
# Riverside, California: Overall Prosperity 53.2 (5th decile\*)







Breakdown of performance	2010	Score 10-year trend	2020	Decile (1 to 10) 2020	10-year decile change	Rank - California (1 to 58) 2020
Overall Prosperity	48.0		53.2	5	<b>1</b>	26
Inclusive Societies	49.5		53.2	5	<b>^</b> 2	29
Safety and Security	52.1	~	52.9	9	-	27
Personal Freedom	60.7		62.3	2	<b>1</b>	3
	48.9		61.7	2	<b>4</b>	1
గ్లోని Social Capital	36.2	<b>/</b>	35.8	10		51
Open Economies	40.0		48.3	6	<b>4</b> 3	30
Business Environment	34.7	~~	39.1	9	<b>1</b>	33
Market Access and Infrastructure	46.4	~	49.3	3	<b>1</b>	12
& Economic Quality	38.8		56.4	7	<b>^</b> 2	44
Empowered People	54.5		58.1	4		30
Living Conditions	60.4	~~	63.0	5	<b>v</b> 2	27
Ç Health	57.6	~~~	62.8	3	<b>1</b>	31
	40.8		45.8	8	-	36
Natural Environment	59.1	_	60.7	2	-	28

Riverside, California (5th decile*)													
_	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	^0	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 20	20	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Safety and Security	52.1	A-	52.9	9		27	Personal Freedom	60.7	~	2.3	2	<b>1</b>	3
Terror-related Crime 15%	93.6		87.9	9	<b>A</b> 1	41	Agency 30%	58.5	- 6	3.5	8	<b>▼</b> 3	1
Violent Crime 50%	49.2		49.3	7	<b>▲</b> 1	19	Freedom of Association and Speech 15%	33.1		2.8	9		1
Property Crime 35%	38.5	_	43.1	9		39	Absence of Legal Discrimination 25%	60.5	7	1.1	1		1
							Social Tolerance 30%	76.8		.0	1		3
							Social I declarate SC/20	70.0	~	.0	'		3
	2010	Overall Prosperity	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	020	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 20	20	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Governance	48.9	-	61.7	2	▲ 4	1	Social Capital	36.2	<i>A</i>	5.8	10		51
Political Accountability 30%	56.3	V	63.8	3	<b>▼</b> 2	1	Personal and Family Relationships 25%	54.9	6	).3	6	▲ 1	20
Rule of Law 35%	42.5		58.5	1	<b>^</b> 6	1	Social Networks 25%	31.3		i.1	10	-	52
Government Integrity 35%	49.1		63.1	3	<b>▲</b> 4	1	Institutional Trust 20%	45.9	4	).2	9	▲ 1	55
							Civic and Social Participation 30%	18.3	2	.5	9	<b>A</b> 1	38
4	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	<b>\tau</b>	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 20	20 _	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Business Environment	34.7	$\sim$	39.1	9	<b>1</b>	33	Market Access and Infrastructure	46.4	-	9.3	3	<b>1</b>	12
Financing Ecosystems 40%	57.5	7	67.5	1		33	Communications 40%	65.1	p+	5.1	2		13
Domestic Market Contestability 30%	2.1	_/ \_	0.6	10		1	Resources 25%	42.5	<b>√</b> 5	1.2	6	<b>4</b>	9
Burden of Regulation 10%	38.1		41.9	7	<b>^</b> 1	1	Transport 35%	42.6	4	2.6	6		27
Labor Market Flexibility 10%	42.9	1	24.1	9		1							
Price Distortions 10%	30.3	$\sim$	53.1	10		1							
\$	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020							
Economic Quality	38.8		56.4	7	<b>^</b> 2	44							
Fiscal Sustainability 25%	22.0		49.5	8	<u> </u>	46							
Productivity and Competitiveness 25%	50.8		65.2	5	<b>v</b> 1	46							
Dynamism 20%	64.9	7	56.3	3	<b>▼</b> 2	55							
Labor Force Engagement 30%	25.5		54.9	8	<b>A</b> 1	27							
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	$\sim$	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 20	20 _	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Living Conditions	60.4	~ /	63.0	5	<b>▼</b> 2	27	Health	57.6		2.8	3	▲ 1	31
Material Resources 25%	62.5		63.6	5	<b>▼</b> 1	31	Behavioral Risk Factors 15%	61.3	6	3.6	3	<b>▲</b> 1	22
Nutrition 15%	54.0		68.0	5	<b>▼</b> 2	47	Preventative Interventions 15%	40.8	<b>√</b> √ 5.	1.8	3	<b>▲</b> 3	13
Water Services 15%	45.8		44.5	8	<b>▼</b> 1	36	Care Systems 15%	38.3	4	9.1	5	<b>▲</b> 1	49
Shelter 15%	34.6	V	32.9	10		23	Mental Health 15%	73.7	6	9.8	2	<b>▼</b> 1	28
Connectedness 15%	83.3		88.2	2	<b>▼</b> 1	21	Physical Health 20%	57.5	5	b.8	5		53
Protection from Harm 15%	80.6		80.4	1		20	Longevity 20%	70.0	7	0.0	1	<b>A</b> 1	20
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020		2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 20	20 _	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Education	40.8		45.8	8	io-yi dec. change	36	Natural Environment	59.1		).7	2	- Lo-yi dec. change	28
Pre-Primary Education 5%	37.6	-	36.2	9	<b>v</b> 1	48	Emissions 25%	72.7	7	1.4	1		17
Primary Education 20%	35.7		38.8	10	<b>▼</b> 1	29	Exposure to Air Pollution 25%	38.9		1.5	8	<b>v</b> 1	42
Secondary Education 25%	42.6	-	50.7	9		31	Forest, Land and Soil 20%	56.2	10	1.4	2		43
Tertiary Education 25%	45.0	~^	50.3	2	<u> </u>	27	Freshwater 20%	64.7	1	i.4	8		15
Adult Skills 25%	39.5		43.9	6		37	Preservation Efforts 10%	70.3		).3	1		1
2570	07.0						10/0	, 5.5	,				
			į										
* The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for	each pillar, ele	ement and indicator. Counti	es in the 1st	t decile are the	e strongest performers	and those in the 10th de	ile are the weakest.						

														Italics: Indica	tor contain	1S İ.
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	
Terror-related Crime (9th)			15%	93.6	7	87.9	10	9	Violent Crime (7th)			50%	49.2	$\Lambda$	49.3	
Mass shooting deaths	GVA	deaths /1,000,000 population	1.5	0.0		0.7	1	9	Murder	NACJD	deaths /100,000 population	1.5	4.3	1	4.2	
Mass shooting injuries	GVA	injuries /1,000,000 population	1.0	2.3	The	3.1	10	9	Rape	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	19.6	$\Lambda$	21.0	I
Terrorism deaths	GTD	deaths /1,000,000 population	1.0	0.0		0.0	1	1	Aggravated assaults	NACJD	assaults /100,000 population	1.0	192.6	1	192.3	
Terrorism injuries	GTD	injuries /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.1		0.0	10	1	Robbery	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	120.2		95.7	
Terrorism events	GTD	events /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.1		0.2	10	10								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	2020								
Property Crime (9th)			35%	38.5	1	43.1	9	9								
Burglary	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.5	799.8	~	536.8	8	7								
Motor vehicle theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	394.7		488.3	10	10								
Larceny theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	1,623.7	<b>√</b> \_	1,722.5	7	8								
Identity theft	FTC	reports /100,000 population	0.5	133.4	M	161.0	10	10								

	×	٥
. 1	2	Ū
$\vee$	$\mathbb{R}$	

														Italics: Indica	ntor contains	s imputed v
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010
gency (8th)			30%	58.5	~~~	63.5	5	8	Freedom of Association and Speech (9th)			15%	33.1		32.8	9
atal 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	1.0		1.0	1
tatewide death row population	NAACP	number /100,000 population	1.0	1.8	\	1.9	9	10	Statewide right-to-work	NCSL	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.0		0.0	8
tatewide adult incarceration	BJS	number /100,000 adult population	1.0	750.0		670.0	2	2	Statewide press suppression	USPFT	number /100,000 state population	0.5	0.0		0.0	5
statewide youth incarceration	CJRP	prisoners /100,000 youth population	0.5	139.2		62.8	9	7	Statewide invasive cell phone surveillance	ACLU	codling, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	6
Statewide trafficking	POL	reports /100,000 population	1.0	8.3		8.3	8	8								
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Dec			Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
Absence of Legal Discrimination (1st)			25%	60.5	10-yr trend	61.1	2010	2020	Social Tolerance (1st)			30%	<sup>2010</sup> 76.8	10-yr trend	77.0	2010
itatewide religious freedom restoration act nacted	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.0		0.0	5	5	Hate group concentration	SPLC	number /100,000 population	1.0	0.5	2	0.7	1
tatewide employment anti-discrimination law	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	1.0		1.0	1	1	Ethnic slur google traffic	Google	index, 0-100	1.0	17.8		17.8	1
tatewide government discrimination based on ex prohibited	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.5		0.5	2	2	Statewide same sex marriage support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	61.0		66.0	1
tatewide affirmative action in public services anned	Cato	coding, 0-2	0.5	2.0		2.0	1	1	Statewide LGBT non-discrimination law support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	75.0		73.0	1
tatewide LGBT relationships & parenthood ecognition	MAP	coding, 0-9	0.5	8.0		6.3	1	1						_		
Statewide LGBT non-discrimination laws	MAP	coding, 0-11	0.5	4.1		7.0	3	3								
İ							<u> </u>			<u> </u>						

<sup>\*</sup> 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			Italics: Indica	ator contain		
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010	e 2020
Political Accountability (3rd)			30%	56.3	V	63.8	1	3	Rule of Law (1st)			35%	42.5		58.5	7	1
Statewide Elections Performance Index	MIT	Overall Prosperity, 0-1	1.5	0.5	\	0.6	10	9	Statewide Justice Index	NCAJ	index rank 1-51	1.5	31.0		12.0	7	1
Statewide gender balance in legislatures	CAWP	percentage	0.5	26.7	$\sim$	31.7	1	2	Statewide judicial integrity	ATRF	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.5		1.0	6	6
Statewide state campaign disclosure	NIMP	index, 0-1	1.0	0.9		0.8	4	7									
Statewide term limits	NCSL	coding, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	1	1									
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend_	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		!		<u> </u>	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	
Government Integrity (3rd)			35%	49.1		63.1	7	3									
Statewide legal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	9.5		8.0	7	2									
Statewide illegal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	9.5		5.0	10	2									
Statewide Corruption Reflection Index	ICS	Overall Prosperity, 0-1	0.5	0.4		0.3	6	6									
Statewide State Integrity Investigation	CPI	index rank, 1-50	1.0	4.0		2.0	1	1									
Statewide public record request compliance	Cuillier	percentage	1.0	36.3		36.3	7	7									
Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index	USPIRG	Overall Prosperity, 0-100	0.5	34.0		47.0	10	10									

<sup>\*</sup> 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

0	2	Ž)	Q
C	Ĺ	)	7
n.	П	Б	J

itivei side, Camornia. Sociai Caj														Italics: Indica	tor contain	s imputer
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010
Personal and Family Relationships (6th)			25%	54.9	~~	60.3	7		Social Networks (10th)			25%	31.3	7/~	25.1	10
Statewide divorce		instances, /1,000 population		2.9		2.9	2		Favors between neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	35.8	1	21.1	9
Children in unmarried households	Census	percentage	1.0	24.6	\_	27.4	4	4	Frequently talk with neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	66.1	$\sim$	39.8	9
Teen births	CDC	instances /1,000 female 15-19 population	1.0	42.2		14.8	4	3	Trust in people in neighborhood	CPS	percentage	1.5	41.0		50.8	10
Statewide parent's attendance of children's activities	NSCH	percentage	0.5	88.9		85.9	10	4	Statewide supportive neighborhood for a child	NSCH	percentage	1.0	45.4		53.2	10
Shared meals with household members	CPS	percentage	0.5	91.9	M_	87.4	7	7	Statewide trust in people	ANES	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.5		0.5	5
Frequently hear from family and friends	CPS	percentage	1.0	74.1		83.8	10	7								
Close friends	CPS	average	1.0	5.5		5.5	10	10								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	tile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010
Institutional Trust (9th)			20%	45.9		40.2	10	9	Civic and Social Participation (9th)			30%	18.3	M	21.5	10
Confidence in corporations	CPS	percentage	1.0	49.1		52.8	10	10	Statewide volunteer rate	CNCS	instances, /1,000 population	1.0	0.2	M	0.2	9
Confidence in the media	CPS	percentage	1.0	57.2	-	47.4	9	9	Statewide volunteering intensity	CNCS	hours, per capita	1.0	31.6	My	29.9	9
Statewide trust in federal government	ANES	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.4	- Labolatoria	0.4	4	4	Statewide active in neighborhood	CNCS	percentage	1.0	5.7	1	6.7	8
									Statewide helping the community	CNCS	instances, /1,000	1.0	1.6	/~-	2.1	3
									(Non-religious) membership organizations	Census	number /1,000 population	1.0	0.2	~	0.2	8
									Religious membership organizations	USRC	number /1,000 population	0.5	0.5		0.5	10
									Religious organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	13.0	\_	16.4	10
									Sport or recreation organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	8.0	1	9.9	7
									School, neighborhood or community association participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	11.6	Ĭ	11.1	9

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

#### Riverside, California: Business Environment (9th decile\*)

П	$\overline{}$
	$\overline{}$

													Italics: Indica	tor contain:	imputed valu
Financing Ecosystems (1st)	Source		Weight	2010 57.5	Value 10-yr trend	2020 67.5	Decile 2010 2020 1 1	Domestic Market Contestability (10th)			Weight 30%	2010	Value 10-yr trend	0.6	Decile 2010 20 10
enture capital invested	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	104.3	~~~	500.0	1 1	Statewide low-income licensed occupations	Inst Just	number	1.5	76.0		76.0	10
Number of venture capital deals	NVCA	number /1,000,000	1.0	12.7		21.2	1 1	Statewide occupational licensing training cost	Inst Just	\$	1.0	486.0		486.0	10
Assets under management	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	854.9	~~	1,460.1	1 1	Statewide occupational licensing training time	Inst Just	days	1.0	827.0		827.0	10
enture capital fundraising	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	37.4	~~~	212.3	1 1	Statewide age requirements for license	Inst Just	years	1.0	15.0		15.0	10
Bank branch access	FDIC	number /square mile	1.5	0.0		0.0	3 3	Statewide regulation density index	Cato	Overall Prosperity	1.0	0.0	-1	0.0	7
New Foreign Direct Investment	BEA	\$ /capita	1.0	62,613.0		62,613.0	1 1								
Burden of Regulation (7th)	Source	Unit	Weight	2010 38.1	Value 10-yr trend	2020 41.9	Decile 2010 2020 8 7	Labor Market Flexibility (9th)	Source	Unit	Weight	2010 42.9	Value 10-yr trend	2020 24.1	Decile 2010 20
Statewide Federal Regulation and State Enterprise Index	QuantGov	Overall Prosperity	1.0	1.0		0.9	2 1	Statewide collective bargaining agreement coverage	FI	percent	1.0	18.6	~~~~	16.8	9
Statewide state regulation	QuantGov	percent	1.0	1.9		1.9	10 10		НЈК	\$	0.5	4,490.0	7	5,340.0	8
								Workers Compensation Premium Rate	State OR	\$ per \$100	0.5	2.7	~ /	1.7	8
								Statewide minimum wage	DOL	ş	1.0	8.0		12.0	10
Price Distortions (10th)	Source	Unit	Unit 10%	2010 30.3	Value 10-yr trend	2020 53.1	Decile 2010 2020 10 10		i.	ı	1				
Statewide subsidies to the private sector	BEA	percent	1.0	0.3	M	0.2	10 10								
Statewide Corporate Tax Score	Tax Found	Overall Prosperity	1.0	4.4		4.9	9 6								

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

	- 6	$\simeq$
		$\geq$
		乭

10

10

3

		i	i						l					Italics: Indica	atc
	Source				Value 10-yr trend		Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend	
Communications (2nd)			40%	65.1		65.1	2	2	Resources (6th)			25%	42.5	M	
Mean download speed	BBN	Mbps	1.5	104.2		104.2	2	2	Customers affected by electricity outages	Mukherjee	number /10,000 population	0.5	0.1	1	
Ultra-fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	8.2		8.2	5	5	Statewide net electricity generation	EIA	kWh/capita	1.0	0.0	M	
Fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	99.2		99.2	3	3	Water usage	USGS	Mgal /capita	1.0	0.2		
internet providers (Business)	FCC	number	0.5	35.0		35.0	1	1	Electricity outage duration	EIA	minutes	1.0	92.5	-	
									Electricity outage frequency	EIA	per year	1.0	0.9	-	
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		1					_
Transport (6th)			35%	42.6		42.6	6	6							
Statewide number of airports	BTS	number /square mile	0.5	0.0		0.0	8	8							
Road condition	BTS	percent	1.5	5.6		5.6	3	3							
Statewide railroad length	AAR	miles /square mile	1.0	0.0		0.0	8	8							
Bus transit route mileage	BTS	miles /square mile	0.5	0.2		0.2	2	2							
Public road density	BTS	miles /square mile	1.0	0.5		0.5	6	6							
Bridge condition	BTS	percent	0.5	5.1		5.1	6	6							
Distance to airport	BTS	km	1.0	48.4		48.4	4	4							

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

#### Riverside, California: Economic Quality (7th decile\*)

		٠	
,	J	١,	Ų.
1	7	,	١
v.	Y		J
		٠	/

	1 1				Meline				I	i	i	i	ı	Italics: Indica	ntor contain.		
	Source				Value 10-yr trend		Deci 2010		Dan donath dan an d			Weight		Value 10-yr trend			
Fiscal Sustainability (8th)			25%	22.0		49.5	10	8	Productivity and Competitiveness (5th)			25%	50.8		65.2	4	
Statewide government credit rating	Ballotpedia	rating	0.5	2.0		5.0	10	10	Export value (goods)	BIEM	\$ /capita	1.0	1,459.8	$\mathcal{M}$	1,462.2	8	
Statewide state reserves capacity	Pew	days	1.0	-22.4		51.4	10	4	Export value (services)	BIEM	\$ /capita	0.5	720.7	_	831.9	6	
Government revenue to expenditure ratio	Census	ratio	1.0	1.0	-	1.0	5	7	Labor productivity	BLS	\$ per hour	1.5	66.3	شمرسم	75.9	1	
Statewide state budget balance	Pew	\$ /capita	1.0	-143.1		452.3	10	1									
Statewide state pension funding	FR	percent	1.0	53.2	W	51.1	2	6									
Debt-to-GDP ratio	Census	percent	1.0	31.0		20.2	7	7									
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value _ 10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020
Dynamism (3rd)			20%	64.9	N	56.3	1	3	Labor Force Engagement (8th)			30%	25.5	_/_	54.9	9	
Startup concentration	Kauffman	number /1,000 businesses	0.5	136.9	1	92.4	1	1	Unemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	13.1		4.4	10	
Startup early job creation	Kauffman	number /1,000 population	1.0	6.3	V	6.5	3	1	Youth unemployment	Census	percent	1.0	24.8	$\checkmark$	21.7	9	
Startup early survival rate	Kauffman	percent	0.5	77.1	1	81.1	10	1	Employee Engagement	Gallup	percent	0.5	29.0		34.0	5	
Opportunity-driven startups	Kauffman	percent	1.0	81.0	-	80.9	4	9	Statewide underemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	8.1		3.4	10	1
Rate of new entrepreneurs	Kauffman	number /100,000 population	1.5	470.0		360.0	2	8	Labor force participation	Census	percent	1.5	62.3		60.1	5	
Patent applications	USPTO	number /1,000	1.0	108.1	1	108.9	3	4									
					*												
																	_

## Riverside, California: Living Conditions (5th decile\*)

J	/	7
1	н	Ŧ

		i													tor contains	imputed value.
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2					Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Material Resources (5th)			25%	62.5	$\neg \forall$	63.6	4	5	Nutrition (5th)			15%	54.0		68.0	3 5
Low income	Census	percentage	1.0	26.8	_/	24.6	5	5	Food security	FA	percentage	1.0	82.0		90.6	7
Poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	15.6	$\neg$	14.7	5	5	Statewide borderline food security	USDA	percentage	1.0	94.9		96.1	3
Deep poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	6.7	-/	6.2	6	5	Fruit consumption	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	66.5	1	65.7	1 :
Liquid asset poverty	Pros Now	percentage	1.0	41.5		41.5	7	7	Vegetable consumption	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	79.6		72.4	3 10
Statewide high risk loans	Talk Pov	percentage	1.0	5.3	1	5.7	1	1						-		
					-											
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2	2020				Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Water Services (8th)			15%	45.8	\~	44.5	7	8	Shelter (10th)			15%	34.6	V	32.9	10 10
Statewide clean and safe water	Gallup	percentage	0.5	93.9	1	94.0	6	5	Homelessness	HUD	number / 10,000 population	0.5	15.7	V	11.5	9
Public drinking water violations	CHR	Score, 0 or 1	1.0	1.0		1.0	5	6	Unsheltered homeless rate	HUD	percentage	0.5	60.7	M	72.7	5 10
Complete kitchen and plumbing facilities	HUD	percentage	1.0	99.2	"\_	99.1	4	5	Households with overcrowding	HUD	percentage	1.0	6.7		7.1	10 10
									Availability of affordable housing	UI	units / 100 very low income	1.0	11.4	7	11.9	5
											tenants			***************************************		
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2	2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr_trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020
Connectedness (2nd)			15%	83.3	10-yr trend	88.2	1		Protection from Harm (1st)			15%	80.6	1	80.4	1
Access to broadband	FCC	percentage	1.5	95.6		96.1	1		Fatalities from unintentional injuries	CDC	deaths / 100,000	1.0	9.9		9.5	1
Households with a smartphone	Census	percentage	1.0	75.0	1	79.9	2	2	Traffic deaths	CDC	population number / 100,000	1.0	13.8	m	14.4	2
Trouseriores with a smartphone		,							mand deaths		population			1		-

# Riverside, California: Health (3rd decile\*)

	_	V
7	- 1	١.
	١	Ĭ

															tor contain:	s imputed valu
	Source				Value 10-yr trend		Decii 2010	le 2020		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 202
Behavioral Risk Factors (3rd)			15%	61.3	<b>✓</b>	63.6	4	3	Preventative Interventions (3rd)			15%	40.8	$\sim$	54.8	6
Obesity	CDC	percentage	1.0	25.3	M	27.0	3	3	Adult dentist visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	63.0		62.4	5
Smoking	CHR	percentage	1.5	14.6		12.5	3	1	Adult doctor visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	66.5	$\mathcal{N}$	70.7	7
Alcohol use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	6.4		6.4	7	7	Colorectal cancer screening	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	61.8		71.5	6
Illicit drug use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	2.6		2.6	7	7	Statewide child medical visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	87.2		80.8	5
Pain reliever misuse	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	4.8		4.8	8	8	Statewide HPV immunizations	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	49.1		52.6	1
									Pap smear test	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	84.4		81.1	4
									Statewide child immunization	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	49.9	~~	68.6	1
									Statewide child dentist visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	76.2		81.9	10
																i
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202
Care Systems (5th)			15%	38.3		49.1	6	5	Mental Health (2nd)			15%	73.7	~~	69.8	1
Statewide child mental health access	NSCH	percentage	1.0	63.6		63.6	10	10	Suicide	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	1.0	10.0	1	12.3	1
Adults with no health care coverage	CHR	percentage	0.5	22.3	1	8.9	6	3	Drug overdose deaths	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	10.8	7	17.6	8
Avoided medical care due to cost	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	15.7		12.6	4	3	Serious mental illness	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	1.0	3.7		3.6	1
Hospital rating	HCA	percentage	0.5	64.9		68.8	9	8	Statewide disability weighted prevalence from mental illness	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	1.0	2,082.1		2,072.8	2
Preventable hospitalizations for medicare enrolees	CHR	discharges / 100,000	1.0	3,715.0	1	3,750.0	4	4	Self-reported mental health not good	CHR	percentage	1.0	11.6	-1	12.6	7
					•											
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Deci			Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
Physical Health (5th)			20%	<sup>2010</sup> 57.5	10-yr trend	56.8	<sup>2010</sup>	2020	Longevity (1st)			20%	<sup>2010</sup> 70.0	10-yr trend	79.0	2010 202
High blood pressure	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	28.9		31.7	4	5	Under 5 death rate	CDC	deaths / 100,000 under 5	1.0	126.3	~~	95.8	1
Diabetes	CDC	percentage	1.0	7.9	11	8.7	4	5	5-14 death rate	CDC	population deaths / 100,000	0.5	10.9	MM	9.4	1
Heart attack	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	4.3	1/_	3.6	5	4	15-64 death rate	CDC	5-14 population deaths / 100,000	2.0	261.3	1	248.2	3
Statewide disability weighted prevalence of	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	0.5	336.4	\	347.3	3	3	Maternal mortality	IMHE	15-64 population deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	0.3	/ /	0.2	3
infectious diseases Self-reported poor physical health	CHR	population	1.0	12.6	1	11.8	8	6	Mortality risk 65-85	IMHE	population	1.0	51.6	~~~	44.1	3
					***************************************									-		
																<u> </u>

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Riverside, California: Education (8th decile\*

	^
<	
	$\sim$
	$\overline{}$

Riverside, California: Education	n (8th de	cile^)													
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value	ator contain: 2020	Decile 2010 2
Pre-Primary Education (9th)			5%	37.6	10-yr trend	36.2		Primary Education (10th)			20%	35.7	10-yr trend	38.8	9
re-primary enrollment	Census	percentage	2.0	38.7	~	36.3	7 8	Math grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	3.1	-/_	2.9	8
Statewide state pre-K quality	NIEER	Overall Prosperity, 0-10	1.0	4.0		4.3	6 7	Statewide science grade 4 score	NAEP	scale score, 0-300	1.5	136.3		140.5	10
								English, language and arts grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	2.9	5	3.3	9
								Primary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	95.6	$\wedge$	95.6	6
													and he		
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2
Secondary Education (9th)			25%	42.6		50.7		Tertiary Education (2nd)			25%	45.0		50.3	4
Math grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	6.7	I	6.8	9 9	College enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	33.9		42.2	3
Statewide science grade 8 score	NAEP	scale score, 0-500	1.0	136.6		142.8	10 10	Statewide college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	64.3	~1r	64.0	1
English, language and arts grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	6.8	1	7.3	9 7	Statewide university quality for enrolled	QS Rank	Legatum Institute	1.0	0.3	A	0.3	2
High school graduation rate	CHR	percentage	1.0	82.1	مر	88.9	7 6	students  Community college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	25.3	~	34.3	9
Secondary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	97.6	M	97.5	4 5						1		
Secondary Chromnent					-VY /										
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile								<u> </u>
A -1(4 C).((1) (7.4%)	Source	Ont		2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 2020								
Adult Skills (6th)			25%	39.5	/	43.9	6 6								
Adult population with at least a high school diploma	Census	percentage	1.0	79.2		81.7	7 8	3							
Adult population with bachelor's degree or higher	Census	percentage	1.0	20.5		21.8	4 4								
-															
	1		1				1								

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

#### Riverside California: Natural Environment (2nd decile\*

		-	٠,	
	۲.	٠.	r	
,	J	~		j
ы	_	-		,
и		_	-	

Riverside, California: Natural E	nvironm	ent (2nd dec	ile*)												
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	tor contain 2020	Decile 2010 20
Emissions (1st)			25%	72.7	To-yr trend	74.4	1 1	Exposure to Air Pollution (8th)			25%	38.9	- Joseph Herid	44.5	7
oxic air releases	EPA	index, 0-1	2.0	0.9		0.9	6 6	Life expectancy loss from air pollution	JBEN	years	2.0	0.2		0.2	8
O2 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	2.0	0.9	/	0.9	2 2	Fine particulate matter exposure	OECD	micrograms per cubic meter	1.0	9.3		7.6	6
litrous oxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.8		0.9	1 1								
arbon monoxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.8		0.9	1 1								
M2.5 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.9		1.0	1 1								
ulfur dioxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	1 1								
Ozone emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.7		0.8	2 2								
Lead emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	1.0		0.9	4 4								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 20
Forest, Land and Soil (2nd)			20%	56.2	N	54.4		Freshwater (8th)			20%	64.7		65.4	8
oxic land releases	EPA	lb / square mile	1.0	0.1		0.2	8 8	Statewide good quality rivers and streams	EPA	percentage	0.5	10.8		10.8	10
Statewide rural parks and wildlife areas	USDA	percentage	1.0	18.9		18.7	1 1	Statewide good quality lakes, resevoirs and ponds	EPA	percentage	0.5	2.2		2.2	10
Statewide compliant underground storage anks facilities	EPA	percentage	1.0	70.0	my	60.0	6 6	Total freshwater withdrawals per capita	USGS	million gallons / 1,000 population	1.0	0.6		0.5	6
Statewide exposure to pesticides	CDC	number / 100,000 population	1.0	27.0	~/^~	24.2	1 3	Toxic water releases	EPA	lb / square mile	1.0	0.0		0.0	7
Free canopy cover	NLCD	percentage	1.0	1.0		1.0	9 9								
Wetlands and deepwater habitats	USFWS	percentage	1.0	3.6		3.6	6 6								
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			<u> </u>
Preservation Efforts (1st)			10%	70.3		70.3	1 1								
Statewide GAP 1 protected areas	USGS	percentage	2.0	15.9		15.9	1 1								
Statewide GAP 2 protected areas	USGS	percentage	1.5	6.5		6.5	1 1								
Statewide GAP 3 protected areas	USGS	percentage	1.0	28.4		28.4	1 1								

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Railroad American Civil Liberties Union American National Election Studies СШ ATRE American Tort Reform Association Ballotpedia
BroadbandNow
United States Bureau of Economic Analysis Ballotpedia BBN BEA Brookings Institution Export Monitor
United States Bureau of Justice Statistics
United States Bureau of Labour Statistics RIFM BRESS Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System United States Bureau of Transportation Statistics Cato - Freedom in the 50 States Center for American Women and Politics :AWF Center for Disease Control and Prevention - Diabetes Atlas Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Center for Disease Control (WONDER) 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 County Health Rankings Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement JRP Corporation for National and Community Service, Volunteering & Civil Life in America CNCS Center for Public Integrity
Current Population Survey, Civic Engagement Supplement Cuillier Dave Cuillier Dave cultied States Department of Labor Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, The National Survey on Drug Use and Health DUH Nat Srvy United States Energy Information Administration United States Environmental Protection Agency Feeding America Federal Communications Commission Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Fraser Institute DIC Federal Reserve TC. Federal Trade Commission, Consumer Sentinel Network Gallup Google Trends Sallup Google Global Terrorism Database
Gun Violence Archive
Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems Henry J Kaiser Family Foundation United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Institute for Corruption Studies HIK HUD IMHE Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation nst Just Institute for Justice

Bennett et al. 2019. "Particulate matter air pollution and national and county life expectancy loss in the USA: A spatiotemporal analysis" Kauffmar Kauffman Foundation MAP Movement Advancement Project
MIT Election and Data Science Lab coding of state policies .... Mukherjee Mukherjee et al. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People NAACE National Association for the Advancement of National Archive Of Criminal Justice Data National Assessment of Educational Progress National Center for Access to Justice NACJD NAEP NCAL NCES NCIRD National Center for Education Statistics
National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases NCSL National Conference of State Legislatures National Institute for Early Education Resolutional Institute on Money in Politics NIFFR NLCD National Land Cover Database National Survey of Children's Health
National Venture Capital Association
Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development NSCH

DECD Pew Research Center

Polaris Project Prosperity Now Scorecard ros Nov Public Religion Research Institute QS World University Rankings QuantGov PRRI QS Rank QuantGov Stanford Education Data Archive SEDA

Southern Poverty Law Center State of Oregon State OR Talk Pov Talk Poverty Tax Foundation Urban Institute Tax Found

PI C

USDA United States Department of Agriculture United States Fish and Wildlife Service United States Geological Survey United States Press Freedom Tracker ISFWS USPFT United States Public Interest Research Group USPIRG USPTO USRC United States Patent and Trademark Office United States Religious Census

Washington Post