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## Dimensions and Determinants of Elderly Migration

## National Perspective

The growing elderly population of Texas and other parts of the United States is of increasing importance to both the public and private sectors. This importance is driven not only by the fact that this population is growing as a result of inmigration and immigration to Texas and by increased life expectancy but also by the retirement of the baby-boom generation, composed of the nearly 65 million surviving persons of the 70 million Americans born between 1946 and 1964 (Rogerson and Kim, 2005; Cromartie and Nelson, 2009). As its members reach elderly ages between 2011 and 2029, it will make up the largest elderly cohort in the history of the United States. And because they were also one of the best educated and socioeconomically successful cohorts (relative to the much smaller cohorts before and after them) in U.S. history (Longino, 1998), their activities are impacting markets for a wide variety of goods and services, including real estate in both urban and rural areas.

Much of the focus of research on this group has tended to point to rural areas as the major beneficiary of the growing elderly population. Analyses such as those by Nelson et al. (2004) and Plane and Jurjevich (2009) note that:

The movement at the late-career, empty nester, and retirement stage are the most "demographically effective" or unidirectional. The elderly fleeing large metropolitan areas have been congregating in micropolitan and rural counties with special climatic and other natural amenities. The opposite net flow is found for younger adults who have been flocking into megametropolitan conurbations. At the midcareer stage, the net movement is from larger to medium metropolitan areas (page 4).

In fact, whether the elderly remain in the areas where they spent most of their working lives, move to rural locations or to other areas in their retirement is affected by a complex set of factors. Brown et al. (2011) note that the elderly who move, particularly those who move to rural locations, tend to do so after having periodically lived in these locations for short periods of time (extended vacations, holidays, etc.) and to have established attachments to the area during their middle ages. He and his colleagues further establish that rural areas that become centers for elderly migrants tend to be ones in relative proximity to more urban locations (e.g., within about 50 miles or a one-hour drive from a metropolitan area), ones with or near areas with recreational and amenity characteristics (parks, lakes, etc.), ones with superior medical care facilities (such as hospitals with staff representing a wider range of medical specialties), and ones with proximity to cultural and educational institutions (museums, colleges and universities, etc.). They note:

Counties with a long history of population growth, previous experience attracting older inmigrants, attractive natural amenities and a developed recreation and tourism industry are those most likely to be retirement-age migration destinations. In contrast, agricultural heartland and relatively large population size are associated with lower rates of older inmigration. Older inmigration should be seen as neither a panacea for strapped rural communities nor a "pensions and care issue." Older migrants can be "gray gold" but can also pose challenges, such as possibly increased demand for public services as they age in place (page 44).

Determining whether the elderly will move and where are clearly critical questions for the real estate industry in today's market. Should housing be developed in rural and other areas in anticipation that such migration will occur if housing becomes available? Has the market for real estate for such populations been altered by the last recession?

The answer to the latter question is clearly yes, especially for some parts of the United States. Flanagan and Wilson, using data from 2007-09 compared with the 2010-12 American Community Survey (ACS), note that:

The median home value in current dollars, based on decennial census data, rose slowly from 1940 to 1970 . After that the median home value rose steadily. By 2000 it had increased by more than seven times the median home value in 1970. However, the housing bubble was followed by a housing crash and the recession. ... ACS data, which replaced the decennial long form, shows that after the peak of the reported monetary value in 2008, the median home value in current dollars declined. By 2009, the median home value according to the 2009 American Community Survey was $\$ 185,200$. This was the same estimate that the 2006 American Community Survey reported as the median home value in 2006. The median home value continued to decline from 2009 to 2012. The median home value for the United States in 2010-12 was $\$ 174,600$, a $\$ 17,300$ decline from the median home value in 2007-09 (pages 1-2).

## Texas Perspective

Texas' real estate markets for older populations are influenced by factors that suggest it will likely have larger overall population growth but a proportionally smaller elderly population and a more diverse elderly population than the United States as a whole (Jones, 1996; Cowley and Witherspoon, 2000; Hunt, 2007, Murdock et al., 2014). Texas had the fastest growing population of any state from 2000-10 and from 2010-13 (United States Census of Population, 2010; 2014), leading to growth in populations of all ages. Similarly, the average value of homes increased by $\$ 4,000$ from 2006 to 2012 rather than declining by more than $\$ 17,000$ for the nation). Homeownership rates in Texas decreased by 1.2 percent compared with a 1.7 percent decline in the nation.

At the same time, Texas is a comparably younger state with 10.3 percent of its population 65 years or older in 2010 compared with 13 percent for the nation. By 2050, Texas' elderly are projected to be about 16 percent of its population compared with over 20 percent for the nation (Murdock et al., 2014). In 2010, Texas' nearly 5.7 million baby boomers were 22.6 percent of the Texas population compared with 24.9 percent in the nation.

Texas' total and elderly populations are also more racially and ethnically diverse. In 2010, whereas 15.4 percent of non-Hispanic Whites were 65 years or older, 7.6 percent of non-
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Hispanic Blacks, 5.6 percent of Hispanics, and 6.5 percent of non-Hispanic Asians and all Others were 65 years or older. By 2030, when all the baby boomers are 65 years or older, 25.9 percent of non-Hispanic Whites, 15.6 percent of non-Hispanic Blacks, 9.8 percent of Hispanics and 11.1 percent of non-Hispanic Asians and Others will be 65 years or older. By 2050, these percentages are projected to be 27.7 percent non-Hispanic White, 19.3 percent non-Hispanic Black, 12.9 percent Hispanics, and 14.1 percent non-Hispanic Asians and Others. However, although 67.7 percent of all elderly were non-Hispanic White in 2010 and 33.3 percent were minority, the much faster growth of minority than the non-Hispanic White population means that, by 2030, 53.6 percent of the elderly will be non-Hispanic White while 46.4 will be minority (Murdock et al., 2014) and by 205035.8 percent of the elderly will be non-Hispanic White and 64.2 percent will be minority.

With minority group households, such as those of Hispanics and non-Hispanic Blacks, having incomes that were only 60-75 percent of the incomes for non-Hispanic Whites, and poverty rates that were two to three times higher than those for non-Hispanic Whites in 2010 (Murdock et al, 2014), the large size of the elderly population in the future may have a smaller relative effect on future markets, including housing markets, than anticipated. Thus, in 2010, 57.6 percent of all housing expenditures in Texas were by households with a non-Hispanic White householder, 10.1 percent were by households with a non-Hispanic Black householder, 26.5 percent were by households with a Hispanic householder and 5.8 percent were by householders with an Asian/Other householder. By 2050, the percentage of all housing expenditures in Texas attributed to non-Hispanic White households is projected to be 30 percent, non-Hispanic Blacks 9.2 percent, Hispanic households 44.8 percent, and 16 percent non-Hispanic Asian and Other households (Murdock et al., 2014).

If the majority of persons of elderly ages in the future have fewer financial resources than those of the current elderly, changes in the characteristics of the elderly populations may impact the level of resources spent on housing. In fact, recent projections (Murdock et al., 2014) show the overall number of households in Texas will increase by 127.6 percent from 2010 to 2050 while overall expenditures on housing will increase by only 117.3 percent during the same period. When viewed in conjunction with the uncertainty regarding future long-term income growth, it is clear that for those involved in the development of housing for the elderly, a large number of factors require consideration, particularly in Texas, a growing state that is geographically, socioeconomically, racially and ethnically diverse.

## Objectives of this Report

Given the previous factors, the objectives of this report are to:

- Examine the size, distribution and characteristics of current elderly populations in Texas. This will include an examination of the size and characteristics of the elderly population from 1970 to 2010 in metropolitan areas, in counties of different types, in the major tourism regions of Texas and in rural retirement destination counties in Texas.
- Examine the projected size, distribution and characteristics of elderly population in Texas from 2010 through 2050 for metropolitan areas, counties, tourism regions and rural retirement destination counties in Texas.
- Provide an overall evaluation of the relative size and characteristics of the potential elderly housing markets in Texas from 2010 through 2050.


## Size, Geographic Distribution and Characteristics of Elderly Populations and Households in Texas, 1970-2050

In this section of the report we examine the patterns of change in elderly populations. The elderly are often defined as those 65 years or older. Because we wish to examine markets for elderly including those about to be elderly in 2015, we define the elderly in this analysis as persons 60 years or older. We examine patterns for this population during the past 40 years (from 1970-2010), and the projected patterns for the 40-year period from 2010-2050. We evaluate
such change for counties that are the location for metropolitan central cities, for suburban counties (all other non-central city counties within Metropolitan Statistical Areas), for nonmetropolitan counties that border (are adjacent to) a metropolitan central city or suburban county, and for counties that are not adjacent to a metropolitan central city or suburban county as of 2010 (Figure 1). We then evaluate the change in elderly populations in the seven tourism

Figure 1: Metropolitan and Suburban Counties in Texas

regions as designated by the Governor's Office of Tourism (Figure 2). Finally we examine counties with high levels of elderly growth and inmigration within the tourism regions. These counties are referred to as retirement destination counties. These are counties that have elderly
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net inmigration rates of 15 percent or more (for the last decade from 2000-10 or for all three prior decade periods of 1970-80, 1980-90, and 1990-2000 if they did not have a 15 percent rate of inmigration from 2000-10) and have an elderly population that accounts for 25 percent or higher percentages of all residents in the county in 2010 (Appendix A).

Figure 2: Tourism Regions and Retirement Destination Counties in Texas


## Elderly Populations in Texas Metropolitan Areas, Counties, Tourism Regions and Elderly Destination Areas, 1970-2010

The elderly population of Texas has grown substantially in recent decades. Whereas
Texas population of persons 60 years or older was $1,441,669$ in 1970, it was $3,776,653$ by 2010
(Table 1). This growth of more than 2.3 million or 162 percent was driven by both the state's
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overall population increase and by the fact that the baby-boom generation had begun to enter elderly ages.

The data in Table 1 further show that growth in the elderly population in metropolitan areas (Figure 1) has largely reflected relative levels of overall population growth with the rapidly growing metropolitan areas of Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington; Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown; Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos; and San Antonio-New Braunfels having not only rapid overall population growth but substantial elderly population growth. On the other hand, areas such as Wichita Falls, Waco, Abilene, Beaumont-Port Arthur, Texarkana, Sherman-Denison and Longview had relatively lower levels of elderly growth similar in relative terms to that for their total populations.

As shown in Table 2, the largest proportions of all elderly persons were in the largest population centers of Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington (22.3\%), Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown (20.5\%), San Antonio-New Braunfels (9.0\%) and Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos (5.6\%). However, rural areas accounted for a disproportionate share of the elderly population compared with their total share of the total population. While nonmetropolitan areas accounted for just 12.2 percent of the total population in 2010, they accounted for 17.7 percent of the elderly in 2010 (Table 2). However, this was down from 28.8 percent in 1970, when nonmetropolitan areas accounted for more of the elderly population than any single metropolitan area. Although the elderly are thus still disproportionately in nonmetropolitan areas, this is less true now than in the past.

In fact, the data in Table 3 show that whereas nonmetropolitan areas have shown relative stability in the proportion of their population that is elderly from 1970 to 2010, increases in the proportion of the elderly population have occurred in 21 of 25 metropolitan areas (the exceptions
being Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, College Station-Bryan, Laredo and Waco). As a result, the percentage of all elderly persons in metropolitan areas is increasing. Although nonmetropolitan areas are the areas of residence for a disproportionate number of elderly, their share of all elderly persons is continuing to decline from 28.8 percent in 1970 to 17.7 percent in 2010. As a result, markets for goods and services for the elderly, who live disproportionately in rural areas, are in the aggregate moving increasingly to metropolitan areas.

The data in Table 4 show that there was positive net elderly migration (meaning migration into such areas) for all but two metropolitan areas (Beaumont-Port Arthur and Odessa) in the 2000s but that net outmigration occurred for more metropolitan areas in earlier periods. For example, the Beaumont-Port Arthur and the Odessa area showed net outmigration for all periods from 1970-80 to 2000-10; Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown and Wichita Falls showed outmigration in the 1970s, 1980s and the 1990s; and the Corpus Christi and Midland Metropolitan areas experienced outmigration for both the 1970s and the 1980s.

Nonmetropolitan areas continued to show net inmigration in all four decades, and the total net inmigration exceeded that in any single metropolitan area (Table 4). At the same time, it is important to note that the difference between the aggregate net migration for nonmetropolitan areas and the metropolitan areas with the largest number of elderly migrants has closed substantially over time. In the 1970s, the number of elderly nonmetropolitan inmigrants exceeded the number in the largest metropolitan center by nearly 43,000 ; in the 1980 s it exceeded the number in any single metropolitan center by more than 21,000 ; and in the 1990 s nonmetropolitan areas net migration was 24,000 larger than that in any single metropolitan area. As a result of such patterns nonmetropolitan net elderly migration was 49.8 percent of total net
inmigration for elderly persons in the 1970s, 79.9 percent of such inmigration for the 1980s, and 40.3 percent of all net inmigration of the elderly in Texas in the 1990s.

The decade from 2000 to 2010 shows a substantial shift, however. Nonmetropolitan elderly migration accounted for only 19.1 percent of net inmigration for elderly persons to Texas during that period. While the numerical level of net migration into nonmetropolitan areas at 40,164 was larger than that for any single metropolitan center, the number of net inmigrants exceeded 30,000 for each of the metropolitan areas of Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos; DallasFort Worth-Arlington and San Antonio-New Braunfels and was more than 26,000 for HoustonSugar Land-Baytown. Together, these four metropolitan areas accounted for more than 125,000 , nearly 60 percent, of all elderly inmigrants in Texas.

In fact, as shown in Table 5, the overall net migration rate for the elderly in nonmetropolitan areas was 6.4 per 100 from 2000 to 2010 whereas it was 17.3 percent for Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, 13.0 percent for the College Station-Bryan, 14.5 percent for Killen-Temple-Fort Hood, 11.0 percent for McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, 10.2 percent for the San Antonio-New Braunfels, 12.8 percent for the Sherman-Denison, and 13.6 percent for the Tyler metropolitan area. Elderly migration shifted toward metropolitan areas during the last census decade.

## Projections of Elderly Populations in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Texas, 2010-50

The growth in the elderly population will only increase as a proportion of all growth in the coming decades (see Tables 6-10). Although the population 60 years of age and older increased by 2.3 million from 1970 to 2010 to nearly 3.8 million, the number of elderly is expected to increase to $11,983,397$ by 2050 (an increase of another $8,206,744$ [see Table 6] or 217.3 percent between 2010 to 2050). This compares to a projected growth in the total
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population (Hobby Center for the Study of Texas, 2013) of $30,059,969$ or 119.5 percent. In fact, of the total growth in the Texas population from 2010 to 2050, growth in the elderly population will account for $8,206,744$ of the State's total population increase of $30,059,969$, equivalent to 27.3 percent of all population growth in the State of Texas from 2010 to 2050 (see Murdock et al., 2014).

The data in Table 6 also indicate that the growth in elderly populations will shift to metropolitan areas in the long term. The number of elderly will increase by 52.2 percent in nonmetropolitan areas from 2010 to 2050 but, as noted above, by 217.3 percent statewide. Growth rates greater than the 52.2 percent in nonmetropolitan areas will occur in 18 of 25 metropolitan areas. Rates of growth from 2010 to 2050 that are larger than 200 percent will be evident in many metropolitan centers including 455.8 percent in Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, 318.7 percent in Houston-Sugarland-Baytown, 304.3 percent in Dallas-Fort WorthArlington, 264.5 percent in McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, 249.8 percent in Laredo, 218.9 percent in Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood, and 204.5 percent in San Antonio-New Braunfels. All of these areas, with the exception of San Antonio-New Braunfels, will show a larger increase in their older populations than the state as a whole. In fact, these seven metropolitan areas are projected to account for $7,154,581$ or 87.2 percent of the statewide growth in elderly populations from 2010 to 2050. At the same time, the growth of 349,711 older persons in nonmetropolitan areas will account for 4.3 percent of the state's total projected growth in its elderly population, down from the 10.9 percent that they accounted for from 1970 to 2010. Similarly, although the number of elderly in nonmetropolitan areas will increase by 349,711 from 2010 to 2050, the percentage of all elderly who live in nonmetropolitan areas will decline from 17.7 percent in 2010 to 8.5 percent in 2050.
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The data in Table 7 show the pervasive aging of the Texas population. In all metropolitan areas and in nonmetropolitan Texas the percentage of the elderly will increase from 2010 to 2050. By 2050, in 18 of 25 metropolitan areas and nonmetropolitan areas the elderly will make up more than 20 percent of the population.

Tables 8 and 9 show the projected net migration for each metropolitan and nonmetropolitan area from 2010 to 2050 . What is evident in these projections is the increasing concentration of the elderly in metropolitan areas in later parts of the projection period, particularly the 2040-50 decade. During this decade, the four largest metropolitan areas in Texas - Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, Houston-Sugar LandBaytown, and San Antonio-New Braunfels - would show an increase of 1,678,788 in their elderly populations. This value is larger than the total state gain because the total for these areas is diminished by the decline in elderly populations in other areas including a decline of 71,506 elderly persons in nonmetropolitan Texas from 2040 to 2050. The extent to which elderly inmigrants are projected to be in Texas' largest metropolitan areas is further evident in Table 9, in which only the four largest metropolitan areas in Texas have net inmigration rates of more than 10 percent for the elderly. At the same time change during this period includes a numerical outmigration of elderly of 71,506 or 7 percent for the elderly in nonmetropolitan areas. This level of outmigration in nonmetropolitan areas is nearly ten times larger than the decline in any metropolitan area in the state during the same period.

In the near term, elderly migrants will be a more significant source of growth in nonmetropolitan areas. As is evident in Tables 8 and 9, for each of the periods from 2010 to 2020 and 2020 to 2030, more than 80,000 elderly migrants will move to nonmetropolitan areas in Texas. Although still a smaller number than that in the four major metropolitan centers
combined, these two periods are clearly ones in which nonmetropolitan areas will have larger numbers of new residents than in either the 2030 to 2040 or 2040 to 2050 decades. In the near term, nonmetropolitan areas will continue to provide sources of elderly population growth through inmigration, but long-term trends suggest that metropolitan areas are likely to increasingly dominate elderly migration patterns.

## Historic and Future Patterns of Elderly Population Change in Central City and Suburban Metropolitan Counties and in Adjacent and Nonadjacent Nonmetropolitan Counties in Texas

As a further means of discerning the patterns of elderly population change in Texas, in this section we examine counties by the type of county, central city or suburban, within metropolitan areas, and nonmetropolitan counties in terms of whether they are either adjacent or not adjacent to metropolitan counties. We examine patterns of population change and migration for both historic (1970-2010) and future (2010-50) periods for central city and suburban metropolitan counties and adjacent and nonadjacent nonmetropolitan counties.

## Historic Patterns in Counties by Metropolitan Type, 1970-2010

Tables 10-14 show patterns of population change for the four county types metropolitan central city, metropolitan suburban, nonmetropolitan adjacent (to a metropolitan central city or suburban county) and nonmetropolitan nonadjacent counties. These data are shown for 1970-2010.

The data in Table 10 indicate that the largest numerical increases in elderly populations in Texas counties have been in central city counties. The elderly populations of such counties increased from 832,499 in 1970 to $2,301,354$ in 2010, 176.4 percent increase. Suburban counties had the next largest number of elderly residents with 193,541 in 1970 and 805,496 in 2010, an increase of 316.2 percent.

Nonmetropolitan counties that were adjacent to (bordered) a metropolitan county had a larger number of elderly residents and a larger percentage increase than nonadjacent counties. Nonmetropolitan adjacent counties had 516,794 persons 60 years or older by 2010, an increase of 201,805 or 64.1 percent from 1970 to 2010 . Nonadjacent counties had a total elderly population of 153,009 by 2050 , showing an increase of 52,309 or 52 percent from 1970 to 2010 .

Table 11 shows the percent of the elderly population in each of the four county types for each decade from 1970 to 2010. The data in this table show that central city counties were the areas of residence for the largest percentage of older Texans in all periods with that percentage changing from 57.7 percent in 1970 to 62.1 percent in 2010 . Suburban areas housed 21.3 percent of older Texans in 2010, up from 13.4 percent in 1970. Nonmetropolitan adjacent areas were home to 13.7 percent of elderly persons in the state in 2010, down from 21.8 in 1970, while only 4 percent of the population lived in nonadjacent counties in 2010, down from 7 percent in 1970 .

Table 12 provides data showing the prevalence of older adults in each of the four types of counties. The data in this table indicate that the elderly percentage of the total population increased across time in all county types and also that nonmetropolitan counties had larger percentages of elderly in their populations than either metropolitan county type. For example, in 2010, 22.2 percent of all persons in nonmetropolitan adjacent counties were 60 years or older compared with 20.8 percent in nonmetropolitan nonadjacent counties, 14.9 percent in metropolitan suburban counties, and 13.8 percent in metropolitan central city counties.

Finally, the data in Tables 13 and 14 indicate that elderly net migration has increased by more than 100,000 from the 1970 s to the 2000s. These data indicate that the number and rates of migration decreased in both nonmetropolitan county types from 1970 to 2010 while increasing (although with declines occurring in the 1980s and 1990s for central city counties) in central city
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and suburban areas from 1970 to 2010. Particularly notable is that suburban counties accounted for 38.3 percent of all elderly migrants in 1970 and 74.6 percent of all migrants to the state in 2010.

Projected Patterns for Counties by Type, 2010-50
Tables 15 through 19 show projected patterns for the four county types of metropolitan central city, metropolitan suburban, nonmetropolitan adjacent, and nonmetropolitan nonadjacent. The data in these tables show, as one would expect given that they are projections based on historical data, that the patterns noted above for the 1970 to 2010 period will continue, although accentuated, in the projections for 2010 to 2050.

Growth in the older population in the future is expected to be most extensive in suburban areas, followed by central city, nonmetropolitan adjacent and nonmetropolitan nonadjacent areas (Table 15). The suburban share of the elderly is projected to increase to 42.6 percent of all elderly by 2050 compared with 21.3 percent in 2010 while the percent in central cities decreases from 60.9 to 48.9 percent, the percent in nonmetropolitan adjacent counties decreases from 12.7 percent in 2010 to 6.6 percent in 2050 and the percent in nonmetropolitan nonadjacent counties decreases from 4.0 percent in 2010 to 1.9 percent in 2050 (Table 16).

Because of the general aging of the population, the percent of elderly persons increases across all county types (Table 17) but the percentage of older persons remains highest in nonmetropolitan adjacent counties, followed by suburban, nonmetropolitan nonadjacent, and central city counties. The projections shown in Tables 18 and 19 show elderly net migration and the related rates to become negative in both adjacent and nonadjacent county types by the 2040s and to be positive and increase in both central city and suburban counties, particularly in
suburban counties, from their base in 2010. These data indicate that elderly populations will come to be increasingly metropolitan and decreasingly nonmetropolitan in the years to come.

## Historic and Future Patterns in Texas Tourism Regions and Retirement Destination Counties

The Texas Economic Development and Tourism Division of the Governor's Office has named the state's tourism regions. The Texas Department of Agriculture uses these regions as a means to advertise GO TEXAN Certified Retirement Communities. These regions are shown in Figure 2 on a Texas regional map. A set of retirement destination counties was developed using criteria described in the following section.

## Historic and Future Patterns of Change in Tourism Regions

The data in Table 20 indicate that in all of the tourism regions with the exception of the Panhandle Plains Region older adult populations increased by more than 100 percent from 1970 to 2010. Particularly large increases were evident for the Hill Country (an increase of 271.7 percent) and the Big Bend Region (232.4 percent) but 200+ percent increases were also evident in the Gulf Coast and South Texas Regions. At the same time, although the overall rate of growth in the number of older residents was larger in these latter regions, the largest single number of older adults in 2010 was in the Prairie and Lakes Region, which included the DallasFort Worth-Arlington areas and parts of Central Texas. In fact, this region's percentage of all elderly in the state (the Prairie and Lakes Region) in 2010 was the largest at 33.1 percent (see Table 21) followed by the Gulf Coast Region (Houston-Galveston-Corpus Christi and related areas) with 24.3 percent of all elderly and South Texas with 12.0 percent.

Although these regions are large sources of elderly residents, they do not necessarily have the highest percentage of elderly. As shown in Table 22, the Piney Woods (with 19.4 percent of its residents being 60 years or older) and the Panhandle Plains (with 18.4 percent elderly) were
the regions with the highest percentage of elderly persons in 2010, while the Gulf Coast (with 13.7 percent of its population 60 years or older), South Texas (with 14.4 percent) and the Prairie and Lakes Region (with 14.7 percent) had the highest percentages of elderly persons.

In addition to the regions noted above, some of the regions with smaller overall numbers of elderly still have substantial numbers of older inmigrants. As shown in Table 23, although the Prairie and Lakes Region had the largest number of older (age 60+) migrants at 85,605 during the 2000s, the Hill Country Region was the area with the second largest number of inmigrants (50,960 during the 2000s) followed by the Piney Woods $(41,993)$. The Hill Country and Piney Woods Regions had the highest percentages of elderly migrants in the state (Table 24).

The data in Tables 20-24 show both where the largest numbers of elderly are located and where the most inmigration of elderly persons occurs. The data in these tables suggest that where the largest number of elderly live and the areas to which elderly migrants are moving are not necessarily the same but that both areas may be important in establishing the market for elderly housing. Although the highest elderly inmigration rates are in the relatively rural areas of the state (the Hill Country and Piney Woods) the largest number of elderly migrants are likely to be in the more urban Prairie and Lakes tourist region.

The data in Tables 25-29 show that if the trends of the 2000 to 2010 period continue the future will be one of substantial growth in elderly residents in Texas (in fact an overall increase of 8.2 million elderly from 2010 to 2050). By 2050, the Prairies and Lakes Region would have 4.3 million, the Gulf Coast nearly 3.0 million, the Hill Country nearly 1.4 million, the South Texas Region 1.3 million and the Piney Woods 1.1 million elderly persons (Table 25). Only the Panhandle Plains region would have a growth rate (at 58.4 percent for 2010 to 2050) less than

130 percent and overall the number of older Texans will increase by more than 217 percent from 2010 to 2050, from nearly 3.8 million in 2010 to nearly 12 million by 2050 .

By 2050, four regions - the Gulf Coast, Hill Country, Prairies and Lakes and South Texas (Table 26) - would be home to more than 83 percent of Texas' older population and, by 2050 (see Table 27), all but one region (the Prairies and Lakes with 20.7 percent) would have 21 percent or more of its population 60 or older. No region had as much as 20 percent of its population in this age group in 2010.

The data in Tables 28 and 29 indicate just how extensive future elderly net migration will be. From 2040-50 only the Panhandle Plains Region would have outmigration of older Texans while the Prairies and Lakes Region would show net inmigration of more than 680,000 elderly, the Gulf Coast nearly 395,000 , the Hill Country more than 289,000 and the Piney Woods more than 223,000. Each of these regions would also show net migration rates per 100 exceeding 13 percent. At the state level the same period would show net migration of more than 1.6 million older persons. When all future periods (the 2010s, 2020s, 2030s, and 2040s) are combined, more than 3.6 million older persons are projected to inmigrate to Texas from 2010 to 2050 with more than 1.4 million inmigrating to the Prairies and Lakes Region alone.

## Historic and Future Patterns of Change in Retirement Destination Counties

Counties designated as retirement destination counties must have two characteristics. They must have had 25 percent or more of their population 60 years or older in 2010 and they must have had net inmigration rates of 15 or more per 100 persons 60 years or older from either 2000 to 2010 or for all three of the inter-decade periods of 1970-80, 1980-90 and 1990-2000.

For the projected period 2010-50, counties are required only to meet the criteria of 25 percent elderly population and 15 percent net inmigration for any decade from 2010 to 2050 . The
numbers of counties meeting these criteria for each region are shown in parenthesis after the name of the region (Table 30).

Table 30 shows that the number of older persons in the retirement destination counties in these regions is relatively small compared to the total number of older persons in these regions overall. For example, when the numerical change in these retirement destination counties relative to the total change in these regions is examined, the number of older persons in destination counties is relatively small compared to all older persons in these regions (Table 20 and Table 30). Thus in the Big Bend area the 1970-2010 change was 126,669 ; in destination counties it was 549 , for the Gulf Coast the change was 5,747 in destination counties compared with 615,431 in the region overall. Even for the areas with the largest number of new older persons in such counties - the Hill Country and the Prairie and Lakes area - the changes in destination areas are 36,831 for such counties in the Hill Country and 51,194 for those in the Prairie and Lakes area compared to total increases in these areas of 227,101 and 756,263 , respectively. Similarly, the data on the percent of the total elderly population in Texas accounted for by such counties (Table 31) indicate that they accounted for only 5.5 percent of the 60 and older population in the state in 2010.

However, when one examines projected values for rural destination counties (Tables 32 and 33), the results suggest that for some regions such counties may become of increasing importance. For example, the projected numerical increase for rural destination counties from 2010 to 2050 in the Hill Country region is 641,699 out of an overall increase of $1,084,552$. The total change for such counties in the Piney Woods would be 599,949 out of a total of 761,873 , and for the Prairies and Lakes region, 250,896 out of a total of $3,030,654$. For these regions
retirement destination counties will clearly be important. Migration to such counties will be of much less significance for other regions.

Data in Tables 34 and 35 suggest that net migration will play larger roles in overall growth in the destination counties in the Piney Woods (at 227,844) and the Hill Country (at 195,063). However, even for these areas net migration of older persons would account only for 20 to 30 percent of the net change.

Overall, it appears that the retirement destination counties are of importance in only a small number of areas in Texas but that importance will increase over time. Whereas only 5.4 percent of the increase in the number of older migrants was due to the destination counties in the period of 1970-2010, for 2010-50, these counties will account for 17.2 percent of all elderly inmigrants to Texas. Although a discussion of projected elderly populations in each destination county is not possible, Appendix B provides data on the projected number of persons 60 years or older for all counties in the state.

## Detailed Historical Demographic and Housing Characteristics of Elderly Populations in Texas

Having examined the demographic characteristics of past and future elderly populations in Texas, it is useful to examine more detailed characteristics of populations and households with householders (persons in whose name a housing unit is owned or rented) who are 60 years or older. Although detailed projections are not available for future populations, these data, as with the projections data, provide further insight into the characteristics of the elderly in Texas, including their housing characteristics. Because of the detailed nature of the data, examined analyses are provided only for metropolitan areas, nonmetropolitan areas as a whole, and the state. Appendix C provides data on the characteristics discussed here for metropolitan areas for selected counties (those with an estimated population size of 20,000 or more in 2011) in Texas.

The data in Table 36 show that the elderly are substantially less diverse than the total population of the state. For example, although 21 percent of the state's population was Hispanic in 2010 and 66.3 percent was non-Hispanic White, only eight areas (Brownsville-Harlingen, Corpus Christi, El Paso, Laredo, McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, Odessa, San Antonio-New Braunfels, and Victoria) had larger percentage Hispanic populations than the state as a whole. While the state was 66.3 percent non-Hispanic White, 17 metropolitan areas had non-Hispanic White populations that exceeded 66.3 percent. Seventeen of the 25 areas had elderly populations that were thus less diverse than the population of the state as a whole.

The data in Table 37 show the effects of differentials in marital status between younger and older population and the effects of mortality on older population. Twelve of 24 areas showed a higher percentage of married couple households than the state as a whole (at 48.6 percent) but nine areas had higher percentages of female householder households with no husband present (at 9.2 percent) and 14 showed a higher percentage of householders living alone (at 37.3 percent) than the state as a whole and, as shown in Table 38, 19 of the 25 metropolitan areas showed a higher percentage of widowed persons than the state as a whole (at 22.4 percent).

These tables also provide data on the educational characteristics of the elderly in Texas. Metropolitan areas show that such populations tend to have moderate levels of education (Table 39). In nine metropolitan areas, the percent of persons with less than a high school level of education was greater than the state as a whole (at 25 percent) and only seven with as high or higher percentages with a Bachelor's degree or higher (the state percentage was 23 percent) while 14 had higher percentages with a high school degree than in the state as a whole (at 27.1 percent) and 19 metropolitan areas had higher percentages with some college than the state as a whole (at 24.9 percent).

Table 40 shows data on veteran status of persons 60 years or older, a factor with significance for housing affordability and financing. The data shows that in 18 of the 25 metropolitan areas the percentage of persons who were veterans was as high or higher than for the state as a whole (at 21.9 percent).

Mobility of the elderly, that is, how many elderly had moved in the last year is shown in Table 41. Whereas 92.8 percent or more were in the same house as a year earlier for the state as a whole, this held true in only 13 metropolitan areas. The number of elderly who have moved is less than for nonelderly but still substantial.

Table 42 provides data showing English proficiency for elderly persons in metropolitan areas in Texas. Whereas only 13.9 percent of elderly in the state as a whole speak English less than very well, this percentage is exceeded in eight of 25 metropolitan areas. These are border areas such as Brownsville-Harlingen, El Paso, Laredo, McAllen-Edinburg-Mission as well as Corpus Christi, Odessa, San Antonio-New Braunfels, and Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown.

Tables 43-46 show income and economic characteristics of households with householders 60 years or older. Table 43 indicates the percentage of persons 60 years or older still in the labor force. This percentage is 28.8 percent statewide and is higher in eight areas: Amarillo, Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, College Station-Bryan, Dallas-Fort WorthArlington, Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, Lubbock, Midland, and Odessa. Table 44 shows that 50.2 percent of persons 60 years or older have earnings income, 74.9 percent Social Security income, and 39.6 percent retirement income. The elderly in South Texas were the most likely to show supplemental income, public assistance income and food stamps.

Table 45 shows data on the mean income from each of these sources, showing overall state averages of $\$ 59,040$ for earnings-based income, $\$ 16,403$ for Social Security income, and
$\$ 23,499$ for retirement income. However, there is substantial variability with the range for earnings-based income varying from \$77,477 for Midland and \$70,726 for Houston-Sugar Land Baytown to $\$ 38,104$ in Laredo; Social Security income varying from $\$ 17,549$ in Midland to \$12,747 in Laredo; and retirement income from Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos at \$29,007 to Longview at \$18,682.

Finally, Table 46 shows high poverty rates in South Texas metropolitan areas (e.g., 25.2 percent in Brownsville-Harlingen and 25.0 percent in McAllen-Edinburg-Mission) to low levels in Austin (7.1 percent), Killeen-Temple-Ford Hood (7.9 percent) and Tyler (8.1 percent). Such data clearly indicate that the socioeconomic differences across the metropolitan areas overall are equally evident for the elderly in these areas.

The last three tables in this section deal specifically with housing. Table 47 shows data on owner- and renter-occupied housing. The table shows high percentages of owner-occupied housing among persons 60 or older in all metropolitan areas with the variation in such housing being from 75.8 percent in Laredo to 85.1 percent in Tyler. Ownership rates are above 80 percent in 21 of 25 metropolitan areas.

Table 48 shows median values and costs across metropolitan areas. The median values largely reflect the income differences delineated above. However, the percentage of households with monthly costs exceeding 30 percent of household income (thought to be burdensome to most households) varies from 18.6 percent in Abilene, 18.7 percent in San Angelo and 18.8 percent in Longview, to 30.6 percent in Laredo, 26.8 percent in Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, 26.2 percent in Brownsville-Harlingen, and 25.6 percent in Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos and in Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown.

Median gross rent values are shown in Table 49. Overall, 13 areas showed more than 50 percent of their residents paying more than 30 percent of their income for rent and 12 areas with $30-40$ percent of their residents paying more than 30 percent. Median rents vary from $\$ 894$ in Midland and \$848 in Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos to \$420 in McAllen-Edinburg-Mission and $\$ 462$ in Brownsville-Harlingen. Overall such data indicate the diversity in economic conditions impacting the older population across Texas.

## Summary

This report examines the future of elderly housing growth in Texas. Data analysis on current and future elderly populations suggests the following:

- Texas' population 60 years or older has increased dramatically over the past several decades, rising from 1.4 million in 1970 to nearly 3.8 million by 2010, an increase of 162 percent compared with 124.5 percent for the total population. This was a result of both inmigration and the aging of the baby-boom generation (persons born between 1946 and 1964).
- Nonmetropolitan areas remain disproportionately elderly. Overall, 21.9 percent of persons in nonmetropolitan areas were 60 years or older in 2010, a larger percentage of elderly persons than in any single metropolitan center in Texas and greater than the 15 percent of persons in the state as a whole who were elderly in 2010.
- Whereas the population 60 years or older in ten metropolitan areas, including the largest four areas (Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, San AntonioNew Braunfels, and Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos), increased by more than 162 percent from 1970 to 2010, nonmetropolitan areas increased such populations by only 61.2 percent from 1970 to 2010.
- Although much attention has been concentrated on the growth of elderly housing markets in rural areas, such as the Hill Country or East Texas, elderly markets are increasing in urban areas as well. In 1970, 71.2 percent of the population 60 years or older lived in metropolitan centers and 28.8 percent in nonmetropolitan areas, but by 2010 those in metropolitan centers had increased to 82.3 percent while the percentage in nonmetropolitan centers had decreased to 17.7 percent. From 2000 to 2010, nearly 60 percent of all elderly net inmigration in Texas occurred in one of its four largest metropolitan areas.
- Elderly housing markets in Texas will expand in the coming years. Texas' total population is projected to increase from the 25.1 million that it was in 2010 to 55.2
million by 2050, an increase of 119.5 percent. At the same time, its population of persons 60 years or older is projected to increase by $8,206,744$ from $3,776,653$ in 2010 to 11,983,397 in 2050, an increase of 217.3 percent (Murdock et al., 2014).
- Projections of future populations 60 years or older point to a decreasing rate of growth of such populations in rural areas ( 52.2 percent from 2010 to 2050 compared with 61.2 percent from 1970 to 2010) and to substantial increases in the elderly in metropolitan centers with Texas' four largest centers increasing their elderly populations by more than 200 percent and with 18 of 25 metropolitan areas having 2010 to 2050 rates of elderly population growth higher than those for nonmetropolitan areas.
- Due to the continued aging of the Texas population, by 2050 more than 25 percent of the persons in nonmetropolitan areas will be 60 years or older (up from 21.9 percent in 2010) and all 25 metropolitan areas will have higher percentages in these age groups in 2050 than in 2010. In 19 of the 25 metropolitan areas, persons 60 years or older will account for 20 percent or more of all persons in their populations by 2050 .
- The number of migrants to nonmetropolitan Texas is projected to change substantially over the next four decades. Whereas more than 80,000 elderly persons are projected to inmigrate to nonmetropolitan areas in the 2010-20 and 2020-30 decades, only 12,000 are projected to inmigrate to such areas from 2030 to 2040. Net outmigration of more than 71,000 is projected to occur from 2040 to 2050.
- Elderly inmigration is projected to be 276,115 from 2040 to 2050 for Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, 648,619 for Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, 643,413 for Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, and 110,641 for San Antonio-New Braunfels. At the same time, 12 metropolitan areas in Texas will show declines in the number of elderly inmigrants from 2040 to 2050.
- When examined in terms of central city, suburban, nonmetropolitan counties adjacent to a metropolitan central city or suburban county, and nonmetropolitan counties not adjacent to a metropolitan central city or suburban county, it is obvious that growth in elderly populations reflect general population growth with the 1970-2010 increase in populations 60 years or older being 316 percent for suburban counties, 176 percent for central city counties, 64 percent for nonmetropolitan adjacent counties, and 52 percent for nonmetropolitan nonadjacent counties. As a result of such changes, by 201061 percent of all persons 60 years or older lived in central city counties, 21 percent in suburban counties, 14 percent in nonmetropolitan adjacent counties and 4 percent in nonmetropolitan nonadjacent counties. Despite such patterns of growth, the percentage of all persons 60 years or older was less than 15 percent in central city and suburban counties but over 20 percent in nonmetropolitan adjacent and nonadjacent counties. Of the 210,013 elderly migrants to Texas from 2000 to $2010,156,615$ or 74.5 percent moved to suburban areas. The migration rate to suburban areas was 24.4 percent compared with 7.7 percent for nonmetropolitan adjacent, 5.9 percent for nonmetropolitan nonadjacent, and 0.6 percent for metropolitan central city areas.
- When projections for 2010 to 2050 are examined the patterns reflect those of 1970-2010 with the most extensive growth in suburban ( 4.3 million), central city ( 3.6 million), nonmetropolitan adjacent $(280,000)$ and nonmetropolitan nonadjacent $(70,000)$ areas. Nonmetropolitan counties will continue to have the highest percentage of elderly persons, but by the 2040-50 decade these counties are projected to have net outmigration of elderly persons while metropolitan, particularly suburban, areas will have extensive rates of net inmigration.
- Data on tourism regions from 1970 to 2010 show the most extensive growth in elderly populations in the Prairies and Lakes region (which includes the Dallas-Fort WorthArlington metropolitan area), followed by the Gulf Coast (which includes the HoustonSugar Land-Baytown metropolitan area), followed by South Texas. These areas contained 69 percent of all persons 60 years or older by 2010. The Hill Country and the Piney Woods areas showed the next largest levels of growth. However, when rates of net inmigration are examined, the Hill Country and Piney Woods areas have the highest inmigration rates from 2000 to 2010.
- For tourism regions, growth follows the general patterns noted in number 12 above, with more than 680,000 elderly migrants to the Prairies and Lakes areas, nearly 395,000 to the Gulf Coast, 289,000 to the Hill Country, and more than 223,000 to the Piney Woods.
- Migration rates are highest for the Hill Country (at 20.7 percent) followed by the Piney Woods (19.7 percent), Prairies and Lakes (15.9 percent), and the Gulf Coast (13.2 percent).
- An examination of data for the retirement destination counties shows patterns reflective of those for the tourism regions but show that large concentrations of elderly inmigrants are expected to be in specific counties. When the total increase in the number of inmigrants from 2010-50 is examined, 544,000 elderly migrants are expected to move to the ten Hill Country counties between 2010 and 2050, nearly 515,117 to the seven counties in the Piney Woods, and nearly 204,000 to the 12 counties in the Prairies and Lakes tourism region.
- Detailed characteristics of the populations 60 years or older in the last part of this document show the elderly to be disproportionately non-Hispanic White (with the populations in 15 areas being more than 70 percent non-Hispanic White). These data also show such households to have large proportions of traditional married couple and family households. In all but one metropolitan area, more than 20 percent of their elderly persons are widowed. Education levels are high school or higher.
- In 18 of the 25 metropolitan areas more than 20 percent of the elderly were veterans. More than 90 percent of those 60 and older in all areas had lived in the same house for the past 12 months. Only those in border communities had large proportions of elderly who could not speak English. And 20 to 30 percent of the elderly were still in the labor force in all metropolitan areas.
- Financially, more than 70 percent of the elderly in all areas received Social Security income, and more than 40 percent in all metropolitan areas had some earning income. More than 29 percent in all areas had retirement income. Only in border metropolitan areas were more than 20 percent living in poverty.
- In only four of 25 areas was the percentage of owner-occupied housing below 80 percent, and in only one area (Laredo) was the percentage of household income being spent on housing costs more than 30 percent. More than 40 percent of renters in all areas were spending more than 30 percent of their income on rent.

The data in this report provide clear indications of several important trends likely to markedly impact elderly housing markets in the future. First, the population growth underlying such housing markets has been, and will continue to be, substantial, with an increase of 162 percent, from 1.4 to 3.7 million persons, from 1970 to 2010, and expected growth of 217 percent, from 3.7 to 8.2 million persons, from 2010 to 2050. By comparison, the total population of Texas is projected to increase by 119.5 percent from 2010 to 2050. The market for elderly housing will grow substantially given appropriate economic conditions.

Second, it is also clear that housing markets for the elderly are likely to increasingly reflect the patterns of population change in the state as a whole. The growth in the state's elderly population is expected to move increasingly toward metropolitan and away from nonmetropolitan areas. As noted above, although the number of elderly inmigrants was larger in nonmetropolitan areas than that in any one metropolitan area through the 2000s, there was a substantial shift toward metropolitan areas overall. In the 1970s, for example, the number of elderly inmigrants to nonmetropolitan centers was 53,833 while the combined net gain for the four largest metropolitan centers in Texas was 7,037. In the 1980s, elderly nonmetropolitan net migration was 33,583 while the four metropolitan centers combined had negative elderly net migration of 14,993 . In the 1990 s, nonmetropolitan elderly net inmigration was 43,081 compared with 23,892 in the four largest metropolitan centers, while in the 2000s elderly nonmetropolitan
net inmigration was 40,164 compared with the four largest metropolitan centers at 125,397 . Looking forward, although nonmetropolitan elderly net inmigration is projected to nearly double during the 2010s and 2020s to more than 80,000 for each period, the number of elderly net inmigrants in the four largest areas is expected to be nearly twice the nonmetropolitan number. By the 2030s, the number of elderly net migrants to nonmetropolitan areas is projected to decline to 12,146 while net elderly inmigration to the four largest metropolitan areas is projected to be 972,167 . By the 2040s, elderly net migration in nonmetropolitan areas is projected to change to a negative (outmigration) of $-71,506$ while elderly net inmigration to metropolitan areas is projected to be $1,678,788$.

Third, the key subareas in term of metropolitan growth in elderly populations, particularly in the near term, are suburban areas. For example, from 2000 to 2010, suburban counties showed a net of 156,615 elderly inmigrants compared with 13,135 for central city areas, 36,502 for nonmetropolitan adjacent counties and 3,662 for nonmetropolitan nonadjacent areas. This pattern is expected to continue in the projection period through 2050. In fact, from 2030 to 2040 and 2040 to 2050 , the net migration of elderly is projected to exceed one million persons. By 2040-50, nonmetropolitan areas of all types will experience net outmigration of elderly persons.

Fourth, an examination of migration of elderly into the tourism regions shows the most growth in four regions in the 1970-2010 period and five regions from 2010-50. For example, for the 2000-10 period (the period that showed the highest number of inmigrants for any decade from 1970 to 2010) the Prairies and Lakes region had 85,605 inmigrants, the Hill Country 50,960, the Piney Woods 41,993 , and the South Texas region 26,202 inmigrants. The number of inmigrants for the projected period from 2040 to 2050, which had the largest increases for any
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decade during the projection period, was 680,354 for the Prairies and Lakes Region, 394,841 for the Gulf Coast, 289,260 for the Hill Country, 223,218 for the Piney Woods and 83,824 for the South Texas Region. When migration for the retirement destination counties is examined it is evident that these counties will show significant elderly population growth. This will be most evident in the counties in the Piney Woods, Hill Country and Prairies and Lakes. High levels of net inmigration are unlikely to occur except in a few rural areas.

## Conclusions

The data in this report suggest several conclusions regarding future housing markets for the elderly. First, it is apparent that such markets have increased in the last several decades but will increase even more in the coming decades. The 2.3 million increase in the number of older Texans (60 years and older) during the period from 1970 to 2010 and the projected increase of 8.2 million additional elderly from 2010 to 2050 represent substantial increases in markets for all kinds of goods and services including elderly housing. There is no doubt that the demand for housing for the elderly will continue to increase.

Many analysts have seen elderly housing as either consisting of rural homes built on the edge of idyllic, beautiful rural landscapes or as assisted living or nursing homes. Both have and will likely continue to be developed. The data here suggest that the market is of sufficient size to support a range of real estate products and may represent an important source of new real estate development for Texas.

This analysis suggests that two very different types of areas may experience growth in the markets for housing for older persons. First, there is likely to be continued growth in elderly housing in rural and less dense areas. However, these data suggest that the growth in rural areas is likely to continue to be concentrated in certain regions of the state and that no broad-based
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rural elderly housing markets are likely to occur throughout the state. The Prairies and Lakes, Hill Country, and the Piney Woods areas are likely to continue to attract significant numbers of elderly migrants but there is little in this report to suggest that rural areas as a whole will experience extensive growth in elderly housing markets. The characteristics noted in the introduction relative to proximity to larger urban centers, more developed medical, art, educational, and cultural infrastructure and facilities continue to be important and limit broadbased renewed growth in rural elderly populations.

What is also evident in the data examined here is that the growth in elderly populations will also likely be extensive in metropolitan centers, particularly those around the large, fast growing areas of Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, and San Antonio-New Braunfels. In fact, as noted above, the data on elderly population growth would suggest that metropolitan, particularly suburban, areas around Texas' four largest metropolitan areas will show more growth in older populations than nonmetropolitan areas.

Along with housing options located in rural areas that provide rural amenities but are sufficiently close to metropolitan areas to provide access to health and other urban services, there may be markets for housing in suburban areas with developed health and urban recreational facilities but with sufficient proximity to access more rural areas and their amenities. Suburbs that have long been seen as the haven for the traditional family (parents and children) may also become a preferred location for elderly who want access to both rural and urban services and environments but less dense living arrangements than in central city locations. As with rural elderly housing developments, suburban developments will require careful site selection and extensive marketing efforts.

The results here thus suggest substantial growth in housing for the elderly in both traditional rural retirement locations in the state and potential developments in suburban locations. In general, we believe the opportunity for such developments will expand housing development for the elderly extensively. However, several potential limiting conditions and factors also merit mention here.

First, despite renewed economic growth, particularly in Texas, the financial markets and the relatively slow general growth in new housing continue to impact financial forces across the country. This may be particularly problematic for the elderly who often have fixed economic resources and limited opportunities to enhance their resource bases without experiencing undue financial risks. The slow growth in more secure financial vehicles is limiting elderly income growth and maintenance in many areas, and many elderly express concern about the level of resources needed to support them for the remainder of their lifetimes. The general malaise that impacted levels of savings and markets in the past may not have been sufficiently alleviated to provide the confidence necessary to animate elderly purchasers. Also, as noted in the introduction, Texas has high percentages of elderly in poverty and growing elderly minority populations who, due to a variety of historic, discriminatory and other factors, have lower income and higher poverty rates. They will represent a larger proportion of future elderly populations in the state, and if these populations do not come to have the resources necessary to take advantage of new housing products, the market for elderly housing may not increase at the level anticipated.

The description provided above of the economic and other characteristics of Texas' elderly populations also suggests that they have many of the same housing patterns, financial limitations and household structures as they have had traditionally. Although many conditions
have changed, many of the characteristics of the elderly have not. They are therefore likely to continue to desire products and services that are similar to those with which they have had experience and which economically meet their needs. The housing products developed must thus both be familiar and innovative to address their long-term preferences and new financial and socioeconomic realities. It is clear that innovation without an element of familiarity will likely meet with skepticism.

In sum, then, the size of housing markets for the elderly should increase substantially in Texas in the coming years. Developing such markets will likely require continued careful analysis and innovative product development while at the same time paying close attention to the long-established limitations and preferences of the elderly. Elderly housing markets in Texas should thus continue to provide both substantial opportunities and challenges.
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## Appendices

## Appendix A

Table 1: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Metropolitan Statistical Areas by Decade, 1970-2010

| Area | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | Change 1970-2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Abilene | 19,356 | 22,992 | 25,476 | 27,055 | 30,746 | 11,390 | 58.8 |
| Amarillo | 18,746 | 25,649 | 31,689 | 35,617 | 41,803 | 23,057 | 123.0 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 49,130 | 67,523 | 89,936 | 123,388 | 211,611 | 162,481 | 330.7 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 43,071 | 54,661 | 65,032 | 66,226 | 71,047 | 27,976 | 65.0 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 17,225 | 27,332 | 37,279 | 48,724 | 62,348 | 45,123 | 262.0 |
| College Station-Bryan | 12,180 | 15,706 | 17,530 | 20,550 | 28,205 | 16,025 | 131.6 |
| Corpus Christi | 30,102 | 41,857 | 54,015 | 61,376 | 78,349 | 48,247 | 160.3 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 270,824 | 359,465 | 452,695 | 561,487 | 841,463 | 570,639 | 210.7 |
| El Paso | 30,317 | 46,406 | 69,864 | 88,348 | 115,645 | 85,328 | 281.5 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 214,004 | 300,199 | 403,694 | 510,675 | 778,812 | 564,808 | 263.9 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 18,164 | 24,013 | 30,537 | 37,013 | 51,947 | 33,783 | 186.0 |
| Laredo | 8,319 | 11,105 | 14,783 | 19,793 | 27,990 | 19,671 | 236.5 |
| Longview | 23,748 | 30,478 | 34,196 | 35,486 | 41,772 | 18,024 | 75.9 |
| Lubbock | 18,700 | 24,995 | 31,498 | 36,359 | 44,018 | 25,318 | 135.4 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 20,137 | 35,330 | 51,453 | 71,909 | 100,425 | 80,288 | 398.7 |
| Midland | 5,512 | 9,141 | 14,064 | 17,567 | 21,256 | 15,744 | 285.6 |
| Odessa | 7,089 | 12,012 | 15,998 | 17,645 | 19,933 | 12,844 | 181.2 |
| San Angelo | 11,292 | 14,147 | 16,775 | 18,399 | 21,421 | 10,129 | 89.7 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 112,594 | 151,817 | 201,052 | 244,517 | 341,081 | 228,487 | 202.9 |
| Sherman-Denison | 15,381 | 18,525 | 19,966 | 21,414 | 26,177 | 10,796 | 70.2 |
| Texarkana | 11,123 | 13,643 | 15,457 | 15,738 | 18,413 | 7,290 | 65.5 |
| Tyler | 15,407 | 21,879 | 27,667 | 31,989 | 40,988 | 25,581 | 166.0 |
| Victoria | 8,342 | 11,658 | 15,612 | 18,395 | 22,873 | 14,531 | 174.2 |
| Waco | 25,684 | 30,415 | 33,610 | 35,085 | 40,590 | 14,906 | 58.0 |
| Wichita Falls | 19,593 | 21,993 | 24,607 | 25,642 | 27,937 | 8,344 | 42.6 |
| Non-Metropolitan | 415,629 | 509,769 | 549,922 | 583,804 | 669,803 | 254,174 | 61.2 |
| State of Texas | 1,441,669 | 1,902,710 | 2,344,407 | 2,774,201 | 3,776,653 | 2,334,984 | 162.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.

Table 2: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Metropolitan Statistical Areas as a Share of the Total Older Adult Population in Texas by Decade, 1970-2010

| Area | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abilene | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| Amarillo | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 5.6 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 1.9 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| College Station-Bryan | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Corpus Christi | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.1 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 18.8 | 18.9 | 19.3 | 20.2 | 22.3 |
| El Paso | 2.1 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.1 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 14.7 | 15.9 | 17.1 | 18.4 | 20.5 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| Laredo | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Longview | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Lubbock | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 1.4 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
| Midland | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Odessa | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| San Angelo | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 7.8 | 8.0 | 8.6 | 8.8 | 9.0 |
| Sherman-Denison | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| Texarkana | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Tyler | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| Victoria | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Waco | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Wichita Falls | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Non-Metropolitan | 28.8 | 26.8 | 23.5 | 21.0 | 17.7 |
| State of Texas | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.

Table 3: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Metropolitan Statistical Areas by Decade, 1970-2010

| Area | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abilene | 15.8 | 16.5 | 17.2 | 16.9 | 18.6 |
| Amarillo | 12.3 | 14.1 | 16.2 | 15.7 | 16.7 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 12.3 | 11.5 | 10.6 | 9.9 | 12.3 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 12.5 | 14.6 | 18.0 | 17.2 | 18.3 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 12.3 | 13.0 | 14.3 | 14.5 | 15.3 |
| College Station-Bryan | 14.8 | 13.0 | 11.6 | 11.1 | 12.3 |
| Corpus Christi | 10.2 | 12.3 | 14.7 | 15.2 | 18.3 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 11.2 | 11.9 | 11.3 | 10.9 | 13.2 |
| El Paso | 8.4 | 9.7 | 11.8 | 13.0 | 14.4 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 9.7 | 9.5 | 10.7 | 10.8 | 13.1 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 10.7 | 10.6 | 11.4 | 11.2 | 12.8 |
| Laredo | 11.4 | 11.2 | 11.1 | 10.2 | 11.2 |
| Longview | 18.1 | 18.0 | 19.0 | 18.3 | 19.5 |
| Lubbock | 9.9 | 11.3 | 13.7 | 14.6 | 15.5 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 11.1 | 12.5 | 13.4 | 12.6 | 13.0 |
| Midland | 8.4 | 11.1 | 13.2 | 15.1 | 15.5 |
| Odessa | 7.7 | 10.4 | 13.5 | 14.6 | 14.5 |
| San Angelo | 15.7 | 16.4 | 16.8 | 17.4 | 19.2 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 11.8 | 13.1 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 15.9 |
| Sherman-Denison | 18.5 | 20.6 | 21.0 | 19.4 | 21.7 |
| Texarkana | 16.4 | 18.1 | 18.9 | 17.6 | 19.9 |
| Tyler | 15.9 | 17.0 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 19.5 |
| Victoria | 10.9 | 12.5 | 15.7 | 16.5 | 19.8 |
| Waco | 17.4 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 16.4 | 17.3 |
| Wichita Falls | 14.4 | 15.9 | 17.5 | 16.9 | 18.5 |
| Non-Metropolitan | 19.4 | 20.4 | 21.0 | 20.1 | 21.9 |
| State of Texas | 12.9 | 13.4 | 13.8 | 13.3 | 15.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.

Table 4: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) for Metropolitan Statistical Areas by Decade, 1970-2010

| Area | 1970-1980 | 1980-1990 | 1990-2000 | 2000-2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abilene | 704 | 584 | 719 | 1,466 |
| Amarillo | 967 | -137 | 1,095 | 1,061 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 8,390 | 8,743 | 15,364 | 31,000 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | -3,317 | -3,916 | -3,749 | -2,993 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 6,833 | 4,864 | 7,785 | 2,083 |
| College Station-Bryan | 2,118 | 1,240 | 1,528 | 3,211 |
| Corpus Christi | -187 | -631 | 1,019 | 2,106 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 3,006 | -9,120 | -608 | 36,649 |
| El Paso | 4,333 | 2,930 | 1,769 | 2,195 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | -5,419 | -27,043 | -9,864 | 26,394 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 3,062 | 2,205 | 2,558 | 6,520 |
| Laredo | 1,314 | 1,096 | 3,174 | 1,491 |
| Longview | 2,978 | 1,633 | 846 | 2,987 |
| Lubbock | 56 | 66 | 1,061 | 2,033 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 10,968 | 9,099 | 14,705 | 9,939 |
| Midland | -51 | -203 | 397 | 312 |
| Odessa | -405 | -1,681 | -1,294 | -598 |
| San Angelo | 1,228 | 942 | 1,177 | 1,186 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 10,620 | 12,427 | 19,000 | 31,354 |
| Sherman-Denison | 2,206 | 1,140 | 2,099 | 2,932 |
| Texarkana | 224 | 358 | 465 | 753 |
| Tyler | 3,599 | 3,167 | 3,167 | 4,851 |
| Victoria | 527 | 238 | 587 | 621 |
| Waco | 936 | 623 | 1,102 | 2,124 |
| Wichita Falls | -507 | -259 | -428 | 73 |
| Non-Metropolitan | 53,833 | 33,583 | 43,081 | 40,164 |
| State of Texas | 108,016 | 41,948 | 106,755 | 209,914 |

Source: Winkler et al., Applied Population Laboratory, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2013.

Table 5: Rates of Net Migration (per 100 people) for the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Metropolitan Statistical Areas by Decade, 1970-2010

| Area | 1970-1980 | 1980-1990 | 1990-2000 | 2000-2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abilene | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 5.1 |
| Amarillo | 3.9 | -0.5 | 3.2 | 2.6 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 14.1 | 13.2 | 14.2 | 17.3 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | -5.7 | -6.7 | -5.4 | -4.1 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 33.1 | 18.0 | 18.9 | 3.5 |
| College Station-Bryan | 15.5 | 9.5 | 8.0 | 13.0 |
| Corpus Christi | -0.4 | -1.3 | 1.7 | 2.8 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 0.8 | -2.3 | -0.1 | 4.6 |
| El Paso | 10.2 | 5.1 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | -1.8 | -7.2 | -1.9 | 3.5 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 14.5 | 9.6 | 7.4 | 14.5 |
| Laredo | 13.3 | 9.7 | 18.8 | 5.6 |
| Longview | 10.8 | 6.3 | 2.5 | 7.8 |
| Lubbock | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 4.9 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 44.7 | 26.0 | 25.7 | 11.0 |
| Midland | -0.6 | -1.6 | 2.3 | 1.5 |
| Odessa | -3.2 | -10.7 | -6.8 | -2.9 |
| San Angelo | 9.4 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 5.9 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 7.5 | 7.9 | 8.5 | 10.2 |
| Sherman-Denison | 13.4 | 7.6 | 11.0 | 12.8 |
| Texarkana | 1.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 4.3 |
| Tyler | 19.6 | 16.0 | 11.0 | 13.6 |
| Victoria | 4.7 | 1.8 | 3.3 | 2.8 |
| Waco | 3.2 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 5.6 |
| Wichita Falls | -2.2 | -1.3 | -1.6 | 0.3 |
| Non-Metropolitan | 11.7 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 6.4 |
| State of Texas | 6.0 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 5.9 |

Source: Winkler et al., Applied Population Laboratory, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2013.

Table 6: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Metropolitan Statistical Areas in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| Area | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | Change 2010-2050 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Abilene | 30,746 | 39,139 | 44,591 | 43,748 | 46,051 | 15,305 | 49.8 |
| Amarillo | 41,803 | 58,471 | 71,595 | 79,567 | 92,381 | 50,578 | 121.0 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 211,611 | 371,852 | 573,310 | 841,814 | 1,176,236 | 964,625 | 455.8 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 71,047 | 91,248 | 103,115 | 103,950 | 106,319 | 35,272 | 49.6 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 62,348 | 89,246 | 117,256 | 141,569 | 152,919 | 90,571 | 145.3 |
| College Station-Bryan | 28,205 | 41,774 | 53,323 | 62,653 | 80,166 | 51,961 | 184.2 |
| Corpus Christi | 78,349 | 108,091 | 126,741 | 129,467 | 130,324 | 51,975 | 66.3 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 841,463 | 1,320,036 | 1,923,655 | 2,601,486 | 3,402,163 | 2,560,700 | 304.3 |
| El Paso | 115,645 | 165,815 | 217,286 | 251,981 | 278,620 | 162,975 | 140.9 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 778,812 | 1,268,864 | 1,810,995 | 2,439,631 | 3,261,180 | 2,482,368 | 318.7 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 51,947 | 80,078 | 109,624 | 131,280 | 165,642 | 113,695 | 218.9 |
| Laredo | 27,990 | 42,751 | 62,633 | 82,818 | 97,922 | 69,932 | 249.8 |
| Longview | 41,772 | 56,487 | 67,463 | 74,827 | 86,660 | 44,888 | 107.5 |
| Lubbock | 44,018 | 58,499 | 67,797 | 70,619 | 78,441 | 34,423 | 78.2 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 100,425 | 155,475 | 224,990 | 300,006 | 366,040 | 265,615 | 264.5 |
| Midland | 21,256 | 30,697 | 37,338 | 42,665 | 52,907 | 31,651 | 148.9 |
| Odessa | 19,933 | 28,519 | 35,644 | 41,618 | 50,645 | 30,712 | 154.1 |
| San Angelo | 21,421 | 26,920 | 29,571 | 28,747 | 27,854 | 6,433 | 30.0 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 341,081 | 516,243 | 714,098 | 874,759 | 1,038,727 | 697,646 | 204.5 |
| Sherman-Denison | 26,177 | 35,655 | 42,440 | 42,699 | 41,393 | 15,216 | 58.1 |
| Texarkana | 18,413 | 22,438 | 24,294 | 22,815 | 20,944 | 2,531 | 13.7 |
| Tyler | 40,988 | 53,292 | 62,932 | 68,900 | 80,857 | 39,869 | 97.3 |
| Victoria | 22,873 | 30,417 | 34,580 | 34,104 | 33,600 | 10,727 | 46.9 |
| Waco | 40,590 | 52,286 | 59,925 | 60,393 | 61,269 | 20,679 | 50.9 |
| Wichita Falls | 27,937 | 34,752 | 38,033 | 36,434 | 34,623 | 6,686 | 23.9 |
| Non-Metropolitan | 669,803 | 898,294 | 1,058,988 | 1,069,699 | 1,019,514 | 349,711 | 52.2 |
| State of Texas | 3,776,653 | 5,677,339 | 7,712,217 | 9,678,249 | 11,983,397 | 8,206,744 | 217.3 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 7: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Metropolitan Statistical Areas in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Net Migration

| Area | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abilene | 18.6 | 22.2 | 24.2 | 23.0 | 23.7 |
| Amarillo | 16.7 | 20.4 | 21.5 | 20.3 | 19.9 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 12.3 | 16.0 | 18.7 | 20.8 | 22.1 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 18.3 | 21.9 | 22.7 | 20.8 | 19.2 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 15.3 | 18.2 | 20.3 | 21.5 | 21.0 |
| College Station-Bryan | 12.3 | 15.0 | 15.8 | 15.6 | 16.8 |
| Corpus Christi | 18.3 | 23.2 | 25.4 | 25.0 | 24.8 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 13.2 | 16.7 | 19.3 | 20.2 | 20.3 |
| El Paso | 14.4 | 17.4 | 19.6 | 20.2 | 20.3 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 13.1 | 17.0 | 19.4 | 21.0 | 22.6 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 12.8 | 15.8 | 17.9 | 17.9 | 19.1 |
| Laredo | 11.2 | 13.5 | 16.0 | 17.8 | 18.4 |
| Longview | 19.5 | 23.0 | 23.4 | 21.7 | 20.8 |
| Lubbock | 15.5 | 18.2 | 18.8 | 17.6 | 17.8 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 13.0 | 15.4 | 17.6 | 19.4 | 20.3 |
| Midland | 15.5 | 19.2 | 20.1 | 19.9 | 21.8 |
| Odessa | 14.5 | 17.9 | 19.4 | 19.9 | 21.6 |
| San Angelo | 19.2 | 23.0 | 24.1 | 22.7 | 21.7 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 15.9 | 19.5 | 22.3 | 23.2 | 24.0 |
| Sherman-Denison | 21.7 | 26.6 | 28.5 | 26.1 | 22.9 |
| Texarkana | 19.9 | 23.7 | 25.3 | 23.8 | 22.1 |
| Tyler | 19.5 | 21.8 | 21.9 | 20.3 | 20.1 |
| Victoria | 19.8 | 24.1 | 25.3 | 23.5 | 22.2 |
| Waco | 17.3 | 20.6 | 21.5 | 20.0 | 18.8 |
| Wichita Falls | 18.5 | 22.5 | 24.1 | 22.9 | 21.8 |
| Non-Metropolitan | 21.9 | 26.7 | 29.0 | 27.7 | 25.3 |
| State of Texas | 15.0 | 18.6 | 20.7 | 21.4 | 21.7 |

[^0]Table 8: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Metropolitan Statistical Areas by Decade, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| Area | 2010-2020 | 2020-2030 | 2030-2040 | 2040-2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abilene | 695 | 251 | -2,313 | -5,161 |
| Amarillo | 1,605 | 2,930 | 2,377 | 6,124 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 44,004 | 82,145 | 159,756 | 276,115 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | -2,279 | -1,437 | -2,016 | -2,304 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 8,154 | 10,016 | 8,298 | -454 |
| College Station-Bryan | 3,622 | 3,722 | 2,837 | 7,409 |
| Corpus Christi | 1,861 | 1,531 | -2,951 | -5,846 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 41,565 | 148,319 | 370,100 | 648,619 |
| El Paso | 4,326 | 8,479 | 6,280 | -847 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 46,435 | 154,114 | 347,366 | 643,413 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 7,196 | 9,072 | 3,431 | 9,820 |
| Laredo | 2,196 | 3,998 | 4,633 | 3,948 |
| Longview | 2,912 | 4,070 | 4,879 | 6,920 |
| Lubbock | -393 | -804 | -3,537 | -3,237 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 23,749 | 29,465 | 31,484 | 31,205 |
| Midland | -444 | 546 | 1,953 | 5,190 |
| Odessa | -312 | 722 | 1,648 | 2,012 |
| San Angelo | -147 | -506 | -1,481 | -2,955 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 43,818 | 80,170 | 94,945 | 110,641 |
| Sherman-Denison | 2,954 | 3,051 | 493 | -2,380 |
| Texarkana | -525 | -1,191 | -2,037 | -1,850 |
| Tyler | 3,077 | 3,589 | 3,103 | 4,406 |
| Victoria | 609 | 522 | -549 | -949 |
| Waco | 103 | -412 | -3,192 | -4,994 |
| Wichita Falls | -847 | -1,452 | -2,561 | -3,516 |
| Non-Metropolitan | 80,454 | 86,413 | 12,146 | -71,506 |
| State of Texas | 314,388 | 627,323 | 1,035,092 | 1,649,823 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 9: Projected Rates of Net Migration (per 100 people) of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Metropolitan Statistical Areas by Decade Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| Area | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abilene | 1.8 | 0.6 | -5.3 | -11.2 |
| Amarillo | 2.7 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 6.6 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 11.8 | 14.3 | 19.0 | 23.5 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | -2.5 | -1.4 | -1.9 | -2.2 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 9.1 | 8.5 | 5.9 | -0.3 |
| College Station-Bryan | 8.7 | 7.0 | 4.5 | 9.2 |
| Corpus Christi | 1.7 | 1.2 | -2.3 | -4.5 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 3.1 | 7.7 | 14.2 | 19.1 |
| El Paso | 2.6 | 3.9 | 2.5 | -0.3 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 3.7 | 8.5 | 14.2 | 19.7 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 9.0 | 8.3 | 2.6 | 5.9 |
| Laredo | 5.1 | 6.4 | 5.6 | 4.0 |
| Longview | 5.2 | 6.0 | 6.5 | 8.0 |
| Lubbock | -0.7 | -1.2 | -5.0 | -4.1 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 15.3 | 13.1 | 10.5 | 8.5 |
| Midland | -1.4 | 1.5 | 4.6 | 9.8 |
| Odessa | -1.1 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| San Angelo | -0.5 | -1.7 | -5.2 | -10.6 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 8.5 | 11.2 | 10.9 | 10.7 |
| Sherman-Denison | 8.3 | 7.2 | 1.2 | -5.7 |
| Texarkana | -2.3 | -4.9 | -8.9 | -8.8 |
| Tyler | 5.8 | 5.7 | 4.5 | 5.4 |
| Victoria | 2.0 | -1.6 | -2.8 |  |
| Waco | 0.2 | -5.9 | -8.2 |  |
| Wichita Falls | -2.4 | -7.0 | -10.2 |  |
| Non-Metropolitan | -3.8 | -7.0 |  |  |
| State oxas | 8.2 | 13.8 |  |  |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 10: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Texas Counties by County Type and Decade, 1970-2010

|  |  |  |  |  | Change 1970-2010 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| County Type | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Numeric | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Central City | 832,499 | $1,129,325$ | $1,452,156$ | $1,723,316$ | $2,301,354$ | $1,468,855$ | 176.4 |
| Suburban | 193,541 | 263,616 | 342,329 | 467,081 | 805,496 | 611,955 | 316.2 |
| Non-Metro Adjacent | 314,989 | 387,639 | 419,127 | 447,411 | 516,794 | 201,805 | 64.1 |
| Non-Metro Non-Adjacent | 100,640 | 122,130 | 130,795 | 136,393 | 153,009 | 52,369 | 52.0 |
| State of Texas | $1,441,669$ | $1,902,710$ | $2,344,407$ | $2,774,201$ | $3,776,653$ | $2,334,984$ | 162.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
County types are delineated based upon Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 11: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Texas Counties by County Type as a Share of the Total Older Adult Population in Texas by Decade, 1970-2010

| County Type | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City | 57.7 | 59.3 | 61.9 | 62.1 | 61.0 |
| Suburban | 13.4 | 13.9 | 14.6 | 16.8 | 21.3 |
| Non-Metro Adjacent | 21.8 | 20.4 | 17.9 | 16.2 | 13.7 |
| Non-Metro Non-Adjacent | 7.1 | 6.4 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 4.0 |
| State of Texas | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
County types are delineated based upon Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 12: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Texas Counties by County Type and Decade, 1970-2010

| County Type | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City | 10.7 | 11.5 | 12.4 | 12.2 | 13.8 |
| Suburban | 15.4 | 13.7 | 12.9 | 12.1 | 14.9 |
| Non-Metro Adjacent | 19.7 | 20.8 | 21.2 | 20.3 | 22.2 |
| Non-Metro Non-Adjacent | 18.4 | 19.4 | 20.3 | 19.5 | 20.8 |
| State of Texas | 12.9 | 13.4 | 13.8 | 13.3 | 15.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
County types are delineated based upon Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 13: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) for Texas
Counties by County Type and Decade, 1970-2010

| County Type | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0 - 1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0 - 1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0 - 2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City | 12,829 | $-25,549$ | $-1,551$ | 13,135 |
| Suburban | 41,354 | 33,914 | 65,225 | 156,615 |
| Non-Metro Adjacent | 44,171 | 27,258 | 37,668 | 36,502 |
| Non-Metro Non-Adjacent | 9,662 | 6,325 | 5,413 | 3,662 |
| State of Texas | 108,016 | 41,948 | 106,755 | 209,914 |

Source: Winkler et al., Applied Population Laboratory, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2013. County types are delineated based upon Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 14: Rates of Net Migration (per 100 people) for the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Texas Counties by County Type and Decade, 1970-2010

| County Type | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0 - 1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0 - 1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0 - 2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City | 1.1 | -2.0 | -0.1 | 0.6 |
| Suburban | 18.5 | 13.4 | 16.3 | 24.4 |
| Non-Metro Adjacent | 12.8 | 8.7 | 9.3 | 7.7 |
| Non-Metro Non-Adjacent | 8.5 | 6.4 | 4.2 | 2.5 |
| State of Texas | 6.0 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 5.9 |

Source: Winkler et al., Applied Population Laboratory, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2013. County types are delineated based upon Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 15: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by County Type in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 by Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Change 2010-2050 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| County Type | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ | Numeric | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Central City | $2,301,354$ | $3,298,656$ | $4,216,845$ | $4,933,855$ | $5,856,011$ | $3,554,657$ | 154.5 |
| Suburban | 805,496 | $1,480,389$ | $2,436,384$ | $3,674,695$ | $5,107,872$ | $4,302,376$ | 534.1 |
| Non-Metropolitan Adjacent | 516,794 | 698,353 | 827,110 | 837,418 | 796,312 | 279,518 | 54.1 |
| Non-Metropolitan Non-Adjacent | 153,009 | 199,941 | 231,878 | 232,281 | 223,202 | 70,193 | 45.9 |
| State of Texas | $3,776,653$ | $5,677,339$ | $7,712,217$ | $9,678,249$ | $11,983,397$ | $8,206,744$ | 217.3 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
County types are delineated based upon Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 16: Share of State Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by County Type in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County Type | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Central City | 61.0 | 58.1 | 54.7 | 51.0 | 48.9 |
| Suburban | 21.3 | 26.1 | 31.6 | 38.0 | 42.6 |
| Non-Metropolitan Adjacent | 13.7 | 12.3 | 10.7 | 8.6 | 6.6 |
| Non-Metropolitan Non-Adjacent | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 1.9 |
| State of Texas | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
County types are delineated based upon Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 17: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by County Type in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Net Migration

| County Type | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City | 13.8 | 16.8 | 18.4 | 18.8 | 19.6 |
| Suburban | 14.9 | 19.5 | 22.7 | 24.2 | 23.9 |
| Non-Metropolitan Adjacent | 22.2 | 27.3 | 29.8 | 28.6 | 26.0 |
| Non-Metropolitan Non-Adjacent | 20.8 | 24.7 | 26.5 | 25.1 | 23.0 |
| State of Texas | 15.0 | 18.6 | 20.7 | 21.4 | 21.7 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
County types are delineated based upon Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 18: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by County Type and Decade, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County Type | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City | $-43,547$ | $-45,112$ | $-32,810$ | 289,538 |
| Suburban | 277,481 | 586,022 | $1,055,756$ | $1,431,791$ |
| Non-Metropolitan Adjacent | 68,149 | 74,298 | 15,153 | $-53,538$ |
| Non-Metropolitan Non-Adjacent | 12,305 | 12,115 | $-3,007$ | $-17,968$ |
| State of Texas | 314,388 | 627,323 | $1,035,092$ | $1,649,823$ |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
County types are delineated based upon Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 19: Projected Rates of Net Migration (per 100 people) of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by County Type and Decade Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County Type | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central City | -1.3 | -1.1 | -0.7 | 4.9 |
| Suburban | 18.7 | 24.1 | 28.7 | 28.0 |
| Non-Metropolitan Adjacent | 9.8 | 9.0 | 1.8 | -6.7 |
| Non-Metropolitan Non-Adjacent | 6.2 | 5.2 | -1.3 | -8.1 |
| State of Texas | 5.5 | 8.1 | 10.7 | 13.8 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
County types are delineated based upon Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

Table 20: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Tourism Regions by Decade, 1970-2010

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Change 1970-2010 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Region | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Numeric | $\boldsymbol{\%}$ |
| Big Bend | 54,505 | 82,700 | 118,780 | 144,350 | 181,174 | 126,669 | 232.4 |
| Gulf Coast | 302,299 | 415,174 | 540,484 | 652,370 | 917,730 | 615,431 | 203.6 |
| Hill Country | 83,577 | 116,039 | 149,945 | 197,641 | 310,678 | 227,101 | 271.7 |
| Panhandle Plains | 201,458 | 241,055 | 260,698 | 269,480 | 293,237 | 91,779 | 45.6 |
| Piney Woods | 156,383 | 209,809 | 251,061 | 286,232 | 371,133 | 214,750 | 137.3 |
| Prairies and Lakes | 493,994 | 630,310 | 750,708 | 887,695 | $1,250,257$ | 756,263 | 153.1 |
| South Texas | 149,453 | 207,623 | 272,731 | 336,433 | 452,444 | 302,991 | 202.7 |
| State of Texas | $1,441,669$ | $1,902,710$ | $2,344,407$ | $2,774,201$ | $3,776,653$ | $2,334,984$ | 162.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 21: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Tourism Regions as a Share of the Total Older Adult Population in Texas by Decade, 1970-2010

| Region | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Big Bend | 3.8 | 4.3 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 4.8 |
| Gulf Coast | 21.0 | 21.8 | 23.1 | 23.5 | 24.3 |
| Hill Country | 5.8 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 7.1 | 8.2 |
| Panhandle Plains | 14.0 | 12.7 | 11.1 | 9.7 | 7.8 |
| Piney Woods | 10.8 | 11.0 | 10.7 | 10.3 | 9.8 |
| Prairies and Lakes | 34.2 | 33.1 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 33.1 |
| South Texas | 10.4 | 11.0 | 11.6 | 12.2 | 12.0 |
| State of Texas | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 22: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Tourism Regions by Decade, 1970-2010

| Region | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Bend | 8.7 | 10.3 | 12.6 | 13.8 | 15.0 |
| Gulf Coast | 10.1 | 10.4 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 13.7 |
| Hill Country | 15.4 | 14.9 | 14.0 | 12.8 | 15.1 |
| Panhandle Plains | 15.3 | 16.8 | 18.1 | 17.7 | 18.4 |
| Piney Woods | 17.3 | 17.3 | 18.4 | 17.5 | 19.4 |
| Prairies and Lakes | 14.0 | 14.4 | 13.5 | 12.6 | 14.7 |
| South Texas | 11.5 | 12.7 | 13.6 | 13.4 | 14.4 |
| State of Texas | 12.9 | 13.4 | 13.8 | 13.3 | 15.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 23: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) for Tourism
Regions by Decade, 1970-2010

| Region | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0 - 1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0 - 1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0 - 2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Bend | 2,817 | 951 | -405 | 665 |
| Gulf Coast | $-9,268$ | $-32,412$ | $-14,758$ | 4,723 |
| Hill Country | 21,508 | 19,529 | 32,536 | 50,960 |
| Panhandle Plains | 1,388 | $-3,478$ | -573 | -294 |
| Piney Woods | 31,623 | 21,797 | 25,763 | 41,993 |
| Prairies and Lakes | 39,541 | 18,568 | 32,507 | 85,605 |
| South Texas | 20,407 | 16,993 | 31,685 | 26,262 |
| State of Texas | 108,016 | 41,948 | 106,755 | 209,914 |

Source: Winkler et al., Applied Population Laboratory, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2013. Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 24: Rates of Net Migration (Per 100 People) for the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Tourism Regions and Decade, 1970-2010

| Region | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0 - 1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0 - 1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0 - 2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Bend | 3.5 | 0.9 | -0.3 | 0.4 |
| Gulf Coast | -2.2 | -6.5 | -2.2 | 0.5 |
| Hill Country | 22.6 | 18.7 | 19.8 | 19.8 |
| Panhandle Plains | 0.6 | -1.6 | -0.2 | -0.1 |
| Piney Woods | 17.7 | 11.7 | 10.0 | 12.9 |
| Prairies and | 6.7 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 7.4 |
| Lakes | 10.8 | 7.9 | 10.4 | 6.2 |
| South Texas | 6.0 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 5.9 |
| State of Texas |  |  |  |  |

Source: Winkler et al., Applied Population Laboratory, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2013. Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 25: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Tourism Regions in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

|  |  |  |  |  | Change 2010-2050 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Region | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ | Numeric | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Big Bend | 181,174 | 257,860 | 329,142 | 376,452 | 421,283 | 240,109 | 132.5 |
| Gulf Coast | 917,730 | $1,409,225$ | $1,898,211$ | $2,387,433$ | $2,985,835$ | $2,068,105$ | 225.4 |
| Hill Country | 310,678 | 519,810 | 769,700 | $1,058,304$ | $1,395,230$ | $1,084,552$ | 349.1 |
| Panhandle Plains | 293,237 | 383,620 | 441,783 | 449,840 | 464,605 | 171,368 | 58.4 |
| Piney Woods | 371,133 | 541,762 | 716,240 | 891,625 | $1,133,006$ | 761,873 | 205.3 |
| Prairies and Lakes | $1,250,257$ | $1,900,727$ | $2,655,710$ | $3,409,062$ | $4,280,911$ | $3,030,654$ | 242.4 |
| South Texas | 452,444 | 664,335 | 901,431 | $1,105,533$ | $1,302,527$ | 850,083 | 187.9 |
| State of Texas | $3,776,653$ | $5,677,339$ | $7,712,217$ | $9,678,249$ | $11,983,397$ | $8,206,744$ | 217.3 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 26: Percent of State's Total Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Tourism Regions in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| Region | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Big Bend | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 3.5 |
| Gulf Coast | 24.3 | 24.8 | 24.6 | 24.7 | 24.9 |
| Hill Country | 8.2 | 9.2 | 10.0 | 10.9 | 11.6 |
| Panhandle Plains | 7.8 | 6.8 | 5.7 | 4.6 | 3.9 |
| Piney Woods | 9.8 | 9.5 | 9.3 | 9.2 | 9.5 |
| Prairies and Lakes | 33.1 | 33.5 | 34.4 | 35.2 | 35.7 |
| South Texas | 12.0 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 11.5 | 10.9 |
| State of Texas | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 27: Percent of the Total Population that are Older Adults (Age 60+) in Tourism Regions in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Net Migration

| Region | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Bend | 15.0 | 18.3 | 20.2 | 20.6 | 21.0 |
| Gulf Coast | 13.7 | 17.3 | 19.3 | 20.3 | 21.4 |
| Hill Country | 15.1 | 19.0 | 21.7 | 23.2 | 23.9 |
| Panhandle Plains | 18.4 | 22.1 | 23.3 | 22.0 | 21.1 |
| Piney Woods | 19.4 | 23.6 | 25.5 | 25.6 | 25.8 |
| Prairies and Lakes | 14.7 | 18.2 | 20.5 | 20.9 | 20.7 |
| South Texas | 14.4 | 17.3 | 19.5 | 20.6 | 21.4 |
| State of Texas | 15.0 | 18.6 | 20.7 | 21.4 | 21.7 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 28: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Tourism Regions by Decade, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific

Rates of Net Migration

| Region | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Bend | 4,210 | 10,124 | 8,707 | 2,684 |
| Gulf Coast | 17,363 | 83,032 | 195,212 | 394,841 |
| Hill Country | 76,790 | 127,873 | 192,741 | 289,260 |
| Panhandle Plains | 3,887 | 2,621 | $-13,387$ | $-24,358$ |
| Piney Woods | 62,755 | 108,326 | 158,450 | 223,218 |
| Prairies and Lakes | 104,618 | 228,066 | 422,469 | 680,354 |
| South Texas | 44,765 | 67,281 | 70,900 | 83,824 |
| State of Texas | 314,388 | 627,323 | $1,035,092$ | $1,649,823$ |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 29: Projected Rates of Net Migration (per 100 people) of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Tourism Regions by Decade Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| Region | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Bend | 1.6 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 0.6 |
| Gulf Coast | 1.2 | 4.4 | 8.2 | 13.2 |
| Hill Country | 14.8 | 16.6 | 18.2 | 20.7 |
| Panhandle Plains | 1.0 | 0.6 | -3.0 | -5.2 |
| Piney Woods | 11.6 | 15.1 | 17.8 | 19.7 |
| Prairies and Lakes | 5.5 | 8.6 | 12.4 | 15.9 |
| South Texas | 6.7 | 7.5 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| State of Texas | 5.5 | 8.1 | 10.7 | 13.8 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 30: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Retirement Destination Counties within Tourism Regions by Decade, 1970-2010

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Change 1970-2010 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Region (Counties) | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Numeric | $\boldsymbol{\%}$ |
| Big Bend (1) | 232 | 328 | 475 | 497 | 781 | 549 | 236.6 |
| Gulf Coast (1) | 1,852 | 3,127 | 4,533 | 5,874 | 7,599 | 5,747 | 310.3 |
| Hill Country (9) | 18,796 | 27,864 | 34,643 | 43,010 | 55,627 | 36,831 | 196.0 |
| Panhandle (1) | 754 | 982 | 1,120 | 1,174 | 1,094 | 340 | 45.1 |
| Piney Woods (6) | 17,259 | 24,824 | 31,970 | 37,388 | 46,115 | 28,856 | 167.2 |
| Prairies \& Lakes (11) | 39,788 | 53,289 | 63,335 | 73,150 | 90,982 | 51,194 | 128.7 |
| Rest of State (225) | $1,362,988$ | $1,792,296$ | $2,208,331$ | $2,613,108$ | $3,574,455$ | $2,211,467$ | 162.3 |
| State of Texas (254) | $1,441,669$ | $1,902,710$ | $2,344,407$ | $2,774,201$ | $3,776,653$ | $2,334,984$ | 162.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 31: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Retirement Destination Counties within Tourism Regions as a Share of the Total Older Adult Population in Texas by Decade, 1970-2010

| Region (Counties) | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Big Bend (1) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Gulf Coast (1) | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Hill Country (9) | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| Panhandle (1) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Piney Woods (6) | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| Prairies \& Lakes (11) | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| Rest of State (225) | 94.5 | 94.1 | 94.2 | 94.3 | 94.7 |
| State of Texas (254) | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 32: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Retirement Destination Counties within Tourism Regions in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

|  |  |  |  |  | Change 2010-2050 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Region (No. of Counties) | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ | Numeric | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Gulf Coast (1) | 7,599 | 10,476 | 11,591 | 10,699 | 9,332 | 1,733 | 22.8 |
| Hill Country (10) | 149,723 | 265,297 | 421,178 | 601,635 | 791,422 | 641,699 | 428.6 |
| Piney Woods (7) | 124,100 | 215,516 | 335,994 | 496,891 | 724,049 | 599,949 | 483.4 |
| Prairies \& Lakes (12) | 98,816 | 158,900 | 231,228 | 295,871 | 349,712 | 250,896 | 253.9 |
| South Texas (2) | 16,386 | 28,138 | 42,547 | 53,898 | 61,254 | 44,868 | 273.8 |
| Rest of State (222) | $3,380,029$ | $4,999,012$ | $6,669,679$ | $8,219,255$ | $10,047,628$ | $6,667,599$ | 197.3 |
| State of Texas (254) | $3,776,653$ | $5,677,339$ | $7,712,217$ | $9,678,249$ | $11,983,397$ | $8,206,744$ | 217.3 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 33: Share of the State Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Retirement Destination Counties within Tourism Regions in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| Region (No. of Counties) | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Gulf Coast (1) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Hill Country (10) | 4.0 | 4.7 | 5.5 | 6.2 | 6.6 |
| Piney Woods (7) | 3.3 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 5.1 | 6.0 |
| Prairies \& Lakes (12) | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.9 |
| South Texas (2) | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Rest of State (222) | 89.5 | 88.0 | 86.3 | 84.9 | 83.9 |
| State of Texas (254) | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 34: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Retirement Destination Counties in Tourism Regions by Decade, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| Region (No. of Counties) | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gulf Coast (1) | 1,995 | 1,577 | 191 | -782 |
| Hill Country (10) | 70,272 | 116,530 | 162,434 | 195,063 |
| Piney Woods (7) | 45,643 | 89,509 | 152,121 | 227,844 |
| Prairies \& Lakes (12) | 30,885 | 51,631 | 62,845 | 58,436 |
| South Texas (2) | 5,541 | 9,738 | 10,872 | 8,311 |
| Rest of State (222) | 160,052 | 358,338 | 646,629 | $1,160,951$ |
| State of Texas (254) | 314,388 | 627,323 | $1,035,092$ | $1,649,823$ |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 35: Projected Rates of Net Migration (per 100 people) of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Retirement Destination Counties in Tourism Regions by Decade Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| Region (No. of Counties) | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 - 2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 - 2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 - 2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gulf Coast (1) | 23.5 | 13.6 | 1.8 | -8.4 |
| Hill Country (10) | 36.0 | 27.7 | 27.0 | 24.6 |
| Piney Woods (7) | 26.9 | 26.6 | 30.6 | 31.5 |
| Prairies \& Lakes (12) | 24.1 | 22.3 | 21.2 | 16.7 |
| South Texas (2) | 24.5 | 22.9 | 20.2 | 13.6 |
| Rest of State (222) | 3.3 | 5.4 | 7.9 | 11.6 |
| State of Texas (254) | 5.9 | 8.1 | 10.7 | 13.8 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
Tourism regions as defined by the Texas Governor's Office, Economic and Tourism Division.

Table 36: Selected Characteristics of the Older Population (Age 60+)

| Area | Population 60 and Older | Percent of <br> Total <br> Population | Percent of Population 60 and Older |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Hispanic | NH White | Black | NH Asian \& Other |
| Abilene | 30,308 | 18.5 | 8.9 | 84.8 | 4.1 | 2.2 |
| Amarillo | 41,880 | 16.9 | 8.7 | 85.1 | 3.4 | 2.8 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 204,819 | 12.2 | 15.0 | 74.9 | 6.3 | 3.8 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 70,475 | 18.2 | 4.4 | 73.8 | 19.7 | 2.1 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 61,135 | 15.3 | 68.9 | 30.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| College Station-Bryan | 27,766 | 12.4 | 9.2 | 77.7 | 10.8 | 2.3 |
| Corpus Christi | 77,232 | 18.1 | 42.7 | 52.5 | 2.9 | 1.9 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 816,680 | 13.0 | 10.3 | 73.3 | 11.4 | 5.0 |
| El Paso | 113,059 | 14.4 | 73.8 | 22.4 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 754,165 | 12.9 | 16.5 | 61.4 | 15.0 | 7.1 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 50,750 | 12.8 | 9.3 | 76.0 | 10.4 | 4.3 |
| Laredo | 27,601 | 11.2 | 94.5 | 5.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Longview | 41,386 | 19.5 | 2.8 | 82.2 | 13.7 | 1.3 |
| Lubbock | 43,495 | 15.5 | 17.2 | 76.0 | 5.3 | 1.5 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 98,387 | 13.0 | 71.3 | 27.4 | 0.2 | 1.1 |
| Midland | 21,314 | 15.8 | 16.3 | 75.8 | 5.8 | 2.1 |
| Odessa | 19,293 | 14.2 | 28.8 | 65.2 | 4.1 | 1.9 |
| San Angelo | 20,728 | 18.7 | 19.7 | 76.0 | 2.4 | 1.9 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 331,100 | 15.7 | 39.1 | 53.2 | 5.3 | 2.4 |
| Sherman-Denison | 25,207 | 21.0 | 2.1 | 91.8 | 3.9 | 2.2 |
| Texarkana | 17,973 | 19.6 | 1.6 | 79.9 | 16.7 | 1.8 |
| Tyler | 40,382 | 19.5 | 4.2 | 81.3 | 12.9 | 1.6 |
| Victoria | 22,678 | 19.7 | 26.8 | 66.5 | 4.9 | 1.8 |
| Waco | 39,391 | 16.9 | 9.3 | 77.6 | 11.7 | 1.4 |
| Wichita Falls | 27,911 | 18.5 | 6.3 | 85.1 | 5.5 | 3.1 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 634,028 | 21.8 | 15.4 | 77.9 | 5.3 | 1.4 |
| State of Texas | 3,685,380 | 14.9 | 21.0 | 66.3 | 9.0 | 3.7 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 37: Households by Household Type for Households Headed by a Person Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | Percent of Households |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Family Households | MarriedCouple Family | Female <br> Householder, No Husband Present | NonFamily | Householder Living Alone |
| Abilene | 19,251 | 55.1 | 44.7 | 9.2 | 44.9 | 42.6 |
| Amarillo | 25,399 | 56.7 | 47.4 | 7.3 | 43.3 | 41.6 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 122,203 | 59.7 | 49.9 | 7.3 | 40.3 | 37.8 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 44,836 | 57.2 | 43.3 | 10.8 | 42.8 | 41.1 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 33,905 | 67.1 | 50.5 | 13.1 | 32.9 | 30.7 |
| College Station-Bryan | 16,937 | 61.6 | 52.2 | 7.5 | 38.4 | 37.0 |
| Corpus Christi | 47,311 | 60.8 | 46.4 | 10.5 | 39.2 | 36.8 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 484,460 | 60.3 | 48.8 | 9.1 | 39.7 | 37.1 |
| El Paso | 64,748 | 62.1 | 44.8 | 13.7 | 37.9 | 36.1 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 440,197 | 61.6 | 48.6 | 10.0 | 38.4 | 36.1 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 29,291 | 60.6 | 51.1 | 7.4 | 39.4 | 36.9 |
| Laredo | 15,008 | 71.4 | 49.6 | 17.9 | 28.6 | 27.8 |
| Longview | 25,586 | 56.5 | 45.9 | 8.3 | 43.5 | 41.8 |
| Lubbock | 27,039 | 56.7 | 46.0 | 8.2 | 43.3 | 41.0 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 54,307 | 68.0 | 51.9 | 12.7 | 32.0 | 30.1 |
| Midland | 12,814 | 58.9 | 50.6 | 6.8 | 41.1 | 39.0 |
| Odessa | 12,335 | 55.1 | 44.7 | 7.6 | 44.9 | 43.2 |
| San Angelo | 13,318 | 57.9 | 48.5 | 7.5 | 42.1 | 40.9 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 198,369 | 61.1 | 48.0 | 10.2 | 38.9 | 36.8 |
| Sherman-Denison | 15,132 | 59.9 | 50.7 | 6.7 | 40.1 | 38.3 |
| Texarkana | 11,210 | 57.0 | 45.8 | 9.0 | 43.0 | 41.7 |
| Tyler | 24,612 | 61.5 | 51.2 | 8.0 | 38.5 | 37.5 |
| Victoria | 14,139 | 62.2 | 52.5 | 8.0 | 37.8 | 36.2 |
| Waco | 23,774 | 58.0 | 45.8 | 9.6 | 42.0 | 40.0 |
| Wichita Falls | 17,525 | 57.5 | 47.3 | 8.4 | 42.5 | 40.4 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 383,654 | 59.2 | 49.5 | 7.1 | 40.8 | 38.7 |
| State of Texas | 2,193,657 | 60.5 | 48.6 | 9.2 | 39.5 | 37.3 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 38: Marital Status for Persons Age 60 and Older

| Metropolitan Statistical Area | Population | Percent of the Population Age 60 and Older |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Married | Widowed | Divorced | Separated | Never <br> Married |
| Abilene | 30,308 | 57.1 | 26.2 | 12.6 | 1.2 | 2.9 |
| Amarillo | 41,880 | 58.6 | 22.9 | 13.6 | 1.5 | 3.4 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 204,819 | 61.0 | 18.4 | 15.4 | 1.2 | 3.9 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 70,475 | 55.3 | 27.3 | 13.1 | 1.1 | 3.2 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 61,135 | 59.9 | 22.7 | 8.7 | 2.9 | 5.8 |
| College Station-Bryan | 27,766 | 62.7 | 22.3 | 10.2 | 1.1 | 3.7 |
| Corpus Christi | 77,232 | 57.8 | 22.8 | 13.8 | 1.7 | 4.0 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 816,680 | 58.8 | 21.6 | 14.4 | 1.5 | 3.8 |
| El Paso | 113,059 | 55.1 | 24.0 | 12.4 | 2.8 | 5.8 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 754,165 | 58.4 | 21.7 | 13.7 | 1.9 | 4.2 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 50,750 | 58.3 | 23.8 | 13.0 | 1.6 | 3.3 |
| Laredo | 27,601 | 55.8 | 25.4 | 8.3 | 3.8 | 6.8 |
| Longview | 41,386 | 56.8 | 26.3 | 13.0 | 1.3 | 2.6 |
| Lubbock | 43,495 | 58.2 | 23.5 | 14.0 | 0.8 | 3.4 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 98,387 | 62.6 | 22.8 | 8.0 | 2.8 | 3.8 |
| Midland | 21,314 | 62.1 | 21.3 | 11.4 | 1.6 | 3.5 |
| Odessa | 19,293 | 57.7 | 25.0 | 13.3 | 1.7 | 2.3 |
| San Angelo | 20,728 | 60.6 | 22.7 | 12.8 | 0.8 | 3.1 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 331,100 | 58.5 | 21.8 | 13.4 | 1.5 | 4.8 |
| Sherman-Denison | 25,207 | 59.9 | 24.0 | 13.3 | 0.8 | 2.1 |
| Texarkana | 17,973 | 55.1 | 26.3 | 12.9 | 1.5 | 4.3 |
| Tyler | 40,382 | 62.9 | 23.1 | 10.1 | 1.2 | 2.7 |
| Victoria | 22,678 | 63.7 | 23.2 | 9.6 | 0.9 | 2.6 |
| Waco | 39,391 | 56.0 | 24.3 | 14.3 | 1.0 | 4.5 |
| Wichita Falls | 27,911 | 58.5 | 23.2 | 13.8 | 0.9 | 3.6 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 634,028 | 61.0 | 23.5 | 11.1 | 1.2 | 3.2 |
| State of Texas | 3,685,380 | 59.1 | 22.4 | 13.0 | 1.6 | 3.9 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 39: Educational Attainment for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Metropolitan Statistical Area | Population | Percent of the Population Age 60 and Older |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Less Than High School/GED | High School/ GED | Some College/ Associate | Bachelor or Higher |
| Abilene | 30,308 | 20.4 | 32.0 | 27.1 | 20.5 |
| Amarillo | 41,880 | 18.3 | 27.6 | 31.8 | 22.3 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 204,819 | 15.8 | 22.3 | 25.7 | 36.2 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 70,475 | 21.1 | 37.1 | 26.6 | 15.1 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 61,135 | 51.4 | 19.3 | 16.7 | 12.6 |
| College Station-Bryan | 27,766 | 21.2 | 27.9 | 21.5 | 29.4 |
| Corpus Christi | 77,232 | 30.9 | 24.6 | 25.2 | 19.3 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 816,680 | 18.8 | 26.8 | 26.9 | 27.6 |
| El Paso | 113,059 | 48.3 | 21.3 | 16.6 | 13.8 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 754,165 | 22.4 | 25.7 | 25.2 | 26.7 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 50,750 | 18.9 | 32.4 | 28.1 | 20.7 |
| Laredo | 27,601 | 60.2 | 14.9 | 13.9 | 11.0 |
| Longview | 41,386 | 21.7 | 33.1 | 28.1 | 17.2 |
| Lubbock | 43,495 | 25.5 | 25.6 | 25.9 | 23.0 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 98,387 | 54.4 | 19.0 | 14.4 | 12.2 |
| Midland | 21,314 | 22.2 | 27.7 | 26.8 | 23.3 |
| Odessa | 19,293 | 36.2 | 25.4 | 24.8 | 13.7 |
| San Angelo | 20,728 | 23.5 | 28.7 | 25.4 | 22.5 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 331,100 | 26.0 | 25.5 | 25.8 | 22.7 |
| Sherman-Denison | 25,207 | 19.2 | 34.0 | 28.3 | 18.4 |
| Texarkana | 17,973 | 21.5 | 34.0 | 26.0 | 18.5 |
| Tyler | 40,382 | 16.1 | 27.9 | 30.9 | 25.2 |
| Victoria | 22,678 | 26.6 | 29.3 | 27.0 | 17.1 |
| Waco | 39,391 | 22.8 | 31.6 | 25.7 | 19.9 |
| Wichita Falls | 27,911 | 21.1 | 35.0 | 27.6 | 16.4 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 634,028 | 28.1 | 31.7 | 23.6 | 16.6 |
| State of Texas | 3,685,380 | 25.0 | 27.1 | 24.9 | 23.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 40: Veteran Status for the Total Population and the Population Age 60 and Older

| Metropolitan Statistical Area | Population 18 and Older |  |  | Population 60 and Older |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population | Veterans | Percent <br> Veteran | Population 60 and Older | Veterans | Percent <br> Veteran |
| Abilene | 121,279 | 15,524 | 12.8 | 30,308 | 7,698 | 25.4 |
| Amarillo | 182,461 | 17,151 | 9.4 | 41,880 | 9,549 | 22.8 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 1,253,563 | 109,060 | 8.7 | 204,819 | 49,566 | 24.2 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 291,411 | 29,433 | 10.1 | 70,475 | 16,280 | 23.1 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 267,297 | 17,642 | 6.6 | 61,135 | 9,537 | 15.6 |
| College Station-Bryan | 176,398 | 11,113 | 6.3 | 27,766 | 6,497 | 23.4 |
| Corpus Christi | 311,841 | 37,421 | 12.0 | 77,232 | 18,304 | 23.7 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 4,524,643 | 371,021 | 8.2 | 816,668 | 178,850 | 21.9 |
| El Paso | 535,766 | 47,683 | 8.9 | 113,051 | 19,558 | 17.3 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 4,198,377 | 306,482 | 7.3 | 754,165 | 150,079 | 19.9 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 253,698 | 54,038 | 21.3 | 50,750 | 16,443 | 32.4 |
| Laredo | 158,776 | 5,716 | 3.6 | 27,601 | 2,732 | 9.9 |
| Longview | 159,574 | 17,234 | 10.8 | 41,386 | 9,395 | 22.7 |
| Lubbock | 212,307 | 17,197 | 8.1 | 43,495 | 9,177 | 21.1 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 493,894 | 23,707 | 4.8 | 98,355 | 13,376 | 13.6 |
| Midland | 97,781 | 9,191 | 9.4 | 21,314 | 4,732 | 22.2 |
| Odessa | 96,035 | 7,491 | 7.8 | 19,293 | 4,129 | 21.4 |
| San Angelo | 80,589 | 9,510 | 11.8 | 20,728 | 4,850 | 23.4 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 1,512,899 | 199,703 | 13.2 | 331,098 | 86,748 | 26.2 |
| Sherman-Denison | 90,899 | 10,272 | 11.3 | 25,207 | 6,302 | 25.0 |
| Texarkana | 69,354 | 8,531 | 12.3 | 17,973 | 4,206 | 23.4 |
| Tyler | 153,639 | 15,978 | 10.4 | 40,382 | 9,732 | 24.1 |
| Victoria | 84,238 | 8,677 | 10.3 | 22,678 | 5,420 | 23.9 |
| Waco | 173,411 | 17,515 | 10.1 | 39,391 | 9,572 | 24.3 |
| Wichita Falls | 108,921 | 14,051 | 12.9 | 27,911 | 7,061 | 25.3 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 2,182,690 | 217,062 | 9.9 | 634,028 | 41,048 | 6.5 |
| State of Texas | 17,893,673 | 1,610,431 | 9.0 | 3,685,326 | 807,086 | 21.9 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 41: Residence One Year Ago for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Metropolitan Statistical Area | Population Age 60+ | Same <br> House | Different House |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Same <br> County | Same <br> State | Other State | Abroad |
| Abilene | 30,308 | 91.9 | 4.9 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.0 |
| Amarillo | 41,880 | 91.7 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 0.9 | 0.4 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 204,819 | 90.5 | 4.6 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 0.4 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 70,475 | 92.6 | 4.9 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 61,135 | 93.4 | 3.5 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 0.7 |
| College Station-Bryan | 27,766 | 92.9 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| Corpus Christi | 77,232 | 92.4 | 4.2 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.3 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 816,680 | 92.4 | 4.1 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| El Paso | 113,059 | 94.6 | 3.9 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 754,165 | 92.3 | 4.6 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 50,750 | 92.3 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.4 |
| Laredo | 27,601 | 93.7 | 5.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Longview | 41,386 | 93.2 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Lubbock | 43,495 | 92.6 | 4.9 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 98,387 | 92.6 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
| Midland | 21,314 | 93.5 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| Odessa | 19,293 | 95.7 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| San Angelo | 20,728 | 93.1 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 331,100 | 93.0 | 4.3 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| Sherman-Denison | 25,207 | 92.9 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Texarkana | 17,973 | 94.7 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
| Tyler | 40,382 | 92.6 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 0.3 |
| Victoria | 22,678 | 92.9 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.1 |
| Waco | 39,391 | 92.6 | 5.1 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Wichita Falls | 27,911 | 92.8 | 4.2 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.1 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 634,028 | 94.1 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| State of Texas | 3,685,380 | 92.8 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.4 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 42: Language Spoken at Home for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population Age 60+ | English Only | Other Language | Speaks English Less Than Very Well |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abilene | 30,308 | 89.2 | 10.8 | 4.9 |
| Amarillo | 41,880 | 89.5 | 10.5 | 5.6 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 204,819 | 80.8 | 19.2 | 8.6 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 70,475 | 91.8 | 8.2 | 3.2 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 61,135 | 33.4 | 66.6 | 44.8 |
| College Station-Bryan | 27,766 | 88.4 | 11.6 | 5.2 |
| Corpus Christi | 77,232 | 56.5 | 43.5 | 20.2 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 816,680 | 84.3 | 15.7 | 9.0 |
| El Paso | 113,059 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 48.7 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 754,165 | 75.6 | 24.4 | 14.4 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 50,750 | 85.4 | 14.6 | 7.6 |
| Laredo | 27,601 | 6.7 | 93.3 | 70.3 |
| Longview | 41,386 | 95.8 | 4.2 | 2.1 |
| Lubbock | 43,495 | 81.4 | 18.6 | 9.6 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 98,387 | 28.3 | 71.7 | 49.3 |
| Midland | 21,314 | 82.0 | 18.0 | 11.6 |
| Odessa | 19,293 | 69.4 | 30.6 | 18.9 |
| San Angelo | 20,728 | 79.6 | 20.4 | 10.2 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 331,100 | 58.9 | 41.1 | 16.6 |
| Sherman-Denison | 25,207 | 96.9 | 3.1 | 1.2 |
| Texarkana | 17,973 | 97.6 | 2.4 | 1.0 |
| Tyler | 40,382 | 94.4 | 5.6 | 3.3 |
| Victoria | 22,678 | 73.2 | 26.8 | 10.2 |
| Waco | 39,391 | 89.5 | 10.5 | 4.0 |
| Wichita Falls | 27,911 | 92.0 | 8.0 | 3.4 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 634,028 | 83.2 | 16.8 | 9.5 |
| State of Texas | 3,685,380 | 75.2 | 24.8 | 13.9 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 43: Employment Status for the Population Age 60 and Older)

| Area | Population | In Labor Force |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent |
| Abilene | 30,308 | 8,456 | 27.9 |
| Amarillo | 41,880 | 12,103 | 28.9 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 204,819 | 65,952 | 32.2 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 70,475 | 15,152 | 21.5 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 61,135 | 11,921 | 19.5 |
| College Station-Bryan | 27,766 | 8,607 | 31.0 |
| Corpus Christi | 77,232 | 20,544 | 26.6 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 816,680 | 270,321 | 33.1 |
| El Paso | 113,059 | 25,891 | 22.9 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 754,165 | 246,612 | 32.7 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 50,750 | 13,195 | 26.0 |
| Laredo | 27,601 | 7,425 | 26.9 |
| Longview | 41,386 | 11,050 | 26.7 |
| Lubbock | 43,495 | 12,831 | 29.5 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 98,387 | 18,694 | 19.0 |
| Midland | 21,314 | 6,650 | 31.2 |
| Odessa | 19,293 | 5,634 | 29.2 |
| San Angelo | 20,728 | 5,431 | 26.2 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 331,100 | 87,079 | 26.3 |
| Sherman-Denison | 25,207 | 6,075 | 24.1 |
| Texarkana | 17,973 | 4,565 | 25.4 |
| Tyler | 40,382 | 11,186 | 27.7 |
| Victoria | 22,678 | 6,168 | 27.2 |
| Waco | 39,391 | 10,360 | 26.3 |
| Wichita Falls | 27,911 | 7,731 | 27.7 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 634,028 | 155,144 | 24.5 |
| State of Texas | 3,685,380 | 1,061,389 | 28.8 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 44: Percent of Households by Source of Income in the Past 12 Months for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | With Earnings | With Social Security Income | With <br> Supplemental Security Income | With Cash Public Assistance | With <br> Retirement Income | With Food Stamps SNAP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abilene | 19,251 | 47.2 | 80.0 | 5.9 | 1.1 | 41.9 | 7.0 |
| Amarillo | 25,399 | 47.5 | 77.6 | 4.8 | 1.0 | 39.9 | 5.9 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 122,203 | 53.0 | 71.4 | 4.6 | 0.9 | 47.5 | 4.8 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 44,836 | 42.1 | 81.6 | 6.6 | 1.4 | 44.5 | 9.1 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 33,905 | 42.3 | 77.6 | 14.5 | 1.8 | 29.2 | 21.1 |
| College Station-Bryan | 16,937 | 49.3 | 73.5 | 5.7 | 2.0 | 41.0 | 6.7 |
| Corpus Christi | 47,311 | 49.1 | 76.2 | 8.3 | 1.5 | 39.5 | 11.3 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 484,460 | 54.4 | 71.4 | 5.0 | 1.3 | 40.0 | 6.0 |
| El Paso | 64,748 | 47.0 | 76.5 | 10.6 | 4.5 | 35.2 | 19.6 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 440,197 | 56.0 | 70.0 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 36.2 | 7.2 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 29,291 | 46.7 | 77.0 | 5.6 | 1.2 | 50.8 | 6.4 |
| Laredo | 15,008 | 57.6 | 73.3 | 15.6 | 2.9 | 27.4 | 29.4 |
| Longview | 25,586 | 44.4 | 78.3 | 6.3 | 0.9 | 37.5 | 6.4 |
| Lubbock | 27,039 | 50.3 | 76.8 | 6.4 | 1.3 | 36.8 | 8.5 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 54,307 | 43.9 | 77.5 | 17.8 | 1.8 | 29.8 | 26.5 |
| Midland | 12,814 | 50.9 | 75.1 | 5.3 | 0.4 | 32.5 | 4.4 |
| Odessa | 12,335 | 48.3 | 77.6 | 8.4 | 1.9 | 30.5 | 9.9 |
| San Angelo | 13,318 | 45.1 | 83.3 | 5.3 | 1.0 | 44.6 | 7.4 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 198,369 | 49.7 | 75.4 | 6.9 | 1.4 | 46.9 | 8.7 |
| Sherman-Denison | 15,132 | 43.5 | 81.6 | 5.5 | 1.0 | 42.6 | 6.9 |
| Texarkana | 11,210 | 45.4 | 75.8 | 5.3 | 0.8 | 47.2 | 9.1 |
| Tyler | 24,612 | 46.2 | 77.7 | 5.1 | 0.6 | 45.4 | 5.6 |
| Victoria | 14,139 | 48.0 | 78.6 | 4.4 | 0.5 | 44.7 | 6.7 |
| Waco | 23,774 | 46.4 | 80.7 | 5.5 | 1.1 | 42.1 | 7.8 |
| Wichita Falls | 17,525 | 47.2 | 79.9 | 6.1 | 1.4 | 45.0 | 7.0 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 383,654 | 43.2 | 81.4 | 6.9 | 1.3 | 37.7 | 9.8 |
| State of Texas | 2,193,657 | 50.2 | 74.9 | 6.5 | 1.4 | 39.6 | 8.7 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 45: Mean Income by Source in the Past 12 Months for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | With Earnings | With Social Security Income | With <br> Supplemental Security Income | With Cash Public Assistance | With Retirement Income |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abilene | 19,251 | \$ 43,858 | \$ 15,830 | \$ 8,331 | \$ 3,371 | \$ 20,483 |
| Amarillo | 25,399 | 53,806 | 17,018 | 7,914 | 3,146 | 22,333 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 122,203 | 66,125 | 17,422 | 8,904 | 5,530 | 29,007 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 44,836 | 49,380 | 16,563 | 7,795 | 4,769 | 18,727 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 33,905 | 40,560 | 13,595 | 6,635 | 2,467 | 22,022 |
| College Station-Bryan | 16,937 | 68,900 | 16,640 | 8,361 | 3,114 | 26,019 |
| Corpus Christi | 47,311 | 54,037 | 15,350 | 7,182 | 3,842 | 22,946 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 484,460 | 67,683 | 17,524 | 8,386 | 3,834 | 23,927 |
| El Paso | 64,748 | 44,322 | 13,573 | 6,577 | 2,554 | 22,364 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 440,197 | 70,726 | 17,159 | 8,027 | 3,536 | 23,831 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 29,291 | 55,608 | 15,940 | 7,733 | 4,747 | 25,075 |
| Laredo | 15,008 | 38,104 | 12,747 | 5,916 | 3,256 | 19,851 |
| Longview | 25,586 | 46,462 | 16,423 | 7,879 | 2,626 | 18,682 |
| Lubbock | 27,039 | 53,146 | 16,821 | 7,663 | 4,622 | 22,777 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 54,307 | 39,222 | 13,494 | 6,309 | 3,121 | 20,004 |
| Midland | 12,814 | 77,477 | 17,549 | 9,540 | 3,032 | 22,020 |
| Odessa | 12,335 | 53,366 | 15,892 | 7,603 | 5,076 | 20,115 |
| San Angelo | 13,318 | 43,436 | 15,578 | 7,898 | 9,141 | 21,952 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 198,369 | 53,138 | 15,384 | 7,423 | 3,879 | 27,591 |
| Sherman-Denison | 15,132 | 47,838 | 17,244 | 8,368 | 3,106 | 20,470 |
| Texarkana | 11,210 | 45,137 | 14,799 | 6,654 | 1,179 | 21,449 |
| Tyler | 24,612 | 54,803 | 17,423 | 8,057 | 2,417 | 22,779 |
| Victoria | 14,139 | 51,689 | 16,427 | 8,826 | 6,070 | 20,304 |
| Waco | 23,774 | 47,462 | 16,092 | 7,600 | 2,040 | 21,110 |
| Wichita Falls | 17,525 | 48,548 | 16,333 | 7,046 | 2,791 | 21,959 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 383,654 | 46,323 | 16,566 | 7,343 | 2,847 | 21,648 |
| State of Texas | 2,193,657 | 59,040 | 16,403 | 7,579 | 3,508 | 23,499 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 46: Population in Poverty for Persons Age 60 and Older

| Metropolitan Statistical Area | Population for Whom Poverty Determined | Below 100\% of Poverty |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent |
| Abilene | 29,202 | 2,979 | 10.2 |
| Amarillo | 40,537 | 3,770 | 9.3 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 200,456 | 14,232 | 7.1 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 68,400 | 7,661 | 11.2 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 59,875 | 15,089 | 25.2 |
| College Station-Bryan | 27,056 | 2,706 | 10.0 |
| Corpus Christi | 75,594 | 9,147 | 12.1 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 798,509 | 67,873 | 8.5 |
| El Paso | 111,815 | 22,810 | 20.4 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 741,198 | 77,826 | 10.5 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 49,014 | 3,872 | 7.9 |
| Laredo | 27,174 | 6,141 | 22.6 |
| Longview | 39,549 | 4,113 | 10.4 |
| Lubbock | 42,227 | 3,674 | 8.7 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 96,923 | 24,231 | 25.0 |
| Midland | 20,715 | 2,134 | 10.3 |
| Odessa | 18,963 | 2,522 | 13.3 |
| San Angelo | 20,280 | 1,886 | 9.3 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 324,070 | 35,972 | 11.1 |
| Sherman-Denison | 24,139 | 2,197 | 9.1 |
| Texarkana | 17,191 | 2,097 | 12.2 |
| Tyler | 39,233 | 3,178 | 8.1 |
| Victoria | 22,064 | 2,339 | 10.6 |
| Waco | 37,689 | 3,957 | 10.5 |
| Wichita Falls | 26,735 | 2,299 | 8.6 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 608,095 | 78,131 | 12.8 |
| State of Texas | 3,591,930 | 405,888 | 11.3 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 47: Housing Tenure Average Household Size for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Occupied Housing Units | Owner Occupied |  |  | Renter Occupied |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent | Avg. Household Size | Number | Percent | Avg. Household Size |
| Abilene | 19,251 | 15,489 | 80.5 | 1.9 | 3,762 | 19.5 | 1.5 |
| Amarillo | 25,399 | 20,493 | 80.7 | 2.0 | 4,906 | 19.3 | 1.5 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 122,203 | 98,112 | 80.3 | 2.0 | 24,091 | 19.7 | 1.5 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 44,836 | 37,325 | 83.2 | 2.0 | 7,511 | 16.8 | 1.6 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 33,905 | 27,458 | 81.0 | 2.6 | 6,447 | 19.0 | 2.0 |
| College Station-Bryan | 16,937 | 13,965 | 82.5 | 2.0 | 2,972 | 17.5 | 1.5 |
| Corpus Christi | 47,311 | 38,142 | 80.6 | 2.2 | 9,169 | 19.4 | 1.7 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 484,460 | 383,946 | 79.3 | 2.1 | 100,514 | 20.7 | 1.6 |
| El Paso | 64,748 | 49,763 | 76.9 | 2.4 | 14,985 | 23.1 | 1.8 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 440,197 | 348,737 | 79.2 | 2.2 | 91,460 | 20.8 | 1.7 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 29,291 | 24,116 | 82.3 | 2.2 | 5,175 | 17.7 | 1.7 |
| Laredo | 15,008 | 11,369 | 75.8 | 2.9 | 3,639 | 24.2 | 2.1 |
| Longview | 25,586 | 21,019 | 82.2 | 1.9 | 4,567 | 17.8 | 1.5 |
| Lubbock | 27,039 | 21,659 | 80.1 | 2.0 | 5,380 | 19.9 | 1.4 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 54,307 | 44,335 | 81.6 | 2.6 | 9,972 | 18.4 | 1.9 |
| Midland | 12,814 | 10,563 | 82.4 | 2.0 | 2,251 | 17.6 | 1.4 |
| Odessa | 12,335 | 10,013 | 81.2 | 2.0 | 2,322 | 18.8 | 1.4 |
| San Angelo | 13,318 | 11,144 | 83.7 | 1.9 | 2,174 | 16.3 | 1.4 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 198,369 | 161,358 | 81.3 | 2.2 | 37,011 | 18.7 | 1.6 |
| Sherman-Denison | 15,132 | 12,435 | 82.2 | 2.0 | 2,697 | 17.8 | 1.5 |
| Texarkana | 11,210 | 9,267 | 82.7 | 2.1 | 1,943 | 17.3 | 1.5 |
| Tyler | 24,612 | 20,951 | 85.1 | 1.9 | 3,661 | 14.9 | 1.6 |
| Victoria | 14,139 | 11,919 | 84.3 | 2.0 | 2,220 | 15.7 | 1.6 |
| Waco | 23,774 | 19,102 | 80.3 | 1.9 | 4,672 | 19.7 | 1.7 |
| Wichita Falls | 17,525 | 14,040 | 80.1 | 1.9 | 3,485 | 19.9 | 1.4 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 383,654 | 326,069 | 85.1 | 2.0 | 57,585 | 14.9 | 1.6 |
| State of Texas | 2,193,657 | 1,776,326 | 81.0 | 2.1 | 417,331 | 19.0 | 1.6 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

Table 48: Housing Tenure Average Household Size for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Owner Occupied Housing Units | Median Value | Monthly Owner <br> Costs as a Percentage of Household Income |  | Median Monthly Costs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Less than } \\ & 30 \\ & \text { Percent } \end{aligned}$ | 30 <br> Percent or More | With a Mortgage | Without <br> a <br> Mortgage |
| Abilene | 15,489 | \$ 79,600 | 81.4 | 18.6 | \$ 1,006 | \$ 403 |
| Amarillo | 20,493 | 109,900 | 80.2 | 19.8 | 1,067 | 406 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 98,112 | 188,600 | 74.4 | 25.6 | 1,472 | 544 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 37,325 | 86,400 | 80.1 | 19.9 | 1,032 | 380 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 27,458 | 66,800 | 73.8 | 26.2 | 1,012 | 335 |
| College Station-Bryan | 13,965 | 137,700 | 79.6 | 20.4 | 1,245 | 439 |
| Corpus Christi | 38,142 | 96,200 | 76.5 | 23.5 | 1,213 | 436 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 383,946 | 137,900 | 73.2 | 26.8 | 1,437 | 523 |
| El Paso | 49,763 | 94,900 | 76.6 | 23.4 | 957 | 319 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 348,737 | 131,200 | 74.4 | 25.6 | 1,418 | 498 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 24,116 | 104,500 | 80.8 | 19.2 | 1,101 | 433 |
| Laredo | 11,369 | 87,300 | 69.4 | 30.6 | 1,163 | 404 |
| Longview | 21,019 | 101,500 | 81.2 | 18.8 | 989 | 359 |
| Lubbock | 21,659 | 99,700 | 79.7 | 20.3 | 1,045 | 408 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 44,335 | 62,400 | 77.1 | 22.9 | 914 | 323 |
| Midland | 10,563 | 124,600 | 77.8 | 22.2 | 1,194 | 471 |
| Odessa | 10,013 | 83,700 | 79.8 | 20.2 | 976 | 384 |
| San Angelo | 11,144 | 88,900 | 81.3 | 18.7 | 1,022 | 377 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 161,358 | 112,700 | 77.7 | 22.3 | 1,166 | 398 |
| Sherman-Denison | 12,435 | 103,100 | 77.9 | 22.1 | 1,192 | 445 |
| Texarkana | 9,267 | 90,100 | 79.5 | 20.5 | 1,065 | 354 |
| Tyler | 20,951 | 127,000 | 77.6 | 22.4 | 1,190 | 434 |
| Victoria | 11,919 | 95,300 | 80.9 | 19.1 | 1,042 | 418 |
| Waco | 19,102 | 100,800 | 78.2 | 21.8 | 1,087 | 443 |
| Wichita Falls | 14,040 | 84,400 | 80.9 | 19.1 | 979 | 431 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 326,069 | -NA- | 79.0 | 21.0 | -NA- | -NA- |
| State of Texas | 1,776,326 | 114,000 | 76.3 | 23.7 | 1,269 | 432 |

[^1]Table 49: Median Gross Rent and Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income for Renter Occupied Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Renter Occupied Housing Units | Median Gross Rent | Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Less than 30 Percent | 30 Percent or More |
| Abilene | 3,762 | \$ 686 | 50.7 | 49.3 |
| Amarillo | 4,906 | 590 | 49.8 | 50.2 |
| Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos | 24,091 | 848 | 45.0 | 55.0 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur | 7,511 | 630 | 51.4 | 48.6 |
| Brownsville-Harlingen | 6,447 | 462 | 54.0 | 46.0 |
| College Station-Bryan | 2,972 | 653 | 55.0 | 45.0 |
| Corpus Christi | 9,169 | 630 | 48.2 | 51.8 |
| Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington | 100,514 | 823 | 44.2 | 55.8 |
| El Paso | 14,985 | 472 | 48.8 | 51.2 |
| Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown | 91,460 | 781 | 45.1 | 54.9 |
| Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood | 5,175 | 648 | 50.1 | 49.9 |
| Laredo | 3,639 | 532 | 56.9 | 43.1 |
| Longview | 4,567 | 617 | 53.9 | 46.1 |
| Lubbock | 5,380 | 663 | 49.7 | 50.3 |
| McAllen-Edinburg-Mission | 9,972 | 420 | 52.8 | 47.2 |
| Midland | 2,251 | 894 | 46.4 | 53.6 |
| Odessa | 2,322 | 560 | 53.2 | 46.8 |
| San Angelo | 2,174 | 573 | 51.9 | 48.1 |
| San Antonio-New Braunfels | 37,011 | 673 | 49.3 | 50.7 |
| Sherman-Denison | 2,697 | 631 | 49.5 | 50.5 |
| Texarkana | 1,943 | 551 | 51.3 | 48.7 |
| Tyler | 3,661 | 792 | 47.7 | 52.3 |
| Victoria | 2,220 | 615 | 53.0 | 47.0 |
| Waco | 4,672 | 718 | 46.9 | 53.1 |
| Wichita Falls | 3,485 | 663 | 47.7 | 52.3 |
| Non-Metropolitan* | 57,585 | -NA- | 62.6 | 37.4 |
| State of Texas | 417,331 | 704 | 49.1 | 50.9 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
*Estimates are not available for all counties.

## Appendix B. Retirement Destination Counties

| County | Region | Historical | Projected |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aransas | Gulf Coast | Yes | Yes |
| Atascosa | South Texas |  | Yes |
| Austin | Prairies \& Lakes |  | Yes |
| Bandera | Hill Country | Yes | Yes |
| Blanco | Hill Country | Yes | Yes |
| Bosque | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes | Yes |
| Burnet | Hill Country | Yes | Yes |
| Coke | Panhandle Plains | Yes |  |
| Comal | Hill Country |  | Yes |
| Fayette | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes | Yes |
| Franklin | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes |  |
| Gillespie | Hill Country | Yes | Yes |
| Guadalupe | Prairies \& Lakes |  | Yes |
| Hamilton | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes |  |
| Henderson | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes |  |
| Hill | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes |  |
| Hood | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes | Yes |
| Houston | Piney Woods | Yes |  |
| Jeff Davis | Big Bend | Yes |  |
| Kerr | Hill Country | Yes | Yes |
| Kimble | Hill Country | Yes |  |
| Kimble | Hill Country | Yes |  |
| Lee | Prairies \& Lakes |  | Yes |
| Leon | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes | Yes |
| Liberty | Piney Woods |  | Yes |
| Llano | Hill Country | Yes | Yes |
| Medina | Hill Country |  | Yes |
| Menard | Hill Country | Yes |  |
| Montgomery | Piney Woods |  | Yes |
| Parker | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes |  |
| Polk | Piney Woods | Yes | Yes |
| Rains | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes | Yes |
| Real | Hill Country | Yes |  |
| Rockwall | Prairies \& Lakes |  | Yes |
| Sabine | Piney Woods | Yes | Yes |
| San Jacinto | Piney Woods | Yes | Yes |
| Somerville | Prairies \& Lakes |  | Yes |
| Trinity | Piney Woods | Yes | Yes |
| Van Zandt | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes |  |
| Washington | Prairies \& Lakes | Yes | Yes |
| Williamson | Hill Country |  | Yes |
| Wilson | South Texas |  | Yes |
| Wise | Prairies \& Lakes |  | Yes |
| Wood | Piney Woods | Yes | Yes |

## Appendix C. Historical and Projected Population Change in Texas Counties

Table C.1: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010


Table C.1: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | Change 1970-2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Carson County | 1,095 | 1,232 | 1,341 | 1,356 | 1,441 | 346 | 31.6 |
| Cass County | 5,122 | 6,218 | 6,614 | 6,938 | 7,930 | 2,808 | 54.8 |
| Castro County | 839 | 1,160 | 1,256 | 1,361 | 1,441 | 602 | 71.8 |
| Chambers County | 1,419 | 2,164 | 2,717 | 3,279 | 5,169 | 3,750 | 264.3 |
| Cherokee County | 7,427 | 8,817 | 9,123 | 9,037 | 10,570 | 3,143 | 42.3 |
| Childress County | 1,885 | 1,939 | 1,685 | 1,499 | 1,377 | -508 | -26.9 |
| Clay County | 1,921 | 2,217 | 2,250 | 2,361 | 2,656 | 735 | 38.3 |
| Cochran County | 688 | 709 | 727 | 744 | 627 | -61 | -8.9 |
| Coke County* | 754 | 982 | 1,120 | 1,174 | 1,094 | 340 | 45.1 |
| Coleman County | 3,254 | 3,350 | 3,059 | 2,648 | 2,627 | -627 | -19.3 |
| Collin County | 8,972 | 12,949 | 19,588 | 38,914 | 94,624 | 85,652 | 954.7 |
| Collingsworth County | 1,323 | 1,244 | 1,033 | 853 | 711 | -612 | -46.3 |
| Colorado County | 3,552 | 4,334 | 4,699 | 4,773 | 5,423 | 1,871 | 52.7 |
| Comal County* | 4,332 | 7,454 | 11,074 | 15,251 | 24,577 | 20,245 | 467.3 |
| Comanche County | 3,534 | 3,789 | 3,927 | 3,681 | 3,876 | 342 | 9.7 |
| Concho County | 793 | 832 | 743 | 714 | 808 | 15 | 1.9 |
| Cooke County | 4,461 | 5,401 | 6,327 | 7,112 | 8,492 | 4,031 | 90.4 |
| Coryell County | 3,533 | 4,151 | 4,971 | 5,983 | 8,228 | 4,695 | 132.9 |
| Cottle County | 702 | 826 | 680 | 589 | 464 | -238 | -33.9 |
| Crane County | 447 | 593 | 612 | 606 | 704 | 257 | 57.5 |
| Crockett County | 568 | 612 | 662 | 709 | 758 | 190 | 33.5 |
| Crosby County | 1,439 | 1,628 | 1,507 | 1,413 | 1,383 | -56 | -3.9 |
| Culberson County | 255 | 339 | 438 | 483 | 499 | 244 | 95.7 |
| Dallam County | 973 | 1,081 | 1,073 | 864 | 943 | -30 | -3.1 |
| Dallas County | 133,090 | 174,304 | 212,887 | 244,058 | 307,088 | 173,998 | 130.7 |
| Dawson County | 2,579 | 2,841 | 2,886 | 2,693 | 2,550 | -29 | -1.1 |
| Deaf Smith County | 1,883 | 2,475 | 2,806 | 2,975 | 3,026 | 1,143 | 60.7 |
| Delta County | 1,543 | 1,628 | 1,405 | 1,220 | 1,422 | -121 | -7.8 |
| Denton County | 8,558 | 12,875 | 19,457 | 32,082 | 73,353 | 64,795 | 757.1 |
| DeWitt County | 4,735 | 5,142 | 4,980 | 4,676 | 4,964 | 229 | 4.8 |
| Dickens County | 1,045 | 1,003 | 809 | 663 | 629 | -416 | -39.8 |
| Dimmit County | 1,263 | 1,495 | 1,610 | 1,675 | 2,043 | 780 | 61.8 |
| Donley County | 1,026 | 1,163 | 1,166 | 1,099 | 1,022 | -4 | -0.4 |
| Duval County | 1,746 | 2,293 | 2,283 | 2,378 | 2,538 | 792 | 45.4 |
| Eastland County | 5,596 | 5,705 | 5,278 | 4,822 | 4,954 | -642 | -11.5 |

Table C.1: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | Change 1970-2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Ector County | 7,089 | 12,012 | 15,998 | 17,645 | 19,933 | 12,844 | 181.2 |
| Edwards County | 375 | 372 | 391 | 487 | 595 | 220 | 58.7 |
| Ellis County | 8,637 | 10,200 | 11,468 | 14,068 | 22,449 | 13,812 | 159.9 |
| El Paso County | 30,317 | 46,406 | 69,864 | 88,348 | 115,645 | 85,328 | 281.5 |
| Erath County | 4,760 | 5,578 | 5,457 | 5,597 | 6,655 | 1,895 | 39.8 |
| Falls County | 4,878 | 5,228 | 4,421 | 3,916 | 3,865 | -1,013 | -20.8 |
| Fannin County | 6,297 | 6,969 | 6,507 | 6,523 | 7,896 | 1,599 | 25.4 |
| Fayette County* | 5,365 | 5,819 | 5,844 | 5,920 | 7,011 | 1,646 | 30.7 |
| Fisher County | 1,680 | 1,589 | 1,349 | 1,249 | 1,152 | -528 | -31.4 |
| Floyd County | 1,744 | 1,908 | 1,796 | 1,593 | 1,457 | -287 | -16.5 |
| Foard County | 651 | 687 | 538 | 462 | 408 | -243 | -37.3 |
| Fort Bend County | 5,631 | 9,437 | 16,617 | 29,572 | 70,140 | 64,509 | 1,145.6 |
| Franklin County* | 1,477 | 1,756 | 1,943 | 2,319 | 2,739 | 1,262 | 85.4 |
| Freestone County | 3,258 | 3,895 | 3,848 | 3,726 | 4,562 | 1,304 | 40.0 |
| Frio County | 1,613 | 1,943 | 1,985 | 2,264 | 2,765 | 1,152 | 71.4 |
| Gaines County | 1,247 | 1,669 | 1,828 | 2,015 | 2,196 | 949 | 76.1 |
| Galveston County | 19,695 | 25,970 | 32,466 | 37,281 | 48,573 | 28,878 | 146.6 |
| Garza County | 824 | 1,010 | 1,034 | 915 | 958 | 134 | 16.3 |
| Gillespie County* | 2,813 | 3,966 | 5,313 | 6,567 | 8,526 | 5,713 | 203.1 |
| Glasscock County | 104 | 144 | 131 | 186 | 241 | 137 | 131.7 |
| Goliad County | 1,101 | 1,082 | 1,342 | 1,564 | 1,927 | 826 | 75.0 |
| Gonzales County | 3,683 | 3,927 | 3,939 | 3,936 | 4,101 | 418 | 11.3 |
| Gray County | 4,574 | 5,281 | 5,470 | 5,188 | 4,809 | 235 | 5.1 |
| Grayson County | 15,381 | 18,525 | 19,966 | 21,414 | 26,177 | 10,796 | 70.2 |
| Gregg County | 11,370 | 15,330 | 18,497 | 19,193 | 22,583 | 11,213 | 98.6 |
| Grimes County | 2,972 | 3,160 | 3,397 | 4,307 | 5,279 | 2,307 | 77.6 |
| Guadalupe County* | 5,709 | 7,419 | 10,391 | 13,570 | 22,101 | 16,392 | 287.1 |
| Hale County | 4,563 | 5,919 | 5,752 | 6,010 | 5,988 | 1,425 | 31.2 |
| Hall County | 1,543 | 1,538 | 1,271 | 1,024 | 976 | -567 | -36.7 |
| Hamilton County* | 2,542 | 2,948 | 2,543 | 2,420 | 2,670 | 128 | 5.0 |
| Hansford County | 644 | 864 | 1,016 | 1,071 | 1,043 | 399 | 62.0 |
| Hardeman County | 1,893 | 1,797 | 1,525 | 1,204 | 1,074 | -819 | -43.3 |
| Hardin County | 4,220 | 5,891 | 6,750 | 7,851 | 10,439 | 6,219 | 147.4 |
| Harris County | 159,125 | 217,420 | 287,340 | 351,836 | 507,254 | 348,129 | 218.8 |
| Harrison County | 8,082 | 9,600 | 10,244 | 10,748 | 12,667 | 4,585 | 56.7 |

Table C.1: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | Change 1970-2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Hartley County | 448 | 722 | 746 | 900 | 1,033 | 585 | 130.6 |
| Haskell County | 2,091 | 2,267 | 2,129 | 1,852 | 1,652 | -439 | -21.0 |
| Hays County | 3,032 | 4,460 | 7,039 | 10,283 | 20,455 | 17,423 | 574.6 |
| HempHill County* | 539 | 690 | 650 | 640 | 696 | 157 | 29.1 |
| Henderson County* | 5,546 | 10,238 | 15,089 | 17,570 | 20,493 | 14,947 | 269.5 |
| Hidalgo County | 20,137 | 35,330 | 51,453 | 71,909 | 100,425 | 80,288 | 398.7 |
| Hill County* | 6,290 | 7,145 | 7,166 | 7,185 | 8,749 | 2,459 | 39.1 |
| Hockley County | 2,426 | 3,172 | 3,469 | 3,766 | 4,044 | 1,618 | 66.7 |
| Hood County* | 1,522 | 3,748 | 6,410 | 9,918 | 14,817 | 13,295 | 873.5 |
| Hopkins County | 4,788 | 5,833 | 5,955 | 6,275 | 7,560 | 2,772 | 57.9 |
| Houston County* | 4,055 | 5,124 | 5,175 | 5,309 | 6,055 | 2,000 | 49.3 |
| Howard County | 4,805 | 5,724 | 6,315 | 6,257 | 6,234 | 1,429 | 29.7 |
| Hudspeth County | 211 | 300 | 417 | 466 | 671 | 460 | 218.0 |
| Hunt County | 8,596 | 10,787 | 11,808 | 13,115 | 16,869 | 8,273 | 96.2 |
| Hutchinson County | 3,343 | 4,760 | 5,236 | 4,741 | 4,445 | 1,102 | 33.0 |
| Irion County | 233 | 294 | 294 | 356 | 407 | 174 | 74.7 |
| Jack County | 1,651 | 1,832 | 1,699 | 1,736 | 1,862 | 211 | 12.8 |
| Jackson County | 1,979 | 2,529 | 2,892 | 2,907 | 3,095 | 1,116 | 56.4 |
| Jasper County | 4,182 | 5,754 | 6,739 | 7,232 | 8,202 | 4,020 | 96.1 |
| Jeff Davis County* | 232 | 328 | 475 | 497 | 781 | 549 | 236.6 |
| Jefferson County | 32,092 | 39,306 | 45,643 | 43,841 | 44,596 | 12,504 | 39.0 |
| Jim Hogg County | 693 | 874 | 902 | 1,021 | 1,130 | 437 | 63.1 |
| Jim Wells County | 3,699 | 5,044 | 6,071 | 6,493 | 7,536 | 3,837 | 103.7 |
| Johnson County | 8,032 | 10,608 | 13,792 | 17,561 | 25,468 | 17,436 | 217.1 |
| Jones County | 4,008 | 4,242 | 3,950 | 3,754 | 3,827 | -181 | -4.5 |
| Karnes County | 2,358 | 2,781 | 2,871 | 2,794 | 2,807 | 449 | 19.0 |
| Kaufman County | 6,676 | 7,295 | 8,345 | 10,458 | 15,774 | 9,098 | 136.3 |
| Kendall County* | 1,647 | 2,299 | 3,026 | 4,407 | 8,046 | 6,399 | 388.5 |
| Kenedy County | 78 | 87 | 78 | 70 | 93 | 15 | 19.2 |
| Kent County | 298 | 310 | 284 | 288 | 277 | -21 | -7.0 |
| Kerr County* | 6,000 | 8,848 | 11,086 | 13,392 | 15,982 | 9,982 | 166.4 |
| Kimble County* | 818 | 1,034 | 1,140 | 1,212 | 1,459 | 641 | 78.4 |
| King County | 58 | 57 | 40 | 48 | 52 | -6 | -10.3 |
| Kinney County | 297 | 464 | 918 | 1,031 | 1,127 | 830 | 279.5 |
| Kleberg County | 2,916 | 3,446 | 4,110 | 4,519 | 5,141 | 2,225 | 76.3 |

Table C.1: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | Change 1970-2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Knox County | 1,431 | 1,545 | 1,338 | 1,199 | 991 | -440 | -30.7 |
| Lamar County | 7,849 | 9,338 | 9,607 | 9,865 | 11,311 | 3,462 | 44.1 |
| Lamb County | 3,161 | 3,718 | 3,411 | 3,233 | 2,889 | -272 | -8.6 |
| Lampasas County | 2,135 | 2,547 | 2,771 | 3,394 | 4,346 | 2,211 | 103.6 |
| La Salle County | 763 | 884 | 907 | 904 | 1,218 | 455 | 59.6 |
| Lavaca County | 4,881 | 5,525 | 5,409 | 5,187 | 5,470 | 589 | 12.1 |
| Lee County* | 2,214 | 2,486 | 2,678 | 2,886 | 3,557 | 1,343 | 60.7 |
| Leon County* | 2,350 | 2,956 | 3,337 | 4,004 | 4,825 | 2,475 | 105.3 |
| Liberty County* | 5,344 | 7,261 | 8,616 | 9,681 | 12,604 | 7,260 | 135.9 |
| Limestone County | 4,942 | 5,588 | 5,032 | 4,591 | 5,198 | 256 | 5.2 |
| Lipscomb County | 607 | 681 | 685 | 715 | 655 | 48 | 7.9 |
| Live Oak County | 1,268 | 1,769 | 2,112 | 2,614 | 2,969 | 1,701 | 134.1 |
| LLano County* | 2,529 | 4,266 | 5,102 | 6,643 | 7,957 | 5,428 | 214.6 |
| Loving County | 18 | 25 | 22 | 15 | 20 | 2 | 11.1 |
| Lubbock County | 17,261 | 23,367 | 29,991 | 34,946 | 42,635 | 25,374 | 147.0 |
| Lynn County | 1,487 | 1,532 | 1,374 | 1,229 | 1,241 | -246 | -16.5 |
| McCulloch County | 2,342 | 2,633 | 2,396 | 2,021 | 2,247 | -95 | -4.1 |
| McLennan County | 25,684 | 30,415 | 33,610 | 35,085 | 40,590 | 14,906 | 58.0 |
| McMullen County | 186 | 173 | 177 | 207 | 228 | 42 | 22.6 |
| Madison County | 1,851 | 2,181 | 2,200 | 2,352 | 2,625 | 774 | 41.8 |
| Marion County | 2,023 | 2,516 | 2,607 | 2,892 | 3,216 | 1,193 | 59.0 |
| Martin County | 669 | 783 | 802 | 830 | 832 | 163 | 24.4 |
| Mason County | 950 | 1,107 | 1,047 | 1,120 | 1,344 | 394 | 41.5 |
| Matagorda County | 4,218 | 5,419 | 5,832 | 6,277 | 7,385 | 3,167 | 75.1 |
| Maverick County | 1,803 | 3,013 | 4,473 | 5,960 | 8,011 | 6,208 | 344.3 |
| Medina County* | 3,172 | 4,165 | 5,122 | 6,404 | 9,002 | 5,830 | 183.8 |
| Mendard County* | 709 | 680 | 704 | 654 | 782 | 73 | 10.3 |
| Midland County | 5,512 | 9,141 | 14,064 | 17,567 | 21,256 | 15,744 | 285.6 |
| Milam County | 4,931 | 5,352 | 5,400 | 5,316 | 5,855 | 924 | 18.7 |
| Mills County | 1,466 | 1,558 | 1,487 | 1,476 | 1,510 | 44 | 3.0 |
| Mitchell County | 2,036 | 2,279 | 2,150 | 1,807 | 1,699 | -337 | -16.6 |
| Montague County | 4,076 | 4,919 | 4,789 | 4,888 | 5,303 | 1,227 | 30.1 |
| Montgomery County* | 6,379 | 13,117 | 22,499 | 36,051 | 71,436 | 65,057 | 1,019.9 |
| Moore County | 1,197 | 1,932 | 2,505 | 2,782 | 2,951 | 1,754 | 146.5 |
| Morris County | 2,106 | 2,715 | 2,931 | 3,075 | 3,318 | 1,212 | 57.5 |

Table C.1: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | Change 1970-2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Motley County | 613 | 588 | 508 | 417 | 416 | -197 | -32.1 |
| Nacogdoches County | 5,807 | 7,470 | 8,509 | 9,189 | 10,714 | 4,907 | 84.5 |
| Navarro County | 8,071 | 8,771 | 8,658 | 8,365 | 9,641 | 1,570 | 19.5 |
| Newton County | 2,155 | 2,379 | 2,521 | 2,840 | 3,291 | 1,136 | 52.7 |
| Nolan County | 3,301 | 3,628 | 3,524 | 3,318 | 3,446 | 145 | 4.4 |
| Nueces County | 23,223 | 31,829 | 40,906 | 46,046 | 58,828 | 35,605 | 153.3 |
| Ochiltree County | 985 | 1,222 | 1,378 | 1,387 | 1,483 | 498 | 50.6 |
| Oldham County | 299 | 283 | 322 | 333 | 379 | 80 | 26.8 |
| Orange County | 6,759 | 9,464 | 12,639 | 14,534 | 16,012 | 9,253 | 136.9 |
| Palo Pinto County | 3,979 | 5,177 | 5,561 | 5,781 | 6,432 | 2,453 | 61.6 |
| Panola County | 3,429 | 4,383 | 4,487 | 4,698 | 5,109 | 1,680 | 49.0 |
| Parker County* | 5,184 | 7,349 | 9,781 | 13,008 | 21,078 | 15,894 | 306.6 |
| Parmer County | 1,164 | 1,507 | 1,590 | 1,678 | 1,668 | 504 | 43.3 |
| Pecos County | 1,268 | 1,549 | 2,079 | 2,477 | 2,581 | 1,313 | 103.5 |
| Polk County* | 3,234 | 5,815 | 8,493 | 9,797 | 11,693 | 8,459 | 261.6 |
| Potter County | 13,265 | 16,065 | 17,109 | 17,179 | 18,439 | 5,174 | 39.0 |
| Presidio County | 853 | 977 | 1,278 | 1,298 | 1,871 | 1,018 | 119.3 |
| Rains County* | 952 | 1,264 | 1,626 | 2,063 | 3,127 | 2,175 | 228.5 |
| Randall County | 3,907 | 7,845 | 12,685 | 16,564 | 21,377 | 17,470 | 447.1 |
| Reagan County | 363 | 368 | 480 | 459 | 499 | 136 | 37.5 |
| Real County* | 402 | 573 | 672 | 877 | 1,168 | 766 | 190.5 |
| Red River County | 3,981 | 4,256 | 3,972 | 3,561 | 3,617 | -364 | -9.1 |
| Reeves County | 1,483 | 1,861 | 2,288 | 2,218 | 2,243 | 760 | 51.2 |
| Refugio County | 1,335 | 1,728 | 1,701 | 1,726 | 1,932 | 597 | 44.7 |
| Roberts County | 219 | 201 | 164 | 174 | 208 | -11 | -5.0 |
| Robertson County | 3,549 | 3,955 | 3,656 | 3,502 | 3,856 | 307 | 8.7 |
| Rockwall County* | 1,221 | 1,766 | 2,864 | 5,206 | 11,162 | 9,941 | 814.2 |
| Runnels County | 3,107 | 3,204 | 2,912 | 2,808 | 2,706 | -401 | -12.9 |
| Rusk County | 8,079 | 9,508 | 9,622 | 9,522 | 10,548 | 2,469 | 30.6 |
| Sabine County* | 1,517 | 2,336 | 3,262 | 3,435 | 3,878 | 2,361 | 155.6 |
| San Augustine County | 1,655 | 2,262 | 2,343 | 2,453 | 2,717 | 1,062 | 64.2 |
| San Jacinto County* | 1,471 | 2,334 | 3,683 | 4,845 | 6,518 | 5,047 | 343.1 |
| San Patricio County | 5,027 | 6,901 | 8,576 | 9,456 | 11,922 | 6,895 | 137.2 |
| San Saba County | 1,603 | 1,867 | 1,547 | 1,547 | 1,609 | 6 | 0.4 |
| Schleicher County | 498 | 508 | 600 | 626 | 642 | 144 | 28.9 |

Table C.1: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | $1990$ | 2000 | 2010 | Change 1970-2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Scurry County | 2,433 | 3,036 | 3,357 | 3,221 | 3,221 | 788 | 32.4 |
| Shackelford County | 952 | 970 | 851 | 765 | 818 | -134 | -14.1 |
| Shelby County | 4,664 | 5,615 | 5,436 | 5,392 | 5,430 | 766 | 16.4 |
| Sherman County | 403 | 529 | 544 | 543 | 555 | 152 | 37.7 |
| Smith County | 15,407 | 21,879 | 27,667 | 31,989 | 40,988 | 25,581 | 166.0 |
| Somervell County* | 805 | 757 | 838 | 1,179 | 1,816 | 1,011 | 125.6 |
| Starr County | 2,101 | 3,264 | 4,075 | 6,058 | 8,777 | 6,676 | 317.8 |
| Stephens County | 2,195 | 2,247 | 2,230 | 2,183 | 2,323 | 128 | 5.8 |
| Sterling County | 172 | 236 | 231 | 259 | 266 | 94 | 54.7 |
| Stonewall County | 546 | 670 | 542 | 506 | 455 | -91 | -16.7 |
| Sutton County | 546 | 551 | 617 | 671 | 811 | 265 | 48.5 |
| Swisher County | 1,583 | 1,717 | 1,823 | 1,714 | 1,730 | 147 | 9.3 |
| Tarrant County | 76,538 | 104,735 | 135,537 | 164,557 | 241,515 | 164,977 | 215.5 |
| Taylor County | 13,031 | 16,048 | 18,862 | 20,357 | 23,527 | 10,496 | 80.5 |
| Terrell County | 265 | 282 | 276 | 266 | 295 | 30 | 11.3 |
| Terry County | 1,660 | 2,276 | 2,375 | 2,378 | 2,419 | 759 | 45.7 |
| Throckmorton County | 646 | 641 | 539 | 510 | 515 | -131 | -20.3 |
| Titus County | 3,664 | 4,505 | 4,715 | 4,598 | 5,263 | 1,599 | 43.6 |
| Tom Green County | 11,059 | 13,853 | 16,481 | 18,043 | 21,014 | 9,955 | 90.0 |
| Travis County | 30,541 | 43,161 | 57,779 | 74,762 | 115,757 | 85,216 | 279.0 |
| Trinity County* | 1,945 | 2,607 | 3,354 | 3,923 | 4,433 | 2,488 | 127.9 |
| Tyler County | 2,931 | 3,949 | 4,495 | 4,872 | 5,521 | 2,590 | 88.4 |
| Upshur County | 4,299 | 5,640 | 6,077 | 6,771 | 8,641 | 4,342 | 101.0 |
| Upton County | 580 | 613 | 586 | 665 | 675 | 95 | 16.4 |
| Uvalde County | 2,795 | 3,508 | 3,900 | 4,508 | 5,439 | 2,644 | 94.6 |
| Val Verde County | 2,459 | 3,829 | 5,247 | 6,728 | 8,392 | 5,933 | 241.3 |
| Van Zandt County* | 5,455 | 7,594 | 8,983 | 10,892 | 13,011 | 7,556 | 138.5 |
| Victoria County | 5,714 | 8,238 | 11,148 | 13,183 | 16,499 | 10,785 | 188.7 |
| Walker County | 3,560 | 4,792 | 6,147 | 7,664 | 10,175 | 6,615 | 185.8 |
| Waller County | 2,101 | 2,969 | 3,423 | 4,194 | 6,575 | 4,474 | 212.9 |
| Ward County | 1,450 | 1,800 | 2,015 | 2,040 | 2,164 | 714 | 49.2 |
| Washington County* | 4,622 | 5,246 | 5,850 | 6,381 | 8,330 | 3,708 | 80.2 |
| Webb County | 8,319 | 11,105 | 14,783 | 19,793 | 27,990 | 19,671 | 236.5 |
| Wharton County | 6,089 | 7,261 | 7,518 | 7,436 | 8,216 | 2,127 | 34.9 |
| Wheeler County | 1,668 | 1,786 | 1,576 | 1,384 | 1,319 | -349 | -20.9 |

Table C.1: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

|  |  |  |  |  | Change $\mathbf{1 9 7 0 - 2 0 1 0}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| County | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Numeric |
| Wichita County | 16,485 | 18,415 | 20,862 | 21,635 | 23,297 | 6,812 |
| Wilbarger County | 3,753 | 4,063 | 3,571 | 2,998 | 2,863 | -890 |
| Willacy County | 1,909 | 2,389 | 2,724 | 3,033 | 3,574 | 1,665 |
| Williamson County* | 7,886 | 10,247 | 14,152 | 25,119 | 55,880 | 47,994 |
| Wilson County* | 2,233 | 2,982 | 3,792 | 5,038 | 8,098 | 5,865 |
| Winkler County | 1,072 | 1,439 | 1,481 | 1,319 | 1,203 | 131 |
| Wise County* | 3,777 | 4,969 | 5,763 | 7,240 | 10,661 | 6,884 |
| Wood County* | 5,037 | 6,608 | 8,003 | 10,079 | 13,538 | 8,501 |
| Yoakum County | 616 | 940 | 1,075 | 1,127 | 1,257 | 168.2 |
| Young County | 4,063 | 4,541 | 4,268 | 4,435 | 4,525 | 641 |
| Zapata County | 843 | 1,441 | 1,764 | 2,222 | 2,068 | 104.1 |
| Zavala County | 1,337 | 1,521 | 1,762 | 1,691 | 2,005 | 1,225 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

Table C.2: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties as a Share of the Total Older Adult Population in Texas by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State of Texas | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Anderson County | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Andrews County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Angelina County | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Aransas County* | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Archer County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Armstrong County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Atascosa County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Austin County* | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Bailey County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bandera County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Bastrop County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Baylor County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bee County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Bell County | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Bexar County | 6.3 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 6.8 |
| Blanco County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Borden County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bosque County* | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Bowie County | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Brazoria County | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Brazos County | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Brewster County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Briscoe County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Brooks County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Brown County | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Burleson County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Burnet County* | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Caldwell County | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Calhoun County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Callahan County | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Cameron County | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| Camp County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Carson County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| $\mathrm{A} \mathbb{M}_{\square}^{\mathrm{M}} \mid \underset{\mathrm{TEXA}}{\operatorname{REAL}}$ |  |  |  |  | 80 |
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Table C.2: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties as a Share of the Total Older Adult Population in Texas by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harrison County | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Hartley County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Haskell County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Hays County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| HempHill County* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Henderson County* | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Hidalgo County | 1.4 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
| Hill County* | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Hockley County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Hood County* | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Hopkins County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Houston County* | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Howard County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Hudspeth County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Hunt County | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Hutchinson County | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Irion County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Jack County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Jackson County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Jasper County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Jeff Davis County* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Jefferson County | 2.2 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.2 |
| Jim Hogg County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Jim Wells County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Johnson County | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Jones County | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Karnes County | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Kaufman County | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Kendall County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Kenedy County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Kent County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Kerr County* | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Kimble County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| King County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{A}} \mid \underset{\mathrm{TEXAS}}{\operatorname{REAL}}$ |  |  |  |  | 83 |
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| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kinney County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Kleberg County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Knox County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lamar County | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Lamb County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Lampasas County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| La Salle County | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lavaca County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Lee County* | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Leon County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Liberty County* | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Limestone County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Lipscomb County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Live Oak County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| LLano County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Loving County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lubbock County | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Lynn County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| McCulloch County | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| McLennan County | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| McMullen County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Madison County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Marion County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Martin County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Mason County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Matagorda County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Maverick County | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Medina County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Mendard County* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Midland County | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Milam County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Mills County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Mitchell County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Montague County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| $\bar{A} \mathbb{M}_{\square} \mid \underset{T E X A S}{R E A L}$ |  |  |  |  | 84 |

Table C.2: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties as a Share of the Total Older Adult Population in Texas by Decade, 1970-2010


Table C.2: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties as a Share of the Total Older Adult Population in Texas by Decade, 1970-2010


Table C.2: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties as a Share of the Total Older Adult Population in Texas by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ward County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Washington County* | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Webb County | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Wharton County | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Wheeler County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Wichita County | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| Wilbarger County | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Willacy County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Williamson County* | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 1.5 |
| Wilson County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Winkler County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Wise County* | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Wood County* | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Yoakum County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Young County | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Zapata County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Zavala County | 0.1 | 0.1 |  | 0.1 |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

REAL ESTATE CENTER

Table C.3: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12.9 | 13.4 | 13.8 | 13.3 | 15.0 |
| Anderson County | 23.4 | 20.1 | 16.5 | 15.3 | 17.7 |
| Andrews County | 9.0 | 11.2 | 13.7 | 16.4 | 15.7 |
| Angelina County | 15.3 | 15.9 | 17.3 | 16.8 | 19.0 |
| Aransas County* | 20.8 | 21.9 | 25.3 | 26.1 | 32.8 |
| Archer County | 20.6 | 18.7 | 18.8 | 18.6 | 21.9 |
| Armstrong County | 25.3 | 25.4 | 27.4 | 24.1 | 28.7 |
| Atascosa County* | 16.4 | 16.2 | 15.6 | 14.5 | 18.5 |
| Austin County* | 26.7 | 23.9 | 22.6 | 18.9 | 21.8 |
| Bailey County | 13.9 | 16.2 | 18.2 | 19.5 | 18.4 |
| Bandera County* | 25.7 | 25.3 | 24.4 | 21.9 | 28.9 |
| Bastrop County | 23.0 | 21.1 | 16.5 | 13.9 | 17.6 |
| Baylor County | 26.0 | 29.9 | 31.9 | 29.8 | 31.2 |
| Bee County | 12.0 | 13.5 | 15.4 | 13.4 | 15.4 |
| Bell County | 10.0 | 11.0 | 11.9 | 11.6 | 12.7 |
| Bexar County | 11.0 | 12.3 | 13.5 | 13.7 | 14.9 |
| Blanco County* | 26.4 | 27.5 | 25.7 | 21.6 | 26.8 |
| Borden County | 10.2 | 15.0 | 19.1 | 23.2 | 28.9 |
| Bosque County* | 33.4 | 34.1 | 30.0 | 26.0 | 28.6 |
| Bowie County | 16.4 | 18.1 | 18.9 | 17.6 | 19.9 |
| Brazoria County | 8.4 | 9.0 | 11.4 | 12.2 | 14.2 |
| Brazos County | 10.7 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 10.4 |
| Brewster County | 12.8 | 15.9 | 18.9 | 19.3 | 24.3 |
| Briscoe County | 18.0 | 23.1 | 26.4 | 24.6 | 30.1 |
| Brooks County | 12.3 | 16.8 | 17.4 | 19.2 | 23.1 |
| Brown County | 25.2 | 22.4 | 22.7 | 21.1 | 23.9 |
| Burleson County | 24.4 | 24.8 | 23.1 | 21.0 | 24.3 |
| Burnet County* | 29.5 | 30.4 | 28.7 | 23.4 | 25.8 |
| Caldwell County | 17.4 | 18.7 | 17.6 | 16.1 | 17.0 |
| Calhoun County | 8.6 | 11.9 | 16.4 | 17.7 | 20.8 |
| Callahan County | 28.2 | 24.6 | 22.5 | 22.8 | 25.0 |
| Cameron County | 12.3 | 13.0 | 14.3 | 14.5 | 15.3 |
| Camp County | 22.3 | 22.2 | 23.2 | 21.3 | 22.3 |
| Carson County | 17.2 | 18.5 | 20.4 | 20.8 | 23.3 |

Table C.3: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cass County | 21.2 | 21.1 | 22.1 | 22.8 | 26.0 |
| Castro County | 8.1 | 11.0 | 13.8 | 16.4 | 17.9 |
| Chambers County | 11.6 | 11.7 | 13.5 | 12.6 | 14.7 |
| Cherokee County | 23.2 | 23.1 | 22.2 | 19.4 | 20.8 |
| Childress County | 28.5 | 27.9 | 28.3 | 19.5 | 19.6 |
| Clay County | 23.8 | 23.1 | 22.4 | 21.5 | 24.7 |
| Cochran County | 12.9 | 14.7 | 16.6 | 19.9 | 20.1 |
| Coke County* | 24.4 | 30.7 | 32.7 | 30.4 | 33.0 |
| Coleman County | 31.6 | 32.1 | 31.5 | 28.7 | 29.5 |
| Collin County | 13.4 | 9.0 | 7.4 | 7.9 | 12.1 |
| Collingsworth County | 27.8 | 26.8 | 28.9 | 26.6 | 23.3 |
| Colorado County | 20.1 | 23.0 | 25.6 | 23.4 | 26.0 |
| Comal County* | 17.9 | 20.5 | 21.4 | 19.5 | 22.7 |
| Comanche County | 29.7 | 30.0 | 29.3 | 26.2 | 27.7 |
| Concho County | 27.0 | 28.5 | 24.4 | 18.0 | 19.8 |
| Cooke County | 19.0 | 19.5 | 20.6 | 19.6 | 22.1 |
| Coryell County | 10.0 | 7.3 | 7.7 | 8.0 | 10.9 |
| Cottle County | 21.9 | 28.0 | 30.3 | 30.9 | 30.8 |
| Crane County | 10.7 | 12.9 | 13.2 | 15.2 | 16.1 |
| Crockett County | 14.6 | 13.3 | 16.2 | 17.3 | 20.4 |
| Crosby County | 15.8 | 18.4 | 20.6 | 20.0 | 22.8 |
| Culberson County | 7.4 | 10.2 | 12.9 | 16.2 | 20.8 |
| Dallam County | 16.2 | 16.6 | 19.6 | 13.9 | 14.1 |
| Dallas County | 10.0 | 11.2 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 13.0 |
| Dawson County | 15.5 | 17.6 | 20.1 | 18.0 | 18.4 |
| Deaf Smith County | 9.9 | 11.7 | 14.7 | 16.0 | 15.6 |
| Delta County | 31.3 | 33.6 | 28.9 | 22.9 | 27.2 |
| Denton County | 11.3 | 9.0 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 11.1 |
| DeWitt County | 25.4 | 27.2 | 26.4 | 23.4 | 24.7 |
| Dickens County | 28.0 | 28.3 | 31.5 | 24.0 | 25.7 |
| Dimmit County | 14.0 | 13.2 | 15.4 | 16.3 | 20.4 |
| Donley County | 28.2 | 28.5 | 31.5 | 28.7 | 27.8 |
| Duval County | 14.9 | 18.3 | 17.7 | 18.1 | 21.5 |
| Eastland County | 30.9 | 29.3 | 28.5 | 26.4 | 26.7 |

Table C.3: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Ector County | 7.7 | 10.4 | 13.5 | 14.6 | 14.5 |
| Edwards County | 17.8 | 18.3 | 17.3 | 22.5 | 29.7 |
| Ellis County | 18.5 | 17.1 | 13.5 | 12.6 | 15.0 |
| El Paso County | 8.4 | 9.7 | 11.8 | 13.0 | 14.4 |
| Erath County | 26.2 | 24.7 | 19.5 | 17.0 | 17.6 |
| Falls County | 28.2 | 29.1 | 25.0 | 21.1 | 21.6 |
| Fannin County | 27.7 | 28.7 | 26.2 | 20.9 | 23.3 |
| Fayette County* | 30.4 | 30.9 | 29.1 | 27.2 | 28.6 |
| Fisher County | 26.5 | 27.0 | 27.9 | 28.8 | 29.0 |
| Floyd County | 15.8 | 19.4 | 21.1 | 20.5 | 22.6 |
| Foard County | 29.4 | 31.8 | 30.0 | 28.5 | 30.5 |
| Fort Bend County | 10.8 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 8.3 | 12.0 |
| Franklin County* | 27.9 | 25.5 | 24.9 | 24.5 | 25.8 |
| Freestone County | 29.3 | 26.3 | 24.3 | 20.9 | 23.0 |
| Frio County | 14.5 | 14.1 | 14.7 | 13.9 | 16.1 |
| Gaines County | 10.8 | 12.7 | 12.9 | 13.9 | 12.5 |
| Galveston County | 11.6 | 13.3 | 14.9 | 14.9 | 16.7 |
| Garza County | 15.6 | 18.9 | 20.1 | 18.8 | 14.8 |
| Gillespie County* | 26.7 | 29.3 | 30.9 | 31.6 | 34.3 |
| Glasscock County | 9.0 | 11.0 | 9.1 | 13.2 | 19.7 |
| Goliad County | 22.6 | 20.8 | 22.4 | 22.6 | 26.7 |
| Gonzales County | 22.5 | 23.3 | 22.9 | 21.1 | 20.7 |
| Gray County | 17.0 | 20.0 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 21.3 |
| Grayson County | 18.5 | 20.6 | 21.0 | 19.4 | 21.7 |
| Gregg County | 15.0 | 15.4 | 17.6 | 17.2 | 18.6 |
| Grimes County | 25.1 | 23.3 | 18.0 | 18.3 | 19.8 |
| Guadalupe County* | 17.0 | 15.9 | 16.0 | 15.2 | 16.8 |
| Hale County | 13.4 | 15.7 | 16.6 | 16.4 | 16.5 |
| Hall County | 25.7 | 27.5 | 32.5 | 27.1 | 29.1 |
| Hamilton County* | 35.3 | 35.5 | 32.9 | 29.4 | 31.3 |
| Hansford County | 10.1 | 13.9 | 17.4 | 19.9 | 18.6 |
| Hardeman County | 28.2 | 28.9 | 25.5 | 25.9 |  |
| Hardin County | 14.5 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 19.1 |  |
| Harris County | 10.2 | 10.3 | 12.4 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |

Table C.3: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harrison County | 18.0 | 18.4 | 17.8 | 17.3 | 19.3 |
| Hartley County | 16.1 | 18.1 | 20.5 | 16.3 | 17.0 |
| Haskell County | 24.6 | 29.3 | 31.2 | 30.4 | 28.0 |
| Hays County | 11.0 | 11.0 | 10.7 | 10.5 | 13.0 |
| HempHill County* | 17.5 | 13.0 | 17.5 | 19.1 | 18.3 |
| Henderson County* | 21.0 | 24.0 | 25.8 | 24.0 | 26.1 |
| Hidalgo County | 11.1 | 12.5 | 13.4 | 12.6 | 13.0 |
| Hill County* | 27.8 | 28.6 | 26.4 | 22.2 | 24.9 |
| Hockley County | 11.9 | 13.7 | 14.3 | 16.6 | 17.6 |
| Hood County* | 23.9 | 21.2 | 22.1 | 24.1 | 28.9 |
| Hopkins County | 23.1 | 23.1 | 20.7 | 19.6 | 21.5 |
| Houston County* | 22.7 | 23.0 | 24.2 | 22.9 | 25.5 |
| Howard County | 12.7 | 17.3 | 19.5 | 18.6 | 17.8 |
| Hudspeth County | 8.8 | 11.0 | 14.3 | 13.9 | 19.3 |
| Hunt County | 17.9 | 19.5 | 18.4 | 17.1 | 19.6 |
| Hutchinson County | 13.7 | 18.1 | 20.4 | 19.9 | 20.1 |
| Irion County | 21.8 | 21.2 | 18.0 | 20.1 | 25.5 |
| Jack County | 24.6 | 24.7 | 24.3 | 19.8 | 20.6 |
| Jackson County | 15.3 | 18.9 | 22.2 | 20.2 | 22.0 |
| Jasper County | 16.9 | 18.7 | 21.7 | 20.3 | 23.0 |
| Jeff Davis County* | 15.2 | 19.9 | 24.4 | 22.5 | 33.3 |
| Jefferson County | 13.1 | 15.7 | 19.1 | 17.4 | 17.7 |
| Jim Hogg County | 14.9 | 16.9 | 17.7 | 19.3 | 21.3 |
| Jim Wells County | 11.2 | 13.8 | 16.1 | 16.5 | 18.5 |
| Johnson County | 17.5 | 15.7 | 14.2 | 13.8 | 16.9 |
| Jones County | 24.9 | 24.6 | 24.0 | 18.1 | 18.9 |
| Karnes County | 17.5 | 20.5 | 23.1 | 18.1 | 18.9 |
| Kaufman County | 20.6 | 18.7 | 16.0 | 14.7 | 15.3 |
| Kendall County* | 23.7 | 21.6 | 20.7 | 18.6 | 24.1 |
| Kenedy County | 11.5 | 16.0 | 17.0 | 16.9 | 22.4 |
| Kent County | 20.8 | 27.1 | 28.1 | 33.5 | 34.3 |
| Kerr County* | 30.7 | 30.5 | 30.7 | 32.2 |  |
| Kimble County* | King County | 25.4 | 27.7 | 27.1 | 31.7 |
|  | 11.3 | 13.5 | 18.2 |  |  |

Table C.3: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Counties
by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kinney County | 14.8 | 20.4 | 29.4 | 30.5 | 31.3 |
| Kleberg County | 8.8 | 10.3 | 13.6 | 14.3 | 16.0 |
| Knox County | 24.0 | 29.0 | 27.7 | 28.2 | 26.6 |
| Lamar County | 21.8 | 22.2 | 21.9 | 20.3 | 22.7 |
| Lamb County | 17.8 | 19.9 | 22.6 | 22.0 | 20.7 |
| Lampasas County | 22.9 | 21.2 | 20.5 | 19.1 | 22.1 |
| La Salle County | 15.2 | 16.0 | 17.3 | 15.4 | 17.7 |
| Lavaca County | 27.3 | 29.1 | 28.9 | 27.0 | 28.4 |
| Lee County* | 27.5 | 22.7 | 20.8 | 18.4 | 21.4 |
| Leon County* | 26.9 | 30.8 | 26.3 | 26.1 | 28.7 |
| Liberty County* | 16.2 | 15.4 | 16.3 | 13.8 | 16.7 |
| Limestone County | 27.3 | 27.6 | 24.0 | 20.8 | 22.2 |
| Lipscomb County | 17.4 | 18.1 | 21.8 | 23.4 | 19.8 |
| Live Oak County | 18.9 | 18.4 | 22.1 | 21.2 | 25.7 |
| LLano County* | 36.2 | 42.1 | 43.9 | 39.0 | 41.2 |
| Loving County | 11.0 | 27.5 | 20.6 | 22.4 | 24.4 |
| Lubbock County | 9.6 | 11.0 | 13.5 | 14.4 | 15.3 |
| Lynn County | 16.3 | 17.8 | 20.3 | 18.8 | 21.0 |
| McCulloch County | 27.3 | 30.1 | 27.3 | 24.6 | 27.1 |
| McLennan County | 17.4 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 16.4 | 17.3 |
| McMullen County | 17.0 | 21.9 | 21.7 | 24.3 | 32.2 |
| Madison County | 24.1 | 20.5 | 20.1 | 18.2 | 19.2 |
| Marion County | 23.8 | 24.3 | 26.1 | 26.4 | 30.5 |
| Martin County | 14.0 | 16.7 | 16.2 | 17.5 | 17.3 |
| Mason County | 28.3 | 30.1 | 30.6 | 30.0 | 33.5 |
| Matagorda County | 15.1 | 14.3 | 15.8 | 16.5 | 20.1 |
| Maverick County | 10.0 | 9.6 | 12.3 | 12.6 | 14.8 |
| Medina County* | 15.7 | 18.0 | 18.8 | 16.3 | 19.6 |
| Mendard County* | 26.8 | 29.0 | 31.3 | 27.7 | 34.9 |
| Midland County | 8.4 | 11.1 | 13.2 | 15.1 | 15.5 |
| Milam County | 24.6 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 21.9 | 23.6 |
| Mills County | 34.8 | 34.8 | 32.8 | 28.7 | 30.6 |
| Mitchell County | 22.4 | 25.1 | 26.8 | 18.6 | 18.1 |
| Montague County | 26.6 | 28.3 | 27.7 | 25.6 | 26.9 |
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Table C.3: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Montgomery County* | 12.9 | 10.2 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 15.7 |
| Moore County | 8.5 | 11.7 | 14.0 | 13.8 | 13.5 |
| Morris County | 17.1 | 18.6 | 22.2 | 23.6 | 25.7 |
| Motley County | 28.1 | 30.2 | 33.2 | 29.2 | 34.4 |
| Nacogdoches County | 16.0 | 16.0 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 16.6 |
| Navarro County | 25.9 | 24.8 | 21.7 | 18.5 | 20.2 |
| Newton County | 18.5 | 17.9 | 18.6 | 18.8 | 22.8 |
| Nolan County | 20.4 | 20.9 | 21.2 | 21.0 | 22.6 |
| Nueces County | 9.8 | 11.9 | 14.1 | 14.7 | 17.3 |
| Ochiltree County | 10.2 | 12.7 | 15.1 | 15.4 | 14.5 |
| Oldham County | 13.2 | 12.4 | 14.1 | 15.2 | 18.5 |
| Orange County | 9.5 | 11.3 | 15.7 | 17.1 | 19.6 |
| Palo Pinto County | 13.7 | 21.5 | 22.2 | 21.4 | 22.9 |
| Panola County | 21.6 | 21.1 | 20.4 | 20.6 | 21.5 |
| Parker County* | 15.3 | 16.5 | 15.1 | 14.7 | 18.0 |
| Parmer County | 11.1 | 13.7 | 16.1 | 16.8 | 16.2 |
| Pecos County | 9.2 | 10.6 | 14.2 | 14.7 | 16.6 |
| Polk County* | 22.4 | 23.8 | 27.7 | 23.8 | 25.7 |
| Potter County | 14.7 | 16.3 | 17.5 | 15.1 | 15.2 |
| Presidio County | 17.6 | 18.8 | 19.3 | 17.8 | 23.9 |
| Rains County* | 25.4 | 26.1 | 24.2 | 22.6 | 28.7 |
| Randall County | 7.3 | 10.5 | 14.1 | 15.9 | 17.7 |
| Reagan County | 11.2 | 8.9 | 10.6 | 13.8 | 14.8 |
| Real County* | 20.0 | 23.2 | 27.9 | 28.8 | 35.3 |
| Red River County | 27.8 | 26.4 | 27.7 | 24.9 | 28.1 |
| Reeves County | 9.0 | 11.8 | 14.4 | 16.9 | 16.3 |
| Refugio County | 14.1 | 18.6 | 21.3 | 22.0 | 26.2 |
| Roberts County | 22.6 | 16.9 | 16.0 | 19.6 | 22.4 |
| Robertson County | 24.7 | 27.0 | 23.6 | 21.9 | 23.2 |
| Rockwall County* | 17.3 | 12.2 | 11.2 | 12.1 | 14.2 |
| Runnels County | 25.7 | 27.0 | 25.8 | 24.4 | 25.8 |
| Rusk County | 23.7 | 23.0 | 22.0 | 20.1 | 19.8 |
| Sabine County* | 21.1 | 26.8 | 34.0 | 32.8 | 35.8 |
| San Augustine County | 21.1 | 25.7 | 29.3 | 27.4 | 30.6 |

Table C.3: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Jacinto County* | 21.9 | 20.4 | 22.5 | 21.8 | 24.7 |
| San Patricio County | 10.6 | 11.9 | 14.6 | 14.1 | 18.4 |
| San Saba County | 28.9 | 30.1 | 28.6 | 25.0 | 26.2 |
| Schleicher County | 21.9 | 18.0 | 20.1 | 21.3 | 18.5 |
| Scurry County | 15.4 | 16.7 | 18.0 | 19.7 | 19.0 |
| Shackelford County | 28.6 | 24.8 | 25.7 | 23.2 | 24.2 |
| Shelby County | 23.7 | 24.3 | 24.7 | 21.4 | 21.3 |
| Sherman County | 11.0 | 16.7 | 19.0 | 17.0 | 18.3 |
| Smith County | 15.9 | 17.0 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 19.5 |
| Somervell County* | 28.8 | 18.2 | 15.6 | 17.3 | 21.4 |
| Starr County | 11.9 | 12.0 | 10.1 | 11.3 | 14.4 |
| Stephens County | 26.1 | 22.6 | 24.8 | 22.6 | 24.1 |
| Sterling County | 16.3 | 19.6 | 16.1 | 18.6 | 23.3 |
| Stonewall County | 22.8 | 27.8 | 26.9 | 29.9 | 30.5 |
| Sutton County | 17.2 | 10.7 | 14.9 | 16.5 | 19.6 |
| Swisher County | 15.3 | 17.7 | 22.4 | 20.5 | 22.0 |
| Tarrant County | 10.7 | 12.2 | 11.6 | 11.4 | 13.4 |
| Taylor County | 13.3 | 14.5 | 15.8 | 16.1 | 17.9 |
| Terrell County | 13.7 | 17.7 | 19.6 | 24.6 | 30.0 |
| Terry County | 11.8 | 15.6 | 18.0 | 18.6 | 19.1 |
| Throckmorton County | 29.3 | 31.2 | 28.7 | 27.6 | 31.4 |
| Titus County | 21.9 | 21.0 | 19.6 | 16.4 | 16.3 |
| Tom Green County | 15.6 | 16.3 | 16.7 | 17.3 | 19.1 |
| Travis County | 10.3 | 10.3 | 10.0 | 9.2 | 11.3 |
| Trinity County* | 25.5 | 27.6 | 29.3 | 28.5 | 30.4 |
| Tyler County | 23.6 | 24.3 | 27.0 | 23.3 | 25.4 |
| Upshur County | 20.5 | 19.7 | 19.4 | 19.2 | 22.0 |
| Upton County | 12.3 | 13.3 | 13.2 | 19.5 | 20.1 |
| Uvalde County | 16.1 | 15.6 | 16.7 | 17.4 | 20.6 |
| Val Verde County | 9.0 | 10.7 | 13.6 | 15.0 | 17.2 |
| Van Zandt County* | 24.6 | 24.2 | 23.7 | 22.6 | 24.7 |
| Victoria County | 10.6 | 12.0 | 15.0 | 15.7 | 19.0 |
| Walker County | 12.9 | 11.5 | 12.1 | 12.4 | 15.0 |
| Waller County | 14.7 | 15.0 | 14.6 | 12.8 | 15.2 |

Table C.3: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Percent of the Total Population in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Ward County | 11.1 | 12.9 | 15.4 | 18.7 | 20.3 |
| Washington County* | 24.5 | 23.8 | 22.4 | 21.0 | 24.7 |
| Webb County | 11.4 | 11.2 | 11.1 | 10.2 | 11.2 |
| Wharton County | 16.6 | 18.0 | 18.8 | 18.1 | 19.9 |
| Wheeler County | 25.9 | 25.0 | 26.8 | 26.2 | 24.4 |
| Wichita County | 13.5 | 15.2 | 17.0 | 16.4 | 17.7 |
| Wilbarger County | 24.4 | 25.5 | 23.6 | 20.4 | 21.2 |
| Willacy County | 12.3 | 13.7 | 15.4 | 15.1 | 16.1 |
| Williamson County* | 21.1 | 13.4 | 10.1 | 10.0 | 13.2 |
| Wilson County* | 17.1 | 17.8 | 16.7 | 18.5 | 18.4 |
| Winkler County | 11.1 | 14.5 | 16.6 | 14.8 | 16.9 |
| Wise County* | 19.2 | 18.7 | 27.2 | 27.4 | 18.0 |
| Wood County* | 27.1 | 26.8 | 12.2 | 15.4 | 32.3 |
| Yoakum County | 8.4 | 11.3 | 23.5 | 24.7 | 16.0 |
| Young County | 26.4 | 23.8 | 19.0 | 18.2 | 24.4 |
| Zapata County | 19.4 | 11.8 | 13.0 |  | 14.6 |
| Zavala County |  |  |  | 17.2 |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census of given year.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).
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Table C.4: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anderson County | 956 | 373 | 862 | 1,267 |
| Andrews County | -83 | -177 | -234 | -61 |
| Angelina County | 1,267 | 817 | 657 | 1,263 |
| Aransas County* | 1,095 | 941 | 1,300 | 1,185 |
| Archer County | 54 | 40 | -174 | -33 |
| Armstrong County | 5 | 9 | -1 | 4 |
| Atascosa County* | 606 | 224 | 596 | 1,348 |
| Austin County* | 614 | 456 | 264 | 1,262 |
| Bailey County | -218 | -178 | -137 | -130 |
| Bandera County* | 468 | 609 | 966 | 1,074 |
| Bastrop County | 1,107 | 1,016 | 1,197 | 2,428 |
| Baylor County | -3 | 45 | 24 | -23 |
| Bee County | 159 | 13 | 175 | -207 |
| Bell County | 2,258 | 1,603 | 2,074 | 5,667 |
| Bexar County | 4,100 | 5,439 | 8,750 | 11,946 |
| Blanco County* | 293 | 265 | 371 | 701 |
| Borden County | -28 | -12 | -57 | -37 |
| Bosque County* | 1,051 | 581 | 693 | 800 |
| Bowie County | 224 | 358 | 465 | 753 |
| Brazoria County | 1,097 | -989 | 1,481 | 3,754 |
| Brazos County | 1,204 | 741 | 963 | 2,696 |
| Brewster County | 83 | 279 | -28 | 129 |
| Briscoe County | -60 | -49 | -50 | 21 |
| Brooks County | 121 | -160 | 101 | -75 |
| Brown County | 902 | 863 | 887 | 983 |
| Burleson County | 511 | 368 | 364 | 288 |
| Burnet County* | 2,058 | 1,381 | 1,888 | 2,354 |
| Caldwell County | 637 | 367 | 600 | 347 |
| Calhoun County | 116 | -284 | -235 | 39 |
| Callahan County | 441 | 172 | 196 | 210 |
| Cameron County | 6,833 | 4,864 | 7,785 | 2,083 |
| Camp County | 237 | 221 | 348 | 247 |
| Carson County | -67 | -60 | -95 | -61 |
| Cass County | 793 | 460 | 619 | 460 |
| Castro County | -144 | -225 | -236 | -203 |
| $\underset{A_{0}}{\mathbb{M}} \mid \underset{\mathrm{TEXA}}{\text { REAL }}$ |  |  |  | 96 |

Table C.4: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chambers County | 90 | -94 | -6 | 434 |
| Cherokee County | 644 | 589 | 245 | 856 |
| Childress County | -9 | -37 | 122 | -102 |
| Clay County | 232 | 86 | -66 | -194 |
| Cochran County | -223 | -84 | -117 | -167 |
| Coke County* | 189 | 148 | 196 | -17 |
| Coleman County | 276 | 222 | 19 | 180 |
| Collin County | 2,840 | 3,423 | 8,760 | 23,077 |
| Collingsworth County | -93 | -50 | -24 | -59 |
| Colorado County | 348 | 276 | 553 | 598 |
| Comal County* | 2,588 | 2,736 | 3,732 | 6,203 |
| Comanche County | 299 | 540 | 111 | 142 |
| Concho County | -21 | 22 | 48 | -10 |
| Cooke County | 433 | 667 | 776 | 571 |
| Coryell County | 421 | 374 | -84 | 215 |
| Cottle County | 8 | 18 | -49 | -120 |
| Crane County | -148 | -141 | -98 | -25 |
| Crockett County | -73 | -61 | -41 | -142 |
| Crosby County | -65 | -122 | -139 | -161 |
| Culberson County | -82 | -6 | -116 | -163 |
| Dallam County | -103 | -66 | -179 | -88 |
| Dallas County | -9,714 | -19,154 | -22,333 | -36,247 |
| Dawson County | -213 | -147 | -332 | -489 |
| Deaf Smith County | -4 | -277 | -135 | -397 |
| Delta County | 84 | 81 | 31 | 127 |
| Denton County | 2,274 | 2,530 | 5,045 | 16,547 |
| DeWitt County | 387 | 235 | 365 | 328 |
| Dickens County | -80 | -68 | -36 | -47 |
| Dimmit County | 192 | -136 | 52 | -38 |
| Donley County | 121 | 68 | 76 | -51 |
| Duval County | 85 | -34 | 169 | -177 |
| Eastland County | 584 | 303 | 330 | 402 |
| Ector County | -405 | -1,681 | -1,294 | -598 |
| Edwards County | -51 | 15 | 13 | -21 |
| Ellis County | 790 | 788 | 1,126 | 3,924 |
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Table C.4: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| El Paso County | 4,333 | 2,930 | 1,769 | 2,195 |
| Erath County | 895 | 612 | 483 | 739 |
| Falls County | 606 | -75 | -37 | -25 |
| Fannin County | 608 | 277 | 745 | 1,562 |
| Fayette County* | 301 | 563 | 839 | 1,477 |
| Fisher County | -100 | -90 | -42 | -55 |
| Floyd County | -184 | -111 | -245 | -178 |
| Foard County | -7 | -17 | -34 | -67 |
| Fort Bend County | 2,267 | 2,369 | 5,659 | 16,098 |
| Franklin County* | 330 | 290 | 375 | 259 |
| Freestone County | 765 | 357 | 138 | 508 |
| Frio County | 193 | -90 | 195 | -107 |
| Gaines County | -178 | -171 | -325 | -259 |
| Galveston County | -1,682 | -2,079 | 557 | 1,214 |
| Garza County | -93 | -16 | -99 | -19 |
| Gillespie County* | 1,339 | 1,362 | 1,668 | 1,971 |
| Glasscock County | -69 | -59 | -74 | -64 |
| Goliad County | -2 | 182 | 148 | 168 |
| Gonzales County | 136 | 198 | 197 | -43 |
| Gray County | -330 | -192 | -378 | -453 |
| Grayson County | 2,206 | 1,140 | 2,099 | 2,932 |
| Gregg County | 1,061 | 755 | 173 | 1,882 |
| Grimes County | 279 | 477 | 1,021 | 149 |
| Guadalupe County* | 1,132 | 1,884 | 1,551 | 4,844 |
| Hale County | 98 | -628 | -368 | -740 |
| Hall County | -7 | -95 | -57 | 28 |
| Hamilton County* | 549 | 90 | 414 | 505 |
| Hansford County | -75 | -92 | -108 | -95 |
| Hardeman County | -117 | -92 | -123 | -231 |
| Hardin County | 638 | -177 | 409 | 1,268 |
| Harris County | -15,588 | -32,131 | -27,953 | -18,645 |
| Harrison County | 631 | 338 | -83 | -193 |
| Hartley County | 164 | -71 | 44 | -170 |
| Haskell County | -66 | 68 | 52 | -32 |
| Hays County | 798 | 1,708 | 2,251 | 6,224 |
|  |  |  |  | 98 |

Table C.4: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HempHill County* | 70 | -161 | -28 | -67 |
| Henderson County* | 4,136 | 3,949 | 2,272 | 1,765 |
| Hidalgo County | 10,968 | 9,099 | 14,705 | 9,939 |
| Hill County* | 925 | 697 | 765 | 1,360 |
| Hockley County | -245 | -73 | -200 | -261 |
| Hood County* | 2,263 | 1,953 | 3,417 | 4,065 |
| Hopkins County | 834 | 548 | 532 | 626 |
| Houston County* | 1,041 | 403 | 755 | 760 |
| Howard County | -511 | -413 | -350 | -252 |
| Hudspeth County | -47 | -33 | -98 | -3 |
| Hunt County | 1,636 | 721 | 281 | 1,334 |
| Hutchinson County | -383 | -626 | -752 | -618 |
| Irion County | 12 | 19 | 3 | -100 |
| Jack County | 109 | 25 | 89 | 6 |
| Jackson County | -19 | 111 | 7 | 77 |
| Jasper County | 924 | 573 | 630 | 287 |
| Jeff Davis County* | 16 | 104 | -53 | 123 |
| Jefferson County | -3,634 | -3,002 | -3,735 | -3,510 |
| Jim Hogg County | -10 | 3 | 127 | -37 |
| Jim Wells County | 0 | -39 | -65 | -62 |
| Johnson County | 2,038 | 1,868 | 1,795 | 2,882 |
| Jones County | 44 | -92 | 28 | -191 |
| Karnes County | 115 | -15 | 157 | 18 |
| Kaufman County | -24 | 718 | 1,667 | 3,555 |
| Kendall County* | 699 | 528 | 1,411 | 2,827 |
| Kenedy County | -8 | -14 | -38 | 2 |
| Kent County | -47 | -19 | 14 | 16 |
| Kerr County* | 3,227 | 2,638 | 3,681 | 3,584 |
| Kimble County* | 176 | 77 | 110 | 214 |
| King County | -60 | -23 | -20 | -25 |
| Kinney County | 90 | 351 | 83 | 20 |
| Kleberg County | -319 | -162 | -119 | -423 |
| Knox County | -19 | -25 | 12 | -61 |
| Lamar County | 1,117 | 632 | 962 | 931 |
| Lamb County | -16 | -312 | -227 | -300 |
| $\underset{A_{0}}{\mathbb{M}} \mid \underset{\mathrm{TEXAS}}{\operatorname{REAL}}$ |  |  |  | 99 |

Table C.4: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 s}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lampasas County | 383 | 228 | 568 | 638 |
| La Salle County | -18 | -8 | 61 | 46 |
| Lavaca County | 464 | 437 | 466 | 485 |
| Lee County* | 340 | 250 | 292 | 356 |
| Leon County* | 515 | 754 | 903 | 638 |
| Liberty County* | 1,230 | 141 | 623 | 771 |
| Limestone County | 664 | 222 | 270 | 529 |
| Lipscomb County | -87 | -61 | 16 | -93 |
| Live Oak County | 333 | 72 | 275 | -240 |
| LLano County* | 1,776 | 1,231 | 2,275 | 1,205 |
| Loving County | -33 | -7 | -10 | 1 |
| Lubbock County | 121 | 188 | 1,200 | 2,194 |
| Lynn County | -141 | -155 | -254 | -108 |
| McCulloch County | 360 | 134 | 101 | 252 |
| McLennan County | 936 | 623 | 1,102 | 2,124 |
| McMullen County | -68 | -17 | -4 | -39 |
| Madison County | 422 | 200 | 394 | 168 |
| Marion County | 457 | 213 | 200 | 105 |
| Martin County | -72 | -81 | -49 | -42 |
| Mason County | 164 | 47 | 228 | 125 |
| Matagorda County | -160 | 832 | 802 | 486 |
| Maverick County | 538 | 539 | 224 | 744 |
| Medina County* | -32 | -469 | -110 | 130 |
| Mendard County* | 732 | 291 | 829 | 305 |
| Midland County | 566 | 537 | 991 | 1,290 |
| Milam County | -10 | 66 | 74 | 118 |
| Mills County | -51 | -203 | 397 | 312 |
| Mitchell County | 465 | 280 | 219 | 352 |
| Montague County | 221 | 141 | 171 | -41 |
| Montgomery County* | -157 | -73 | -72 | -330 |
| Moore County | 300 | 364 | 884 | 479 |
| Morris County | 3,902 | 8,409 | 19,805 |  |
| Motley County | -261 | -185 | -394 |  |
| Nacogdoches County | 21 | 141 | 262 |  |
| Navarro County | -35 | -22 | 0 |  |

REAL ESTATE CENTER
100
TEXAS A\&M UNIVERSITY

Table C.4: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Newton County | 95 | 24 | -50 | -88 |
| Nolan County | 4 | -102 | -127 | 10 |
| Nueces County | -1,408 | -1,378 | -129 | 885 |
| Ochiltree County | -155 | -192 | -185 | -192 |
| Oldham County | -73 | -5 | -54 | -82 |
| Orange County | -321 | -737 | -423 | -751 |
| Palo Pinto County | 616 | 284 | 326 | 272 |
| Panola County | 587 | 175 | 117 | -64 |
| Parker County* | 1,496 | 1,175 | 1,542 | 4,053 |
| Parmer County | -52 | -195 | -123 | -236 |
| Pecos County | -309 | -103 | -150 | -508 |
| Polk County* | 2,535 | 2,419 | 1,681 | 1,876 |
| Potter County | -594 | -1,210 | 1,005 | 659 |
| Presidio County | 32 | 229 | -158 | 161 |
| Rains County* | 248 | 347 | 417 | 702 |
| Randall County | 1,623 | 1,124 | 186 | 459 |
| Reagan County | -169 | -127 | -89 | -20 |
| Real County* | 97 | 84 | 263 | 205 |
| Red River County | 445 | 119 | 44 | 200 |
| Reeves County | -314 | -96 | -505 | -380 |
| Refugio County | -114 | -183 | -63 | 78 |
| Roberts County | -4 | -42 | -36 | -29 |
| Robertson County | 403 | 131 | 201 | 227 |
| Rockwall County* | 407 | 535 | 1,377 | 3,821 |
| Runnels County | 102 | 11 | 223 | -6 |
| Rusk County | 929 | 579 | 203 | -72 |
| Sabine County* | 697 | 910 | 274 | 500 |
| San Augustine County | 491 | 143 | 316 | 315 |
| San Jacinto County* | 753 | 1,182 | 637 | 607 |
| San Patricio County | 126 | -194 | -152 | 36 |
| San Saba County | 305 | -62 | 164 | 82 |
| Schleicher County | 0 | 65 | -25 | -19 |
| Scurry County | -162 | -228 | -365 | -245 |
| Shackelford County | -13 | -24 | 8 | 24 |
| Shelby County | 960 | 189 | 435 | -131 |

Table C.4: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | 1970s | 1980s | 1990s | 2000s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sherman County | -13 | -56 | -72 | -105 |
| Smith County | 3,599 | 3,167 | 3,167 | 4,851 |
| Somervell County* | 45 | 36 | 374 | 537 |
| Starr County | 661 | 343 | 901 | 793 |
| Stephens County | 104 | -19 | 158 | 36 |
| Sterling County | 21 | -3 | 8 | -31 |
| Stonewall County | 36 | -95 | -1 | -25 |
| Sutton County | -35 | -104 | -58 | -39 |
| Swisher County | -144 | -70 | -176 | -85 |
| Tarrant County | 335 | -2,337 | -665 | 12,120 |
| Taylor County | 219 | 504 | 495 | 1,447 |
| Terrell County | -132 | -38 | -48 | -23 |
| Terry County | 28 | -107 | -195 | -204 |
| Throckmorton County | -41 | 1 | 3 | -25 |
| Titus County | 503 | 321 | 64 | 159 |
| Tom Green County | 1,216 | 923 | 1,174 | 1,286 |
| Travis County | 3,735 | 3,117 | 2,832 | 2,286 |
| Trinity County* | 667 | 848 | 662 | 563 |
| Tyler County | 1,006 | 582 | 498 | 300 |
| Upshur County | 988 | 299 | 470 | 1,177 |
| Upton County | -155 | -156 | -38 | -98 |
| Uvalde County | 378 | 9 | 421 | 254 |
| Val Verde County | 545 | 383 | 627 | -109 |
| Van Zandt County* | 1,940 | 1,410 | 1,922 | 1,345 |
| Victoria County | 413 | 340 | 674 | 414 |
| Walker County | 763 | 464 | 456 | 351 |
| Waller County | 643 | 200 | 465 | 1,094 |
| Ward County | -320 | -265 | -267 | -158 |
| Washington County* | 623 | 787 | 892 | 1,807 |
| Webb County | 1,314 | 1,096 | 3,174 | 1,491 |
| Wharton County | 347 | -173 | -215 | 64 |
| Wheeler County | 17 | -23 | -29 | -47 |
| Wichita County | -793 | -385 | -188 | 300 |
| Wilbarger County | -52 | -159 | -243 | -132 |
| Willacy County | 39 | -85 | 69 | -286 |

Table C.4: Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade, 1970-2010

| County | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 s}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Williamson County* | 2,113 | 2,535 | 8,484 | 19,715 |
| Wilson County* | 461 | 470 | 1,003 | 1,822 |
| Winkler County | -196 | -245 | -335 | -191 |
| Wise County* | 844 | 532 | 766 | 1,456 |
| Wood County* | 1,596 | 1,786 | 2,863 | 3,388 |
| Yoakum County | -149 | -228 | -255 | -169 |
| Young County | 530 | 21 | 610 | 337 |
| Zapata County | 608 | 291 | 493 | -589 |
| Zavala County | -143 | -31 | -157 | -43 |

Source: Winkler et al, Applied Population Laboratory, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2013.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

Table C.5: Older Adult Population (60+) in Texas Counties and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | Change 2010-2050 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| State of Texas | 3,776,653 | 5,677,339 | 7,712,217 | 9,678,249 | 11,983,397 | 8,206,744 | 217.3 |
| Anderson County | 10,354 | 14,464 | 18,012 | 18,871 | 17,674 | 7,320 | 70.7 |
| Andrews County | 2,320 | 3,362 | 4,286 | 4,800 | 5,401 | 3,081 | 132.8 |
| Angelina County | 16,460 | 22,065 | 26,317 | 27,204 | 26,292 | 9,832 | 59.7 |
| Aransas County* | 7,599 | 10,476 | 11,591 | 10,699 | 9,332 | 1,733 | 22.8 |
| Archer County | 1,984 | 2,704 | 3,271 | 3,337 | 3,032 | 1,048 | 52.8 |
| Armstrong County | 546 | 736 | 723 | 597 | 495 | -51 | -9.3 |
| Atascosa County* | 8,288 | 13,416 | 18,828 | 22,809 | 25,491 | 17,203 | 207.6 |
| Austin County* | 6,199 | 10,087 | 13,452 | 16,549 | 19,857 | 13,658 | 220.3 |
| Bailey County | 1,316 | 1,753 | 2,045 | 2,185 | 2,411 | 1,095 | 83.2 |
| Bandera County* | 5,916 | 9,950 | 13,220 | 13,537 | 12,215 | 6,299 | 106.5 |
| Bastrop County | 13,064 | 23,525 | 34,895 | 44,764 | 53,971 | 40,907 | 313.1 |
| Baylor County | 1,162 | 1,328 | 1,382 | 1,239 | 1,051 | -111 | -9.6 |
| Bee County | 4,900 | 6,319 | 7,324 | 7,488 | 7,321 | 2,421 | 49.4 |
| Bell County | 39,373 | 61,326 | 84,395 | 101,282 | 134,327 | 94,954 | 241.2 |
| Bexar County | 255,053 | 367,136 | 485,332 | 576,660 | 684,786 | 429,733 | 168.5 |
| Blanco County* | 2,814 | 4,824 | 6,673 | 7,265 | 6,802 | 3,988 | 141.7 |
| Borden County | 185 | 240 | 271 | 240 | 178 | -7 | -3.8 |
| Bosque County* | 5,210 | 7,001 | 8,227 | 8,121 | 7,420 | 2,210 | 42.4 |
| Bowie County | 18,413 | 22,438 | 24,294 | 22,815 | 20,944 | 2,531 | 13.7 |
| Brazoria County | 44,344 | 77,531 | 120,944 | 174,932 | 226,274 | 181,930 | 410.3 |
| Brazos County | 20,181 | 30,432 | 39,247 | 47,683 | 64,886 | 44,705 | 221.5 |
| Brewster County | 2,241 | 3,095 | 3,438 | 3,264 | 3,042 | 801 | 35.7 |
| Briscoe County | 493 | 587 | 585 | 525 | 416 | -77 | -15.6 |
| Brooks County | 1,668 | 2,020 | 2,122 | 1,898 | 1,752 | 84 | 5.0 |
| Brown County | 9,111 | 11,793 | 13,172 | 12,672 | 11,383 | 2,272 | 24.9 |
| Burleson County | 4,168 | 5,917 | 7,384 | 7,672 | 7,467 | 3,299 | 79.2 |
| Burnet County* | 11,023 | 17,351 | 23,268 | 25,795 | 26,202 | 15,179 | 137.7 |
| Caldwell County | 6,455 | 10,614 | 15,047 | 18,735 | 23,122 | 16,667 | 258.2 |
| Calhoun County | 4,447 | 6,225 | 7,684 | 7,953 | 8,368 | 3,921 | 88.2 |
| Callahan County | 3,392 | 4,522 | 5,299 | 5,311 | 5,311 | 1,919 | 56.6 |
| Cameron County | 62,348 | 89,246 | 117,256 | 141,569 | 152,919 | 90,571 | 145.3 |
| Camp County | 2,771 | 3,840 | 4,486 | 4,529 | 4,393 | 1,622 | 58.5 |
| Carson County | 1,441 | 1,832 | 2,065 | 2,032 | 1,807 | 366 | 25.4 |

REAL ESTATE CENTER
104

Table C.5: Older Adult Population (60+) in Texas Counties and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | Change 2010-2050 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Cass County | 7,930 | 9,764 | 10,634 | 10,058 | 8,685 | 755 | 9.5 |
| Castro County | 1,441 | 2,028 | 2,254 | 2,314 | 2,194 | 753 | 52.3 |
| Chambers County | 5,169 | 9,076 | 13,455 | 18,741 | 24,485 | 19,316 | 373.7 |
| Cherokee County | 10,570 | 14,183 | 16,555 | 17,077 | 16,330 | 5,760 | 54.5 |
| Childress County | 1,377 | 1,667 | 1,779 | 1,641 | 1,331 | -46 | -3.3 |
| Clay County | 2,656 | 3,610 | 4,078 | 3,876 | 3,295 | 639 | 24.1 |
| Cochran County | 627 | 889 | 1,039 | 943 | 854 | 227 | 36.2 |
| Coke County* | 1,094 | 1,125 | 1,098 | 883 | 703 | -391 | -35.7 |
| Coleman County | 2,627 | 3,315 | 3,604 | 3,352 | 2,732 | 105 | 4.0 |
| Collin County | 94,624 | 195,116 | 367,772 | 624,011 | 922,381 | 827,757 | 874.8 |
| Collingsworth County | 711 | 887 | 978 | 917 | 846 | 135 | 19.0 |
| Colorado County | 5,423 | 7,270 | 8,124 | 7,637 | 6,686 | 1,263 | 23.3 |
| Comal County* | 24,577 | 45,301 | 71,256 | 93,777 | 112,814 | 88,237 | 359.0 |
| Comanche County | 3,876 | 4,469 | 4,890 | 4,537 | 3,931 | 55 | 1.4 |
| Concho County | 808 | 1,179 | 1,738 | 2,154 | 2,277 | 1,469 | 181.8 |
| Cooke County | 8,492 | 11,511 | 13,308 | 12,954 | 12,043 | 3,551 | 41.8 |
| Coryell County | 8,228 | 12,381 | 16,920 | 20,973 | 22,293 | 14,065 | 170.9 |
| Cottle County | 464 | 569 | 554 | 462 | 350 | -114 | -24.6 |
| Crane County | 704 | 1,180 | 1,629 | 1,657 | 1,619 | 915 | 130.0 |
| Crockett County | 758 | 1,190 | 1,305 | 1,188 | 995 | 237 | 31.3 |
| Crosby County | 1,383 | 1,803 | 2,063 | 2,264 | 2,405 | 1,022 | 73.9 |
| Culberson County | 499 | 741 | 863 | 786 | 706 | 207 | 41.5 |
| Dallam County | 943 | 1,508 | 2,029 | 2,274 | 2,474 | 1,531 | 162.4 |
| Dallas County | 307,088 | 410,506 | 503,745 | 568,223 | 645,843 | 338,755 | 110.3 |
| Dawson County | 2,550 | 3,076 | 3,271 | 3,141 | 3,162 | 612 | 24.0 |
| Deaf Smith County | 3,026 | 4,012 | 4,970 | 5,645 | 5,963 | 2,937 | 97.1 |
| Delta County | 1,422 | 1,910 | 2,158 | 2,163 | 2,154 | 732 | 51.5 |
| Denton County | 73,353 | 147,091 | 265,088 | 427,674 | 631,502 | 558,149 | 760.9 |
| DeWitt County | 4,964 | 6,212 | 6,900 | 6,541 | 5,881 | 917 | 18.5 |
| Dickens County | 629 | 843 | 903 | 901 | 805 | 176 | 28.0 |
| Dimmit County | 2,043 | 2,683 | 3,154 | 3,125 | 2,832 | 789 | 38.6 |
| Donley County | 1,022 | 1,113 | 1,122 | 968 | 892 | -130 | -12.7 |
| Duval County | 2,538 | 3,157 | 3,587 | 3,572 | 3,273 | 735 | 29.0 |
| Eastland County | 4,954 | 6,077 | 6,621 | 6,157 | 5,650 | 696 | 14.0 |

Table C.5: Older Adult Population (60+) in Texas Counties and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | Change 2010-2050 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Ector County | 19,933 | 28,519 | 35,644 | 41,618 | 50,645 | 30,712 | 154.1 |
| Edwards County | 595 | 805 | 801 | 654 | 523 | -72 | -12.1 |
| Ellis County | 22,449 | 40,004 | 61,215 | 84,943 | 110,219 | 87,770 | 391.0 |
| El Paso County | 115,645 | 165,815 | 217,286 | 251,981 | 278,620 | 162,975 | 140.9 |
| Erath County | 6,655 | 8,829 | 10,293 | 9,865 | 9,699 | 3,044 | 45.7 |
| Falls County | 3,865 | 5,172 | 6,337 | 6,439 | 6,378 | 2,513 | 65.0 |
| Fannin County | 7,896 | 10,959 | 13,680 | 13,952 | 12,605 | 4,709 | 59.6 |
| Fayette County* | 7,011 | 10,153 | 12,662 | 12,792 | 11,753 | 4,742 | 67.6 |
| Fisher County | 1,152 | 1,293 | 1,292 | 1,105 | 894 | -258 | -22.4 |
| Floyd County | 1,457 | 1,758 | 1,866 | 1,727 | 1,513 | 56 | 3.8 |
| Foard County | 408 | 490 | 505 | 417 | 330 | -78 | -19.1 |
| Fort Bend County | 70,140 | 156,633 | 289,462 | 480,396 | 689,301 | 619,161 | 882.8 |
| Franklin County* | 2,739 | 3,391 | 3,877 | 3,717 | 3,378 | 639 | 23.3 |
| Freestone County | 4,562 | 6,050 | 6,800 | 6,919 | 6,654 | 2,092 | 45.9 |
| Frio County | 2,765 | 3,879 | 5,023 | 5,715 | 6,540 | 3,775 | 136.5 |
| Gaines County | 2,196 | 3,270 | 4,291 | 4,932 | 5,632 | 3,436 | 156.5 |
| Galveston County | 48,573 | 70,287 | 85,595 | 93,126 | 102,579 | 54,006 | 111.2 |
| Garza County | 958 | 1,550 | 2,143 | 2,265 | 2,695 | 1,737 | 181.3 |
| Gillespie County* | 8,526 | 11,792 | 14,724 | 15,623 | 15,571 | 7,045 | 82.6 |
| Glasscock County | 241 | 404 | 464 | 467 | 373 | 132 | 54.8 |
| Goliad County | 1,927 | 2,857 | 3,496 | 3,593 | 3,450 | 1,523 | 79.0 |
| Gonzales County | 4,101 | 5,498 | 6,573 | 6,781 | 6,688 | 2,587 | 63.1 |
| Gray County | 4,809 | 5,599 | 6,118 | 6,234 | 6,344 | 1,535 | 31.9 |
| Grayson County | 26,177 | 35,655 | 42,440 | 42,699 | 41,393 | 15,216 | 58.1 |
| Gregg County | 22,583 | 29,338 | 33,557 | 35,908 | 42,044 | 19,461 | 86.2 |
| Grimes County | 5,279 | 8,334 | 10,399 | 10,828 | 10,424 | 5,145 | 97.5 |
| Guadalupe County* | 22,101 | 37,268 | 59,788 | 85,971 | 111,251 | 89,150 | 403.4 |
| Hale County | 5,988 | 7,359 | 8,547 | 8,773 | 8,673 | 2,685 | 44.8 |
| Hall County | 976 | 1,039 | 1,036 | 921 | 754 | -222 | -22.7 |
| Hamilton County* | 2,670 | 3,044 | 3,335 | 3,204 | 2,934 | 264 | 9.9 |
| Hansford County | 1,043 | 1,396 | 1,700 | 1,811 | 1,800 | 757 | 72.6 |
| Hardeman County | 1,074 | 1,321 | 1,386 | 1,300 | 1,108 | 34 | 3.2 |
| Hardin County | 10,439 | 15,126 | 18,964 | 21,210 | 22,051 | 11,612 | 111.2 |
| Harris County | 507,254 | 764,447 | 990,218 | 1,191,992 | 1,497,116 | 989,862 | 195.1 |
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Table C.5: Older Adult Population (60+) in Texas Counties and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | Change 2010-2050 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Harrison County | 12,667 | 17,449 | 20,294 | 20,342 | 19,753 | 7,086 | 55.9 |
| Hartley County | 1,033 | 1,245 | 1,461 | 1,611 | 1,412 | 379 | 36.7 |
| Haskell County | 1,652 | 1,929 | 2,139 | 2,034 | 1,738 | 86 | 5.2 |
| Hays County | 20,455 | 42,106 | 72,757 | 114,699 | 169,296 | 148,841 | 727.7 |
| HempHill County* | 696 | 974 | 1,158 | 1,381 | 1,497 | 801 | 115.1 |
| Henderson County* | 20,493 | 26,385 | 29,933 | 29,062 | 26,472 | 5,979 | 29.2 |
| Hidalgo County | 100,425 | 155,475 | 224,990 | 300,006 | 366,040 | 265,615 | 264.5 |
| Hill County* | 8,749 | 11,818 | 13,848 | 13,698 | 12,947 | 4,198 | 48.0 |
| Hockley County | 4,044 | 5,477 | 6,328 | 6,344 | 6,290 | 2,246 | 55.5 |
| Hood County* | 14,817 | 22,603 | 28,774 | 29,836 | 29,093 | 14,276 | 96.3 |
| Hopkins County | 7,560 | 9,982 | 11,759 | 11,929 | 11,400 | 3,840 | 50.8 |
| Houston County* | 6,055 | 7,628 | 8,556 | 7,962 | 6,760 | 705 | 11.6 |
| Howard County | 6,234 | 9,272 | 11,277 | 10,987 | 10,637 | 4,403 | 70.6 |
| Hudspeth County | 671 | 1,118 | 1,352 | 1,276 | 1,109 | 438 | 65.3 |
| Hunt County | 16,869 | 24,852 | 32,108 | 36,366 | 40,361 | 23,492 | 139.3 |
| Hutchinson County | 4,445 | 5,781 | 6,219 | 6,029 | 5,342 | 897 | 20.2 |
| Irion County | 407 | 580 | 655 | 594 | 438 | 31 | 7.6 |
| Jack County | 1,862 | 2,485 | 3,083 | 3,132 | 2,865 | 1,003 | 53.9 |
| Jackson County | 3,095 | 3,827 | 3,991 | 3,592 | 3,153 | 58 | 1.9 |
| Jasper County | 8,202 | 10,453 | 11,681 | 10,920 | 9,464 | 1,262 | 15.4 |
| Jeff Davis County* | 781 | 1,121 | 1,066 | 778 | 502 | -279 | -35.7 |
| Jefferson County | 44,596 | 55,137 | 59,696 | 57,614 | 59,489 | 14,893 | 33.4 |
| Jim Hogg County | 1,130 | 1,409 | 1,537 | 1,493 | 1,445 | 315 | 27.9 |
| Jim Wells County | 7,536 | 9,967 | 11,366 | 11,340 | 10,475 | 2,939 | 39.0 |
| Johnson County | 25,468 | 40,430 | 55,908 | 68,310 | 81,986 | 56,518 | 221.9 |
| Jones County | 3,827 | 5,096 | 6,214 | 6,550 | 6,756 | 2,929 | 76.5 |
| Karnes County | 2,807 | 4,026 | 5,177 | 5,520 | 5,297 | 2,490 | 88.7 |
| Kaufman County | 15,774 | 28,934 | 47,058 | 72,855 | 104,927 | 89,153 | 565.2 |
| Kendall County* | 8,046 | 13,906 | 21,045 | 26,510 | 29,726 | 21,680 | 269.5 |
| Kenedy County | 93 | 141 | 189 | 177 | 159 | 66 | 71.0 |
| Kent County | 277 | 310 | 303 | 260 | 188 | -89 | -32.1 |
| Kerr County* | 15,982 | 21,656 | 26,509 | 26,530 | 24,761 | 8,779 | 54.9 |
| Kimble County* | 1,459 | 1,989 | 2,240 | 2,045 | 1,665 | 206 | 14.1 |
| King County | 52 | 103 | 130 | 121 | 89 | 37 | 71.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 107 |

Table C.5: Older Adult Population (60+) in Texas Counties and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | Change 2010-2050 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Kinney County | 1,127 | 1,301 | 1,324 | 1,248 | 1,141 | 14 | 1.2 |
| Kleberg County | 5,141 | 6,766 | 7,713 | 7,541 | 7,061 | 1,920 | 37.3 |
| Knox County | 991 | 1,101 | 1,137 | 1,036 | 906 | -85 | -8.6 |
| Lamar County | 11,311 | 14,052 | 16,141 | 15,954 | 14,902 | 3,591 | 31.7 |
| Lamb County | 2,889 | 3,414 | 3,744 | 3,569 | 3,246 | 357 | 12.4 |
| Lampasas County | 4,346 | 6,371 | 8,309 | 9,025 | 9,022 | 4,676 | 107.6 |
| La Salle County | 1,218 | 1,724 | 2,110 | 2,303 | 2,937 | 1,719 | 141.1 |
| Lavaca County | 5,470 | 6,677 | 7,296 | 6,766 | 5,736 | 266 | 4.9 |
| Lee County* | 3,557 | 5,441 | 7,244 | 7,787 | 7,502 | 3,945 | 110.9 |
| Leon County* | 4,825 | 6,716 | 7,944 | 7,859 | 7,272 | 2,447 | 50.7 |
| Liberty County* | 12,604 | 20,022 | 27,227 | 33,076 | 40,305 | 27,701 | 219.8 |
| Limestone County | 5,198 | 7,133 | 8,381 | 8,485 | 8,306 | 3,108 | 59.8 |
| Lipscomb County | 655 | 913 | 1,068 | 1,070 | 1,272 | 617 | 94.2 |
| Live Oak County | 2,969 | 3,635 | 3,978 | 3,783 | 3,295 | 326 | 11.0 |
| LLano County* | 7,957 | 9,948 | 10,939 | 10,252 | 9,140 | 1,183 | 14.9 |
| Loving County | 20 | 42 | 51 | 35 | 32 | 12 | 60.0 |
| Lubbock County | 42,635 | 56,696 | 65,734 | 68,355 | 76,036 | 33,401 | 78.3 |
| Lynn County | 1,241 | 1,674 | 1,870 | 1,681 | 1,425 | 184 | 14.8 |
| McCulloch County | 2,247 | 2,922 | 3,260 | 3,060 | 2,769 | 522 | 23.2 |
| McLennan County | 40,590 | 52,286 | 59,925 | 60,393 | 61,269 | 20,679 | 50.9 |
| McMullen County | 228 | 312 | 311 | 262 | 202 | -26 | -11.4 |
| Madison County | 2,625 | 3,534 | 4,135 | 4,393 | 4,515 | 1,890 | 72.0 |
| Marion County | 3,216 | 4,360 | 4,857 | 4,268 | 3,485 | 269 | 8.4 |
| Martin County | 832 | 1,259 | 1,608 | 1,604 | 1,568 | 736 | 88.5 |
| Mason County | 1,344 | 1,673 | 1,819 | 1,596 | 1,192 | -152 | -11.3 |
| Matagorda County | 7,385 | 10,319 | 12,071 | 11,718 | 10,672 | 3,287 | 44.5 |
| Maverick County | 8,011 | 11,661 | 14,874 | 16,952 | 17,482 | 9,471 | 118.2 |
| Medina County* | 9,002 | 14,544 | 20,910 | 24,406 | 26,681 | 17,679 | 196.4 |
| Mendard County* | 782 | 965 | 954 | 730 | 552 | -230 | -29.4 |
| Midland County | 21,256 | 30,697 | 37,338 | 42,665 | 52,907 | 31,651 | 148.9 |
| Milam County | 5,855 | 7,685 | 8,665 | 8,362 | 7,371 | 1,516 | 25.9 |
| Mills County | 1,510 | 1,693 | 1,807 | 1,561 | 1,219 | -291 | -19.3 |
| Mitchell County | 1,699 | 2,213 | 2,380 | 2,245 | 1,935 | 236 | 13.9 |
| Montague County | 5,303 | 6,722 | 7,715 | 7,570 | 6,872 | 1,569 | 29.6 |
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Table C.5: Older Adult Population (60+) in Texas Counties and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | Change 2010-2050 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| Montgomery County* | 71,436 | 138,307 | 238,665 | 391,791 | 615,292 | 543,856 | 761.3 |
| Moore County | 2,951 | 4,285 | 5,477 | 6,562 | 7,657 | 4,706 | 159.5 |
| Morris County | 3,318 | 4,127 | 4,253 | 4,164 | 3,760 | 442 | 13.3 |
| Motley County | 416 | 488 | 426 | 348 | 268 | -148 | -35.6 |
| Nacogdoches County | 10,714 | 14,904 | 17,930 | 18,719 | 19,292 | 8,578 | 80.1 |
| Navarro County | 9,641 | 13,435 | 16,674 | 17,957 | 17,775 | 8,134 | 84.4 |
| Newton County | 3,291 | 4,002 | 4,124 | 3,621 | 3,081 | -210 | -6.4 |
| Nolan County | 3,446 | 4,437 | 4,827 | 4,695 | 4,302 | 856 | 24.8 |
| Nueces County | 58,828 | 81,890 | 96,977 | 101,253 | 105,638 | 46,810 | 79.6 |
| Ochiltree County | 1,483 | 2,104 | 2,730 | 3,418 | 4,098 | 2,615 | 176.3 |
| Oldham County | 379 | 579 | 643 | 607 | 490 | 111 | 29.3 |
| Orange County | 16,012 | 20,985 | 24,455 | 25,126 | 24,779 | 8,767 | 54.8 |
| Palo Pinto County | 6,432 | 9,152 | 11,090 | 11,141 | 10,256 | 3,824 | 59.5 |
| Panola County | 5,109 | 7,120 | 8,070 | 8,113 | 7,811 | 2,702 | 52.9 |
| Parker County* | 21,078 | 36,596 | 55,165 | 73,637 | 95,467 | 74,389 | 352.9 |
| Parmer County | 1,668 | 2,295 | 2,784 | 3,090 | 3,473 | 1,805 | 108.2 |
| Pecos County | 2,581 | 3,475 | 4,123 | 4,320 | 4,204 | 1,623 | 62.9 |
| Polk County* | 11,693 | 16,322 | 20,034 | 21,461 | 21,518 | 9,825 | 84.0 |
| Potter County | 18,439 | 24,999 | 30,249 | 32,403 | 36,064 | 17,625 | 95.6 |
| Presidio County | 1,871 | 2,384 | 2,811 | 2,865 | 2,638 | 767 | 41.0 |
| Rains County* | 3,127 | 4,859 | 6,207 | 6,496 | 5,957 | 2,830 | 90.5 |
| Randall County | 21,377 | 30,904 | 38,558 | 44,535 | 54,015 | 32,638 | 152.7 |
| Reagan County | 499 | 889 | 1,157 | 1,200 | 1,174 | 675 | 135.3 |
| Real County* | 1,168 | 1,448 | 1,476 | 1,164 | 815 | -353 | -30.2 |
| Red River County | 3,617 | 4,449 | 4,667 | 4,196 | 3,494 | -123 | -3.4 |
| Reeves County | 2,243 | 3,000 | 3,940 | 4,792 | 5,170 | 2,927 | 130.5 |
| Refugio County | 1,932 | 2,296 | 2,344 | 2,033 | 1,679 | -253 | -13.1 |
| Roberts County | 208 | 318 | 353 | 307 | 258 | 50 | 24.0 |
| Robertson County | 3,856 | 5,425 | 6,692 | 7,298 | 7,813 | 3,957 | 102.6 |
| Rockwall County* | 11,162 | 23,139 | 44,298 | 72,068 | 96,260 | 85,098 | 762.4 |
| Runnels County | 2,706 | 3,315 | 3,588 | 3,227 | 2,841 | 135 | 5.0 |
| Rusk County | 10,548 | 14,776 | 18,787 | 22,317 | 27,428 | 16,880 | 160.0 |
| Sabine County* | 3,878 | 5,215 | 6,188 | 5,674 | 4,533 | 655 | 16.9 |
| San Augustine County | 2,717 | 3,392 | 3,643 | 3,204 | 2,634 | -83 | -3.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 109 |

Table C.5: Older Adult Population (60+) in Texas Counties and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | Change 2010-2050 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Numeric | \% |
| San Jacinto County* | 6,518 | 10,204 | 13,010 | 14,272 | 14,806 | 8,288 | 127.2 |
| San Patricio County | 11,922 | 15,725 | 18,173 | 17,515 | 15,354 | 3,432 | 28.8 |
| San Saba County | 1,609 | 2,033 | 2,309 | 2,015 | 1,681 | 72 | 4.5 |
| Schleicher County | 642 | 961 | 1,098 | 1,083 | 1,081 | 439 | 68.4 |
| Scurry County | 3,221 | 4,239 | 4,749 | 4,832 | 4,902 | 1,681 | 52.2 |
| Shackelford County | 818 | 1,120 | 1,327 | 1,243 | 994 | 176 | 21.5 |
| Shelby County | 5,430 | 7,060 | 8,351 | 8,865 | 9,054 | 3,624 | 66.7 |
| Sherman County | 555 | 777 | 1,003 | 1,058 | 903 | 348 | 62.7 |
| Smith County | 40,988 | 53,292 | 62,932 | 68,900 | 80,857 | 39,869 | 97.3 |
| Somervell County* | 1,816 | 2,802 | 3,958 | 4,571 | 4,549 | 2,733 | 150.5 |
| Starr County | 8,777 | 11,969 | 15,567 | 18,171 | 18,813 | 10,036 | 114.3 |
| Stephens County | 2,323 | 2,848 | 3,116 | 2,966 | 2,674 | 351 | 15.1 |
| Sterling County | 266 | 384 | 443 | 409 | 343 | 77 | 28.9 |
| Stonewall County | 455 | 534 | 538 | 481 | 376 | -79 | -17.4 |
| Sutton County | 811 | 1,297 | 1,555 | 1,470 | 1,256 | 445 | 54.9 |
| Swisher County | 1,730 | 2,035 | 2,249 | 2,051 | 1,901 | 171 | 9.9 |
| Tarrant County | 241,515 | 354,168 | 464,749 | 541,862 | 635,857 | 394,342 | 163.3 |
| Taylor County | 23,527 | 29,521 | 33,078 | 31,887 | 33,984 | 10,457 | 44.4 |
| Terrell County | 295 | 385 | 408 | 365 | 299 | 4 | 1.4 |
| Terry County | 2,419 | 2,963 | 3,175 | 3,045 | 2,981 | 562 | 23.2 |
| Throckmorton County | 515 | 580 | 585 | 503 | 387 | -128 | -24.9 |
| Titus County | 5,263 | 7,007 | 8,686 | 9,674 | 10,378 | 5,115 | 97.2 |
| Tom Green County | 21,014 | 26,340 | 28,916 | 28,153 | 27,416 | 6,402 | 30.5 |
| Travis County | 115,757 | 179,582 | 237,977 | 305,676 | 402,337 | 286,580 | 247.6 |
| Trinity County* | 4,433 | 6,315 | 7,800 | 7,690 | 6,931 | 2,498 | 56.4 |
| Tyler County | 5,521 | 7,244 | 8,296 | 8,105 | 7,647 | 2,126 | 38.5 |
| Upshur County | 8,641 | 12,373 | 15,119 | 16,602 | 17,188 | 8,547 | 98.9 |
| Upton County | 675 | 1,053 | 1,184 | 1,135 | 1,139 | 464 | 68.7 |
| Uvalde County | 5,439 | 6,708 | 7,719 | 7,661 | 6,652 | 1,213 | 22.3 |
| Val Verde County | 8,392 | 10,625 | 12,718 | 13,701 | 13,583 | 5,191 | 61.9 |
| Van Zandt County* | 13,011 | 17,584 | 20,829 | 21,031 | 19,196 | 6,185 | 47.5 |
| Victoria County | 16,499 | 21,335 | 23,400 | 22,558 | 21,782 | 5,283 | 32.0 |
| Walker County | 10,175 | 13,320 | 15,405 | 15,031 | 14,847 | 4,672 | 45.9 |
| Waller County | 6,575 | 12,270 | 18,967 | 24,756 | 31,165 | 24,590 | 374.0 |
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Table C.5: Older Adult Population (60+) in Texas Counties and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Change 2010-2050 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| County | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ | Numeric | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Ward County | 2,164 | 2,745 | 2,978 | 2,825 | 2,663 | 499 | 23.1 |
| Washington County* | 8,330 | 11,541 | 14,283 | 14,447 | 13,592 | 5,262 | 63.2 |
| Webb County | 27,990 | 42,751 | 62,633 | 82,818 | 97,922 | 69,932 | 249.8 |
| Wharton County | 8,216 | 10,800 | 12,518 | 12,338 | 11,390 | 3,174 | 38.6 |
| Wheeler County | 1,319 | 1,602 | 1,629 | 1,674 | 1,751 | 432 | 32.8 |
| Wichita County | 23,297 | 28,438 | 30,684 | 29,221 | 28,296 | 4,999 | 21.5 |
| Wilbarger County | 2,863 | 3,792 | 4,378 | 4,249 | 4,213 | 1,350 | 47.2 |
| Willacy County | 3,574 | 4,798 | 5,967 | 6,930 | 7,919 | 4,345 | 121.6 |
| Williamson County* | 55,880 | 116,025 | 212,634 | 357,940 | 527,510 | 471,630 | 844.0 |
| Wilson County* | 8,098 | 14,722 | 23,719 | 31,089 | 35,763 | 27,665 | 341.6 |
| Winkler County | 1,203 | 1,865 | 2,313 | 2,389 | 2,405 | 1,202 | 99.9 |
| Wise County* | 10,661 | 17,290 | 24,391 | 29,374 | 35,206 | 24,545 | 230.2 |
| Wood County* | 13,538 | 19,131 | 23,070 | 22,927 | 20,664 | 7,126 | 52.6 |
| Yoakum County | 1,257 | 1,875 | 2,305 | 2,548 | 2,901 | 1,644 | 130.8 |
| Young County | 4,525 | 5,717 | 6,482 | 6,396 | 6,125 | 1,600 | 35.4 |
| Zapata County | 2,068 | 2,660 | 3,360 | 3,961 | 4,424 | 2,356 | 113.9 |
| Zavala County | 2,005 | 2,557 | 2,943 | 2,975 | 2,987 | 982 | 49.0 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

Table C.6: County Share of State Older Adult Population (60+) in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State of Texas | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Anderson County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Andrews County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Angelina County | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Aransas County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Archer County | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Armstrong County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Atascosa County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Austin County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Bailey County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bandera County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Bastrop County | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Baylor County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bee County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Bell County | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| Bexar County | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 5.7 |
| Blanco County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Borden County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bosque County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Bowie County | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Brazoria County | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.9 |
| Brazos County | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Brewster County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Briscoe County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Brooks County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Brown County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Burleson County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Burnet County* | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Caldwell County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Calhoun County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Callahan County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Cameron County | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Camp County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Carson County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Table C.6: County Share of State Older Adult Population (60+) in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cass County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Castro County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Chambers County | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Cherokee County | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Childress County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Clay County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cochran County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Coke County* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Coleman County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Collin County | 2.5 | 3.4 | 4.8 | 6.4 | 7.7 |
| Collingsworth County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Colorado County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Comal County* | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Comanche County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Concho County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cooke County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Coryell County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Cottle County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Crane County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Crockett County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Crosby County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Culberson County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Dallam County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Dallas County | 8.1 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 5.4 |
| Dawson County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Deaf Smith County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Delta County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Denton County | 1.9 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 5.3 |
| DeWitt County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Dickens County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Dimmit County | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Donley County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Duval County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Eastland County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Table C.6: County Share of State Older Adult Population (60+) in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ector County | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Edwards County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Ellis County | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| El Paso County | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.3 |
| Erath County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Falls County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Fannin County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Fayette County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Fisher County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Floyd County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Foard County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Fort Bend County | 1.9 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 5.0 | 5.8 |
| Franklin County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Freestone County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Frio County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Gaines County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Galveston County | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Garza County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Gillespie County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Glasscock County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Goliad County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Gonzales County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Gray County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Grayson County | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Gregg County | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Grimes County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Guadalupe County* | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Hale County | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Hall County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Hamilton County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Hansford County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Hardeman County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Hardin County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Harris County | 13.4 | 13.5 | 12.8 | 12.3 | 12.5 |

Table C.6: County Share of State Older Adult Population (60+) in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harrison County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Hartley County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Haskell County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Hays County | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| HempHill County* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Henderson County* | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Hidalgo County | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| Hill County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Hockley County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Hood County* | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Hopkins County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Houston County* | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Howard County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Hudspeth County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Hunt County | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Hutchinson County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Irion County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Jack County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Jackson County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Jasper County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Jeff Davis County* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Jefferson County | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Jim Hogg County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Jim Wells County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Johnson County | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Jones County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Karnes County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Kaufman County | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.9 |
| Kendall County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Kenedy County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Kent County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Kerr County* | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Kimble County* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| King County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Table C.6: County Share of State Older Adult Population (60+) in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kinney County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Kleberg County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Knox County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lamar County | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Lamb County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lampasas County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| La Salle County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lavaca County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Lee County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Leon County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Liberty County* | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Limestone County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Lipscomb County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Live Oak County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LLano County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Loving County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lubbock County | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Lynn County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| McCulloch County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| McLennan County | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| McMullen County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Madison County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Marion County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Martin County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Mason County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Matagorda County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Maverick County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Medina County* | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Mendard County* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Midland County | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Milam County | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Mills County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Mitchell County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Montague County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 116 |

Table C.6: County Share of State Older Adult Population (60+) in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Montgomery County* | 1.9 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 5.1 |
| Moore County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Morris County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Motley County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Nacogdoches County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Navarro County | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Newton County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Nolan County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Nueces County | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Ochiltree County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Oldham County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Orange County | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Palo Pinto County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Panola County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Parker County* | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Parmer County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pecos County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Polk County* | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Potter County | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Presidio County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Rains County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Randall County | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Reagan County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Real County* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Red River County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Reeves County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Refugio County | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Roberts County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Robertson County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Rockwall County* | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Runnels County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Rusk County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Sabine County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| San Augustine County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Table C.6: County Share of State Older Adult Population (60+) in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Jacinto County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| San Patricio County | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| San Saba County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Schleicher County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Scurry County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Shackelford County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Shelby County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Sherman County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Smith County | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Somervell County* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Starr County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Stephens County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Sterling County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Stonewall County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Sutton County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Swisher County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Tarrant County | 6.4 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 5.6 | 5.3 |
| Taylor County | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Terrell County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Terry County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Throckmorton County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Titus County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Tom Green County | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Travis County | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| Trinity County* | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Tyler County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Upshur County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Upton County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Uvalde County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Val Verde County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Van Zandt County* | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Victoria County | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Walker County | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Waller County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 |

Table C.6: County Share of State Older Adult Population (60+) in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity -Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ward County | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Washington County* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Webb County | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| Wharton County | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Wheeler County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Wichita County | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Wilbarger County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Willacy County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Williamson County* | 1.5 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 4.4 |
| Wilson County* | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Winkler County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Wise County* | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Wood County* | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Yoakum County | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Young County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Zapata County | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Zavala County |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

Table C.7: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Share of the Total Population in Counties in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Net Migration

| County | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State of Texas | 15.0 | 18.6 | 20.7 | 21.4 | 21.7 |
| Anderson County | 17.7 | 23.4 | 28.0 | 29.0 | 27.4 |
| Andrews County | 15.7 | 19.3 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.9 |
| Angelina County | 19.0 | 23.5 | 26.0 | 25.5 | 23.7 |
| Aransas County* | 32.8 | 40.7 | 43.1 | 40.6 | 37.0 |
| Archer County | 21.9 | 27.8 | 31.4 | 30.4 | 26.8 |
| Armstrong County | 28.7 | 38.0 | 38.7 | 34.6 | 32.2 |
| Atascosa County* | 18.5 | 23.9 | 27.7 | 29.1 | 29.2 |
| Austin County* | 21.8 | 27.4 | 28.5 | 27.3 | 25.4 |
| Bailey County | 18.4 | 20.5 | 20.0 | 18.0 | 17.2 |
| Bandera County* | 28.9 | 39.8 | 46.0 | 43.9 | 38.5 |
| Bastrop County | 17.6 | 23.1 | 24.4 | 22.4 | 19.1 |
| Baylor County | 31.2 | 35.6 | 37.7 | 36.0 | 33.6 |
| Bee County | 15.4 | 19.2 | 22.0 | 23.1 | 24.0 |
| Bell County | 12.7 | 15.5 | 17.4 | 17.1 | 18.9 |
| Bexar County | 14.9 | 17.8 | 19.9 | 20.5 | 21.5 |
| Blanco County* | 26.8 | 37.1 | 43.2 | 43.0 | 38.5 |
| Borden County | 28.9 | 36.3 | 42.1 | 41.2 | 36.0 |
| Bosque County* | 28.6 | 34.5 | 37.1 | 35.1 | 31.3 |
| Bowie County | 19.9 | 23.7 | 25.3 | 23.8 | 22.1 |
| Brazoria County | 14.2 | 18.9 | 22.4 | 24.6 | 24.5 |
| Brazos County | 10.4 | 12.7 | 13.4 | 13.6 | 15.3 |
| Brewster County | 24.3 | 30.9 | 32.8 | 31.1 | 29.9 |
| Briscoe County | 30.1 | 35.7 | 37.0 | 37.3 | 34.0 |
| Brooks County | 23.1 | 27.4 | 28.9 | 27.0 | 26.9 |
| Brown County | 23.9 | 29.4 | 32.1 | 31.3 | 28.9 |
| Burleson County | 24.3 | 30.1 | 33.5 | 32.3 | 30.2 |
| Burnet County* | 25.8 | 32.7 | 36.2 | 35.1 | 31.7 |
| Caldwell County | 17.0 | 21.5 | 23.8 | 24.1 | 25.1 |
| Calhoun County | 20.8 | 24.6 | 25.8 | 23.1 | 21.5 |
| Callahan County | 25.0 | 29.7 | 31.4 | 29.4 | 28.0 |
| Cameron County | 18.3 | 28.7 | 20.2 | 27.1 | 24.5 |
| Camp County | Carson County | 22.5 | 29.6 | 21.0 |  |
|  |  |  | 21.0 |  |  |

Table C.7: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Share of the Total Population in Counties in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cass County | 26.0 | 31.0 | 33.5 | 32.2 | 28.5 |
| Castro County | 17.9 | 22.9 | 23.8 | 23.8 | 22.4 |
| Chambers County | 14.7 | 18.9 | 20.6 | 20.9 | 20.0 |
| Cherokee County | 20.8 | 24.6 | 25.2 | 23.1 | 19.3 |
| Childress County | 19.6 | 22.8 | 23.2 | 20.6 | 16.2 |
| Clay County | 24.7 | 31.7 | 35.1 | 34.0 | 30.0 |
| Cochran County | 20.1 | 25.7 | 28.8 | 26.4 | 24.4 |
| Coke County* | 33.0 | 36.5 | 38.0 | 34.7 | 30.7 |
| Coleman County | 29.5 | 35.4 | 37.8 | 36.1 | 31.0 |
| Collin County | 12.1 | 16.9 | 21.2 | 23.7 | 23.5 |
| Collingsworth County | 23.3 | 27.1 | 27.8 | 24.3 | 20.4 |
| Colorado County | 26.0 | 32.3 | 34.2 | 31.3 | 26.9 |
| Comal County* | 22.7 | 29.8 | 34.9 | 36.1 | 35.5 |
| Comanche County | 27.7 | 30.5 | 32.1 | 29.5 | 25.6 |
| Concho County | 19.8 | 25.8 | 36.3 | 46.8 | 55.2 |
| Cooke County | 22.1 | 27.7 | 29.8 | 27.6 | 24.4 |
| Coryell County | 10.9 | 14.4 | 17.3 | 18.9 | 18.2 |
| Cottle County | 30.8 | 36.9 | 37.3 | 34.0 | 29.2 |
| Crane County | 16.1 | 22.4 | 26.2 | 23.5 | 20.7 |
| Crockett County | 20.4 | 29.5 | 31.6 | 29.6 | 25.9 |
| Crosby County | 22.8 | 25.2 | 24.5 | 23.6 | 22.5 |
| Culberson County | 20.8 | 27.8 | 30.9 | 28.7 | 26.3 |
| Dallam County | 14.1 | 18.8 | 21.6 | 21.3 | 20.6 |
| Dallas County | 13.0 | 15.6 | 17.3 | 17.7 | 18.3 |
| Dawson County | 18.4 | 21.0 | 21.5 | 20.1 | 20.3 |
| Deaf Smith County | 15.6 | 18.0 | 19.4 | 19.8 | 19.4 |
| Delta County | 27.2 | 33.1 | 34.7 | 33.9 | 33.4 |
| Denton County | 11.1 | 15.4 | 18.8 | 20.2 | 20.0 |
| DeWitt County | 24.7 | 29.4 | 31.4 | 29.7 | 27.1 |
| Dickens County | 25.7 | 33.9 | 37.3 | 40.9 | 41.2 |
| Dimmit County | 20.4 | 25.4 | 29.0 | 29.2 | 28.2 |
| Donley County | 27.8 | 29.7 | 30.1 | 27.5 | 26.7 |
| Duval County | 21.5 | 25.3 | 28.2 | 28.5 | 27.4 |
| Eastland County | 26.7 | 30.9 | 32.7 | 30.6 | 28.7 |

Table C.7: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Share of the Total Population in Counties in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Net Migration

| County | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ector County | 14.5 | 17.9 | 19.4 | 19.9 | 21.6 |
| Edwards County | 29.7 | 38.0 | 40.0 | 35.1 | 31.6 |
| Ellis County | 15.0 | 19.8 | 22.5 | 23.7 | 23.7 |
| El Paso County | 14.4 | 17.4 | 19.6 | 20.2 | 20.3 |
| Erath County | 17.6 | 21.0 | 22.0 | 19.4 | 17.7 |
| Falls County | 21.6 | 26.7 | 31.1 | 31.3 | 31.7 |
| Fannin County | 23.3 | 29.1 | 33.0 | 31.5 | 26.9 |
| Fayette County* | 28.6 | 35.8 | 39.1 | 36.5 | 31.4 |
| Fisher County | 29.0 | 33.1 | 34.3 | 31.5 | 27.6 |
| Floyd County | 22.6 | 26.3 | 27.1 | 25.4 | 22.8 |
| Foard County | 30.5 | 35.8 | 38.3 | 35.0 | 31.3 |
| Fort Bend County | 12.0 | 17.5 | 21.7 | 24.6 | 24.7 |
| Franklin County* | 25.8 | 29.0 | 30.4 | 27.1 | 23.1 |
| Freestone County | 23.0 | 27.9 | 29.1 | 28.2 | 26.2 |
| Frio County | 16.1 | 19.4 | 22.1 | 23.2 | 25.2 |
| Gaines County | 12.5 | 14.7 | 15.5 | 14.5 | 13.9 |
| Galveston County | 16.7 | 21.0 | 22.5 | 21.8 | 21.5 |
| Garza County | 14.8 | 22.0 | 29.0 | 29.7 | 35.6 |
| Gillespie County* | 34.3 | 39.3 | 41.9 | 40.0 | 37.0 |
| Glasscock County | 19.7 | 30.1 | 33.2 | 36.2 | 32.5 |
| Goliad County | 26.7 | 34.0 | 36.8 | 35.1 | 32.7 |
| Gonzales County | 20.7 | 24.7 | 26.6 | 25.5 | 23.7 |
| Gray County | 12.4 | 22.6 | 21.5 | 18.5 | 15.5 |
| Grayson County | 21.3 | 15.7 | 17.2 | 17.9 | 22.9 .9 |
| Gregg County | 21.7 | 26.6 | 28.5 | 26.1 | 22.9 |
| Grimes County | 18.6 | 21.4 | 21.1 | 18.9 | 18.1 |
| Guadalupe County* | 19.8 | 27.1 | 29.9 | 28.7 | 25.8 |
| Hale County | 16.8 | 20.1 | 23.6 | 25.8 | 26.2 |
| Hall County | 29.1 | 19.4 | 21.8 | 22.3 | 22.6 |
| Hamilton County* | 31.3 | 31.5 | 29.6 | 25.9 |  |
| Hansford County | 34.4 | 36.5 | 35.3 | 33.3 |  |
| Hardeman County | 21.6 | 22.5 | 21.2 | 19.1 |  |
| Hardin County | 30.2 | 30.0 | 27.1 | 21.8 |  |
| Harris County | 27.3 | 27.5 | 26.2 |  |  |
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Table C.7: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Share of the Total Population in Counties in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harrison County | 19.3 | 24.3 | 25.4 | 22.5 | 18.2 |
| Hartley County | 17.0 | 19.9 | 22.4 | 24.5 | 21.8 |
| Haskell County | 28.0 | 31.8 | 34.3 | 32.3 | 27.4 |
| Hays County | 13.0 | 16.4 | 18.0 | 18.3 | 17.8 |
| HempHill County* | 18.3 | 22.2 | 23.0 | 24.2 | 23.2 |
| Henderson County* | 26.1 | 30.9 | 32.6 | 29.9 | 25.4 |
| Hidalgo County | 13.0 | 15.4 | 17.6 | 19.4 | 20.3 |
| Hill County* | 24.9 | 30.1 | 32.5 | 30.6 | 27.9 |
| Hockley County | 17.6 | 22.0 | 24.1 | 23.7 | 23.7 |
| Hood County* | 28.9 | 36.9 | 40.5 | 38.2 | 34.5 |
| Hopkins County | 21.5 | 25.6 | 27.1 | 24.7 | 20.8 |
| Houston County* | 25.5 | 31.0 | 34.3 | 32.2 | 27.7 |
| Howard County | 17.8 | 24.7 | 28.8 | 27.9 | 27.7 |
| Hudspeth County | 19.3 | 28.2 | 31.7 | 29.6 | 26.4 |
| Hunt County | 19.6 | 23.7 | 24.7 | 22.1 | 19.0 |
| Hutchinson County | 20.1 | 25.8 | 27.8 | 27.8 | 26.0 |
| Irion County | 25.5 | 34.5 | 39.2 | 38.4 | 33.8 |
| Jack County | 20.6 | 25.5 | 29.7 | 29.1 | 26.0 |
| Jackson County | 22.0 | 27.1 | 28.7 | 27.1 | 25.5 |
| Jasper County | 23.0 | 28.3 | 31.2 | 29.4 | 26.2 |
| Jeff Davis County* | 33.3 | 45.8 | 46.6 | 39.8 | 29.9 |
| Jefferson County | 17.7 | 20.6 | 20.5 | 17.8 | 16.2 |
| Jim Hogg County | 21.3 | 24.6 | 25.5 | 24.4 | 23.7 |
| Jim Wells County | 18.5 | 22.9 | 25.3 | 25.2 | 24.0 |
| Johnson County | 16.9 | 21.5 | 23.5 | 22.5 | 21.0 |
| Jones County | 18.9 | 23.1 | 26.0 | 25.8 | 25.7 |
| Karnes County | 18.9 | 25.1 | 30.3 | 32.0 | 32.0 |
| Kaufman County | 15.3 | 19.1 | 21.1 | 22.5 | 22.6 |
| Kendall County* | 24.1 | 30.7 | 35.6 | 35.6 | 33.0 |
| Kenedy County | 22.4 | 30.2 | 37.4 | 35.2 | 36.2 |
| Kent County | 34.3 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 36.4 | 31.1 |
| Kerr County* | 32.2 | 37.9 | 41.3 | 39.0 | 35.5 |
| Kimble County* | 31.7 | 39.8 | 42.8 | 40.2 | 34.5 |
| King County | 18.2 | 34.4 | 41.9 | 42.3 | 36.6 |

Table C.7: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Share of the Total Population in Counties in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kinney County | 31.3 | 34.5 | 35.1 | 34.5 | 33.2 |
| Kleberg County | 16.0 | 19.2 | 20.5 | 19.3 | 17.8 |
| Knox County | 26.6 | 29.4 | 30.1 | 28.1 | 25.5 |
| Lamar County | 22.7 | 26.5 | 28.5 | 26.4 | 23.0 |
| Lamb County | 20.7 | 23.6 | 25.2 | 23.9 | 22.1 |
| Lampasas County | 22.1 | 27.2 | 30.5 | 29.0 | 25.6 |
| La Salle County | 17.7 | 21.4 | 23.2 | 23.0 | 27.3 |
| Lavaca County | 28.4 | 34.3 | 37.2 | 35.8 | 32.4 |
| Lee County* | 21.4 | 28.5 | 33.7 | 34.1 | 32.1 |
| Leon County* | 28.7 | 34.6 | 36.4 | 33.2 | 28.3 |
| Liberty County* | 16.7 | 21.8 | 24.4 | 24.7 | 25.1 |
| Limestone County | 22.2 | 27.5 | 29.9 | 28.7 | 26.9 |
| Lipscomb County | 19.8 | 24.2 | 25.3 | 22.9 | 24.8 |
| Live Oak County | 25.7 | 31.0 | 34.3 | 34.1 | 31.9 |
| LLano County* | 41.2 | 46.7 | 48.8 | 45.7 | 41.5 |
| Loving County | 24.4 | 52.5 | 67.1 | 62.5 | 76.2 |
| Lubbock County | 15.3 | 18.1 | 18.6 | 17.5 | 17.7 |
| Lynn County | 21.0 | 26.9 | 28.9 | 26.2 | 22.6 |
| McCulloch County | 27.1 | 32.5 | 34.1 | 31.4 | 28.4 |
| McLennan County | 17.3 | 20.6 | 21.5 | 20.0 | 18.8 |
| McMullen County | 32.2 | 42.4 | 44.1 | 40.9 | 36.6 |
| Madison County | 19.2 | 22.8 | 23.9 | 23.1 | 21.6 |
| Marion County | 30.5 | 39.5 | 44.9 | 43.2 | 40.3 |
| Martin County | 17.3 | 22.7 | 25.7 | 23.7 | 21.9 |
| Mason County | 33.5 | 39.6 | 41.8 | 37.8 | 30.2 |
| Matagorda County | 20.1 | 26.4 | 29.8 | 28.9 | 27.1 |
| Maverick County | 14.8 | 18.5 | 21.0 | 22.0 | 21.6 |
| Medina County* | 19.6 | 25.4 | 30.2 | 30.5 | 29.9 |
| Mendard County* | 34.9 | 42.2 | 43.6 | 37.8 | 32.6 |
| Midland County | 15.5 | 19.2 | 20.1 | 19.9 | 21.8 |
| Milam County | 23.6 | 28.9 | 31.0 | 29.4 | 25.8 |
| Mills County | 30.6 | 32.9 | 32.9 | 27.3 | 20.8 |
| Mitchell County | 18.1 | 22.3 | 23.0 | 21.1 | 18.1 |
| Montague County | 26.9 | 31.8 | 34.6 | 33.1 | 29.6 |
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Table C.7: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Share of the Total Population in Counties in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Net Migration

| County | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Montgomery County* | 15.7 | 20.7 | 24.2 | 26.9 | 28.8 |
| Moore County | 13.5 | 16.8 | 18.4 | 18.8 | 18.6 |
| Morris County | 25.7 | 30.1 | 29.7 | 27.4 | 22.9 |
| Motley County | 34.4 | 40.9 | 38.3 | 35.3 | 31.3 |
| Nacogdoches County | 16.6 | 20.1 | 21.0 | 19.5 | 18.2 |
| Navarro County | 20.2 | 24.5 | 26.4 | 24.8 | 21.4 |
| Newton County | 22.8 | 28.8 | 32.1 | 31.8 | 31.1 |
| Nolan County | 22.6 | 27.4 | 28.6 | 27.5 | 25.4 |
| Nueces County | 17.3 | 21.9 | 23.8 | 23.7 | 24.0 |
| Ochiltree County | 14.5 | 16.4 | 16.6 | 16.5 | 16.0 |
| Oldham County | 18.5 | 26.2 | 27.6 | 26.9 | 22.9 |
| Orange County | 19.6 | 24.0 | 26.4 | 25.7 | 24.1 |
| Palo Pinto County | 22.9 | 29.1 | 32.2 | 30.8 | 27.4 |
| Panola County | 21.5 | 27.6 | 28.8 | 27.1 | 24.3 |
| Parker County* | 18.0 | 22.7 | 24.3 | 22.2 | 19.0 |
| Parmer County | 16.2 | 18.5 | 18.7 | 17.6 | 17.3 |
| Pecos County | 16.6 | 20.7 | 23.5 | 24.2 | 24.0 |
| Polk County* | 25.7 | 31.5 | 34.6 | 34.3 | 32.2 |
| Potter County | 15.2 | 18.7 | 20.3 | 19.7 | 20.0 |
| Presidio County | 23.9 | 27.8 | 31.1 | 31.5 | 29.5 |
| Rains County* | 28.7 | 37.0 | 41.3 | 40.1 | 35.2 |
| Randall County | 30.6 | 21.5 | 21.9 | 20.3 | 19.6 |
| Reagan County | 17.7 | 26.7 | 39.8 | 37.3 | 33.3 |
| Real County* | 14.8 | 22.7 | 26.2 | 25.3 | 23.4 |
| Red River County | 35.3 | 41.8 | 43.1 | 37.0 | 28.1 |
| Reeves County | 28.1 | 33.8 | 36.1 | 34.0 | 29.8 |
| Refugio County | 16.3 | 19.8 | 24.5 | 29.1 | 32.2 |
| Roberts County | 26.2 | 30.5 | 31.2 | 28.1 | 24.4 |
| Robertson County | 22.4 | 32.0 | 35.6 | 32.8 | 30.6 |
| Rockwall County* | 23.2 | 27.7 | 29.6 | 28.6 | 27.9 |
| Runnels County | 14.2 | 19.3 | 24.5 | 27.0 | 25.1 |
| Rusk County | 30.5 | 32.7 | 30.2 | 28.0 |  |
| Sabine County* | 23.2 | 24.4 | 23.9 | 24.1 |  |
| San Augustine County | 43.6 | 49.6 | 47.8 | 42.5 |  |

Table C.7: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Share of the Total Population in Counties in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Jacinto County* | 24.7 | 31.1 | 32.7 | 30.4 | 26.9 |
| San Patricio County | 18.4 | 23.8 | 27.7 | 27.8 | 26.2 |
| San Saba County | 26.2 | 31.4 | 34.1 | 29.7 | 25.1 |
| Schleicher County | 18.5 | 24.4 | 25.3 | 23.4 | 22.3 |
| Scurry County | 19.0 | 22.6 | 23.0 | 21.6 | 20.5 |
| Shackelford County | 24.2 | 30.6 | 34.3 | 32.4 | 26.8 |
| Shelby County | 21.3 | 25.2 | 27.3 | 27.2 | 26.3 |
| Sherman County | 18.3 | 22.9 | 26.3 | 24.8 | 19.3 |
| Smith County | 19.5 | 21.8 | 21.9 | 20.3 | 20.1 |
| Somervell County* | 21.4 | 27.1 | 32.1 | 32.6 | 29.7 |
| Starr County | 14.4 | 17.7 | 21.6 | 24.6 | 25.9 |
| Stephens County | 24.1 | 28.4 | 30.1 | 28.5 | 26.2 |
| Sterling County | 23.3 | 31.9 | 36.4 | 35.5 | 34.7 |
| Stonewall County | 30.5 | 35.7 | 37.0 | 35.2 | 31.5 |
| Sutton County | 19.6 | 28.0 | 30.8 | 28.0 | 23.5 |
| Swisher County | 22.0 | 24.9 | 26.5 | 24.1 | 22.9 |
| Tarrant County | 13.4 | 16.6 | 18.2 | 17.9 | 17.8 |
| Taylor County | 17.9 | 21.2 | 23.0 | 21.7 | 22.8 |
| Terrell County | 30.0 | 37.0 | 39.0 | 37.8 | 34.8 |
| Terry County | 19.1 | 22.4 | 23.5 | 22.6 | 22.7 |
| Throckmorton County | 31.4 | 35.3 | 37.4 | 34.0 | 29.2 |
| Titus County | 16.3 | 18.7 | 20.0 | 19.5 | 18.4 |
| Tom Green County | 19.1 | 22.8 | 23.9 | 22.5 | 21.6 |
| Travis County | 11.3 | 14.1 | 15.8 | 17.7 | 20.2 |
| Trinity County* | 30.4 | 38.3 | 43.7 | 42.8 | 39.7 |
| Tyler County | 25.4 | 31.8 | 36.0 | 36.6 | 37.5 |
| Upshur County | 22.0 | 27.3 | 28.9 | 27.5 | 24.5 |
| Upton County | 20.1 | 27.3 | 27.5 | 24.4 | 22.7 |
| Uvalde County | 20.6 | 23.3 | 25.1 | 24.2 | 21.0 |
| Val Verde County | 17.2 | 19.9 | 22.6 | 23.6 | 23.3 |
| Van Zandt County* | 24.7 | 30.1 | 32.5 | 30.7 | 26.4 |
| Victoria County | 19.0 | 23.0 | 24.0 | 22.4 | 21.4 |
| Walker County | 15.0 | 18.5 | 20.4 | 19.4 | 18.9 |
| Waller County | 15.2 | 20.8 | 23.6 | 22.9 | 21.9 |

Table C.7: Older Adult Population (Age 60+) as a Share of the Total Population in Counties in 2010 and Projected to 2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Rates of Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Net Migration

| County | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ward County | 20.3 | 24.5 | 26.0 | 24.9 | 24.3 |
| Washington County* | 24.7 | 30.4 | 33.9 | 31.9 | 28.3 |
| Webb County | 11.2 | 13.5 | 16.0 | 17.8 | 18.4 |
| Wharton County | 19.9 | 24.9 | 27.5 | 26.8 | 25.0 |
| Wheeler County | 24.4 | 27.4 | 25.4 | 23.3 | 21.7 |
| Wichita County | 17.7 | 21.4 | 22.6 | 21.3 | 20.7 |
| Wilbarger County | 21.2 | 26.1 | 28.4 | 26.8 | 26.4 |
| Willacy County | 16.1 | 18.5 | 20.3 | 21.5 | 22.9 |
| Williamson County* | 13.2 | 18.1 | 22.3 | 25.5 | 26.2 |
| Wilson County* | 18.9 | 25.4 | 31.7 | 33.8 | 33.0 |
| Winkler County | 16.9 | 22.6 | 25.0 | 24.0 | 22.8 |
| Wise County* | 18.0 | 23.1 | 25.4 | 23.6 | 21.6 |
| Wood County* | 32.3 | 39.2 | 42.4 | 39.7 | 33.9 |
| Yoakum County | 16.0 | 19.6 | 19.7 | 18.4 | 18.1 |
| Young County | 24.4 | 29.0 | 30.6 | 28.8 | 26.6 |
| Zapata County | 14.8 | 16.0 | 17.6 | 18.7 | 19.4 |
| Zavala County | 17.2 | 20.2 | 21.9 | 21.7 | 22.0 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).
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Table C.8: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010s | 2020s | 2030s | 2040s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State of Texas | 314,388 | 627,323 | 1,035,092 | 1,649,823 |
| Anderson County | 1,337 | 1,814 | 369 | -1,449 |
| Andrews County | 1 | 64 | 79 | 81 |
| Angelina County | 1,284 | 1,126 | -619 | -2,511 |
| Aransas County* | 1,995 | 1,577 | 191 | -782 |
| Archer County | 75 | 117 | 133 | -88 |
| Armstrong County | 13 | -30 | -78 | -39 |
| Atascosa County* | 2,314 | 3,441 | 3,424 | 2,467 |
| Austin County* | 1,769 | 2,575 | 3,326 | 3,633 |
| Bailey County | -1 | 2 | -23 | -52 |
| Bandera County* | 2,257 | 3,043 | 1,556 | -163 |
| Bastrop County | 4,404 | 7,241 | 8,961 | 10,238 |
| Baylor County | 44 | 41 | -48 | -139 |
| Bee County | 135 | 190 | -274 | -945 |
| Bell County | 5,626 | 6,822 | 2,154 | 9,358 |
| Bexar County | 10,390 | 21,008 | 24,619 | 48,101 |
| Blanco County* | 1,169 | 1,652 | 962 | -17 |
| Borden County | -4 | -16 | -22 | -27 |
| Bosque County* | 1,085 | 1,137 | 391 | -330 |
| Bowie County | -525 | -1,191 | -2,037 | -1,850 |
| Brazoria County | 10,681 | 23,175 | 41,609 | 49,122 |
| Brazos County | 2,288 | 1,892 | 1,512 | 6,931 |
| Brewster County | 277 | 276 | 62 | -70 |
| Briscoe County | -13 | -43 | -52 | -52 |
| Brooks County | -27 | -44 | -131 | -310 |
| Brown County | 978 | 787 | -159 | -1,600 |
| Burleson County | 685 | 946 | 626 | -17 |
| Burnet County* | 4,156 | 5,479 | 3,424 | 1,155 |
| Caldwell County | 1,777 | 2,788 | 3,086 | 3,333 |
| Calhoun County | 512 | 587 | 182 | 302 |
| Callahan County | 419 | 459 | 178 | 159 |
| Cameron County | 8,154 | 10,016 | 8,298 | -454 |
| Camp County | 413 | 356 | -68 | -277 |
| Carson County | -8 | 38 | -40 | -104 |

Table C.8: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010s | 2020s | 2030s | 2040s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cass County | 632 | 526 | -108 | -1,031 |
| Castro County | -22 | -80 | -103 | -257 |
| Chambers County | 784 | 1,929 | 4,295 | 6,052 |
| Cherokee County | 1,307 | 1,306 | 141 | -1,283 |
| Childress County | 24 | -17 | -161 | -179 |
| Clay County | 195 | 154 | -2 | -223 |
| Cochran County | -14 | -62 | -83 | -129 |
| Coke County* | -57 | -64 | -78 | -104 |
| Coleman County | 330 | 273 | -68 | -398 |
| Collin County | 40,859 | 97,228 | 208,023 | 300,273 |
| Collingsworth County | -18 | -22 | -87 | -96 |
| Colorado County | 732 | 690 | 15 | -715 |
| Comal County* | 12,719 | 22,002 | 24,561 | 21,973 |
| Comanche County | 209 | 214 | -97 | -478 |
| Concho County | 39 | 98 | 192 | 125 |
| Cooke County | 787 | 753 | -33 | -1,104 |
| Coryell County | 791 | 1,264 | 491 | 203 |
| Cottle County | -11 | -40 | -45 | -47 |
| Crane County | 25 | 36 | -13 | -20 |
| Crockett County | -25 | -80 | -106 | -116 |
| Crosby County | 21 | 127 | 162 | 166 |
| Culberson County | -7 | -40 | -75 | -75 |
| Dallam County | 11 | 15 | -80 | -85 |
| Dallas County | -46,932 | -60,171 | -67,512 | -25,756 |
| Dawson County | -27 | -98 | -215 | -288 |
| Deaf Smith County | 4 | 104 | -50 | -363 |
| Delta County | 211 | 146 | 75 | 16 |
| Denton County | 25,739 | 60,056 | 125,087 | 195,785 |
| DeWitt County | 407 | 421 | -72 | -493 |
| Dickens County | 20 | -4 | -72 | -112 |
| Dimmit County | 83 | 75 | -96 | -366 |
| Donley County | -15 | -28 | -85 | -173 |
| Duval County | 104 | 107 | -95 | -353 |
| Eastland County | 439 | 479 | -82 | -644 |
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Table C.8: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010s | 2020s | 2030s | 2040s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ector County | -312 | 722 | 1,648 | 2,012 |
| Edwards County | -18 | -36 | -53 | -55 |
| Ellis County | 6,365 | 11,895 | 20,039 | 24,325 |
| El Paso County | 4,326 | 8,479 | 6,280 | -847 |
| Erath County | 658 | 603 | -224 | -893 |
| Falls County | 464 | 656 | 227 | -263 |
| Fannin County | 1,609 | 1,965 | 766 | -902 |
| Fayette County* | 2,052 | 2,368 | 933 | -387 |
| Fisher County | -62 | -60 | -113 | -135 |
| Floyd County | -71 | -101 | -152 | -204 |
| Foard County | -10 | -45 | -34 | -48 |
| Fort Bend County | 30,855 | 83,969 | 167,767 | 213,142 |
| Franklin County* | 239 | 261 | -58 | -373 |
| Freestone County | 623 | 537 | 101 | -379 |
| Frio County | 268 | 423 | 135 | 286 |
| Gaines County | -7 | -14 | -101 | -215 |
| Galveston County | -1,738 | -750 | 2,581 | 8,114 |
| Garza County | 53 | 108 | -111 | -273 |
| Gillespie County* | 3,021 | 3,522 | 2,042 | 703 |
| Glasscock County | 11 | -25 | -39 | -52 |
| Goliad County | 370 | 444 | 329 | 148 |
| Gonzales County | 320 | 423 | 52 | -354 |
| Gray County | -95 | -31 | -64 | -202 |
| Grayson County | 2,954 | 3,051 | 493 | -2,380 |
| Gregg County | 530 | 238 | 123 | 1,633 |
| Grimes County | 1,133 | 1,291 | 539 | -401 |
| Guadalupe County* | 6,867 | 14,094 | 23,093 | 25,242 |
| Hale County | -223 | -285 | -645 | -1,492 |
| Hall County | -50 | -43 | -95 | -98 |
| Hamilton County* | 322 | 328 | -6 | -188 |
| Hansford County | -28 | -9 | -45 | -28 |
| Hardeman County | -7 | -6 | -88 | -131 |
| Hardin County | 909 | 1,463 | 1,753 | 579 |
| Harris County | -34,501 | -39,989 | -25,520 | 126,945 |
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Table C.8: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010s | 2020s | 2030s | 2040s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harrison County | 698 | 511 | -311 | -1,487 |
| Hartley County | -2 | 4 | -83 | -138 |
| Haskell County | 64 | 71 | -122 | -270 |
| Hays County | 11,210 | 22,893 | 38,485 | 52,940 |
| HempHill County* | -34 | 6 | 57 | 59 |
| Henderson County* | 2,593 | 2,864 | 571 | -1,968 |
| Hidalgo County | 23,749 | 29,465 | 31,484 | 31,205 |
| Hill County* | 1,575 | 1,479 | 381 | -837 |
| Hockley County | -30 | -6 | -300 | -924 |
| Hood County* | 5,603 | 6,265 | 2,834 | 136 |
| Hopkins County | 578 | 598 | 42 | -748 |
| Houston County* | 1,031 | 944 | -181 | -1,031 |
| Howard County | 205 | 124 | -545 | -1,046 |
| Hudspeth County | 62 | 18 | -27 | -105 |
| Hunt County | 3,261 | 4,678 | 5,194 | 4,746 |
| Hutchinson County | -241 | -186 | -484 | -844 |
| Irion County | -5 | -40 | -25 | -69 |
| Jack County | 190 | 268 | 40 | -277 |
| Jackson County | -154 | -281 | -400 | -512 |
| Jasper County | 525 | 486 | -417 | -1,272 |
| Jeff Davis County* | 45 | -21 | -85 | -111 |
| Jefferson County | -2,827 | -2,924 | -3,927 | -2,107 |
| Jim Hogg County | -15 | -63 | -118 | -168 |
| Jim Wells County | 21 | -99 | -649 | -1,554 |
| Johnson County | 4,510 | 7,095 | 9,591 | 12,627 |
| Jones County | 387 | 612 | 440 | 338 |
| Karnes County | 523 | 743 | 184 | -448 |
| Kaufman County | 5,626 | 11,723 | 22,419 | 32,017 |
| Kendall County* | 3,484 | 6,004 | 6,471 | 4,491 |
| Kenedy County | 4 | 7 | -3 | -28 |
| Kent County | -4 | -31 | -11 | -29 |
| Kerr County* | 5,291 | 5,602 | 1,927 | -1,232 |
| Kimble County* | 297 | 247 | -42 | -222 |
| King County | -1 | -4 | -14 | -8 |

Table C.8: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010s | 2020s | 2030s | 2040s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kinney County | 38 | -4 | -33 | -91 |
| Kleberg County | 158 | 62 | -597 | -1,506 |
| Knox County | -48 | -52 | -111 | -134 |
| Lamar County | 690 | 614 | -248 | -1,588 |
| Lamb County | -140 | -202 | -284 | -484 |
| Lampasas County | 779 | 986 | 786 | 259 |
| La Salle County | 137 | 103 | 136 | 99 |
| Lavaca County | 532 | 488 | -46 | -661 |
| Lee County* | 817 | 1,110 | 593 | -135 |
| Leon County* | 1,172 | 1,194 | 344 | -245 |
| Liberty County* | 2,273 | 3,834 | 4,867 | 6,376 |
| Limestone County | 707 | 737 | -56 | -639 |
| Lipscomb County | -4 | -8 | -31 | 92 |
| Live Oak County | 46 | 16 | -203 | -403 |
| LLano County* | 1,916 | 2,170 | 771 | -223 |
| Loving County | -3 | 1 | -8 | 2 |
| Lubbock County | -414 | -931 | -3,699 | -3,403 |
| Lynn County | -59 | -104 | -148 | -201 |
| McCulloch County | 275 | 227 | -57 | -182 |
| McLennan County | 103 | -412 | -3,192 | -4,994 |
| McMullen County | -4 | -19 | -15 | -24 |
| Madison County | 438 | 382 | 219 | -26 |
| Marion County | 536 | 542 | -107 | -491 |
| Martin County | 2 | 21 | -102 | -83 |
| Mason County | 187 | 149 | -63 | -225 |
| Matagorda County | 515 | 565 | -298 | -1,356 |
| Maverick County | 688 | 640 | 267 | -1,088 |
| Medina County* | 2,560 | 4,281 | 3,773 | 2,686 |
| Mendard County* | 47 | -2 | -94 | -100 |
| Midland County | -444 | 546 | 1,953 | 5,190 |
| Milam County | 570 | 492 | -65 | -766 |
| Mills County | 94 | 46 | -116 | -196 |
| Mitchell County | 49 | -27 | -139 | -182 |
| Montague County | 723 | 747 | 129 | -578 |

Table C.8: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010s | 2020s | 2030s | 2040s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Montgomery County* | 31,732 | 71,809 | 140,766 | 222,794 |
| Moore County | -47 | -57 | 23 | 83 |
| Morris County | 196 | 112 | -42 | -453 |
| Motley County | -11 | -42 | -33 | -29 |
| Nacogdoches County | 1,294 | 1,530 | 472 | -136 |
| Navarro County | 1,398 | 1,668 | 861 | -655 |
| Newton County | -142 | -310 | -414 | -603 |
| Nolan County | 160 | 35 | -187 | -509 |
| Nueces County | 80 | 517 | -1,750 | -2,454 |
| Ochiltree County | -30 | -23 | 161 | 334 |
| Oldham County | -15 | -46 | -64 | -64 |
| Orange County | -361 | 24 | 158 | -776 |
| Palo Pinto County | 1,075 | 1,164 | 286 | -844 |
| Panola County | 560 | 531 | -100 | -610 |
| Parker County* | 6,183 | 11,873 | 18,396 | 23,929 |
| Parmer County | -29 | -56 | 23 | 30 |
| Pecos County | -7 | 75 | -34 | -361 |
| Polk County* | 2,849 | 3,703 | 2,246 | 285 |
| Potter County | -135 | -214 | -1,460 | -1,472 |
| Presidio County | 200 | 198 | 39 | -189 |
| Rains County* | 1,184 | 1,279 | 585 | -285 |
| Randall County | 1,735 | 3,136 | 3,955 | 7,739 |
| Reagan County | 4 | -38 | -52 | -62 |
| Real County* | 123 | 73 | -118 | -194 |
| Red River County | 251 | 174 | -185 | -554 |
| Reeves County | -58 | 39 | -16 | -245 |
| Refugio County | -73 | -143 | -182 | -206 |
| Roberts County | -1 | -37 | -34 | -40 |
| Robertson County | 649 | 884 | 699 | 495 |
| Rockwall County* | 5,865 | 14,942 | 24,703 | 25,751 |
| Runnels County | 132 | 62 | -172 | -347 |
| Rusk County | 1,160 | 2,200 | 3,138 | 4,421 |
| Sabine County* | 1,139 | 1,258 | 115 | -792 |
| San Augustine County | 356 | 274 | -129 | -401 |

Table C.8: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010s | 2020s | 2030s | 2040s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Jacinto County* | 1,814 | 2,548 | 1,896 | 949 |
| San Patricio County | -214 | -563 | -1,392 | -2,610 |
| San Saba County | 214 | 196 | -127 | -306 |
| Schleicher County | -2 | -27 | -78 | -74 |
| Scurry County | 82 | 108 | -82 | -324 |
| Shackelford County | 48 | 92 | -43 | -192 |
| Shelby County | 478 | 666 | 234 | -232 |
| Sherman County | -5 | -30 | -59 | -110 |
| Smith County | 3,077 | 3,589 | 3,103 | 4,406 |
| Somervell County* | 488 | 680 | 573 | 86 |
| Starr County | 583 | 533 | 10 | -1,902 |
| Stephens County | 165 | 145 | -133 | -335 |
| Sterling County | 0 | -27 | -42 | -63 |
| Stonewall County | -10 | -34 | -32 | -56 |
| Sutton County | 29 | 7 | -71 | -145 |
| Swisher County | 8 | -19 | -165 | -233 |
| Tarrant County | -12,198 | -14,939 | -687 | 48,907 |
| Taylor County | -111 | -820 | -2,931 | -5,658 |
| Terrell County | 1 | -15 | -30 | -34 |
| Terry County | -114 | -188 | -256 | -502 |
| Throckmorton County | -10 | -44 | -42 | -63 |
| Titus County | 77 | 152 | -15 | -372 |
| Tom Green County | -142 | -466 | -1,456 | -2,886 |
| Travis County | -7,086 | -13,552 | -7,723 | 43,914 |
| Trinity County* | 1,260 | 1,570 | 438 | -465 |
| Tyler County | 797 | 870 | 164 | -425 |
| Upshur County | 1,222 | 1,632 | 1,618 | 866 |
| Upton County | 1 | -7 | -76 | -30 |
| Uvalde County | 357 | 298 | -206 | -879 |
| Val Verde County | 167 | -13 | -604 | -1,914 |
| Van Zandt County* | 1,937 | 2,176 | 987 | -1,106 |
| Victoria County | -273 | -509 | -1,060 | -1,399 |
| Walker County | 1,058 | 1,240 | -27 | -1,290 |
| Waller County | 2,766 | 5,014 | 5,779 | 6,286 |

Table C.8: Projected Net Migration of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties, 2010-2050 Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 s}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ward County | -88 | -188 | -289 | -406 |
| Washington County* | 1,907 | 2,194 | 698 | $-1,029$ |
| Webb County | 2,196 | 3,998 | 4,633 | 3,948 |
| Wharton County | 403 | 416 | -460 | $-1,527$ |
| Wheeler County | -11 | -32 | -28 | 27 |
| Wichita County | $-1,117$ | $-2,692$ | $-3,205$ |  |
| Wilbarger County | 130 | -174 | -395 |  |
| Willacy County | 236 | 81 | -189 | $-16,947$ |
| Williamson County* | 33,699 | 357 | 7,448 | 165,690 |
| Wilson County* | 3,227 | 62,775 | -18 | 5,844 |
| Winkler County | 25 | 6,297 | -113 |  |
| Wise County* | 2,076 | 18 | 1,772 | 5,999 |
| Wood County* | 4,576 | 3,793 | $-1,303$ |  |
| Yoakum County | -29 | 4,787 | 94 | 159 |
| Young County | 315 | -39 | 68 | -323 |
| Zapata County | 23 | 397 | -206 | -261 |
| Zavala County | -46 | -52 | -452 |  |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

REAL ESTATE CENTER

Table C.9: Projected Rates of Net Migration (per 100 people) of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | 2010s | 2020s | 2030s | 2040s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State of Texas | 5.5 | 8.1 | 10.7 | 13.8 |
| Anderson County | 9.2 | 10.1 | 2.0 | -8.2 |
| Andrews County | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| Angelina County | 5.8 | 4.3 | -2.3 | -9.6 |
| Aransas County* | 19.0 | 13.6 | 1.8 | -8.4 |
| Archer County | 2.8 | 3.6 | 4.0 | -2.9 |
| Armstrong County | 1.8 | -4.1 | -13.1 | -7.9 |
| Atascosa County* | 17.2 | 18.3 | 15.0 | 9.7 |
| Austin County* | 17.5 | 19.1 | 20.1 | 18.3 |
| Bailey County | -0.1 | 0.1 | -1.1 | -2.2 |
| Bandera County* | 22.7 | 23.0 | 11.5 | -1.3 |
| Bastrop County | 18.7 | 20.8 | 20.0 | 19.0 |
| Baylor County | 3.3 | 3.0 | -3.9 | -13.2 |
| Bee County | 2.1 | 2.6 | -3.7 | -12.9 |
| Bell County | 9.2 | 8.1 | 2.1 | 7.0 |
| Bexar County | 2.8 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 7.0 |
| Blanco County* | 24.2 | 24.8 | 13.2 | -0.2 |
| Borden County | -1.7 | -5.9 | -9.2 | -15.2 |
| Bosque County* | 15.5 | 13.8 | 4.8 | -4.4 |
| Bowie County | -2.3 | -4.9 | -8.9 | -8.8 |
| Brazoria County | 13.8 | 19.2 | 23.8 | 21.7 |
| Brazos County | 7.5 | 4.8 | 3.2 | 10.7 |
| Brewster County | 8.9 | 8.0 | 1.9 | -2.3 |
| Briscoe County | -2.2 | -7.4 | -9.9 | -12.5 |
| Brooks County | -1.3 | -2.1 | -6.9 | -17.7 |
| Brown County | 8.3 | 6.0 | -1.3 | -14.1 |
| Burleson County | 11.6 | 12.8 | 8.2 | -0.2 |
| Burnet County* | 24.0 | 23.5 | 13.3 | 4.4 |
| Caldwell County | 16.7 | 18.5 | 16.5 | 14.4 |
| Calhoun County | 8.2 | 7.6 | 2.3 | 3.6 |
| Callahan County | 9.3 | 8.7 | 3.4 | 3.0 |
| Cameron County | 9.1 | 8.5 | 5.9 | -0.3 |
| Camp County | 10.8 | 7.9 | -1.5 | -6.3 |
| Carson County | -0.4 | 1.8 | -2.0 | -5.8 |
|  |  |  |  | 136 |
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| County | 2010s | 2020s | 2030s | 2040s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ector County | -1.1 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Edwards County | -2.2 | -4.5 | -8.1 | -10.5 |
| Ellis County | 15.9 | 19.4 | 23.6 | 22.1 |
| El Paso County | 2.6 | 3.9 | 2.5 | -0.3 |
| Erath County | 7.5 | 5.9 | -2.3 | -9.2 |
| Falls County | 9.0 | 10.4 | 3.5 | -4.1 |
| Fannin County | 14.7 | 14.4 | 5.5 | -7.2 |
| Fayette County* | 20.2 | 18.7 | 7.3 | -3.3 |
| Fisher County | -4.8 | -4.6 | -10.2 | -15.1 |
| Floyd County | -4.0 | -5.4 | -8.8 | -13.5 |
| Foard County | -2.0 | -8.9 | -8.2 | -14.5 |
| Fort Bend County | 19.7 | 29.0 | 34.9 | 30.9 |
| Franklin County* | 7.0 | 6.7 | -1.6 | -11.0 |
| Freestone County | 10.3 | 7.9 | 1.5 | -5.7 |
| Frio County | 6.9 | 8.4 | 2.4 | 4.4 |
| Gaines County | -0.2 | -0.3 | -2.0 | -3.8 |
| Galveston County | -2.5 | -0.9 | 2.8 | 7.9 |
| Garza County | 3.4 | 5.0 | -4.9 | -10.1 |
| Gillespie County* | 25.6 | 23.9 | 13.1 | 4.5 |
| Glasscock County | 2.7 | -5.4 | -8.4 | -13.9 |
| Goliad County | 13.0 | 12.7 | 9.2 | 4.3 |
| Gonzales County | 5.8 | 6.4 | 0.8 | -5.3 |
| Gray County | -1.7 | -0.5 | -1.0 | -3.2 |
| Grayson County | 8.3 | 7.2 | 1.2 | -5.7 |
| Gregg County | 1.8 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 3.9 |
| Grimes County | 13.6 | 12.4 | 5.0 | -3.8 |
| Guadalupe County* | 18.4 | 23.6 | 26.9 | 22.7 |
| Hale County | -3.0 | -3.3 | -7.4 | -17.2 |
| Hall County | -4.8 | -4.2 | -10.3 | -13.0 |
| Hamilton County* | 10.6 | 9.8 | -0.2 | -6.4 |
| Hansford County | -2.0 | -0.5 | -2.5 | -1.6 |
| Hardeman County | -0.5 | -0.4 | -6.8 | -11.8 |
| Hardin County | 6.0 | 7.7 | 8.3 | 2.6 |
| Harris County | -4.5 | -4.0 | -2.1 | 8.5 |
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| County | 2010s | 2020s | 2030s | 2040s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Jacinto County* | 17.8 | 19.6 | 13.3 | 6.4 |
| San Patricio County | -1.4 | -3.1 | -7.9 | -17.0 |
| San Saba County | 10.5 | 8.5 | -6.3 | -18.2 |
| Schleicher County | -0.2 | -2.5 | -7.2 | -6.8 |
| Scurry County | 1.9 | 2.3 | -1.7 | -6.6 |
| Shackelford County | 4.3 | 6.9 | -3.5 | -19.3 |
| Shelby County | 6.8 | 8.0 | 2.6 | -2.6 |
| Sherman County | -0.6 | -3.0 | -5.6 | -12.2 |
| Smith County | 5.8 | 5.7 | 4.5 | 5.4 |
| Somervell County* | 17.4 | 17.2 | 12.5 | 1.9 |
| Starr County | 4.9 | 3.4 | 0.1 | -10.1 |
| Stephens County | 5.8 | 4.7 | -4.5 | -12.5 |
| Sterling County | 0.0 | -6.1 | -10.3 | -18.4 |
| Stonewall County | -1.9 | -6.3 | -6.7 | -14.9 |
| Sutton County | 2.2 | 0.5 | -4.8 | -11.5 |
| Swisher County | 0.4 | -0.8 | -8.0 | -12.3 |
| Tarrant County | -3.4 | -3.2 | -0.1 | 7.7 |
| Taylor County | -0.4 | -2.5 | -9.2 | -16.6 |
| Terrell County | 0.3 | -3.7 | -8.2 | -11.4 |
| Terry County | -3.8 | -5.9 | -8.4 | -16.8 |
| Throckmorton County | -1.7 | -7.5 | -8.3 | -16.3 |
| Titus County | 1.1 | 1.7 | -0.2 | -3.6 |
| Tom Green County | -0.5 | -1.6 | -5.2 | -10.5 |
| Travis County | -3.9 | -5.7 | -2.5 | 10.9 |
| Trinity County* | 20.0 | 20.1 | 5.7 | -6.7 |
| Tyler County | 11.0 | 10.5 | 2.0 | -5.6 |
| Upshur County | 9.9 | 10.8 | 9.7 | 5.0 |
| Upton County | 0.1 | -0.6 | -6.7 | -2.6 |
| Uvalde County | 5.3 | 3.9 | -2.7 | -13.2 |
| Val Verde County | 1.6 | -0.1 | -4.4 | -14.1 |
| Van Zandt County* | 11.0 | 10.4 | 4.7 | -5.8 |
| Victoria County | -1.3 | -2.2 | -4.7 | -6.4 |
| Walker County | 7.9 | 8.0 | -0.2 | -8.7 |
| Waller County | 22.5 | 26.4 | 23.3 | 20.2 |
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Table C.9: Projected Rates of Net Migration (per 100 people) of the Older Adult Population (Age 60+) in Counties by Decade Assuming 2000-2010 Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity-Specific Rates of Net Migration

| County | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0 s}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0 s}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ward County | -3.2 | -6.3 | -10.2 | -15.2 |
| Washington County* | 16.5 | 15.4 | 4.8 | -7.6 |
| Webb County | 5.1 | 6.4 | 5.6 | 4.0 |
| Wharton County | 3.7 | -3.3 | -3.7 | -13.4 |
| Wheeler County | -0.7 | -1.7 | 1.5 |  |
| Wichita County | -3.9 | -9.2 | -11.3 |  |
| Wilbarger County | 3.4 | -5.6 | -4.1 | -9.4 |
| Willacy County | 4.9 | 1.9 | -2.3 |  |
| Williamson County* | 29.0 | 6.0 | 31.4 |  |
| Wilson County* | 21.9 | 29.5 | 16.3 |  |
| Winkler County | 1.3 | 26.5 | -0.8 | -4.7 |
| Wise County* | 12.0 | 0.8 | 16.2 | 17.0 |
| Wood County* | 23.9 | 15.6 | 7.8 | -6.3 |
| Yoakum County | -1.5 | 20.7 | 3.7 | 5.5 |
| Young County | 5.5 | -1.7 | 1.1 | -5.3 |
| Zapata County | 0.9 | 6.1 | 0.5 | -5.9 |
| Zavala County | -1.8 | 2.2 | -1.8 | -15.1 |

Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).
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Table D.1: Selected Characteristics of the Older Population (Age 60 and Older)

| Area | Population 60 and Older | Percent of Total Population | Percent of Population 60 and Older |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Hispanic | NH White | Black | NH Asian \& Other |
| Anderson County | 10,349 | 17.8 | 4.8 | 81.5 | 12.2 | 1.5 |
| Angelina County | 16,647 | 19.3 | 6.2 | 82.0 | 10.4 | 1.4 |
| Aransas County* | 7,126 | 30.7 | 10.5 | 87.2 | 0.4 | 1.9 |
| Atascosa County* | 7,886 | 17.7 | 43.3 | 54.4 | 0.5 | 1.8 |
| Bastrop County | 12,526 | 17.1 | 12.2 | 78.3 | 7.5 | 2.0 |
| Bell County | 38,430 | 12.7 | 10.1 | 73.6 | 11.6 | 4.7 |
| Bexar County | 248,902 | 14.8 | 45.1 | 45.9 | 6.3 | 2.7 |
| Bowie County | 17,973 | 19.6 | 1.6 | 79.9 | 16.7 | 1.8 |
| Brazoria County | 43,356 | 14.1 | 13.8 | 72.9 | 8.5 | 4.8 |
| Brazos County | 19,781 | 10.4 | 9.8 | 78.0 | 9.6 | 2.6 |
| Brown County | 8,504 | 22.3 | 7.2 | 89.9 | 1.8 | 1.1 |
| Burnet County* | 10,643 | 25.0 | 6.1 | 92.6 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| Cameron County | 61,135 | 15.3 | 68.9 | 30.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| Cass County | 7,802 | 25.8 | 0.8 | 84.3 | 13.7 | 1.2 |
| Cherokee County | 10,651 | 21.1 | 2.5 | 84.4 | 12.0 | 1.1 |
| Collin County | 89,644 | 11.7 | 5.7 | 81.1 | 4.2 | 9.0 |
| Comal County* | 23,167 | 21.8 | 12.9 | 85.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Cooke County | 8,491 | 22.1 | 2.3 | 93.5 | 1.8 | 2.4 |
| Coryell County | 8,096 | 10.8 | 6.4 | 81.2 | 7.8 | 4.6 |
| Dallas County | 301,669 | 12.8 | 14.3 | 61.5 | 19.0 | 5.2 |
| Denton County | 68,969 | 10.6 | 7.2 | 82.9 | 4.1 | 5.8 |
| Ector County | 19,293 | 14.2 | 28.8 | 65.2 | 4.1 | 1.9 |
| El Paso County | 113,059 | 14.4 | 73.8 | 22.4 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
| Ellis County | 21,537 | 14.7 | 9.1 | 81.7 | 7.7 | 1.5 |
| Fannin County | 7,622 | 22.5 | 2.1 | 94.0 | 3.2 | 0.7 |
| Fayette County* | 7,108 | 29.1 | 4.2 | 91.4 | 3.9 | 0.5 |
| Fort Bend County | 66,686 | 11.8 | 14.5 | 51.6 | 16.6 | 17.3 |
| Galveston County | 47,293 | 16.3 | 11.5 | 72.4 | 12.5 | 3.6 |
| Gillespie County* | 8,273 | 33.7 | 4.6 | 94.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| Grayson County | 25,207 | 21.0 | 2.1 | 91.8 | 3.9 | 2.2 |
| Gregg County | 22,555 | 18.7 | 3.1 | 80.9 | 14.5 | 1.5 |
| Guadalupe County* | 21,281 | 16.7 | 21.3 | 71.4 | 5.2 | 2.1 |
| Hardin County | 10,341 | 19.2 | 1.9 | 92.0 | 4.9 | 1.2 |
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Table D.1: Selected Characteristics of the Older Population (Age 60 and Older)

| Area | Population 60 and Older | Percent of Total Population | Percent of Population 60 and Older |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Hispanic | NH White | Black | NH Asian \& Other |
| Harris County | 492,563 | 12.2 | 19.7 | 55.5 | 17.5 | 7.3 |
| Harrison County | 12,280 | 18.9 | 2.0 | 74.6 | 23.2 | 0.2 |
| Hays County | 19,806 | 13.0 | 20.1 | 75.4 | 2.8 | 1.7 |
| Henderson County* | 20,418 | 26.0 | 2.8 | 92.1 | 3.8 | 1.3 |
| Hidalgo County | 98,387 | 13.0 | 71.3 | 27.4 | 0.2 | 1.1 |
| Hill County* | 8,418 | 24.0 | 5.5 | 88.6 | 4.7 | 1.2 |
| Hood County* | 14,337 | 28.4 | 1.3 | 96.9 | 0.3 | 1.5 |
| Hopkins County | 7,584 | 21.7 | 2.7 | 90.4 | 5.6 | 1.3 |
| Hunt County | 16,786 | 19.7 | 3.3 | 88.5 | 6.2 | 2.0 |
| Jasper County | 8,221 | 23.1 | 1.2 | 84.8 | 12.8 | 1.2 |
| Jefferson County | 44,218 | 17.6 | 5.7 | 64.1 | 27.7 | 2.5 |
| Jim Wells County | 7,171 | 17.6 | 69.9 | 29.2 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
| Johnson County | 24,058 | 16.1 | 6.4 | 90.3 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Kaufman County | 15,041 | 14.9 | 5.2 | 84.4 | 8.8 | 1.6 |
| Kendall County* | 7,820 | 24.0 | 7.8 | 90.2 | 0.6 | 1.4 |
| Kerr County* | 15,636 | 31.8 | 7.8 | 89.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Lamar County | 11,136 | 22.4 | 1.6 | 88.4 | 7.7 | 2.3 |
| Liberty County* | 12,160 | 16.1 | 5.4 | 83.4 | 9.4 | 1.8 |
| LLano County* | 7,929 | 41.4 | 2.8 | 95.6 | 0.2 | 1.4 |
| Lubbock County | 42,153 | 15.4 | 16.8 | 76.3 | 5.4 | 1.5 |
| Matagorda County | 7,381 | 20.1 | 17.8 | 69.7 | 10.8 | 1.7 |
| Maverick County | 7,793 | 14.6 | 94.6 | 3.9 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| McLennan County | 39,391 | 16.9 | 9.3 | 77.6 | 11.7 | 1.4 |
| Medina County* | 8,231 | 18.1 | 35.2 | 63.2 | 0.3 | 1.3 |
| Midland County | 21,314 | 15.8 | 16.3 | 75.8 | 5.8 | 2.1 |
| Montgomery County* | 68,501 | 15.4 | 6.4 | 88.3 | 3.0 | 2.3 |
| Nacogdoches County | 10,414 | 16.3 | 4.4 | 81.6 | 12.8 | 1.2 |
| Navarro County | 9,326 | 19.6 | 5.5 | 81.9 | 12.1 | 0.5 |
| Nueces County | 58,242 | 17.3 | 47.2 | 47.1 | 3.7 | 2.0 |
| Orange County | 15,916 | 19.4 | 2.4 | 89.0 | 7.1 | 1.5 |
| Parker County* | 20,220 | 17.6 | 2.9 | 94.6 | 0.6 | 1.9 |
| Polk County* | 11,785 | 25.8 | 3.9 | 87.7 | 6.2 | 2.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 145 |

Table D.1: Selected Characteristics of the Older Population (Age 60 and Older)

| Area | Population 60 and Older | Percent of Total Population | Percent of Population 60 and Older |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Hispanic | NH White | Black | NH Asian \& Other |
| Potter County | 18,867 | 15.6 | 14.0 | 75.3 | 6.8 | 3.9 |
| Randall County | 20,951 | 17.6 | 4.4 | 93.2 | 0.5 | 1.9 |
| Rockwall County* | 11,206 | 14.7 | 5.4 | 87.6 | 3.9 | 3.1 |
| Rusk County | 10,451 | 19.8 | 3.8 | 80.1 | 14.8 | 1.3 |
| San Patricio County | 11,864 | 18.1 | 39.5 | 58.3 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| Smith County | 40,382 | 19.5 | 4.2 | 81.3 | 12.9 | 1.6 |
| Starr County | 8,544 | 14.1 | 96.6 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Tarrant County | 235,862 | 13.2 | 10.3 | 75.0 | 10.1 | 4.6 |
| Taylor County | 23,421 | 18.0 | 9.7 | 83.9 | 4.3 | 2.1 |
| Tom Green County | 20,399 | 18.7 | 19.8 | 75.9 | 2.4 | 1.9 |
| Travis County | 112,598 | 11.2 | 16.4 | 70.8 | 8.1 | 4.7 |
| Upshur County | 8,380 | 21.5 | 0.7 | 88.2 | 10.0 | 1.1 |
| Val Verde County | 8,349 | 17.2 | 72.7 | 25.4 | 1.4 | 0.5 |
| Van Zandt County* | 12,677 | 24.2 | 1.9 | 93.9 | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| Victoria County | 16,268 | 18.8 | 27.1 | 66.1 | 5.6 | 1.2 |
| Walker County | 9,685 | 14.5 | 4.7 | 80.1 | 13.0 | 2.2 |
| Washington County* | 8,177 | 24.6 | 3.3 | 85.5 | 10.5 | 0.7 |
| Webb County | 27,601 | 11.2 | 94.5 | 5.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Wharton County | 8,050 | 19.6 | 17.7 | 66.3 | 15.6 | 0.4 |
| Wichita County | 23,325 | 17.8 | 7.0 | 83.1 | 6.5 | 3.4 |
| Williamson County* | 53,668 | 13.1 | 9.3 | 83.8 | 3.3 | 3.6 |
| Wilson County* | 8,068 | 19.1 | 27.0 | 70.0 | 2.3 | 0.7 |
| Wise County* | 10,333 | 17.6 | 3.8 | 93.2 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| Wood County* | 13,489 | 32.2 | 2.0 | 93.9 | 2.2 | 1.9 |
| Texas | 3,685,380 | 14.9 | 21.0 | 66.3 | 9.0 | 3.7 |
| United States | 55,901,267 | 18.2 | 7.1 | 79.1 | 8.9 | 4.9 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).
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Table D.2: Households by Household Type for Households Headed by a Person Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | Percent of Households |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Family Households | Married- <br> Couple <br> Family | Female Householder, No Husband Present | NonFamily | Householder Living Alone |
| Anderson County | 5,614 | 56.6 | 45.7 | 9.2 | 43.4 | 41.3 |
| Angelina County | 10,099 | 61.0 | 49.3 | 7.4 | 39.0 | 37.6 |
| Aransas County* | 4,308 | 58.8 | 53.6 | 3.9 | 41.2 | 39.6 |
| Atascosa County* | 4,658 | 66.9 | 51.0 | 13.3 | 33.1 | 32.7 |
| Bastrop County | 7,301 | 61.8 | 51.0 | 7.7 | 38.2 | 35.7 |
| Bell County | 22,278 | 59.9 | 50.2 | 7.8 | 40.1 | 37.4 |
| Bexar County | 150,046 | 59.2 | 45.1 | 11.1 | 40.8 | 38.5 |
| Bowie County | 11,210 | 57.0 | 45.8 | 9.0 | 43.0 | 41.7 |
| Brazoria County | 24,824 | 63.7 | 52.5 | 8.6 | 36.3 | 34.3 |
| Brazos County | 12,149 | 61.1 | 52.9 | 6.8 | 38.9 | 37.6 |
| Brown County | 4,793 | 58.0 | 48.5 | 5.5 | 42.0 | 40.6 |
| Burnet County* | 6,326 | 64.2 | 56.1 | 5.8 | 35.8 | 32.3 |
| Cameron County | 33,905 | 67.1 | 50.5 | 13.1 | 32.9 | 30.7 |
| Cass County | 4,828 | 59.3 | 49.6 | 6.8 | 40.7 | 39.9 |
| Cherokee County | 6,173 | 59.9 | 48.1 | 9.2 | 40.1 | 36.9 |
| Collin County | 50,979 | 66.7 | 58.6 | 6.7 | 33.3 | 31.3 |
| Comal County* | 13,439 | 67.1 | 59.0 | 6.5 | 32.9 | 30.9 |
| Cooke County | 5,177 | 59.2 | 51.9 | 5.7 | 40.8 | 38.9 |
| Coryell County | 4,401 | 67.2 | 57.8 | 7.2 | 32.8 | 31.5 |
| Dallas County | 182,018 | 56.3 | 42.4 | 10.9 | 43.7 | 40.7 |
| Denton County | 38,866 | 64.6 | 56.1 | 6.9 | 35.4 | 33.2 |
| Ector County | 12,335 | 55.1 | 44.7 | 7.6 | 44.9 | 43.2 |
| El Paso County | 64,748 | 62.1 | 44.8 | 13.7 | 37.9 | 36.1 |
| Ellis County | 12,496 | 68.5 | 57.3 | 8.1 | 31.5 | 29.7 |
| Fannin County | 4,505 | 60.4 | 48.7 | 7.1 | 39.6 | 38.5 |
| Fayette County* | 4,411 | 57.9 | 52.2 | 3.9 | 42.1 | 40.7 |
| Fort Bend County | 34,848 | 71.6 | 60.5 | 8.6 | 28.4 | 26.5 |
| Galveston County | 28,555 | 57.8 | 46.0 | 9.3 | 42.2 | 40.2 |
| Gillespie County* | 5,047 | 60.4 | 56.0 | 3.8 | 39.6 | 37.3 |
| Grayson County | 15,132 | 59.9 | 50.7 | 6.7 | 40.1 | 38.3 |
| Gregg County | 14,299 | 54.5 | 44.6 | 7.8 | 45.5 | 43.8 |
| Guadalupe County* | 12,607 | 64.3 | 53.8 | 8.0 | 35.7 | 33.8 |
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Table D.2: Households by Household Type for Households Headed by a Person Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | Percent of Households |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Family Households | Married- <br> Couple <br> Family | Female Householder, No Husband Present | NonFamily | Householder <br> Living Alone |
| Hardin County | 6,530 | 59.7 | 47.5 | 9.3 | 40.3 | 38.3 |
| Harris County | 290,080 | 59.9 | 45.7 | 11.0 | 40.1 | 37.6 |
| Harrison County | 8,054 | 56.7 | 43.0 | 11.1 | 43.3 | 41.1 |
| Hays County | 11,283 | 64.0 | 54.7 | 7.5 | 36.0 | 34.0 |
| Henderson County* | 12,397 | 61.1 | 51.4 | 7.9 | 38.9 | 36.8 |
| Hidalgo County | 54,307 | 68.0 | 51.9 | 12.7 | 32.0 | 30.1 |
| Hill County* | 5,229 | 57.4 | 47.9 | 7.4 | 42.6 | 40.3 |
| Hood County* | 8,648 | 65.8 | 58.8 | 5.7 | 34.2 | 31.7 |
| Hopkins County | 4,532 | 65.3 | 55.5 | 7.4 | 34.7 | 32.9 |
| Hunt County | 10,082 | 60.4 | 50.1 | 7.2 | 39.6 | 36.9 |
| Jasper County | 5,102 | 63.0 | 51.8 | 9.9 | 37.0 | 35.9 |
| Jefferson County | 28,649 | 54.5 | 39.8 | 11.4 | 45.5 | 44.2 |
| Jim Wells County | 4,346 | 63.3 | 47.4 | 12.4 | 36.7 | 34.9 |
| Johnson County | 14,162 | 67.7 | 55.8 | 8.0 | 32.3 | 28.5 |
| Kaufman County | 8,886 | 67.5 | 55.3 | 10.1 | 32.5 | 30.0 |
| Kendall County* | 4,534 | 73.4 | 65.2 | 4.2 | 26.6 | 25.5 |
| Kerr County* | 9,689 | 59.1 | 52.5 | 5.2 | 40.9 | 38.9 |
| Lamar County | 6,860 | 58.1 | 49.2 | 6.4 | 41.9 | 39.6 |
| Liberty County* | 7,542 | 60.6 | 47.6 | 10.2 | 39.4 | 38.3 |
| LLano County* | 4,741 | 59.5 | 55.1 | 2.9 | 40.5 | 38.2 |
| Lubbock County | 26,302 | 56.7 | 45.8 | 8.4 | 43.3 | 40.9 |
| Matagorda County | 4,469 | 58.9 | 49.1 | 8.4 | 41.1 | 38.3 |
| Maverick County | 4,299 | 67.6 | 51.3 | 11.9 | 32.4 | 31.9 |
| McLennan County | 23,774 | 58.0 | 45.8 | 9.6 | 42.0 | 40.0 |
| Medina County* | 4,806 | 67.9 | 55.7 | 7.8 | 32.1 | 30.7 |
| Midland County | 12,814 | 58.9 | 50.6 | 6.8 | 41.1 | 39.0 |
| Montgomery County* | 40,350 | 64.9 | 55.7 | 7.2 | 35.1 | 33.2 |
| Nacogdoches County | 6,423 | 58.6 | 49.0 | 8.1 | 41.4 | 40.0 |
| Navarro County | 5,780 | 57.4 | 46.1 | 8.8 | 42.6 | 40.9 |
| Nueces County | 35,971 | 60.1 | 44.6 | 11.7 | 39.9 | 37.3 |
| Orange County | 9,657 | 63.4 | 50.7 | 10.1 | 36.6 | 33.8 |
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Table D.2: Households by Household Type for Households Headed by a Person Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | Percent of Households |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Family Households | Married- <br> Couple <br> Family | Female Householder, No Husband Present | NonFamily | Householder Living Alone |
| Parker County* | 12,262 | 65.7 | 56.4 | 6.5 | 34.3 | 31.7 |
| Polk County* | 6,953 | 59.6 | 50.0 | 7.1 | 40.4 | 38.9 |
| Potter County | 11,104 | 53.5 | 41.1 | 10.1 | 46.5 | 44.3 |
| Randall County | 13,099 | 58.4 | 51.7 | 4.9 | 41.6 | 40.2 |
| Rockwall County* | 6,049 | 69.4 | 62.0 | 5.5 | 30.6 | 28.7 |
| Rusk County | 6,216 | 57.8 | 46.2 | 9.7 | 42.2 | 41.1 |
| San Patricio County | 7,032 | 65.6 | 51.3 | 8.8 | 34.4 | 32.0 |
| Smith County | 24,612 | 61.5 | 51.2 | 8.0 | 38.5 | 37.5 |
| Starr County | 4,713 | 71.0 | 51.4 | 16.3 | 29.0 | 28.9 |
| Tarrant County | 141,699 | 59.1 | 48.1 | 8.8 | 40.9 | 38.7 |
| Taylor County | 14,775 | 56.3 | 44.5 | 10.4 | 43.7 | 41.5 |
| Tom Green County | 13,090 | 57.9 | 48.5 | 7.6 | 42.1 | 40.9 |
| Travis County | 68,665 | 57.3 | 46.1 | 8.3 | 42.7 | 39.8 |
| Upshur County | 5,071 | 60.6 | 49.2 | 8.1 | 39.4 | 37.2 |
| Val Verde County | 4,944 | 64.0 | 53.1 | 8.7 | 36.0 | 35.2 |
| Van Zandt County* | 7,773 | 57.7 | 48.4 | 6.9 | 42.3 | 40.2 |
| Victoria County | 10,134 | 62.1 | 52.2 | 8.1 | 37.9 | 36.3 |
| Walker County | 5,336 | 60.3 | 55.8 | 4.2 | 39.7 | 38.3 |
| Washington County* | 5,118 | 53.8 | 43.9 | 8.4 | 46.2 | 44.8 |
| Webb County | 15,008 | 71.4 | 49.6 | 17.9 | 28.6 | 27.8 |
| Wharton County | 5,107 | 52.6 | 41.8 | 5.7 | 47.4 | 46.2 |
| Wichita County | 14,782 | 56.5 | 45.4 | 9.1 | 43.5 | 41.4 |
| Williamson County* | 31,557 | 63.4 | 56.8 | 4.9 | 36.6 | 34.6 |
| Wilson County* | 4,588 | 69.0 | 60.6 | 6.3 | 31.0 | 30.2 |
| Wise County* | 6,090 | 66.0 | 54.7 | 8.5 | 34.0 | 31.3 |
| Wood County* | 7,882 | 65.8 | 59.1 | 5.6 | 34.2 | 31.9 |
| Texas | 2,193,657 | 60.5 | 48.6 | 9.2 | 39.5 | 37.3 |
| United States | 34,062,044 | 56.9 | 46.7 | 7.8 | 43.1 | 40.5 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

Table D.3: Marital Status for Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population | Percent of the Population Age 60 and Older |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Married | Widowed | Divorced | Separated | Never <br> Married |
| Anderson County | 10,349 | 50.4 | 26.8 | 16.5 | 2.5 | 3.8 |
| Angelina County | 16,647 | 60.0 | 22.2 | 12.2 | 1.9 | 3.7 |
| Aransas County* | 7,126 | 66.1 | 15.9 | 14.6 | 1.8 | 1.6 |
| Atascosa County* | 7,886 | 62.9 | 22.5 | 9.6 | 2.3 | 2.8 |
| Bastrop County | 12,526 | 61.7 | 17.5 | 16.6 | 1.3 | 2.9 |
| Bell County | 38,430 | 57.8 | 23.4 | 13.6 | 1.7 | 3.6 |
| Bexar County | 248,902 | 55.7 | 22.7 | 14.5 | 1.6 | 5.5 |
| Bowie County | 17,973 | 55.1 | 26.3 | 12.9 | 1.5 | 4.3 |
| Brazoria County | 43,356 | 60.9 | 23.1 | 12.2 | 1.1 | 2.6 |
| Brazos County | 19,781 | 63.2 | 21.8 | 10.3 | 1.1 | 3.6 |
| Brown County | 8,504 | 57.6 | 27.6 | 10.8 | 1.1 | 2.8 |
| Burnet County* | 10,643 | 65.2 | 19.0 | 14.2 | 0.2 | 1.3 |
| Cameron County | 61,135 | 59.9 | 22.7 | 8.7 | 2.9 | 5.8 |
| Cass County | 7,802 | 62.2 | 23.0 | 11.4 | 1.3 | 2.1 |
| Cherokee County | 10,651 | 60.0 | 23.5 | 11.9 | 0.5 | 4.1 |
| Collin County | 89,644 | 67.2 | 17.1 | 12.5 | 0.7 | 2.6 |
| Comal County* | 23,167 | 68.8 | 16.0 | 10.9 | 0.6 | 3.8 |
| Cooke County | 8,491 | 64.5 | 20.8 | 12.1 | 0.6 | 2.1 |
| Coryell County | 8,096 | 60.6 | 24.9 | 10.4 | 1.8 | 2.3 |
| Dallas County | 301,669 | 53.2 | 23.3 | 16.0 | 2.1 | 5.3 |
| Denton County | 68,969 | 63.8 | 19.0 | 13.5 | 0.9 | 2.7 |
| Ector County | 19,293 | 57.7 | 25.0 | 13.3 | 1.7 | 2.3 |
| El Paso County | 113,059 | 55.1 | 24.0 | 12.4 | 2.8 | 5.8 |
| Ellis County | 21,537 | 66.8 | 20.8 | 9.1 | 0.9 | 2.5 |
| Fannin County | 7,622 | 58.7 | 25.9 | 11.7 | 1.0 | 2.8 |
| Fayette County* | 7,108 | 65.8 | 22.0 | 7.8 | 0.4 | 3.9 |
| Fort Bend County | 66,686 | 65.9 | 18.3 | 11.2 | 1.5 | 3.2 |
| Galveston County | 47,293 | 56.4 | 23.4 | 15.6 | 1.5 | 3.1 |
| Gillespie County* | 8,273 | 68.0 | 17.9 | 11.6 | 0.4 | 2.1 |
| Grayson County | 25,207 | 59.9 | 24.0 | 13.3 | 0.8 | 2.1 |
| Gregg County | 22,555 | 56.0 | 27.6 | 13.0 | 1.0 | 2.4 |
| Guadalupe County* | 21,281 | 63.2 | 21.9 | 11.2 | 1.2 | 2.5 |
| Hardin County | 10,341 | 58.8 | 27.9 | 11.1 | 0.5 | 1.6 |
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Table D.3: Marital Status for Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population | Percent of the Population Age 60 and Older |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Married | Widowed | Divorced | Separated | Never <br> Married |
| Randall County | 20,951 | 64.2 | 20.6 | 12.2 | 0.5 | 2.5 |
| Rockwall County* | 11,206 | 66.4 | 18.8 | 10.3 | 1.4 | 3.2 |
| Rusk County | 10,451 | 56.6 | 26.0 | 12.0 | 1.6 | 3.7 |
| San Patricio County | 11,864 | 61.3 | 21.6 | 11.7 | 2.2 | 3.1 |
| Smith County | 40,382 | 62.9 | 23.1 | 10.1 | 1.2 | 2.7 |
| Starr County | 8,544 | 62.9 | 23.8 | 7.8 | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| Tarrant County | 235,862 | 58.3 | 22.1 | 14.8 | 1.4 | 3.3 |
| Taylor County | 23,421 | 57.1 | 26.3 | 12.6 | 1.1 | 2.9 |
| Tom Green County | 20,399 | 60.6 | 22.6 | 12.7 | 0.8 | 3.2 |
| Travis County | 112,598 | 58.1 | 19.1 | 16.7 | 1.4 | 4.8 |
| Upshur County | 8,380 | 59.1 | 23.1 | 14.3 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| Val Verde County | 8,349 | 62.8 | 24.5 | 7.8 | 2.0 | 2.8 |
| Van Zandt County* | 12,677 | 59.3 | 25.8 | 12.1 | 0.9 | 1.9 |
| Victoria County | 16,268 | 63.1 | 23.4 | 9.7 | 0.7 | 3.1 |
| Walker County | 9,685 | 60.2 | 20.7 | 13.9 | 1.5 | 3.8 |
| Washington County* | 8,177 | 55.6 | 30.5 | 8.7 | 1.3 | 3.9 |
| Webb County | 27,601 | 55.8 | 25.4 | 8.3 | 3.8 | 6.8 |
| Wharton County | 8,050 | 54.0 | 25.2 | 10.2 | 2.8 | 7.7 |
| Wichita County | 23,325 | 56.7 | 23.8 | 14.8 | 0.9 | 3.8 |
| Williamson County* | 53,668 | 67.2 | 16.6 | 12.8 | 0.9 | 2.5 |
| Wilson County* | 8,068 | 70.3 | 18.9 | 9.0 | 0.6 | 1.2 |
| Wise County* | 10,333 | 65.7 | 20.2 | 11.0 | 0.6 | 2.5 |
| Wood County* | 13,489 | 69.0 | 17.5 | 10.6 | 0.9 | 2.0 |
| Texas | 3,685,380 | 59.1 | 22.4 | 13.0 | 1.6 | 3.9 |
| United States | 55,901,267 | 58.0 | 22.8 | 12.6 | 1.4 | 5.2 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).
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Table D.4: Educational Attainment for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population | Percent of the Population Age 60 and Older |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Less Than High School/GED | High <br> School/GED | Some <br> College/ Associate | Bachelor or Higher |
| Anderson County | 10,349 | 24.5 | 36.7 | 23.8 | 15.0 |
| Angelina County | 16,647 | 29.1 | 27.8 | 26.6 | 16.5 |
| Aransas County* | 7,126 | 13.3 | 28.1 | 32.8 | 25.9 |
| Atascosa County* | 7,886 | 39.9 | 30.1 | 18.4 | 11.7 |
| Bastrop County | 12,526 | 24.6 | 28.5 | 26.5 | 20.4 |
| Bell County | 38,430 | 18.7 | 31.5 | 28.2 | 21.6 |
| Bexar County | 248,902 | 27.3 | 24.8 | 25.7 | 22.2 |
| Bowie County | 17,973 | 21.5 | 34.0 | 26.0 | 18.5 |
| Brazoria County | 43,356 | 20.7 | 29.5 | 29.5 | 20.3 |
| Brazos County | 19,781 | 17.5 | 25.3 | 21.7 | 35.5 |
| Brown County | 8,504 | 22.8 | 38.3 | 23.2 | 15.6 |
| Burnet County* | 10,643 | 13.1 | 31.8 | 27.8 | 27.3 |
| Cameron County | 61,135 | 51.4 | 19.3 | 16.7 | 12.6 |
| Cass County | 7,802 | 26.6 | 38.8 | 22.8 | 11.8 |
| Cherokee County | 10,651 | 25.4 | 34.8 | 25.9 | 13.9 |
| Collin County | 89,644 | 10.3 | 21.8 | 27.8 | 40.1 |
| Comal County* | 23,167 | 14.4 | 26.4 | 27.1 | 32.1 |
| Cooke County | 8,491 | 17.6 | 30.8 | 31.1 | 20.5 |
| Coryell County | 8,096 | 19.3 | 35.0 | 29.0 | 16.8 |
| Dallas County | 301,669 | 22.5 | 25.2 | 24.3 | 28.1 |
| Denton County | 68,969 | 12.4 | 25.4 | 30.0 | 32.3 |
| Ector County | 19,293 | 36.2 | 25.4 | 24.8 | 13.7 |
| El Paso County | 113,059 | 48.3 | 21.3 | 16.6 | 13.8 |
| Ellis County | 21,537 | 20.9 | 32.6 | 27.9 | 18.6 |
| Fannin County | 7,622 | 23.2 | 39.0 | 25.1 | 12.8 |
| Fayette County* | 7,108 | 25.1 | 34.7 | 21.0 | 19.2 |
| Fort Bend County | 66,686 | 18.4 | 22.6 | 25.1 | 33.9 |
| Galveston County | 47,293 | 18.4 | 30.2 | 28.6 | 22.8 |
| Gillespie County* | 8,273 | 13.7 | 32.7 | 25.4 | 28.2 |
| Grayson County | 25,207 | 19.2 | 34.0 | 28.3 | 18.4 |
| Gregg County | 22,555 | 19.4 | 31.8 | 29.5 | 19.3 |
| Guadalupe County* | 21,281 | 24.1 | 29.9 | 26.1 | 19.9 |
| Hardin County | 10,341 | 21.1 | 41.8 | 25.7 | 11.4 |
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Table D.4: Educational Attainment for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population | Percent of the Population Age 60 and Older |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Less Than High School/GED | High <br> School/GED | Some <br> College/ <br> Associate | Bachelor or Higher |
| Randall County | 20,951 | 10.8 | 28.7 | 33.3 | 27.2 |
| Rockwall County* | 11,206 | 11.7 | 28.9 | 28.2 | 31.2 |
| Rusk County | 10,451 | 23.8 | 35.6 | 25.5 | 15.1 |
| San Patricio County | 11,864 | 36.8 | 28.8 | 20.2 | 14.2 |
| Smith County | 40,382 | 16.1 | 27.9 | 30.9 | 25.2 |
| Starr County | 8,544 | 75.5 | 10.2 | 7.1 | 7.2 |
| Tarrant County | 235,862 | 18.2 | 27.8 | 28.5 | 25.5 |
| Taylor County | 23,421 | 19.6 | 29.9 | 27.2 | 23.3 |
| Tom Green County | 20,399 | 23.5 | 28.5 | 25.2 | 22.7 |
| Travis County | 112,598 | 15.3 | 20.4 | 24.6 | 39.7 |
| Upshur County | 8,380 | 25.1 | 33.6 | 27.3 | 14.0 |
| Val Verde County | 8,349 | 54.2 | 18.9 | 17.9 | 9.1 |
| Van Zandt County* | 12,677 | 26.2 | 35.8 | 25.5 | 12.5 |
| Victoria County | 16,268 | 25.9 | 29.5 | 27.0 | 17.6 |
| Walker County | 9,685 | 14.8 | 33.9 | 24.8 | 26.5 |
| Washington County* | 8,177 | 24.0 | 27.8 | 22.2 | 25.9 |
| Webb County | 27,601 | 60.2 | 14.9 | 13.9 | 11.0 |
| Wharton County | 8,050 | 38.1 | 29.8 | 20.0 | 12.0 |
| Wichita County | 23,325 | 21.3 | 34.8 | 27.2 | 16.7 |
| Williamson County* | 53,668 | 12.5 | 24.2 | 28.2 | 35.1 |
| Wilson County* | 8,068 | 26.0 | 32.4 | 23.4 | 18.2 |
| Wise County* | 10,333 | 22.5 | 37.1 | 27.6 | 12.8 |
| Wood County* | 13,489 | 19.0 | 33.1 | 28.2 | 19.8 |
| Texas | 3,685,380 | 25.0 | 27.1 | 24.9 | 23.0 |
| United States | 55,901,267 | 20.3 | 32.7 | 23.7 | 23.3 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).
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Table D.5: Veteran Status for the Total Population and the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population 18 and Older |  |  | Population 60 and Older |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population | Veterans | Percent <br> Veteran | Population | Veterans | Percent <br> Veteran |
| Anderson County | 46,619 | 5,035 | 10.8 | 10,349 | 2,349 | 22.7 |
| Angelina County | 62,897 | 6,856 | 10.9 | 16,647 | 3,829 | 23.0 |
| Aransas County* | 18,558 | 2,951 | 15.9 | 7,126 | 2,074 | 29.1 |
| Atascosa County* | 31,675 | 3,104 | 9.8 | 7,886 | 1,459 | 18.5 |
| Bastrop County | 53,994 | 7,343 | 13.6 | 12,526 | 3,495 | 27.9 |
| Bell County | 192,558 | 41,207 | 21.4 | 38,430 | 12,182 | 31.7 |
| Bexar County | 1,204,306 | 152,947 | 12.7 | 248,902 | 63,968 | 25.7 |
| Bowie County | 69,354 | 8,531 | 12.3 | 17,973 | 4,206 | 23.4 |
| Brazoria County | 221,959 | 21,974 | 9.9 | 43,356 | 10,102 | 23.3 |
| Brazos County | 151,050 | 8,459 | 5.6 | 19,781 | 4,589 | 23.2 |
| Brown County | 28,838 | 3,634 | 12.6 | 8,504 | 2,135 | 25.1 |
| Burnet County* | 32,680 | 4,575 | 14.0 | 10,643 | 2,937 | 27.6 |
| Cameron County | 267,297 | 17,642 | 6.6 | 61,135 | 9,537 | 15.6 |
| Cass County | 23,256 | 3,140 | 13.5 | 7,802 | 1,833 | 23.5 |
| Cherokee County | 37,369 | 3,737 | 10.0 | 10,651 | 2,418 | 22.7 |
| Collin County | 544,618 | 42,480 | 7.8 | 89,644 | 19,542 | 21.8 |
| Comal County* | 80,473 | 12,473 | 15.5 | 23,165 | 6,648 | 28.7 |
| Cooke County | 28,449 | 3,072 | 10.8 | 8,491 | 2,140 | 25.2 |
| Coryell County | 46,652 | 9,890 | 21.2 | 8,096 | 2,923 | 36.1 |
| Dallas County | 1,697,138 | 110,314 | 6.5 | 301,669 | 58,524 | 19.4 |
| Denton County | 469,215 | 39,414 | 8.4 | 68,969 | 16,139 | 23.4 |
| Ector County | 96,035 | 7,491 | 7.8 | 19,293 | 4,129 | 21.4 |
| El Paso County | 535,766 | 47,683 | 8.9 | 113,051 | 19,558 | 17.3 |
| Ellis County | 104,249 | 10,112 | 9.7 | 21,537 | 4,824 | 22.4 |
| Fannin County | 26,300 | 3,551 | 13.5 | 7,622 | 2,012 | 26.4 |
| Fayette County* | 19,004 | 2,395 | 12.6 | 7,108 | 1,756 | 24.7 |
| Fort Bend County | 397,133 | 25,417 | 6.4 | 66,686 | 11,870 | 17.8 |
| Galveston County | 214,933 | 22,998 | 10.7 | 47,293 | 11,398 | 24.1 |
| Gillespie County* | 19,566 | 3,013 | 15.4 | 8,273 | 2,184 | 26.4 |
| Grayson County | 90,899 | 10,272 | 11.3 | 25,207 | 6,302 | 25.0 |
| Gregg County | 89,745 | 8,975 | 10.0 | 22,555 | 4,894 | 21.7 |
| Guadalupe County* | 90,876 | 15,267 | 16.8 | 21,281 | 6,299 | 29.6 |
| Hardin County | 39,919 | 4,511 | 11.3 | 10,341 | 2,565 | 24.8 |
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Table D.5: Veteran Status for the Total Population and the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population 18 and Older |  |  | Population 60 and Older |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population | Veterans | Percent <br> Veteran | Population | Veterans | Percent <br> Veteran |
| Harris County | 2,892,026 | 187,982 | 6.5 | 492,563 | 91,124 | 18.5 |
| Harrison County | 48,110 | 5,148 | 10.7 | 12,280 | 2,972 | 24.2 |
| Hays County | 115,412 | 10,502 | 9.1 | 19,806 | 5,090 | 25.7 |
| Henderson County* | 60,354 | 8,027 | 13.3 | 20,418 | 5,268 | 25.8 |
| Hidalgo County | 493,894 | 23,707 | 4.8 | 98,355 | 13,376 | 13.6 |
| Hill County* | 26,453 | 3,280 | 12.4 | 8,418 | 2,071 | 24.6 |
| Hood County* | 39,708 | 5,996 | 15.1 | 14,337 | 3,871 | 27.0 |
| Hopkins County | 25,969 | 2,753 | 10.6 | 7,584 | 1,752 | 23.1 |
| Hunt County | 63,842 | 7,853 | 12.3 | 16,786 | 4,062 | 24.2 |
| Jasper County | 26,648 | 3,331 | 12.5 | 8,221 | 1,932 | 23.5 |
| Jefferson County | 190,096 | 17,869 | 9.4 | 44,218 | 9,861 | 22.3 |
| Jim Wells County | 28,833 | 2,220 | 7.7 | 7,171 | 1,226 | 17.1 |
| Johnson County | 108,667 | 10,758 | 9.9 | 24,058 | 5,654 | 23.5 |
| Kaufman County | 72,017 | 7,202 | 10.0 | 15,041 | 3,354 | 22.3 |
| Kendall County* | 24,749 | 3,737 | 15.1 | 7,820 | 2,088 | 26.7 |
| Kerr County* | 39,197 | 6,428 | 16.4 | 15,636 | 4,394 | 28.1 |
| Lamar County | 37,444 | 4,081 | 10.9 | 11,136 | 2,539 | 22.8 |
| Liberty County* | 55,791 | 5,970 | 10.7 | 12,160 | 3,320 | 27.3 |
| LLano County* | 16,125 | 2,870 | 17.8 | 7,929 | 2,204 | 27.8 |
| Lubbock County | 207,990 | 16,847 | 8.1 | 42,153 | 8,979 | 21.3 |
| Matagorda County | 26,933 | 3,043 | 11.3 | 7,381 | 2,067 | 28.0 |
| Maverick County | 35,302 | 1,518 | 4.3 | 7,793 | 530 | 6.8 |
| McLennan County | 173,411 | 17,515 | 10.1 | 39,391 | 9,572 | 24.3 |
| Medina County* | 33,644 | 4,306 | 12.8 | 8,231 | 2,074 | 25.2 |
| Midland County | 97,781 | 9,191 | 9.4 | 21,314 | 4,732 | 22.2 |
| Montgomery County* | 320,260 | 31,385 | 9.8 | 68,501 | 16,646 | 24.3 |
| Nacogdoches County | 48,925 | 3,816 | 7.8 | 10,414 | 2,281 | 21.9 |
| Navarro County | 34,634 | 3,602 | 10.4 | 9,326 | 2,294 | 24.6 |
| Nueces County | 246,848 | 28,634 | 11.6 | 58,242 | 13,570 | 23.3 |
| Orange County | 61,396 | 7,122 | 11.6 | 15,916 | 3,852 | 24.2 |
| Parker County* | 85,051 | 11,227 | 13.2 | 20,220 | 5,621 | 27.8 |
| Polk County* | 36,060 | 4,796 | 13.3 | 11,785 | 3,123 | 26.5 |
| Potter County | 87,063 | 7,400 | 8.5 | 18,867 | 3,924 | 20.8 |
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Table D.5: Veteran Status for the Total Population and the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population 18 and Older |  |  | Population 60 and Older |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population | Veterans | Percent <br> Veteran | Population | Veterans | Percent <br> Veteran |
| Randall County | 89,273 | 9,106 | 10.2 | 20,951 | 5,154 | 24.6 |
| Rockwall County* | 53,380 | 5,071 | 9.5 | 11,206 | 2,723 | 24.3 |
| Rusk County | 40,379 | 4,522 | 11.2 | 10,451 | 2,529 | 24.2 |
| San Patricio County | 46,435 | 5,758 | 12.4 | 11,864 | 2,669 | 22.5 |
| Smith County | 153,639 | 15,978 | 10.4 | 40,382 | 9,732 | 24.1 |
| Starr County | 39,825 | 1,115 | 2.8 | 8,544 | 624 | 7.3 |
| Tarrant County | 1,279,236 | 120,248 | 9.4 | 235,850 | 55,189 | 23.4 |
| Taylor County | 94,716 | 12,313 | 13.0 | 23,421 | 5,972 | 25.5 |
| Tom Green County | 79,395 | 9,289 | 11.7 | 20,399 | 4,753 | 23.3 |
| Travis County | 765,492 | 54,350 | 7.1 | 112,598 | 25,222 | 22.4 |
| Upshur County | 29,450 | 3,622 | 12.3 | 8,380 | 1,978 | 23.6 |
| Val Verde County | 32,720 | 2,912 | 8.9 | 8,349 | 1,361 | 16.3 |
| Van Zandt County* | 39,795 | 4,974 | 12.5 | 12,677 | 3,385 | 26.7 |
| Victoria County | 63,122 | 6,123 | 9.7 | 16,268 | 3,758 | 23.1 |
| Walker County | 55,833 | 4,857 | 8.7 | 9,685 | 2,383 | 24.6 |
| Washington County* | 25,799 | 2,528 | 9.8 | 8,177 | 1,799 | 22.0 |
| Webb County | 158,776 | 5,716 | 3.6 | 27,601 | 2,732 | 9.9 |
| Wharton County | 30,062 | 2,225 | 7.4 | 8,050 | 1,344 | 16.7 |
| Wichita County | 93,817 | 12,384 | 13.2 | 23,325 | 5,901 | 25.3 |
| Williamson County* | 290,827 | 33,736 | 11.6 | 53,668 | 14,329 | 26.7 |
| Wilson County* | 30,864 | 4,846 | 15.7 | 8,068 | 2,493 | 30.9 |
| Wise County* | 43,248 | 5,103 | 11.8 | 10,333 | 2,563 | 24.8 |
| Wood County* | 33,255 | 5,188 | 15.6 | 13,489 | 3,858 | 28.6 |
| Texas | 17,893,673 | 1,610,431 | 9.0 | 3,685,326 | 807,086 | 21.9 |
| United States | 231,421,987 | 22,216,511 | 9.6 | 55,900,422 | 12,465,794 | 22.3 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).
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Table D.6: Residence One Year Ago for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Population Age } \\ 60+ \end{gathered}$ | Same <br> House | Different House |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Same County | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Same } \\ & \text { State } \end{aligned}$ | Other <br> State | Abroad |
| Anderson County | 10,349 | 91.2 | 4.4 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 0.3 |
| Angelina County | 16,647 | 94.9 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| Aransas County* | 7,126 | 92.9 | 2.0 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Atascosa County* | 7,886 | 95.7 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bastrop County | 12,526 | 93.4 | 3.5 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| Bell County | 38,430 | 92.0 | 4.0 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 0.4 |
| Bexar County | 248,902 | 92.9 | 4.8 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.4 |
| Bowie County | 17,973 | 94.7 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
| Brazoria County | 43,356 | 92.5 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| Brazos County | 19,781 | 91.5 | 4.5 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| Brown County | 8,504 | 94.2 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Burnet County* | 10,643 | 94.7 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
| Cameron County | 61,135 | 93.4 | 3.5 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 0.7 |
| Cass County | 7,802 | 96.3 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Cherokee County | 10,651 | 93.1 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 0.1 |
| Collin County | 89,644 | 91.2 | 3.6 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 0.6 |
| Comal County* | 23,167 | 90.9 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 1.4 | 0.3 |
| Cooke County | 8,491 | 92.4 | 5.3 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| Coryell County | 8,096 | 92.8 | 3.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 0.6 |
| Dallas County | 301,669 | 93.3 | 4.2 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.4 |
| Denton County | 68,969 | 89.7 | 4.6 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 0.5 |
| Ector County | 19,293 | 95.7 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| El Paso County | 113,059 | 94.6 | 3.9 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Ellis County | 21,537 | 92.9 | 4.0 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Fannin County | 7,622 | 92.7 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| Fayette County* | 7,108 | 95.6 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 0.7 |
| Fort Bend County | 66,686 | 93.1 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Galveston County | 47,293 | 91.3 | 4.9 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| Gillespie County* | 8,273 | 94.7 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 0.1 |
| Grayson County | 25,207 | 92.9 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Gregg County | 22,555 | 91.9 | 4.3 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| Guadalupe County* | 21,281 | 92.6 | 3.5 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 0.1 |
| Hardin County | 10,341 | 92.3 | 4.3 | 3.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
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Table D.6: Residence One Year Ago for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Population Age } \\ 60+ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Same <br> House | Different House |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Same <br> County | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Same } \\ & \text { State } \end{aligned}$ | Other State | Abroad |
| Harris County | 492,563 | 92.2 | 5.3 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| Harrison County | 12,280 | 95.9 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
| Hays County | 19,806 | 89.5 | 5.2 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
| Henderson County* | 20,418 | 94.0 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 0.3 |
| Hidalgo County | 98,387 | 92.6 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
| Hill County* | 8,418 | 94.5 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Hood County* | 14,337 | 90.5 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 0.1 |
| Hopkins County | 7,584 | 91.3 | 4.1 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 0.1 |
| Hunt County | 16,786 | 90.3 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| Jasper County | 8,221 | 96.0 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Jefferson County | 44,218 | 92.3 | 5.2 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| Jim Wells County | 7,171 | 94.9 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Johnson County | 24,058 | 94.5 | 2.6 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| Kaufman County | 15,041 | 93.2 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 0.1 |
| Kendall County* | 7,820 | 91.8 | 2.8 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 0.1 |
| Kerr County* | 15,636 | 93.1 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Lamar County | 11,136 | 93.3 | 3.5 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| Liberty County* | 12,160 | 93.2 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 0.9 | 0.1 |
| LLano County* | 7,929 | 95.1 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Lubbock County | 42,153 | 92.6 | 5.0 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Matagorda County | 7,381 | 93.4 | 1.5 | 4.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Maverick County | 7,793 | 94.7 | 4.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| McLennan County | 39,391 | 92.6 | 5.1 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Medina County* | 8,231 | 96.3 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Midland County | 21,314 | 93.5 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| Montgomery County* | 68,501 | 91.0 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 0.4 |
| Nacogdoches County | 10,414 | 94.6 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| Navarro County | 9,326 | 94.5 | 3.1 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| Nueces County | 58,242 | 92.5 | 4.6 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 0.3 |
| Orange County | 15,916 | 93.7 | 4.3 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
| Parker County* | 20,220 | 94.5 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Polk County* | 11,785 | 94.5 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
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Table D.6: Residence One Year Ago for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Population Age } \\ 60+ \end{gathered}$ | Same <br> House | Different House |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Same <br> County | Same <br> State | Other <br> State | Abroad |
| Potter County | 18,867 | 90.5 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| Randall County | 20,951 | 92.6 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.3 |
| Rockwall County* | 11,206 | 91.4 | 1.7 | 4.5 | 1.7 | 0.7 |
| Rusk County | 10,451 | 94.4 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| San Patricio County | 11,864 | 91.5 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 1.7 | 0.1 |
| Smith County | 40,382 | 92.6 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 0.3 |
| Starr County | 8,544 | 97.4 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Tarrant County | 235,862 | 92.3 | 4.7 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 0.3 |
| Taylor County | 23,421 | 91.6 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
| Tom Green County | 20,399 | 92.9 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| Travis County | 112,598 | 91.0 | 5.2 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.4 |
| Upshur County | 8,380 | 95.1 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Val Verde County | 8,349 | 94.7 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Van Zandt County* | 12,677 | 93.9 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Victoria County | 16,268 | 91.8 | 5.2 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 0.1 |
| Walker County | 9,685 | 92.9 | 1.9 | 4.7 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| Washington County* | 8,177 | 93.1 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Webb County | 27,601 | 93.7 | 5.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Wharton County | 8,050 | 95.0 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Wichita County | 23,325 | 91.9 | 4.9 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 0.1 |
| Williamson County* | 53,668 | 88.8 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 2.3 | 0.6 |
| Wilson County* | 8,068 | 95.4 | 1.4 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| Wise County* | 10,333 | 94.6 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Wood County* | 13,489 | 93.2 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| Texas | 3,685,380 | 92.8 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.4 |
| United States | 55,901,267 | 93.8 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.3 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).
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Table D.7: Nativity and Citizenship Status for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Native Born |  |  | Foreign Born |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population Age 65+ | Native | Percent of Population | Foreign Born | Percent of Population | Percent Naturalized |
| Anderson County | 10,349 | 9,999 | 96.6 | 350 | 3.4 | 53.7 |
| Angelina County | 16,647 | 15,985 | 96.0 | 662 | 4.0 | 55.6 |
| Aransas County* | 7,126 | 6,631 | 93.1 | 495 | 6.9 | 36.8 |
| Atascosa County* | 7,886 | 7,191 | 91.2 | 695 | 8.8 | 43.9 |
| Bastrop County | 12,526 | 11,919 | 95.2 | 607 | 4.8 | 46.6 |
| Bell County | 38,430 | 34,627 | 90.1 | 3,803 | 9.9 | 67.4 |
| Bexar County | 248,902 | 210,074 | 84.4 | 38,828 | 15.6 | 63.0 |
| Bowie County | 17,973 | 17,703 | 98.5 | 270 | 1.5 | 71.1 |
| Brazoria County | 43,356 | 38,775 | 89.4 | 4,581 | 10.6 | 61.7 |
| Brazos County | 19,781 | 18,440 | 93.2 | 1,341 | 6.8 | 53.3 |
| Brown County | 8,504 | 8,279 | 97.4 | 225 | 2.6 | 72.9 |
| Burnet County* | 10,643 | 10,313 | 96.9 | 330 | 3.1 | 41.2 |
| Cameron County | 61,135 | 38,887 | 63.6 | 22,248 | 36.4 | 52.6 |
| Cass County | 7,802 | 7,754 | 99.4 | 48 | 0.6 | 95.8 |
| Cherokee County | 10,651 | 10,468 | 98.3 | 183 | 1.7 | 53.0 |
| Collin County | 89,644 | 76,098 | 84.9 | 13,546 | 15.1 | 69.7 |
| Comal County* | 23,167 | 22,061 | 95.2 | 1,106 | 4.8 | 71.7 |
| Cooke County | 8,491 | 8,268 | 97.4 | 223 | 2.6 | 45.3 |
| Coryell County | 8,096 | 7,170 | 88.6 | 926 | 11.4 | 70.8 |
| Dallas County | 301,669 | 255,458 | 84.7 | 46,211 | 15.3 | 55.4 |
| Denton County | 68,969 | 61,134 | 88.6 | 7,835 | 11.4 | 62.6 |
| Ector County | 19,293 | 16,456 | 85.3 | 2,837 | 14.7 | 43.7 |
| El Paso County | 113,059 | 59,502 | 52.6 | 53,557 | 47.4 | 60.6 |
| Ellis County | 21,537 | 20,317 | 94.3 | 1,220 | 5.7 | 54.3 |
| Fannin County | 7,622 | 7,486 | 98.2 | 136 | 1.8 | 69.1 |
| Fayette County* | 7,108 | 6,958 | 97.9 | 150 | 2.1 | 75.3 |
| Fort Bend County | 66,686 | 47,589 | 71.4 | 19,097 | 28.6 | 70.6 |
| Galveston County | 47,293 | 43,367 | 91.7 | 3,926 | 8.3 | 65.0 |
| Gillespie County* | 8,273 | 8,095 | 97.8 | 178 | 2.2 | 59.6 |
| Grayson County | 25,207 | 24,676 | 97.9 | 531 | 2.1 | 75.5 |
| Gregg County | 22,555 | 21,598 | 95.8 | 957 | 4.2 | 52.9 |
| Guadalupe County* | 21,281 | 19,602 | 92.1 | 1,679 | 7.9 | 64.1 |
| Hardin County | 10,341 | 10,204 | 98.7 | 137 | 1.3 | 56.2 |
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Table D.7: Nativity and Citizenship Status for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Native Born |  |  | Foreign Born |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population Age 65+ | Native | Percent of Population | Foreign Born | Percent of Population | Percent Naturalized |
| Harris County | 492,563 | 381,369 | 77.4 | 111,194 | 22.6 | 61.3 |
| Harrison County | 12,280 | 12,009 | 97.8 | 271 | 2.2 | 33.2 |
| Hays County | 19,806 | 18,612 | 94.0 | 1,194 | 6.0 | 69.4 |
| Henderson County* | 20,418 | 19,995 | 97.9 | 423 | 2.1 | 66.2 |
| Hidalgo County | 98,387 | 57,717 | 58.7 | 40,670 | 41.3 | 48.0 |
| Hill County* | 8,418 | 8,177 | 97.1 | 241 | 2.9 | 72.2 |
| Hood County* | 14,337 | 14,045 | 98.0 | 292 | 2.0 | 68.5 |
| Hopkins County | 7,584 | 7,333 | 96.7 | 251 | 3.3 | 63.3 |
| Hunt County | 16,786 | 16,177 | 96.4 | 609 | 3.6 | 42.7 |
| Jasper County | 8,221 | 8,091 | 98.4 | 130 | 1.6 | 41.5 |
| Jefferson County | 44,218 | 41,776 | 94.5 | 2,442 | 5.5 | 64.0 |
| Jim Wells County | 7,171 | 6,853 | 95.6 | 318 | 4.4 | 50.0 |
| Johnson County | 24,058 | 23,239 | 96.6 | 819 | 3.4 | 55.8 |
| Kaufman County | 15,041 | 14,576 | 96.9 | 465 | 3.1 | 48.8 |
| Kendall County* | 7,820 | 7,339 | 93.8 | 481 | 6.2 | 43.7 |
| Kerr County* | 15,636 | 14,955 | 95.6 | 681 | 4.4 | 68.1 |
| Lamar County | 11,136 | 10,908 | 98.0 | 228 | 2.0 | 57.0 |
| Liberty County* | 12,160 | 11,725 | 96.4 | 435 | 3.6 | 52.0 |
| LLano County* | 7,929 | 7,772 | 98.0 | 157 | 2.0 | 48.4 |
| Lubbock County | 42,153 | 40,192 | 95.3 | 1,961 | 4.7 | 54.5 |
| Matagorda County | 7,381 | 6,807 | 92.2 | 574 | 7.8 | 52.4 |
| Maverick County | 7,793 | 2,294 | 29.4 | 5,499 | 70.6 | 51.8 |
| McLennan County | 39,391 | 38,009 | 96.5 | 1,382 | 3.5 | 51.4 |
| Medina County* | 8,231 | 7,832 | 95.2 | 399 | 4.8 | 73.7 |
| Midland County | 21,314 | 19,321 | 90.6 | 1,993 | 9.4 | 50.6 |
| Montgomery County* | 68,501 | 63,012 | 92.0 | 5,489 | 8.0 | 62.8 |
| Nacogdoches County | 10,414 | 10,158 | 97.5 | 256 | 2.5 | 48.4 |
| Navarro County | 9,326 | 9,082 | 97.4 | 244 | 2.6 | 52.5 |
| Nueces County | 58,242 | 53,029 | 91.0 | 5,213 | 9.0 | 69.1 |
| Orange County | 15,916 | 15,520 | 97.5 | 396 | 2.5 | 69.2 |
| Parker County* | 20,220 | 19,597 | 96.9 | 623 | 3.1 | 53.0 |
| Polk County* | 11,785 | 11,429 | 97.0 | 356 | 3.0 | 56.2 |
| Potter County | 18,867 | 17,285 | 91.6 | 1,582 | 8.4 | 42.9 |
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Table D.7: Nativity and Citizenship Status for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Native Born |  |  | Foreign Born |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population Age 65+ | Native | Percent of Population | Foreign Born | Percent of Population | Percent Naturalized |
| Randall County | 20,951 | 20,270 | 96.7 | 681 | 3.3 | 62.0 |
| Rockwall County* | 11,206 | 10,405 | 92.9 | 801 | 7.1 | 65.9 |
| Rusk County | 10,451 | 10,162 | 97.2 | 289 | 2.8 | 45.0 |
| San Patricio County | 11,864 | 11,430 | 96.3 | 434 | 3.7 | 65.4 |
| Smith County | 40,382 | 38,465 | 95.3 | 1,917 | 4.7 | 61.3 |
| Starr County | 8,544 | 4,160 | 48.7 | 4,384 | 51.3 | 44.6 |
| Tarrant County | 235,862 | 209,350 | 88.8 | 26,512 | 11.2 | 59.1 |
| Taylor County | 23,421 | 22,190 | 94.7 | 1,231 | 5.3 | 64.7 |
| Tom Green County | 20,399 | 19,158 | 93.9 | 1,241 | 6.1 | 67.7 |
| Travis County | 112,598 | 97,264 | 86.4 | 15,334 | 13.6 | 57.7 |
| Upshur County | 8,380 | 8,312 | 99.2 | 68 | 0.8 | 73.5 |
| Val Verde County | 8,349 | 4,982 | 59.7 | 3,367 | 40.3 | 53.1 |
| Van Zandt County* | 12,677 | 12,418 | 98.0 | 259 | 2.0 | 62.5 |
| Victoria County | 16,268 | 15,696 | 96.5 | 572 | 3.5 | 67.3 |
| Walker County | 9,685 | 9,325 | 96.3 | 360 | 3.7 | 58.3 |
| Washington County* | 8,177 | 7,927 | 96.9 | 250 | 3.1 | 52.4 |
| Webb County | 27,601 | 13,091 | 47.4 | 14,510 | 52.6 | 51.8 |
| Wharton County | 8,050 | 7,738 | 96.1 | 312 | 3.9 | 17.0 |
| Wichita County | 23,325 | 22,145 | 94.9 | 1,180 | 5.1 | 78.9 |
| Williamson County* | 53,668 | 49,309 | 91.9 | 4,359 | 8.1 | 69.4 |
| Wilson County* | 8,068 | 7,686 | 95.3 | 382 | 4.7 | 73.8 |
| Wise County* | 10,333 | 10,026 | 97.0 | 307 | 3.0 | 66.1 |
| Wood County* | 13,489 | 13,149 | 97.5 | 340 | 2.5 | 62.4 |
| Texas | 3,685,380 | 3,168,090 | 86.0 | 517,290 | 14.0 | 58.8 |
| United States | 55,901,267 | 49,060,993 | 87.8 | 6,840,274 | 12.2 | 71.0 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).
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Table D.8: Language Spoken at Home for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population Age 60+ | English <br> Only | Other <br> Language | Speaks English Less <br> Than Very Well |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anderson County | 10,349 | 94.7 | 5.3 | 3.1 |
| Angelina County | 16,647 | 92.5 | 7.5 | 3.7 |
| Aransas County* | 7,126 | 87.6 | 12.4 | 3.9 |
| Atascosa County* | 7,886 | 57.0 | 43.0 | 21.7 |
| Bastrop County | 12,526 | 86.8 | 13.2 | 4.7 |
| Bell County | 38,430 | 84.8 | 15.2 | 8.1 |
| Bexar County | 248,902 | 53.2 | 46.8 | 19.0 |
| Bowie County | 17,973 | 97.6 | 2.4 | 1.0 |
| Brazoria County | 43,356 | 82.3 | 17.7 | 8.7 |
| Brazos County | 19,781 | 87.2 | 12.8 | 5.3 |
| Brown County | 8,504 | 94.1 | 5.9 | 3.0 |
| Burnet County* | 10,643 | 92.7 | 7.3 | 2.6 |
| Cameron County | 61,135 | 33.4 | 66.6 | 44.8 |
| Cass County | 7,802 | 97.0 | 3.0 | 0.9 |
| Cherokee County | 10,651 | 98.0 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| Collin County | 89,644 | 83.0 | 17.0 | 8.7 |
| Comal County* | 23,167 | 83.0 | 17.0 | 5.2 |
| Cooke County | 8,491 | 96.3 | 3.7 | 1.4 |
| Coryell County | 8,096 | 85.8 | 14.2 | 1.4 .5 |
| Dallas County | 301,669 | 80.0 | 20.0 | 7.3 |
| Denton County | 68,969 | 86.9 | 13.1 | 12.0 |
| Ector County | 19,293 | 69.4 | 30.6 | 7.2 |
| El Paso County | 113,059 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 18.9 |
| Ellis County | 21,537 | 88.3 | 11.7 | 48.7 |
| Fannin County | 7,622 | 96.2 | 3.8 | 4.9 |
| Fayette County* | 7,108 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 1.1 |
| Fort Bend County | 66,686 | 66.8 | 33.2 | 3.3 |
| Galveston County | 47,293 | 86.0 | 14.0 | 17.6 |
| Gillespie County* | 8,273 | 81.0 | 19.0 | 5.5 |
| Grayson County | 25,207 | 96.9 | 3.1 | 4.7 |
| Gregg County | 22,555 | 94.7 | 5.3 | 1.2 |
| Guadalupe County* | 21,281 | 75.1 | 24.9 | 2.4 |
| Hardin County | 96.6 | 3.4 | 1.9 | 28.1 |
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Table D.8: Language Spoken at Home for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population Age 60+ | English <br> Only | Other <br> Language | Speaks English Less <br> Than Very Well |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harrison County | 12,280 | 97.1 | 2.9 | 1.7 |
| Hays County | 19,806 | 77.8 | 22.2 | 8.7 |
| Henderson County* | 20,418 | 96.7 | 3.3 | 0.7 |
| Hidalgo County | 98,387 | 28.3 | 71.7 | 49.3 |
| Hill County* | 8,418 | 93.6 | 6.4 | 3.0 |
| Hood County* | 14,337 | 96.7 | 3.3 | 0.9 |
| Hopkins County | 7,584 | 96.4 | 3.6 | 2.3 |
| Hunt County | 16,786 | 94.7 | 5.3 | 2.9 |
| Jasper County | 8,221 | 98.1 | 1.9 | 1.0 |
| Jefferson County | 44,218 | 90.0 | 10.0 | 4.3 |
| Jim Wells County | 7,171 | 32.1 | 67.9 | 28.3 |
| Johnson County | 24,058 | 93.6 | 6.4 | 3.4 |
| Kaufman County | 15,041 | 93.3 | 6.7 | 2.6 |
| Kendall County* | 7,820 | 87.6 | 12.4 | 5.0 |
| Kerr County* | 15,636 | 89.6 | 10.4 | 4.5 |
| Lamar County | 11,136 | 97.7 | 2.3 | 1.0 |
| Liberty County* | 12,160 | 92.0 | 8.0 | 2.7 |
| LLano County* | 7,929 | 96.5 | 3.5 | 1.5 |
| Lubbock County | 42,153 | 81.7 | 18.3 | 1.5 |
| Matagorda County | 7,381 | 81.3 | 18.7 | 9.3 |
| Maverick County | 7,793 | 5.4 | 94.6 | 9.5 |
| McLennan County | 39,391 | 89.5 | 10.5 | 79.4 |
| Medina County* | 8,231 | 65.4 | 34.6 | 4.0 |
| Midland County | 21,314 | 82.0 | 18.0 | 14.4 |
| Montgomery County* | 68,501 | 90.9 | 9.1 | 11.6 |
| Nacogdoches County | 10,414 | 95.5 | 4.5 | 4.0 |
| Navarro County | 9,326 | 94.5 | 5.5 | 2.0 |
| Nueces County | 58,242 | 52.2 | 47.8 | 3.3 |
| Orange County | 15,916 | 93.6 | 6.4 | 21.6 |
| Parker County* | 20,220 | 95.5 | 4.5 | 1.3 |
| Polk County* | 11,785 | 92.0 | 8.0 | 2.0 |
| Potter County | 18,867 | 83.6 | 16.4 | 2.2 |
| Rockwall County County* | 94.3 | 5.7 | 7.5 | 2.5 |

REAL ESTATE CENTER
TEXAS A\&M UNIVERSITY

Table D.8: Language Spoken at Home for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population Age 60+ | English Only | Other <br> Language | Speaks English Less Than Very Well |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rusk County | 10,451 | 96.0 | 4.0 | 2.2 |
| San Patricio County | 11,864 | 59.0 | 41.0 | 22.9 |
| Smith County | 40,382 | 94.4 | 5.6 | 3.3 |
| Starr County | 8,544 | 4.4 | 95.6 | 75.2 |
| Tarrant County | 235,862 | 85.1 | 14.9 | 8.5 |
| Taylor County | 23,421 | 88.5 | 11.5 | 5.2 |
| Tom Green County | 20,399 | 79.5 | 20.5 | 10.2 |
| Travis County | 112,598 | 78.1 | 21.9 | 10.5 |
| Upshur County | 8,380 | 98.4 | 1.6 | 1.1 |
| Val Verde County | 8,349 | 28.9 | 71.1 | 49.3 |
| Van Zandt County* | 12,677 | 96.9 | 3.1 | 1.3 |
| Victoria County | 16,268 | 72.9 | 27.1 | 9.7 |
| Walker County | 9,685 | 93.8 | 6.2 | 1.8 |
| Washington County* | 8,177 | 93.3 | 6.7 | 2.1 |
| Webb County | 27,601 | 6.7 | 93.3 | 70.3 |
| Wharton County | 8,050 | 76.1 | 23.9 | 7.9 |
| Wichita County | 23,325 | 91.1 | 8.9 | 3.8 |
| Williamson County* | 53,668 | 87.3 | 12.7 | 5.0 |
| Wilson County* | 8,068 | 71.0 | 29.0 | 10.3 |
| Wise County* | 10,333 | 94.7 | 5.3 | 3.2 |
| Wood County* | 13,489 | 97.6 | 2.4 | 1.3 |
| Texas | 3,685,380 | 75.2 | 24.8 | 13.9 |
| United States | 55,901,267 | 85.8 | 14.2 | 8.1 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

REAL ESTATE CENTER
TEXASA\&M UNIVERSITY

Table D.9: Employment Status for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population | In Labor Force |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent |
| Anderson County | 10,349 | 2,132 | 20.6 |
| Angelina County | 16,647 | 4,095 | 24.6 |
| Aransas County* | 7,126 | 1,425 | 20.0 |
| Atascosa County* | 7,886 | 1,861 | 23.6 |
| Bastrop County | 12,526 | 3,720 | 29.7 |
| Bell County | 38,430 | 10,222 | 26.6 |
| Bexar County | 248,902 | 64,715 | 26.0 |
| Bowie County | 17,973 | 4,565 | 25.4 |
| Brazoria County | 43,356 | 12,140 | 28.0 |
| Brazos County | 19,781 | 6,726 | 34.0 |
| Brown County | 8,504 | 1,820 | 21.4 |
| Burnet County* | 10,643 | 2,363 | 22.2 |
| Cameron County | 61,135 | 11,921 | 19.5 |
| Cass County | 7,802 | 1,685 | 21.6 |
| Cherokee County | 10,651 | 2,386 | 22.4 |
| Collin County | 89,644 | 34,334 | 38.3 |
| Comal County* | 23,167 | 6,139 | 26.5 |
| Cooke County | 8,491 | 2,734 | 32.2 |
| Coryell County | 8,096 | 1,975 | 24.4 |
| Dallas County | 301,669 | 98,042 | 32.5 |
| Denton County | 68,969 | 25,863 | 37.5 |
| Ector County | 19,293 | 5,634 | 29.2 |
| El Paso County | 113,059 | 25,891 | 22.9 |
| Ellis County | 21,537 | 7,000 | 32.5 |
| Fannin County | 7,622 | 1,753 | 23.0 |
| Fayette County* | 7,108 | 2,004 | 28.2 |
| Fort Bend County | 66,686 | 24,074 | 36.1 |
| Galveston County | 47,293 | 14,803 | 31.3 |
| Gillespie County* | 8,273 | 2,250 | 27.2 |
| Grayson County | 25,207 | 6,075 | 24.1 |
| Gregg County | 22,555 | 6,361 | 28.2 |
| Guadalupe County* | 21,281 | 6,044 | 28.4 |
| Hardin County | 10,341 | 2,151 | 20.8 |
| Harris County | 492,563 | 165,501 | 33.6 |

REAL ESTATE CENTER
TEXASA\&M UNIVERSITY

Table D.9: Employment Status for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population | In Labor Force |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent |
| Harrison County | 12,280 | 3,303 | 26.9 |
| Hays County | 19,806 | 6,001 | 30.3 |
| Henderson County* | 20,418 | 4,635 | 22.7 |
| Hidalgo County | 98,387 | 18,694 | 19.0 |
| Hill County* | 8,418 | 2,180 | 25.9 |
| Hood County* | 14,337 | 3,484 | 24.3 |
| Hopkins County | 7,584 | 2,040 | 26.9 |
| Hunt County | 16,786 | 4,180 | 24.9 |
| Jasper County | 8,221 | 1,570 | 19.1 |
| Jefferson County | 44,218 | 10,037 | 22.7 |
| Jim Wells County | 7,171 | 1,850 | 25.8 |
| Johnson County | 24,058 | 6,905 | 28.7 |
| Kaufman County | 15,041 | 4,227 | 28.1 |
| Kendall County* | 7,820 | 2,424 | 31.0 |
| Kerr County* | 15,636 | 3,409 | 21.8 |
| Lamar County | 11,136 | 2,728 | 24.5 |
| Liberty County* | 12,160 | 3,344 | 27.5 |
| LLano County* | 7,929 | 1,895 | 23.9 |
| Lubbock County | 42,153 | 12,477 | 29.6 |
| Matagorda County | 7,381 | 2,310 | 31.3 |
| Maverick County | 7,793 | 1,683 | 21.6 |
| McLennan County | 39,391 | 10,360 | 26.3 |
| Medina County* | 8,231 | 1,943 | 23.6 |
| Midland County | 21,314 | 6,650 | 31.2 |
| Montgomery County* | 68,501 | 20,550 | 30.0 |
| Nacogdoches County | 10,414 | 2,177 | 20.9 |
| Navarro County | 9,326 | 2,760 | 29.6 |
| Nueces County | 58,242 | 15,900 | 27.3 |
| Orange County | 15,916 | 2,976 | 18.7 |
| Parker County* | 20,220 | 6,066 | 30.0 |
| Polk County* | 11,785 | 2,381 | 20.2 |
| Potter County | 18,867 | 5,188 | 27.5 |
| Randall County | 20,951 | 6,348 | 30.3 |
| Rockwall County* | 11,206 | 3,720 | 33.2 |

REAL ESTATE CENTER
TEXAS A \& M UNIVERSITY

Table D.9: Employment Status for the Population Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population | In Labor Force |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent |
| Rusk County | 10,451 | 2,550 | 24.4 |
| San Patricio County | 11,864 | 3,251 | 27.4 |
| Smith County | 40,382 | 11,186 | 27.7 |
| Starr County | 8,544 | 1,401 | 16.4 |
| Tarrant County | 235,862 | 76,891 | 32.6 |
| Taylor County | 23,421 | 6,534 | 27.9 |
| Tom Green County | 20,399 | 5,263 | 25.8 |
| Travis County | 112,598 | 39,184 | 34.8 |
| Upshur County | 8,380 | 2,129 | 25.4 |
| Val Verde County | 8,349 | 1,879 | 22.5 |
| Van Zandt County* | 12,677 | 2,675 | 21.1 |
| Victoria County | 16,268 | 4,588 | 28.2 |
| Walker County | 9,685 | 2,082 | 21.5 |
| Washington County* | 8,177 | 2,069 | 25.3 |
| Webb County | 27,601 | 7,425 | 26.9 |
| Wharton County | 8,050 | 2,536 | 31.5 |
| Wichita County | 23,325 | 6,321 | 27.1 |
| Williamson County* | 53,668 | 15,671 | 29.2 |
| Wilson County* | 8,068 | 2,307 | 28.6 |
| Wise County* | 10,333 | 2,873 | 27.8 |
| Wood County* | 13,489 | 2,495 | 18.5 |
| Texas | 3,685,380 | 1,061,389 | 28.8 |
| United States | 55,901,267 | 15,149,243 | 27.1 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

REAL ESTATE CENTER
TEXASA\&M UNIVERSITY

Table D.10: Percent of Households by Source of Income in the Past 12 Months for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | With Earnings | With Social Security Income | With Supplemental Security Income | With Cash Public Assistance | With Retirement Income | With Food Stamps SNAP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anderson County | 5,614 | 41.9 | 79.6 | 5.4 | 2.2 | 42.6 | 9.3 |
| Angelina County | 10,099 | 46.2 | 79.9 | 7.5 | 1.3 | 44.0 | 11.3 |
| Aransas County* | 4,308 | 36.0 | 84.3 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 42.1 | 5.7 |
| Atascosa County* | 4,658 | 50.0 | 84.2 | 8.1 | 1.4 | 36.7 | 14.0 |
| Bastrop County | 7,301 | 47.8 | 79.1 | 4.4 | 0.2 | 48.3 | 8.5 |
| Bell County | 22,278 | 48.0 | 75.7 | 6.1 | 1.3 | 49.5 | 6.9 |
| Bexar County | 150,046 | 49.7 | 74.7 | 7.5 | 1.5 | 46.7 | 9.5 |
| Bowie County | 11,210 | 45.4 | 75.8 | 5.3 | 0.8 | 47.2 | 9.1 |
| Brazoria County | 24,824 | 51.7 | 73.0 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 40.6 | 5.0 |
| Brazos County | 12,149 | 52.1 | 70.5 | 5.0 | 1.4 | 41.7 | 4.5 |
| Brown County | 4,793 | 38.7 | 85.5 | 5.8 | 0.9 | 42.2 | 8.1 |
| Burnet County* | 6,326 | 39.7 | 82.0 | 6.4 | 1.0 | 44.1 | 7.3 |
| Cameron County | 33,905 | 42.3 | 77.6 | 14.5 | 1.8 | 29.2 | 21.1 |
| Cass County | 4,828 | 39.8 | 82.9 | 8.1 | 0.8 | 44.1 | 8.8 |
| Cherokee County | 6,173 | 40.8 | 81.7 | 6.7 | 0.3 | 35.8 | 10.5 |
| Collin County | 50,979 | 61.4 | 66.5 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 40.4 | 2.9 |
| Comal County* | 13,439 | 48.1 | 76.3 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 48.0 | 3.7 |
| Cooke County | 5,177 | 50.4 | 76.6 | 4.6 | 0.8 | 42.4 | 5.7 |
| Coryell County | 4,401 | 43.6 | 82.3 | 3.9 | 0.6 | 57.2 | 4.7 |
| Dallas County | 182,018 | 53.1 | 71.0 | 6.2 | 1.5 | 35.8 | 8.0 |
| Denton County | 38,866 | 59.1 | 69.8 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 43.5 | 2.9 |
| Ector County | 12,335 | 48.3 | 77.6 | 8.4 | 1.9 | 30.5 | 9.9 |
| El Paso County | 64,748 | 47.0 | 76.5 | 10.6 | 4.5 | 35.2 | 19.6 |
| Ellis County | 12,496 | 55.9 | 73.9 | 5.6 | 1.5 | 40.1 | 6.5 |
| $\underset{A}{\mathbb{M}}{\underset{\mathrm{~T}}{\mathrm{EX}}}_{\mathrm{RE}}$ | REAL ESTATE CENTER <br> TEXASAA\&M UNIVARSITY |  |  |  |  |  | 171 |

Table D.10: Percent of Households by Source of Income in the Past $\mathbf{1 2}$ Months for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | With <br> Earnings | With Social Security Income | With Supplemental Security Income | With Cash Public Assistance | With Retirement Income | With Food Stamps SNAP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fannin County | 4,505 | 46.2 | 81.3 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 39.0 | 8.5 |
| Fayette County* | 4,411 | 45.9 | 77.5 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 35.5 | 2.8 |
| Fort Bend County | 34,848 | 64.5 | 64.2 | 4.4 | 1.2 | 37.0 | 4.5 |
| Galveston County | 28,555 | 52.9 | 74.8 | 4.6 | 1.0 | 44.8 | 6.8 |
| Gillespie County* | 5,047 | 43.6 | 84.6 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 45.7 | 2.3 |
| Grayson County | 15,132 | 43.5 | 81.6 | 5.5 | 1.0 | 42.6 | 6.9 |
| Gregg County | 14,299 | 44.2 | 76.9 | 7.0 | 0.7 | 38.4 | 6.5 |
| Guadalupe County* | 12,607 | 50.8 | 76.8 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 49.7 | 7.2 |
| Hardin County | 6,530 | 41.4 | 83.3 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 43.4 | 6.4 |
| Harris County | 290,080 | 56.8 | 68.7 | 6.2 | 1.6 | 34.4 | 8.1 |
| Harrison County | 8,054 | 46.8 | 79.4 | 5.6 | 1.3 | 38.6 | 9.2 |
| Hays County | 11,283 | 52.8 | 72.4 | 4.4 | 1.4 | 46.2 | 4.7 |
| Henderson County* | 12,397 | 42.1 | 78.9 | 6.7 | 1.1 | 45.5 | 6.4 |
| Hidalgo County | 54,307 | 43.9 | 77.5 | 17.8 | 1.8 | 29.8 | 26.5 |
| Hill County* | 5,229 | 44.0 | 80.1 | 7.3 | 3.2 | 35.8 | 8.0 |
| Hood County* | 8,648 | 43.8 | 80.7 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 45.8 | 3.5 |
| Hopkins County | 4,532 | 45.6 | 80.2 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 43.4 | 6.0 |
| Hunt County | 10,082 | 44.7 | 79.9 | 4.1 | 1.6 | 39.4 | 6.6 |
| Jasper County | 5,102 | 36.2 | 86.1 | 8.2 | 1.8 | 40.5 | 12.1 |
| Jefferson County | 28,649 | 42.5 | 81.4 | 6.8 | 1.5 | 43.2 | 10.3 |
| Jim Wells County | 4,346 | 48.3 | 81.4 | 13.9 | 0.6 | 28.5 | 20.1 |
| Johnson County | 14,162 | 55.4 | 78.6 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 42.9 | 5.1 |
| Kaufman County | 8,886 | 54.6 | 78.1 | 5.4 | 1.1 | 43.9 | 6.5 |
| Kendall County* | 4,534 | 54.4 | 73.6 | 2.5 | 1.4 | 41.9 | 3.5 |
| Kerr County* | 9,689 | 36.9 | 84.4 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 46.3 | 4.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 172 |

Table D.10: Percent of Households by Source of Income in the Past $\mathbf{1 2}$ Months for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | With Earnings | With Social Security Income | With Supplemental Security Income | With Cash Public Assistance | With Retirement Income | With Food Stamps SNAP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lamar County | 6,860 | 40.4 | 83.0 | 6.1 | 1.6 | 44.9 | 10.7 |
| Liberty County* | 7,542 | 46.0 | 78.8 | 7.3 | 1.4 | 32.0 | 11.1 |
| LLano County* | 4,741 | 38.1 | 82.1 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 45.6 | 2.5 |
| Lubbock County | 26,302 | 50.5 | 76.7 | 6.4 | 1.3 | 37.0 | 8.3 |
| Matagorda County | 4,469 | 49.0 | 77.0 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 41.2 | 9.0 |
| Maverick County | 4,299 | 47.1 | 73.1 | 27.8 | 2.1 | 20.1 | 39.0 |
| McLennan County | 23,774 | 46.4 | 80.7 | 5.5 | 1.1 | 42.1 | 7.8 |
| Medina County* | 4,806 | 43.7 | 79.1 | 7.7 | 0.6 | 48.0 | 8.8 |
| Midland County | 12,814 | 50.9 | 75.1 | 5.3 | 0.4 | 32.5 | 4.4 |
| Montgomery County* | 40,350 | 52.4 | 75.0 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 39.6 | 4.8 |
| Nacogdoches County | 6,423 | 40.0 | 80.3 | 7.2 | 1.8 | 39.9 | 8.5 |
| Navarro County | 5,780 | 48.0 | 81.6 | 6.0 | 0.9 | 38.8 | 7.5 |
| Nueces County | 35,971 | 50.5 | 74.4 | 8.4 | 1.5 | 40.2 | 11.4 |
| Orange County | 9,657 | 41.4 | 80.9 | 7.7 | 1.0 | 49.2 | 7.4 |
| Parker County* | 12,262 | 50.3 | 75.7 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 41.0 | 5.0 |
| Polk County* | 6,953 | 34.8 | 85.6 | 6.4 | 2.0 | 41.0 | 8.8 |
| Potter County | 11,104 | 48.0 | 76.8 | 6.2 | 1.4 | 35.1 | 9.7 |
| Randall County | 13,099 | 47.6 | 78.4 | 3.3 | 0.9 | 44.2 | 3.1 |
| Rockwall County* | 6,049 | 52.3 | 72.6 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 46.8 | 3.0 |
| Rusk County | 6,216 | 43.1 | 80.0 | 4.1 | 1.4 | 37.1 | 6.5 |
| San Patricio County | 7,032 | 49.7 | 80.2 | 10.9 | 1.8 | 34.3 | 14.4 |
| Smith County | 24,612 | 46.2 | 77.7 | 5.1 | 0.6 | 45.4 | 5.6 |
| Starr County | 4,713 | 40.3 | 79.7 | 32.4 | 1.0 | 24.3 | 39.7 |
| Tarrant County | 141,699 | 53.5 | 71.3 | 4.4 | 1.2 | 43.3 | 5.5 |
| Taylor County | 14,775 | 48.2 | 79.5 | 5.6 | 1.1 | 43.6 | 6.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 173 |

Table D.10: Percent of Households by Source of Income in the Past $\mathbf{1 2}$ Months for Households Headed by Persons Age $\mathbf{6 0}$ and Older

| Area | Households | With Earnings | With Social Security Income | With Supplemental Security Income | With Cash Public Assistance | With Retirement Income | With Food Stamps SNAP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tom Green County | 13,090 | 44.9 | 83.5 | 5.4 | 1.1 | 44.8 | 7.4 |
| Travis County | 68,665 | 55.7 | 68.5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 45.7 | 5.1 |
| Upshur County | 5,071 | 46.5 | 80.1 | 6.9 | 1.1 | 35.6 | 6.2 |
| Val Verde County | 4,944 | 40.9 | 76.4 | 13.4 | 0.9 | 34.9 | 20.3 |
| Van Zandt County* | 7,773 | 39.9 | 80.1 | 6.5 | 1.2 | 40.4 | 6.6 |
| Victoria County | 10,134 | 50.0 | 78.6 | 4.3 | 0.3 | 43.6 | 7.0 |
| Walker County | 5,336 | 41.5 | 80.2 | 4.5 | 0.2 | 52.6 | 5.8 |
| Washington County* | 5,118 | 41.2 | 77.7 | 6.8 | 1.6 | 37.4 | 5.4 |
| Webb County | 15,008 | 57.6 | 73.3 | 15.6 | 2.9 | 27.4 | 29.4 |
| Wharton County | 5,107 | 45.9 | 79.3 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 29.4 | 8.4 |
| Wichita County | 14,782 | 46.7 | 79.9 | 6.3 | 1.6 | 46.6 | 7.5 |
| Williamson County* | 31,557 | 49.3 | 74.8 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 52.6 | 3.3 |
| Wilson County* | 4,588 | 49.6 | 78.3 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 50.0 | 6.4 |
| Wise County* | 6,090 | 48.9 | 79.8 | 6.2 | 0.6 | 40.1 | 6.9 |
| Wood County* | 7,882 | 36.9 | 86.9 | 5.2 | 1.1 | 43.4 | 5.4 |
| Texas | 2,193,657 | 50.2 | 74.9 | 6.5 | 1.4 | 39.6 | 8.7 |
| United States | 34,062,044 | 45.8 | 77.3 | 5.8 | 1.7 | 44.9 | 7.1 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

Table D.11: Mean Income by Source in the Past 12 Months for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older


Table D.11: Mean Income by Source in the Past 12 Months for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | With <br> Earnings | With Social Security Income | With Supplemental Security Income | With Cash Public Assistance | With Retirement Income |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fayette County* | 4,411 | 56,712 | 17,030 | 10,285 | 393 | 24,650 |
| Fort Bend County | 34,848 | 84,703 | 18,038 | 10,143 | 3,125 | 25,101 |
| Galveston County | 28,555 | 64,054 | 17,523 | 8,903 | 4,398 | 22,235 |
| Gillespie County* | 5,047 | 50,773 | 17,032 | 8,657 | 5,198 | 27,338 |
| Grayson County | 15,132 | 47,838 | 17,244 | 8,368 | 3,106 | 20,470 |
| Gregg County | 14,299 | 49,212 | 16,234 | 8,334 | 2,077 | 18,442 |
| Guadalupe County* | 12,607 | 48,586 | 16,144 | 7,228 | 3,167 | 25,427 |
| Hardin County | 6,530 | 46,065 | 16,653 | 7,386 | 3,130 | 18,036 |
| Harris County | 290,080 | 71,462 | 16,772 | 7,726 | 3,663 | 24,004 |
| Harrison County | 8,054 | 44,339 | 15,195 | 5,815 | 3,287 | 18,393 |
| Hays County | 11,283 | 60,897 | 17,709 | 9,038 | 4,118 | 26,345 |
| Henderson County* | 12,397 | 44,449 | 17,240 | 6,927 | 2,804 | 20,116 |
| Hidalgo County | 54,307 | 39,222 | 13,494 | 6,309 | 3,121 | 20,004 |
| Hill County* | 5,229 | 39,044 | 16,005 | 7,050 | 1,357 | 20,645 |
| Hood County* | 8,648 | 56,378 | 18,335 | 9,019 | 241 | 26,252 |
| Hopkins County | 4,532 | 49,260 | 16,435 | 7,669 | 9,773 | 20,093 |
| Hunt County | 10,082 | 52,394 | 16,901 | 8,785 | 1,955 | 21,086 |
| Jasper County | 5,102 | 45,045 | 16,157 | 7,552 | 2,994 | 17,882 |
| Jefferson County | 28,649 | 52,257 | 16,165 | 7,782 | 5,720 | 19,123 |
| Jim Wells County | 4,346 | 45,317 | 14,713 | 6,450 | . | 15,012 |
| Johnson County | 14,162 | 54,650 | 18,374 | 9,773 | 2,671 | 20,631 |
| Kaufman County | 8,886 | 53,255 | 17,160 | 8,413 | 2,504 | 18,771 |
| Kendall County* | 4,534 | 61,969 | 18,543 | 6,965 | 3,924 | 35,105 |
| Kerr County* | 9,689 | 46,085 | 17,295 | 9,136 | 1,021 | 26,954 |
| Lamar County | 6,860 | 38,181 | 15,631 | 7,696 | 1,664 | 17,470 |
| REAL ESTATE CENTER <br> $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}T & E & A & S & A & \text { M } & \text { U N I V E R S I T }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 176 |

Table D.11: Mean Income by Source in the Past 12 Months for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | With <br> Earnings | With Social Security Income | With Supplemental Security Income | With Cash Public Assistance | With Retirement Income |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liberty County* | 7,542 | 51,022 | 16,042 | 8,145 | 3,044 | 14,812 |
| LLano County* | 4,741 | 62,871 | 18,453 | 8,396 | 7,092 | 24,970 |
| Lubbock County | 26,302 | 53,543 | 16,843 | 7,708 | 4,615 | 22,810 |
| Matagorda County | 4,469 | 43,401 | 16,282 | 8,489 | 1,208 | 18,908 |
| Maverick County | 4,299 | 40,375 | 10,491 | 5,928 | 936 | 17,993 |
| McLennan County | 23,774 | 47,462 | 16,092 | 7,600 | 2,040 | 21,110 |
| Medina County* | 4,806 | 43,995 | 15,066 | 6,771 | 6,726 | 27,099 |
| Midland County | 12,814 | 77,477 | 17,549 | 9,540 | 3,032 | 22,020 |
| Montgomery County* | 40,350 | 70,178 | 18,474 | 8,939 | 2,240 | 26,219 |
| Nacogdoches County | 6,423 | 43,514 | 15,481 | 8,662 | 2,247 | 20,343 |
| Navarro County | 5,780 | 42,426 | 16,802 | 8,561 | 1,820 | 18,732 |
| Nueces County | 35,971 | 55,728 | 14,867 | 7,334 | 3,512 | 22,459 |
| Orange County | 9,657 | 42,862 | 17,689 | 7,980 | 2,339 | 18,107 |
| Parker County* | 12,262 | 62,986 | 17,975 | 9,595 | 3,663 | 21,455 |
| Polk County* | 6,953 | 35,173 | 17,574 | 7,367 | 2,297 | 19,120 |
| Potter County | 11,104 | 50,568 | 15,874 | 6,958 | 2,397 | 20,598 |
| Randall County | 13,099 | 56,399 | 17,964 | 9,337 | 4,123 | 23,639 |
| Rockwall County* | 6,049 | 79,538 | 19,593 | 9,885 | 1,263 | 27,965 |
| Rusk County | 6,216 | 45,613 | 16,129 | 6,554 | 2,450 | 19,342 |
| San Patricio County | 7,032 | 47,667 | 16,220 | 6,758 | 3,082 | 20,680 |
| Smith County | 24,612 | 54,803 | 17,423 | 8,057 | 2,417 | 22,779 |
| Starr County | 4,713 | 37,801 | 10,074 | 5,891 | 1,278 | 14,315 |
| Tarrant County | 141,699 | 64,311 | 17,589 | 8,423 | 3,893 | 23,877 |
| Taylor County | 14,775 | 45,413 | 15,951 | 8,319 | 1,829 | 21,105 |

Table D.11: Mean Income by Source in the Past 12 Months for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Households | With Earnings | With Social Security Income | With Supplemental Security Income | With Cash Public Assistance | With Retirement Income |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tom Green County | 13,090 | 42,745 | 15,557 | 7,895 | 9,141 | 22,075 |
| Travis County | 68,665 | 71,073 | 17,160 | 8,815 | 5,250 | 30,200 |
| Upshur County | 5,071 | 40,051 | 17,293 | 7,557 | 3,891 | 18,573 |
| Val Verde County | 4,944 | 33,229 | 12,455 | 5,564 | 4,242 | 21,184 |
| Van Zandt County* | 7,773 | 44,288 | 16,286 | 7,280 | 2,859 | 19,665 |
| Victoria County | 10,134 | 54,200 | 16,425 | 8,036 | 1,051 | 19,515 |
| Walker County | 5,336 | 48,855 | 17,005 | 9,949 |  | 23,510 |
| Washington County* | 5,118 | 45,979 | 16,203 | 7,585 | 4,668 | 21,726 |
| Webb County | 15,008 | 38,104 | 12,747 | 5,916 | 3,256 | 19,851 |
| Wharton County | 5,107 | 38,987 | 15,219 | 6,246 | 1,097 | 19,670 |
| Wichita County | 14,782 | 48,586 | 16,162 | 6,955 | 2,831 | 22,613 |
| Williamson County* | 31,557 | 60,983 | 18,208 | 9,949 | 7,307 | 28,822 |
| Wilson County* | 4,588 | 51,152 | 15,450 | 9,109 | 7,243 | 25,448 |
| Wise County* | 6,090 | 51,253 | 17,300 | 7,903 | 9,847 | 17,347 |
| Wood County* | 7,882 | 45,240 | 18,405 | 8,157 | 6,051 | 24,411 |
| Texas | 2,193,657 | 59,040 | 16,403 | 7,579 | 3,508 | 23,499 |
| United States | 34,062,044 | 58,191 | 17,099 | 8,470 | 3,785 | 23,110 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

REAL ESTATE CENTER

Table D.12: Population in Poverty for Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population for Whom Poverty Determined | Below 100\% of Poverty |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent |
| Anderson County | 9,594 | 1,669 | 17.4 |
| Angelina County | 15,969 | 1,501 | 9.4 |
| Aransas County* | 6,956 | 584 | 8.4 |
| Atascosa County* | 7,698 | 1,363 | 17.7 |
| Bastrop County | 12,144 | 887 | 7.3 |
| Bell County | 37,192 | 3,013 | 8.1 |
| Bexar County | 243,941 | 29,273 | 12.0 |
| Bowie County | 17,191 | 2,097 | 12.2 |
| Brazoria County | 41,822 | 3,931 | 9.4 |
| Brazos County | 19,294 | 1,563 | 8.1 |
| Brown County | 8,055 | 846 | 10.5 |
| Burnet County* | 10,511 | 799 | 7.6 |
| Cameron County | 59,875 | 15,089 | 25.2 |
| Cass County | 7,444 | 931 | 12.5 |
| Cherokee County | 10,101 | 1,333 | 13.2 |
| Collin County | 88,547 | 5,224 | 5.9 |
| Comal County* | 22,656 | 1,201 | 5.3 |
| Cooke County | 8,190 | 598 | 7.3 |
| Coryell County | 7,816 | 555 | 7.1 |
| Dallas County | 295,015 | 31,862 | 10.8 |
| Denton County | 68,038 | 3,538 | 5.2 |
| Ector County | 18,963 | 2,522 | 13.3 |
| El Paso County | 111,815 | 22,810 | 20.4 |
| Ellis County | 21,091 | 1,476 | 7.0 |
| Fannin County | 7,171 | 825 | 11.5 |
| Fayette County* | 6,685 | 562 | 8.4 |
| Fort Bend County | 65,809 | 4,936 | 7.5 |
| Galveston County | 46,298 | 4,352 | 9.4 |
| Gillespie County* | 7,851 | 495 | 6.3 |
| Grayson County | 24,139 | 2,197 | 9.1 |
| Gregg County | 21,553 | 2,242 | 10.4 |
| Guadalupe County* | 20,828 | 1,562 | 7.5 |
| Hardin County | 10,039 | 813 | 8.1 |

REAL ESTATE CENTER

Table D.12: Population in Poverty for Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population for Whom Poverty Determined | Below 100\% of Poverty |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent |
| Harris County | 484,451 | 55,712 | 11.5 |
| Harrison County | 12,043 | 1,132 | 9.4 |
| Hays County | 19,363 | 1,181 | 6.1 |
| Henderson County* | 19,829 | 1,685 | 8.5 |
| Hidalgo County | 96,923 | 24,231 | 25.0 |
| Hill County* | 8,031 | 972 | 12.1 |
| Hood County* | 14,154 | 948 | 6.7 |
| Hopkins County | 7,255 | 813 | 11.2 |
| Hunt County | 16,325 | 1,698 | 10.4 |
| Jasper County | 7,971 | 869 | 10.9 |
| Jefferson County | 42,859 | 5,143 | 12.0 |
| Jim Wells County | 6,900 | 1,125 | 16.3 |
| Johnson County | 23,335 | 1,517 | 6.5 |
| Kaufman County | 14,541 | 1,003 | 6.9 |
| Kendall County* | 7,505 | 518 | 6.9 |
| Kerr County* | 15,067 | 1,115 | 7.4 |
| Lamar County | 10,696 | 1,241 | 11.6 |
| Liberty County* | 11,849 | 1,446 | 12.2 |
| LLano County* | 7,765 | 528 | 6.8 |
| Lubbock County | 40,956 | 3,481 | 8.5 |
| Matagorda County | 7,147 | 1,179 | 16.5 |
| Maverick County | 7,745 | 2,486 | 32.1 |
| McLennan County | 37,689 | 3,957 | 10.5 |
| Medina County* | 7,962 | 1,027 | 12.9 |
| Midland County | 20,715 | 2,134 | 10.3 |
| Montgomery County* | 67,796 | 5,017 | 7.4 |
| Nacogdoches County | 10,015 | 1,082 | 10.8 |
| Navarro County | 9,075 | 953 | 10.5 |
| Nueces County | 57,085 | 7,079 | 12.4 |
| Orange County | 15,502 | 1,736 | 11.2 |
| Parker County* | 19,731 | 1,480 | 7.5 |
| Polk County* | 11,229 | 1,269 | 11.3 |
| Potter County | 17,883 | 2,432 | 13.6 |

Table D.12: Population in Poverty for Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Population for Whom Poverty Determined | Below 100\% of Poverty |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent |
| Randall County | 20,715 | 1,160 | 5.6 |
| Rockwall County* | 10,756 | 527 | 4.9 |
| Rusk County | 9,973 | 1,247 | 12.5 |
| San Patricio County | 11,553 | 1,456 | 12.6 |
| Smith County | 39,233 | 3,178 | 8.1 |
| Starr County | 8,475 | 2,865 | 33.8 |
| Tarrant County | 229,724 | 18,608 | 8.1 |
| Taylor County | 22,686 | 2,291 | 10.1 |
| Tom Green County | 19,951 | 1,875 | 9.4 |
| Travis County | 110,514 | 8,731 | 7.9 |
| Upshur County | 8,023 | 642 | 8.0 |
| Val Verde County | 8,144 | 1,873 | 23.0 |
| Van Zandt County* | 12,148 | 1,506 | 12.4 |
| Victoria County | 15,788 | 1,579 | 10.0 |
| Walker County | 8,402 | 765 | 9.1 |
| Washington County* | 7,783 | 911 | 11.7 |
| Webb County | 27,174 | 6,141 | 22.6 |
| Wharton County | 7,807 | 1,109 | 14.2 |
| Wichita County | 22,277 | 1,938 | 8.7 |
| Williamson County* | 52,588 | 2,524 | 4.8 |
| Wilson County* | 7,785 | 607 | 7.8 |
| Wise County* | 10,132 | 750 | 7.4 |
| Wood County* | 13,027 | 1,225 | 9.4 |
| Texas | 3,591,930 | 405,888 | 11.3 |
| United States | 54,457,267 | 5,064,526 | 9.3 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

Table D.13: Housing Tenure Average Household Size for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older


Table D.13: Housing Tenure Average Household Size for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Occupied Housing Units | Owner Occupied |  |  | Renter Occupied |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent | Avg. Household Size | Number | Percent | Avg. Household Size |
| Hardin County | 6,530 | 5,699 | 87.3 | 1.9 | 831 | 12.7 | 1.4 |
| Harris County | 290,080 | 222,192 | 76.6 | 2.2 | 67,888 | 23.4 | 1.8 |
| Harrison County | 8,054 | 6,871 | 85.3 | 2.0 | 1,183 | 14.7 | 1.5 |
| Hays County | 11,283 | 9,434 | 83.6 | 2.2 | 1,849 | 16.4 | 1.6 |
| Henderson County* | 12,397 | 11,128 | 89.8 | 1.9 | 1,269 | 10.2 | 1.6 |
| Hidalgo County | 54,307 | 44,335 | 81.6 | 2.6 | 9,972 | 18.4 | 1.9 |
| Hill County* | 5,229 | 4,318 | 82.6 | 1.9 | 911 | 17.4 | 1.5 |
| Hood County* | 8,648 | 7,420 | 85.8 | 1.9 | 1,228 | 14.2 | 1.4 |
| Hopkins County | 4,532 | 3,947 | 87.1 | 1.9 | 585 | 12.9 | 1.5 |
| Hunt County | 10,082 | 8,249 | 81.8 | 2.1 | 1,833 | 18.2 | 1.6 |
| Jasper County | 5,102 | 4,519 | 88.6 | 1.9 | 583 | 11.4 | 1.7 |
| Jefferson County | 28,649 | 23,050 | 80.5 | 2.0 | 5,599 | 19.5 | 1.6 |
| Jim Wells County | 4,346 | 3,745 | 86.2 | 2.4 | 601 | 13.8 | 1.6 |
| Johnson County | 14,162 | 12,502 | 88.3 | 2.2 | 1,660 | 11.7 | 1.6 |
| Kaufman County | 8,886 | 7,665 | 86.3 | 2.2 | 1,221 | 13.7 | 1.6 |
| Kendall County* | 4,534 | 3,569 | 78.7 | 2.1 | 965 | 21.3 | 1.5 |
| Kerr County* | 9,689 | 8,393 | 86.6 | 1.8 | 1,296 | 13.4 | 1.6 |
| Lamar County | 6,860 | 5,364 | 78.2 | 1.9 | 1,496 | 21.8 | 1.5 |
| Liberty County* | 7,542 | 6,392 | 84.8 | 2.1 | 1,150 | 15.2 | 1.7 |
| LLano County* | 4,741 | 4,211 | 88.8 | 1.8 | 530 | 11.2 | 1.5 |
| Lubbock County | 26,302 | 21,034 | 80.0 | 2.0 | 5,268 | 20.0 | 1.4 |
| Matagorda County | 4,469 | 3,867 | 86.5 | 1.9 | 602 | 13.5 | 1.3 |
| Maverick County | 4,299 | 3,175 | 73.9 | 2.6 | 1,124 | 26.1 | 2.0 |
| McLennan County | 23,774 | 19,102 | 80.3 | 1.9 | 4,672 | 19.7 | 1.7 |
| Medina County* | 4,806 | 4,335 | 90.2 | 2.0 | 471 | 9.8 | 1.6 |
| Midland County | 12,814 | 10,563 | 82.4 | 2.0 | 2,251 | 17.6 | 1.4 |
| Montgomery County* | 40,350 | 33,897 | 84.0 | 2.1 | 6,453 | 16.0 | 1.6 |
| Nacogdoches County | 6,423 | 5,223 | 81.3 | 2.0 | 1,200 | 18.7 | 1.7 |
| Navarro County | 5,780 | 4,836 | 83.7 | 1.9 | 944 | 16.3 | 1.3 |
| Nueces County | 35,971 | 28,692 | 79.8 | 2.2 | 7,279 | 20.2 | 1.6 |
| Orange County | 9,657 | 8,576 | 88.8 | 2.0 | 1,081 | 11.2 | 1.6 |
| Parker County* | 12,262 | 10,791 | 88.0 | 2.0 | 1,471 | 12.0 | 1.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 183 |

Table D.13: Housing Tenure Average Household Size for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Occupied <br> Housing Units | Owner Occupied |  |  | Renter Occupied |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent | Avg. <br> Household Size | Number | Percent | Avg. <br> Household Size |
| Polk County* | 6,953 | 6,173 | 88.8 | 2.0 | 780 | 11.2 | 1.5 |
| Potter County | 11,104 | 8,383 | 75.5 | 2.1 | 2,721 | 24.5 | 1.7 |
| Randall County | 13,099 | 10,969 | 83.7 | 1.9 | 2,130 | 16.3 | 1.3 |
| Rockwall County* | 6,049 | 5,405 | 89.4 | 2.0 | 644 | 10.6 | 1.4 |
| Rusk County | 6,216 | 5,418 | 87.2 | 1.9 | 798 | 12.8 | 1.6 |
| San Patricio County | 7,032 | 5,561 | 79.1 | 2.3 | 1,471 | 20.9 | 1.9 |
| Smith County | 24,612 | 20,951 | 85.1 | 1.9 | 3,661 | 14.9 | 1.6 |
| Starr County | 4,713 | 3,907 | 82.9 | 2.8 | 806 | 17.1 | 2.5 |
| Tarrant County | 141,699 | 112,044 | 79.1 | 2.0 | 29,655 | 20.9 | 1.6 |
| Taylor County | 14,775 | 11,631 | 78.7 | 2.0 | 3,144 | 21.3 | 1.5 |
| Tom Green County | 13,090 | 10,922 | 83.4 | 1.9 | 2,168 | 16.6 | 1.4 |
| Travis County | 68,665 | 53,195 | 77.5 | 2.0 | 15,470 | 22.5 | 1.5 |
| Upshur County | 5,071 | 4,478 | 88.3 | 2.0 | 593 | 11.7 | 1.3 |
| Val Verde County | 4,944 | 3,878 | 78.4 | 2.4 | 1,066 | 21.6 | 1.7 |
| Van Zandt County* | 7,773 | 6,584 | 84.7 | 2.0 | 1,189 | 15.3 | 1.5 |
| Victoria County | 10,134 | 8,353 | 82.4 | 2.1 | 1,781 | 17.6 | 1.6 |
| Walker County | 5,336 | 4,865 | 91.2 | 1.8 | 471 | 8.8 | 1.7 |
| Washington County* | 5,118 | 3,965 | 77.5 | 1.9 | 1,153 | 22.5 | 1.5 |
| Webb County | 15,008 | 11,369 | 75.8 | 2.9 | 3,639 | 24.2 | 2.1 |
| Wharton County | 5,107 | 4,183 | 81.9 | 2.0 | 924 | 18.1 | 1.5 |
| Wichita County | 14,782 | 11,542 | 78.1 | 1.9 | 3,240 | 21.9 | 1.4 |
| Williamson County* | 31,557 | 26,301 | 83.3 | 2.0 | 5,256 | 16.7 | 1.6 |
| Wilson County* | 4,588 | 4,131 | 90.0 | 1.9 | 457 | 10.0 | 1.5 |
| Wise County* | 6,090 | 5,345 | 87.8 | 2.1 | 745 | 12.2 | 1.7 |
| Wood County* | 7,882 | 7,148 | 90.7 | 2.0 | 734 | 9.3 | 1.7 |
| Texas | 2,193,657 | 1,776,326 | 81.0 | 2.1 | 417,331 | 19.0 | 1.6 |
| United States | 34,062,044 | 26,958,275 | 79.1 | 2.0 | 7,103,769 | 20.9 | 1.6 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

Table D.14: Housing Tenure Average Household Size for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Owner Occupied Housing Units | Median Value | Monthly Owner <br> Costs as a <br> Percentage of Household Income |  | Median Monthly Costs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Less than 30 Percent | 30 <br> Percent or More | With a Mortgage | Without a Mortgage |
| Anderson County | 4,748 | \$ 84,900 | 77.7 | 22.3 | \$ 1,053.0 | \$ 379 |
| Angelina County | 8,558 | 82,400 | 82.4 | 17.6 | 942 | 376 |
| Aransas County* | 3,889 | 146,300 | 75.7 | 24.3 | 1,520 | 475 |
| Atascosa County* | 3,981 | 81,300 | 75.6 | 24.4 | 1,052 | 384 |
| Bastrop County | 6,421 | 124,200 | 74.2 | 25.8 | 1,242 | 474 |
| Bell County | 18,059 | 108,200 | 80.6 | 19.4 | 1,124 | 443 |
| Bexar County | 119,477 | 103,900 | 78.2 | 21.8 | 1,134 | 393 |
| Bowie County | 9,267 | 90,100 | 79.5 | 20.5 | 1,065 | 354 |
| Brazoria County | 21,071 | 121,300 | 77.4 | 22.6 | 1,363 | 458 |
| Brazos County | 9,919 | 152,300 | 80.8 | 19.2 | 1,383 | 468 |
| Brown County | 3,986 | 80,300 | 78.5 | 21.5 | 1,036 | 424 |
| Burnet County* | 5,289 | 159,400 | 76.8 | 23.2 | 1,346 | 434 |
| Cameron County | 27,458 | 66,800 | 73.8 | 26.2 | 1,012 | 335 |
| Cass County | 3,694 | 70,900 | 81.0 | 19.0 | 884 | 337 |
| Cherokee County | 5,083 | 72,800 | 80.9 | 19.1 | 997 | 349 |
| Collin County | 40,716 | 194,500 | 72.1 | 27.9 | 1,715 | 658 |
| Comal County* | 11,605 | 199,200 | 75.7 | 24.3 | 1,402 | 466 |
| Cooke County | 4,084 | 115,700 | 80.6 | 19.4 | 1,233 | 494 |
| Coryell County | 3,755 | 89,300 | 83.5 | 16.5 | 967 | 384 |
| Dallas County | 138,225 | 125,300 | 71.0 | 29.0 | 1,386 | 518 |
| Denton County | 31,405 | 171,700 | 72.2 | 27.8 | 1,574 | 590 |
| Ector County | 10,013 | 83,700 | 79.8 | 20.2 | 976 | 384 |
| El Paso County | 49,763 | 94,900 | 76.6 | 23.4 | 957 | 319 |
| Ellis County | 10,816 | 125,200 | 78.5 | 21.5 | 1,297 | 477 |
| Fannin County | 3,778 | 84,200 | 78.1 | 21.9 | 990 | 416 |
| Fayette County* | 3,988 | 151,100 | 81.5 | 18.5 | 1,162 | 391 |
| Fort Bend County | 29,907 | 166,200 | 70.8 | 29.2 | 1,692 | 596 |
| Galveston County | 22,917 | 124,700 | 74.4 | 25.6 | 1,439 | 497 |
| Gillespie County* | 4,426 | 201,500 | 77.6 | 22.4 | 1,439 | 427 |
| Grayson County | 12,435 | 103,100 | 77.9 | 22.1 | 1,192 | 445 |

Table D.14: Housing Tenure Average Household Size for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older


Table D.14: Housing Tenure Average Household Size for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Owner Occupied Housing Units | Median Value | Monthly Owner <br> Costs as a <br> Percentage of Household Income |  | Median Monthly Costs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Less than <br> 30 <br> Percent | 30 <br> Percent or More | With a Mortgage | Without a Mortgage |
| Navarro County | 4,836 | 78,700 | 77.6 | 22.4 | 993 | 383 |
| Nueces County | 28,692 | 94,800 | 76.2 | 23.8 | 1,228 | 432 |
| Orange County | 8,576 | 82,100 | 81.4 | 18.6 | 984 | 362 |
| Parker County* | 10,791 | 137,200 | 78.5 | 21.5 | 1,308 | 460 |
| Polk County* | 6,173 | 77,600 | 79.1 | 20.9 | 982 | 345 |
| Potter County | 8,383 | 79,400 | 80.3 | 19.7 | 917 | 349 |
| Randall County | 10,969 | 132,000 | 79.9 | 20.1 | 1,160 | 454 |
| Rockwall County* | 5,405 | 200,700 | 72.1 | 27.9 | 1,773 | 693 |
| Rusk County | 5,418 | 90,300 | 81.9 | 18.1 | 953 | 345 |
| San Patricio County | 5,561 | 86,800 | 78.8 | 21.2 | 1,008 | 429 |
| Smith County | 20,951 | 127,000 | 77.6 | 22.4 | 1,190 | 434 |
| Starr County | 3,907 | 53,400 | 78.0 | 22.0 | 874 | 260 |
| Tarrant County | 112,044 | 126,900 | 74.6 | 25.4 | 1,393 | 504 |
| Taylor County | 11,631 | 84,200 | 81.6 | 18.4 | 1,024 | 420 |
| Tom Green County | 10,922 | 89,200 | 81.2 | 18.8 | 1,031 | 377 |
| Travis County | 53,195 | 214,100 | 75.2 | 24.8 | 1,545 | 562 |
| Upshur County | 4,478 | 88,900 | 82.8 | 17.2 | 879 | 344 |
| Val Verde County | 3,878 | 81,600 | 71.5 | 28.5 | 951 | 349 |
| Van Zandt County* | 6,584 | 98,800 | 76.0 | 24.0 | 1,002 | 391 |
| Victoria County | 8,353 | 94,900 | 80.4 | 19.6 | 1,055 | 443 |
| Walker County | 4,865 | 129,100 | 72.1 | 27.9 | 1,235 | 433 |
| Washington County* | 3,965 | 137,400 | 75.2 | 24.8 | 1,325 | 432 |
| Webb County | 11,369 | 87,300 | 69.4 | 30.6 | 1,163 | 404 |
| Wharton County | 4,183 | 84,700 | 76.5 | 23.5 | 944 | 411 |
| Wichita County | 11,542 | 84,700 | 80.7 | 19.3 | 970 | 431 |
| Williamson County* | 26,301 | 174,400 | 73.6 | 26.4 | 1,437 | 555 |
| Wilson County* | 4,131 | 120,600 | 75.1 | 24.9 | 1,153 | 409 |
| Wise County* | 5,345 | 113,000 | 78.2 | 21.8 | 1,226 | 459 |
| Wood County* | 7,148 | 110,000 | 79.7 | 20.3 | 1,004 | 378 |
| Texas | 1,776,326 | 114,000 | 76.3 | 23.7 | 1,269 | 432 |

Table D.14: Housing Tenure Average Household Size for Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

|  |  |  | Monthly Owner <br> Costs as a Percentage of Household Income |  | Median Monthly Costs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Owner Occupied Housing Units | Median Value | Less than 30 <br> Percent | 30 <br> Percent or More | With a Mortgage | Without a Mortgage |
| United States | 26,958,275 | 172,800 | 71.6 | 28.4 | 1,355 | 441 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).

Table D.15: Median Gross Rent and Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income for Renter Occupied Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Renter Occupied Housing Units | Median Gross Rent | Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Less than 30 Percent | 30 Percent or More |
| Anderson County | 866 | \$ 571 | 46.5 | 53.5 |
| Angelina County | 1,541 | 568 | 56.3 | 43.7 |
| Aransas County* | 419 | 828 | 47.0 | 53.0 |
| Atascosa County* | 677 | 474 | 58.1 | 41.9 |
| Bastrop County | 880 | 617 | 48.1 | 51.9 |
| Bell County | 4,219 | 657 | 47.6 | 52.4 |
| Bexar County | 30,569 | 671 | 47.9 | 52.1 |
| Bowie County | 1,943 | 551 | 51.3 | 48.7 |
| Brazoria County | 3,753 | 783 | 52.9 | 47.1 |
| Brazos County | 2,230 | 688 | 54.5 | 45.5 |
| Brown County | 807 | 538 | 48.9 | 51.1 |
| Burnet County* | 1,037 | 637 | 51.2 | 48.8 |
| Cameron County | 6,447 | 462 | 54.0 | 46.0 |
| Cass County | 1,134 | 500 | 71.6 | 28.4 |
| Cherokee County | 1,090 | 506 | 61.5 | 38.5 |
| Collin County | 10,263 | 972 | 43.6 | 56.4 |
| Comal County* | 1,834 | 738 | 55.0 | 45.0 |
| Cooke County | 1,093 | 736 | 59.9 | 40.1 |
| Coryell County | 646 | 586 | 64.9 | 35.1 |
| Dallas County | 43,793 | 790 | 42.9 | 57.1 |
| Denton County | 7,461 | 926 | 46.0 | 54.0 |
| Ector County | 2,322 | 560 | 53.2 | 46.8 |
| El Paso County | 14,985 | 472 | 48.8 | 51.2 |
| Ellis County | 1,680 | 771 | 38.6 | 61.4 |
| Fannin County | 727 | 473 | 61.3 | 38.7 |
| Fayette County* | 423 | 404 | 64.8 | 35.2 |
| Fort Bend County | 4,941 | 1,117 | 48.9 | 51.1 |
| Galveston County | 5,638 | 799 | 41.3 | 58.7 |
| Gillespie County* | 621 | 703 | 66.2 | 33.8 |
| Grayson County | 2,697 | 631 | 49.5 | 50.5 |
| Gregg County | 3,176 | 673 | 49.4 | 50.6 |

Table D.15: Median Gross Rent and Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income for Renter Occupied Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Renter Occupied Housing Units | Median Gross Rent | Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Less than 30 Percent | 30 Percent or More |
| Guadalupe County* | 1,805 | 599 | 59.2 | 40.8 |
| Hardin County | 831 | 563 | 66.1 | 33.9 |
| Harris County | 67,888 | 769 | 44.0 | 56.0 |
| Harrison County | 1,183 | 446 | 69.4 | 30.6 |
| Hays County | 1,849 | 743 | 45.3 | 54.7 |
| Henderson County* | 1,269 | 593 | 57.5 | 42.5 |
| Hidalgo County | 9,972 | 420 | 52.8 | 47.2 |
| Hill County* | 911 | 545 | 53.5 | 46.5 |
| Hood County* | 1,228 | 847 | 40.2 | 59.8 |
| Hopkins County | 585 | 552 | 54.9 | 45.1 |
| Hunt County | 1,833 | 684 | 43.4 | 56.6 |
| Jasper County | 583 | 511 | 64.5 | 35.5 |
| Jefferson County | 5,599 | 645 | 48.0 | 52.0 |
| Jim Wells County | 601 | 486 | 62.6 | 37.4 |
| Johnson County | 1,660 | 647 | 58.6 | 41.4 |
| Kaufman County | 1,221 | 690 | 47.0 | 53.0 |
| Kendall County* | 965 | 945 | 40.2 | 59.8 |
| Kerr County* | 1,296 | 676 | 56.3 | 43.8 |
| Lamar County | 1,496 | 535 | 57.4 | 42.6 |
| Liberty County* | 1,150 | 528 | 53.7 | 46.3 |
| LLano County* | 530 | 550 | 59.1 | 40.9 |
| Lubbock County | 5,268 | 666 | 49.3 | 50.7 |
| Matagorda County | 602 | 471 | 38.9 | 61.1 |
| Maverick County | 1,124 | 373 | 64.1 | 35.9 |
| McLennan County | 4,672 | 718 | 46.9 | 53.1 |
| Medina County* | 471 | 639 | 56.9 | 43.1 |
| Midland County | 2,251 | 894 | 46.4 | 53.6 |
| Montgomery County* | 6,453 | 810 | 47.3 | 52.7 |
| Nacogdoches County | 1,200 | 502 | 68.7 | 31.3 |
| Navarro County | 944 | 500 | 62.1 | 37.9 |
| Nueces County | 7,279 | 623 | 46.4 | 53.6 |

Table D.15: Median Gross Rent and Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income for Renter Occupied Households Headed by Persons Age 60 and Older

| Area | Renter Occupied Housing Units | Median Gross Rent | Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Less than 30 Percent | 30 Percent or More |
| Orange County | 1,081 | 603 | 57.2 | 42.8 |
| Parker County* | 1,471 | 802 | 54.1 | 45.9 |
| Polk County* | 780 | 447 | 67.2 | 32.8 |
| Potter County | 2,721 | 566 | 43.4 | 56.6 |
| Randall County | 2,130 | 620 | 57.8 | 42.2 |
| Rockwall County* | 644 | 945 | 40.4 | 59.6 |
| Rusk County | 798 | 547 | 57.8 | 42.2 |
| San Patricio County | 1,471 | 623 | 57.0 | 43.0 |
| Smith County | 3,661 | 792 | 47.7 | 52.3 |
| Starr County | 806 | 392 | 51.5 | 48.5 |
| Tarrant County | 29,655 | 816 | 44.3 | 55.7 |
| Taylor County | 3,144 | 708 | 46.7 | 53.3 |
| Tom Green County | 2,168 | 572 | 52.0 | 48.0 |
| Travis County | 15,470 | 866 | 44.8 | 55.2 |
| Upshur County | 593 | 479 | 72.7 | 27.3 |
| Val Verde County | 1,066 | 437 | 48.6 | 51.4 |
| Van Zandt County* | 1,189 | 580 | 52.1 | 47.9 |
| Victoria County | 1,781 | 629 | 47.6 | 52.4 |
| Walker County | 471 | 596 | 55.0 | 45.0 |
| Washington County* | 1,153 | 730 | 59.7 | 40.3 |
| Webb County | 3,639 | 532 | 56.9 | 43.1 |
| Wharton County | 924 | 489 | 56.4 | 43.6 |
| Wichita County | 3,240 | 671 | 45.7 | 54.3 |
| Williamson County* | 5,256 | 860 | 46.5 | 53.5 |
| Wilson County* | 457 | 638 | 63.9 | 36.1 |
| Wise County* | 745 | 690 | 66.0 | 34.0 |
| Wood County* | 734 | 515 | 57.4 | 42.6 |
| Texas | 417,331 | 704.0 | 49.1 | 50.9 |
| United States | 7,103,769 | 726.0 | 47.6 | 52.4 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
*Identified as retirement destination county (current or projected).
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[^0]:    Source: Hobby Center for the Study of Texas at Rice University, 2013.
    Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.

[^1]:    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2007-2011.
    Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2009.
    *Estimates are not available for all counties.

