
## Leon, Texas: Overall Prosperity 50.0 (7th decile\*)







Breakdown of performance	2010	Score 10-year trend	2020	Decile (1 to 10) 2020	10-year decile change	Rank - Texas (1 to 254) 2020
Overall Prosperity	46.8	~~	50.0	7		166
Inclusive Societies	54.1	<b>√</b> ~	52.7	5		80
Safety and Security	74.0	<b>-</b>	77.1	3	<b>1</b>	72
Personal Freedom	40.3		41.9	7		139
Governance	57.3		50.5	4	<b>▼</b> 1	1
స్టోన్లి Social Capital	44.9	<b>/</b>	41.2	7	<b>-</b> -	174
Open Economies	41.5		46.8	7	<b>1</b>	204
Business Environment	48.2	<b></b> ✓    ✓    ✓    ✓    ✓    ✓    ✓	51.1	2	<b>A</b> 3	61
Market Access and Infrastructure	28.4		30.6	9	<b>1</b>	212
Economic Quality	47.8		58.5	6	<b>▼</b> 1	219
Empowered People	44.9	~~ <u> </u>	50.5	8		142
Living Conditions	47.2	$\mathcal{N}$	58.5	7		90
Ç Health	48.1	M	46.8	8	<b>▼</b> 1	194
	38.9	بمهمر	48.6	6	<b>^</b> 2	104
Natural Environment	45.5		47.9	9	<b>-</b> -	219

Leon, Texas (7th decile*)						
	Overall Prosperity 2010 10-yr trend	Decile 2020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020	<i>∞</i>	Overall Prosperity 2010 10-yr trend 2020	Decile Texas Rank 2020 10-yr dec. change 2020
Safety and Security	74.0	77.1 3 • 1	72	Personal Freedom	40.3 41.9	7 - 139
Terror-related Crime 15%	100.0	00.0 1 = -	1	Agency 30%	56.6 64.5	5 = - 1
Violent Crime 50%	65.4	78.1 3 📤 2	59	Freedom of Association and Speech 15%	39.6 39.7	6 = - 1
Property Crime 35%	75.3	56.0 5 2	114	Absence of Legal Discrimination 25%	13.0	6 = - 1
				Social Tolerance 30%	47.1 44.1	9 - 142
	Overall Prosperity	Decile	Texas Rank	- 0 -	Overall Prosperity	Decile Texas Rank
Governance	~	0.5 4 To-yr dec. change	2020 1	Social Capital	2010 10-yr trend 2020 44.9 41.2	2020 10-yr dec. change 2020 7 = 174
Political Accountability 30%	~ <b>v</b>	52.4 7 $\checkmark$ 4	1	Personal and Family Relationships 25%	56.4 58.9	6 = - 165
Rule of Law 35%		52.0 3 🔺 1	1	Social Networks 25%	46.0 34.2	5 🔺 1 27
Government Integrity 35%	~~1	47.4	1	Institutional Trust 20%	60.8 57.6	5 🔻 1 39
	<b>~</b>			Civic and Social Participation 30%	23.9 21.3	9 🔻 1 176
		Decile 2020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020	Market Access and	Overall Prosperity 2010 10-yr trend 2020	Decile Texas Rank 2020 10-yr dec. change 2020
Business Environment	48.2	51.1 2 🔺 3	61	Market Access and Infrastructure	28.4 30.6	9 🔺 1 212
Financing Ecosystems 40%	36.7	45.2 3 📤 2	61	Communications 40%	6.9 6.9	9 - 213
Domestic Market Contestability 30%	49.3	51.6 3 🔺 4	1	Resources 25%	47.3 56.3	5 🔺 3 134
Burden of Regulation 10%	~~	43.2 3 • 2	1	Transport 35%	41.0 41.0	7 = - 142
Labor Market Flexibility 10%	<b>1</b>	74.1 1 • 2	1			
Price Distortions 10%	71.3	6 🔻 3	1			
•	Overall Prosperity 2010 10-yr trend	Decile 2020 2020 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020			
Economic Quality		8.5 6 <b>▼</b> 1	219			
Fiscal Sustainability 25%	54.4	55.3 6 🔻 1	231			
Productivity and Competitiveness 25%	56.3	75.2 3	117			
Dynamism 20%	43.5	53.5 4 🔺 4	131			
Labor Force Engagement 30%	37.9	50.6 9 🔻 2	223			
	Overall Prosperity	Decile	Texas Rank		Charall Provide	Decile Texas Rank
Living Conditions	2010 10-yr trend	2020 Decire 10-yr dec. change 8.5 7 = -	2020 90	Health	2010 Overall Prosperity 2020 10-yr trend 2020 48.1 46.8	2020 10-yr dec. change 2020
	~			V		
Material Resources 25%  Nutrition 15%	——/ <sub>/*</sub>	57.2 6 <b>A</b> 1	121 215	Behavioral Risk Factors 15%  Preventative Interventions 15%	57.1 61.0	8 = - 48
Water Services 15%	× /	32.5 4 1	43	Care Systems 15%	30.8 28.6	9 1 127
Shelter 15%	~/	56.2 6 = -	92	Mental Health 15%	68.7 63.1	5 1 196
Connectedness 15%	- V	52.9 8 = -	176	Physical Health 20%	48.3 38.6	9 🔻 3 223
Protection from Harm 15%	53.1	6 = -	81	Longevity 20%	55.6 57.4	7 = - 149
	*				•	
	Overall Prosperity 2010 10-yr trend	Decile 10-yr dec. change	Texas Rank 2020	Ø	Overall Prosperity 2010 10-yr trend 2020	Decile Texas Rank 2020 10-yr dec. change 2020
Education	38.9	8.6 6 • 2	104	Natural Environment	45.5 47.9	9 = - 219
Pre-Primary Education 5%	12.9	6 📤 4	64	Emissions 25%	52.5 54.9	8 - 195
Primary Education 20%	44.2	57.8 5 🔺 3	90	Exposure to Air Pollution 25%	31.4 39.1	9 - 199
Secondary Education 25%		55.6 4 🔺 1	115	Forest, Land and Soil 20%	46.2 45.9	6 2 133
Tertiary Education 25%	~~	33.6 7 🔺 1	125	Freshwater 20%	74.0 73.9	5 - 174
Adult Skills 25%	31.0	7 📤 1	130	Preservation Efforts 10%	4.7 4.7	6 = - 1
* The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for	each pillar, element and indicator, Countie	in the 1st decile are the strongest performer	s and those in the 10th de	cile are the weakest.		

													$\top$
	Source	Unit	Weight		10-yr trend	2020	2010			Source	Unit	Weight	20
error-related Crime (1st)			15%	100.0		100.0	1	1	Violent Crime (3rd)			50%	6
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	(
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	4
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	11
Terrorism injuries	GTD	injuries /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	1	Robbery	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	2
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 (5th)			35%	75.3	1	66.0	3	5					
	NACJD	incidents /100,000	1.5	363.7		540.6	3	7					
Burglary					<i>V</i> \_								
	NACJD	population incidents /100,000	0.5	88.0	<b>√</b> √	94.3	5	5					
Burglary  Motor vehicle theft  Larceny theft	NACJD NACJD	population incidents	0.5 1.0	88.0 322.7		94.3	5	5					
Motor vehicle theft		population incidents /100,000 population incidents /100,000			\\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\			5 1 3					
Motor vehicle theft  Larceny theft	NACJD	population incidents /100,000 population incidents /100,000 population reports/100,000	1.0	322.7	\\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\	804.6	1	5 1					
Motor vehicle theft Larceny theft	NACJD	population incidents /100,000 population incidents /100,000 population reports/100,000	1.0	322.7	\\ \_	804.6	1	5					
Motor vehicle theft Larceny theft	NACJD	population incidents /100,000 population incidents /100,000 population reports/100,000	1.0	322.7	\\ \_\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	804.6	1	5 1					
Motor vehicle theft Larceny theft	NACJD	population incidents /100,000 population incidents /100,000 population reports/100,000	1.0	322.7	\	804.6	1	5					
Motor vehicle theft Larceny theft	NACJD	population incidents /100,000 population incidents /100,000 population reports/100,000	1.0	322.7	\	804.6	1	5					

	,
· ·	

Leon, Texas: Personal Freedom	(7tiruet	110 )														· ·	)
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	cile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	tor contain	Decile	
Agency (5th)			30%	56.6	Joyl Tell	64.5	5	5	Freedom of Association and Speech (6th)			15%	39.6		39.7	6	6
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	0.0		0.0	2	2
Statewide death row population	NAACP	number /100,000 population	1.0	1.4		0.8	6	6	Statewide right-to-work	NCSL	coding, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	1	1
Statewide adult incarceration	BJS	number /100,000 adult population	1.0	1,130.0		1,050.0	5	5	Statewide press suppression	USPFT	number /100,000 state population	0.5	0.0	Á	0.0	6	3
Statewide youth incarceration	CJRP	prisoners /100,000 youth population	0.5	108.2		51.4	5	4	Statewide invasive cell phone surveillance	ACLU	coding, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	6	6
Statewide trafficking	POL	reports /100,000 population	1.0	7.3		7.3	5	5									
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Dec	cile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile	
Absence of Legal Discrimination (6th)			25%	13.0	10-yr trend	13.7	2010	6	Social Tolerance (9th)			30%	<sup>2010</sup> 47.1	10-yr trend	44.1	9	9
Statewide religious freedom restoration act enacted	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.5		0.5	1	1	Hate group concentration	SPLC	number /100,000 population	1.0	25.9	1	66.2	8	8
Statewide employment anti-discrimination law	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.0		0.0	5	5	Ethnic slur google traffic	Google	index, 0-100	1.0	33.2		33.2	8	8
Statewide government discrimination based on sex prohibited	Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.0		0.0	4	4	Statewide same sex marriage support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	48.0		55.0	4	5
Statewide affirmative action in public services banned	Cato	coding, 0-2	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	2	Statewide LGBT non-discrimination law support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	67.0	$\overline{}$	66.0	4	5
Statewide LGBT relationships & parenthood recognition	MAP	coding, 0-9	0.5	1.5		2.0	4	6	1								
Statewide LGBT non-discrimination laws	MAP	coding, 0-11	0.5	0.0		0.0	5	5									

<sup>\*</sup> The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.

1	T	П

52.0

		I		İ	I	Value		Dec	llo.	I	!		į .	lt.
Statewide Bectons Performance Index MIT Downall processors Statewide gender balance in legislatures CAMP percentage 0.5 23.8 23.2 3 7 Statewide judicial integrity ATIB Coding 0.1 0.5 0.5 0.5  Statewide term limits  NCSL coding 0.3 0.5 0.0 0.0 4 4  Statewide legisl corruption perceptions KS 33.5 Statewide legisl corruption perceptions KS 34.5 Statewide legisl corruption perceptions KS 35.5 Statewide legislature KS 35.5 Statewide legislature KS 35.5 Statewide legislature KS 35.5 Statewide legislature KS 35.		Source	Unit	Weight	2010		2020				Source	Unit	Weight	2010 10
Statewide Electrors Performance Index	Political Accountability (7th)			30%	53.2	V	52.4	3	7	Rule of Law (3rd)			35%	65.0
Statewide state campaign disclosure	Statewide Elections Performance Index	MIT	Prosperity,	1.5	0.6	$\sim $	0.7	4	5	Statewide Justice Index	NCAJ	index rank 1-51	1.5	16.0
Statewide term limits    No.St.   Coding.   O.5   O.0   O.0   4   4	Statewide gender balance in legislatures	CAWP	percentage	0.5	23.8	45	23.2	3	7	Statewide judicial integrity	ATRF	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.5
Source	Statewide state campaign disclosure	NIMP		1.0	1.0		0.8	1	7					
Government Integrity (5th)  35% 53.2 47.4 3 5  Statewide legal corruption perceptions  ICS expert survey. 3.15 10 9.0 11.5 3 6  Statewide illegal corruption perceptions  ICS expert survey. 10 8.0 7.0 5 3  Statewide Corruption Reflection Index ICS Overall Prosperity. 0.5 0.4 0.2 7 2  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank 1.50 10 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank 1.50 10 41.4 41.4 4 4  Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index USPIRG Prosperity, 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2	Statewide term limits	NCSL		0.5	0.0		0.0	4	4					
Government Integrity (5th)  35% 53.2 47.4 3 5  Statewide legal corruption perceptions ICS expert survey. 3.15 10 9.0 11.5 3 6  Statewide illegal corruption perceptions ICS expert survey. 10 8.0 7.0 5 3  Statewide Corruption Reflection Index ICS Overall Prosperity. 0.5 0.4 0.2 7 2  Statewide State Integrity Investigation CPI Index rank 1.50 10 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide State Integrity Investigation CPI Index rank 1.50 10 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide public record request compliance Cullier percentage 10 41.4 41.4 4 4  Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index USPIRS Prosperity, 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2														
Government Integrity (5th)  35% 53.2 47.4 3 5  Statewide legal corruption perceptions ICS expert survey. 3-15 10 9.0 11.5 3 6  Statewide illegal corruption perceptions ICS expert survey. 3-15 10 8.0 7.0 5 3  Statewide Corruption Reflection Index ICS Overall Prosperty. 90 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10														
Government Integrity (5th)  35% 53.2 47.4 3 5  Statewide legal corruption perceptions  ICS expert survey. 3.15 10 9.0 11.5 3 6  Statewide illegal corruption perceptions  ICS expert survey. 10 8.0 7.0 5 3  Statewide Corruption Reflection Index ICS Overall Prosperity. 0.5 0.4 0.2 7 2  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank 1.50 10 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank 1.50 10 41.4 41.4 4 4  Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index USPIRG Prosperity, 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2														
Government Integrity (5th)  35% 53.2 47.4 3 5  Statewide legal corruption perceptions ICS expert survey. 3.15 10 9.0 11.5 3 6  Statewide illegal corruption perceptions ICS expert survey. 10 8.0 7.0 5 3  Statewide Corruption Reflection Index ICS Overall Prosperity. 0.5 0.4 0.2 7 2  Statewide State Integrity Investigation CPI Index rank 1.50 10 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide State Integrity Investigation CPI Index rank 1.50 10 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide public record request compliance Cullier percentage 10 41.4 41.4 4 4  Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index USPIRS Prosperity, 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2														
Government Integrity (5th)  35% 53.2 47.4 3 5  Statewide legal corruption perceptions  ICS expert survey. 3.15 10 9.0 11.5 3 6  Statewide illegal corruption perceptions  ICS expert survey. 10 8.0 7.0 5 3  Statewide Corruption Reflection Index ICS Overall Prosperity. 0.5 0.4 0.2 7 2  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank 1.50 10 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank 1.50 10 41.4 41.4 4 4  Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index USPIRG Prosperity, 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2														
Government Integrity (5th)  35% 53.2 47.4 3 5  Statewide legal corruption perceptions  ICS expert survey. 3.15 10 9.0 11.5 3 6  Statewide illegal corruption perceptions  ICS expert survey. 10 8.0 7.0 5 3  Statewide Corruption Reflection Index  ICS Overall Prosperity. 0.5 0.4 0.2 7 2  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank. 10 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank. 10 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide public record request compliance  Cuillier percentage  10 41.4 41.4 4 4  Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index. USPRIG Prosperity. 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2						Valuo		Doo	lle.					
Statewide legal corruption perceptions ICS expert survey. 3-15  Statewide lilegal corruption perceptions ICS expert survey. 3-15  1.0 9.0 11.5 3 6  Statewide Corruption perceptions ICS expert survey. 3-15  Statewide Corruption Reflection Index ICS Propertly. 0.5 0.4 0.2 7 2  Statewide State Integrity Investigation CPI Index rank, 1-9 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide public record request compliance Cullier percentage 1.0 41.4 41.4 4 4  Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index. USPIRG Propertly. 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2		Source			1			2010						
Statewide lilegal corruption perceptions  ICS superf survey. 10 8.0 7.0 5 3  Statewide Corruption Reflection Index ICS Overall Prosperty. 0.5 0.4 0.2 7 2  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank 1.50 1.0 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide public record request compliance Cullier percentage 10 41.4 41.4 4 4  Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index USPIRG Prosperty, 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2	Government Integrity (5th)			35%	53.2	بالم	47.4	3	5					
Statewide Corruption Reflection Index  ICS  Overall Prosperity. 0-1  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank. 1-50  1-50	Statewide legal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	9.0	\ <u></u>	11.5	3	6					
Statewide Corruption Reflection Index  ICS Prosperity, 0.5 0.4 V 0.2 7 2  Statewide State Integrity Investigation  CPI Index rank, 1.0 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide public record request compliance  Cuillier percentage 1.0 41.4 4.4 4  Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index USPRIG Prosperity, 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2	Statewide illegal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	8.0		7.0	5	3					
Statewide State Integrity Investigation CPI Index rank, 1.50 1.0 27.0 39.0 2 7  Statewide public record request compliance Cullier percentage 1.0 41.4 4.4 4  Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index USPIRG Prosperity, 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2	Statewide Corruption Reflection Index	ICS	Prosperity,	0.5	0.4	V	0.2	7	2					
Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index USPIRG Prosperity, 0.5 91.0 82.0 1 2	Statewide State Integrity Investigation	CPI	index rank,	1.0	27.0		39.0	2	7					
Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index USPIRG Prosperity, 0.5 91.0 \ 82.0 1 2	Statewide public record request compliance	Cuillier	percentage	1.0	41.4		41.4	4	4					
	Statewide Online Spending Transparency Index	USPIRG	Prosperity,	0.5	91.0	-1	82.0	1	2					
						-								

	þ
$\zeta\zeta$	

														Italics: Indica	tor contair	is imputed	values
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010	ile 2020
Personal and Family Relationships (6th)			25%	56.4	~^	58.9	6	6	Social Networks (5th)			25%	46.0	$\mathcal{N}$	34.2	6	5
Statewide divorce	CDC	instances, /1,000 population	1.0	3.3	^	2.6	3	4	Favors between neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	47.9	M	27.9	1	6
Children in unmarried households	Census	percentage	1.0	32.2	\ <u>\</u>	33.5	8	7	Frequently talk with neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	68.1	$\Lambda \overline{}$	50.1	5	
Teen births	CDC	instances /1,000 female 15-19 population	1.0	68.5		36.1	8	8	Trust in people in neighborhood		percentage		55.7		55.8	6	4
Statewide parent's attendance of children's activities	NSCH	percentage	0.5	90.2		83.0	6	7	Statewide supportive neighborhood for a child	NSCH	percentage	1.0	46.8		54.5	7	3
Shared meals with household members	CPS	percentage		93.8		91.6	3		Statewide trust in people	ANES	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.5		0.5	7	7
Frequently hear from family and friends	CPS	percentage	1.0	83.0		78.6	3	8									
Close friends	CPS	average		7.3		7.3	1	7									
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010	ile 2020
Institutional Trust (5th)			20%	60.8		57.6	4	5	Civic and Social Participation (9th)			30%	23.9		21.3	8	9
Confidence in corporations	CPS	percentage		57.7		63.5	6	5	Statewide volunteer rate	CNCS	instances, /1,000 population	1.0	0.3	M	0.2	4	
Confidence in the media	CPS	percentage	1.0	62.1		52.6	3	6	Statewide volunteering intensity	CNCS	hours, per capita	1.0	32.2	$\sqrt{}$	26.3	6	
Statewide trust in federal government	ANES	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.4		0.4	1	1	Statewide active in neighborhood	CNCS	percentage	1.0	6.2	<u></u>	5.8	5	
									Statewide helping the community	CNCS	instances, /1,000	1.0	1.3	$\bigwedge$	1.6	7	
									(Non-religious) membership organizations	Census	number /1,000 population	1.0	0.1	\_	0.1	10	10
									Religious membership organizations	USRC	number /1,000 population	0.5	3.4		3.4	2	:
									Religious organization participation		percentage	0.5	19.6	$\sqrt{}$	19.6	6	£
									Sport or recreation organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	5.9	1	7.0	8	ć
									School, neighborhood or community association participation		percentage	0.5	13.3	V	15.2	6	

<sup>\*</sup> The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.

_	
т.	

														Italics: Indica	tor contain	
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2	2020				Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Deci 2010
nancing Ecosystems (3rd)			40%	36.7	WV	45.2	5	3	Domestic Market Contestability (3rd)			30%	49.3	المر	51.6	7
nture capital invested	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	20.3	MV	44.0	4	4	Statewide low-income licensed occupations	Inst Just	number	1.5	37.0		37.0	2
mber of venture capital deals	NVCA	number /1,000,000	1.0	3.7	_	6.6	4	3	Statewide occupational licensing training cost	Inst Just	S	1.0	253.0		253.0	5
sets under management	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	89.4		60.0	4	3	Statewide occupational licensing training time	Inst Just	days	1.0	341.0	—	341.0	4
nture capital fundraising	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	0.1	W	11.1	5	3	Statewide age requirements for license	Inst Just	years	1.0	10.0		10.0	2
nk branch access	FDIC	number /square mile	1.5	0.0		0.0	8	7	Statewide regulation density index	Cato	Overall Prosperity	1.0	0.0		0.0	7
ew Foreign Direct Investment	BEA	\$ /capita	1.0	30,520.0		30,520.0	1	1								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2	2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10_yr trend	2020	Dec 2010
Burden of Regulation (3rd)			10%	44.0		43.2	5	3	Labor Market Flexibility (1st)			10%	72.6	<b>/</b> ~	74.1	3
atewide Federal Regulation and State Iterprise Index	QuantGov	Overall Prosperity	1.0	1.1		1.1	7	7	Statewide collective bargaining agreement coverage	FI	percent	1.0	6.7	~	5.7	2
atewide state regulation	QuantGov	percent	1.0	1.5		1.5	3	3	Statewide employee health insurance cost	НЈК	s	0.5	4,251.0		5,176.0	5
									Workers Compensation Premium Rate	State OR	\$ per \$100	0.5	2.4		0.7	5
									Statewide minimum wage	DOL	s	1.0	7.3		7.3	1
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile									
Price Distortions (6th)	Source		10%	2010 71.3	10-yr trend	58.1	2010 2	6								
					1 ^			0								
atewide subsidies to the private sector	BEA	percent Overall	1.0	0.1	W'	0.1	1	2								
atewide Corporate Tax Score	Tax Found	Prosperity	1.0	4.7	1	4.0	6	6								

<sup>\*</sup> The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest

	- (		^
	1	•	
	/		
			С
	`		~

8

3

47.3 56.3

0.0

97.3

	Source											Weigl
Communications (9th)			40%	2010 6.9	10-yr trend	6.9	<sup>2010</sup>		Resources (5th)			259
Mean download speed	BBN	Mbps	1.5	17.2		17.2	9	9	Customers affected by electricity outages	Mukherjee	number /10,000 population	0.5
Ultra-fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	0.0		0.0	8	8	Statewide net electricity generation	EIA	kWh /capita	1.0
Fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	42.2		42.2	9	9	Water usage	USGS	Mgal /capita	1.0
internet providers (Business)	FCC	number	0.5	9.0		9.0	8	8	Electricity outage duration	EIA	minutes	1.0
									Electricity outage frequency	EIA	per year	1.0
					Value							
Transport (7th)	Source		Weight 35%	2010 41.0	10-yr trend	<del>2020</del> 41.0	Dec 2010 7	2020 7				
Statewide number of airports	BTS	number /square mile	0.5	0.0		0.0	3	3				
Road condition	BTS	percent	1.5	10.5		10.5	4	4				
Statewide railroad length	AAR	miles /square mile	1.0	0.0		0.0	5	5				
Bus transit route mileage	BTS	miles /square mile	0.5	0.1		0.1	5	5				
Public road density	BTS	miles /square mile	1.0	1.1		1.1	1	7				
Bridge condition	BTS	percent	0.5	1.2		1.2	3	3				
Distance to airport	BTS	km	1.0	86.0		86.0	7	7				

<sup>\*</sup> The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.

(\$			
(3)		-	The second
(3)			٣.
		•	Ψ,
	- (		/

Leon, Texas. Economic Quanty	(	,												Italies: Indies	itor contain	s imputed value.
	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
Fiscal Sustainability (6th)			25%	54.4	<b>√</b>	55.3	5	6	Productivity and Competitiveness (3rd)			25%	56.3	سمم	75.2	3 3
Statewide government credit rating	Ballotpedia	rating	0.5	7.0		8.0	4	1	Export value (goods)	BIEM	\$ /capita	1.0	3,673.0		6,159.3	4
Statewide state reserves capacity	Pew	days	1.0	85.3	1	68.9	1	1	Export value (services)	BIEM	\$ /capita	0.5	644.9	_/\~	727.3	6
Government revenue to expenditure ratio	Census	ratio	1.0	0.8		0.8	10	10	Labor productivity	BLS	S per hour	1.5	62.7		71.1	2
Statewide state budget balance	Pew	\$ /capita	1.0	365.5	\\\\	368.8	1	2								
Statewide state pension funding	FR	percent	1.0	51.5	W_	51.1	3	3								
Debt-to-GDP ratio	Census	percent	1.0	4.5		3.3	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 <u>202</u> 0
Dynamism (4th)			20%	43.5	V	53.5	8	4	Labor Force Engagement (9th)			30%	37.9		50.6	7 9
Startup concentration	Kauffman	number/1,000 businesses	0.5	104.0	7	85.2	5	3	Unemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	7.0	VV	5.0	4
Startup early job creation	Kauffman	number /1,000 population	1.0	6.2	\~	5.7	4	5	Youth unemployment	Census	percent	1.0	14.8	~~~	19.7	4
Startup early survival rate	Kauffman	percent	0.5	78.2	1	79.2	3	6	Employee Engagement	Gallup	percent	0.5	34.0	$\neg \sqrt{}$	36.0	1
Opportunity-driven startups	Kauffman	percent	1.0	72.5		82.2	7	6	Statewide underemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	5.2		2.7	3
Rate of new entrepreneurs	Kauffman	number /100,000 population	1.5	423.5	1	475.6	2	1	Labor force participation	Census	percent	1.5	51.0		50.7	10
Patent applications	USPTO	number /1,000	1.0	0.0	$\wedge$	0.0	6	6								
	i	i	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			<u> </u>		1	<u> </u>	<u>i                                      </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			

<sup>\*</sup> The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.



Leon, Texas: Living Conditions	s (7th deci	ie^)												Italics: Indica	ator contain	s imputed v
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010
laterial Resources (6th)			25%	50.1		57.2	7	6	Nutrition (10th)			15%	36.0	M	44.9	8
w income	Census	percentage	1.0	29.2	_/\	30.1	6	7	Food security	FA	percentage	1.0	81.4	$\mathcal{M}$	82.0	8
overty	Census	percentage	1.0	17.1	$\sqrt{}$	16.6	6	7	Statewide borderline food security	USDA	percentage	1.0	93.6	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	94.6	7
leep poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	9.2		5.5	9	4	Fruit consumption	BRFSS	percentage		55.3	-	57.6	7
iquid asset poverty	Pros Now	percentage	1.0	37.0		37.0	4	4	Vegetable consumption	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	77.4		78.1	4
Statewide high risk loans	Talk Pov	percentage	1.0	11.4		9.3	7	7								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr_trend	2020	Decil 2010	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010
Water Services (4th)			15%	74.4		82.5	5	4	Shelter (6th)			15%	50.2	W	56.2	6
Statewide clean and safe water	Gallup	percentage	0.5	93.9	Y	93.1	7	7	Homelessness	HUD	number / 10,000 population	0.5	8.6	~~	3.5	3
ublic drinking water violations	CHR	Score, 0 or 1	1.0	0.0	\/	0.0	1	1	Unsheltered homeless rate	HUD	percentage	0.5	31.7	~~~	17.1	4
Complete kitchen and plumbing facilities	HUD	percentage	1.0	97.8	~	99.0	10	5	Households with overcrowding	HUD	percentage	1.0	3.4	7	3.2	8
					¢ujuř				Availability of affordable housing	UI	units / 100 very low income	1.0	5.0	-	8.0	8
											tenants					•
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decil	le		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
Connectedness (8th)			15%	<sup>2010</sup> 17.6	10-yr trend	52.9	2010	2020	Protection from Harm (6th)			15%	53.1	10-yr trend	58.1	2010
Access to broadband	FCC	percentage	1.5	0.0	·	55.8	8		Fatalities from unintentional injuries	CDC	deaths / 100,000		20.8	20/	17.9	6
Households with a smartphone	Census	percentage	1.0	66.2		68.1	4	6		CDC	population number / 100,000	1.0	22.1	1-	21.6	6
iouseriolus witir a smartpriorie	Cersus	percentage	1.0	00.2		00.1	4	O	Tranic deaths	CDC	population	1.0	22.1	√ V~	21.0	0
		1	1				1		I .	1	1	1	1			1

<sup>\*</sup> The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.

	_
(	- 7
÷	٦,
	_

															tor contain	s imputed value
					Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 202	20	Proventative Interventions	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Behavioral Risk Factors (4th)			15%	57.1	7	61.0	5	4	Preventative Interventions (8th)			15%	25.3	/ ~	31.7	8
Obesity	CDC	percentage	1.0	26.8	m	34.0	4	7	Adult dentist visits	BRFSS	percentage		56.4	\\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\	55.3	8
Smoking	CHR	percentage	1.5	21.2		15.7	8	6	Adult doctor visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	69.2		61.7	4
Alcohol use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	5.1		5.1	2	2	Colorectal cancer screening	BRFSS	percentage		56.6		54.3	8
Illicit drug use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	2.2		2.2	3	3	Statewide child medical visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	85.6	~_	75.1	6
Pain reliever misuse	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	4.5		4.5	7	7	Statewide HPV immunizations	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	32.9		43.5	7
									Pap smear test	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	74.1		72.5	7
									Statewide child immunization	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	40.7	M-	67.8	7
									Statewide child dentist visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	80.6	1	81.2	5
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202	20		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020
Care Systems (9th)			15%	30.8		28.6	8	9	Mental Health (5th)			15%	68.7	~	63.1	4
Statewide child mental health access	NSCH	percentage	1.0	62.0		62.0	7	7	Suicide	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population		12.4	1	16.4	4
Adults with no health care coverage	CHR	percentage	0.5	28.7	_/\	24.7	10	10	Drug overdose deaths	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	8.8	W	9.6	3
Avoided medical care due to cost	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	20.7	-1	23.7	8	8	Serious mental illness	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	1.0	4.5		3.9	7
Hospital rating	HCA	percentage	0.5	81.6		82.3	1	2	Statewide disability weighted prevalence from mental illness	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	1.0	2,106.4		2,114.7	4
Preventable hospitalizations for medicare enrolees	CHR	discharges / 100,000	1.0	4,503.0		5,009.0	6	7	Self-reported mental health not good	CHR	percentage	1.0	9.5		12.9	3
					•									•		
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile			Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
Physical Health (9th)			20%	<sup>2010</sup> 48.3	10-yr trend	38.6	6		Longevity (7th)			20%	<sup>2010</sup> 55.6	10-yr trend	<sup>2020</sup> 57.4	2010 2020 <b>7</b>
High blood pressure	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	33.2	/ / ر	34.8	6	7	Under 5 death rate	CDC	deaths / 100,000 under 5	1.0	149.9	1	138.4	4
Diabetes	CDC	percentage	1.0	8.3	7	16.6		10	5-14 death rate	CDC	population deaths / 100,000	0.5	12.8	IM	13.4	4
Heart attack	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	5.2	~/	3.7	7	5	15-64 death rate	CDC	5-14 population deaths / 100,000	2.0	374.0	V	374.1	7
Statewide disability weighted prevalence of	IMHE	years / 100,000	0.5	385.4		375.0	6	6	Maternal mortality	IMHE	15-64 population deaths / 100,000	0.5	0.4	7	0.4	6
infectious diseases		population					4		-		population					
Self-reported poor physical health	CHR	percentage	1.0	10.0	(	11.8	4	0	Mortality risk 65-85	IMHE	percentage	1.0	56.1	1	53.9	6

<sup>\*</sup> The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.

		i			Mahar		D							Italics: Indica	tor contain		
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 20	020		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decil 2010	
Pre-Primary Education (6th)			5%	12.9	~J	46.9	10	6	Primary Education (5th)			20%	44.2		57.8	8	5
Pre-primary enrollment	Census	percentage	2.0	21.1	~/	47.7	10	4	Math grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	3.1	_~	4.0	9	5
Statewide state pre-K quality	NIEER	Overall Prosperity, 0-10	1.0	2.0		4.0	7	7	Statewide science grade 4 score	NAEP	scale score, 0-300	1.5	147.6		154.7	5	2
									English, language and arts grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	3.5	-VV	3.7	6	6
									Primary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	94.7		96.1	8	6
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend			020		Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decil 2010	
Secondary Education (4th)			25%	56.2	<u></u>	65.6	5	4	Tertlary Education (7th)			25%	30.4	ما به کر	33.6	8	7
Math grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	7.6		8.1	6	5	College enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	19.1	~W	22.6	8	7
Statewide science grade 8 score	NAEP	scale score, 0-500	1.0	150.5		156.2	3	3	Statewide college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	48.6	<i></i>	53.0	4	3
English, language and arts grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	7.1	~/ \	7.3	7	7	Statewide university quality for enrolled students	QS Rank	Legatum Institute score	1.0	0.2	^	0.2	6	5
High school graduation rate	CHR	percentage	1.0	93.3	$-\sqrt{}$	96.8	2	2	Community college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	26.5		26.5	7	
Secondary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	96.3	~\\	98.5	6	3									
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile			<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>				
Adult Skills (7th)			25%	<sup>2010</sup> 31.0	10-yr trend	39.4	2010 20	7									
Adult population with at least a high school								,									
diploma  Adult population with bachelor's degree or	Census	percentage	1.0	78.7	~	82.4	7	-/									
higher	Census	percentage	1.0	12.6		16.4	9	7									
	1		1														

<sup>\*</sup> The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.

62
וצו
$\sim$

2020 2010 39.1 9 0.2 9 7.7 8
0.2 9
7.7 ε
D 2020 2010
73.9 5
57.7 2
56.4 3
0.6 5
4.3 9
_

<sup>\*</sup> The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for each pillar, element and indicator. Counties in the 1st decile are the strongest performers and those in the 10th decile are the weakest.





Association of American Railroads American Civil Liberties Union American National Election Studies ACLU ANES ATRF American Tort Reform Association Ballotpedia Ballotpedia BroadbandNow United States Bureau of Economic Analysis BBN BEA Brookings Institution Export Monitor United States Bureau of Justice Statistics United States Bureau of Labour Statistics BIFM Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System United States Bureau of Transportation Statistics Cato - Freedom in the 50 States BRESS BTS Cato CAWP Center for American Women and Politics Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - Diabetes Atlas Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Center for Disease Control (WONDER) CDC 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 CHR County Health Rankings Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement Corporation for National and Community Service, Volunteering & Civil Life in America CNCS CPI CPS Cuillier Center for Public Integrity
Current Population Survey, Civic Engagement Supplement Dave Cuillier United States Department of Labor OI United States Depart Intent of Labor.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, The National Survey on Drug Use and Health
United States Energy Information Administration
United States Environmental Protection Agency DUH Nat Srvy EPA Feeding America Federal Communications Commission Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation FA FCC FDIC Fraser Institute Federal Reserve FTC Federal Trade Commission, Consumer Sentinel Network Gallup Google Trends Gallup Google Global Terrorism Database
Gun Violence Archive
Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems GVA HCA Henry J Kaiser Family Foundation HJK United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Institute for Corruption Studies Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation HUD IMHE Institute for Justice
Bennett et al. 2019. "Particulate matter air pollution and national and county life expectancy loss in the USA: A spatiotemporal analysis".
Kauffman Foundation Inst Just JBEN Kauffman Movement Advancement Project
MIT Election and Data Science Lab coding of state policies
Mukherjee et al. MAP Mukherjee National Association for the Advancement of Colored People NAACE National Archive Of Criminal Justice Data National Assessment of Educational Progress NACJD VAEP NCAJ National Center for Access to Justice National Center for Education Statistics
National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases
National Conference of State Legislatures NCES NCSL National Institute for Early Education Research National Institute on Money in Politics National Land Cover Database NIFFR NIMP NLCD National Survey of Children's Health National Venture Capital Association Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development NSCH NVCA OECD Pew Research Center POL Pros Now PRRI Polaris Project Prosperity Now Scorecard Public Religion Research Institute QS World University Rankings QuantGov Stanford Education Data Archive QS Rank QuantGov SEDA Southern Poverty Law Center State of Oregon Talk Poverty SPLC State OR Talk Pov Tax Foundation Tax Found Urban Institute
United States Department of Agriculture USDA United States Fish and Wildlife Service USFWS USGS USPFT United States Geological Survey
United States Press Freedom Tracker
United States Public Interest Research Group USPIRG

United States Patent and Trademark Office United States Religious Census

USPTO USRC