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Forest Country Region, TX
What is a regional snapshot?
The Forest Country Region is comprised of 12 Texas counties. State Highway 59 connects the region to I-69 and Houston to the south, while State Highway 190 connects the region to I-45 to the west.

- Angelina
- Houston
- Jasper
- Nacogdoches
- Newton
- Polk
- Sabine
- San Augustine
- San Jacinto
- Shelby
- Trinity
- Tyler
Overview

What is a regional snapshot?

What is the snapshot?
This snapshot is a demographic and economic assessment of the Forest Country Region in Texas. Using county-level data to form the region, PCRD analyzed a number of indicators to gauge the overall economic performance of the Forest Country Region in comparison to the rest of the state.

What is its purpose?
The snapshot is intended to inform the region’s leaders, organizations and residents of the key attributes of the region’s population and economy. In particular, it takes stock of the region’s important assets and challenges. With such data in hand, regional leaders and organizations are in a better position to invest in the mix of strategies that will spur the growth of the economy and provide a higher quality of life for residents of the region.

What are its focus areas?
PCRD secured and analyzed recent data from both public and private sources to generate the snapshot. In order to build a more comprehensive picture of the region, the report presents information under three key categories.

- Demography
- Human Capital
- Labor Force

When appropriate or relevant, the report compares information on the region with data on the remainder of the state. By so doing, the region is better able to determine how well it is performing relative to the state on a variety of important metrics.
02 demography

- Population change
- Age structure
- Race/Ethnicity
- Income and poverty
Demography

Population Change

Total population projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCR, TX</td>
<td>355,862</td>
<td>20,495,958</td>
<td>24,767,084</td>
<td>27,088,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Texas</td>
<td>378,477</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,767,084</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28,408,755</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions:

- How does the region’s population trend compare to that of the state?
- What may be some of the elements driving the trends in the region? In the state?
- What strengths or challenges might these trends present?

* Note: Three net-migration scenarios are applied to project 2020 population by Office of State Demographer. These scenarios assume the same set of mortality and fertility assumption in each scenario, but differ in their assumptions relative to net migration. 1) zero net-migration (0.0 scenario), 2) the one-half net-migration rate of 2000-2010 (0.5 scenario), and 3) the same net-migration rate of 2000-2010 (1.0 scenario). In this report 0.5 scenario is utilized.

Components of Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Change</td>
<td>23,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Increase</td>
<td>10,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Migration</td>
<td>7,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Migration**</td>
<td>5,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions:

- Which component contributes most to the population change?
- To what extent is net international migration or met domestic migration factors in fueling population change in the region?
- What are the implications of these trends for the region?

* Note: 2000-2010 components of population change are estimated based on 2000 Census population while 2010-2014 components of population change are based on 2010 Census population. The total change estimated from components of population change might not match with the census numbers because of the residuals.

** Domestic migration is estimated by analyzing the year-by-year IRS U.S. migration database from 2000 to 2014 accounting for the internal migration within the region. Please note that within a region in-and-out migration cancels each other.

Population Age Structure, 2000

A visual presentation of the age distribution of the population (in percent)

Notice the age distribution of the population in 2000 and compare it to information contained in the next slide.

Source: 2000 Decennial Census, U.S. Census Bureau
Demography

Population Age Structure, 2014

A visual presentation of the age distribution of the population (in percent)

Questions:

• Is the region experiencing an aging of its population? How does this compare to the rest of the state?

• Is there a sizable number of people of prime working age (20-49 years) in the region?

• Is the youth population (under 20 years old) growing or declining?

• What are the implications of the region’s age structure on its economic development efforts?

Demography

Race

- White 77.0%
- Black 16.4%
- Other 6.6%

2000

- Asian 0.4%
- American Indian & Alaska Native 0.5%
- Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander 0.03%
- Two or More Races 5.6%

Hispanics - 2000

- 8.8%

Ethnicity

- White 80.9%
- Black 15.7%
- Other 3.4%

2014

- Asian 0.9%
- American Indian & Alaska Native 1.0%
- Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander 0.05%
- Two or More Races 1.4%

Hispanics - 2014

- 14.5%

## Income and Poverty

**Source:** U.S. Census Bureau – Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE)

### Questions:

- Is the poverty rate for individuals in the region getting better or worse?
- Is poverty for minors in the region lower or higher than the overall poverty rate for all individuals? Why?
- Has real median income (adjusted for inflation) improved or worsened over the 2004 to 2014 time period? What may be reasons for these changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population in Poverty</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors (Age 0-17) in Poverty</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Median Household Income* ($ 2014)</td>
<td>$40,370</td>
<td>$39,880</td>
<td>$39,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Regional Median Household income is the population-weighted average of median household income values across the Forest Country Region counties.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau – Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE)
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Educational attainment
Patents
Educational Attainment, 2014

Questions:

- What proportion of the adult population in the region has a high school education only?

- How many are college graduates (associate’s, bachelors degree or higher)?

- How does the educational profile of the region compare to that of the rest of the state?

- What are the implications of the educational profile of the region in terms of the region’s economic opportunities or workforce challenges?

Source: 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
Patenting trends are an important indicator of innovation in a region. Commercializing this innovation can lead to long-term growth for regional economies.

Questions:

• How does the region’s patent rate compare to that of the rest of the state?
• How have rates changed over time?
• What might these data suggest for the future of the region?

Patents per 10,000 Jobs 2001-2013

From 2001 to 2013, Forest Country Region counties were issued patents at a rate of 0.75 per 10,000 jobs, while the remaining Texas counties garnered 4.85 patents per 10,000 jobs.

Patents per 10,000 residents 2001-2013

From 2001 to 2013, 0.32 patents per 10,000 residents were issued in Forest Country Region counties. The rest of Texas amassed 2.80 patents per 10,000 residents.

*Note: Patent origin is determined by the residence of the first-named inventor. Since a number of workers commute into the region, the number of patents produced in the Forest Country Region could be high. However, among residents of the region, patent production is relatively low.
04 labor force

- Unemployment rates
- Earnings per worker
- Source of labor for the region
Unemployment Rates

Questions:

• How does the region’s unemployment rate compare to the rest of the state and nation?

• How well has the region’s unemployment rate improved since the 2007-2009 Great Recession? How does that compare to the state and national trends?

• What might this suggest for the region’s economic future?

Source: LAUS, BLS
Questions:

• How does the region’s average earnings compare to that of the rest of the state?

• What might be some driving factors for the differences?

• Do these represent potential strengths or challenges for the region?

NOTE: Earnings include wages, salaries, supplements and earnings from partnerships and proprietorships

Source: EMSI Class of Worker 2015.4 (QCEW, non-QCEW, self-employed and extended proprietors)
Journey to Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 Count</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed in FCR</td>
<td>106,276</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both employed and living in the region</td>
<td>73,544</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in the region but living outside</td>
<td>32,732</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in FCR</td>
<td>136,952</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both living and employed in the region</td>
<td>73,544</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in the region but employed outside</td>
<td>63,408</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions:
- How many people employed in the region actually reside outside the region? How many who live in the region commute to jobs outside the region?
- What might be done to reduce the flow of labor to jobs located outside the region?
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