



JAMES A. BAKER III INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY  
RICE UNIVERSITY

EDUCATION, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND  
BORDER ECONOMIC GROWTH:  
APPENDIXES

PART OF THE BORDER ECONOMIES SERIES  
OF THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER PROGRAM

BY

THOMAS M. FULLERTON JR.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

AND

ENEDINA LICERIO, EMMANUEL VILLALOBOS, AND  
ANGEL L. MOLINA JR.

BORDER REGION MODELING PROJECT  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND FINANCE  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

MARCH 24, 2010

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendixes

© 2010 BY THE JAMES A. BAKER III INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY OF RICE UNIVERSITY

THIS MATERIAL MAY BE QUOTED OR REPRODUCED WITHOUT PRIOR PERMISSION,  
PROVIDED APPROPRIATE CREDIT IS GIVEN TO THE AUTHOR AND  
THE JAMES A. BAKER III INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY.

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

**Appendix A: Data**

**Table A1: County Education Data**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Drop Outs HSDR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Graduates HSGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Partial College Attendance COLSOM25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Bachelor Degrees BACHGR25</b>
<b>1 Anderson</b>	25.8%	28.2%	21.0%	7.0%
<b>2 Andrews</b>	17.6%	32.6%	18.0%	8.5%
<b>3 Angelina</b>	17.0%	29.3%	22.3%	10.1%
<b>4 Aransas</b>	16.4%	29.1%	24.4%	11.1%
<b>5 Archer</b>	12.8%	36.0%	26.1%	11.8%
<b>6 Armstrong</b>	13.3%	27.8%	26.3%	15.8%
<b>7 Atascosa</b>	16.5%	32.0%	18.6%	6.9%
<b>8 Austin</b>	13.3%	32.3%	18.8%	12.5%
<b>9 Bailey</b>	15.6%	31.5%	16.7%	6.7%
<b>10 Bandera</b>	9.8%	31.9%	27.4%	13.6%
<b>11 Bastrop</b>	12.3%	31.7%	22.9%	12.3%
<b>12 Baylor</b>	21.2%	32.7%	21.8%	8.7%
<b>13 Bee</b>	12.7%	34.8%	20.0%	7.4%
<b>14 Bell</b>	9.5%	27.5%	28.7%	13.4%
<b>15 Bexar</b>	11.8%	24.3%	23.9%	14.4%
<b>16 Blanco</b>	11.1%	30.5%	23.1%	15.3%
<b>17 Borden</b>	9.2%	32.9%	23.0%	17.3%
<b>18 Bosque</b>	14.5%	32.1%	23.2%	10.8%
<b>19 Bowie</b>	15.2%	31.9%	24.1%	10.1%
<b>20 Brazoria</b>	12.7%	27.2%	25.8%	13.7%
<b>21 Brazos</b>	10.9%	20.1%	19.7%	19.7%
<b>22 Brewster</b>	8.0%	21.1%	25.8%	17.4%
<b>23 Briscoe</b>	13.9%	30.4%	24.4%	13.9%
<b>24 Brooks</b>	20.5%	23.4%	18.0%	3.1%
<b>25 Brown</b>	15.5%	35.0%	21.2%	10.5%
<b>26 Burlison</b>	18.2%	37.5%	16.4%	9.5%
<b>27 Burnet</b>	14.9%	32.5%	23.3%	11.7%
<b>28 Caldwell</b>	16.5%	34.8%	20.2%	10.0%
<b>29 Calhoun</b>	17.6%	33.1%	19.3%	8.1%
<b>30 Callahan</b>	14.4%	38.1%	24.2%	8.9%
<b>31 Cameron</b>	15.4%	20.1%	17.5%	8.5%
<b>32 Camp</b>	18.7%	32.6%	20.7%	8.5%
<b>33 Carson</b>	12.1%	31.0%	29.6%	11.2%
<b>34 Cass</b>	17.9%	38.2%	20.8%	8.3%
<b>35 Castro</b>	14.5%	29.7%	17.4%	11.1%
<b>36 Chambers</b>	14.6%	32.4%	27.0%	8.4%
<b>37 Cherokee</b>	19.4%	32.0%	20.6%	7.5%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Drop Outs HSDR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Graduates HSGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Partial College Attendance COLSOM25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Bachelor Degrees BACHGR25</b>
38 Childress	20.9%	31.0%	20.8%	5.7%
39 Clay	14.7%	39.6%	22.3%	11.1%
40 Cochran	15.8%	28.3%	19.9%	5.7%
41 Coke	16.0%	34.0%	22.0%	10.9%
42 Coleman	17.9%	38.2%	18.5%	8.1%
43 Collin	5.0%	15.0%	23.2%	32.7%
44 Collingsworth	16.2%	25.5%	26.6%	10.0%
45 Colorado	15.3%	33.4%	16.9%	10.0%
46 Comal	8.9%	28.5%	24.1%	17.5%
47 Comanche	15.9%	34.6%	19.5%	8.9%
48 Concho	23.5%	27.2%	13.5%	11.0%
49 Cooke	13.3%	31.5%	25.2%	10.4%
50 Coryell	12.2%	32.1%	28.5%	8.7%
51 Cottle	19.4%	30.6%	17.2%	11.5%
52 Crane	13.8%	32.9%	18.6%	7.2%
53 Crockett	18.6%	28.9%	20.6%	7.0%
54 Crosby	18.9%	30.6%	18.3%	7.4%
55 Culberson	17.3%	27.6%	12.0%	10.3%
56 Dallam	22.3%	32.1%	19.8%	6.7%
57 Dallas	13.1%	21.7%	21.3%	18.0%
58 Dawson	16.0%	34.8%	18.0%	7.9%
59 Deaf Smith	17.0%	26.5%	19.5%	8.2%
60 Delta	16.0%	36.1%	21.5%	8.5%
61 Denton	6.5%	19.9%	26.2%	26.6%
62 DeWitt	16.3%	32.9%	19.0%	8.0%
63 Dickens	16.2%	38.5%	22.3%	6.8%
64 Dimmit	14.9%	26.3%	14.5%	7.8%
65 Donley	15.6%	26.5%	28.5%	10.9%
66 Duval	17.4%	29.7%	18.2%	5.6%
67 Eastland	17.1%	33.5%	21.1%	9.0%
68 Ector	16.7%	26.8%	23.8%	8.6%
69 Edwards	12.1%	29.4%	17.2%	12.9%
70 Ellis	13.8%	30.8%	24.6%	12.4%
71 El Paso	12.8%	22.6%	21.6%	11.0%
72 Erath	13.4%	26.6%	22.4%	16.2%
73 Falls	20.7%	34.1%	17.8%	6.2%
74 Fannin	18.4%	35.7%	20.1%	8.1%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Drop Outs HSDR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Graduates HSGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Partial College Attendance COLSOM25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Bachelor Degrees BACHGR25</b>
75 Fayette	13.6%	35.8%	17.2%	10.9%
76 Fisher	12.4%	38.4%	18.1%	9.2%
77 Floyd	16.5%	31.0%	17.4%	10.0%
78 Foard	17.6%	35.1%	22.9%	7.5%
79 Fort Bend	8.5%	19.4%	21.8%	25.1%
80 Franklin	15.1%	35.6%	21.1%	10.9%
81 Freestone	15.9%	37.7%	21.6%	7.8%
82 Frio	19.4%	28.4%	17.3%	6.5%
83 Gaines	17.3%	26.4%	16.9%	7.9%
84 Galveston	12.3%	26.4%	25.5%	14.7%
85 Garza	17.0%	38.4%	19.7%	6.8%
86 Gillespie	9.6%	29.5%	23.5%	15.1%
87 Glasscock	14.0%	24.2%	22.7%	15.4%
88 Goliad	13.3%	29.6%	25.0%	8.4%
89 Gonzales	17.7%	33.8%	15.1%	8.3%
90 Gray	16.7%	33.6%	24.7%	8.3%
91 Grayson	13.3%	30.0%	25.3%	11.2%
92 Gregg	14.3%	27.7%	25.3%	13.2%
93 Grimes	19.9%	32.8%	20.1%	7.2%
94 Guadalupe	12.3%	30.1%	22.9%	13.1%
95 Hale	17.2%	28.7%	18.9%	9.8%
96 Hall	20.5%	32.8%	15.1%	7.5%
97 Hamilton	16.5%	33.0%	20.8%	10.6%
98 Hansford	13.8%	29.8%	18.2%	14.5%
99 Hardeman	16.2%	33.3%	21.9%	8.0%
100 Hardin	14.0%	40.3%	21.0%	9.7%
101 Harris	13.3%	21.6%	21.3%	17.9%
102 Harrison	14.6%	34.1%	23.1%	10.8%
103 Hartley	15.4%	33.9%	22.1%	13.3%
104 Haskell	16.3%	36.5%	18.3%	9.3%
105 Hays	8.0%	22.9%	25.7%	20.3%
106 Hemphill	10.2%	29.2%	29.3%	14.2%
107 Henderson	17.6%	32.4%	23.6%	8.2%
108 Hidalgo	15.7%	20.3%	14.4%	8.4%
109 Hill	18.7%	33.3%	20.9%	8.6%
110 Hockley	16.1%	26.2%	21.1%	8.8%
111 Hood	12.2%	29.6%	28.7%	14.1%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Drop Outs HSDR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Graduates HSGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Partial College Attendance COLSOM25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Bachelor Degrees BACHGR25</b>
<b>112 Hopkins</b>	16.3%	35.7%	19.9%	10.1%
<b>113 Houston</b>	18.4%	34.7%	19.2%	7.9%
<b>114 Howard</b>	15.3%	31.3%	22.1%	7.8%
<b>115 Hudspeth</b>	15.8%	20.6%	13.0%	6.4%
<b>116 Hunt</b>	15.9%	34.3%	22.1%	10.8%
<b>117 Hutchinson</b>	13.1%	34.1%	25.2%	9.5%
<b>118 Irion</b>	11.4%	31.0%	22.7%	17.1%
<b>119 Jack</b>	16.1%	36.6%	22.1%	9.0%
<b>120 Jackson</b>	14.6%	34.3%	20.7%	9.5%
<b>121 Jasper</b>	17.5%	39.6%	19.1%	7.0%
<b>122 Jeff Davis</b>	11.2%	19.0%	16.0%	21.5%
<b>123 Jefferson</b>	13.6%	33.2%	23.7%	11.5%
<b>124 Jim Hogg</b>	16.1%	28.3%	17.3%	6.0%
<b>125 Jim Wells</b>	17.8%	32.3%	18.1%	7.2%
<b>126 Johnson</b>	15.7%	33.3%	25.0%	9.7%
<b>127 Jones</b>	23.7%	34.6%	17.5%	5.8%
<b>128 Karnes</b>	20.7%	32.3%	14.0%	6.3%
<b>129 Kaufman</b>	17.3%	33.8%	22.9%	8.8%
<b>130 Kendall</b>	7.5%	23.0%	26.3%	20.6%
<b>131 Kenedy</b>	15.7%	21.9%	15.3%	11.5%
<b>132 Kent</b>	12.4%	37.0%	22.9%	10.1%
<b>133 Kerr</b>	10.6%	29.2%	23.8%	15.0%
<b>134 Kimble</b>	17.1%	34.2%	18.0%	11.3%
<b>135 King</b>	13.6%	25.9%	16.2%	21.1%
<b>136 Kinney</b>	11.3%	27.3%	17.8%	12.9%
<b>137 Kleberg</b>	16.2%	23.0%	21.8%	12.8%
<b>138 Knox</b>	16.3%	33.7%	18.3%	9.3%
<b>139 Lamar</b>	15.5%	33.2%	22.9%	9.5%
<b>140 Lamb</b>	16.3%	28.4%	19.5%	7.9%
<b>141 Lampasas</b>	12.4%	30.5%	25.8%	11.0%
<b>142 La Salle</b>	19.2%	25.7%	16.0%	5.4%
<b>143 Lavaca</b>	16.7%	36.7%	17.0%	7.8%
<b>144 Lee</b>	12.5%	36.7%	17.7%	9.4%
<b>145 Leon</b>	17.1%	37.9%	21.0%	8.4%
<b>146 Liberty</b>	19.9%	36.2%	22.2%	5.4%
<b>147 Limestone</b>	18.6%	30.0%	21.3%	6.5%
<b>148 Lipscomb</b>	12.0%	29.3%	23.9%	13.7%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Drop Outs HSDR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Graduates HSGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Partial College Attendance COLSOM25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Bachelor Degrees BACHGR25</b>
149 Live Oak	17.8%	28.3%	21.5%	7.5%
150 Llano	11.9%	32.6%	26.1%	13.8%
151 Loving	13.7%	37.3%	37.2%	0.0%
152 Lubbock	13.0%	25.3%	24.2%	16.0%
153 Lynn	16.8%	28.0%	17.7%	9.3%
154 McCulloch	17.3%	35.0%	18.8%	9.7%
155 McLennan	14.3%	27.9%	22.5%	11.8%
156 McMullen	12.1%	35.2%	18.9%	13.4%
157 Madison	18.0%	43.9%	15.3%	8.4%
158 Marion	23.4%	33.2%	22.3%	5.5%
159 Martin	13.3%	31.4%	19.9%	9.2%
160 Mason	11.7%	27.8%	27.4%	13.8%
161 Matagorda	15.3%	31.2%	21.8%	9.5%
162 Maverick	17.7%	18.8%	10.8%	5.7%
163 Medina	13.0%	33.4%	21.1%	9.3%
164 Menard	13.6%	31.0%	19.7%	11.5%
165 Midland	11.6%	23.0%	25.3%	18.4%
166 Milam	17.3%	37.0%	18.4%	8.7%
167 Mills	13.4%	35.9%	18.3%	13.0%
168 Mitchell	16.9%	41.0%	17.0%	7.9%
169 Montague	18.0%	35.4%	22.2%	8.3%
170 Montgomery	12.1%	27.4%	24.0%	17.7%
171 Moore	17.8%	28.5%	19.6%	7.6%
172 Morris	18.2%	34.4%	23.5%	7.6%
173 Motley	16.9%	33.7%	22.2%	10.6%
174 Nacogdoches	15.9%	27.3%	20.2%	13.7%
175 Navarro	16.6%	32.7%	21.1%	7.9%
176 Newton	20.9%	45.4%	15.1%	3.7%
177 Nolan	17.7%	32.1%	19.9%	9.5%
178 Nueces	13.3%	25.1%	24.8%	12.0%
179 Ochiltree	14.6%	27.4%	22.1%	12.9%
180 Oldham	11.9%	27.1%	28.0%	15.5%
181 Orange	14.6%	38.7%	24.1%	8.2%
182 Palo Pinto	18.4%	31.7%	23.1%	8.1%
183 Panola	16.1%	34.8%	22.5%	8.8%
184 Parker	14.4%	30.4%	25.3%	12.5%
185 Parmer	13.7%	25.4%	19.0%	10.1%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Drop Outs HSDR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Graduates HSGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Partial College Attendance COLSOM25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Bachelor Degrees BACHGR25</b>
<b>186 Pecos</b>	14.6%	29.4%	17.3%	7.8%
<b>187 Polk</b>	20.5%	36.5%	19.4%	7.0%
<b>188 Potter</b>	18.1%	29.3%	23.2%	8.7%
<b>189 Presidio</b>	13.3%	19.9%	10.0%	6.8%
<b>190 Rains</b>	17.2%	37.5%	21.2%	7.5%
<b>191 Randall</b>	8.0%	23.3%	29.9%	19.6%
<b>192 Reagan</b>	16.6%	29.9%	20.3%	6.4%
<b>193 Real</b>	15.3%	28.3%	23.4%	12.9%
<b>194 Red River</b>	20.9%	33.7%	19.2%	5.3%
<b>195 Reeves</b>	21.1%	24.8%	11.9%	4.9%
<b>196 Refugio</b>	16.6%	32.5%	20.3%	7.6%
<b>197 Roberts</b>	7.4%	28.5%	31.0%	20.1%
<b>198 Robertson</b>	19.8%	35.9%	15.8%	7.9%
<b>199 Rockwall</b>	8.4%	22.9%	25.3%	22.4%
<b>200 Runnels</b>	16.0%	35.2%	18.8%	9.8%
<b>201 Rusk</b>	17.3%	33.0%	22.2%	8.1%
<b>202 Sabine</b>	17.6%	37.7%	21.0%	6.6%
<b>203 San Augustine</b>	18.4%	38.6%	18.3%	6.4%
<b>204 San Jacinto</b>	18.5%	38.6%	21.9%	6.4%
<b>205 San Patricio</b>	14.4%	29.8%	23.8%	9.2%
<b>206 San Saba</b>	14.9%	31.2%	20.2%	10.5%
<b>207 Schleicher</b>	17.7%	20.6%	18.4%	13.7%
<b>208 Scurry</b>	14.6%	31.9%	22.8%	7.3%
<b>209 Shackelford</b>	13.1%	32.6%	21.5%	15.4%
<b>210 Shelby</b>	19.6%	35.5%	18.2%	7.6%
<b>211 Sherman</b>	12.8%	26.9%	23.0%	17.0%
<b>212 Smith</b>	12.3%	24.8%	25.4%	15.3%
<b>213 Somervell</b>	13.7%	32.4%	23.9%	11.0%
<b>214 Starr</b>	19.0%	16.9%	9.3%	3.7%
<b>215 Stephens</b>	18.3%	29.3%	24.1%	8.1%
<b>216 Sterling</b>	12.8%	27.9%	21.3%	12.2%
<b>217 Stonewall</b>	16.5%	37.9%	18.4%	10.1%
<b>218 Sutton</b>	15.7%	29.8%	18.2%	10.0%
<b>219 Swisher</b>	13.5%	31.0%	19.8%	13.1%
<b>220 Tarrant</b>	11.1%	23.5%	25.2%	18.8%
<b>221 Taylor</b>	12.3%	28.4%	24.8%	14.9%
<b>222 Terrell</b>	9.9%	27.4%	22.3%	15.2%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Drop Outs HSDR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ High School Graduates HSGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Partial College Attendance COLSOM25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ Bachelor Degrees BACHGR25</b>
223 Terry	17.7%	31.8%	18.0%	7.1%
224 Throckmorton	14.3%	33.5%	23.2%	13.9%
225 Titus	19.1%	29.4%	19.1%	8.5%
226 Tom Green	13.4%	28.5%	23.1%	14.1%
227 Travis	7.9%	17.4%	21.4%	26.1%
228 Trinity	17.2%	39.5%	21.1%	6.5%
229 Tyler	20.5%	41.5%	18.2%	5.8%
230 Upshur	17.3%	36.3%	23.9%	7.5%
231 Upton	14.1%	34.2%	18.4%	8.0%
232 Uvalde	14.9%	22.4%	19.0%	9.7%
233 Val Verde	14.1%	24.8%	16.2%	8.8%
234 Van Zandt	19.1%	34.4%	21.4%	7.6%
235 Victoria	12.6%	29.0%	24.7%	10.9%
236 Walker	16.5%	31.7%	20.0%	11.7%
237 Waller	15.0%	31.5%	22.3%	11.0%
238 Ward	14.9%	34.5%	20.4%	7.9%
239 Washington	14.4%	28.6%	18.4%	13.7%
240 Webb	17.5%	18.0%	15.9%	8.6%
241 Wharton	14.7%	29.3%	20.2%	9.7%
242 Wheeler	16.8%	30.6%	23.2%	9.7%
243 Wichita	13.1%	29.8%	24.3%	14.3%
244 Wilbarger	15.4%	29.5%	19.8%	12.3%
245 Willacy	15.5%	24.3%	15.2%	5.4%
246 Williamson	6.4%	22.2%	26.3%	24.4%
247 Wilson	12.8%	34.1%	21.2%	9.8%
248 Winkler	17.4%	27.3%	20.3%	7.7%
249 Wise	15.6%	34.8%	23.5%	9.2%
250 Wood	16.1%	32.8%	24.4%	9.2%
251 Yoakum	15.7%	26.5%	19.0%	7.0%
252 Young	18.0%	32.1%	21.8%	10.3%
253 Zapata	16.5%	27.7%	15.1%	5.7%
254 Zavala	17.7%	20.3%	11.9%	4.0%
255 State	12.8%	24.9%	22.3%	15.6%
256 National	12.1%	28.6%	21.0%	15.5%

Census Data Center Source: [http://txsdc.utsa.edu/data/census/2000/dp2\\_4/pdf/](http://txsdc.utsa.edu/data/census/2000/dp2_4/pdf/)

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

**Table A2: County Education Data, Continued**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ who held Graduate or Professional Degrees GRADGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ who held Bachelor's Graduate or Professional Degrees COGR25</b>
<b>1 Anderson</b>	4.1%	11.1%
<b>2 Andrews</b>	3.9%	12.4%
<b>3 Angelina</b>	4.6%	14.7%
<b>4 Aransas</b>	5.6%	16.7%
<b>5 Archer</b>	4.1%	15.9%
<b>6 Armstrong</b>	4.7%	20.5%
<b>7 Atascosa</b>	3.6%	10.5%
<b>8 Austin</b>	4.8%	17.3%
<b>9 Bailey</b>	2.6%	9.3%
<b>10 Bandera</b>	5.8%	19.4%
<b>11 Bastrop</b>	4.7%	17.0%
<b>12 Baylor</b>	3.4%	12.1%
<b>13 Bee</b>	4.8%	12.2%
<b>14 Bell</b>	6.4%	19.8%
<b>15 Bexar</b>	8.3%	22.7%
<b>16 Blanco</b>	6.9%	22.2%
<b>17 Borden</b>	4.1%	21.4%
<b>18 Bosque</b>	4.6%	15.4%
<b>19 Bowie</b>	6.0%	16.1%
<b>20 Brazoria</b>	5.9%	19.6%
<b>21 Brazos</b>	17.3%	37.0%
<b>22 Brewster</b>	10.3%	27.7%
<b>23 Briscoe</b>	3.6%	17.5%
<b>24 Brooks</b>	3.7%	6.8%
<b>25 Brown</b>	4.5%	15.0%
<b>26 Burleson</b>	3.7%	13.2%
<b>27 Burnet</b>	5.7%	17.4%
<b>28 Caldwell</b>	3.3%	13.3%
<b>29 Calhoun</b>	4.0%	12.1%
<b>30 Callahan</b>	3.4%	12.3%
<b>31 Cameron</b>	4.9%	13.4%
<b>32 Camp</b>	3.7%	12.2%
<b>33 Carson</b>	4.3%	15.5%
<b>34 Cass</b>	3.7%	12.0%
<b>35 Castro</b>	3.6%	14.7%
<b>36 Chambers</b>	3.7%	12.1%
<b>37 Cherokee</b>	3.9%	11.4%

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A

Counties 2000 Census Data	% Adults Age 25+ who held Graduate or Professional Degrees <b>GRADGR25</b>	% Adults Age 25+ who held Bachelor's Graduate or Professional Degrees <b>COGR25</b>
<b>38 Childress</b>	2.9%	8.6%
<b>39 Clay</b>	2.8%	13.9%
<b>40 Cochran</b>	4.5%	10.2%
<b>41 Coke</b>	3.8%	14.7%
<b>42 Coleman</b>	3.6%	11.7%
<b>43 Collin</b>	14.6%	47.3%
<b>44 Collingsworth</b>	5.3%	15.3%
<b>45 Colorado</b>	4.4%	14.4%
<b>46 Comal</b>	8.7%	26.2%
<b>47 Comanche</b>	4.1%	13.0%
<b>48 Concho</b>	3.1%	14.1%
<b>49 Cooke</b>	5.3%	15.7%
<b>50 Coryell</b>	3.7%	12.4%
<b>51 Cottle</b>	3.8%	15.3%
<b>52 Crane</b>	5.6%	12.8%
<b>53 Crockett</b>	3.4%	10.4%
<b>54 Crosby</b>	3.1%	10.5%
<b>55 Culberson</b>	3.6%	13.9%
<b>56 Dallam</b>	2.9%	9.6%
<b>57 Dallas</b>	9.0%	27.0%
<b>58 Dawson</b>	2.6%	10.5%
<b>59 Deaf Smith</b>	3.6%	11.8%
<b>60 Delta</b>	5.4%	13.9%
<b>61 Denton</b>	10.0%	36.6%
<b>62 DeWitt</b>	3.8%	11.8%
<b>63 Dickens</b>	1.6%	8.4%
<b>64 Dimmit</b>	2.3%	10.1%
<b>65 Donley</b>	4.9%	15.8%
<b>66 Duval</b>	3.3%	8.9%
<b>67 Eastland</b>	3.7%	12.7%
<b>68 Ector</b>	3.4%	12.0%
<b>69 Edwards</b>	4.4%	17.3%
<b>70 Ellis</b>	4.7%	17.1%
<b>71 El Paso</b>	5.6%	16.6%
<b>72 Erath</b>	8.8%	25.0%
<b>73 Falls</b>	3.4%	9.6%
<b>74 Fannin</b>	4.5%	12.6%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ who held Graduate or Professional Degrees GRADGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ who held Bachelor's Graduate or Professional Degrees COGR25</b>
<b>75 Fayette</b>	3.7%	14.6%
<b>76 Fisher</b>	3.2%	12.4%
<b>77 Floyd</b>	2.3%	12.3%
<b>78 Foard</b>	3.0%	10.5%
<b>79 Fort Bend</b>	11.8%	36.9%
<b>80 Franklin</b>	5.3%	16.2%
<b>81 Freestone</b>	3.1%	10.9%
<b>82 Frio</b>	1.9%	8.4%
<b>83 Gaines</b>	2.6%	10.5%
<b>84 Galveston</b>	8.0%	22.7%
<b>85 Garza</b>	3.2%	10.0%
<b>86 Gillespie</b>	7.8%	22.9%
<b>87 Glasscock</b>	3.3%	18.7%
<b>88 Goliad</b>	3.9%	12.3%
<b>89 Gonzales</b>	2.4%	10.7%
<b>90 Gray</b>	3.6%	11.9%
<b>91 Grayson</b>	6.0%	17.2%
<b>92 Gregg</b>	6.3%	19.5%
<b>93 Grimes</b>	3.1%	10.3%
<b>94 Guadalupe</b>	6.0%	19.1%
<b>95 Hale</b>	4.6%	14.4%
<b>96 Hall</b>	2.8%	10.3%
<b>97 Hamilton</b>	6.2%	16.8%
<b>98 Hansford</b>	4.1%	18.6%
<b>99 Hardeman</b>	4.8%	12.8%
<b>100 Hardin</b>	3.3%	13.0%
<b>101 Harris</b>	9.0%	26.9%
<b>102 Harrison</b>	4.6%	15.4%
<b>103 Hartley</b>	4.3%	17.6%
<b>104 Haskell</b>	5.1%	14.4%
<b>105 Hays</b>	11.0%	31.3%
<b>106 Hemphill</b>	3.7%	17.9%
<b>107 Henderson</b>	3.9%	12.1%
<b>108 Hidalgo</b>	4.5%	12.9%
<b>109 Hill</b>	3.9%	12.5%
<b>110 Hockley</b>	4.8%	13.6%
<b>111 Hood</b>	6.4%	20.5%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ who held Graduate or Professional Degrees GRADGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ who held Bachelor's Graduate or Professional Degrees COGR25</b>
<b>112 Hopkins</b>	5.0%	15.1%
<b>113 Houston</b>	4.3%	12.2%
<b>114 Howard</b>	3.3%	11.1%
<b>115 Hudspeth</b>	3.3%	9.7%
<b>116 Hunt</b>	6.0%	16.8%
<b>117 Hutchinson</b>	4.8%	14.3%
<b>118 Irion</b>	4.4%	21.5%
<b>119 Jack</b>	3.8%	12.8%
<b>120 Jackson</b>	3.3%	12.8%
<b>121 Jasper</b>	3.5%	10.5%
<b>122 Jeff Davis</b>	13.6%	35.1%
<b>123 Jefferson</b>	4.8%	16.3%
<b>124 Jim Hogg</b>	3.5%	9.5%
<b>125 Jim Wells</b>	3.7%	10.9%
<b>126 Johnson</b>	4.1%	13.8%
<b>127 Jones</b>	2.4%	8.2%
<b>128 Karnes</b>	3.1%	9.4%
<b>129 Kaufman</b>	3.5%	12.3%
<b>130 Kendall</b>	10.8%	31.4%
<b>131 Kenedy</b>	8.8%	20.3%
<b>132 Kent</b>	5.0%	15.1%
<b>133 Kerr</b>	8.3%	23.3%
<b>134 Kimble</b>	6.0%	17.3%
<b>135 King</b>	3.5%	24.6%
<b>136 Kinney</b>	4.8%	17.7%
<b>137 Kleberg</b>	7.6%	20.4%
<b>138 Knox</b>	2.5%	11.8%
<b>139 Lamar</b>	5.0%	14.5%
<b>140 Lamb</b>	3.2%	11.1%
<b>141 Lampasas</b>	5.2%	16.2%
<b>142 La Salle</b>	1.0%	6.4%
<b>143 Lavaca</b>	3.6%	11.4%
<b>144 Lee</b>	3.7%	13.1%
<b>145 Leon</b>	3.7%	12.1%
<b>146 Liberty</b>	2.7%	8.1%
<b>147 Limestone</b>	4.6%	11.1%
<b>148 Lipscomb</b>	5.2%	18.9%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ who held Graduate or Professional Degrees GRADGR25</b>	<b>% Adults Age 25+ who held Bachelor's Graduate or Professional Degrees COGR25</b>
<b>149 Live Oak</b>	4.5%	12.0%
<b>150 Llano</b>	7.2%	21.0%
<b>151 Loving</b>	5.9%	5.9%
<b>152 Lubbock</b>	8.4%	24.4%
<b>153 Lynn</b>	4.1%	13.4%
<b>154 McCulloch</b>	4.3%	14.0%
<b>155 McLennan</b>	7.3%	19.1%
<b>156 McMullen</b>	2.8%	16.2%
<b>157 Madison</b>	3.1%	11.5%
<b>158 Marion</b>	3.0%	8.5%
<b>159 Martin</b>	2.6%	11.8%
<b>160 Mason</b>	4.9%	18.7%
<b>161 Matagorda</b>	3.0%	12.5%
<b>162 Maverick</b>	3.4%	9.1%
<b>163 Medina</b>	4.0%	13.3%
<b>164 Menard</b>	5.7%	17.2%
<b>165 Midland</b>	6.4%	24.8%
<b>166 Milam</b>	2.9%	11.6%
<b>167 Mills</b>	7.2%	20.2%
<b>168 Mitchell</b>	2.5%	10.4%
<b>169 Montague</b>	3.0%	11.3%
<b>170 Montgomery</b>	7.6%	25.3%
<b>171 Moore</b>	3.4%	11.0%
<b>172 Morris</b>	3.6%	11.2%
<b>173 Motley</b>	4.1%	14.7%
<b>174 Nacogdoches</b>	9.1%	22.8%
<b>175 Navarro</b>	4.3%	12.2%
<b>176 Newton</b>	1.8%	5.5%
<b>177 Nolan</b>	3.7%	13.2%
<b>178 Nueces</b>	6.8%	18.8%
<b>179 Ochiltree</b>	3.2%	16.1%
<b>180 Oldham</b>	3.9%	19.4%
<b>181 Orange</b>	2.8%	11.0%
<b>182 Palo Pinto</b>	4.0%	12.1%
<b>183 Panola</b>	4.6%	13.4%
<b>184 Parker</b>	6.1%	18.6%
<b>185 Parmer</b>	3.3%	13.4%

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A

Counties 2000 Census Data	% Adults Age 25+ who held Graduate or Professional Degrees <b>GRADGR25</b>	% Adults Age 25+ who held Bachelor's Graduate or Professional Degrees <b>COGR25</b>
<b>186 Pecos</b>	5.1%	12.9%
<b>187 Polk</b>	3.4%	10.4%
<b>188 Potter</b>	4.8%	13.5%
<b>189 Presidio</b>	4.9%	11.7%
<b>190 Rains</b>	4.0%	11.5%
<b>191 Randall</b>	9.3%	28.9%
<b>192 Reagan</b>	2.8%	9.2%
<b>193 Real</b>	4.4%	17.3%
<b>194 Red River</b>	3.7%	9.0%
<b>195 Reeves</b>	3.1%	8.0%
<b>196 Refugio</b>	4.0%	11.6%
<b>197 Roberts</b>	5.3%	25.4%
<b>198 Robertson</b>	4.8%	12.7%
<b>199 Rockwall</b>	10.3%	32.7%
<b>200 Runnels</b>	3.3%	13.1%
<b>201 Rusk</b>	4.7%	12.8%
<b>202 Sabine</b>	4.0%	10.6%
<b>203 San Augustine</b>	5.4%	11.8%
<b>204 San Jacinto</b>	3.2%	9.6%
<b>205 San Patricio</b>	3.8%	13.0%
<b>206 San Saba</b>	5.3%	15.8%
<b>207 Schleicher</b>	3.9%	17.6%
<b>208 Scurry</b>	4.5%	11.8%
<b>209 Shackelford</b>	5.4%	20.8%
<b>210 Shelby</b>	4.6%	12.2%
<b>211 Sherman</b>	3.4%	20.4%
<b>212 Smith</b>	7.2%	22.5%
<b>213 Somervell</b>	6.2%	17.2%
<b>214 Starr</b>	3.2%	6.9%
<b>215 Stephens</b>	5.3%	13.4%
<b>216 Sterling</b>	4.9%	17.1%
<b>217 Stonewall</b>	2.5%	12.6%
<b>218 Sutton</b>	3.0%	13.0%
<b>219 Swisher</b>	3.1%	16.2%
<b>220 Tarrant</b>	7.8%	26.6%
<b>221 Taylor</b>	7.6%	22.5%
<b>222 Terrell</b>	3.8%	19.0%

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A

Counties 2000 Census Data	% Adults Age 25+ who held Graduate or Professional Degrees <b>GRADGR25</b>	% Adults Age 25+ who held Bachelor's Graduate or Professional Degrees <b>COGR25</b>
223 Terry	2.4%	9.5%
224 Throckmorton	4.3%	18.2%
225 Titus	4.7%	13.2%
226 Tom Green	5.4%	19.5%
227 Travis	14.5%	40.6%
228 Trinity	2.9%	9.4%
229 Tyler	3.9%	9.7%
230 Upshur	3.6%	11.1%
231 Upton	3.8%	11.8%
232 Uvalde	4.1%	13.8%
233 Val Verde	5.3%	14.1%
234 Van Zandt	4.0%	11.6%
235 Victoria	5.3%	16.2%
236 Walker	6.6%	18.3%
237 Waller	5.8%	16.8%
238 Ward	4.5%	12.4%
239 Washington	5.3%	19.0%
240 Webb	5.3%	13.9%
241 Wharton	4.6%	14.3%
242 Wheeler	3.3%	13.0%
243 Wichita	5.7%	20.0%
244 Wilbarger	4.8%	17.1%
245 Willacy	2.1%	7.5%
246 Williamson	9.2%	33.6%
247 Wilson	3.0%	12.8%
248 Winkler	2.8%	10.5%
249 Wise	3.8%	13.0%
250 Wood	5.3%	14.5%
251 Yoakum	3.2%	10.2%
252 Young	4.1%	14.4%
253 Zapata	3.0%	8.7%
254 Zavala	3.6%	7.6%
255 State	7.6%	23.2%
256 National	8.9%	24.4%

Census Data Center Source: [http://txsdc.utsa.edu/data/census/2000/dp2\\_4/pdf/](http://txsdc.utsa.edu/data/census/2000/dp2_4/pdf/)

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

**Table A3: County Demographics**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Female Labor Participation Rate FLFPR</b>	<b>% of County Population 18, Younger POPLT18</b>	<b>% of County Population 65, Younger POPGT65</b>	<b>% of County Population English only PCTENGL</b>	<b>% of County Population Spanish only PCTSPNH</b>
<b>1 Anderson</b>	47.6%	20.7%	11.7%	93%	2.6%
<b>2 Andrews</b>	43.0%	31.5%	12.5%	66%	11.1%
<b>3 Angelina</b>	45.1%	27.7%	12.6%	86%	5.8%
<b>4 Aransas</b>	44.2%	23.8%	19.7%	82%	4.4%
<b>5 Archer</b>	44.4%	28.2%	13.9%	95%	2.1%
<b>6 Armstrong</b>	42.7%	26.0%	19.2%	96%	1.1%
<b>7 Atascosa</b>	44.4%	31.7%	10.8%	55%	16.0%
<b>8 Austin</b>	43.1%	27.0%	14.8%	83%	6.3%
<b>9 Bailey</b>	40.2%	30.3%	15.2%	58%	15.3%
<b>10 Bandera</b>	43.3%	24.7%	16.2%	87%	3.0%
<b>11 Bastrop</b>	44.1%	28.0%	10.3%	78%	8.1%
<b>12 Baylor</b>	50.3%	23.4%	24.1%	91%	1.8%
<b>13 Bee</b>	45.8%	23.4%	10.2%	58%	13.8%
<b>14 Bell</b>	43.7%	28.9%	8.8%	82%	4.0%
<b>15 Bexar</b>	46.5%	28.5%	10.4%	57%	13.9%
<b>16 Blanco</b>	43.9%	24.4%	16.7%	83%	5.5%
<b>17 Borden</b>	45.8%	24.6%	16.3%	84%	9.9%
<b>18 Bosque</b>	45.3%	24.4%	20.5%	89%	4.4%
<b>19 Bowie</b>	48.1%	24.8%	13.8%	95%	1.1%
<b>20 Brazoria</b>	43.7%	28.6%	8.8%	79%	6.9%
<b>21 Brazos</b>	45.5%	21.5%	6.7%	80%	6.0%
<b>22 Brewster</b>	47.2%	22.2%	14.6%	57%	12.5%
<b>23 Briscoe</b>	40.1%	27.1%	19.3%	83%	7.5%
<b>24 Brooks</b>	45.8%	31.6%	14.4%	22%	27.4%
<b>25 Brown</b>	45.6%	25.8%	16.4%	88%	3.8%
<b>26 Burleson</b>	45.9%	26.9%	16.1%	86%	4.7%
<b>27 Burnet</b>	44.4%	24.5%	17.9%	87%	5.0%
<b>28 Caldwell</b>	46.2%	28.3%	12.5%	68%	9.7%
<b>29 Calhoun</b>	42.4%	28.5%	13.3%	67%	8.5%
<b>30 Callahan</b>	46.9%	26.2%	17.0%	94%	1.6%
<b>31 Cameron</b>	45.9%	33.8%	11.1%	21%	35.3%
<b>32 Camp</b>	45.0%	26.9%	16.3%	84%	7.4%
<b>33 Carson</b>	43.4%	27.9%	15.7%	93%	2.7%
<b>34 Cass</b>	44.7%	24.9%	17.6%	97%	1.0%
<b>35 Castro</b>	38.4%	33.1%	12.7%	55%	17.1%
<b>36 Chambers</b>	42.5%	28.9%	9.0%	88%	4.1%
<b>37 Cherokee</b>	45.4%	26.3%	15.1%	87%	7.3%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Female Labor Participation Rate FLFPR</b>	<b>% of County Population 18, Younger POPLT18</b>	<b>% of County Population 65, Younger POPGT65</b>	<b>% of County Population English only PCTENGL</b>	<b>% of County Population Spanish only PCTSPNH</b>
38 Childress	50.1%	22.1%	15.8%	82%	4.8%
39 Clay	45.2%	24.9%	16.1%	97%	0.9%
40 Cochran	45.5%	31.5%	14.4%	58%	17.1%
41 Coke	48.2%	24.4%	24.1%	86%	3.7%
42 Coleman	44.3%	23.6%	23.0%	90%	2.8%
43 Collin	43.8%	28.7%	5.3%	81%	4.0%
44 Collingsworth	43.4%	26.4%	22.0%	82%	5.5%
45 Colorado	44.4%	25.6%	18.6%	80%	8.0%
46 Comal	45.3%	25.5%	14.8%	80%	5.6%
47 Comanche	43.4%	25.3%	20.3%	81%	7.4%
48 Concho	45.2%	16.1%	13.8%	71%	9.2%
49 Cooke	44.8%	27.3%	14.9%	90%	5.2%
50 Coryell	38.7%	26.2%	5.7%	85%	2.1%
51 Cottle	45.1%	23.9%	25.6%	84%	7.1%
52 Crane	44.9%	31.9%	10.9%	59%	13.6%
53 Crockett	44.6%	28.9%	12.9%	52%	18.6%
54 Crosby	46.0%	30.7%	15.6%	58%	13.2%
55 Culberson	45.0%	32.2%	11.2%	27%	26.4%
56 Dallam	41.3%	31.8%	10.3%	80%	6.7%
57 Dallas	45.1%	27.9%	8.1%	67%	15.5%
58 Dawson	43.6%	25.6%	14.3%	56%	12.2%
59 Deaf Smith	42.9%	33.3%	12.1%	51%	20.2%
60 Delta	45.7%	25.6%	17.7%	98%	0.3%
61 Denton	45.7%	27.7%	5.0%	84%	4.6%
62 DeWitt	45.9%	23.8%	18.9%	77%	7.0%
63 Dickens	47.5%	18.5%	19.0%	78%	4.1%
64 Dimmit	44.4%	33.2%	12.6%	23%	28.9%
65 Donley	45.2%	22.4%	21.7%	94%	1.6%
66 Duval	41.5%	29.5%	14.0%	22%	26.7%
67 Eastland	45.2%	23.2%	20.9%	90%	4.4%
68 Ector	44.9%	30.4%	10.9%	63%	13.2%
69 Edwards	40.7%	28.5%	16.2%	53%	17.7%
70 Ellis	45.4%	30.2%	9.2%	83%	6.8%
71 El Paso	45.2%	32.0%	9.7%	27%	32.0%
72 Erath	44.0%	24.6%	13.4%	85%	6.8%
73 Falls	44.6%	27.6%	16.9%	86%	6.6%
74 Fannin	45.7%	23.2%	16.1%	94%	2.5%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Female Labor Participation Rate FLFPR</b>	<b>% of County Population 18, Younger POPLT18</b>	<b>% of County Population 65, Younger POPGT65</b>	<b>% of County Population English only PCTENGL</b>	<b>% of County Population Spanish only PCTSPNH</b>
75 Fayette	44.9%	23.2%	22.0%	80%	6.0%
76 Fisher	44.6%	23.9%	22.7%	80%	6.8%
77 Floyd	44.0%	31.4%	16.2%	60%	12.8%
78 Foard	45.9%	25.8%	23.1%	88%	3.0%
79 Fort Bend	45.7%	32.0%	5.7%	69%	7.0%
80 Franklin	44.2%	24.3%	18.5%	90%	4.3%
81 Freestone	44.4%	23.6%	16.4%	93%	3.0%
82 Frio	44.1%	28.7%	10.6%	39%	22.7%
83 Gaines	38.6%	35.0%	10.3%	52%	12.4%
84 Galveston	46.4%	26.7%	11.1%	83%	5.9%
85 Garza	44.2%	28.0%	14.1%	70%	10.9%
86 Gillespie	47.2%	21.6%	25.5%	74%	6.6%
87 Glasscock	34.5%	33.5%	9.0%	73%	10.4%
88 Goliad	46.9%	25.9%	17.5%	71%	7.9%
89 Gonzales	43.1%	28.0%	16.8%	66%	14.2%
90 Gray	42.5%	24.0%	18.1%	87%	4.3%
91 Grayson	46.4%	25.3%	15.1%	93%	2.9%
92 Gregg	46.9%	26.8%	13.3%	91%	4.4%
93 Grimes	43.2%	24.8%	13.8%	86%	4.7%
94 Guadalupe	45.4%	28.5%	11.3%	73%	8.2%
95 Hale	44.3%	30.2%	12.9%	61%	13.8%
96 Hall	43.5%	27.2%	21.5%	74%	11.1%
97 Hamilton	46.8%	23.8%	23.6%	91%	3.5%
98 Hansford	40.6%	29.3%	15.2%	70%	14.6%
99 Hardeman	46.6%	25.4%	20.2%	88%	3.6%
100 Hardin	42.9%	27.8%	12.2%	97%	0.5%
101 Harris	44.5%	29.0%	7.4%	64%	15.2%
102 Harrison	46.0%	26.8%	13.1%	94%	2.5%
103 Hartley	41.0%	20.8%	11.9%	89%	1.9%
104 Haskell	44.3%	23.8%	25.5%	83%	6.4%
105 Hays	45.6%	24.5%	7.7%	77%	6.6%
106 Hemphill	44.6%	28.0%	14.7%	87%	5.9%
107 Henderson	44.7%	24.4%	18.2%	92%	3.0%
108 Hidalgo	43.6%	35.3%	9.7%	17%	38.2%
109 Hill	45.0%	25.9%	17.3%	87%	5.6%
110 Hockley	44.9%	29.1%	12.6%	71%	10.1%
111 Hood	44.6%	23.6%	17.9%	92%	2.6%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Female Labor Participation Rate FLFPR</b>	<b>% of County Population 18, Younger POPLT18</b>	<b>% of County Population 65, Younger POPGT65</b>	<b>% of County Population English only PCTENGL</b>	<b>% of County Population Spanish only PCTSPNH</b>
<b>112 Hopkins</b>	43.4%	26.1%	15.2%	90%	4.3%
<b>113 Houston</b>	46.2%	23.2%	18.0%	92%	3.0%
<b>114 Howard</b>	47.9%	24.2%	14.6%	69%	10.6%
<b>115 Hudspeth</b>	40.8%	34.1%	9.9%	26%	40.1%
<b>116 Hunt</b>	44.3%	26.5%	12.6%	91%	3.8%
<b>117 Hutchinson</b>	42.1%	27.4%	15.6%	87%	4.4%
<b>118 Irion</b>	43.9%	26.7%	15.6%	77%	6.8%
<b>119 Jack</b>	42.5%	23.4%	15.2%	93%	2.6%
<b>120 Jackson</b>	43.0%	27.4%	16.0%	81%	7.2%
<b>121 Jasper</b>	44.3%	26.5%	15.3%	95%	2.1%
<b>122 Jeff Davis</b>	44.7%	24.4%	16.3%	63%	14.9%
<b>123 Jefferson</b>	47.2%	25.9%	13.6%	87%	4.0%
<b>124 Jim Hogg</b>	42.5%	31.6%	14.6%	18%	27.5%
<b>125 Jim Wells</b>	44.5%	31.4%	12.4%	37%	21.5%
<b>126 Johnson</b>	44.6%	28.8%	10.0%	88%	4.5%
<b>127 Jones</b>	45.0%	22.5%	14.0%	84%	3.2%
<b>128 Karnes</b>	45.7%	21.8%	14.4%	57%	13.8%
<b>129 Kaufman</b>	44.5%	29.2%	10.6%	89%	4.7%
<b>130 Kendall</b>	44.6%	27.2%	13.9%	83%	5.9%
<b>131 Kenedy</b>	39.5%	29.2%	10.6%	15%	36.5%
<b>132 Kent</b>	44.6%	20.6%	25.5%	89%	4.2%
<b>133 Kerr</b>	47.2%	22.7%	24.9%	82%	6.5%
<b>134 Kimble</b>	46.5%	23.6%	20.9%	82%	6.1%
<b>135 King</b>	39.6%	33.7%	10.4%	95%	2.7%
<b>136 Kinney</b>	40.8%	25.7%	24.3%	53%	19.2%
<b>137 Kleberg</b>	42.7%	27.3%	10.6%	45%	16.7%
<b>138 Knox</b>	43.2%	27.8%	22.7%	77%	9.7%
<b>139 Lamar</b>	46.8%	26.1%	15.6%	95%	1.3%
<b>140 Lamb</b>	43.9%	29.6%	17.3%	65%	13.3%
<b>141 Lampasas</b>	45.1%	27.6%	14.5%	84%	5.5%
<b>142 La Salle</b>	41.0%	29.4%	11.6%	30%	27.6%
<b>143 Lavaca</b>	47.0%	24.2%	21.8%	86%	3.0%
<b>144 Lee</b>	44.0%	28.8%	14.4%	80%	6.3%
<b>145 Leon</b>	43.4%	24.3%	20.0%	91%	3.0%
<b>146 Liberty</b>	41.9%	27.6%	10.3%	88%	4.8%
<b>147 Limestone</b>	46.9%	25.4%	16.4%	88%	5.7%
<b>148 Lipscomb</b>	42.7%	27.6%	18.4%	81%	9.8%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Female Labor Participation Rate FLFPR</b>	<b>% of County Population 18, Younger POPLT18</b>	<b>% of County Population 65, Younger POPGT65</b>	<b>% of County Population English only PCTENGL</b>	<b>% of County Population Spanish only PCTSPNH</b>
149 Live Oak	42.7%	22.3%	16.0%	70%	8.3%
150 Llano	43.6%	15.9%	30.7%	93%	2.4%
151 Loving	47.6%	19.4%	16.4%	67%	23.9%
152 Lubbock	47.5%	25.7%	11.0%	78%	5.9%
153 Lynn	41.3%	31.2%	14.0%	63%	13.2%
154 McCulloch	45.5%	26.6%	19.5%	79%	5.7%
155 McLennan	47.9%	26.6%	12.9%	84%	6.1%
156 McMullen	34.8%	23.4%	17.9%	73%	8.5%
157 Madison	46.6%	21.1%	14.0%	84%	8.4%
158 Marion	46.5%	22.4%	19.2%	96%	0.8%
159 Martin	42.0%	33.9%	13.3%	61%	12.7%
160 Mason	43.7%	22.4%	23.5%	81%	5.7%
161 Matagorda	43.8%	30.0%	12.4%	73%	10.0%
162 Maverick	43.4%	36.9%	9.5%	8%	46.5%
163 Medina	44.9%	29.0%	12.4%	63%	11.4%
164 Menard	43.9%	24.2%	22.0%	73%	9.8%
165 Midland	45.3%	30.2%	11.6%	74%	9.0%
166 Milam	44.3%	27.5%	17.2%	83%	5.0%
167 Mills	40.7%	25.6%	23.1%	88%	5.5%
168 Mitchell	47.9%	19.8%	15.1%	72%	10.4%
169 Montague	43.9%	24.0%	19.8%	94%	2.0%
170 Montgomery	42.5%	29.5%	8.7%	86%	5.7%
171 Moore	42.2%	33.6%	10.6%	59%	19.8%
172 Morris	46.9%	25.2%	18.3%	96%	1.6%
173 Motley	44.0%	24.0%	23.7%	89%	5.0%
174 Nacogdoches	48.0%	24.0%	12.1%	88%	6.3%
175 Navarro	45.3%	27.2%	14.4%	85%	8.3%
176 Newton	42.2%	26.2%	14.2%	96%	0.7%
177 Nolan	45.0%	27.1%	16.4%	76%	7.3%
178 Nueces	45.6%	28.4%	11.2%	57%	13.1%
179 Ochiltree	41.3%	30.6%	11.7%	71%	15.5%
180 Oldham	43.7%	35.0%	11.3%	87%	4.9%
181 Orange	44.2%	27.3%	12.7%	94%	1.0%
182 Palo Pinto	45.1%	26.0%	16.4%	89%	5.2%
183 Panola	43.5%	25.2%	15.8%	95%	1.6%
184 Parker	44.6%	27.5%	10.5%	93%	2.3%
185 Parmer	41.2%	32.9%	12.7%	56%	19.0%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Female Labor Participation Rate FLFPR</b>	<b>% of County Population 18, Younger POPLT18</b>	<b>% of County Population 65, Younger POPGT65</b>	<b>% of County Population English only PCTENGL</b>	<b>% of County Population Spanish only PCTSPNH</b>
186 Pecos	45.4%	27.7%	10.8%	44%	21.0%
187 Polk	45.8%	22.9%	18.0%	88%	3.8%
188 Potter	46.3%	28.0%	11.7%	75%	8.1%
189 Presidio	45.2%	32.7%	13.9%	16%	45.3%
190 Rains	41.9%	23.8%	16.1%	94%	2.5%
191 Randall	46.9%	26.1%	11.9%	92%	1.5%
192 Reagan	38.2%	34.2%	10.3%	52%	19.0%
193 Real	44.1%	23.4%	20.8%	80%	5.8%
194 Red River	44.5%	23.9%	19.7%	94%	2.4%
195 Reeves	42.8%	29.9%	12.6%	33%	29.1%
196 Refugio	44.3%	26.1%	16.6%	68%	9.7%
197 Roberts	41.2%	25.0%	14.4%	98%	0.7%
198 Robertson	47.1%	28.2%	17.0%	87%	3.6%
199 Rockwall	43.0%	30.1%	8.6%	87%	4.9%
200 Runnels	46.0%	26.9%	19.5%	77%	9.4%
201 Rusk	43.4%	24.9%	15.7%	92%	4.2%
202 Sabine	44.2%	21.1%	24.9%	97%	1.0%
203 San Augustine	45.5%	23.7%	21.4%	96%	1.6%
204 San Jacinto	43.9%	25.2%	15.9%	94%	2.0%
205 San Patricio	42.3%	31.1%	10.5%	61%	12.3%
206 San Saba	42.8%	27.9%	20.3%	80%	6.5%
207 Schleicher	43.5%	27.9%	16.4%	59%	17.7%
208 Scurry	46.5%	25.2%	15.4%	77%	7.4%
209 Shackelford	45.3%	26.7%	18.2%	91%	3.4%
210 Shelby	44.0%	26.6%	16.6%	91%	5.1%
211 Sherman	40.2%	31.4%	13.6%	74%	11.2%
212 Smith	46.5%	26.6%	14.1%	88%	5.4%
213 Somervell	44.3%	28.4%	13.3%	88%	5.1%
214 Starr	44.1%	37.4%	8.2%	9%	51.3%
215 Stephens	45.3%	24.4%	17.7%	87%	5.0%
216 Sterling	38.3%	28.7%	14.6%	73%	12.1%
217 Stonewall	41.0%	22.8%	24.0%	88%	2.9%
218 Sutton	42.8%	28.8%	12.5%	52%	18.0%
219 Swisher	42.2%	27.9%	16.0%	73%	10.0%
220 Tarrant	45.3%	28.1%	8.3%	78%	8.2%
221 Taylor	46.4%	26.6%	12.4%	86%	3.7%
222 Terrell	42.9%	26.6%	17.6%	47%	16.2%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Female Labor Participation Rate FLFPR</b>	<b>% of County Population 18, Younger POPLT18</b>	<b>% of County Population 65, Younger POPGT65</b>	<b>% of County Population English only PCTENGL</b>	<b>% of County Population Spanish only PCTSPNH</b>
223 Terry	40.0%	28.4%	14.6%	61%	11.7%
224 Throckmorton	43.3%	25.2%	20.5%	93%	2.2%
225 Titus	44.7%	30.3%	12.5%	73%	17.3%
226 Tom Green	47.2%	26.1%	13.4%	73%	7.9%
227 Travis	44.3%	23.8%	6.8%	71%	10.3%
228 Trinity	45.7%	22.9%	22.0%	95%	1.9%
229 Tyler	43.6%	23.2%	17.8%	95%	2.1%
230 Upshur	44.2%	27.0%	14.3%	95%	1.6%
231 Upton	45.3%	29.3%	14.2%	62%	16.6%
232 Uvalde	45.2%	31.4%	13.6%	40%	23.5%
233 Val Verde	42.6%	32.1%	11.0%	30%	29.7%
234 Van Zandt	43.5%	25.6%	17.1%	93%	3.4%
235 Victoria	45.6%	29.1%	12.0%	73%	8.0%
236 Walker	47.8%	18.0%	9.0%	86%	5.7%
237 Waller	44.7%	25.7%	9.4%	82%	8.7%
238 Ward	43.3%	30.6%	14.3%	64%	13.0%
239 Washington	44.8%	24.7%	16.9%	87%	3.2%
240 Webb	43.2%	36.2%	7.6%	8%	44.2%
241 Wharton	44.2%	28.7%	13.9%	73%	8.5%
242 Wheeler	46.2%	24.9%	20.9%	90%	4.6%
243 Wichita	44.7%	25.2%	12.7%	88%	2.9%
244 Wilbarger	47.9%	27.9%	16.2%	83%	5.1%
245 Willacy	44.8%	31.6%	11.6%	22%	32.2%
246 Williamson	45.1%	30.0%	7.4%	83%	4.5%
247 Wilson	45.1%	29.2%	11.5%	70%	8.5%
248 Winkler	44.3%	29.8%	14.3%	60%	18.1%
249 Wise	43.1%	28.3%	10.6%	89%	4.5%
250 Wood	44.4%	21.8%	20.9%	94%	2.5%
251 Yoakum	42.2%	32.1%	11.5%	60%	16.6%
252 Young	44.7%	25.0%	19.7%	90%	3.6%
253 Zapata	41.1%	33.0%	14.3%	21%	36.0%
254 Zavala	45.8%	34.1%	11.3%	15%	41.7%
255 State	45.0%	28.2%	9.9%	69%	12.3%
256 National	46.5%	25.7%	12.4%	82%	5.2%

Census Data Center Source: [http://txsdc.utsa.edu/data/census/2000/dp2\\_4/pdf/](http://txsdc.utsa.edu/data/census/2000/dp2_4/pdf/)

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

**Table A4: County Demographics & Geography**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Population 600k+  URBAN</b>	<b>Located on Border w/Mexico BORDER</b>	<b>County Population  POP</b>	<b>% County Population Born Overseas FRNBRN</b>	<b>Population Density per Square Mile DENSITY</b>	<b>% County Population Eng. &amp; Span. Bilingual PCTBLNG</b>
1 Anderson	0	0	55,109	3.2%	51.47	3.5%
2 Andrews	0	0	13,004	10.6%	8.67	21.4%
3 Angelina	0	0	80,130	6.9%	99.97	7.1%
4 Aransas	0	0	22,497	5.7%	89.32	9.6%
5 Archer	0	0	8,854	2.3%	9.73	2.0%
6 Armstrong	0	0	2,148	0.9%	2.35	2.6%
7 Atascosa	0	0	38,628	5.1%	31.35	27.9%
8 Austin	0	0	23,590	7.3%	36.15	7.2%
9 Bailey	0	0	6,594	13.1%	7.98	25.7%
10 Bandera	0	0	17,645	3.9%	22.29	8.0%
11 Bastrop	0	0	57,733	8.1%	64.99	12.2%
12 Baylor	0	0	4,093	2.0%	4.70	5.0%
13 Bee	0	0	32,359	2.0%	36.77	27.7%
14 Bell	0	0	237,974	7.3%	224.56	8.0%
15 Bexar	1	0	1,392,931	10.9%	1117.19	26.5%
16 Blanco	0	0	8,418	5.0%	11.84	8.3%
17 Borden	0	0	729	4.5%	0.81	6.0%
18 Bosque	0	0	17,204	4.4%	17.39	5.6%
19 Bowie	0	0	89,306	1.5%	100.58	3.1%
20 Brazoria	0	0	241,767	8.5%	174.38	11.1%
21 Brazos	0	0	152,415	10.3%	260.19	8.2%
22 Brewster	0	1	8,866	6.9%	1.43	28.5%
23 Briscoe	0	0	1,790	4.9%	1.99	8.9%
24 Brooks	0	0	7,976	6.1%	8.46	49.7%
25 Brown	0	0	37,674	3.1%	39.92	7.6%
26 Burleson	0	0	16,470	3.0%	24.75	6.8%
27 Burnet	0	0	34,147	5.4%	34.28	7.2%
28 Caldwell	0	0	32,194	5.1%	58.99	21.3%
29 Calhoun	0	0	20,647	8.5%	40.30	20.3%
30 Callahan	0	0	12,905	1.4%	14.36	3.8%
31 Cameron	0	1	335,227	25.6%	370.11	43.0%
32 Camp	0	0	11,549	9.9%	58.47	7.3%
33 Carson	0	0	6,516	2.7%	7.06	3.7%
34 Cass	0	0	30,438	1.1%	32.47	1.5%
35 Castro	0	0	8,285	12.1%	9.22	27.2%
36 Chambers	0	0	26,031	5.1%	43.43	5.3%
37 Cherokee	0	0	46,659	7.9%	44.34	4.8%

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A

Counties 2000 Census Data	Population 600k+	Located on Border w/Mexico BORDER	County Population  POP	% County Population Born Overseas FRNBRN	Population Density per Square Mile DENSITY	% County Population Eng. & Span. Bilingual PCTBLNG
38 Childress	0	0	7,688	4.7%	10.82	11.7%
39 Clay	0	0	11,006	1.4%	10.03	1.5%
40 Cochran	0	0	3,730	9.8%	4.81	24.1%
41 Coke	0	0	3,864	2.8%	4.30	10.4%
42 Coleman	0	0	9,235	3.4%	7.33	6.9%
43 Collin	0	0	491,675	13.3%	580.11	4.9%
44 Collingsworth	0	0	3,206	4.3%	3.49	11.0%
45 Colorado	0	0	20,390	7.9%	21.17	8.3%
46 Comal	0	0	78,021	4.8%	138.96	10.8%
47 Comanche	0	0	14,026	7.1%	14.96	10.6%
48 Concho	0	0	3,966	2.8%	4.00	18.9%
49 Cooke	0	0	36,363	5.5%	41.62	3.3%
50 Coryell	0	0	74,978	5.3%	71.29	7.9%
51 Cottle	0	0	1,904	3.6%	2.11	8.6%
52 Crane	0	0	3,996	14.4%	5.09	24.7%
53 Crockett	0	0	4,099	10.5%	1.46	28.2%
54 Crosby	0	0	7,072	3.9%	7.86	27.9%
55 Culberson	0	0	2,975	15.6%	0.78	45.7%
56 Dallam	0	0	6,222	7.9%	4.14	12.3%
57 Dallas	1	0	2,218,899	20.9%	2522.62	11.0%
58 Dawson	0	0	14,985	4.2%	16.61	29.2%
59 Deaf Smith	0	0	18,561	11.6%	12.40	28.2%
60 Delta	0	0	5,327	0.5%	19.23	1.2%
61 Denton	0	0	432,976	9.4%	487.29	5.5%
62 DeWitt	0	0	20,013	2.6%	22.01	13.5%
63 Dickens	0	0	2,762	2.0%	3.05	17.5%
64 Dimmit	0	0	10,248	7.6%	7.70	47.2%
65 Donley	0	0	3,828	1.6%	4.12	3.8%
66 Duval	0	0	13,120	3.4%	7.32	51.3%
67 Eastland	0	0	18,297	4.0%	19.76	5.3%
68 Ector	0	0	121,123	10.6%	134.42	22.8%
69 Edwards	0	0	2,162	10.8%	1.02	28.9%
70 Ellis	0	0	111,360	7.1%	118.48	8.5%
71 El Paso	1	1	679,622	27.4%	670.83	39.2%
72 Erath	0	0	33,001	7.3%	30.38	6.4%
73 Falls	0	0	18,576	4.6%	24.15	5.9%
74 Fannin	0	0	31,242	3.1%	35.05	2.8%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Population 600k+  URBAN</b>	<b>Located on Border w/Mexico BORDER</b>	<b>County Population  POP</b>	<b>% County Population Born Overseas FRNBRN</b>	<b>Population Density per Square Mile DENSITY</b>	<b>% County Population Eng. &amp; Span. Bilingual PCTBLNG</b>
75 Fayette	0	0	21,804	5.6%	22.95	5.2%
76 Fisher	0	0	4,344	2.3%	4.82	11.9%
77 Floyd	0	0	7,771	5.9%	7.83	27.2%
78 Foard	0	0	1,622	1.6%	2.30	8.6%
79 Fort Bend	0	0	354,452	18.3%	405.25	10.5%
80 Franklin	0	0	9,458	5.4%	33.11	4.3%
81 Freestone	0	0	17,867	3.1%	20.36	3.5%
82 Frio	0	0	16,252	5.8%	14.34	38.4%
83 Gaines	0	0	14,467	18.9%	9.63	18.4%
84 Galveston	0	0	250,158	8.3%	627.80	7.6%
85 Garza	0	0	4,872	6.3%	5.44	19.2%
86 Gillespie	0	0	20,814	7.0%	19.62	7.9%
87 Glasscock	0	0	1,406	14.1%	1.56	15.1%
88 Goliad	0	0	6,928	2.8%	8.12	19.3%
89 Gonzales	0	0	18,628	11.0%	17.45	18.9%
90 Gray	0	0	22,744	4.3%	24.50	7.5%
91 Grayson	0	0	110,595	3.9%	118.47	2.8%
92 Gregg	0	0	111,379	5.4%	406.45	3.7%
93 Grimes	0	0	23,552	5.0%	29.68	7.6%
94 Guadalupe	0	0	89,023	6.5%	125.18	15.7%
95 Hale	0	0	36,602	8.2%	36.43	24.6%
96 Hall	0	0	3,782	9.1%	4.19	14.1%
97 Hamilton	0	0	8,229	3.7%	9.85	4.3%
98 Hansford	0	0	5,369	15.6%	5.84	14.2%
99 Hardeman	0	0	4,724	2.5%	6.79	8.1%
100 Hardin	0	0	48,073	1.3%	53.75	1.3%
101 Harris	1	0	3,400,578	22.2%	1966.98	13.6%
102 Harrison	0	0	62,110	3.3%	69.11	3.0%
103 Hartley	0	0	5,537	2.6%	3.79	8.0%
104 Haskell	0	0	6,093	3.6%	6.75	10.6%
105 Hays	0	0	97,589	5.6%	143.96	14.5%
106 Hemphill	0	0	3,351	6.5%	3.68	7.0%
107 Henderson	0	0	73,277	3.8%	83.82	3.7%
108 Hidalgo	0	1	569,463	29.5%	362.77	44.1%
109 Hill	0	0	32,321	5.9%	33.59	6.1%
110 Hockley	0	0	22,716	5.2%	25.01	18.5%
111 Hood	0	0	41,100	3.3%	97.48	3.8%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Population 600k+</b>	<b>Located on Border w/Mexico BORDER</b>	<b>County Population POP</b>	<b>% County Population Born Overseas FRNBRN</b>	<b>Population Density per Square Mile DENSITY</b>	<b>% County Population Eng. &amp; Span. Bilingual PCTBLNG</b>
	<b>URBAN</b>					
112 Hopkins	0	0	31,960	5.6%	40.85	4.5%
113 Houston	0	0	23,185	3.0%	18.84	4.0%
114 Howard	0	0	33,627	6.0%	37.25	19.5%
115 Hudspeth	0	1	3,344	33.2%	0.73	33.8%
116 Hunt	0	0	76,596	4.7%	91.06	3.8%
117 Hutchinson	0	0	23,857	5.8%	26.89	7.8%
118 Irion	0	0	1,771	3.5%	1.68	15.7%
119 Jack	0	0	8,763	2.8%	9.56	3.4%
120 Jackson	0	0	14,391	4.8%	17.35	10.0%
121 Jasper	0	0	35,604	2.2%	37.98	2.0%
122 Jeff Davis	0	1	2,207	10.9%	0.97	21.1%
123 Jefferson	0	0	252,051	6.2%	278.96	4.4%
124 Jim Hogg	0	0	5,281	5.1%	4.65	54.1%
125 Jim Wells	0	0	39,326	3.6%	45.49	40.4%
126 Johnson	0	0	126,811	5.2%	173.85	5.9%
127 Jones	0	0	20,785	1.6%	22.33	12.7%
128 Karnes	0	0	15,446	3.7%	20.59	24.8%
129 Kaufman	0	0	71,313	5.7%	90.72	5.1%
130 Kendall	0	0	23,743	5.6%	35.84	8.1%
131 Kenedy	0	0	414	13.3%	0.28	48.9%
132 Kent	0	0	859	1.7%	0.95	7.2%
133 Kerr	0	0	43,653	6.6%	39.46	9.4%
134 Kimble	0	0	4,468	5.5%	3.57	10.4%
135 King	0	0	356	2.2%	0.39	2.1%
136 Kinney	0	1	3,379	11.7%	2.48	26.7%
137 Kleberg	0	0	31,549	6.5%	36.22	36.5%
138 Knox	0	0	4,253	6.7%	5.01	12.6%
139 Lamar	0	0	48,499	2.1%	52.90	2.0%
140 Lamb	0	0	14,709	6.3%	14.47	21.4%
141 Lampasas	0	0	17,762	6.0%	24.95	6.2%
142 La Salle	0	0	5,866	4.0%	3.94	41.1%
143 Lavaca	0	0	19,210	2.5%	19.81	4.6%
144 Lee	0	0	15,657	6.1%	24.91	8.1%
145 Leon	0	0	15,335	4.2%	14.30	4.6%
146 Liberty	0	0	70,154	5.1%	60.49	6.0%
147 Limestone	0	0	22,051	5.5%	24.26	5.5%
148 Lipscomb	0	0	3,057	11.7%	3.28	7.4%

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A

Counties 2000 Census Data	Population 600k+  URBAN	Located on Border w/Mexico BORDER	County Population  POP	% County Population Born Overseas FRNBRN	Population Density per Square Mile DENSITY	% County Population Eng. & Span. Bilingual PCTBLNG
149 Live Oak	0	0	12,309	2.3%	11.88	20.7%
150 Llano	0	0	17,044	2.0%	18.23	3.2%
151 Loving	0	0	67	0.0%	0.10	9.0%
152 Lubbock	0	0	242,628	3.3%	269.74	14.4%
153 Lynn	0	0	6,550	5.0%	7.34	23.4%
154 McCulloch	0	0	8,205	3.2%	7.67	15.2%
155 McLennan	0	0	213,517	6.1%	204.93	7.3%
156 McMullen	0	0	851	4.2%	0.76	18.1%
157 Madison	0	0	12,940	4.8%	27.55	7.1%
158 Marion	0	0	10,941	0.9%	28.70	1.6%
159 Martin	0	0	4,746	8.1%	5.19	23.2%
160 Mason	0	0	3,738	4.7%	4.01	10.2%
161 Matagorda	0	0	37,957	9.9%	34.06	13.8%
162 Maverick	0	1	47,297	37.8%	36.95	44.1%
163 Medina	0	0	39,304	4.1%	29.60	24.0%
164 Menard	0	0	2,360	4.8%	2.62	16.9%
165 Midland	0	0	116,009	7.6%	128.86	15.3%
166 Milam	0	0	24,238	5.6%	23.84	9.8%
167 Mills	0	0	5,151	4.4%	6.89	5.5%
168 Mitchell	0	0	9,698	2.8%	10.66	16.9%
169 Montague	0	0	19,117	2.4%	20.54	3.2%
170 Montgomery	0	0	293,768	8.6%	281.38	5.8%
171 Moore	0	0	20,121	20.9%	22.37	19.9%
172 Morris	0	0	13,048	2.0%	51.27	2.0%
173 Motley	0	0	1,426	3.3%	1.44	5.8%
174 Nacogdoches	0	0	59,203	6.2%	62.53	4.2%
175 Navarro	0	0	45,124	9.1%	44.78	6.0%
176 Newton	0	0	15,072	0.9%	16.16	1.8%
177 Nolan	0	0	15,802	4.2%	17.33	16.0%
178 Nueces	0	0	313,645	6.5%	375.25	27.9%
179 Ochiltree	0	0	9,006	16.1%	9.82	12.9%
180 Oldham	0	0	2,185	5.4%	1.46	7.6%
181 Orange	0	0	84,966	2.1%	238.40	1.7%
182 Palo Pinto	0	0	27,026	4.4%	28.36	5.1%
183 Panola	0	0	22,756	2.9%	28.41	2.1%
184 Parker	0	0	88,495	2.6%	97.95	3.6%
185 Parmer	0	0	10,016	20.1%	11.36	23.9%

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A

Counties 2000 Census Data	Population 600k+  URBAN	Located on Border w/Mexico BORDER	County Population  POP	% County Population Born Overseas FRNBRN	Population Density per Square Mile DENSITY	% County Population Eng. & Span. Bilingual PCTBLNG
186 Pecos	0	0	16,809	13.5%	3.53	33.5%
187 Polk	0	0	41,133	4.3%	38.91	5.7%
188 Potter	0	0	113,546	9.4%	124.88	13.3%
189 Presidio	0	1	7,304	35.8%	1.89	38.5%
190 Rains	0	0	9,139	2.5%	39.38	2.4%
191 Randall	0	0	104,312	2.6%	114.07	5.0%
192 Reagan	0	0	3,326	16.4%	2.83	27.8%
193 Real	0	0	3,047	4.0%	4.35	13.8%
194 Red River	0	0	14,314	2.5%	13.63	2.8%
195 Reeves	0	0	13,137	14.7%	4.98	37.6%
196 Refugio	0	0	7,828	2.6%	10.16	21.4%
197 Roberts	0	0	887	0.5%	0.96	0.5%
198 Robertson	0	0	16,000	3.3%	18.72	7.9%
199 Rockwall	0	0	43,080	7.8%	334.50	5.1%
200 Runnels	0	0	11,495	4.5%	10.94	13.1%
201 Rusk	0	0	47,372	4.4%	51.29	3.5%
202 Sabine	0	0	10,469	1.1%	21.35	0.8%
203 San Augustine	0	0	8,946	2.0%	16.95	1.9%
204 San Jacinto	0	0	22,246	2.5%	38.98	2.9%
205 San Patricio	0	0	67,138	3.3%	97.07	25.4%
206 San Saba	0	0	6,186	5.5%	5.45	12.1%
207 Schleicher	0	0	2,935	13.9%	2.24	22.2%
208 Scurry	0	0	16,361	3.1%	18.13	14.8%
209 Shackelford	0	0	3,302	2.9%	3.61	5.1%
210 Shelby	0	0	25,224	6.6%	31.76	3.4%
211 Sherman	0	0	3,186	12.4%	3.45	13.8%
212 Smith	0	0	174,706	6.6%	188.18	5.1%
213 Somervell	0	0	6,809	5.7%	36.38	6.3%
214 Starr	0	1	53,597	36.9%	43.82	39.1%
215 Stephens	0	0	9,674	6.6%	10.81	7.1%
216 Sterling	0	0	1,393	9.2%	1.51	14.7%
217 Stonewall	0	0	1,693	2.0%	1.84	8.9%
218 Sutton	0	0	4,077	13.0%	2.79	28.8%
219 Swisher	0	0	8,378	4.9%	9.30	17.1%
220 Tarrant	1	0	1,446,219	12.7%	1674.99	8.2%
221 Taylor	0	0	126,555	4.0%	138.22	8.4%
222 Terrell	0	1	1,081	9.9%	0.46	36.2%

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Population 600k+  URBAN</b>	<b>Located on Border w/Mexico BORDER</b>	<b>County Population  POP</b>	<b>% County Population Born Overseas FRNBRN</b>	<b>Population Density per Square Mile DENSITY</b>	<b>% County Population Eng. &amp; Span. Bilingual PCTBLNG</b>
223 Terry	0	0	12,761	7.2%	14.34	25.4%
224 Throckmorton	0	0	1,850	1.6%	2.03	4.3%
225 Titus	0	0	28,118	17.4%	68.49	9.2%
226 Tom Green	0	0	104,010	5.9%	68.33	17.0%
227 Travis	1	0	812,280	15.1%	821.07	12.0%
228 Trinity	0	0	13,779	2.7%	19.89	2.1%
229 Tyler	0	0	20,871	1.2%	22.61	1.7%
230 Upshur	0	0	35,291	2.0%	60.06	2.2%
231 Upton	0	0	3,404	11.2%	2.74	20.9%
232 Uvalde	0	0	25,926	11.2%	16.66	35.6%
233 Val Verde	0	1	44,856	23.4%	14.15	39.3%
234 Van Zandt	0	0	48,140	3.6%	56.73	3.1%
235 Victoria	0	0	84,088	4.3%	95.28	17.4%
236 Walker	0	0	61,758	4.5%	78.43	7.2%
237 Waller	0	0	32,663	9.4%	63.59	7.7%
238 Ward	0	0	10,909	6.6%	13.06	22.5%
239 Washington	0	0	30,373	5.4%	49.86	5.3%
240 Webb	0	1	193,117	29.0%	57.53	47.2%
241 Wharton	0	0	41,188	6.6%	37.78	15.3%
242 Wheeler	0	0	5,284	5.4%	5.78	5.2%
243 Wichita	0	0	131,664	5.1%	209.77	5.8%
244 Wilbarger	0	0	14,676	4.2%	15.11	9.6%
245 Willacy	0	0	20,082	13.3%	33.66	45.7%
246 Williamson	0	0	249,967	7.4%	222.63	8.2%
247 Wilson	0	0	32,408	3.3%	40.16	18.2%
248 Winkler	0	0	7,173	14.3%	8.53	21.2%
249 Wise	0	0	48,793	5.1%	53.94	5.5%
250 Wood	0	0	36,752	3.8%	56.52	2.3%
251 Yoakum	0	0	7,322	16.6%	9.16	21.4%
252 Young	0	0	17,943	3.7%	19.45	5.5%
253 Zapata	0	1	12,182	24.1%	12.22	42.1%
254 Zavala	0	0	11,600	13.8%	8.93	42.8%
255 State	1	1	20,851,820	13.9%	79.6	14.7%
256 National	1	1	281,421,906	11.1%	79.6	5.5%

Census Data Center Source: [http://txsdc.utsa.edu/data/census/2000/dp2\\_4/pdf/](http://txsdc.utsa.edu/data/census/2000/dp2_4/pdf/)

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

**Table A5: County Infrastructure**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Distance to Nearest Border Crossing DISTANCE</b>	<b>Commercial Airport Tower Operations AIRPORT</b>	<b>Miles to Nearest Commercial Airport AIRMILES</b>	<b>Centerline Miles* CENMILES</b>	<b>Lane Miles* LANE</b>
<b>1 Anderson</b>	421	0	51	445.235	967.793
<b>2 Andrews</b>	301	0	50	236.286	541.988
<b>3 Angelina</b>	570	0	101	374.219	928.687
<b>4 Aransas</b>	197	0	42	82.992	205.003
<b>5 Archer</b>	379	0	121	264.301	546.050
<b>6 Armstrong</b>	454	0	33	153.192	377.999
<b>7 Atascosa</b>	222	0	38	426.035	1,011.140
<b>8 Austin</b>	286	0	58	286.599	613.782
<b>9 Bailey</b>	426	0	77	225.251	490.364
<b>10 Bandera</b>	146	0	66	195.892	414.777
<b>11 Bastrop</b>	142	0	27	325.038	811.277
<b>12 Baylor</b>	348	0	121	217.000	437.334
<b>13 Bee</b>	135	0	57	291.759	648.539
<b>14 Bell</b>	291	0	64	596.327	1,509.760
<b>15 Bexar</b>	144	396,482	1	1,014.122	3,273.548
<b>16 Blanco</b>	211	0	59	184.269	461.858
<b>17 Borden</b>	308	0	109	171.806	343.612
<b>18 Bosque</b>	332	0	42	346.658	695.036
<b>19 Bowie</b>	552	0	89	494.098	1,196.433
<b>20 Brazoria</b>	327	0	42	475.704	1,293.606
<b>21 Brazos</b>	385	86,228	1	324.858	891.825
<b>22 Brewster</b>	0	0	282	289.521	590.826
<b>23 Briscoe</b>	422	0	89	161.568	325.576
<b>24 Brooks</b>	66	0	68	121.374	317.297
<b>25 Brown</b>	240	0	77	329.115	764.184
<b>26 Burleson</b>	313	0	32	233.866	522.232
<b>27 Burnet</b>	240	0	64	292.386	803.654
<b>28 Caldwell</b>	211	0	33	247.934	591.240
<b>29 Calhoun</b>	221	0	89	173.571	402.065
<b>30 Callahan</b>	270	0	22	340.295	744.710
<b>31 Cameron</b>	0	82,047	1	641.642	1,675.655
<b>32 Camp</b>	530	0	49	117.617	265.234
<b>33 Carson</b>	504	0	31	314.334	775.695
<b>34 Cass</b>	579	0	73	438.995	985.370
<b>35 Castro</b>	368	0	82	261.103	533.604
<b>36 Chambers</b>	385	0	54	309.186	744.438
<b>37 Cherokee</b>	451	0	43	509.315	1,121.302

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Distance to Nearest Border Crossing DISTANCE</b>	<b>Commercial Airport Tower Operations AIRPORT</b>	<b>Miles to Nearest Commercial Airport AIRMILES</b>	<b>Centerline Miles* CENMILES</b>	<b>Lane Miles* LANEMILES</b>
38 Childress	409	0	116	209.569	476.768
39 Clay	419	0	87	359.812	790.688
40 Cochran	304	0	74	231.859	468.238
41 Coke	186	0	41	172.024	367.716
42 Coleman	230	0	61	335.531	753.726
43 Collin	469	155,780	1	559.182	1,516.831
44 Collingsworth	450	0	96	217.340	445.258
45 Colorado	253	0	88	330.067	761.121
46 Comal	182	0	35	268.069	679.176
47 Comanche	268	0	85	356.343	737.436
48 Concho	186	0	58	207.714	463.155
49 Cooke	477	0	78	367.664	847.368
50 Coryell	294	0	58	326.504	683.746
51 Cottle	383	0	123	195.112	390.224
52 Crane	209	0	58	137.956	317.822
53 Crockett	136	0	94	338.372	784.890
54 Crosby	351	0	41	253.062	568.598
55 Culberson	106	0	152	321.604	748.265
56 Dallam	430	0	108	397.535	644.396
57 Dallas	418	1,462,144	1	784.576	3,353.390
58 Dawson	286	0	73	313.278	714.569
59 Deaf Smith	380	0	67	315.415	668.393
60 Delta	477	0	57	272.453	603.080
61 Denton	431	0	15	166.701	342.700
62 DeWitt	200	0	85	563.187	1,557.682
63 Dickens	367	0	68	207.788	468.306
64 Dimmit	54	0	79	249.338	506.320
65 Donley	460	0	55	185.481	456.998
66 Duval	73	0	70	311.956	629.166
67 Eastland	291	0	63	453.946	1,022.834
68 Ector	225	0	27	336.890	950.892
69 Edwards	66	0	122	239.225	499.188
70 Ellis	381	0	36	626.760	1,536.176
71 El Paso	0	140,618	1	477.025	1,620.794
72 Erath	295	0	77	387.616	821.258
73 Falls	323	0	43	346.522	733.380
74 Fannin	487	0	41	481.522	964.786

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Distance to Nearest Border Crossing DISTANCE</b>	<b>Commercial Airport Tower Operations AIRPORT</b>	<b>Miles to Nearest Commercial Airport AIRMILES</b>	<b>Centerline Miles* CENMILES</b>	<b>Lane Miles* LANEMILES</b>
75 Fayette	258	0	61	439.207	1,032.400
76 Fisher	257	0	60	273.972	555.132
77 Floyd	384	0	59	324.411	702.622
78 Foard	367	0	129	149.004	298.306
79 Fort Bend	283	0	44	433.824	1,181.914
80 Franklin	521	0	74	156.860	335.584
81 Freestone	389	0	74	377.082	809.399
82 Frio	96	0	59	337.908	759.022
83 Gaines	261	0	76	274.572	668.374
84 Galveston	380	0	35	332.138	1,058.978
85 Garza	325	0	60	183.891	459.420
86 Gillespie	186	0	72	272.451	688.772
87 Glasscock	231	0	43	136.823	294.402
88 Goliad	167	0	72	248.700	504.539
89 Gonzales	204	0	64	409.056	880.091
90 Gray	500	0	61	338.044	773.024
91 Grayson	489	0	45	521.439	1,209.698
92 Gregg	512	88,202	1	264.217	798.474
93 Grimes	332	0	33	291.591	614.738
94 Guadalupe	184	0	48	388.608	931.534
95 Hale	387	0	35	460.332	1,057.482
96 Hall	432	0	110	208.461	456.574
97 Hamilton	277	0	88	287.671	579.944
98 Hansford	491	0	97	260.859	525.323
99 Hardeman	387	0	149	200.840	465.114
100 Hardin	442	0	38	249.236	574.658
101 Harris	318	794,163	1	1,180.964	4,882.293
102 Harrison	548	0	34	474.401	1,184.438
103 Hartley	415	0	93	253.167	539.748
104 Haskell	306	0	67	297.312	669.586
105 Hays	210	0	35	265.965	686.389
106 Hemphill	509	0	100	183.514	386.399
107 Henderson	418	0	38	419.859	1,014.466
108 Hidalgo	0	61,976	1	795.543	2,227.330
109 Hill	360	0	44	493.748	1,075.048
110 Hockley	336	0	39	336.190	751.628
111 Hood	322	0	45	175.400	389.345

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Distance to Nearest Border Crossing DISTANCE</b>	<b>Commercial Airport Tower Operations AIRPORT</b>	<b>Miles to Nearest Commercial Airport AIRMILES</b>	<b>Centerline Miles* CENMILES</b>	<b>Lane Miles* LANEMILES</b>
112 Hopkins	491	0	74	439.261	964.476
113 Houston	400	0	90	402.233	843.695
114 Howard	247	0	58	344.870	858.518
115 Hudspeth	0	0	69	340.083	826.260
116 Hunt	455	0	34	587.462	1,307.856
117 Hutchinson	498	0	59	207.054	474.074
118 Irion	149	0	34	123.263	246.526
119 Jack	403	0	65	272.074	575.960
120 Jackson	222	0	111	293.295	636.200
121 Jasper	468	0	84	323.760	770.625
122 Jeff Davis	0	0	177	226.974	468.518
123 Jefferson	414	46,961	1	365.365	1,123.201
124 Jim Hogg	65	0	85	143.055	288.206
125 Jim Wells	115	0	36	273.423	714.920
126 Johnson	355	0	34	396.805	949.724
127 Jones	277	0	39	451.803	1,010.946
128 Karnes	157	0	56	337.427	696.324
129 Kaufman	439	0	38	496.401	1,201.473
130 Kendall	184	0	45	193.932	453.314
131 Kenedy	74	0	56	46.948	187.792
132 Kent	399	0	104	162.637	325.274
133 Kerr	132	0	98	292.800	702.553
134 Kimble	120	0	106	294.727	686.326
135 King	358	0	104	92.885	198.972
136 Kinney	0	0	125	203.367	406.734
137 Kleberg	132	0	44	151.102	373.140
138 Knox	343	0	104	220.251	466.010
139 Lamar	517	0	88	444.227	991.461
140 Lamb	376	0	56	362.069	805.032
141 Lampasas	265	0	89	212.944	489.703
142 La Salle	68	0	72	277.904	648.986
143 Lavaca	236	0	118	315.953	641.233
144 Lee	286	0	52	194.268	529.413
145 Leon	366	0	71	389.110	833.378
146 Liberty	387	0	57	368.147	817.401
147 Limestone	349	0	39	379.168	769.453
148 Lipscomb	553	0	132	197.256	411.573

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Distance to Nearest Border Crossing DISTANCE</b>	<b>Commercial Airport Tower Operations AIRPORT</b>	<b>Miles to Nearest Commercial Airport AIRMILES</b>	<b>Centerline Miles* CENMILES</b>	<b>Lane Miles* LANEMILES</b>
149 Live Oak	111	0	58	419.167	1,000.939
150 Llano	208	0	85	227.689	498.312
151 Loving	198	0	128	33.644	67.288
152 Lubbock	387	128,608	1	634.536	1,705.178
153 Lynn	346	0	42	318.885	709.848
154 McCulloch	194	0	86	296.773	607.870
155 McLennan	323	57,084	1	653.964	1,669.835
156 McMullen	95	0	76	158.499	316.998
157 Madison	369	0	51	263.987	571.213
158 Marion	562	0	47	149.979	322.877
159 Martin	258	0	37	266.020	574.150
160 Mason	177	0	117	192.734	422.743
161 Matagorda	291	0	90	319.370	690.998
162 Maverick	0	0	122	210.949	475.736
163 Medina	119	0	41	324.293	766.045
164 Menard	160	0	66	170.313	345.743
165 Midland	263	95,678	1	387.919	1,036.102
166 Milam	319	0	62	334.663	690.841
167 Mills	264	0	100	209.712	451.107
168 Mitchell	240	0	83	297.543	662.220
169 Montague	444	0	72	384.121	849.670
170 Montgomery	380	219,078	1	476.753	1,218.851
171 Moore	488	0	62	199.676	467.136
172 Morris	532	0	59	135.590	355.546
173 Motley	390	0	93	165.174	330.904
174 Nacogdoches	489	0	81	404.823	958.008
175 Navarro	387	0	61	511.989	1,191.976
176 Newton	498	0	94	273.372	550.612
177 Nolan	229	0	56	292.559	694.295
178 Nueces	151	129,131	1	522.100	1,495.321
179 Ochiltree	548	0	108	212.191	430.390
180 Oldham	401	0	66	178.105	472.150
181 Orange	439	0	28	233.724	619.229
182 Palo Pinto	347	0	61	385.063	829.276
183 Panola	509	0	34	322.312	770.629
184 Parker	370	0	37	351.618	879.770
185 Parmer	351	0	85	253.560	613.772

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Distance to Nearest Border Crossing DISTANCE</b>	<b>Commercial Airport Tower Operations AIRPORT</b>	<b>Miles to Nearest Commercial Airport AIRMILES</b>	<b>Centerline Miles* CENMILES</b>	<b>Lane Miles* LANEMILES</b>
186 Pecos	173	0	105	716.014	1,682.916
187 Polk	416	0	84	363.997	856.714
188 Potter	441	120,400	1	307.094	901.481
189 Presidio	0	0	222	271.676	544.574
190 Rains	483	0	54	134.053	268.106
191 Randall	414	0	34	359.746	901.658
192 Reagan	245	0	82	158.958	320.088
193 Real	107	0	118	148.169	296.338
194 Red River	544	0	106	375.151	750.302
195 Reeves	151	0	107	494.329	1,180.001
196 Refugio	174	0	58	194.021	464.682
197 Roberts	515	0	75	120.486	240.972
198 Robertson	324	0	41	294.387	626.978
199 Rockwall	445	0	38	143.853	339.090
200 Runnels	208	0	50	341.579	729.684
201 Rusk	481	0	20	524.312	1,181.707
202 Sabine	514	0	118	240.315	486.894
203 San Augustine	497	0	120	261.150	529.037
204 San Jacinto	391	0	59	237.201	516.428
205 San Patricio	142	0	29	365.133	947.205
206 San Saba	232	0	117	216.168	435.782
207 Schleicher	118	0	45	178.513	360.980
208 Scurry	268	0	73	288.339	679.774
209 Shackelford	306	0	45	174.827	353.218
210 Shelby	524	0	66	381.378	861.092
211 Sherman	459	0	91	194.732	429.112
212 Smith	504	103,852	1	603.042	1,598.753
213 Somervell	326	0	58	91.866	198.152
214 Starr	0	0	64	233.002	493.972
215 Stephens	316	0	79	267.145	560.462
216 Sterling	206	0	62	108.559	282.881
217 Stonewall	308	0	69	163.340	328.992
218 Sutton	97	0	68	241.807	592.058
219 Swisher	420	0	54	350.495	806.610
220 Tarrant	403	558,660	1	863.452	3,213.117
221 Taylor	237	80,551	1	484.552	1,214.706
222 Terrell	0	0	202	176.153	374.048

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Distance to Nearest Border Crossing DISTANCE</b>	<b>Commercial Airport Tower Operations AIRPORT</b>	<b>Miles to Nearest Commercial Airport AIRMILES</b>	<b>Centerline Miles* CENMILES</b>	<b>Lane Miles* LANEMILES</b>
223 Terry	297	0	62	275.841	630.340
224 Throckmorton	328	0	77	169.845	341.388
225 Titus	522	0	78	225.227	540.897
226 Tom Green	151	88,404	1	392.796	1,022.310
227 Travis	221	212,635	1	560.769	1,955.367
228 Trinity	430	0	91	214.450	436.386
229 Tyler	448	0	72	250.907	521.208
230 Upshur	530	0	33	332.926	786.961
231 Upton	216	0	60	189.726	391.182
232 Uvalde	82	0	105	337.570	739.804
233 Val Verde	0	0	164	311.884	712.935
234 Van Zandt	473	0	28	519.818	1,165.974
235 Victoria	186	0	94	310.590	890.199
236 Walker	381	0	54	342.627	798.502
237 Waller	308	0	41	234.927	584.182
238 Ward	182	0	65	276.865	666.335
239 Washington	301	0	34	275.059	658.068
240 Webb	0	74,979	1	435.107	1,126.630
241 Wharton	262	0	71	394.922	885.324
242 Wheeler	473	0	100	298.067	671.984
243 Wichita	394	0	124	431.779	1,122.631
244 Wilbarger	386	0	148	319.215	736.393
245 Willacy	46	0	22	220.983	478.940
246 Williamson	260	0	50	581.849	1,656.722
247 Wilson	172	0	34	331.970	745.240
248 Winkler	202	0	68	135.870	294.432
249 Wise	446	0	42	372.898	856.455
250 Wood	492	0	47	417.873	898.965
251 Yoakum	272	0	113	208.071	430.808
252 Young	361	0	101	343.518	706.270
253 Zapata	0	0	69	118.961	248.107
254 Zavala	57	0	114	265.634	542.410
255 State		5,183,661		80,080.931	192,541.756
256 National		134,945,023		779,131.000	1,852,655.000

Tower Operations Data Source: United States Air Traffic Activity Data System (ATADS).  
 Highway Miles Data Source: Texas Department of Transportation; National Data: Federal  
 Highway Administration  
 (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics/2007/hm81.cfm>).

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

**Table A6: County Capital Stock, Per Capita Income and Federal Education Expenditures**

<b>Counties</b>	<b>Private Sector Capital Stock</b>	<b>Per Capita Income*</b>	<b>Federal Education Expenditure</b>
<b>2000 Census Data</b>	<b>PROP</b>	<b>PCINC</b>	<b>EDUEXP</b>
<b>1 Anderson</b>	\$1,987,400,864	\$17,668	\$1,461,113
<b>2 Andrews</b>	\$1,317,132,110	\$20,462	\$548,097
<b>3 Angelina</b>	\$3,019,189,608	\$22,398	\$5,358,999
<b>4 Aransas</b>	\$1,205,489,619	\$24,116	\$779,450
<b>5 Archer</b>	\$486,986,827	\$25,317	\$166,399
<b>6 Armstrong</b>	\$173,212,200	\$22,446	\$31,941
<b>7 Atascosa</b>	\$1,420,509,865	\$19,086	\$1,082,773
<b>8 Austin</b>	\$1,783,243,503	\$26,496	\$627,525
<b>9 Bailey</b>	\$284,768,886	\$21,343	\$385,782
<b>10 Bandera</b>	\$1,111,740,380	\$25,771	\$297,354
<b>11 Bastrop</b>	\$2,724,761,612	\$22,422	\$1,492,440
<b>12 Baylor</b>	\$251,496,581	\$20,107	\$134,592
<b>13 Bee</b>	\$833,363,510	\$14,973	\$4,208,411
<b>14 Bell</b>	\$6,982,554,870	\$23,776	\$88,284,356
<b>15 Bexar</b>	\$51,169,126,820	\$27,321	\$133,905,280
<b>16 Blanco</b>	\$1,259,218,093	\$25,299	\$544,992
<b>17 Borden</b>	\$267,088,711	\$17,792	\$592,114
<b>18 Bosque</b>	\$1,151,748,827	\$21,276	\$462,975
<b>19 Bowie</b>	\$3,174,748,783	\$22,795	\$4,716,703
<b>20 Brazoria</b>	\$14,944,906,370	\$27,022	\$6,416,468
<b>21 Brazos</b>	\$5,621,371,089	\$19,709	\$29,421,668
<b>22 Brewster</b>	\$515,167,515	\$21,677	\$3,076,747
<b>23 Briscoe</b>	\$106,200,542	\$20,669	\$61,278
<b>24 Brooks</b>	\$622,837,885	\$14,878	\$828,242
<b>25 Brown</b>	\$1,546,467,576	\$20,305	\$2,287,179
<b>26 Burleson</b>	\$997,927,120	\$21,126	\$447,866
<b>27 Burnet</b>	\$2,079,581,730	\$24,336	\$893,367
<b>28 Caldwell</b>	\$1,170,261,742	\$19,778	\$2,343,196
<b>29 Calhoun</b>	\$3,621,307,725	\$21,048	\$713,975
<b>30 Callahan</b>	\$493,963,898	\$20,541	\$1,640,424
<b>31 Cameron</b>	\$8,314,725,408	\$14,913	\$53,781,601
<b>32 Camp</b>	\$447,362,862	\$24,893	\$467,008
<b>33 Carson</b>	\$619,624,552	\$26,913	\$97,888
<b>34 Cass</b>	\$1,311,138,450	\$20,991	\$1,361,203
<b>35 Castro</b>	\$509,464,766	\$29,324	\$597,019
<b>36 Chambers</b>	\$4,339,792,610	\$27,629	\$328,515
<b>37 Cherokee</b>	\$1,582,630,779	\$22,165	\$1,892,897

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Private Sector Capital Stock PROP</b>	<b>Per Capita Income *  PCINC</b>	<b>Federal Education Expenditure EDUEXP</b>
38 Childress	\$194,977,180	\$15,376	\$418,508
39 Clay	\$631,430,180	\$21,173	\$160,646
40 Cochran	\$322,087,670	\$20,347	\$361,604
41 Coke	\$327,793,111	\$18,319	\$90,058
42 Coleman	\$511,113,826	\$20,062	\$481,313
43 Collin	\$41,296,592,307	\$45,403	\$4,519,563
44 Collingsworth	\$228,121,560	\$22,905	\$186,468
45 Colorado	\$1,571,418,286	\$23,548	\$703,548
46 Comal	\$5,166,908,118	\$29,133	\$1,501,789
47 Comanche	\$729,985,149	\$20,535	\$407,738
48 Concho	\$326,221,880	\$14,520	\$120,901
49 Cooke	\$1,847,242,746	\$24,160	\$2,024,548
50 Coryell	\$1,346,277,568	\$18,267	\$11,727,117
51 Cottle	\$146,940,180	\$22,579	\$147,748
52 Crane	\$683,660,680	\$19,199	\$179,399
53 Crockett	\$1,019,617,225	\$17,191	\$267,270
54 Crosby	\$312,000,300	\$21,594	\$554,884
55 Culberson	\$259,753,250	\$13,913	\$228,926
56 Dallam	\$441,178,441	\$30,285	\$260,294
57 Dallas	\$132,409,530,710	\$36,046	\$111,749,585
58 Dawson	\$695,465,416	\$18,054	\$1,119,105
59 Deaf Smith	\$788,590,667	\$24,385	\$1,262,643
60 Delta	\$172,588,107	\$18,994	\$226,825
61 Denton	\$26,211,359,134	\$33,060	\$32,995,964
62 DeWitt	\$951,733,250	\$20,456	\$1,145,929
63 Dickens	\$150,837,650	\$16,407	\$135,984
64 Dimmit	\$585,141,144	\$13,262	\$1,369,673
65 Donley	\$237,861,080	\$21,549	\$423,466
66 Duval	\$774,187,912	\$15,499	\$1,112,609
67 Eastland	\$714,123,360	\$21,368	\$2,347,547
68 Ector	\$4,484,587,294	\$21,093	\$13,688,373
69 Edwards	\$438,603,114	\$14,604	\$318,195
70 Ellis	\$5,888,022,401	\$26,751	\$3,174,003
71 El Paso	\$20,271,011,438	\$18,562	\$77,616,929
72 Erath	\$1,575,381,069	\$22,226	\$4,509,715
73 Falls	\$574,692,060	\$17,133	\$848,564
74 Fannin	\$1,079,488,316	\$19,921	\$703,112

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Private Sector Capital Stock PROP</b>	<b>Per Capita Income *  PCINC</b>	<b>Federal Education Expenditure EDUEXP</b>
75 Fayette	\$2,065,370,221	\$25,697	\$502,544
76 Fisher	\$287,390,489	\$17,798	\$177,991
77 Floyd	\$359,676,577	\$24,167	\$563,552
78 Foard	\$97,443,828	\$20,992	\$53,973
79 Fort Bend	\$19,474,177,462	\$33,672	\$6,167,352
80 Franklin	\$673,454,334	\$23,243	\$203,568
81 Freestone	\$1,712,353,450	\$18,417	\$452,563
82 Frio	\$648,965,490	\$14,879	\$1,214,779
83 Gaines	\$2,203,748,859	\$18,763	\$992,359
84 Galveston	\$13,250,162,022	\$29,449	\$12,146,406
85 Garza	\$412,868,430	\$19,719	\$247,561
86 Gillespie	\$2,186,410,020	\$25,462	\$375,059
87 Glasscock	\$419,912,780	\$18,126	\$90,993
88 Goliad	\$771,904,563	\$20,555	\$228,024
89 Gonzales	\$1,022,626,488	\$22,572	\$1,151,261
90 Gray	\$1,042,495,617	\$24,590	\$579,540
91 Grayson	\$4,574,245,156	\$23,046	\$4,507,225
92 Gregg	\$5,322,102,809	\$27,205	\$7,120,402
93 Grimes	\$1,472,400,915	\$17,851	\$865,629
94 Guadalupe	\$3,793,232,766	\$23,100	\$2,845,869
95 Hale	\$1,268,397,489	\$20,691	\$3,267,690
96 Hall	\$158,225,174	\$15,901	\$274,332
97 Hamilton	\$553,070,149	\$22,731	\$226,765
98 Hansford	\$430,639,247	\$33,530	\$209,728
99 Hardeman	\$290,215,170	\$20,494	\$230,291
100 Hardin	\$1,756,214,330	\$22,683	\$1,388,016
101 Harris	\$182,965,069,723	\$35,606	\$212,444,938
102 Harrison	\$3,384,480,504	\$21,560	\$6,504,447
103 Hartley	\$474,888,130	\$27,972	\$58,548
104 Haskell	\$344,822,684	\$19,040	\$248,877
105 Hays	\$5,265,498,353	\$23,467	\$11,763,453
106 Hemphill	\$768,922,180	\$33,584	\$52,718
107 Henderson	\$3,173,606,944	\$22,790	\$3,799,012
108 Hidalgo	\$14,066,062,847	\$13,576	\$86,119,937
109 Hill	\$1,296,677,552	\$20,005	\$1,955,253
110 Hockley	\$1,556,651,718	\$20,465	\$4,279,032
111 Hood	\$2,180,416,332	\$27,698	\$543,095

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Private Sector Capital Stock PROP</b>	<b>Per Capita Income *  PCINC</b>	<b>Federal Education Expenditure EDUEXP</b>
<b>112 Hopkins</b>	\$1,430,820,993	\$22,531	\$855,193
<b>113 Houston</b>	\$1,082,999,970	\$22,238	\$1,329,664
<b>114 Howard</b>	\$1,298,524,904	\$20,011	\$2,716,293
<b>115 Hudspeth</b>	\$324,652,481	\$14,137	\$270,130
<b>116 Hunt</b>	\$2,450,298,721	\$22,944	\$38,409,274
<b>117 Hutchinson</b>	\$1,715,968,670	\$23,403	\$1,150,497
<b>118 Irion</b>	\$238,770,640	\$22,984	\$38,206
<b>119 Jack</b>	\$656,304,323	\$18,488	\$251,541
<b>120 Jackson</b>	\$1,334,188,718	\$22,896	\$475,979
<b>121 Jasper</b>	\$1,973,628,445	\$20,970	\$1,335,866
<b>122 Jeff Davis</b>	\$301,493,516	\$17,081	\$122,509
<b>123 Jefferson</b>	\$13,978,005,478	\$24,335	\$15,784,211
<b>124 Jim Hogg</b>	\$420,477,729	\$17,360	\$339,731
<b>125 Jim Wells</b>	\$1,055,044,914	\$18,653	\$2,263,832
<b>126 Johnson</b>	\$4,423,112,534	\$24,117	\$3,441,461
<b>127 Jones</b>	\$510,726,824	\$16,211	\$1,466,071
<b>128 Karnes</b>	\$560,103,260	\$15,058	\$1,010,018
<b>129 Kaufman</b>	\$3,054,439,025	\$25,213	\$3,044,170
<b>130 Kendall</b>	\$2,080,407,391	\$30,712	\$577,593
<b>131 Kenedy</b>	\$448,687,741	\$25,504	\$18,408
<b>132 Kent</b>	\$367,553,884	\$19,759	\$31,781
<b>133 Kerr</b>	\$2,619,854,412	\$26,414	\$2,273,449
<b>134 Kimble</b>	\$541,033,825	\$17,519	\$119,716
<b>135 King</b>	\$199,506,273	\$20,664	NA
<b>136 Kinney</b>	\$319,321,010	\$16,614	\$181,540
<b>137 Kleberg</b>	\$1,252,012,634	\$18,001	\$9,154,275
<b>138 Knox</b>	\$191,832,075	\$18,195	\$243,857
<b>139 Lamar</b>	\$2,152,487,531	\$22,201	\$4,381,235
<b>140 Lamb</b>	\$997,004,730	\$20,110	\$970,518
<b>141 Lampasas</b>	\$831,294,199	\$22,846	\$709,362
<b>142 La Salle</b>	\$417,997,065	\$14,182	\$428,171
<b>143 Lavaca</b>	\$1,465,313,887	\$22,388	\$340,067
<b>144 Lee</b>	\$1,094,311,145	\$22,227	\$488,033
<b>145 Leon</b>	\$1,314,251,720	\$22,049	\$500,995
<b>146 Liberty</b>	\$2,713,030,253	\$21,081	\$2,061,499
<b>147 Limestone</b>	\$1,332,212,365	\$19,060	\$791,342
<b>148 Lipscomb</b>	\$379,955,567	\$25,125	\$83,111

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Private Sector Capital Stock PROP</b>	<b>Per Capita Income *  PCINC</b>	<b>Federal Education Expenditure EDUEXP</b>
149 Live Oak	\$1,098,899,120	\$16,754	\$418,264
150 Llano	\$1,963,382,263	\$23,146	\$212,211
151 Loving	\$152,592,756	\$71,726	NA
152 Lubbock	\$8,404,909,963	\$24,306	\$21,390,904
153 Lynn	\$326,451,101	\$18,512	\$546,879
154 McCulloch	\$548,309,730	\$20,804	\$453,960
155 McLennan	\$6,889,188,625	\$22,715	\$44,245,497
156 McMullen	\$447,437,916	\$26,458	\$15,870
157 Madison	\$539,867,544	\$18,608	\$507,721
158 Marion	\$560,332,560	\$16,840	\$548,551
159 Martin	\$443,622,640	\$17,721	\$271,770
160 Mason	\$570,158,569	\$18,952	\$135,982
161 Matagorda	\$2,952,550,099	\$20,548	\$1,655,789
162 Maverick	\$1,179,373,973	\$11,509	\$4,892,362
163 Medina	\$1,628,477,827	\$19,693	\$1,466,579
164 Menard	\$316,117,848	\$15,839	\$119,968
165 Midland	\$4,921,998,415	\$35,419	\$6,700,482
166 Milam	\$1,352,923,952	\$22,379	\$1,033,355
167 Mills	\$409,739,252	\$21,023	\$315,884
168 Mitchell	\$446,942,052	\$14,568	\$359,921
169 Montague	\$909,036,689	\$22,367	\$500,987
170 Montgomery	\$13,614,818,229	\$32,989	\$9,172,994
171 Moore	\$1,447,404,221	\$21,460	\$400,241
172 Morris	\$645,766,762	\$22,032	\$661,327
173 Motley	\$118,701,899	\$16,447	\$64,677
174 Nacogdoches	\$2,260,997,001	\$19,485	\$8,233,494
175 Navarro	\$1,813,261,584	\$20,834	\$3,274,696
176 Newton	\$777,503,885	\$15,172	\$657,367
177 Nolan	\$723,844,034	\$20,036	\$2,949,217
178 Nueces	\$12,708,335,230	\$23,925	\$26,154,575
179 Ochiltree	\$581,168,544	\$28,097	\$173,956
180 Oldham	\$166,102,702	\$23,086	\$369,979
181 Orange	\$3,980,442,220	\$22,985	\$3,682,246
182 Palo Pinto	\$1,356,186,782	\$21,616	\$909,774
183 Panola	\$2,428,469,181	\$21,417	\$1,790,178
184 Parker	\$4,359,889,737	\$28,548	\$2,940,716
185 Parmer	\$518,035,105	\$25,590	\$545,580

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Private Sector Capital Stock PROP</b>	<b>Per Capita Income *  PCINC</b>	<b>Federal Education Expenditure EDUEXP</b>
<b>186 Pecos</b>	\$1,984,079,882	\$13,953	\$1,045,131
<b>187 Polk</b>	\$1,960,430,103	\$24,294	\$1,374,237
<b>188 Potter</b>	\$4,554,675,138	\$23,837	\$6,115,716
<b>189 Presidio</b>	\$303,482,075	\$13,448	\$709,611
<b>190 Rains</b>	\$359,272,986	\$19,720	\$171,061
<b>191 Randall</b>	\$4,433,865,074	\$25,126	\$7,405,885
<b>192 Reagan</b>	\$451,618,240	\$16,599	\$105,214
<b>193 Real</b>	\$347,551,307	\$18,234	\$57,924
<b>194 Red River</b>	\$584,091,020	\$18,204	\$726,526
<b>195 Reeves</b>	\$416,034,500	\$15,833	\$1,020,523
<b>196 Refugio</b>	\$644,283,110	\$25,775	\$392,756
<b>197 Roberts</b>	\$266,186,799	\$23,305	\$10,430
<b>198 Robertson</b>	\$1,246,533,990	\$19,789	\$912,324
<b>199 Rockwall</b>	\$2,942,054,019	\$36,943	\$402,108
<b>200 Runnels</b>	\$521,310,300	\$18,751	\$345,686
<b>201 Rusk</b>	\$2,583,101,790	\$21,044	\$2,029,082
<b>202 Sabine</b>	\$452,285,221	\$21,098	\$370,890
<b>203 San Augustine</b>	\$344,441,412	\$18,797	\$450,961
<b>204 San Jacinto</b>	\$944,276,269	\$19,965	\$752,749
<b>205 San Patricio</b>	\$2,712,742,222	\$19,405	\$4,284,022
<b>206 San Saba</b>	\$694,112,360	\$19,458	\$355,004
<b>207 Schleicher</b>	\$339,819,880	\$17,371	\$134,636
<b>208 Scurry</b>	\$769,174,931	\$20,532	\$1,042,442
<b>209 Shackelford</b>	\$333,260,758	\$25,235	\$108,921
<b>210 Shelby</b>	\$846,955,023	\$21,276	\$1,066,622
<b>211 Sherman</b>	\$461,000,982	\$43,521	\$80,380
<b>212 Smith</b>	\$8,198,245,931	\$28,055	\$10,838,454
<b>213 Somervell</b>	\$2,269,306,385	\$24,460	\$196,349
<b>214 Starr</b>	\$1,299,402,460	\$9,558	\$6,166,901
<b>215 Stephens</b>	\$556,584,172	\$20,751	\$332,417
<b>216 Sterling</b>	\$280,276,254	\$16,026	\$36,340
<b>217 Stonewall</b>	\$166,470,546	\$22,454	\$64,021
<b>218 Sutton</b>	\$587,829,207	\$19,403	\$138,110
<b>219 Swisher</b>	\$353,139,487	\$24,683	\$469,793
<b>220 Tarrant</b>	\$73,634,574,269	\$30,300	\$58,343,164
<b>221 Taylor</b>	\$4,302,210,227	\$25,932	\$8,855,324
<b>222 Terrell</b>	\$332,647,118	\$24,892	\$86,333

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix A**

<b>Counties 2000 Census Data</b>	<b>Private Sector Capital Stock PROP</b>	<b>Per Capita Income *  PCINC</b>	<b>Federal Education Expenditure EDUEXP</b>
<b>223 Terry</b>	\$603,318,983	\$20,907	\$852,243
<b>224 Throckmorton</b>	\$203,733,617	\$24,142	\$57,601
<b>225 Titus</b>	\$1,907,629,025	\$20,732	\$1,953,415
<b>226 Tom Green</b>	\$3,418,904,037	\$23,869	\$6,418,687
<b>227 Travis</b>	\$60,573,365,486	\$35,213	\$610,534,360
<b>228 Trinity</b>	\$619,565,581	\$18,721	\$590,896
<b>229 Tyler</b>	\$852,627,250	\$18,152	\$705,706
<b>230 Upshur</b>	\$1,336,319,460	\$21,214	\$1,081,794
<b>231 Upton</b>	\$671,899,245	\$19,114	\$194,757
<b>232 Uvalde</b>	\$1,059,101,148	\$18,669	\$4,774,676
<b>233 Val Verde</b>	\$1,119,424,353	\$16,798	\$3,394,499
<b>234 Van Zandt</b>	\$1,958,746,920	\$23,525	\$1,546,030
<b>235 Victoria</b>	\$3,842,560,406	\$26,552	\$10,490,515
<b>236 Walker</b>	\$1,478,798,645	\$16,982	\$5,953,255
<b>237 Waller</b>	\$1,742,200,979	\$19,852	\$10,163,647
<b>238 Ward</b>	\$757,583,749	\$18,774	\$524,348
<b>239 Washington</b>	\$2,108,951,147	\$27,826	\$2,875,069
<b>240 Webb</b>	\$6,859,242,780	\$15,069	\$24,585,640
<b>241 Wharton</b>	\$1,919,327,118	\$22,217	\$2,647,417
<b>242 Wheeler</b>	\$508,002,341	\$29,824	\$187,250
<b>243 Wichita</b>	\$4,625,760,090	\$24,745	\$9,870,933
<b>244 Wilbarger</b>	\$632,054,770	\$22,176	\$1,647,536
<b>245 Willacy</b>	\$680,703,428	\$13,554	\$2,056,292
<b>246 Williamson</b>	\$15,655,284,776	\$31,449	\$15,412,805
<b>247 Wilson</b>	\$1,424,025,149	\$21,964	\$984,973
<b>248 Winkler</b>	\$520,611,920	\$18,706	\$378,272
<b>249 Wise</b>	\$2,562,936,381	\$21,768	\$683,011
<b>250 Wood</b>	\$1,844,205,962	\$19,899	\$3,477,905
<b>251 Yoakum</b>	\$1,461,512,638	\$20,330	\$410,931
<b>252 Young</b>	\$846,274,230	\$25,271	\$482,650
<b>253 Zapata</b>	\$1,080,303,240	\$12,208	\$920,715
<b>254 Zavala</b>	\$505,086,670	\$10,874	\$1,535,743
<b>255 State</b>		\$28,313	
<b>256 National</b>		\$29,845	

Personal Income Data Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis Regional Economic Information System (REIS), 1969-2000, Table CA1-3, Per Capita Personal Income (Dollars).

Property Valuation Data Source: Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts.

Federal Education Expenditures Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau Consolidated Federal Funds Report.

**Appendix B: Econometric Estimation Results**

**Group 1 – Linear Specifications**

**Equation 1**

Dependent Variable: PCINC  
 Method: Least Squares  
 Sample: 1 254  
 Included observations: 254  
 White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	3169.823	1950.770	1.624909	0.1055
HSGR25	40.78670	52.11037	0.782698	0.4346
COLSOM25	383.9780	100.8641	3.806887	0.0002
COGR25	297.4971	73.55434	4.044589	0.0001
DENSITY	4.490352	1.038650	4.323258	0.0000
AIRPC	2234.964	1900.922	1.175726	0.2408
DISTANCE	9.695626	2.169142	4.469798	0.0000
PROPPC	0.016403	0.004070	4.030032	0.0001
R-squared	0.652930	Mean dependent var		21943.96
Adjusted R-squared	0.643054	S.D. dependent var		6006.626
S.E. of regression	3588.658	Akaike info criterion		19.23993
Sum squared resid	3.17E+09	Schwarz criterion		19.35135
Log likelihood	-2435.472	Hannan-Quinn criter.		19.28475
F-statistic	66.11284	Durbin-Watson stat		2.063862
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

**Artificial Regression Test Results for Educational Attainment Variable Exogeneity**

**Ho: OLS Parameter Estimates Consistent**

**Ha: Endogeneity Present**

Variable	<i>n</i>	t-value	Critical t-value	Decision
<b>Linear Specification</b>				
HSGR25	252	-0.0189	1.96	Fail to Reject Null Hypothesis
COLSOM25	252	-0.0189	1.96	Fail to Reject Null Hypothesis
COGR25	252	0.0189	1.96	Fail to Reject Null Hypothesis

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 2

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	4505.505	2105.991	2.139375	0.0334
HSGR25	48.46107	51.45487	0.941817	0.3472
COLSOM25	312.2876	100.0154	3.122394	0.0020
COGR25	327.4140	66.07004	4.955560	0.0000
DENSITY	3.496531	0.973444	3.591916	0.0004
LANE	-20181.20	5604.723	-3.600749	0.0004
AIRPC	1484.566	1886.964	0.786749	0.4322
DISTANCE	9.977868	2.118342	4.710224	0.0000
PROPPC	0.026533	0.005309	4.997355	0.0000
R-squared	0.684124	Mean dependent var		21943.96
Adjusted R-squared	0.673810	S.D. dependent var		6006.626
S.E. of regression	3430.567	Akaike info criterion		19.15363
Sum squared resid	2.88E+09	Schwarz criterion		19.27897
Log likelihood	-2423.511	Hannan-Quinn criter.		19.20405
F-statistic	66.32767	Durbin-Watson stat		1.992869
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 3

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	1805.284	3526.235	0.511958	0.6091
HSGR25	84.88889	58.41618	1.453174	0.1475
COLSOM25	332.2675	93.94121	3.536973	0.0005
COGR25	352.6015	83.40332	4.227667	0.0000
PCTBLNG	31.05796	44.04698	0.705110	0.4814
DENSITY	3.469246	0.993027	3.493606	0.0006
LANE	-20251.65	5648.830	-3.585106	0.0004
AIRPC	1418.905	1908.094	0.743624	0.4578
DISTANCE	11.14042	3.164807	3.520095	0.0005
PROPPC	0.026479	0.005407	4.897001	0.0000
R-squared	0.684947	Mean dependent var		21943.96
Adjusted R-squared	0.673326	S.D. dependent var		6006.626
S.E. of regression	3433.109	Akaike info criterion		19.15889
Sum squared resid	2.88E+09	Schwarz criterion		19.29816
Log likelihood	-2423.180	Hannan-Quinn criter.		19.21492
F-statistic	58.94150	Durbin-Watson stat		2.010692
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 4

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	3828.723	2197.656	1.742185	0.0827
HSGR25	45.60205	50.33834	0.905911	0.3659
COLSOM25	348.7637	111.6771	3.122966	0.0020
COGR25	320.2162	69.99478	4.574858	0.0000
DENSITY	4.176517	0.936021	4.461991	0.0000
CENPC	-31242.24	15869.90	-1.968648	0.0501
DISTANCE	9.881222	2.133487	4.631490	0.0000
PROPPC	0.023543	0.006607	3.563214	0.0004
R-squared	0.669710	Mean dependent var		21943.96
Adjusted R-squared	0.660312	S.D. dependent var		6006.626
S.E. of regression	3500.830	Akaike info criterion		19.19038
Sum squared resid	3.01E+09	Schwarz criterion		19.30179
Log likelihood	-2429.178	Hannan-Quinn criter.		19.23520
F-statistic	71.25716	Durbin-Watson stat		1.997833
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 5

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	3681.437	2217.830	1.659928	0.0982
HSGR25	53.50680	51.08591	1.047389	0.2960
COLSOM25	345.3918	111.5754	3.095590	0.0022
COGR25	316.4354	70.51146	4.487717	0.0000
DENSITY	3.834430	1.035052	3.704578	0.0003
CENPC	-30510.60	15874.58	-1.921979	0.0558
AIRPC	1727.675	1899.079	0.909743	0.3639
DISTANCE	9.803284	2.149865	4.559954	0.0000
PROPPC	0.023456	0.006560	3.575515	0.0004
R-squared	0.671202	Mean dependent var	21943.96	
Adjusted R-squared	0.660466	S.D. dependent var	6006.626	
S.E. of regression	3500.033	Akaike info criterion	19.19372	
Sum squared resid	3.00E+09	Schwarz criterion	19.31906	
Log likelihood	-2428.603	Hannan-Quinn criter.	19.24414	
F-statistic	62.51740	Durbin-Watson stat	2.023791	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 6

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	4627.798	19276.31	0.240077	0.8105
HSGR25	157.4651	84.66162	1.859935	0.0641
COLSOM25	366.4681	120.1819	3.049278	0.0026
COGR25	380.4947	82.44684	4.615030	0.0000
PCTBLNG	-171.9236	200.5830	-0.857120	0.3922
PCTENGL	-201.8300	179.8758	-1.122052	0.2630
PCTSPNH	-237.4897	175.4861	-1.353325	0.1772
POPGT65	170.4328	70.87279	2.404771	0.0170
POPLT18	381.7645	108.2922	3.525320	0.0005
FLFPR	12.48177	133.7671	0.093310	0.9257
FRNBRN	7.272600	81.81511	0.088891	0.9292
DENSITY	3.722887	1.020471	3.648203	0.0003
LANE	-22841.12	6677.190	-3.420768	0.0007
AIRPC	2619.435	1771.850	1.478362	0.1406
AIRMILES	9.476255	5.940892	1.595090	0.1120
DISTANCE	10.65688	3.096365	3.441737	0.0007
PROPPC	0.028280	0.005768	4.902631	0.0000
R-squared	0.715824	Mean dependent var		21943.96
Adjusted R-squared	0.696639	S.D. dependent var		6006.626
S.E. of regression	3308.340	Akaike info criterion		19.11087
Sum squared resid	2.59E+09	Schwarz criterion		19.34762
Log likelihood	-2410.080	Hannan-Quinn criter.		19.20611
F-statistic	37.31193	Durbin-Watson stat		2.011003
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 7

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	6763.937	18407.99	0.367446	0.7136
HSGR25	115.6789	85.40174	1.354526	0.1768
COLSOM25	374.1078	123.8498	3.020659	0.0028
COGR25	348.9325	79.22633	4.404249	0.0000
PCTBLNG	-270.6215	186.7291	-1.449273	0.1486
PCTENGL	-148.1069	177.4635	-0.834576	0.4048
PCTSPNH	-99.96214	196.2156	-0.509450	0.6109
POPGT65	126.2494	69.07678	1.827668	0.0688
POPLT18	421.1925	117.2195	3.593196	0.0004
LANE	-20338.90	6869.849	-2.960604	0.0034
AIRPC	3250.769	1427.810	2.276751	0.0237
URBAN	4213.680	1643.963	2.563123	0.0110
BORDER	-2968.693	1501.757	-1.976813	0.0492
PROPPC	0.025791	0.005707	4.519095	0.0000
R-squared	0.687675	Mean dependent var		21943.96
Adjusted R-squared	0.670758	S.D. dependent var		6006.626
S.E. of regression	3446.581	Akaike info criterion		19.18169
Sum squared resid	2.85E+09	Schwarz criterion		19.37667
Log likelihood	-2422.075	Hannan-Quinn criter.		19.26013
F-statistic	40.64851	Durbin-Watson stat		1.885279
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Group 2 – Linear Specifications with Quadratic Terms

#### Equation 8

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	1282.613	3341.493	0.383844	0.7014
HSGR25	53.38836	59.14645	0.902647	0.3676
COLSOM25	260.4534	86.80367	3.000489	0.0030
COGR25	433.4818	73.70896	5.880992	0.0000
PCTBLNG	61.24886	37.19035	1.646902	0.1009
DENSITY	3.502573	1.105139	3.169351	0.0017
LANE	-7699.352	6572.537	-1.171443	0.2426
LANE^2	-16371.42	19498.89	-0.839608	0.4020
AIRPC	-6297.727	6028.859	-1.044597	0.2973
AIRPC^2	8918.137	6912.324	1.290179	0.1982
DISTANCE	29.96763	6.695148	4.476022	0.0000
DISTANCE^2	-0.029623	0.008871	-3.339335	0.0010
PROPPC	0.004106	0.006142	0.668420	0.5045
PROPPC^2	1.24E-08	2.85E-09	4.356925	0.0000
R-squared	0.733969	Mean dependent var		21943.96
Adjusted R-squared	0.719559	S.D. dependent var		6006.626
S.E. of regression	3180.908	Akaike info criterion		19.02126
Sum squared resid	2.43E+09	Schwarz criterion		19.21623
Log likelihood	-2401.700	Hannan-Quinn criter.		19.09970
F-statistic	50.93471	Durbin-Watson stat		1.988692
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

### Artificial Regression Test Results for Educational Attainment Variable Exogeneity

**Ho: OLS Parameter Estimates Consistent**

**Ha: Endogeneity Present**

Variable	<i>n</i>	t-value	Critical t-value	Decision
<b>Linear Specification with Quadratic Terms</b>				
HSGR25	252	0.0806	1.96	Fail to Reject Null Hypothesis
COLSOM25	252	0.0806	1.96	Fail to Reject Null Hypothesis
COGR25	252	-0.0806	1.96	Fail to Reject Null Hypothesis

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 9

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-4652.261	5909.863	-0.787203	0.4319
HSGR25	293.1534	463.4354	0.632566	0.5276
HSGR25^2	-4.156383	7.306266	-0.568879	0.5700
COLSOM25	463.6791	524.7566	0.883608	0.3778
COLSOM25^2	-4.676989	12.87781	-0.363182	0.7168
COGR25	446.8517	74.23230	6.019640	0.0000
PCTBLNG	166.8217	81.43004	2.048651	0.0416
PCTBLNG^2	-2.395012	1.374596	-1.742339	0.0827
AIRPC	1763.605	1737.720	1.014896	0.3112
DISTANCE	26.89980	7.242336	3.714243	0.0003
DISTANCE^2	-0.022789	0.010674	-2.134962	0.0338
URBAN	3670.740	1725.532	2.127309	0.0344
PROPPC	-0.006240	0.004588	-1.360192	0.1750
PROPPC^2	1.27E-08	2.42E-09	5.248871	0.0000
R-squared	0.718856	Mean dependent var		21943.96
Adjusted R-squared	0.703627	S.D. dependent var		6006.626
S.E. of regression	3270.016	Akaike info criterion		19.07652
Sum squared resid	2.57E+09	Schwarz criterion		19.27149
Log likelihood	-2408.718	Hannan-Quinn criter.		19.15495
F-statistic	47.20417	Durbin-Watson stat		2.001368
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 10

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-29899.56	6336.602	-4.718547	0.0000
HSGR25	1134.196	398.0307	2.849520	0.0048
HSGR25^2	-15.72372	6.091167	-2.581397	0.0104
COLSOM25	538.9871	503.7118	1.070031	0.2857
COLSOM25^2	-6.051968	12.17169	-0.497217	0.6195
COGR25	194.9218	206.0436	0.946022	0.3451
COGR25^2	7.549803	4.766524	1.583922	0.1145
PCTBLNG	-3.557826	39.20122	-0.090758	0.9278
POPGT65	143.8178	63.88388	2.251238	0.0253
POPLT18	459.1413	96.26648	4.769482	0.0000
DENSITY	3.790560	2.525825	1.500721	0.1348
DENSITY^2	3.42E-05	0.000853	0.040092	0.9681
DISTANCE	19.62632	6.980172	2.811724	0.0053
DISTANCE^2	-0.018327	0.009373	-1.955224	0.0517
AIRPC	1621.849	1677.110	0.967050	0.3345
PROPPC	-0.006943	0.004892	-1.419289	0.1571
PROPPC^2	1.34E-08	2.46E-09	5.422990	0.0000
R-squared	0.755971	Mean dependent var	21943.96	
Adjusted R-squared	0.739497	S.D. dependent var	6006.626	
S.E. of regression	3065.754	Akaike info criterion	18.95856	
Sum squared resid	2.23E+09	Schwarz criterion	19.19531	
Log likelihood	-2390.737	Hannan-Quinn criter.	19.05380	
F-statistic	45.88726	Durbin-Watson stat	2.056748	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 11

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-26348.32	7495.431	-3.515251	0.0005
HSGR25	1203.576	488.0377	2.466153	0.0144
HSGR25^2	-16.77759	7.606510	-2.205688	0.0284
COLSOM25	578.2298	478.9547	1.207275	0.2285
COLSOM25^2	-7.442332	11.09242	-0.670938	0.5029
COGR25	221.9577	166.2372	1.335186	0.1831
COGR25^2	6.628998	3.800245	1.744361	0.0824
PCTBLNG	-19.32246	39.20826	-0.492816	0.6226
POPLT18	381.6688	74.71545	5.108299	0.0000
DENSITY	2.175986	2.697815	0.806573	0.4207
DENSITY^2	0.000632	0.001208	0.523328	0.6012
DISTANCE	17.01234	6.994464	2.432258	0.0157
DISTANCE^2	-0.015299	0.010071	-1.519092	0.1301
AIRPC	1489.793	1492.436	0.998229	0.3192
PROPPC	-0.006716	0.003434	-1.955651	0.0517
PROPPC^2	1.33E-08	1.89E-09	7.016653	0.0000
R-squared	0.750626	Mean dependent var		21943.96
Adjusted R-squared	0.734909	S.D. dependent var		6006.626
S.E. of regression	3092.633	Akaike info criterion		18.97235
Sum squared resid	2.28E+09	Schwarz criterion		19.19518
Log likelihood	-2393.489	Hannan-Quinn criter.		19.06199
F-statistic	47.75920	Durbin-Watson stat		2.069105
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 12

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-25595.92	7541.937	-3.393812	0.0008
HSGR25	1129.675	494.7103	2.283509	0.0233
HSGR25^2	-15.66282	7.704119	-2.033045	0.0432
COLSOM25	624.5515	481.7245	1.296491	0.1961
COLSOM25^2	-8.595308	11.16595	-0.769778	0.4422
COGR25	232.9161	166.7122	1.397115	0.1637
COGR25^2	6.338287	3.814450	1.661652	0.0979
PCTBLNG	-17.59053	39.26530	-0.447992	0.6546
POPLT18	376.3200	74.96297	5.020078	0.0000
DENSITY	3.312482	2.966243	1.116727	0.2652
DENSITY^2	0.000269	0.001271	0.211598	0.8326
DISTANCE	16.99856	6.996655	2.429526	0.0159
DISTANCE^2	-0.015282	0.010074	-1.516937	0.1306
AIRPC	-3571.693	5682.875	-0.628501	0.5303
AIRPC^2	6239.201	6759.134	0.923077	0.3569
PROPPC	-0.006741	0.003435	-1.962283	0.0509
PROPPC^2	1.33E-08	1.89E-09	7.047144	0.0000
R-squared	0.751519	Mean dependent var		21943.96
Adjusted R-squared	0.734744	S.D. dependent var		6006.626
S.E. of regression	3093.594	Akaike info criterion		18.97664
Sum squared resid	2.27E+09	Schwarz criterion		19.21339
Log likelihood	-2393.033	Hannan-Quinn criter.		19.07188
F-statistic	44.79968	Durbin-Watson stat		2.049915
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 13

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-98676.46	65011.79	-1.517824	0.1305
HSGR25	835.5906	511.1210	1.634820	0.1035
HSGR25^2	-11.16170	7.852764	-1.421372	0.1566
COLSOM25	447.6004	624.6221	0.716594	0.4744
COLSOM25^2	-3.804742	14.77603	-0.257494	0.7970
COGR25	239.2817	193.7538	1.234978	0.2182
COGR25^2	5.815521	4.586743	1.267898	0.2062
PCTBLNG	-473.7482	215.7478	-2.195842	0.0291
PCTBLNG^2	15.63463	5.444212	2.871789	0.0045
PCTENGL	1399.564	450.3125	3.107984	0.0021
PCTENGL^2	-10.05793	3.063051	-3.283632	0.0012
PCTSPNH	-666.8043	278.5918	-2.393482	0.0175
PCTSPNH^2	22.02787	7.532678	2.924308	0.0038
POPGT65	894.3690	349.7973	2.556821	0.0112
POPGT65^2	-20.01992	9.539904	-2.098546	0.0370
POPLT18	-222.7348	721.3266	-0.308785	0.7578
POPLT18^2	11.80366	14.39728	0.819854	0.4132
FLFPR	1876.711	3002.053	0.625142	0.5325
FLFPR^2	-24.44054	33.76576	-0.723826	0.4699
FRNBRN	135.0569	163.4068	0.826507	0.4094
FRNBRN^2	-1.612946	4.140482	-0.389555	0.6972
DENSITY	6.733250	3.216092	2.093613	0.0374
DENSITY^2	-0.001102	0.000981	-1.123577	0.2624
LANE	-11762.65	8309.976	-1.415485	0.1583
LANE^2	-13630.91	17278.17	-0.788909	0.4310
AIRPC	337.5132	6250.820	0.053995	0.9570
AIRPC^2	3114.399	6941.516	0.448663	0.6541
AIRMILES	14.61734	13.66225	1.069907	0.2858
AIRMILES^2	-0.022151	0.052570	-0.421367	0.6739
DISTANCE	20.08637	7.903859	2.541337	0.0117
DISTANCE^2	-0.017544	0.010917	-1.607068	0.1095
PROPPC	0.003672	0.005346	0.686903	0.4929
PROPPC^2	1.32E-08	3.53E-09	3.727822	0.0002
<hr/>				
R-squared	0.798630	Mean dependent var	21943.96	
Adjusted R-squared	0.769473	S.D. dependent var	6006.626	
S.E. of regression	2883.978	Akaike info criterion	18.89240	
Sum squared resid	1.84E+09	Schwarz criterion	19.35197	
Log likelihood	-2366.335	Hannan-Quinn criter.	19.07728	
F-statistic	27.39010	Durbin-Watson stat	1.965850	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 14

Dependent Variable: PCINC

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-55410.10	14871.21	-3.725998	0.0002
HSGR25	825.1648	478.0240	1.726200	0.0857
HSGR25^2	-10.67210	7.222871	-1.477543	0.1409
COLSOM25	310.6703	611.2093	0.508288	0.6117
COLSOM25^2	-0.760857	14.43464	-0.052710	0.9580
COGR25	264.4071	195.1873	1.354633	0.1769
COGR25^2	5.715393	4.557990	1.253928	0.2112
PCTBLNG	-538.5135	220.5523	-2.441659	0.0154
PCTBLNG^2	14.47334	5.435501	2.662742	0.0083
PCTENGL	1288.058	448.9472	2.869064	0.0045
PCTENGL^2	-9.711409	3.119494	-3.113136	0.0021
PCTSPNH	-540.3332	232.3152	-2.325862	0.0209
PCTSPNH^2	19.41331	6.782096	2.862435	0.0046
POPGT65	757.4330	321.0062	2.359558	0.0191
POPGT65^2	-15.62969	8.758865	-1.784443	0.0757
POPLT18	-124.8910	718.0119	-0.173940	0.8621
POPLT18^2	11.62865	14.40879	0.807053	0.4205
DENSITY	5.186122	2.864418	1.810533	0.0715
DENSITY^2	-0.000482	0.000887	-0.543460	0.5873
LANE	-8688.141	8741.099	-0.993941	0.3213
LANE^2	-19985.76	18660.51	-1.071019	0.2853
AIRPC	-2033.567	5821.875	-0.349298	0.7272
AIRPC^2	4473.269	6679.757	0.669675	0.5037
DISTANCE	15.52455	8.131927	1.909086	0.0575
DISTANCE^2	-0.009071	0.011229	-0.807779	0.4201
PROPPC	0.005608	0.005273	1.063611	0.2886
PROPPC^2	1.25E-08	3.62E-09	3.437828	0.0007
R-squared	0.789066	Mean dependent var	21943.96	
Adjusted R-squared	0.764907	S.D. dependent var	6006.626	
S.E. of regression	2912.399	Akaike info criterion	18.89156	
Sum squared resid	1.93E+09	Schwarz criterion	19.26757	
Log likelihood	-2372.228	Hannan-Quinn criter.	19.04282	
F-statistic	32.66030	Durbin-Watson stat	1.961016	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Group 3 – Logarithmic Specifications

#### Equation 15

Dependent Variable: LOG(PCINC)

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 252

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	6.345468	0.604151	10.50311	0.0000
LOG(HSGR25)	0.084723	0.075955	1.115445	0.2658
LOG(COLSOM25)	0.425104	0.128153	3.317163	0.0010
LOG(COGR25)	0.187539	0.083784	2.238375	0.0261
LOG(DENSITY)	0.047207	0.009225	5.117345	0.0000
LOG(AIRPCLN)	0.002747	0.036655	0.074953	0.9403
LOG(BORDERLN)	-0.136765	0.057005	-2.399198	0.0172
LOG(PROPPC)	0.127823	0.043484	2.939503	0.0036
R-squared	0.580083	Mean dependent var	9.967125	
Adjusted R-squared	0.568036	S.D. dependent var	0.241075	
S.E. of regression	0.158444	Akaike info criterion	-0.815604	
Sum squared resid	6.125475	Schwarz criterion	-0.703558	
Log likelihood	110.7661	Hannan-Quinn criter.	-0.770519	
F-statistic	48.15251	Durbin-Watson stat	1.930774	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

### Artificial Regression Test Results for Educational Attainment Variable Exogeneity

**Ho: OLS Parameter Estimates Consistent**

**Ha: Endogeneity Present**

Variable	<i>n</i>	t-value	Critical t-value	Decision
<b>Logarithmic Specification</b>				
HSGR25	252	-3.3521	1.96	Reject Null Hypothesis
COLSOM25	252	-3.3521	1.96	Reject Null Hypothesis
COGR25	252	3.3521	1.96	Reject Null Hypothesis

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 16

Dependent Variable: LOG(PCINC)

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	7.178951	0.556613	12.89756	0.0000
LOG(HSGR25)	0.043734	0.087415	0.500302	0.6173
LOG(COLSOM25)	0.514405	0.137652	3.736987	0.0002
LOG(COGR25)	0.215872	0.084827	2.544853	0.0115
LOG(URBANLN)	0.218061	0.070680	3.085197	0.0023
LOG(BORDERLN)	-0.174156	0.052797	-3.298559	0.0011
LOG(PROPPC)	0.046063	0.038993	1.181326	0.2386
R-squared	0.545324	Mean dependent var		9.965811
Adjusted R-squared	0.534279	S.D. dependent var		0.240852
S.E. of regression	0.164366	Akaike info criterion		-0.746266
Sum squared resid	6.673025	Schwarz criterion		-0.648780
Log likelihood	101.7758	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-0.707049
F-statistic	49.37392	Durbin-Watson stat		1.942666
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 17

Dependent Variable: LOG(PCINC)

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 252

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	7.097905	0.569164	12.47075	0.0000
LOG(HSGR25)	0.059916	0.082072	0.730032	0.4661
LOG(COLSOM25)	0.505334	0.135108	3.740229	0.0002
LOG(COGR25)	0.217986	0.084870	2.568465	0.0108
LOG(AIRPCLN)	-0.033157	0.040307	-0.822618	0.4115
LOG(BORDERLN)	-0.182998	0.053869	-3.397091	0.0008
LOG(URBANLN)	0.186414	0.080443	2.317332	0.0213
LOG(PROPPC)	0.050420	0.040025	1.259718	0.2090
R-squared	0.552455	Mean dependent var		9.967125
Adjusted R-squared	0.539615	S.D. dependent var		0.241075
S.E. of regression	0.163573	Akaike info criterion		-0.751882
Sum squared resid	6.528504	Schwarz criterion		-0.639837
Log likelihood	102.7372	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-0.706797
F-statistic	43.02801	Durbin-Watson stat		1.926424
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 18

Dependent Variable: LOG(PCINC)

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 254

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	6.636157	0.603834	10.99004	0.0000
LOG(HSGR25)	-0.014245	0.081027	-0.175809	0.8606
LOG(COLSOM25)	0.380842	0.133385	2.855202	0.0047
LOG(COGR25)	0.169517	0.084164	2.014118	0.0451
LOG(DENSITY)	0.044423	0.009016	4.926853	0.0000
LOG(DISTANCELN)	0.042060	0.011161	3.768586	0.0002
LOG(PROPPC)	0.128086	0.045257	2.830193	0.0050
R-squared	0.597477	Mean dependent var		9.965811
Adjusted R-squared	0.587699	S.D. dependent var		0.240852
S.E. of regression	0.154653	Akaike info criterion		-0.868099
Sum squared resid	5.907604	Schwarz criterion		-0.770613
Log likelihood	117.2485	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-0.828882
F-statistic	61.10485	Durbin-Watson stat		1.986584
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 19

Dependent Variable: LOG(PCINC)

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 252

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	7.282426	0.340968	21.35810	0.0000
LOG(HSGR25)	-0.037230	0.078386	-0.474960	0.6352
LOG(COLSOM25)	0.442847	0.067324	6.577893	0.0000
LOG(COGR25)	0.198460	0.039217	5.060625	0.0000
LOG(AIRPCLN)	-0.044230	0.043090	-1.026461	0.3057
LOG(DISTANCELN)	0.050783	0.009594	5.293231	0.0000
LOG(URBANLN)	0.173995	0.079984	2.175377	0.0306
LOG(PROPPC)	0.059956	0.016207	3.699462	0.0003
R-squared	0.580492	Mean dependent var		9.967125
Adjusted R-squared	0.568457	S.D. dependent var		0.241075
S.E. of regression	0.158367	Akaike info criterion		-0.816577
Sum squared resid	6.119515	Schwarz criterion		-0.704532
Log likelihood	110.8887	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-0.771492
F-statistic	48.23334	Durbin-Watson stat		1.955555
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 20

Dependent Variable: LOG(PCINC)

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 252

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	5.521517	1.538820	3.588150	0.0004
LOG(HSGR25)	0.003814	0.109645	0.034786	0.9723
LOG(COLSOM25)	0.377769	0.125590	3.007965	0.0029
LOG(COGR25)	0.172445	0.081671	2.111471	0.0358
LOG(PCTBLNG)	-0.040183	0.052778	-0.761360	0.4472
LOG(PCTENGL)	0.119420	0.066475	1.796465	0.0737
LOG(PCTSPNH)	0.084278	0.087252	0.965914	0.3351
LOG(POPGT65)	0.063682	0.066815	0.953102	0.3415
LOG(POPLT18)	0.240278	0.122378	1.963399	0.0508
LOG(FLFPR)	-0.088645	0.329911	-0.268693	0.7884
LOG(FRNBRNLN)	-0.013563	0.048217	-0.281285	0.7787
LOG(DENSITY)	0.012898	0.029861	0.431931	0.6662
LOG(LANE)	-0.045746	0.040452	-1.130890	0.2593
LOG(AIRPCLN)	-0.025638	0.050848	-0.504205	0.6146
LOG(DISTANCELN)	0.038023	0.013496	2.817439	0.0053
LOG(AIRMILES)	0.000623	0.012002	0.051931	0.9586
LOG(PROPPC)	0.113585	0.039112	2.904088	0.0040
R-squared	0.627251	Mean dependent var	9.967125	
Adjusted R-squared	0.601872	S.D. dependent var	0.241075	
S.E. of regression	0.152112	Akaike info criterion	-0.863326	
Sum squared resid	5.437423	Schwarz criterion	-0.625230	
Log likelihood	125.7791	Hannan-Quinn criter.	-0.767521	
F-statistic	24.71568	Durbin-Watson stat	1.885280	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix B

### Equation 21

Dependent Variable: LOG(PCINC)

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1 254

Included observations: 252

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	5.161902	0.582955	8.854725	0.0000
LOG(HSGR25)	0.023890	0.109136	0.218896	0.8269
LOG(COLSOM25)	0.391360	0.157129	2.490696	0.0134
LOG(COGR25)	0.152024	0.085597	1.776042	0.0770
LOG(PCTBLNG)	-0.050486	0.042073	-1.199953	0.2314
LOG(PCTENGL)	0.174679	0.060629	2.881129	0.0043
LOG(PCTSPNH)	0.077108	0.054436	1.416490	0.1579
LOG(POPGT65)	0.043005	0.064124	0.670650	0.5031
LOG(POPLT18)	0.279716	0.177275	1.577865	0.1159
LOG(LANE)	-0.053579	0.016324	-3.282174	0.0012
LOG(AIRPCLN)	-2.49E-05	0.039053	-0.000638	0.9995
LOG(URBANLN)	0.115236	0.068881	1.672966	0.0956
LOG(BORDERLN)	-0.108135	0.058304	-1.854682	0.0649
LOG(PROPPC)	0.104269	0.036595	2.849268	0.0048
R-squared	0.616492	Mean dependent var		9.967125
Adjusted R-squared	0.595544	S.D. dependent var		0.241075
S.E. of regression	0.153316	Akaike info criterion		-0.858680
Sum squared resid	5.594369	Schwarz criterion		-0.662601
Log likelihood	122.1937	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-0.779782
F-statistic	29.42973	Durbin-Watson stat		1.839705
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			

Appendix C: Complete Texas County Income Simulation Results

Table C1: Increased High School Graduation Income Gains

Income Gains from Increased High School Graduation Rates		
County	Per Capita Impact	Aggregate Impact
1 Anderson	NC	NC
2 Andrews	NC	NC
3 Angelina	NC	NC
4 Aransas	NC	NC
5 Archer	NC	NC
6 Armstrong	NC	NC
7 Atascosa	NC	NC
8 Austin	NC	NC
9 Bailey	NC	NC
10 Bandera	NC	NC
11 Bastrop	NC	NC
12 Baylor	NC	NC
13 Bee	NC	NC
14 Bell	NC	NC
15 Bexar	\$24.47	\$34,087,837
16 Blanco	NC	NC
17 Borden	NC	NC
18 Bosque	NC	NC
19 Bowie	NC	NC
20 Brazoria	NC	NC
21 Brazos	\$195.78	\$29,839,225
22 Brewster	\$154.99	\$1,374,137
23 Briscoe	NC	NC
24 Brooks	\$61.18	\$487,972
25 Brown	NC	NC
26 Burleson	NC	NC
27 Burnet	NC	NC
28 Caldwell	NC	NC
29 Calhoun	NC	NC
30 Callahan	NC	NC
31 Cameron	\$195.78	\$65,629,458
32 Camp	NC	NC
33 Carson	NC	NC
34 Cass	NC	NC
35 Castro	NC	NC
36 Chambers	NC	NC
37 Cherokee	NC	NC

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased High School Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
38 Childress	NC	NC
39 Clay	NC	NC
40 Cochran	NC	NC
41 Coke	NC	NC
42 Coleman	NC	NC
43 Collin	\$403.79	\$198,532,637
44 Collingsworth	NC	NC
45 Colorado	NC	NC
46 Comal	NC	NC
47 Comanche	NC	NC
48 Concho	NC	NC
49 Cooke	NC	NC
50 Coryell	NC	NC
51 Cottle	NC	NC
52 Crane	NC	NC
53 Crockett	NC	NC
54 Crosby	NC	NC
55 Culberson	NC	NC
56 Dallam	NC	NC
57 Dallas	\$130.52	\$289,605,031
58 Dawson	NC	NC
59 Deaf Smith	NC	NC
60 Delta	NC	NC
61 Denton	\$203.93	\$88,298,315
62 DeWitt	NC	NC
63 Dickens	NC	NC
64 Dimmit	NC	NC
65 Donley	NC	NC
66 Duval	NC	NC
67 Eastland	NC	NC
68 Ector	NC	NC
69 Edwards	NC	NC
70 Ellis	NC	NC
71 El Paso	\$93.81	\$63,754,942
72 Erath	NC	NC
73 Falls	NC	NC
74 Fannin	NC	NC

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased High School Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
75	Fayette	NC
76	Fisher	NC
77	Floyd	NC
78	Foard	NC
79	Fort Bend	\$224.33
		\$79,513,105
80	Franklin	NC
81	Freestone	NC
82	Frio	NC
83	Gaines	NC
84	Galveston	NC
85	Garza	NC
86	Gillespie	NC
87	Glasscock	\$28.55
		\$40,142
88	Goliad	NC
89	Gonzales	NC
90	Gray	NC
91	Grayson	NC
92	Gregg	NC
93	Grimes	NC
94	Guadalupe	NC
95	Hale	NC
96	Hall	NC
97	Hamilton	NC
98	Hansford	NC
99	Hardeman	NC
100	Hardin	NC
101	Harris	\$134.60
		\$457,704,593
102	Harrison	NC
103	Hartley	NC
104	Haskell	NC
105	Hays	\$81.57
		\$7,960,667
106	Hemphill	NC
107	Henderson	NC
108	Hidalgo	\$187.62
		\$106,841,981
109	Hill	NC
110	Hockley	NC
111	Hood	NC

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased High School Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
112 Hopkins	NC	NC
113 Houston	NC	NC
114 Howard	NC	NC
115 Hudspeth	\$175.38	\$586,480
116 Hunt	NC	NC
117 Hutchinson	NC	NC
118 Irion	NC	NC
119 Jack	NC	NC
120 Jackson	NC	NC
121 Jasper	NC	NC
122 Jeff Davis	\$240.64	\$531,096
123 Jefferson	NC	NC
124 Jim Hogg	NC	NC
125 Jim Wells	NC	NC
126 Johnson	NC	NC
127 Jones	NC	NC
128 Karnes	NC	NC
129 Kaufman	NC	NC
130 Kendall	\$77.49	\$1,839,957
131 Kenedy	\$122.36	\$50,657
132 Kent	NC	NC
133 Kerr	NC	NC
134 Kimble	NC	NC
135 King	NC	NC
136 Kinney	NC	NC
137 Kleberg	\$77.49	\$2,444,881
138 Knox	NC	NC
139 Lamar	NC	NC
140 Lamb	NC	NC
141 Lampasas	NC	NC
142 La Salle	NC	NC
143 Lavaca	NC	NC
144 Lee	NC	NC
145 Leon	NC	NC
146 Liberty	NC	NC
147 Limestone	NC	NC
148 Lipscomb	NC	NC

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased High School Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
149 Live Oak	NC	NC
150 Llano	NC	NC
151 Loving	NC	NC
152 Lubbock	NC	NC
153 Lynn	NC	NC
154 McCulloch	NC	NC
155 McLennan	NC	NC
156 McMullen	NC	NC
157 Madison	NC	NC
158 Marion	NC	NC
159 Martin	NC	NC
160 Mason	NC	NC
161 Matagorda	NC	NC
162 Maverick	\$248.80	\$11,767,441
163 Medina	NC	NC
164 Menard	NC	NC
165 Midland	\$77.49	\$8,990,087
166 Milam	NC	NC
167 Mills	NC	NC
168 Mitchell	NC	NC
169 Montague	NC	NC
170 Montgomery	NC	NC
171 Moore	NC	NC
172 Morris	NC	NC
173 Motley	NC	NC
174 Nacogdoches	NC	NC
175 Navarro	NC	NC
176 Newton	NC	NC
177 Nolan	NC	NC
178 Nueces	NC	NC
179 Ochiltree	NC	NC
180 Oldham	NC	NC
181 Orange	NC	NC
182 Palo Pinto	NC	NC
183 Panola	NC	NC
184 Parker	NC	NC
185 Parmer	NC	NC

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased High School Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
186 Pecos	NC	NC
187 Polk	NC	NC
188 Potter	NC	NC
189 Presidio	\$203.93	\$1,489,530
190 Rains	NC	NC
191 Randall	\$65.26	\$6,807,268
192 Reagan	NC	NC
193 Real	NC	NC
194 Red River	NC	NC
195 Reeves	\$4.08	\$53,581
196 Refugio	NC	NC
197 Roberts	NC	NC
198 Robertson	NC	NC
199 Rockwall	\$81.57	\$3,514,182
200 Runnels	NC	NC
201 Rusk	NC	NC
202 Sabine	NC	NC
203 San Augustine	NC	NC
204 San Jacinto	NC	NC
205 San Patricio	NC	NC
206 San Saba	NC	NC
207 Schleicher	\$175.38	\$514,749
208 Scurry	NC	NC
209 Shackelford	NC	NC
210 Shelby	NC	NC
211 Sherman	NC	NC
212 Smith	\$4.08	\$712,568
213 Somervell	NC	NC
214 Starr	\$326.29	\$17,488,359
215 Stephens	NC	NC
216 Sterling	NC	NC
217 Stonewall	NC	NC
218 Sutton	NC	NC
219 Swisher	NC	NC
220 Tarrant	\$57.10	\$82,581,105
221 Taylor	NC	NC
222 Terrell	NC	NC

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C

<b>Income Gains from Increased High School Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
223 Terry	NC	NC
224 Throckmorton	NC	NC
225 Titus	NC	NC
226 Tom Green	NC	NC
227 Travis	\$305.90	\$248,476,667
228 Trinity	NC	NC
229 Tyler	NC	NC
230 Upshur	NC	NC
231 Upton	NC	NC
232 Uvalde	\$101.97	\$2,643,590
233 Val Verde	\$4.08	\$182,953
234 Van Zandt	NC	NC
235 Victoria	NC	NC
236 Walker	NC	NC
237 Waller	NC	NC
238 Ward	NC	NC
239 Washington	NC	NC
240 Webb	\$281.43	\$54,348,578
241 Wharton	NC	NC
242 Wheeler	NC	NC
243 Wichita	NC	NC
244 Wilbarger	NC	NC
245 Willacy	\$24.47	\$491,447
246 Williamson	\$110.12	\$27,527,390
247 Wilson	NC	NC
248 Winkler	NC	NC
249 Wise	NC	NC
250 Wood	NC	NC
251 Yoakum	NC	NC
252 Young	NC	NC
253 Zapata	NC	NC
254 Zavala	\$187.62	\$2,176,378

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

**Table C2: Increased Limited College Attendance Income Gains**

<b>Income Gains from Increased Limited College Attendance</b>			
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>	
<b>1 Anderson</b>	\$499.17	\$27,508,840	
<b>2 Andrews</b>	\$1,651.11	\$21,470,977	
<b>3 Angelina</b>	\$0.00	\$0	
<b>4 Aransas</b>	NC	NC	
<b>5 Archer</b>	NC	NC	
<b>6 Armstrong</b>	NC	NC	
<b>7 Atascosa</b>	\$1,420.72	\$54,879,525	
<b>8 Austin</b>	\$1,343.92	\$31,703,148	
<b>9 Bailey</b>	\$2,150.28	\$14,178,927	
<b>10 Bandera</b>	NC	NC	
<b>11 Bastrop</b>	NC	NC	
<b>12 Baylor</b>	\$191.99	\$785,811	
<b>13 Bee</b>	\$883.15	\$28,577,835	
<b>14 Bell</b>	NC	NC	
<b>15 Bexar</b>	NC	NC	
<b>16 Blanco</b>	NC	NC	
<b>17 Borden</b>	NC	NC	
<b>18 Bosque</b>	NC	NC	
<b>19 Bowie</b>	NC	NC	
<b>20 Brazoria</b>	NC	NC	
<b>21 Brazos</b>	\$998.34	\$152,162,437	
<b>22 Brewster</b>	NC	NC	
<b>23 Briscoe</b>	NC	NC	
<b>24 Brooks</b>	\$1,651.11	\$13,169,218	
<b>25 Brown</b>	\$422.38	\$15,912,588	
<b>26 Burleson</b>	\$2,265.47	\$37,312,299	
<b>27 Burnet</b>	NC	NC	
<b>28 Caldwell</b>	\$806.35	\$25,959,758	
<b>29 Calhoun</b>	\$1,151.93	\$23,783,984	
<b>30 Callahan</b>	NC	NC	
<b>31 Cameron</b>	\$1,843.09	\$617,855,085	
<b>32 Camp</b>	\$614.36	\$7,095,300	
<b>33 Carson</b>	NC	NC	
<b>34 Cass</b>	\$575.97	\$17,531,286	
<b>35 Castro</b>	\$1,881.49	\$15,588,165	
<b>36 Chambers</b>	NC	NC	
<b>37 Cherokee</b>	\$652.76	\$30,457,254	

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased Limited College Attendance</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
38 Childress	\$575.97	\$4,428,035
39 Clay	\$0.00	\$0
40 Cochran	\$921.55	\$3,437,371
41 Coke	\$115.19	\$445,107
42 Coleman	\$1,459.12	\$13,474,942
43 Collin	NC	NC
44 Collingsworth	NC	NC
45 Colorado	\$2,073.48	\$42,278,287
46 Comal	NC	NC
47 Comanche	\$1,075.14	\$15,079,893
48 Concho	\$3,379.01	\$13,401,141
49 Cooke	NC	NC
50 Coryell	NC	NC
51 Cottle	\$1,958.29	\$3,728,580
52 Crane	\$1,420.72	\$5,677,192
53 Crockett	\$652.76	\$2,675,674
54 Crosby	\$1,535.91	\$10,861,971
55 Culberson	\$3,954.97	\$11,766,047
56 Dallam	\$959.95	\$5,972,779
57 Dallas	\$383.98	\$852,008,509
58 Dawson	\$1,651.11	\$24,741,818
59 Deaf Smith	\$1,075.14	\$19,955,646
60 Delta	\$307.18	\$1,636,361
61 Denton	NC	NC
62 DeWitt	\$1,267.13	\$25,359,024
63 Dickens	\$0.00	\$0
64 Dimmit	\$2,995.03	\$30,693,055
65 Donley	NC	NC
66 Duval	\$1,574.31	\$20,654,947
67 Eastland	\$460.77	\$8,430,776
68 Ector	NC	NC
69 Edwards	\$1,958.29	\$4,233,819
70 Ellis	NC	NC
71 El Paso	\$268.78	\$182,671,951
72 Erath	NC	NC
73 Falls	\$1,727.90	\$32,097,493
74 Fannin	\$844.75	\$26,391,733

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased Limited College Attendance</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
75 Fayette	\$1,958.29	\$42,698,513
76 Fisher	\$1,612.71	\$7,005,603
77 Floyd	\$1,881.49	\$14,621,078
78 Foard	NC	NC
79 Fort Bend	\$191.99	\$68,050,894
80 Franklin	\$460.77	\$4,357,997
81 Freestone	\$268.78	\$4,802,375
82 Frio	\$1,919.89	\$31,202,056
83 Gaines	\$2,073.48	\$29,997,056
84 Galveston	NC	NC
85 Garza	\$998.34	\$4,863,927
86 Gillespie	NC	NC
87 Glasscock	NC	NC
88 Goliad	NC	NC
89 Gonzales	\$2,764.64	\$51,499,750
90 Gray	NC	NC
91 Grayson	NC	NC
92 Gregg	NC	NC
93 Grimes	\$844.75	\$19,895,592
94 Guadalupe	NC	NC
95 Hale	\$1,305.53	\$47,784,839
96 Hall	\$2,764.64	\$10,455,876
97 Hamilton	\$575.97	\$4,739,633
98 Hansford	\$1,574.31	\$8,452,470
99 Hardeman	\$153.59	\$725,565
100 Hardin	\$499.17	\$23,996,670
101 Harris	\$383.98	\$1,305,747,305
102 Harrison	NC	NC
103 Hartley	\$76.80	\$425,217
104 Haskell	\$1,535.91	\$9,358,313
105 Hays	NC	NC
106 Hemphill	NC	NC
107 Henderson	NC	NC
108 Hidalgo	\$3,033.43	\$1,727,424,204
109 Hill	\$537.57	\$17,374,776
110 Hockley	\$460.77	\$10,466,934
111 Hood	NC	NC

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C

<b>Income Gains from Increased Limited College Attendance</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
112 Hopkins	\$921.55	\$29,452,652
113 Houston	\$1,190.33	\$27,597,846
114 Howard	\$76.80	\$2,582,406
115 Hudspeth	\$3,571.00	\$11,941,410
116 Hunt	\$76.80	\$5,882,237
117 Hutchinson	NC	NC
118 Irion	NC	NC
119 Jack	\$76.80	\$672,960
120 Jackson	\$614.36	\$8,841,325
121 Jasper	\$1,228.73	\$43,747,694
122 Jeff Davis	\$2,419.06	\$5,338,869
123 Jefferson	NC	NC
124 Jim Hogg	\$1,919.89	\$10,138,940
125 Jim Wells	\$1,612.71	\$63,421,347
126 Johnson	NC	NC
127 Jones	\$1,843.09	\$38,308,722
128 Karnes	\$3,187.02	\$49,226,677
129 Kaufman	NC	NC
130 Kendall	NC	NC
131 Kenedy	\$2,687.85	\$1,112,768
132 Kent	NC	NC
133 Kerr	NC	NC
134 Kimble	\$1,651.11	\$7,377,140
135 King	\$2,342.27	\$833,847
136 Kinney	\$1,727.90	\$5,838,578
137 Kleberg	\$191.99	\$6,057,062
138 Knox	\$1,535.91	\$6,532,235
139 Lamar	NC	NC
140 Lamb	\$1,075.14	\$15,814,213
141 Lampasas	NC	NC
142 La Salle	\$2,419.06	\$14,190,216
143 Lavaca	\$2,035.08	\$39,093,957
144 Lee	\$1,766.30	\$27,654,944
145 Leon	\$499.17	\$7,654,794
146 Liberty	\$38.40	\$2,693,760
147 Limestone	\$383.98	\$8,467,100
148 Lipscomb	NC	NC

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C

<b>Income Gains from Increased Limited College Attendance</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
149 Live Oak	\$307.18	\$3,781,109
150 Llano	NC	NC
151 Loving	NC	NC
152 Lubbock	NC	NC
153 Lynn	\$1,766.30	\$11,569,259
154 McCulloch	\$1,343.92	\$11,026,890
155 McLennan	NC	NC
156 McMullen	\$1,305.53	\$1,111,002
157 Madison	\$2,687.85	\$34,780,732
158 Marion	\$0.00	\$0
159 Martin	\$921.55	\$4,373,664
160 Mason	NC	NC
161 Matagorda	\$191.99	\$7,287,327
162 Maverick	\$4,415.75	\$208,851,612
163 Medina	\$460.77	\$18,110,248
164 Menard	\$998.34	\$2,356,089
165 Midland	NC	NC
166 Milam	\$1,497.51	\$36,296,754
167 Mills	\$1,535.91	\$7,911,484
168 Mitchell	\$2,035.08	\$19,736,241
169 Montague	\$38.40	\$734,051
170 Montgomery	NC	NC
171 Moore	\$1,036.74	\$20,860,260
172 Morris	NC	NC
173 Motley	\$38.40	\$54,755
174 Nacogdoches	\$806.35	\$47,738,570
175 Navarro	\$460.77	\$20,791,951
176 Newton	\$2,764.64	\$41,668,683
177 Nolan	\$921.55	\$14,562,291
178 Nueces	NC	NC
179 Ochiltree	\$76.80	\$691,621
180 Oldham	NC	NC
181 Orange	NC	NC
182 Palo Pinto	NC	NC
183 Panola	NC	NC
184 Parker	NC	NC
185 Parmer	\$1,267.13	\$12,691,550

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased Limited College Attendance</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
186 Pecos	\$1,919.89	\$32,271,435
187 Polk	\$1,113.54	\$45,803,090
188 Potter	NC	NC
189 Presidio	\$4,722.93	\$34,496,281
190 Rains	\$422.38	\$3,860,093
191 Randall	NC	NC
192 Reagan	\$767.96	\$2,554,222
193 Real	NC	NC
194 Red River	\$1,190.33	\$17,038,412
195 Reeves	\$3,993.37	\$52,460,924
196 Refugio	\$767.96	\$6,011,560
197 Roberts	NC	NC
198 Robertson	\$2,495.86	\$39,933,717
199 Rockwall	NC	NC
200 Runnels	\$1,343.92	\$15,448,397
201 Rusk	\$38.40	\$1,818,981
202 Sabine	\$499.17	\$5,225,826
203 San Augustine	\$1,535.91	\$13,740,270
204 San Jacinto	\$153.59	\$3,416,790
205 San Patricio	NC	NC
206 San Saba	\$806.35	\$4,988,105
207 Schleicher	\$1,497.51	\$4,395,205
208 Scurry	NC	NC
209 Shackelford	\$307.18	\$1,014,316
210 Shelby	\$1,574.31	\$39,710,395
211 Sherman	NC	NC
212 Smith	NC	NC
213 Somervell	NC	NC
214 Starr	\$4,991.71	\$267,540,929
215 Stephens	NC	NC
216 Sterling	\$383.98	\$534,881
217 Stonewall	\$1,497.51	\$2,535,292
218 Sutton	\$1,574.31	\$6,418,462
219 Swisher	\$959.95	\$8,042,420
220 Tarrant	NC	NC
221 Taylor	NC	NC
222 Terrell	\$0.00	\$0

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C

<b>Income Gains from Increased Limited College Attendance</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
223 Terry	\$1,651.11	\$21,069,759
224 Throckmorton	NC	NC
225 Titus	\$1,228.73	\$34,549,423
226 Tom Green	NC	NC
227 Travis	\$345.58	\$280,707,921
228 Trinity	\$460.77	\$6,349,000
229 Tyler	\$1,574.31	\$32,857,424
230 Upshur	NC	NC
231 Upton	\$1,497.51	\$5,097,539
232 Uvalde	\$1,267.13	\$32,851,549
233 Val Verde	\$2,342.27	\$105,064,688
234 Van Zandt	\$345.58	\$16,636,233
235 Victoria	NC	NC
236 Walker	\$883.15	\$54,541,548
237 Waller	\$0.00	\$0
238 Ward	\$729.56	\$7,958,751
239 Washington	\$1,497.51	\$45,484,005
240 Webb	\$2,457.46	\$474,577,209
241 Wharton	\$806.35	\$33,212,105
242 Wheeler	NC	NC
243 Wichita	NC	NC
244 Wilbarger	\$959.95	\$14,088,155
245 Willacy	\$2,726.24	\$54,748,435
246 Williamson	NC	NC
247 Wilson	\$422.38	\$13,688,357
248 Winkler	\$767.96	\$5,508,549
249 Wise	NC	NC
250 Wood	NC	NC
251 Yoakum	\$1,267.13	\$9,277,908
252 Young	\$191.99	\$3,444,859
253 Zapata	\$2,764.64	\$33,678,868
254 Zavala	\$3,993.37	\$46,323,112

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

**Table C3: Increased College Graduation Income Gains**

<b>Income Gains from Increased College Graduation Rates</b>			
	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
1	Anderson	\$3,599.72	\$198,376,700
2	Andrews	\$3,212.97	\$41,781,447
3	Angelina	\$2,528.73	\$202,626,773
4	Aransas	\$1,933.73	\$43,503,152
5	Archer	\$2,171.73	\$19,228,488
6	Armstrong	\$803.24	\$1,725,364
7	Atascosa	\$3,778.21	\$145,944,826
8	Austin	\$1,755.23	\$41,405,946
9	Bailey	\$4,135.21	\$27,267,574
10	Bandera	\$1,130.49	\$19,947,479
11	Bastrop	\$1,844.48	\$106,487,486
12	Baylor	\$3,302.22	\$13,515,978
13	Bee	\$3,272.47	\$105,893,801
14	Bell	\$1,011.49	\$240,708,368
15	Bexar	\$148.75	\$207,196,478
16	Blanco	\$297.50	\$2,504,331
17	Borden	\$535.49	\$390,376
18	Bosque	\$2,320.48	\$39,921,495
19	Bowie	\$2,112.23	\$188,634,770
20	Brazoria	\$1,070.99	\$258,929,947
21	Brazos	NC	NC
22	Brewster	NC	NC
23	Briscoe	\$1,695.73	\$3,035,363
24	Brooks	\$4,878.95	\$38,914,527
25	Brown	\$2,439.48	\$91,904,832
26	Burleson	\$2,974.97	\$48,997,775
27	Burnet	\$1,725.48	\$58,920,077
28	Caldwell	\$2,945.22	\$94,818,459
29	Calhoun	\$3,302.22	\$68,180,895
30	Callahan	\$3,242.72	\$41,847,283
31	Cameron	\$2,915.47	\$977,344,844
32	Camp	\$3,272.47	\$37,793,736
33	Carson	\$2,290.73	\$14,926,382
34	Cass	\$3,331.97	\$101,418,433
35	Castro	\$2,528.73	\$20,950,491
36	Chambers	\$3,302.22	\$85,960,036
37	Cherokee	\$3,510.47	\$163,794,832

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased College Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
38 Childress	\$4,343.46	\$33,392,504
39 Clay	\$2,766.72	\$30,450,555
40 Cochran	\$3,867.46	\$14,425,635
41 Coke	\$2,528.73	\$9,770,995
42 Coleman	\$3,421.22	\$31,594,937
43 Collin	NC	NC
44 Collingsworth	\$2,350.23	\$7,534,828
45 Colorado	\$2,617.97	\$53,380,503
46 Comal	NC	NC
47 Comanche	\$3,034.47	\$42,561,484
48 Concho	\$2,707.22	\$10,736,849
49 Cooke	\$2,231.23	\$81,134,157
50 Coryell	\$3,212.97	\$240,901,979
51 Cottle	\$2,350.23	\$4,474,833
52 Crane	\$3,093.97	\$12,363,504
53 Crockett	\$3,807.96	\$15,608,841
54 Crosby	\$3,778.21	\$26,719,525
55 Culberson	\$2,766.72	\$8,231,001
56 Dallam	\$4,045.96	\$25,173,968
57 Dallas	NC	NC
58 Dawson	\$3,778.21	\$56,616,527
59 Deaf Smith	\$3,391.47	\$62,949,021
60 Delta	\$2,766.72	\$14,738,334
61 Denton	NC	NC
62 DeWitt	\$3,391.47	\$67,873,432
63 Dickens	\$4,402.96	\$12,160,968
64 Dimmit	\$3,897.21	\$39,938,631
65 Donley	\$2,201.48	\$8,427,260
66 Duval	\$4,254.21	\$55,815,219
67 Eastland	\$3,123.72	\$57,154,700
68 Ector	\$3,331.97	\$403,577,924
69 Edwards	\$1,755.23	\$3,794,814
70 Ellis	\$1,814.73	\$202,088,601
71 El Paso	\$1,963.48	\$1,334,424,862
72 Erath	NC	NC
73 Falls	\$4,045.96	\$75,157,767
74 Fannin	\$3,153.47	\$98,520,692

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased College Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
75 Fayette	\$2,558.48	\$55,784,993
76 Fisher	\$3,212.97	\$13,957,137
77 Floyd	\$3,242.72	\$25,199,166
78 Foard	\$3,778.21	\$6,128,262
79 Fort Bend	NC	NC
80 Franklin	\$2,082.48	\$19,696,094
81 Freestone	\$3,659.21	\$65,379,186
82 Frio	\$4,402.96	\$71,556,862
83 Gaines	\$3,778.21	\$54,659,413
84 Galveston	\$148.75	\$37,210,642
85 Garza	\$3,926.96	\$19,132,159
86 Gillespie	\$89.25	\$1,857,631
87 Glasscock	\$1,338.74	\$1,882,264
88 Goliad	\$3,242.72	\$22,465,554
89 Gonzales	\$3,718.71	\$69,272,204
90 Gray	\$3,361.72	\$76,458,901
91 Grayson	\$1,784.98	\$197,410,161
92 Gregg	\$1,100.74	\$122,599,246
93 Grimes	\$3,837.71	\$90,385,812
94 Guadalupe	\$1,219.74	\$108,584,752
95 Hale	\$2,617.97	\$95,823,107
96 Hall	\$3,837.71	\$14,514,230
97 Hamilton	\$1,903.98	\$15,667,864
98 Hansford	\$1,368.49	\$7,347,405
99 Hardeman	\$3,093.97	\$14,615,914
100 Hardin	\$3,034.47	\$145,876,104
101 Harris	NC	NC
102 Harrison	\$2,320.48	\$144,124,858
103 Hartley	\$1,665.98	\$9,224,553
104 Haskell	\$2,617.97	\$15,951,319
105 Hays	NC	NC
106 Hemphill	\$1,576.73	\$5,283,638
107 Henderson	\$3,302.22	\$241,976,628
108 Hidalgo	\$3,064.22	\$1,744,960,083
109 Hill	\$3,183.22	\$102,884,826
110 Hockley	\$2,855.97	\$64,876,267
111 Hood	\$803.24	\$33,013,255

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased College Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
112 Hopkins	\$2,409.73	\$77,014,863
113 Houston	\$3,272.47	\$75,872,177
114 Howard	\$3,599.72	\$121,047,620
115 Hudspeth	\$4,016.21	\$13,430,210
116 Hunt	\$1,903.98	\$145,837,370
117 Hutchinson	\$2,647.72	\$63,166,759
118 Irion	\$505.75	\$895,675
119 Jack	\$3,093.97	\$27,112,459
120 Jackson	\$3,093.97	\$44,525,322
121 Jasper	\$3,778.21	\$134,519,509
122 Jeff Davis	NC	NC
123 Jefferson	\$2,052.73	\$517,392,675
124 Jim Hogg	\$4,075.71	\$21,523,827
125 Jim Wells	\$3,659.21	\$143,902,271
126 Johnson	\$2,796.47	\$354,623,524
127 Jones	\$4,462.46	\$92,752,163
128 Karnes	\$4,105.46	\$63,412,938
129 Kaufman	\$3,242.72	\$231,247,989
130 Kendall	NC	NC
131 Kenedy	\$862.74	\$357,175
132 Kent	\$2,409.73	\$2,069,955
133 Kerr	NC	NC
134 Kimble	\$1,755.23	\$7,842,381
135 King	NC	NC
136 Kinney	\$1,636.23	\$5,528,835
137 Kleberg	\$832.99	\$26,280,062
138 Knox	\$3,391.47	\$14,423,910
139 Lamar	\$2,588.22	\$125,526,320
140 Lamb	\$3,599.72	\$52,948,209
141 Lampasas	\$2,082.48	\$36,989,006
142 La Salle	\$4,997.95	\$29,317,984
143 Lavaca	\$3,510.47	\$67,436,051
144 Lee	\$3,004.72	\$47,044,915
145 Leon	\$3,302.22	\$50,639,513
146 Liberty	\$4,492.21	\$315,146,252
147 Limestone	\$3,599.72	\$79,377,318
148 Lipscomb	\$1,279.24	\$3,910,629

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased College Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
149 Live Oak	\$3,331.97	\$41,013,190
150 Llano	\$654.49	\$11,155,190
151 Loving	\$5,146.70	\$344,829
152 Lubbock	NC	NC
153 Lynn	\$2,915.47	\$19,096,340
154 McCulloch	\$2,736.97	\$22,456,867
155 McLennan	\$1,219.74	\$260,434,836
156 McMullen	\$2,082.48	\$1,772,190
157 Madison	\$3,480.72	\$45,040,468
158 Marion	\$4,373.21	\$47,847,264
159 Martin	\$3,391.47	\$16,095,903
160 Mason	\$1,338.74	\$5,004,199
161 Matagorda	\$3,183.22	\$120,825,449
162 Maverick	\$4,194.71	\$198,397,168
163 Medina	\$2,945.22	\$115,758,984
164 Menard	\$1,784.98	\$4,212,559
165 Midland	NC	NC
166 Milam	\$3,450.97	\$83,644,527
167 Mills	\$892.49	\$4,597,223
168 Mitchell	\$3,807.96	\$36,929,626
169 Montague	\$3,540.22	\$67,678,303
170 Montgomery	NC	NC
171 Moore	\$3,629.46	\$73,028,462
172 Morris	\$3,569.97	\$46,580,908
173 Motley	\$2,528.73	\$3,605,963
174 Nacogdoches	\$119.00	\$7,045,089
175 Navarro	\$3,272.47	\$147,666,859
176 Newton	\$5,265.70	\$79,364,615
177 Nolan	\$2,974.97	\$47,010,494
178 Nueces	\$1,308.99	\$410,557,325
179 Ochiltree	\$2,112.23	\$19,022,739
180 Oldham	\$1,130.49	\$2,470,119
181 Orange	\$3,629.46	\$308,381,108
182 Palo Pinto	\$3,302.22	\$89,245,743
183 Panola	\$2,915.47	\$66,344,475
184 Parker	\$1,368.49	\$121,104,234
185 Parmer	\$2,915.47	\$29,201,365

## Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C

<b>Income Gains from Increased College Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
186 Pecos	\$3,064.22	\$51,506,479
187 Polk	\$3,807.96	\$156,632,946
188 Potter	\$2,885.72	\$327,662,193
189 Presidio	\$3,421.22	\$24,988,568
190 Rains	\$3,480.72	\$31,810,266
191 Randall	NC	NC
192 Reagan	\$4,164.96	\$13,852,656
193 Real	\$1,755.23	\$5,348,195
194 Red River	\$4,224.46	\$60,468,907
195 Reeves	\$4,521.96	\$59,404,938
196 Refugio	\$3,450.97	\$27,014,166
197 Roberts	NC	NC
198 Robertson	\$3,123.72	\$49,979,516
199 Rockwall	NC	NC
200 Runnels	\$3,004.72	\$34,539,266
201 Rusk	\$3,093.97	\$146,567,547
202 Sabine	\$3,748.46	\$39,242,666
203 San Augustine	\$3,391.47	\$30,340,065
204 San Jacinto	\$4,045.96	\$90,006,444
205 San Patricio	\$3,034.47	\$203,728,286
206 San Saba	\$2,201.48	\$13,618,347
207 Schleicher	\$1,665.98	\$4,889,663
208 Scurry	\$3,391.47	\$55,487,794
209 Shackelford	\$713.99	\$2,357,605
210 Shelby	\$3,272.47	\$82,544,740
211 Sherman	\$832.99	\$2,653,912
212 Smith	\$208.25	\$36,382,172
213 Somervell	\$1,784.98	\$12,153,947
214 Starr	\$4,849.20	\$259,902,733
215 Stephens	\$2,915.47	\$28,204,274
216 Sterling	\$1,814.73	\$2,527,922
217 Stonewall	\$3,153.47	\$5,338,824
218 Sutton	\$3,034.47	\$12,371,537
219 Swisher	\$2,082.48	\$17,447,016
220 Tarrant	NC	NC
221 Taylor	\$208.25	\$26,354,823
222 Terrell	\$1,249.49	\$1,350,696

**Education, Infrastructure, and Border Economic Growth: Appendix C**

<b>Income Gains from Increased College Graduation Rates</b>		
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Impact</b>	<b>Aggregate Impact</b>
223 Terry	\$4,075.71	\$52,010,142
224 Throckmorton	\$1,487.49	\$2,751,848
225 Titus	\$2,974.97	\$83,650,239
226 Tom Green	\$1,100.74	\$114,487,898
227 Travis	NC	NC
228 Trinity	\$4,105.46	\$56,569,136
229 Tyler	\$4,016.21	\$83,822,341
230 Upshur	\$3,599.72	\$127,037,546
231 Upton	\$3,391.47	\$11,544,554
232 Uvalde	\$2,796.47	\$72,501,356
233 Val Verde	\$2,707.22	\$121,435,229
234 Van Zandt	\$3,450.97	\$166,129,530
235 Victoria	\$2,082.48	\$175,111,563
236 Walker	\$1,457.74	\$90,026,852
237 Waller	\$1,903.98	\$62,189,749
238 Ward	\$3,212.97	\$35,050,277
239 Washington	\$1,249.49	\$37,950,696
240 Webb	\$2,766.72	\$534,301,280
241 Wharton	\$2,647.72	\$109,054,470
242 Wheeler	\$3,034.47	\$16,034,143
243 Wichita	\$951.99	\$125,342,913
244 Wilbarger	\$1,814.73	\$26,633,013
245 Willacy	\$4,670.70	\$93,797,092
246 Williamson	NC	NC
247 Wilson	\$3,093.97	\$100,269,380
248 Winkler	\$3,778.21	\$27,101,125
249 Wise	\$3,034.47	\$148,060,923
250 Wood	\$2,588.22	\$95,122,442
251 Yoakum	\$3,867.46	\$28,317,560
252 Young	\$2,617.97	\$46,974,319
253 Zapata	\$4,313.71	\$52,549,593
254 Zavala	\$4,640.96	\$53,835,078