

Part III: Research Findings of Target Need Areas

Overview

- The population of the 12 county area has increased an average of 8.7%. Three counties, Brooks, Kenedy and Refugio, has actually decreased an average of -4.9% while the others have increased and average of 13.3%. The population of Texas has increased 22.8% over the same period.
- Nueces County has 57% of the total population of the area.

Total Area Population		
Area	1990 Population	2000 Population
<i>Aransas</i>	17,892	22,497
<i>Bee</i>	25,135	32,359
<i>Brooks</i>	8,204	7,976
<i>Duval</i>	12,918	13,120
<i>Jim Wells</i>	37,679	39,326
<i>Kenedy</i>	460	414
<i>Kleberg</i>	30,274	31,549
<i>Live Oak</i>	9,556	12,309
<i>McMullen</i>	817	851
<i>Nueces</i>	291,145	313,645
<i>Refugio</i>	7,976	7,828
<i>San Patricio</i>	58,749	67,138
<i>Total Area</i>	500,805	549,012
<i>Texas</i>	16,986,510	20,851,820

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2000)

<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/48000.html>

- The racial demographics of the area consists of 74.2% White; 3.8% African American; 0.65% Native American; 1.02% Asian; 0.08% Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders; 17.4% Other; 2.95% Two or More Races

Racial Demographics							
County	White	African American	Native Am/Alaskan	Asian	Hawaiian/Pac. Islanders	Other	Two or More Races
<i>Aransas</i>	19,672	322	131	623	11	1,200	538
<i>Bee</i>	21,957	3,203	137	164	11	6,198	689
<i>Brooks</i>	6,049	15	37	7	6	1,721	141
<i>Duval</i>	10,525	71	70	14	4	2,028	408
<i>Jim Wells</i>	30,634	237	243	171	35	7,050	956
<i>Kenedy</i>	267	3	3	2	0	132	7
<i>Kleberg</i>	22,675	1,167	192	464	31	5,995	1,025
<i>Live Oak</i>	10,743	301	50	24	2	950	239
<i>McMullen</i>	752	10	2	0	0	76	11
<i>Nueces</i>	225,912	13,307	1,994	3,632	230	58,762	9,808
<i>Refugio</i>	6,280	530	44	23	4	816	313
<i>San Patricio</i>	51,533	1,885	472	426	76	10,699	2,047
<i>Total Area</i>	406,999	21,051	3,375	5,550	410	95,627	16,182
<i>Texas</i>	14,799,505	2,404,566	118,362	562,319	14,434	2,438,001	514,633

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2000)

<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/48000.html>

- The number of persons of Hispanic or Latino origin in the 12 CR in 2000 was 308,190; that is 56.13% of the population. Hispanics may be of any race, so also are included in applicable race categories in the previous charts.

Hispanic Population		
Area	Number of Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin, percent, 2000	Percent of Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin, percent, 2000
<i>Aransas</i>	4571	20.3
<i>Bee</i>	17450	53.9
<i>Brooks</i>	7304	91.6
<i>Duval</i>	11544	88.0
<i>Jim Wells</i>	29772	75.7
<i>Kenedy</i>	327	79.0
<i>Kleberg</i>	20635	65.4
<i>Live Oak</i>	4683	38.0
<i>McMullen</i>	282	33.0
<i>Nueces</i>	174951	55.8
<i>Refugio</i>	3490	44.6
<i>San Patricio</i>	33181	49.4
<i>Total</i>	308,190	
<i>Percent of 12 CR</i>	56.13	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2000)

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/BasicFactsTable?_lang=en&_vt_name=DEC_2000_PL_U_GCTPL_ST2&_geo_id=04000US48

Key Informant Survey

During the fall of 2003, Key Informants were requested to fill out a survey about their experiences working with citizens in the twelve county region. Respondents were asked to identify which counties they were most knowledgeable about and with which Target Need Areas they had the most experience. A complete list of Key Informant responses is included in Appendix D. A list of responses about each the counties is detailed in Part IV, County Specific Observations.

Who Responded?

251 Key Informants responded throughout the 12 county area.

County about which they reported knowledge:

Aransas	6.4%	Jim Wells	9.2%	McMullen	2%
Bee	9.6%	Kenedy	4.4%	Nueces	64.8%
Brooks	8.8%	Kleberg	8%	Refugio	3.2%
Duval	4.8%	Live Oak	4%	San Patricio	9.6%

(>100% some identified more than one county)

Described Roles in the community (does not add to 100%)	
Citizen in the county	81%
Agency worker in the county	50%
Consumer of services in the county	40%
Involved in planning & coordinating initiatives in the county	38%
Elected officials in the county	7%
Religious leader in the county	4%

Telephone Survey of Community Citizens

During October and November 2003, telephone surveys were conducted with over 1000 citizens in the twelve county region. The number of calls completed in each county was proportional to best current population estimates of the county. Telephone contacts required 15-30 minutes each. A complete list of Telephone Survey Responses is included in Appendix E.

Who Responded?

1,002 Randomly Selected Citizens responded.

County in which they live

Aransas	45	Live Oak /McMullen	25	Nueces	572
Bee	55	Kenedy/ Kleberg	60		
Brooks	14	Refugio	14		
Duval/Jim Wells	95	San Patricio	122		

Gender

Female	67%
Male	33%

Ethnicity as Reported by Respondents

White	67%
African American	6%
Native American	1%
Asian	0%
Other	3%
Hispanic	22%
NR / DK	1%

Number of persons in the household of age 60 or older

Zero	50%
One or two	50%

Marital Status

Married	57%
Widowed	18%
Divorced	9%
Separated	1%
Living with a partner	1%
Never Married	13%
NR / DK	1%

Children Present in the Household

13% reported children living in the household

Employment Status

Employed full-time	30%
Employed part-time	10%
Unemployed	7%
Retired	35%
A student	2%
A homemaker	11%
Disabled or too ill to work	4%
NR/DK	1%

Reported Continuous Employment for the last two years

Yes	37%
No	62%
No Response	1%

Community Listening Sessions

Methodology. Participants in the focus groups included invitees as well as members of the public who responded to media announcements about the sessions in each community. Generally, between four and eight people participated in each session (one session in Alice, held in conjunction with a Rotary Club meeting, had a significantly larger number of participants). A total of 75 citizens participated in the sessions.

Eighteen sessions were originally scheduled in order to provide two meeting opportunities in each of the counties (some counties with small populations were combined). In a few instances, additional sessions were scheduled if there were no attendees at either of the scheduled sessions. Two of the rescheduled sessions were conducted with existing community groups. Ultimately, sixteen sessions were completed.

The sessions lasted between 60 and 75 minutes. One rescheduled session in Portland was abbreviated in order to accommodate other items on the group’s agenda. Each session was led by a professional facilitator, who introduced the session with an overview of the study. Following individual introductions, participants were asked a series of questions. Responses were entered into a laptop computer data bank for later analysis.

First, participants were asked about what they were proudest of in their community or county. Then, the facilitator reviewed the first five of the eight needs assessment study areas: (1) basic needs; (2) education and job preparation; (3) neighborhoods and communities; (4) health and well-being; and (5) disabilities. Each participant was given two “sticky dots” and asked to select the two areas that presented the greatest challenge for the community or county. The table below indicates the number of dots each area received in each community.

Location	Basic Needs	Education / Job Preparation	Neighborhoods / Communities	Health / Well-being	Disabilities
Alice	2	22		21	1
Beeville	2	4		5	
Corpus Christi	1	3	1	3	
Falfurrias	1	7	1	8	
Kingsville	3	7	4	3	
Refugio	2	3			1
Robstown	1	2	3	2	
Rockport	2	5	2	3	2
San Diego	1	1			
Sinton	1	4	1	4	
Three Rivers	1	2		2	2
Tilden	3		1	2	

(No dots were used in the abbreviated Portland session. Alice, Beeville, Falfurrias, and Kingsville figures are totals for two sessions.)

The two areas receiving the highest number of dots were discussed first. For each priority area, participants were asked to explain why they felt that area was a challenge for that community, what awareness they had of

existing efforts to address those challenges, and barriers people experienced getting the help they needed with those challenges.

Finally, the facilitator asked participants to focus on the last three study areas: (6) families; (7) children and youth; and (8) senior citizens. Participants were asked to describe what would need to happen in their community or county in order to improve the existing situation for each of the three groups.

Key Informant Sessions

Methodology. Participants in these focus groups were individuals who had completed the Key Informant Survey. Between two and eleven people participated in each session, with a total of 55 citizens participating overall.

Nine sessions were originally scheduled in order to provide a meeting opportunity in each of the counties (some counties with small populations were combined). Ultimately, eight sessions were completed.

The sessions lasted approximately 60 minutes. A professional facilitator, who introduced the session with an overview of the study, led each session. Following individual introductions, participants were provided with a handout that summarized the data gleaned from the Key Informant Survey. Participants were asked to review the data, and then comment on the results in each area as they pertained to their counties specifically. Guiding questions included:

What do you find surprising about the data?

What is consistent with your county experience? What is inconsistent?

What other issues should be included?

Responses were compiled using a laptop computer data bank for later theme analysis.

Community Response Sessions

Methodology. Participants in these focus groups included invitees as well as members of the public who responded to media announcements about the sessions in each community. Between two and 27 people participated in each session. A total of 62 citizens participated in the sessions.

Eighteen sessions were originally scheduled in order to provide a meeting opportunity in each of the counties (some counties with small populations were combined). Ultimately, twelve sessions were completed.

The sessions lasted approximately 60 minutes. A professional facilitator, who introduced the session with an overview of the study, led each session. Following individual introductions, the facilitator used an overhead presentation to summarize the data gleaned from the Key Informant Survey and the Telephone Survey. Participants were asked to review the data, and then comment on the results in each area as they pertained to their counties specifically. Guiding questions included:

What do you find surprising about the data?

What is consistent with your county experience? What is inconsistent?

What other issues should be included?

Responses were compiled using a laptop computer data bank for later theme analysis.