the Corpus Christi TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates
in the city of Mathis was $33.10 \%$, compared to San Patricio County's poverty rate of $16.40 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. According to the 2019 ACS, the Mathis Poverty rate dropped to $29.9 \%$.

The city of Mathis's population is $90.60 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than San Patricio County's $57.80 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Mathis is $7.20 \%$ white alone, less than San Patricio County's white alone percentage of $38.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Mathis is $1.30 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than San Patricio County (1.50\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Mathis is $0.00 \%$, less than San Patricio County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Mathis is $0.10 \%$ Asian alone, less than San Patricio County's percentage of $1.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

As indicated, the population in Mathis is almost all people of Hispanic or Latino origin. It appears that everyone will receive similar benefits from these projects. It appears that no group will be unduly burdened or benefitted as part of the improvements.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $97.9 \%$ in the city of Mathis, less than $94.5 \%$ in San Patricio County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Mathis is $54.30 \%$ male, greater than San Patricio County (50.40\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Mathis is $45.70 \%$ female, less than the $49.60 \%$ of San Patricio County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Mathis, $22.90 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than San Patricio County's percentage of $25.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Mathis's households are $8.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than San Patricio County's percentage of $7.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Mathis's households are $8.50 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than San Patricio County at $11.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Mathis are $4.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it less than San Patricio County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Mathis $42.40 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than San Patricio County, which is at $38.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Mathis that have one or more people of 65 or older is $29.90 \%$, which is equal to San Patricio County's $29.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Mathis is $22.40 \%$ which is greater than San Patricio County's $15.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Thirty-one percent of the housing in Mathis is rental housing according to the Census data. Of the 596 rental units, 338 or $56.7 \%$ of these are considered unaffordable rents by HUD's $30 \%$ or more standard. Even though the community is significantly of the same race or ethnicity, the Fair

Housing Act still covers discrimination. Same race or ethnicity people can discriminate based on national origin, family status, and of course the most common Fair Housing complaint being filed currently is for people with special needs which cuts across all races and ethnicities. Mathis has a special needs population of $22.40 \%$.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1073-APP |  |
|  |  |  | San |  | City of Mathis |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.20\% |  | 67.11\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$56,556 |  | \$31,818 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.40\% |  | 33.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 67,008 |  | 4,826 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 38,724 | 57.8\% | 4,370 | 90.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 28,284 | 42.2\% | 456 | 9.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 25,725 | 38.4\% | 346 | 7.2\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 975 | 1.5\% | 63 | 1.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 123 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 666 | 1.0\% | 7 | 0.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 31 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 11 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 753 | 1.1\% | 40 | 0.8\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 63,337 | 94.5\% | 4,723 | 97.9\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 62,807 | 93.7\% | 4,723 | 97.9\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 530 | 0.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 3,671 | 5.5\% | 103 | 2.1\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 33,774 | 50.4\% | 2,620 | 54.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 33,234 | 49.6\% | 2,206 | 45.7\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 22,898 | 100\% | 1,596 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 11,615 | 50.7\% | 628 | 39.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 4,766 | 20.8\% | 276 | 17.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,452 | 6.3\% | 67 | 4.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 723 | 3.2\% | 40 | 2.5\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Patricio County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1073-APP City of Mathis City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 4,085 | 17.8\% | 535 | 33.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 458 | 2.0\% | 69 | 4.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,600 | 11.4\% | 291 | 18.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 806 | 3.5\% | 136 | 8.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 5,746 | 25.1\% | 366 | 22.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,637 | 7.1\% | 130 | 8.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,536 | 11.1\% | 135 | 8.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,415 | 6.2\% | 72 | 4.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 8,852 | 38.7\% | 676 | 42.4\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 6,854 | 29.9\% | 478 | 29.9\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 66,220 | 100\% | 4,746 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 10,448 | 15.8\% | 1,062 | 22.4\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

San Patricio County: Channel Outfall Drainage Improvement Project - \$15,435,182.60 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within San Patricio County, benefitting 54.54\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $32.38 \%$ greater than San Patricio County's LMI percentage of $41.20 \%$ and $22.12 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The project will improve drainage as the project area is very susceptible to flooding due to the channel's inadequate capacity. Currently, the existing ditch sections are undersized, and several culvert crossings severely restrict the amount of runoff that can be conveyed into the downstream natural channel.

The project will deepen and widen existing outfall channels and ditches, reconstruct bridges and trestles, and harden ditch stretches that are subject to erosion. The improvements will improve the area's capacity to handle future heavy rain events, help minimize public and private losses due to flooding, and reduce the need for rescue and relief efforts. The project consists of the following sites:

Taft Site

- Widen and deepen the existing channel for a total of 24,600 LF
- Widen the existing railroad crossing adjacent to US Highway 181
- Replace the following bridges: CR 71 bridge, CR 100 bridge, CR 98 bridge, and Pyron Farm Road bridge
- Concrete plate the ditch section through Highway 181 to prevent erosion
- Concrete plate the bend in channel alignment to prevent erosion

Sinton Site

- Widen and deepen the existing channel for a total of 18,500 LF
- Widen the existing railroad crossing adjacent to US Highway 181
- Concrete plat the ditch section through Highway 181 to prevent erosion
- Concrete plate the bend in channel alignment to prevent erosion
- Build a new lower water crossing to serve the farming community

In order to build the project, two drainage easements, one per site, will be obtained.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 8,370 within San Patricio County $(67,008)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The AMFI for the communities within the project zones are: Census Tract $108 \$ 41,714$, Census Tract $110 \$ 53,578$, Sinton $\$ 51,648$, Taft $\$ 41,714$, and Taft Southwest $\$ 40,625$ according to ACS 2019. These compare with San Patricio County of $\$ 67,832$ in ACS 2019 and the HUD AMFI for San Patricio County which is $\$ 66,600$. San Patricio County is within the Corpus Christi TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $31.77 \%$, which is greater than San Patricio County's poverty rate of $16.40 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $80.67 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than San Patricio County's $57.80 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The project beneficiary area is $16.69 \%$ white alone, less than San Patricio County's percentage of $38.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $1.20 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than San Patricio County (1.50\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The population in the project benefit area is $1.03 \%$ Asian alone, greater than San Patricio County's percentage of $1.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.04 \%$, greater than San Patricio County $(0.000 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.10 \%$ some other race alone, greater than San Patricio County's percentage of $0.00 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.27 \%$ two or more races, less than San Patricio County, which is at $1.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The project area is heavily concentrated with Hispanic or Latino origin residents. All the areas identified in the income section except Rancho Chico have a higher than 78\% Hispanic or Latino origin population. Rancho Chico's population is $69.9 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin. This compares with the San Patricio County Hispanic or Latino origin community of $57.8 \%$ In addition, Rancho Chico (32.1\%), Sinton (35.4\%), Taft Southwest (35.3\%) and Census Tract 110 ( $35.6 \%$ ) all have poverty rates over $30 \%$ compared with San Patricio County's poverty rate of $12.7 \%$. There are no recognized R/ECAPs in San Patricio County, but there is a high incidence of poverty; and there are concentrations of ethnic minorities that these projects are designed to benefit.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $95.63 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than San Patricio County at $94.50 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $37.76 \%$ married couple families, less than San Patricio County's $50.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $15.32 \%$, less than San Patricio County's percentage of $20.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $5.39 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than San Patricio County's percentage of $6.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children
in the household under 18 comprise $2.45 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than San Patricio County's $3.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $37.19 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than San Patricio County's percentage of $25.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $12.18 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, which is greater than San Patricio County's percentage of $7.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $14.43 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than San Patricio County at $11.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $9.27 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than San Patricio County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $40.99 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than San Patricio County, which is at $38.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $28.58 \%$, less than San Patricio County's $29.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's 24.5\%.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $17.86 \%$, greater than San Patricio County's $15.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

During our windshield survey, the Rancho Chico area showed many characteristics of a being a Colonia. The housing is small, and it does not seem to be governed by building standards. A few homes are well maintained, but most will need some form of repair/code enforcement to help bring the neighborhood up to a higher standard. These homes are small wooden structures, but there are larger new homes just down the street. Otherwise, there is agricultural land in the area. In Taft, the project also runs through agricultural areas. The bridge replacement is going over the drainage culverts in the drainage stream. However, south of Highway 181; there are some very small houses that are adjacent to the flood way. Several are in disrepair and may be abandoned. There is some newer construction at the start of the project area.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Patricio County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1152-APP <br> San Patricio County <br> Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.20\% |  | 54.54\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$56,556 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.40\% |  | 31.77\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 67,008 |  | 10,726 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 38,724 | 57.8\% | 8,653 | 80.7\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 28,284 | 42.2\% | 2,073 | 19.3\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 25,725 | 38.4\% | 1,790 | 16.7\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 975 | 1.5\% | 129 | 1.2\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 123 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 666 | 1.0\% | 110 | 1.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 31 | 0.0\% | 4 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 11 | 0.0\% | 11 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 753 | 1.1\% | 29 | 0.27\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 63,337 | 94.5\% | 10,325 | 96.3\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 62,807 | 93.7\% | 10,257 | 95.6\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 530 | 0.8\% | 68 | 0.6\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 3,671 | 5.5\% | 401 | 4\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 33,774 | 50.4\% | 5,201 | 48.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 33,234 | 49.6\% | 5,525 | 51.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 22,898 | 100\% | 3,506 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 11,615 | 50.7\% | 1,324 | 37.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 4,766 | 20.8\% | 537 | 15.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,452 | 6.3\% | 189 | 5.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 723 | 3.2\% | 86 | 2.5\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Patricio County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1152-APP <br> San Patricio County <br> Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 4,085 | 17.8\% | 689 | 19.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 458 | 2.0\% | 67 | 1.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,600 | 11.4\% | 365 | 10.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 806 | 3.5\% | 20 | 0.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 5,746 | 25.1\% | 1,304 | 37.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,637 | 7.1\% | 427 | 12.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,536 | 11.1\% | 506 | 14.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,415 | 6.2\% | 325 | 9.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 8,852 | 38.7\% | 1,437 | 41.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 6,854 | 29.9\% | 1,002 | 28.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 66,220 | 100\% | 10,410 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 10,448 | 15.8\% | 1,859 | 17.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## San Patricio County: Project Service Areas



## San Patricio County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
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American Indian and Alaska Native Population

- Two or More Races Population
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15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ with no predominant ategory or no population are blank

Population by Category



## San Patricio County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (19 Block Groups)10-25 percent ( 15 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (10 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Caldwell County: Emergency Shelter Project - \$17,618,764 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a County-Wide benefit for Caldwell County, benefitting $60.48 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $35.43 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

During Hurricane Harvey and prior flood events, due to the lack of a shelter and limited hotel capacity in the area, significant numbers of Caldwell County residents were displaced outside of Caldwell County and, in some cases, rendered homeless. With the construction of the Caldwell County Evacuation Shelter the county will be able to provide safe haven to its own residents andto evacuees from outside of the county. The building will be equipped with adequate water, sewer, and broadband services.

This facility, which will be located in Luling, will increase resilience to disasters and reduce or eliminate the long-term risk of loss of life, injury, damage to and loss of property, and suffering and hardship, by lessening the impact of future disasters.

This project will acquire real property and build an emergency shelter in the city of Luling that will host up to 350 evacuees.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Caldwell County is a community of 35,490 residents, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Caldwell County is $\$ 54,152,3.83 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Caldwell County's service area AMFI is $\$ 80,519$ according to ACS 2019. This is $83 \%$ of the HUD Caldwell County AMFI of $\$ 97,600$. Caldwell County is within the Austin-Round Rock TX MSA, The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in Caldwell County is at $17.70 \%$, greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

Caldwell County's population is $52.20 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Caldwell County is $39.70 \%$ white alone, less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). Caldwell County is $5.60 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Caldwell County is majority minority, and the percentage of Hispanic or Latino residents is increasing according to the 2020 Census. The Hispanic or Latino origin population rose from $52.1 \%$ to $55.5 \%$, and the overall racial and ethnic minority population rose from $57.1 \%$ to $60.3 \%$. When considering location, Caldwell County should consider that Census Tract 9607 at the
southern part of the County has the highest poverty rate and lowest income totals ( $33.3 \%$ and $\$ 52,575$ respectively). At the northern end of the county, Census Tract 9601.01 has the largest racial and ethnic population in raw numbers and the second largest as a percentage (5,446 and 69\% respectively).

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $87.50 \%$ in Caldwell County, greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In Caldwell County, $26.30 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Caldwell County's households are $6.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Caldwell County's households are $12.00 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Caldwell County are $6.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than the MIT eligible area, which is at $5.5 \%$.

In Caldwell County $35.70 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Caldwell County that have one or more people of 65 or older is $28.90 \%$, which is greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in Caldwell County is $14.20 \%$ which is greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The project will be located in Luling. The City of Luling is $50 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, $8 \%$ Black or African American alone, and 40.8\% while alone. The poverty rate is $33.5 \%$ for 2019 ACS data estimates.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1020-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Caldwell | unty | Caldwell County |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | County-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 60.48\% |  | 60.48\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$54,152 |  | \$54,152 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.70\% |  | 17.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 42,144 |  | 42,144 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 21,993 | 52.2\% | 21,993 | 52.2\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 20,151 | 47.8\% | 20,151 | 47.8\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 16,718 | 39.7\% | 16,718 | 39.7\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,360 | 5.6\% | 2,360 | 5.6\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 176 | 0.4\% | 176 | 0.4\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 407 | 1.0\% | 407 | 1.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 53 | 0.1\% | 53 | 0.1\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 7 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 430 | 1.0\% | 430 | 1.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 37,431 | 88.8\% | 37,431 | 88.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 36,893 | 87.5\% | 36,893 | 87.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 538 | 1.3\% | 538 | 1.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 4,713 | 11.2\% | 4,713 | 11.2\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 21,313 | 50.6\% | 21,313 | 50.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 20,831 | 49.4\% | 20,831 | 49.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 13,460 | 100\% | 13,460 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,900 | 51.3\% | 6,900 | 51.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,810 | 20.9\% | 2,810 | 20.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 693 | 5.1\% | 693 | 5.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 249 | 1.8\% | 249 | 1.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Caldwell County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1020-APP Caldwell County County-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,328 | 17.3\% | 2,328 | 17.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 153 | 1.1\% | 153 | 1.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,605 | 11.9\% | 1,605 | 11.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 488 | 3.6\% | 488 | 3.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,539 | 26.3\% | 3,539 | 26.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 852 | 6.3\% | 852 | 6.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,614 | 12.0\% | 1,614 | 12.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 859 | 6.4\% | 859 | 6.4\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 4,811 | 35.7\% | 4,811 | 35.7\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,892 | 28.9\% | 3,892 | 28.9\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 40,074 | 100\% | 40,074 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,690 | 14.2\% | 5,690 | 14.2\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Uhland: Flood Control \& Drainage Improvements - \$11,851,660.80 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Uhland, benefitting 68.31\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $12.95 \%$ greater than Caldwell County's LMI percentage of $60.48 \%$ and $52.96 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Risks due to flooding are overwhelming to established drainage routes. Water depths rise during large rain events and inundate adjacent properties and roadways. During flash flood events the creek floods, damaging structures and infrastructure, causing severe erosion, and creating ingress/egress issues throughout the community for vehicular travel and emergency personnel. The entire downtown of Uhland floods frequently when a tributary to this creek leaves its banks and covers the roadway with rushing water.

The project will include construction of a detention pond and the implementation of multiple channel improvements designed to increase the capacity of drainage routes and reduce flooding.

Improvements include:

Pond A

- Construct a detention pond (Pond A) located northwest and adjacent to SH 21 (Camino Real), between Poco Loco Supermercado and St. John Lutheran Church

Old Spanish Trail Bridge

- Construct a new bridge for Old Spanish Trail over Plum Creek and remove existing box culverts.
Plum Creek
- Widen the channel upstream and downstream of Old Spanish Trail at the proposed bridge
- Clean and clear the channels of trees, brush, and debris.


## East Drainage/Seeliger Drive

- Implement channel improvements to connect the discharge point of the existing TxDOT culvert located approximately 750 feet northeast of Short Street at its intersection with SH 21, to Plum Creek
- Lower the elevation and repave Seeliger Drive

Middle Drainage Channel

- Implement channel improvements between SH 21 and Old Spanish Trail to increase the drainage capacity between these two roadways
- Clean and clear the channels of trees, brush, and debris. Past Old Spanish Trail toward the southwest, the existing channel that connects to Plum Creek will also be improved.

Summer Sun Cove/Channel

- Implement channel improvements.
- Install new box culverts across Cotton Gin Road, and the channel improvements will continue to the southwest to connect to Plum Creek.


## Camino Roadside

- Implement roadside drainage improvements southwest of the proposed Pond A including a larger driveway culvert for Poco Loco Supermercado, enhance roadside drainage swale, a larger culvert at Cotton Gin Road with outfall into Plum Creek along the north side of SH 21

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Uhland is a community of 1,211 residents in Caldwell County $(42,144)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Uhland is $\$ 46,442,14.24 \%$ less than Caldwell County's median income of $\$ 54,152$, and $10.95 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Uhland has an AMFI of $\$ 47,404$ according to ACS 2019. This is $49 \%$ of the County average for both Hayes $(\$ 97,600)$ and Caldwell Counties $(\$ 97,600)$ as they are both in the Austin-Round Rock TX HUD metro MSA. The family number is significant because $64 \%$ of Uhland Households are family households. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in the city of Uhland was $10.80 \%$, less than Caldwell County's poverty rate of $17.70 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In the ACS 2019 data, Uhland's poverty rate fell to $7.7 \%$.

The city of Uhland's population is $70.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Caldwell County's $52.20 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Uhland is $20.90 \%$ white alone, less than Caldwell County's white alone percentage of $39.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Uhland is $4.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Caldwell County (5.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Uhland is a majority minority city with almost $75 \%$ of the population being racial or ethnic minorities. The projects appear to cover much of the city, either indirectly through water detention of the channels being created behind the population centers of Uhland and with adjacent improvements.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $78.90 \%$ in the city of Uhland, less than $88.80 \%$ in Caldwell County and less than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Uhland is $54.00 \%$ male, greater than Caldwell County (50.60\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Uhland is $46.00 \%$ female, less than the $49.40 \%$ of Caldwell County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of 50.4\%.

The households in Uhland are comprised of $64.00 \%$ married couple families, which is greater than Caldwell County's $51.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Uhland that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $33.90 \%$ this is greater than Caldwell County's percentage of $20.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Uhland's households are $7.50 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Caldwell County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $6.30 \%$ is within the city of Uhland, which is greater than Caldwell County's $1.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Uhland, $13.50 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Caldwell County's percentage of $26.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Uhland's households are $4.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Caldwell County's percentage of $6.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$.

In Uhland $48.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Caldwell County, which is at $35.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Uhland that have one or more people of 65 or older is $24.30 \%$, which is less than Caldwell County's $28.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Uhland is $8.80 \%$ which is less than Caldwell County's $14.20 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

In looking at the map of Uhland, the city limits do not always correspond to the project area. For instance, Flint is not next to the Hays County channel project, but it is in the Uhland limits, and Flint has mainly MHU and similar style housing. On the other hand, one of the closest streets to the major channel in Hays County is Summer Sun Cove. This street is partially in the city limits and partially out. There is one stick-built home on this road and the rest appear to be MHU style housing.

On the Caldwell County side of the project, the street that is adjacent to the Plum Creek tributary and it has rural style houses mainly made from wood. Where the Channel projects would be happening in Caldwell County, there is a large ranch at the end of Seeliger that is gated. The downtown area is on Old Spanish Trail, and some of the work to help water flow there has recently been done.

The ACS estimates say that of the 346 housing units in Uhland, 333 are occupied. Twenty-nine percent (104) are rental units, and of those 61 are occupied by people who have unaffordable rent according to HUD standards.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Caldwell County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1018-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Uhland |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 60.48\% |  | 68.31\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$54,152 |  | \$46,442 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.70\% |  | 10.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 42,144 |  | 1,211 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 21,993 | 52.2\% | 849 | 70.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 20,151 | 47.8\% | 362 | 29.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 16,718 | 39.7\% | 253 | 20.9\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,360 | 5.6\% | 54 | 4.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 176 | 0.4\% | 5 | 0.4\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 407 | 1.0\% | 5 | 0.4\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 53 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 430 | 1.0\% | 45 | 3.7\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 37,431 | 88.8\% | 974 | 80.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 36,893 | 87.5\% | 955 | 78.9\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 538 | 1.3\% | 19 | 1.6\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 4,713 | 11.2\% | 237 | 19.6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 21,313 | 50.6\% | 654 | 54.0\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 20,831 | 49.4\% | 557 | 46.0\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 13,460 | 100\% | 333 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,900 | 51.3\% | 213 | 64.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,810 | 20.9\% | 113 | 33.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 693 | 5.1\% | 25 | 7.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 249 | 1.8\% | 21 | 6.3\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Caldwell County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1018-APP City of Uhland City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,328 | 17.3\% | 50 | 15.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 153 | 1.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,605 | 11.9\% | 38 | 11.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 488 | 3.6\% | 19 | 5.7\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,539 | 26.3\% | 45 | 13.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 852 | 6.3\% | 15 | 4.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,614 | 12.0\% | 9 | 2.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 859 | 6.4\% | 5 | 1.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 4,811 | 35.7\% | 161 | 48.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,892 | 28.9\% | 81 | 24.3\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 40,074 | 100\% | 1,211 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,690 | 14.2\% | 107 | 8.8\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Martindale - NW River Road Flood Control Improvements - \$6,678,027.21-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Martindale, benefitting 72.01\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $19.07 \%$ greater than Caldwell County's LMI percentage of $60.48 \%$ and $61.25 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The proposed improvements will provide localized flood relief by installing better street sections for storm water conveyance along with storm sewer improvements for greater conveyance capacity. The city has previously completed a sewer line project along the roadway. This project will enhance sewer line infrastructure improvement by moving floodwaters away from the area faster, so they are less likely to inundate the sewer system.

The project site consists of NW River Road (from Lockhart Street to Quail Run Road) in Martindale, Texas. NW River Road runs parallel to the San Marcos River and is an important thoroughfare in Martindale. This road serves as an East-West thoroughfare for the city, which provides citywide circulation and access. The project will replace existing culverts with larger structures and install storm sewers.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Martindale is a community of 913 residents in Caldwell County (42,144), while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Martindale is $\$ 56,000$, $3.41 \%$ greater than Caldwell County's median income of $\$ 54,152$, and $7.37 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Martindale's AMFI is $\$ 67,188$ according to the ACS 2019. This is $69 \%$ of the HUD AMFI of $\$ 97,600$. Martindale is in Caldwell County, which is part of the Austin-Round Rock TX MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Martindale was $10.30 \%$, compared with Caldwell County's poverty rate of $17.70 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Martindale's population is $60.60 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Caldwell County's $52.20 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Martindale is $34.00 \%$ white alone, less than Caldwell County's white alone percentage of $39.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Martindale is $1.90 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Caldwell County (5.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Martindale is a smaller community and North River Road does appear to be a frequently used road separate from the nearby state highway. Martindale is $60.6 \%$ Hispanic and $1.9 \%$ Black or African American. According to the 2020 Census, the community grew by $27 \%$ and the major
demographic categories all increased in population; however, Martindale remains a majority Hispanic or Latino origin community. There is nothing in the project itself that raises any AFFH questions, as it does not appear to benefit or burden any particular demographic.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $93.5 \%$ in the city of Martindale, greater than $88.8 \%$ in Caldwell County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Martindale, $31.10 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Caldwell County's percentage of $26.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Martindale's households are $2.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Caldwell County's percentage of $6.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Martindale's households are $18.70 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Caldwell County at $12.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Martindale are $8.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Caldwell County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.40 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Martindale $29.80 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than Caldwell County, which is at $35.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Martindale that have one or more people of 65 or older is $38.30 \%$, which is greater than Caldwell County's $28.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Martindale is $15.10 \%$ which is greater than Caldwell County's $14.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The housing along North West River Road is mixed. There is some new construction, but there is older housing as well. There are large and small homes intermixed with each other. Some homes have wood exteriors, and others have brick. Some homes are well maintained, and others have deferred maintenance, or like the Martindale Civic Hall, are damaged and are not in use. There are houses that are on the river, but they are on higher ground so they may not flood easily. While it is not housing, it is important to note that the end of the project is a road that leads to river access which appears to be heavily used. This is also the main street that goes through the downtown area, which appears to be a historic district.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Caldwell County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0894-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Martindale |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 60.48\% |  | 72.01\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$54,152 |  | \$56,000 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.70\% |  | 10.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 42,144 |  | 913 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 21,993 | 52.2\% | 553 | 60.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 20,151 | 47.8\% | 360 | 39.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 16,718 | 39.7\% | 310 | 34.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,360 | 5.6\% | 17 | 1.9\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 176 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 407 | 1.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 53 | 0.1\% | 6 | 0.7\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 430 | 1.0\% | 27 | 3.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 37,431 | 88.8\% | 874 | 95.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 36,893 | 87.5\% | 854 | 93.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 538 | 1.3\% | 20 | 2.2\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 4,713 | 11.2\% | 39 | 4.3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 21,313 | 50.6\% | 446 | 48.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 20,831 | 49.4\% | 467 | 51.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 13,460 | 100\% | 386 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,900 | 51.3\% | 187 | 48.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,810 | 20.9\% | 68 | 17.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 693 | 5.1\% | 19 | 4.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 249 | 1.8\% | 11 | 2.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Caldwell County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0894-APP <br> City of Martindale City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,328 | 17.3\% | 60 | 15.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 153 | 1.1\% | 11 | 2.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,605 | 11.9\% | 49 | 12.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 488 | 3.6\% | 33 | 8.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,539 | 26.3\% | 120 | 31.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 852 | 6.3\% | 9 | 2.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,614 | 12.0\% | 72 | 18.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 859 | 6.4\% | 31 | 8.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 4,811 | 35.7\% | 115 | 29.8\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,892 | 28.9\% | 148 | 38.3\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 40,074 | 100\% | 913 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,690 | 14.2\% | 138 | 15.1\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Caldwell County: Project Service Areas



## Caldwell County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population
- Black or African American Population

Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
0-1
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { 15-85 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Note: Block Groups } \\ \text { with no predominant } \\ \text { category or no } \\ \text { poplation are blank }\end{array} \\ \text { 85-100 } & \text { 0. }\end{array}$ population are blank

Population by Category


## Caldwell County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (8 Block Groups)$10-25$ percent ( 9 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (6 Block Groups)
$\square \geq 45$ percent (2 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



This project provides an area benefit within Jasper County, benefitting 58.13\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $37.40 \%$ greater than Jasper County's LMI percentage of $42.31 \%$ and $30.17 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Since Hurricane Rita in 2005 and subsequent storms and flooding events following Hurricane Harvey, Jasper County has recognized the need to mitigate flooding from hurricanes/tropical storms/tropical depressions and riverine flooding. This project provides for drainage improvements from north of the city of Jasper to the Buna area, including three (3) storm water detention basins and fourteen (14) drainage structures to mitigate flooding in the Jasper, Kirbyville and Buna areas along the Hwy 96 corridor. The improvements are all interconnected and function to reduce flooding.

This project is a continuation of drainage improvements such as:

- Bridges
- Large storm water detention basins
- Concrete box culverts
- Road hardening
- Culvert upsizing and
- Other drainage improvements

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 12,643 within Jasper County $(35,506)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The AMFI for Jasper County is $\$ 59,031$ according to ACS 2019. The AMFI was not available for the Block Groups in the Census data. The Jasper County ACS 2019 AMFI is $96 \%$ of HUD's AMFI for Jasper County of $\$ 61,700$. Jasper County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $16.70 \%$, which is equal to Jasper County's poverty rate of $16.70 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $7.55 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than Jasper County's $6.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $69.01 \%$ white alone, less than Jasper County's percentage of $74.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $21.43 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is greater than Jasper County (16.50\%) and greater than the MIT
eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.12 \%$, which is greater than Jasper County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.52 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.09 \%$, less than Jasper County ( $0.100 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.42 \%$ some other race alone, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $0.30 \%$ and greater than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.86 \%$ two or more races, less than Jasper County, which is at $1.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The project site appears to be more diverse than the County as a whole. The block group location of the project sites was used to determine the demographics of the projects. The combined localized block groups have a demographic breakdown of Black or African American population at 19.9\%, Hispanic of Latino origin is $10.3 \%$, and White not of Hispanic or Latino origin of $68 \%$. This compares to the Jasper County demographics of Black or African American at $16.5 \%$, Hispanic or Latino origin at $8.1 \%$, and White not of Hispanic or Latino origin on at $74.5 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $43.64 \%$ married couple families, less than Jasper County's $47.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $12.76 \%$, less than Jasper County's percentage of $15.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $5.07 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $4.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $3.02 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than Jasper County's $2.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $31.17 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $28.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $6.13 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, which is greater than Jasper County's percentage of $5.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $17.63 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Jasper County at $16.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $9.97 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Jasper County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $9.80 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $30.12 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Jasper County, which is at $30.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $38.05 \%$, greater than Jasper County's $37.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $16.94 \%$, greater than Jasper County's $15.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The project work locations are adjacent to Jasper County's major highway, covering most of the length of the County and three of its largest cities. The projects do not appear to benefit or burden one group over the other. When taken collectively, the projects seem to benefit people of colorpredominately in the Jasper area-more than the countywide demographics indicate are present.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-0957-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Jasper |  | Jasper County |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.31\% |  | 58.13\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$44,370 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.70\% |  | 16.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 35,506 |  | 27,384 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 2,386 | 6.7\% | 2,068 | 7.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 33,120 | 93.3\% | 25,316 | 92.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 26,460 | 74.5\% | 18,897 | 69.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,869 | 16.5\% | 5,869 | 21.4\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 44 | 0.1\% | 34 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 160 | 0.5\% | 142 | 0.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 24 | 0.1\% | 24 | 0.1\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 114 | 0.3\% | 114 | 0.42\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 449 | 1.3\% | 236 | 0.86\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 34,523 | 97.2\% | 26,572 | 97.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 34,404 | 96.9\% | 26,484 | 96.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 119 | 0.3\% | 88 | 0.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 983 | 2.8\% | 812 | 3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 17,510 | 49.3\% | 13,044 | 47.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 17,996 | 50.7\% | 14,340 | 52.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,936 | 100\% | 10,137 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,195 | 47.9\% | 4,424 | 43.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,029 | 15.7\% | 1,293 | 12.8\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 570 | 4.4\% | 514 | 5.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 334 | 2.6\% | 306 | 3.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jasper County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0957-APP Jasper County Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,476 | 19.1\% | 2,039 | 20.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 285 | 2.2\% | 277 | 2.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,678 | 13.0\% | 1,352 | 13.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 667 | 5.2\% | 505 | 5.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,695 | 28.6\% | 3,160 | 31.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 667 | 5.2\% | 621 | 6.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,075 | 16.0\% | 1,787 | 17.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,262 | 9.8\% | 1,011 | 10.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,963 | 30.6\% | 3,053 | 30.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,896 | 37.8\% | 3,857 | 38.0\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 34,598 | 100\% | 26,476 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,477 | 15.8\% | 4,486 | 16.9\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Jasper: Citywide Street and Drainage Improvements Project - \$11,258,023.51-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Jasper, benefitting 57.86\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $36.74 \%$ greater than Jasper County's LMI percentage of $42.31 \%$ and $29.55 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Jasper has recognized the need to mitigate flooding from past hurricanes/tropical storms/tropical depressions and riverine flooding. The city of Jasper's proposed project addresses flood mitigation, street hardening and drainage issues citywide by focusing on the twenty-one most vulnerable specific sites that will significantly impact flooding, drainage, and street conditions throughout the city. The improvements are all interconnected and function to reduce damage to streets when floods do occur. The project includes street improvements, culverts, and the addition of curb and gutters.

- $23,800 \mathrm{LF}$ of street improvements throughout the city
- 90 LF of concrete box culverts along the Upper Walnut Run and Lower Walnut Run Tributaries.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Jasper is a community of 7,583 residents in Jasper County $(35,506)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Jasper is $\$ 38,132,14.06 \%$ less than Jasper County's median income of $\$ 44,370$, and $26.89 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The AMFI for the City of Jasper is $\$ 48,504$ according to ACS 2019. This is $79 \%$ of the Jasper County AMFI of $\$ 59,031$. For Census Tract 9503 , the AMFI is $\$ 39,719$ according to ACS 2019 which is $67.9 \%$ of the Jasper County AMFI. Jasper county is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Jasper was $24.70 \%$, compared with Jasper County's poverty rate of $16.70 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. Census Tract 9503 is shown as a R/ECAP in HUD documentation. According to ACS 2019, the racial concentration is $71.8 \%$ and the current poverty level is $36.3 \%$. The projects are divided between Census Tract 9502 and 9503.

The city of Jasper's population is $4.40 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Jasper County's $6.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Jasper is $40.90 \%$ white alone, less than Jasper County's white alone percentage of $74.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Jasper is $54.20 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Jasper County ( $16.50 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Jasper is $0.00 \%$, less than Jasper County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Jasper
is $0.20 \%$ Asian alone, less than Jasper County's percentage of $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Jasper is a majority minority city with a majority of residents being Black or African American at $54.2 \%$. There is not a large Hispanic or Latino origin demographic with only $4.4 \%$ of the population being in that demographic. White, not of Hispanic or Latino origin residents make up a sizable minority at $40.9 \%$. More than half of the racial and ethnic minorities in Jasper County live in the City of Jasper.

In the city of Jasper, $38.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $28.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Jasper's households are $11.60 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $5.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Jasper's households are $18.90 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Jasper County at $16.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Jasper are $9.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it less than Jasper County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $9.80 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Jasper $38.00 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than Jasper County, which is at $30.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Jasper that have one or more people of 65 or older is $33.70 \%$, which is less than Jasper County's $37.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Jasper is $14.60 \%$ which is less than Jasper County's $15.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The selected streets run throughout the entire city. However, three of the streets are largely commercial or school sites. Two of the projects run in front of the new GLO Harvey multifamily developments. Three of the projects are in areas with larger homes that are well maintained. The balance of the projects is in mixed-housing neighborhoods. In looking at the streets during the site visit, they all looked as though they could be candidates for this type of work.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1062-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Jasper |  | City of Jasper |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.31\% |  | 57.86\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$44,370 |  | \$38,132 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.70\% |  | 24.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 35,506 |  | 7,583 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 2,386 | 6.7\% | 331 | 4.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 33,120 | 93.3\% | 7,252 | 95.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 26,460 | 74.5\% | 3,099 | 40.9\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,869 | 16.5\% | 4,113 | 54.2\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 44 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 160 | 0.5\% | 16 | 0.2\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 24 | 0.1\% | 24 | 0.3\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 114 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 449 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 34,523 | 97.2\% | 7,319 | 96.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 34,404 | 96.9\% | 7,295 | 96.2\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 119 | 0.3\% | 24 | 0.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 983 | 2.8\% | 264 | 3.5\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 17,510 | 49.3\% | 3,497 | 46.1\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 17,996 | 50.7\% | 4,086 | 53.9\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,936 | 100\% | 2,735 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,195 | 47.9\% | 1,347 | 49.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,029 | 15.7\% | 486 | 17.8\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 570 | 4.4\% | 65 | 2.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 334 | 2.6\% | 58 | 2.1\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jasper County |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1062-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Jasper |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 2,476 | 19.1\% | 266 | 9.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 285 | 2.2\% | 22 | 0.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,678 | 13.0\% | 208 | 7.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 667 | 5.2\% | 89 | 3.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,695 | 28.6\% | 1,057 | 38.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 667 | 5.2\% | 318 | 11.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,075 | 16.0\% | 516 | 18.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,262 | 9.8\% | 260 | 9.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,963 | 30.6\% | 1,039 | 38.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,896 | 37.8\% | 921 | 33.7\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 34,598 | 100\% | 7,366 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,477 | 15.8\% | 1,078 | 14.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Browndell, benefitting 52.63\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $24.40 \%$ greater than Jasper County's LMI percentage of $42.31 \%$ and $17.85 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Jasper County will mitigate flooding on CR 200 and improve the capacity of the drainage structures through the City of Browndell and the Mill Creek drainage flow area by reconstructing CR 200, including roadway elevation and drainage structure improvements. Additionally, the roadway segment will be hardened to mitigate the excessive amount of repetitive erosion of the road.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. The County Commissioners determined this project was important as a part of the County transportation plan. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Browndell is a community of 190 residents in Jasper County $(35,506)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Browndell is $\$ 26,198,14.06 \%$ less than Jasper County's median income of $\$ 44,370$, and $26.89 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Browndell's AMFI is $\$ 27,811$ according to ACS 2019. This is $44 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Jasper County of $\$ 61,700$. Jasper County is not in a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Browndell is at $57.20 \%$, greater than Jasper County's poverty rate of $16.70 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Browndell's population is $0 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Jasper County's $6.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Browndell is $42.9 \%$ white alone, less than Jasper County's white alone percentage of $74.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Browndell is $57.1 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Jasper County (16.50\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Browndell is a small majority minority community. If HUD recognized Census Places for R/ECAPs, Browndell would likely qualify with a $57.1 \%$ minority population (all Black or African American) and $58.2 \%$ poverty rate.

The city of Browndell is $46.10 \%$ male, less than Jasper County (49.30\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Browndell is $53.90 \%$ female, greater than the $50.70 \%$ of Jasper County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in Browndell are comprised of $49.30 \%$ married couple families, which is greater than Jasper County's $47.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Browndell that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $17.80 \%$ this is greater than Jasper County's percentage of $15.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of Browndell, $38.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $28.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Browndell's households are $11.60 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $5.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Browndell's households are $18.90 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Jasper County at $16.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Browndell are $9.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than Jasper County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $9.80 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Browndell $38.00 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Jasper County, which is at $30.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Browndell that have one or more people of 65 or older is $33.70 \%$, which is less than Jasper County's $37.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Browndell is $14.60 \%$ which is less than Jasper County's $15.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Browndell is a small community that has a church, a community center, a water supply plant, and many smaller homes including some MHUs. This project covers the length of Browndell, although it is not in the most populated area. Most houses in Browndell are not on County Road 200. The housing stock is relatively older, with 117 of the 152 homes being built before 1999. Ninety-nine of the owner-occupied homes have a value of less than \$99,999 according to ACS 2019.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jasper County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1065-APP |
|  |  |  | Jasper County |
|  |  |  | City-Wide (City of Jasper) |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 42.31\% |  | 52.63\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$44,370 |  | \$38,132 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 16.70\% |  | 57.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 35,506 |  | 7,583 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 2,386 | 6.7\% | 331 | 4.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 33,120 | 93.3\% | 7,252 | 95.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 26,460 | 74.5\% | 3,099 | 40.9\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,869 | 16.5\% | 4,113 | 54.2\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 44 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 160 | 0.5\% | 16 | 0.2\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 24 | 0.1\% | 24 | 0.3\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 114 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 449 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 34,523 | 97.2\% | 7,319 | 96.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 34,404 | 96.9\% | 7,295 | 96.2\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 119 | 0.3\% | 24 | 0.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 983 | 2.8\% | 264 | 3.5\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 17,510 | 49.3\% | 3,497 | 46.1\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 17,996 | 50.7\% | 4,086 | 53.9\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,936 | 100\% | 2,735 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,195 | 47.9\% | 1,347 | 49.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,029 | 15.7\% | 486 | 17.8\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 570 | 4.4\% | 65 | 2.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 334 | 2.6\% | 58 | 2.1\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jasper County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1065-APP |
|  |  |  | Jasper County |
|  |  |  | City-Wide (City of Jasper) |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 2,476 | 19.1\% | 266 | 9.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 285 | 2.2\% | 22 | 0.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,678 | 13.0\% | 208 | 7.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 667 | 5.2\% | 89 | 3.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,695 | 28.6\% | 1,057 | 38.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 667 | 5.2\% | 318 | 11.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,075 | 16.0\% | 516 | 18.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,262 | 9.8\% | 260 | 9.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,963 | 30.6\% | 1,039 | 38.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,896 | 37.8\% | 921 | 33.7\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 34,598 | 100\% | 7,366 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,477 | 15.8\% | 1,078 | 14.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Kirbyville: Flood Mitigation Project - \$3,356,625-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Kirbyville, benefitting $64.59 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $52.66 \%$ greater than Jasper County's LMI percentage of $42.31 \%$ and $44.63 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city proposes to build a detention pond to mitigate flooding of Highway 96, South Elizabeth and MLK. Reducing the risk of flooding on Highway 96 will ensure there is a safe evacuation route not only for residents of the city, but also for areas south of Kirbyville. The project will include outfall improvements to channels and drainage culverts for the Herndon/MLK Ditch, Dole Bean Ditch, Railroad Crossing and East Drew Street Outfall. These improvements will increase capacity, make structures resistant to erosion and retain a higher strength during and after a storm event, reducing flooding within the most populated areas throughout the city.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Kirbyville is a community of 2,631 residents in Jasper County $(35,506)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Kirbyville is $\$ 24,503$, $44.78 \%$ less than Jasper County's median income of $\$ 44,370$, and $53.02 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of \$52,155. Kirbyville's AMFI was \$39,400 according to ACS 2019 which is $63.9 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Jasper County of $\$ 61,700$. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in the city of Kirbyville was $23.90 \%$, compared with Jasper County's poverty rate of $16.70 \%$, the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. Poverty increased in the ACS 2019 to $31.8 \%$ for Kirbyville. Jasper County's poverty rate increased to $18.5 \%$.

The city of Kirbyville's population is $16.20 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Jasper County's $6.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Kirbyville is $63.70 \%$ white alone, less than Jasper County's white alone percentage of $74.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Kirbyville is $15.80 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Jasper County ( $16.50 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Kirbyville is $0.50 \%$, greater than Jasper County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. Kirbyville is $1.70 \%$ some other race alone, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $0.30 \%$ and greater than of the area's $0.2 \%$. In the city of Kirbyville, $2.20 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Jasper County, which is at $1.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Most of the work to reduce flooding is being completed in Census Tract 9506 Block Group 2. That Block Group contains the most racially and ethnically diverse part of Kirbyville. Census

Tract 9506 Block Group 2 has a demographic population of Blacks or African Americans at 23.4\%, Hispanic or Latino origin at $20.7 \%$, and White not of Hispanic or Latino origin at $52.4 \%$. This contrasts with Census Tract 9506 Block Group 1, which has a White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population of $80.1 \%$ or citywide in Kirbyville of $63.7 \%$.

In the city of Kirbyville, $48.10 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $28.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Kirbyville's households are $9.70 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Jasper County's percentage of $5.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Kirbyville's households are $27.80 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Jasper County at $16.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$.

In Kirbyville $30.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Jasper County, which is at $30.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Kirbyville that have one or more people of 65 or older is $34.20 \%$, which is less than Jasper County's $37.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Kirbyville is $16.50 \%$ which is greater than Jasper County's $15.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

It appears that the improvements will be made to an existing natural ditch that runs through a neighborhood. The neighborhood with the drainage to the detention pond has mixed housing, but generally the housing is older and a little smaller. It includes some public housing units as well. North of the detention pond, the neighborhood includes an area called Pecan Grove that seems to be apartments and a recreational area. To the south of the detention pond site is a very small neighborhood with about ten small houses, some in need of repair. Based on the map, the detention pond will either be located within a heavily wooded area, or portions of these woods will be cleared to make the pond.

The other projects are at the ends of streets in neighborhoods. With the East Drew project being at the end of a road and having some commercial buildings on the street, it provides access to nearby housing. The Fair Street site is at the end of a single road with four brick houses and an apartment complex on the other side of the existing drainage. Looking at the site, it appears the most likely scenario would be to use the existing drainage to the detention pond.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jasper County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0948-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Kirbyville |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 42.31\% |  | 64.59\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$44,370 |  | \$24,503 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 16.70\% |  | 23.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 35,506 |  | 2,631 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 2,386 | 6.7\% | 425 | 16.2\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 33,120 | 93.3\% | 2,206 | 83.8\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 26,460 | 74.5\% | 1,675 | 63.7\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,869 | 16.5\% | 416 | 15.8\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 44 | 0.1\% | 12 | 0.5\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 160 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 24 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 114 | 0.3\% | 45 | 1.7\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 449 | 1.3\% | 58 | 2.2\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 34,523 | 97.2\% | 2,566 | 97.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 34,404 | 96.9\% | 2,560 | 97.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 119 | 0.3\% | 6 | 0.2\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 983 | 2.8\% | 65 | 2.5\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 17,510 | 49.3\% | 1,240 | 47.1\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 17,996 | 50.7\% | 1,391 | 52.9\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,936 | 100\% | 975 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,195 | 47.9\% | 272 | 27.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,029 | 15.7\% | 68 | 7.0\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 570 | 4.4\% | 111 | 11.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 334 | 2.6\% | 46 | 4.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jasper County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0948-APP City of Kirbyville City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,476 | 19.1\% | 123 | 12.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 285 | 2.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,678 | 13.0\% | 95 | 9.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 667 | 5.2\% | 20 | 2.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,695 | 28.6\% | 469 | 48.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 667 | 5.2\% | 95 | 9.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,075 | 16.0\% | 271 | 27.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,262 | 9.8\% | 151 | 15.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,963 | 30.6\% | 293 | 30.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,896 | 37.8\% | 333 | 34.2\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 34,598 | 100\% | 2,553 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,477 | 15.8\% | 422 | 16.5\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Jasper County: Project Service Areas



## Awardee Application ID Total Benefs.

City of Jasper CDR17-1062-APP 7,586
City of Kirbyville CDR17-0948-APP 2,330
Jasper County CDR17-1065-APP

## Funding \$ by Awardee
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## Jasper County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Jasper County: Population in Poverty by Block Group
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City of Smithville: Drainage Improvement Project - \$12,966,041 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Smithville, benefitting 55.79\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $15.48 \%$ greater than the City of Smithville's LMI percentage of $48.31 \%, 15.36 \%$ greater than Bastrop County's LMI percentage of $48.36 \%$ and $24.92 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Historically, during heavy rainfall events, the city of Smithville has experienced flooding in various parts of the city. Generally, existing terrain within the city is extremely flat with elevations typically varying between $0.2 \%$ to $1.0 \%$. Primary means of storm water collection is through a combination of open ditches, curb and gutter, and an existing storm sewer system with sizes typically ranging between 12-30 inches in diameter. Runoff that is collected either drains to Willow Creek which is located on the south and east sides of the city, Gazley Creek which is located on the west side of the city, or the Colorado River with is located on the north side. During such storm events, the existing storm sewer system, ditches, and streets are overwhelmed and unable to quickly convey storm water resulting in flooding of residential neighborhoods, businesses, and City streets. The project will upgrade the existing storm sewer system along NE/NW 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street from Gresham Street to Ramona and reconstruct the existing streets to properly drain into the new storm sewer system. Project details include the following:

- Construct a regional detention pond at the east end of Martin Luther King Drive and SE $4^{\text {th }}$ Street. Install approximately $4,500 \mathrm{LF}$ of new storm sewer to this pond (along SE $4^{\text {th }}$ Street, Martin Luther King Drive, Bunte Street, SE $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street, and Gentry Street).
- Extend the storm sewer along Garwood Street and enlarge the storm sewer along Byrne Street, totaling approximately 2,730 LF of new storm sewer.
- Construct a regional detention pond north of the railroad right-of-way south of Loop 230 and southeast of the intersection of McSweeney Street and NE $1^{\text {st }}$ Install approximately 1,980 LF of new storm sewer from the pond north to Loop 230, east to Faulkner Road, north to Oak Meadows Drive and east to Lueders Lane.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 2,635 within and adjacent to the city of Smithville, a community of 4,363 residents in Bastrop County $(84,522)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Smithville's AMFI is $\$ 68,125$ according to ACS 2019. This is $70 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Bastrop County of $\$ 97,600$. Bastrop County is within the Austin-Round Rock TX MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is
$10.00 \%$, greater than the city of Smithville which is at $7.50 \%$, less than Bastrop County's poverty rate of $10.00 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $13.26 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, less than the city of Smithville's population percentage of $13.80 \%$, less than Bastrop County's $37.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $70.95 \%$ white alone, less than the city of Smithville's percentage of $71.30 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $52.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $8.69 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is greater than the city of Smithville, which has $8.40 \%$, greater than Bastrop County (7.10\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.57 \%$, less than the city of Smithville, which is at $0.60 \%$, greater than Bastrop County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $1.86 \%$ Asian alone, greater than the city of Smithville at $1.00 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $0.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $3.84 \%$ some other race alone, less than the city of Smithville, which is at $4.00 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $0.40 \%$ and greater than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.83 \%$ two or more races, less than the city of Smithville at $0.90 \%$, less than Bastrop County, which is at $1.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Smithville was a majority White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population at the time of application. However, in the 2020 Census, this demographic majority dropped from $71.3 \%$ to $62.3 \%$ while the racial and ethnic minority population grew from $22.2 \%$ to $33.4 \%$.

The Windshield survey provides some context to the fact that this is a $70 \%$ White not of Latino or Hispanic origin community. The detention ponds are located near smaller housing. As these are going to be detention ponds, it should benefit the neighborhood without causing a negative visual or olfactory impact. Based on the site visit, the $4^{\text {th }}$ street detention pond should benefit LMI residents and help protect their homes along with what appears to be, by observation, a higher concentration of minority population. While it was not discussed, the number of empty lots in this area could be an indicator of formerly flooded homes. Outside the detention ponds, much of the work appears to be in the downtown streets of the community. On account of this, the work would benefit and burden all members of the community equally in a town of this size.

In the project beneficiary area, $32.00 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than the city of Smithville at $28.10 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $24.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $4.23 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than the city of Smithville which is at $4.40 \%$, less than Bastrop County's percentage of $4.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $18.55 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than the city of Smithville at $15.90 \%$, greater than Bastrop County at $12.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $12.87 \%$ occupied by female householders with no
partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than the city of Smithville who is at $10.90 \%$, greater than Bastrop County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $25.04 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the city of Smithville at $26.50 \%$, less than Bastrop County, which is at $35.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $44.87 \%$, greater than the city of Smithville at $44.40 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's $30.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $20.47 \%$, greater than the city of Smithville at $20.30 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's $13.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

There is varied housing in Smithville. Near the detention pond site at the end of $4^{\text {th }}$ Street, there is a cooperative style community called RVICS (Roving Volunteers in Christ's Service) that has smaller homes and MHUs near the detention pond. Going up Martin Luther King Road, there are smaller houses, some houses that need work, empty lots, and one of the Public Housing Authority sites. The other detention Pond near Loop 230 appears to have a barracks style multi-family housing development near it. The other homes in the area are on Quail Run and are single family tract style homes with brick exteriors.

In the area around Garwood Street, the homes are larger, and some are historic style. Most homes are well maintained and on slightly larger residential lots. There is a school at NE $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street in the project area. Up around Northeast $2^{\text {nd }}$, there is one large Historic Style home and a Bed and Breakfast in a residential area. Most of the property in this area is in a "historic downtown" style community and is either commercial or retail stores.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Bastrop County |  | City of Smithville |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1021-APP City of Smithville Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 48.36\% |  | 48.31\% |  | 55.79\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$64,597 |  | \$54,333 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.00\% |  | 7.50\% |  | 10.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 84,522 |  | 4,363 |  | 4,579 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 31,852 | 37.70\% | 602 | 13.8\% | 607 | 13.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 52,670 | 62.30\% | 3,761 | 86.2\% | 3,972 | 86.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 44,228 | 52.30\% | 3,112 | 71.3\% | 3,249 | 71.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,977 | 7.10\% | 366 | 8.4\% | 398 | 8.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 228 | 0.30\% | 26 | 0.6\% | 26 | 0.6\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 710 | 0.80\% | 43 | 1.0\% | 85 | 1.9\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 371 | 0.40\% | 176 | 4.00\% | 176 | 3.84\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,156 | 1.40\% | 38 | 0.90\% | 38 | 0.83\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 74,407 | 88.00\% | 4,153 | 95.2\% | 4,327 | 94.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 72,629 | 85.90\% | 4,112 | 94.2\% | 4,286 | 93.6\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 1,778 | 2.10\% | 41 | 0.9\% | 41 | 0.9\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 10,115 | 12.00\% | 210 | 5\% | 252 | 6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 42,810 | 50.60\% | 2,232 | 51.2\% | 2,253 | 49.2\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 41,712 | 49.40\% | 2,131 | 48.8\% | 2,326 | 50.8\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 25,571 | 100\% | 1,646 | 100\% | 1,725 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 14,204 | 55.50\% | 825 | 50.1\% | 808 | 46.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,482 | 21.40\% | 270 | 16.4\% | 234 | 13.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,435 | 5.60\% | 94 | 5.7\% | 94 | 5.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 557 | 2.20\% | 19 | 1.2\% | 19 | 1.1\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Bastrop County |  | City of Smithville |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1021-APP City of Smithville Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 3,744 | 14.60\% | 265 | 16.1\% | 271 | 15.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 395 | 1.50\% | 21 | 1.3\% | 21 | 1.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,569 | 10.00\% | 232 | 14.1\% | 232 | 13.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 701 | 2.70\% | 151 | 9.2\% | 151 | 8.8\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 6,188 | 24.20\% | 462 | 28.1\% | 552 | 32.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,137 | 4.40\% | 73 | 4.4\% | 73 | 4.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,284 | 12.80\% | 262 | 15.9\% | 320 | 18.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,760 | 6.90\% | 179 | 10.9\% | 222 | 12.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 9,087 | 35.50\% | 436 | 26.5\% | 432 | 25.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 7,751 | 30.30\% | 731 | 44.4\% | 774 | 44.9\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 82,357 | 100\% | 4,264 | 100\% | 4,480 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 11,229 | 13.60\% | 866 | 20.3\% | 917 | 20.5\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Elgin: Roadway Flooding Prevention Project - \$10,940,981 - Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Elgin, benefitting 58.03\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $20.01 \%$ greater than Bastrop County's LMI percentage of $48.36 \%$ and $29.95 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

During heavy rain and storm events, the high traffic roadways in Elgin become impassable. This project will correct the flooding and drainage issues; giving an alternative route that is needed for residents and emergency service vehicles to access the area - preserving life and property and reduce hardship for residents. The project will reconstruct channels, and a detention pond to ensure water does not flood roads or existing infrastructure systems; to ensure better stormwater routing and a safer route of travel for pedestrians and vehicles.

- Upgrade the drainage systems (curb inlets, storm sewer) to pass the minimum storm event
- Replace and design the culvert crossings at US 290 and Central Avenue to pass the 25 to 50 -year storm events- Installing sidewalk bridges
- Install a storm sewer system along County Line Road consisting of 25 curb inlets, four manholes, and 6,076 LF of reinforced concrete pipe (RCP)
- Install 5,936 SY of new sidewalk along Kennedy Street and along both sides of County Line Road: and 3,037 LF (east side)
- Reconstruct the detention pond at the Neidig Elementary School on County Line Road
- Provide 7,089 LF of trench protection for the installation of storm sewer: 1,013 LF on Kennedy Street and Central Avenue and 6,076 LF on County Line Road
- Relocate the power poles along both sides of Kennedy Street
- Right-of-way acquisition on both sides of County Line Road, along Kennedy Street and County Line Road, and Kennedy Street and Building demolition site

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Elgin is a community of 10,064 residents in Bastrop County $(84,522)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Elgin is $\$ 58,816,8.95 \%$ less than Bastrop County's median income of $\$ 64,597$, and $12.77 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Elgin has an AMFI of \$69,757 according to ACS 2019. This is $71 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 97,600$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Austin-Round Rock, TX MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Elgin is at $14.20 \%$, compared to Bastrop County's poverty rate of $10.00 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Elgin's population is $44.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Bastrop County's $37.70 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Elgin
is $26.80 \%$ white alone, less than Bastrop County's white alone percentage of $52.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Elgin is $27.10 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Bastrop County ( $7.10 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Elgin is $0.00 \%$, less than Bastrop County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively.

The city of Elgin is a majority minority city with racial and ethnic minorities making up $71.9 \%$ of the community. This is significantly greater than Bastrop County as a whole which has a $44.8 \%$ racial and ethnic minority population. With poverty averaging $13.3 \%$ in Elgin, there are no R/ECAPs in the community even with the racial and ethnic concentrations.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $88.1 \%$ in the city of Elgin, less than $95.4 \%$ in Bastrop County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Elgin, $31.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $24.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Elgin's households are $5.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $4.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Elgin's households are $13.10 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Bastrop County at $12.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Elgin are $7.60 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Bastrop County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $6.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Elgin $41.00 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than Bastrop County, which is at $35.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Elgin that have one or more people of 65 or older is $27.40 \%$, which is less than Bastrop County's $30.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Elgin is $14.00 \%$ which is greater than Bastrop County's $13.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

In examining the location of projects during a windshield survey, and demographic data in the ACS 2019 Census; the projects appear to benefit the community in equal or higher numbers as compared with the population as whole. In one project area, the Hispanic or Latino origin population accounted for over $92 \%$ of the total population of the area. In the case of the project's areas, the school population is slightly higher as a percentage of racial and ethnic minorities than the population as a whole.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Bastrop County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0824-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Elgin |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 48.36\% |  | 58.03\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$64,597 |  | \$58,816 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.00\% |  | 14.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 84,522 |  | 10,064 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 31,852 | 37.70\% | 4,515 | 44.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 52,670 | 62.30\% | 5,549 | 55.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 44,228 | 52.30\% | 2,699 | 26.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,977 | 7.10\% | 2,730 | 27.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 228 | 0.30\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 710 | 0.80\% | 29 | 0.3\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 371 | 0.40\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,156 | 1.40\% | 91 | 0.9\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 74,407 | 88.00\% | 8,741 | 86.9\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 72,629 | 85.90\% | 8,662 | 86.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 1,778 | 2.10\% | 79 | 0.8\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 10,115 | 12.00\% | 1,323 | 13.1\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 42,810 | 50.60\% | 4,912 | 48.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 41,712 | 49.40\% | 5,152 | 51.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 25,571 | 100\% | 2,750 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 14,204 | 55.50\% | 1,465 | 53.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,482 | 21.40\% | 692 | 25.2\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,435 | 5.60\% | 139 | 5.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 557 | 2.20\% | 69 | 2.5\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Bastrop County |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0824-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Elgin |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 3,744 | 14.60\% | 275 | 10.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 395 | 1.50\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,569 | 10.00\% | 252 | 9.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 701 | 2.70\% | 65 | 2.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 6,188 | 24.20\% | 871 | 31.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,137 | 4.40\% | 152 | 5.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,284 | 12.80\% | 360 | 13.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,760 | 6.90\% | 208 | 7.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 9,087 | 35.50\% | 1,127 | 41.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 7,751 | 30.30\% | 753 | 27.4\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 82,357 | 100\% | 9,946 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 11,229 | 13.60\% | 1,393 | 14.0\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## City of Elgin: Water Treatment Plan - \$4,899,840-Addressed Risk: Storms

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Elgin, benefitting 58.03\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $20.01 \%$ greater than Bastrop County's LMI percentage of $48.36 \%$ and $29.95 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The Pistol Hill Ground Storage Tank project will add an additional water storage tank and increase the amount of water available to all of Elgin. During previous disaster events, the city and its citizens were faced with water pressure issues that could have impacted clean water access. With an additional water storage tank, the city will have the capacity and availability to provide water and lessen the suffering of its citizens during a disaster.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Elgin is a community of 10,064 residents in Bastrop County $(84,522)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Elgin is $\$ 58,816,8.95 \%$ less than Bastrop County's median income of $\$ 64,597$, and $12.77 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Elgin has an AMFI of \$69,757 according to ACS 2019. This is $71 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 97,600$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Austin-Round Rock, TX MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Elgin is at $14.20 \%$, compared to Bastrop County's poverty rate of $10.00 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Elgin's population is $44.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Bastrop County's $37.70 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Elgin is $26.80 \%$ white alone, less than Bastrop County's white alone percentage of $52.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Elgin is $27.10 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Bastrop County ( $7.10 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

The city of Elgin is a majority minority city with racial and ethnic minorities making up $71.9 \%$ of the community. This is significantly greater than Bastrop County as a whole which has a $44.8 \%$ racial and ethnic minority population. With poverty averaging $13.3 \%$ in Elgin, there are no R/ECAPs in the community even with the racial and ethnic concentrations.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $86.10 \%$ in the city of Elgin, less than $88.00 \%$ in Bastrop County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Elgin, $31.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $24.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Elgin's households are $5.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no
spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $4.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Elgin's households are $13.10 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Bastrop County at $12.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Elgin are $7.60 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Bastrop County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $6.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Elgin $41.00 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Bastrop County, which is at $35.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Elgin that have one or more people of 65 or older is $27.40 \%$, which is less than Bastrop County's $30.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Elgin is $14.00 \%$ which is greater than Bastrop County's $13.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The project appears to support all residents who have water service equally, and therefore it is not beneficial or prejudicial to any particular group of residents. The location in Census Tract 9502 Block Group 5 has a higher concentration of people of Hispanic or Latino origin, and fewer White not of Hispanic or Latino origin residents. However, it does not appear that the project will be disruptive to large parts of the community. The project area has limited housing (one house directly across the street), and is more agricultural than residential in nature.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Bastrop County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0823-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Elgin |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 48.36\% |  | 58.03\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$64,597 |  | \$58,816 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 10.00\% |  | 14.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 84,522 |  | 10,064 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 31,852 | 37.70\% | 4,515 | 44.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 52,670 | 62.30\% | 5,549 | 55.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 44,228 | 52.30\% | 2,699 | 26.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,977 | 7.10\% | 2,730 | 27.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 228 | 0.30\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 710 | 0.80\% | 29 | 0.3\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 371 | 0.40\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,156 | 1.40\% | 91 | 0.9\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 74,407 | 88.00\% | 8,741 | 86.9\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 72,629 | 85.90\% | 8,662 | 86.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 1,778 | 2.10\% | 79 | 0.8\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 10,115 | 12.00\% | 1,323 | 13.1\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 42,810 | 50.60\% | 4,912 | 48.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 41,712 | 49.40\% | 5,152 | 51.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 25,571 | 100\% | 2,750 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 14,204 | 55.50\% | 1,465 | 53.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,482 | 21.40\% | 692 | 25.2\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,435 | 5.60\% | 139 | 5.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 557 | 2.20\% | 69 | 2.5\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Bastrop County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0823-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Elgin |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 3,744 | 14.60\% | 275 | 10.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 395 | 1.50\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,569 | 10.00\% | 252 | 9.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 701 | 2.70\% | 65 | 2.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 6,188 | 24.20\% | 871 | 31.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,137 | 4.40\% | 152 | 5.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,284 | 12.80\% | 360 | 13.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,760 | 6.90\% | 208 | 7.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 9,087 | 35.50\% | 1,127 | 41.00\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 7,751 | 30.30\% | 753 | 27.4\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 82,357 | 100\% | 9,946 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 11,229 | 13.60\% | 1,393 | 14.0\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Bastrop: Agnes Road Extension Project - \$4,240,329.20 - Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Bastrop, benefitting 63.89\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $28.87 \%$ greater than the City of Bastrop's LMI percentage of $49.58 \%, 32.12 \%$ greater than Bastrop County's LMI percentage of $48.36 \%$ and $43.06 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Texas Highway 71 through Bastrop is a state designated major hurricane evacuation route as well as an evacuation route for other flood-related events throughout central Texas. During these times when traffic is heavy or stopped along the route through Bastrop, Highway 71 is impassable, and first responders have difficulty providing service south of the highway and west of the river due to a lack of alternate east and west connector roads. The extension of Agnes Road will reduce the response time of first responders to these rapidly developing areas on the southwest side of the city by providing an alternate route from Fire Station 1 to this southwest area of Bastrop.

The project will improve a roadway with the acquisition of two partial tracts of vacant land and the construction of a two-lane asphalt pavement section with concrete curb and gutter from Home Depot Way to the existing Agnes Road.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 3,905 within the city of Bastrop, a community of 8,776 residents in Bastrop County $(84,522)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The AMFI of Census Tract 9504 is $\$ 82,118$ according to ACS 2019. The city of Bastrop's AMFI is $\$ 75,878$ which is $78 \%$ of the HUD Bastrop County income of $\$ 97,600$. Bastrop County is within the Austin-Round Rock TX MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $5.50 \%$, equal to the city of Bastrop which is at $5.50 \%$, less than Bastrop County's poverty rate of $10.00 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Bastrop increased to $13.2 \%$

The project beneficiary area is $15.35 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, less than the city of Bastrop's population percentage of $24.50 \%$, less than Bastrop County's $37.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $75.53 \%$ white alone, greater than the city of Bastrop's percentage of $67.90 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $52.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $4.28 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is greater than the city of Bastrop, which has $3.30 \%$, less than Bastrop County ( $7.10 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $3.46 \%$ two or more races, greater than the city of Bastrop
at $1.80 \%$, greater than Bastrop County, which is at $1.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The diversity of the project area and of Bastrop is changing. In the 2020 Census, the Hispanic or Latino population went from being $15.3 \%$ of Census Tract 9504 Block Group 2 to $22 \%$ in the same block group. The Black or African American population rose from $1.9 \%$ to $8.7 \%$, causing a racial and ethnic percentage rise from $16 \%$ to $30.7 \%$ in the Block Group where the work will be done.

This is similar to the city of Bastrop, where the White not of Hispanic or Latino origin demographic dropped by $10 \%$ points from $67.9 \%$ to $57.7 \%$ from the 2019 ACS to the 2020 Census data. There does not appear to be concentrated areas of poverty or minorities within the community. In addition to having access to the Hospital without driving on the major highway, this area has access to Walmart, other retail outlets, Home Depot, fast food restaurants and new housing that would benefit the entire community. The road to be connected appears to run through an empty field that will link the two portions of road together (Agnes and Home Depot Way); providing local access without having to go onto the major highway or feeder roads.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $96.11 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than $95.40 \%$ in the city of Bastrop, greater than Bastrop County at $88.00 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $49.46 \%$ male, less than the city of Bastrop at $49.90 \%$, less than Bastrop County $(50.60 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $50.54 \%$ female, greater than the city of Bastrop at $50.10 \%$, greater than the $49.40 \%$ of Bastrop County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $50.43 \%$ married couple families, greater than the city of Bastrop at $51.80 \%$ less than Bastrop County's $55.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $16.87 \%$, less than the city of Bastrop at $25.40 \%$, less than Bastrop County's percentage of $21.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $7.05 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than the city of Bastrop's percentage of $4.90 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $5.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.65 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than the city of Bastrop at $0.00 \%$, less than Bastrop County's $2.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $29.38 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of Bastrop at $33.70 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's percentage of $24.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $4.35 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18 , less than the city of Bastrop which is at $7.60 \%$, less than Bastrop County's percentage of $4.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $19.17 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the city of Bastrop at $21.80 \%$, greater than Bastrop County at $12.80 \%$ and
greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $9.27 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than the city of Bastrop who is at $12.30 \%$, greater than Bastrop County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

The project beneficiary area is comprised of $13.14 \%$ households that are occupied by a male with no spouse or partner present, greater than the city of Bastrop at $9.60 \%$, less than Bastrop County $(14.60 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $17.6 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $0.00 \%$ occupied by a male householder with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18 , less than the city of Bastrop at $1.00 \%$, less than Bastrop County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $1.4 \%$. The project beneficiary area has $11.83 \%$ of households that are occupied by a male living alone, which is greater than the city of Bastrop $7.40 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's $10.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage $11.8 \%$. The project beneficiary area has $1.59 \%$ households occupied by a male householder with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , less than the city of Bastrop at $1.80 \%$, less than Bastrop County, which is at $2.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area, which has $2.7 \%$

In the project eligibility area, $26.25 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the city of Bastrop at $36.70 \%$, less than Bastrop County, which is at $35.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $32.42 \%$, greater than the city of Bastrop at $30.50 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's $30.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $16.52 \%$, greater than the city of Bastrop at $14.70 \%$, greater than Bastrop County's $13.60 \%$,and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

At the time of the site review, there were two new sections of the Pecan Park area with new homes being constructed, including some garden homes near the proposed extension. Bastrop is a growing community ( 8,776 in ACS 2019 and 9,668 in 2020 Census data). The extension could relieve pressure on the evacuation route and make access to the hospital more expedient.

At the other end of Agnes behind the Walmart, there is a relatively new, but more established neighborhood along with multifamily apartments.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Bastrop County |  | City of Bastrop |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1003-APP City of Bastrop |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 48.36\% |  | 49.58\% |  | 63.89\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$64,597 |  | \$56,425 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.00\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 84,522 |  | 8,776 |  | 9,375 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 31,852 | 37.70\% | 2152 | 24.5\% | 1439 | 15.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 52,670 | 62.30\% | 6,624 | 75.5\% | 7936 | 84.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 44,228 | 52.30\% | 5,955 | 67.9\% | 7081 | 75.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,977 | 7.10\% | 288 | 3.3\% | 401 | 4.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 228 | 0.30\% | 29 | 0.3\% | 49 | 0.5\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 710 | 0.80\% | 198 | 2.3\% | 47 | 0.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 371 | 0.40\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 34 | 0.36\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,156 | 1.40\% | 154 | 1.80\% | 324 | 3.46\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 74,407 | 88.00\% | 8,374 | 95.4\% | 9,061 | 96.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 72,629 | 85.90\% | 8,284 | 94.4\% | 9,010 | 96.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 1,778 | 2.10\% | 90 | 1.0\% | 51 | 0.5\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 10,115 | 12.00\% | 402 | 5\% | 314 | 3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 42,810 | 50.60\% | 4,380 | 49.9\% | 4,637 | 49.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 41,712 | 49.40\% | 4,396 | 50.1\% | 4,738 | 50.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 25,571 | 100\% | 3,109 | 100\% | 3,516 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 14,204 | 55.50\% | 1,612 | 51.8\% | 1,773 | 50.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,482 | 21.40\% | 789 | 25.4\% | 593 | 16.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,435 | 5.60\% | 151 | 4.9\% | 248 | 7.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 557 | 2.20\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 58 | 1.6\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Bastrop County |  | City of Bastrop |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1003-APP City of Bastrop Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 3,744 | 14.60\% | 299 | 9.6\% | 462 | 13.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 395 | 1.50\% | 31 | 1.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,569 | 10.00\% | 230 | 7.4\% | 416 | 11.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 701 | 2.70\% | 56 | 1.8\% | 56 | 1.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 6,188 | 24.20\% | 1047 | 33.7\% | 1,033 | 29.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,137 | 4.40\% | 237 | 7.6\% | 153 | 4.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,284 | 12.80\% | 677 | 21.8\% | 674 | 19.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,760 | 6.90\% | 381 | 12.3\% | 326 | 9.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 9,087 | 35.50\% | 1140 | 36.7\% | 923 | 26.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 7,751 | 30.30\% | 948 | 30.5\% | 1,140 | 32.4\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 82,357 | 100\% | 8,201 | 100\% | 8,867 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 11,229 | 13.60\% | 1209 | 14.7\% | 1,465 | 16.5\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or <br> Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov <br> ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov <br> ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Bastrop County: Project Service Areas



## Funding \$ by Awardee

14,000,00


| Awardee | Application ID | Total Benefs. |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| City of Bastrop | CDR17-1003-APP | 3,905 |
| City of Elgin | CDR17-0823-APP | 8,090 |
| City of Elgin | CDR17-0824-APP | 8,090 |
| City of Smithville | CDR17-1021-APP | 2,635 |

Awardee Application ID CDR17-1003-APP
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { City of Elgin } & \text { CDR17-0823-APP } \\ \text { City of Elgin } & \text { CDR17-0824-APP }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { City of Elgin } & \text { CDR17-0823-APP } \\ \text { City of Elgin } & \text { CDR17-0824-APP }\end{array}$ 2,635

$\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{B}^{\prime \prime}$

## Bastrop County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Bastrop County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Premont: Drainage Improvements and Flood Mitigation Project - \$13,115,995 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Premont, benefitting 55.28\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $35.17 \%$ greater than Jim Wells County's LMI percentage of $40.90 \%$ and $23.79 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Although located 50 miles inland, the city of Premont frequently bears the harsh impact of tropical storms and hurricanes that devastate the Gulf Coast annually. With severe storms stalling as they encroach inland, the city often becomes the recipient of torrential unforgiving rains. When there are severe weather events Premont's watershed becomes immediately overwhelmed leaving the city incapacitated. The relatively "flat slope" terrain and low soil permeability adds to the city's susceptibility as many drainageways are constricted by inadequate channel capacities. The project will increase the resiliency and capacity of the drainage system, allowing storm water to flow offsite faster, and be detained. This will thereby alleviate future flooding potential, and reduce/eliminate damage to roads, residential properties, and critical utilities.

To accomplish this, the project encompasses drainage channel rehabilitation, drainage channel widening and deepening, installation of properly sized culvert systems, and creation of retention ponds:

- Ditch work- 3,390 LF
- Detention Ponds- 57,482 acres
- Drainpipe- Northwest $3^{\text {rd }} 2,851$ LF
- HMAC Pavement- 19,157 SY

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Premont is a community of 2,580 residents in Jim Wells County $(40,972)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Premont is $\$ 47,879,15.36 \%$ greater than Jim Wells County's median income of $\$ 41,505$, and $8.20 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Premont's AMFI is $\$ 54,931$. This is $99 \%$ of HUD's AMFI for Jim Wells County which is $\$ 55,400$. Jim Wells is not in a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Premont was $25.00 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County's poverty rate of $23.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The Premont poverty rate decreased to $20.4 \%$ in the ACS 2019 data estimates.

The city of Premont's population is $90.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Jim Wells County's $80.30 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The
population of Premont is $9.30 \%$ white alone, less than Jim Wells County's white alone percentage of $18.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Premont is $0.30 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Jim Wells County ( $0.60 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The city of Premont is $0.30 \%$ Asian alone, less than Jim Wells County's percentage of $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

The population of Premont is $90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin. The projects seem to be designed to benefit all residents by limiting home flooding and allowing for egress during weather events. It does not appear that the projects will benefit or burden any demographic at greater levels than the any other demographic of the population.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $87.30 \%$ in the city of Premont, less than $94.40 \%$ in Jim Wells County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Premont is $56.70 \%$ male, greater than Jim Wells County (49.10\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Premont is $43.30 \%$ female, less than the $50.90 \%$ of Jim Wells County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of 50.4\%.

In the city of Premont, $35.30 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Jim Wells County's percentage of $30.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Premont's households are $1.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18 , less than Jim Wells County's percentage of $7.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Premont's households are $14.80 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Jim Wells County at $14.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Premont are $6.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it equal to Jim Wells County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.30 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Premont $22.00 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Jim Wells County, which is at $34.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Premont that have one or more people of 65 or older is $39.80 \%$, which is greater than Jim Wells County's $31.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Premont is $24.30 \%$ which is greater than Jim Wells County's $15.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Throughout most of Premont and near the project sites, the housing consists of rural style houses or MHUs that are generally well-kept. There are exceptions at both ends of the city with some larger homes and homes with deferred maintenance.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1057-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Jim Wells | unty | City of Premont |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.90\% |  | 55.28\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$41,505 |  | \$47,879 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 23.00\% |  | 25.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 40,972 |  | 2,580 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 32,893 | 80.30\% | 2,324 | 90.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 8,079 | 19.70\% | 256 | 9.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 7,357 | 18.00\% | 241 | 9.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 255 | 0.60\% | 8 | 0.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 82 | 0.20\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 210 | 0.50\% | 7 | 0.3\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 54 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 13 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 108 | 0.30\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 38,659 | 94.40\% | 2,274 | 88.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 38,534 | 94.00\% | 2,252 | 87.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 125 | 0.30\% | 22 | 0.9\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,313 | 5.60\% | 306 | 11.9\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 20,117 | 49.10\% | 1,463 | 56.7\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 20,855 | 50.90\% | 1,117 | 43.3\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,987 | 100\% | 822 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,321 | 48.70\% | 401 | 48.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,259 | 17.40\% | 99 | 12.0\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 755 | 5.80\% | 27 | 3.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 343 | 2.60\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jim Wells County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1057-APP City of Premont City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,013 | 15.50\% | 104 | 12.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 227 | 1.70\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,281 | 9.90\% | 52 | 6.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 435 | 3.30\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,898 | 30.00\% | 290 | 35.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 999 | 7.70\% | 15 | 1.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,823 | 14.00\% | 122 | 14.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 824 | 6.30\% | 52 | 6.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 4,528 | 34.90\% | 181 | 22.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,082 | 31.40\% | 327 | 39.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 40,584 | 100\% | 2,544 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,422 | 15.80\% | 618 | 24.3\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides an area benefit within Jim Wells County, benefitting 54.87\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $26.00 \%, 34.16 \%$ greater than Jim Wells County's LMI percentage of $40.90 \%$ and $22.87 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The Jim Wells County mitigation project will make improvements to the county drainage system in the Rancho Alegre and Alice Acres Census Designated Places (CDPs). These improvements will help to mitigate flooding issues in this rural area.

This will be achieved through rehabilitation of drainage channels by widening and deepening, installation of properly sized culvert systems, and creation of retention ponds to capture stormwater runoff. The drainage project will hasten the flow of storm water runoff away from the CDPs, restore resiliency, and reduce the risk to public health and safety.

This will be accomplished by the following:

- Rancho Alegre CDP
- Ditch Improvements: 5,440 LF
- Detention Pond Improvements: 152,750 CY
- Drainage Improvement: 12,847 LF
- Alice Acres CDP
- Ditch Improvements: 26,560 LF
- Detention Pond Improvements: 82,250 acres
- Drainage Improvement: 9,303 LF

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 1,950 within Jim Wells County, $(40,972)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Alice Acres has an AMFI of $\$ 90,493$ and Rancho Alegre has an AMFI of $\$ 57,520$ according to ACS 2019. This is $163 \%$ and $103 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Jim Wells County of $\$ 55,400$. Jim Wells is not within a HUD recognized MSA. It is important to note that the Census survey data is reporting an extremely high margin of error. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $23.00 \%$, less than Jim Wells County's poverty rate of $23.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $80.54 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than Jim Wells County's $80.30 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $17.34 \%$ white alone, less than Jim Wells County's percentage of $18.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $1.02 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, greater than Jim Wells County ( $0.60 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$, less than Jim Wells County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $1.10 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Jim Wells County's percentage of $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$, less than Jim Wells County ( $0.100 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$ some other race alone, equal to Jim Wells County's percentage of $0.00 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$ two or more races, less than Jim Wells County, which is at $0.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

We are focusing on the work sites in the two named Colonias (also a CDP by the Census Bureau). Rancho Alegre is the more populated of the two areas with 1,123 residents that in include no Black or African Americans and 94.8\% Hispanic or Latino origin residents.

Alice Acres has 254 residents, 178 ( $70 \%$ ) of which are Hispanic or Latino origin. There are 76 White not of Hispanic or Latino origin residents in Alice Acres and no Black or African American residents. The Median home value in Alice Aces is $\$ 81,000$. The poverty rate is listed at $0 \%$ (there is a $+/$ - margin of error of $15.4 \%$ ).

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $94.07 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than $92.50 \%$ in Jim Wells County, less than Jim Wells County at $94.40 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $48.21 \%$ married couple families, less than Jim Wells County's $48.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $31.18 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Jim Wells County's percentage of $30.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $11.66 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Jim Wells County's percentage of $7.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $14.19 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Jim Wells County at $14.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $6.47 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , greater than Jim Wells County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.30 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $16.39 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County's $15.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

Alice Acres and Rancho Alegre are listed as Colonias in the application and Census Designated Places. The Secretary of State statue defines a "Colonia" as a geographic area that:
(1) is an economically distressed area as defined by Section 17.921, Water Code;
(2) is located in a county any part of which is within 62 miles of an international border; and
(3) consists of 11 or more dwellings that are located in close proximity to each other in an area that may be described as a community or neighborhood.

McMaster in Rancho Alegre looks and feels like colonia housing. Small housing units are present, and many are in need of repair. Rancho Alegre has 196 houses valued at less than $\$ 50,000$. There are 36 houses valued between $\$ 50,000$ and $\$ 99,999$, and no houses valued over $\$ 100,000$. In Rayo, the houses are more mixed as to type and quality. FM 135 is a somewhat more traditional neighborhood with some brick homes and MHUs present.

Alice Acres is a different type of Colonia. It has mixed housing with many MHUs present. According to the ACS 2019 estimate, the Median home value in Alice Acres is $\$ 81,000$. There are no rental units in Alice Acres. The detention pond here is behind two houses in a remote area.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jim Wells County |  | City of Alice |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1055-APP Jim Wells County Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.90\% |  | 43.55\% |  | 54.87\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$41,505 |  | \$36,059 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 23.00\% |  | 25.70\% |  | 23.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 40,972 |  | 19,007 |  | 14,852 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 32,893 | 80.30\% | 16,031 | 84.3\% | 11,962 | 80.5\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 8,079 | 19.70\% | 2,976 | 15.7\% | 2,890 | 19.5\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 7,357 | 18.00\% | 2,312 | 12.2\% | 2,575 | 17.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 255 | 0.60\% | 221 | 1.2\% | 151 | 1.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 82 | 0.20\% | 82 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 210 | 0.50\% | 194 | 1.0\% | 164 | 1.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 54 | 0.10\% | 54 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 13 | 0.00\% | 13 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 108 | 0.30\% | 100 | 0.50\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 38,659 | 94.40\% | 17,577 | 92.5\% | 14,075 | 94.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 38,534 | 94.00\% | 17,529 | 92.2\% | 13,972 | 94.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 125 | 0.30\% | 48 | 0.3\% | 103 | 0.7\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,313 | 5.60\% | 1,430 | 8\% | 777 | 5\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 20,117 | 49.10\% | 8,856 | 46.6\% | 7,040 | 47.4\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 20,855 | 50.90\% | 10,151 | 53.4\% | 7,812 | 52.6\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,987 | 100\% | 6,472 | 100\% | 4,821 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,321 | 48.70\% | 2,774 | 42.9\% | 2,324 | 48.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,259 | 17.40\% | 984 | 15.2\% | 659 | 13.7\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 755 | 5.80\% | 450 | 7.0\% | 365 | 7.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 343 | 2.60\% | 224 | 3.5\% | 138 | 2.9\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jim Wells County |  | City of Alice |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1055-APP Jim Wells County Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,013 | 15.50\% | 995 | 15.4\% | 629 | 13.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 227 | 1.70\% | 165 | 2.5\% | 137 | 2.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,281 | 9.90\% | 623 | 9.6\% | 385 | 8.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 435 | 3.30\% | 232 | 3.6\% | 125 | 2.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,898 | 30.00\% | 2,253 | 34.8\% | 1,503 | 31.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 999 | 7.70\% | 547 | 8.5\% | 562 | 11.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,823 | 14.00\% | 1,107 | 17.1\% | 684 | 14.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 824 | 6.30\% | 445 | 6.9\% | 312 | 6.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 4,528 | 34.90\% | 2,078 | 32.1\% | 1,665 | 34.5\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,082 | 31.40\% | 1,849 | 28.6\% | 1,477 | 30.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 40,584 | 100\% | 18,707 | 100\% | 14,676 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,422 | 15.80\% | 2,634 | 14.1\% | 2,406 | 16.4\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Alice: Virginia St. Area Drainage Project - \$6,942,192.60 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Alice, benefitting 56.00\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $28.59 \%$ greater than the City of Alice's LMI percentage of $43.55 \%, 36.92 \%$ greater than Jim Wells County's LMI percentage of $40.90 \%$ and $25.39 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

This project will increase the resiliency of the existing drainage system in the Virginia Street area, located in the southern portion of the city of Alice. The City has suffered extensive flooding due to severe weather events, and the roads in the Virginia Street area lack adequate drainage structures to direct water away from streets and homes. The flooding renders streets impassable, stranding residents in their homes and preventing first responder operations. The proposed project will reconstruct the existing streets, will upgrade storm sewers, and will improve roadside ditches. These improvements will mitigate water ponding and provide a defined pathway for run off to be conveyed, thereby directing water away from residences and allowing streets to remain accessible.

The project has is composed of two sites:
Site 1: work will occur on S. Reynolds Street, Old Kingsville Road, Mora Street, Oliver Street, Mary Vera Street, Virginia Street and Prado Street. Construction will consist of the following:

1. $5,551 \mathrm{LF}$ of new street curb and gutter will be installed
2. $7,650 \mathrm{LF}$ of road will be reconstructed, along with sidewalk, curb inlets, and all related appurtenances
3. $5,280 \mathrm{LF}$ of sewer pipes will be cleaned out

Site 2: work will occur on S. Reynolds Street and along the ditch located south of, and running parallel to, Hughes Street. Construction will consist of the following:

1. 3,500 LF of ditches will be reshaped and regraded
2. $3,500 \mathrm{LF}$ of road will be reconstructed
3. 16 culverts with safety end treatments will be installed
4. 1 storm water drainage equalizer will be installed
5. Existing sewer pipes will be removed and replaced, for a total of 350 LF

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 4,125 within the city of Alice, a community of 19,007 residents in Jim Wells County $(40,972)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The City of Alice has an AMFI of $\$ 45,777$ according to the ACS 2019. This is $83 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Jim Wells County of $\$ 55,400$. Jim Wells is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $25.70 \%$, equal to the city of Alice which is at $25.70 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County's poverty rate of $23.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $84.39 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than the city of Alice's population percentage of $84.30 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County's $80.30 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $11.98 \%$ white alone, less than the city of Alice's percentage of $12.20 \%$, less than Jim Wells County's percentage of $18.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $1.38 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is greater than the city of Alice, which has $1.20 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County ( $0.60 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.75 \%$, greater than the city of Alice, which is at $0.40 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $1.50 \%$ Asian alone, greater than the city of Alice at $1.00 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County's percentage of $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$, less than the city of Alice at $0.30 \%$, less than Jim Wells County ( $0.100 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$ some other race alone, less than the city of Alice, which is at $0.10 \%$, equal to Jim Wells County's percentage of $0.00 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$ two or more races, less than the city of Alice at $0.50 \%$, less than Jim Wells County, which is at $0.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The area appears to be in Census Tract 9506 Block Group 1, although we also looked at Block Group 3 that is near Virginia Street. The block groups are both almost entirely Hispanic, with $95.4 \%$ and $94.9 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin demographics, respectively. The largest nonHispanic or Latino race or ethnicity group is the American Indian or Alaska Native population with 62 people or $4.1 \%$ of Block Group 1 .

The City of Alice is less concentrated than the Virginia Street area, but it is still predominately Hispanic or Latino at $84.3 \%$. Whites, not of Hispanic or Latino origin make up $12.2 \%$ of the City's population. There are 221 Blacks or African Americans equaling $1.2 \%$ of the residents. Jim Wells County has a heavy concentration of Hispanic and Latino residents, but fortunately, poverty across the County and in the beneficiary, area is between $20 \%$ and $25 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $40.14 \%$ married couple families, greater than the city of Alice at $42.90 \%$ less than Jim Wells County's $48.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $11.35 \%$, less than the city of Alice
at $15.20 \%$, less than Jim Wells County's percentage of $17.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $34.75 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of Alice at $34.80 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County's percentage of $30.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $8.45 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than the city of Alice which is at $8.50 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County's percentage of $7.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $15.21 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the city of Alice at $17.10 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County at $14.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $7.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than the city of Alice who is at $6.90 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.30 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $29.14 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the city of Alice at $32.10 \%$, less than Jim Wells County, which is at $34.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $32.43 \%$, greater than the city of Alice at $28.60 \%$, greater than Jim Wells County's $31.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $14.62 \%$, greater than the city of Alice at $14.10 \%$, less than Jim Wells County's $15.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

Houses in the Virginia Street area are generally smaller, older homes with wood siding. There are some MHUs present. Many have fenced front yards and parking on the street. There are open lots as well. There are homes with deferred maintenance present. There are generally no curbs or gutters, and the roads are of mixed quality. The project is listed as the Virginia Street Area Drainage. We did not have a map of the streets that are planned to be repaired, but because of the size of the area, we were able to drive in multi block directions from Virginia which is a one block street.

Our windshield survey confirms that the area appears to be predominately a Hispanic or Latino origin population. The work should provide flooding relief as there is very little drainage in the community at this time. There may be some disruption during the construction, but it should upgrade the entire neighborhood.

While the concentration of Hispanic or Latino origin residents in the project area is high, it is not too different from the demographics in the city of Alice overall. From the site visit, it seems the area needs the work to be performed and the project will benefit the local residents in the defined project area by providing flooding protection.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jim Wells County |  | City of Alice |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Harvey (State MID) } \\ \text { CDR17-0902-APP } \\ \text { City of Alice } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 40.90\% |  | 43.55\% |  | 56.00\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$41,505 |  | \$36,059 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 23.00\% |  | 25.70\% |  | 25.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 40,972 |  | 19,007 |  | 10,950 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 32,893 | 80.30\% | 16,031 | 84.3\% | 9,241 | 84.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 8,079 | 19.70\% | 2,976 | 15.7\% | 1,709 | 15.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 7,357 | 18.00\% | 2,312 | 12.2\% | 1,312 | 12.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 255 | 0.60\% | 221 | 1.2\% | 151 | 1.4\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 82 | 0.20\% | 82 | 0.4\% | 82 | 0.7\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 210 | 0.50\% | 194 | 1.0\% | 164 | 1.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 54 | 0.10\% | 54 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 13 | 0.00\% | 13 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 108 | 0.30\% | 100 | 0.50\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 38,659 | 94.40\% | 17,577 | 92.5\% | 10,061 | 91.9\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 38,534 | 94.00\% | 17,529 | 92.2\% | 10,013 | 91.4\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 125 | 0.30\% | 48 | 0.3\% | 48 | 0.4\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,313 | 5.60\% | 1,430 | 8\% | 889 | 8\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 20,117 | 49.10\% | 8,856 | 46.6\% | 5,095 | 46.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 20,855 | 50.90\% | 10,151 | 53.4\% | 5,855 | 53.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,987 | 100\% | 6,472 | 100\% | 3919 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,321 | 48.70\% | 2,774 | 42.9\% | 1573 | 40.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,259 | 17.40\% | 984 | 15.2\% | 445 | 11.4\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 755 | 5.80\% | 450 | 7.0\% | 347 | 8.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 343 | 2.60\% | 224 | 3.5\% | 119 | 3.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jim Wells County |  | City of Alice |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0902-APP <br> City of Alice <br> Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,013 | 15.50\% | 995 | 15.4\% | 637 | 16.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 227 | 1.70\% | 165 | 2.5\% | 124 | 3.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,281 | 9.90\% | 623 | 9.6\% | 468 | 11.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 435 | 3.30\% | 232 | 3.6\% | 165 | 4.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,898 | 30.00\% | 2,253 | 34.8\% | 1,362 | 34.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 999 | 7.70\% | 547 | 8.5\% | 331 | 8.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,823 | 14.00\% | 1,107 | 17.1\% | 596 | 15.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 824 | 6.30\% | 445 | 6.9\% | 294 | 7.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 4,528 | 34.90\% | 2,078 | 32.1\% | 1,142 | 29.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,082 | 31.40\% | 1,849 | 28.6\% | 1,271 | 32.4\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 40,584 | 100\% | 18,707 | 100\% | 10,826 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,422 | 15.80\% | 2,634 | 14.1\% | 1,583 | 14.6\% |
| ² Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD orHousehold Surveys${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Jim Wells County: Project Service Areas
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## Jim Wells County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




## City of Cameron: Little River Pump Station Improvements Project - \$14,125,469 - Addressed Risk:

 Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical DepressionsThis project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Cameron, benefitting 72.11\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $65.13 \%$ greater than Milam County's LMI percentage of $43.67 \%$ and $61.47 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Cameron has an existing four (4) million gallons per day (MGD) pump station and low water impoundment located on the Little River that is in danger of being cut-off from the river by necking occurring just upstream of the existing pump station. Continued flooding has caused erosion of the riverbank near the existing pump station and impoundment, which is causing an oxbow to form that will leave the segment of the river without water.

The project will relocate the pump station and low head impoundment to ensure access to a dependable water supply during future storm events. This project will ensure that a safe and dependable water supply is available to residents.

The project includes the following improvements:

- Pump Station \& Low Head Impoundment: One 4 MGD pump station 7,450 linear feet (LF) of raw water supply line; 5,000 LF of effluent discharge line located.
- Raw Water Supply Line: From the proposed pump station location, cross-country following the west bank of the Little River north to the east end of E. Gillis St., and from the east end of E. Gillis St. west to the Water Treatment Plant.
- Effluent Discharge Line: From the existing connection of the wastewater treatment plant, effluent discharge line located approximately 450 ' northeast of the endpoint of E. Gillis St., cross-country following the west bank of the Little River south approximately 4,400 feet.
- Access road with four manholes, concrete bridge, rip rap, and fencing.
- Elevated electrical building, supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system, generator, electrical modifications, and all related appurtenances.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

At the time of application, Cameron had 5,489 residents in Milam County $(24,770)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Cameron is $\$ 37,448,21.82 \%$ less than Milam County's median income of $\$ 47,902$, and $28.20 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Cameron has an AMFI of $\$ 45,417$ according to ACS 2019. This is $78 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 58,100$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Milan County, TX HUD Income Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in
the city of Cameron was $24.60 \%$, compared to Milam County's poverty rate of $14.60 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Cameron increased to $29.8 \%$ while Milam County's poverty rate increased to $15.4 \%$.

The city of Cameron's population at the time of the application was 27.10\% Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Milam County's $26.40 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Cameron is $49.80 \%$ white alone, less than Milam County's white alone percentage of $62.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Cameron is $21.40 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Milam County ( $9.20 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

The current trend based on the 2020 Census shows that the City of Cameron is now $55.3 \%$ Black/African American/Hispanic or Latino origin in population. The populations of both Black and African American ( $21.40 \%$ versus $18.4 \%$ ) and White not of Hispanic Origin ( $49.8 \%$ versus $42 \%$ ) have decreased. Even with the overall drop in population, the Hispanic or Latino population increased by 468 people - just under $9 \%$-- and comprises $36.9 \%$ of the population. When conducting a site visit, the location was not accessible as it is remote, and access is blocked from visitation. There is limited housing near the location on East Gillis, and the housing tends to be smaller wood homes and MHUs (one larger MHU community is near the existing site but not adjacent). Much of the land closest to the site appears to be owned by the City of Cameron or is open agricultural land. Still East Gillis should be considered for repairs in support of the community.

Cameron is not a large community in size and all its residents have similar access to community amenities and services. As stated previously, there is limited housing near the site and the neighborhoods in Cameron appear to be generally mixed with one or two limited streets having some historic housing. The services offered and maintenance appear to be similar in nature for most residents.

The benefits anticipated to be provided extend to all residents equally according to the application narrative. When the project is completed, the community will be a majority minority community, and all residents are expected to benefit. Other than some additional traffic during construction for the limited number of residents on the street leading to the construction site, the project does not appear to unduly burden any part of the community.

In the city of Cameron, $40.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Milam County's percentage of $27.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Cameron's households are $14.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Milam County's percentage of $6.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Cameron's households are $14.30 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Milam County at $13.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Cameron are $8.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Milam County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $7.30 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Cameron, $28.90 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Milam County, which is at $28.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Cameron that have one or more people of 65 or older is $37.60 \%$, which is greater than Milam County's $36.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's 24.5\%.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Cameron is $17.50 \%$ which is greater than Milam County's $16.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-0836-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Milam |  | City of Cameron |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 43.67\% |  | 72.11\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$47,902 |  | \$37,448 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.60\% |  | 24.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 24,770 |  | 5,489 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 6,546 | 26.4\% | 1,490 | 27.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 18,224 | 73.6\% | 3,999 | 72.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 15,447 | 62.4\% | 2,734 | 49.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,279 | 9.2\% | 1,177 | 21.4\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 66 | 0.3\% | 27 | 0.5\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 129 | 0.5\% | 27 | 0.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 295 | 1.2\% | 34 | 0.6\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 23,603 | 95.3\% | 5,076 | 92.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 23,293 | 94.0\% | 5,013 | 91.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 310 | 1.3\% | 63 | 1.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,167 | 4.7\% | 413 | 7.5\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 12,270 | 49.5\% | 2,885 | 52.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 12,500 | 50.5\% | 2,604 | 47.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 9,228 | 100\% | 2,000 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,768 | 51.7\% | 711 | 35.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,572 | 17.0\% | 146 | 7.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 298 | 3.2\% | 43 | 2.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 87 | 0.9\% | 30 | 1.5\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Milam County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0836-APP City of Cameron City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,629 | 17.7\% | 434 | 21.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 67 | 0.7\% | 39 | 2.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,348 | 14.6\% | 350 | 17.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 575 | 6.2\% | 250 | 12.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,533 | 27.4\% | 812 | 40.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 553 | 6.0\% | 289 | 14.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,277 | 13.8\% | 285 | 14.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 671 | 7.3\% | 164 | 8.2\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,594 | 28.1\% | 578 | 28.9\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,351 | 36.3\% | 752 | 37.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 24,254 | 100\% | 5,197 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,067 | 16.8\% | 908 | 17.5\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Buckholts: Sewer and Stormwater Improvements Project - \$4,479,940-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Buckholts, benefitting 75.53\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $72.96 \%$ greater than Milam County's LMI percentage of $43.67 \%$ and $69.13 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Although Buckholts is more inland, the resulting tropical storms and depressions are historically still carrying heavy rains when they reach the town, resulting in major flooding, housing damage, environmental health hazards, and damage to an already burdened infrastructure.

The project is designed as an integrative, comprehensive approach to address the effects of flooding throughout the entire town. The goal is to alleviate the flooding at the lift stations to reduce the volume of water in the central collection system and ultimately the wastewater treatment plant. These improvements are broken into two infrastructure activities - sewer lines and flood control drainage - both activities address flooding risks and reduce/mitigate the impact on housing, infrastructure, and human health conditions.

Wastewater system improvements

1. Remove and install twenty-four (24) new sewer line cleanouts
2. Remove and replace twenty-six (26) new manholes in the outer collections system to prevent infiltration and inflow and decrease the risk on the downstream system

Flood control and drainage Improvements

1. Excavate and replace 20500 linear feet (LF) of gravity sewer
2. Remove 100 existing culverts and replace them with 3200 LF of reinforced concrete pipe culverts
3. Repair of 4000 LF of sewer line pavement

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Buckholts is a community of 417 residents in Milam County $(24,770)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Buckholts is $\$ 41,528,13.31 \%$ less than Milam County's median income of $\$ 47,902$, and $20.38 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The Buckholts has an AMFI of $\$ 50,938$ according to ACS 2019. This is $88 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 58,100$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Milam County, TX HUD Income Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Buckholts was $38.20 \%$ compared to Milam County's poverty rate of $14.60 \%$, and the MIT eligible
area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the Buckholts decreased to $18.5 \%$ while Milam County's poverty rate increased to $15.4 \%$.

At the time of application, the city of Buckholts's population was $31.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Milam County's $26.40 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Buckholts is $64.30 \%$ white alone, greater than Milam County's white alone percentage of $62.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Buckholts is $0.00 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Milam County (9.20\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Buckholts is $0.00 \%$, less than Milam County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Buckholts is $3.80 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Milam County's percentage of $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

According to the 2020 Census, Buckholts has become a majority minority community with $50.1 \%$ Black/African American (1 person identifies as this demographic) or Hispanic/Latino origin (182 residents). The White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population decreased to 165 residents or $45.2 \%$ of the 365 residents (reduction of 52 total residents). During the application process, Buckholts was significantly more diverse than Milam County, and is now a majority minority community.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $91.1 \%$ in the city of Buckholts, less than $95.3 \%$ in Milam County and less than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Buckholts is $43.60 \%$ male, less than Milam County (49.50\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Buckholts is $56.40 \%$ female, greater than the $50.50 \%$ of Milam County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Buckholts, $28.80 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Milam County's percentage of $27.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$.

In Buckholts $16.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Milam County, which is at $28.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Buckholts that have one or more people of 65 or older is $54.20 \%$, which is greater than Milam County's $36.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Buckholts is $25.90 \%$ which is greater than Milam County's $16.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

In the area around FM 1915 and Avenue H, the residences are mostly homes based with an agricultural curtilage, or small wood exterior wood homes. On Avenue H on the East side of FM 1915, the predominate feature of the area is the School System. The wastewater system is in a rural area and identified on google maps.

The project East of 10th Street on East Main Street has several MHUs, some commercial businesses, and what appears to be a fairly large gravel truck site. We could not enter to see if the manholes in this area were present. The housing on 2nd and the alphabet streets are small, wood
rural style homes with some intermixed MHUs. In the Oak, Elm and Cemetery area, there is mixed housing, with some MHUs present. The extension that comes off of Elm goes beyond a dead end, and into what appears to be a private ranch property. There was no access to this area from Elm or from FM 1915.

Overall, the projects seem to be dispersed throughout the community and do not appear to be negative or overly beneficial to any particular residential area. This project would benefit the residents regardless of race, ethnicity or poverty status.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Milam County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0674-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Buckholts |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 43.67\% |  | 75.53\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$47,902 |  | \$41,528 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.60\% |  | 38.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 24,770 |  | 417 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 6,546 | 26.4\% | 133 | 31.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 18,224 | 73.6\% | 284 | 68.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 15,447 | 62.4\% | 268 | 64.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,279 | 9.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 66 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 129 | 0.5\% | 16 | 3.8\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 295 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 23,603 | 95.3\% | 397 | 95.2\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 23,293 | 94.0\% | 380 | 91.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 310 | 1.3\% | 17 | 4.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,167 | 4.7\% | 20 | 4.8\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 12,270 | 49.5\% | 182 | 43.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 12,500 | 50.5\% | 235 | 56.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 9,228 | 100\% | 153 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,768 | 51.7\% | 76 | 49.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,572 | 17.0\% | 12 | 7.8\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 298 | 3.2\% | 3 | 2.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 87 | 0.9\% | 3 | 2.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Milam County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0674-APP City of Buckholts City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,629 | 17.7\% | 30 | 19.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 67 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,348 | 14.6\% | 23 | 15.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 575 | 6.2\% | 8 | 5.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,533 | 27.4\% | 44 | 28.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 553 | 6.0\% | 2 | 1.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,277 | 13.8\% | 27 | 17.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 671 | 7.3\% | 17 | 11.1\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,594 | 28.1\% | 25 | 16.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,351 | 36.3\% | 83 | 54.2\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 24,254 | 100\% | 417 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,067 | 16.8\% | 108 | 25.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Rockdale: Ham Branch Watershed Drainage Improvements Project - \$4,417,469.03 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Rockdale, benefitting 53.07\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $21.52 \%$ greater than Milam County's LMI percentage of $43.67 \%$ and $18.82 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The proposed drainage improvement activities will aid in mitigating flood hazards along the Ham Branch Watershed. Flooding has been repeatedly documented and the sites selected for this project will increase safety and mitigate this flood hazard. Assets of this project include implementation and installation of storm sewers, culverts, storm water detention facilities, and streambank stabilization measures that will each serve to reduce the flooding hazards in the Ham Branch watershed.

The project proposes the following for each site:

- Belton Avenue Culvert, Conveyance Channel, and Detention Basin Improvements There is an existing low water crossing of a tributary of Ham Branch over Belton Avenue that during extreme rainfall events floods the street to depths that results in the roadway being impassable to vehicular traffic, including emergency vehicles. The proposed project will include the construction a new twin box culvert at Belton Avenue that will safely convey flood waters such that Belton Avenue will become passable during extreme rainfall events. Additionally, storm water detention improvements are proposed both immediately upstream of Belton Avenue, which will help reduce peak runoff rates to the new Belton Avenue culverts. Storm water channel conveyance improvements and stormwater detention improvements located immediately downstream (south) of Belton Avenue and north of Cameron Avenue (USH 79) are planned, which includes the 4.79 acres of property acquisition.
- Ham Branch Streambank Stabilization Improvements - Two existing tributaries of Ham Branch (East Ham Branch and West Ham Branch) join at a confluence point located just downstream (south) of Cameron Avenue (USH 79) near the city's downtown area. There is visual evidence of significant streambank erosion, which has resulted in transport and deposition of sediment and debris within receiving downstream reaches of Ham Branch. The goal of this project is to perform streambank regrading improvements that will increase flood conveyance capacity of the two reaches of Ham Branch generally located south of Bell Avenue to a location approximately 200 feet downstream (south) of Cameron Avenue (USH 79). The regraded streambanks and streambed will be armored with permanent articulated concrete stabilization measures equipped with open cells backfilled with soil that can have native vegetation established.
- Allday St., Post Oak Rd., \& San Jacinto Dr. Drainage Improvements - Localized drainage and flooding issues are currently experienced within a primarily residential neighborhood located on the northwest side of the city due to insufficient drainage infrastructure. The goal of this project is to install new a new storm sewer system that will run along Allday Street from the existing water tower south approximately 1,000 LF to an existing low point that currently experiences overland flooding issues. The storm sewer
system will continue to the east approximately 900 LF where it will tie into an existing storm sewer system located along San Jacinto Drive.
- Meadow Drive and Childress Drive Storm Sewer Drainage Improvements Significant drainage and flooding has occurred along both Meadow Drive and Childress Drive, especially at existing low points located along each respective street immediately north of Cameron Avenue (USH 79). This flooding has been the result of insufficient drainage infrastructure. The goal of this drainage improvement project along Meadow Drive is to extend new storm sewer improvements approximately 1,000 lineal feet along Meadow Drive from the intersection of Brazos Avenue. This new storm sewer system will effectively intercept and convey storm water runoff in an enclosed drainage system and will relieve flooding near the intersection of Meadow Drive and Cameron Avenue (USH 79). The goal of this drainage improvement project along Childress Drive is to extend new storm sewer improvements approximately 250 LF along Childress Drive north from near the intersection of USH 79 to the intersection of Zana Lane and then east approximately 200 feet along Zana Lane. This new storm sewer system will effectively intercept and convey storm water runoff in an enclosed drainage system and will relieve flooding near the intersection of Childress Drive and Cameron Avenue (USH 79) and also provide positive drainage along a flood prone area of Zana Lane.
- Burleson St. Culvert, Conveyance Channel, and Detention Basin Improvements Repetitive flood damage located along Burleson Street approximately 300 LF northwest of San Andres Avenue has resulted due to insufficient culvert capacity and lack of a positive overland flood route. Structural flood damage has occurred at the residence located immediately northeast of the existing culvert. Acquisition of this parcel and demolition of the structure is planned to accommodate a new flood channel and stormwater detention basin to safely store and convey flood flows to a new box culvert under Burleson Street. Additional channel regrading is planned within the roadside ditch located immediately downstream of the Burleson Street culvert to San Andres Avenue.
- Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. and 7th Ave. Drainage Improvements - Repetitive flood damage has historically occurred at an existing residence located along the west side of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard near the intersection of 7th Avenue due to insufficient drainage infrastructure. The goal of this project activity is to install new storm sewer improvements at this intersection that will safely route drainage to the southwest into a newly constructed open channel. This project will reduce roadway flooding along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and structural damage at the existing residence.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Rockdale is a community of 5,531 residents in Milam County $(24,770)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Rockdale is $\$ 39,598$, $17.34 \%$ less than Milam County's median income of $\$ 47,902$, and $24.08 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Rockdale's AMFI is $\$ 55,754$. This is $96 \%$ of the HUD

AMFI for Milam County of $\$ 58,100$. Milam County is not in a recognized HUD MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Rockdale was $13.30 \%$, less than Milam County's poverty rate of $14.60 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The poverty rate in Rockdale grew to $20.6 \%$ according to the ACS 2019 data estimates.

The city of Rockdale's population is $37.30 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Milam County's $26.40 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Rockdale is $50.40 \%$ white alone, less than Milam County's white alone percentage of $62.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Rockdale is $11.10 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Milam County ( $9.20 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Rockdale is $0.30 \%$, equal to Milam County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Rockdale is $0.60 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Milam County's percentage of $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Rockdale is a diverse community with almost a 50-50 demographic split between people of color (48.4\%) and White, not of Hispanic or Latino origin (50.4\%). In reviewing popular media, there does not appear to be any specific race or ethnicity concerns in Rockdale. The drainage appears to be spread out in the community, and therefore the project should benefit evenly.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $92.50 \%$ in the city of Rockdale, less than $95.30 \%$ in Milam County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Rockdale, $27.00 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Milam County's percentage of $27.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Rockdale's households are $5.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18 , less than Milam County's percentage of $6.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Rockdale's households are $14.50 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Milam County at $13.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Rockdale are $7.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it equal to Milam County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.30 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Rockdale $36.50 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Milam County, which is at $28.10 \%$ and equal to the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Rockdale that have one or more people of 65 or older is $28.90 \%$, which is less than Milam County's $36.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Rockdale is $11.90 \%$ which is less than Milam County's $16.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The Post Oak San Jacinto areas are basic urban neighborhoods with tract style housing on standard size lots. The areas are fairly dense, with mid-sized houses utilizing both brick and wood finishes. Allday is adjacent to the Post Oak San Jacinto area but is a more rural street with larger lots and midsized houses. Allday street is less dense than the Post Oak Jacinto area. Burleson has small,
predominately wood sided housing, but there are brick veneer houses as well. Burleson is less dense but not rural in nature. The houses near MLK and 7th are small houses, and some are in need of repair. There are agricultural uses present, and these are likely LMI houses. This area is slightly offset from the other projects. The Ham Branch project at 79 is in a commercial area, but it is next to a church and has midsized housing across the street. There are larger homes in the area as well.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Milam County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1016-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Rockdale |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 43.67\% |  | 53.07\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$47,902 |  | \$39,598 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.60\% |  | 13.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 24,770 |  | 5,531 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 6,546 | 26.4\% | 2,064 | 37.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 18,224 | 73.6\% | 3,467 | 62.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 15,447 | 62.4\% | 2,789 | 50.4\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,279 | 9.2\% | 613 | 11.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 66 | 0.3\% | 19 | 0.3\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 129 | 0.5\% | 35 | 0.6\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 295 | 1.2\% | 11 | 0.2\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 23,603 | 95.3\% | 5,165 | 93.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 23,293 | 94.0\% | 5,116 | 92.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 310 | 1.3\% | 49 | 0.9\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,167 | 4.7\% | 366 | 6.6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 12,270 | 49.5\% | 2,755 | 49.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 12,500 | 50.5\% | 2,776 | 50.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 9,228 | 100\% | 1,954 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,768 | 51.7\% | 912 | 46.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,572 | 17.0\% | 468 | 24.0\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 298 | 3.2\% | 178 | 9.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 87 | 0.9\% | 47 | 2.4\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Milam County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1016-APP City of Rockdale City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,629 | 17.7\% | 337 | 17.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 67 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,348 | 14.6\% | 281 | 14.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 575 | 6.2\% | 44 | 2.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,533 | 27.4\% | 527 | 27.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 553 | 6.0\% | 105 | 5.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,277 | 13.8\% | 283 | 14.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 671 | 7.3\% | 143 | 7.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,594 | 28.1\% | 714 | 36.5\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,351 | 36.3\% | 564 | 28.9\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 24,254 | 100\% | 5,402 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,067 | 16.8\% | 643 | 11.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Milano: Citywide Road and Drainage Improvements Project - \$4,317,323-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Milano, benefitting 65.17\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $49.23 \%$ greater than Milam County's LMI percentage of $43.67 \%$ and $45.92 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

When major flooding occurs, damage to roadways is likely. The ability of a road surface to quickly drain water is directly related to the safety of the road. There must also be adequate drainage infrastructure at the roadside to collect and move water to designated areas where it can be properly managed and not impact city infrastructure. To that end, the city of Milano proposes street improvements and accompanying drainage features.

Milano is subject to frequent flooding due to the streams and rivers that border and flow through the area. The project includes the following:

- Acquire land needed for right-of-way (ROW)
- Reconstruct roads including flex base as needed under a 2" lift of HMAC to 24 ' wide and complementary drainage improvements
- Construct new drainage infrastructures at the roadside to direct rainwater away and prevent road coverage damage due to standing water seeping into the base
- Create erosion control measures to prevent present issues from reoccurring and increase the ability of the drainage system to quickly recover after heavy rain events

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Milano is a community of 488 residents in Milam County $(24,770)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Milano is $\$ 51,705,7.94 \%$ greater than Milam County's median income of $\$ 47,902$, and $0.86 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Milano's AMFI is $\$ 62,232$ according to the ACS 2019. This is $107 \%$ of Milam County's HUD AMFI of $\$ 58,100$. Milam County is not in a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in the city of Milano was $12.00 \%$, compared with Milam County's poverty rate of $14.60 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. According to the ACS 2019 Milano's poverty rate is $3.5 \%$.

The city of Milano's population is $33.40 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Milam County's $26.40 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Milano is $53.10 \%$ white alone, less than Milam County's white alone percentage of $62.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Milano is $12.30 \%$ Black or African American
alone, greater than Milam County (9.20\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Milano is a small rural style town that has diverse demographics. As indicated above, the White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population is a small majority of the community, but Milano also has a significant racial and ethnic minority population at $45.7 \%$ of the residents. According to reviews of online media, there is no indication that there are any racial or ethnic issues in the community.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $96.5 \%$ in the city of Milano, less than $95.3 \%$ in Milam County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Milano, $27.90 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Milam County's percentage of $27.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Milano's households are $20.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Milam County's percentage of $6.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$.

In Milano $50.80 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Milam County, which is at $28.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Milano that have one or more people of 65 or older is $24.00 \%$, which is less than Milam County's $36.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$. The Milano ISD has a $100 \%$ graduation rate for students.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Milano is $19.90 \%$ which is greater than Milam County's $16.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The houses in the community are predominantly smaller, rural style homes, however, there are also MHUs. The Census estimates state there are 137 single family homes, 38 units in 5-9 unit complexes, and 39 MHUs. The community housing is not dense and has larger lots. There are plenty of agricultural areas within the community as well. There are dirt roads around Texas and Avenue F, but there are at least partially paved roads around Church and Avenue E.

The projects cover most roads in the community and are near schools, so it appears that the entire town will benefit from the projects.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Milam County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0987-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Milano |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 43.67\% |  | 65.17\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$47,902 |  | \$51,705 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.60\% |  | 12.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 24,770 |  | 488 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 6,546 | 26.4\% | 163 | 33.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 18,224 | 73.6\% | 325 | 66.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 15,447 | 62.4\% | 259 | 53.1\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,279 | 9.2\% | 60 | 12.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 66 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 129 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 295 | 1.2\% | 6 | 1.2\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 23,603 | 95.3\% | 471 | 96.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 23,293 | 94.0\% | 471 | 96.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 310 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,167 | 4.7\% | 17 | 3.5\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 12,270 | 49.5\% | 268 | 54.9\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 12,500 | 50.5\% | 220 | 45.1\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 9,228 | 100\% | 183 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,768 | 51.7\% | 89 | 48.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,572 | 17.0\% | 43 | 23.5\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 298 | 3.2\% | 7 | 3.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 87 | 0.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Milam County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0987-APP City of Milano City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,629 | 17.7\% | 36 | 19.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 67 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,348 | 14.6\% | 32 | 17.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 575 | 6.2\% | 9 | 4.9\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,533 | 27.4\% | 51 | 27.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 553 | 6.0\% | 38 | 20.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,277 | 13.8\% | 3 | 1.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 671 | 7.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,594 | 28.1\% | 93 | 50.8\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,351 | 36.3\% | 44 | 24.0\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 24,254 | 100\% | 488 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,067 | 16.8\% | 97 | 19.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Milam County: Project Service Areas




Awardee Application ID Total Benefs.
City of Buckholts CDR17-0674-APP City of Cameron CDR17-0836-APP City of Milano CDR17-0987-APP

Funding \$ by Awardee


## Milam County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Milam County: Population in Poverty by Block Group
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Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Hidalgo County: Main Floodwater Channel Expansion Project Phase 2 - \$9,962,444.40 Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding, and Storms

This project provides an area benefit within Hidalgo County, benefitting 53.49\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $2.50 \%$ less than Hidalgo County's LMI percentage of $54.86 \%$ and $19.77 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The Hidalgo County Main Floodwater Channel Expansion Project was jointly submitted by Hidalgo County and Hidalgo County Drainage District No. 1 ("Drainage District"). This is Phase 2 of a 2-phase project, and both phases work in tandem. Expanding the Main Floodwater Channel will add millions of cubic yards of storm-water capacity, which in turn will benefit the citizens of Hidalgo County and provide mitigation against flooding for a large portion of Hidalgo County and the Rio Grande Valley.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 397,800 within Hidalgo County $(855,176)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Census Tracts $244.04,245$ and 24 have AMFI's of $\$ 35,406, \$ 35,443$, and $\$ 42,368$ respectively according to ACS 2019. Census Tracts 244.04 and 245 are both $78 \%$ while Census Tract 246 is $94 \%$ of HUD's Hidalgo County AMFI of $\$ 45,000$. Hidalgo County is within the McAllen-Edinburg-Mission TX MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $31.20 \%$, which is less than Hidalgo County's poverty rate of $31.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The poverty rates are higher where the work is expected to take place in Census Tract 244.04 (35.4\%), Census Tract 245 (35.6\%), and Census Tract 246 (32.5\%) according to ACS 2019.

The project beneficiary area is $91.74 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, less than Hidalgo County's $92.20 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $6.91 \%$ white alone, greater than Hidalgo County's percentage of $6.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $0.26 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than Hidalgo County ( $0.40 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.07 \%$, which is less than Hidalgo County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.84 \%$ Asian alone, less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $0.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.01 \%$, greater than Hidalgo County ( $0.000 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.03 \%$ some other race alone, less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $0.10 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project
beneficiary area is $0.14 \%$ two or more races, greater than Hidalgo County, which is at $0.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Hidalgo County and the impacted area is homogeneous in regard to race and ethnicity. The targeted work areas are 100\% (Census Tract 244.04), 99.5\% (Census Tract 245) and 98.9\% (Census Tract 246) Hispanic or Latino in origin. The foreign-born population around the work areas are noticeably less than Hidalgo County as a whole, which is $32.7 \%$ foreign born. According to the materials provided by HUD, there are several R/ECAP Census Tracts in the drainage area. These include Census Tracts 244.02 , 245, and 246. This project will provide direct benefit to these areas and help limit flooding conditions during storms.

All areas in Hidalgo County are areas of concentrated ethnic minorities with a $92.5 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin population. There are 41 areas identified by HUD as R/ECAPs in Hidalgo County.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $72.66 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Hidalgo County at $73.20 \%$ and less than the eligible area, which is at 81.20\%.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $53.54 \%$ married couple families, less than Hidalgo County's $53.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $27.43 \%$, less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $27.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $2.94 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $4.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.23 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Hidalgo County's $2.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $30.25 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Hidalgo County's percentage of $29.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $11.23 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, which is less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $11.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $8.97 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Hidalgo County at $8.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $4.82 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Hidalgo County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $4.70 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $48.04 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Hidalgo County, which is at $49.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $27.56 \%$, greater than Hidalgo County's $26.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $12.73 \%$, less than Hidalgo County's $13.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

As the name indicates, this is the second part of the construction that begins in Phase 1. It begins on the other side of the 4 Mile West bridge. There are a few houses that should already be notified from the Phase 1 construction near the start. In conducting a site visit and using Google Maps for areas not reachable by road, there are three houses that are located on FM 1015 that are near but not adjacent to the project construction site. The remainder of the property is agricultural in nature and should disrupt no residents during construction. There are houses on 4 Mile West, but they are not adjacent to the Phase 2 project, unlike Phase 1. The nearest neighborhood to Phase 2 is $3-$ to- 4 blocks away at the 4 Mile W Bridge. There are a few scattered rural houses nearby, but primarily there is nothing but agricultural land adjacent to the Phase 2 construction site.

The channel location identified in the application is physically near the Edcouch/La Villa area . The application indicates the central western half of Hidalgo County drains into this channel as well, just as Phase 1 does.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-0919-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Hidalgo |  | Hidalgo County |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 54.86\% |  | 53.49\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$40,014 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 31.20\% |  | 31.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 855,176 |  | 459,126 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 788,282 | 92.2\% | 421,184 | 91.7\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 66,894 | 7.8\% | 37,942 | 8.3\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 52,492 | 6.1\% | 31,742 | 6.9\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 3,612 | 0.4\% | 1,209 | 0.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 532 | 0.1\% | 329 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 8,043 | 0.9\% | 3,858 | 0.8\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 73 | 0.0\% | 51 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 1,115 | 0.1\% | 130 | 0.03\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,027 | 0.1\% | 623 | 0.14\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 626,291 | 73.2\% | 339,581 | 74.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 614,630 | 71.9\% | 333,592 | 72.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 11,661 | 1.4\% | 5,989 | 1.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 228,885 | 26.8\% | 119,545 | 26\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 418,867 | 49.0\% | 224,937 | 49.0\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 436,309 | 51.0\% | 234,189 | 51.0\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 238,345 | 100\% | 131,152 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 128,126 | 53.8\% | 70,217 | 53.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 65,845 | 27.6\% | 35,981 | 27.4\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 9,728 | 4.1\% | 3,854 | 2.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 4,995 | 2.1\% | 1,609 | 1.2\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Hidalgo County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0919-APP |
|  |  |  | Hidalgo County |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 30,294 | 12.7\% | 17,411 | 13.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 2,887 | 1.2\% | 1,693 | 1.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 18,296 | 7.7\% | 10,680 | 8.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 5,497 | 2.3\% | 3,299 | 2.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 70,197 | 29.5\% | 39,670 | 30.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 26,826 | 11.3\% | 14,722 | 11.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 20,409 | 8.6\% | 11,767 | 9.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 11,199 | 4.7\% | 6,325 | 4.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 117,373 | 49.2\% | 63,006 | 48.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 62,834 | 26.4\% | 36,150 | 27.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 846,855 | 100\% | 457,415 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 109,673 | 13.0\% | 58,245 | 12.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides an area benefit within Hidalgo County, benefitting 53.49\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $2.50 \%$ less than Hidalgo County's LMI percentage of $54.86 \%$ and $19.77 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Hidalgo County has experienced six disaster declarations from flooding in five years, with saturation of the Main Floodwater Channel identified as the main source. All stormwater in Hidalgo County ultimately outfalls to the Gulf of Mexico through either the Main Floodwater Channel or the Arroyo Colorado Floodway. Expansion of the Main Floodwater Channel due to the greater regional benefit. The proposed project involves expanding 3.3 miles of the existing Main Floodwater Channel from an average of 150 feet to, more than doubling its capacity, a width of 350-400 feet. Expanding the Main Floodwater Channel will create additional outfall capacity to hundreds of existing and future local drainage systems.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 397,800 within Hidalgo County $(855,176)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Census Tracts $244.04,245$ and 24 have AMFI's of $\$ 35,406, \$ 35,443$, and $\$ 42,368$ respectively according to ACS 2019. Census Tracts 244.04 and 245 are both $78 \%$ while Census Tract 246 is $94 \%$ of HUD's Hidalgo County AMFI of \$45,000. Hidalgo County is within the McAllen-Edinburg-Mission TX MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $31.20 \%$, which is equal to Hidalgo County's poverty rate of $31.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. According to ACS 2019, the poverty rates are higher where the work is expected to take place in Census Tract 244.04 (35.4\%) and Census Tract 245 (35.6\%).

The project beneficiary area is $91.74 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, less than Hidalgo County's $92.20 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $6.91 \%$ white alone, greater than Hidalgo County's percentage of $6.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $0.26 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than Hidalgo County ( $0.40 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.07 \%$, which is less than Hidalgo County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.84 \%$ Asian alone, less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $0.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.01 \%$, greater than Hidalgo County ( $0.000 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible
area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.03 \%$ some other race alone, less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $0.10 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.14 \%$ two or more races, greater than Hidalgo County, which is at $0.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Hidalgo County and the impacted area is homogeneous in regard to race and ethnicity. The targeted work areas are $100 \%$ and $99.5 \%$ Hispanic or Latino in origin. The foreign-born population around the work areas is noticeably less than Hidalgo County as a whole, which is $32.7 \%$ foreign born. According to the materials provided by HUD, there are several R/ECAP Census Tracts in the drainage area. These include Census Tracts 244.02, 245, and 246. This project will provide direct benefit to these areas and help limit flooding conditions during storms.

All areas in Hidalgo County are areas of concentrated ethnic minorities with a $92.5 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin population. There are 41 areas identified by HUD as R/ECAPs in Hidalgo County.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $72.66 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Hidalgo County at $73.20 \%$ and less than the eligible area, which is at 81.20\%.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of 53.54\% married couple families, less than Hidalgo County's $53.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $27.43 \%$, less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $27.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $2.94 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $4.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.23 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Hidalgo County's $2.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $30.25 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Hidalgo County's percentage of $29.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $11.23 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, which is less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $11.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $8.97 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Hidalgo County at $8.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $4.82 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Hidalgo County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $4.70 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $48.04 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Hidalgo County, which is at $49.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $27.56 \%$, greater than Hidalgo County's $26.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $12.73 \%$, less than Hidalgo County's $13.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The channel location identified in the application is physically near the Elsa/Edcouch area. However, the application indicates the central western half of Hidalgo County drains into this channel as well. There are homes nearby to some of the three+-mile expansion, but the land necessary for the project appears to be already obtained by the applicant. There will be noise issues during construction that should be mitigated (hours, notifications to residents, etc.), but no property should be taken based on-site visit observations and the application.

There are limited neighborhoods in the work area (within one mile). The homes are varied and include large parcel tracts, MHUs, ranch homes, large estates, and mid-sized brick and wood homes. Some of these homes back up to or are located across the street from the channel levees. The county could consider some mitigation measures for construction noise and potential traffic.

Even though the community is significantly of the same race or ethnicity, the Fair Housing Act still covers discrimination. Same race or ethnicity people can discriminate based on national origin, family status, and of course the most common Fair Housing complaint being filed currently is for people with special needs which cuts across all races and ethnicities.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Hidalgo County |  | 2015 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0883-APP |
|  |  |  | Hidalgo County |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 54.86\% |  | 53.49\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$40,014 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 31.20\% |  | 31.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 855,176 |  | 459,126 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 788,282 | 92.2\% | 421,184 | 91.7\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 66,894 | 7.8\% | 37,942 | 8.3\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 52,492 | 6.1\% | 31,742 | 6.9\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 3,612 | 0.4\% | 1,209 | 0.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 532 | 0.1\% | 329 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 8,043 | 0.9\% | 3,858 | 0.8\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 73 | 0.0\% | 51 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 1,115 | 0.1\% | 130 | 0.03\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,027 | 0.1\% | 623 | 0.14\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 626,291 | 73.2\% | 339,581 | 74.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 614,630 | 71.9\% | 333,592 | 72.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 11,661 | 1.4\% | 5,989 | 1.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 228,885 | 26.8\% | 119,545 | 26\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 418,867 | 49.0\% | 224,937 | 49.0\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 436,309 | 51.0\% | 234,189 | 51.0\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 238,345 | 100\% | 131,152 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 128,126 | 53.8\% | 70,217 | 53.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 65,845 | 27.6\% | 35,981 | 27.4\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 9,728 | 4.1\% | 3,854 | 2.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 4,995 | 2.1\% | 1,609 | 1.2\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Hidalgo County |  | 2015 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0883-APP |
|  |  |  | Hidalgo County |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 30,294 | 12.7\% | 17,411 | 13.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 2,887 | 1.2\% | 1,693 | 1.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 18,296 | 7.7\% | 10,680 | 8.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 5,497 | 2.3\% | 3,299 | 2.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 70,197 | 29.5\% | 39,670 | 30.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 26,826 | 11.3\% | 14,722 | 11.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 20,409 | 8.6\% | 11,767 | 9.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 11,199 | 4.7\% | 6,325 | 4.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 117,373 | 49.2\% | 63,006 | 48.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 62,834 | 26.4\% | 36,150 | 27.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 846,855 | 100\% | 457,415 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 109,673 | 13.0\% | 58,245 | 12.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Penitas: Tom Gill Road Flood Mitigation Project - \$4,379,172.40-Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding, and Storms

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Penitas, benefitting 57.47\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $4.76 \%$ greater than Hidalgo County's LMI percentage of $54.86 \%$ and $28.69 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The proposed project will be designed to mitigate impacts from severe weather events, which historically cause severe flooding in the entire city. The City's Tom Gill Road areas of development continuously experiences flooding during heavy. The proposed project of an updated roadway and drainage system along the Tom Gill Road corridor and adjacent subdivisions will address higher year rainfall events and reduce flooding. This combined with Hidalgo County's upgrading of the drainage system near this area will improve stormwater conveyance in the area.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Penitas is a community of 4,769 residents in Hidalgo County $(855,176)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Penitas is $\$ 45,632,14.04 \%$ greater than Hidalgo County's median income of $\$ 40,014$, and $12.51 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Penitas' AMFI is $\$ 44,881$ according to the ACS 2019 . This is $99.5 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Hidalgo County which is $\$ 45,100$. Hidalgo County is part of the McAllen-Edinburg-Mission TX MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Penitas was $21.40 \%$, less than Hidalgo County's poverty rate of $31.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The Penitas poverty rate rose to $24.2 \%$ according to ACS 2019 data estimates.

The city of Penitas's population as minority majority city is $96.30 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Hidalgo County's $92.20 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Penitas is $1.80 \%$ white alone, less than Hidalgo County's white alone percentage of $6.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Penitas is $0.00 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Hidalgo County ( $0.40 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The city of Penitas is $1.90 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Hidalgo County's percentage of $0.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

The project area is in a block group with other cities, although the block group is still smaller than Penitas as a whole. Upon examination of the northern part of Penitas in Census Tract 242.03 Block Group 2, one sees that the population in that area is $83.1 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin. Looking at Census Tract 242.05 (Penitas is divided into two Block Groups in this Census Tract but does not
occupy all of either one), Penitas is $97.2 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin. When looking at Penitas as a whole, it is $96.3 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin. In fact, the second largest demographic group in Penitas is Asian at $1.9 \%$ or 96 people. In 2019, there were no Blacks or African Americans in the Block Group, Census Tract or City as a whole.

In the 2020 Census, Penitas grew by $38 \%$ to 6,460 residents. The concentration of Hispanics increased from $96.3 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin to $97.9 \%$. The Black or African American population increased from zero to six and the Asian population reduced from 91 to 7 .

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $73.10 \%$ in the city of Penitas, less than $73.20 \%$ in Hidalgo County and less than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Penitas is $52.10 \%$ male, greater than Hidalgo County ( $49.00 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Penitas is $47.90 \%$ female, less than the $51.00 \%$ of Hidalgo County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of 50.4\%.

The households in Penitas are comprised of $65.70 \%$ married couple families, which is greater than Hidalgo County's $53.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Penitas that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $46.80 \%$ this is greater than Hidalgo County's percentage of $27.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of Penitas, $20.90 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Hidalgo County's percentage of $29.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Penitas's households are $12.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Hidalgo County's percentage of $11.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$.

In Penitas $68.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Hidalgo County, which is at $49.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Penitas that have one or more people of 65 or older is $19.60 \%$, which is less than Hidalgo County's $26.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Penitas is $9.40 \%$ which is less than Hidalgo County's $13.00 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

In conducting a windshield tour of the impacted side streets off Tom Gill Road, one notices that many of the houses are new, well-constructed, relatively large, and quite nice. Many of these homes look similar to homes found in suburban areas of Austin or Dallas. However, there are a few homes mixed in that are smaller, or in need of repair. There are also MHUs mixed in throughout the neighborhood. When we conducted the site visit on a Thursday at $5: 30 \mathrm{pm}$, Tom Gill street was very busy.

Even though the community is significantly of the same race or ethnicity, the Fair Housing Act still covers discrimination. Same race or ethnicity people can discriminate based on national origin, family status, and of course the most common Fair Housing complaint being filed currently is for people with special needs which cuts across all races and ethnicities.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2015 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1210-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Hidalgo |  | City of Penitas |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 54.86\% |  | 57.47\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$40,014 |  | \$45,632 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 31.20\% |  | 21.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 855,176 |  | 4,769 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 788,282 | 92.2\% | 4,592 | 96.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 66,894 | 7.8\% | 177 | 3.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 52,492 | 6.1\% | 86 | 1.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 3,612 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 532 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 8,043 | 0.9\% | 91 | 1.9\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 73 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 1,115 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,027 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 626,291 | 73.2\% | 3,528 | 74.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 614,630 | 71.9\% | 3,488 | 73.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 11,661 | 1.4\% | 40 | 0.8\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 228,885 | 26.8\% | 1,241 | 26.0\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 418,867 | 49.0\% | 2,483 | 52.1\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 436,309 | 51.0\% | 2,286 | 47.9\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 238,345 | 100\% | 1,150 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 128,126 | 53.8\% | 755 | 65.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 65,845 | 27.6\% | 538 | 46.8\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 9,728 | 4.1\% | 102 | 8.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 4,995 | 2.1\% | 66 | 5.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Hidalgo County |  | 2015 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1210-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Penitas |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 30,294 | 12.7\% | 53 | 4.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 2,887 | 1.2\% | 13 | 1.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 18,296 | 7.7\% | 40 | 3.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 5,497 | 2.3\% | 5 | 0.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 70,197 | 29.5\% | 240 | 20.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 26,826 | 11.3\% | 148 | 12.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 20,409 | 8.6\% | 68 | 5.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 11,199 | 4.7\% | 68 | 5.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 117,373 | 49.2\% | 785 | 68.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 62,834 | 26.4\% | 225 | 19.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 846,855 | 100\% | 4,769 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 109,673 | 13.0\% | 450 | 9.4\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Deep East Texas Council of Governments: LMI Broadband Telecommunications Infrastructure Project - \$9,008,688-Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding, Storms, and Tornadoes

This project provides an area benefit within Newton County, benefitting 52.76\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $25.46 \%$ greater than Newton County's LMI percentage of $42.05 \%$ and $18.13 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The proposed project will make significant telecommunication improvements to provide broadband internet access to communities in northern Newton County. Having a reliable connection will help mitigate the consequences of future disasters by facilitating emergency response and reducing service disruption in several areas, including work, education, health, and sanitation. DETCOG will develop, construct, and operate the broadband system making sure it's affordable to all residents.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 6,710 within Newton County $(13,914)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Newton County's AMFI is $\$ 49,440$ according to ACS 2019. Newton County is within the Newton County TX HUD Metro Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $15.5 \%$, less than Newton County's poverty rate of $20.60 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $4.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than Newton County's $3.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The project beneficiary area is $64.27 \%$ white alone, less than Newton County's percentage of $73.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $28.62 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, greater than Newton County (20.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.11 \%$, less than Newton County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.08 \%$ Asian alone, less than Newton County's percentage of $0.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$, equal to Newton County ( $0.000 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.51 \%$ some other race alone, greater than Newton County's percentage of $0.30 \%$ and greater than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $1.52 \%$ two or more races, greater than Newton County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

This project is being completed by DETCOG, a statutorily created Council of Government that encompasses 11 counties in deep East Texas. The beneficiaries are generally White not of

Hispanic or Latino origin. This project completes getting internet service to the two remaining census block groups in Newton County. All other areas of the county, where the minority population is somewhat larger, had already been served through other resources.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $98.25 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Newton County at $98.90 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $34.76 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Newton County's percentage of $29.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $9.48 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Newton County's percentage of $8.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $17.48 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Newton County at $14.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $10.79 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , greater than Newton County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $8.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $30.90 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , less than Newton County, which is at $31.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $41.07 \%$, greater than Newton County's $37.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $17.05 \%$, less than Newton County's $18.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

DETCOG is seeking this funding to build a broadband network in northern Newton County that will improve the access and affordability of broadband services. The network is composed of a fiber-optic backbone that spans 8 census block groups and provides a high-speed "highway" that interconnects the area and its data centers. Wireless distribution points are connected to the fiberoptic backbone across the region using existing communications towers. The network provides a fully contiguous system from the block group level, connecting every block group in the covered area with fiber and wireless infrastructure.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Newton County |  | City of Newton |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) CDR17-1142-APP <br> Deep East Texas COG <br> Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.05\% |  | 52.91\% |  | 52.76\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$40,101 |  | \$39,844 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.60\% |  | 20.40\% |  | 20.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 13,914 |  | 2,199 |  | 7,618 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 504 | 3.60\% | 160 | 7.3\% | 373 | 4.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,410 | 96.40\% | 2,039 | 92.7\% | 7,245 | 95.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 10,223 | 73.50\% | 1,392 | 63.3\% | 4,896 | 64.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,823 | 20.30\% | 575 | 26.1\% | 2,180 | 28.6\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 46 | 0.30\% | 8 | 0.4\% | 8 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 77 | 0.60\% | 6 | 0.3\% | 6 | 0.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 39 | 0.30\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 39 | 0.51\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 202 | 1.50\% | 58 | 2.60\% | 116 | 1.52\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 13,763 | 98.90\% | 2,135 | 97.1\% | 7,529 | 98.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 13,711 | 98.50\% | 2,135 | 97.1\% | 7,485 | 98.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 52 | 0.40\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 44 | 0.6\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 151 | 1.10\% | 64 | 3\% | 89 | 1\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 7,130 | 51.20\% | 1,063 | 48.3\% | 3,859 | 50.7\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 6,784 | 48.80\% | 1,136 | 51.7\% | 3,759 | 49.3\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 5,315 | 100\% | 823 | 100\% | 2,900 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,633 | 49.50\% | 336 | 40.8\% | 1,421 | 49.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 884 | 16.60\% | 106 | 12.9\% | 402 | 13.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 192 | 3.60\% | 48 | 5.8\% | 109 | 3.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 74 | 1.40\% | 20 | 2.4\% | 62 | 2.1\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Newton County |  | City of Newton |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) CDR17-1142-APP <br> Deep East Texas COG <br> Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 919 | 17.30\% | 102 | 12.4\% | 362 | 12.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 144 | 2.70\% | 15 | 1.8\% | 86 | 3.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 525 | 9.90\% | 69 | 8.4\% | 219 | 7.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 142 | 2.70\% | 46 | 5.6\% | 102 | 3.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,571 | 29.60\% | 337 | 40.9\% | 1,008 | 34.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 431 | 8.10\% | 110 | 13.4\% | 275 | 9.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 764 | 14.40\% | 184 | 22.4\% | 507 | 17.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 472 | 8.90\% | 122 | 14.8\% | 313 | 10.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,695 | 31.90\% | 286 | 34.8\% | 896 | 30.9\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,015 | 37.90\% | 315 | 38.3\% | 1,191 | 41.1\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 13,729 | 100\% | 2,044 | 100\% | 7,449 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,509 | 18.30\% | 345 | 16.9\% | 1,270 | 17.0\% |
| 'Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Newton: Water System Improvements Project - \$6,646,990 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Newton, benefitting 52.91\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $25.83 \%$ greater than Newton County's LMI percentage of $42.05 \%$ and $18.47 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city proposes to mitigate the existing threat to public health and safety by doing the following:

- Drill a new water well at a higher elevation.
- Install a new 250,000-gallon storage tank.
- Replace piping with 700 LF of main casing, 300 LF of screen, 300 LF of column pipe, 25,100 LF of water main, fire hydrants, control valve and piping, electrical controls, Aerator tower, aerator, pressure filter system, backwash tank, electrical and controls, emergency power generator, supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system and associated appurtenances.
- Repair pavement totaling 3,765 LF.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Newton is a community of 2,199 residents in Newton County $(13,914)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Newton is $\$ 39,844,0.64 \%$ less than Newton County's median income of $\$ 40,101$, and $23.60 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Newton's AMFI is $\$ 49,559$ according to the ACS 2019 which is $91 \%$ of Newton County's AMFI of $\$ 54,600$. Newton County is in the Newton County TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in the city of Newton was $20.40 \%$, compared with Newton County's poverty rate of $20.60 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In the ACS 2019 data, the City of Newton had a poverty rate of $27.7 \%$ and Newton County increased to $24.4 \%$.

The city of Newton's population is $7.30 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Newton County's $3.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Newton is $63.30 \%$ white alone, less than Newton County's white alone percentage of $73.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Newton is $26.10 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Newton County ( $20.30 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Newton is $0.40 \%$, greater than Newton County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Newton is $0.30 \%$ Asian alone, less than Newton County's percentage of $0.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Racial and ethnic minorities make up approximately $33.4 \%$ of Newton. The project appears to be positioned to benefit Newton's residents by providing adequate potable water to customers including during weather events. It does not appear to benefit or burden any demographic over others.

In the city of Newton, $40.90 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Newton County's percentage of $29.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Newton's households are $13.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Newton County's percentage of $8.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Newton's households are $22.40 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Newton County at $14.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Newton are $14.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Newton County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $8.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Newton $34.80 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Newton County, which is at $31.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Newton that have one or more people of 65 or older is $38.30 \%$, which is greater than Newton County's $37.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Newton is $16.90 \%$ which is less than Newton County's $18.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

There are scattered neighborhoods with varied levels of housing throughout the city, and the homes are generally well-maintained. Some houses are rural with large curtilage around the home. The more typical houses are older homes built on a residential lot, although many are on larger residential lots. Out of the 1,047 homes in Newton, 867 ( $83 \%$ ) of these were built prior to 1999.

Even though Newton is generally a small community with 2,199 residents, 250 of the housing units are rental households. Of those, 133 or $53.2 \%$ are unaffordable with a rent payment of $30 \%$ or more of the residents income.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1136-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Newto |  | City of Newton |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.05\% |  | 52.91\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$40,101 |  | \$39,844 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.60\% |  | 20.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 13,914 |  | 2,199 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 504 | 3.60\% | 160 | 7.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,410 | 96.40\% | 2,039 | 92.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 10,223 | 73.50\% | 1,392 | 63.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,823 | 20.30\% | 575 | 26.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 46 | 0.30\% | 8 | 0.4\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 77 | 0.60\% | 6 | 0.3\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 39 | 0.30\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 202 | 1.50\% | 58 | 2.6\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 13,763 | 98.90\% | 2,135 | 97.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 13,711 | 98.50\% | 2,135 | 97.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 52 | 0.40\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 151 | 1.10\% | 64 | 2.9\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 7,130 | 51.20\% | 1,063 | 48.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 6,784 | 48.80\% | 1,136 | 51.7\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 5,315 | 100\% | 823 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,633 | 49.50\% | 336 | 40.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 884 | 16.60\% | 106 | 12.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 192 | 3.60\% | 48 | 5.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 74 | 1.40\% | 20 | 2.4\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Newton County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1136-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Newton |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 919 | 17.30\% | 102 | 12.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 144 | 2.70\% | 15 | 1.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 525 | 9.90\% | 69 | 8.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 142 | 2.70\% | 46 | 5.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,571 | 29.60\% | 337 | 40.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 431 | 8.10\% | 110 | 13.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 764 | 14.40\% | 184 | 22.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 472 | 8.90\% | 122 | 14.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,695 | 31.90\% | 286 | 34.8\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,015 | 37.90\% | 315 | 38.3\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 13,729 | 100\% | 2,044 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,509 | 18.30\% | 345 | 16.9\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Newton: Flood/Drainage and Sewer - \$4,457,650-Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding, and Storms

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Newton, benefitting 52.91\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $25.83 \%$ greater than Newton County's LMI percentage of $42.05 \%$ and $18.47 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Newton will improve drainage and sewer systems by acquiring land for water detention basin to contain excessive flood waters that enter the city's wastewater collection system. Additional improvements include elevation of a lift station between US 190 and SH 87 and replacement of manholes throughout the City of Newton, as well as improvements to the city's wastewater treatment plant. These improvements will prevent the inundation of roads, which can limit access for emergency responders to many residential areas and prevent problems with the sewage system during heavy rainfall.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Newton is a community of 2,199 residents in Newton County $(13,914)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Newton is $\$ 39,844,0.64 \%$ less than Newton County's median income of $\$ 40,101$, and $23.60 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Newton's AMFI is $\$ 49,559$ according to the ACS 2019. This is $91 \%$ of Newton County's AMFI of $\$ 54,600$. Newton County is in the Newton County TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Newton was $20.40 \%$, compared with Newton County's poverty rate of $20.60 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In the ACS 2019 data a year later, the City of Newton had a poverty rate of $27.7 \%$ and Newton County increased to $24.4 \%$

The city of Newton's population is $7.30 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Newton County's $3.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Newton is $63.30 \%$ white alone, less than Newton County's white alone percentage of $73.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Newton is $26.10 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Newton County ( $20.30 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Newton is $0.40 \%$, greater than Newton County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Newton is $0.30 \%$ Asian alone, less than Newton County's percentage of $0.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

The projects seem to benefit all residents equally. Racial and ethnic minorities make up approximately $33.4 \%$ of the community. Census Tract 9502 Block Group 2 has the largest percentage of minorities at $43.8 \%$. Census Tract 9502 Block Group 3 - the location of the
wastewater plant -- has an $18.5 \%$ racial and ethnic minority population. It is important to note that Block Group 3 is larger in raw population number than Block Group 2.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $97.10 \%$ in the city of Newton, less than $98.90 \%$ in Newton County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Newton, $40.90 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Newton County's percentage of $29.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Newton's households are $13.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Newton County's percentage of $8.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Newton's households are $22.40 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Newton County at $14.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Newton are $14.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Newton County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $8.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Newton $34.80 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Newton County, which is at $31.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Newton that have one or more people of 65 or older is $38.30 \%$, which is greater than Newton County's $37.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Newton is $16.90 \%$ which is less than Newton County's $18.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.There is not much housing near the wastewater treatment plant. Davison is a long road with various types of housing ranging from MHUs to larger homes.

There are scattered neighborhoods with varied levels of housing throughout the city, and the homes are generally well-maintained. Some houses are rural with large curtilage around the home. The more typical homes are older homes built on a residential lot, although many are on larger residential lots. Out of the 1,047 homes in Newton, $867(83 \%)$ of these were built prior to 1999.

Even though Newton is generally a small community with 2,199 residents, 250 of the housing units are rental households. Of those, 133 or $53.2 \%$ are unaffordable with a rent payment of $30 \%$ or more of residents' income. HUD has determined rents at this level to be unaffordable, but it is not necessarily a Fair Housing violation. However, this puts potential Fair Housing pressure on a community if there is not sufficient affordable housing available.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Newton County |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0958-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Newton |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 42.05\% |  | 52.91\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$40,101 |  | \$39,844 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 20.60\% |  | 20.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 13,914 |  | 2,199 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 504 | 3.60\% | 160 | 7.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,410 | 96.40\% | 2,039 | 92.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 10,223 | 73.50\% | 1,392 | 63.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,823 | 20.30\% | 575 | 26.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 46 | 0.30\% | 8 | 0.4\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 77 | 0.60\% | 6 | 0.3\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 39 | 0.30\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 202 | 1.50\% | 58 | 2.6\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 13,763 | 98.90\% | 2,135 | 97.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 13,711 | 98.50\% | 2,135 | 97.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 52 | 0.40\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 151 | 1.10\% | 64 | 2.9\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 7,130 | 51.20\% | 1,063 | 48.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 6,784 | 48.80\% | 1,136 | 51.7\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 5,315 | 100\% | 823 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,633 | 49.50\% | 336 | 40.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 884 | 16.60\% | 106 | 12.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 192 | 3.60\% | 48 | 5.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 74 | 1.40\% | 20 | 2.4\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Newton County |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0958-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Newton |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 919 | 17.30\% | 102 | 12.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 144 | 2.70\% | 15 | 1.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 525 | 9.90\% | 69 | 8.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 142 | 2.70\% | 46 | 5.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,571 | 29.60\% | 337 | 40.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 431 | 8.10\% | 110 | 13.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 764 | 14.40\% | 184 | 22.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 472 | 8.90\% | 122 | 14.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,695 | 31.90\% | 286 | 34.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,015 | 37.90\% | 315 | 38.3\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 13,729 | 100\% | 2,044 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,509 | 18.30\% | 345 | 16.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides an area benefit within Newton County, benefitting 60.12\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is, $42.98 \%$ greater than Newton County's LMI percentage of $42.05 \%$ and $34.63 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Newton County will mitigate the threat to public health and safety that storm events have by reconstructing bridges and culverts in a major drainage basin flowing into the Sabine River in Newton County. The project will include the replacement of bridges and box culverts in the Big Cow Creek watershed and a bridge and box culvert in the Caney Creek watershed.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 4,168 within Newton County $(13,914)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Newton County's AMFI is $\$ 49,440$ according to ACS 2019. This is $91 \%$ of HUD's Newton County AMFI of $\$ 54,600$. Newton County is within the Newton County TX HUD Metro area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $20.60 \%$, greater than the city of Newton which is at $20.40 \%$, less than Newton County's poverty rate of $20.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $6.18 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than Newton County's $3.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The project beneficiary area is $57.65 \%$ white alone, less than Newton County's percentage of $73.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $34.03 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, greater than Newton County (20.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.14 \%$, less than Newton County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.11 \%$ Asian alone, less than Newton County's percentage of $0.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $1.89 \%$ two or more races, greater than Newton County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

For this analysis, we are looking at where the actual work is being conducted. There are seven locations for work included in the project plans, and these are in the rural part of Newton County (Census Tract 9502 Block Groups 1 and 6). These Census Tract Block Groups have a majority Black or African American population of $50.2 \%$. There are no Hispanic or Latino origin residents in these two block groups.

Two Census Tract Block Groups (CT 9502 Block Groups 2 and 3) are 65\% White not of Hispanic or Latino origin.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $47.17 \%$ married couple families, less than Newton County's $49.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $14.35 \%$, less than Newton County's percentage of $16.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $4.82 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Newton County's percentage of $3.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $2.93 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than Newton County's $1.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $36.36 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Newton County's percentage of $29.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $11.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Newton County's percentage of $8.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $17.66 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Newton County at $14.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $10.01 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , greater than Newton County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $8.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $34.66 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , greater than Newton County, which is at $31.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $38.86 \%$, greater than Newton County's $37.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $15.75 \%$, less than Newton County's $18.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

Most of the projects are in very rural areas, except for the Davison Street Culvert. The culvert/bridge on Davison has larger houses at the front of the street, and these houses become smaller closer to bridge. Only one house and the Wastewater treatment plant are present after the culvert/bridge. The housing in the other areas is generally smaller, but there are some exceptions. There is limited housing in the rural areas, but there is some housing nearby.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Newton County |  | City of Newton |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) CDR17-1048-APP <br> Newton County <br> Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.05\% |  | 52.91\% |  | 60.12\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$40,101 |  | \$39,844 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.60\% |  | 20.40\% |  | 20.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 13,914 |  | 2,199 |  | 5,665 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE $^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 504 | 3.60\% | 160 | 7.3\% | 350 | 6.2\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,410 | 96.40\% | 2,039 | 92.7\% | 5,315 | 93.8\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 10,223 | 73.50\% | 1,392 | 63.3\% | 3,266 | 57.7\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,823 | 20.30\% | 575 | 26.1\% | 1,928 | 34.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 46 | 0.30\% | 8 | 0.4\% | 8 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 77 | 0.60\% | 6 | 0.3\% | 6 | 0.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 39 | 0.30\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 202 | 1.50\% | 58 | 2.60\% | 107 | 1.89\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 13,763 | 98.90\% | 2,135 | 97.1\% | 5590 | 98.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 13,711 | 98.50\% | 2,135 | 97.1\% | 5590 | 98.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 52 | 0.40\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 151 | 1.10\% | 64 | 3\% | 75 | 1\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 7,130 | 51.20\% | 1,063 | 48.3\% | 2,864 | 50.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 6,784 | 48.80\% | 1,136 | 51.7\% | 2,801 | 49.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 5,315 | 100\% | 823 | 100\% | 2,118 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,633 | 49.50\% | 336 | 40.8\% | 999 | 47.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 884 | 16.60\% | 106 | 12.9\% | 304 | 14.4\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 192 | 3.60\% | 48 | 5.8\% | 102 | 4.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 74 | 1.40\% | 20 | 2.4\% | 62 | 2.9\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Newton County |  | City of Newton |  | 2016 Floods (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1048-APP |  |  |
|  |  |  | Newton County |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 919 | 17.30\% | 102 | 12.4\% | 247 | 11.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 144 | 2.70\% | 15 | 1.8\% | 73 | 3.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 525 | 9.90\% | 69 | 8.4\% | 146 | 6.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 142 | 2.70\% | 46 | 5.6\% | 85 | 4.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,571 | 29.60\% | 337 | 40.9\% | 770 | 36.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 431 | 8.10\% | 110 | 13.4\% | 235 | 11.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 764 | 14.40\% | 184 | 22.4\% | 374 | 17.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 472 | 8.90\% | 122 | 14.8\% | 212 | 10.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,695 | 31.90\% | 286 | 34.8\% | 734 | 34.7\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,015 | 37.90\% | 315 | 38.3\% | 823 | 38.9\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 13,729 | 100\% | 2,044 | 100\% | 5,510 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,509 | 18.30\% | 345 | 16.9\% | 868 | 15.8\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Newton County: Project Service Areas




Funding \$ by Awardee



## Newton County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group





## Newton County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (2 Block Groups)
10-25 percent (7 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (3 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (2 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Yoakum: Electrical System Upgrade Project - \$8,143,545.20 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Yoakum, benefitting 53.30\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $37.94 \%$ greater than DeWitt County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $19.35 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The project will upgrade electrical system components which serve the entire city of Yoakum community. There are three project areas to address increased demand and loading:

1. Y260 Upgrades will be located in the northern portion of the city and involve replacing the primary conductor, damaged air break switches and wood poles.
2. Y180/Y270 Upgrades are specifically around the downtown area and involve replacing the primary conductor, service drops, wood poles, damaged capacitor banks, and disconnects/cutouts.
3. Y170 upgrades will be located in the eastern portion of the city and involve replacing the primary conductor, damaged air break switches, service drops, wood poles, damaged capacitor banks, and disconnects/cutouts.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Yoakum is a community of 5,996 residents in DeWitt County $(20,340)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Yoakum is $\$ 41,384$, $52.38 \%$ less than DeWitt County's median income of $\$ 86,913$, and $20.65 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Yoakum's AMFI is $\$ 45,154$ according to ACS 2019. Yoakum falls across two counties: Dewitt and Lavaca, and neither of these are within a HUD recognized MSA. Yoakum's AMFI is $65 \%$ of Dewitt County ( $\$ 69,700$ ) and $68 \%$ of Lavaca County $(\$ 66,100)$. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Yoakum was $18.00 \%$, greater than DeWitt County's poverty rate of $16.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Yoakum's population is $49.60 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than DeWitt County's $35.40 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Yoakum is $36.80 \%$ white alone, less than DeWitt County's white alone percentage of $54.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Yoakum is $12.20 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than DeWitt County ( $9.30 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. In the city of Yoakum, $1.40 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than DeWitt County, which is at $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

ACS 2019 data shows Yoakum as a majority minority community with $61.8 \%$ being racial or ethnic minorities. However, no demographic had a majority of the population. In the 2020 Census data, the Hispanic or Latino origin population increased to $52.5 \%$ but the Black or African American population reduced to $8.4 \%$ : creating a smaller racial and ethnic minority majority of $60.8 \%$. The Project does not benefit or burden any population more or less. The project has citywide benefit.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $86.40 \%$ in the city of Yoakum, less than $96.30 \%$ in DeWitt County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Yoakum, $30.00 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than DeWitt County's percentage of $23.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Yoakum's households are $5.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than DeWitt County's percentage of $3.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Yoakum's households are $14.70 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than DeWitt County at $15.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Yoakum are $9.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than DeWitt County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $10.80 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Yoakum $40.00 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than DeWitt County, which is at $34.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Yoakum that have one or more people of 65 or older is $32.00 \%$, which is less than DeWitt County's $37.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Yoakum is $13.50 \%$ which is less than DeWitt County's $17.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

There is limited housing in two of the three project areas. In the Y260 project, there is one street not on Highway 77 that has less than 10 smaller rural houses. On Highway 77, there are also generally small, wood sided houses that face the Highway. These houses are fairly limited in number within the target area. There are stores and the airport is nearby the project too. For the Y 180/270 project, it is primarily commercial or retail interests. The HEB, the fire station, the Historic District, and restaurants predominate the area. Depending on the reach of the replacements, there are some historic style houses adjoining the downtown area that will need to be considered.

Most of the housing is in Lavaca County for the Y170 project; however, the project does go into Dewitt County and stops at the elementary school. The housing on the Pat Cleburn side of the project appears to benefit smaller wood homes. The neighborhood is likely low income but is generally well maintained. When the project goes up Clark Street, we believe that the neighborhood (where the power lines are on the edge) will benefit from the work. This neighborhood looks established, with houses intermixed that vary in size and quality. The houses on Sheehan are a little larger than the others in this project and are generally well maintained.

When the project crosses into DeWitt County on Josephine, the houses appear to be on larger lots, and several are larger structures. There is also more open land in this area. From McVean to Aubrey, the houses are generally smaller with wood siding in a rural style. The project appears to end at the school on Aubrey.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | DeWitt County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0997-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Yoakum |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.64\% |  | 53.30\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$86,913 |  | \$41,384 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 8.10\% |  | 18.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 20,340 |  | 5,996 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 7,192 | 35.4\% | 2,977 | 49.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,148 | 64.6\% | 3,019 | 50.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 11,143 | 54.8\% | 2,206 | 36.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,888 | 9.3\% | 730 | 12.2\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 5 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 111 | 0.5\% | 83 | 1.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 19,592 | 96.3\% | 5,182 | 86.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 19,457 | 95.7\% | 5,182 | 86.4\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 135 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 748 | 3.7\% | 814 | 13.6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 10,574 | 52.0\% | 2,820 | 47.0\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,766 | 48.0\% | 3,176 | 53.0\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,048 | 100\% | 2,186 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,030 | 57.2\% | 1,142 | 52.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,538 | 21.8\% | 580 | 26.5\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 450 | 6.4\% | 154 | 7.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 222 | 3.1\% | 135 | 6.2\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | DeWitt County |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0997-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Yoakum |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 935 | 13.3\% | 234 | 10.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 60 | 0.9\% | 13 | 0.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 628 | 8.9\% | 167 | 7.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 252 | 3.6\% | 116 | 5.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,633 | 23.2\% | 656 | 30.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 273 | 3.9\% | 129 | 5.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,099 | 15.6\% | 321 | 14.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 758 | 10.8\% | 215 | 9.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,435 | 34.5\% | 875 | 40.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,631 | 37.3\% | 700 | 32.0\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 18,413 | 100\% | 5,812 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,147 | 17.1\% | 786 | 13.5\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Yorktown: Wastewater Treatment Plant Project - \$6,183,237 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Yorktown, benefitting $58.61 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $51.69 \%$ greater than DeWitt County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $31.24 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Yorktown's existing wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and lift stations allow the infiltration and inflow of stormwater into the wastewater system which results in flows and levels of metals, organic compounds, fecal coliform bacteria, and total suspended solids that exceed permit limits in times of heavy rainfall or flood events. These conditions also cause increased levels of grit and other pollutants which reduce the capacity of treatment processes.

The improvements will increase the resiliency of Yorktown's wastewater collection and treatment system to the identified risks.

- Replace the existing WWTP with a new $0.26-0.3$ MGD extended aeration treatment plant at the current WWTP site.
- Elevate several treatment components and containment systems to withstand inundation from flooding and increased flows from storm events.
- Improve lift stations at the $11^{\text {th }}$ Street and the $8^{\text {th }}$ Street to include new wet wells that will be properly sized for increased storage. Emergency generators will be provided at each lift station.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Yorktown is a community of 1,916 residents in DeWitt County $(20,340)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Yorktown is $\$ 53,443$, $38.51 \%$ less than DeWitt County's median income of $\$ 86,913$, and $2.47 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Yorktown's AMFI is $\$ 70,774$ according to the ACS 2019. This is $102 \%$ of HUD's DeWitt County AMFI of $\$ 69,700$. DeWitt County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Yorktown was $20.50 \%$, greater than DeWitt County's poverty rate of $16.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Yorktown's population is $50.60 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than DeWitt County's $35.40 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Yorktown is $45.10 \%$ white alone, less than DeWitt County's white alone percentage of $54.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Yorktown is $4.30 \%$ Black
or African American alone, less than DeWitt County (9.30\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

The City of Yorktown is a minority majority city with $54.8 \%$ of the total population, of which $50.5 \%$ are Hispanic or Latino origin residents. The community is much more diverse than the sum of the Census Tracts around it. The data shows that all but 58 of the racial or ethnic minorities within the three block groups (CT 9704 Block Group 3, CT 9705 Block Groups 1 and 3) live within the city limits. This calculation is based on an analysis of the total number of minorities in each of the Block Groups that are in Yorktown, and includes more area than the city of Yorktown itself. The combined demographics of the three full block groups are $64.5 \%$ White not of Hispanic or Latino origin.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $96.80 \%$ in the city of Yorktown, greater than $96.30 \%$ in DeWitt County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in Yorktown are comprised of $46.80 \%$ married couple families, which is less than DeWitt County's $57.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Yorktown that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $13.50 \%$ this is less than DeWitt County's percentage of $21.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Yorktown's households are $14.00 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than DeWitt County's percentage of $6.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $7.90 \%$ is within the city of Yorktown, which is greater than DeWitt County's $3.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area 2.2\%.

In the city of Yorktown, $23.40 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than DeWitt County's percentage of $23.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Yorktown's households are $0.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than DeWitt County's percentage of $3.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Yorktown's households are $19.00 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than DeWitt County at $15.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Yorktown are $13.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than DeWitt County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $10.80 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Yorktown $31.80 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than DeWitt County, which is at $34.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Yorktown that have one or more people of 65 or older is $34.10 \%$, which is less than DeWitt County's $37.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Yorktown is $21.10 \%$ which is greater than DeWitt County's $17.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

This is a citywide project, and it does not appear that the lift station or wastewater treatment plant projects will negatively impact any targeted areas. Nor will the projects benefit any group at a level greater than the community population demographics.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | DeWitt County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1135-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Yorktown |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.64\% |  | 58.61\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$86,913 |  | \$53,443 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 8.10\% |  | 20.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 20,340 |  | 1,916 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 7,192 | 35.4\% | 969 | 50.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,148 | 64.6\% | 947 | 49.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 11,143 | 54.8\% | 865 | 45.1\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,888 | 9.3\% | 82 | 4.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 5 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 111 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 19,592 | 96.3\% | 1,872 | 97.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 19,457 | 95.7\% | 1,854 | 96.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 135 | 0.7\% | 18 | 0.9\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 748 | 3.7\% | 44 | 2.3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 10,574 | 52.0\% | 940 | 49.1\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,766 | 48.0\% | 976 | 50.9\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,048 | 100\% | 800 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,030 | 57.2\% | 374 | 46.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,538 | 21.8\% | 108 | 13.5\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 450 | 6.4\% | 112 | 14.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 222 | 3.1\% | 63 | 7.9\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | DeWitt County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1135-APP City of Yorktown City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 935 | 13.3\% | 127 | 15.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 60 | 0.9\% | 17 | 2.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 628 | 8.9\% | 110 | 13.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 252 | 3.6\% | 38 | 4.8\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,633 | 23.2\% | 187 | 23.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 273 | 3.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,099 | 15.6\% | 152 | 19.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 758 | 10.8\% | 107 | 13.4\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,435 | 34.5\% | 254 | 31.8\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,631 | 37.3\% | 273 | 34.1\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 18,413 | 100\% | 1,861 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,147 | 17.1\% | 392 | 21.1\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Yoakum: Water System Improvements Project - \$4,960, 187.10 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Yoakum, benefitting 53.30\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $37.94 \%$ greater than DeWitt County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $19.35 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.
. During stormy and high wind events, the nearly 100 year old, Yoakum Street Tank must be filled to capacity to ensure it is at maximum weight, preventing the tank from being pulled from its foundation. For full capacity, the tank must be shut off from the city's water distribution system, so water usage does not reduce the filled capacity. The community is detrimentally affected by this operation due to low water pressure within the distribution system, jeopardizing fire-fighting capabilities because water flow/pressure would be significantly reduced in certain areas with the tank out of service. Insufficient water flow/pressure may not allow fires to be effectively extinguished, leading to additional structure damage.

A new replacement storage tank would be structurally sound such that it would remain in service during all-weather events and provide effective water flow and pressure within the distribution system, including that needed for fire protection. These new facilities would enhance the city's water supply, storage, flow, and pressure by providing increased elevated storage capacity, increased water transportation by replacing very old mains, and increased water production by the construction of a new well, therefore minimizing future maintenance needs.

The project will include:

1. Replacement of the water tank at the end of Yoakum Street to increase tank capacity from 250,000 gallons to 500,000 gallons and provide the city with enhanced fire flow protection by increasing the available elevated storage volume, estimated at 3.5 additional hours of fire flow capacity.
2. Replacement of the water main including burying 5,750 linear feet (LF) of pipeline laid along Arnold and Pruitt Streets from the water tank before joining another water main line heading East along Hopkins Street starting at Irvine Street, under the railroad tracks and then along Waco Street and Price Street before terminating at Schrimscher Street.
3. Improvements for the water main would include related facilities such as fire hydrants, customer service connections and in-line isolation valves.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Yoakum is a community of 5,996 residents in DeWitt County $(20,340)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Yoakum is $\$ 41,384$, $52.38 \%$ less than DeWitt County's median income of $\$ 86,913$, and $20.65 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Yoakum's AMFI is $\$ 45,154$ according to ACS 2019. Yoakum falls across two counties: Dewitt and Lavaca, and neither of these are within a HUD recognized MSA. Yoakum's AMFI is $65 \%$ of Dewitt County ( $\$ 69,700$ ) and $68 \%$ of Lavaca County $(\$ 66,100)$. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Yoakum was $18.00 \%$, greater than DeWitt County's poverty rate of $16.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Yoakum's population is $49.60 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than DeWitt County's $35.40 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Yoakum is $36.80 \%$ white alone, less than DeWitt County's white alone percentage of $54.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Yoakum is $12.20 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than DeWitt County (9.30\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. In the city of Yoakum, $1.40 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than DeWitt County, which is at $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

ACS 2019 data shows Yoakum as a majority minority community with $61.8 \%$ of the population being racial or ethnic minorities. However, no demographic had a majority of the population. In the 2020 Census data, the Hispanic or Latino origin population increased to $52.5 \%$, but the Black or African American population reduced to $8.4 \%$ : creating a smaller racial and ethnic minority majority of $60.8 \%$.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $86.40 \%$ in the city of Yoakum, less than $96.30 \%$ in DeWitt County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Yoakum, $30.00 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than DeWitt County's percentage of $23.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Yoakum's households are $5.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than DeWitt County's percentage of $3.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Yoakum's households are $14.70 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than DeWitt County at $15.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Yoakum are $9.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than DeWitt County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $10.80 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Yoakum $40.00 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than DeWitt County, which is at $34.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Yoakum that have one or more people of 65 or older is $32.00 \%$, which is less than DeWitt County's $37.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Yoakum is $13.50 \%$ which is less than DeWitt County's $17.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The proposed water tank and water well are in a more remote area with a few houses and businesses around. The main project is near a neighborhood of small houses, and potentially near a Public Housing Authority development on Capitol. There are three smaller houses on the dead-end street with the water tower. There are smaller wood homes adjacent to where the pipeline will run in the field behind the houses. On Hopkins Street, there are fewer houses and some business properties nearby.

Once the pipeline goes underground and runs under the train tracks, the homes become larger and are made of brick and wood, moving up Price Street. There is also a school on Price near the end of the project which dead ends into a family center that may be part of a church.

The Project should benefit and burden the community equally since the project has citywide benefit.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | DeWitt County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1188-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Yoakum |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.64\% |  | 53.30\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$86,913 |  | \$41,384 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 8.10\% |  | 18.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 20,340 |  | 5,996 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 7,192 | 35.4\% | 2,977 | 49.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,148 | 64.6\% | 3,019 | 50.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 11,143 | 54.8\% | 2,206 | 36.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,888 | 9.3\% | 730 | 12.2\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 5 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 111 | 0.5\% | 83 | 1.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 19,592 | 96.3\% | 5,182 | 86.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 19,457 | 95.7\% | 5,182 | 86.4\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 135 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 748 | 3.7\% | 814 | 13.6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 10,574 | 52.0\% | 2,820 | 47.0\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,766 | 48.0\% | 3,176 | 53.0\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,048 | 100\% | 2,186 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,030 | 57.2\% | 1,142 | 52.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,538 | 21.8\% | 580 | 26.5\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 450 | 6.4\% | 154 | 7.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 222 | 3.1\% | 135 | 6.2\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | DeWitt County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1188-APP City of Yoakum City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 935 | 13.3\% | 234 | 10.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 60 | 0.9\% | 13 | 0.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 628 | 8.9\% | 167 | 7.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 252 | 3.6\% | 116 | 5.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,633 | 23.2\% | 656 | 30.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 273 | 3.9\% | 129 | 5.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,099 | 15.6\% | 321 | 14.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 758 | 10.8\% | 215 | 9.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,435 | 34.5\% | 875 | 40.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,631 | 37.3\% | 700 | 32.0\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 18,413 | 100\% | 5,812 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,147 | 17.1\% | 786 | 13.5\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Cuero, benefitting 59.66\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $28.81 \%$ greater than the City of Cuero's LMI percentage of $46.32 \%, 54.41 \%$ greater than DeWitt County's LMI percentage of $38.64 \%$ and $33.60 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The French Street Water Treatment Plant and various waterline improvements have been identified as critical projects for the target area. The French Street Water Treatment Plant is a decommissioned water treatment plant that needs to be made operational, to provide a localized pressure source and water to the area. In addition, any damage to critical facilities would leave this area of the city without a dependable water supply during a disaster event. These improvement projects are needed to reduce the effects of future disasters on the area, to improve the resiliency and effectiveness of the system, and to better serve residents. This project will increase system reliability, improve the city's ability to isolate mains and complete necessary repairs, provide reliable fire protection and ensure fire flows can be achieved, and protect the health, safety, and welfare of residents.

- Replace 17,025 LF of existing cast iron mains with PVC pipe and fire hydrants. Locations include Baker Street, French Street, Evers Street, W Morgan Avenue, Douglas Street, E South Railroad Street, Hutcheson Street, E Court House Street, T L Overture Street, Buchel Street, Kathryn, Keller Street, Nash Street, N Gazzie Street, St. Charles Street, Crain Street, Graham Street, and Schleicher Street.
- French Street Water Treatment Plant Improvements - construct a new ground water well, rehabilitate the existing ground storage tank, install two (2) new high service pumps, and install one (1) new generator.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 3,570 adjacent to and within the city of Cuero, a community of 8,297 residents in DeWitt County $(20,340)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Cuero has an AMFI of $\$ 68,732$ according to ACS 2019. There are no block group incomes available in ACS 2019. This is $99 \%$ of the HUD DeWitt County AMFI that is $\$ 69,700$. DeWitt County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $18.10 \%$, equal to the city of Cuero which is at $18.10 \%$, greater than DeWitt County's poverty rate of $16.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $36.31 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, less than the city of Cuero's population percentage of $43.90 \%$, greater than DeWitt County's $35.40 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $51.44 \%$ white alone, greater than the city of Cuero's percentage of $38.50 \%$, less than DeWitt County's percentage of $54.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $11.85 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than the city of Cuero, which has $17.20 \%$, greater than DeWitt County ( $9.30 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

The target area for these projects is $70.6 \%$ minority majority with the Hispanic or Latino origin population being $47.6 \%$, and Black or African American residents at $23 \%$. This is higher than the Cuero citywide demographics of $61.1 \%$ racial or ethnic minorities. The actual work appears to be completed in the block groups within Cuero. Two are in Census Tract 9702 Block Groups 3 and 4, and Census Tract 9704 Block Group 1. Census Tract 9702 Block Group 3 ( 810 people) is a majority minority area of $76.2 \%$ with a majority Black or African American population of 57.4\%. Block Group 4 ( 2,070 people) is also a majority minority area with $77.9 \%$ total and a $63.2 \%$ Hispanic or Latino Majority. Census Tract 9704 Block Group 1 ( 807 people) is a more racially diverse area with a demographic split of Black or African American at 9.5\%, Hispanic or Latino origin at $36.7 \%$, and White not of Hispanic or Latino origin at $51 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $56.87 \%$ male, greater than the city of Cuero at $55.30 \%$, greater than DeWitt County $(52.00 \%)$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $43.13 \%$ female, less than the city of Cuero at $44.70 \%$, less than the $48.00 \%$ of DeWitt County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $54.51 \%$ married couple families, less than the city of Cuero at $48.80 \%$ less than DeWitt County's $57.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $19.62 \%$, less than the city of Cuero at $21.40 \%$, less than DeWitt County's percentage of $21.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $24.03 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of Cuero at $32.50 \%$, greater than DeWitt County's percentage of $23.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $4.31 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than the city of Cuero which is at $6.40 \%$, greater than DeWitt County's percentage of $3.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $15.98 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the city of Cuero at $22.60 \%$, greater than DeWitt County at $15.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $10.26 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it less than the city of Cuero who is at $15.40 \%$, less than DeWitt County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $10.80 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $32.39 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the city of Cuero at $34.40 \%$, less than DeWitt County, which is at $34.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $35.80 \%$, greater than the city of Cuero at $32.80 \%$, less than DeWitt County's $37.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $17.67 \%$, less than the city of Cuero at $18.70 \%$, greater than DeWitt County's $17.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

Around Saint Charles, there are houses that have deferred maintenance, but there are many homes that are well maintained too. The houses generally have wood exteriors. There are empty lots in this section too. In the area near Douglas and West Morgan, the homes are generally well kept and appear to be slightly larger. On Douglass, one side of the street generally does not have houses, but there is Recreational vehicle parking. There are also some MHUs in this area.

It appears that the residents in this area will benefit from this work-especially the water plant rehab. There might be some temporary inconvenience to the residents in the area with during construction, but it should be offset by having an improved water system.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | DeWitt County |  | City of Cuero |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Harvey (State MID) } \\ & \hline \text { CDR17-1161-APP } \\ & \hline \text { City of Cuero } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.64\% |  | 46.32\% |  | 59.66\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$86,913 |  | \$50,408 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 8.10\% |  | 18.10\% |  | 18.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 20,340 |  | 8,297 |  | 9,404 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 7,192 | 35.4\% | 3,644 | 43.9\% | 3,415 | 36.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,148 | 64.6\% | 4,653 | 56.1\% | 5,989 | 63.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 11,143 | 54.8\% | 3,193 | 38.5\% | 4,837 | 51.4\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,888 | 9.3\% | 1,429 | 17.2\% | 1,114 | 11.8\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 5 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 5 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1 | 0.0\% | 1 | 0.0\% | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 111 | 0.5\% | 30 | 0.40\% | 32 | 0.34\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 19,592 | 96.3\% | 8,044 | 97.0\% | 9,121 | 97.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 19,457 | 95.7\% | 7,959 | 95.9\% | 9,108 | 96.9\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 135 | 0.7\% | 85 | 1.0\% | 13 | 0.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 748 | 3.7\% | 253 | 3\% | 283 | 3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 10,574 | 52.0\% | 4,590 | 55.3\% | 5,348 | 56.9\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,766 | 48.0\% | 3,707 | 44.7\% | 4,056 | 43.1\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,048 | 100\% | 2,409 | 100\% | 2,992 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,030 | 57.2\% | 1,175 | 48.8\% | 1,631 | 54.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,538 | 21.8\% | 515 | 21.4\% | 587 | 19.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 450 | 6.4\% | 147 | 6.1\% | 143 | 4.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 222 | 3.1\% | 62 | 2.6\% | 43 | 1.4\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | DeWitt County |  | City of Cuero |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1161-APP City of Cuero Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 935 | 13.3\% | 304 | 12.6\% | 499 | 16.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 60 | 0.9\% | 33 | 1.4\% | 52 | 1.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 628 | 8.9\% | 197 | 8.2\% | 353 | 11.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 252 | 3.6\% | 50 | 2.1\% | 116 | 3.9\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,633 | 23.2\% | 783 | 32.5\% | 719 | 24.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 273 | 3.9\% | 155 | 6.4\% | 129 | 4.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,099 | 15.6\% | 545 | 22.6\% | 478 | 16.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 758 | 10.8\% | 372 | 15.4\% | 307 | 10.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,435 | 34.5\% | 828 | 34.4\% | 969 | 32.4\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,631 | 37.3\% | 789 | 32.8\% | 1,071 | 35.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 18,413 | 100\% | 6,523 | 100\% | 7,827 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,147 | 17.1\% | 1,219 | 18.7\% | 1,383 | 17.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Eastland, benefitting $57.25 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $16.03 \%$ greater than Eastland County's LMI percentage of $49.34 \%$ and $28.19 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Eastland will conduct dam repairs including clearing brush overgrowth that currently compromises structural integrity. Vegetation will be removed from spillway areas to restore the original capacity and the spillway of Lake Eastland will be reconstructed. The drainage structure under E. Main Street will be reconstructed to alleviate the chokepoint it now poses to storm drainage in that area. Street repairs will be conducted to restore stormwater carrying capacity and provide a stable driving surface during rain events. Eastland will also use funds to acquire several repetitive flooded properties to create a flood easement.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. The GLO did raise concerns where there were any questions about the distribution of projects or beneficiaries included.

Eastland is a community of 3,853 residents in Eastland County $(18,273)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Eastland is $\$ 33,375$, $10.47 \%$ less than Eastland County's median income of $\$ 37,276$, and $36.01 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Eastland has an AMFI of $\$ 56,853$ according to ACS 2019. This is $122 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 46,700$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Eastland County, TX HUD Income Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Eastland was $26.50 \%$, compared to Eastland County's poverty rate of $20.50 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

Although the poverty rate in Eastland is over 20\%, there does not appear to be any R/ECAPS within the city of Eastland or Eastland County. The population in the City of Eastland is fairly dispersed within neighborhoods that are near the city center. The dams are in parks or near golf courses. There are a few houses near the dams, but the homes are not adjacent to the dams.

The city of Eastland's population is $26.50 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Eastland County's $16.40 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Eastland is $68.20 \%$ white alone, less than Eastland County's white alone percentage of $79.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Eastland is $2.20 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Eastland County (2.90\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Eastland is $0.00 \%$, less than Eastland County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Eastland is $2.60 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Eastland County's percentage of $0.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

The households in Eastland are comprised of $48.20 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Eastland County's $49.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Eastland that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $13.20 \%$ this is greater than Eastland County's percentage of $13.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of Eastland, $25.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Eastland County's percentage of $26.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Eastland's households are $0.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Eastland County's percentage of $2.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Eastland's households are $24.10 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Eastland County at 19.70\% and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Eastland are $15.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Eastland County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $11.10 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Eastland $15.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Eastland County, which is at $20.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Eastland that have one or more people of 65 or older is $41.70 \%$, which is greater than Eastland County's $40.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Eastland is $22.60 \%$ which is greater than Eastland County's $21.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The city housing is primarily in neighborhood settings, but there is rural housing as well. The housing is mixed in regards to style, size, and quality throughout the community. The housing can vary within the same streets as well. There are some MHU looking houses and a travel trailer park near the main avenue project.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1110-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Eastland | unty | City of Eastland |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 49.34\% |  | 57.25\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$37,276 |  | \$33,375 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.50\% |  | 26.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 18,273 |  | 3,853 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 2,989 | 16.4\% | 1,020 | 26.5\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 15,284 | 83.6\% | 2,833 | 73.5\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 14,494 | 79.3\% | 2,629 | 68.2\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 522 | 2.9\% | 86 | 2.2\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 54 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 113 | 0.6\% | 100 | 2.6\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 101 | 0.6\% | 18 | 0.5\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 17,438 | 95.4\% | 3,512 | 91.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 17,211 | 94.2\% | 3,393 | 88.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 227 | 1.2\% | 119 | 3.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 835 | 4.6\% | 341 | 8.9\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 9,150 | 50.1\% | 2,063 | 53.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,123 | 49.9\% | 1,790 | 46.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 6,492 | 100\% | 1,474 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,217 | 49.6\% | 711 | 48.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 849 | 13.1\% | 194 | 13.2\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 115 | 1.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 35 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Eastland County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1110-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Eastland |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 1,466 | 22.6\% | 384 | 26.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 29 | 0.4\% | 19 | 1.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,212 | 18.7\% | 297 | 20.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 371 | 5.7\% | 86 | 5.8\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,694 | 26.1\% | 379 | 25.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 178 | 2.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,279 | 19.7\% | 355 | 24.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 723 | 11.1\% | 223 | 15.1\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,341 | 20.7\% | 225 | 15.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,608 | 40.2\% | 615 | 41.7\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 18,010 | 100\% | 3,747 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,832 | 21.3\% | 845 | 22.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides an area benefit within Eastland County, benefitting 51.25\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $3.86 \%$ greater than Eastland County's LMI percentage of $49.34 \%$ and $14.75 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Lake Leon Dam is a large high-hazard dam located approximately 8 miles south of IH-20 on Farm-to-Market 2461 in Eastland County. More than $72 \%$ of the Eastland County population would lose their potable water supply source if the Lake Leon dam were to fail, which would also result in the inundation of downstream homes and roadways. With these funds, Eastland County will stabilize the remaining portions of the upstream dam embankment and saddle dam to mitigate risk of chronic geotechnical slope failures. Improvements will also include installation of erosion measures and rehabilitation of the concrete principal spillway conduit and riser, as well as replacement of the existing raw water intake conduit with a floating intake structure. These improvements will mitigate the risk of a catastrophic dam failure associated with an erosion breach of the auxiliary spillway during an extreme flood event

The project has a beneficiary total of 6,625 within Eastland County $(18,273)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $20.50 \%$, which is equal to Eastland County's poverty rate of $20.50 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project beneficiary area is $18.94 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than Eastland County's $16.40 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $75.74 \%$ white alone, less than Eastland County's percentage of $79.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $3.63 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is greater than Eastland County ( $2.90 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.10 \%$, which is less than Eastland County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $1.20 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Eastland County's percentage of $0.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.39 \%$ two or more races, less than Eastland County, which is at $0.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$. Census Tracts 9501 and 9502 have AMFI's of \$43,782 and \$79,368 respectively according to ACS 2019.

The areas targeted are more racially and ethnically diverse than the county; including the most diverse area in the county located near the project site at $34.8 \%$. The project provides water for the larger cities in the County of Eastland: the city of Eastland and the city of Ranger. These cities have racial and ethnic populations of $28.7 \%$ and $18.7 \%$, respectively. The city of Eastland's total minority population is almost $10 \%$ greater than the County as a whole. Ranger's minority populations consistent with Eastland County's population. The project serves Eastland County's population consistently with the demographics of the area and does not appear to burden or benefit any single race or ethnicity disproportionately to the demographics of the population.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $46.90 \%$ married couple families, less than Eastland County's $49.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $13.07 \%$, less than Eastland County's percentage of $13.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $2.16 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Eastland County's percentage of $1.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.14 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than Eastland County's $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $25.13 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Eastland County's percentage of $26.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $0.72 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, which is less than Eastland County's percentage of $2.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $21.63 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Eastland County at $19.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $13.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Eastland County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $11.10 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $16.76 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Eastland County, which is at $20.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $40.36 \%$, greater than Eastland County's $40.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $21.60 \%$, greater than Eastland County's $21.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The housing directly around the dam site is generally lake style neighborhoods but $72 \%$ of the County population benefits from potable water and protection from inundation downstream of both housing and roadways. The houses vary in size and quality, with some appearing to be weekend housing and others to be occupied full time. We did not visit all other communities in the County as their participation is in the form of potable drinking water.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1026-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Eastland | unty | Eastland County |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 49.34\% |  | 51.25\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$37,276 |  | \#N/A |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.50\% |  | 20.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 18,273 |  | 8,734 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 2,989 | 16.4\% | 1,654 | 18.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 15,284 | 83.6\% | 7,080 | 81.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 14,494 | 79.3\% | 6,615 | 75.7\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 522 | 2.9\% | 317 | 3.6\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 54 | 0.3\% | 9 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 113 | 0.6\% | 105 | 1.2\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 101 | 0.6\% | 34 | 0.39\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 17,438 | 95.4\% | 8,192 | 93.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 17,211 | 94.2\% | 8,073 | 92.4\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 227 | 1.2\% | 119 | 1.4\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 835 | 4.6\% | 542 | 6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 9,150 | 50.1\% | 4,638 | 53.1\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,123 | 49.9\% | 4,096 | 46.9\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 6,492 | 100\% | 3,060 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,217 | 49.6\% | 1,435 | 46.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 849 | 13.1\% | 400 | 13.1\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 115 | 1.8\% | 66 | 2.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 35 | 0.5\% | 35 | 1.1\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Eastland County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1026-APP |
|  |  |  | Eastland County |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 1,466 | 22.6\% | 790 | 25.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 29 | 0.4\% | 19 | 0.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,212 | 18.7\% | 628 | 20.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 371 | 5.7\% | 182 | 5.9\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,694 | 26.1\% | 769 | 25.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 178 | 2.7\% | 22 | 0.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,279 | 19.7\% | 662 | 21.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 723 | 11.1\% | 404 | 13.2\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,341 | 20.7\% | 513 | 16.8\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,608 | 40.2\% | 1,235 | 40.4\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 18,010 | 100\% | 8,586 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,832 | 21.3\% | 1,855 | 21.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Eastland County: Project Service Areas



Awardee Application ID Total Benefs.
City of Eastland CDR17-1110-APP 3,415
Eastland County CDR17-1026-APP



## Eastland County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

- Non-Hispanic White Population
- Hispanic or Latino Population
- Black or African American Population

Asian Population

- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$\square$ 0-15
$\square$
$\square$
Note: Block Groups with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Eastland County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (5 Block Groups)10-25 percent (10 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (4 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Vidor: Citywide Floodwater Detention and Drainage Project - \$15,801,291 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Vidor, benefitting 65.97\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $74.76 \%$ greater than Orange County's LMI percentage of $37.75 \%$ and $47.72 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

During several named and unnamed flooding events over the last decade, streets and structures in the city of Vidor have become inundated with floodwaters and remained submerged for several days, preventing the safe evacuation of residents and resulting in millions of dollars in damages. Additionally, transport of supplies and access by first responders and volunteers has been limited due to the failure of the existing drainage facilities to adequately direct water away from structures and infrastructure.

Following these periods of significant rainfall, the drainage system often remains overwhelmed for significant periods of time due to undersized and inadequate drainage structures, causing the ditches to overflow onto the roadways and into adjacent homes.

To mitigate loss of life, damage to property, suffering, and improve access of emergency vehicles and first responders during future events, the city of Vidor will execute the following citywide flood and drainage improvements:

- Construct three detention facilities at Tram Road, Conn Park and Orange Street, for a total capacity of 391,700 cubic yards.
- Ditch improvements at Lyndale Street, Heritage Drive, Lexington Drive, and Concord Street for a total of 2,500 linear feet.
- Correct roadside culvert sizing and improve culvert crossing at Ferndale Street, Lyndale Street, Heritage Drive, Lamar Street, Lexington Drive, Concord Street, and Orange Street for a total of 2,880 linear feet.
- Replace storm sewer lines at Orange Street, Lyndale Street, Heritage Drive, and Lamar Street, for a total of 10,300 linear feet.
- Install roadway at the Tram Road detention pond, Conn Park detention pond, and Orange Road detention pond for a total of 8,800 linear feet and roadway reconstruction at Ferndale Street and Orange Street for a total of 360 linear feet.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Vidor is a community of 10,725 residents in Orange County $(84,069)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Vidor is $\$ 43,637,26.54 \%$ less than Orange County's median income of $\$ 59,399$, and $16.33 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's
median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Vidor has an AMFI of \$61,196 according to ACS 2019. This is $91 \%$ of the Orange County AMFI which is $\$ 67,500$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Vidor was $19.50 \%$, greater than Orange County's poverty rate of $13.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Vidor's population is $8.20 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Orange County's $7.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Vidor is $90.50 \%$ white alone, greater than Orange County's white alone percentage of $80.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Vidor is $0.10 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Orange County ( $8.70 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Vidor is $0.10 \%$, less than Orange County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. In the city of Vidor, $1.20 \%$ of the population is two or more races, less than Orange County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Vidor lost almost 1,000 residents between the 2019 ACS data and 2020 Census: shifting from 10,725 to 9,789 people. The Black or African American population increased from seven residents to thirty-nine residents. While this change seems small, this is substantial progress for the racial make-up of Vidor. With that being said, the Black or African American community remains less than one percent of the overall population. Vidor has had a reputation as a "sundown town" in the past which is why even modest growth in the Black or African American populations is a trend in the right direction. The Hispanic population dropped by 123 people which offset the gain they had made in 2019. The White, not of Hispanic or Latino population has dropped by 1,030 people. The net effect is that the population of Vidor has dropped as a percentage in both minority totals and White, not Hispanic or Latino totals.

It is not measurable directly because of the low number of people who use I-10, but the flooding in Vidor closed the highway at Vidor during the Harvey storm. That impacted other communities like Beaumont ( $64.7 \%$ racial and ethnic population), the City of Orange ( $44.7 \%$ racial and ethnic population), and Port Arthur ( 75.3 racial and ethnic population).

The households in Vidor are comprised of $51.00 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Orange County's $53.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Vidor that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $21.50 \%$ this is greater than Orange County's percentage of $20.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Vidor's households are $2.70 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Orange County's percentage of $5.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $0.80 \%$ is within the city of Vidor, which is less than Orange County's $2.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Vidor, $29.40 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Orange County's percentage of $24.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Vidor's households are $6.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no
spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Orange County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and equal to the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Vidor's households are $17.60 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Orange County at $13.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Vidor are $8.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Orange County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.50 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

The city of Vidor is comprised of $16.90 \%$ households that are occupied by a male with no spouse or partner present, less than Orange County $(16.80 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $17.6 \%$. The city of Vidor's households are $1.30 \%$ occupied by a male householder with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Orange County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $1.4 \%$. Vidor has $10.90 \%$ of households that are occupied by a male living alone, which is less than Orange County's $12.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage $11.8 \%$. The city of Vidor's households are $4.90 \%$ occupied by a male householder over the age of 65 with no partner or spouse, which is greater than Orange County at $3.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.7 \%$.

In Vidor $34.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Orange County, which is at $34.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Vidor that have one or more people of 65 or older is $29.80 \%$, which is greater than Orange County's $29.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Vidor is $18.70 \%$ which is greater than Orange County's $16.50 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Orange County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0896-APP City of Vidor |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 37.75\% |  | 65.97\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$59,399 |  | \$43,637 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.80\% |  | 19.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 84,069 |  | 10,725 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 6,456 | 7.7\% | 880 | 8.2\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 77,613 | 92.3\% | 9,845 | 91.8\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 67,807 | 80.7\% | 9,701 | 90.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 7,302 | 8.7\% | 7 | 0.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 244 | 0.3\% | 9 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 980 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 39 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,241 | 1.5\% | 128 | 1.2\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 81,143 | 96.5\% | 10,467 | 97.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 80,791 | 96.1\% | 10,455 | 97.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 352 | 0.4\% | 12 | 0.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,926 | 3.5\% | 258 | 2.4\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 41,719 | 49.6\% | 5,090 | 47.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 42,350 | 50.4\% | 5,635 | 52.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 31,694 | 100\% | 3,929 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 16,794 | 53.0\% | 2,005 | 51.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 6,619 | 20.9\% | 846 | 21.5\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,810 | 5.7\% | 105 | 2.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 740 | 2.3\% | 33 | 0.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Orange County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0896-APP City of Vidor City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 5,335 | 16.8\% | 665 | 16.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 477 | 1.5\% | 52 | 1.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 3,902 | 12.3\% | 427 | 10.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,108 | 3.5\% | 193 | 4.9\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 7,755 | 24.5\% | 1,154 | 29.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,632 | 5.1\% | 257 | 6.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 4,188 | 13.2\% | 691 | 17.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 2,375 | 7.5\% | 321 | 8.2\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 10,773 | 34.0\% | 1,349 | 34.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 9,359 | 29.5\% | 1,172 | 29.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 83,317 | 100\% | 10,559 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 13,783 | 16.5\% | 1,976 | 18.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of West Orange: Citywide Flood and Drainage Improvements Project - \$3,790,353 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of West Orange, benefitting 77.24\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $104.60 \%$ greater than Orange County's LMI percentage of $37.75 \%$ and $72.95 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The project will mitigate loss of life, damage to property, suffering, and improve access of emergency vehicles and first responders during future events. During several named and unnamed flooding events over the last decade, streets have become inundated with floodwaters and remained submerged for several days, preventing the safe evacuation of residents. Additionally, transport of supplies and access by first responders and volunteers has been limited due to the failure of the existing drainage facilities to adequately direct water away from structures and infrastructure.

The improvements will reduce the risk as well as the duration of flooding along city roadways. Deepening and widening road-side ditches, removing and replacing damaged and undersized driveways and street crossing culverts, hardening existing outfall ditches and installing concrete lining will allow for faster dissipation of flood waters. This will ensure that the residents may safely evacuate and that the emergency operations remain open for those unable to do so.

The city of West Orange will improve over 40 different sites throughout the city. The project will provide the following:

- Regrade/reshape approximately 16,850 linear feet of street ditches
- Remove and replace culverts for a combined total of approximately 16,851 linear feet
- Conduct approximately 6,760 linear feet of driveway repairs
- Reshape/regrade approximately 4,500 linear feet of a collection ditch
- Line a collection ditch with approximately 4,500 linear feet of concrete

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

West Orange is a community of 3,342 residents in Orange County $(84,069)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of West Orange is $\$ 47,692$, $19.71 \%$ less than Orange County's median income of $\$ 59,399$, and $8.56 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. West Orange's AMFI is $\$ 50,938$ according to ACS 2019. This is $76 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Orange County of $\$ 67,500$. Orange County is within the Beaumont-Port Arthur TX HUD Metro FMR area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of West Orange was $13.10 \%$, less than Orange County's poverty rate of
$13.80 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. According to ACS 2019 data estimates, the poverty rate in West Orange increased to $20.3 \%$.

The city of West Orange's population is $16.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Orange County's $7.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of West Orange is $61.80 \%$ white alone, less than Orange County's white alone percentage of $80.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of West Orange is $17.70 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Orange County (8.70\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. In the city of West Orange, $4.30 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Orange County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

West Orange has a substantial racial and ethnic minority population with $33.8 \%$ being in those demographics. Blacks and African Americans make up approximately $17.7 \%$ of the city's total population. We do not know where the population lives as to exact streets, but $61 \%$ of the racial minority population is being served by these projects. This calculation is based on the population of the Census Tract Block Groups. Racial and ethnic minorities account of $32.3 \%$ of Block Group 1 and $39.2 \%$ of Block Group 2. Both Block Groups have streets receiving project benefits. Block Group 2 has a higher-than-average White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population and is receiving work in the area. Block Group 4 does not appear to be getting much focus in this program; however, this is likely because it received work from previous projects. Block Group 4 has the highest population of African Americans by raw numbers, but the number of African Americans there is less than the total number in the other Block Groups combined.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $88.10 \%$ in the city of West Orange, less than $96.50 \%$ in Orange County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in West Orange are comprised of $42.40 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Orange County's $53.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in West Orange that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $17.10 \%$ this is less than Orange County's percentage of $20.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of West Orange's households are $8.10 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Orange County's percentage of $5.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $3.00 \%$ is within the city of West Orange, which is greater than Orange County's $2.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of West Orange, $31.00 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Orange County's percentage of $24.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. West Orange's households are $3.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Orange County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. West Orange's households are $16.40 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Orange County at $13.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in West Orange are $7.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present
that are over the age of 65, making it less than Orange County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.50 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In West Orange $35.70 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Orange County, which is at $34.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within West Orange that have one or more people of 65 or older is $29.40 \%$, which is less than Orange County's $29.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of West Orange is $18.10 \%$ which is greater than Orange County's $16.50 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Overall, the housing in the project areas consists of many smaller, wood sided houses and some MHUs. The roads north of Western (Pampa, Osage, Jasper) and around Austin Avenue generally have smaller houses that are well maintained. There are City facilities in this area and a Park near Jasper Street.

Burnett Street has commercial properties on it, open land, and it does feed into neighborhoods. The streets around Lansing and Smith are generally smaller, but have well-maintained wood and brick homes. The streets between Flint and Albany and the dead-end streets off of Bowie are a mixed area. Crocket has some larger and well-kept houses. Bonham has small houses and the streets that dead-end off of Bowie (Boston, Erie, Dayton, and Chester) have smaller homes some in need of repair. The Delano, Bowie, Travis, Milam and Smith section is a remote part of town. It is not heavily populated, and the homes vary greatly. Some are elevated, clearly having been in flood areas. A few are larger, but most are small.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Orange County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0622-APP <br> City of West Orange City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.75\% |  | 77.24\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$59,399 |  | \$47,692 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.80\% |  | 13.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 84,069 |  | 3,342 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE $^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 6,456 | 7.7\% | 538 | 16.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 77,613 | 92.3\% | 2,804 | 83.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 67,807 | 80.7\% | 2,067 | 61.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 7,302 | 8.7\% | 593 | 17.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 244 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 980 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 39 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,241 | 1.5\% | 144 | 4.3\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 81,143 | 96.5\% | 2,963 | 88.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 80,791 | 96.1\% | 2,943 | 88.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 352 | 0.4\% | 20 | 0.6\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,926 | 3.5\% | 379 | 11.3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 41,719 | 49.6\% | 1,718 | 51.4\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 42,350 | 50.4\% | 1,624 | 48.6\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 31,694 | 100\% | 1,302 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 16,794 | 53.0\% | 552 | 42.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 6,619 | 20.9\% | 222 | 17.1\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,810 | 5.7\% | 105 | 8.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 740 | 2.3\% | 39 | 3.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Orange County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0622-APP <br> City of West Orange City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 5,335 | 16.8\% | 242 | 18.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 477 | 1.5\% | 61 | 4.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 3,902 | 12.3\% | 162 | 12.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,108 | 3.5\% | 58 | 4.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 7,755 | 24.5\% | 403 | 31.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,632 | 5.1\% | 43 | 3.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 4,188 | 13.2\% | 213 | 16.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 2,375 | 7.5\% | 95 | 7.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 10,773 | 34.0\% | 465 | 35.7\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 9,359 | 29.5\% | 383 | 29.4\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 83,317 | 100\% | 3,342 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 13,783 | 16.5\% | 605 | 18.1\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Orange County: Project Service Areas



## Orange County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population
Asian Population

- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance - 0-1 ategory or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Orange County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (28 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent ( 26 Block Groups)25-45 percent (10 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Refugio, benefitting 51.98\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $36.08 \%$ greater than Refugio County's LMI percentage of $38.20 \%$ and $16.40 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The town of Refugio is located approximately 15 miles from the Gulf of Mexico. It is surrounded by an intricate creek and river system, making it very susceptible to flooding. This susceptibility causes drainage issues, damaging critical assets. During Hurricane Harvey flooding damaged or destroyed $100 \%$ of the county's affordable rental housing .

Refugio's mitigation project proposes improvements to the drainage system and increases resiliency to the water and wastewater system affecting the entire town. These activities will mitigate the issues the town encounters providing continuous drainage and critical water and wastewater services to residents during heavy rain events, severe flooding, and subsequent power outages. These activities will increase the town's resilience to disasters, reduce/eliminate future damage and loss of property, greatly reduce the health risks to citizens, and reduce suffering and hardship by lessening the impact of future disasters on the town's drainage, water and wastewater systems.

This will be accomplished by the following:

- Build a new wastewater treatment plant adjacent to the existing plant above the floodplain
- Install lift station generators
- Demolish the existing elevated water storage tank and install a new elevated water storage tank
- Install generators at the wastewater treatment plant
- Construct drainage improvements at Whitlow Addition
- Install concrete pavement and underground storm drains on Commerce Street from FM 774 to Commons and on Commons Street from Swift to 1st Street (RR tracks)

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Refugio is a community of 2,806 residents in Refugio County $(7,145)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Refugio is $\$ 52,929,5.70 \%$ greater than Refugio County's median income of $\$ 50,076$, and $1.48 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The Town of Refugio has an AMFI of $\$ 63,359$ according to ACS 2019. This is $99.9 \%$ of the HUD area AMFI for Refugio County which is $\$ 63,400$. The HUD

AMFI is part of the Refugio County Income Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Refugio was $18.60 \%$, greater than Refugio County's poverty rate of $18.40 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the Town of Refugio increased to $21.2 \%$ while Refugio County's poverty rate decreased to $16.5 \%$.

The city of Refugio's population is $55.80 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Refugio County's $50.40 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Refugio is $30.50 \%$ white alone, less than Refugio County's white alone percentage of $41.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Refugio is $12.80 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Refugio County (6.50\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Refugio is a majority minority community with $68 \%$ of the population identifying as minorities. The Hispanic or Latino origin population is a substantial portion of the community, constituting $57 \%$ of the total population. The White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population is the second largest demographic at $29.2 \%$. No particular group will be burdened with more negative aspects of the projects than others. Additionally, the wastewater treatment plant is located away from any housing.

Even though the community is significantly of the same race or ethnicity, the Fair Housing Act still covers discrimination. Same race or ethnicity people can discriminate based on national origin, family status, and of course the most common Fair Housing complaint being filed currently is for people with special needs which cuts across all races and ethnicities.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $98.40 \%$ in the city of Refugio, greater than $98.20 \%$ in Refugio County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in Refugio are comprised of $40.30 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Refugio County's $47.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Refugio that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $16.60 \%$ this is greater than Refugio County's percentage of $13.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Refugio's households are $6.20 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Refugio County's percentage of $4.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $5.30 \%$ is within the city of Refugio, which is greater than Refugio County's $3.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Refugio, $34.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Refugio County's percentage of $30.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Refugio's households are $6.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Refugio County's percentage of $6.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Refugio's households are $24.10 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Refugio

County at $15.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Refugio are $12.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Refugio County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Refugio is $23.70 \%$ which is greater than Refugio County's $21.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Throughout the community, there are homes in need of repair; but most of the homes in the community are generally in good condition. Scattered around the lift station projects, there is mixed housing with some larger homes and smaller homes nearby.

The housing in the Whitlow drainage project area is generally mid-size, brick, and tract style housing that is mostly well maintained. One of the drainage projects indicated in the application appears to run through an open field behind the homes on Fanning. Based on the map markings, it also appears to run behind the football stadium toward the school.. There is a cul-de-sac in this area that has comparatively larger homes that may be included in the drainage project based on the map.

The water tower project is across the street from some affordable housing. It is in a large open area with sports fields in the same area. There is also some smaller, wooden, rural housing across the side street. The work here may cause a temporary noise issue, but long term, it does not appear that it would be an ongoing issue.

The Commerce Street project contains some mixed-use housing, large well cared for homes, public use buildings (City Hall, Police Station, Library) and commercial areas on a historical downtown avenue. Most of Refugios's commerce currently appears to be on the next street over (Highway 77).

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1053-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Refugio |  | City of Refugio |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 38.20\% |  | 51.98\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$50,076 |  | \$52,929 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.40\% |  | 18.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 7,145 |  | 2,806 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,604 | 50.4\% | 1,567 | 55.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 3,541 | 49.6\% | 1,239 | 44.2\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 2,975 | 41.6\% | 856 | 30.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 463 | 6.5\% | 358 | 12.8\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.1\% | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 21 | 0.3\% | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 75 | 1.0\% | 21 | 0.7\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 7,015 | 98.2\% | 2,771 | 98.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 6,976 | 97.6\% | 2,760 | 98.4\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 39 | 0.5\% | 11 | 0.4\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 130 | 1.8\% | 35 | 1.2\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 3,439 | 48.1\% | 1,377 | 49.1\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 3,706 | 51.9\% | 1,429 | 50.9\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 2,547 | 100\% | 972 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,199 | 47.1\% | 392 | 40.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 346 | 13.6\% | 161 | 16.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 116 | 4.6\% | 60 | 6.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 85 | 3.3\% | 52 | 5.3\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1053-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Refugio |  | City of Refugio |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 466 | 18.3\% | 183 | 18.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 40 | 1.6\% | 30 | 3.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 335 | 13.2\% | 110 | 11.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 133 | 5.2\% | 39 | 4.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 766 | 30.1\% | 337 | 34.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 156 | 6.1\% | 62 | 6.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 400 | 15.7\% | 234 | 24.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 200 | 7.9\% | 117 | 12.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 755 | 29.6\% | 331 | 34.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,036 | 40.7\% | 348 | 35.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 6,981 | 100\% | 2,699 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,505 | 21.6\% | 639 | 23.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Refugio County: Hazard Mitigation Improvements Project - \$6,910,131 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the town of Woodsboro, benefitting 59.17\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $54.89 \%$ greater than Refugio County's LMI percentage of $38.20 \%$ and $32.49 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Refugio County's mitigation project proposes improvements to the drainage system and increases resiliency to the water system in the town of Woodsboro. The proposed activities will mitigate the issues Woodsboro encounters by providing continuous drainage and critical water services during flooding and power outages. These activities will increase the town's resilience to disasters, reduce future loss of property, reduce health risks to citizens, and lessen the impact of future disasters on the town's drainage and water systems.

This will be accomplished by the following:

1. Underground storm sewer drainage on Jeter Street from Driscoll Street to FM 1360 Ditch, to include inlets at street intersections.
2. Southwest drainage improvements on Driscoll, Davis, Gallia, Beasley, Vance, Elizabeth, Magnolia, and 6th Streets to include ditch regrading, driveway culverts and street culverts.
3. Drainage improvements on FM 1360 (Kasten Avenue) from FM 1360 to the ditch just south of the high school/Jeter Street to include concrete ditch lining and street drainage crossings.
4. New water well and water treatment facility to include ground storage tank, pumps, chlorination system, fencing, etc., at existing location.
5. New trunk line from new water plant to existing elevated storage tank.
6. Locke Street water line replacement from Terminal Street to FM 1360.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Woodsboro is a community of 1,396 residents in Refugio County $(7,145)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Woodsboro is $\$ 44,637$, $10.86 \%$ less than Refugio County's median income of $\$ 50,076$, and $14.41 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Woodsboro has an AMFI of $\$ 59,861$ according to ACS 2019. This is $94 \%$ of the HUD area AMFI which is $\$ 63,400$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Refugio County, TX HUD Income Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the town of Woodsboro is at $17.40 \%$, less than Refugio County's poverty rate of $18.40 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The town of Woodsboro's population is $54.50 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Refugio County's $50.40 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Woodsboro is $39.50 \%$ white alone, less than Refugio County's white alone percentage of $41.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The town of Woodsboro is 4.20\% Black or African American alone, less than Refugio County ( $6.50 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The town of Woodsboro is $0.30 \%$ Asian alone, equal to Refugio County's percentage of $0.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. In the town of Woodsboro, $1.40 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Refugio County, which is at $1.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Woodsboro is a majority minority city with a racial and ethnic population of $58.7 \%$. It is the second largest city in Refugio County after the city of Refugio. Refugio County has a slightly lower racial and ethnic population compared to Woodsboro, with $56.9 \%$ of the population in this demographic.

Initially, there was a concern before conducting the windshield survey that one half of the town is benefiting over the other. However, upon driving through the neighborhoods, it was clear that many of the other streets had the drainage trenches recently cleaned. Furthermore, some streets had been repaved which is likely from prior HUD/GLO funding. Therefore, the project looks to be a continuation of the Woodsboro Harvey project and would likely complete most of the Town.

The households in Woodsboro are comprised of $31.80 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Refugio County's $47.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Woodsboro that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $8.70 \%$ this is less than Refugio County's percentage of $13.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The town of Woodsboro's households are $5.90 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Refugio County's percentage of $4.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $2.80 \%$ is within the town of Woodsboro, which is less than Refugio County's $3.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area 2.2\%.

In the town of Woodsboro, $38.10 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Refugio County's percentage of $30.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Woodsboro's households are $5.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Refugio County's percentage of $6.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Woodsboro's households are $15.00 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than Refugio County at $15.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Woodsboro are $7.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than Refugio County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

The town of Woodsboro is comprised of $24.10 \%$ households that are occupied by a male with no spouse or partner present, greater than Refugio County ( $18.30 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible
area of $17.6 \%$. The town of Woodsboro's households are $0.60 \%$ occupied by a male householder with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18 , less than Refugio County, which is at $1.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $1.4 \%$. Woodsboro has $17.80 \%$ of households that are occupied by a male living alone, which is greater than Refugio County's $13.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage $11.8 \%$. The town of Woodsboro's households are $6.10 \%$ occupied by a male householder over the age of 65 with no partner or spouse, which is greater than Refugio County at $5.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.7 \%$.

In Woodsboro $29.60 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is equal to Refugio County, which is at $29.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Woodsboro that have one or more people of 65 or older is $46.20 \%$, which is greater than Refugio County's $40.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the town of Woodsboro is $21.20 \%$ which is less than Refugio County's $21.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Woodsboro is a smaller rural community with a mix of housing. Most of the housing is smaller in size and generally has wood siding. There are, however, larger homes and homes that are predominately brick. Additionally, there is new construction and there are also MHUs. Most housing is well maintained, but there are exceptions that have deferred maintenance. There are numerous churches and some retail type activities in the community. There are generally no curbs or gutters. The water plant is near a neighborhood, but it is somewhat screened and is not visually offensive.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Refugio County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1052-APP Refugio County |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide (Town of Woodsboro) |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.20\% |  | 59.17\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$50,076 |  | \$44,637 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.40\% |  | 17.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 7,145 |  | 1,344 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,604 | 50.4\% | 733 | 54.5\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 3,541 | 49.6\% | 611 | 45.5\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 2,975 | 41.6\% | 531 | 39.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 463 | 6.5\% | 57 | 4.2\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 21 | 0.3\% | 4 | 0.3\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 75 | 1.0\% | 19 | 1.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 7,015 | 98.2\% | 1,301 | 96.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 6,976 | 97.6\% | 1,301 | 96.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 39 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 130 | 1.8\% | 43 | 3.2\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 3,439 | 48.1\% | 631 | 46.9\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 3,706 | 51.9\% | 713 | 53.1\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 2,547 | 100\% | 493 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,199 | 47.1\% | 157 | 31.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 346 | 13.6\% | 43 | 8.7\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 116 | 4.6\% | 29 | 5.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 85 | 3.3\% | 14 | 2.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Refugio County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) <br> CDR17-1052-APP <br> Refugio County <br> City-Wide (Town of Woodsboro) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 466 | 18.3\% | 119 | 24.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 40 | 1.6\% | 3 | 0.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 335 | 13.2\% | 88 | 17.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 133 | 5.2\% | 30 | 6.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 766 | 30.1\% | 188 | 38.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 156 | 6.1\% | 25 | 5.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 400 | 15.7\% | 74 | 15.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 200 | 7.9\% | 36 | 7.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 755 | 29.6\% | 146 | 29.6\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,036 | 40.7\% | 228 | 46.2\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 6,981 | 100\% | 1,344 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,505 | 21.6\% | 285 | 21.2\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Refugio County: Project Service Areas



## Refugio County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-15

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Refugio County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (2 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (4 Block Groups)25-45 percent (2 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



## Calhoun County: Heron Slough Drainage System Improvements Project - \$11,305,233 -

 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical DepressionsThis project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Seadrift, benefitting 56.68\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $34.95 \%$ greater than Calhoun County's LMI percentage of $42.00 \%$ and $26.91 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

This project will increase the resiliency of the existing drainage system in the city of Seadrift. Seadrift often experiences flooding due to inadequate ditch and culvert capacity and the inability of the system to quickly drain water runoff, leaving this low-income community flooded with standing water. Many upstream properties flood during storm events due to the slow drain time of the city drainage system. Heron Slough is the main city drainage passage, and it encompasses a large portion of the city.

- Clean out and increase capacity of the Heron Slough
- Increase capacity of tributary ditches throughout the southern part of the city that flow to the Slough and size their culverts appropriately
- Upgrade four road crossings located on $4^{\text {th }}, 5^{\text {th }}, 6^{\text {th }}$, and Dallas Street to make them more resistant to erosion and create a higher structural strength during and after a storm event.
- Build a new diversion culvert on $9^{\text {th }}$ Street to divert most water runoff down the new culvert instead of going into Heron Slough.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Seadrift is a community of 1,535 residents in Calhoun County $(21,668)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Seadrift is $\$ 33,365,43.23 \%$ less than Calhoun County's median income of $\$ 58,776$, and $36.03 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Seadrift's AMFI is $\$ 71,513$ compared with Calhoun County's at $\$ 71,735$. These are both $97 \%$ of HUDs AMFI for Calhoun County of $\$ 72,700$. Calhoun County is not in a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Seadrift is at $32.00 \%$, greater than Calhoun County's poverty rate of $14.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Seadrift's population is $35.60 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Calhoun County's $48.90 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Seadrift is $57.30 \%$ white alone, greater than Calhoun County's white alone percentage of $42.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Seadrift is $0.00 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Calhoun County ( $2.30 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of 13.2 , The city of Seadrift is $5.20 \%$ Asian alone, less than Calhoun County's percentage of $5.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. In the city of Seadrift,
$1.90 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Calhoun County, which is at $1.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.
Seadrift has more White not of Hispanic or Latino Origin residents than the County, but the population of non-White alone not of Hispanic or Latino origin in Seadrift is $42.5 \%$. The work cuts through the heart of Seadrift to protect homes that are along the drainage and reroutes water away from the houses. The housing directly adjacent to Herron Slough generally trends toward the smaller size; however, there are a small number of larger houses near the slough closer to the bay.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $83.00 \%$ in the city of Seadrift, less than $87.10 \%$ in Calhoun County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in Seadrift are comprised of $44.60 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Calhoun County's $50.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Seadrift that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $22.30 \%$ this is greater than Calhoun County's percentage of $20.30 \%$ and equal to the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Seadrift's households are $2.80 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Calhoun County's percentage of $5.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $2.80 \%$ is within the city of Seadrift, which is greater than Calhoun County's $2.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.
In the city of Seadrift, $27.00 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Calhoun County's percentage of $24.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Seadrift's households are $0.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Calhoun County's percentage of $6.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Seadrift's households are $16.80 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Calhoun County at $12.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Seadrift are $6.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Calhoun County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Seadrift $39.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Calhoun County, which is at $33.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Seadrift that have one or more people of 65 or older is $30.30 \%$, which is less than Calhoun County's $32.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Seadrift is $29.00 \%$ which is greater than Calhoun County's $18.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The properties in Seadrift are similar to many other coastal communities. Some are elevated although most are not. They are mostly smaller, wood exterior homes, but a few larger homes are present as well. There are a few scattered brick homes mixed in throughout the community. There is a drainage/bayou/slough area in Seadrift, and generally there is open land around it. There are also nice, larger, beach style houses that may be vacation housing closer to the water. However,
these houses do not appear to be benefitted by the proposed work as they are separate from the Herron Slough, or are away from other construction.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Calhoun County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0828-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Calhoun County |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide (City of Seadrift) |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 42.00\% |  | 56.68\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$58,776 |  | \$33,365 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.10\% |  | 32.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 21,668 |  | 1,181 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 10,589 | 48.9\% | 421 | 35.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 11,079 | 51.1\% | 760 | 64.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 9,163 | 42.3\% | 677 | 57.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 505 | 2.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1,140 | 5.3\% | 61 | 5.2\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 264 | 1.2\% | 22 | 1.9\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 18,866 | 87.1\% | 980 | 83.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 18,695 | 86.3\% | 980 | 83.0\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 171 | 0.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,802 | 12.9\% | 201 | 17.0\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 11,082 | 51.1\% | 565 | 47.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,586 | 48.9\% | 616 | 52.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,582 | 100\% | 363 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,850 | 50.8\% | 162 | 44.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,536 | 20.3\% | 81 | 22.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 390 | 5.1\% | 10 | 2.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 164 | 2.2\% | 10 | 2.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Calhoun County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0828-APP Calhoun County City-Wide (City of Seadrift) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,519 | 20.0\% | 93 | 25.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 41 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,134 | 15.0\% | 77 | 21.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 346 | 4.6\% | 37 | 10.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,823 | 24.0\% | 98 | 27.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 512 | 6.8\% | 1 | 0.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 939 | 12.4\% | 61 | 16.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 503 | 6.6\% | 25 | 6.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,556 | 33.7\% | 142 | 39.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,434 | 32.1\% | 110 | 30.3\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 21,444 | 100\% | 1,181 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,979 | 18.6\% | 342 | 29.0\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Seadrift: Drainage Improvement Project - \$4,850,939.04-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Seadrift, benefitting 56.68\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $34.95 \%$ greater than Calhoun County's LMI percentage of $42.00 \%$ and $26.91 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Seadrift is the only city along the shores of the San Antonio Bay. Generally protected from the daily churn of the gulf, the city unfortunately is frequently in the path of hurricanes and tropical depressions.

Every flooding event in the city leaves houses as islands midst the high water and strands residents in their homes until the waters recede. During all flood/ hurricane events, flood waters cover the streets creating dangerous ingress/egress for residents and emergency vehicles.

As identified in the 2017 Calhoun County HMAP, the Seadrift drainage project is designed to reduce flooding within the city of Seadrift. The drainage improvements will allow the storm water to drain to San Antonio Bay quicker and mitigate flooding from all but the most severe storms.

The project will include of regrading and deepening of ditches and replacing drainage culverts throughout the city. The project contains the following improvements:

- Deepening of Herrin's Slough from Bay Ave. to 9th St.
- Replacing of road crossing culverts at $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street, $4^{\text {th }}$ Street, $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, and Dallas Avenue.
- Construction of storm sewer and appurtenances along Oakland Avenue from Hallies Bayou to $9^{\text {th }}$
- Construction of storm sewer and appurtenances on $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street from Oakland Avenue to Denver Avenue.
- Street reconstruction on Oakland Avenue from $4^{\text {th }}$ Street to $6^{\text {th }}$

This project will increase the resilience of the city to disasters and reduce the long term risk of loss of life, injury, damage to and loss of property, suffering and hardship by lessening the impact of future disasters by relieving the impact of the flooding that comes with heavy rain events including hurricanes and tropical depressions.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Seadrift is a community of 1,181 residents in Calhoun County $(21,668)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Seadrift is $\$ 33,365,43.23 \%$
less than Calhoun County's median income of $\$ 58,776$, and $36.03 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Seadrift's AMFI is $\$ 71,513$. This is $98 \%$ of HUD's Calhoun County AMFI which is $\$ 72,700$. Calhoun County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Seadrift was $32.00 \%$, greater than Calhoun County's poverty rate of $14.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The Seadrift poverty rate was $25.3 \%$ in the ACS 2019 data estimates.

The city of Seadrift's population is $35.60 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Calhoun County's $48.90 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Seadrift is $57.30 \%$ white alone, greater than Calhoun County's white alone percentage of $42.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Seadrift is $0.00 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Calhoun County (2.30\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The city of Seadrift is $5.20 \%$ Asian alone, less than Calhoun County's percentage of $5.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Seadrift has a Non-white population of $42.7 \%$. The majority of the ethnic or racial minorities in the community consists of the $35.6 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin population. The Vietnamese community makes up $5.2 \%$ of the total population. According to ACS 2019 estimates, there are no Blacks or African Americans in Seadrift. After considering the demographic profile of Seadrift, it does not appear that these projects will unduly benefit or burden any specific population in this community.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $83.00 \%$ in the city of Seadrift, less than $87.10 \%$ in Calhoun County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Seadrift, $27.00 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Calhoun County's percentage of $24.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Seadrift's households are $0.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Calhoun County's percentage of $6.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Seadrift's households are $16.80 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Calhoun County at $12.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Seadrift are $6.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Calhoun County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Seadrift $39.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Calhoun County, which is at $33.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Seadrift that have one or more people of 65 or older is $30.30 \%$, which is less than Calhoun County's $32.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Seadrift is $29.00 \%$ which is greater than Calhoun County's $18.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

There is not much rental housing in Seadrift, with only 96 units being rented. Only seven homes have an estimated value of over $\$ 200,000$, and there are 272 MHUs in Seadrift according to the ACS 2019.

The properties in Seadrift are similar to many other coastal communities. Some properties are elevated, but most are not. The housing generally consists of smaller, wood exterior homes, but a few larger homes are present as well. There are a few scattered brick homes mixed in throughout the community. There is a drainage/bayou/slough area in Seadrift, and generally there is open land around it.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1024-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Calhoun | unty | City of Seadrift |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.00\% |  | 56.68\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$58,776 |  | \$33,365 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.10\% |  | 32.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 21,668 |  | 1,181 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE $^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 10,589 | 48.9\% | 421 | 35.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 11,079 | 51.1\% | 760 | 64.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 9,163 | 42.3\% | 677 | 57.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 505 | 2.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1,140 | 5.3\% | 61 | 5.2\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 264 | 1.2\% | 22 | 1.9\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 18,866 | 87.1\% | 980 | 83.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 18,695 | 86.3\% | 980 | 83.0\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 171 | 0.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,802 | 12.9\% | 201 | 17.0\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 11,082 | 51.1\% | 565 | 47.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,586 | 48.9\% | 616 | 52.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,582 | 100\% | 363 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,850 | 50.8\% | 162 | 44.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,536 | 20.3\% | 81 | 22.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 390 | 5.1\% | 10 | 2.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 164 | 2.2\% | 10 | 2.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Calhoun County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1024-APP City of Seadrift City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,519 | 20.0\% | 93 | 25.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 41 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,134 | 15.0\% | 77 | 21.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 346 | 4.6\% | 37 | 10.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,823 | 24.0\% | 98 | 27.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 512 | 6.8\% | 1 | 0.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 939 | 12.4\% | 61 | 16.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 503 | 6.6\% | 25 | 6.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,556 | 33.7\% | 142 | 39.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,434 | 32.1\% | 110 | 30.3\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 21,444 | 100\% | 1,181 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,979 | 18.6\% | 342 | 29.0\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Calhoun County: Project Service Areas



## Calhoun County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Calhoun County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



City of Iola: Wastewater System Improvements Project - \$10,934,297 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Iola, benefitting 59.89\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $41.26 \%$ greater than Grimes County's LMI percentage of $42.40 \%$ and $34.11 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Iola, located in northwestern Grimes County, is vulnerable to hurricanes, tropical depressions, tropical storms, and the subsequent flooding that can be caused by excessive rainfall. The city has been negatively impacted by floods and storms in recent years.

The impact of excessive rain on the wastewater system is of particular concern for Iola as the city does not have adequate wastewater infrastructure nor a central wastewater system. Each residence disposes of wastewater on their own lot by way of an on-site sewage facility (OSSF). Many lots have inadequate area, inadequate/failing OSSF systems or no OSSF system at all (direct discharge).

The project will provide a first-time central wastewater collection and treatment system for the city which will eliminate the long-term risk to public health and negative environmental impact associated with the OSSF systems.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Iola is a community of 209 residents in Grimes County $(27,984)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Iola is $\$ 50,417,4.72 \%$ less than Grimes County's median income of $\$ 52,913$, and $3.33 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Iola has an AMFI of $\$ 57,778$ according to ACS 2019. This is $95 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 60,800$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Grimes County, TX HUD Income Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Iola was $3.10 \%$, compared with Grimes County's poverty rate of $19.10 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Iola increased to $8.1 \%$ while Grimes County's poverty rate decreased to $17 \%$.

The city of Iola's population is $10.50 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Grimes County's $24.20 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Iola is $88.00 \%$ white alone, greater than Grimes County's white alone percentage of $58.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). In the city of Iola, $1.40 \%$ of the population is two or more races, less than Grimes County, which is at $2.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Iola is a small town that has a population that is predominately White not of Hispanic or Latino origin. According to the 2020 Census, Iola grew from a population of 209 to 311. The 2020 Census also reflects that the minority and ethnic population grew from $10.5 \%$ to $15.8 \%$, including Black or African American residents (0 to 7) and Hispanic or Latino resident increases from 22 to 50.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $96.2 \%$ in the city of Iola, greater than $93.2 \%$ in Grimes County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Iola is $45.00 \%$ male, less than Grimes County (54.20\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Iola is $55.00 \%$ female, greater than the $45.80 \%$ of Grimes County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Iola, $30.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Grimes County's percentage of $26.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Iola's households are $1.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Grimes County's percentage of $7.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$.

In Iola $15.80 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Grimes County, which is at $33.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Iola that have one or more people of 65 or older is $28.70 \%$, which is less than Grimes County's $35.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Iola is $23.90 \%$ which is greater than Grimes County's $14.50 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Almost every street in Iola is covered by this project, so all residents will benefit equally from this project and there is no benefit or burden to any demographic group. The Census has an estimate 116 single family detached homes and 32 mobile homes in Iola. There are businesses, civic buildings, and a school system in the community as well. The location designated for the wastewater treatment plant is currently in what would be a public works area with a trash disposal site, and other maintenance equipment. The site is not a far distance from houses, but it is not in one of the more densely populated areas in Iola, either.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1214-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Grimes |  | City of Iola |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.40\% |  | 59.89\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,913 |  | \$50,417 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 19.10\% |  | 3.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 27,984 |  | 209 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 6,761 | 24.2\% | 22 | 10.5\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 21,223 | 75.8\% | 187 | 89.5\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 16,371 | 58.5\% | 184 | 88.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 4,164 | 14.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 71 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 55 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 562 | 2.0\% | 3 | 1.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 26,081 | 93.2\% | 201 | 96.2\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 25,892 | 92.5\% | 201 | 96.2\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 189 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,903 | 6.8\% | 8 | 3.8\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 15,171 | 54.2\% | 94 | 45.0\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 12,813 | 45.8\% | 115 | 55.0\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 9,011 | 100\% | 101 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,803 | 53.3\% | 44 | 43.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,447 | 16.1\% | 15 | 14.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 402 | 4.5\% | 5 | 5.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 173 | 1.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Grimes County |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1214-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Iola |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 1,437 | 15.9\% | 21 | 20.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 100 | 1.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,009 | 11.2\% | 11 | 10.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 483 | 5.4\% | 2 | 2.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,369 | 26.3\% | 31 | 30.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 711 | 7.9\% | 1 | 1.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,193 | 13.2\% | 13 | 12.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 614 | 6.8\% | 2 | 2.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,040 | 33.7\% | 16 | 15.8\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,225 | 35.8\% | 29 | 28.7\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 24,570 | 100\% | 209 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,568 | 14.5\% | 50 | 23.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Bedias: Drainage and Flood Improvements Project - \$3,965,736 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Bedias, benefitting 56.45\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $33.14 \%$ greater than Grimes County's LMI percentage of $42.40 \%$ and $26.40 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

During heavy or extended rain events, flooding occurs throughout the city. Existing driveway culverts and roadside ditches are either non-existent or insufficiently sized to convey drainage along the street right-of-way. The site of all project activities are the streets and adjacent right-ofway in those areas identified as most problematic and most impactful.

The project includes street and drainage activities throughout the city with the purpose of mitigating against damage and public safety threats posed by stormwater and flooding. Construction includes the following:

- Grade ditches, replace driveway and roadway culverts, road subgrade stabilization, placement of base material, and placement of hot mix asphalt pavement

1. Main Street
2. Plum Street, West Street, and Gin Tank Street
3. East Street, West Street, and Magnolia Street
4. Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Access Road

- Grade ditches, replace driveway and roadway culverts, cut drainage swale from Sycamore Street to WWTP property to provide drainage outfall and relieve standing water on northeast side the city, road subgrade stabilization, placement of base material, and placement of hot mix asphalt pavement

1. Sycamore Street

- Road subgrade stabilization, placement of base material, and placement of hot mix asphalt pavement

1. Cedar Street/Madison Street

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Bedias is a community of 374 residents in Grimes County $(27,984)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Bedias is $\$ 54,375,2.76 \%$ greater than Grimes County's median income of $\$ 52,913$, and $4.26 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Bedias has an AMFI of $\$ 61,250$ according to ACS 2019. This is $101 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 60,800$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Grimes County HUD Income Area. The poverty rate based off of the 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Bedias was $18.30 \%$ compared to Grimes County's poverty rate of, and $18.29 \%$ and the MIT
eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in Bedias increased to $21.9 \%$ while Grimes County's poverty rate decreased to $17 \%$.

Bedias, Texas is a rural community which is a vital part of the state and designated for participation because of prevalent flooding. With fewer than 400 residents, the projected work will cover most of the community; even places where there are localized pieces of the project. It was difficult to determine from Census numbers if the work is being spread evenly over the city in a demographic sense, but there were racial and ethnic minorities in the project areas when we conducted a windshield survey. The housing is mainly rural style with wood housing or MHUs throughout the community.

The city of Bedias's population is $27.30 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Grimes County's $24.20 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Bedias is $59.40 \%$ white alone, greater than Grimes County's white alone percentage of $58.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Bedias is $8.00 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Grimes County (14.90\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Bedias is $1.10 \%$, greater than Grimes County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively.

The city of Bedias is $50.50 \%$ female, greater than the $45.80 \%$ of Grimes County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Bedias, $29.90 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Grimes County's percentage of $26.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Bedias's households are $3.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Grimes County's percentage of $7.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Bedias's households are $21.10 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Grimes County at $13.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Bedias are $9.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Grimes County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $6.80 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

The city of Bedias is comprised of $11.60 \%$ households that are occupied by a male with no spouse or partner present, less than Grimes County (15.90\%) and less than the MIT eligible area of $17.6 \%$. The city of Bedias's households are $1.40 \%$ occupied by a male householder with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Grimes County, which is at $1.10 \%$ and equal to the MIT eligible area's $1.4 \%$. Bedias has $8.80 \%$ of households that are occupied by a male living alone, which is less than Grimes County's $11.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage 11.8\%. The city of Bedias's households are $3.40 \%$ occupied by a male householder over the age of 65 with no partner or spouse, which is less than Grimes County at $5.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.7 \%$.

In Bedias 29.30\% of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than Grimes County, which is at $33.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Bedias that have one or more people of 65 or older is $44.90 \%$, which is greater than Grimes County's $35.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Bedias is $25.40 \%$ which is greater than Grimes County's $14.50 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

It appears that there are not any concentrations of racial or ethnic minorities that would not receive the benefits provided to the community. The project does appear to provide help to the entire community, allowing for improved access from emergency vehicles, and helping to prevent flooding in the residential areas. Based on the locations reviewed, it does not appear that the projects will benefit or harm any communities to a greater extent than others.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1104-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Grimes |  | City of Bedias |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.40\% |  | 56.45\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,913 |  | \$54,375 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 19.10\% |  | 18.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 27,984 |  | 374 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 6,761 | 24.2\% | 102 | 27.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 21,223 | 75.8\% | 272 | 72.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 16,371 | 58.5\% | 222 | 59.4\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 4,164 | 14.9\% | 30 | 8.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 71 | 0.3\% | 4 | 1.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 55 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 562 | 2.0\% | 16 | 4.3\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 26,081 | 93.2\% | 333 | 89.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 25,892 | 92.5\% | 333 | 89.0\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 189 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,903 | 6.8\% | 41 | 11.0\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 15,171 | 54.2\% | 185 | 49.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 12,813 | 45.8\% | 189 | 50.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 9,011 | 100\% | 147 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,803 | 53.3\% | 84 | 57.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,447 | 16.1\% | 23 | 15.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 402 | 4.5\% | 2 | 1.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 173 | 1.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Grimes County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1104-APP City of Bedias City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,437 | 15.9\% | 17 | 11.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 100 | 1.1\% | 2 | 1.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,009 | 11.2\% | 13 | 8.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 483 | 5.4\% | 5 | 3.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,369 | 26.3\% | 44 | 29.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 711 | 7.9\% | 5 | 3.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,193 | 13.2\% | 31 | 21.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 614 | 6.8\% | 14 | 9.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,040 | 33.7\% | 43 | 29.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,225 | 35.8\% | 66 | 44.9\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 24,570 | 100\% | 374 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,568 | 14.5\% | 95 | 25.4\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Grimes County: Project Service Areas



## Grimes County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group
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City of El Campo: Tres Palacios Creek Improvements Project - \$14,840,316.83-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the city of El Campo, benefitting 53.59\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $12.75 \%$ greater than the City of El Campo's LMI percentage of $47.53 \%$, $33.37 \%$ greater than Wharton County's LMI percentage of $40.18 \%$ and $19.99 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of El Campo has incurred substantial damage to residential and commercial property due to various declared disasters. This project will be the second phase of Tres Palacios Improvements. The first phase improved the channel downstream of US Highway 59, constructed a regional detention basin south of the city and was completed on March 9, 2020.

This project will add capacity to the main channel of the Tres Palacios Creek upstream of US Highway 59 from West Business 59S \& Avenue I Street moving south along the Tres Palacios River to US Highway 59 \& East Alfred Street. The proposed project will accomplish this by:

- Widening of the Tres Palacios Creek channel
- Adding concrete slope lining
- Adjusting forty (40) existing culverts
- Adding fifty-two (52) Backslope Drains
- Pinchot Bridge replacement
- Acquiring right-of-way

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 10,129 within the city of El Campo, a community of 11,630 residents in Wharton County $(41,577)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. El Campo has an AMFI of $\$ 62,697$ and Census Tract 7410 has an AMFI of $\$ 45,903$ according to ACS 2019. For El Campo, this is $103 \%$ and Census Tract 7410 is $75 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Wharton County of $\$ 61,000$. Wharton County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $19.70 \%$, equal to the city of El Campo which is at $19.70 \%$, greater than Wharton County's poverty rate of $17.50 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $51.02 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, less than the city of El Campo's population percentage of $56.00 \%$, greater than Wharton County's $41.40 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $42.41 \%$ white alone, greater than the city of El Campo's percentage of $35.70 \%$, less than Wharton County's percentage
of $44.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $6.15 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than the city of El Campo, which has $7.90 \%$, less than Wharton County $(13.50 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Looking at El Campo as a whole, it is a minority majority community of $63.9 \%$. Both Census Tract 7410 and Census Tract 7407 Block Group 1, where it appears most of the work will take place, are higher with $71 \%$ and $78.2 \%$ racial and ethnic minorities, respectively. The Tres Palacios projects are near housing in Census Tract 7410, but it should not impact the housing directly during the construction because of the adjacent green space. There has been significant work on Highway 59 in El Campo to upgrade the bridges - including those that cross Tres Palacios. The benefit of having drainage should offset the challenges during the construction process. There should be no relocations with this project.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $88.70 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than $88.10 \%$ in the city of El Campo, less than Wharton County at $90.10 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $47.73 \%$ male, greater than the city of El Campo at $47.30 \%$, less than Wharton County ( $49.10 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $52.27 \%$ female, less than the city of El Campo at $52.70 \%$, greater than the $50.90 \%$ of Wharton County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of 50.4\%.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $48.96 \%$ married couple families, less than the city of El Campo at $45.60 \%$ less than Wharton County's $49.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $22.20 \%$, greater than the city of El Campo at $20.90 \%$, greater than Wharton County's percentage of $20.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $28.94 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of El Campo at $31.60 \%$, less than Wharton County's percentage of $29.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $10.44 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than the city of El Campo which is at $10.50 \%$, greater than Wharton County's percentage of $8.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $13.12 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the city of El Campo at $14.10 \%$, less than Wharton County at $13.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $8.96 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than the city of El Campo who is at $10.30 \%$, greater than Wharton County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $8.10 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $39.64 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than the city of El Campo at $38.80 \%$, greater than Wharton County, which is at
$35.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $33.02 \%$, greater than the city of El Campo at $32.90 \%$, less than Wharton County's $33.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $13.46 \%$, less than the city of El Campo at $13.80 \%$, less than Wharton County's $14.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

Adjacent to part of the project site, there is a triangle shape area of land between Tres Palacios and the highways - where Highway 71 and Highway 59 intersect. The highways have commercial properties like gas stations, service businesses, and fast-food restaurants. There is a neighborhood between the highways and behind the highway businesses that goes almost to Tres Palacios. The neighborhood has a large number of MHU style housing. There are also small wood structures here. The City's wastewater plant is in this neighborhood as well.

In the neighborhood upstream from the project site, there is a mix of houses in regard to both quality and style. There is new construction, older homes in need of maintenance, and the vast majority are smaller, rural houses with some being brick and some being wood. Running parallel to Tres Palacios is Blue Creek Road. Blue Creek Road has limited small housing and the City's water plant. There also appears to be some land used for agricultural purposes along this street. In addition to the housing, there are some commercial properties near US 59. On Highway 59, there is a scrap metal yard adjacent to the river where the Highway 59 bridge goes over Tres Palacios.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Wharton County |  | City of El Campo |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0965-APP City of El Campo Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.18\% |  | 47.53\% |  | 53.59\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$48,310 |  | \$49,182 |  | -- |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.50\% |  | 19.70\% |  | 19.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 41,577 |  | 11,630 |  | 16,785 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 17,208 | 41.4\% | 6,507 | 56.0\% | 8,563 | 51.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 24,369 | 58.6\% | 5,123 | 44.0\% | 8,222 | 49.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 18,484 | 44.5\% | 4,148 | 35.7\% | 7,119 | 42.4\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,623 | 13.5\% | 918 | 7.9\% | 1,032 | 6.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 25 | 0.1\% | 22 | 0.2\% | 22 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 142 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 14 | 0.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 88 | 0.2\% | 35 | 0.30\% | 35 | 0.21\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 37,477 | 90.1\% | 10,244 | 88.1\% | 14,957 | 89.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 37,291 | 89.7\% | 10,221 | 87.9\% | 14,888 | 88.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 186 | 0.4\% | 23 | 0.2\% | 69 | 0.4\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 4,100 | 9.9\% | 1,386 | 12\% | 1,828 | 11\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 20,419 | 49.1\% | 5,499 | 47.3\% | 8,012 | 47.7\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 21,158 | 50.9\% | 6,131 | 52.7\% | 8,773 | 52.3\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 15,199 | 100\% | 4,159 | 100\% | 6,103 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 7,445 | 49.0\% | 1,897 | 45.6\% | 2,988 | 49.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 3,051 | 20.1\% | 869 | 20.9\% | 1,355 | 22.2\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 529 | 3.5\% | 217 | 5.2\% | 260 | 4.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 256 | 1.7\% | 99 | 2.4\% | 123 | 2.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Wharton County |  | City of El Campo |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0965-APP City of El Campo Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,782 | 18.3\% | 732 | 17.6\% | 1,089 | 17.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 209 | 1.4\% | 98 | 2.4\% | 137 | 2.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,142 | 14.1\% | 478 | 11.5\% | 776 | 12.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 777 | 5.1\% | 142 | 3.4\% | 358 | 5.9\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 4,443 | 29.2\% | 1,313 | 31.6\% | 1,766 | 28.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,273 | 8.4\% | 435 | 10.5\% | 637 | 10.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,070 | 13.6\% | 586 | 14.1\% | 801 | 13.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,232 | 8.1\% | 428 | 10.3\% | 547 | 9.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 5,364 | 35.3\% | 1,613 | 38.8\% | 2,419 | 39.6\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 5,059 | 33.3\% | 1,369 | 32.9\% | 2,015 | 33.0\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 41,228 | 100\% | 11,515 | 100\% | 16,670 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,032 | 14.6\% | 1,586 | 13.8\% | 2,243 | 13.5\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Wharton County: Project Service Areas




Awardee Application ID Total Benefs City of El Campo CDR17-0965-APP 10,129



## Wharton County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Wharton County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (9 Block Groups)10-25 percent (19 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (7 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Sabine County: Priority Drainage Improvements Project - \$11,180,882.62 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a County-Wide benefit for Sabine County, benefitting 51.91\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $16.24 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Sabine County previously conducted a countywide drainage study with CDBG-DR funds with Hurricane Harvey infrastructure funding that identified 19 structures (bridges and culverts) in need of replacement or upgrade. The Sabine County drainage improvements project implements these drainage improvements identified in the previous drainage study throughout the county. This project will reduce damage to roads and homes.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Sabine County is a community of 10,458 residents, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Sabine County is $\$ 34,992,32.91 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Sabine County has an AMFI of $\$ 50,185$ according to ACS 2019. This is $114 \%$ of the HUD area AMFI which is $\$ 44,100$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Sabine County Income Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in Sabine County is at $21.40 \%$, greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

Sabine County's population is $4.60 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Sabine County is $85.50 \%$ white alone, greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). Sabine County is $5.60 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Sabine County is $0.20 \%$, equal to the MIT eligible area, who is at $0.20 \%$. Sabine County is $0.10 \%$ Asian alone, less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for Sabine County is $0.30 \%$, greater than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. Sabine County is $0.50 \%$ some other race alone, greater than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. In Sabine County, $3.20 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Sabine County is a small county that contains three census recognized population centers (Milam, Hemphill and Pineland, and a large national forest). The largest of these population centers is Milam which is within the National Forest. Pineland is the most diverse of the communities with $29.2 \%$ of the population being racial or ethnic minorities. The projects are intended to help the entire county. Flooding into the Sabine River can potentially impact Louisiana, Newton County, San Augustine County, Sam Rayburn Reservoir, and Japer County. Improving the drainage system would help to protect the Sabine County.

Sabine County has developed a Fair Housing Assistance program with a Fair Housing Program Administrator. This program includes links to FHEO complaint forms, and an Anti-NIMBYism plan.

The households in Sabine County are comprised of $54.10 \%$ married couple families, which is greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Sabine County that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $11.60 \%$, this is less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. Sabine County's households are $2.30 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.00 \%$ is within Sabine County, which is less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In Sabine County, $24.40 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the MIT eligible area's 26.8\%. Sabine County's households are 3.50\% occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18 , less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Sabine County's households are $13.50 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Sabine County are $9.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than the MIT eligible area, which is at $5.5 \%$.

In Sabine County $20.70 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Sabine County that have one or more people of 65 or older is $49.70 \%$, which is greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in Sabine County is $26.40 \%$ which is greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The County has employed an engineering firm to evaluate the flooding condition in Sabine County. Twenty-two of the most critical drainage structures in the County were studied. This project will replace 19 of those structures (bridges or culverts) in order to mitigate the flooding conditions which impact housing and infrastructure on a county wide basis. Taken as a comprehensive approach, flow calculations have been used to "size" the drainage structures as needed.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Sabine County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1061-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Sabine County |  |  |
|  |  |  | County-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 51.91\% |  | 51.91\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$34,992 |  | \$34,992 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 21.40\% |  | 21.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 10,471 |  | 10,471 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 477 | 4.6\% | 477 | 4.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 9,994 | 95.4\% | 9,994 | 95.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 8,956 | 85.5\% | 8,956 | 85.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 591 | 5.6\% | 591 | 5.6\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 23 | 0.2\% | 23 | 0.2\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 7 | 0.1\% | 7 | 0.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 30 | 0.3\% | 30 | 0.3\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 50 | 0.5\% | 50 | 0.5\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 337 | 3.2\% | 337 | 3.2\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 10,341 | 98.8\% | 10,341 | 98.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 10,312 | 98.5\% | 10,312 | 98.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 29 | 0.3\% | 29 | 0.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 130 | 1.2\% | 130 | 1.2\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 5,013 | 47.9\% | 5,013 | 47.9\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 5,458 | 52.1\% | 5,458 | 52.1\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,311 | 100\% | 4,311 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,331 | 54.1\% | 2,331 | 54.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 499 | 11.6\% | 499 | 11.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 98 | 2.3\% | 98 | 2.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 44 | 1.0\% | 44 | 1.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Sabine County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1061-APP Sabine County County-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 828 | 19.2\% | 828 | 19.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 52 | 1.2\% | 52 | 1.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 699 | 16.2\% | 699 | 16.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 441 | 10.2\% | 441 | 10.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,054 | 24.4\% | 1,054 | 24.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 150 | 3.5\% | 150 | 3.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 583 | 13.5\% | 583 | 13.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 407 | 9.4\% | 407 | 9.4\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 893 | 20.7\% | 893 | 20.7\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,141 | 49.7\% | 2,141 | 49.7\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 10,382 | 100\% | 10,382 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,742 | 26.4\% | 2,742 | 26.4\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Pineland: Sewer System Improvement Project - \$3,080,000-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions
This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Pineland, benefitting $64.45 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $24.16 \%$ greater than Sabine County's LMI percentage of $51.91 \%$ and $44.31 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

During heavy rain fall from hurricanes, tropical storms, and tropical depressions the infiltration and inflow (I\&I) in the sewage collection system causes manholes to overflow creating an environmental concern. The wastewater treatment plant cannot treat the sewage properly, creating a discharge from the facility that does not meet TCEQ's discharge parameters and therefore creating further environmental problems in the discharge stream.

The sewer system improvements will provide resiliency to ensure future uninterrupted service to the city residents and mitigate the discharge of raw, untreated sewer into the environment \& surrounding residences.

Improvements will include:

- Replace approximately 22,100 linear feet of existing sewer main and appurtenances.This project proposes improvements for approximately 35 sites.
- Reduce the infiltration/inflow in the system by installing new sewer pipe and manholes that aide in precluding extraneous water from entering the system during rainfall events.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Pineland is a community of 619 residents in Sabine County $(10,471)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Pineland is $\$ 20,813,40.52 \%$ less than Sabine County's median income of $\$ 34,992$, and $60.09 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Pineland's AMFI is $\$ 32,386$ according to ACS 2019.This is $73 \%$ of the Sabine County AMFI of $\$ 44,100$. Sabine County is not in a recognized HUD MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Pineland was $30.80 \%$, greater than Sabine County's poverty rate of $21.40 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. Pineland's percentage of population below the poverty level rose to $48 \%$ according to the ACS 2019 data estimates.

The city of Pineland's population is $2.70 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Sabine County's $4.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Pineland is $69.50 \%$ white alone, less than Sabine County's white alone percentage of $85.50 \%$ and greater
than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Pineland is $26.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Sabine County (5.60\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Pinedale is a predominately White not of Hispanic or Latino origin community at $69.5 \%$. The new sewer lines runs throughout the city. is the design to improves the ability of the wastewater system to function during weather events. This includes preventing discharges that are health hazards and cause back-ups into people's homes. This project appears to be a benefit to all residents.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $99.70 \%$ in the city of Pineland, greater than $98.80 \%$ in Sabine County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Pineland is $46.40 \%$ male, less than Sabine County (47.90\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Pineland is $53.60 \%$ female, greater than the $52.10 \%$ of Sabine County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Pineland, $37.10 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Sabine County's percentage of $24.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Pineland's households are $6.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Sabine County's percentage of $3.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Pineland's households are $28.40 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Sabine County at $13.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of 13.4\%. The households in Pineland are 13.10\% occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Sabine County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $9.40 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Pineland $20.40 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Sabine County, which is at $20.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Pineland that have one or more people of 65 or older is $36.70 \%$, which is less than Sabine County's $49.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Pineland is $28.90 \%$ which is greater than Sabine County's $26.40 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

There are two main sections of housing in Pineland. The northern part of the city near Magnolia and Cypress mostly has older, smaller, wood sided houses or MHUs. These streets typically dead end at the location of the new pipeline or at the railroad tracks. In the southern area around Yaupon, there are larger brick homes. Much of the new line will be in open areas that provide service to the neighborhoods. There is also an MHU Park in the southern part of the city.

On the Eastern side of the Railroad tracks, it appears that one of the lines will run adjacent to the Georgia Pacific plant. There is no street in the marked location. Near the Thomas Street location, there are apartments or townhomes. There are also houses that run along FM 2425. Some of the Project runs near a school, and in the limited business area including the US Post Office.

Pineland does not have a large rental population at only 57 units for rent out of the total of 378 . However, the rents for 49 of the residents in those units exceed $30 \%$ of their income, and is therefore considered unaffordable housing according to HUD's definition..

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1068-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Sabine |  | City of Pineland |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 51.91\% |  | 64.45\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$34,992 |  | \$20,813 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 21.40\% |  | 30.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 10,471 |  | 619 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 477 | 4.6\% | 17 | 2.7\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 9,994 | 95.4\% | 602 | 97.3\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 8,956 | 85.5\% | 430 | 69.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 591 | 5.6\% | 164 | 26.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 23 | 0.2\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 7 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 30 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 50 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 337 | 3.2\% | 7 | 1.1\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 10,341 | 98.8\% | 617 | 99.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 10,312 | 98.5\% | 617 | 99.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 29 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 130 | 1.2\% | 2 | 0.3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 5,013 | 47.9\% | 287 | 46.4\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 5,458 | 52.1\% | 332 | 53.6\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,311 | 100\% | 275 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,331 | 54.1\% | 118 | 42.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 499 | 11.6\% | 10 | 3.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 98 | 2.3\% | 6 | 2.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 44 | 1.0\% | 6 | 2.2\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Sabine County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1068-APP City of Pineland City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 828 | 19.2\% | 49 | 17.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 52 | 1.2\% | 11 | 4.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 699 | 16.2\% | 31 | 11.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 441 | 10.2\% | 6 | 2.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,054 | 24.4\% | 102 | 37.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 150 | 3.5\% | 19 | 6.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 583 | 13.5\% | 78 | 28.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 407 | 9.4\% | 36 | 13.1\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 893 | 20.7\% | 56 | 20.4\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,141 | 49.7\% | 101 | 36.7\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 10,382 | 100\% | 619 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,742 | 26.4\% | 179 | 28.9\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Sabine County: Project Service Areas



Awardee Application ID Total Benefs. City of Pineland CDR17-1068-APP 872
Sabine County CDR17-1061-APP 10,458


## Sabine County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category



## Sabine County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (2 Block Groups)10-25 percent (3 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (5 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Hallettsville: Flood Control and Drainage Project - \$9,882,441.85-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Hallettsville, benefitting 56.19\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $65.32 \%$ greater than Lavaca County's LMI percentage of $33.99 \%$ and $25.82 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Improving and upgrading storm water drainage systems throughout the city has been a critical problem for the city for many years and is part of the Lavaca County Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The proposed activities will increase resilience to disasters, reduce the long-term risk of loss of life, injury, damage to and loss of property, suffering and hardship by lessening the impact of future disasters at the following locations:

Donna Dr and Kahn St (approx. 1,281 feet north of Fairwinds St to Willis St)

- 5,454 LF of bar ditches and upgrade storm sewer system with 11 new curb inlets and outfall

Market St (between 1st St and 2nd St), Ridge St (between Page St and 2nd St) and 2nd St (between Promenade St and Market St and between Ridge St and Rickaway Branch Creek)

- Replace 6,823 LF of new curb and gutters; 26 Storm Sewer Inlets; 9 Grate Inlets; and 3,387 LF of pipe

FM 957 (between Park Rd 3 \& Park 2 Rd) and Park St (from FM 957 to 150 ft west on Park St)

- Remove 303 LF of bar ditches and install 303 LF of pipe with 6 grate inlets.

Crockett St (midway between La Grange St and Texana St)

- Remove the low water crossing and install 36 LF of box culvert to pass the flow under the roadway and install 160 LF of new curb and gutters and resurface the road

Texana St (between Russell Street and approximately 130 north of Church St) and Glendale St (between 5th St and Depot St)

- Remove 5 concrete flumes, install 16 storm sewer inlets, and install 2,914 LF of new curb and gutters and resurface the road.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make
local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Hallettsville is a community of 2,627 residents in Lavaca County ( 20,021 ), while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Hallettsville is $\$ 45,115$, $17.07 \%$ less than Lavaca County's median income of $\$ 54,403$, and $13.50 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The AMFI for Hallettsville was $\$ 54,118$ (ACS 2019) which was $82 \%$ of the HUD AMFI of $\$ 66,100$ for Lavaca County. Lavaca County is not in a recognized MSA. In Hallettsville, 454 of the 1,367 housing units are rentals (33\%), and $25.6 \%$ of the rentals are classified as unaffordable. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Hallettsville is at $26.90 \%$, compared with Lavaca County's poverty rate of $11.70 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The poverty rate by block group was not available in the Census data. However, based on the median income for each of the block groups, and despite the poverty rate in Hallettsville being more than double the poverty rate in Lavaca County; there were no concentrations of poverty approaching $40 \%$ found.

The city of Hallettsville's population is $22.80 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Lavaca County's $18.90 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Hallettsville is $56.20 \%$ white alone, less than Lavaca County's white alone percentage of $73.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Hallettsville is $17.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Lavaca County (6.20\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Hallettsville is $0.00 \%$, equal to Lavaca County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.00 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Hallettsville is $2.80 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Lavaca County's percentage of $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Hallettsville is a relatively diverse City although predominately White not of Hispanic or Latino origin of $56.2 \%$. The Black and African American community make up $17.5 \%$ of the City's residents and the Hispanic or Latino origin population is $22.8 \%$ of the total population.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $91.9 \%$ in the city of Hallettsville, less than $95.0 \%$ in Lavaca County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Hallettsville is $47.20 \%$ male, less than Lavaca County ( $48.40 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Hallettsville is $52.80 \%$ female, greater than the $51.60 \%$ of Lavaca County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Hallettsville, $41.10 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Lavaca County's percentage of $25.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Hallettsville's households are $9.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Lavaca County's percentage of $4.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$.

In Hallettsville $32.70 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than Lavaca County, which is at $31.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households
within Hallettsville that have one or more people of 65 or older is $36.80 \%$, which is less than Lavaca County's $39.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Hallettsville is $21.60 \%$ which is greater than Lavaca County's $16.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

A windshield review of the project sites was conducted, and it seems that a large portion of the projects are going to be near the high school or in neighborhoods with larger homes. These appear to be the areas with the most need. For example, the USDA apartments on Donna may not be at as great a risk for flooding because they have a higher elevation than both the low water crossing and the homes on Donna.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Lavaca County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1012-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Hallettsville |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 33.99\% |  | 56.19\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$54,403 |  | \$45,115 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 11.70\% |  | 26.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 20,021 |  | 2,627 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,785 | 18.9\% | 599 | 22.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 16,236 | 81.1\% | 2,028 | 77.2\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 14,717 | 73.5\% | 1,477 | 56.2\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,234 | 6.2\% | 459 | 17.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 94 | 0.5\% | 73 | 2.8\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 2 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 182 | 0.9\% | 19 | 0.7\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 19,011 | 95.0\% | 2,422 | 92.2\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 18,958 | 94.7\% | 2,413 | 91.9\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 53 | 0.3\% | 9 | 0.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,010 | 5.0\% | 205 | 7.8\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 9,697 | 48.4\% | 1,239 | 47.2\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,324 | 51.6\% | 1,388 | 52.8\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,826 | 100\% | 1,056 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,419 | 56.5\% | 358 | 33.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,680 | 21.5\% | 133 | 12.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 424 | 5.4\% | 73 | 6.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 255 | 3.3\% | 39 | 3.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Lavaca County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1012-APP City of Hallettsville City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,012 | 12.9\% | 191 | 18.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 45 | 0.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 851 | 10.9\% | 180 | 17.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 349 | 4.5\% | 57 | 5.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,971 | 25.2\% | 434 | 41.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 319 | 4.1\% | 99 | 9.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,174 | 15.0\% | 269 | 25.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 844 | 10.8\% | 170 | 16.1\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,488 | 31.8\% | 345 | 32.7\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,108 | 39.7\% | 389 | 36.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 19,582 | 100\% | 2,431 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,148 | 16.1\% | 526 | 21.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Moulton: Drainage Improvements and Flood Mitigation Project - \$4,298,611.68 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Moulton, benefitting 52.13\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $53.37 \%$ greater than Lavaca County's LMI percentage of $33.99 \%$ and $16.72 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

During Harvey, Moulton received over 19.5 inches of rain in a short time flooding much of the low-lying areas of the city. Similar flooding, caused by other hurricanes and tropical storms, has caused localized impoundment to streets and damage to residences and businesses. The flooding impairs emergency service vehicle ingress and egress and washes out roadway base and bar ditches. The flooding during Harvey also caused water service interruption. Wastewater system surcharged by storm water resulted in wastewater treatment plant overload and spill.

The project improvements will restore and improve flow conveyance through the project area, reduce flood hazard, enhance emergency vehicles ingress and egress during storms, and protect the city's infrastructure.

The city of Moulton will execute the following improvements:

- Acquire easements of two parcels for channel widening at South Pecan Street (south of Cedar Lane).
- Improve 10,400 LF of streets and drainage including Arnim Street, Pecan Street, Hackberry Street and Main Street.

1. Regrade existing bar ditches
2. Replace corrugated metal culverts
3. Regrade drainage channels
4. Install concrete ribbon curb along the proposed roadways and rehabilitate existing pavement.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Moulton is a community of 925 residents in Lavaca County $(20,021)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Moulton is $\$ 54,643,0.44 \%$ greater than Lavaca County's median income of $\$ 54,403$, and $4.77 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Moulton has a $55.20 \%$ of married households rate that generates a AMFI of $\$ 71,518$ according to ACS. This is $108 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Lavaca County of $\$ 66,100$. Lavaca County is not in a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS

5-year estimates in the city of Moulton was $13.70 \%$, compared to Lavaca County's poverty rate of $11.70 \%$ the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Moulton's population is $26.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Lavaca County's $18.90 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Moulton is $71.00 \%$ white alone, less than Lavaca County's white alone percentage of $73.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Moulton is $0.00 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Lavaca County ( $6.20 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Moulton is $0.80 \%$, greater than Lavaca County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.00 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Moulton is $2.20 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Lavaca County's percentage of $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

In the ACS 2019 survey, Moulton had no Black or African American residents; however, its population is $26.1 \%$ Hispanic or Latin origin. In the 2020 Census data, Moulton had 16 Black or African American residents, and had slightly increased the number of Hispanic or Latino community members. White not of Hispanic or Latino origin residents dropped as a percentage from $71 \%$ to $65.6 \%$.

From a windshield survey, it did not appear that the projects are benefiting one demographic over another. Based on community size, how the housing in the town is intermixed in size and quality, and with the Census Block Group information; there is no reason to believe that there is a discriminatory pattern. According to US News and World Report, the Moulton School system has a minority population of $40.9 \%$. No information was found regarding racial tensions in Moulton during an online review of various media outlets.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $91.7 \%$ in the city of Moulton, less than $95.7 \%$ in Lavaca County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Moulton is $47.00 \%$ male, less than Lavaca County ( $48.40 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Moulton is $53.00 \%$ female, greater than the $51.60 \%$ of Lavaca County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in Moulton are comprised of $55.20 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Lavaca County's $56.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Moulton that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $18.70 \%$ this is less than Lavaca County's percentage of $21.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of Moulton, $27.20 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Lavaca County's percentage of $25.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Moulton's households are $2.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Lavaca County's percentage of $4.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Moulton's households are $16.50 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Lavaca County at $15.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Moulton are $11.50 \%$ occupied
by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Lavaca County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $10.80 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Moulton $28.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Lavaca County, which is at $31.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Moulton that have one or more people of 65 or older is $46.40 \%$, which is greater than Lavaca County's $39.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Moulton is $15.80 \%$ which is less than Lavaca County's $16.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

On the West Jackson side of the Pecan repairs, there are generally smaller wood sided houses in a rural style. On Arnim Street, there is a commercial property on one side of the street at West Jackson and a larger historical style residential property on the other. Otherwise in the project area, the housing is mixed but still in a more rural style housing. At the Church and Pecan part of the project, there is a large church and smaller houses in this area. These houses are on the other side of the school.

Hackberry Street has mixed housing with some larger homes, but also many craftsmen style houses that are smaller wood sided homes. This street dead ends into the school. Main Street starts at the school with some smaller houses and continues past the baseball fields to the large drainage area behind the fields. The project bypasses the City Hall block, but then continues in front of other retail buildings.

Given the scope of the projects, it does not appear to place an unequal benefit or burden on any one demographic although in 2019 there were no Black or African Americans to impact.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Lavaca County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0911-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Moulton |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 33.99\% |  | 52.13\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$54,403 |  | \$54,643 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 11.70\% |  | 13.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 20,021 |  | 925 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,785 | 18.9\% | 241 | 26.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 16,236 | 81.1\% | 684 | 73.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 14,717 | 73.5\% | 657 | 71.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,234 | 6.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 7 | 0.8\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 94 | 0.5\% | 20 | 2.2\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 2 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 182 | 0.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 19,011 | 95.0\% | 853 | 92.2\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 18,958 | 94.7\% | 848 | 91.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 53 | 0.3\% | 5 | 0.5\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,010 | 5.0\% | 72 | 7.8\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 9,697 | 48.4\% | 435 | 47.0\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,324 | 51.6\% | 490 | 53.0\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,826 | 100\% | 364 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,419 | 56.5\% | 201 | 55.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,680 | 21.5\% | 68 | 18.7\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 424 | 5.4\% | 28 | 7.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 255 | 3.3\% | 6 | 1.6\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Lavaca County |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0911-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Moulton |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 1,012 | 12.9\% | 36 | 9.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 45 | 0.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 851 | 10.9\% | 36 | 9.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 349 | 4.5\% | 20 | 5.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,971 | 25.2\% | 99 | 27.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 319 | 4.1\% | 9 | 2.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,174 | 15.0\% | 60 | 16.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 844 | 10.8\% | 42 | 11.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,488 | 31.8\% | 103 | 28.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,108 | 39.7\% | 169 | 46.4\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 19,582 | 100\% | 879 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,148 | 16.1\% | 139 | 15.8\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Lavaca County: Project Service Areas



## Lavaca County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| category or no |
| population are blank |

Population by Category



## Lavaca County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty


Gonzales County: Fire Protection \& Emergency Communications Project - \$6,071,588.57 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides an area benefit within Gonzales County, benefitting 53.59\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $16.61 \%$ greater than Gonzales County's LMI percentage of $45.96 \%$ and $20.01 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The proposed improvements will provide better access to emergency personnel for area residents, more efficient and reliable access between emergency dispatchers in Smiley and Belmont to different areas of the county, more compatibility for multiple emergency response jurisdictions throughout the county and more efficient emergency personnel response times.

The design for Gonzales County is a trunked solution with a 4-Site, 4-Channel simulcast system. Each site will have four (4) VHF radio channels. One radio channel at each site is allocated to be the control channel. The remaining three radio channels are used for voice calls.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 12,380 within Gonzales County $(20,731)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The Gonzales County AMFI is $\$ 62,407$ according to ACS 2019. This 101\% of HUD's Gonzales County AMFI of $\$ 62,000$. Gonzales County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $15.70 \%$, which is equal to Gonzales County's poverty rate of $15.70 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $50.74 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than Gonzales County's $50.70 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $41.65 \%$ white alone, less than Gonzales County's percentage of $41.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $6.47 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than Gonzales County ( $6.50 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.14 \%$, which is greater than Gonzales County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.37 \%$ Asian alone, less than Gonzales County's percentage of $0.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.02 \%$, greater than Gonzales County ( $0.000 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.62 \%$ two or more races, greater than Gonzales County, which is at $0.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Gonzales County is a majority minority community at $57.2 \%$. The County has a slight Hispanic or Latino origin majority at $50.7 \%$. Blacks or African Americans represent $6.5 \%$ of the County population, and White not of Hispanic or Latino origin make up $41.7 \%$ of the population. The county is diverse and while generally rural, it does have population centers.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $87.95 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Gonzales County at $88.40 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $53.57 \%$ married couple families, less than Gonzales County's $53.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $21.28 \%$, less than Gonzales County's percentage of $21.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $3.52 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Gonzales County's percentage of $3.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $2.28 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Gonzales County's $2.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $24.55 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Gonzales County's percentage of $24.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $7.31 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, which is greater than Gonzales County's percentage of $7.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $12.19 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than Gonzales County at $12.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $6.97 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than Gonzales County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $37.25 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Gonzales County, which is at $37.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $32.85 \%$, greater than Gonzales County's $32.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's 24.5\%.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $16.85 \%$, less than Gonzales County's $16.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The proposed project will aid Gonzales County in providing efficient communication to the populated areas of the County during future severe weather events. Two new radio communication towers at Belmont and Gonzales County South will enhance the existing tower in Waelder, and the under-construction tower in Smiley. The installation and improvements at all of these new and existing towers will vastly improve communications in the population areas. These upgrades will better protect residents and provide emergency responders better access to the area.

There was limited housing near the Belmont Tower estimated location, and the houses were far apart and rural in type. The tower in Smiley is under construction. The Gonzales tower location was said to be at the Sheriff's Office which has very limited housing nearby. The office is adjacent to the County Offices and the County Jail. Nearby businesses include bail bond offices, a car dealership, and across the street are retail businesses like Randolph Brooks Federal Credit Union.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Gonzales County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1010-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Gonzales County |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 45.96\% |  | 53.59\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$53,577 |  | -- |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 15.70\% |  | 15.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 20,731 |  | 20,731 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 10,518 | 50.7\% | 10,518 | 50.7\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 10,213 | 49.3\% | 10,213 | 49.3\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 8,635 | 41.7\% | 8,635 | 41.7\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,341 | 6.5\% | 1,341 | 6.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 28 | 0.1\% | 28 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 76 | 0.4\% | 76 | 0.4\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 5 | 0.0\% | 5 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 128 | 0.6\% | 128 | 0.62\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 18,322 | 88.4\% | 18,322 | 88.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 18,233 | 88.0\% | 18,233 | 88.0\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 89 | 0.4\% | 89 | 0.4\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,409 | 11.6\% | 2,409 | 12\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 10,540 | 50.8\% | 10,540 | 50.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,191 | 49.2\% | 10,191 | 49.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,364 | 100\% | 7,364 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,945 | 53.6\% | 3,945 | 53.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,567 | 21.3\% | 1,567 | 21.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 259 | 3.5\% | 259 | 3.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 168 | 2.3\% | 168 | 2.3\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Gonzales County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1010-APP Gonzales County Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,352 | 18.4\% | 1,352 | 18.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 115 | 1.6\% | 115 | 1.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 945 | 12.8\% | 945 | 12.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 315 | 4.3\% | 315 | 4.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,808 | 24.6\% | 1,808 | 24.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 538 | 7.3\% | 538 | 7.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 898 | 12.2\% | 898 | 12.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 513 | 7.0\% | 513 | 7.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,743 | 37.2\% | 2,743 | 37.2\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,419 | 32.8\% | 2,419 | 32.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 20,450 | 100\% | 20,450 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,446 | 16.9\% | 3,446 | 16.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Gonzales: Tinsley Creek Flood Mitigation Project - \$3,778,467.00 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Gonzales, benefitting 57.29\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $24.66 \%$ greater than Gonzales County's LMI percentage of $45.96 \%$ and $28.29 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

During Hurricane Harvey, the portion of the Guadalupe River that runs through Gonzales was at Flood Stage 42.1 feet. Flood stage for the river is 31 feet. During heavy rainfall, flooding closes Highways 183, 97 and Farm to Market 108. The runoff down Tinsley Creek in Gonzales adds to the Guadalupe River backwater, which floods the lowest homes near the creek. Secondary roads and streets near the river are flooded and dangerous to motorists.

The project will increase the flow capacity of the Guadalupe River and Tinsley Creek. Improvements include:

1) Replace a low water crossing with 6 culverts at Johnson Street
2) Add 4 new culverts between Tinsley Creek and St. Andrew Street
3) Replace box culvert crossings with free span bridge crossings at St. Andrew Street, St. Lawrence Street, St. Louis Street, St. Matthew Street, St. Michael Street and St. Vincent Street. These free span bridges will allow Tinsley Creek to flow unimpeded through these crossings.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Gonzales is a community of 7,517 residents in Gonzales County $(20,731)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Gonzales is $\$ 46,182$, $13.80 \%$ less than Gonzales County's median income of $\$ 53,577$, and $11.45 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Gonzales AMFI is $\$ 51,474$ (ACS 2019). This is $83 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Gonzales County which is $\$ 62,000$. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in the city of Gonzales was $23.00 \%$, compared to Gonzales County's poverty rate of $15.70 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The poverty rate declined in the ACS 2019 average to $16.8 \%$, but this does not demonstrate a concentration of poverty in the community. The highest poverty rate in the city is $19.3 \%$, and it is in Census Tract 3 where some of the work is occurring.

The city of Gonzales's population is $55.70 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Gonzales County's $50.70 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Gonzales is $32.00 \%$ white alone, less than Gonzales County's white alone percentage of $41.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Gonzales is $11.00 \%$ Black or

African American alone, greater than Gonzales County (6.50\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Gonzales is $0.40 \%$, greater than Gonzales County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Gonzales is $0.70 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Gonzales County's percentage of $0.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Gonzales is a majority minority city with $66.7 \%$ of the population being racial or ethnic minorities, and a majority being Hispanic or Latino origin at $55.7 \%$. The demographics of the specific block groups in Gonzales are similar to the demographics of the city overall. This project appears to benefit the city's population without regard to race or ethnicity.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $89.90 \%$ in the city of Gonzales, greater than $88.40 \%$ in Gonzales County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Gonzales, $39.70 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Gonzales County's percentage of $24.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Gonzales's households are $13.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Gonzales County's percentage of $7.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Gonzales's households are $19.20 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Gonzales County at $12.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Gonzales are $9.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Gonzales County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $7.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Gonzales $41.20 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Gonzales County, which is at $37.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Gonzales that have one or more people of 65 or older is $25.60 \%$, which is less than Gonzales County's $32.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Gonzales is $15.60 \%$ which is less than Gonzales County's $16.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

There is limited housing in the areas where the work is being completed. However, the housing in the area tends to be smaller wood style housing. Near the Johnson Street bridge replacement, there are houses with agricultural uses, but largely they are small wood exterior houses, some with deferred maintenance. There are also a limited number of MHUs in this area. It is not adjacent, but within the view of the primary neighborhood near the Johnson creek project and a large industrial plant. There are also MHUs in this area. Most of the project has empty lots or park space adjacent to the sites.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-0963-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Gonzales | unty | City of Gonzales |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 45.96\% |  | 57.29\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$53,577 |  | \$46,182 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 15.70\% |  | 23.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 20,731 |  | 7,517 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 10,518 | 50.7\% | 4,184 | 55.7\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 10,213 | 49.3\% | 3,333 | 44.3\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 8,635 | 41.7\% | 2,402 | 32.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,341 | 6.5\% | 824 | 11.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 28 | 0.1\% | 28 | 0.4\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 76 | 0.4\% | 51 | 0.7\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 5 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 128 | 0.6\% | 28 | 0.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 18,322 | 88.4\% | 6,786 | 90.3\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 18,233 | 88.0\% | 6,756 | 89.9\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 89 | 0.4\% | 30 | 0.4\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,409 | 11.6\% | 731 | 9.7\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 10,540 | 50.8\% | 3,634 | 48.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,191 | 49.2\% | 3,883 | 51.7\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,364 | 100\% | 2,687 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,945 | 53.6\% | 1,020 | 38.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,567 | 21.3\% | 466 | 17.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 259 | 3.5\% | 85 | 3.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 168 | 2.3\% | 75 | 2.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Gonzales County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0963-APP City of Gonzales City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,352 | 18.4\% | 514 | 19.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 115 | 1.6\% | 61 | 2.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 945 | 12.8\% | 365 | 13.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 315 | 4.3\% | 119 | 4.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,808 | 24.6\% | 1,068 | 39.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 538 | 7.3\% | 370 | 13.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 898 | 12.2\% | 517 | 19.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 513 | 7.0\% | 254 | 9.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,743 | 37.2\% | 1,108 | 41.2\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,419 | 32.8\% | 689 | 25.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 20,450 | 100\% | 7,296 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,446 | 16.9\% | 1,138 | 15.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## City of Nixon: Sanitary Sewer System Improvements Project - \$3,592,211.82-Addressed Risk:

 Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical DepressionsThis project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Nixon, benefitting 52.37\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $13.95 \%$ greater than Gonzales County's LMI percentage of $45.96 \%$ and $17.27 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Nixon's sanitary sewer system experiences heavy levels of inflow and infiltration during heavy rainfall events. As a result, various components of the city's system experience capacity issues that result in wastewater surcharges and inundation with the potential to negatively affect public welfare and the environment.

Many of the city's sanitary sewer collection system lines are failing in a variety of ways including cracking, collapsing, joint separation and misalignment. The proposed project includes improvements to the sanitary sewer system that would reduce the potential for inflow and infiltration, which causes wastewater surcharges \& inundation, increase conveyance capacity, and improves key system structures to better handle the impacts of significant rain events.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Nixon is a community of 2,510 residents in Gonzales County $(20,731)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Nixon is $\$ 57,460,7.25 \%$ greater than Gonzales County's median income of $\$ 53,577$, and $10.17 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Nixon has an AMFI of \$60,702 according to ACS 2019. This is $98 \%$ of HUD's AMFI for Lavaca County of $\$ 62,00$. Lavaca County is not in a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Nixon was $18.70 \%$, compared with Gonzales County's poverty rate of $15.70 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Nixon's population is $83.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Gonzales County's $50.70 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Nixon is $14.50 \%$ white alone, less than Gonzales County's white alone percentage of $41.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Nixon is $2.10 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Gonzales County (6.50\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Nixon is a largely Hispanic or Latino origin community at $83.1 \%$. It is interesting to note that in the adjacent block group in Wilson County (it is 427 people smaller); the White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population is at $83.4 \%$. It appears that the area outside of Nixon in the Gonzales County block groups have a higher concentration of the White not of Hispanic or Latino origin demographic. There are 660 White not of Hispanic or Latino origin residents in the block groups, but only 365 in Nixon. There is an unusually low number of native-born residents in the community as well.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $73.1 \%$ in the city of Nixon, less than $88.4 \%$ in Gonzales County and less than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in Nixon are comprised of $59.50 \%$ married couple families, which is greater than Gonzales County's $53.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Nixon that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $29.40 \%$ this is greater than Gonzales County's percentage of $21.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Nixon's households are $3.20 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Gonzales County's percentage of $3.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $3.20 \%$ is within the city of Nixon, which is greater than Gonzales County's $2.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In Nixon $45.60 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Gonzales County, which is at $37.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Nixon that have one or more people of 65 or older is $22.30 \%$, which is less than Gonzales County's $32.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Nixon is $14.60 \%$ which is less than Gonzales County's $16.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Even though the community is significantly of the same race or ethnicity, the Fair Housing Act still covers discrimination. Same race or ethnicity people can discriminate based on national origin, family status, and of course the most common Fair Housing complaint being filed currently is for people with special needs which cuts across all races and ethnicities.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1014-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Gonzales | unty | City of Nixon |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 45.96\% |  | 52.37\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$53,577 |  | \$57,460 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 15.70\% |  | 18.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 20,731 |  | 2,510 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 10,518 | 50.7\% | 2,087 | 83.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 10,213 | 49.3\% | 423 | 16.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 8,635 | 41.7\% | 365 | 14.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,341 | 6.5\% | 53 | 2.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 28 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 76 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 5 | 0.0\% | 5 | 0.2\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 128 | 0.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 18,322 | 88.4\% | 1,836 | 73.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 18,233 | 88.0\% | 1,836 | 73.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 89 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,409 | 11.6\% | 674 | 26.9\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 10,540 | 50.8\% | 1,294 | 51.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,191 | 49.2\% | 1,216 | 48.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,364 | 100\% | 761 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,945 | 53.6\% | 453 | 59.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,567 | 21.3\% | 224 | 29.4\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 259 | 3.5\% | 24 | 3.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 168 | 2.3\% | 24 | 3.2\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Gonzales County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1014-APP City of Nixon City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,352 | 18.4\% | 114 | 15.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 115 | 1.6\% | 6 | 0.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 945 | 12.8\% | 82 | 10.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 315 | 4.3\% | 50 | 6.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,808 | 24.6\% | 170 | 22.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 538 | 7.3\% | 48 | 6.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 898 | 12.2\% | 96 | 12.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 513 | 7.0\% | 41 | 5.4\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,743 | 37.2\% | 347 | 45.6\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,419 | 32.8\% | 170 | 22.3\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 20,450 | 100\% | 2,510 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,446 | 16.9\% | 366 | 14.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Gonzales County: Project Service Areas



## Gonzales County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group
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## Gonzales County: Population in Poverty by Block Group
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San Augustine County: Countywide Roads and Drainage Improvements for Flood Mitigation \$4,100,000 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a County-Wide benefit for San Augustine County, benefitting 55.42\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $24.09 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Heavy rains from hurricanes, tropical storms, and tropical depressions impact San Augustine County. Of all the natural hazards that effect San Augustine County, floods are the most common and the costliest, these include flash floods, riverine floods, and groundwater flooding. Flash floods are the most common because of the many creeks, streams, and development patterns along them within the county.

The county will improve drainage and elevate streets in flood prone areas providing a countywide benefit. These actions will reduce, and in some cases eliminate risks by diverting floodwaters away from residential streets, houses, buildings, and other infrastructure into natural drainage pathways.

These goals will be achieved by meeting the following objectives:

- Replace 3,020 linear feet (LF) of drainage culverts
- Road improvements of 193,025 square yards (SY)
- Improvement to ditch drainage systems of 29,725 SY

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

San Augustine County is a community of 8,445 residents, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of San Augustine County is $\$ 40,353,22.63 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. San Augustine County's AMFI is $\$ 47,250$ according to ACS 2019. This is $91 \%$ of HUD's AMFI for San Augustine County of $\$ 51,700$. San Augustine County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in San Augustine County is at $24.00 \%$, greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

San Augustine County's population is $7.20 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of San Augustine County is $69.10 \%$ white alone, greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). San Augustine County is $21.30 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for San Augustine County is $1.60 \%$, greater than the MIT eligible area, who is at $0.20 \%$. San Augustine County is $0.00 \%$ some other race alone, less
than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. In San Augustine County, $0.80 \%$ of the population is two or more races, less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

San Augustine County has a significant rural population, so these projects are generally supporting the residents who live outside of the city of San Augustine. More than half of the racial and ethnic minority population in San Augustine County lives the area outside of the city.

Without further beneficiary data beyond that available by the Census in the areas of the projects, we cannot tell the specifics of the demographic groups. The block groups outside of the City of San Augustine are geographically very large, so they do not provide much information regarding the racial and ethnic residences near the rural projects. With the windshield surveys, we did not get any indication that the toured select projects were benefiting any one demographic group over others, but that is an observational analysis only.

The households in San Augustine County are comprised of $48.70 \%$ married couple families, which is less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in San Augustine County that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $15.00 \%$, this is less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. San Augustine County's households are $3.40 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $3.00 \%$ is within San Augustine County, which is greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In San Augustine County, $27.50 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. San Augustine County's households are $6.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18 , equal to the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. San Augustine County's households are $11.10 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in San Augustine County are $7.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than the MIT eligible area, which is at $5.5 \%$.

In San Augustine County $30.70 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within San Augustine County that have one or more people of 65 or older is $43.90 \%$, which is greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in San Augustine County is $25.20 \%$ which is greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

We looked at seven sites in the northern part of the County. In all cases, the projects were located in rural areas with limited populations. One site was near the Airport, another site was in a forested area, and many sites had poultry operations with large coops visible. A few spots had other agricultural operations as well. Almost all of the houses were smaller, rural style wooden structures. Most houses were not in a neighborhood setting, although in some places, there were several houses together in an area. There were also many MHU's in the gathered house pockets. Even in these areas, however, the housing density was not substantial.

The roads were almost always dirt, caliche, damaged pavement, or a combination of all three. The roads were frequently surrounded by trees on both sides. The project largely supported moving water under the roads. The projects were mixed in that some would be addressing a smaller culvert, and others would be creating a concrete or steel supported bridge.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Augustine County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1113-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | San Augustine County |  |  |
|  |  |  | County-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 55.42\% |  | 55.42\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$40,353 |  | \$40,353 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 24.00\% |  | 24.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 8,286 |  | 8,286 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 597 | 7.2\% | 597 | 7.2\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 7,689 | 92.8\% | 7,689 | 92.8\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 5,725 | 69.1\% | 5,725 | 69.1\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,768 | 21.3\% | 1,768 | 21.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 132 | 1.6\% | 132 | 1.6\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 64 | 0.8\% | 64 | 0.8\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 8,074 | 97.4\% | 8,074 | 97.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 8,074 | 97.4\% | 8,074 | 97.4\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 212 | 2.6\% | 212 | 2.6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 3,969 | 47.9\% | 3,969 | 47.9\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 4,317 | 52.1\% | 4,317 | 52.1\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 3,451 | 100\% | 3,451 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,680 | 48.7\% | 1,680 | 48.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 518 | 15.0\% | 518 | 15.0\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 119 | 3.4\% | 119 | 3.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 104 | 3.0\% | 104 | 3.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Augustine County |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1113-APP |
|  |  |  | San Augustine County |
|  |  |  | County-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 702 | 20.3\% | 702 | 20.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 58 | 1.7\% | 58 | 1.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 550 | 15.9\% | 550 | 15.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 250 | 7.2\% | 250 | 7.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 950 | 27.5\% | 950 | 27.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 223 | 6.5\% | 223 | 6.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 383 | 11.1\% | 383 | 11.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 250 | 7.2\% | 250 | 7.2\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,060 | 30.7\% | 1,060 | 30.7\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,515 | 43.9\% | 1,515 | 43.9\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 8,050 | 100\% | 8,050 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,030 | 25.2\% | 2,030 | 25.2\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of San Augustine, benefitting 58.53\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $5.61 \%$ greater than San Augustine County's LMI percentage of $55.42 \%$ and $31.05 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The goal of this countywide storm mitigation project is to increase resilience to disasters and reduce the risk of loss of life or injury as well as damage to, or loss of, property. By lessening the impact of future disasters, San Augustine residents will endure far less suffering and hardship because of flood and tornado events. With these funds, officials will improve the existing structures located at the San Augustine County Fairground, which will serve to provide temporary emergency sheltering from storms, tornado and floods, as well as other critical incidents.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

San Augustine is a community of 2,315 residents in San Augustine County $(8,286)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of San Augustine is $\$ 29,479,26.95 \%$ less than San Augustine County's median income of $\$ 40,353$, and $43.48 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of San Augustine's AMFI is $\$ 41,350$ and San Augustine County's AMFI is $\$ 47,250$ according to ACS 2019. These are $80 \%$ and $91 \%$ of HUD's AMFI for San Augustine County of $\$ 51,700$. San Augustine County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of San Augustine is at $30.80 \%$, greater than San Augustine County's poverty rate of $24.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of San Augustine's population is $14.30 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than San Augustine County's $7.20 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of San Augustine is $37.90 \%$ white alone, less than San Augustine County's white alone percentage of $69.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of San Augustine is 45.70\% Black or African American alone, greater than San Augustine County (21.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. In the city of San Augustine, $2.10 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than San Augustine County, which is at $0.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

San Augustine County is largely a rural populated county. The largest City is San Augustine, the county seat, and the location for this project. About $23 \%$ of the county's population lives in San Augustine. San Augustine is a majority minority city with a racial and ethnic population of $60 \%$. According to the 2020 Census, the City of San Augustine has become a Black or African American
community with $50.4 \%$ of the population identifying as that demographic. Nearly half of all racial and ethnic minorities ( $47.9 \%$ ) in San Augustine County live in the city of San Augustine.

The three census tracts in the rural County are roughly equal in size and in population, with Census Tract 9501 having a population of 2,946 (surrounds Census Tract 9502). Census Tract 9502 consists of roughly $2 / 3 \mathrm{rds}$ of the City of San Augustine, and 1,889 of the 2,710 people in this Census Tract live within the city of San Augustine. Finally, Census Tract 9503 is largely the southern portion of the county and has 2,635 residents.

The city of San Augustine is $44.50 \%$ male, less than San Augustine County (47.90\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. San Augustine is $55.50 \%$ female, greater than the $52.10 \%$ of San Augustine County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of 50.4\%.

The households in San Augustine are comprised of $32.50 \%$ married couple families, which is less than San Augustine County's $48.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in San Augustine that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $8.30 \%$ this is less than San Augustine County's percentage of $15.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of San Augustine, $42.80 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than San Augustine County's percentage of $27.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. San Augustine's households are $20.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than San Augustine County's percentage of $6.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. San Augustine's households are $15.00 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than San Augustine County at $11.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in San Augustine are $5.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than San Augustine County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In San Augustine 35.50\% of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than San Augustine County, which is at $30.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within San Augustine that have one or more people of 65 or older is $32.10 \%$, which is less than San Augustine County's 43.90\% and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of San Augustine is $22.10 \%$ which is less than San Augustine County's $25.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The project is located in the City of San Augustine, at the San Augustine County Fairgrounds. While the shelter would be most convenient for the residents of the diverse city of San Augustine, it could benefit all San Augustine County residents.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Augustine County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) CDR17-1112-APP <br> San Augustine County |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide (City of San Augustine) |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 55.42\% |  | 55.42\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$40,353 |  | \$29,479 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 24.00\% |  | 30.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 8,286 |  | 1,889 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 597 | 7.2\% | 270 | 14.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 7,689 | 92.8\% | 1,619 | 85.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 5,725 | 69.1\% | 716 | 37.9\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,768 | 21.3\% | 863 | 45.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 132 | 1.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 64 | 0.8\% | 40 | 2.1\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 8,074 | 97.4\% | 1,844 | 97.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 8,074 | 97.4\% | 1,844 | 97.6\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 212 | 2.6\% | 45 | 2.4\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 3,969 | 47.9\% | 840 | 44.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 4,317 | 52.1\% | 1,049 | 55.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 3,451 | 100\% | 858 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,680 | 48.7\% | 279 | 32.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 518 | 15.0\% | 71 | 8.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 119 | 3.4\% | 15 | 1.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 104 | 3.0\% | 15 | 1.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Augustine County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1112-APP |
|  |  |  | San Augustine County |
|  |  |  | City-Wide (City of San Augustine) |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 702 | 20.3\% | 197 | 23.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 58 | 1.7\% | 16 | 1.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 550 | 15.9\% | 169 | 19.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 250 | 7.2\% | 65 | 7.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 950 | 27.5\% | 367 | 42.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 223 | 6.5\% | 173 | 20.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 383 | 11.1\% | 129 | 15.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 250 | 7.2\% | 43 | 5.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,060 | 30.7\% | 305 | 35.5\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,515 | 43.9\% | 275 | 32.1\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 8,050 | 100\% | 1,754 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,030 | 25.2\% | 387 | 22.1\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## City of San Augustine: Public Water System Improvements Project - \$3,472,500 - Addressed Risk:

 Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical DepressionsThis project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of San Augustine, benefitting 58.53\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $5.61 \%$ greater than San Augustine County's LMI percentage of $55.42 \%$ and $31.06 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of San Augustine public water system consists of critical infrastructure subject to damage from weather hazards such as hurricane, tornado, and floods. The water system critical infrastructure elements are a high service pump station, transmission main, and light plant booster station. Should any of these facilities be rendered inoperable due to hurricane, tornado, or flood, the citizens of San Augustine could find themselves without a source of potable water for a sustained duration.

The project scope will comprise the following activities so that these structures and mechanical systems can be hardened against future hazards:

1. Construct new facilities for both the High Service Pump Station located south of the city near City Lake and the Light Plant Booster Pump Station located on the north side of the city. Activities at these facilities will include constructing new buildings, installing new pumps and piping, and other site improvements.
2. Replace the transmission mains with new facilities(s).
3. The "Highway 96 Pressure Zone" transmission main will be constructed along the westbound corridor of Planters Street into a newly acquired easement before turning southbound along South Broadway Street and terminating near Ayish Bayou, for a total of 4,865 linear feet.

The "Hospital Pressure Zone" transmission main will begin at the High Service Pump Station before heading northbound along South Liberty Street to Planters Street, then east along Planters Street turning north on South Milam Street and terminating at the intersection of East Main Street/State Highway 21 West, for a total of 8,690 linear feet.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

San Augustine is a community of 1,889 residents in San Augustine County $(8,286)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of San Augustine is $\$ 29,479,26.95 \%$ less than San Augustine County's median income of $\$ 40,353$, and $43.48 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. San Augustine's AMFI is $\$ 41,350$. This is $80 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for San Augustine County $\$ 51,700$. San Augustine

County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of San Augustine was $24.00 \%$, less than San Augustine County's poverty rate of $24.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of San Augustine increased to $27.4 \%$ while San Augustine County's poverty rate increased to $24.8 \%$.

The city of San Augustine's population is $14.30 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than San Augustine County's $7.20 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of San Augustine is $37.90 \%$ white alone, less than San Augustine County's white alone percentage of $69.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of San Augustine is $45.70 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than San Augustine County $(21.30 \%)$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

San Augustine is a majority minority community with approximately $60 \%$ of the population being racial and ethnic minorities. The Black or African American population is the largest population at $45.70 \%$. It is important to note that no single demographic is a majority population. The project appears to be a community wide benefit because the main goal is the distribution of potable water to San Augustine residents. The residents on Planters may be slightly more inconvenienced with the construction on their street, but there does not appear to be a greater benefit or burden (other than the temporary construction) on any segment of the community.

The city of San Augustine is $44.50 \%$ male, less than San Augustine County (47.90\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. San Augustine is $55.50 \%$ female, greater than the $52.10 \%$ of San Augustine County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of 50.4\%.

The households in San Augustine are comprised of $32.50 \%$ married couple families, which is less than San Augustine County's $48.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in San Augustine that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $8.30 \%$ this is less than San Augustine County's percentage of $15.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of San Augustine, $42.80 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than San Augustine County's percentage of $27.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. San Augustine's households are $20.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than San Augustine County's percentage of $6.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. San Augustine's households are $15.00 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than San Augustine County at $11.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$.

In San Augustine $35.50 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than San Augustine County, which is at $30.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within San Augustine that have one or more people of 65 or older is $32.10 \%$, which is less than San Augustine County's 43.90\% and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of San Augustine is $22.10 \%$ which is less than San Augustine County's $25.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

San Augustine has mixed housing, but generally it is well-kept. The immediate area where the project construction is being completed has larger houses than the overall community. Some are wood, but many are brick and the homes are generally on larger lots. In the direction of the water plant project site, the homes on FM 2213 are larger and are on very large lots. Closer to the lake where the water plant is, there are more agricultural uses present. There are many smaller homes in the community, and some have deferred maintenance.

The total number of households in the community is 1,168 , and of those $354(30 \%)$ are rental units. Rent is considered unaffordable for 197 units ( $17 \%$ of total residences) by HUD standards. The population over 65 is 415 ( $22 \%$ ) people. While age is not a protected class for Fair Housing purposes, there can be a higher incidence of disabilities in this population.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Augustine County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1042-APP City of San Augustine City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 55.42\% |  | 58.53\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$40,353 |  | \$29,479 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 24.00\% |  | 24.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 8,286 |  | 1,889 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 597 | 7.2\% | 270 | 14.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 7,689 | 92.8\% | 1,619 | 85.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 5,725 | 69.1\% | 716 | 37.9\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,768 | 21.3\% | 863 | 45.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 132 | 1.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 64 | 0.8\% | 40 | 2.1\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 8,074 | 97.4\% | 1,844 | 97.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 8,074 | 97.4\% | 1,844 | 97.6\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 212 | 2.6\% | 45 | 2.4\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 3,969 | 47.9\% | 840 | 44.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 4,317 | 52.1\% | 1,049 | 55.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 3,451 | 100\% | 858 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,680 | 48.7\% | 279 | 32.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 518 | 15.0\% | 71 | 8.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 119 | 3.4\% | 15 | 1.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 104 | 3.0\% | 15 | 1.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Augustine County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1042-APP City of San Augustine City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 702 | 20.3\% | 197 | 23.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 58 | 1.7\% | 16 | 1.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 550 | 15.9\% | 169 | 19.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 250 | 7.2\% | 65 | 7.6\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 950 | 27.5\% | 367 | 42.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 223 | 6.5\% | 173 | 20.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 383 | 11.1\% | 129 | 15.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 250 | 7.2\% | 43 | 5.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,060 | 30.7\% | 305 | 35.5\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,515 | 43.9\% | 275 | 32.1\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 8,050 | 100\% | 1,754 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,030 | 25.2\% | 387 | 22.1\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## San Augustine County: Project Service Areas



## San Augustine County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category




## San Augustine County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (0 Block Groups)10-25 percent (5 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (3 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty
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City of Ivanhoe: Stormwater Detention and Management Project - \$11,472,116.80-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Ivanhoe, benefitting 57.38\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $39.79 \%$ greater than Tyler County's LMI percentage of $41.05 \%$ and $28.49 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Ivanhoe is surrounded by several lakes that have been inundated by repetitive flooding from Hurricane Harvey and other storms. Overflowing flood waters from Lake Ivanhoe and Lake Tristan have caused structural damage to dams and roadways, creating hazards for residents and first responders.

During Hurricane Harvey, inflows to Lake Ivanhoe exceeded the capacity of the outfall structures and spilled over the top of the dam, causing severe erosion on the face of the dam. Without a functional dam, storm water run-off flows unabated through the breached dam location causing Ivanhoe Drive to flood, trapping residents inside the city and obstructing ingress for emergency responders. The city of Ivanhoe has identified the conversion of Lake Ivanhoe to a stormwater detention facility to mitigate the frequent and repetitive flooding of Ivanhoe Drive, the only ingress/egress route for the city.

Flood waters are controlled and released by the outlet works at the Lake Tristan outfall located on the northeast side of the lake. Recent storm events have exceeded the capacity of Lake Tristan's outlet works, resulting in water overtopping this section of the dam and causing roadway flooding and erosion damages. Due to repeated overtopping, a portion of Lakewood Drive has experienced extended periods of saturation and suffered base failure. The flooding of Lakewood Drive presents a dangerous hazard to first responders and to the public travelling along Lakewood Drive during and after storm events.

The proposed activities will increase resilience to disasters, reduce the long-term risk of loss of life, injury, and damage to and loss of property by lessening the impact of future disasters. The project will include:

- Reconstruct the Lake Ivanhoe Dam to remove structurally compromised components of the existing dam and install new water control gates to convert the lake into a stormwater detention facility.
- Acquire 28 acres of Lake Ivanhoe and adjacent property from the Ivanhoe Property Owners Improvement Association.
- Clear/grade and channel line drainage channels to improve conveyance into and out of Lake Ivanhoe totaling 3,700 linear feet (LF) to mitigate against future erosion.
- Replace the emergency discharge structure at Lake Tristan to improve capacity and protect the adjacent road from flooding.
- Demolish and reconstruct the undersized outlet works of Lake Tristan to provide better control of flood water releases.
- Clear and expand the discharge channels on downstream side of the Lake Tristan Dam to improve capacity in the existing storm drains.
- Elevate a section of Lakewood Drive 300 LF to prevent overtopping by flood waters in the future.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Ivanhoe is a community of 1,614 residents in Tyler County $(21,518)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Ivanhoe is $\$ 35,786,19.58 \%$ less than Tyler County's median income of $\$ 44,497$, and $31.39 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Ivanhoe's AMFI is $\$ 46,429$ according to ACS 2019 compared with Tyler County's HUD AMFI of $\$ 63,800$. Tyler County is not in a recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Ivanhoe was $24.80 \%$, compared with Tyler County's poverty rate of $14.90 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Ivanhoe's population is $7.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Tyler County's $7.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Ivanhoe is $80.00 \%$ white alone, greater than Tyler County's white alone percentage of $79.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Ivanhoe is $3.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Tyler County ( $10.60 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Ivanhoe is $0.20 \%$, greater than Tyler County and equal to the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively.

Ivanhoe is $80 \%$ White not of Hispanic or Latino origin. The ACS shows that Ivanhoe is $3.5 \%$ Black or African American and $7.9 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin. Ivanhoe says on its website that the largest population consists of "weekenders." One would expect that "weekenders" (a.k.a. weekend homeowners" are listed for Census purposes at their primary residence, so we do not know the accuracy of the racial and ethnic demographics. The ACS data shows that $46.5 \%$ of the population are 65 years or older.

Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $0.70 \%$ is within the city of Ivanhoe, which is less than Tyler County's $1.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Ivanhoe, $31.40 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Tyler County's percentage of $28.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Ivanhoe's households are $7.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Tyler County's percentage of $4.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Ivanhoe's households are $16.10 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Tyler County at $15.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Ivanhoe are $10.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it
greater than Tyler County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $9.80 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Ivanhoe $21.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is less than Tyler County, which is at $26.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Ivanhoe that have one or more people of 65 or older is $36.10 \%$, which is less than Tyler County's $42.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Ivanhoe is $22.70 \%$ which is greater than Tyler County's $22.50 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The City of Ivanhoe is the second largest city in rural Tyler County. Originally a master planned community intended for weekend homes and retirees, it is built around a series of lakes. When constructed by developers, the lakes were intended to serve as amenities to residents but were not subject to state or federal oversight. With continued development around the lakes and multiple flood events affecting Ivanhoe, it has become evident that the lakes were not designed to serve as flood control facilities or to withstand repeated overtopping of the earthen dams.

The focus of the project is on the lakes and the single ingress/egress entrance to the community. The housing around the lakes is typical for lake style housing. Many of the houses have docks on the water or yards that accentuate the lake. Most housing not on the lakes are smaller to midsize housing.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Tyler County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1027-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Ivanhoe |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 41.05\% |  | 57.38\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$44,497 |  | \$35,786 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.90\% |  | 24.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 21,518 |  | 1,614 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,656 | 7.7\% | 127 | 7.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 19,862 | 92.3\% | 1,487 | 92.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 17,004 | 79.0\% | 1,292 | 80.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,289 | 10.6\% | 56 | 3.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 23 | 0.1\% | 3 | 0.2\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 70 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 18 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 458 | 2.1\% | 136 | 8.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 20,877 | 97.0\% | 1,557 | 96.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 20,700 | 96.2\% | 1,537 | 95.2\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 177 | 0.8\% | 20 | 1.2\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 641 | 3.0\% | 57 | 3.5\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 11,699 | 54.4\% | 771 | 47.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,819 | 45.60\% | 843 | 52.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,100 | 100\% | 682 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,617 | 50.9\% | 277 | 40.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,058 | 14.9\% | 58 | 8.5\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 267 | 3.8\% | 5 | 0.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 136 | 1.9\% | 5 | 0.7\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Tyler County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1027-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Ivanhoe |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 1,188 | 16.7\% | 186 | 27.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 41 | 0.6\% | 18 | 2.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 993 | 14.0\% | 130 | 19.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 432 | 6.1\% | 17 | 2.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,028 | 28.6\% | 214 | 31.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 322 | 4.5\% | 50 | 7.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,122 | 15.8\% | 110 | 16.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 693 | 9.8\% | 69 | 10.1\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,872 | 26.4\% | 144 | 21.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,027 | 42.6\% | 246 | 36.1\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 18,863 | 100\% | 1,614 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,238 | 22.5\% | 367 | 22.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Tyler County: Project Service Areas



## Tyler County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




## Tyler County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
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Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Ganado: Water \& Sewer Mitigation Project - \$7,190,056-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Ganado, benefitting 54.99\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $40.92 \%$ greater than Jackson County's LMI percentage of $39.02 \%$ and $23.12 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Due to the location of the city of Ganado, the entire city is vulnerable to hurricanes, tropical depressions, tropical storms, and flood waters caused by excessive rainfall associated with these major weather events. The impact of flooding on residents of Ganado includes threats to public health and safety from the floodwater itself, damage to residential and commercial properties and overtopping of roadways that can inhibit residents and first responders from traversing the streets.

The project scope includes replacing water infrastructure and sanitary sewer lines to mitigate risks associated with future flooding events and help to ensure safe drinking water. The project will:

- Replace approximately 29,200 LF wastewater pipes, upsize as necessary
- Replace or rehabilitate approximately 71 manholes
- Water line improvements include approximately 28,700 LF of PVC pipes, approximately 540 -line replacements, 35 fire hydrant assemblies, and boring.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Ganado is a community of 2,136 residents in Jackson County $(14,816)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Ganado is $\$ 52,321,16.69 \%$ less than Jackson County's median income of $\$ 62,806$, and $0.32 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The AMFI in Ganado is $\$ 62,067$ according to the ACS 2019 five-year average. This is $82 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Jackson County $(\$ 75,300)$. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Ganado was $23.30 \%$, compared with Jackson County's poverty rate of $13.90 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Ganado's population is $57.20 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Jackson County's $33.10 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Ganado is $39.20 \%$ white alone, less than Jackson County's white alone percentage of $58.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Ganado is $1.30 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Jackson County (6.50\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Ganado is $0.00 \%$, equal to Jackson County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.00 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Ganado is $1.50 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Jackson County's percentage of $1.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Ganado is a majority minority community with $58.3 \%$ of the community being racial and ethnic minorities. The project (water and wastewater) directly benefits almost all of the streets in the City, and while there does not seem to be a pattern in particular, the water projects appear to be even more broadly spread out. The distribution of the projects does not appear to unfairly benefit or burden any particular group given the demographics and the broad reach of the projects.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $74.60 \%$ in the city of Ganado, less than $90.30 \%$ in Jackson County and less than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Ganado, $40.30 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Jackson County's percentage of $24.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Ganado's households are $7.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Jackson County's percentage of $5.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Ganado's households are $19.70 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Jackson County at $13.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Ganado are $7.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Jackson County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $7.30 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Ganado $33.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Jackson County, which is at $32.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Ganado that have one or more people of 65 or older is $26.50 \%$, which is less than Jackson County's $32.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Ganado is $11.20 \%$ which is less than Jackson County's $17.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

As almost every street is impacted, the housing reflects all styles, types, facades, and quality. The houses are frequently well kept with a mix in sizes. The quality and size of the houses also seemed to be intermixed.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jackson County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1199-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Ganado |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 39.02\% |  | 54.99\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$62,806 |  | \$52,321 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.90\% |  | 23.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 14,816 |  | 2,136 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 4,905 | 33.1\% | 1,221 | 57.2\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 9,911 | 66.9\% | 915 | 42.8\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 8,665 | 58.5\% | 838 | 39.2\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 960 | 6.5\% | 28 | 1.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 155 | 1.0\% | 32 | 1.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 9 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 122 | 0.8\% | 17 | 0.8\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 13,380 | 90.3\% | 1,635 | 76.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 13,295 | 89.7\% | 1,594 | 74.6\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 85 | 0.6\% | 41 | 1.9\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,436 | 9.7\% | 501 | 23.5\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 7,316 | 49.4\% | 1,042 | 48.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 7,500 | 50.6\% | 1,094 | 51.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,917 | 100\% | 709 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,857 | 58.1\% | 291 | 41.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,029 | 20.9\% | 145 | 20.5\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 124 | 2.5\% | 34 | 4.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 27 | 0.5\% | 3 | 0.4\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jackson County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1199-APP City of Ganado City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 732 | 14.9\% | 98 | 13.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 42 | 0.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 479 | 9.7\% | 60 | 8.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 148 | 3.0\% | 21 | 3.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,204 | 24.5\% | 286 | 40.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 248 | 5.0\% | 55 | 7.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 667 | 13.6\% | 140 | 19.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 359 | 7.3\% | 55 | 7.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,574 | 32.0\% | 235 | 33.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,613 | 32.80\% | 188 | 26.5\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 14,594 | 100\% | 2,095 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,598 | 17.8\% | 234 | 11.2\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of La Ward: Drainage Improvements Project - \$3,280,106-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, Riverine Flooding, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of La Ward, benefitting 55.26\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $41.63 \%$ greater than Jackson County's LMI percentage of $39.02 \%$ and $23.74 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of La Ward is approximately 12 miles from the Gulf of Mexico. The city has a pancakeflat topography with a poorly defined natural drainage system. Due to its inadequate drainage system, the city is prone to flooding during storm events with hurricanes and tropical storms being especially devastating to the community.

During major storm events, the existing drainage system is unable to accommodate the storm water flow, resulting in water ponding on the streets and adjoining properties and making all the residents vulnerable to flooding. In addition to causing damage to structures and community infrastructure, the flooding of the streets puts all citizens' health and safety at risk. Available ditches and culverts are mostly undersized, causing most drainage to flow on the streets. To mitigate the on-going risk of flooding, the community drainage system will need to be improved by increasing capacity, expanding channels, and crowning streets to shed storm water.

The city of La Ward mitigation will improve the community-wide drainage system that will result in increased efficiency in the movement of water and enhance the safety of the roadways for drivers.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

La Ward is a community of 305 residents in Jackson County $(14,816)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of La Ward is $\$ 53,125,15.41 \%$ less than Jackson County's median income of $\$ 62,806$, and $1.86 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. La Ward's AMFI is $\$ 52,159$ according to ACS 2019. This is $69.3 \%$ of the AMFI for Jackson County of $\$ 75,300$ according to HUD AMFI tables. Jackson County is not located within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5year estimates in the city of La Ward was $21.30 \%$, compared with Jackson County's poverty rate of $13.90 \%$ and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The ACS 2019 poverty rate for La Ward was $13.1 \%$.

The city of La Ward's population is $37.00 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Jackson County's $33.10 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of La Ward is $62.30 \%$ white alone, greater than Jackson County's white alone
percentage of $58.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of La Ward is $0.70 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Jackson County ( $6.50 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

The City is majority White not of Hispanic or Latino origin (62.3\%), which is in between the two Census Tract block groups demographics totals.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $91.1 \%$ in the city of La Ward, greater than $90.30 \%$ in Jackson County and less than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in La Ward are comprised of $69.80 \%$ married couple families, which is greater than Jackson County's $58.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in La Ward that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $22.90 \%$ this is greater than Jackson County's percentage of $20.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In La Ward $37.50 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Jackson County, which is at $32.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within La Ward that have one or more people of 65 or older is $20.80 \%$, which is less than Jackson County's $32.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of La Ward is $21.60 \%$ which is greater than Jackson County's $17.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

According to a windshield survey, the project appears to include most of the community, and appears to make repairs where they are needed. There are a few larger homes and a few MHUs, but most of the housing in La Ward is similar in nature, size, and design. The housing is generally smaller, wood-sided homes constructed in a rural style. The east side of the city (from State Highway 172) appears to have older homes generally, along with some MHUs and some homes with deferred maintenance. There are several larger brick homes on the west side of the city (from State Highway 172), along with an MHU park and more open land.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jackson County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0888-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of La Ward |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 39.02\% |  | 55.26\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$62,806 |  | \$53,125 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.90\% |  | 21.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 14,816 |  | 305 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 4,905 | 33.1\% | 113 | 37.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 9,911 | 66.9\% | 192 | 63.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 8,665 | 58.5\% | 190 | 62.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 960 | 6.5\% | 2 | 0.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 155 | 1.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 9 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 122 | 0.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 13,380 | 90.3\% | 282 | 92.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 13,295 | 89.7\% | 278 | 91.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 85 | 0.6\% | 4 | 1.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,436 | 9.7\% | 23 | 7.5\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 7,316 | 49.4\% | 163 | 53.4\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 7,500 | 50.6\% | 142 | 46.6\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,917 | 100\% | 96 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,857 | 58.1\% | 67 | 69.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,029 | 20.9\% | 22 | 22.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 124 | 2.5\% | 10 | 10.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 27 | 0.5\% | 4 | 4.2\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Jackson County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0888-APP City of La Ward City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 732 | 14.9\% | 10 | 10.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 42 | 0.9\% | 7 | 7.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 479 | 9.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 148 | 3.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,204 | 24.5\% | 9 | 9.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 248 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 667 | 13.6\% | 9 | 9.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 359 | 7.3\% | 6 | 6.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,574 | 32.0\% | 36 | 37.5\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,613 | 32.80\% | 20 | 20.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 14,594 | 100\% | 305 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,598 | 17.8\% | 66 | 21.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Jackson County: Project Service Areas
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## Jackson County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance

- 15

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| categry or no |
| population are blank |

85-100

## Population by Category



## Jackson County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (6 Block Groups)10-25 percent (3 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (2 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



## City of Raymondville: Drainage Improvements - \$10,000,000 - Addressed Risk: Storms

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Raymondville, benefitting $66.01 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $5.78 \%$ greater than Willacy County's LMI percentage of $62.41 \%$ and $47.82 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Raymondville will increase the resiliency and capacity of the drainage system, allowing storm water to flow off-site faster, thereby alleviating future flooding potential and damage to roads and critical facilities. The proposed project will provide significant enhancements to several areas throughout the city by increasing storage in detention areas and diverting overflows into the North Raymondville Drain. Drainage ditch improvements will increase storage capacity on outflow ditches surrounding Raymondville on the south, west and north areas of the city. A major trunk line will drain the southside area into existing ditches. Upon completion, this drainage project will hasten the flow of stormwater runoff away from the city, restore resiliency, and reduce the risk to public health and safety.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Raymondville is a community of 11,021 residents in Willacy County $(21,588)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Raymondville is $\$ 29,750,16.25 \%$ less than Willacy County's median income of $\$ 35,521$, and $42.96 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Raymondville's AMFI is $\$ 31,636$. This is $94 \%$ of Willacy County's HUD AMI of $\$ 33,300$. Willacy County is not in a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Raymondville was $40.00 \%$, greater than Willacy County's poverty rate of $33.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Raymondville decreased to $29.8 \%$ while Willacy County's poverty rate decreased to $27.0 \%$.

The city of Raymondville's population is $91.70 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Willacy County's $88.20 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Raymondville is $7.20 \%$ white alone, less than Willacy County's white alone percentage of $11.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Raymondville is $1.10 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Willacy County ( $0.60 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

The community is homogeneous with $92.7 \%$ of the population being White of Hispanic or Latino origin. $7.3 \%$ of the population is White, not of Latino or Hispanic origin, and there are only 119 Black or African American residents, representing 1.1\% of the community. All 119 of the Black
or African American population appear to live in the Eastern part of Raymondville in Census Tract 9504.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $85.60 \%$ in the city of Raymondville, greater than $85.10 \%$ in Willacy County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Raymondville is $56.90 \%$ male, greater than Willacy County ( $54.00 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Raymondville is $43.10 \%$ female, less than the $46.00 \%$ of Willacy County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in Raymondville are comprised of $45.70 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Willacy County's $50.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Raymondville that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $15.00 \%$ this is less than Willacy County's percentage of $18.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of Raymondville, $31.20 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Willacy County's percentage of $28.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Raymondville's households are $7.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Willacy County's percentage of $7.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Raymondville's households are $8.40 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than Willacy County at $9.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$.

In Raymondville $41.60 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than Willacy County, which is at $41.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Raymondville that have one or more people of 65 or older is $39.00 \%$, which is greater than Willacy County's $34.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Raymondville is $19.30 \%$ which is greater than Willacy County's $16.80 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Raymondville has compact neighborhoods consisting of single-family homes and multi-family communities located on both sides of the street near the main street of $7^{\text {th }}$ Street. There are neighborhoods located east of Interstate 69, away from the underground channel project. Rural scattered housing also exists in the community.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Willacy County |  | 2015 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1058-APP <br> City of Raymondville |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 62.41\% |  | 66.01\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$35,521 |  | \$29,750 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 33.00\% |  | 40.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 21,588 |  | 11,021 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 19,039 | 88.2\% | 10,105 | 91.7\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,549 | 11.8\% | 916 | 8.3\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 2,427 | 11.2\% | 797 | 7.2\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 119 | 0.6\% | 119 | 1.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 3 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 18,367 | 85.1\% | 9,487 | 86.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 18,240 | 84.5\% | 9,430 | 85.6\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 127 | 0.6\% | 57 | 0.5\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 3,221 | 14.9\% | 1,534 | 13.9\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 11,663 | 54.0\% | 6,272 | 56.9\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,925 | 46.0\% | 4,749 | 43.1\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 5,782 | 100\% | 2,685 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,931 | 50.7\% | 1,226 | 45.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,067 | 18.5\% | 402 | 15.0\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 311 | 5.4\% | 132 | 4.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 161 | 2.8\% | 81 | 3.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Willacy County |  | 2015 Floods (State MID) CDR17-1058-APP City of Raymondville City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 888 | 15.4\% | 488 | 18.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 115 | 2.0\% | 87 | 3.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 505 | 8.7\% | 211 | 7.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 151 | 2.6\% | 89 | 3.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,652 | 28.6\% | 839 | 31.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 439 | 7.6\% | 191 | 7.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 534 | 9.2\% | 226 | 8.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 330 | 5.7\% | 131 | 4.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,399 | 41.5\% | 1,118 | 41.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,014 | 34.8\% | 1,048 | 39.0\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 20,335 | 100\% | 9,768 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,425 | 16.8\% | 1,881 | 19.3\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Willacy County: Project Service Areas



## Willacy County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group
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## Willacy County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
< 10 percent (2 Block Groups)10-25 percent ( 6 Block Groups) 25-45 percent (7 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



## City of Buffalo: Wastewater Plant - \$9,881,420-Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Buffalo, benefitting 59.19\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $52.16 \%$ greater than Leon County's LMI percentage of $38.90 \%$ and $32.53 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The proposed project will upgrade and expand the City of Buffalo's Wastewater Treatment Plant. During significant weather events, the antiquated sewer system is constantly surcharged, and the plant is subject to overflows, ultimately resulting in service outages which pose significant health and safety issues. The proposed wastewater treatment plant project will alleviate the risk of surcharges and overflows during severe storm events. The project will include improvements to, or replacement of, the gravity influent lines, aeration basins, clarifiers, blower facilities, sludge handling, disinfection, electrical systems, and the gravity outfall. The project is included in the Leon County Hazard Mitigation Action Plan.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Buffalo is a community of 1,917 residents in Leon County $(17,225)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Buffalo is $\$ 45,078,4.72 \%$ greater than Leon County's median income of $\$ 43,045$, and $13.57 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Buffalo has an AMFI of $\$ 58,646$ according to ACS 2019. This is $97 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 60,200$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Leon County, TX HUD Income Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Buffalo was $24.50 \%$, compared to Leon County's poverty rate of $16.60 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Buffalo increased to $27.9 \%$ while Leon County's poverty rate increased to $17.6 \%$. The project will benefit the entire city by ensuring water treatment systems continue to function during flood events. All residents of Buffalo will benefit from this project, including areas with higher poverty.

At the time of applciation the city of Buffalo's population was $29.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Leon County's $14.60 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Buffalo is $53.60 \%$ white alone, less than Leon County's white alone percentage of $76.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Buffalo is $12.50 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Leon County ( $6.70 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Buffalo is $1.50 \%$, greater than Leon County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.60 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Buffalo is $0.50 \%$ Asian alone, less than Leon County's percentage of $0.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for Buffalo is $0.00 \%$, which is less than Leon County $(0.30 \%)$ and less
than the MIT eligible area at 0.1 In the city of Buffalo, $2.00 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Leon County, which is at $0.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

In the 2020 census, the population of Buffalo decreased by 150 people and became more diverse with the Black/African American (9.3\%) and Hispanic or Latino origin population increasing (38.1\%) . These populations now makeup a total of $47.4 \%$ of the total population compared with White not of Hispanic or Latino origin at $47.6 \%$. As is referenced above in the 2019 ACS percentages, the balance is American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian and two or more races.

The city of Buffalo is $50.00 \%$ male, greater than Leon County (49.70\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Buffalo is $50.00 \%$ female, less than the $50.30 \%$ of Leon County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in Buffalo are comprised of $43.20 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Leon County's $52.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Buffalo that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $18.80 \%$ this is greater than Leon County's percentage of $15.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of Buffalo, $37.40 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Leon County's percentage of $27.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Buffalo's households are $4.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Leon County's percentage of $3.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Buffalo's households are $21.80 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Leon County at $15.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Buffalo are 12.10\% occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Leon County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $9.70 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Buffalo $25.80 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Leon County, which is at $25.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Buffalo that have one or more people of 65 or older is $29.50 \%$, which is less than Leon County's $43.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Buffalo is $17.90 \%$ which is less than Leon County's $19.50 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The housing directly by the wastewater treatment plant on Brown Chapel and Josie are smaller homes and MHU's. Moving away from the wastewater treatment plant, the houses on Legalley (across from plant) and Bullock are larger and are on bigger lots. Overall, the housing in Buffalo can be characterized as rural community-housing.

The wastewater treatment plant is in a neighborhood, but improvements should help make the plant a better part of the area. The houses exist around the location now, and it does appear that the city will do any form of eminent domain of housing to acquire property given the large
amounts of open land surrounding the plant. The City has 865 housing units listed in the Census data, but of those, 273 , or $31.6 \%$, appear to be rental units.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Leon County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1212-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Buffalo |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 38.90\% |  | 59.19\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$43,045 |  | \$45,078 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 16.60\% |  | 24.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 17,225 |  | 1,917 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 2,509 | 14.6\% | 574 | 29.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 14,716 | 85.4\% | 1,343 | 70.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 13,113 | 76.1\% | 1,027 | 53.6\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,155 | 6.7\% | 239 | 12.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 103 | 0.6\% | 29 | 1.5\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 138 | 0.8\% | 10 | 0.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 55 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 152 | 0.9\% | 38 | 2.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 16,328 | 94.8\% | 1,664 | 86.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 16,320 | 94.7\% | 1,664 | 86.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 8 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 897 | 5.2\% | 253 | 13.2\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 8,569 | 49.7\% | 958 | 50.0\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 8,656 | 50.3\% | 959 | 50.0\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 6,443 | 100\% | 655 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,354 | 52.1\% | 283 | 43.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 966 | 15.0\% | 123 | 18.8\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 328 | 5.1\% | 46 | 7.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 105 | 1.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Leon County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1212-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Buffalo |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 975 | 15.1\% | 81 | 12.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 46 | 0.7\% | 9 | 1.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 828 | 12.9\% | 69 | 10.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 442 | 6.9\% | 15 | 2.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,786 | 27.7\% | 245 | 37.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 248 | 3.8\% | 32 | 4.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,001 | 15.5\% | 143 | 21.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 622 | 9.7\% | 79 | 12.1\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,623 | 25.2\% | 169 | 25.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,825 | 43.8\% | 193 | 29.5\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 17,136 | 100\% | 1,889 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,337 | 19.5\% | 339 | 17.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Leon County: Project Service Areas



## Leon County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Leon County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



City of Hempstead: Citywide Drainage Project - \$9,395,324-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Hempstead, benefitting 71.77\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $46.29 \%$ greater than Waller County's LMI percentage of $49.06 \%$ and $60.70 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Hempstead has had continued issues with local drainage and sporadic flooding during major storm events causing mobility restrictions. These issues directly and indirectly affect the health and safety of all the residents within the community. The city will improve local drainage to mitigate the effect of storm events that impair citizen mobility and threaten housing. In addition, the city will provide two detention facilities to mitigate the effects of the enhanced drainage.

The citywide drainage project encompasses the following:

- Comprehensive regrading program for the open channel drainage systems throughout the city. This will be accomplished by channel staking, elevation setting, regrading, and shaping 110,000 linear feet (LF) of drainage.
- Hydraulically enhance and revegetate approximately 4,400 LF of the stream to prevent additional and future erosion. The detention areas on both Blasingame and Clear Creeks will provide additional capacity for mitigation of storm water flows generated throughout the city limits before draining to the south of the city.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Hempstead is a community of 7,691 residents in Waller County $(51,832)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Hempstead is $\$ 35,688$, $40.16 \%$ less than Waller County's median income of $\$ 59,642$, and $31.57 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Hempstead has an AMFI of $\$ 47,726$ according to ACS 2019. This is $61 \%$ of the HUD AMFI which is $\$ 78,800$. The HUD AMFI is part of the HoustonThe Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Hempstead was $23.70 \%$, compared to Waller County's poverty rate of $16.90 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. The poverty rate in Hempstead increased slightly according to the ACS 2019 to $25.5 \%$ for the city overall. In Waller County, the poverty rate is $16.5 \%$.

The city of Hempstead's population is $33.70 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Waller County's $30.10 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Hempstead is $21.80 \%$ white alone, less than Waller County's white alone percentage of $42.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Hempstead is $42.50 \%$ Black or African

American alone, greater than Waller County (24.80\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Hempstead is $0.40 \%$, greater than Waller County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively.

Hempstead is a majority minority community and is fairly diverse between racial and ethnic groups. No particular demographic has a majority. The largest plurality is Black or African American at $42.5 \%$ of the population. Hispanic or Latino origin at $33.7 \%$ combines with Black or African American to a total racial and ethnic minority population of $76.2 \%$. White not of Hispanic or Latino origin represents $21.8 \%$ of Hempstead's population.

The Census Tracts that are a part of Hempstead have a higher concentration of Black or African American people in them than the surrounding areas outside of Hempstead's city limits. This is also true in other parts of Waller County. The areas outside of Hempstead are almost evenly divided between Black and African American people, people of Hispanic or Latino origin, and people of White not of Hispanic or Latino origin at $33.2 \%, 32.9 \%$ and $33.2 \%$ respectively.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $83.5 \%$ in the city of Hempstead, less than $86.1 \%$ in Waller County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Hempstead is $52.80 \%$ male, greater than Waller County ( $49.90 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Hempstead is $47.20 \%$ female, less than the $50.10 \%$ of Waller County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Hempstead, $28.40 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Waller County's percentage of $20.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Hempstead's households are $11.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Waller County's percentage of $4.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Hempstead's households are $10.30 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Waller County at $8.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$.

In Hempstead $33.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Waller County, which is at $33.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Hempstead that have one or more people of 65 or older is $19.60 \%$, which is less than Waller County's $26.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Hempstead is $12.30 \%$ which is greater than Waller County's $11.70 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The community has more rental properties $(1,755$ out of 2,750$)$ than homeowner occupied properties. In addition, $41 \%$ of the housing units $(1,125)$ have rents that exceed $30 \%$ of their income; surpassing the HUD definition of affordable rents. Furthermore, the ACS 2019 shows a $0 \%$ vacancy rate in the community per Census data. .

The neighborhood including Lafayette and Washington Street is adjacent to a large creek (it appears to be the waterway that runs through the detention pond). The houses in this area are smaller wood houses or MHUs. Some have deferred maintenance. These appear to be LMI houses but are in a fairly dense neighborhood setting. The $7^{\text {th }}$ street area has the High School and some larger housing. The neighborhood containing Calvit Street and $1^{\text {st }}$ has many open lots, MHUs, and mixed housing in size and quality.

The houses on Shepard and Colorado Streets are mixed housing; however, they are generally small. The side streets off Shepard and Colorado itself dead-end into the wooded area that appears to be the twenty-acre site. There are empty lots in this area.

The twelve-acre detention pond is in a more remote area of Hempstead that is an agricultural area. The proposed area is located within a large land mass that is gated. On account of this, we were unable to go to the site. There are three other houses and an Equine Facility on Gratehouse Lane. There is one smaller house within the fences of the larger agricultural areas, and one side of the road is agricultural property with no development. The twenty-acre development is in the middle of a wooded, non-developed area surrounded on three sides by neighborhoods.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Waller County |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-09 | APP |
|  |  |  | City of | tead |
|  |  |  | City- |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 49.06\% |  | 71.77\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$59,642 |  | \$35,688 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 16.90\% |  | 23.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 51,832 |  | 7,691 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 15,581 | 30.1\% | 2,594 | 33.7\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 36,251 | 69.9\% | 5,097 | 66.3\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 22,222 | 42.9\% | 1,678 | 21.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 12,831 | 24.8\% | 3,265 | 42.5\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 97 | 0.2\% | 32 | 0.4\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 486 | 0.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 25 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 64 | 0.1\% | 22 | 0.3\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 526 | 1.0\% | 100 | 1.3\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 44,651 | 86.1\% | 6,509 | 84.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 44,176 | 85.2\% | 6,422 | 83.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 475 | 0.9\% | 87 | 1.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 7,181 | 13.9\% | 1,182 | 15.4\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 25,844 | 49.9\% | 4,061 | 52.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 25,988 | 50.1\% | 3,630 | 47.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 15,171 | 100\% | 2,648 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 8,369 | 55.2\% | 1,127 | 42.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 3,358 | 22.1\% | 500 | 18.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 818 | 5.4\% | 39 | 1.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 299 | 2.0\% | 23 | 0.9\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Waller County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0992-APP <br> City of Hempstead <br> City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,849 | 18.8\% | 730 | 27.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 105 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,774 | 11.7\% | 474 | 17.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 485 | 3.2\% | 47 | 1.8\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,135 | 20.7\% | 752 | 28.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 710 | 4.7\% | 290 | 11.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,255 | 8.3\% | 273 | 10.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 662 | 4.4\% | 99 | 3.7\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 5,138 | 33.9\% | 876 | 33.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,076 | 26.9\% | 518 | 19.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 51,619 | 100\% | 7,606 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,050 | 11.7\% | 933 | 12.3\% |
| Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Waller County: Project Service Areas



## Waller County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Waller County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



City of Goliad: Wastewater Treatment System Improvements Project - \$9,353,554 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Goliad, benefitting 52.86\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $48.52 \%$ greater than Goliad County's LMI percentage of $35.59 \%$ and $18.35 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Goliad's wastewater treatment facility is located in the floodplain, excessive rains and heavy storm events impact the over 40 -year-old wastewater treatment plant. This causes inflow and infiltration issues, resulting in dilution which decreases efficiency of treatment by exceeding sewage volumes. The overflow of water in the system interrupts sewer service, and affects the safety of the residents. The city has recognized this pressing issue and made it a priority to have the wastewater treatment plant improved and floodproofed.

This project aims to improve the wastewater treatment system by replacing and rehabilitating facility components such as:

- Relocate the influent lift station out of the floodplain
- Replace current clarifier
- Replace current disc aerators and rehabilitate/replace a number of disc aerator structural supports
- Replace filter media and replace/adjust the underdrain
- Rehabilitate and/or replace valves, electrical panels, and supports
- New piping with supports, and upgrades for instrumentation and electrical components of the injection system
- Flood-proof the entire facility by raising/filling or by flood wall
- Upgrade back-up generators
- Construct a new lab/workshop building

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

Goliad is a community of 2,300 residents in Goliad County $(7,565)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Goliad is $\$ 45,962,24.27 \%$ less than Goliad County's median income of $\$ 60,690$, and $11.87 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Goliad has an AMFI of $\$ 59,034$ (ACS 2019) which is $86 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Victoria, Texas MSA $(\$ 68,800)$. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Goliad was $22.30 \%$, compared to Goliad County's poverty rate of $17.10 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Goliad's population is $57.40 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Goliad County's $35.80 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of

Goliad is $31.80 \%$ white alone, less than Goliad County's white alone percentage of $58.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Goliad is 9.30\% Black or African American alone, greater than Goliad County ( $4.90 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Goliad is $0.00 \%$, equal to Goliad County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.00 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Goliad is $1.40 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Goliad County's percentage of $0.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

The City of Goliad supplied a Fair Housing determination that demonstrated it was a majority minority community with a clear plurality of Hispanic or Latino origin residents at $57.4 \%$. Our review shows a minority population in the immediate Block Group where the work will be performed with zero Blacks or African Americans, and 58\% of the population being Hispanic or Latino origin. The racial minorities may not be present where the work is being conducted, but it appears that the entire community will benefit from the work being done to improve the wastewater facility including Goliad's $9.3 \%$ racial minority demographics.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $88.8 \%$ in the city of Goliad, less than $95.5 \%$ in Goliad County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Goliad, $36.30 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Goliad County's percentage of $21.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Goliad's households are $9.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Goliad County's percentage of $3.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Goliad's households are $15.80 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Goliad County at $14.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Goliad are $9.60 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than Goliad County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $10.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Goliad $32.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Goliad County, which is at $27.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Goliad that have one or more people of 65 or older is $42.70 \%$, which is greater than Goliad County's $38.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Goliad is $13.70 \%$ which is less than Goliad County's $15.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The wastewater treatment plant is at the end of a neighborhood with small rural wood exterior houses. There is a house next door to the plant across a dirt path/street. About a block away, there is a neighborhood that is well maintained and a church. The plant is a short distance (less than a mile) from the courthouse area. The plant is not visible from these areas, so there is a limited negative impact to most residents and all residents will benefit from these upgrades.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1060-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Goliad |  | City of Goliad |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 35.59\% |  | 52.86\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$60,690 |  | \$45,962 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.10\% |  | 22.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 7,565 |  | 2,300 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 2,712 | 35.8\% | 1,321 | 57.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 4,853 | 64.2\% | 979 | 42.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 4,408 | 58.3\% | 731 | 31.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 372 | 4.9\% | 215 | 9.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 55 | 0.7\% | 33 | 1.4\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 18 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 7,228 | 95.5\% | 2,084 | 90.6\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 7,186 | 95.0\% | 2,042 | 88.8\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 42 | 0.6\% | 42 | 1.8\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 337 | 4.5\% | 216 | 9.4\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 3,756 | 49.6\% | 953 | 41.4\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 3,809 | 50.4\% | 1,347 | 58.6\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 2,727 | 100\% | 670 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,613 | 59.1\% | 288 | 43.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 514 | 18.8\% | 88 | 13.1\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 127 | 4.7\% | 21 | 3.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 53 | 1.9\% | 13 | 1.9\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Goliad County |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1060-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Goliad |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 399 | 14.6\% | 118 | 17.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 10 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 336 | 12.3\% | 75 | 11.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 142 | 5.2\% | 20 | 3.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 588 | 21.6\% | 243 | 36.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 86 | 3.2\% | 62 | 9.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 381 | 14.0\% | 106 | 15.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 274 | 10.0\% | 64 | 9.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 761 | 27.9\% | 215 | 32.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,044 | 38.3\% | 286 | 42.7\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 7,464 | 100\% | 2,222 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,144 | 15.3\% | 304 | 13.7\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Goliad County: Project Service Areas



## Goliad County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category




## Goliad County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\square 10$ percent (4 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (1 Block Groups)25-45 percent (1 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Caldwell: Flood Mitigation Improvements - \$5,094,852 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Caldwell, benefitting 60.68\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $58.14 \%$ greater than the City of Caldwell's LMI percentage of $38.37 \%, 60.40 \%$ greater than Burleson County's LMI percentage of $37.83 \%$ and $35.87 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The central portion of the city of Caldwell has a long history of experiencing significant flooding issues related to poor drainage due in part to deficient storm water conveyance infrastructure. Existing drainage from an approximate 65 -acre watershed directs runoff to a series of drainage ditches and cross culverts. The City of Caldwell's sanitary sewer collection system contains several miles of clay pipe, brick manholes and lift stations that lead to significant infiltration of storm water.

During rain events, the city's wastewater collection system, as well as its treatment plant sees significant peak flows that are near or exceed their design capacity. Kleb Street located on the southwest side of the city is overtopped with water during large rain events damaging the pavement. The majority of the roadway is open ditch, with limited concrete curb and gutter sections.

The project will include four activities for an overall mitigation strategy within the city. These activities consist of the following:

- Replace clay pipe wastewater lines and brick manholes. This will include the direct replacement of approximately 12,000 linear feet of 6 " gravity sewer line and 3,500 linear feet of gravity sewer line
- Reconstruct the lift station complete with new concrete wet well, submersible pumps, piping, fittings, valves, controls, a new permanent standby generator, fencing and access roadway
- Mitigate insufficient drainage in this area
- Reconstruct roadway as well as drainage improvements along the roadway. Replace all existing manholes with new, precast concrete manholes, new service connections and new service line cleanouts.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 1,030 within the city of Caldwell, a community of 4,315 residents in Burleson County $(18,058)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$.

The work is being done in Census Tract 9703 Block Group 1. Census Tract 9703 has an AMFI of $\$ 67,031$ according to ACS 2019 (No Block Group income was available). The City of Caldwell has an AMFI of $\$ 72,000$ according to ACS 2019 which is $110 \%$ of Burleson County's AMFI. Burleson County has a HUD AMFI of $\$ 65,600$. The City of Caldwell is in Burleson County which is located within the College Station-Bryan TX MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $16.60 \%$, equal to the city of Caldwell which is at $16.60 \%$, greater than Burleson County's poverty rate of $12.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $26.62 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, less than the city of Caldwell's population percentage of $27.80 \%$, greater than Burleson County's $20.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $54.45 \%$ white alone, greater than the city of Caldwell's percentage of $49.30 \%$, less than Burleson County's percentage of $64.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $18.04 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than the city of Caldwell, which has $22.30 \%$, greater than Burleson County (13.10\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.66 \%$ two or more races, greater than the city of Caldwell at $0.30 \%$, less than Burleson County, which is at $1.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The city of Caldwell is significantly more concentrated with racial and ethnic minorities than Burleson County. Caldwell is a majority minority community, with $50.1 \%$ racial and ethnic minorities based on ACS 2019. There is a slight decrease in that percentage with the population of Census Tract 9703, which combined has a plurality of racial and ethnic minorities. The school diversity is representative of the evenly divided population. White not Hispanic or Latino origin students make up $49 \%$ of all students, and racial and ethnic minority students account for $49 \%$ of the student body across all the schools. The students are $58 \%$ LMI collectively.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $49.34 \%$ married couple families, greater than the city of Caldwell at $49.90 \%$ less than Burleson County's $56.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $24.11 \%$, less than the city of Caldwell at $24.20 \%$, greater than Burleson County's percentage of $17.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $9.55 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than the city of Caldwell's percentage of $10.20 \%$, greater than Burleson County's percentage of $5.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.01 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than the city of Caldwell at $1.10 \%$, less than Burleson County's $2.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $19.87 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of Caldwell at $19.90 \%$, less than Burleson County's percentage of $23.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $3.88 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than the city of Caldwell which is
at $4.20 \%$, greater than Burleson County's percentage of $2.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $10.32 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than the city of Caldwell at $9.70 \%$, less than Burleson County at $13.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $6.68 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than the city of Caldwell who is at $5.80 \%$, less than Burleson County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $8.40 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $32.22 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the city of Caldwell at $35.40 \%$, greater than Burleson County, which is at $28.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $24.70 \%$, greater than the city of Caldwell at $23.60 \%$, less than Burleson County's $35.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $12.92 \%$, less than the city of Caldwell at $13.50 \%$, less than Burleson County's $16.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The housing is mixed in these projects. The houses on and near Kleb Street are smaller. Some with deferred maintenance, but many have brick exteriors and are well maintained. The houses generally seem to be LMI type housing in size and quality. Kleb is a dead-end street that is in need of repair. The Bear and Harvey Culvert has washed out, and the wall is being undercut for a nearby house. The houses on this side of the Bear are mixed as to quality, but are generally midsized, made of brick, rock, and wood. It is a more traditional tract style neighborhood with typical sized lots, and the housing is in better condition than the housing near Kleb and Bear. A couple of blocks away from Bear and Harvey are larger ranch style houses. The lift station does not have housing as it is adjacent to the train tracks that separate the two sides of Bear. The housing around $7^{\text {th }}$ street is a standard neighborhood size lot with primarily wood housing.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Burleson County |  | City of Caldwell |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1156-APP City of Caldwell |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 37.83\% |  | 38.37\% |  | 60.68\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$57,731 |  | \$48,966 |  | -- |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 12.60\% |  | 16.60\% |  | 16.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 18,058 |  | 4,315 |  | 4,512 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,736 | 20.7\% | 1,201 | 27.8\% | 1,201 | 26.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 14,322 | 79.3\% | 3,114 | 72.2\% | 3,311 | 73.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 11,688 | 64.7\% | 2,127 | 49.3\% | 2,457 | 54.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,370 | 13.1\% | 962 | 22.3\% | 814 | 18.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 62 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 10 | 0.1\% | 10 | 0.20\% | 10 | 0.22\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 185 | 1.0\% | 15 | 0.30\% | 30 | 0.66\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 16,862 | 93.4\% | 4,011 | 93.0\% | 4,208 | 93.3\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 16,721 | 92.6\% | 3,960 | 91.8\% | 4,157 | 92.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 141 | 0.8\% | 51 | 1.2\% | 51 | 1.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,196 | 6.6\% | 304 | 7\% | 304 | 7\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 8,951 | 49.6\% | 2,317 | 53.7\% | 2,406 | 53.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,107 | 50.4\% | 1,998 | 46.3\% | 2,106 | 46.7\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 6,810 | 100\% | 1,566 | 100\% | 1,676 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,835 | 56.3\% | 782 | 49.9\% | 827 | 49.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,189 | 17.5\% | 379 | 24.2\% | 404 | 24.1\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 353 | 5.2\% | 160 | 10.2\% | 160 | 9.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 138 | 2.0\% | 17 | 1.1\% | 17 | 1.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Burleson County |  | City of Caldwell |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1156-APP City of Caldwell Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,051 | 15.4\% | 312 | 19.9\% | 356 | 21.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 54 | 0.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 840 | 12.3\% | 270 | 17.2\% | 314 | 18.7\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 216 | 3.2\% | 21 | 1.3\% | 31 | 1.8\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,571 | 23.1\% | 312 | 19.9\% | 333 | 19.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 199 | 2.9\% | 65 | 4.2\% | 65 | 3.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 940 | 13.8\% | 152 | 9.7\% | 173 | 10.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 573 | 8.4\% | 91 | 5.8\% | 112 | 6.7\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,962 | 28.8\% | 554 | 35.4\% | 540 | 32.2\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,440 | 35.8\% | 369 | 23.6\% | 414 | 24.7\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 17,888 | 100\% | 4,145 | 100\% | 4,342 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,025 | 16.9\% | 561 | 13.5\% | 561 | 12.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Snook, benefitting 55.90\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $47.78 \%$ greater than Burleson County's LMI percentage of $37.83 \%$ and $25.18 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Stormwater accumulation will continue to cause issues with Inflow and Infiltration (I\&I) to the city's wastewater system through low manhole tops adjacent to creeks and roadside ditches, sewer piping joints, cleanouts, and services. The stormwater inflows end up going into the sewer collection system and inundating the downstream manholes, piping, and lift stations.

The lift station inundation causes all pumps at each lift stations to be running at the same time, surcharging the common downstream single force main between the Marilyn Street Lift Station \& WWTP. This surcharge led to backups \& essentially rendered the Marilyn Street Lift Station inoperable since the pumps were unable to discharge minimal amounts of sewer into the force main.

Additionally, during Hurricane Harvey the stormwater runoff along the main drainage channel overtopped the FM 2155 Lift Station \& associated electrical control panels, rendering the facility inoperable. These conditions have led to repetitive inoperability of the FM 2155 \& Marilyn Street Lift Stations and discharge of raw, untreated waste to the environment. The issues with the Marilyn Street Lift Station \& associated force main led to backup of raw, untreated waste into several houses in the area.

Improvements to the sewer system include the following:

- Relocate the FM 2155 Lift Station and access driveway, install new sewer gravity lines, and new manholes outside of the 100-year floodplain.
- Raise the Marilyn Street Lift Station including the associated wet wells, manholes and electrical components above the 100-year floodplain.
- Construct a second Force Main between the Marilyn Street Lift station and the Wastewater Treatment Plant (4100 LF).
- Install Emergency Generators at each of the two lift stations.
- Install $(14,500 \mathrm{LF})$ of gravity sewer lines.
- These improvements will provide resiliency to ensure future uninterrupted sewer service to City residents and mitigate the discharge of raw, untreated sewer into the environment and surrounding residences.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be
impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Snook is a community of 495 residents in Burleson County $(18,058)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Snook is $\$ 80,250,39.01 \%$ greater than Burleson County's median income of $\$ 57,731$, and $53.87 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The city of Snook's AMFI is $\$ 83,625$. This is $127 \%$ or Burleson County's AMFI of $\$ 65,600$. Burleson County is located within College Station-Bryan MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Snook was $12.40 \%$, less than Burleson County's poverty rate of $12.60 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. Snook's poverty rate in 2019 was $18.2 \%$ according to ACS 2019 data estimates.

The city of Snook's population is $18.00 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Burleson County's $20.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Snook is $62.60 \%$ white alone, less than Burleson County's white alone percentage of $64.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Snook is $16.00 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Burleson County (13.10\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. In the city of Snook, $3.40 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Burleson County, which is at $1.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The racial and ethnic minority population in Snook is $34 \%$ of the total population. Snook is a small town with only 225 houses. According to www.har.com, the population of Snook ISD, which benefits from this project along with all residents in the community, has a student population larger than the City of Snook. with the population of Snook ISD is 513 students compared to the community's 495 residents. The racial and ethnic make-up of the student body is diverse with $24.2 \%$ African American, $28.4 \%$ Hispanic and $41.9 \%$ white. Snook ISD has a $97 \%$ graduation rate, including a $100 \%$ Hispanic graduation rate.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $88.30 \%$ in the city of Snook, less than $93.40 \%$ in Burleson County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Snook, $29.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Burleson County's percentage of $23.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Snook's households are $6.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Burleson County's percentage of $2.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Snook's households are $9.20 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than Burleson County at $13.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Snook are $0.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than Burleson County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $8.40 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Snook $26.50 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Burleson County, which is at $28.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Snook that have one or more people of 65 or older is $23.50 \%$, which is less than Burleson County's $35.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Snook is $18.60 \%$ which is greater than Burleson County's $16.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Much of the project is in open land. Where there are houses, it is agricultural related housing with large curtilages around the houses. The exception to this is some small housing in the Fojt and Hull Street areas where there are dead end streets (the pipeline runs through an agriculture field toward the water tower) with smaller mixed housing. The High School is also near this area on FM 2155. The wastewater treatment plant is on a dirt road with oil pump facilities across the street. The Marilyn and County Road 268 area have mixed housing with some MHUs, but it is mainly agricultural lands.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Burleson County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1069-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Snook |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 37.83\% |  | 55.90\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$57,731 |  | \$80,250 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 12.60\% |  | 12.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 18,058 |  | 495 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,736 | 20.7\% | 89 | 18.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 14,322 | 79.3\% | 406 | 82.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 11,688 | 64.7\% | 310 | 62.6\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,370 | 13.1\% | 79 | 16.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 62 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 10 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 185 | 1.0\% | 17 | 3.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 16,862 | 93.4\% | 437 | 88.3\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 16,721 | 92.6\% | 437 | 88.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 141 | 0.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,196 | 6.6\% | 58 | 11.7\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 8,951 | 49.6\% | 251 | 50.7\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,107 | 50.4\% | 244 | 49.3\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 6,810 | 100\% | 196 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,835 | 56.3\% | 94 | 48.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,189 | 17.5\% | 30 | 15.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 353 | 5.2\% | 7 | 3.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 138 | 2.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Burleson County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1069-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Snook |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 1,051 | 15.4\% | 37 | 18.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 54 | 0.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 840 | 12.3\% | 26 | 13.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 216 | 3.2\% | 8 | 4.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,571 | 23.1\% | 58 | 29.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 199 | 2.9\% | 12 | 6.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 940 | 13.8\% | 18 | 9.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 573 | 8.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,962 | 28.8\% | 52 | 26.5\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,440 | 35.8\% | 46 | 23.5\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 17,888 | 100\% | 495 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,025 | 16.9\% | 92 | 18.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Burleson County: Project Service Areas



## Burleson County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population
- Black or African American Population
- Asian Population

American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-15

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Burleson County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



City of Sour Lake: Water System Improvements Project - \$9,071,196.29 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Sour Lake, benefitting 51.57\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $61.32 \%$ greater than Hardin County's LMI percentage of $31.97 \%$ and $15.48 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Since Hurricane Rita in 2005, the city of Sour Lake has recognized the need to mitigate its portable water supply from hurricanes, tropical storms, tropical depressions, and riverine flooding. There are thousands of linear feet of short joint asbestos cement water pipe that both leak and pose a severe health hazards to residents. The transmission line that brings water from the water well to Sour Lake is over 2 miles long, crosses two (2) streams and is vulnerable to breaks caused by flooding. Furthermore, additional water well capacity and elevated storage tank capacity for redundancy is needed. This will aid in providing reliable water supply and increased water pressure to the residents of Sour Lake.

Currently, the city has two (2) operational water wells, they are Well \#1 at 650 GPM in capacity and Well \#2 at 500 GPM. To mitigate the problems of the portable water system the city will execute the following:

- Water Well \#3 - East Side of Sour Lake on Highway 105: Construct a 650 GPM water well, 100,000-gallon elevated storage tank, chemical feed system, electrical and controls, control building, SCADA communications systems, standby generator, header piping, yard piping, access drive, and parking area.
- Water Line Replacement: Replace approximately 68,028 (LF) of old water line pipes that will eliminate leaks and provide more reliable portable water to the residents of Sour Lake.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Sour Lake is a community of 2,206 residents in Hardin County $(56,765)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Sour Lake is $\$ 56,065$, $7.08 \%$ less than Hardin County's median income of $\$ 60,339$, and $7.50 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Sour Lake has an AMFI of $\$ 63,368$ according to the ACS 2019. This is $94 \%$ of the HUD Hardin County AMFI of $\$ 67,500$. Hardin County is within the Beaumont-Port Arthur TX HUD Metro MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Sour Lake was $13.90 \%$, greater than Hardin County's poverty rate of $12.60 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Sour Lake's population is $5.80 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Hardin County's $5.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Sour Lake is $87.70 \%$ white alone, greater than Hardin County's white alone percentage of $86.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Sour Lake is $2.60 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Hardin County (5.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Sour Lake is $0.00 \%$, less than Hardin County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Sour Lake is $2.80 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Hardin County's percentage of $0.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for Sour Lake is $0.00 \%$, which is equal to Hardin County $(0.00 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. Sour Lake is $0.00 \%$ some other race alone, less than Hardin County's percentage of $0.20 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. In the city of Sour Lake, $1.00 \%$ of the population is two or more races, less than Hardin County, which is at $1.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

There is a limited racial and ethnic minority population in the community; however, a search for any racial conflicts in the community was conducted, and it does not appear to be an issue in Sour Lake. There was a 2014 discrimination complaint against the local school system that was resolved voluntarily by the school system taking steps to change issues related to special needs access at the school district's facilities. The report also said they did not obtain any civilian complaints about the Sour Lake police department. The organization Freedom for All Americans advocates for LGBTQ rights and identifies Sour Lake as one of the few municipalities that protects residents from housing discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $98.70 \%$ in the city of Sour Lake, greater than $98.00 \%$ in Hardin County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Sour Lake is $47.10 \%$ male, less than Hardin County (48.20\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Sour Lake is $52.90 \%$ female, greater than the $51.80 \%$ of Hardin County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of 50.4\%.
The households in Sour Lake are comprised of $51.10 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Hardin County's $56.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Sour Lake that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $25.50 \%$ this is greater than Hardin County's percentage of $23.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$.

In the city of Sour Lake, $24.80 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than Hardin County's percentage of $25.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Sour Lake's households are $7.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Hardin County's percentage of $5.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Sour Lake's households are $14.40 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Hardin County at $13.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Sour Lake are $8.60 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making
it greater than Hardin County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at 7.50\% and 5.5\% respectively.

In Sour Lake $43.90 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than Hardin County, which is at $34.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Sour Lake that have one or more people of 65 or older is $30.60 \%$, which is less than Hardin County's $31.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Sour Lake is $12.50 \%$ which is less than Hardin County's $16.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Most of the housing in Sour Lake falls into Block Group 2, although there are some houses in Block Group 3. The houses in the core residential part of the city are older and vary from Historic style housing to small, rural, wood sided housing. Most homes in this area are on standard sized neighborhood residential lots. Sour Lake also has MHU's in several areas. The houses and MHUs vary in quality and in need of deferred maintenance. In other parts of the community, there are standard tract style ranch homes on larger lots. On Highway 105 and near the schools, there are large agricultural style estates with large surrounding curtilages, many enclosed by fences. Even in the predominately larger home areas the neighborhoods are mixed in size and quality.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Hardin County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0968-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Sour Lake |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 31.97\% |  | 51.57\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$60,339 |  | \$56,065 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  |  |  | 12.60\% |  | 13.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 56,765 |  | 2,206 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,230 | 5.7\% | 129 | 5.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 53,535 | 94.3\% | 2,077 | 94.2\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 49,096 | 86.5\% | 1,935 | 87.7\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 3,153 | 5.6\% | 58 | 2.6\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 148 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 351 | 0.6\% | 62 | 2.8\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 96 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 691 | 1.2\% | 22 | 1.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 55,628 | 98.0\% | 2,180 | 98.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 55,276 | 97.4\% | 2,178 | 98.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 352 | 0.6\% | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,137 | 2.0\% | 26 | 1.2\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 27,374 | 48.2\% | 1,039 | 47.1\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 29,391 | 51.8\% | 1,167 | 52.9\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 20,626 | 100\% | 779 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 11,553 | 56.0\% | 398 | 51.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 4,743 | 23.0\% | 199 | 25.5\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 500 | 2.4\% | 40 | 5.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 177 | 0.9\% | 27 | 3.5\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Hardin County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-0968-APP City of Sour Lake City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 3,340 | 16.2\% | 148 | 19.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 242 | 1.2\% | 22 | 2.8\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,218 | 10.8\% | 82 | 10.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 763 | 3.7\% | 37 | 4.7\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 5,233 | 25.4\% | 193 | 24.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,091 | 5.3\% | 58 | 7.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,839 | 13.8\% | 112 | 14.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,551 | 7.5\% | 67 | 8.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 7,048 | 34.2\% | 342 | 43.9\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 6,441 | 31.2\% | 238 | 30.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 56,320 | 100\% | 2,206 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 9,126 | 16.2\% | 275 | 12.5\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Hardin County: Project Service Areas



## Hardin County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group
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City of Brenham: Drainage and Flooding Hazards Mitigation Project - \$5,001,643 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Brenham, benefitting 52.53\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $12.96 \%$ greater than the City of Brenham's LMI percentage of $46.50 \%, 20.56 \%$ greater than Washington County's LMI percentage of $43.57 \%$ and $17.62 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Brenham has incurred substantial damage to residential and commercial property due to various declared disasters including the Floods of 2015 and 2016 and Hurricane Harvey (2017). Given the city of Brenham's proximity to the coast, the city will continue to be susceptible to excessive localized flooding conditions during hurricanes, tropical storms, tropical depressions, and riverine flooding. During these periods of significant rain, excessive runoff into the creek does not flow unobstructed due to the combination of excessive vegetation, erosion, and channel restrictions.

To mitigate from future flooding losses, the city plans to conduct drainage improvement activities such as storm sewers, culverts, and streambank stabilization measures, that will each serve to reduce flooding hazards in the following areas of the city:

- North Dixie Street: Construct new twin box culverts to replace the existing undersized single corrugated metal pipe to allow flood waters to pass below the roadway.
- Burleson Street Low Water Crossing: Construct new twin box culverts and raise the elevation of the roadway at this location. These improvements would safely convey flood waters through the culverts, thus no longer impeding traffic through this area.
- North Saeger and West Jefferson Streets: Install a new storm sewer along the north side of West Jefferson Street to tie into the North Saeger Street Improvements.
- Higgins Branch Creek along Henderson Park to Farm-to-market (FM) 577: Remove accumulated sedimentation and re-establish the eroded sections of the channel. The regraded streambanks and streambed will be armored with permanent articulated concrete stabilization measures.
- Baylor Street Drainage Improvements: Install a new storm sewer, which include curb inlets and piping for conveyance of the storm water to alleviate the current flooding in this area.
- Commerce Street/Seelhorst Street/Clinton Street/Dark Street: Install of a new storm sewer, which includes new curb inlets, piping, and junction boxes, for an overall system that will outfall south of the cul-de-sac along Dark Street into Hogg Branch Creek.
- Hogg Branch Creek at Alamo Street: Add a concrete flume, concrete apron, and erosion control along Hogg Branch Creek to prevent future and further erosion.
- Hogg Branch Creek from Jackson Street to Day Street: Replace the existing concrete slope paving with regraded streambanks. These regraded streambanks and streambed will be armored with permanent articulated concrete stabilization measures.
- Hogg Branch Creek at Pecan Street: Replace the existing structures with twin box culverts, new concrete headwalls, a curb inlet, and channel restoration. Reestablish the road section with a new guard fence.
- Tom Dee Street: Install new storm sewer improvements at Tom Dee Street that will route underground through drainage easements to intersect an existing storm sewer at the intersection of Durden Street and Marie Street.
- Spinn Street at Day Street: Install a new recessed curb inlet along with concrete box culverts.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 10,185 within the city of Brenham, a community of 17,123 residents in Washington County $(35,163)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Brenham's AMFI is $\$ 56,395$ according to ACS 2019. This is $79 \%$ of the HUD Washington County AMFI of $\$ 71,000$. Washington County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $18.60 \%$, equal to the city of Brenham which is at $18.60 \%$, greater than Washington County's poverty rate of $13.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $18.07 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, less than the city of Brenham's population percentage of $20.20 \%$, greater than Washington County's $16.10 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $59.96 \%$ white alone, greater than the city of Brenham's percentage of $52.00 \%$, less than Washington County's percentage of $64.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $17.37 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than the city of Brenham, which has $22.10 \%$, greater than Washington County ( $16.40 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $2.02 \%$ two or more races, less than the city of Brenham at $2.80 \%$, greater than Washington County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

Brenham is a diverse community with a Black or African American population of $22 \%$, a Hispanic or Latino population of $20.2 \%$, and a White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population of $52 \%$. This compares with Washington County that has a $64 \%$ White not of Hispanic or Latino population.

The projects are in various parts of the flood areas. According to our windshield survey and the Census data review, the work is being conducted in an area where the demographics are similar to the Brenham population. The identified block groups are generally consistent with the Black and African American ( $25.3 \%$ in projects and $22 \%$ overall), and White not of Hispanic of Latino origin ( $54 \%$ in projects and $52 \%$ overall) populations. However, the number of residents identified as being Hispanic or Latino origin dropped ( $14.2 \%$ for projects and $20.2 \%$ overall). In looking at the areas of Brenham not covered, we did not find any concentrated areas of Hispanic or Latino origin populations away from the project area.

The project beneficiary area is $48.28 \%$ male, greater than the city of Brenham at $47.20 \%$, less than Washington County ( $49.10 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $51.72 \%$ female, less than the city of Brenham at $52.80 \%$, greater than the $50.90 \%$ of Washington County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of 50.4\%.

In the project beneficiary area, $31.58 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the city of Brenham at $37.60 \%$, greater than Washington County's percentage of $27.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $3.24 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18 , less than the city of Brenham which is at $6.20 \%$, less than Washington County's percentage of $4.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $23.22 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the city of Brenham at $25.60 \%$, greater than Washington County at $17.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $12.85 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than the city of Brenham who is at $13.40 \%$, greater than Washington County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $9.70 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $24.02 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the city of Brenham at $28.50 \%$, less than Washington County, which is at $25.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $38.42 \%$, greater than the city of Brenham at $37.50 \%$, less than Washington County's $39.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $14.01 \%$, less than the city of Brenham at $14.60 \%$, less than Washington County's $15.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

The homes and areas seem to be varied in size, quality, and construction. There are many commercial areas involved and that may be just the course of the development happening there. Brenham has also looked at another part of the same flood prone area to provide other low income residents with projects to limit neighborhood flooding.

Brenham has about $30 \%$ of its housing as rental units, with 2,117 units out of 6,684 having renters according to ACS 2019. There are 1,114 units where the occupant's rent is classified by HUD standards as unaffordable.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Washington County |  | City of Brenham |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1086-APP City of Brenham Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 43.57\% |  | 46.50\% |  | 52.53\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$54,971 |  | \$45,197 |  | -- |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.90\% |  | 18.60\% |  | 18.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 35,163 |  | 17,123 |  | 23,296 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 5,646 | 16.1\% | 3,464 | 20.2\% | 4,209 | 18.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 29,517 | 83.9\% | 13,659 | 79.8\% | 19,087 | 81.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 22,508 | 64.0\% | 8,902 | 52.0\% | 13,969 | 60.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,763 | 16.4\% | 3,780 | 22.1\% | 4,046 | 17.4\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 88 | 0.3\% | 47 | 0.3\% | 47 | 0.2\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 582 | 1.7\% | 459 | 2.7\% | 554 | 2.4\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 38 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 538 | 1.5\% | 471 | 2.80\% | 471 | 2.02\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 32,594 | 92.7\% | 15,574 | 91.0\% | 21,320 | 91.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 32,308 | 91.9\% | 15,409 | 90.0\% | 21,135 | 90.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 286 | 0.8\% | 165 | 1.0\% | 185 | 0.8\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,569 | 7.3\% | 1,549 | 9\% | 1,976 | 8\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 17,282 | 49.1\% | 8,077 | 47.2\% | 11,247 | 48.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 17,881 | 50.9\% | 9,046 | 52.8\% | 12,049 | 51.7\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,625 | 100\% | 5,774 | 100\% | 5,737 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,723 | 53.3\% | 2,611 | 45.2\% | 2,786 | 48.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,077 | 16.5\% | 971 | 16.8\% | 92 | 1.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 477 | 3.8\% | 289 | 5.0\% | 327 | 5.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 121 | 1.0\% | 110 | 1.9\% | 186 | 3.2\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Washington County |  | City of Brenham |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1086-APP City of Brenham Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,962 | 15.5\% | 701 | 12.1\% | 812 | 14.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 151 | 1.2\% | 43 | 0.7\% | 66 | 1.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,388 | 11.0\% | 475 | 8.2\% | 605 | 10.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 631 | 5.0\% | 236 | 4.1\% | 284 | 5.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,463 | 27.4\% | 2,173 | 37.6\% | 1,812 | 31.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 507 | 4.0\% | 356 | 6.2\% | 186 | 3.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,191 | 17.4\% | 1,478 | 25.6\% | 1,332 | 23.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,223 | 9.7\% | 771 | 13.4\% | 737 | 12.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,194 | 25.3\% | 1,647 | 28.5\% | 1,378 | 24.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 5,038 | 39.9\% | 2,165 | 37.5\% | 2,204 | 38.4\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 34,469 | 100\% | 16,429 | 100\% | 16,085 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,273 | 15.3\% | 2,393 | 14.6\% | 2,254 | 14.0\% |
| ² Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD orHousehold Surveys${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

City of Brenham: Drainage Improvements - 2016 Floods - \$3,400,594.00 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the City of Brenham, benefitting 53.80\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $15.69 \%$ greater than the City of Brenham's LMI percentage of $46.50 \%, 23.47 \%$ greater than Washington County's LMI percentage of $44.00 \%$ and $20.46 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The proposed project will mitigate severe flooding issues as a result of hurricanes, tropical storms, tropical depressions, and riverine flooding events for the benefit population identified within this application. The scope of the project is to improve the City's drainage system along Hogg Branch Creek, which is the main drainage channel throughout this section of the city. The overall emphasis of the project will be to ensure the resilience to future natural disasters. The enhanced functionality of the system will ensure the long-term protection of life, property, and alleviate or lessen the potential for injury and suffering of the City of Brenham.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 6,915 within the City of Brenham, a community of 17,123 residents in Washington County $(35,163)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. Brenham's AMFI is $\$ 56,395$ according to ACS 2019. This is $79 \%$ of the HUD Washington County AMFI of $\$ 71,000$. Washington County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $18.60 \%$, equal to the City of Brenham which is at $18.60 \%$, greater than Washington County's poverty rate of $13.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $19.50 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, less than the City of Brenham's population percentage of $20.20 \%$, greater than Washington County's $16.10 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $57.30 \%$ white alone, greater than the City of Brenham's percentage of $52.00 \%$, less than Washington County's percentage of $64.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $18.70 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is less than the City of Brenham, which has $22.10 \%$, greater than Washington County ( $16.40 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.30 \%$, equal to the City of Brenham, which is at $0.30 \%$, equal to Washington County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $2.00 \%$ Asian alone, less than the City of Brenham at $2.70 \%$, greater than Washington County's percentage of $1.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander percentage for
the project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$, equal to than the City of Brenham at $0.00 \%$, less than Washington County $(0.100 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $0.1 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $0.00 \%$ some other race alone, equal to the City of Brenham, which is at $0.00 \%$, equal to Washington County's percentage of $0.00 \%$ and less than of the MIT eligible area's $0.2 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $2.27 \%$ two or more races, less than the City of Brenham at $2.80 \%$, greater than Washington County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

During our windshield survey we concentrated on the Census Tract Block Groups where the work would be performed to determine if there was a burden on that community, compared to the beneficiary area, the block groups have a higher than city average population of Black or African Americans at $36.8 \%$ versus $22 \%$ community wide. The project has a significantly lower White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population at $37.2 \%$ versus $52 \%$ in Brenham as a whole. The Hispanic or Latino origin population is almost the same at $21 \%$ versus $20.2 \%$. This provides a majority minority population for this project of $57.8 \%$. Looking at the census tracts, the beneficiary area has racial and ethnic minority population a little lower at $42.5 \%$.

The Black or African American and White populations may be oversampled since the largest percentage areas for Blacks or African Americans are at the start of the project, and the largest percentage for Whites, not of Hispanic or Latino origin are at the end of the project. Both areas will benefit, but probably not as directly as those adjacent to Hogg Creek.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $48.60 \%$ married couple families, less than the City of Brenham at $45.20 \%$ less than Washington County's $53.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $15.40 \%$, less than the City of Brenham at $16.80 \%$, less than Washington County's percentage of $16.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $5.70 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than the City of Brenham's percentage of $5.00 \%$, greater than Washington County's percentage of $3.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.60 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than the City of Brenham at $1.90 \%$, greater than Washington County's $1.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $31.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, less than the City of Brenham at $37.60 \%$, greater than Washington County's percentage of $27.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $3.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than the City of Brenham which is at $6.20 \%$, less than Washington County's percentage of $4.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $23.20 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the City of Brenham at $25.60 \%$, greater than Washington County at $17.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $12.80 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than the City of Brenham who is at
$13.40 \%$, greater than Washington County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $9.70 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $24.00 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the City of Brenham at $28.50 \%$, less than Washington County, which is at $25.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $38.40 \%$, greater than the City of Brenham at $37.50 \%$, less than Washington County's $39.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $14.00 \%$, less than the City of Brenham at $14.60 \%$, less than Washington County's $15.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$

Overall, the homes in the project area are generally well maintained and are mostly quality singlefamily homes. However, generally the houses are not higher end homes that are available in Brenham or in other nearby areas not directly impacted by the project. The start of the project is a few blocks from the Blue Bell Creameries Plant, but the plant itself appears to be on a higher elevation, and likely will not be impacted by the project.

Brenham has about $30 \%$ of its housing as rental units, with 2,117 units out of 6,684 having renters according to ACS 2019. There are 1,114 units where the occupant's rent is classified by HUD standards as unaffordable.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1085-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Washingto | ounty | City of Brenham |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 43.57\% |  | 53.80\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$54,971 |  | -- |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.90\% |  | 18.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 35,163 |  | 16,603 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 5,646 | 16.1\% | 3,237 | 19.5\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 29,517 | 83.9\% | 13,366 | 80.5\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 22,508 | 64.0\% | 9,506 | 57.3\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,763 | 16.4\% | 3,112 | 18.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 88 | 0.3\% | 47 | 0.3\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 582 | 1.7\% | 324 | 2.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 38 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 538 | 1.5\% | 377 | 2.27\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 32,594 | 92.7\% | 15,130 | 91.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 32,308 | 91.9\% | 15,021 | 90.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 286 | 0.8\% | 109 | 0.7\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,569 | 7.3\% | 1,473 | 9\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 17,282 | 49.1\% | 7,997 | 48.2\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 17,881 | 50.9\% | 8,606 | 51.8\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,625 | 100\% | 5,737 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,723 | 53.3\% | 2,786 | 48.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,077 | 16.5\% | 881 | 15.4\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 477 | 3.8\% | 327 | 5.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 121 | 1.0\% | 92 | 1.6\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Washington County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1085-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Brenham |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 1,962 | 15.5\% | 812 | 14.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 151 | 1.2\% | 66 | 1.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,388 | 11.0\% | 605 | 10.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 631 | 5.0\% | 284 | 5.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,463 | 27.4\% | 1,812 | 31.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 507 | 4.0\% | 186 | 3.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,191 | 17.4\% | 1,332 | 23.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,223 | 9.7\% | 737 | 12.8\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,194 | 25.3\% | 1,378 | 24.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 5,038 | 39.9\% | 2,204 | 38.4\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 34,469 | 100\% | 16,085 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,273 | 15.3\% | 2,254 | 14.0\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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City of Palacios: Flood Mitigation Improvements Project - \$5,014,832 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Palacios, benefitting 57.10\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $37.83 \%$ greater than Matagorda County's LMI percentage of $41.43 \%$ and $27.86 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The project consists of constructing improvements throughout the city of Palacios to eliminate known flooding areas. Heavy rainfall events, which typically occur during hurricanes and tropical storms, cause flooding which prevent residents and first responders from traversing the streets. Construction will occur along the following streets: Gray, Green, Lucas, Perryman, Main, Welch, $1^{\text {st }}$ through $4^{\text {th }}, 6^{\text {th }}, 8^{\text {th }}$ through $11^{\text {th }}$, Moore, and Morton streets.

Improvements will include:

- Construct new storm sewer systems to enhance the capacity of the existing under-sized system, install new storm sewers and approximately 50 inlets, for a total of 14,325 linear feet (LF)
- Replace and/or install roadside and driveway culverts, a total of 3,525 LF
- Clean and grade existing roadside ditches on many of the streets mentioned above and an area outfall ditch specifically along Gray Street, a total of 14,000 LF

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Palacios is a community of 4,590 residents in Matagorda County ( 36,774 ), while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Palacios is $\$ 38,140$, $22.02 \%$ less than Matagorda County's median income of $\$ 48,913$, and $26.87 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The AMFI for Palacios was $\$ 49,150$ according to the 2019 ACS. This is $84 \%$ of the HUD Matagorda County AMFI of $\$ 58,600$. Matagorda County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Palacios was $20.20 \%$, greater than Matagorda County's poverty rate of $20.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. Palacios has a $24.1 \%$ poverty rate according to the 2019 ACS estimates.

The city of Palacios's population is $65.90 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Matagorda County's $42.50 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Palacios is $18.60 \%$ white alone, less than Matagorda County's white alone percentage of $43.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Palacios is $2.80 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Matagorda County (10.30\%) and less than the MIT
eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Palacios is $0.40 \%$, greater than Matagorda County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.30 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Palacios is $11.00 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Matagorda County's percentage of $1.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Palacios is a majority minority community. The Black or African American and Hispanic or Latino origin communities account for $65.9 \%$ of this. Including the Asian population, the total non-white not of Hispanic or Latino origin population is $79.8 \%$. Even though the community is significantly of the same race or ethnicity, the Fair Housing Act still covers discrimination. Same race or ethnicity people can discriminate based on national origin, family status, and of course the most common Fair Housing complaint being filed currently is for people with special needs which cuts across all races and ethnicities.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $80.70 \%$ in the city of Palacios, less than $89.40 \%$ in Matagorda County and less than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Palacios is $52.70 \%$ male, greater than Matagorda County (49.90\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Palacios is $47.30 \%$ female, less than the $50.10 \%$ of Matagorda County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in Palacios are comprised of $47.90 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Matagorda County's $51.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The city of Palacios's households are $0.00 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Matagorda County's percentage of $3.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$.

In the city of Palacios, $26.00 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Matagorda County's percentage of $23.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Palacios's households are $2.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Matagorda County's percentage of $4.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Palacios's households are $10.80 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than Matagorda County at $14.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Palacios are $4.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than Matagorda County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.70 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Palacios $34.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Matagorda County, which is at $28.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Palacios that have one or more people of 65 or older is $22.80 \%$, which is less than Matagorda County's $30.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Palacios is $8.10 \%$ which is less than Matagorda County's $15.00 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

During a windshield survey using the project site maps, a variety of housing in the community was observed. Around the 8th, 10th, and 11th street area, there are smaller wood homes with some brick houses mixed into the community. In the area near the Welch, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th

Avenues; the housing is mixed. Closer to 4th and Welch, there is some mixed housing, along with some light retail (ex. a dentist office). On first street near the waterfront, there is a large Baptist Campground and larger waterfront homes. Behind those on Commerce, there are some empty lots and some larger, higher quality homes. There are smaller wood exterior homes in this area along with some historic type homes. Perryman Lane is comprised of mostly school related property.

In the Green Avenue project area, there is a hospital area and there are larger, higher quality homes. There are also open lots in the area. In the area around Gray and East Tres Palacios, there is a Public Housing Authority/USDA development and mixed housing with some larger houses and some smaller wood exterior homes. Part of the project is planned to take place on undeveloped land.

Given the concentration of the population and the breadth of the work conducted in Palacios, it does not appear that the project would benefit or burden the demographics outside of the population standards.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Matagorda County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0950-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Palacios |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 41.43\% |  | 57.10\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$48,913 |  | \$38,140 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.10\% |  | 20.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 36,774 |  | 4,590 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 15,612 | 42.5\% | 3,027 | 65.9\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 21,162 | 57.5\% | 1,563 | 34.1\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 16,045 | 43.6\% | 853 | 18.6\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 3,785 | 10.3\% | 129 | 2.8\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 99 | 0.3\% | 19 | 0.4\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 710 | 1.9\% | 507 | 11.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 120 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 156 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 247 | 0.7\% | 55 | 1.2\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 32,863 | 89.4\% | 3,720 | 81.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 32,270 | 87.8\% | 3,706 | 80.7\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 593 | 1.6\% | 14 | 0.3\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 3,911 | 10.6\% | 870 | 19.0\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 18,349 | 49.9\% | 2,419 | 52.7\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 18,425 | 50.1\% | 2,171 | 47.3\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 13,848 | 100\% | 1,670 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 7,180 | 51.8\% | 800 | 47.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,283 | 16.5\% | 349 | 20.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 414 | 3.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 171 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-0950-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Matagord | unty | City of Palacios |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 3,024 | 21.8\% | 436 | 26.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 283 | 2.0\% | 94 | 5.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,365 | 17.1\% | 328 | 19.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 628 | 4.5\% | 105 | 6.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,230 | 23.3\% | 434 | 26.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 591 | 4.3\% | 36 | 2.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,950 | 14.1\% | 181 | 10.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 924 | 6.7\% | 66 | 4.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,899 | 28.2\% | 573 | 34.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,153 | 30.0\% | 380 | 22.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 36,305 | 100\% | 4,562 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,431 | 15.0\% | 371 | 8.1\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Matagorda County: Blessing CDP Drainage, Water, and Wastewater Collection System Improvements - \$3,111,098 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides an area benefit within Blessing Census Designated Place, benefitting 76.38\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $84.36 \%$ greater than Matagorda County's LMI percentage of $41.43 \%$ and $71.03 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Matagorda County's location and its topography are such that hurricanes, tropical storms, and flooding impact the Blessing Census Designated Place. Matagorda County Water Control and Improvement District No. 5 provides water and sanitary sewer service. The county will make improvements to its drainage, water, and wastewater systems. All these systems are interconnected and failure of one during a natural disaster means problems for all.

The county will execute the following mitigation measures:

- Install or upgrade culverts.
- Deepen and regrade ditches city-wide, including 87,492 feet of roadside ditches.
- Construct a new water plant to include:

1. Ground Storage Tank
2. Hydropneumatics Tank
3. Two (2) Booster Pumps
4. Chlorine Disinfection System

- Rehabilitate a sanitary sewer line and manholes around the city.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 995 within Matagorda County (36,774), while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the project beneficiary area was $20.10 \%$, which is equal to Matagorda County's poverty rate of $20.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. Blessing's poverty rate was $40.1 \%$ according to ACS 2019, compared with Matagorda County's poverty rate of $18.9 \%$. The census tract where Blessing is located, CT 7307, has an AMFI of \$68,611 according to the 2019 ACS.

The project beneficiary area is $53.00 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than Matagorda County's $42.50 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $47.00 \%$ white alone, greater than Matagorda County's percentage of $43.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $0.00 \%$ Black or

African American alone persons, this is less than Matagorda County (10.30\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Blessing has roughly the same minority percentage as the County as a whole, but there are no Blacks or African Americans in ACS estimates for Blessing. Blessing has a 53\% Hispanic or Latino majority, with the balance being White not of Hispanic or Latino origin. The County has a $10.3 \%$ Black or African American population. Blessing has a poverty percentage more than two times the average of Matagorda County. Blessing could be considered as a R/ECAP, if HUD looked at communities rather than only Census Tracts for ethnic and poverty concentrations.

According to the 2020 Census data, Blessing changed in size and in demographics. Blessing added 318 new residents and climbed to 856 total. Blessing also now has Black or African American residents ( 11 or $1.3 \%$ ), and the Hispanic or Latino majority has grown to $63 \%$ of the population. There are no income or poverty numbers available at this time from the 2020 census.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $91.40 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, greater than Matagorda County at $89.40 \%$ and greater than the eligible area, which is at $81.20 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $57.60 \%$ male, greater than Matagorda County(49.90\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $42.40 \%$ female, less than the $50.10 \%$ of Matagorda County and less than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $18.20 \%$ married couple families, less than Matagorda County's $51.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $6.10 \%$, less than Matagorda County's percentage of $16.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $0.00 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Matagorda County's percentage of $3.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $0.00 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than Matagorda County's $1.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $59.10 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Matagorda County's percentage of $23.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $8.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, which is greater than Matagorda County's percentage of $4.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $30.40 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Matagorda County at $14.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $11.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Matagorda County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.70 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $23.90 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Matagorda County, which is at $28.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $22.30 \%$, less than Matagorda County's $30.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $5.20 \%$, less than Matagorda County's $15.00 \%$, and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of 11

The projects cover almost all of the streets in Blessing. The housing is intermixed with brick, wood, and MHUs. The houses vary in quality and size. There are nicer homes near Railroad and near the baseball park. There are some houses that have deferred maintenance, but generally the community has well-kept homes. Given the amount of work to be performed and the size of the community; there is not a benefit or burden to any demographic in this project.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Matagorda County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0974-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Matagorda County |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit (Blessing CDP) |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 41.43\% |  | 76.38\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$48,913 |  | - |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.10\% |  | 20.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 36,774 |  | 538 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 15,612 | 42.5\% | 285 | 53.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 21,162 | 57.5\% | 253 | 47.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 16,045 | 43.6\% | 253 | 47.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 3,785 | 10.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 99 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 710 | 1.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 120 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 156 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 247 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 32,863 | 89.4\% | 519 | 96.5\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 32,270 | 87.8\% | 492 | 91.4\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 593 | 1.6\% | 27 | 5.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 3,911 | 10.6\% | 19 | 3.5\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 18,349 | 49.9\% | 310 | 57.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 18,425 | 50.1\% | 228 | 42.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 13,848 | 100\% | 247 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 7,180 | 51.8\% | 45 | 18.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,283 | 16.5\% | 15 | 6.1\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 414 | 3.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 171 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Matagorda County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0974-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Matagorda County |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit (Blessing CDP) |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 3,024 | 21.8\% | 56 | 22.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 283 | 2.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,365 | 17.1\% | 39 | 15.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 628 | 4.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,230 | 23.3\% | 146 | 59.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 591 | 4.3\% | 22 | 8.9\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,950 | 14.1\% | 75 | 30.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 924 | 6.7\% | 28 | 11.3\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,899 | 28.2\% | 59 | 23.9\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,153 | 30.0\% | 55 | 22.3\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 36,305 | 100\% | 538 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,431 | 15.0\% | 28 | 5.2\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Matagorda County: Project Service Areas




## Matagorda County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group





## Matagorda County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 9 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (21 Block Groups)$25-45$ percent (5 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of New Waverly: Sewer System Improvements Project - \$6,601,843 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of New Waverly, benefitting 65.54\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $34.06 \%$ greater than Walker County's LMI percentage of $48.89 \%$ and $46.76 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of New Waverly's sewer system improvements project will mitigate severe, repetitive flooding and sewer issues resulting from hurricanes, tropical storms, tropical depressions and riverine flooding events. The improvements include:

- Decommissioning of the city's east-side wastewater treatment plant, which is located in the 100-year floodplain, and expanding the west-side wastewater treatment plant to handle all of the city's sewer needs.
- Construct a new gravity sewer line and a force main.

The overall emphasis of the project will be to ensure the resilience to future natural disasters. The enhanced functionality of the system will ensure the long-term protection of life, property, and alleviate or lessen the potential for injury and suffering of the city.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

New Waverly is a community of 1,142 residents in Walker County $(72,321)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of New Waverly is $\$ 33,700$, $22.96 \%$ less than Walker County's median income of $\$ 43,742$, and $35.38 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. New Waverly's AMFI is $\$ 40,921$ according to ACS 2019. This is $61 \%$ of Walker County's HUD AMFI of $\$ 55,500$. Walker County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of New Waverly was $38.30 \%$, compared with Walker County's poverty rate of $24.10 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of New Waverly's population is $5.30 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Walker County's $17.90 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of New Waverly is $62.50 \%$ white alone, greater than Walker County's white alone percentage of $56.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of New Waverly is $30.70 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Walker County (23.00\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

New Waverly is majority White not of Hispanic or Latino origin. In doing the windshield survey, the homes appear to be generally low-to-moderate income style homes. Because of the broad scope of the project, it does not appear to unduly benefit or burden any demographic group over another.

In the 2020 Census, the Hispanic or Latino origin population increased from being $5.2 \%$ to $24.7 \%$ of the population. The percentage of White not of Hispanic or Latino origin dropped from $62.5 \%$ to $56.5 \%$.

The households in New Waverly are comprised of $46.10 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Walker County's $46.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in New Waverly that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $22.50 \%$ this is greater than Walker County's percentage of $17.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of New Waverly's households are $6.70 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Walker County's percentage of $3.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $3.50 \%$ is within the city of New Waverly, which is greater than Walker County's $0.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of New Waverly, $36.60 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Walker County's percentage of $31.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. New Waverly's households are $20.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Walker County's percentage of $5.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. New Waverly's households are $8.80 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than Walker County at $16.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in New Waverly are $7.40 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Walker County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.70 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In New Waverly $53.20 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Walker County, which is at $27.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within New Waverly that have one or more people of 65 or older is $30.80 \%$, which is greater than Walker County's $26.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of New Waverly is $11.20 \%$ which is greater than Walker County's $8.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

According to a January 27, 2022 article in The Houston Business Journal, there is a plan for a new residential community featuring 1,600 homes that "could more than quadruple the town of just over 1,000 residents."

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Walker County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1079-APP City of New Waverly |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 48.89\% |  | 65.54\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$43,742 |  | \$33,700 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 24.10\% |  | 38.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 72,321 |  | 1,142 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 12,973 | 17.90\% | 60 | 5.3\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 59,348 | 82.10\% | 1,082 | 94.7\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 40,789 | 56.40\% | 714 | 62.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 16,656 | 23.00\% | 351 | 30.7\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 315 | 0.40\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 912 | 1.30\% | 12 | 1.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 9 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 12 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 655 | 0.90\% | 5 | 0.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 66,296 | 91.70\% | 1,127 | 98.7\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 65,588 | 90.70\% | 1,120 | 98.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 708 | 1.00\% | 7 | 0.6\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 6,025 | 8.30\% | 15 | 1.3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 42,217 | 58.40\% | 550 | 48.2\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 30,104 | 41.60\% | 592 | 51.8\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 21,963 | 100\% | 432 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 10,156 | 46.20\% | 199 | 46.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 3,870 | 17.60\% | 97 | 22.5\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 852 | 3.90\% | 29 | 6.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 82 | 0.40\% | 15 | 3.5\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Walker County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1079-APP <br> City of New Waverly City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 4,146 | 18.90\% | 46 | 10.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 274 | 1.20\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,682 | 12.20\% | 32 | 7.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 621 | 2.80\% | 9 | 2.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 6,809 | 31.00\% | 158 | 36.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,251 | 5.70\% | 87 | 20.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,612 | 16.40\% | 38 | 8.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,482 | 6.70\% | 32 | 7.4\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 6,072 | 27.60\% | 230 | 53.2\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 5,759 | 26.20\% | 133 | 30.8\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 58,240 | 100\% | 1,142 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,824 | 8.30\% | 128 | 11.2\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Walker County: Project Service Areas
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## Walker County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Walker County: Population in Poverty by Block Group
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City of Madisonville: Wastewater (Sewer) System Improvement - \$6,525,000-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Madisonville, benefitting 53.56\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $21.65 \%$ greater than Madison County's LMI percentage of $44.03 \%$ and $19.94 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

Portions of the sewer system experience high Infiltration \& Inflow during storm events. The storm water causes the sewer system \& the downstream wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) to become inundated \& overwhelmed with storm water during storm events. The flooding that occurs at the WWTP can result in overflows causing wastewater to pass untreated into the environment, cause disruption to the treatment system, and damage equipment.

The objective is to alleviate infiltration and inflow at the highest risk areas of the city and reduce the total volume of water that is conveyed to the WWTP. The project will reduce the risk of a catastrophic failure of the town's wastewater infrastructure.

The improvements are broken into two activities:
Sewer infrastructure improvements:

- Replace 30,400 linear feet of gravity sewer line throughout the city
- Replace manholes with new manholes designed to ensure surface flooding will not cause storm water to enter the sewer system

WWTP flood control \& drainage improvements:

- Replace buried \& undersized culvert on site
- Create a drainage ditch
- Install two area inlets and grade the area around the clarifiers

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Madisonville is a community of 4,653 residents in Madison County $(14,197)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Madisonville is $\$ 50,519$, $4.07 \%$ less than Madison County's median income of $\$ 52,664$, and $3.14 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Madisonville's AMFI is $\$ 60,679$ according to the ACS 2019 report, and that is $101 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Madison County of $\$ 59,900$. The poverty rate
based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Madisonville was $17.00 \%$, compared with Madison County's poverty rate of $14.00 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Madisonville's population is $30.10 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Madison County's $23.20 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Madisonville is $37.70 \%$ white alone, less than Madison County's white alone percentage of $55.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Madisonville is $23.40 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Madison County (16.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Madisonville is $0.10 \%$, equal to Madison County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.10 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Madisonville is $5.50 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Madison County's percentage of $3.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Overall, the projects seem to be well balanced throughout the town. Madisonville is racially and ethnically diverse with people of color representing $59 \%$ of the total population (including the $5.5 \%$ Asian population), and White not of Hispanic or Latino origin at $37.7 \%$. The City submitted an AFFH Determination which was very accurate and high quality. The 2020 Census shows that Madisonville changed from being a $53.1 \%$ majority minority city to a $66.6 \%$ majority minority city. Both Black or African American and Hispanic or Latino origin populations grew in raw population number, and the White not of Hispanic or Latino origin population reduced in size as Madisonville's population decreased.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $79.3 \%$ in the city of Madisonville, less than $89.40 \%$ in Madison County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Madisonville is $42.10 \%$ male, less than Madison County ( $56.80 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Madisonville is $57.90 \%$ female, greater than the $43.20 \%$ of Madison County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Madisonville, $37.50 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Madison County's percentage of $25.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Madisonville's households are $8.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Madison County's percentage of $4.90 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Madisonville's households are $22.10 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Madison County at $15.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Madisonville are $13.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Madison County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $9.20 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Madisonville $37.40 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than Madison County, which is at $31.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Madisonville that have one or more people of 65 or older is $31.80 \%$, which is less than Madison County's $36.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Madisonville is $15.20 \%$ which is less than Madison County's $15.60 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The area that appears to have the most work (not counting the wastewater treatment project), appears to be one of most racially and ethnically diverse areas of the city. Census Tract 4 Block Group 4 is $34 \%$ Black or African American, $30.2 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, and $29.9 \%$ White not of Hispanic or Latino origin. This area contains the McIver and Madison projects, and the Panama and Collard projects too.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Madison County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1070-APP <br> City of Madisonville City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 44.03\% |  | 53.56\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,664 |  | \$50,519 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.00\% |  | 17.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 14,197 |  | 4,653 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,290 | 23.2\% | 1,400 | 30.1\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 10,907 | 76.8\% | 3,253 | 69.9\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 7,809 | 55.0\% | 1,756 | 37.7\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,310 | 16.3\% | 1,087 | 23.4\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 16 | 0.1\% | 6 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 477 | 3.4\% | 255 | 5.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 10 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 12 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 273 | 1.9\% | 149 | 3.2\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 12,691 | 89.4\% | 3,740 | 80.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 12,592 | 88.7\% | 3,692 | 79.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 99 | 0.7\% | 48 | 1.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,506 | 10.6\% | 913 | 19.6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 8,060 | 56.8\% | 1,959 | 42.1\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 6,137 | 43.2\% | 2,694 | 57.9\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,269 | 100\% | 1,662 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,211 | 51.8\% | 707 | 42.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 855 | 20.0\% | 360 | 21.7\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 154 | 3.6\% | 28 | 1.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 57 | 1.3\% | 19 | 1.1\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Madison County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1070-APP <br> City of Madisonville City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 799 | 18.7\% | 304 | 18.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 31 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 669 | 15.7\% | 280 | 16.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 260 | 6.1\% | 104 | 6.3\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,105 | 25.9\% | 623 | 37.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 210 | 4.9\% | 136 | 8.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 661 | 15.5\% | 368 | 22.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 391 | 9.2\% | 220 | 13.2\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,348 | 31.6\% | 621 | 37.4\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,538 | 36.0\% | 528 | 31.8\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 11,105 | 100\% | 4,506 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,727 | 15.6\% | 686 | 15.2\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Madison County: Project Service Areas



## Madison County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance - 0-15

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Madison County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (5 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (4 Block Groups)
- 25-45 percent (2 Block Groups)
$\square \geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Lexington: Drainage Ditch and Culvert Improvements Project - \$6,393,661.50-Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Lexington, benefitting $57.31 \%$ LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $37.46 \%$ greater than Lee County's LMI percentage of $41.69 \%$ and $28.32 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

This project will improve the storm sewers, culverts, and drainage ditches in three areas within the city of Lexington. These areas have been impacted by widespread issues of flooding in larger storm events and will benefit from upgraded and improved downstream drainage infrastructure providing adequate conveyance of stormwater flows.

Large diameter pipe and box culverts are proposed on the downstream portions of drainage infrastructure for each area. Improvements will also include clearing debris within the Ordinary High-Water Mark of the creeks and regrading the creeks immediately downstream of major outfall locations.

Area 1:

- Regrade ditches on the north side of town near Business 77 (N. Rockdale Street) and the baseball fields
- Complete culvert improvements crossing Business 77 and within the park

Area 2:

- Clear and regrade an unnamed tributary of Shaw Branch to provide increased downstream drainage conveyance and depth for upstream storm sewer improvements.
- Improve box culvert near 3rd St. and Caldwell St. to 4th St. and Caldwell St
- Clear and regrade drainage ditch from south of McDade\Belton Street to Business 77 to provide increased downstream drainage conveyance and depth for upstream storm sewer improvements.
- Complete culvert improvements at Belton\McDade Street and Business 77

Area 3:

- Clear and regrade drainage ditch to provide increased downstream drainage conveyance and depth for upstream storm sewer improvements south of Avenue D at Shaw St.
- Improve culverts at Avenue D and Shaw Street

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be
impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Lexington is a community of 1,389 residents in Lee County $(17,058)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Lexington is $\$ 51,010,6.82 \%$ less than Lee County's median income of $\$ 54,744$, and $2.20 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The Lexington AMFI according to ACS 2019 is $\$ 58,942$. This is $84 \%$ of the HUD AMFI of $\$ 70,200$ for Lee County. Lee County is not in a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Lexington was $15.00 \%$, compared to Lee County's poverty rate of $14.20 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Lexington's population is $17.40 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Lee County's $23.70 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Lexington is $74.90 \%$ white alone, greater than Lee County's white alone percentage of $63.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Lexington is $6.30 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Lee County (11.10\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

In the 2020 Census data, the percentage of Lexington that is White not of Hispanic or Latino origin dropped by $6 \%$. The percentage of Black or African American residents increased by $2.7 \%$.

Given the community size and the areas covered in the drainage maps, the project seems to cover most of the community. So, no demographic should be benefitted or burdened more than any others as the project is designed to reduce flooding throughout the entire city.

The city of Lexington is $44.90 \%$ male, less than Lee County (50.00\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Lexington is $55.10 \%$ female, greater than the $50.00 \%$ of Lee County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

In the city of Lexington, $32.50 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Lee County's percentage of $23.70 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Lexington's households are $6.30 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Lee County's percentage of $6.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Lexington's households are $19.80 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Lee County at $12.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Lexington are $7.90 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Lee County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Lexington $33.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18, which is greater than Lee County, which is at $31.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Lexington that have one or more people of 65 or older is $39.60 \%$, which is greater than Lee County's $34.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Lexington is $14.00 \%$ which is greater than Lee County's $13.00 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.
The housing near $7^{\text {th }}$ Street is comprised of larger, ranch style brick housing and school properties. There are also commercial properties in the general area of the project. Near $3^{\text {rd }}$ and Yegua, there are smaller houses of mixed quality with both brick veneer and wood siding. Over near First and Snow, the houses are smaller and predominately have wood siding. Further back on McClanahan, there are ranch houses and cottage style housing. In the general area of Avenue D and Shaw, there is ranch land, empty lots, small housing made of brick and wood, and MHUs mixed together.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Lee County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0900-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Lexington |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 41.69\% |  | 57.31\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$54,744 |  | \$51,010 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.20\% |  | 15.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 17,058 |  | 1,389 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 4,040 | 23.70\% | 242 | 17.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,018 | 76.30\% | 1,147 | 82.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 10,804 | 63.30\% | 1,041 | 74.9\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,899 | 11.10\% | 88 | 6.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 169 | 1.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 25 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 121 | 0.70\% | 18 | 1.3\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 15,627 | 91.60\% | 1,339 | 96.4\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 15,496 | 90.80\% | 1,268 | 91.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 131 | 0.80\% | 71 | 5.1\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,431 | 8.40\% | 50 | 3.6\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 8,530 | 50.00\% | 623 | 44.9\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 8,528 | 50.00\% | 766 | 55.1\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 6,036 | 100\% | 541 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,462 | 57.40\% | 274 | 50.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,136 | 18.80\% | 102 | 18.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 229 | 3.80\% | 18 | 3.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 154 | 2.60\% | 10 | 1.8\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Lee County |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-0900-APP City of Lexington City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 913 | 15.10\% | 73 | 13.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 94 | 1.60\% | 22 | 4.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 671 | 11.10\% | 41 | 7.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 253 | 4.20\% | 15 | 2.8\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,432 | 23.70\% | 176 | 32.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 389 | 6.40\% | 34 | 6.3\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 737 | 12.20\% | 107 | 19.8\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 420 | 7.00\% | 43 | 7.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,908 | 31.60\% | 179 | 33.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,076 | 34.40\% | 214 | 39.6\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 16,601 | 100\% | 1,389 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,162 | 13.00\% | 195 | 14.0\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Lee County: Project Service Areas



## Lee County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Lee County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



City of Shepherd: Citywide Sewer Infiltration and Inflow Mitigation Project - \$4,200,000 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

The project service area encompasses the entire population of the city of Shepard, benefitting 65.42 percent LMI persons and meeting the LMI national objective. The project's beneficiary percentage is 46 percent greater than the LMI percentages of both San Jacinto County (HUD MID) and the overall MIT Eligible counties ( 44.9 percent and 44.66 percent respectively).

The city of Shepherd has experienced ongoing drainage issues throughout the city. The goal of this citywide sewer infiltration and inflow mitigation project is to increase resilience to disasters and reduce or eliminate the long-term risk of loss of life, injury, damage to and loss of property, and suffering and hardship, by lessening the impact of future disasters during flood events that occur with hurricanes, tropical storms, and tropical depressions.

This goal will be achieved by meeting the following project objectives:

- Replace sewer lines
- Replace and/or reconstruct of sewer manholes
- Raise and harden a lift station

The project will encompass approximately 46,872 linear feet of sanitary sewer line replacement, trench safety, connect new main (or new manhole) to existing manhole (or existing main), main line cleanout, connect service to new main, remove existing manhole with standard manhole replacement, driveway repairs, highway and railroad bore, replace one sewer lift station, elevate and rehabilitate 18 manholes, and associated appurtenances.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by hurricanes and flooding. The impacted areas were able to prioritize local project selections that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by future storms. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

There are no R/ECAP areas located within San Jacinto County, but the City of Shepard has a slightly higher racial level than the county ( $22.8 \%$ compared with $22 \%$ ) but a significantly high LMI population with a $20.59 \%$ increase over the county and $4.3 \%$ higher poverty rate, despite having a higher median income. Shepherd has an AMFI of \$50,709 according to ACS 2019.

The City of Shepard lost 214 residents between 2010 and 2020. The 2010 Census data shows Black or African American rate of $14.1 \%$, a Hispanic or Latino origin rate of $11.3 \%$ and a White not of Hispanic of Latino origin of $70.9 \%$ (lower than the county demographic rates). In 2020, Black or African American and White not of Hispanic Origin declined to $11.8 \%$ and $64.3 \%$ respectively. The Hispanic or Latino origin population increased from $11.3 \%$ to $18.3 \%$.

In addition, Census data from 2010 for San Jacinto County show a Black or African American Rate of $10.1 \%$, a Hispanic or Latino rate of $10.9 \%$ and a White not of Hispanic of $76.6 \%$. In 2020, the data also changed with Black or African American and White not of Hispanic or Latino origin declined to $7.6 \%$ and $70 \%$ respectively. The Hispanic or Latino origin population increased from
$10.9 \%$ to $17.6 \%$. The Hispanic or Latino origin population growth represents a raw number growth of 1,942 people while both Black and African American and White not of Latino populations declines. The county overall grew 1,018 residents. The City of Shepard is the largest City within the county at 2,105 residents according to the 2020 Census. The City of Shepard is the largest community in the county and has the largest raw number of people of color in the county.

Shepherd is a community of 2,105 residents in San Jacinto County $(28,180)$, while the population of the MIT Eligible Area is $1,327,377$. Because it is encompassed within 3 block groups that extend beyond the city limits, surveys were necessary to define the project service area. This project is included in both the City and County wide hazard mitigation plans. The median income of Shepherd is $\$ 44,046,6$ percent greater than the county median income of $\$ 41,614$ and 16 percent less than the MIT Eligible Area $(\$ 52,155)$. Poverty in Shepherd is at 16 percent, 5 percent greater than the County poverty rate of 15.2 percent, and 9 percent greater than the state rate of 13.6 percent (2019 ACS data). Based on the observations from the AFFH project review for this project, with the exception of one area (a group of larger homes in one area that were not LMI) all the homes appear to be generally similar and with the same rate of repairs needed.

National origin from within the United States is 91.5 percent for the City, 92.3 percent for the County, and 81.2 percent for the MIT eligible area. Married-couple families with children for the City is 33.9 percent with the County at 16.3 percent and the MIT Eligible Area at 22.3 percent. In the City, housing with a female householder is 28.1 percent, the County is 22 percent, and the MIT Eligible Area is 26.8 percent. Households with children in Shepherd is 51.1 percent and the County count is 27.9 percent, while the MIT Eligible Area estimate is 36.5 percent. Over 16 percent ( 16.5 percent) are disabled in Shepherd with 21.5 percent in the County and 11.1 percent in the MIT Eligible Area, while the percentage of persons over 65 years old with a disability is 72.9 percent in Shepherd with 45.3 percent in the County and 36.6 percent in the MIT Eligible Area.

In conclusion, this city of Shepherd citywide sewer infiltration and inflow mitigation project will have a positive impact on the entire community including protected classes while also benefiting the 65.42 percent of LMI persons across the city.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Jacinto County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1115-APP City of Shepherd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 44.90\% |  | 65.42\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$41,614 |  | \$44,026 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.90\% |  | 19.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 28,180 |  | 3,202 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,693 | 13.10\% | 404 | 12.6\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 24,487 | 86.90\% | 2,798 | 87.4\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 21,043 | 74.70\% | 2,395 | 74.8\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,517 | 8.90\% | 327 | 10.2\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 218 | 0.80\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 9 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 10 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 690 | 2.40\% | 76 | 2.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 26,479 | 94.00\% | 2,938 | 91.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 26,014 | 92.30\% | 2,931 | 91.5\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 465 | 1.70\% | 7 | 0.2\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,701 | 6.00\% | 264 | 8.2\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 13,797 | 49.00\% | 1,481 | 46.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 14,383 | 51.00\% | 1,721 | 53.7\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 10,043 | 100\% | 975 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 5,303 | 52.80\% | 473 | 48.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,638 | 16.30\% | 331 | 33.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 547 | 5.40\% | 116 | 11.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 151 | 1.50\% | 25 | 2.6\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | San Jacinto County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1115-APP City of Shepherd City-Wide |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,984 | 19.80\% | 112 | 11.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 63 | 0.60\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,612 | 16.10\% | 88 | 9.0\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 954 | 9.50\% | 50 | 5.1\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,209 | 22.00\% | 274 | 28.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 299 | 3.00\% | 74 | 7.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,293 | 12.90\% | 126 | 12.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 693 | 6.90\% | 58 | 5.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,798 | 27.90\% | 498 | 51.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,191 | 41.70\% | 252 | 25.8\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 28,041 | 100\% | 3,125 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,026 | 21.50\% | 517 | 16.5\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## San Jacinto County: Project Service Areas



## San Jacinto County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## San Jacinto County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



City of Trinity: Trinity City-Wide Water System Improvements - \$4,028,986.00 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding
This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Trinity, benefitting 70.15\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $37.84 \%$ greater than Trinity County's LMI percentage of $50.89 \%$ and $57.07 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Trinity experienced major flooding during the floods of 2016 and Hurricane Harvey. This interrupted the water supply when the electricity was affected. The flooding encroached on the water supply system and damaged the system. This mitigation project includes the replacement of underground concrete storage tank with an above-ground welded steel tank, the installation of a treatment and disinfection facilities, the replacement of a booster plant, approximately 1 mile of new waterline and the installation of a SCADA system. In turn, Trinity will have a resilient water supply that will be able to withstand future hazards.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Trinity is a community of 2,756 residents in Trinity County $(14,620)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Trinity is $\$ 26,045$, less than Trinity County's median income of $\$ 41,357$, and less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Trinity's AMFI is $\$ 32,083$ according to ACS 2019. This is $71 \%$ of the HUD AMFI for Trinity County which is $\$ 45,500$. Trinity County is not in a HUD MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Trinity was $30.70 \%$, greater than Trinity County's poverty rate of $16.10 \%$, greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Trinity increased to $33.4 \%$ while Trinity County's poverty rate decreased to $15.5 \%$.

The city of Trinity's population is $24.80 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Trinity County's $10.00 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Trinity is $42.70 \%$ white alone, less than Trinity County's white alone percentage of $78.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Trinity is $27.90 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Trinity County ( $9.90 \%$ ) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The city of Trinity is $0.20 \%$ Asian alone, greater than Trinity County's percentage of $0.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$. In the city of Trinity, $4.40 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Trinity County, which is at $1.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The City of Trinity is a majority minority community and is more diverse than Trinity County with a racial and ethnic population of $52.7 \%$ compared to $19.9 \%$. There is a plurality of White not of Hispanic or Latino origin residents in the City of Trinity at $42.6 \%$. The projects are dispersed in
rural areas and throughout the community, so it does not appear that the projects are benefitting or creating an unfair burden on any part of the community. Twenty-six percent of the housing is rental and of those renters, $68.9 \%$ have unaffordable rent.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $89.30 \%$ in the city of Trinity, less than $96.20 \%$ in Trinity County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

In the city of Trinity, $40.90 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Trinity County's percentage of $28.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Trinity's households are $7.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Trinity County's percentage of $4.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Trinity's households are $26.20 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Trinity County at $16.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Trinity are $7.70 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it less than Trinity County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $9.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Trinity $27.10 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Trinity County, which is at $22.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Trinity that have one or more people of 65 or older is $23.70 \%$, which is less than Trinity County's $43.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Trinity is $28.10 \%$ which is greater than Trinity County's $26.90 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$

Trinity identified six areas for improvements to the water system. Two of the areas included water towers in more rural areas. One area was on Pine Valley where there were a few houses nearby, and the other was on State Highway 94 that was primarily agricultural lands. There is an emergency water supply unit on Robb Street that is generally near smaller homes that have a rural character, wood siding, and porches.

Two other locations are at City Hall and near a school in the center of town. There are many homes here, and many are of a craftsman or small brick style common in the city. This area is more densely populated, but it is likely receiving the SCADA system in City Hall. There appears to be some pipe replacement on Walker Street that leads to another major water plant in a lightly populated area. There appear to be some MHUs in the area and small rural housing. Some of the housing is in need of repair. At the end of the block is the USDA development near the main street. The water plant is not directly facing housing, so it is partially naturally screened.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-0993-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Trinity |  | City of Trinity |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 50.89\% |  | 70.15\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$41,357 |  | \$26,045 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.10\% |  | 30.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 14,620 |  | 2,756 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,460 | 10.0\% | 684 | 24.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,160 | 90.0\% | 2,072 | 75.2\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 11,457 | 78.4\% | 1,176 | 42.7\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,454 | 9.9\% | 770 | 27.9\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 18 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 5 | 0.0\% | 5 | 0.2\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 226 | 1.5\% | 121 | 4.4\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 14,062 | 96.2\% | 2,462 | 89.3\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 14,027 | 95.9\% | 2,462 | 89.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 35 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 558 | 3.8\% | 294 | 10.7\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 7,022 | 48.0\% | 1,453 | 52.7\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 7,598 | 52.0\% | 1,303 | 47.3\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 6,030 | 100\% | 1,096 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,054 | 50.6\% | 351 | 32.0\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 691 | 11.5\% | 194 | 17.7\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 196 | 3.3\% | 17 | 1.6\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 93 | 1.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Trinity County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0993-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Trinity |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 1,075 | 17.8\% | 280 | 25.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 31 | 0.5\% | 18 | 1.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 731 | 12.1\% | 190 | 17.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 322 | 5.3\% | 42 | 3.8\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,705 | 28.3\% | 448 | 40.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 275 | 4.6\% | 79 | 7.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 963 | 16.0\% | 287 | 26.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 540 | 9.0\% | 84 | 7.7\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,351 | 22.4\% | 297 | 27.1\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,631 | 43.6\% | 260 | 23.7\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 14,466 | 100\% | 2,665 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,893 | 26.9\% | 749 | 28.1\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Trinity County: Project Service Areas



## Trinity County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| category or no |
| population are blank |

## Population by Category




## Trinity County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\square 10$ percent (4 Block Groups)
-10-25 percent (7 Block Groups)$25-45$ percent (3 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



## City of Tenaha - \$3,875,691-Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding, Storms, and Tornadoes

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the town of Tenaha, benefitting 77.66\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $54.00 \%$ greater than Shelby County's LMI percentage of $50.43 \%$ and $73.90 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Tenaha will replace deteriorated sewer lines, inadequate manholes, upgrade lift stations and add monitoring SCADA equipment and generators at all crucial infrastructure points. During previous disaster events, the city and its citizens were faced with depleted water tanks, leading to water restrictions, mixing of flood water and wastewater in the streets, and sink holes. Monitoring these statuses will enable quicker response to outages, eliminate the need to check critical infrastructure during significant storm events, and provide real time feedback to emergency response teams.

The city will replace the most problematic and critical sanitary sewer infrastructure. Manholes will be equipped with water-tight rings and covers. Failing lines will be replaced. The wastewater treatment plant will be equipped with an equalization basin to regulate the influent flow of the plant. An existing abandoned wastewater lagoon will be rehabilitated and returned to service.

The two remote lift station pumps will be replaced with higher capacity lift station pumps. All water facilities such as remote wells, water plants, and elevated storage tanks will receive standby generators. These generators will maintain water service through significant rain events regardless of damage to the electrical grid.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Tenaha is a community of 1,198 residents in Shelby County $(25,349)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Tenaha is $\$ 24,485,42.42 \%$ less than Shelby County's median income of $\$ 42,522$, and $53.05 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Tenaha's AMFI is $\$ 26,968$ according to ACS 2019. This is $53.96 \%$ of the Shelby County HUD AMFI of $\$ 50,000$. Shelby County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the town of Tenaha was $41.80 \%$, greater than Shelby County's poverty rate of $23.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In the 2019 ACS, the data shows that $54 \%$ of all children 18 and under in Tenaha are in poverty. Also, $70 \%$ of children under 5 are in poverty in Tenaha.

The town of Tenaha's population is $34.50 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Shelby County's $18.30 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Tenaha is $29.20 \%$ white alone, less than Shelby County's white alone percentage of $61.60 \%$
and less than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The town of Tenaha is $35.80 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Shelby County (18.90\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$.

Tenaha is the largest community in Census Tract 9501 in Shelby County. Census Tract 9501 is $69 \%$ White not of Hispanic or Latino origin and $29.2 \%$ racial and ethnic minorities. Tenaha is a majority minority city with $80.2 \%$ of its residents being Black or African American or of Hispanic or Latino origin. If HUD considered Census Places for R/ECAP status, Tenaha at the time of application would be $80.2 \%$ concentrated racial and ethnic minorities, with a concentrated poverty rate of $41.8 \%$. Census Tract 9501 has a larger White not of Hispanic of Latino origin than both Shelby County ( $-8 \%$ ) and Tenaha (11.2\%).

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $82.90 \%$ in the town of Tenaha, less than $91.80 \%$ in Shelby County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in Tenaha are comprised of $38.50 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Shelby County's $51.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Tenaha that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $13.30 \%$ this is less than Shelby County's percentage of $19.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The town of Tenaha's households are $5.20 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Shelby County's percentage of $3.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $3.40 \%$ is within the town of Tenaha, which is greater than Shelby County's $2.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the town of Tenaha, $37.80 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Shelby County's percentage of $27.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Tenaha's households are $18.70 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Shelby County's percentage of $8.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Tenaha's households are $13.50 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Shelby County at $13.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Tenaha are $8.60 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it greater than Shelby County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $7.00 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Tenaha $42.60 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is greater than Shelby County, which is at $38.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Tenaha that have one or more people of 65 or older is $26.00 \%$, which is less than Shelby County's $32.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the town of Tenaha is $19.00 \%$ which is greater than Shelby County's $17.20 \%$,and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Even though the community is a majority minority population, the Fair Housing Act still covers discrimination against people in the protected classes. Same race or ethnicity people can
discriminate based on national origin, family status, and of course the most common Fair Housing complaint being filed currently is for people with special needs, which cuts across all races and ethnicities.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1071-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Shelby |  | Town of Tenaha |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 50.43\% |  | 77.66\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$42,522 |  | \$24,485 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 23.30\% |  | 41.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 25,349 |  | 1,198 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 4,644 | 18.3\% | 413 | 34.5\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 20,705 | 81.7\% | 785 | 65.5\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 15,611 | 61.6\% | 350 | 29.2\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 4,803 | 18.9\% | 429 | 35.8\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 35 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 114 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 37 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 105 | 0.4\% | 6 | 0.5\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 23,258 | 91.8\% | 1,028 | 85.8\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 23,152 | 91.3\% | 993 | 82.9\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 106 | 0.4\% | 35 | 2.9\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 2,091 | 8.2\% | 170 | 14.2\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 12,585 | 49.6\% | 579 | 48.3\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 12,764 | 50.4\% | 619 | 51.7\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 9,293 | 100\% | 465 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,763 | 51.3\% | 179 | 38.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,812 | 19.5\% | 62 | 13.3\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 344 | 3.7\% | 24 | 5.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 202 | 2.2\% | 16 | 3.4\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Shelby County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1071-APP |
|  |  |  | Town of Tenaha |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 1,638 | 17.6\% | 86 | 18.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 276 | 3.0\% | 11 | 2.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,189 | 12.8\% | 58 | 12.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 506 | 5.4\% | 16 | 3.4\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,548 | 27.4\% | 176 | 37.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 758 | 8.2\% | 87 | 18.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,231 | 13.2\% | 63 | 13.5\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 655 | 7.0\% | 40 | 8.6\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,544 | 38.1\% | 198 | 42.6\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,027 | 32.6\% | 121 | 26.0\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 25,178 | 100\% | 1,198 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,327 | 17.2\% | 228 | 19.0\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Shelby County: Project Service Areas



## Shelby County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




## Shelby County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\square 10$ percent (2 Block Groups)10-25 percent (10 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (7 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



City of Beeville: Low Water Crossings Replacement Project - \$3,844,490 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Riverine Flooding

This project provides an area benefit within the city of Beeville, benefitting 55.28\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project area's LMI beneficiary percentage is $17.72 \%$ greater than the City of Beeville's LMI percentage of $46.96 \%, 32.03 \%$ greater than Bee County's LMI percentage of $41.87 \%$ and $23.78 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Beeville mitigation project includes primarily bridge and roadway construction to remove and replace existing low water crossings in three areas of the city: Jackson Street at Poesta Creek, Tyler Street at Poesta Creek, and Tyler Street at Hensley Creek. These crossings were identified by the city of Beeville as having a high probability of flooding during extreme storm events including flash floods, hurricanes, and tropical storms. The improvements will improve the hydraulic capacity, roadway functional capacity, structural integrity, channel stability, and overall resilience of each problematic crossing to reduce the potential for loss of life and property damage during extreme storm events.

The improvements include the following activities:

- Remove low water crossings and undersized culverts
- Install new bridge structures to raise the roadway above the existing normal creek floodway.
- Realign roadway at bridge approaches to raise the roadway elevation to match bridge structures.
- Install temporary and permanent erosion control and streambank stabilization measures at these crossings.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

The project has a beneficiary total of 4,260 within the city of Beeville, a community of 12,912 residents in Bee County (32,611), while the population of the MIT eligible area is 21,890,877. Census Tract 9505 has an AMFI of $\$ 35,179$ (Bee County); and Beeville has an AMFI of $\$ 38,346$ according to ACS 2019. Bee County has a HUD AMFI of $\$ 51,200$. Bee County HUD AMFI is $\$ 51,200$. Bee County is not within a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5 -year estimates in the project beneficiary area is $29.00 \%$, equal to the city of Beeville which is at $29.00 \%$, greater than Bee County's poverty rate of $21.70 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The project beneficiary area is $74.84 \%$ Hispanic or Latino alone, greater than the city of Beeville's population percentage of $69.00 \%$, greater than Bee County's $58.90 \%$ and greater than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is $21.96 \%$ white alone, less than the city of Beeville's percentage of $27.00 \%$, less than Bee County's percentage of $31.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The project beneficiary area is comprised of $1.98 \%$ Black or African American alone persons, this is greater than the city of Beeville, which has $1.80 \%$, less than Bee County ( $6.80 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for the project beneficiary area is $0.90 \%$, greater than the city of Beeville, which is at $0.70 \%$, greater than Bee County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.40 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The population in the project benefit area is $0.16 \%$ Asian alone, less than the city of Beeville at $1.00 \%$, less than Bee County's percentage of $0.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Beeville is a majority Hispanic or Latino origin city, but it has less than either of the Census Tracts identified for the population near the construction. Beeville is $69 \%$ Hispanic or Latino while Census Tract 9505 is $74.8 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin. Black or African American residents make up two percent or less of the population in all three areas. The application focuses on Block Group 6 of Census Tract 9505.

The project will largely benefit people who are of Hispanic or Latino origin based simply on the population. After having done a windshield survey of the community surrounding the three low water crossings, this will benefit low-income people and almost certainly people in protected classes. The project itself does not seem to have AFFH concerns.

The project beneficiary area is $43.57 \%$ male, less than the city of Beeville at $49.10 \%$, less than Bee County $(61.10 \%)$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. The project beneficiary area is $56.43 \%$ female, greater than the city of Beeville at $50.90 \%$, greater than the $38.90 \%$ of Bee County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in the project beneficiary area are comprised of $38.33 \%$ married couple families, greater than the city of Beeville at $41.80 \%$ less than Bee County's $48.40 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in the project beneficiary area who have their own children in the household under 18 is $12.93 \%$, less than the city of Beeville at $17.80 \%$, less than Bee County's percentage of $19.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The project area's households are $6.08 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than the city of Beeville's percentage of $4.40 \%$, less than Bee County's percentage of $6.20 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.37 \%$ in the project beneficiary area, less than the city of Beeville at $2.60 \%$, less than Bee County's $1.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the project beneficiary area, $39.65 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than the city of Beeville at $35.70 \%$, greater than Bee County's percentage of $29.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. The project beneficiary benefit area's households are $11.42 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner
present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than the city of Beeville which is at $9.10 \%$, greater than Bee County's percentage of $6.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. The project beneficiary area's households are $13.07 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than the city of Beeville at $13.70 \%$, less than Bee County at $13.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.4 \%$. The households in the project beneficiary area are $5.89 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65, making it less than the city of Beeville who is at $6.60 \%$, less than Bee County and greater than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.60 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In the project eligibility area, $37.83 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than the city of Beeville at $39.90 \%$, greater than Bee County, which is at $36.10 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within the project eligibility area that have one or more people of 65 or older is $22.61 \%$, less than the city of Beeville at $26.90 \%$, less than Bee County's $30.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in in the project eligibility area is $17.28 \%$, less than the city of Beeville at $17.30 \%$, greater than Bee County's $16.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $11.1 \%$.

It looks as though there are Public Housing Authority units near two of the three project sites that are more typical of older barracks style PHA housing units. The other housing in the area is mostly small wood structures, but there are ranch/tract style brick houses as well. It appears to be a lowincome area based on the windshield survey and ACS 2019 Census data. There are some commercial areas and a large park around the project sites on Tyler Street. The housing near the Tyler Street projects is more mixed in size and quality. There also appears to be a dump site not too far from the projects.

In Beeville, $32.6 \%$ of all housing units are estimated to be rental units. That percentage is not that far out of average. Even though the community is significantly of the same race or ethnicity, the Fair Housing Act still covers discrimination. Same race or ethnicity people can discriminate based on national origin, family status, and of course the most common Fair Housing complaint being filed currently is for people with special needs which cuts across all races and ethnicities.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Bee County |  | City of Beeville |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1105-APP City of Beeville |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Area-Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 41.87\% |  | 46.96\% |  | 55.28\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$44,578 |  | \$33,995 |  | -- |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 21.70\% |  | 29.00\% |  | 29.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 32,611 |  | 12,912 |  | 6,215 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 19,194 | 58.9\% | 8,910 | 69.0\% | 4,651 | 74.8\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,417 | 41.1\% | 4,002 | 31.0\% | 1,564 | 25.2\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 10,234 | 31.4\% | 3,485 | 27.0\% | 1,365 | 22.0\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,228 | 6.8\% | 229 | 1.8\% | 123 | 2.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 138 | 0.4\% | 92 | 0.7\% | 56 | 0.9\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 169 | 0.5\% | 133 | 1.0\% | 10 | 0.2\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 4 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.0\% | 7 | 0.10\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 637 | 2.0\% | 56 | 0.40\% | 10 | 0.16\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 31,529 | 96.7\% | 12,525 | 97.0\% | 6,037 | 97.1\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 31,214 | 95.7\% | 12,347 | 95.6\% | 6,024 | 96.9\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 315 | 1.0\% | 178 | 1.4\% | 13 | 0.2\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 1,082 | 3.3\% | 387 | 3\% | 178 | 3\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 19,915 | 61.1\% | 6,337 | 49.1\% | 2,708 | 43.6\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 12,696 | 38.9\% | 6,575 | 50.9\% | 3,507 | 56.4\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 8,269 | 100\% | 4,285 | 100\% | 2,189 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,002 | 48.4\% | 1,793 | 41.8\% | 839 | 38.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,638 | 19.8\% | 762 | 17.8\% | 283 | 12.9\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 510 | 6.2\% | 190 | 4.4\% | 133 | 6.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 158 | 1.9\% | 113 | 2.6\% | 30 | 1.4\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Bee County |  | City of Beeville |  | Harvey (State MID) CDR17-1105-APP City of Beeville Area-Benefit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,328 | 16.1\% | 771 | 18.0\% | 349 | 15.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 72 | 0.9\% | 46 | 1.1\% | 16 | 0.7\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,011 | 12.2\% | 568 | 13.3\% | 269 | 12.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 394 | 4.8\% | 252 | 5.9\% | 44 | 2.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,429 | 29.4\% | 1,531 | 35.7\% | 868 | 39.7\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 538 | 6.5\% | 389 | 9.1\% | 250 | 11.4\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,083 | 13.1\% | 588 | 13.7\% | 286 | 13.1\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 548 | 6.6\% | 283 | 6.6\% | 129 | 5.9\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,981 | 36.1\% | 1,710 | 39.9\% | 828 | 37.8\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,533 | 30.6\% | 1,153 | 26.9\% | 495 | 22.6\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 24,977 | 100\% | 12,769 | 100\% | 6,072 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,062 | 16.3\% | 2,207 | 17.3\% | 1,049 | 17.3\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Bee County: Project Service Areas



## Bee County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Bee County: Population in Poverty by Block Group
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City of Zavalla: Citywide Flood Mitigation - \$3,600,000 - Addressed Risk: Riverine Flooding, and Storms

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Zavalla, benefitting 53.90\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $25.98 \%$ greater than Angelina County's LMI percentage of $42.78 \%$ and $20.68 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The City of Zavalla will improve drainage and elevate streets in flood prone areas throughout the city. Utilities including water and sewer infrastructure located under existing streets will also be moved out from underneath these streets to eliminate the need to cut into streets to make repairs or provide maintenance. These actions will reduce flooding risks from residential streets, houses, buildings, and other infrastructure into natural drainage pathways.

These improvements will take place on Townsend Street between Jacks Street and Highway 147; along Campus Drive between FM 2109 and East Main Street; along Pickard Road from the northern city limit boundary to Campus Drive; on Johnson Street between Barge Road and East Main again from South 2nd Street to South 1st Street; improving Barge Road from East Main Street to the southern city limit boundary; on North 2nd Street from the northern city limit boundary to East Main Street and from Johnson to Miller Road.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Zavalla is a community of 797 residents in Angelina County $(87,322)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Zavalla is $\$ 35,750,29.14 \%$ less than Angelina County's median income of $\$ 50,453$, and $31.45 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Zavalla's AMFI is $\$ 40,278$ according to ACS 2019. This is $70 \%$ of HUD's AMFI for Angelina County of $\$ 57,500$. Angelina County is not in a HUD recognized MSA. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Zavalla was $24.60 \%$, greater than Angelina County's poverty rate of $18.30 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

The city of Zavalla's population is $1.00 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Angelina County's $22.10 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area (36.3\%). The population of Zavalla is $94.50 \%$ white alone, greater than Angelina County's white alone percentage of $60.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Zavalla is $0.80 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Angelina County (14.60\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. Zavalla is separated from other population centers in Angelina County and is in the Southeastern part of the County. Angelina County is itself $61 \%$ White not of Hispanic or

Latino origin, although its two largest cities are majority minority communities. In the city of Zavalla, $3.80 \%$ of the population is two or more races, greater than Angelina County, which is at $1.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area which is $1.7 \%$.

The city of Zavalla is $42.80 \%$ male, less than Angelina County ( $48.80 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Zavalla is $57.20 \%$ female, greater than the $51.20 \%$ of Angelina County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in Zavalla are comprised of $42.20 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Angelina County's $51.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Zavalla that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $13.10 \%$ this is less than Angelina County's percentage of $21.20 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Zavalla's households are $8.90 \%$ cohabitating couple households, greater than Angelina County's percentage of $5.80 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.90 \%$ is within the city of Zavalla, which is less than Angelina County's $2.50 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area 2.2\%.

In the city of Zavalla, $35.50 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Angelina County's percentage of $27.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Zavalla's households are $5.10 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, less than Angelina County's percentage of $7.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Zavalla's households are $11.20 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, less than Angelina County at $12.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Zavalla are $3.50 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it less than Angelina County and less than the MIT eligible area, which are at $6.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

In Zavalla $32.30 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Angelina County, which is at $39.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Zavalla that have one or more people of 65 or older is $24.00 \%$, which is less than Angelina County's $30.70 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Zavalla is $24.60 \%$ which is greater than Angelina County's $18.20 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Zavalla is a rural community. Townsend is a caliche type road with small houses and some MHUs. Campus is a narrow residential road that is paved but needs repairs in some areas. It has houses on both sides, and is mixed with some larger brick homes, smaller homes, MHUs and agricultural properties. The ditches on Campus Drive need to be cleaned for better water removal. Likewise, the drainage ditches on Pickard need to be cleaned as well. Pickard's housing consists of smaller houses and many MHUs. .

The North and South 2nd street area and Barge Road appears to be the most densely populated of the project's areas. The houses are mostly older, rural, wood style houses, and many are in need
of repair. There are MHUs in this project area too. Second street in particular appears to be in need of drainage maintenance. The roads here are generally paved, but many sections could use some repair as is called for in this application.

Johnson Street is the most unique in the group. It has some commercial properties like Brookshire Brothers Express with a drive through Deli that exits onto Johnson St., and a few other service-related companies. From 1st to 2nd, there are a few homes on Johnson before the commercial enterprises. After the commercial areas, there are a few larger homes at the end of Johnson.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-0990-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Angelina | unty | City of Zavalla |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.78\% |  | 53.90\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$50,453 |  | \$35,750 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.30\% |  | 24.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 87,322 |  | 797 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 19,326 | 22.1\% | 8 | 1.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 67,996 | 77.9\% | 789 | 99.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 52,832 | 60.5\% | 753 | 94.5\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 12,747 | 14.6\% | 6 | 0.8\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 105 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 957 | 1.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 5 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 102 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,248 | 1.4\% | 30 | 3.8\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 79,929 | 91.5\% | 797 | 100.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 79,408 | 90.9\% | 790 | 99.1\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 521 | 0.6\% | 7 | 0.9\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 7,393 | 8.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 42,606 | 48.8\% | 341 | 42.8\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 44,716 | 51.2\% | 456 | 57.2\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 31,035 | 100\% | 313 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 15,867 | 51.1\% | 132 | 42.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 6,574 | 21.2\% | 41 | 13.1\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,807 | 5.8\% | 28 | 8.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 770 | 2.5\% | 6 | 1.9\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Angelina County |  | 2016 Floods (State MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-0990-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Zavalla |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 4,808 | 15.5\% | 42 | 13.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 561 | 1.8\% | 5 | 1.6\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 3,194 | 10.3\% | 32 | 10.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,038 | 3.3\% | 13 | 4.2\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 8,553 | 27.6\% | 111 | 35.5\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 2,370 | 7.6\% | 16 | 5.1\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,975 | 12.8\% | 35 | 11.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 2,152 | 6.9\% | 11 | 3.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 12,186 | 39.3\% | 101 | 32.3\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 9,513 | 30.7\% | 75 | 24.0\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 85,265 | 100\% | 797 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 15,480 | 18.2\% | 196 | 24.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Angelina County: Project Service Areas





## Angelina County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




## Angelina County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty

| $\leq 10$ percent (14 Block Groups) |
| :---: |
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City of Anahuac: Citywide Water System Improvements - \$3,548,091.09 - Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions, and Severe Coastal Flooding

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Anahuac, benefitting 56.88\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $69.08 \%$ greater than Chambers County's LMI percentage of $33.64 \%$ and $27.36 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Anahuac has been adversely impacted by various disaster events over the years. Most recently, Hurricane Ike and Hurricane Harvey have proved detrimental for the city. Both disasters severely impacted the city's water plant and inhibited their ability to provide potable water.

This project will provide for key features, equipment, and processes needed by the plant to produce high quality potable water for the city. The project includes the following items:

- Replace 41 LF of the existing force main from the supernatant lift station at the water treatment plant to a manhole near the Texas Street lift station.
- Paint the existing control and lab building.
- Construct a new control building with new electrical and controls for better water quality monitoring by the surface water treatment plant operators.
- Construct a cover and pump removal system over the high service pump station to allow operation of the pumps during periods of wet weather.
- Construct a clarifier drain system to allow the city to drain the clarifiers to the wastewater pump station during periods of poor clarifier performance.
- Construct filter to waste piping for the filter effluent lines to better meet the maximum turbidity levels as required by the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality.
- Relocate all sampling and chemical injection lines between the plant and the chemical feed building.
- Construct an area to allow for the installation of a sludge drying system for the water treatment plant's sludge holding pond.
- Rehabilitate the clarifier structure and piping to eliminate the leakage and seepage.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future. All the beneficiaries in the service area will benefit from the above described project. Below are the various statistics of the population being served.

Anahuac is a community of 2,149 residents in Chambers County $(41,305)$, while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Anahuac is $\$ 58,500,35.81 \%$ less than Chambers County's median income of $\$ 91,141$, and $12.17 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. Anahuac has an AMFI of $\$ 75,192$ according to ACS 2019. This is $95.4 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 78,800$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugarland TX HUD FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates
in the city of Anahuac was $24.00 \%$ compared to Chambers County's poverty rate of $12.70 \%$ and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$.

At the time of application, the city of Anahuac's population was majority minority with $56.6 \%$ of the population being Black/African American or Hispanic/Latino origin. The work appears to be beneficial to all Anahuac residents, and some of the visual upgrades will be directly benefit areas that appeared during the site visit to have a majority minority population. The project description shows a slight concentration of projects in the northern part of the town. This appears to be the more established but generally well-maintained housing in Anahuac; however, the projects are generally to the benefit of or are neutral to the population. The northern area projects are between the drainage canal and the neighborhood below Beaumont there are three separate areas with one area near Oak Street having newer homes near South Main (Oak Street was under construction at the time of the site visit). Running into Oak Street is the Tower Street pipe work. This is the area for the water tower renovations. The water tower is on a street that ends but it is adjacent to an elementary school. The homes in this area are older brick homes. There are a mix of smaller and larger homes, but the homes become smaller as they get closer to the water tower. Also, below Beaumont are some MHUs mixed with brick homes. On Belton, there are some larger brick homes near the elementary school.

Overall, the projects seem to be dispersed throughout the community and do not appear to be negative or overly beneficial to any particular residential area. This project would benefit the residents regardless of race, ethnicity or poverty status.

The city of Anahuac's residents' demographics at the time of application were $33.40 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, greater than Chambers County's $22.40 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Anahuac is $42.20 \%$ white alone, less than Chambers County's white alone percentage of $67.00 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area ( $43.3 \%$ ). The city of Anahuac is $23.20 \%$ Black or African American alone, greater than Chambers County (7.30\%) and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Anahuac is $0.10 \%$, less than Chambers County and less than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.20 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively. The city of Anahuac is $1.10 \%$ Asian alone, equal to Chambers County's percentage of $1.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's rate of $5.0 \%$.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $87.00 \%$ in the city of Anahuac, less than $92.30 \%$ in Chambers County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The city of Anahuac is $44.50 \%$ male, less than Chambers County (50.70\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $49.6 \%$. Anahuac is $55.50 \%$ female, greater than the $49.30 \%$ of Chambers County and greater than the MIT eligible area's female percentage of $50.4 \%$.

The households in Anahuac are comprised of $41.90 \%$ married couple families, which is less than Chambers County's $64.10 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Anahuac that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $23.10 \%$ this is less than Chambers County's percentage of
$30.60 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Anahuac's households are $4.30 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Chambers County's percentage of $6.60 \%$ and less than the eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $1.50 \%$ is within the city of Anahuac, which is less than Chambers County's $4.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

In the city of Anahuac, $40.10 \%$ of households are occupied by a female householder with no spouse or partner present, greater than Chambers County's percentage of $17.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $26.8 \%$. Anahuac's households are $13.20 \%$ occupied by female householders with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Chambers County's percentage of $3.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area at $6.5 \%$. Anahuac's households are $17.20 \%$ occupied by female householders living alone, greater than Chambers County at $9.00 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area of $13.4 \%$. The households in Anahuac are $10.00 \%$ occupied by female householders with no partner present that are over the age of 65 , making it greater than Chambers County and greater than the eligible area, which are at $4.90 \%$ and $5.5 \%$ respectively.

The city of Anahuac is comprised of $13.80 \%$ households that are occupied by a male with no spouse or partner present, greater than Chambers County ( $11.80 \%$ ) and less than the MIT eligible area of $17.6 \%$. The city of Anahuac's households are $1.50 \%$ occupied by a male householder with no spouse or partner present who have their own children in the household under 18, greater than Chambers County, which is at $1.40 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's $1.4 \%$. Anahuac has $9.60 \%$ of households that are occupied by a male living alone, which is greater than Chambers County's $8.90 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage $11.8 \%$. The city of Anahuac's households are $3.50 \%$ occupied by a male householder over the age of 65 with no partner or spouse, which is equal to Chambers County at $3.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area $2.7 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Anahuac is $18.60 \%$ which is greater than Chambers County's $10.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  |  |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | CDR17-1202-APP |  |
|  |  |  | Chambers | unty | City of Anahuac |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | City-Wide |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 33.64\% |  | 56.88\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$91,141 |  | \$58,500 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 12.70\% |  | 24.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 41,305 |  | 2,149 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 9,267 | 22.4\% | 718 | 33.4\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 32,038 | 77.6\% | 1,431 | 66.6\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 27,661 | 67.0\% | 906 | 42.2\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,997 | 7.3\% | 498 | 23.2\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 63 | 0.2\% | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 465 | 1.1\% | 23 | 1.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 852 | 2.1\% | 2 | 0.1\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 38,115 | 92.3\% | 1,870 | 87.0\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 37,820 | 91.6\% | 1,870 | 87.0\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 295 | 0.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 3,190 | 7.7\% | 279 | 13.0\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 20,939 | 50.7\% | 956 | 44.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 20,366 | 49.3\% | 1,193 | 55.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 14,069 | 100\% | 798 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 9,018 | 64.1\% | 334 | 41.9\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 4,303 | 30.6\% | 184 | 23.1\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 929 | 6.6\% | 34 | 4.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 680 | 4.8\% | 12 | 1.5\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Chambers County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1202-APP |
|  |  |  | City of Anahuac |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent |  |  | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% |  |  | 1,666 | 11.8\% | 110 | 13.8\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% |  |  | 192 | 1.4\% | 12 | 1.5\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,258 | 8.9\% | 77 | 9.6\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 497 | 3.5\% | 28 | 3.5\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,456 | 17.5\% | 320 | 40.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 492 | 3.5\% | 105 | 13.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,265 | 9.0\% | 137 | 17.2\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 686 | 4.9\% | 80 | 10.0\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 6,331 | 45.0\% | 343 | 43.0\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,273 | 23.3\% | 186 | 23.3\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 41,023 | 100\% | 1,990 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,129 | 10.1\% | 370 | 18.6\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Chambers County: Project Service Areas



## Chambers County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group
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## Chambers County: Population in Poverty by Block Group
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City of Daisetta: Drainage and Wastewater Collection System Improvements - \$3,366,142 Addressed Risk: Hurricanes, Tropical Storms and Tropical Depressions

This project provides a City-Wide benefit for the city of Daisetta, benefitting 54.05\% LMI persons, therefore meeting the LMI national objective. The project's LMI beneficiary percentage is $10.09 \%$ greater than Liberty County's LMI percentage of $49.10 \%$ and $21.03 \%$ greater than the MIT eligible area's LMI percentage of $44.66 \%$.

The city of Daisetta project will make improvements to the drainage system that will result in increased efficiency in the movement of water and enhance the safety of the roadways for drivers. Daisetta has been impacted by hurricanes with historic rainfall and flooding occurrences. The project will improve the drainage system through work on manholes, ditches, replacing sewer line, culverts, and pavement repairs.

Included improvements:

- Raise 68 existing manholes and replace 26 throughout the city.
- Rehabilitation to sewer lines for a total of 7,530 linear feet of lateral pipeline for replacement.
- Ditch improvements to bring drainage infrastructure to needed capacity.

1. Preparation for $7,740 \mathrm{LF}$ prior to gradation
2. Regrade $29,950 \mathrm{LF}$ of ditches to bring drainage infrastructure to needed capacity.
3. Installation of 1,920 cubic yards of concrete slope.

- Replace a total of 780 LF of culverts and $1,470 \mathrm{LF}$ of pavement repair where culverts are replaced.

As part of the award process, GLO developed a competitive scoring process that highlightedessentially required-that the projects be LMI majority projects-for areas in Texas that were impacted by weather related events in various categories. The impacted areas were able to make local selections of projects that they believed would enhance the ability for residents not to be impacted by storms in the future.

This project will increase the resiliency and functionality of the drainage system in the city, moving water and preventing flooding. Functional manholes allow for clearance via sewer jetting trucks when lines are clogged, and evaluation of pipe and system integrity using special cameras and equipment.

Daisetta is a community of 938 residents in Liberty County ( 83,702 ), while the population of the MIT eligible area is $21,890,877$. The median household income of Daisetta is $\$ 44,563,13.46 \%$ less than Liberty County's median income of $\$ 51,494$, and $14.56 \%$ less than the MIT eligible area's median income of $\$ 52,155$. The City of Daisetta has an AMFI of $\$ 48,750$ according to ACS 2019. This is $62 \%$ of the HUD are AMFI which is $\$ 78,800$. The HUD AMFI is part of the Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX HUD Metro FMR Area. The poverty rate based on 2018 ACS 5-year estimates in the city of Daisetta was $8.00 \%$, compared to Liberty County's poverty
rate of $14.90 \%$, and the MIT eligible area's poverty rate of $15.47 \%$. In 2019 the poverty rate in the City of Daisetta increased to $11.5 \%$ while Liberty County's poverty rate decreased to $14.1 \%$.

The city of Daisetta's population is $5.00 \%$ Hispanic or Latino origin, less than Liberty County's $24.80 \%$ and less than the percentage for the MIT eligible area ( $36.3 \%$ ). The population of Daisetta is $93.60 \%$ white alone (in the 2020 census it has dropped to $83.2 \%$ ), greater than Liberty County's white alone percentage of $63.30 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area (43.3\%). The city of Daisetta is $0.30 \%$ Black or African American alone, less than Liberty County (9.80\%) and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $13.2 \%$. The American Indian and Alaska Native alone percentage for Daisetta is $0.40 \%$, less than Liberty County and greater than the MIT eligible area, who are at $0.50 \%$ and $0.20 \%$ respectively.

Native born national origin residents from within the United States is $98.3 \%$ in the city of Daisetta, greater than $91.9 \%$ in Liberty County and greater than $81.20 \%$ for the MIT eligible area.

The households in Daisetta are comprised of $59.10 \%$ married couple families, which is greater than Liberty County's $55.50 \%$ and greater than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $50.2 \%$. The percentage of households in Daisetta that are occupied by married couples who have their own children in the household under 18 is $21.60 \%$ this is greater than Liberty County's percentage of $20.80 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area's percentage of $22.3 \%$. The city of Daisetta's households are $4.30 \%$ cohabitating couple households, less than Liberty County's percentage of $4.80 \%$ and less than the eligible area's $5.5 \%$. Households with cohabitating couples who have their own children in the household under 18 comprise $0.00 \%$ is within the city of Daisetta, which is less than Liberty County's $2.30 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area $2.2 \%$.

Daisetta identifies that $36 \%$ of the housing in the community is substandard in their 2017 Master Plan. In conducting a windshield survey of the streets targeted for some of the work, the housing falls into groups. Most of the housing is generally well-kept wood rural housing. This is true for streets like Idaho, West Oak, and Elm. There are areas mixed with houses and MHUs like West and East Pine, Utah and Nebraska - some are in need of repair. The other type is Bobcat Lane which has larger, mostly brick homes. Bobcat Lane ends at 834 even though the project maps show it as one project. The homes on 834 change style from the brick homes in Bobcat Lane into smaller largely wood sided housing. Interestingly, Bobcat appears to back up to an Exxon Mobile facility and appears to have the City's water plant on this street.

In Daisetta $30.50 \%$ of homes have one or more people under the age of 18 , which is less than Liberty County, which is at $34.60 \%$ and less than the MIT eligible area of $36.5 \%$. Households within Daisetta that have one or more people of 65 or older is $24.50 \%$, which is less than Liberty County's $29.60 \%$ and equal to the MIT eligible area's $24.5 \%$.

The percentage of persons with a disability in the city of Daisetta is $18.90 \%$ which is greater than Liberty County's $17.10 \%$, and greater than the MIT eligible area of $11.1 \%$.

The City of Daisetta in the 2017 Comprehensive plan indicated they would take strong actions to implement a fair housing plan. These plans included a Fair Housing complaint process, antiNIMBYism provisions, annual Fair Housing training for staff, reviewing and updating ordinances,
limiting concentration of items like sewer plants, and developing affordable and mixed income housing. With a special needs population greater than the county and a racial and ethnic minority population that has almost doubled, the ability to hold landlords or lenders accountable to Fair Housing regulations could be vital.

Overall, the projects seem to be dispersed throughout the community and do not appear to be negative or overly beneficial to any particular residential area. This project would benefit the residents regardless of race, ethnicity or poverty status.

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Liberty County |  | Harvey (HUD MID) CDR17-1006-APP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | City of Daisetta |  |  |
|  |  |  | City-Wide |  |  |
| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  |  |  | 49.10\% |  | 54.05\% |  |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  |  |  | \$51,494 |  | \$44,563 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.90\% |  | 8.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 83,702 |  | 938 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 20,788 | 24.8\% | 47 | 5.0\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 62,914 | 75.2\% | 891 | 95.0\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 52,983 | 63.3\% | 878 | 93.6\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 8,239 | 9.8\% | 3 | 0.3\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 411 | 0.5\% | 4 | 0.4\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 439 | 0.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 8 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 37 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 797 | 1.0\% | 6 | 0.6\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.5\% | 76,919 | 91.9\% | 922 | 98.3\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.2\% | 76,244 | 91.1\% | 922 | 98.3\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.4\% | 675 | 0.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.5\% | 6,783 | 8.1\% | 16 | 1.7\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 41,320 | 49.4\% | 474 | 50.5\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 42,382 | 50.6\% | 464 | 49.5\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 26,873 | 100\% | 347 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 14,920 | 55.5\% | 205 | 59.1\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,592 | 20.8\% | 75 | 21.6\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,296 | 4.8\% | 15 | 4.3\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 616 | 2.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |

Table of Project Specific Protected Classes Statistics

|  | CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas |  | Liberty County |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CDR17-1006-APP <br> City of Daisetta City-Wide |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 4,188 | 15.6\% | 70 | 20.2\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 267 | 1.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 3,183 | 11.8\% | 64 | 18.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,003 | 3.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 6,469 | 24.1\% | 57 | 16.4\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,367 | 5.1\% | 11 | 3.2\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,527 | 13.1\% | 46 | 13.3\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,842 | 6.9\% | 19 | 5.5\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 9,311 | 34.6\% | 106 | 30.5\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 7,964 | 29.6\% | 85 | 24.5\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 76,291 | 100\% | 938 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 13,015 | 17.1\% | 177 | 18.9\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Calculated by project service area using HUD LMISD or Household Surveys <br> ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Liberty County: Project Service Areas



## Liberty County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Liberty County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Anderson County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Anderson County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 43.95\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$43,455 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 57,810 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 47,527 | 82.20\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 34,069 | 58.90\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 12,111 | 20.90\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 181 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 321 | 0.60\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 9 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 16 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 820 | 1.40\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 54,416 | 94.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 53,895 | 93.20\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 521 | 0.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,394 | 5.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 35,201 | 60.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 22,609 | 39.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 16,677 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 8,514 | 51.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,938 | 17.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,089 | 6.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 501 | 3.00\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,704 | 16.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 293 | 1.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,944 | 11.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 742 | 4.40\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 4,370 | 26.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,015 | 6.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,511 | 15.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,316 | 7.90\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 5,449 | 32.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 5,440 | 32.60\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 44,396 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,583 | 14.80\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Anderson County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Anderson County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (14 Block Groups)
$10-25$ percent ( 20 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (4 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Aransas County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Aransas County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 45.27\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$45,137 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 24,462 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 17,741 | 72.50\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 16,486 | 67.40\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 337 | 1.40\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 27 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 489 | 2.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 402 | 1.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 22,332 | 91.30\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 21,996 | 89.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 336 | 1.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 2,130 | 8.70\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 11,904 | 48.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 12,558 | 51.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 9,548 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 5,035 | 52.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 882 | 9.20\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 541 | 5.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 218 | 2.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,913 | 20.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 56 | 0.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,769 | 18.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 687 | 7.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,059 | 21.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 414 | 4.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,240 | 13.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 922 | 9.70\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,872 | 19.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,350 | 45.60\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 24,093 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,794 | 19.90\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Aransas County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Aransas County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 7 Block Groups)10-25 percent (8 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (2 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 2 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Archer County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Archer County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 30.00\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$63,835 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 8,716 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 8.30\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 7,994 | 91.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 7,700 | 88.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 76 | 0.90\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 59 | 0.70\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 15 | 0.20\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 144 | 1.70\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 8,426 | 96.70\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 8,391 | 96.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 35 | 0.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 290 | 3.30\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 4,347 | 49.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 4,369 | 50.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 3,452 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,960 | 56.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 798 | 23.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 152 | 4.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 68 | 2.00\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 518 | 15.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 48 | 1.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 368 | 10.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 127 | 3.70\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 822 | 23.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 115 | 3.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 561 | 16.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 338 | 9.80\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,097 | 31.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,243 | 36.00\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 8,655 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,307 | 15.10\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Archer County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Archer County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Atascosa County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Atascosa County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.79\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$55,366 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 15.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 49,528 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 64.30\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 17,673 | 35.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 16,487 | 33.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 135 | 0.30\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 53 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 173 | 0.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 18 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 807 | 1.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 46,120 | 93.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 45,880 | 92.60\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 240 | 0.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,408 | 6.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 24,733 | 49.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 24,795 | 50.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 15,546 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 8,157 | 52.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 3,304 | 21.30\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 873 | 5.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 438 | 2.80\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,536 | 16.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 375 | 2.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,484 | 9.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 477 | 3.10\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,980 | 25.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 935 | 6.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,674 | 10.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,039 | 6.70\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 6,261 | 40.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,838 | 31.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 49,097 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,741 | 11.70\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Atascosa County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-1

Population by Category


## Atascosa County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty$\leq 10$ percent (8 Block Groups)
10- 25 percent ( 13 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (4 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Bandera County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Bandera County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 35.78\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$58,661 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 15.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 22,215 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 18,040 | 81.20\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 17,289 | 77.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 154 | 0.70\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 78 | 0.40\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 62 | 0.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 15 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 442 | 2.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 21,160 | 95.30\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 20,888 | 94.00\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 272 | 1.20\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,055 | 4.70\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 11,192 | 50.40\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 11,023 | 49.60\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 8,399 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,774 | 56.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 897 | 10.70\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 386 | 4.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 143 | 1.70\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,190 | 14.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 21 | 0.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 961 | 11.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 413 | 4.90\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,049 | 24.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 328 | 3.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,231 | 14.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 732 | 8.70\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,621 | 19.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,924 | 46.70\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 22,036 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,420 | 20.10\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Bandera County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population

- Black or African American Population
- Asian Population

American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-15
15-85 Note: Block Groups with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Bandera County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (4 Block Groups)
10-25 percent (7 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent ( 1 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent ( 0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty


Bandera County


Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Baylor County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Baylor County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.41\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$40,739 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 3,577 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 3,272 | 91.50\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 3,098 | 86.60\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 110 | 3.10\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 9 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 40 | 1.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 15 | 0.40\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 3,474 | 97.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 3,443 | 96.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 31 | 0.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 103 | 2.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 1,746 | 48.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 1,831 | 51.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,530 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 800 | 52.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 297 | 19.40\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 71 | 4.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 30 | 2.00\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 319 | 20.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 249 | 16.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 191 | 12.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 340 | 22.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 34 | 2.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 289 | 18.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 206 | 13.50\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 401 | 26.20\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 644 | 42.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 3,499 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 683 | 19.50\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Baylor County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Baylor County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Blanco County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Blanco County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.41\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$66,390 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 11,478 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 19.40\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 9,254 | 80.60\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 8,837 | 77.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 3 | 0.00\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 14 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 165 | 1.40\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 42 | 0.40\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 193 | 1.70\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 10,829 | 94.30\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 10,562 | 92.00\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 267 | 2.30\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 649 | 5.70\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 5,931 | 51.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 5,547 | 48.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,343 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,435 | 56.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 608 | 14.00\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 160 | 3.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 56 | 1.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 712 | 16.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 52 | 1.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 448 | 10.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 201 | 4.60\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,036 | 23.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 135 | 3.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 581 | 13.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 402 | 9.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,097 | 25.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,800 | 41.40\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 11,384 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,878 | 16.50\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Blanco County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category




## Blanco County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (5 Block Groups)
10-25 percent (2 Block Groups)$25-45$ percent ( 0 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Bosque County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Bosque County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 38.91\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,148 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 18,296 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 14,940 | 81.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 14,239 | 77.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 295 | 1.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 65 | 0.40\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 100 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 241 | 1.30\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 17,119 | 93.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 16,987 | 92.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 132 | 0.70\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,177 | 6.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 9,013 | 49.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,283 | 50.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,211 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,272 | 59.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,205 | 16.70\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 492 | 6.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 237 | 3.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 954 | 13.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 60 | 0.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 755 | 10.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 309 | 4.30\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,493 | 20.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 305 | 4.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 882 | 12.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 570 | 7.90\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,114 | 29.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,917 | 40.50\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 17,952 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,292 | 18.30\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Bosque County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category



## Bosque County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Bowie County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Bowie County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.99\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$50,164 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 93,373 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 86,275 | 92.40\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 59,562 | 63.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 22,768 | 24.40\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 825 | 0.90\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 971 | 1.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 20 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 53 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 2,076 | 2.20\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 89,778 | 96.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 89,280 | 95.60\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 498 | 0.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,595 | 3.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 46,960 | 50.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 46,413 | 49.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 34,076 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 15,791 | 46.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,608 | 16.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 559 | 1.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 264 | 0.80\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 5,935 | 17.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 761 | 2.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 3,891 | 11.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,176 | 3.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 11,791 | 34.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 2,881 | 8.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 6,010 | 17.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 2,929 | 8.60\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 11,259 | 33.00\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 10,566 | 31.00\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 87,808 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 10,591 | 12.10\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Bowie County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| categry or no |
| population are blank |

85-100

Population by Category



## Bowie County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Brazos County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Brazos County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 51.05\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$49,181 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 25.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 222,981 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 165,986 | 74.40\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 124,411 | 55.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 22,923 | 10.30\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 291 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 13,619 | 6.10\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 123 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 272 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 4,347 | 1.90\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 193,049 | 86.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 190,331 | 85.40\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 2,718 | 1.20\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 29,932 | 13.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 112,629 | 50.50\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 110,352 | 49.50\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 79,412 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 31,506 | 39.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 14,192 | 17.90\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 3,832 | 4.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 1,183 | 1.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 18,628 | 23.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 713 | 0.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 10,274 | 12.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,528 | 1.90\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 25,446 | 32.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 5,330 | 6.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 12,383 | 15.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 3,373 | 4.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 23,687 | 29.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 13,652 | 17.20\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 218,617 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 18,538 | 8.50\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Brazos County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Brazos County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (36 Block Groups)10-25 percent ( 29 Block Groups)
25-45 percent ( 32 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent ( 21 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Brown County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Brown County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 43.81\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$48,365 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 37,855 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 29,433 | 77.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 27,115 | 71.60\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,337 | 3.50\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 109 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 270 | 0.70\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 602 | 1.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 36,179 | 95.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 35,988 | 95.10\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 191 | 0.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,676 | 4.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 18,681 | 49.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 19,174 | 50.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 14,409 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 7,623 | 52.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,852 | 19.80\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 526 | 3.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 181 | 1.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,717 | 18.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 249 | 1.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,907 | 13.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 805 | 5.60\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,543 | 24.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 510 | 3.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,181 | 15.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,271 | 8.80\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 4,432 | 30.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,986 | 34.60\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 36,785 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,999 | 16.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Brown County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




## Brown County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Callahan County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Callahan County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 39.74\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$48,651 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 13,856 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 12,522 | 90.40\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 11,916 | 86.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 126 | 0.90\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 5 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 69 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 406 | 2.90\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 13,638 | 98.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 13,500 | 97.40\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 138 | 1.00\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 218 | 1.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 6,899 | 49.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 6,957 | 50.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 5,367 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,796 | 52.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 851 | 15.90\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 188 | 3.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 74 | 1.40\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 952 | 17.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 46 | 0.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 789 | 14.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 293 | 5.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,431 | 26.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 158 | 2.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,032 | 19.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 567 | 10.60\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,315 | 24.50\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,078 | 38.70\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 13,769 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,745 | 19.90\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Callahan County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Callahan County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Cameron County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Cameron County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 55.14\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$38,758 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 30.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 421,666 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 89.70\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 43,585 | 10.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 37,770 | 9.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,683 | 0.40\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 573 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 2,792 | 0.70\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 47 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 49 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 671 | 0.20\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 324,484 | 77.00\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 318,542 | 75.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 5,942 | 1.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 97,182 | 23.00\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 204,948 | 48.60\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 216,718 | 51.40\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 124,605 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 65,112 | 52.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 30,715 | 24.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 4,265 | 3.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 2,194 | 1.80\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 17,408 | 14.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 2,174 | 1.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 10,091 | 8.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,953 | 3.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 37,820 | 30.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 13,229 | 10.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 13,688 | 11.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 7,628 | 6.10\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 57,083 | 45.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 38,630 | 31.00\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 419,669 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 52,089 | 12.40\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Cameron County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Populatio
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population

- Asian Population

American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance - 0-1

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Cameron County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Cass County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Cass County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 44.53\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$44,848 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 19.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 30,059 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,352 | 4.50\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 28,707 | 95.50\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 22,938 | 76.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,133 | 17.10\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 13 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 166 | 0.60\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 14 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 442 | 1.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 29,436 | 97.90\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 29,324 | 97.60\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 112 | 0.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 623 | 2.10\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 14,496 | 48.20\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 15,563 | 51.80\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 11,934 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,180 | 51.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,141 | 17.90\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 308 | 2.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 113 | 0.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,072 | 17.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 139 | 1.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,471 | 12.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 740 | 6.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,374 | 28.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 582 | 4.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,918 | 16.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,170 | 9.80\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,608 | 30.20\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,810 | 40.30\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 29,683 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,460 | 18.40\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Cass County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

- Non-Hispanic White Population
- Hispanic or Latino Population
- Black or African American Population

Asian Population

- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance

- 0-15

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ with no predominant ategory or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Cass County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 9 Block Groups)10-25 percent (11 Block Groups) 25-45 percent (7 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Cherokee County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Cherokee County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 46.34\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$48,186 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 52,118 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 40,060 | 76.90\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 31,628 | 60.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 7,035 | 13.50\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 290 | 0.60\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 227 | 0.40\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 43 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 837 | 1.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 46,436 | 89.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 46,293 | 88.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 143 | 0.30\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 5,682 | 10.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 26,587 | 51.00\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 25,531 | 49.00\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 18,138 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 9,557 | 52.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 3,582 | 19.70\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 713 | 3.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 356 | 2.00\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,970 | 16.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 394 | 2.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,892 | 10.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 794 | 4.40\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 4,898 | 27.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,188 | 6.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,350 | 13.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,179 | 6.50\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 6,353 | 35.00\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 5,938 | 32.70\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 49,386 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,095 | 12.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Cherokee County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| $15-85$ |
| 15-100Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |

## Population by Category



## Cherokee County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (11 Block Groups)
$10-25$ percent (16 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent ( 7 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Clay County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Clay County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 34.14\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$55,989 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 10,403 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 653 | 6.30\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 9,750 | 93.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 9,339 | 89.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 47 | 0.50\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 101 | 1.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 117 | 1.10\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 146 | 1.40\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 10,013 | 96.30\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 9,970 | 95.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 43 | 0.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 390 | 3.70\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 5,214 | 50.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 5,189 | 49.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,105 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,479 | 60.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 842 | 20.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 142 | 3.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 38 | 0.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 766 | 18.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 66 | 1.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 536 | 13.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 207 | 5.00\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 718 | 17.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 109 | 2.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 533 | 13.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 328 | 8.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,162 | 28.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,531 | 37.30\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 10,313 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,883 | 18.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Clay County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population

American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Clay County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Coleman County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Coleman County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 51.24\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$46,743 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 19.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 8,334 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 6,874 | 82.50\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 6,403 | 76.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 134 | 1.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 44 | 0.50\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 42 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 251 | 3.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 7,870 | 94.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 7,844 | 94.10\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 26 | 0.30\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 464 | 5.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 4,308 | 51.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 4,026 | 48.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 3,423 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,871 | 54.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 690 | 20.20\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 151 | 4.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 26 | 0.80\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 593 | 17.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 30 | 0.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 469 | 13.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 258 | 7.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 808 | 23.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 61 | 1.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 551 | 16.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 340 | 9.90\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 960 | 28.00\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,431 | 41.80\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 8,299 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,285 | 15.50\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Coleman County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Coleman County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Collingsworth County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Collingsworth County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 43.83\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$39,120 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 15.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 2,969 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 28.80\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,115 | 71.20\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,784 | 60.10\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 248 | 8.40\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 62 | 2.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 21 | 0.70\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 2,709 | 91.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 2,698 | 90.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 11 | 0.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 260 | 8.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 1,493 | 50.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 1,476 | 49.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,035 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 577 | 55.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 221 | 21.40\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 48 | 4.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 34 | 3.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 144 | 13.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 33 | 3.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 103 | 10.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4 | 0.40\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 266 | 25.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 67 | 6.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 160 | 15.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 108 | 10.40\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 379 | 36.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 330 | 31.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 2,904 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 494 | 17.00\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Collingsworth County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population
$\square$ Asian Population

- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$\square$ 0-15
15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Collingsworth County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Colorado County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Colorado County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.78\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,559 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 21,224 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 29.70\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 14,914 | 70.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 11,871 | 55.90\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,683 | 12.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 20 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 5 | 0.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 335 | 1.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 19,102 | 90.00\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 18,974 | 89.40\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 128 | 0.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 2,122 | 10.00\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 10,590 | 49.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,634 | 50.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,450 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,895 | 52.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,198 | 16.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 357 | 4.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 167 | 2.20\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,096 | 14.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 64 | 0.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 859 | 11.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 301 | 4.00\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,102 | 28.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 336 | 4.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,324 | 17.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 916 | 12.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,998 | 26.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,039 | 40.80\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 20,909 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,708 | 13.00\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Colorado County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population

- Black or African American Population

Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance

- 0-15
$\square$
Note: Block Groups with no predominant category or no category or no
population are blank

Population by Category



## Colorado County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 11 Block Groups)10-25 percent ( 6 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (1 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Comal County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Comal County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 30.90\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$79,936 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 8.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 141,642 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 38,756 | 27.40\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 102,886 | 72.60\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 95,622 | 67.50\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,828 | 2.00\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 119 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1,577 | 1.10\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 44 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 294 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 2,402 | 1.70\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 132,854 | 93.80\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 130,332 | 92.00\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 2,522 | 1.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 8,788 | 6.20\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 69,980 | 49.40\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 71,662 | 50.60\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 51,367 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 31,558 | 61.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 11,425 | 22.20\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 2,711 | 5.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 1,146 | 2.20\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 7,079 | 13.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 750 | 1.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 5,025 | 9.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,488 | 2.90\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 10,019 | 19.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,759 | 3.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 6,171 | 12.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 3,256 | 6.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 16,717 | 32.50\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 16,506 | 32.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 140,424 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 19,749 | 14.10\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Comal County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Comal County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Comanche County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Comanche County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.23\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$53,516 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 13,529 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 9,752 | 72.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 9,397 | 69.50\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 81 | 0.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 94 | 0.70\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 82 | 0.60\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 1 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 97 | 0.70\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 12,462 | 92.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 12,395 | 91.60\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 67 | 0.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,067 | 7.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 6,798 | 50.20\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 6,731 | 49.80\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 5,487 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,109 | 56.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,062 | 19.40\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 149 | 2.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 45 | 0.80\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 964 | 17.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 60 | 1.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 781 | 14.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 236 | 4.30\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,265 | 23.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 147 | 2.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 789 | 14.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 613 | 11.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,530 | 27.90\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,324 | 42.40\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 13,327 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,544 | 19.10\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Comanche County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group





## Comanche County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (7 Block Groups)
10-25 percent (5 Block Groups)$25-45$ percent (2 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Cooke County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Cooke County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.13\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$60,202 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 40,041 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 18.20\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 32,772 | 81.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 30,166 | 75.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,121 | 2.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 278 | 0.70\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 344 | 0.90\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 24 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 54 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 785 | 2.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 36,488 | 91.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 36,228 | 90.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 260 | 0.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,553 | 8.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 19,871 | 49.60\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 20,170 | 50.40\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 15,351 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 8,421 | 54.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,912 | 19.00\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 900 | 5.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 354 | 2.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,774 | 18.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 236 | 1.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,981 | 12.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 580 | 3.80\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,256 | 21.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 836 | 5.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,784 | 11.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,062 | 6.90\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 5,118 | 33.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,929 | 32.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 39,576 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,445 | 13.80\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Cooke County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population
- Black or African American Population
- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population
- Two or More Races Population

Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-1
15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant } \\ & \text { cater }\end{aligned}$ category or no
population are blank

Population by Category



## Cooke County：Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent（17 Block Groups）
－10－25 percent（6 Block Groups）25－45 percent（5 Block Groups） $\geq 45$ percent（2 Block Groups）

Distribution of Percent in Poverty
55
50
45
40
른 35

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { W⿳亠二口欠口⿱亠䒑𧰨 } & 25 \\ & 20\end{array}$



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Coryell County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Coryell County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 39.87\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,893 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 75,280 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 61,519 | 81.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 44,173 | 58.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 9,617 | 12.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 489 | 0.60\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1,468 | 2.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 561 | 0.70\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 5,211 | 6.90\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 70,192 | 93.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 66,057 | 87.70\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 4,135 | 5.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 5,088 | 6.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 37,556 | 49.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 37,724 | 50.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 22,322 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 11,821 | 53.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,909 | 26.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,143 | 5.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 524 | 2.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 3,568 | 16.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 356 | 1.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,332 | 10.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 682 | 3.10\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 5,790 | 25.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,597 | 7.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,013 | 13.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,470 | 6.60\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 9,248 | 41.40\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 5,306 | 23.80\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 57,995 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 10,424 | 18.00\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Coryell County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Coryell County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Dallas County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Dallas County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 54.11\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$59,607 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 2,606,868 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 1,559,434 | 59.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 759,485 | 29.10\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 580,189 | 22.30\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 5,411 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 162,770 | 6.20\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 1,014 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 4,810 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 45,755 | 1.80\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 1,963,011 | 75.30\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 1,933,223 | 74.20\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 29,788 | 1.10\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 643,857 | 24.70\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 1,285,388 | 49.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 1,321,480 | 50.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 928,341 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 403,376 | 43.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 184,233 | 19.80\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 57,714 | 6.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 23,715 | 2.60\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 186,367 | 20.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 12,446 | 1.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 124,798 | 13.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 22,795 | 2.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 280,884 | 30.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 66,936 | 7.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 143,708 | 15.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 49,466 | 5.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 327,807 | 35.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 197,580 | 21.30\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 2,588,571 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 244,865 | 9.50\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Dallas County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Dallas County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty

$$
\leq 10 \text { percent (770 Block Groups) }
$$

10-25 percent (537 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (297 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent ( 65 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Delta County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Delta County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 44.91\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$55,357 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 5,249 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 4,841 | 92.20\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 4,239 | 80.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 461 | 8.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 4 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 28 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 4 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 105 | 2.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 5,180 | 98.70\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 5,109 | 97.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 71 | 1.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 69 | 1.30\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 2,488 | 47.40\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,761 | 52.60\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,999 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,153 | 57.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 392 | 19.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 59 | 3.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 9 | 0.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 328 | 16.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 32 | 1.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 258 | 12.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 71 | 3.60\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 459 | 23.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 48 | 2.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 274 | 13.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 160 | 8.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 535 | 26.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 729 | 36.50\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 5,183 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 933 | 18.00\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Delta County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

- Non-Hispanic White Population
- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population
Asian Population

- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$\square$ 0-15
15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant } \\ & \text { category or no }\end{aligned}$ category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Delta County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (1 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (2 Block Groups)
- 25-45 percent (1 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Denton County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Denton County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 31.68\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$51,038 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 23.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 833,822 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 19.30\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 672,889 | 80.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 494,029 | 59.20\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 79,871 | 9.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 3,045 | 0.40\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 72,148 | 8.70\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 629 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 1,191 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 21,976 | 2.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 704,223 | 84.50\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 691,799 | 83.00\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 12,424 | 1.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 129,599 | 15.50\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 410,114 | 49.20\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 423,708 | 50.80\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 290,229 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 164,358 | 56.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 81,494 | 28.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 14,467 | 5.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 4,541 | 1.60\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 43,700 | 15.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 3,316 | 1.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 30,245 | 10.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4,901 | 1.70\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 67,704 | 23.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 14,636 | 5.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 37,320 | 12.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 12,149 | 4.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 111,264 | 38.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 55,555 | 19.10\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 830,187 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 66,033 | 8.00\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Denton County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Denton County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (264 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (88 Block Groups)$25-45$ percent (19 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (7 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Dickens County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Dickens County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 44.93\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$42,540 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 2,203 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 1,546 | 70.20\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,476 | 67.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 59 | 2.70\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 11 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 2,091 | 94.90\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 2,085 | 94.60\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 6 | 0.30\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 112 | 5.10\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 1,084 | 49.20\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 1,119 | 50.80\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 845 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 408 | 48.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 131 | 15.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 28 | 3.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 4 | 0.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 117 | 13.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 6 | 0.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 95 | 11.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 21 | 2.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 292 | 34.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 42 | 5.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 209 | 24.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 131 | 15.50\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 205 | 24.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 339 | 40.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 2,088 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 411 | 19.70\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Dickens County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

- Non-Hispanic White Population
- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance

- 0-15

Note: Block Groups
with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Dickens County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Duval County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Duval County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.76\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$41,186 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 25.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 11,268 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 1,202 | 10.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,053 | 9.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 148 | 1.30\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 1 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 10,658 | 94.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 10,645 | 94.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 13 | 0.10\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 610 | 5.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 5,717 | 50.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 5,551 | 49.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 3,511 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,536 | 43.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 584 | 16.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 295 | 8.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 172 | 4.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 534 | 15.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 422 | 12.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 182 | 5.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,146 | 32.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 369 | 10.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 454 | 12.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 362 | 10.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,374 | 39.10\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,381 | 39.30\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 10,754 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,500 | 23.20\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Duval County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




## Duval County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty





Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Edwards County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Edwards County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.42\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$40,766 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 6.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 1,918 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 1,086 | 56.60\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 832 | 43.40\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 830 | 43.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1 | 0.10\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 1,805 | 94.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 1,804 | 94.10\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 1 | 0.10\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 113 | 5.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 993 | 51.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 925 | 48.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 789 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 352 | 44.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 40 | 5.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 4 | 0.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 4 | 0.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 212 | 26.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 144 | 18.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 120 | 15.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 221 | 28.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 200 | 25.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 97 | 12.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 104 | 13.20\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 444 | 56.30\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 1,906 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 561 | 29.40\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Edwards County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Edwards County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Ellis County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Ellis County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.19\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$76,871 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 173,772 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 128,195 | 73.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 105,705 | 60.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 17,028 | 9.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 485 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1,104 | 0.60\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 65 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 112 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 3,696 | 2.10\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 160,377 | 92.30\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 159,238 | 91.60\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 1,139 | 0.70\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 13,395 | 7.70\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 85,705 | 49.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 88,067 | 50.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 57,307 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 36,123 | 63.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 15,433 | 26.90\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 2,420 | 4.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 1,164 | 2.00\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 6,823 | 11.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 612 | 1.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 4,599 | 8.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,495 | 2.60\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 11,941 | 20.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 3,193 | 5.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 5,689 | 9.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 3,111 | 5.40\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 23,201 | 40.50\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 14,835 | 25.90\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 172,528 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 20,360 | 11.80\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Ellis County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population
- Black or African American Population
- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance - 0-15

Population by Category



## Ellis County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Erath County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Erath County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 45.07\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,742 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 21.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 41,841 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 33,020 | 78.90\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 31,197 | 74.60\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 776 | 1.90\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 30 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 369 | 0.90\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 85 | 0.20\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 9 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 554 | 1.30\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 38,218 | 91.30\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 37,877 | 90.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 341 | 0.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,623 | 8.70\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 20,347 | 48.60\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 21,494 | 51.40\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 13,595 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 7,318 | 53.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,664 | 19.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 919 | 6.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 338 | 2.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,088 | 15.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 83 | 0.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,545 | 11.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 491 | 3.60\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,270 | 24.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 463 | 3.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,229 | 16.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 803 | 5.90\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,936 | 29.00\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,618 | 26.60\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 41,333 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,169 | 12.50\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Erath County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| categry or no |
| population are blank |

85-100

Population by Category



## Erath County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (12 Block Groups)10-25 percent (8 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (6 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (3 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Falls County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Falls County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 46.67\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$39,497 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 25.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 17,272 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,272 | 76.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 8,851 | 51.20\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 4,164 | 24.10\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 68 | 0.40\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 82 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 107 | 0.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 16,307 | 94.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 16,132 | 93.40\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 175 | 1.00\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 965 | 5.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 8,127 | 47.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,145 | 52.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 5,199 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,334 | 44.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 753 | 14.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 165 | 3.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 80 | 1.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,380 | 26.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 144 | 2.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,012 | 19.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 384 | 7.40\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,320 | 25.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 253 | 4.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 692 | 13.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 484 | 9.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,365 | 26.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,033 | 39.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 15,526 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,480 | 22.40\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Falls County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Falls County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (3 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent ( 3 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (3 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Fannin County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Fannin County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 39.44\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$54,648 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 12.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 34,537 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 11.30\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 30,637 | 88.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 27,211 | 78.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,944 | 5.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 231 | 0.70\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 220 | 0.60\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 13 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 4 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,014 | 2.90\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 32,706 | 94.70\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 32,424 | 93.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 282 | 0.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,831 | 5.30\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 18,246 | 52.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 16,291 | 47.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,453 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 6,880 | 55.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,477 | 19.90\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 425 | 3.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 140 | 1.10\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,269 | 18.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 170 | 1.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,728 | 13.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 627 | 5.00\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,879 | 23.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 389 | 3.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,633 | 13.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,066 | 8.60\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,735 | 30.00\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,343 | 34.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 31,653 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,864 | 15.40\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Fannin County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Fannin County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 16 Block Groups)10-25 percent (10 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (4 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Fayette County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Fayette County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.75\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$60,189 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 25,141 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 21.00\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 19,865 | 79.00\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 17,907 | 71.20\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,645 | 6.50\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 11 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 119 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 25 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 158 | 0.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 23,218 | 92.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 23,108 | 91.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 110 | 0.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,923 | 7.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 12,393 | 49.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 12,748 | 50.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 9,135 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 5,368 | 58.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,668 | 18.30\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 315 | 3.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 111 | 1.20\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,450 | 15.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 65 | 0.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 947 | 10.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 397 | 4.30\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,002 | 21.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 335 | 3.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,294 | 14.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 890 | 9.70\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,450 | 26.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,829 | 41.90\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 24,726 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,727 | 15.10\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Fayette County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$\square$ 0-1
15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Fayette County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\square 10$ percent ( 15 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (8 Block Groups)$25-45$ percent (0 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (2 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Fisher County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Fisher County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.31\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$46,146 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 3,856 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,595 | 67.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 2,382 | 61.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 102 | 2.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 5 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 12 | 0.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 94 | 2.40\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 3,682 | 95.50\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 3,660 | 94.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 22 | 0.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 174 | 4.50\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 1,833 | 47.50\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,023 | 52.50\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,601 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 808 | 50.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 299 | 18.70\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 113 | 7.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 45 | 2.80\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 235 | 14.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 8 | 0.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 207 | 12.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 122 | 7.60\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 445 | 27.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 60 | 3.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 342 | 21.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 235 | 14.70\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 443 | 27.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 639 | 39.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 3,838 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 714 | 18.60\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Fisher County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$\square$ 0-15
$15-85$
$85-100$
Note: Block Groups
with no predominant category or no cotegulation are blank

Population by Category


## Fisher County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Frio County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Frio County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 50.25\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$46,729 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 19,871 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 79.30\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 4,118 | 20.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 3,233 | 16.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 631 | 3.20\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 9 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 160 | 0.80\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 14 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 71 | 0.40\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 16,417 | 82.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 16,327 | 82.20\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 90 | 0.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,454 | 17.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 11,883 | 59.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 7,988 | 40.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,542 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,443 | 53.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 751 | 16.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 173 | 3.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 130 | 2.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 575 | 12.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 45 | 1.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 483 | 10.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 187 | 4.10\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,351 | 29.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 465 | 10.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 622 | 13.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 300 | 6.60\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,690 | 37.20\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,677 | 36.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 15,664 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,594 | 16.60\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Frio County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



Population by Category


## Frio County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Gaines County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Gaines County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.74\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$63,054 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 20,706 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 12,115 | 58.50\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 11,493 | 55.50\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 450 | 2.20\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 57 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 102 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 9 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 4 | 0.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 15,293 | 73.90\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 15,021 | 72.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 272 | 1.30\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 5,413 | 26.10\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 10,556 | 51.00\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,150 | 49.00\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 5,812 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,832 | 65.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,018 | 34.70\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 175 | 3.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 75 | 1.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 869 | 15.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 128 | 2.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 592 | 10.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 166 | 2.90\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 936 | 16.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 237 | 4.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 539 | 9.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 347 | 6.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,663 | 45.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,319 | 22.70\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 20,597 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,483 | 12.10\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Gaines County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



Andrews
Martin
County
County
ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispar or Lano Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population

American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$\square$ 0-15
15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Gaines County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Andrews
County

Martin
County

Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (6 Block Groups)10-25 percent (4 Block Groups) $25-45$ percent (2 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent (1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Garza County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Garza County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 35.19\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$49,627 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 6,070 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,900 | 47.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 2,407 | 39.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 342 | 5.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 119 | 2.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 24 | 0.40\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 3,959 | 65.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 3,897 | 64.20\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 62 | 1.00\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 2,111 | 34.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 3,829 | 63.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,241 | 36.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,543 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 921 | 59.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 342 | 22.20\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 114 | 7.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 75 | 4.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 181 | 11.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 122 | 7.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 47 | 3.00\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 327 | 21.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 52 | 3.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 176 | 11.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 139 | 9.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 504 | 32.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 569 | 36.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 4,208 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 720 | 17.10\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Garza County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

- Non-Hispanic White Population
- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population
- Two or More Races Population

Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$0-15$
$15-85$
$85-100$
Note: Block Groups
with no predominant
category or no
category or no
population are blank

Population by Category


## Garza County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Gillespie County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Gillespie County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.75\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$59,155 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 11.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 26,459 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 20,327 | 76.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 19,765 | 74.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 21 | 0.10\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 85 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 32 | 0.10\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 28 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 396 | 1.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 23,715 | 89.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 23,522 | 88.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 193 | 0.70\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 2,744 | 10.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 12,798 | 48.40\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 13,661 | 51.60\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 10,694 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 5,927 | 55.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,509 | 14.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 293 | 2.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 82 | 0.80\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,554 | 14.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 47 | 0.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,165 | 10.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 614 | 5.70\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,920 | 27.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 343 | 3.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,070 | 19.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,413 | 13.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,454 | 22.90\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 5,250 | 49.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 26,117 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,639 | 13.90\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Gillespie County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Gillespie County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Kerr County
Kendall
County


Percent of Population in Poverty

10-25 percent (4 Block Groups)25-45 percent (1 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent ( 0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Grayson County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Grayson County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.49\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$54,815 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 131,014 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 113,437 | 86.60\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 98,801 | 75.40\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 6,871 | 5.20\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,355 | 1.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 2,062 | 1.60\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 12 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 177 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 4,159 | 3.20\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 122,804 | 93.70\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 121,550 | 92.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 1,254 | 1.00\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 8,210 | 6.30\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 63,944 | 48.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 67,070 | 51.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 48,454 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 24,107 | 49.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 9,270 | 19.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 2,342 | 4.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 1,096 | 2.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 8,509 | 17.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 794 | 1.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 6,085 | 12.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 2,024 | 4.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 13,496 | 27.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 2,562 | 5.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 7,739 | 16.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 3,894 | 8.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 15,815 | 32.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 15,777 | 32.60\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 129,692 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 22,067 | 17.00\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Grayson County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-15
$\begin{array}{r}15 \\ \square \\ \hline\end{array}$
Note: Block Groups
with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Grayson County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Gregg County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Gregg County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.55\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$50,180 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 123,443 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 18.70\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 100,343 | 81.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 70,988 | 57.50\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 24,425 | 19.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 213 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1,577 | 1.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 130 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 205 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 2,805 | 2.30\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 112,300 | 91.00\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 111,561 | 90.40\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 739 | 0.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 11,143 | 9.00\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 60,105 | 48.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 63,338 | 51.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 45,460 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 20,480 | 45.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 7,936 | 17.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 3,039 | 6.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 1,135 | 2.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 8,361 | 18.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 517 | 1.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 6,129 | 13.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,445 | 3.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 13,580 | 29.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 3,245 | 7.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 6,807 | 15.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 3,320 | 7.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 14,833 | 32.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 12,788 | 28.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 121,085 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 17,367 | 14.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Gregg County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Gregg County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 35 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent ( 30 Block Groups)25-45 percent (23 Block Groups)
$\square 45$ percent (7 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Hall County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Hall County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 61.18\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$34,673 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 23.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 3,048 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 34.80\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 1,988 | 65.20\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,695 | 55.60\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 188 | 6.20\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 16 | 0.50\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 8 | 0.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 81 | 2.70\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 2,698 | 88.50\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 2,652 | 87.00\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 46 | 1.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 350 | 11.50\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 1,534 | 50.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 1,514 | 49.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,267 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 588 | 46.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 140 | 11.00\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 56 | 4.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 12 | 0.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 266 | 21.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 25 | 2.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 216 | 17.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 89 | 7.00\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 357 | 28.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 71 | 5.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 205 | 16.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 131 | 10.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 299 | 23.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 471 | 37.20\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 2,993 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 560 | 18.70\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Hall County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




## Hall County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Harrison County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Harrison County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.40\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,220 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 66,580 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 13.10\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 57,853 | 86.90\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 42,336 | 63.60\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 13,760 | 20.70\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 164 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 528 | 0.80\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 14 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 13 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,038 | 1.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 62,986 | 94.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 62,484 | 93.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 502 | 0.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,594 | 5.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 32,338 | 48.60\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 34,242 | 51.40\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 23,292 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 12,618 | 54.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,010 | 21.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 847 | 3.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 264 | 1.10\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 3,614 | 15.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 413 | 1.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,396 | 10.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 808 | 3.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 6,213 | 26.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,681 | 7.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,705 | 11.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,590 | 6.80\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 8,390 | 36.00\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 7,503 | 32.20\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 65,819 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 8,691 | 13.20\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Harrison County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

- Non-Hispanic White Population
- Hispanic or Latino Pop

Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$\square 0-1$
$15-85$
$85-100$
Note: Block Groups
with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Harrison County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\square 10$ percent ( 16 Block Groups)10-25 percent ( 25 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (4 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (7 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Hartley County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Hartley County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 35.68\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$58,298 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 6.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 5,669 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 4,154 | 73.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 3,400 | 60.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 420 | 7.40\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 20 | 0.40\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 82 | 1.40\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 35 | 0.60\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 197 | 3.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 5,098 | 89.90\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 5,091 | 89.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 7 | 0.10\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 571 | 10.10\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 3,346 | 59.00\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,323 | 41.00\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,678 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,127 | 67.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 535 | 31.90\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 61 | 3.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 24 | 1.40\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 268 | 16.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 249 | 14.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 68 | 4.10\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 222 | 13.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 40 | 2.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 176 | 10.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 141 | 8.40\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 633 | 37.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 540 | 32.20\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 4,130 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 574 | 13.90\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Hartley County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



[^1]

ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hisario La Pulatio

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population

American Indian and Alaska Native PopulationNative Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance

- 0-15

| $15-85$ |
| :---: |
| $-85-100$ |

Note: Block Groups with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Hartley County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Potter County


Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Hays County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Hays County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 46.12\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$68,717 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 15.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 213,366 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 38.90\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 130,297 | 61.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 114,727 | 53.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 8,207 | 3.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 522 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 3,210 | 1.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 341 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 3,290 | 1.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 194,535 | 91.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 190,939 | 89.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 3,596 | 1.70\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 18,831 | 8.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 106,252 | 49.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 107,114 | 50.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 73,437 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 37,636 | 51.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 17,059 | 23.20\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 5,110 | 7.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 1,612 | 2.20\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 13,729 | 18.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,038 | 1.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 8,153 | 11.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,551 | 2.10\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 16,962 | 23.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 2,585 | 3.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 8,554 | 11.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 3,074 | 4.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 24,555 | 33.40\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 15,719 | 21.40\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 211,703 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 19,691 | 9.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Hays County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native PopulationNative Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-1

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ with no predominant ategory or no population are blank

Population by Category


Hays County


## Hays County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\square 10$ percent ( 43 Block Groups)10-25 percent (19 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (10 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (8 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Henderson County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Henderson County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 43.28\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$47,355 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 81,070 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 70,723 | 87.20\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 63,378 | 78.20\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,150 | 6.40\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 622 | 0.80\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 525 | 0.60\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 26 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 43 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 979 | 1.20\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 77,195 | 95.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 76,545 | 94.40\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 650 | 0.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,875 | 4.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 39,485 | 48.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 41,585 | 51.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 30,757 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 16,563 | 53.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,197 | 16.90\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,987 | 6.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 746 | 2.40\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 4,446 | 14.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 317 | 1.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 3,214 | 10.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,371 | 4.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 7,761 | 25.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,223 | 4.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 4,440 | 14.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 2,822 | 9.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 8,872 | 28.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 12,387 | 40.30\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 80,091 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 14,372 | 17.90\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Henderson County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native PopulationNative Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance - 0-15

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ with no predominant ategory or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Henderson County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (17 Block Groups)
10-25 percent ( 28 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (7 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (2 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Hill County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Hill County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.22\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$53,307 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 15.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 35,689 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 20.60\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 28,335 | 79.40\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 25,196 | 70.60\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,239 | 6.30\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 108 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 143 | 0.40\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 59 | 0.20\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 20 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 570 | 1.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 33,123 | 92.80\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 32,989 | 92.40\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 134 | 0.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 2,566 | 7.20\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 17,809 | 49.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 17,880 | 50.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 12,992 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 7,063 | 54.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,419 | 18.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 590 | 4.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 163 | 1.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,181 | 16.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 115 | 0.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,679 | 12.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 758 | 5.80\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,158 | 24.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 784 | 6.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,663 | 12.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,069 | 8.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 4,056 | 31.20\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,896 | 37.70\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 35,029 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,228 | 17.80\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Hill County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Hill County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 10 Block Groups)10-25 percent (12 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (2 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Hood County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Hood County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.64\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$64,041 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 58,318 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| $\mathrm{RACE}^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 51,086 | 87.60\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 49,117 | 84.20\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 441 | 0.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 517 | 0.90\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 411 | 0.70\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 37 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 563 | 1.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 56,717 | 97.30\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 56,438 | 96.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 279 | 0.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,601 | 2.70\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 28,416 | 48.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 29,902 | 51.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 22,152 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 13,427 | 60.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 4,262 | 19.20\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 835 | 3.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 289 | 1.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,955 | 13.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 165 | 0.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,152 | 9.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 815 | 3.70\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 4,935 | 22.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 605 | 2.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,315 | 15.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,935 | 8.70\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 6,200 | 28.00\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 9,183 | 41.50\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 57,636 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,766 | 11.70\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Hood County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$0-15$
$\square$
$15-85$
$85-100$
Note: Block Groups
with no predominant
category or no
population are blank

Population by Category



## Hood County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (16 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (12 Block Groups)$25-45$ percent (2 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Hopkins County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Hopkins County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.30\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,078 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 36,486 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 16.90\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 30,329 | 83.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 26,738 | 73.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,555 | 7.00\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 100 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 243 | 0.70\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 44 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 38 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 611 | 1.70\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 33,794 | 92.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 33,486 | 91.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 308 | 0.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 2,692 | 7.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 17,904 | 49.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 18,582 | 50.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 13,424 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 7,455 | 55.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,733 | 20.40\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 669 | 5.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 305 | 2.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,874 | 14.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 100 | 0.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,196 | 8.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 444 | 3.30\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,426 | 25.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 657 | 4.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,883 | 14.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,070 | 8.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 4,662 | 34.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,439 | 33.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 36,013 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,508 | 15.30\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Hopkins County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population
Asian Population

- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance

- 0-15 population are blank

Population by Category



## Hopkins County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (9 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (12 Block Groups)$25-45$ percent ( 6 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Houston County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Houston County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 49.07\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$37,904 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 24.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 22,954 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 20,410 | 88.90\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 14,192 | 61.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,717 | 24.90\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 53 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 88 | 0.40\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 360 | 1.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 22,208 | 96.80\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 22,115 | 96.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 93 | 0.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 746 | 3.20\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 12,452 | 54.20\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,502 | 45.80\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 8,252 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,957 | 48.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,224 | 14.80\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 414 | 5.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 129 | 1.60\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,409 | 17.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 80 | 1.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,106 | 13.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 564 | 6.80\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,472 | 30.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 457 | 5.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,417 | 17.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 734 | 8.90\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,279 | 27.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,384 | 41.00\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 19,877 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,846 | 19.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Houston County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group


$A^{\circ} \underline{-}^{20}$

## Houston County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (3 Block Groups)10-25 percent (13 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (2 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (3 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Jack County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Jack County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.56\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,045 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 15.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 8,852 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 7,358 | 83.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 6,830 | 77.20\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 420 | 4.70\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 24 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 9 | 0.10\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 22 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 53 | 0.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 8,387 | 94.70\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 8,258 | 93.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 129 | 1.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 465 | 5.30\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 5,053 | 57.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 3,799 | 42.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 3,168 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,796 | 56.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 740 | 23.40\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 131 | 4.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 48 | 1.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 467 | 14.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 59 | 1.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 356 | 11.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 84 | 2.70\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 774 | 24.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 162 | 5.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 447 | 14.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 229 | 7.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,110 | 35.00\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,003 | 31.70\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 7,717 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,330 | 17.20\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Jack County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance

- 0-15

Note: Block Groups with no predominant category or no cotegulation are blank

Population by Category


## Jack County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Jefferson County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Jefferson County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 43.39\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$51,248 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 254,340 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 201,632 | 79.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 103,229 | 40.60\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 85,092 | 33.50\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 515 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 9,493 | 3.70\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 130 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 220 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 2,953 | 1.20\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 223,852 | 88.00\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 221,466 | 87.10\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 2,386 | 0.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 30,488 | 12.00\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 130,051 | 51.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 124,289 | 48.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 92,988 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 40,846 | 43.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 16,241 | 17.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 5,022 | 5.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 1,765 | 1.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 17,917 | 19.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,026 | 1.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 13,875 | 14.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,284 | 3.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 29,203 | 31.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 7,653 | 8.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 14,544 | 15.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 6,753 | 7.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 30,279 | 32.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 25,381 | 27.30\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 240,481 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 34,855 | 14.50\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Jefferson County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Jefferson County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Johnson County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Johnson County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.05\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$64,359 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 167,212 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 21.40\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 131,498 | 78.60\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 120,380 | 72.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,794 | 3.50\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 568 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1,536 | 0.90\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 661 | 0.40\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 92 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 2,467 | 1.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 160,122 | 95.80\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 158,761 | 94.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 1,361 | 0.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 7,090 | 4.20\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 83,534 | 50.00\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 83,678 | 50.00\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 57,310 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 33,844 | 59.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 13,918 | 24.30\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 2,749 | 4.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 1,093 | 1.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 8,049 | 14.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 769 | 1.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 5,244 | 9.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,252 | 2.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 12,668 | 22.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 3,158 | 5.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 6,295 | 11.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 3,300 | 5.80\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 22,237 | 38.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 15,905 | 27.80\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 164,746 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 16,767 | 10.20\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

Johnson County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group


ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population
- Black or African American Population
- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$0-15$
$15-85$
$85-100$
Note: Block Groups
with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Johnson County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Jones County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Jones County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.65\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$50,344 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 19,943 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 14,449 | 72.50\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 10,799 | 54.10\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,790 | 14.00\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 42 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 77 | 0.40\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 32 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 709 | 3.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 19,238 | 96.50\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 19,118 | 95.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 120 | 0.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 705 | 3.50\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 12,527 | 62.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 7,416 | 37.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 5,696 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,060 | 53.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 873 | 15.30\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 339 | 6.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 110 | 1.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 851 | 14.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 99 | 1.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 571 | 10.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 243 | 4.30\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,446 | 25.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 327 | 5.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 809 | 14.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 542 | 9.50\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,815 | 31.90\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,115 | 37.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 12,839 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,647 | 20.60\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Jones County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

- Non-Hispanic White Population

Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$\square$ 0-15 population are blank

Population by Category


## Jones County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Kaufman County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Kaufman County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.95\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$70,107 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 123,804 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 97,280 | 78.60\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 78,847 | 63.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 14,504 | 11.70\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 332 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1,590 | 1.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 55 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 65 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,887 | 1.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 113,993 | 92.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 112,919 | 91.20\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 1,074 | 0.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 9,811 | 7.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 60,806 | 49.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 62,998 | 50.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 38,015 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 22,581 | 59.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 10,607 | 27.90\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,876 | 4.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 814 | 2.10\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 4,846 | 12.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 577 | 1.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,954 | 7.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 939 | 2.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 8,712 | 22.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 2,271 | 6.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,941 | 10.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,955 | 5.10\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 16,478 | 43.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 9,735 | 25.60\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 122,679 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 15,575 | 12.70\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Kaufman County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| categry or no |
| population are blank |

85-100

## Population by Category



## Kaufman County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty
Van Zandt
County



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Kendall County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Kendall County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.61\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$84,747 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 5.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 43,769 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 33,319 | 76.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 31,664 | 72.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 214 | 0.50\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 52 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 392 | 0.90\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 55 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 942 | 2.20\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 40,864 | 93.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 40,152 | 91.70\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 712 | 1.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 2,905 | 6.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 21,485 | 49.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 22,284 | 50.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 14,253 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 9,196 | 64.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 3,565 | 25.00\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 615 | 4.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 335 | 2.40\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,619 | 11.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 265 | 1.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,139 | 8.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 418 | 2.90\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,823 | 19.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 574 | 4.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,717 | 12.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 977 | 6.90\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 5,000 | 35.10\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,988 | 35.00\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 43,339 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,773 | 13.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Kendall County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population

- Black or African American Population
- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance

- 0-1 population are blank

Population by Category


## Kendall County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (17 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (4 Block Groups)
- 25-45 percent (0 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Lamar County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Lamar County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.31\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$45,117 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 49,611 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| $\mathrm{RACE}^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,902 | 7.90\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 45,709 | 92.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 36,920 | 74.40\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 6,324 | 12.70\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 271 | 0.50\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 382 | 0.80\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 56 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 16 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,740 | 3.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 47,624 | 96.00\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 47,079 | 94.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 545 | 1.10\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,987 | 4.00\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 23,770 | 47.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 25,841 | 52.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 19,793 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 9,555 | 48.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 3,268 | 16.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 945 | 4.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 393 | 2.00\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 3,131 | 15.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 297 | 1.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,384 | 12.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 851 | 4.30\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 6,162 | 31.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,352 | 6.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,430 | 17.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 2,024 | 10.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 6,021 | 30.40\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 6,714 | 33.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 49,061 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 9,534 | 19.40\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Lamar County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| category or no |
| population are blank |

Population by Category



## Lamar County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Limestone County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Limestone County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.59\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$44,418 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 23,417 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 21.90\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 18,287 | 78.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 13,735 | 58.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 3,945 | 16.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 108 | 0.50\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 177 | 0.80\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 67 | 0.30\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 63 | 0.30\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 192 | 0.80\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 21,215 | 90.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 21,070 | 90.00\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 145 | 0.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 2,202 | 9.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 12,010 | 51.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 11,407 | 48.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 8,377 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,275 | 51.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,514 | 18.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 358 | 4.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 171 | 2.00\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,644 | 19.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 166 | 2.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,206 | 14.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 418 | 5.00\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,100 | 25.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 434 | 5.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,074 | 12.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 621 | 7.40\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,672 | 31.90\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,888 | 34.50\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 22,585 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 3,805 | 16.80\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Limestone County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| category or no |
| population are blank |

## Population by Category




## Limestone County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (5 Block Groups)10-25 percent (7 Block Groups)
25-45 percent (4 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (2 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Lubbock County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Lubbock County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 44.36\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,429 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 304,808 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 196,815 | 64.60\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 162,989 | 53.50\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 20,125 | 6.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,110 | 0.40\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 6,494 | 2.10\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 200 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 349 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 5,548 | 1.80\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 286,682 | 94.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 283,208 | 92.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 3,474 | 1.10\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 18,126 | 5.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 150,307 | 49.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 154,501 | 50.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 113,488 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 48,760 | 43.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 20,030 | 17.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 7,821 | 6.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 3,023 | 2.70\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 23,079 | 20.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,390 | 1.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 14,650 | 12.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 2,768 | 2.40\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 33,828 | 29.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 6,960 | 6.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 17,189 | 15.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 7,291 | 6.40\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 36,680 | 32.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 26,313 | 23.20\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 300,582 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 41,130 | 13.70\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Lubbock County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance
$\square$ Note: Block Groups with no predominant category or no cotegulation are blank

Population by Category


## Lubbock County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 72 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent ( 67 Block Groups)25-45 percent ( 52 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 13 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Lynn County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Lynn County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 46.95\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$43,382 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 5,830 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 3,077 | 52.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 2,874 | 49.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 41 | 0.70\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 4 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 46 | 0.80\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 6 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 106 | 1.80\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 5,508 | 94.50\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 5,422 | 93.00\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 86 | 1.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 322 | 5.50\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 3,011 | 51.60\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 2,819 | 48.40\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 2,154 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,209 | 56.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 497 | 23.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 31 | 1.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 26 | 1.20\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 403 | 18.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 28 | 1.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 336 | 15.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 144 | 6.70\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 511 | 23.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 128 | 5.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 235 | 10.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 180 | 8.40\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 758 | 35.20\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 721 | 33.50\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 5,789 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,352 | 23.40\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Lynn County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance
$\square$ 0-15 category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Lynn County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (1 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (2 Block Groups)$25-45$ percent ( 1 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent ( 0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty


Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Marion County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Marion County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.35\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$37,662 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 20.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 10,017 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 9,602 | 95.90\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 7,097 | 70.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,294 | 22.90\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 11 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 32 | 0.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 41 | 0.40\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 127 | 1.30\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 9,803 | 97.90\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 9,718 | 97.00\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 85 | 0.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 214 | 2.10\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 4,858 | 48.50\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 5,159 | 51.50\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,715 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,261 | 48.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 541 | 11.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 65 | 1.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 10 | 0.20\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 991 | 21.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 7 | 0.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 782 | 16.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 318 | 6.70\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,398 | 29.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 125 | 2.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 890 | 18.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 546 | 11.60\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 920 | 19.50\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,951 | 41.40\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 9,886 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,189 | 22.10\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Marion County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population
- Black or African American Population

Asian Population

- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance - 0-15

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant } \\ & \text { 1 }\end{aligned}$ category or no population are blank

Population by Category


Marion County


## Marion County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (3 Block Groups)10-25 percent (4 Block Groups) 25-45 percent (2 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent (1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for McLennan County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

McLennan County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 44.97\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$49,778 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 19.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 251,089 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 184,941 | 73.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 140,429 | 55.90\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 35,807 | 14.30\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 455 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 3,961 | 1.60\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 62 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 392 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 3,835 | 1.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 229,965 | 91.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 227,279 | 90.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 2,686 | 1.10\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 21,124 | 8.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 122,580 | 48.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 128,509 | 51.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 90,054 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 41,425 | 46.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 15,886 | 17.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 4,928 | 5.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 1,979 | 2.20\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 15,709 | 17.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,348 | 1.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 10,040 | 11.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 2,728 | 3.00\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 27,992 | 31.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 7,009 | 7.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 13,652 | 15.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 6,301 | 7.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 30,438 | 33.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 25,003 | 27.80\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 246,845 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 33,345 | 13.50\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## McLennan County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-15
15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant } \\ & \text { 15 }\end{aligned}$ category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## McLennan County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 63 Block Groups)10-25 percent (47 Block Groups)
25-45 percent ( 35 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 20 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Montague County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Montague County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.67\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$51,765 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 19,489 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| $\mathrm{RACE}^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 17,351 | 89.00\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 16,720 | 85.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 131 | 0.70\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 159 | 0.80\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 341 | 1.70\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 18,572 | 95.30\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 18,487 | 94.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 85 | 0.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 917 | 4.70\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 9,460 | 48.50\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 10,029 | 51.50\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,800 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,264 | 54.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,402 | 18.00\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 347 | 4.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 111 | 1.40\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,350 | 17.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 113 | 1.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,023 | 13.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 423 | 5.40\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,839 | 23.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 344 | 4.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,209 | 15.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 720 | 9.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,218 | 28.40\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,949 | 37.80\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 19,189 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,071 | 21.20\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Montague County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




## Montague County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Montgomery County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Montgomery County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 36.19\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$80,902 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 9.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 571,949 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 433,868 | 75.90\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 377,623 | 66.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 27,435 | 4.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 1,085 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 16,677 | 2.90\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 207 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 664 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 10,177 | 1.80\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 494,698 | 86.50\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 484,238 | 84.70\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 10,460 | 1.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 77,251 | 13.50\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 283,117 | 49.50\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 288,832 | 50.50\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 198,649 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 119,139 | 60.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 54,583 | 27.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 10,204 | 5.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 3,987 | 2.00\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 27,371 | 13.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 3,016 | 1.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 18,320 | 9.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4,480 | 2.30\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 41,935 | 21.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 9,483 | 4.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 22,961 | 11.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 10,376 | 5.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 76,963 | 38.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 50,292 | 25.30\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 569,445 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 56,596 | 9.90\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Montgomery County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category


## Montgomery County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\quad \leq 10$ percent (113 Block Groups)
$10-25$ percent ( 50 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent ( 20 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 3 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Nacogdoches County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Nacogdoches County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 46.23\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$44,847 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 24.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 65,339 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 52,649 | 80.60\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 38,888 | 59.50\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 11,279 | 17.30\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 266 | 0.40\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 917 | 1.40\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 14 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 74 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,211 | 1.90\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 60,200 | 92.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 59,429 | 91.00\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 771 | 1.20\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 5,139 | 7.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 31,350 | 48.00\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 33,989 | 52.00\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 23,757 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 10,824 | 45.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 4,185 | 17.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,447 | 6.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 787 | 3.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 4,722 | 19.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 400 | 1.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,979 | 12.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 986 | 4.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 6,764 | 28.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,406 | 5.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 3,513 | 14.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,679 | 7.10\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 7,705 | 32.40\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 6,675 | 28.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 64,576 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 10,983 | 17.00\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Nacogdoches County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category




## Nacogdoches County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Navarro County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Navarro County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 44.08\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$48,529 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 48,995 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 27.30\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 35,641 | 72.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 27,461 | 56.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,977 | 12.20\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 123 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 333 | 0.70\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 657 | 1.30\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 39 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,051 | 2.10\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 42,665 | 87.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 42,407 | 86.60\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 258 | 0.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 6,330 | 12.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 24,098 | 49.20\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 24,897 | 50.80\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 17,338 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 8,928 | 51.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 3,206 | 18.50\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 891 | 5.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 429 | 2.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,980 | 17.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 403 | 2.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,659 | 9.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 482 | 2.80\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 4,539 | 26.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 964 | 5.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,520 | 14.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,258 | 7.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 5,907 | 34.10\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 5,515 | 31.80\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 48,192 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 8,479 | 17.60\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Navarro County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population

- Asian Population

American Indian and Alaska Native Population

- Two or More Races Population

Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-15

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ with no predominant ategory or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Navarro County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (7 Block Groups)10- 25 percent ( 20 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent ( 7 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Nueces County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Nueces County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.56\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$55,919 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 361,540 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 131,090 | 36.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 106,563 | 29.50\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 13,101 | 3.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 907 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 7,247 | 2.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 213 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 194 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 2,865 | 0.80\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 329,543 | 91.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 325,199 | 89.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 4,344 | 1.20\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 31,997 | 8.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 178,516 | 49.40\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 183,024 | 50.60\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 129,451 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 58,826 | 45.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 22,920 | 17.70\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 8,287 | 6.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 3,238 | 2.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 25,309 | 19.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 2,188 | 1.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 16,367 | 12.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 4,061 | 3.10\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 37,029 | 28.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 9,133 | 7.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 17,310 | 13.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 7,866 | 6.10\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 44,179 | 34.10\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 36,042 | 27.80\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 356,637 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 47,492 | 13.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Nueces County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-15 population are blank

Population by Category



## Nueces County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Palo Pinto County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Palo Pinto County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 45.85\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$50,154 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 28,540 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 19.90\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 22,866 | 80.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 21,419 | 75.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 715 | 2.50\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 159 | 0.60\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 226 | 0.80\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 29 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 30 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 288 | 1.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 26,529 | 93.00\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 26,259 | 92.00\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 270 | 0.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 2,011 | 7.00\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 14,057 | 49.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 14,483 | 50.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 10,255 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 5,256 | 51.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,641 | 16.00\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 735 | 7.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 247 | 2.40\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,475 | 14.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 133 | 1.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,038 | 10.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 426 | 4.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,789 | 27.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 439 | 4.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,628 | 15.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 874 | 8.50\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,879 | 28.10\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,687 | 36.00\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 28,298 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 5,018 | 17.70\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Palo Pinto County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population

- Black or African American Population

Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance

- 0-15

Note: Block Groups with no predominant category or no category or no
population are blank

Population by Category


## Palo Pinto County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Parker County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Parker County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 33.95\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$77,503 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 8.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 133,811 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 117,368 | 87.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 111,688 | 83.50\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,663 | 1.20\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 690 | 0.50\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 724 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 58 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 143 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 2,402 | 1.80\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 127,044 | 94.90\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 125,133 | 93.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 1,911 | 1.40\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 6,767 | 5.10\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 66,500 | 49.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 67,311 | 50.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 44,263 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 28,155 | 63.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 10,923 | 24.70\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,756 | 4.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 874 | 2.00\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 6,172 | 13.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 558 | 1.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 4,214 | 9.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,601 | 3.60\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 8,180 | 18.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,250 | 2.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 4,823 | 10.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 2,647 | 6.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 15,234 | 34.40\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 13,312 | 30.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 132,401 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 16,039 | 12.10\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Parker County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population

- Black or African American Population
- Asian Population

American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance

- 0-15
cotegulation are blank

Population by Category


## Parker County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Polk County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Polk County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 43.35\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$49,279 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 48,913 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 7,471 | 15.30\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 41,442 | 84.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 34,672 | 70.90\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 4,742 | 9.70\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 710 | 1.50\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 375 | 0.80\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 70 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 873 | 1.80\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 45,779 | 93.60\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 45,319 | 92.70\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 460 | 0.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,134 | 6.40\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 26,465 | 54.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 22,448 | 45.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 18,033 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 9,051 | 50.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,667 | 14.80\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 963 | 5.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 420 | 2.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 3,262 | 18.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 331 | 1.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,289 | 12.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 922 | 5.10\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 4,757 | 26.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,062 | 5.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,544 | 14.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,159 | 6.40\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 5,357 | 29.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 6,381 | 35.40\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 45,390 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 9,844 | 21.70\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Polk County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Polk County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (9 Block Groups)10-25 percent ( 14 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (8 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Real County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Real County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 47.00\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$35,862 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 22.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 3,408 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 2,513 | 73.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 2,491 | 73.10\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 19 | 0.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 2 | 0.10\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1 | 0.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 3,287 | 96.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 3,231 | 94.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 56 | 1.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 121 | 3.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 1,498 | 44.00\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 1,910 | 56.00\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 1,126 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 508 | 45.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 78 | 6.90\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 38 | 3.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 20 | 1.80\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 235 | 20.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 180 | 16.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 66 | 5.90\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 345 | 30.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 31 | 2.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 238 | 21.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 155 | 13.80\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 199 | 17.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 621 | 55.20\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 3,308 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 836 | 25.30\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Real County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Real County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Red River County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Red River County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 53.17\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$39,142 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 12,171 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 886 | 7.30\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 11,285 | 92.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 8,932 | 73.40\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,039 | 16.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 39 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 10 | 0.10\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 265 | 2.20\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 11,854 | 97.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 11,650 | 95.70\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 204 | 1.70\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 317 | 2.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 5,759 | 47.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 6,412 | 52.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 4,963 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 2,296 | 46.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 629 | 12.70\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 103 | 2.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 23 | 0.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 857 | 17.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 15 | 0.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 678 | 13.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 267 | 5.40\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,707 | 34.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 246 | 5.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 913 | 18.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 549 | 11.10\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,218 | 24.50\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,941 | 39.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 11,974 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,210 | 18.50\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Red River County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category rno <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category



## Red River County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (3 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (7 Block Groups) 25-45 percent (4 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (1 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Robertson County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Robertson County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.93\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,928 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 12.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 16,990 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 21.00\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 13,426 | 79.00\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 9,718 | 57.20\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 3,437 | 20.20\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 39 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 29 | 0.20\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 18 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 22 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 163 | 1.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 15,783 | 92.90\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 15,684 | 92.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 99 | 0.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,207 | 7.10\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 8,315 | 48.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 8,675 | 51.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 6,444 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 3,332 | 51.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,111 | 17.20\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 320 | 5.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 173 | 2.70\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,000 | 15.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 103 | 1.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 722 | 11.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 258 | 4.00\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,792 | 27.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 366 | 5.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 880 | 13.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 451 | 7.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,097 | 32.50\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,206 | 34.20\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 16,796 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,400 | 14.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Robertson County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Robertson County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (5 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (4 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Rusk County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Rusk County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 39.15\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$55,234 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 12.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 53,755 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 16.80\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 44,713 | 83.20\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 34,267 | 63.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 9,015 | 16.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 71 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 279 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 30 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 25 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,026 | 1.90\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 50,002 | 93.00\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 49,673 | 92.40\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 329 | 0.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,753 | 7.00\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 28,614 | 53.20\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 25,141 | 46.80\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 18,108 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 10,024 | 55.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 3,908 | 21.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 856 | 4.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 407 | 2.20\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,707 | 14.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 147 | 0.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,039 | 11.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 748 | 4.10\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 4,521 | 25.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,032 | 5.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,178 | 12.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,304 | 7.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 6,457 | 35.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 6,108 | 33.70\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 48,945 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 7,482 | 15.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Rusk County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category




## Rusk County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (18 Block Groups)
$10-25$ percent (20 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent ( 3 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Smith County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Smith County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.25\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$56,810 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 16.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 227,449 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 44,360 | 19.50\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 183,089 | 80.50\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 135,850 | 59.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 39,165 | 17.20\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 681 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 3,825 | 1.70\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 212 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 318 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 3,038 | 1.30\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 208,471 | 91.70\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 206,630 | 90.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 1,841 | 0.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 18,978 | 8.30\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 109,770 | 48.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 117,679 | 51.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 77,678 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 41,250 | 53.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 15,964 | 20.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 2,933 | 3.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 866 | 1.10\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 11,609 | 14.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 1,182 | 1.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 7,600 | 9.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 2,267 | 2.90\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 21,886 | 28.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 4,201 | 5.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 12,313 | 15.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 6,315 | 8.10\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 25,547 | 32.90\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 24,593 | 31.70\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 225,116 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 30,802 | 13.70\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Smith County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population

- Asian Population

American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance - 0-1

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant } \\ & \text { categry or no }\end{aligned}$ ategory or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Smith County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Somervell County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Somervell County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 39.42\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$60,632 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 24.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 8,860 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 7,214 | 81.40\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 7,010 | 79.10\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 105 | 1.20\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 24 | 0.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 68 | 0.80\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 5 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 2 | 0.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 8,522 | 96.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 8,477 | 95.70\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 45 | 0.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 338 | 3.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 4,448 | 50.20\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 4,412 | 49.80\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 3,123 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,960 | 62.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 901 | 28.90\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 120 | 3.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 29 | 0.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 351 | 11.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 39 | 1.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 135 | 4.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 103 | 3.30\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 692 | 22.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 89 | 2.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 377 | 12.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 213 | 6.80\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,325 | 42.40\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,151 | 36.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 8,675 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,265 | 14.60\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Somervell County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population
- Two or More Races Population
- Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance

- 0-15

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant } \\ & \text { category or no }\end{aligned}$ category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Somervell County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\square \leq 10$ percent (1 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (1 Block Groups)
- 25-45 percent (3 Block Groups)
$\square \geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty


5

Somervell County
$\mathrm{A}^{\circ}-{ }^{-2}$

Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Starr County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Starr County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 61.69\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$30,387 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 35.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 64,078 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 529 | 0.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 444 | 0.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 24 | 0.00\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 10 | 0.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 27 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 17 | 0.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 45,758 | 71.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 44,562 | 69.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 1,196 | 1.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 18,320 | 28.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 31,183 | 48.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 32,895 | 51.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 16,188 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 7,860 | 48.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 3,774 | 23.30\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 664 | 4.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 472 | 2.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,963 | 12.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 176 | 1.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,310 | 8.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 604 | 3.70\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 5,701 | 35.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 2,257 | 13.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,767 | 10.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 989 | 6.10\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 7,781 | 48.10\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,887 | 30.20\% |
| DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 63,545 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 10,560 | 16.60\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Starr County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population

- Black or African American Population
- Asian Population

American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance

- 0-1

15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$ with no predominant ategory or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Starr County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Stephens County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Stephens County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.54\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$46,232 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 22.60\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 9,364 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 2,223 | 23.70\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 7,141 | 76.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 6,657 | 71.10\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 265 | 2.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 31 | 0.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 34 | 0.40\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 154 | 1.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 8,909 | 95.10\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 8,751 | 93.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 158 | 1.70\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 455 | 4.90\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 4,858 | 51.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 4,506 | 48.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 3,247 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,618 | 49.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 525 | 16.20\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 161 | 5.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 58 | 1.80\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 620 | 19.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 80 | 2.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 395 | 12.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 163 | 5.00\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 848 | 26.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 224 | 6.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 434 | 13.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 245 | 7.50\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,102 | 33.90\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,146 | 35.30\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 8,943 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 1,776 | 19.90\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Stephens County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance

with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Stephens County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Tarrant County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Tarrant County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.70\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$67,700 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 12.90\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 2,049,770 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 1,459,285 | 71.20\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 957,676 | 46.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 330,853 | 16.10\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 6,154 | 0.30\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 110,144 | 5.40\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 3,802 | 0.20\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 4,441 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 46,215 | 2.30\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 1,720,400 | 83.90\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 1,687,835 | 82.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 32,565 | 1.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 329,370 | 16.10\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 1,002,709 | 48.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 1,047,061 | 51.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 708,252 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 355,750 | 50.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 163,028 | 23.00\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 41,186 | 5.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 17,533 | 2.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 119,497 | 16.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 10,558 | 1.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 79,417 | 11.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 15,645 | 2.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 191,819 | 27.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 49,675 | 7.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 94,453 | 13.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 37,460 | 5.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 269,299 | 38.00\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 157,366 | 22.20\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 2,033,815 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 208,695 | 10.30\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Tarrant County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| category no no |
| population are blank |

## Population by Category

- Non-Hispanic White Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
-
Strength of Predominance
0
15
85
with no predominan category or no population are blank


## Tarrant County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 621 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent ( 180 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 32 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Throckmorton County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Throckmorton County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 40.46\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$40,000 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 1,436 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 190 | 13.20\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 1,246 | 86.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 1,218 | 84.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 14 | 1.00\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 14 | 1.00\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 1,425 | 99.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 1,414 | 98.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 11 | 0.80\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 11 | 0.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 658 | 45.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 778 | 54.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 668 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 355 | 53.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 89 | 13.30\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 16 | 2.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 4 | 0.60\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 85 | 12.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 81 | 12.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 35 | 5.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 212 | 31.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 34 | 5.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 149 | 22.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 87 | 13.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 144 | 21.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 281 | 42.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 1,432 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 329 | 23.00\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Throckmorton County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



Throckmorton County: Population in Poverty by Block Group

| Baylor County |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Haskell |  |  |
| County | Throckmorton | Young |
|  |  | County |

Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (0 Block Groups)10-25 percent (2 Block Groups)25-45 percent (0 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Tom Green County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Tom Green County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 41.19\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$53,903 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 117,986 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 70,922 | 60.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 62,852 | 53.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 4,706 | 4.00\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 240 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1,420 | 1.20\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 79 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 113 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,512 | 1.30\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 110,527 | 93.70\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 108,948 | 92.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 1,579 | 1.30\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 7,459 | 6.30\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 58,707 | 49.80\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 59,279 | 50.20\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 43,314 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 20,292 | 46.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 7,987 | 18.40\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 2,345 | 5.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 811 | 1.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 8,348 | 19.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 800 | 1.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 5,720 | 13.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,288 | 3.00\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 12,329 | 28.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 2,359 | 5.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 7,157 | 16.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 3,184 | 7.40\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 13,529 | 31.20\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 12,082 | 27.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 113,076 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 15,456 | 13.70\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Tom Green County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




## Tom Green County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Travis County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Travis County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 46.34\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$75,887 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 1,226,805 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 812,060 | 66.20\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 600,694 | 49.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 96,367 | 7.90\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 2,042 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 81,212 | 6.60\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 338 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 2,006 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 29,401 | 2.40\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 1,008,677 | 82.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 987,285 | 80.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 21,392 | 1.70\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 218,128 | 17.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 619,629 | 50.50\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 607,176 | 49.50\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 472,361 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 204,593 | 43.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 95,683 | 20.30\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 33,093 | 7.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 6,617 | 1.40\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 108,049 | 22.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 5,965 | 1.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 73,899 | 15.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 10,373 | 2.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 126,626 | 26.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 21,580 | 4.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 73,462 | 15.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 19,961 | 4.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 141,003 | 29.90\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 82,570 | 17.50\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 1,219,139 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 101,570 | 8.30\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Travis County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population
Hispanic or Latino Population
Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population
Some Other Race Population
Strength of Predominance
$0-15$

15-85 | Note: Block Groups |
| :--- |
| with no predominant |
| category or no |
| population are blank |

Population by Category



## Travis County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 327 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent ( 182 Block Groups)
- 25-45 percent (46 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 25 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Upshur County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Upshur County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 35.11\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$52,162 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 13.30\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 41,018 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 7,936,913 | 36.3\% | 3,524 | 8.60\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 37,494 | 91.40\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 32,971 | 80.40\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 3,337 | 8.10\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 210 | 0.50\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 128 | 0.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 159 | 0.40\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 689 | 1.70\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 39,479 | 96.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 39,293 | 95.80\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 186 | 0.50\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,539 | 3.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 20,139 | 49.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 20,879 | 50.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 14,108 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 7,901 | 56.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,799 | 19.80\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 407 | 2.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 95 | 0.70\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,548 | 18.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 227 | 1.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,743 | 12.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 530 | 3.80\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 3,252 | 23.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 451 | 3.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,907 | 13.50\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,133 | 8.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 4,332 | 30.70\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,959 | 35.20\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 40,474 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 7,218 | 17.80\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Upshur County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category



## Upshur County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (7 Block Groups)10-25 percent ( 17 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (3 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Uvalde County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Uvalde County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 46.52\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$41,679 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 17.00\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 26,920 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 7,614 | 28.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 7,042 | 26.20\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 88 | 0.30\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 58 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 253 | 0.90\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 25 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 148 | 0.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 23,916 | 88.80\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 23,394 | 86.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 522 | 1.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 3,004 | 11.20\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 13,185 | 49.00\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 13,735 | 51.00\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 8,841 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,004 | 45.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,384 | 15.70\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 216 | 2.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 83 | 0.90\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,913 | 21.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 256 | 2.90\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,096 | 12.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 536 | 6.10\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,708 | 30.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 727 | 8.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,186 | 13.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 631 | 7.10\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,027 | 34.20\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 3,098 | 35.00\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 26,460 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 4,541 | 17.20\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Uvalde County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Uvalde County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Van Zandt County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Van Zandt County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 37.42\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$54,654 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 55,103 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 49,093 | 89.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 46,127 | 83.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 1,543 | 2.80\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 259 | 0.50\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 271 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 48 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 845 | 1.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 52,591 | 95.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 52,268 | 94.90\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 323 | 0.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 2,512 | 4.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 27,074 | 49.10\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 28,029 | 50.90\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 20,156 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 11,647 | 57.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 4,252 | 21.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 916 | 4.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 272 | 1.30\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,861 | 14.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 214 | 1.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,088 | 10.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 826 | 4.10\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 4,732 | 23.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 809 | 4.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,385 | 11.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,409 | 7.00\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 6,502 | 32.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 7,543 | 37.40\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 54,486 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 9,560 | 17.50\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Van Zandt County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance

- 0-15

1
$\square$
$\square$
Note: Block Groups with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Van Zandt County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\quad \leq 10$ percent (12 Block Groups)
$10-25$ percent ( 21 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (4 Block Groups)$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Victoria County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Victoria County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 38.47\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$56,834 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 15.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 92,109 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 48,934 | 53.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 41,147 | 44.70\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 5,163 | 5.60\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 109 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 1,046 | 1.10\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 18 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 156 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,295 | 1.40\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 85,868 | 93.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 84,973 | 92.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 895 | 1.00\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 6,241 | 6.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 45,075 | 48.90\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 47,034 | 51.10\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 32,255 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 16,169 | 50.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,989 | 18.60\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 1,989 | 6.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 853 | 2.60\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 5,327 | 16.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 454 | 1.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 3,526 | 10.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 940 | 2.90\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 8,770 | 27.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,755 | 5.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 4,602 | 14.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 2,459 | 7.60\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 10,768 | 33.40\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 9,977 | 30.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 91,105 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 14,005 | 15.40\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Victoria County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category

| Non-Hispanic White Population |
| :--- |
| Hispanic or Latino Population |
| Black or African American Population |
| Asian Population |
| American Indian and Alaska Native Population |
| Two or More Races Population |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population |
| Some Other Race Population |
| Strength of Predominance |
| $0-15$ |
| 15-85Note: Block Groups <br> with no predominant <br> category or no <br> population are blank |
| $85-100 \quad$ |

## Population by Category




## Victoria County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty


Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Wichita County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Wichita County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.03\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$48,650 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 18.40\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 131,596 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 19.20\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 106,338 | 80.80\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 85,899 | 65.30\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 13,104 | 10.00\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 975 | 0.70\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 2,864 | 2.20\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 99 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 382 | 0.30\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 3,015 | 2.30\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 122,881 | 93.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 120,648 | 91.70\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 2,233 | 1.70\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 8,715 | 6.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 68,389 | 52.00\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 63,207 | 48.00\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 48,356 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 21,531 | 44.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 8,312 | 17.20\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 2,675 | 5.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 1,045 | 2.20\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 9,408 | 19.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 488 | 1.00\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 6,629 | 13.70\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 1,715 | 3.50\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 14,742 | 30.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 3,085 | 6.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 8,371 | 17.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 4,252 | 8.80\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 14,637 | 30.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 13,610 | 28.10\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 117,060 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 19,533 | 16.70\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Wichita County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population
Asian Population

- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$\square$ 0-15
$15-85$
$85-100$
Note: Block Groups
with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category



## Wichita County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent ( 45 Block Groups)

- 10-25 percent (32 Block Groups)

25-45 percent (21 Block Groups)
$\square \geq 45$ percent (8 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Williamson County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Williamson County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 32.55\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$87,337 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 6.70\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 547,604 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| $\mathrm{RACE}^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 413,732 | 75.60\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 325,160 | 59.40\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 33,561 | 6.10\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 935 | 0.20\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 37,170 | 6.80\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 377 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 1,068 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 15,461 | 2.80\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 478,611 | 87.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 468,064 | 85.50\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 10,547 | 1.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 68,993 | 12.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 269,549 | 49.20\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 278,055 | 50.80\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 180,160 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 104,975 | 58.30\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 50,629 | 28.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 8,901 | 4.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 3,009 | 1.70\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 26,412 | 14.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 2,602 | 1.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 17,646 | 9.80\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 3,934 | 2.20\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 39,872 | 22.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 9,220 | 5.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 22,760 | 12.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 9,590 | 5.30\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 70,611 | 39.20\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 41,889 | 23.30\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 544,319 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 54,513 | 10.00\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Williamson County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category


## Williamson County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Percent of Population in Poverty
$\quad \leq 10$ percent (185 Block Groups)
$10-25$ percent (50 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent ( 8 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent ( 0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Wilson County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Wilson County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 30.52\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$76,692 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 10.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 49,173 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 39.70\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 29,660 | 60.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 28,045 | 57.00\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 600 | 1.20\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 43 | 0.10\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 152 | 0.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 40 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 54 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 726 | 1.50\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 47,332 | 96.30\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 46,811 | 95.20\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 521 | 1.10\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,841 | 3.70\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 24,716 | 50.30\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 24,457 | 49.70\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 15,733 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 10,341 | 65.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 4,290 | 27.30\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 660 | 4.20\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 228 | 1.40\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,152 | 13.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 169 | 1.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,465 | 9.30\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 440 | 2.80\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 2,580 | 16.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 667 | 4.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 1,244 | 7.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 667 | 4.20\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 6,029 | 38.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 4,639 | 29.50\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 48,518 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 6,230 | 12.80\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Wilson County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population
Asian Population
American Indian and Alaska Native Population
Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance - 0-15

| 1 |
| :--- |
| $\square$ |15-85 Note: Block Groups with no predominant category or no category or no

population are blank

Population by Category



## Wilson County: Population in Poverty by Block Group




Percent of Population in Poverty
$\leq 10$ percent (18 Block Groups)10- 25 percent ( 11 Block Groups)
$25-45$ percent (0 Block Groups)
$\geq 45$ percent (0 Block Groups)

Distribution of Percent in Poverty



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Wise County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Wise County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 38.27\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$64,536 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 12.50\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 66,290 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 53,468 | 80.70\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 50,878 | 76.80\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 845 | 1.30\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 236 | 0.40\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 338 | 0.50\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 121 | 0.20\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 2 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 1,048 | 1.60\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 61,120 | 92.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 60,475 | 91.20\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 645 | 1.00\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 5,170 | 7.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 33,406 | 50.40\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 32,884 | 49.60\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 22,369 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 13,606 | 60.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 5,466 | 24.40\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 793 | 3.50\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 329 | 1.50\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 3,300 | 14.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 294 | 1.30\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 2,271 | 10.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 758 | 3.40\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 4,670 | 20.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 1,010 | 4.50\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,497 | 11.20\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,306 | 5.80\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 8,122 | 36.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 6,559 | 29.30\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 65,372 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 11,081 | 17.00\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Wise County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



## Wise County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics for Wood County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Wood County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 38.43\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$53,394 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 14.20\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 44,366 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| $\mathrm{RACE}^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 39,931 | 90.00\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 36,584 | 82.50\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 2,184 | 4.90\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 323 | 0.70\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 286 | 0.60\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 37 | 0.10\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 37 | 0.10\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 480 | 1.10\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 42,782 | 96.40\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 42,397 | 95.60\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 385 | 0.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,584 | 3.60\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 22,059 | 49.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 22,307 | 50.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 16,510 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 9,357 | 56.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 2,108 | 12.80\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 593 | 3.60\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 186 | 1.10\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 2,476 | 15.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 302 | 1.80\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 1,840 | 11.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 875 | 5.30\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 4,084 | 24.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 700 | 4.20\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 2,568 | 15.60\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 1,626 | 9.80\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 3,924 | 23.80\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 7,627 | 46.20\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 43,361 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 9,197 | 21.20\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Wood County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
$\square$ Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population - Some Other Race Population Strength of Predominance $\square$ 0-1

85-100 category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Wood County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Young County

CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas
Young County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 42.29\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$50,635 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 12.10\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 18,036 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  | 18.70\% |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 14,670 | 81.30\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 14,052 | 77.90\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 379 | 2.10\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 102 | 0.60\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 48 | 0.30\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 33 | 0.20\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 56 | 0.30\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 16,982 | 94.20\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 16,820 | 93.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 162 | 0.90\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 1,054 | 5.80\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 8,785 | 48.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 9,251 | 51.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 7,307 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 4,016 | 55.00\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 1,371 | 18.80\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 395 | 5.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 144 | 2.00\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 1,382 | 18.90\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 125 | 1.70\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 981 | 13.40\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 206 | 2.80\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,514 | 20.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 392 | 5.40\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 878 | 12.00\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 625 | 8.60\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 2,216 | 30.30\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 2,480 | 33.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 17,743 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,525 | 14.20\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Young County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group




ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$\square$ 0-15
$15-85$
$85-100$
Note: Block Groups
with no predominant category or no population are blank

Population by Category


## Young County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Table of Protected Classes Statistics
for Zavala County CDBG-MIT Eligible Areas

Zavala County

| Low- and Moderate-Income ${ }^{1}$ | 44.66\% |  | 58.21\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median Household Income ${ }^{2}$ | \$52,155 |  | \$34,459 |  |
| Poverty Rate ${ }^{3}$ | 15.47\% |  | 34.80\% |  |
| Total Population ${ }^{4}$ | 21,890,877 |  | 12,039 |  |
| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| RACE ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) |  |  |  |  |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 13,953,964 | 63.7\% | 735 | 6.10\% |
| White alone | 9,486,588 | 43.3\% | 611 | 5.10\% |
| Black or African American alone | 2,900,142 | 13.2\% | 40 | 0.30\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 53,118 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Asian alone | 1,091,595 | 5.0\% | 3 | 0.00\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 14,663 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Some other race alone | 35,557 | 0.2\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Two or more races | 372,301 | 1.7\% | 81 | 0.70\% |
| NATIONAL ORIGIN ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 18,066,724 | 82.50\% | 11,183 | 92.90\% |
| Born in United States | 17,768,969 | 81.20\% | 10,870 | 90.30\% |
| Born in Puerto Rico, U.S. Island areas, or born abroad to American parent(s) | 297,755 | 1.40\% | 313 | 2.60\% |
| Foreign born | 3,824,153 | 17.50\% | 856 | 7.10\% |
| SEX ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10,866,060 | 49.6\% | 6,221 | 51.70\% |
| Female | 11,024,817 | 50.4\% | 5,818 | 48.30\% |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total households | 7,562,396 | 100\% | 3,571 | 100\% |
| Married-couple family | 3,792,625 | 50.2\% | 1,646 | 46.10\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 1,687,609 | 22.3\% | 431 | 12.10\% |
| Cohabiting couple household | 415,456 | 5.5\% | 157 | 4.40\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 164,078 | 2.2\% | 85 | 2.40\% |


| Protected Classes | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAMILIAL STATUS ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Male householder, no spouse/partner present | 1,327,377 | 17.6\% | 635 | 17.80\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 103,885 | 1.4\% | 182 | 5.10\% |
| Householder living alone | 895,339 | 11.8\% | 253 | 7.10\% |
| 65 years and over | 202,010 | 2.7\% | 152 | 4.30\% |
| Female householder, no spouse/partner present | 2,026,938 | 26.8\% | 1,133 | 31.70\% |
| With own children of the householder under 18 years | 490,034 | 6.5\% | 380 | 10.60\% |
| Householder living alone | 1,011,907 | 13.4\% | 319 | 8.90\% |
| 65 years and over | 419,687 | 5.5\% | 202 | 5.70\% |
| Households with one or more people under 18 years | 2,760,851 | 36.5\% | 1,521 | 42.60\% |
| Households with one or more people 65 years and over | 1,854,065 | 24.5\% | 1,246 | 34.90\% |
| DISABILITY $^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population | 21,563,108 | 100\% | 11,875 | 100\% |
| With a disability | 2,387,537 | 11.1\% | 2,491 | 21.00\% |
| 'HUD LMISD, FY 2021 ACS 5-Year 2011-2015 ${ }^{2}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: S1903, data.census.gov ${ }^{3}$ ACS 5-Year, 2018, Table: S1701, data.census.gov ${ }^{4}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP05, data.census.gov ${ }^{5}$ ACS 5-Year, 2019, Table: DP02, data.census.gov |  |  |  |  |

## Zavala County: Racial and Ethnic Makeup by Block Group



[^2]

ACS Race and Ethnicity Variables
Predominant Category
Non-Hispanic White Population

- Hispanic or Latino Population

Black or African American Population

- Asian Population
- American Indian and Alaska Native Population

Two or More Races Population
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population

- Some Other Race Population

Strength of Predominance
$\square 0-15$
15-85 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Note: Block Groups } \\ & \text { with no predominant }\end{aligned}$
85-100 category or no
population are blank

Population by Category


## Zavala County: Population in Poverty by Block Group



Dimmit County



[^0]:    ${ }^{456}$ CDBG-MIT Grant Agreement, State of Texas, Unique Federal Award Identification Number: B-18-DP-48-0002, January 12, 2021

[^1]:    Oldham County

[^2]:    Dimmit County

