
Glasscock, Texas: Overall Prosperity 54.6 (4th decile*)







Breakdown of performance	2010	Score 10-year trend	2020	Decile (1 to 10) 2020	10-year decile change	Rank - Texas (1 to 254) 2020
Overall Prosperity	52.6		54.6	4	- -	19
Inclusive Societies	57.7	<u> </u>	55.6	4		24
Safety and Security	86.5	/	87.7	1	1	23
of Personal Freedom	36.4		38.4	9	1	239
	57.3		50.5	4	▼ 1	1
క్టిస్లి Social Capital	50.6	V	45.9	4	= -	27
Open Economies	47.4		54.3	2	1	46
Business Environment	44.6	1	44.0	7		199
Market Access and Infrastructure	42.4	~~	45.2	5	1	66
Sconomic Quality	55.1		73.7	1	1	6
Empowered People	52.8	~^	53.9	6	▼ 2	61
Living Conditions	54.5	~	63.1	5		31
Ç Health	53.7	/	53.3	6	▼ 1	60
Education	55.9		48.3	6	▼ 4	108
Natural Environment	47.0	~	50.6	7	1	190

Glasscock, Texas (4th decile*)											
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020	A ⁰ .	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 20	20 2	Decile 020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020
Safety and Security	86.5	V	87.7	1 🔺 1	23	Personal Freedom	36.4	38	.4	9 🔺 1	239
Terror-related Crime 15%	100.0		100.0	1 = -	1	Agency 30%	56.6	64	.5	5 = -	1
Violent Crime 50%	88.0	$\overline{}$	100.0	1	1	Freedom of Association and Speech 15%	39.6	39	.7	6 – -	1
Property Crime 35%	78.5	-	64.8	5 🔻 3	120	Absence of Legal Discrimination 25%	13.0	13	.7	6 = -	1
						Social Tolerance 30%	34.3	32	.3	10 = -	240
								*			
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020	229	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 20	20 2	Decile 020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020
Governance	57.3	_ /	50.5	4 🔻 1	1	Social Capital	50.6	45	.9	4 – -	27
Political Accountability 30%	53.2		52.4	7 🔻 4	1	Personal and Family Relationships 25%	76.6	75	d .	2 🔻 1	3
Rule of Law 35%	65.0		52.0	3 📤 1	1	Social Networks 25%	46.0	34	.2	5 🔺 1	27
Government Integrity 35%	53.2	~	47.4	5 🔻 2	1	Institutional Trust 20%	60.8	57	.6	5 🔻 1	39
						Civic and Social Participation 30%	26.1	23	.5	8 🔻 1	87
		Orace II Dec		Pro-197				Querell Process		D. W.	Torres
D	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020	Market Access and	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 20	j i	Decile 020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020
Business Environment	44.6	h~	44.0	7 = -	199	Infrastructure	42.4	45		5 🔺 1	66
Financing Ecosystems 40%	27.4		27.4	7 = -	199	Communications 40%	30.7	30		7 = -	141
Domestic Market Contestability 30%	49.3	\\ \	51.6	3 🔺 4	1	Resources 25%	69.7			1	3
Burden of Regulation 10%	44.0	// _	43.2	3 📤 2	1	Transport 35%	43.3	43	.3	6 = -	99
Labor Market Flexibility 10%	72.6	1	74.1	1 • 2 6 • 3	1						
Price Distortions 10%	71.3		58.1	6 3	1						
<u>^</u>	2010	Overall Prosperity	2020	Decile	Texas Rank						
Economic Quality	²⁰¹⁰ 55.1	10-yr trend	73.7	2020 10-yr dec. change	2020 6						
Fiscal Sustainability 25%	57.4	~/	70.3	1 🔺 3	26						
Productivity and Competitiveness 25%	52.8	~	86.6	1 🔺 3	18						
Dynamism 20%	43.5	~/	53.5	4 📤 4	131						
Labor Force Engagement 30%	62.9	~~~	79.4	1	12						
		~									
			İ								
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020	\sim	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 20	202	Decile 020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020
Living Conditions	54.5	~~~	63.1	5 = -	31	Health	53.7	53	.3	6 ▼ 1	60
Material Resources 25%	69.1		57.2	6 🔻 3	119	Behavioral Risk Factors 15%	68.0	65	.7	2	83
Nutrition 15%	44.2	~~	57.9	7 🔻 2	46	Preventative Interventions 15%	25.3	/^ ₃₁	.7	8 – -	48
Water Services 15%	91.7	7.,	90.1	2 🔻 1	1	Care Systems 15%	30.3	29	.6	9 🔻 1	104
Shelter 15%	33.3	~~	48.3	8 \Delta 2	174	Mental Health 15%	76.6	68	.8	3 🔻 2	94
Connectedness 15%	26.6		76.3	4 📤 2	84	Physical Health 20%	51.7	48	.8	7 🔻 2	131
Protection from Harm 15%	52.3	√ /~	53.0	7 🔻 1	100	Longevity 20%	66.7	71	.0	3 -	23
								0			T
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2020 10-yr dec. change		(Z)	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 20		Decile 020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020
Education	55.9	V	48.3	6 • 4	108	Natural Environment	47.0	50	.6	7 • 1	190
Pre-Primary Education 5%	42.6		13.3	10 🔻 3	237	Emissions 25%	54.5	55		8 = -	187
Primary Education 20%	77.9	7/1	66.9	2 1	25	Exposure to Air Pollution 25%	56.0	61		3	22
Secondary Education 25%	87.3	~~~	73.8	2 1	32	Forest, Land and Soil 20%	37.4	1 44		7 = -	181
Tertiary Education 25%	31.8	~~	31.3	8 = -	184	Freshwater 20%	57.1	60		9 = -	228
Adult Skills 25%	33.9	707	32.1	9 2	184	Preservation Efforts 10%	4.7	4	1	6 = -	1
* The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, fo	r each pillar. e	lement and indicator. Cou	inties in the 1s	t decile are the strongest perform	ers and those in the 10th de	cile are the weakest.					
				3							

	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Deci			Source	Source Unit	Source Unit Weight	Source Unit Weight			Source Unit Weight Value D
	Source				10-yr trend	2020	2010				Source Oill		2010	2010 10-yr tre	2010 10-yr trend 2020	2010 10-yr trend 2020 2010
Terror-related Crime (1st)			15%	100.0		100.0	1	1 Violent Crime (1st)				50%	50% 88.0	50% 88.0 √	50% 88.0 → 100.0	50% 88.0 → 100.0 1
Mass shooting deaths	GVA	deaths /1,000,000 population	1.5	0.0		0.0	1	1 Murder	NACJE)	deaths /100,000 population	deaths /100,000 population 1.5	deaths /100,000 population 1.5 0.0	deaths /100,000 1.5 0.0	0 deaths /100,000 population 1.5 0.0	o deaths /100,000 population 1.5 0.0
Mass shooting injuries	GVA	injuries /1,000,000 population	1.0	0.0		0.0	1	1 Rape	NACID		incidents /100,000 population	/100,000 1.0	/100,000 1.0 0.0	/100,000 1.0 0.0	/100,000 1.0 0.0 0.0	/100,000 1.0 0.0 0.0 1
Ferrorism deaths	GTD	deaths /1,000,000 population	1.0	0.0		0.0	1	1 Aggravated assaults	NACJD		assaults /100,000 population	assaults /100,000 1.0 population	assaults /100,000 1.0 83.8 population	assaults /100,000 population 1.0 83.8	assaults /100,000 population 1.0 83.8 0.0	assaults /100,000 population 1.0 83.8 0.0 2
Terrorism injuries	GTD	injuries /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	1 Robbery	NACJD		incidents /100,000 population	/100,000 0.5	/100,000 0.5 0.0	/100,000 0.5 0.0 V	/100,000 0.5 0.0 \ 0.0	/100,000 0.5 0.0 \ 0.0 1
Terrorism events	GTD	events /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	1								
										-						
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10_yr trend	2020	Decil 2010	20_								
Property Crime (5th)			35%	78.5	٠٨_	64.8	2	5								
Burglary	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.5	251.3	-/_	526.7	2	7								
Motor vehicle theft	NACID	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	83.8	Λ	150.5	4	7								
Larceny theft	NACID	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	1,088.8		602.0	5	1								
Identity theft	FTC	reports /100,000 population	0.5	57.7	V~	71.6	2	3								
	1						i									

-
/ >

GIASSCOCK, TEXAS: PEISONAI FIEE	dom (7t	irucciic)														· ·)
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	tor contain	Decile	
Agency (5th)			30%	56.6	io-yr trend	64.5	5	5	Freedom of Association and Speech (6th)			15%	39.6		39.7	6	6
Fatal police shootings of unarmed civilians	WaPo	deaths /100,000 population	1.0	0.0		0.0	1	1	Statewide free speech in public places	Cato	coding, 0-3	1.0	0.0		0.0	2	2
Statewide death row population	NAACP	number /100,000 population	1.0	1.4		0.8	6	6	Statewide right-to-work	NCSL	coding, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	1	1
Statewide adult incarceration	BJS	number /100,000 adult population	1.0	1,130.0		1,050.0	5	5	Statewide press suppression	USPFT	number /100,000 state population	0.5	0.0	Á	0.0	6	3
Statewide youth incarceration	CJRP	prisoners /100,000 youth population	0.5	108.2		51.4	5	4	Statewide invasive cell phone surveillance	ACLU	coding, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	6	6
Statewide trafficking	POL	reports /100,000 population	1.0	7.3		7.3	5	5									
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Dec	ile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile	9
Absence of Legal Discrimination (6th)			25%	13.0	10-yr trend	13.7	2010	6	Social Tolerance (10th)			30%	34.3	10-yr trend	32.3	10	10
Statewide religious freedom restoration act enacted	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.5		0.5	1	1	Hate group concentration	SPLC	number /100,000 population	1.0	324.7	1	827.7	10	10
Statewide employment anti-discrimination law	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.0		0.0	5	5	Ethnic slur google traffic	Google	index, 0-100	1.0	33.2		33.2	8	8
Statewide government discrimination based on sex prohibited	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.0		0.0	4	4	Statewide same sex marriage support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	48.0		55.0	4	5
Statewide affirmative action in public services banned	Cato	coding, 0-2	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	2	Statewide LGBT non-discrimination law support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	67.0	$\overline{}$	66.0	4	5
Statewide LGBT relationships & parenthood recognition	MAP	coding, 0-9	0.5	1.5	1	2.0	4	6	Support					•			
Statewide LGBT non-discrimination laws	MAP	coding, 0-11	0.5	0.0		0.0	5	5									
		3															

^{*} The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.



52.0

33.0

65.0

16.0

	_		_							_		
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202	20		Source	Unit	W
Political Accountability (7th)			30%	53.2		52.4	3	7	Rule of Law (3rd)			3
Statewide Elections Performance Index	MIT	Overall Prosperity, 0-1	1.5	0.6	~	0.7	4	5	Statewide Justice Index	NCAJ	index rank 1-51	
Statewide gender balance in legislatures	CAWP	percentage	0.5	23.8	1	23.2	3	7	Statewide judicial integrity	ATRF	coding, 0-1	
Statewide state campaign disclosure	NIMP	index, 0-1	1.0	1.0		0.8	1	7				
Statewide term limits	NCSL	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.0		0.0	4	4				
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202					
Government Integrity (5th)			35%	53.2	h	47.4	3	5				
Statewide legal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	9.0	_	11.5	3	6				
Statewide illegal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	8.0		7.0	5	3				
Statewide Corruption Reflection Index	ICS	Overall Prosperity, 0-1	0.5	0.4	M	0.2	7	2				
Statewide State Integrity Investigation	CPI	index rank, 1-50	1.0	27.0		39.0	2	7				
Statewide public record request compliance	Cuillier	percentage	1.0	41.4		41.4	4	4				
Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index	USPIRG	Overall Prosperity, 0-100	0.5	91.0		82.0	1	2				
		0 100			-							

-0-
223
ነ አለረ

													Italics: Indica	tor contain	V √√ ns imputed val
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 20
Personal and Family Relationships (2nd)			25%	76.6	~~1	75.1	1 2	Social Networks (5th)			25%	46.0	M _	34.2	6
Statewide divorce	CDC	instances, /1,000 population	1.0	3.3	^	2.6	3	Favors between neighbors		percentage	1.0	47.9	M_	27.9	1
Children in unmarried households	Census	percentage	1.0	7.6		10.0	1	Frequently talk with neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	68.1		50.1	5
Teen births	CDC	instances /1,000 female 15-19 population	1.0	20.9		9.9	1	Trust in people in neighborhood		percentage		55.7		55.8	6
Statewide parent's attendance of children's activities	NSCH	percentage	0.5	90.2		83.0	6	7 Statewide supportive neighborhood for a child	NSCH	percentage	1.0	46.8		54.5	7
Shared meals with household members		percentage		93.8		91.6		Statewide trust in people	ANES	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.5		0.5	7
Frequently hear from family and friends	CPS	percentage	1.0	83.0		78.6	3 8	7							
Close friends	CPS	average	1.0	7.3		7.3	1								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 20
Institutional Trust (5th)			20%	60.8		57.6	4 5	Civic and Social Participation (8th)			30%	26.1	$\sqrt{}$	23.5	7
Confidence in corporations	CPS	percentage	1.0	57.7		63.5	6 5	Statewide volunteer rate	CNCS	instances, /1,000 population	1.0	0.3	M	0.2	4
Confidence in the media	CPS	percentage	1.0	62.1		52.6	3 6	Statewide volunteering intensity	CNCS	hours, per capita	1.0	32.2		26.3	6
Statewide trust in federal government	ANES	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.4		0.4	1	Statewide active in neighborhood	CNCS	percentage	1.0	6.2	1	5.8	5
								Statewide helping the community	CNCS	instances, /1,000	1.0	1.3	/_	1.6	7
								(Non-religious) membership organizations	Census	number /1,000 population	1.0	0.3			7
								Religious membership organizations	USRC	number /1,000 population	0.5	3.3		3.3	3
								Religious organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	19.6	√ _	19.6	6
								Sport or recreation organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	5.9	1	7.0	8
								School, neighborhood or community association participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	13.3	V	15.2	6

	ċ	
•		
L		H
П		۰

Glasscock, Texas: Business En	vironmen	t (7th decile	^)											Italics: Indica	ator contain	s imputed v
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010	e 2020	Domestic Market	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010
Financing Ecosystems (7th)			40%	27.4		27.4	7	7	Contestability (3rd)			30%	49.3	_ لىر	51.6	7
enture capital invested	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	0.0		0.0	9	9	Statewide low-income licensed occupations	Inst Just	number	1.5	37.0		37.0	2
Number of venture capital deals	NVCA	number /1,000,000	1.0	0.0		0.0	9	9	Statewide occupational licensing training cost	Inst Just	\$	1.0	253.0		253.0	5
Assets under management	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	0.0		0.0	9	9	Statewide occupational licensing training time	Inst Just	days	1.0	341.0		341.0	4
enture capital fundraising	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	0.0		0.0	6	5	Statewide age requirements for license	Inst Just	years	1.0	10.0		10.0	2
Bank branch access	FDIC	number/square mile	1.5	0.3		0.3	1	1	Statewide regulation density index	Cato	Overall Prosperity	1.0	0.0		0.0	7
New Foreign Direct Investment	BEA	\$ /capita	1.0	30,520.0		30,520.0	1	1								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decik 2010	e 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010
Burden of Regulation (3rd)			10%	44.0	<u> </u>	43.2	5	3	Labor Market Flexibility (1st)			10%	72.6	A L	74.1	3
tatewide Federal Regulation and State nterprise Index	QuantGov	Overall Prosperity	1.0	1.1		1.1	7	7	Statewide collective bargaining agreement coverage	FI	percent	1.0	6.7	^	5.7	2
tatewide state regulation	QuantGov	percent	1.0	1.5		1.5	3	3	Statewide employee health insurance cost	НЈК	s	0.5	4,251.0	-	5,176.0	5
									Workers Compensation Premium Rate	State OR	\$ per \$100	0.5	2.4		0.7	5
									Statewide minimum wage	DOL	s	1.0	7.3		7.3	1
51 51 1 1 (41)	Source		Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020										
Price Distortions (6th)			10%	71.3	1 ^	58.1	3	6								
Statewide subsidies to the private sector	BEA	percent	1.0	0.1	W\	0.1	1	2								
Statewide Corporate Tax Score	Tax Found	Overall Prosperity	1.0	4.7		4.0	6	6								

^{*} The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.

	~
	$\overline{}$
- /	
1	- 4
v	- 5
•	_=

3

7

80.9

0.0 11.3 79.5

	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010
Communications (7th)			40%	30.7		30.7	7	7	Resources (1st)			25%	69.7
Mean download speed	BBN	Mbps	1.5	22.7		22.7	8	8	Customers affected by electricity outages	Mukherjee	number /10,000 population	0.5	0.0
Ultra-fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	0.0		0.0	8	8	Statewide net electricity generation	EIA	kWh /capita	1.0	0.0
Fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	100.0		100.0	1	1	Water usage	USGS	Mgal /capita	1.0	12.7
Internet providers (Business)	FCC	number	0.5	8.0		8.0	9	9	Electricity outage duration	EIA	minutes	1.0	103.0
									Electricity outage frequency	EIA	per year	1.0	1.3 .
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	le 2020					
Transport (6th)			35%	43.3		43.3	6	6					
Statewide number of airports	BTS	number/square mile	0.5	0.0		0.0	3	3					
Road condition	BTS	percent	1.5	10.5		10.5	4	4					
Statewide railroad length	AAR	miles /square mile	1.0	0.0		0.0	5	5					
Bus transit route mileage	BTS	miles /square mile	0.5	0.1		0.1	5	5					
Public road density	BTS	miles/square mile	1.0	1.1		1.1	1	1					
Bridge condition	BTS	percent	0.5	0.8		0.8	2	2					
Distance to airport	BTS	km	1.0	64.9		64.9	5	5					
	<u>i</u>	<u>i</u>	i	<u>i </u>			<u> </u>		J				

(\$			
(3)		-	The second
(3)			٣.
		•	Ψ,
	- (/

		r decire)												Italics: Indica	tor contain	s imputed valu
	Source		Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend					Source		Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 202
Fiscal Sustainability (1st)			25%	57.4	√	70.3	4	1	Productivity and Competitiveness (1st)			25%	52.8		86.6	4
Statewide government credit rating	Ballotpedia	rating	0.5	7.0		8.0	4	1	Export value (goods)	BIEM	\$ /capita	1.0	2,237.5		15,605.3	6
Statewide state reserves capacity	Pew	days	1.0	85.3	V	68.9	1	1	Export value (services)	BIEM	\$ /capita	0.5	1,041.1		1,921.0	3
Government revenue to expenditure ratio	Census	ratio	1.0	0.8		1.1	10	4	Labor productivity	BLS	\$ per hour	1.5	62.7		71.1	2
Statewide state budget balance	Pew	\$ /capita	1.0	365.5	$\sqrt{}$	368.8	1	2								
Statewide state pension funding	FR	percent	1.0	51.5	M_	51.1	3	3								
Debt-to-GDP ratio	Census	percent	1.0	1.4		0.9	2	2								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202
Dynamism (4th)			20%	43.5	W	53.5	8	4	Labor Force Engagement (1st)			30%	62.9	~~	79.4	1
Startup concentration	Kauffman	number /1,000 businesses	0.5	104.0	1	85.2	5	3	Unemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	4.6		2.0	1
Startup early job creation	Kauffman	number /1,000 population	1.0	6.2	V~	5.7	4	5	Youth unemployment	Census	percent	1.0	0.0		0.0	1
Startup early survival rate	Kauffman	percent	0.5	78.2	1	79.2	3	6	Employee Engagement	Gallup	percent	0.5	34.0	$\sqrt{}$	36.0	1
Opportunity-driven startups	Kauffman	percent	1.0	72.5		82.2	7	6	Statewide underemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	5.2		2.7	3
Rate of new entrepreneurs	Kauffman	number/100,000 population	1.5	423.5	1	475.6	2	1	Labor force participation	Census	percent	1.5	62.1	W-	61.4	5
Patent applications	USPTO	number /1,000	1.0	0.0		0.0	6	6								
	i		i	<u>i </u>			<u> </u>		1	<u>i </u>	i	<u>i </u>	<u>i </u>			<u>i</u>

^{*} The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.



Acterial Resources (6th) 258 691 572 3 6 Nutrition (7th) 572 3 6 Nutrition (7th) 572 3 6 Nutrition (7th) 588 442 579 57 5 Seconds principle 688 442 579 57 5 Seconds principle 18 33 95 1 0 2 Seconds principle 18 18 66 1 1 6 National Principle 18 33 95 1 0 2 Seconds principle 18 18 66 1 1 6 National Principle 18 18 67 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Glasscock, Texas. Living Condi-	110113 (311	irueche)												Italics: Indica	tor contain.	s imputed valu
Note		Source	Unit	Weight	2010		2020		20		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value		Decile
Part	Material Resources (6th)			25%	69.1	1	57.2	3	6	Nutrition (7th)			15%	44.2	~~	57.9	5
seppority	Low income	Census	percentage	1.0	8.7		25.0	1	5 F	Food security	FA	percentage	1.0	86.3	~~	89.8	3
Take Pool paramage: 10 4.0 45.9 5 1 10 10 11.4 9.3 7 7 7 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	Poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	3.3		9.5	1	2 9	Statewide borderline food security	USDA	percentage	1.0	93.6	~~~	94.6	7
Value Source So	Deep poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	1.8	1	6.6	1	6	Fruit consumption	BRFSS	percentage		55.3	-	57.6	7
Vater Services (2nd) Novine 1696 91.7 90.1 1 2 Shelter (8th) Iterative states and sele water Galler percentage 0.0 93.9 93.1 7 1 Homelescones Hulb Institute At 2000 0.0 15.3 7.1 6 Julic disking water violations Oralle South 10 0.0 0.0 1 1 1 1 1 1 Mounted water Hulb percentage 0.0 63.2 5.77 5 Oralle Kitchen and plumbing facilities Hulb percentage 0.0 63.2 5.77 5 Availability of affordable housing UI South November (7th) The state of the	Liquid asset poverty	Pros Now	percentage	1.0	43.0		45.9	8	9	Vegetable consumption	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	77.4		78.1	4
Vater Services (2nd) 15% 91.7 90.1 1 2 Shelter (8th) 16% 33.3 48.3 10 attewide clean and safe water Culture percentage 0.5 93.9 93.1 7 7 7 Homelessness Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complet	Statewide high risk loans	Talk Pov	percentage	1.0	11.4		9.3	7	7								
Vater Services (2nd) 15% 91.7 90.1 1 2 Shelter (8th) 16% 33.3 48.3 10 attewide clean and safe water Culture percentage 0.5 93.9 93.1 7 7 7 Homelessness Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complet						An included and the second											
Vater Services (2nd) 15% 91.7 90.1 1 2 Shelter (8th) 16% 33.3 48.3 10 attewide clean and safe water Culture percentage 0.5 93.9 93.1 7 7 7 Homelessness Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complet																	
Vater Services (2nd) 15% 91.7 90.1 1 2 Shelter (8th) 16% 33.3 48.3 10 attewide clean and safe water Culture percentage 0.5 93.9 93.1 7 7 7 Homelessness Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complet																	
Vater Services (2nd) 15% 91.7 90.1 1 2 Shelter (8th) 16% 33.3 48.3 10 attewide clean and safe water Culture percentage 0.5 93.9 93.1 7 7 7 Homelessness Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complete kitchen and plumbing facilities Hub percentage 0.5 63.2 57.7 5 complet																	
15% 91.7 90.1 1 2 Shelter (8th) 16% 33.3 48.3 10		Source	Unit	Weight	2010		ეციი		20		Source	Unit	Weight	2010		2020	Decile 2010 20
Source Commerce	Water Services (2nd)			15%		io yr trend				Shelter (8th)			15%				
Source Check Check Source Check	Statewide clean and safe water	Gallup	percentage	0.5	93.9	Y	93.1	7	7	Homelessness	HUD	number / 10,000 population	0.5	15.3	1	7.1	6
Hub percentage 10 100.0 100.0 1 1 Households with overcrowding Hub percentage 10 6.3 3.2 10	Public drinking water violations	CHR	Score, 0 or 1	1.0	0.0	homeone	0.0	1	1 (Unsheltered homeless rate	HUD		0.5	63.2	1	57.7	5
Availability of affordable housing UI low recome ternants 1.0 5.0 8.0 8 Source Unit Unit 2010 Value 2020	Complete kitchen and plumbing facilities	HUD		1.0	100.0		100.0	1	1 H	Households with overcrowding	HUD	percentage	1.0	6.3	1	3.2	10
Source Unit Unit 2010 Value 2020 Decile 2020 2010 2020 Connectedness (4th) Source Unit Weight 2010 Toyr trend 2020 2010 2020									,	Availability of affordable housing	UI	low income	1.0	5.0		8.0	8
Connectedness (4th) 15% 26.6 76.3 6 4 Protection from Harm (7th) 15% 52.3 53.0 6 coess to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 0.0 77.9 8 6 Fatalities from unintentional injuries cpc disattive from unin												tenants					
Connectedness (4th) 15% 26.6 76.3 6 4 Protection from Harm (7th) 15% 52.3 53.0 6 coess to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 0.0 77.9 8 6 Fatalities from unintentional injuries cpc disattive from unin																	
Connectedness (4th) 15% 26.6 76.3 6 4 Protection from Harm (7th) 15% 52.3 53.0 6 coess to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 0.0 77.9 8 6 Fatalities from unintentional injuries cpc disattive from unin																	
Connectedness (4th) 15% 26.6 76.3 6 4 Protection from Harm (7th) 15% 52.3 53.0 6 coess to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 0.0 77.9 8 6 Fatalities from unintentional injuries cpc disattive from unin																	
Connectedness (4th) 15% 26.6 76.3 6 4 Protection from Harm (7th) 15% 52.3 53.0 6 coess to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 0.0 77.9 8 6 Fatalities from unintentional injuries cpc disattive from unin																	
Connectedness (4th) 15% 26.6 76.3 6 4 Protection from Harm (7th) 15% 52.3 53.0 6 coess to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 0.0 77.9 8 6 Fatalities from unintentional injuries cpc disattive from unin		Course	Linit	Helt		Value		Docilo	4		Course	Unit	Molaht		Value		Donilo
ccess to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 0.0 77.9 8 6 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC disatris /100,000 1.0 21.4 21.4 6 oussholds with a smartphone Census percentage 1.0 75.8 78.9 2 2 Traffic deaths CDC 100,000 1.0 22.1 1.0 21.6 6	Connectedness (4th)	Source	Olik					2010 202		Protection from Harm (7th)					10-yr trend		2010 20
ouseholds with a smartphone		500										deaths / 100,000			νγ •		
ouseholds with a smartphone Census percentage 10 75.8 78.9 2 2 1 Irratic deaths CDC 100,000 10 22.1 V 21.6 6						الر						population number/			1		
	Households with a smartphone	Census	percentage	1.0	75.8		78.9	2	2	Traffic deaths	CDC		1.0	22.1	1/~	21.6	6

^{*} The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.

	_
\mathcal{C}	7
_	᠕
	\

			i				i		I	i		i	i	Italics: Indica	tor contain.		
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 20	020	Decision to the land of the land		Unit	Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Dec 2010	ile 2020
Behavioral Risk Factors (2nd)			15%	68.0		65.7	2	2	Preventative Interventions (8th)			15%	25.3	/''~	31.7	8	8
Obesity	CDC	percentage	1.0	26.8	V	23.0	4	1	Adult dentist visits	BRFSS	percentage		56.4		55.3	8	
Smoking	CHR	percentage	1.5	12.0		15.1	1	4	Adult doctor visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	69.2		61.7	4	
Alcohol use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	6.7		6.7	9	9	Colorectal cancer screening	BRFSS	percentage		56.6		54.3	8	
Illicit drug use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	2.3		2.3	4	4	Statewide child medical visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	85.6	~	75.1	6	
Pain reliever misuse	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	4.4		4.4	5	5	Statewide HPV immunizations	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	32.9		43.5	7	
									Pap smear test	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	74.1		72.5	7	
									Statewide child immunization	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	40.7	M-	67.8	7	3
									Statewide child dentist visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	80.6	1	81.2	5	
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 20	020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020
Care Systems (9th)			15%	30.3	_/\	29.6	8	9	Mental Health (3rd)			15%	76.6	~	68.8	1	3
Statewide child mental health access	NSCH	percentage	1.0	62.0		62.0	7	7	Suicide		deaths / 100,000 population		12.4	1	16.4	4	
Adults with no health care coverage	CHR	percentage	0.5	25.8	/	21.9	8	9	Drug overdose deaths	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	8.8	M	9.6	3	
Avoided medical care due to cost	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	20.7		23.7	8	8	Serious mental illness	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	1.0	4.0		3.4	3	
Hospital rating	HCA	percentage	0.5	81.6		82.3	1	2	Statewide disability weighted prevalence from mental illness	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	1.0	2,106.4		2,114.7	4	
Preventable hospitalizations for medicare enrolees	CHR	discharges / 100,000	1.0	4,979.2		4,979.2	7	7	Self-reported mental health not good	CHR	percentage	1.0	7.7		12.4	1	
														1			
																İ	
			<u> </u>		Value		Decile							Value		Dec	ilo
Dhysical Lloalth (7th)	Source		Unit 20%	2010 E 1 7	10-yr trend	2020	2010 20	020	Longovity (2rd)		Unit	Weight 20%	2010 447	10-yr trend	2020 71.0	2010	2020
Physical Health (7th)				51.7		48.8	5	/	Longevity (3rd)		deaths / 100,000		66.7	1		3	3
High blood pressure	BRFSS	percentage		33.2	≤ 1	34.8	6		Under 5 death rate		under 5 population deaths / 100,000		149.9	JW	138.4	4	
Diabetes	CDC	percentage	1.0	8.4	7	9.8	5	6	5-14 death rate	CDC	5-14 population deaths / 100,000	0.5	12.8	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	13.4	4	
Heart attack Statewide disability weighted prevalence of	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	5.2		3.7	7	5	15-64 death rate	CDC	15-64 population	2.0	292.1	/ ,	278.3	4	
infectious diseases	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	0.5	385.4		375.0	6		Maternal mortality	IMHE	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	0.4		0.3	5	4
Self-reported poor physical health	CHR	percentage	1.0	8.2	1	11.8	1	6	Mortality risk 65-85	IMHE	percentage	1.0	48.2		45.0	1	2
																İ	

^{*} The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.



	i	i								i				ator contain	imputed value
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 202
Pre-Primary Education (10th)			5%	42.6	h	13.3	7 10	Primary Education (2nd)			20%	77.9	\sqrt{V}	66.9	1
Pre-primary enrollment	Census	percentage	2.0	50.0		0.0	4 10	Math grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	4.7	-	5.0	1
Statewide state pre-K quality	NIEER	Overall Prosperity, 0-10	1.0	2.0		4.0	7 7	Statewide science grade 4 score	NAEP	scale score, 0-300	1.5	147.6		154.7	5
								English, language and arts grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	6.5	1	3.3	1
								Primary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	100.0		100.0	1
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
Secondary Education (2nd)			25%	2010 87.3	10-yr trend	73.8	1 2	Tertlary Education (8th)			25%	31.8	10-yr trend	31.3	2010 2020
					\v								¬ \		
Math grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	10.4	\- _{/****}	8.6	1 3	College enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	23.5	\\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\	15.3	6
Statewide science grade 8 score	NAEP	scale score, 0-500	1.0	150.5		156.2	3 3		NCES	percentage	1.0	48.6	\(\tag{ \tag} \tag{ \tag{ \tag{ \tag{ \tag{ \tag{ \tag{ \tag{ \tag{ \ta	53.0	4
English, language and arts grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	9.2		8.4	1 2	Statewide university quality for enrolled students	QS Rank	Legatum Institute score	1.0	0.2		0.2	6
High school graduation rate	CHR	percentage	1.0	100.0		100.0	1 1	Community college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	26.5		26.5	7
Secondary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	100.0		97.3	1 5								
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020								
Adult Skills (9th)			25%	33.9	N	32.1	7 9								
Adult population with at least a high school diploma	Census	percentage	1.0	78.0	~~	71.1	8 10								
Adult population with bachelor's degree or	Census	percentage	1.0	16.4		23.2	6 4								
higher					_/~										

^{*} The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest

1
IZI

														Italics: Indica	tor contain:	s imputed v
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Ded 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010
missions (8th)			25%	54.5		55.6	8	8	Exposure to Air Pollution (3rd)			25%	56.0	_/_	61.0	3
oxic air releases	EPA	index, 0-1	2.0	1.0		1.0	1	1	Life expectancy loss from air pollution	JBEN	years	2.0	0.1		0.1	4
O2 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	2.0	0.5		0.5	9	9	Fine particulate matter exposure	OECD	micrograms per cubic meter	1.0	6.8	_/_	5.4	2
litrous oxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.3		0.4	10	10								
arbon monoxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.5		0.5	8	8								
M2.5 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.3		0.6	10	7								
ulfur dioxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.8		0.5	7	10								
Ozone emissions	EPA	index, O-1	0.5	0.3		0.3	9	9								
ead emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	2	4								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010
Forest, Land and Soil (7th)			20%	37.4	1	44.6	7	7	Freshwater (9th)			20%	57.1	$\neg \Box$	60.5	9
oxic land releases	EPA	lb / square mile	1.0	0.0		0.0	1	1	Statewide good quality rivers and streams	EPA	percentage	0.5	57.7		57.7	2
tatewide rural parks and wildlife areas	USDA	percentage	1.0	1.8		1.8	5	5	Statewide good quality lakes, resevoirs and ponds	EPA	percentage	0.5	56.4		56.4	3
tatewide compliant underground storage anks facilities	EPA	percentage	1.0	72.0		88.0	3	1	Total freshwater withdrawals per capita	USGS	million gallons / 1,000 population	1.0	29.9	$\neg \int$	19.5	10
statewide exposure to pesticides	CDC	number / 100,000 population	1.0	42.5	~~~	31.3	3	3	Toxic water releases	EPA	lb / square mile	1.0	0.0		0.0	1
ree canopy cover	NLCD	percentage	1.0	0.1		0.1	10	10								
Vetlands and deepwater habitats	USFWS	percentage	1.0	2.6		2.6	8	8								
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010	ile 2020		i	<u>i</u>	<u> </u>	i			i
Preservation Efforts (6th)			10%	4.7		4.7	6	6								
tatewide GAP 1 protected areas	USGS	percentage	2.0	0.8		0.8	5	5								
statewide GAP 2 protected areas	USGS	percentage	1.5	0.8		0.8	7	7								

^{*} The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.





Association of American Railroads American Civil Liberties Union American National Election Studies ACLU ANES ATRF American Tort Reform Association Ballotpedia Ballotpedia BroadbandNow United States Bureau of Economic Analysis BBN BEA Brookings Institution Export Monitor United States Bureau of Justice Statistics United States Bureau of Labour Statistics BIFM Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System United States Bureau of Transportation Statistics Cato - Freedom in the 50 States BRESS BTS Cato CAWP Center for American Women and Politics Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - Diabetes Atlas Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Center for Disease Control (WONDER) CDC CDC CDC National Environmental Public Health Tracking Network United States Census Bureau United States Census Bureau, American Community Survey CDC ensus Census ensus US Census Bureau CHR County Health Rankings Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement Corporation for National and Community Service, Volunteering & Civil Life in America CNCS CPI CPS Cuillier Center for Public Integrity
Current Population Survey, Civic Engagement Supplement Dave Cuillier United States Department of Labor OI United States Depart Intent of Labor.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, The National Survey on Drug Use and Health
United States Energy Information Administration
United States Environmental Protection Agency DUH Nat Srvy EPA Feeding America Federal Communications Commission Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation FA FCC FDIC Fraser Institute Federal Reserve FTC Federal Trade Commission, Consumer Sentinel Network Gallup Google Trends Gallup Google Global Terrorism Database
Gun Violence Archive
Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems GVA HCA Henry J Kaiser Family Foundation HJK United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Institute for Corruption Studies Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation HUD IMHE Institute for Justice
Bennett et al. 2019. "Particulate matter air pollution and national and county life expectancy loss in the USA: A spatiotemporal analysis".
Kauffman Foundation Inst Just JBEN Kauffman Movement Advancement Project
MIT Election and Data Science Lab coding of state policies
Mukherjee et al. MAP Mukherjee National Association for the Advancement of Colored People NAACE National Archive Of Criminal Justice Data National Assessment of Educational Progress NACJD VAEP NCAJ National Center for Access to Justice National Center for Education Statistics
National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases
National Conference of State Legislatures NCES NCSL National Institute for Early Education Research National Institute on Money in Politics National Land Cover Database NIFFR NIMP NLCD National Survey of Children's Health National Venture Capital Association Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development NSCH NVCA OECD Pew Research Center POL Pros Now PRRI Polaris Project Prosperity Now Scorecard Public Religion Research Institute QS World University Rankings QuantGov Stanford Education Data Archive QS Rank QuantGov SEDA Southern Poverty Law Center State of Oregon Talk Poverty SPLC State OR Talk Pov Tax Foundation Tax Found Urban Institute
United States Department of Agriculture USDA United States Fish and Wildlife Service USFWS USGS USPFT United States Geological Survey
United States Press Freedom Tracker
United States Public Interest Research Group USPIRG

United States Patent and Trademark Office United States Religious Census

USPTO USRC