Lake, California: Overall Prosperity 48.7 (8th 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	44.9		48.7	8	1	52
Inclusive Societies	46.9	~	48.1	8	1	56
Safety and Security	46.4	1	39.2	10		55
Personal Freedom	55.3		56.4	4	-	36
Governance	48.9		61.7	2	4	1
Social Capital	36.8		35.2	10	= -	52
Open Economies	36.7		45.2	8	^ 2	40
Business Environment	32.7	~~	35.2	10		50
Market Access and Infrastructure	45.0	1	46.5	4	1	19
§ Economic Quality	32.3		53.9	8	^ 2	53
Empowered People	51.1	~~	52.9	6	▼ 1	46
Living Conditions	47.9	~	50.3	9	▼ 2	55
— Health	47.9	w	52.9	6	1	58
	40.8	~~~	39.2	10	▼ 2	49
Solution Natural Environment	67.7		69.3	1		2

Lake, California (8th decile*)													
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	20	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 2	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Safety and Security	46.4	~	39.2	10	- -	55	Personal Freedom	55.3	5	6.4	4	- -	36
Terror-related Crime 15%	100.0		59.6	10	▼ 9	57	Agency 30%	58.5		63.5	8	▼ 3	1
Violent Crime 50%	35.0		34.0	10	- -	49	Freedom of Association and Speech 15%	33.1	\ ;	32.8	9		1
Property Crime 35%	39.8		38.1	10	▼ 1	52	Absence of Legal Discrimination 25%	60.5		61.1	1		1
							Social Tolerance 30%	58.9	\sim	57.1	4	- -	40
	<u> </u>	Overall Prosperity			Decile	California Rank		<u> </u>	Overall Prosperity			Decile	California Rank
Governance	²⁰¹⁰ 48.9	10-yr trend	2020 61.7	2020	10-yr dec. change	2020	Social Capital	²⁰¹⁰ 36.8	10-yr trend 2	5.2	10	10-yr dec. change	²⁰²⁰ 52
					·		000		-	1			
Political Accountability 30%	56.3	V	63.8	3	v 2	1	Personal and Family Relationships 25%	50.6	1	47.2	10	▼ 2	55
Rule of Law 35% Government Integrity 35%	42.5 49.1		58.5 63.1	3	▲ 6	1	Social Networks 25% Institutional Trust 20%	34.3 50.5	*****	30.3 48.8	9	▲ 1	25 26
Government Integrity 35%	49.1		03.1	3	4	ı	Civic and Social Participation 30%	18.3	~^	20.3	10	▲ 1 = .	46
							CIVIC and Social Participation 50%	10.3	1 ~	20.3	10		40
4	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-vr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	₩	2010	Overall Prosperity	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Business Environment	32.7	- 1	35.2	10	io-yr dec. change	50	Market Access and Infrastructure	45.0	A ()	6.5	4	▲ 1	19
Financing Ecosystems 40%	52.3	~~	57.7	2	v 1	50	Communications 40%	61.0		61.0	3		18
Domestic Market Contestability 30%	2.1		0.6	10		1	Resources 25%	39.8	N	45.7	9	▲ 1	41
Burden of Regulation 10%	38.1		41.9	7	A 1	1	Transport 35%	44.3		44.3	5		21
Labor Market Flexibility 10%	42.9	-	24.1	9		1							
Price Distortions 10%	30.3	~~~	53.1	10		1							
\$	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020							
Economic Quality	32.3		53.9	8	^ 2	53							
Fiscal Sustainability 25%	30.9		54.7	6	▲ 4	26							
Productivity and Competitiveness 25%	44.5		61.6	5	▲ 1	52							
Dynamism 20%	50.6	~/_	56.8	3	<u> </u>	47							
Labor Force Engagement 30%	11.1	_/	44.8	10		48							
A -		Overall Prosperity			Decile	California Rank		ı	Overall Prosperity	i		Decile	California Rank
Living Conditions	²⁰¹⁰ 47.9	10-yr trend	50.3	9	10-yr dec. change	2020 55	Health	²⁰¹⁰ 47.9	_	2020	6	10-yr dec. change	²⁰²⁰ 58
Material Resources 25%	52.6	~/ ~/	53.8	7	T 1	48	Behavioral Risk Factors 15%	37.6	~~~	55.5	7	A 3	41
Nutrition 15%	54.3	\\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\	66.4	5	2	52	Preventative Interventions 15%	41.1		53.5	3	2 3	15
Water Services 15%	39.4	5	47.4	7	△ 2	27	Care Systems 15%	39.8		53.0	5	A 1	31
Shelter 15%	33.3	V.	31.2	10		31	Mental Health 15%	42.1	1 1	37.3	10		58
Connectedness 15%	63.3	_/	67.0	6	▼ 3	44	Physical Health 20%	61.7		61.2	4		44
Protection from Harm 15%	41.4	~	33.9	10	▼ 1	57	Longevity 20%	57.1		53.8	7	▼ 1	57
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	Ø	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend 2	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Education	40.8	~~\	39.2	10	▼ 2	49	Natural Environment	67.7		9.3	1		2
Pre-Primary Education 5%	42.5	Δ	43.8	7		35	Emissions 25%	62.0		67.3	3	A 1	37
Primary Education 20%	25.8	~~~	20.8	10	- -	58	Exposure to Air Pollution 25%	79.1		B2.2	1		1
Secondary Education 25%	44.9	~~	42.3	10	▼ 2	54	Forest, Land and Soil 20%	62.6	N	50.8	1		16
Tertiary Education 25%	45.0	w	47.1	3	▲ 1	42	Freshwater 20%	64.5		63.5	8	- -	24
Adult Skills 25%	44.3	-	42.3	7	▼ 2	39	Preservation Efforts 10%	70.3		70.3	1	- -	1
		<u></u> _							<u></u>				
* The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for	each pillar, ek	ement and indicator. Count	ties in the 1s	t decile are th	e strongest performers	and those in the 10th de	ile are the weakest.						

Lake, California: Safety and Security (10th decile*)

														Italics: Indica	tor contain	s imput
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	De 2010	cile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	2010
Terror-related Crime (10th)			15%	100.0		59.6	1	10	Violent Crime (10th)			50%	35.0	$\sqrt{}$	34.0	10
Mass shooting deaths	GVA	deaths /1,000,000 population	1.5	0.0		21.8	1	10	Murder	NACJD	deaths /100,000 population	1.5	6.1	-/_	4.7	
Mass shooting injuries	GVA	injuries /1,000,000 population	1.0	0.0		21.8	1	10	Rape	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	64.2	M_{\sim}	60.8	1
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	287.5	1	422.6	
Terrorism injuries	GTD	injuries /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	1	Robbery	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	65.8	$-\sqrt{\ }$	102.9	
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	De 2010	cile 2020								
Property Crime (10th)			35%	39.8	√	38.1	9	10								
Burglary	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.5	931.4	7/	977.8	9	10								
Motor vehicle theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	338.0		530.2	10	10								
Larceny theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	1,393.3	~~~	1,214.9	6	6								
Identity theft	FTC	reports/100,000 population	0.5	114.2		139.5	9	9								
]							

Lake, California: Personal Freedom (4th decile*)

. 2	į
\sim	
· ·	

deaths/100,000 population number/100,000 number/100	1.0	58.5 0.0	Value 10-yr trend	63.5	Decile 2010 20	Ω	Freedom of Association and	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	²⁰²⁰ 32.8	2010 9	202
population number /100,000 population	1.0		~~		5					150/	22.1		32.8	9	
population number /100,000 population	1.0	0.0		0.0		_	Speech (9th)			10%	33.1	l.			
population	1.0			0.0	1	1 :	Statewide free speech in public places	Cato	coding. 0-3	1.0	1.0		1.0	1	
number /100.000	1	1.8	\	1.9	9	10	Statewide right-to-work	NCSL	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.0		0.0	8	
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	
prisoners /100,000 youth population	0.5	139.2		62.8	9	7	Statewide invasive cell phone surveillance	ACLU	coding, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	6	
reports /100,000 population	1.0	8.3		8.3	8	8									
Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-vr trend	2020	Decile 2010 20)20		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-vr trend	2020		ile 2
	25%	60.5		61.1	1		Social Tolerance (4th)			30%	58.9	~	57.1	4	
coding, 0-1	1.0	0.0		0.0	5	5	Hate group concentration	SPLC	number /100,000 population	1.0	13.4	1	22.4	6	
coding, 0-1	1.0	1.0		1.0	1	1	Ethnic slur google traffic	Google	index, 0-100	1.0	30.5		30.5	5	
coding, 0-1	1.0	0.5		0.5	2	2 5	Statewide same sex marriage support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	61.0		66.0	1	
coding, 0-2	0.5	2.0		2.0	1			PRRI	percentage	0.5	75.0		73.0	1	
coding, 0-9	0.5	8.0		6.3	1	1						-			Ī
coding, 0-11	0.5	4.1		7.0	3	3									
	reports /100,000 population Unit coding, 0-1 coding, 0-1 coding, 0-2 coding, 0-9 coding, 0-9 coding, 0-9 coding, 0-9 coding, 0-9	Unit Weight 25%	Unit Weight 2010 25% 60.5 60.5 6	Unit Weight 2010 Value 2010 10-yr trend 25% 60.5	Unit Weight 2010 Value 2020 25% 60.5 61.1	Unit Weight 2010 10-yr trend 2020 2010 20 2010 20 2010 20	Unit Weight 2010 10-yr trend 2020 2010 2020 2020 2010 2020	Unit Weight 2010 10-yr trend 2020 2010 2020 2010 2020	Unit Weight 2010 Value 2020	Unit Weight 2010 Value 2020 2010 2020 2010 2020 2010 2020	Unit Weight 2010 Value 2020 2010 2020	Unit Weight 2010 Value 2020 2010 2020	Unit Weight 2010 Value 2020 2010 2020 2010 2020 2010 2020 2010 2020 2010 2020 2010 2020 2010 2020	Coding 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	Unit Weight 2010 Value 2020 2010 2020

^{*} 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.

.ake, California: Governance (2nd decile*)

	Г	٦	ľ	
	ı	ı		

														Italics: Indica	ator contain.		
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	2010	2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010	le 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		Value		Dec										
Government Integrity (3rd)			35%	²⁰¹⁰ 49.1	10-yr trend	63.1	2010	2020									
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	1	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									
	<u> </u>	İ	<u> </u>	<u> </u>													

C	5	2	0
7	7	٦	۹
٦	አ	r,	1

													Italics: Indica	tor contain	\√\ Is imputed v
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010
Personal and Family Relationships (10th)			25%	50.6	1/1	47.2	8 10	Social Networks (9th)			25%	34.3	-	30.3	10
Statewide divorce		instances, /1,000 population		2.9		2.9	2	Favors between neighbors		percentage		31.8	L	18.2	10
Children in unmarried households	Census	percentage	1.0	31.5	_	42.3	8 10	Frequently talk with neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	61.0		49.8	10
Teen births	CDC	instances /1,000 female 15-19 population	1.0	47.3		26.7	5	Trust in people in neighborhood	CPS	percentage	1.5	51.9		54.2	8
Statewide parent's attendance of children's activities	NSCH	percentage	0.5	88.9		85.9	10	Statewide supportive neighborhood for a child	NSCH	percentage	1.0	45.4		53.2	10
Shared meals with household members	CPS	percentage	0.5	80.3			10 10	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	84.7		84.7	1 6	,							
Close friends	CPS	average	1.0	5.6		5.6	9 9	,							
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010
Institutional Trust (8th)			20%	50.5		48.8	9 8	Civic and Social Participation (10th)			30%	18.3	M	20.3	10
Confidence in corporations	CPS	percentage	1.0	52.0		56.2	10 9	Statewide volunteer rate	CNCS	instances, /1,000 population	1.0	0.2	M	0.2	9
Confidence in the media	CPS	percentage	1.0	59.1		52.8	7 8	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		0.4	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	-1/	0.2	8
								Religious membership organizations	USRC	number /1,000 population	0.5	1.3		1.3	8
								Religious organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	8.0		8.0	10
								Sport or recreation organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	7.4		8.1	7
								School, neighborhood or community association participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	12.9		12.9	9

^{*} 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.

ake, California: Business Environment (10th decile*)

Lake, California: Business Envi	ronment	(10th decile ²	')												
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Italics: Indica	itor contains	imputed vi Decile
	Source				10-yr trend		2010 2020	Domestic Market	Source	Unit		2010	10-yr trend		2010
inancing Ecosystems (2nd)			40%	52.3	74 4	57.7	1 2	Contestability (10th)			30%	2.1	٦ / _	0.6	10
enture capital invested	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	69.8	~~	202.3	1 1	Statewide low-income licensed occupations	Inst Just	number	1.5	76.0		76.0	10
umber of venture capital deals	NVCA	number /1,000,000	1.0	8.5		8.6	2 3	Statewide occupational licensing training cost	Inst Just	\$	1.0	486.0		486.0	10
sets under management	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	571.9	N	590.6	1 1	Statewide occupational licensing training time	Inst Just	days	1.0	827.0		827.0	10
nture capital fundraising	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	25.0	~~	85.9	1 1	Statewide age requirements for license	Inst Just	years	1.0	15.0		15.0	10
ink branch access	FDIC	number /square mile	1.5	0.0		0.0	7 7	Statewide regulation density index	Cato	Overall Prosperity	1.0	0.0	~/	0.0	7
ew Foreign Direct Investment	BEA	\$ /capita	1.0	62,613.C		62,613.0	1 1								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-vr trend	2020	Decil 2010
urden of Regulation (7th)			10%	38.1		41.9		Labor Market Flexibility (9th)			10%	42.9	10-yr trend	24.1	9
atewide Federal Regulation and State	QuantGov	Overall	1.0	1.0		0.9	2 1	Statewide collective bargaining agreement	FI	percent	1.0	18.6	~~	16.8	9
terprise Index atewide state regulation	QuantGov	Prosperity percent	1.0	1.9		1.9	10 10	coverage Statewide employee health insurance cost	HJK	\$	0.5	4,490.0	~	5,340.0	8
								Workers Compensation Premium Rate	State OR	\$ per \$100	0.5	2.7	_ }	1.7	8
									0.01			0.0		12.0	10
								Statewide minimum wage	DOL	\$	1.0	8.0	7	12.0	10
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile								
	Source				10-yr trend		2010 2020								
rice Distortions (10th)			10%	30.3	N	53.1	10 10								
atewide subsidies to the private sector	BEA	percent	1.0	0.3	M	0.2	10 10								
atewide Corporate Tax Score	Tax Found	Overall Prosperity	1.0	4.4		4.9	9 6								
		,			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.

ake. California: Market Access and Infrastructure (4th decile*

	۳	~
1		\geq
- (Ξ

														Italics: Indica	tor contain	_
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Der 2010	cile 2020		Source		Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend		2010
Communications (3rd)			40%	61.0		61.0	3	3	Resources (9th)			25%	39.8	M_{\sim}	45.7	1
Mean download speed	BBN	Mbps	1.5	48.6		48.6	6	6	Customers affected by electricity outages	Mukherjee	number /10,000 population	0.5	0.1	1	0.0	
Ultra-fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	83.7		83.7	1	1	Statewide net electricity generation	EIA	kWh/capita	1.0	0.0	V	0.0	
Fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	92.2		92.2	5	5	Water usage	USGS	Mgal /capita	1.0	0.2	آلير	0.3	
Internet providers (Business)	FCC	number	0.5	11.0		11.0	6	6	Electricity outage duration	EIA	minutes	1.0	113.4		126.3	
									Electricity outage frequency	EIA	per year	1.0	1.0		1.1	
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Der 2010	cile 2020		1				<u> </u>		
Transport (5th)			35%	44.3		44.3	5	5								
Statewide number of airports	BTS	number /square mile	0.5	0.0		0.0	8	8								
Road condition	BTS	percent	1.5	1.7		1.7	1	1								
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	0.3		0.3	7	7								
Bridge condition	BTS	percent	0.5	10.9		10.9	8	8								
Distance to airport	BTS	km	1.0	65.7		65.7	5	5								
	<u> </u>	1	!	!												

Lake, California: Economic Quality (8th decile*)

(3)	- (
(\checkmark)	1		١,	ı
(~)	1.	5	•	
		•		J

			i				i		I	i				Italics: Indica	tor contain.		
	Source				Value 10-yr trend							Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decil 2010	
Fiscal Sustainability (6th)			25%	30.9		54.7	10	6	Productivity and Competitiveness (5th)			25%	44.5	سمسر	61.6	6	
Statewide government credit rating	Ballotpedia	rating	0.5	2.0		5.0	10	10	Export value (goods)	BIEM	\$ /capita	1.0	1,229.1	$\sqrt{}$	1,477.9	9	
Statewide state reserves capacity	Pew	days	1.0	-22.4		51.4	10	4	Export value (services)	BIEM	\$ /capita	0.5	321.4	\nearrow	407.3	10	1
Government revenue to expenditure ratio	Census	ratio	1.0	1.2	$\overline{}$	1.0	2	6	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	14.8		5.6	6	4									
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010	ile 2020
Dynamism (3rd)			20%	50.6	W	56.8	5	3	Labor Force Engagement (10th)			30%	11.1		44.8	10	10
Startup concentration	Kauffman	number /1,000 businesses		112.5	1-	86.3	2	2	Unemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	15.0		5.2	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	35.0		19.1	10	
Startup early survival rate	Kauffman	percent	0.5	77.1	V	81.1	10	1	Employee Engagement	Gallup	percent	0.5	29.0	/	34.0	5	
Opportunity-driven startups	Kauffman	percent	1.0	72.6	~	86.4	7	3	Statewide underemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	8.1		3.4	10	1
Rate of new entrepreneurs	Kauffman	number /100,000 population	1.5	426.6	1	412.9	2	5	Labor force participation	Census	percent	1.5	52.8	-1/	50.0	9	
Patent applications	USPTO	number /1,000	1.0	77.2	1	15.5	4	6									
														<u> </u>		<u> </u>	_

/	M
-	\rightarrow
Ι.	_
ш	_

		i .													tor contain:	s imputed values
		Unit	Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Deci 2010	ile 2020				Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Material Resources (7th)			25%	52.6	$\neg \gamma$	53.8	6	7	Nutrition (5th)			15%	54.3	~~	66.4	3 5
Low income	Census	percentage	1.0	37.4	_/	32.7	9	8	Food security	FA	percentage	1.0	77.8	شرمہ_	84.4	10 8
Poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	23.7	$\neg \checkmark$	21.0	9	9	Statewide borderline food security	USDA	percentage	1.0	94.9		96.1	3 4
Deep poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	8.2		9.6	8	9	Fruit consumption	BRFSS	percentage		72.2	1	68.0	1 1
Liquid asset poverty	Pros Now	percentage	1.0	41.7		41.7	7	7	Vegetable consumption	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	83.4		80.1	1 7
Statewide high risk loans	Talk Pov	percentage	1.0	5.3	1	5.7	1	1								
					Value		Deci	lla						Value		Decile
Mater Condess (7th)		Unit	Weight	2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 9	2020	Chalter (10th)			Weight	2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 2020
Water Services (7th)			15%	39.4	1	47.4		7	Shelter (10th)		number / 10,000	15%	33.3		31.2	10 10
Statewide clean and safe water	Gallup	percentage	0.5	93.9	//	94.0	6	5	Homelessness	HUD	population population	0.5	49.0		63.4	10 10
Public drinking water violations	CHR	Score, 0 or 1	1.0	1.0		1.0	5	6	Unsheltered homeless rate	HUD	percentage	0.5	91.4		93.6	10 10
Complete kitchen and plumbing facilities	HUD	percentage	1.0	98.4	√	99.4	8	3	Households with overcrowding	HUD	percentage	1.0	3.2	$\sqrt{}$	2.9	8 7
									Availability of affordable housing	UI	units / 100 very low income tenants	1.0	17.7		15.8	4 5
					Value		Deci	lla						Value		Decile
Cappantadpass ((th)			Unit	2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010		Drotootion from Horry (10th)			Weight	2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 2020
Connectedness (6th)			15%	63.3		67.0	3		Protection from Harm (10th)		d	15%	41.4	~	33.9	9 10
Access to broadband	FCC	percentage	1.5	88.6	7	83.8	2	5	Fatalities from unintentional injuries	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population number /	1.0	20.1		26.9	6 9
Households with a smartphone	Census	percentage	1.0	58.3		65.3	8	7	Traffic deaths	CDC	100,000 population	1.0	31.2		29.4	10 10

^{*} 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.



															tor contains	s imputed value
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Deci 2010	2020	Drayantativa Interventions			Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Behavioral Risk Factors (7th)			15%	37.6		55.5	10	7	Preventative Interventions (3rd)			15%	41.1	M	53.5	5 3
Obesity	CDC	percentage	1.0	24.3	1	24.5	2	2	Adult dentist visits	BRFSS	percentage		63.9		66.7	3
Smoking	CHR	percentage	1.5	24.5		14.4	9	3	Adult doctor visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	62.0		65.0	8 (
Alcohol use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	6.9		6.9	9	9	Colorectal cancer screening	BRFSS	percentage		66.9		70.0	4 2
Illicit drug use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	3.1		3.1	9	9	Statewide child medical visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	87.2		80.8	5
Pain reliever misuse	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	5.3		5.3	10	10	Statewide HPV immunizations	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	49.1		52.6	1 :
									Pap smear test	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	82.3		81.4	5 .
									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
														announced		
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value _ 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020
Care Systems (5th)			15%	39.8		53.0	6	5	Mental Health (10th)			15%	42.1	M	37.3	10 10
Statewide child mental health access	NSCH	percentage	1.0	63.6		63.6	10	10	Suicide	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	1.0	33.2	-7	35.0	10 1
Adults with no health care coverage	CHR	percentage	0.5	20.3	1	9.2	4	3	Drug overdose deaths	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	28.6	111	53.3	10 1
Avoided medical care due to cost	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	15.2		11.5	4		Serious mental illness	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	1.0	4.6		4.5	9
Hospital rating	HCA	percentage	0.5	65.4	_/	72.3	8	7	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	3,782.0	1	3,379.0	4	3	Self-reported mental health not good	CHR	percentage	1.0	13.1		13.9	9
eniolees		100,000												\		
					Value		D. of							Value		Deelle
Dhysical Health (4th)	Source		Unit	2010	10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010		Langerday (7th)			Weight	2010	10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020
Physical Health (4th)			20%	61.7	WV	61.2	4	4	Longevity (7th)		deaths / 100,000	20%	57.1	V.	53.8	6
High blood pressure	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	28.2		28.3	2		Under 5 death rate	CDC	under 5 population		128.2	W	99.4	7
Diabetes	CDC	percentage	1.0	7.3		9.8	3	6	5-14 death rate	CDC	deaths / 100,000 5-14 population	0.5	10.7	MAAA	9.6	1
Heart attack	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	3.5	N	2.7	2		15-64 death rate	CDC	deaths / 100,000 15-64 population	2.0	385.0	The	502.2	8 1
Statewide disability weighted prevalence of infectious diseases	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	0.5	336.4		347.3	3	3	Maternal mortality	IMHE	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	0.3	\	0.3	4
Self-reported poor physical health	CHR	percentage	1.0	13.2	-	12.7	8	8	Mortality risk 65-85	IMHE	percentage	1.0	58.1		54.8	8
	i		<u> </u>	<u> </u>			1		<u> </u>			<u> </u>	<u> </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.

Lake, California: Education (10th decile*)

	${}^{\sim}$
S	Ä
Ų	ات

Lake, California: Education (10)	th decile	*)													M
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		s imputed value Decile
Pre-Primary Education (7th)			5%	²⁰¹⁰ 42.5	10-yr trend	43.8	7 7	Primary Education (10th)			20%	²⁰¹⁰ 25.8	10-yr trend	2020	10 1
					/ _			-					-V		
Pre-primary enrollment	Census	percentage Overall	2.0	43.4	1/	43.7	6 6	Math grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	2.2		1.6	10 1
Statewide state pre-K quality	NIEER	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 1
								English, language and arts grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	2.3	~	1.7	10 1
								Primary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	95.5	~~	95.9	7
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020		Source		Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Secondary Education (10th)			25%	44.9	-1	42.3	8 10	Tertiary Education (3rd)			25%	45.0	W	47.1	4
Math grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	7.4		7.4	7 8	College enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	21.7	~~	28.7	7
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	~\/	64.0	1
English, language and arts grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	6.4	_/\	6.2	10 10	Statewide university quality for enrolled students	QS Rank	Legatum Institute score	1.0	0.3		0.3	2
High school graduation rate	CHR	percentage	1.0	83.5		78.1	6 10	Community college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	37.3		37.3	4
Secondary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	98.4	7	96.6	3 6								
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020								
Adult Skills (7th)			25%	44.3		42.3	5 7								
Adult population with at least a high school diploma	Census	percentage	1.0	86.3		85.2	4 6								
Adult population with bachelor's degree or higher	Census	percentage	1.0	16.4	~~~	15.8	6 8								

^{*} 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.

ake, California: Natural Environment (1st decile*

	_
_	
-	ν
-64	<u>~</u> ,
ν	
_	

Lake, California: Natural Enviro	onment (ist decile*)												Italics: Indica	tor contain	imputed v
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2	2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010
Emissions (3rd)			25%	62.0		67.3	4	3	Exposure to Air Pollution (1st)			25%	79.1	_//"	82.2	1
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	1
CO2 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	2.0	0.8		0.7	3	5	Fine particulate matter exposure	OECD	micrograms per cubic meter	1.0	5.0	_//	4.1	1
litrous oxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.7		0.8	3	2								
arbon monoxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.4		0.6	9	6								
M2.5 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.5		0.8	9	4								
ulfur dioxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.8		0.9	8	7								
Ozone emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.4		0.5	7	6								
ead emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.7		0.7	10	10								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2	2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010
orest, Land and Soil (1st)			20%	62.6	N	60.8	1	1	Freshwater (8th)			20%	64.5		63.5	8
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	10.8		10.8	10
tatewide 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	0.7		0.9	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	1
ree canopy cover	NLCD	percentage	1.0	28.3		28.2	4	4								
Wetlands and deepwater habitats	USFWS	percentage	1.0	6.5		6.5	4	4								
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2	2020		1	I .	i .	1			
Preservation Efforts (1st)			10%	70.3		70.3	1	1								
tatewide GAP 1 protected areas	USGS	percentage	2.0	15.9		15.9	1	1								
tatewide GAP 2 protected areas	USGS	percentage	1.5	6.5		6.5	1	1								
ratewide GAP 3 protected areas	USGS	percentage	1.0	28.4		28.4	1	1								

^{*} 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