

Douglas, Colorado: Overall Prosperity 66.0 (1st decile*)

LEGATUM







Breakdown of performance	2010	Score 10-year trend	2020	Decile (1 to 10) 2020	10-year decile change	Rank - Colorado (1 to 64) 2020
Overall Prosperity	63.9	~~	66.0	1		2
Inclusive Societies	68.4	~~	67.8	1	1	27
Safety and Security	78.3	~~	71.5	5	~ 2	34
Personal Freedom	66.9	~/	68.9	1	-	6
Governance	76.9		75.7	1	-	1
Social Capital	51.4	~	55.1	3	= -	27
Open Economies	49.6		55.0	2		6
Business Environment	54.7	1	56.9	1		4
Market Access and Infrastructure	45.2	V	45.9	4	1	12
Seconomic Quality	48.9		62.3	4	1	14
Empowered People	73.8	~	75.1	1		1
Living Conditions	75.3	~	76.3	1		2
🔑 Health	71.3	~~	72.7	1	-	3
Education	79.0	M	79.0	1		1
Natural Environment	69.5	~	72.3	1		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.

Douglas, Colorado (1st decile*)													
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	Colorado Rank 2020	20	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	Colorado Rank 2020
Safety and Security	78.3	-V _	71.5	5	▼ 2	34	Personal Freedom	66.9	~~	68.9	1		6
Terror-related Crime 15%	100.0	_ \	81.5	10	▼ 9	61	Agency 30%	75.7		80.5	3		1
Violent Crime 50%	69.3	~~~	63.7	5	▼ 1	39	Freedom of Association and Speech 15%	46.7		44.9	4		1
Property Crime 35%	81.7	~ \	78.4	3	▼ 1	23	Absence of Legal Discrimination 25%	58.5		62.6	1		1
							Social Tolerance 30%	75.1		74.6	1		6
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	Colorado Rank 2020	289	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	Colorado Rank 2020
Governance	76.9	ا سر	75.7	-		1	Social Capital	51.4	V	55.1	3		27
Political Accountability 30%	78.6	7	84.1	1		1	Personal and Family Relationships 25%	68.3		76.0	1	▲ 1	1
Rule of Law 35%	89.5		80.0	1	- -	1	Social Networks 25%	51.6	1	50.5	3	^ 2	51
Government Integrity 35%	62.8		64.2	2		1	Institutional Trust 20%	47.6	1	65.6	3	A 7	51
							Civic and Social Participation 30%	39.8		34.6	3		40
_	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	Colorado Rank 2020	\times	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	Colorado Rank 2020
Business Environment	54.7	M_	56.9	1	- -	4	Market Access and Infrastructure	45.2	V	45.9	4	1	12
Financing Ecosystems 40%	38.1	/	47.4	3	^ 1	4	Communications 40%	62.0		62.0	3		9
Domestic Market Contestability 30%	62.1	/	64.1	1		1	Resources 25%	51.6	V	54.1	6	_ 1	55
Burden of Regulation 10%	70.2	1	69.1	1		1	Transport 35%	35.8		35.8	9		26
Labor Market Flexibility 10%	74.0	1	42.4	8	▼ 6	1							
Price Distortions 10%	63.8	w	75.9	3	▲ 4	1							
\$	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	Colorado Rank 2020		<u> </u>		į			
Economic Quality	48.9	مسر	62.3	4	1	14							
Fiscal Sustainability 25%	43.7	1	51.2	8	▼ 1	30							
Productivity and Competitiveness 25%	34.0		47.4	9		59							
Dynamism 20%	60.8	V	67.8	1	A 1	3							
Labor Force Engagement 30%	57.8		80.4	1	^ 1	4							
		Overall Prosperity			Decile	Colorado Rank			Overall Prosperity			Decile	Colorado Rank
Living Conditions	2010	10-yr trend	2020	2020	10-yr dec. change			2010	10-yr trend	2020	2020	10-yr dec. change	
Living Conditions	75.3	~/\	76.3	1		2	Health	71.3	7~	72.7	1		3
Material Resources 25%	86.1		88.5	1		1	Behavioral Risk Factors 15%	70.3	7	64.6	3	▼ 2	15
Nutrition 15%	66.7	$_{n}$	82.6	1	- -	2	Preventative Interventions 15%	46.7		62.4	1	▲ 4	4
Water Services 15%	56.4		51.9	6	▼ 1	32	Care Systems 15%	64.6		66.5	2		29
Shelter 15%	60.4	1	60.9	5	▼ 2	6	Mental Health 15%	70.4	2	61.7	6	▼ 3	1
Connectedness 15%	93.5		98.5	1		1	Physical Health 20%	84.0	W	84.3	1		6
Protection from Harm 15%	81.8	1	67.4	4	▼ 3	9	Longevity 20%	83.7	Ju.	87.7	1		5
_		Overall Prosperity			Decile	Colorado Rank			Overall Prosperity			Decile	Colorado Rank
Education	79.0	10-yr trend	²⁰²⁰ 79.0	2020	10-yr dec. change	2020	Natural Environment	69.5	10-yr trend	²⁰²⁰ 72.3	2020	10-yr dec. change	²⁰²⁰ 3
Pre-Primary Education 5%	69.5	-	63.0	3	v 1	15	Emissions 25%	74.5	/"	75.5	1		4
Primary Education 5% Primary Education 20%	82.9	-	79.7	1		2	Exposure to Air Pollution 25%	80.0		84.2	1		36
Primary Education 20% Secondary Education 25%	82.9	1	84.4	,		3	Exposure to Air Pollution 25% Forest, Land and Soil 20%	46.6	~~~	54.1	3	<u> </u>	36 25
Secondary Education 25% Tertiary Education 25%	58.1	201	57.6	1		6	Freshwater 20%	89.2	1	89.3	1		3
Adult Skills 25%	96.4	7	97.5	1		1	Preservation Efforts 10%	36.8		36.8	1		3 1
25%	70.4		,7.5				10%	30.0		55.0			
* The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for	each pillar. ele	ement and indicator. Count	ties in the 1s	st decile are th	e strongest performers	and those in the 10th dec	lle are the weakest.						

Douglas, Colorado: Safety and Security (5th decile*)

_	
1	
\	•
\ \	

	T			i .	3.7-1		-			1	i		i .	Melice	tor contail	_
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	
Terror-related Crime (10th)			15%	100.0		81.5	1	10	Violent Crime (5th)			50%	69.3		63.7	
Mass shooting deaths	GVA	deaths /1,000,000 population	1.5	0.0		1.8	1	10	Murder	NACJD	deaths /100,000 population	1.5	0.0	1	0.6	
Mass shooting injuries	GVA	injuries /1,000,000 population	1.0	0.0	/	8.2	1	10	Rape	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	63.0	1	53.7	
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	45.7		80.0	
Terrorism injuries	GTD	injuries /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	1	Robbery	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	15.9		6.4	
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	Dec 2010	ile 2020								
Property Crime (3rd)			35%	81.7	~ _	78.4	2	3								
Burglary	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.5	218.4	N	192.2	2	2								
Motor vehicle theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	53.5		84.9	3	5								
Larceny theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	823.2	V	1,063.9	1	5								
Identity theft	FTC	reports /100,000 population	0.5	117.3	1	126.0	9	9								

Douglas, Colorado: Personal Freedom (1st decile*)

	,	S	0
\		ς	ĭ

Douglas, Colorado: Personal Fre	eaom (ist declie")														· ×	ነ
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Dec			Source	Unit	Weight		Italics: Indic		s imputed Dec	
Agency (3rd)			30%	75.7	10-yr trend	80.5	2010	2020	Freedom of Association and Speech (4th)			15%	46.7	10-yr trend	44.9	2010	202
Fatal police shootings of unarmed civilians	WaPo	deaths /100,000 population	1.0	0.0		0.0	1	1	Statewide free speech in public places	Cato	coding, 0-3	1.0	0.5		0.5	1	
Statewide death row population	NAACP	number /100,000 population	1.0	0.1	15	0.1	2	2	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	790.0		740.0	4	4	Statewide press suppression	USPFT	number /100,000 state population	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	
Statewide youth incarceration	CJRP	prisoners /100,000 youth population	0.5	146.3		68.2	10	9	Statewide invasive cell phone surveillance	ACLU	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.0	_	0.0	1	
Statewide trafficking	POL	reports /100,000 population	1.0	6.0		6.0	3	3									
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Dec			Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Dec	
Absence of Legal Discrimination (1st)			25%	²⁰¹⁰ 58.5	10-yr trend	62.6	2010	2020	Social Tolerance (1st)			30%	²⁰¹⁰ 75.1	10-yr trend	74.6	2010	202
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	0.3	1	1.6	1	
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	20.3		20.3	1	
Statewide government discrimination based on sex prohibited	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	1.0		1.0	1	1	Statewide same sex marriage support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	60.0	7	71.0	2	
Statewide affirmative action in public services panned	Cato	coding, 0-2	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	2	Statewide LGBT non-discrimination law support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	73.0	\	72.0	2	
Statewide LGBT relationships & parenthood ecognition	MAP	coding, 0-9	0.5	3.0		5.8	2	1									
Statewide LGBT non-discrimination laws	MAP	coding, 0-11	0.5	9.0		9.0	1	1									
!			1						1	1		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.

Douglas, Colorado: Governance (1st decile*)

J			_	١
٦	П	П	П	ľ
4	Ш	ш	Ц	Ļ

80.0

														Italics
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010			Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Val 10-yr 1
Political Accountability (1st)			30%	78.6	$\sqrt{}$	84.1	1	1	Rule of Law (1st)			35%	89.5	_
Statewide Elections Performance Index	MIT	Overall Prosperity, 0-1	1.5	0.7		0.8	4	2	Statewide Justice Index	NCAJ	index rank 1-51	1.5	8.0	
Statewide gender balance in legislatures	CAWP	percentage	0.5	38.0	M	45.0	1	1	Statewide judicial integrity	ATRF	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.0	
Statewide state campaign disclosure	NIMP	index, 0-1	1.0	1.0		0.9	1	3						
Statewide term limits	NCSL	coding, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	1	1						
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		!				
Government Integrity (2nd)			35%	62.8		64.2	2	2						
Statewide legal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	7.0	1	9.0	2	3						
Statewide illegal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	5.0	$-\sqrt{}$	7.0	1	3						
Statewide Corruption Reflection Index	ICS	Overall Prosperity, 0-1	0.5	0.3		0.2	2	2						
Statewide State Integrity Investigation	CPI	index rank, 1-50	1.0	33.0		13.0	6	2						
Statewide public record request compliance	Cuillier	percentage	1.0	46.1		46.1	2	2						
Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index	USPIRG	Overall Prosperity, 0-100	0.5	86.0	_/	78.0	6	5						
					_									
		1	1	1										

0	Q	Ω
	$\overline{}$	٦
- 4.1	٠.	Ι,
- V	м	v

Douglas, Colorado. Social Capit														Italics: Indica	tor contain	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	Decil 2010	le 2020
Personal and Family Relationships (1st)			25%	68.3	~	76.0	2	1	Social Networks (3rd)			25%	51.6	V	50.5	5	(
Statewide divorce	CDC	instances, /1,000 population	1.0	4.3		3.3	9	9	Favors between neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	34.0	<u> </u>	29.0	9	
Children in unmarried households	Census	percentage	1.0	12.0	\ \ \ \	14.1	1	1	Frequently talk with neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	68.9		51.9	5	
Teen births	CDC	instances /1,000 female 15-19 population	1.0	10.3		2.8	1	1	Trust in people in neighborhood	CPS	percentage	1.5	56.0		69.6	6	
Statewide parent's attendance of children's activities	NSCH	percentage	0.5	92.0		89.3	2	2	Statewide supportive neighborhood for a child	NSCH	percentage	1.0	57.4	\	57.2	2	
Shared meals with household members	CPS	percentage	0.5	91.5	V	91.6	8	2	Statewide trust in people	ANES	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.5		0.5	4	
Frequently hear from family and friends	CPS	percentage	1.0	77.7	$-\int$	88.2	9	3									
Close friends	CPS	average	1.0	6.3		6.3	5	5									
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Deci 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010	le 2020
Institutional Trust (3rd)			20%	47.6		65.6	10	3	Civic and Social Participation (3rd)			30%	39.8	1	34.6	3	
Confidence in corporations	CPS	percentage	1.0	56.0		71.4	9	2	Statewide volunteer rate	CNCS	instances, /1,000 population	1.0	0.3	M	0.3	2	
Confidence in the media	CPS	percentage	1.0	55.2		58.0	10	4	Statewide volunteering intensity	CNCS	hours, per capita	1.0	52.6	hy-	35.1	1	
Statewide trust in federal government	ANES	coding. 0-1	0.5	0.4		0.4	7	7	Statewide active in neighborhood	CNCS	percentage	1.0	7.1	M	9.0	2	
									Statewide helping the community	CNCS	instances, /1,000	1.0	1.5	N	2.7	4	
									(Non-religious) membership organizations	Census	number /1,000 population	1.0	0.4		0.4	4	
									Religious membership organizations	USRC	number /1,000 population	0.5	0.5		0.5	10	1
									Religious organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	25.5	M	19.4	2	
									Sport or recreation organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	17.3	h	11.7	1	
									School, neighborhood or community association participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	19.4	\ <u></u>	18.0	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.

Douglas, Colorado: Business Environment (1st decile*)

$\overline{}$

Douglas, Cololado: Busilless E													Italics: Indica	tor contain:	imputed va
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2
Financing Ecosystems (3rd)			40%	38.1	1	47.4	4 3	Domestic Market Contestability (1st)			30%	62.1		64.1	1
/enture capital invested	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	158.8	~~	410.1	1 1	Statewide low-income licensed occupations	Inst Just	number	1.5	34.0		34.0	1
Number of venture capital deals	NVCA	number /1,000,000	1.0	26.9	/	73.3	1 1	Statewide occupational licensing training cost	Inst Just	\$	1.0	344.0		344.0	9
Assets under management	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	310.5	~~	556.6	1 1	Statewide occupational licensing training time	Inst Just	days	1.0	260.0		260.0	1
enture capital fundraising	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	0.0	M	2.5	6 5	Statewide age requirements for license	Inst Just	years	1.0	11.0		11.0	6
Bank branch access	FDIC	number/square mile	1.5	0.1		0.1	2 2	Statewide regulation density index	Cato	Overall Prosperity	1.0	0.0		0.0	1
New Foreign Direct Investment	BEA	\$ /capita	1.0	0.0		0.0	8 8								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010
Burden of Regulation (1st)			10%	70.2	1	69.1	1 1	Labor Market Flexibility (8th)			10%	74.0	2	42.4	2
tatewide Federal Regulation and State nterprise Index	QuantGov	Overall Prosperity	1.0	0.9	1	0.9	1 1	Statewide collective bargaining agreement coverage	FI	percent	1.0	8.0	M	10.9	6
Statewide state regulation	QuantGov	percent	1.0	1.3		1.3	1 1	Statewide employee health insurance cost	HJK	\$	0.5	4,506.0		4,966.0	8
								Workers Compensation Premium Rate	State OR	\$ per \$100	0.5	1.4	$-\sqrt{}$	0.8	1
								Statewide minimum wage	DOL	\$	1.0	7.3		12.0	1
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>				
Price Distortions (3rd)			10%	63.8	4	75.9	7 3								
tatewide subsidies to the private sector	BEA	percent	1.0	0.2	W^	0.2	8 8								
Statewide Corporate Tax Score	Tax Found	Overall Prosperity	1.0	5.3	1	5.8	4 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.

~	7
\mathcal{I}	≺
(⇚
_	_

7

2

54.1

0.0

														Italics: India
		Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend			ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend
Communications (3rd)			40%	62.0		62.0	3	3	Resources (6th)			25%	51.6	γ~^
Mean download speed	BBN	Mbps	1.5	88.1		88.1	3	3	Customers affected by electricity outages	Mukherjee	number /10,000 population	0.5	0.0	V
Ultra-fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	10.3		10.3	5	5	Statewide net electricity generation	EIA	kWh /capita	1.0	0.0	\sim
Fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	100.0		100.0	1	1	Water usage	USGS	Mgal /capita	1.0	0.1	1
Internet providers (Business)	FCC	number	0.5	29.0		29.0	1	1	Electricity outage duration	EIA	minutes	1.0	90.8	-M
									Electricity outage frequency	EIA	per year	1.0	1.1	
		Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend			ile 2020						
Transport (9th)			35%	35.8		35.8	9	9						
Statewide number of airports	BTS	number/square mile	0.5	0.0		0.0	9	9						
Road condition	BTS	percent	1.5	7.3		7.3	4	4						
Statewide railroad length	AAR	miles /square mile	1.0	0.0		0.0	9	9						
Bus transit route mileage	BTS	miles /square mile	0.5	0.0		0.0	8	8						
Public road density	BTS	miles /square mile	1.0	0.4		0.4	6	6						
Bridge condition	BTS	percent	0.5	3.8		3.8	5	5						
Distance to airport	BTS	km	1.0	61.4		61.4	5	5						
	1	i .		<u> </u>					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.

Douglas, Colorado: Economic Quality (4th decile*)

	(T)	
,	P	•
(~	١)
١		,

				i					T	1		i	1		tor contain	s imputed valu
	Source				Value 10-yr trend			ile 2020				Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 202
Fiscal Sustainability (8th)			25%	43.7	<u>/_</u>	51.2	7	8	Productivity and Competitiveness (9th)			25%	34.0	~~	47.4	9
Statewide government credit rating	Ballotpedia	rating	0.5	6.0		6.0	8	8	Export value (goods)	BIEM	\$ /capita	1.0	616.4		595.0	10
Statewide state reserves capacity	Pew	days	1.0	7.5	\~~	41.6	9	5	Export value (services)	BIEM	\$ /capita	0.5	2,004.2	$\overline{}$	1,964.9	1
Government revenue to expenditure ratio	Census	ratio	1.0	1.2		1.0	2	5	Labor productivity	BLS	\$ per hour	1.5	57.5	~	66.9	5
Statewide state budget balance	Pew	\$ /capita	1.0	27.1	~~	223.7	9	8								
Statewide state pension funding	FR	percent	1.0	42.4	M	40.7	8	10								
Debt-to-GDP ratio	Census	percent	1.0	4.5		3.9	3	3								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202
Dynamism (1st)			20%	60.8	V Identity Identity	67.8	2		Labor Force Engagement (1st)			30%	57.8	10-yr trend	80.4	2
Startup concentration	Kauffman	number /1,000 businesses	0.5	115.9	1	92.3	1	1	Unemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	6.2	5	2.9	3
Startup early job creation	Kauffman	number /1,000 population	1.0	7.1	L-	6.5	1	1	Youth unemployment	Census	percent	1.0	12.7	~	7.0	3
Startup early survival rate	Kauffman	percent	0.5	77.9	VW	81.1	7	2	Employee Engagement	Gallup	percent	0.5	27.0	N	33.0	7
Opportunity-driven startups	Kauffman	percent	1.0	75.0	1	82.9	7	6	Statewide underemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	5.6		3.1	6
Rate of new entrepreneurs	Kauffman	number /100,000 population	1.5	370.0	1	390.0	7	6	Labor force participation	Census	percent	1.5	76.5	-	73.0	1
Patent applications	USPTO	number /1,000	1.0	529.7	1	568.9	1	1								
					V											
							<u> </u>									

Douglas, Colorado: Living Conditions (1st decile*)

/	\sim
Е	-1
L	

Activation (st) 25% 86.1 88.5 1 1 1 2 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2			1						I						tor contains	imputed value.
Commercing Com		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Second column	Material Resources (1st)			25%	86.1	/	88.5	1 1	Nutrition (1st)			15%	66.7		82.6	1
Separate	Low income	Census	percentage	1.0	6.8		5.4	1 1	Food security	FA	percentage	1.0	90.1	~	92.7	1
Variety Services (6th) Survey Sur	Poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	4.0	/	3.5	1 1	Statewide borderline food security	USDA	percentage	1.0	94.8	~	96.4	4
Value Services S	Deep poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	2.1		1.7	1 1	Fruit consumption	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	64.8		67.3	2
Vater Services (6th) Source 1564 56.4 51.9 5 6 Shelter (5th) Iteration and safe water water water finding water violations Orall Source 10 10 99.8 97.7 1 1 1 1 Households with overcovering 4.00 percentage 10 0.5 1.0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Liquid asset poverty	Pros Now	percentage	1.0	16.3		16.3	1 1	Vegetable consumption	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	80.6	/\	81.4	2
National Composition 15% 56.4 51.9 5 6 5 5 6 5 5 6 5 5	Statewide high risk loans	Talk Pov	percentage	1.0	7.8	1	6.8	4 3								
National Composition 15% 56.4 51.9 5 6 5 5 6 5 5 6 5 5						and the second										
National Composition 15% 56.4 51.9 5 6 5 5 6 5 5 6 5 5																
National Composition 15% 56.4 51.9 5 6 5 5 6 5 5 6 5 5																
National Composition 15% 56.4 51.9 5 6 5 5 6 5 5 6 5 5																
National Composition 15% 56.4 51.9 5 6 5 5 6 5 5 6 5 5																
Source Callup percentage 0.5 96.8 95.3 1 4 Homelessness Hub Interfect 10.000 0.5 32.5 18.4 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 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
Four interest Color Colo	Water Services (6th)			15%	56.4	$ \sim 1 $	51.9	5 6	Shelter (5th)			15%	60.4	M	60.9	3 5
Decision	Statewide clean and safe water	Gallup	percentage	0.5	96.8	1	95.3	1 4	Homelessness	HUD	number / 10,000 population	0.5	32.5	M	18.4	10 10
Availability of affordable housing Use to broadband Foc percentage 1.0 94.2 98.2 1 2 Fatalities from unintentional injuries Considerable housing Use to source Use to broadband Foc percentage 1.0 86.8 89.6 1 1 Traffic deaths CDC 10000000 10 8.1 \(\) 5.8 1	Public drinking water violations	CHR		1.0	1.0	Λ	1.0	5 6	Unsheltered homeless rate	HUD	percentage	0.5	19.4	~~	16.4	3
Availability of affordable housing Unit Unit Value 2020 2010 2020 Connectedness (1st) Source Unit Unit 2010 Value 2020 2010 2020 Toyr trend 2020 2010 2020 Protection from Harm (4th) Foc percentage 15 942 98.2 1 2 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths / 100,000 population Questolds with a smartphone Cersus percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 Traffic deaths CDC 100,0000 10 8.1 Value 2020 2010 2020 Toyr trend 2020 2010 2020 Protection from Harm (4th) Tayline 2020 2010 2020 Protection from Harm (4th) Tayline 2020 2010 2020 Toyr trend 2020 2020 Toyr trend 2020 2010 2020 Toyr trend 2020 Toyr trend 2020 2	Complete kitchen and plumbing facilities	HUD	percentage	1.0	99.8	7	99.7	1 1	Households with overcrowding	HUD	percentage	1.0	0.5	-	1.0	1 :
Source Unit Unit 2010 Volue 2020 2010 2020						_			Availability of affordable housing	UI	low income	1.0	19.4		12.7	3
Connectedness (1st) 15% 93.5 98.5 1 1 1 Protection from Harm (4th) 15% 81.8 67.4 1 0.000 population 15% 94.2 98.2 1 2 Fatalities from unintentional injuries Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths											tenants			L		
Connectedness (1st) 15% 93.5 98.5 1 1 1 Protection from Harm (4th) 15% 81.8 67.4 1 0.000 population 15% 94.2 98.2 1 2 Fatalities from unintentional injuries Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths																
Connectedness (1st) 15% 93.5 98.5 1 1 1 Protection from Harm (4th) 15% 81.8 67.4 1 0.000 population 15% 94.2 98.2 1 2 Fatalities from unintentional injuries Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths																
Connectedness (1st) 15% 93.5 98.5 1 1 1 Protection from Harm (4th) 15% 81.8 67.4 1 0.000 population 15% 94.2 98.2 1 2 Fatalities from unintentional injuries Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths																
Connectedness (1st) 15% 93.5 98.5 1 1 1 Protection from Harm (4th) 15% 81.8 67.4 1 0.000 population 15% 94.2 98.2 1 2 Fatalities from unintentional injuries Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths																
Connectedness (1st) 15% 93.5 98.5 1 1 1 Protection from Harm (4th) 15% 81.8 67.4 1 0.000 population 15% 94.2 98.2 1 2 Fatalities from unintentional injuries Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths Council percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 1 Traffic deaths																
Connectedness (1st) 15% 93.5 98.5 1 1 1 Protection from Harm (4th) 15% 81.8 67.4 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
ccess to broadband FCC percentage 15 94.2 98.2 1 2 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths/100,000 population 10 14.5 26.5 2 ouseholds with a smartphone Census percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 Traffic deaths CDC 100,000 10 8.1 \ \ 5.8 1	Connectedness (1st)			15%		10-yr trend			Protection from Harm (4th)				1	10-yr trend		
Coccess to broadband Feet patronnage 15 94.2 96.2 1 2 Feat antities from unimentional injuries CDC population 10 14.3 20.3 2 ouseholds with a smartphone Census percentage 10 86.8 89.6 1 1 Traffic deaths CDC 100,0000 10 8.1 \leftcommodels 5.8 1	` '					J.					deaths / 100 000			~		
ouseholds with a smartphone Census percentage 1.0 86.8 / 89.6 1 1 Traffic deaths CDC 100,000 1.0 8.1 // 5.8 1		FCC	percentage	1.5					Fatalities from unintentional injuries	CDC	population	1.0				
	Households with a smartphone	Census	percentage	1.0	86.8		89.6	1 1	Traffic deaths	CDC	100,000	1.0	8.1	N	5.8	1



		i												tor contain:	s imputed value:
	Source				Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020	Daniel de la faction de la fac	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Behavioral Risk Factors (3rd)			15%	70.3	7	64.6	1 :	Preventative Interventions (1st)			15%	46.7	/	62.4	5
Obesity	CDC	percentage	1.0	15.9	~	19.1	1	Adult dentist visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	66.1		68.9	3
Smoking	CHR	percentage	1.5	8.3	M	10.7	1	Adult doctor visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	62.3	$-$ \	61.4	8 10
Alcohol use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	7.3		7.3	10 1	Colorectal cancer screening	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	68.8		69.3	3
Illicit drug use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	3.2		3.2	10 1	Statewide child medical visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	88.2	1	84.9	3
Pain reliever misuse	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	5.0		5.0	9	Statewide HPV immunizations	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	48.0		62.5	2
								Pap smear test	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	84.3		82.3	4
								Statewide child immunization	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	46.9		71.0	3
								Statewide child dentist visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	82.7	1	86.9	4 :
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020
Care Systems (2nd)			15%	64.6		66.5	2	Mental Health (6th)			15%	70.4	M	61.7	3 6
Statewide child mental health access	NSCH	percentage	1.0	37.2		37.2	3	Suicide	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	1.0	13.9	W	17.3	7
Adults with no health care coverage	CHR	percentage	0.5	7.7		3.8	1	Drug overdose deaths	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	9.6	$\sim V$	7.8	6
Avoided medical care due to cost	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	14.7		12.9	3	Serious mental illness	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	1.0	3.8		4.1	1 !
Hospital rating	HCA	percentage	0.5	76.5	-1	72.7	4	Statewide disability weighted prevalence from mental illness	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	1.0	2,228.9		2,230.3	9
Preventable hospitalizations for medicare enrolees	CHR	discharges / 100,000	1.0	2,721.0		3,171.0	2	2 Self-reported mental health not good	CHR	percentage	1.0	7.4		9.2	1
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
Physical Health (1st)			20%	2010 84.0	10-yr trend	84.3	2010 2020	Longevity (1st)			20%	2010 83.7	10-yr trend	2020 87.7	2010 2020
High blood pressure	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	25.0	$\neg I$	24.4	1	Under 5 death rate	CDC	deaths / 100,000 under 5	1.0	138.3	4	138.3	4
Diabetes	CDC	percentage	1.0	4.3	1/-	4.6	1	5-14 death rate	CDC	population deaths / 100,000 5-14 population	0.5	11.8		11.8	1 2
Heart attack	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	2.8	-Mr	2.6	1	1 15-64 death rate	CDC	deaths / 100,000	2.0	125.8	1/1	125.8	1
Statewide disability weighted prevalence of	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	0.5	334.2	/ V	343.2	2	2 Maternal mortality	IMHE	15-64 population deaths / 100,000 population	0.5		4444	0.1	1
infectious diseases Self-reported poor physical health	CHR	percentage	1.0	6.7		7.4	1	Mortality risk 65-85	IMHE	percentage	1.0	45.1		38.8	1
								-					-		
															<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.

	\
	1
	٥

Douglas, Colorado: Education ((1st decil	e*)													
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Italics: Indica Value		Decile
Pre-Primary Education (3rd)			5%	69.5	10-yr trend	63.0	2010 2020	Primary Education (1st)			20%	2010 82.9	10-yr trend	²⁰²⁰ 79.7	2010 2
Pre-primary enrollment	Census	percentage	2.0	63.3		60.2		Math grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	5.8		5.4	1
Statewide state pre-K quality	NIEER	Overall Prosperity,	1.0	6.0		5.0		Statewide science grade 4 score	NAEP	scale score,	1.5	154.5		154.5	2
Statewide state pre-K quality	INIEER	0-10	1.0	0.0	<u></u>	3.0	3 0			0-300					
								English, language and arts grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	5.8	1	5.6	1
								Primary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	96.8	~ (~	97.1	4
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr t <u>r</u> end	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2
Secondary Education (1st)			25%	81.3	M	84.4	1 1	Tertiary Education (1st)			25%	58.1	M	57.6	1
Math grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	10.3		9.9	1 1	College enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	35.5	1	37.6	3
Statewide science grade 8 score	NAEP	scale score, 0-500	1.0	155.7		160.6	2 1	Statewide college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	53.4	7	52.6	3
English, language and arts grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	9.5		9.4	1 1	Statewide university quality for enrolled students	QS Rank	Legatum Institute score	1.0	0.3	1	0.4	3
High school graduation rate	CHR	percentage	1.0	84.0		90.8	6 5	Community college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	84.2	$\neg \lor$	75.0	1
Secondary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	97.2	7	98.1	4 4								
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile								
Adult Skills (1st)	Source		25%	2010 96.4	10-yr trend	²⁰²⁰ 97.5	2010 2020								
Adult Skills (15t) Adult population with at least a high school					<u>سر</u>										
diploma	Census	percentage	1.0	97.6	~_/	98.0	1 1								
Adult population with bachelor's degree or higher	Census	percentage	1.0	54.4		57.9	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
_		

Douglas, Colorado: Natural Envir	Onnen	it (1st decile)												
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile	T	Source	Unit	Weight	ļ	Italics: Indica Value	tor contain	s imputed values Decile
E	Source			2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 2020	For a count to Alla Dellottan (4.4)		Cilit		2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 2020
Emissions (1st)			25%	74.5	$\neg \bot$	75.5	1 1	Exposure to Air Pollution (1st)			25%	80.0	-/_	84.2	1 1
Toxic air releases	EPA	index, 0-1	2.0	1.0		1.0	5 5	Life expectancy loss from air pollution	JBEN	years	2.0	0.0		0.0	1 1
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	6.1	_/	4.9	1 2
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		0.8	1 1								
PM2.5 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.9	-	0.9	1 1								
Sulfur dioxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	1 1								
Ozone emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.8		0.8	1 1								
Lead emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	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
Forest, Land and Soil (3rd)			20%	46.6	~~	54.1	4 3	Freshwater (1st)			20%	89.2	~	89.3	1 1
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	82.1		82.1	1 1
Statewide rural parks and wildlife areas	USDA	percentage	1.0	7.5		9.3	2 2	Statewide good quality lakes, resevoirs and ponds	EPA	percentage	0.5	61.4		61.4	2 2
Statewide compliant underground storage tanks facilities	EPA	percentage	1.0	69.0	M	75.0	7 4	Total freshwater withdrawals per capita	USGS	million gallons / 1,000 population	1.0	0.2	$\neg \int$	0.2	2 3
Statewide exposure to pesticides	CDC	number / 100,000 population	1.0	35.4		19.8	2 1	Toxic water releases	EPA	lb / square mile	1.0	0.0		0.0	1 1
Tree canopy cover	NLCD	percentage	1.0	16.4		16.1	6 6								
Wetlands and deepwater habitats	USFWS	percentage	1.0	2.7		2.7	8 8								
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value	2020	Decile		<u> </u>						
Preservation Efforts (1st)			10%	36.8	10-yr trend	36.8	2010 2020								
Statewide GAP 1 protected areas	USGS	percentage	2.0	5.9		5.9	1 1								
Statewide GAP 2 protected areas	USGS	percentage	1.5	3.8		3.8	2 2								
Statewide GAP 3 protected areas	USGS	percentage	1.0	31.7		31.7	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