
Marin, California: Overall Prosperity 61.8 (1st decile*)







		Score		Decile (1 to 10)	10-year	Rank - California (1 to 58)
Breakdown of performance	2010	10-year trend	2020	2020	decile change	2020
Overall Prosperity	56.4	_/	61.8	1	1	2
Inclusive Societies	56.1	~	59.7	3	1	1
Safety and Security	64.3	Λ	66.7	6		7
A Personal Freedom	59.7		60.9	3		9
<u></u> Governance	48.9		61.7	2	4	1
కోసి Social Capital	51.4	M	49.5	3	= -	4
Open Economies	44.2		52.8	3	4 3	10
Business Environment	43.3	~~	45.4	6	1	9
Market Access and Infrastructure	44.0	1	45.4	5		23
Seconomic Quality	45.3		67.6	1	^ 6	11
Empowered People	68.9	_	72.8	1	-	1
Living Conditions	71.4	~	77.0	1	-	1
— Health	70.7	/	75.7	1	-	3
	67.4	~	71.3	1	-	1
Natural Environment	66.0		67.2	1	-	5

^{*} 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.

Marin, California (1st 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	64.3	Λ	66.7	6		7	Personal Freedom	59.	7	60.9	3	- -	9
Terror-related Crime 15%	100.0		100.0	1		1	Agency 30	% 58.5	~	63.5	8	▼ 3	1
Violent Crime 50%	61.6	$_{\sim}$	63.7	5	▲ 1	6	Freedom of Association and Speech 159	% 33.1		32.8	9		1
Property Crime 35%	52.9	M	56.8	7		16	Absence of Legal Discrimination 25	% 60.5		61.1	1		1
							Social Tolerance 30	% 73.7	$\sim\sim$	72.3	1	- -	10
		0			Decile	California Donk			0			Decile	California Rank
(A)	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	PR Carried Carried	2010	Λ.	2020	2020	10-yr dec. change	2020
Governance	48.9		61.7	2	A 4	1	Social Capital	51.4	· W	49.5	3		4
Political Accountability 30%	56.3	~~	63.8	3	▼ 2	1	Personal and Family Relationships 25		~~~	70.1	3	▼ 1	7
Rule of Law 35%	42.5	1	58.5	1	A 6	1	Social Networks 25		*****	36.6	4	▲ 4	9
Government Integrity 35%	49.1		63.1	3	▲ 4	1	Institutional Trust 20		~	64.5	3		13
							Civic and Social Participation 30	% 31.6	/ ~	33.2	3	A 1	2
4	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr_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	43.3	www.	45.4	6	10-yr dec. change	9	Market Access and Infrastructure	44.0	A ()	45.4	5	10-yr dec. change	23
Financing Ecosystems 40%	78.9	~~	83.4	1		9	Communications 40	% 61.7		61.7	3		17
Domestic Market Contestability 30%	2.1		0.6	10		1	Resources 25'	% 39.4	M	45.2	9	A 1	51
Burden of Regulation 10%	38.1		41.9	7	^ 1	1	Transport 35	% 41.1		41.1	7		37
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	45.3		67.6	1	^ 6	11							
Fiscal Sustainability 25%	23.0	\nearrow	60.3	4	^ 6	11							
Productivity and Competitiveness 25%	47.1		78.4	2	▲ 3	17							
Dynamism 20%	71.1	M	63.8	1		25							
Labor Force Engagement 30%	45.2		67.2	5		9							
^-		Overall Prosperity		2020	Decile	California Rank	~		Overall Prosperity		2020	Decile	California Rank
Living Conditions	71.4	10-yr trend	²⁰²⁰ 77.0	1	10-yr dec. change	2020	Health	70.		²⁰²⁰ 75.7	2020	10-yr dec. change	2020
Material Resources 25%	84.8		84.4	1		1	Behavioral Risk Factors 159	% 71.6	177	73.0	1		5
Nutrition 15%	73.1	, , ,	80.3	1		4	Preventative Interventions 155			57.7	3		5
Water Services 15%	46.0	T	80.0	5	a 2	18	Care Systems 159			64.2	3		3
Shelter 15%	45.8	7	37.4	10	▼ 3	14	Mental Health 159			77.4	1	- -	6
Connectedness 15%	85.9		90.5	1		11	Physical Health 20	% 77.5	mt	81.3	1		3
Protection from Harm 15%	84.0	7	84.5	1		15	Longevity 20	% 84.5	~~	93.1	1		2
									_			'	
\sim	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	Ø	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Education	67.4	~~	71.3	1	- -	1	Natural Environment	t 66.0		67.2	1	<u> </u>	5
Pre-Primary Education 5%	73.8		69.9	2	▼ 1	2	Emissions 25'	% 76.0		77.6	1		7
Primary Education 20%	60.6	1	69.0	2	▲ 1	1	Exposure to Air Pollution 25	% 56.4		61.4	3		25
Secondary Education 25%	70.7	1	74.4	2		1	Forest, Land and Soil 20	% 61.9	N	60.2	1		21
Tertiary Education 25%	46.9	W	50.2	2	▲ 1	30	Freshwater 20	% 67.7		66.8	7		7
Adult Skills 25%	88.9		91.5	1		1	Preservation Efforts 10 st	% 70.3		70.3	1		1
* 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	ile are the weakest.						

Marin, California: Safety and Security (6th decile*)

														Italics: Indica	tor cont
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010			Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	
Terror-related Crime (1st)			15%	100.0		100.0	1	1	Violent Crime (5th)			50%	61.6	_/_	63.
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	1.6	_/_	1.1
Mass shooting injuries	GVA	injuries /1,000,000 population	1.0	0.0		0.0	1	1	Rape	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	15.3		19.
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	135.9	~	96.
Terrorism injuries	GTD	injuries /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	1	Robbery	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	58.5	_/_	64.
Terrorism events	GTD	events /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	1							
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr t <u>r</u> end	2020	Decile 2010	2020		į					
Property Crime (7th)			35%	52.9	N	56.8	7	7							
Burglary	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.5	485.0	~	379.5	5	5							
Motor vehicle theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	235.4	1	206.8	9	9							
Larceny theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	1,464.9	M	1,318.9	6	7							
Identity theft	FTC	reports /100,000 population	0.5	110.7	1/2	168.0	9	10							
					~										

Marin, California: Personal Freedom (3rd decile*)

	ď	٥
. 1	\sim	į
\vee	`	

														Italics: Indica	noi comani.	
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010
Agency (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
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	Decile 2010
Absence of Legal Discrimination (1st)			25%	60.5		61.1	1	1	Social Tolerance (1st)			30%	73.7	~	72.3	1
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	3.4	m	5.7	4
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	13.1		13.1	1
itatewide 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
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
itatewide LGBT relationships & parenthood ecognition	MAP	coding, 0-9	0.5	8.0		6.3	1	1						_		
itatewide LGBT non-discrimination laws	MAP	coding, 0-11	0.5	4.1		7.0	3	3								
							1		I .							

^{*} 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.

Marin, California: Governance (2nd decile*)

TITT		/		7	١
- 11111	4	Н	H	H	
		ш			

			i	i	Melice				I	1	i	i	i	Italics: Indica	ILUI CUITLAITI.	De
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Der 2010			Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	2010
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	
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	
itatewide 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		Der	cile								
Government Integrity (3rd)	Source		35%	²⁰¹⁰ 49.1	10-yr trend	63.1	2010	2020								
			3070	47.1		03.1	,	J								
Statewide legal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	9.5	$\neg \vee$	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	ľ	47.0	10	10								
		0.100			Belostestestestestestest											

^{*} 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	2	20
7	Γ	ì
٦	ħ.	г

														Italics: Indica	tor contain	s imputed	valu
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010			Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010	ile 202
Personal and Family Relationships (3rd)			25%	68.7	1	70.1	2	3	Social Networks (4th)			25%	45.5	_	36.6	8	
Statewide divorce		instances, /1,000 population		2.9		2.9	2	7	Favors between neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	35.1	1	24.4	9	
Children in unmarried households	Census	percentage	1.0	21.4	M	22.9	3	3	Frequently talk with neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	75.4	~	56.1	2	
Teen births	CDC	instances /1,000 female 15-19 population	1.0	13.8		4.8	1	1	Trust in people in neighborhood	CPS	percentage	1.5	56.6		54.8	6	
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	94.2	7	83.6	2	9	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	71.6		87.8	10	5									
Close friends	CPS	average	1.0	6.9		6.9	3	3									
					Value		Decile							Value		Deci	
Institutional Trust (3rd)	Source	Unit	Weight 20%	²⁰¹⁰	10-yr trend	2020 64.5		2020	Civic and Social Participation	Source	Unit	Weight 30%	²⁰¹⁰ 31.6	10-yr trend	33.2	2010 4	200 200
institutional frust (sru)			20%	00.9		04.3	3	3	(3rd)			30%	31.0	1 ~	33.2	4	
Confidence in corporations	CPS	percentage	1.0	59.7		60.4	6	8	Statewide volunteer rate	CNCS	instances, /1,000 population	1.0	0.2	M	0.2	9	
Confidence in the media	CPS	percentage	1.0	68.2		64.9	2	1	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	4	Statewide active in neighborhood	CNCS	percentage	1.0	5.7	M-	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	0.9	/_	1.0	2	
									Religious membership organizations	USRC	number /1,000 population	0.5	0.8		0.8	9	
									Religious organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	17.0	1_	13.4	9	
									Sport or recreation organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	11.6	M	13.2	5	
									School, neighborhood or community association participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	18.9	1	16.5	2	

^{*} 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.



Marin, California: Business Env	vironmen [.]	t (6th decile ¹	*)										the time to all the		
Financing Ecosystems (1st)	Source	Unit	Weight	2010 78.9	Value 10-yr trend	83.4	Decile 2010 2020	Domestic Market	Source	Unit	Weight	2010 2.1	Value 10-yr trend	2020 0.6	Decile 2010 20
enture capital invested	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	762.9		3,818.6	1 1	Contestability (10th) Statewide low-income licensed occupations	Inst Just	number	1.5	76.0		76.0	10
lumber of venture capital deals	NVCA	number	1.0	93.1		161.6	1 1	Statewide occupational licensing training cost	Inst Just	S S	1.0	486.0		486.0	10
ssets under management	NVCA	/1,000,000	1.0	6,251.3	کہ	11,150.2	1 1	Statewide occupational licensing training cost			1.0	827.0		827.0	10
-	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	273.5	~~	1,621.1	1 1		Inst Just	days	1.0	15.0		15.0	10
enture capital fundraising		\$ /capita number /square	1.5		1			Statewide age requirements for license		years Overall					
Bank branch access	FDIC	mile		0.1		0.2	2 2	Statewide regulation density index	Cato	Prosperity	1.0	0.0	_	0.0	7
lew Foreign Direct Investment	BEA	\$ /capita	1.0	62,613.0		62,613.0	1 1								
	Source		Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010
Burden of Regulation (7th)			10%	38.1		41.9	8 7	Labor Market Flexibility (9th)			10%	42.9		24.1	9
tatewide Federal Regulation and State nterprise Index	QuantGov	Overall Prosperity	1.0	1.0	1	0.9	2 1	Statewide collective bargaining agreement coverage	FI	percent	1.0	18.6	~~~	16.8	9
tatewide state regulation	QuantGov	percent	1.0	1.9		1.9	10 10	Statewide employee health insurance cost	HJK	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	\$	1.0	8.0	7	12.0	10
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		İ	<u> </u>	İ	İ		i	
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								
tatewide Corporate Tax Score	Tax Found	Overall Prosperity	1.0	4.4	N	4.9	9 6								
		Пофону			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.

Marin, California: Market Access and Infrastructure (5th decile*)

6	~
	\supset
C	复
	_

									1								Italics: Indicator contains imp
	Source				Value 10-yr trend					Source			Weight	Weight 2010	Weight Value 2010 10-yr trend		
Communications (3rd)			40%	61.7		61.7	3	3	Resources (9th)				25%	25% 39.4	25% 39.4	25% 39.4	25% 39.4
Mean download speed	BBN	Mbps	1.5	118.9		118.9	2	2	Customers affected by electricity outages	Mukherjee	number /10,000 population)	0.5	0.5 0.1	0.5 0.1	0.5 0.1 0.0	0.5 0.1 0.0
Ultra-fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	10.1		10.1	5	5	Statewide net electricity generation	EIA	kWh/capita		1.0	1.0 0.0	1.0 0.0	1.0 0.0 0.0	1.0 0.0 0.0
Fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	98.4		98.4	4	4	Water usage	USGS	Mgal /capita		1.0	1.0 0.1	~_		
Internet providers (Business)	FCC	number	0.5	19.0		19.0	2	2	Electricity outage duration	EIA	minutes		1.0	1.0 113.4	1.0 113.4	1.0 113.4 126.3	1.0 113.4 126.3
									Electricity outage frequency	EIA	per year		1.0	1.0 1.0			
												l					
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		1		<u> </u>					
Transport (7th)			35%	41.1		41.1	7	7									
Statewide number of airports	BTS	number/square mile	0.5	0.0		0.0	8	8									
Road condition	BTS	percent	1.5	9.8		9.8	4	4									
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	0.9		0.9	6	6									
Bridge condition	BTS	percent	0.5	9.3		9.3	8	8									
Distance to airport	BTS	km	1.0	49.3		49.3	4	4									
	1		<u> </u>				<u> </u>		J								

Marin, California: Economic Quality (1st decile*)

	T.
	P
1	~

									1						ntor contain.	imputed values
	Source				Value 10-yr trend		Dec 2010					Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Fiscal Sustainability (4th)			25%	23.0		60.3	10	4	Productivity and Competitiveness (2nd)			25%	47.1		78.4	5 2
Statewide government credit rating	Ballotpedia	rating	0.5	2.0		5.0	10	10	Export value (goods)	BIEM	\$ /capita	1.0	638.5	5	2,855.1	10
Statewide state reserves capacity	Pew	days	1.0	-22.4		51.4	10	4	Export value (services)	BIEM	\$ /capita	0.5	3,506.7		4,691.1	1 1
Government revenue to expenditure ratio	Census	ratio	1.0	1.0	_/\	1.2	7	2	Labor productivity	BLS	\$ per hour	1.5	66.3	شمرسم	75.9	1 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	13.8	Λ	13.0	6	6								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020
Dynamism (1st)			20%	71.1	M	63.8	1	1	Labor Force Engagement (5th)			30%	45.2		67.2	5 5
Startup concentration	Kauffman	number /1,000 businesses	0.5	95.6	1	86.5	9	2	Unemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	7.5		2.4	5 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	12.4	·\/~	14.8	3 7
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 7
Opportunity-driven startups	Kauffman	percent	1.0	85.6	M	77.8	3	10	Statewide underemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	8.1		3.4	10 10
Rate of new entrepreneurs	Kauffman	number /100,000 population	1.5	430.0	W/-	370.0	2	6	Labor force participation	Census	percent	1.5	65.4		64.2	3 3
Patent applications	USPTO	number /1,000	1.0	838.3		1,240.1	1	1								
					*											
									1							

Marin, California: Living Conditions (1st decile*)

/	\sim	ı
←	-	Ş
1=		L
	-	L
_	_	,

		1						I						tor contain	s imputed value
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Material Resources (1st)			25%	84.8	V	84.4	1 1	Nutrition (1st)			15%	73.1		80.3	1
Low income	Census	percentage	1.0	13.5	~\\	12.5	1 1	Food security	FA	percentage	1.0	88.5	~	90.5	1
Poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	7.5		7.6	1 1	Statewide borderline food security	USDA	percentage	1.0	94.9		96.1	3
Deep poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	3.6	-1/	3.7	2 2	Fruit consumption	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	71.4		66.9	1
Liquid asset poverty	Pros Now	percentage	1.0	21.7		21.7	1 1	Vegetable consumption	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	87.6		85.8	1
Statewide high risk loans	Talk Pov	percentage	1.0	5.3	1/	5.7	1 1								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020
Water Services (5th)			15%	46.0		80.0		Shelter (10th)			15%	45.8	1	37.4	7 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	40.9	1/	39.8	10 1
Public drinking water violations	CHR	Score, 0 or 1	1.0	1.0		0.0	5 1	Unsheltered homeless rate	HUD	percentage	0.5	41.8	-1	68.5	4 1
Complete kitchen and plumbing facilities	HUD	percentage	1.0	99.3	7	98.5	4 8	Households with overcrowding	HUD	percentage	1.0	2.1	~	3.5	5
					-			Availability of affordable housing	UI	units / 100 very low income	1.0	12.8	1	13.7	4
										tenants					
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
Connectedness (1et)	Source			2010	10-yr trend	2020 OO F	2010 2020	Dratastian from Horry (1st)	Journe			2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 2020
Connectedness (1st)			15%	85.9	V	90.5	1 1	Protection from Harm (1st)			15%	84.0	V	84.5	1
Access to broadband	FCC	percentage	1.5	94.9	1	97.1	1 2	Fatalities from unintentional injuries	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	1.0	11.4	1	13.0	1
Households with a smartphone	Census	percentage	1.0	78.3		81.7	1 1	Traffic deaths	CDC	number / 100,000 population	1.0	9.8		7.7	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

Marin, California: Health (1st decile*)

	~	-
7	A	
	v	7

													Italics: Indica	tor contain:	imputed valu
	Source				Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020				Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 202
Behavioral Risk Factors (1st)			15%	71.6	7\	73.0	1 1	Preventative Interventions (3rd)			15%	47.7	M	57.7	3
Obesity	CDC	percentage	1.0	17.5	1/1	15.7	1 1	Adult dentist visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	72.2		76.5	1
Smoking	CHR	percentage	1.5	9.7	$\neg \bigvee$	9.7	1 1	Adult doctor visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	66.4	\	64.9	7
Alcohol use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	7.0		7.0	10 10	Colorectal cancer screening	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	72.4		72.4	1
Illicit drug use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	3.1		3.1	10 10	Statewide child medical visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	87.2		80.8	5
Pain reliever misuse	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	4.7		4.7	7 7	Statewide HPV immunizations	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	49.1	1	52.6	1
								Pap smear test	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	80.9		80.9	6
								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
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202
Care Systems (3rd)			15%	58.5		64.2	3 3	Mental Health (1st)			15%	77.4	M	77.4	1
Statewide child mental health access	NSCH	percentage	1.0	63.6		63.6	10 10	Suicide	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	1.0	13.9	M	13.6	7
Adults with no health care coverage	CHR	percentage	0.5	12.0		5.4	2 2	Drug overdose deaths	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	10.9	1	12.3	8
Avoided medical care due to cost	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	9.8		7.9	1 1	Serious mental illness	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	1.0	3.5	1	3.3	1
Hospital rating	HCA	percentage	0.5	71.4	\sim	70.9	6 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	2,136.0	1	2,012.0	1 1	Self-reported mental health not good	CHR	percentage	1.0	9.5	Y	10.6	3
					stressooded										
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value	2020	Decile 2010 202
Physical Health (1st)			20%	77.5	w I w	81.3	1 1	Longevity (1st)			20%	84.5	10-yr trend	93.1	1
High blood pressure	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	26.1	1	24.5	2 1	Under 5 death rate	CDC	deaths/100,000 under 5		128.2	MA	99.4	1
Diabetes	CDC	percentage	1.0	6.1	1	3.8	2 1	5-14 death rate	CDC	population deaths / 100,000 5-14 population	0.5	10.7	W	9.6	7
Heart attack	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	2.7		2.8	1 2	15-64 death rate	CDC	deaths / 100,000 15-64 population	2.0	150.4	N	125.4	1
Statewide disability weighted prevalence of	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	0.5	336.4	1	347.3	3 3	Maternal mortality	IMHE	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	0.1	71	0.1	1
infectious diseases Self-reported poor physical health	CHR	percentage	1.0	9.0	_/	8.9	2 1	Mortality risk 65-85	IMHE	percentage	1.0	42.9		36.2	1
					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

Marin, California: Education (1st decile*)

	$\overline{}$
S	<u> </u>
Ų	لت

Marin, California: Education (1s	st decile*	·)													~
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value	ator contain.	Decile
Pre-Primary Education (2nd)			5%	²⁰¹⁰ 73.8	10-yr trend	69.9	1 2	Primary Education (2nd)			20%	60.6	10-yr trend	69.0	2010
					"\ \										
Pre-primary enrollment	Census	percentage Overall	2.0	74.0		69.2	1 1	Math grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	4.6	~\/	5.1	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
								English, language and arts grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	5.3		5.7	1
								Primary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	96.0		96.6	6
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010
Secondary Education (2nd)			25%	70.7	1	74.4	2 2	Tertiary Education (2nd)			25%	46.9	MA	50.2	3
Math grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	9.3		9.3	1 1	College enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	41.6		45.9	2
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	8.6		9.3	1 1	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	94.6		87.1	2 7	Community college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	23.4	VW	30.3	10
Secondary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	99.2	$\neg \bigvee$	99.3	2 3								
		Unit	1	<u> </u>	Value		Decile								
A L II OLIII (A I)	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 2020								
Adult Skills (1st)			25%	88.9	<u></u>	91.5	1 1								
Adult population with at least a high school diploma	Census	percentage	1.0	91.8		93.2	1 2								
Adult population with bachelor's degree or higher	Census	percentage	1.0	54.1		58.8	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.

	/.	7
- /	2	<i>- 1</i>
- 14		\sim
_		

Marin, California: Natural Envir	ronment	(1st decile*))														9
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile			Source	Unit	Weight		Italics: Indica Value		Decil	е
Emissions (1st)			25%	²⁰¹⁰ 76.0	10-yr trend	77.6	2010 2	2020	Exposure to Air Pollution (3rd)			25%	²⁰¹⁰ 56.4	10-yr trend	61.4	2010	2020
, ,		to do			!			'						-/			3
Toxic 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	2	2
CO2 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	2.0	0.9		0.9	1	1	Fine particulate matter exposure	OECD	micrograms per cubic meter	1.0	8.5	~	7.0	4	6
Nitrous oxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.8		0.9	1	1									
Carbon monoxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.8		0.9	1	1									
PM2.5 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.9		1.0	1	1									
Sulfur dioxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.9		1.0	2	1									
Ozone emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.9		0.9	1	1									
Lead emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.9		0.9	6	5									
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile			Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decil	
Forest, Land and Soil (1st)			20%	2010 61.9	10-yr trend	60.2	2010 2	2020	Freshwater (7th)			20%	2010 67.7	10-yr trend	66.8	2010	2020 7
Toxic 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	10
									Statewide good quality livers and streams								
Statewide rural parks and wildlife areas Statewide compliant underground storage	USDA	percentage	1.0	18.9	h	18.7	1		ponds	EPA	percentage	0.5	2.2		2.2	10	10
tanks facilities	EPA	percentage number /	1.0	70.0		60.0	6	6	Total freshwater withdrawals per capita	USGS	million gallons / 1,000 population	1.0	0.1		0.3	2	4
Statewide exposure to pesticides	CDC	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	1
Tree canopy cover	NLCD	percentage	1.0	25.6		25.6	4	4									
Wetlands and deepwater habitats	USFWS	percentage	1.0	6.0		6.0	4	4									
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>				<u> </u>	
Preservation Efforts (1st)			10%	70.3	10-yr trend	70.3	2010 2	2020									
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									

^{*} 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