
San Joaquin, California: Overall Prosperity 51.8 (6th decile*)







Breakdown of performance	2010	Score 10-year trend	2020	Decile (1 to 10) 2020	10-year decile change	Rank - California (1 to 58) 2020
Overall Prosperity	46.5		51.8	6	1	32
Inclusive Societies	46.5		51.0	6	4 3	46
Safety and Security	36.8	~~	40.6	10	— -	53
Personal Freedom	58.1		59.5	4	- -	16
	48.9		61.7	2	4	1
🚓 Social Capital	42.4	1	42.2	7	▲ 2	23
Open Economies	41.0		49.1	6	^ 3	25
Business Environment	37.2	~~	40.3	8	1	22
Market Access and Infrastructure	49.0	~	47.6	4	~ 1	17
Economic Quality	36.8		59.5	5	^ 5	33
Empowered People	51.9		55.4	5		39
Living Conditions	56.6	~~/	60.6	6	v 2	35
Health	56.4	~~~	61.5	3	1	33
	38.0	~	41.6	9		43
Natural Environment	56.5	_/_	58.0	3	▼ 1	42

^{*} 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.

San Joaquin, California (6th decile*)													
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	200	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Safety and Security	36.8	~~	40.6	10		53	Personal Freedom	58.1	_/	59.5	4	- -	16
Terror-related Crime 15%	69.9	~~	74.5	10		52	Agency 30%	58.5	_	63.5	8	▼ 3	1
Violent Crime 50%	35.7	√ <u></u>	32.2	10		53	Freedom of Association and Speech 15%	33.1		32.8	9	- -	1
Property Crime 35%	24.1		38.2	10		51	Absence of Legal Discrimination 25%	60.5		61.1	1		1
	i ! ! !						Social Tolerance 30%	68.2	$\sim \sim$	67.6	1	▲ 1	19
^		Overall Prosperity			Decile	California Rank	-0-		Overall Prosperity			Decile	California Rank
Governance	48.9	10-yr trend	61.7	2020	10-yr dec. change	2020	Social Capital	²⁰¹⁰	10-yr trend	42.2	2020 7	10-yr dec. change	2020
Political Accountability 30%	56.3	200	63.8	3	y 2	1	Personal and Family Relationships 25%	53.2	1	59.3	6	A 1	25
Rule of Law 35%	42.5	, /	58.5	1	A 6	1	Social Networks 25%		1	32.1	8	A 2	23
Government Integrity 35%	49.1		63.1	3	▲ 4	1	Institutional Trust 20%	77.9	"	67.8	2	v 1	7
							Civic and Social Participation 30%	15.3	M	19.3	10	- -	52
		0.000			Daville	California Rank						Decil	0.115
	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change		Market Access and	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Business Environment	37.2		40.3	8	1	22	Infrastructure	49.0		47.6	4	▼ 1	17
Financing Ecosystems 40%	63.6	~ ·	70.5	1		22	Communications 40%			60.8	3	- -	19
Domestic Market Contestability 30% Burden of Regulation 10%	2.1 38.1		0.6 41.9	10	■ 1	1	Resources 25% Transport 35%			46.4 47.2	4	▼ 2	33
Labor Market Flexibility 10%	42.9		24.1	9		1	Transport 3370	47.2		77.2	7		10
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	36.8	_/	59.5	5	▲ 5	33							
Fiscal Sustainability 25%	22.7		53.3	7	▲ 3	31							
Productivity and Competitiveness 25%	55.3	/	69.0	4	▼ 1	38							
Dynamism 20%	50.7	~/_	65.1	1	▲ 4	19							
Labor Force Engagement 30%	24.1		53.1	9	-	29							
^	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020	\sim	2010	Overall Prosperity 10-yr trend	2020	2020	Decile 10-yr dec. change	California Rank 2020
Living Conditions	56.6	~	60.6	6	▼ 2	35	Health	56.4	~	61.5	3	▲ 1	33
Material Resources 25%	58.6	$\neg $	59.8	6	▼ 1	36	Behavioral Risk Factors 15%	54.7	5	60.1	5	A 1	29
Nutrition 15%	57.1	J. J.	71.0	4	▼ 1	29	Preventative Interventions 15%	41.1	~~	53.5	3	▲ 2	15
Water Services 15%	43.6	~~	42.4	8		49	Care Systems 15%	40.8		51.0	5	A 1	42
Shelter 15%	32.3		26.8	10		42	Mental Health 15%		VV	71.5	1	▲ 3	20
Connectedness 15%	79.5		88.7	1	▲ 1	19	Physical Health 20%			64.0	3	A 1	38
Protection from Harm 15%	67.3		75.5	3		30	Longevity 20%	63.9	V ~	66.6	4		44
_	201-	Overall Prosperity	2005	20	Decile	California Rank			Overall Prosperity	2020	2020	Decile	California Rank
Education	38.0	10-yr trend	41.6	9	10-yr dec. change	43	Natural Environment	56.5	10-yr trend	58.0	3	10-yr dec. change	42
Pre-Primary Education 5%	42.7	~ /	42.2	7		37	Emissions 25%			74.5	1		16
Primary Education 20%	30.6	1	32.7	10	<u> </u>	44	Exposure to Air Pollution 25%			35.1	10	v 1	49
Secondary Education 25%	38.6		45.8	10		46	Forest, Land and Soil 20%		V	57.5	2	▼ 1	29
Tertiary Education 25%	46.9	M	48.9	2	▲ 1	36	Freshwater 20%	59.1		60.1	9		31
Adult Skills 25%	33.4	_/	37.0	8	▼ 1	44	Preservation Efforts 10%	70.3		70.3	1		1
									<u> </u>				
* The 829 counties in the 8 states have been grouped into deciles, for	each pillar, ele	ment and indicator. Cou	nties in the 1s	t decile are th	e strongest performers	and those in the 10th dec	ile are the weakest.						

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

							1		I	i			i	Italics: Indica	t
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	
Terror-related Crime (10th)			15%	69.9	~~	74.5	10	10	Violent Crime (10th)			50%	35.7	1	3
Mass shooting deaths	GVA	deaths /1,000,000 population	1.5	7.3		3.5	10	10	Murder	NACJD	deaths /100,000 population	1.5	7.5	V~	
Mass shooting injuries	GVA	injuries /1,000,000 population	1.0	14.6	^	9.2	10	10	Rape	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	21.7	~~~	
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	523.3		
Terrorism injuries	GTD	injuries /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.0		0.0	1	1	Robbery	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	257.6	~	
Terrorism events	GTD	events /1,000,000 population	0.5	0.0		0.3	1	10							
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	2020							
Property Crime (10th)			35%	24.1	_/	38.2	10	10							
Burglary	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.5	1,101.5		581.4	10	8							
Motor vehicle theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	0.5	584.5		485.8	10	10							
Larceny theft	NACJD	incidents /100,000 population	1.0	2,521.7	~~/~	2,036.5	9	9							
Identity theft	FTC	reports /100,000 population	0.5	128.5	M	177.0	10	10							
					1-										
				<u> </u>			<u> </u>								

San Joaquin, California: Personal Freedom (4th decile*)

		۸	O
٠.		Z	\sim
	~		١.

Source	Unit					Decile							Value		
		Weight	2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 20			Source	Unit	Weight	2010	10-yr trend	2020	Der 2010
		30%	58.5	~	63.5	5	8	Speech (9th)			15%	33.1	L	32.8	9
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
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
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
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
POL	reports /100,000 population	1.0	8.3		8.3	8	8								
Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10 us trond	2020	Decile	220		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10 vs trond	2020	Der 2010
		25%	60.5	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	61.1	1		Social Tolerance (1st)			30%	68.2	~~~	67.6	2
Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.0		0.0	5	5	Hate group concentration	SPLC	number /100,000 population	1.0	1.4	2	2.0	2
Cato	coding. 0-1	1.0	1.0		1.0	1	1	Ethnic slur google traffic	Google	index, 0-100	1.0	30.5		30.5	5
Cato	coding, 0-1	1.0	0.5		0.5	2	2	Statewide same sex marriage support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	61.0	$ \longrightarrow $	66.0	1
Cato	coding, 0-2	0.5	2.0		2.0	1		Statewide LGBT non-discrimination law support	PRRI	percentage	0.5	75.0	·······\	73.0	1
MAP	coding, 0-9	0.5	8.0		6.3	1	1						-		
MAP	coding, 0-11	0.5	4.1		7.0	3	3								
- 1															
	AAACP BIS BIS CURP POL CURP COURCE CATO CATO CATO CATO CATO CATO CATO CATO	AACP population AACP population aumber /100,000 population BIS number /100,000 adult population prisoners /100,000 youth population POL reports /100,000 population Cato coding 0-1 Cato coding 0-1 Cato coding 0-2 Cato coding 0-2	MaPo	30% 58.5	30% 58.5	30% 58.5 63.5	30% 58.5 63.5 5	30% 58.5 63.5 5 8	30% 58.5 63.5 5 8 Freedom of Association and Speech (9th)	30% 58.5 63.5 5 8 Freedom of Association and Speech (9th)	National Content	30% 58.5 63.5 5 8	30% 58.5 63.5 5 8 Freedom of Association and Speech (9th) 16% 33.1	30% 58.5 63.5 5 8 Freedom of Association and Speech (9th) 15% 33.1 33.1 33.	30% 58.5 63.5 5 8 Freedom of Association and Speech (9th) 10 0.0 0.0 1 1 1 Statewide free speech in public places Caro Coding 0.3 10 1.0 1.0 1.0 10 18 19 9 10 Statewide free speech in public places Caro Coding 0.3 10 1.0 1.0 1.0 Statewide free speech in public places Caro Coding 0.3 10 1.0 1.0 1.0 Statewide free speech in public places Caro Coding 0.3 10 1.0 1.0 1.0 Statewide inght-to-work NCSL Coding 0.1 0.5 0.0 0.0 Statewide inght-to-work NCSL Coding 0.1 0.0 0.0 Statewide inght-to-work NCSL Coding 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0

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.

San Joaquin, California: Governance (2nd decile*)

TITT		/		7	١
- 11111	4	Н	H	H	
		ш			

			i				1		T. Comments of the Comments of	i	i	i	i	Italics: Indica	itor contain	
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 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	7
Statewide gender balance in legislatures	CAWP	percentage	0.5	26.7	$\sim $	31.7	1	2	Statewide judicial integrity	ATRF	coding, 0-1	0.5	0.5		1.0	6
Statewide state campaign disclosure	NIMP	index, 0-1	1.0	0.9		0.8	4	7								
Statewide term limits	NCSL	coding, 0-1	0.5	1.0		1.0	1	1								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	cile 2020			i	i	i			i
Government Integrity (3rd)			35%	49.1		63.1	7	3								
Statewide legal corruption perceptions	ICS	expert survey, 3-15	1.0	9.5	$\neg $	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	\	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			make the trade desirable ball											

^{*} 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.



														Italics: Indica	tor contain	Noted val
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010	2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 20
Personal and Family Relationships (6th)			25%	53.2	w	59.3	7		Social Networks (8th)			25%	35.6	1	32.1	10
Statewide divorce	CDC	instances, /1,000 population		2.9		2.9	2	7	Favors between neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	35.5	\/—	45.3	9
Children in unmarried households	Census	percentage	1.0	29.4	_	30.2	7	6	Frequently talk with neighbors	CPS	percentage	1.0	69.0	V_	44.0	5
Teen births	CDC	instances /1,000 female 15-19 population	1.0	47.0		17.0	5	3	Trust in people in neighborhood	CPS	percentage	1.5	45.8		40.4	9
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	94.4	V	81.7	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	77.3		91.9	9	1								
Close friends	CPS	average	1.0	5.4		5.4	10	10								
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010	2020	Civic and Social Participation	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 20
Institutional Trust (2nd)			20%	77.9		67.8	1	2	(10th)			30%	15.3	1	19.3	10
Confidence in corporations	CPS	percentage	1.0	72.4		58.9	1	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	66.3		69.9	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	1	6.7	8
									Statewide helping the community	CNCS	instances, /1,000	1.0	1.6	M-	2.1	3
									(Non-religious) membership organizations	Census	number /1,000 population	1.0	0.2	/_	0.2	9
									Religious membership organizations	USRC	number /1,000 population	0.5	0.7		0.7	10
									Religious organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	9.4	1	9.3	10
									Sport or recreation organization participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	6.1	N_	14.6	8
									School, neighborhood or community association participation	CPS	percentage	0.5	8.8	/	5.8	10

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



San Joaquin, California: Busine	ess Enviro	nment (8th	decile*)												
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Italics: Indica	ator contains	imputed va Decile
	Source			2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 2020	Domestic Market	Source				10-yr trend		2010
inancing Ecosystems (1st)			40%	63.6	٠ س	70.5	1 1	Contestability (10th)			30%	2.1	<u> </u>	0.6	10
enture capital invested	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	166.5	~~	605.6	1 1	Statewide low-income licensed occupations	Inst Just	number	1.5	76.0		76.0	10
umber of venture capital deals	NVCA	number /1,000,000	1.0	20.3	$\sqrt{}$	25.6	1 1	Statewide occupational licensing training cost	Inst Just	s	1.0	486.0		486.0	10
sets under management	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	1,364.5	w	1,768.4	1 1	Statewide occupational licensing training time	Inst Just	days	1.0	827.0		827.0	10
nture capital fundraising	NVCA	\$ /capita	1.0	59.7	~~	257.1	1 1	Statewide age requirements for license	Inst Just	years	1.0	15.0		15.0	10
ank branch access	FDIC	number /square mile	1.5	0.1	"كرر	0.1	2 2	Statewide regulation density index	Cato	Overall Prosperity	1.0	0.0	~/	0.0	7
ew Foreign Direct Investment	BEA	\$ /capita	1.0	62,613.0		62,613.0	1 1						-		
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decil
				2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010 2020	Labar Markat Flaulbillton (Oth)				2010	10-yr trend	2020	2010
urden of Regulation (7th)			10%	38.1	I_{\perp}	41.9	8 7	Labor Market Flexibility (9th)			10%	42.9		24.1	9
stewide Federal Regulation and State derprise Index	QuantGov	Overall Prosperity	1.0	1.0	\	0.9	2 1	Statewide collective bargaining agreement coverage	FI	percent	1.0	18.6	~~	16.8	9
atewide state regulation	QuantGov	percent	1.0	1.9		1.9	10 10	Statewide employee health insurance cost	HJK	\$	0.5	4,490.0		5,340.0	8
								Workers Compensation Premium Rate	State OR	\$ per \$100	0.5	2.7	~	1.7	8
								Statewide minimum wage	DOL	s	1.0	8.0		12.0	10
													S-2-2		
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile		1		!	<u> </u>			
rice Distortions (10th)			10%	30.3	10-yr trend	53.1	10 10								
rice distortions (10th)			1076	30.3	~	. 55.1	10 10								
atewide subsidies to the private sector	BEA	percent	1.0	0.3	W	0.2	10 10								
atewide Corporate Tax Score	Tax Found	Overall Prosperity	1.0	4.4	M	4.9	9 6								
		Пофину			7										
Statewide Corporate Tax Score	Tax Found	Overall Prosperity	1.0	4.4		4.9	9 6								

^{*} 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.

	~
	\prec
- (€
_ \	_=

7

10

1

46.4

0.6

	ı	<u> </u>	ļ		Value		Dec	illo.	<u> </u>	I		ļ		Ita
	Source						2010	2020		Source		Weight		10-
Communications (3rd)			40%	60.8		60.8	3	3	Resources (9th)			25%	52.2	/
Mean download speed	BBN	Mbps	1.5	91.0		91.0	3	3	Customers affected by electricity outages	Mukherjee	number /10,000 population	0.5	0.1	1
Ultra-fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	9.2		9.2	5	5	Statewide net electricity generation	EIA	kWh /capita	1.0	0.0	\
Fast internet access	BBN	percent	1.0	99.2		99.2	3	3	Water usage	USGS	Mgal /capita	1.0	0.8	1
Internet providers (Business)	FCC	number	0.5	26.0		26.0	1	1	Electricity outage duration	EIA	minutes	1.0	12.0	****
									Electricity outage frequency	EIA	per year	1.0	0.4	****
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		<u> </u>				
Transport (4th)			35%	47.2		47.2	4	4						
Statewide number of airports	BTS	number /square mile	0.5	0.0		0.0	8	8						
Road condition	BTS	percent	1.5	7.6		7.6	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	1.0		1.0	6	6						
Bridge condition	BTS	percent	0.5	10.1		10.1	8	8						
Distance to airport	BTS	km	1.0	5.2		5.2	1	1						
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>					<u> </u>							

12)	
(4)	
()	

				i					1	i	i	i	1	Italics: Indica	ator contain		
	Source		Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Dec 2010			Source		Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend			2020
Fiscal Sustainability (7th)			25%	22.7		53.3	10	7	Productivity and Competitiveness (4th)			25%	55.3		69.0	3	
Statewide government credit rating	Ballotpedia	rating	0.5	2.0		5.0	10	10	Export value (goods)	BIEM	\$ /capita	1.0	2,115.2	M	1,992.4	6	
Statewide state reserves capacity	Pew	days	1.0	-22.4	5	51.4	10	4	Export value (services)	BIEM	\$ /capita	0.5	721.3		832.5	6	
Government revenue to expenditure ratio	Census	ratio	1.0	1.1		1.1	5	3	Labor productivity	BLS	\$ per hour	1.5	66.3	شمرسم	75.9	1	
Statewide state budget balance	Pew	\$ /capita	1.0	-143.1	_	452.3	10	1									
Statewide state pension funding	FR	percent	1.0	53.2	W	51.1	2	6									
Debt-to-GDP ratio	Census	percent	1.0	30.1	\mathcal{A}	27.3	7	7									
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	ile 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Dec 2010	cile 2020
Dynamism (1st)			20%	50.7	W	65.1	5	1	Labor Force Engagement (9th)			30%	24.1		53.1	9	
Startup concentration	Kauffman	number /1,000 businesses		112.5	1	86.3	2	2	Unemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	14.9		6.0	10	1
Startup early job creation	Kauffman	number /1,000 population	1.0	6.3	V-	6.5	3	1	Youth unemployment	Census	percent	1.0	27.3	~/`	20.1	9	
Startup early survival rate	Kauffman	percent	0.5	77.1	1	81.1	10	1	Employee Engagement	Gallup	percent	0.5	29.0		34.0	5	
Opportunity-driven startups	Kauffman	percent	1.0	72.6	\mathcal{N}	86.4	7		Statewide underemployment	BLS	percent	1.0	8.1		3.4	10	
Rate of new entrepreneurs	Kauffman	number /100,000 population	1.5	426.6	7	412.9	2	5	Labor force participation	Census	percent	1.5	62.4	1	60.5	5	
Patent applications	USPTO	number /1,000	1.0	78.6	5	124.9	4	3									
					1		<u> </u>		<u> </u>			<u> </u>					



Modernate Common										ı						tor contain:	s imputed values
Monte Mont		Source	Unit	Weight		Value 10-yr trend					Source	Unit	Weight		Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020
Commerce	Material Resources (6th)			25%	58.6	$\neg \forall$	59.8	5	6	Nutrition (4th)			15%	57.1		71.0	3 4
Description	Low income	Census	percentage	1.0	29.1	_/	27.1	6	6	Food security	FA	percentage	1.0	79.5		87.2	9 5
Secretary Secr	Poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	17.5	$\overline{}$	15.9	7	6	Statewide borderline food security	USDA	percentage	1.0	94.9		96.1	3 4
### Authoritis with a variable facilities 184 Popular 10	Deep poverty	Census	percentage	1.0	6.8		6.6	6	6	Fruit consumption	BRFSS	percentage		72.2	1	68.0	1 1
Mater Services (8th) 5acros 10st 2000	Liquid asset poverty	Pros Now	percentage	1.0	45.3		45.3	9	8	Vegetable consumption	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	83.4		80.1	1 7
## Water Services (8th) 15% 43.6 42.4 8 8 8 Shelter (10th) 16% 32.3 26.8 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	Statewide high risk loans	Talk Pov	percentage	1.0	5.3	1	5.7	1	1								
## Water Services (8th) 15% 43.6 42.4 8 8 8 Shelter (10th) 15% 32.3 26.8 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1																	
## Water Services (8th) 15% 43.6 42.4 8 8 8 Shelter (10th) 15% 32.3 26.8 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1																	
## Water Services (8th) 15% 43.6 42.4 8 8 8 Shelter (10th) 15% 32.3 26.8 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1																	
## Water Services (8th) 15% 43.6 42.4 8 8 8 Shelter (10th) 15% 32.3 26.8 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1																	
## Water Services (8th) 15% 43.6 42.4 8 8 8 Shelter (10th) 15% 32.3 26.8 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1		6	I I = Is	187-1-67		Value		Dooli	lo.		6	I I = Is	Malaka		Value		Docilo
Source Uset Uset Uset Uset Uset Uset Uset Use	Mater Convices (Oth)	Source	Onit			10-yr trend		2010	2020	Chalter (10th)	Source	Onit					2010 2020
Connectedness (1st)	water Services (8th)			15%	43.6	\\ <u>\</u>	42.4	8	8	Shelter (10th)			15%	32.3	\sim	26.8	10 10
Complete kitchen and plumbing facilities	Statewide clean and safe water	Gallup		0.5	93.9	//	94.0	6	5	Homelessness	HUD	number / 10,000 population	0.5	44.3	1	35.0	10 10
Availability of affordable housing Unit Unit Unit 2010 Vallue 2020 2010 2020 Connectedness (1st) Source Unit Weight 2010 10-yer trend 2020 2010 2020 Toyor trend 2020	Public drinking water violations	CHR		1.0	1.0	***	1.0	5	6	Unsheltered homeless rate	HUD	percentage	0.5	5.5	Ty	59.2	2 10
Availability of affordable housing Unit Unit 2010 Value 2020 2010 2020 Connectedness (1st) Source Unit Weight 2010 10-yr freed 2020 2010 2020 The percentage 15 93.2 99.9 2 1 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths / 100,0000 10 15.9	Complete kitchen and plumbing facilities	HUD	percentage	1.0	99.0	~	98.8	6	7	Households with overcrowding	HUD		1.0	7.2	W	7.1	10 10
Connectedness (1st) 15% 79.5 88.7 2 1 Protection from Harm (3rd) 15% 67.3 75.5 3 3 Access to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 93.2 99.9 2 1 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths / 100.000 population 1.0 17.0 11.3 4 2 Access to broadband Cornel percentage 1.0 72.6 78.1 2 2 Traffic deaths CDC 100.000 1.0 15.9 75.1 16.0 3 4										Availability of affordable housing	UI	low income	1.0	9.6		9.3	6 8
Connectedness (1st) 15% 79.5 88.7 2 1 Protection from Harm (3rd) 15% 67.3 75.5 3 3 Access to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 93.2 99.9 2 1 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths / 100.000 population 1.0 17.0 11.3 4 2 Access to broadband Cornel percentage 1.0 72.6 78.1 2 2 Traffic deaths CDC 100.000 1.0 15.9 75.1 16.0 3 4																	
Connectedness (1st) 15% 79.5 88.7 2 1 Protection from Harm (3rd) 15% 67.3 75.5 3 3 3 Access to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 93.2 99.9 2 1 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths 100.000 population 10 17.0 11.3 4 2 Households with a smartphone Census percentage 1.0 72.6 78.1 2 2 Traffic deaths CDC 100.000 1.0 15.9 16.0 3 44																	
Connectedness (1st) 15% 79.5 88.7 2 1 Protection from Harm (3rd) 15% 67.3 75.5 3 3 Access to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 93.2 99.9 2 1 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths / 100,000 population 10 17.0 11.3 4 2 Access to broadband Cores percentage 1.0 72.6 78.1 2 2 Traffic deaths CDC 100,000 10 15.9 75.1 16.0 3 44																	
Connectedness (1st) 15% 79.5 88.7 2 1 Protection from Harm (3rd) 15% 67.3 75.5 3 3 Access to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 93.2 99.9 2 1 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths / 100,000 population 10 17.0 11.3 4 2 Access to broadband Cores percentage 1.0 72.6 78.1 2 2 Traffic deaths CDC 100,000 10 15.9 75.1 16.0 3 44																	
Connectedness (1st) 15% 79.5 88.7 2 1 Protection from Harm (3rd) 15% 67.3 75.5 3 3 Access to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 93.2 99.9 2 1 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths / 100,000 population 10 17.0 11.3 4 2 Access to broadband Cores percentage 1.0 72.6 78.1 2 2 Traffic deaths CDC 100,000 10 15.9 75.1 16.0 3 44																	
Connectedness (1st) 15% 79.5 88.7 2 1 Protection from Harm (3rd) 15% 67.3 75.5 3 3 Access to broadband FCC percentage 1.5 93.2 99.9 2 1 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths / 100,000 population 10 17.0 11.3 4 2 Access to broadband Cores percentage 1.0 72.6 78.1 2 2 Traffic deaths CDC 100,000 10 15.9 75.1 16.0 3 44																	
Access to broadband FCC percentage 15 93.2 99.9 2 1 Fatalities from unintentional injuries CDC deaths / 100,000 population 10 17.0 11.3 4 2 Inspection of the control of th		Source	Unit			10-yr trend		2010	le 2020		Source	Unit					2010 2020
Access to Dioducidate recomposition for the parameter of	Connectedness (1st)			15%	79.5	/	88.7	2	1	Protection from Harm (3rd)			15%	67.3	/ V	/5.5	3 3
Households with a smartphone Census in percentage 1.0 72.6 78.1 2 2 Traffic deaths CDC 100,000 1.0 15.9 16.0 3 4	Access to broadband	FCC	percentage	1.5	93.2		99.9	2	1	Fatalities from unintentional injuries	CDC	population	1.0	17.0		11.3	4 2
	Households with a smartphone	Census	percentage	1.0	72.6		78.1	2	2	Traffic deaths	CDC	100.000	1.0	15.9	~~	16.0	3 4

^{*} 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.

San Joaquin, California: Health (3rd decile*)

	_
<u> </u>	_^
	τ,
	•

															tor contain:	s imputed valu
	Source	Unit			Value 10-yr trend		Decil 2010		Decrease the later weeklers	Source		Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 202
Behavioral Risk Factors (5th)			15%	54.7		60.1	6	5	Preventative Interventions (3rd)			15%	41.1	M	53.5	5
Obesity	CDC	percentage	1.0	28.9	~	32.5	6	6	Adult dentist visits	BRFSS	percentage		63.9		66.7	3
Smoking	CHR	percentage	1.5	16.4		11.7	4	1	Adult doctor visits	BRFSS	percentage	0.5	62.0		65.0	8
Alcohol use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	6.0		6.0	6	6	Colorectal cancer screening	BRFSS	percentage		66.9		70.0	4
Illicit drug use disorder	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	0.5	3.0		3.0	8	8	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	82.3		81.4	5
									Statewide child immunization	NCIRD	percentage	1.0	49.9	~~	68.6	1
									Statewide child dentist visits	NSCH	percentage	0.5	76.2		81.9	10
														n-b-to-to-to-to-d		
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decil 2010	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202
Care Systems (5th)			15%	40.8		51.0	6	5	Mental Health (1st)			15%	69.1	M	71.5	4
Statewide child mental health access	NSCH	percentage	1.0	63.6		63.6	10	10	Suicide	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	1.0	11.9	M	9.9	4
Adults with no health care coverage	CHR	percentage	0.5	19.3		7.6	4	3	Drug overdose deaths	CDC	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	16.3	M	16.2	10
Avoided medical care due to cost	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	15.2		11.5	4		Serious mental illness	DUH Nat Srvy	percentage	1.0	3.9	1	3.8	2
Hospital rating	HCA	percentage	0.5	69.1		69.6	7	8	Statewide disability weighted prevalence from mental illness	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	1.0	2,082.1		2,072.8	2
Preventable hospitalizations for medicare enrolees	CHR	discharges / 100,000	1.0	3,915.0		3,961.0	4	4	Self-reported mental health not good	CHR	percentage	1.0	11.4	1	11.8	7
					•											
	Source	Unit	Unit	2010	Value	2020	Deci	le 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-vr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202
Physical Health (3rd)			20%	63.8	10-yr trend	64.0	4	3	Longevity (4th)			20%	63.9	M	66.6	4
High blood pressure	BRFSS	percentage		28.2	_/\	28.3	2		Under 5 death rate	CDC	deaths / 100,000 under 5	1.0	141.2	1	137.5	4
Diabetes	CDC	percentage	1.0	7.2	1	10.0	3	6	5-14 death rate	CDC	population deaths / 100,000 5-14 population	0.5	10.7	W	9.6	1
Heart attack	BRFSS	percentage	1.0	3.5	V-	2.7	2	2	15-64 death rate	CDC	deaths / 100,000 15-64 population	2.0	301.8	MA	301.6	5
Statewide disability weighted prevalence of	IMHE	years / 100,000 population	0.5	336.4		347.3	3	3	Maternal mortality	IMHE	deaths / 100,000 population	0.5	0.3	7	0.4	4
infectious diseases Self-reported poor physical health	CHR	percentage	1.0	12.2	1	11.1	7	5	Mortality risk 65-85	IMHE	percentage	1.0	54.7		50.3	5
					Department of the same of the									-		
																<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.

	_
_	
_	
	\sim
	L

San Joaquin, California: Educat	tion (9th	decile^)											4 - 12 4 - 12		
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	ator contain 2020	Decile 2010 20
Pre-Primary Education (7th)			5%	42.7	TO-yr tiend	42.2		Primary Education (10th)			20%	30.6	To-yr trend	32.7	10
Pre-primary enrollment	Census	percentage	2.0	43.6	~/	42.2		Math grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	2.7	-\\ \	2.6	10
Statewide state pre-K quality	NIEER	Overall Prosperity, 0-10	1.0	4.0	X	4.3		Statewide science grade 4 score	NAEP	scale score, 0-300	1.5	136.3	7	140.5	10
		0-10						English, language and arts grade 4 level	SEDA	grade level	2.0	2.3	~ [2.5	10
								Primary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	96.9	-	96.3	4
													7		
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 202
Secondary Education (10th)			25%	38.6		45.8		Tertlary Education (2nd)			25%	46.9	AAn	48.9	3
Math grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	6.7		6.7	9 9	College enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	35.0	~~	38.7	3
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	7/	64.0	1
English, language and arts grade 8 level	SEDA	grade level	1.5	6.4	1	7.1	10 8	Statewide university quality for enrolled students	QS Rank	Legatum Institute score	1.0	0.3	1	0.3	2
High school graduation rate	CHR	percentage	1.0	79.0	/_	81.7	8 9	Community college graduation rate	NCES	percentage	1.0	30.1	MN	33.3	6
Secondary enrollment	Census	percentage	1.0	97.0	-1/	97.0	5 6								
	Source		Unit	2010	Value 10-yr trend		Decile 2010 2020								
Adult Skills (8th)			25%	33.4	_/_	37.0	7 8								
Adult population with at least a high school diploma	Census	percentage	1.0	76.7	_//	78.9	8 9								
Adult population with bachelor's degree or higher	Census	percentage	1.0	17.5	~~	18.4	5 6								
.								•							
	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.

	,	•		7
- 2	•	ь	•	1
7	7	r		,
	_		٠,	,
			~	

San Joaquin, California: Natura	ıl Enviror	nment (3rd d	ecile*)												
	Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile		Source	Unit	Weight		Value		Decile
Emissions (1st)			25%	²⁰¹⁰ 71.8	10-yr trend	74.5	2010 2020	Exposure to Air Pollution			25%	30.7	10-yr trend	35.1	9 10
		index,						(10th)					~		
Toxic air releases	EPA	0-1	2.0	0.9		0.9	6 6	Life expectancy loss from air pollution	JBEN	years	2.0	0.2		0.2	9 9
CO2 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	2.0	0.8		0.9	2 2	Fine particulate matter exposure	OECD	micrograms per cubic meter	1.0	9.8	~	8.5	7 10
Nitrous oxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.7		0.9	2	1							
Carbon monoxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.8		0.9	1 1	1							
PM2.5 emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.9		0.9	1 1	1							
Sulfur dioxide emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.9		1.0	4 2	2							
Ozone emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.8		0.9	1 1	1							
Lead emissions	EPA	index, 0-1	0.5	0.9	7	0.9	5 4	1							
					minus										
	Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10-yr trend	2020	Decile 2010 2020		Source	Unit	Weight	2010	Value 10 vs trond	2020	Decile 2010 2020
Forest, Land and Soil (2nd)			20%	59.9	M	57.5		Preshwater (9th)			20%	59.1	10-yr trend	60.1	9 9
Toxic land releases	EPA	lb / square mile	1.0	15.1		23.1	9 9	Statewide good quality rivers and streams	EPA	percentage	0.5	10.8		10.8	10 10
Statewide rural parks and wildlife areas	USDA	percentage	1.0	18.9	·····/	18.7	1	Statewide good quality lakes, resevoirs and	EPA	percentage	0.5	2.2		2.2	10 10
Statewide compliant underground storage tanks facilities	EPA	percentage	1.0	70.0	my	60.0	6 6	ponds Total freshwater withdrawals per capita	USGS	million gallons / 1,000 population	1.0	2.2	¬ /"	1.8	8 8
Statewide exposure to pesticides	CDC	number / 100,000 population	1.0	27.0	~ //	24.2	1 3	Toxic water releases	EPA	lb / square mile	1.0	0.0	\	0.0	1 1
Tree canopy cover	NLCD	percentage	1.0	2.1		1.9	9 9	,							
Wetlands and deepwater habitats	USFWS	percentage	1.0	24.0	-	24.0	1	1							
	Source	Unit	Unit		Value		Decile								
Preservation Efforts (1st)	50.00		10%	²⁰¹⁰ 70.3	10-yr trend	70.3	2010 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								
Statewide GAP 3 protected areas	USGS	percentage	1.0	28.4		28.4	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.



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