2010 Census Results Summary

Regional Population Growth

- Region crossed the 6 million population mark in 2010
- Region added 2.2 million people over last 20 years (1.2 million since 2000)

County Population Growth

- Largest counties (Harris, Fort Bend, Montgomery, Brazoria, Galveston) had the largest numeric growth
- Waller, Chambers, and Austin added more people in 2000s than in 1990s
- Liberty and Walker added less people 2000s than in 1990s
- Wharton and Colorado showed no growth since 2000
- Matagorda lost population since 2000

Regional Demographic Composition

- In 2010, 28% of population is under the age of 18
- Population is slowly beginning to age, the share of the adult population is increasing
- Hispanic population accounts for 35% of the population in 2010 and 61% of the population growth (2000-2010)
- Among population under the age of 18, the share of Hispanic children has increased from 36% in 2000 to 45% in 2010
- In the voting age population, no group has a majority (the share of White population decreased from 52% in 2000 to 44% in 2010)

County Demographic Composition

- Hispanic population has increased its share in every county, it now varies from over 40% in Harris county to 17% in Waller, accounting region-wide for 35%.
- White population accounts for 40% in the region and varies from 33% in Harris to 71% in Chambers and Montgomery
- Black population accounts for 17% in the region and varies from 24% in Waller to 4% in Montgomery
- Asian population accounts for 6% in the region and varies from under 0.5% in smaller counties to 17% in Fort Bend

Growth Patterns

- In the 1990s, population growth concentrated in the Western part of Harris and Northern part of Fort Bend counties, in the Southeast, and in the Woodlands.
- In the 2000s, the growth also expanded southward and northward of the Beltway
### Population in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>28,417</td>
<td>7,129</td>
<td>21,288</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>6,641</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>18,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazoria</td>
<td>313,166</td>
<td>86,985</td>
<td>226,181</td>
<td>17,013</td>
<td>36,880</td>
<td>86,643</td>
<td>5,956</td>
<td>166,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>35,096</td>
<td>10,011</td>
<td>25,085</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2,817</td>
<td>6,635</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>24,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>20,874</td>
<td>4,968</td>
<td>15,906</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>12,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bend</td>
<td>585,375</td>
<td>173,835</td>
<td>411,540</td>
<td>98,762</td>
<td>123,267</td>
<td>138,967</td>
<td>12,699</td>
<td>211,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>291,309</td>
<td>74,167</td>
<td>217,142</td>
<td>8,515</td>
<td>39,229</td>
<td>65,270</td>
<td>5,643</td>
<td>172,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>4,092,459</td>
<td>1,147,835</td>
<td>2,944,624</td>
<td>93,853</td>
<td>1,671,540</td>
<td>1,729,516</td>
<td>105,027</td>
<td>2,429,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>75,643</td>
<td>19,367</td>
<td>56,276</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>8,074</td>
<td>13,602</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>52,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matagorda</td>
<td>36,702</td>
<td>9,671</td>
<td>27,031</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>14,074</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>17,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>455,746</td>
<td>125,979</td>
<td>329,767</td>
<td>9,347</td>
<td>18,537</td>
<td>94,698</td>
<td>8,553</td>
<td>324,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>67,861</td>
<td>11,318</td>
<td>56,543</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>15,098</td>
<td>11,389</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>39,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller</td>
<td>43,205</td>
<td>10,656</td>
<td>32,549</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>10,537</td>
<td>12,536</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>19,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharton</td>
<td>41,280</td>
<td>11,072</td>
<td>30,208</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5,668</td>
<td>15,445</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>19,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>6,087,133</td>
<td>1,692,993</td>
<td>4,394,140</td>
<td>386,015</td>
<td>1,023,683</td>
<td>2,142,892</td>
<td>105,027</td>
<td>2,429,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change in Population (2010 less 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>4,827</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>4,073</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2,836</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazoria</td>
<td>71,399</td>
<td>17,882</td>
<td>53,517</td>
<td>12,237</td>
<td>16,697</td>
<td>31,580</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>8,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>9,065</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td>6,578</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3,825</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>4,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>-251</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-326</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bend</td>
<td>230,923</td>
<td>60,363</td>
<td>170,560</td>
<td>59,217</td>
<td>53,688</td>
<td>64,096</td>
<td>6,030</td>
<td>47,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>41,151</td>
<td>7,298</td>
<td>33,853</td>
<td>3,363</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>20,331</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>14,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>691,881</td>
<td>163,279</td>
<td>528,602</td>
<td>76,827</td>
<td>134,564</td>
<td>551,789</td>
<td>11,319</td>
<td>-82,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>5,489</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>5,499</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>-878</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matagorda</td>
<td>-1,255</td>
<td>-1,711</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>-198</td>
<td>-718</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>161,978</td>
<td>39,247</td>
<td>122,731</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>8,461</td>
<td>57,548</td>
<td>4,328</td>
<td>85,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>6,103</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>5,901</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller</td>
<td>10,542</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>8,272</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>6,192</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharton</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-765</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-392</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-2,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1,232,679</td>
<td>291,045</td>
<td>941,634</td>
<td>158,260</td>
<td>214,052</td>
<td>752,977</td>
<td>26,718</td>
<td>80,672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preferred Sustainability Status (PSS)

Background

HUD has developed a system to award up to two bonus points on applications for grants in regions that have received Preferred Sustainability Status (either by being awarded a Sustainable Communities Planning Grant or having a highly scored proposal, as determined by HUD). In order to receive these bonus points, applicants have to demonstrate consistency with the Sustainable Communities planning process.

H-GAC is completing the review of two applications that have already been received. For future grants the recommended review process will follow the steps below:

Recommended Approval Process

Due to the short turn-around that will be needed for these requests, the recommendation is that the Executive Committee of the Coordinating Committee act as the reviewing body for future eligible grants that request PSS sign-off. H-GAC staff will coordinate with applicants to receive the necessary information required by the Executive Committee to make the decision.

Applicants requesting PSS sign-off would be required to submit to H-GAC staff (the designated Point of Contact on the HUD PSS website), the following materials:

1. A complete copy of the grant application or a summary if the complete copy is not available
2. SF424 forms that indicate the applicant, funding program, budget breakdown and narrative of the project
3. Local letters of support if applicable
4. Response (a short narrative is acceptable) to the following 3 HUD criteria:

   (1) The applicant is engaged in activities, that in consultation with the designated Point of Contact of the HUD designated Preferred Sustainability Status Communities, further the purposes of the regional planning grant program;

   (2) The applicant’s proposed activities either directly reflect the Livability Principles cited and contained in HUD’s General Section to the FY2011 NOFAs or will result in the delivery of services that are consistent with the goals of the Livability Principles;

   (3) The applicant has committed to maintain an on-going relationship with the HUD Preferred Sustainability Status Communities for the purposes of being part of the planning and implementation processes in the designated area.

Upon review of the above materials and recommendation by the Executive Committee, HUD form 2995 (‘Certification of Consistency with Sustainable Communities Planning and Implementation’) will be completed by H-GAC staff and submitted to HUD.

Additional Information

HUD website detailing PSS process:

cmt
Governmental Advisory Committee

Background
At the June meeting the Coordinating Committee approved a motion to begin the process of empanelling the Governmental Advisory Committee. The Bylaws of the Coordinating Committee state that the Governmental Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the H-GAC Board of Directors. In order to assist in the appointment process, the following details need to be established:

- What is the charge of the Committee?
- What is the preferred composition of the Committee?
- What is the proposed target date for Committee appointment?

The following information about the Governmental Advisory Committee has already been established:

From the grant application:

The organizational structure can be generally compared to a building project. The Coordinating Committee should be thought of as a project manager, the Governmental Advisory Committee as the clients, and the Technical Advisory and Regional Transect groups as the sub-contractors. The Governmental Advisory Committee will consist of elected officials and will act with a limited power of veto but will not generate content. The Governmental Advisory Committee provides an important opportunity to expand cross-cutting policy knowledge among local elected officials. All reports, recommendations, and work products will be presented to the committee to ensure that local elected officials and decision-makers are included in the learning and feedback process. The Governmental Advisory Committee will vet and provide feedback on the feasibility of implementation strategies and monitor the progress of plan development and implementation. The Governmental Advisory Committee will encourage their respective governments to gain approval, adoption and coordinated implementation of the Regional Plan for Sustainable Development.

From the Bylaws:

The Governmental Advisory Committee is comprised of elected officials throughout the 13-county Houston-Galveston region. The Governmental Advisory Committee is appointed by the Board of Directors of the Houston- Galveston Area Council. The Governmental Advisory Committee provides guidance to the Coordinating Committee about the likelihood of political support for the Plan. The Governmental Advisory Committee will provide advice about the products and strategies developed by the Coordinating Committee throughout the planning process. The Governmental Advisory Committee shall evaluate products of the Coordinating Committee through the livability principles developed by HUD and its federal partners and their local practicality. The H-GAC Board of Directors should appoint a Committee that is representative of the whole region with attention paid to the most populous city and most populous county in the 13 county region. The Governmental Advisory Committee should be no larger than 20 members.

Composition Considerations:
- Transect based, requiring a set or minimum number of representatives from each of the grant’s transect areas (urban, suburban, rural, coastal)
- Population thresholds, requiring representatives from jurisdictions of differing population thresholds to ensure representation from small, medium, and large jurisdictions
- Geographic based, requiring a set or minimum number of representatives from each County, and/or supplementing with representative from cities.

For all of these options, they could be weighted by population (more populous areas receiving more representatives on the committee)

**Recommended Action:** Coordinating Committee members approve a charge and composition recommendation for the empanelling of the Governmental Advisory Committee.
Technical Advisory Groups and Regional Transect Groups

Background
The Technical Advisory Groups and Regional Transect Groups provide key functions in the creation of the Regional Plan for Sustainable Development to ensure that the plan addresses the full range of sustainability issues and reflects the diverse geographic contexts of the region. The Coordinating Committee By-Laws give the Coordinating Committee the authority to appoint members to these groups and also develop their operating procedures. The By-Laws include the following information regarding the two groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Advisory Groups</th>
<th>Regional Transect Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Experts in specific disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: bylaws include a separate group for social equity, but HUD has indicated a preference for social equity to be integrated into each of the topics rather than a stand-alone group.

Meeting format for both groups as stated in the By-Laws is to be led through facilitated discussions by staff of Coordinating Committee entities. Meetings will be open to the public.

Points for Discussion
Though the By-Laws provide a general outline for meeting structure, operating procedures have not yet been developed for the groups. Previous discussions of the Coordinating Committee have indicated a desire to discuss other options for meeting facilitation and format. Before membership for these groups is solicited, the Coordinating Committee’s guidance is sought on the following topics:

- How can the meetings of the groups be structured to facilitate open exchange of ideas and allow interested members of the public to engage?
- What is the best way to ensure exchange of information among the groups, and between the groups and the Coordinating Committee?
- How should members be selected/appointed and what criteria should be used?
- What is the ideal size of the groups?
- How can we reach out to potential members to generate interest in serving in the groups?

Proposed Timeline
May/June: Distribute information about Groups and application/interest form. Develop operating procedures for groups. June: Appoint members and approve operating procedures. July: Kickoff meeting/orientation with groups in advance of public visioning meetings

Recommendation
Coordinating Committee determine a process for developing selection and operating procedures for Technical Advisory Groups and Regional Transect Groups. Options include but are not limited to directing H-GAC staff to develop draft operating procedures or forming an ad hoc subcommittee.
Sustainability Peer Information Exchange
Common Projects and Priorities

Economic

- Use access to fresh food through grocery stores and farmers’ markets as economic development
- Use of sustainable development which includes mixed use, infill, and green building as a profitable development model.
- Protect and create more open space in both developed areas and the urban fringe for both food and recreation
- Ensure a housing mix (both housing type and price points) for the viability and stability of communities.
- Create and support more financial incentives/mechanisms for businesses and green development.
- Increase support for local businesses and “buy local” initiatives.
- Increase capacity and partnerships with local communities.
- Create more attractive context-sensitive, livable centers and places that are inclusive, revitalize existing areas, enhance quality of life, create connections, and promote memorable places.
- Invest in more job training and outreach for at-risk populations.

Environmental

- Strive for better resource management through green energy, recycling, and the consideration of the “life-cycle” of items.
- Continue planning and associated initiatives to ensure a high quality and abundant water supply
- Increase quality of place and life through the creation healthy, context sensitive, place-making development, access to fresh food, and high quality exports (goods).
- Educate the public and leadership.
- Strive for well planned green development to avoid negative externalities such as the “heat island” effect and piecemeal infrastructure.
- Foster a development culture that considers and preserves the context for rural and urban areas
- Further preserve important natural areas that provide critical ecological services and habitat
- Further develop public/private/non-profit partnerships
- Ensure environmental justice for all
**Healthy Communities**

- Use the health assessments in rural counties to promote positive change
- Focus on substance abuse prevention and treatment
- Further development of infrastructure that promotes public wellness (complete streets, transit, trails, parks)
- Increase access to healthy food – urban gardening and local food
- Increase access and knowledge of health resources
- Continued promotion of green building and jobs
- Increase awareness about Veterans’ issues including challenges to housing
- Educate for youth on nature and healthy living

**Housing**

- Construct homes that meet needs, not desires
- Create a housing stock that last longer, higher quality materials (it doesn’t have to look affordable)
  - Sustainable and energy-efficient materials
  - Lowering home ownership costs
- Target and investment in deteriorated neighborhoods
- Use a collaborative approach to address issues beyond housing (other sustainable concepts)
- Steady the regulatory environment
- Strive for a mix of housing types and price points for a mix of people
- Lessen the difficulty in finding funding for transitional clients
- New housing should avoid flood plains and storm surge zones
- Revitalization should be for people representing a variety of demographic types
- Add allowances to support green building
- Further partnership amongst entities
- Address the transient nature of region does to provide more “social” sustainability

**Transportation**

- Examine the “Last Mile” of trips – how do you get from the bus to your office? What are the intermodal connections between the “last mile” of your trip (walking, biking, trucking, buses, etc)
- Strive for cleaner air
- Engage in building green streets
- Focus on efficient land use patterns/ transit oriented development
- Continue to increase the capacity of local groups
- More need for multi-modal transportation planning and complete streets
• Increase connectivity in the region
• Continue to develop best practices toolbox, and implementation efforts
• Need to work with developing communities on infrastructure and planning issues
• Shift the priorities of the region towards sustainable projects and outcomes
• Garner support from the community at large
• Plan for growth and development that is inclusive of all groups
• Coordinate efforts to avoid duplication
• Base public sector investments on long-term plans and vision vs. short-term cycles
• Increased education of elected officials

**Overarching needs and common ties of all groups:**

• Further information sharing
  o Specific data needs on: walkability, obesity, access to food, zoning, recycling, legislation
• Staff and resource sharing
• More funding
• More education of the public, officials, and other decision makers
• More communication between public, organizations, officials, and others
• More collaboration amongst groups, and individuals, and within the region at-large
• Shift the priorities of public and leadership for further policy changes and sustainable outcomes