
Madera, California: Overall Prosperity 49.0 (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	44.0		49.0	8	1	51
Inclusive Societies	48.8	V	51.0	6	4 1	47
Safety and Security	53.5	VV-	50.7	9	▼ 1	37
Personal Freedom	56.4	~	57.6	4	- -	29
	48.9		61.7	2	4	1
থ্ণী Social Capital	36.3	h	33.9	10	-	55
Open Economies	37.2		45.9	8	^ 2	38
Business Environment	31.7	~~	38.1	9	1	36
Market Access and Infrastructure	42.6	\\\\	44.5	5	^ 1	26
Economic Quality	37.3		55.2	7	A 3	47
Empowered People	46.1		50.1	8	▼ 1	55
Living Conditions	48.9	/ /	57.2	7	~ 1	45
C Health	55.3		58.6	4		40
Education	32.5	M	35.7	10		57
Natural Environment	47.8		49.1	8	▼ 1	53

Madera, California (8th decile*)													
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	∆°.	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Safety and Security	53.5	W-	50.7	9	▼ 1	37	Personal Freedom	56.4	~~~	57.6	4	- -	29
Terror-related Crime 15%	85.3	1	100.0	1	▲ 9	1	Agency 309	6 58.5		63.5	8	~ 3	1
Violent Crime 50%	49.5	V/-	38.4	9	v 1	36	Freedom of Association and Speech 15%	33.1		32.8	9		1
Property Crime 35%	45.7	~	47.2	8		33	Absence of Legal Discrimination 25%	60.5		61.1	1		1
							Social Tolerance 309	6 62.5	$\sim\sim$	61.3	3		33
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	229	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Governance	48.9		61.7	2	▲ 4	1	Social Capital	36.3	har	33.9	10		55
Political Accountability 30%	56.3	W	63.8	3	▼ 2	1	Personal and Family Relationships 25%	6 42.6	_\\\	45.6	10		56
Rule of Law 35%	42.5		58.5	1	▲ 6	1	Social Networks 25%	6 41.0	h	27.4	9	▼ 1	49
Government Integrity 35%	49.1		63.1	3	▲ 4	1	Institutional Trust 209	6 50.1		53.7	8	▲ 2	22
							Civic and Social Participation 309	6 17.9	M	16.5	10		56
					Duc"	0.77						Bus?	0.77
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	Market Access and	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Business Environment	31.7	/	38.1	9	▲ 1	36	Infrastructure	42.6	/ γ	44.5	5	▲ 1	26
Financing Ecosystems 40%	49.8	1	65.1	1	▲ 1	36	Communications 409	6 50.0		50.0	5		33
Domestic Market Contestability 30%	2.1		0.6	10	- -	1	Resources 25%	6 45.8	1	53.3	6	△ 3	11
Burden of Regulation 10%	38.1		41.9	7	A 1	1	Transport 35%	6 43.3		43.3	6		26
Labor Market Flexibility 10%	42.9		24.1	9		1							
Price Distortions 10%	30.3	~	53.1	10		1							
		Overall Prosperity			Docilo	California Pank							
S Sanamia Quality	2010	10-yr trend	2020	2020	10-yr dec. change								
Economic Quality	37.3		55.2	7	▲ 3	47							
Fiscal Sustainability 25%	30.5		44.2	10		57							
Productivity and Competitiveness 25%	57.7		73.9	3	T 1	27							
Dynamism 20%	48.9	~	63.2	2	▲ 3	30							
Labor Force Engagement 30%	18.3	~	43.3	10		52							
^-		Overall Prosperity			Decile	California Rank		1	Overall Prosperity	1		Decile	California Rank
Living Conditions	²⁰¹⁰ 48.9	10-yr trend	57.2	7	10-yr dec. change	²⁰²⁰	Health	²⁰¹⁰ 55.3	10-yr trend	58.6	2020	10-yr dec. change	²⁰²⁰
		<u> </u>					~		1				
Material Resources 25%	50.0	~	50.8	8	v 1	52	Behavioral Risk Factors 15% Proventative Interventions 15%			50.4	8	▼ 3	52
Nutrition 15% Water Services 15%	58.6 43.7	~	73.4	7	▼ 2	20	Preventative Interventions 15% Care Systems 15%		~ V	53.5 49.3	3	▲ 2 ▲ 2	15 47
Shelter 15%	16.5	N	23.5	10	<u>1</u>	28 46	Care Systems 15% Mental Health 15%		7/1	62.6	5	<u>^</u> 2	46
Connectedness 15%	61.3	~/	86.4	2	<u> </u>	26	Physical Health 209			57.1	5		51
Protection from Harm 15%	62.3	1	67.3	4		44	Longevity 209		-2	74.1	2	△ 1	30
1970		J ~				• •	207	30.0				·	
_	2010	Overall Prosperity	2020	2020	Decile	California Rank		2015	Overall Prosperity	2020	2020	Decile	California Rank
Education	32.5	10-yr trend	35.7	10	10-yr dec. change	²⁰²⁰	Natural Environment	²⁰¹⁰ 47.8	10-yr trend	49.1	8	10-yr dec. change	53
Pre-Primary Education 5%	37.5	-	36.8	8		46	Emissions 25%		~/ _!	64.1	4		42
Primary Education 5% Primary Education 20%	29.1		27.2	10		56	Exposure to Air Pollution 25%		~	17.1	10		54
Secondary Education 25%	34.9	1	40.6	10		55	Forest, Land and Soil 209		~	55.1	2		40
Tertiary Education 25%	45.8	1	48.7	2	▲ 1	37	Freshwater 209		1	53.7	9		45
Adult Skills 25%	18.4	~	24.4	10		54	Preservation Efforts 10%			70.3	1		1
2070							10%	, 0.3					
* The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for	each pillar, ele	ement and indicator. Cou	nties in the 1:	st decile are th	e strongest performers	and those in the 10th dec	lile are the weakest.						

Madera, California: Safety and Security (9th decile*)

1	1 /
١.	1 /
	\sim

														Italics: Indica	tor contail	ns impute
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	2010
Terror-related Crime (1st)			15%	85.3		100.0	10	1	Violent Crime (9th)			50%	49.5	% -	38.4	8
Mass shooting deaths	GVA	deaths /1,000,000 population	1.5	0.0		0.0	1	1	Murder	NACJD	deaths /100,000 population	1.5	2.0	V-	4.5	6
Mass shooting injuries	GVA	injuries /1,000,000 population	1.0	26.5		0.0	10	1	Rape	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	23.9		33.0	6
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	320.8	1	544.2	9
Terrorism injuries	GTD	injuries /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	1	Robbery	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	107.4		80.1	10
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	Deci 2010	le 2020								
Property Crime (8th)			35%	45.7	V	47.2	8	8								
Burglary	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.5	772.9	7	632.1	8	8								
Motor vehicle theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	344.7		369.7	10	10								
Larceny theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	983.7	Y	1,392.8	4	7								
Identity theft	FTC	reports /100,000 population	0.5	180.9	\\\-	108.0	10	7								
	1			1					1							

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

	ď	٥
. 1	\sim	į
\vee	`	

i					Malina							i		Italics: Indica			
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	2010	ile 202
Agency (8th)			30%	58.5	~	63.5	5	8	Freedom of Association and Speech (9th)			15%	33.1	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	
Statewide 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	
statewide 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	coding, 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	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010	ile 200
Absence of Legal Discrimination (1st)			25%	60.5		61.1	1	1	Social Tolerance (3rd)			30%	62.5	~~	61.3	3	
Statewide religious freedom restoration act enacted	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.0		0.0	5	5	Hate group concentration	SPLC	number /100,000 population	1.0	6.2	m	9.2	5	
Statewide 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	30.5		30.5	5	
Statewide government discrimination based on sex 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	
Statewide affirmative action in public services panned	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	
Statewide LGBT relationships & parenthood recognition	MAP	coding, 0-9	0.5	8.0		6.3	1	1						1			
Statewide LGBT non-discrimination laws	MAP	coding, 0-11	0.5	4.1	j	7.0	3	3									
					and the state of t												

^{*} 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.

Madera, California: Governance (2nd decile*)

THE

	i i		i		Malica		1 2	-0-	T	i	i	i	i		tor contain.	imputed valu
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020		cile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 20
Political Accountability (3rd)			30%	56.3	V	63.8	1	3	Rule of Law (1st)			35%	42.5		58.5	7
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
Statewide gender balance in legislatures	CAWP	percentage	0.5	26.7	$\sim \int$	31.7	1	2	Statewide judicial integrity	ATRF	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.5		1.0	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								
					Value		De	ollo								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010	2020								
Government Integrity (3rd)			35%	49.1	/	63.1	7	3								
Statewide legal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	9.5	$\sqrt{}$	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	\frac{1}{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	ľ	47.0	10	10								
					necessaries and the second											

^{*} 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.

C	s	2	a
~	7	٦	٦
٩.	ካ	ď	J

														Italics: Indica	tor contain.	V s imputed v	
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile	
Personal and Family Relationships (10th)			25%	42.6	V-^	45.6	10	10	Social Networks (9th)			25%	41.0	لمسلا	27.4	8	9
Statewide divorce	CDC	instances, /1,000 population		2.9		2.9	2	7	Favors between neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	54.0	h	24.9	1	10
Children in unmarried households	Census	percentage	1.0	26.7	\	29.5	5	6	Frequently talk with neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	76.5	√ —	64.4	2	1
Teen births	CDC	instances /1,000 female 15-19 population	1.0	64.9		25.0	7	6	Trust in people in neighborhood	CPS	percentage	1.5	16.4		16.4	10	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	7
Shared meals with household members	CPS	percentage	0.5	100.0	V-	94.2	1	1	Statewide trust in people	ANES	coding. 0-1	0.5	0.5		0.5	5	5
Frequently hear from family and friends	CPS	percentage	1.0	57.9		48.9	10	10									
Close friends	CPS	average	1.0	4.9		4.9	10	10									
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	2010	2020	Civic and Social Participation	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020		2020
Institutional Trust (8th)			20%	50.1		53.7	10	8	(10th)			30%	17.9	/h.	16.5	10	10
Confidence in corporations	CPS	percentage	1.0	23.3		18.9	10		Statewide volunteer rate	CNCS	instances, /1,000 population	1.0	0.2	M	0.2	9	6
Confidence in the media	CPS	percentage	1.0	71.2		87.3	1	1	Statewide volunteering intensity	CNCS	hours, per capita	1.0	31.6	My	29.9	9	4
Statewide trust in federal government	ANES	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.4		0.4	4	4	Statewide active in neighborhood	CNCS	percentage	1.0	5.7	M-	6.7	8	6
									Statewide helping the community	CNCS	instances, /1,000	1.0	1.6	/ ~~	2.1	3	2
									(Non-religious) membership organizations	Census	number /1,000 population	1.0	0.2	/_	0.2	9	8
									Religious membership organizations	USRC	number /1,000 population	0.5	0.8		0.8	9	9
									Religious organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	3.4	1	2.7	10	10
									Sport or recreation organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	8.3		8.3	7	6
									School, neighborhood or community association participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	16.4		3.2	6	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.



Madera, California: Business Ei	nvironme	nt (9th decil	e^)										ttelies teelies		
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Italics: Indica Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010
Financing Ecosystems (1st)			40%	49.8	~~	65.1	2 1	Domestic Market Contestability (10th)			30%	2.1	- √	0.6	10
/enture capital invested	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	54.2	~~	442.0	2 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	6.6	\nearrow	18.7	3 2	Statewide occupational licensing training cost	Inst Just	s	1.0	486.0		486.0	10
Assets under management	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	444.4	```	1,290.6	1 1	Statewide occupational licensing training time	Inst Just	days	1.0	827.0		827.0	10
enture capital fundraising	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	19.4	~~~	187.6	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	8 8	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								
								'							
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
Burden of Regulation (7th)			10%	²⁰¹⁰ 38.1	10-yr trend	²⁰²⁰ 41.9	2010 2020 8 7	Labor Market Flexibility (9th)			10%	²⁰¹⁰ 42.9	10-yr trend	2020	²⁰¹⁰
statewide Federal Regulation and State Interprise 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	s	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	s	1.0	8.0	/	12.0	10
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020								
Price Distortions (10th)			10%	30.3	~~	53.1	10 10								
Statewide subsidies to the private sector	BEA	percent	1.0	0.3	W	0.2	10 10								
Statewide 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.

	×	9
	≻	≺
/		_
v		
-	-	

9

10

									1					Italics: Indic	2
	Source			2010	Value 10-yr trend					Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend	
Communications (5th)			40%	50.0		50.0	5	5	Resources (6th)			25%	45.8	M	
Mean download speed	BBN	Mbps	1.5	61.2		61.2	5	5	Customers affected by electricity outages	Mukherjee	number /10,000 population	0.5	0.1	N	
Ultra-fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	3.2		3.2	6	6	Statewide net electricity generation	EIA	kWh /capita	1.0	0.0	M	
Fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	100.0		100.0	1	1	Water usage	USGS	Mgal /capita	1.0	2.0	7	
Internet providers (Business)	FCC	number	0.5	16.0		16.0	3	3	Electricity outage duration	EIA	minutes	1.0	95.0	-	
									Electricity outage frequency	EIA	per year	1.0	0.9	7	
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020							
Transport (6th)			35%	43.3		43.3	6	6							
Statewide number of airports	BTS	number/square mile	0.5	0.0		0.0	8	8							
Road condition	BTS	percent	1.5	2.1		2.1	2	2							
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	15.4		15.4	9	9							
Distance to airport	BTS	km	1.0	49.2		49.2	4	4							
	1		1	!			!		J						

^{*} 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.

Madera, California: Economic Quality (7th decile*)

CT.
a Char
12
(~)

							i		I	i				Italics: Indica	tor contain.		
	Source				Value 10-yr trend		Deci 2010					Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010	le 2020
Fiscal Sustainability (10th)			25%	30.5		44.2	10	10	Productivity and Competitiveness (3rd)			25%	57.7	~~	73.9	2	3
Statewide government credit rating	Ballotpedia	rating	0.5	2.0		5.0	10	10	Export value (goods)	BIEM	\$ /capita	1.0	3,230.5	1	3,672.7	4	(
Statewide state reserves capacity	Pew	days	1.0	-22.4		51.4	10	4	Export value (services)	BIEM	\$ /capita	0.5	426.0		517.3	9	
Government revenue to expenditure ratio	Census	ratio	1.0	1.1		0.7	3	10	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	7.3	$-$ _	11.0	4	5									
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010	le 2020
Dynamism (2nd)			20%	48.9	W	63.2	5	2	Labor Force Engagement (10th)			30%	18.3	_/	43.3	10	10
Startup concentration	Kauffman	number /1,000 businesses		112.5	1	86.3	2	2	Unemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	13.4		7.0	10	1
Startup early job creation	Kauffman	number /1,000 population	1.0	6.3	V-	6.5	3	1	Youth unemployment	Census	percent	1.0	23.2	~/~	21.9	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	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	54.2		53.8	9	
Patent applications	USPTO	number /1,000	1.0	53.0	V	82.4	5	4									
					•												
														<u> </u>		<u> </u>	

_	×	
Г.	П	

														Italics: Indicat	or contains	imputed valu	ies
			Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 202	20		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 20	<u>?</u> 0
Material Resources (8th)			25%	50.0	7	50.8	7	8	Nutrition (4th)			15%	58.6		73.4	2	4
Low income	Census	percentage	1.0	36.2	$\overline{}$	32.9	9	8	Food security	FA	percentage	1.0	80.4		88.6	8	4
Poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	21.1	$\neg \checkmark$	20.8	8	9	Statewide borderline food security	USDA	percentage	1.0	94.9		96.1	3	4
Deep poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	9.1	~	9.2	9	9	Fruit consumption	BRFSS	percentage		72.2	1	68.0	7	7
Liquid asset poverty	Pros Now	percentage	1.0	48.6		48.6	10	10	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									_
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile			Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile	_
Water Services (7th)			15%	2010 43.7	10-yr trend	²⁰²⁰ 46.4	2010 202		Shelter (10th)			15%	2010 16.5	10-yr trend	2020	10	10
Statewide clean and safe water	Gallup	percentage	0.5	93.9	^	94.0	6		Homelessness	DUH	number / 10,000	0.5	40.6	/	21.8	10	10
Public drinking water violations	CHR	Score,	1.0	1.0		1.0	5		Unsheltered homeless rate	HUD	population	0.5	56.5	7	82.5		10
-		0 or 1			~												
Complete kitchen and plumbing facilities	HUD	percentage	1.0	99.0		99.3	6		Households with overcrowding	HUD	percentage units / 100 very	1.0	10.2		9.3	10	10
									Availability of affordable housing	UI	low income tenants	1.0	11.1		18.4	5	4
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202	20		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 20:	20
Connectedness (2nd)			15%	61.3		86.4	3	2	Protection from Harm (4th)			15%	62.3	5	67.3	4	4
Access to broadband	FCC	percentage	1.5	67.0		98.6	3	2	Fatalities from unintentional injuries	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	1.0	12.7	\mathcal{M}	14.0	2	3
Households with a smartphone	Census	percentage	1.0	69.8	1	76.4	3	3	Traffic deaths	CDC	number / 100,000 population	1.0	24.1	M	19.1	8	6
					metastastastastastastast						рориалон			_			

^{*} 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.

- /	_		
- 5		۸	
		(7

							ı		l						tor contains	imputed value
	Source				Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 202		Decidentative interventions	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Behavioral Risk Factors (8th)			15%	59.5	M	50.4	5	8	Preventative Interventions (3rd)			15%	41.1	M	53.5	5
Obesity	CDC	percentage	1.0	24.1	7	35.8	2	8	Adult dentist visits	BRFSS	percentage		63.9		66.7	3
Smoking	CHR	percentage	1.5	13.8	$\neg \bigvee$	13.4	2	2	Adult doctor visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	62.0		65.0	8
Alcohol use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	6.1		6.1	7	7	Colorectal cancer screening	BRFSS	percentage		66.9		70.0	4 .
Illicit drug use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	3.2		3.2	10	10	Statewide child medical visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	87.2		80.8	5
Pain reliever misuse	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	5.1		5.1	9	9	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
														minument		
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202	on.		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020
Care Systems (5th)			15%	36.2		49.3			Mental Health (6th)			15%	62.7	1,1	62.6	7 6
Statewide child mental health access	NSCH	percentage	1.0	63.6		63.6	10	10	Suicide	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	1.0	14.6	1_	16.5	8
Adults with no health care coverage	CHR	percentage	0.5	24.1		10.4	7	4	Drug overdose deaths	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	14.0	7/	15.8	9
Avoided medical care due to cost	BRFSS	percentage		15.2		11.5	4	2	Serious mental illness	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	1.0	4.1	1	3.9	3
Hospital rating	HCA	percentage	0.5	55.0		63.0	10	9	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	3,592.0	1	3,584.0	3	3	Self-reported mental health not good	CHR	percentage	1.0	13.2		13.6	9
eniolees					Deleterated and deleter			1						1		
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile			Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
Physical Health (5th)	Source		20%	2010 58.6	10-yr trend	2020 57.1	2010 202		Longevity (2nd)	Source		20%	2010 68.5	10-yr trend	2020 74.1	3 2
	00000		1.0	28.2	_/\	28.3		2	Under 5 death rate	000	deaths / 100,000				99.4	1
High blood pressure	BRFSS	percentage			1		2	7		CDC	under 5 population deaths/100,000	1.0	128.2	MY		
Diabetes	CDC	percentage	1.0	7.8	1	11.6	4	/	5-14 death rate	CDC	5-14 population deaths / 100,000	0.5	10.7	V- V V	9.6	1
Heart attack Statewide disability weighted prevalence of	BRFSS	percentage years / 100,000		3.5	V	2.7	2	-	15-64 death rate	CDC	15-64 population deaths / 100,000	2.0	273.7	WI	267.7	4
infectious diseases	IMHE	population	0.5	336.4		347.3	3		Maternal mortality	IMHE	population	0.5	0.4		0.4	5
Self-reported poor physical health	CHR	percentage	1.0	14.4		13.4	9	9	Mortality risk 65-85	IMHE	percentage	1.0	50.8	1	46.4	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.

	_	\
<		-
	虏	1
	_	_

Madera, California: Education (10th dec	cile*)													M
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		ns imputed value Decile
Pre-Primary Education (8th)			5%	²⁰¹⁰ 37.5	10-yr trend	36.8	8 8	Primary Education (10th)			20%	²⁰¹⁰ 29.1	10-yr trend	2020	10 10
					→			-					_/_		
Pre-primary enrollment	Census	percentage Overall	2.0	38.6		36.9	7 8	Math grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	2.7	7	2.0	10 10
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	-\\	2.0	10 1
								Primary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	95.6	M	97.0	6
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Secondary Education (10th)			25%	34.9	N	40.6	10 10	Tertiary Education (2nd)			25%	45.8	~V	48.7	3 2
Math grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	5.8		5.8	10 10	College enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	24.2	مرر	33.9	6
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	6.6	W	6.3	9 10	Statewide university quality for enrolled students	QS Rank	Legatum Institute score	1.0	0.3		0.3	2 2
High school graduation rate	CHR	percentage	1.0	83.2	_/_	83.2	6 9	Community college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	37.3		37.3	4 4
Secondary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	95.5	~	99.0	7 3								
					pod										
	Source		Unit		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020								
Adult Skills (10th)			25%	18.4		24.4	10 10								
Adult population with at least a high school diploma	Census	percentage	1.0	67.9		71.9	10 10								
Adult population with bachelor's degree or higher	Census	percentage	1.0	13.5	1	14.5	8 8								
- ingred					V										

^{*} 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/
121
\sim

Descriptions Descr	Madera, California: Natural En	vironmer	nt (8th decile	e*)													
## Section (41h) ## 25% 53.0 64.1 4 4 Exposure to Air Pollution (10th) ## 25% 2.5 5.5 7.1 10 10 ## 25% 2.5 5.5 7.1 10 ## 25% 2.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 ## 25% 2.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 ## 25% 2.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 ## 25% 2.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 ## 25% 2.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 ## 25% 2.5		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Dec	dile		Source	Hoit	Weight			tor contain.	
Include control contro	Emissions (4th)	Source				10-yr trend				Exposure to Air Pollution	Source				10-yr trend		
24 100	ETTISSIOTIS (4tTI)			2076				4	4	(10th)			2076	12.3	~		
190 190	Toxic air releases	EPA	0-1	2.0	0.8		0.8	7	7	Life expectancy loss from air pollution	JBEN		2.0	0.2		0.2	10 10
action monade emissions 6N	CO2 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	2.0	0.8		0.8	3	4	Fine particulate matter exposure	OECD	micrograms per cubic meter	1.0	12.9	~~~	11.5	10 10
## ACC PRODUCTION FROM 1	Nitrous oxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.7		0.8	4	3								
Affire disable embosions 1974 Oral Oral	Carbon monoxide emissions	EPA		0.5	0.6		0.7	5	5								
Torrest, Land and Soil (2nd) Source (194) 104 105 105 106 107 107 108 109 109 109 109 109 109 109	PM2.5 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.7		0.7	3	4								
and criticisions 17A	Sulfur dioxide emissions	EPA		0.5	0.9		0.9	5	6								
Source Uset Weight 2000 200	Ozone emissions	EPA		0.5	0.6		0.6	4	4								
20% 56.5 55.1 2 2 2 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 5 5 2 2 2 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 5 5 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 5 5 7 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 7 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 7 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 7 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 7 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 7 2 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Lead emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.8		0.9	9	6								
20% 56.5 55.1 2 2 2 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 5 5 2 2 2 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 5 5 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 5 5 7 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 7 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 7 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 7 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 7 2 2 2 5 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 5 5 7 2 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7																	
20% 56.5 55.1 2 2 Freshwater (9th) 20% 52.8 53.7 9 9 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		Source	Unit	Weight	2010		2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-vr trend	2020	
tatewide cural parks and wildlife areas USDA percentage 10 18.9 18.7 1 Statewide good quality lakes, reservoirs and process of the percentage incis facilities 10 70.0 60.0 6 6 6 Total freshwater withdrawals per capita USDS mining gallores, 1000,000 10 100,000 10 27.0 24.2 1 3 3 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.9 18.2 5 5 5 5 5 10 18.9 18.9 18.9 18.9 18.9 18.9 18.9 18.9	Forest, Land and Soil (2nd)			20%	1	N		1	2	Freshwater (9th)			20%				
tatewide CAP 2 protected areas USDA percentage 10 18.9 18.7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Toxic land releases	EPA	lb / square mile	1.0	5.1		3.7	9	9	Statewide good quality rivers and streams	EPA	percentage	0.5	10.8		10.8	10 10
Intersection of the percentage	Statewide rural parks and wildlife areas	USDA	percentage	1.0	18.9	•••••	18.7	1	1		EPA	percentage	0.5	2.2		2.2	10 10
Composition	Statewide compliant underground storage tanks 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	5.8		5.2	9
Vetlands and deepwater habitats	Statewide exposure to pesticides	CDC	100,000	1.0	27.0	~/^	24.2	1	3	Toxic water releases	EPA	lb / square mile	1.0	0.0		0.0	1
Preservation Efforts (1st) Source Unit Unit 2010 Value 2020 2010 2020 2010 2020 2010 10-yr trend 2020 2010 2020 2010 10-yr trend 2020 2010 2020 2	Tree canopy cover	NLCD	percentage	1.0	18.9		18.2	5	5								
Preservation Efforts (1st) 10% 70.3 70.3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Wetlands and deepwater habitats	USFWS	percentage	1.0	3.2		3.2	7	7								
Preservation Efforts (1st) 10% 70.3 70.3 1 1 1 tatewide GAP 1 protected areas USGS percentage 2.0 15.9 15.9 15.9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1																	
Preservation Efforts (1st) 10% 70.3 70.3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1																	
Preservation Efforts (1st) 10% 70.3 70.3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1																	
Preservation Efforts (1st) 10% 70.3 70.3 1 1 tatewide GAP 1 protected areas USGS percentage 20 15.9 15.9 1 1 tatewide GAP 2 protected areas USGS percentage 1.5 6.5 6.5 1 1		Source	Unit	Unit				Dec	ile				<u> </u>				
tatewide GAP 2 protected areas USGS percentage 1.5 6.5 — 6.5 1	Preservation Efforts (1st)			10%				1	1								
	Statewide GAP 1 protected areas	USGS	percentage	2.0	15.9		15.9	1	1								
tatewide GAP 3 protected areas USGS percentage 10 28.4 28.4 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								

^{*} 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