

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Summary Observations.....	2
Context and Reporting.....	2
Indicator Systems.....	2
Defining the Region.....	3
Regional Indicator Systems—Key Characteristics.....	4
Regional Indicator System Profiles.....	6
Boston.....	6
Chicago.....	7
Cincinnati.....	9
Central Ohio.....	11
Jacksonville.....	12
Puget Sound Region.....	14
Sacramento.....	16
San Diego.....	17
Silicon Valley.....	19
Ventura County.....	20
West Michigan.....	22
Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions.....	Appendix A

Introduction

This report was prepared for People and Land (PAL), a Michigan initiative established in 1999 with support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. PAL's mission is to "influence decisions about Michigan's future prosperity by applying land-related strategies that include economic, environmental, and social innovation." Under the leadership of staff at the Michigan State University Land Policy Institute (LPI) and at Public Sector Consultants (PSC), PAL works to achieve its mission through research and competitive regranting. Since 2007, PAL's efforts have increasingly emphasized regional collaboration and economic transformation that will allow Michigan to better compete in the new economy.

Regional indicator systems are used to measure trends in a region's economic, environmental, and social characteristics and to characterize a region's overall health. This report is an informational product intended to support actors and organizations interested in regional indicator systems, including but not limited to grantees of PAL's Regional Prosperity Initiative. It reviews eleven indicator systems developed by regions around the country, reporting on how regional boundaries were drawn, the lead organization and context for the indicator system, the indicator system's key content, and the nature and frequency of reporting. The report provides summary observations about the collected indicator systems as well as a profile of each indicator system. The report concludes with a list of the specific indicators used in each region, clustered into "people," "place," and "prosperity" categories. Not attached due to length, but available upon request, is additional information on measurement issues and data sources used to support the variety of regional indicators.

The regions considered in this report were selected on the basis of their well-developed indicator systems rather than for any necessary parallels to Michigan or its economic regions. They include the following:

- Boston
- Central Ohio
- Chicago
- Cincinnati
- Jacksonville
- Puget Sound
- Sacramento
- San Diego
- Silicon Valley
- Ventura County
- West Michigan

Summary Observations

This section reviews some of the commonalities and differences across the regional indicator systems reviewed for this report.

Context and Reporting

The regional indicator systems profiled in this summary were typically steered by diverse coalitions involving government, business, nonprofits, funders, and citizens. Regional planning bodies initiated and led a few of the profiled efforts, as did community foundations. However, most of the regional indicator systems were initiated and led by entities focused on regional collaboration and involved in a variety of interrelated economic, environmental, and social projects of regional scope.

Most of the coalitions have a history from the late 1990's or early 2000's, and started their collaborative efforts with an in-depth process to identify the values underpinning the community. This was followed by a second process to identify the indicators that best reflect the region's values, needs, assets, and priorities. Some processes began with a focus on regional economic competitiveness, while others began with an emphasis on sustainability.

Most regions have produced multiple reports on their indicators, and most of these reports are full-color, visually attractive, professionally prepared documents ranging between 25 and 80 pages in length. Two of the regions have gone beyond print publications to develop online data repositories that users can navigate and from which they may download statistics or charts of interest. Frequently, iterations of reports evolved to include benchmarking against the state or nation, or to peer regions throughout the nation. Several of the indicator systems are informed by (and reinforced by) a regional economic strategy developed by the lead entity or key partners, and some authors incorporated information about exemplary regional projects in their indicator reports. Some regions plan to produce annual updates, while others plan biennial or five-year iterations. Finally, several of these efforts rely on volunteers and partners to supply data, while others have employed consultants.

Indicator Systems

In virtually all of the regions, the indicators are based on a principled framework, typically organized as the “triple bottom line” of economic, environmental, and social well-being. Given this orientation, the indicator systems and related reports portray prosperity as explicitly more than an economic calculation, and reference the interconnectedness of the indicators. For example, there are frequent references to community vitality and quality of life, and how these are critical to talent attraction and retention, and ultimately to economic well-being. In most

cases, indicators were chosen through an extensive public process with input from a wide range of participants.

While the type of indicators chosen by regions fell into social, environmental, and economic arenas, how the specific indicators fell into each of these categories did vary between regional initiatives. For example, while Puget Sound looked at air quality in its “people” cluster, Cincinnati and Jacksonville considered it a “place” issue. Another example is housing affordability, which is considered a “people” or social issue in some systems (e.g., Puget Sound, West Michigan, Ventura County) and a “prosperity” issue in another (Jacksonville). This seeming lack of alignment is not problematic, but rather, reflective of the deep interconnectedness of the indicators.

The number of indicators chosen for a given region ranged from as few as 14 to as many as 195. Most indicator projects relied considerably on public data sources and data collected and published by the U. S. Census Bureau, the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and state agencies were particularly likely to be used. A few regions made extensive use of commercial data repositories, philanthropic data collections, or academic studies or collections. Where primary data collection was incorporated, it was used most frequently to capture the public’s opinion about issues such as quality of education, safety, civic engagement, inclusiveness, or access to health care. Some indicator products include one-time measures or special areas of focus as well as core measures that are repeated in successive waves of the product; most indicator products with more than one report have been updated, at least modestly, for reasons of feasibility, data access, or improved fit and value.

Defining the Region

Some “regions” profiled in this report were fortunate enough to have political boundaries that are aligned with economic realities as well as cultural definitions of place. For many, however, boundaries were not so clear.

Some of the regional indicator systems in this report used flexible definitions of the region, tapping into metropolitan, county-level, city, or other geographic definitions of the region as available and appropriate to their concerns, and without undue concern regarding a single definition of the region.

Other efforts were pursued by preexisting coalitions or public service agencies with an established service or catchment area. In some instances, coalitions had established a service area better aligned with the functional economic region than existing political definitions, while in some instances (typically with planning agencies), the service area spanned multiple metropolitan areas or incorporated parts of several metropolitan areas. These entities typically presented their indicator data using measures corresponding to their service areas where possible, and otherwise corresponding to the best available proxy.

Regional Indicator Systems—Key Characteristics

Table 1 is a one-page overview of the regional indicator systems, and includes:

- The type of lead entity, for example, community foundation, business-led coalition, regional planning/metropolitan planning organization (MPO)
- The number of indicators
- The year of the most recent comprehensive indicators report
- Whether the lead entity is engaged in a broader economic strategy for the region
- Whether the regional indicator system includes several common measures in the areas of economy and education, environment and infrastructure, and social indicators
- Unique or unusual aspects of the indicator system

Table 1: Key Characteristics of the Regional Indicator Systems

Region	General Characteristics				Economy, Education Indicators					Environment, Infrastructure Indicators				Social Indicators							Other Indicators/of Interest			
	Lead Entity	Number of Indicators	Last Report	Economic Strategy	Jobs, Employment	R&D, Patents, VC	Green/Energy Jobs/Firms	Business Starts	Educational Attainment	K-12 Achievement	Air and/or Water Quality	Parks/Open Space	Transit ridership	Commute/Congestion	Health	Voting	Housing Affordability	Safety	Racism/Inequality	Poverty		Child Poverty	Density	Culture
Boston	Community Foundation	195	'09	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Access to/use of technology
Chicago	Business-Led Coalition	40	'02	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●		●				Technology transfer
Cincinnati	Community Coalition	14	'05				●		●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●					Sense of community
Central Ohio	Regional Planning/MPO	40	'09	●	●		●			●	●				●	●		●		●	●			Local food (farm markets, comm. gardens)
Jacksonville	Community Coalition	104	'09		●			●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●				●	Septic permits, issues of race
Puget Sound	Business-led Coalition	21	'08	●	●	●		●	●	●			●			●	●						●	Business tax share
Sacramento	Economic Development	19	'09	●	●	●		●	●	●			●			●	●	●						Charitable giving
San Diego	Regional Planning/MPO	43	'08		●	●		●	●	●	●			●		●	●		●					International trade
Silicon Valley	Business-led Coalition	67	'10	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●					●	●	Foreign establishments
Ventura County	Community Foundation	54	'07	●	●				●	●	●	●		●	●	●	●		●			●	●	Agriculture
West Michigan	Community Coalition	18	'09	●	●			●		●			●	●	●	●	●	●		●				Toxic releases
<i>Totals</i>				8	10	6	2	3	6	9	11	8	6	6	8	7	10	10	7	5	4	4	5	

Regional Indicator System Profiles

Boston

The Boston Indicators Project

<http://www.bostonindicators.org/Indicators2008/>

Definition of the Region

While the greater Boston region is clearly the focus of this effort, the indicator products include some measures focused on the City of Boston, some on Boston area neighborhoods, some on the Boston metropolitan statistical area (MSA¹), and some focused on other geographies, such as counties or the whole state. The Boston Indicators Project is the most expansive regional indicator system in this review, and the variant geographies in use in the effort appear to be influenced by data availability. Several measures of social health, culture, and education are targeted to the City of Boston, or neighborhoods within it.

Context

The Boston Indicators Project released its first report in 2000. Leadership for the effort is provided by The Boston Foundation, a regional community foundation, with key support from the City of Boston and the Metropolitan Area Council. Additional partners include the John LaWare Leadership Forum and the Boston Redevelopment Authority.²

The Project also works to foster action to improve the health of the Boston metro area. After many public convenings, meetings, and discussions, leadership of the Boston Indicators Project articulated an “Emerging Civic Agenda” for the region. Expressed for the first time in the 2002-2004 Indicators Report, this agenda emphasizes “a dynamic and open civic culture,” “world class human resources,” “21st century jobs and economic strategies,” and “21st century infrastructure.” The agenda informed the development of the John LaWare Leadership Forum, launched in 2005, which convenes Greater Boston’s business and civic leaders to focus on and respond to regional competitiveness issues.³

¹ The metropolitan statistical area, or MSA, is a designation developed and maintained by the U. S. Census Bureau to identify functionally interconnected metropolitan areas. There are several levels of metropolitan areas at greater or smaller levels of aggregation.

² The Boston Foundation, “The Boston Indicators Project,” (2010) <<http://www.bostonindicators.org/Indicators2006/Content.aspx?id=610>>.

³ The Boston Foundation, “An Emerging Civic Agenda,” (2010) <<http://www.bostonindicators.org/Indicators2006/Content.aspx?id=612>> and the John LaWare Leadership Forum, “Home,” (2009) <<http://www.tbf.org/tbfgem1.asp?id=3270>>

Indicators

The latest report boasts 195 indicators, across ten sectors: civic vitality, cultural life and the arts, the economy, education, the environment, health, housing, public safety, technology, and transportation. Many indicators include comparative data for Massachusetts as a whole and for the nation.

The Boston Indicators Project has also repackaged some of its 195 indicators into clusters that reflect the status of Boston neighborhoods; children and youth; the area's "competitive edge;" the region's fiscal health; issues related to race/ethnicity; and sustainable development. For example, the set of indicators for children and youth draws on measures of educational quality, health status, access to cultural facilities, families in poverty, exposure to environmental hazards, and juvenile crime, among others.

Reporting

The Boston Indicators Project released its first report in 2000. Beginning in 2003, additional reports have been released every two years, and biennial updates are planned through the year 2030. All Boston Indicators Project reports are available online at www.bostonindicators.org. In addition to professionally produced reports, the Boston Indicators Project has a robust Web site that allows the user to navigate to indicators in each of the effort's ten focal areas, to download data or charts for specific indicators, and to access additional resources of relevance.⁴

In partnership with the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, a new Web site allowing users to map indicator data (as well as other information) was launched in 2007 at www.MetroBostonDataCommon.org. The Boston Indicators Project Web site also embeds census data by place, as well as examples of exemplary projects, programs, and efforts underway in the region.

Chicago

Chicago Metropolis 2020—The Metropolis Index
<http://www.chicagometropolis2020.org/>

Definition of the Region

Most of the measures in the Metropolis Index are focused on the six-county area around Chicago (Cook, DuPage, Lake, McHenry, Kane, and Will Counties). Some measures reflect the federally designated Primary MSA (a nine-county region including DeKalb, Grundy, and Kendall Counties) and some reflect the Chicago-Gary-Kenosha Consolidated MSA (a 13-county megaregion including Kankakee, Illinois; Gary, Indiana; and Kenosha, Wisconsin).

⁴ The Boston Foundation, "The Boston Indicators Project," (2010) <<http://www.bostonindicators.org/Indicators2006/Content.aspx?id=610>>.

Context

The *Metropolis Index* report series is an effort of Chicago Metropolis 2020, a coalition created in 1999 through the leadership of the Commercial Club of Chicago to focus on issues related to regional prosperity, competitiveness, and quality of life. The Commercial Club is itself a coalition of business, professional, education, and cultural leaders founded in 1877. In addition to the Metropolis project, the Commercial Club is involved in regional efforts related to improving area schools and fostering public-private partnerships.⁵

As noted in introductory material for the reports here reviewed, as well as other foundational documents for the effort, “Chicago Metropolis 2020’s unifying vision is that the region’s municipalities and local governments must make the kinds of informed choices that will make the region attractive and economically competitive 10, 50, and 100 years from now.”⁶ The effort was initiated in 1996 with the involvement of more than 200 members of the Commercial Club, who participated in six topical working groups to consider the region’s challenges and opportunities. Their efforts resulted in a 1999 report containing several recommendations, one of which was that Chicago Metropolis 2020 be formed.

Chicago Metropolis 2020 has a staff of more than 20, and is governed by an Executive Council with 45 members. Most are from the private sector, but some representation of the public, nonprofit, education, and faith-based sectors is apparent. “Senior executives” of Chicago Metropolis 2020 donate considerable amounts of time to advance the organization’s causes and programs, and are drawn from the ranks of the Chicago area’s seasoned leaders in business, education, and government. Original funding for Chicago Metropolis 2020 came from the Commercial Club of Chicago; Mayer Brown LLP; and several area foundations, including the John T. and Catherine D. MacArthur Foundation, the Chicago Community Trust, the Grand Victoria Foundation, the Robert R. McCormick Foundation, and the Elizabeth Morse Genius Charitable Trust.⁷ Numerous additional supporters of other initiatives of Chicago Metropolis 2020 are listed on the project Web site.

Indicators

Indicators for the Metropolis Index have reflected the following six focal areas: regional economy (growing economy, innovation, and entrepreneurship); transportation and land use (efficient land use and efficient mobility); housing (housing choice and affordability); community life (shared prosperity, safe neighborhoods, and healthy people); education (school readiness and educational achievement); and natural environment (environmental stewardship). The 2001 version of the Index included 40 indicators, whereas for the 2002 report, the indicators were substantially changed and reduced to 31.

As described in *The 2002 Metropolis Index*, the measures rely on publicly available sources from the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. The indicators are informed by a series of community

⁵ The Commercial Club of Chicago, “Home,” (2010) <<http://www.commercialclubchicago.org/>>.

⁶ Chicago Metropolis 2020, “Envisioning a Better Region; Working to Get There,” brochure (July 2003), <<http://www.chicagometropolis2020.org/documents/overviewbrochure03.pdf>>, 3.

⁷ Chicago Metropolis 2020, “Our Support,” (2010) <http://www.chicagometropolis2020.org/5_20.htm>

convenings and conversations that resulted in a set of broad regional goals; however, the specific measures and data sources were developed by local public policy experts.

Reporting

The 2001 Metropolis Index and *the 2002 Metropolis Index* are available on the Chicago Metropolis 2020 Web site, by chapter, in .pdf format.⁸ The publications are professionally prepared with rich graphics and color and feature headline-style analysis of the meaning of the data. For example, analysis related to the “Job Growth” indicator is provided under the header, “Employment Falls in 2001, Breaks Nine-Year Trend.” Some indicator data includes a comparison of regional performance to national norms, some sections compare the performance of the region to itself over time, and some indicators are benchmarked against the performance of other regions.

No additional comprehensive indicator reports have been released since the 2002 version. However, in 2004 and 2006, Chicago Metropolis 2020 released reports focused on indicators and trends in the areas of regional housing and regional crime and justice:

- *The Metropolis Housing Index: Housing as Opportunity* was released in 2004. The report’s introduction presents it as the next in the *Metropolitan Index* series and describes housing as a critical economic and social issue in need of regional approaches. The document includes 39 indicators. While many are focused on housing, several are focused more broadly on places people live and the influence of these choices on their access to employment and education and on quality of life.
- *The 2006 Crime and Justice Index* was published in 2006 and focuses on crime trends, the criminal justice system, the juvenile justice system, and reentry after prison. As with 2004’s *Housing Index* report, the *Crime and Justice Index* is presented as part of Chicago Metropolis 2020’s ongoing indicator series and is a data-driven, professionally prepared publication.

Chicago Metropolis 2020’s most recent report (based on Web site listings) is focused on early childhood education in suburban Chicago. While the report is data-driven with extensive documentation of the status of early childhood education, it is not framed as an “indicator” report and does emphasize a particular early-childhood education program.

Cincinnati

Sustainable Cincinnati Indicators Project Steering Committee

<http://www.sustainablecincinnati.org>

Definition of the Region

This region is defined as an eight-county, tri-state metropolitan region, including Butler, Warren, Hamilton, and Clermont counties in southern Ohio; Dearborn County, Indiana; and Boone,

⁸ Chicago Metropolis 2020, “Reports,” (2009) <http://www.chicagometropolis2020.org/25_3.htm>

Kenton, and Campbell counties in northern Kentucky. The area covered by the indicators is smaller than the census-defined MSA, excluding several outlying counties in Kentucky and Indiana.

Context

The Sustainable Cincinnati coalition was convened by the League of Women Voters in 1999 to explore development of an indicators effort for the greater Cincinnati area. The project Web site now lists 68 member organizations including faith-based groups, environmental groups, universities, planning agencies, civic groups, neighborhood associations, business associations, and more.

As described on Sustainable Cincinnati's Web site, the project's two-year startup period involved an intensive series of meetings, informed by research and presentations from national experts. A national consultant provided facilitation services in 2001 to help the member organizations come to consensus and build understanding of sustainability—the core theme and focus of this indicator system. The current definition of sustainability in use for the effort is:

A sustainable community meets its present needs without sacrificing the ability of others, now and in the future, to meet their own needs. These needs include economic prosperity, quality of life, and healthy, functioning ecosystems. The foundation of sustainability is ensuring that economic prosperity, quality of life, and healthy ecosystems are enduring values for our region.⁹

The project continues under the leadership of its expansive steering committee.¹⁰

Indicators

This region is focused on 14 indicators clustered into four categories: economic prosperity; healthy ecosystems; healthy people and healthy communities; and justice. Not all indicators have been populated with data to date, including work readiness for graduates, workers earning a wages allowing self-sufficiency, and survey-based indicators related to sense of community and perceptions of fair treatment. In these instances, Sustainable Cincinnati has substituted the best available data.

Reporting

Since launching in 2000, Sustainable Cincinnati has produced indicator reports in 2002 and 2005. The 2005 version is available on the Sustainable Cincinnati Web site in .pdf format and includes many graphics and tables. Although the 2005 report indicates the intent to publish further updates, no further information about the schedule was available on the Web site.

⁹ Sustainable Cincinnati, *Regional Indicators Measuring the Economic, Environmental, and Social Health of the Tri-state Metropolitan Area*, Sustainable Cincinnati (2005) <http://www.sustainablecincinnati.org/sc_2005.pdf>, ii.

¹⁰ Sustainable Cincinnati, "History of Sustainable Cincinnati," (2010) <<http://www.sustainablecincinnati.org/pages/history.html>>.

Central Ohio

Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission—State of the Region
http://www.morpc.org/regional_dev/region/region.asp

Definition of the Region

The Central Ohio region includes 12 counties in the center of the state and is home to more than two million residents. The region includes the greater Columbus area as well as the smaller cities of Marion and Mt. Vernon, north of Columbus. This regional geography mirrors the service area of the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC).

Context

The State of the Region report was developed by the MORPC, the area's regional planning body. MORPC is also the federally designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO)¹¹ for the Columbus urbanized area.

Between 2003 and 2007, MORPC led an effort to develop a regional growth strategy for the greater Columbus area. That plan, *Regional Connections*, outlines visions for place, prosperity, people, and regional leadership, as well as providing an implementation strategy. The plan's mission statement is:

Create a **common understanding** of the significant change anticipated for the central Ohio region over the next 20 to 30 years. With this understanding, **shape an approach** to growth and development for the seven county regional community that enhances the quality of life.¹²

The plan was developed with the primary support of counties, cities, and townships in MORPC's service area.

One of the recommendations of *Regional Connections* was that MORPC establish a subcommittee to oversee continuing implementation of the plan, and MORPC accordingly established the Center for Regional Development. According to MORPC's Web site, the Center is a public-private partnership with both leadership and funding from business and government.¹³ The *State of the Region* indicators project is aligned with *Regional Connections* and overseen by the Center.

¹¹ MPOs are transportation planning entities mandated by federal law for U. S. urbanized areas. MPOs may be co-located with regional planning agencies or operated as separate entities. The boundaries of MPOs and regional planning agencies may or may not align.

¹² *Regional Connections, Executive Summary*, (2007) <<http://www.morpc.org/pdf/ExecutiveSummary.pdf>>, i.

¹³ MORPC, "Regional Development," (2010) <http://www.morpc.org/regional_dev/main/regional_dev.asp>.

Indicators

This region tracks 40 indicators, clustered into categories of “people,” “place,” and “prosperity.” Most indicators rely on publicly available national or state-level secondary data sources, and in many instances, a suite of measures was presented for each indicator. The emphasis of the 2009 report is on sustainability, and several of the indicators are focused on energy, the “green economy,” or the environment. A few, such as “grassroots sustainability groups” and “sustainable development” list known groups or activity in the region but are not quantified.

Reporting

The 2009 Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission *State of the Region* report is the second annual report. It is available in .pdf format on the MORPC Web site and includes color graphics, tables, and maps for most indicators.

The report includes tables and graphics for most indicators. Unlike most of the indicator systems here profiled, most of the Central Ohio regional indicators are presented at the county level as well as for the region, overall. Many show trends over time within the region, and several include comparative information for all of Ohio and/or the nation.

Jacksonville

Jacksonville Community Council, Inc.—The Quality of Life Progress Report
<http://jcci.org/jcciwebsite/pages/indicators.html>

Definition of the Region

The Northeast Florida region’s central city is Jacksonville, and the region includes Baker, Clay, Duval, Nassau, and St. Johns Counties. These five counties also compose the Jacksonville MSA.

Context

The *Quality of Life Progress Report* is compiled by the Jacksonville Community Council, Inc. (JCCI). JCCI is a 501(c)3 organization founded in 1975 to provide a forum for Jacksonville area citizens to discuss and take action on pressing issues. As described on the organization’s Web site,

JCCI has been called Jacksonville’s “citizen think tank.” This is the place where community-minded people get together to explore issues of community importance, identify problems, discover solutions, and advocate for positive change. All are welcome to participate - every voice is needed and every thought matters.¹⁴

¹⁴ Jacksonville Community Council, Inc., “About JCCI,” (2009), <<http://jcci.org/jcciwebsite/pages/about.html>>

The *Quality of Life Progress Report* is one of JCCI's signature products and one of the longest-standing in the country—the 2009 version was the 25th annual edition. Other key programs include:

- The annual *Race Relations Progress Report*, initiated in 2005, another indicator-based product exploring outcomes in education, employment, civic participation, housing, justice, health, and other arenas by race/ethnicity¹⁵
- “Forward,” a community- and civic-oriented, leadership development initiative focused on men and women between the ages of 25 and 45
- CommunityWorks, the consulting arm of JCCI, which provides nationally recognized services in community convening and issue resolution

JCCI also pursues topical studies, such as 2009's *Our Money, Our City: Financing Jacksonville's Future*, an eight-month effort involving more than 50 prominent and concerned citizens. As of its 2009 annual report, JCCI had a staff of eleven. The organization's financial support is derived from members and corporate contributors, grants, and contracts.¹⁶ Lead funding for the *Quality of Life Progress Report* of 2009 was provided by the United Way and the City of Jacksonville.

Indicators

The 2009 *Quality of Life Progress Report* employs 104 indicators arranged in seven strands: achieving educational excellence; growing a vibrant economy; preserving the natural environment; promoting social wellbeing and harmony; enjoying arts, culture and recreation; sustaining a healthy community; maintaining responsive government; moving around efficiently and safely; and keeping the community safe.

Some indicators are specific to Duval County, where Jacksonville is located. Most of the data are obtained through secondary research of records and documents from various public and private organizations, and the remaining data are obtained through an annual telephone survey of a random sample of the regional population. The survey covers such themes as sense of safety, satisfaction with local education, perceptions of racism, volunteerism, engagement with local government, satisfaction with elected leaders, and satisfaction with health care, among others. This survey has been conducted pro bono by local research organizations since 1985.

¹⁵ JCCI, “Race Relations Progress Report,” (2009) <<http://jcci.org/jcciwebsite/pages/racerelations.html>>.

¹⁶JCCI, *Annual Report 2009*. (2009) <<http://jcci.org/jcciwebsite/documents/09%20Annual%20Report.pdf>>.

Reporting

The *2009 Quality of Life Progress Report* is the 25th annual edition of the report. The 25th anniversary edition includes a summary document that selects two key indicators and up to four supporting indicators for each indicator strand. A complete version, with all indicators, was also published. Both documents are professionally prepared, attractive documents available in .pdf format on the JCCI Web site; the complete version was also distributed in CD format with printed copies of the summary report.

The indicators are also available in an interactive Web site called the Community Snapshot, also accessible at the JCCI Web site. The Community Snapshot site allows users to navigate to specific indicators of interest, map these for chosen counties (as available), develop trend lines, and in some cases, to incorporate comparative trend data for the state, region, or nation. In 2010, JCCI plans to implement a second phase of the community snapshot as well as further updates to the indicators.

Puget Sound Region

The Prosperity Partnership—Puget Sound Regional Competitiveness Indicators
<http://www.prosperitypartnership.org/data/indicators/index.htm>

Definition of the Region

The Puget Sound region includes King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish Counties and the cities of Seattle, Tacoma, Bremerton, and Bellevue. The four-county region is also the service area of the Puget Sound Regional Council, the area's federally designated economic development and metropolitan planning organization.

Context

The *Puget Sound Regional Competitiveness Indicators* were developed by The Prosperity Partnership. The Prosperity Partnership is a coalition formed in 2004 to develop and implement a comprehensive economic development strategy for the Puget Sound region—and in so doing, to develop 100,000 new jobs for the region. Its eight co-chairs represent the Washington State AFL-CIO, the presidents of the University of Washington and Washington State University, the Chancellor of the Seattle Community College system, leadership at Microsoft and Uwijimaya (an Asian grocery and specialty store), leadership of the YWCA, and the President of the Puget Sound Regional Council, the area's MPO and economic development district. More than 300 diverse organizations throughout the region have signed an agreement to help develop the strategy and promote it with their members or constituents. The Prosperity Partnership is staffed by the Puget Sound Regional Council.

The Central Puget Sound Regional Economic Strategy emphasizes six “foundations” of the economy: human resources, technology, access to capital, business climate, physical infrastructure, and quality of life and social capital. It additionally focuses on the region's

leading industry clusters,¹⁷ including aerospace, clean technology, information technology, life sciences, logistics and international trade, military, and tourism. Working groups from the region have been formed around each “foundation” and cluster to further develop these strategies, to develop action plans, and to take action.

The Prosperity Partnership’s initial funding was derived from federal Economic Development Administration sources, local governments, and area businesses.¹⁸

Indicators

There are 21 indicators, organized into the following groupings:

- Quality of life and social capital
- Education and the workforce
- Transportation and infrastructure
- Technology and innovation
- Enterprise and investment
- Business climate

All the indicators are publicly available secondary data sources. Several are presented at the state level, particularly those focused on innovation and degrees awarded. In comparison to other regional indicator systems, the Puget Sound data is focused more closely on economic performance.

Reporting

The *Puget Sound Regional Competitiveness Indicators 2008-2009 Update*, published in November 2008 by the Prosperity Partnership, is the third report in this series, and is available in .pdf format on the Prosperity Partnership Web site. The indicators in the report closely match the priorities of the regional economic strategy, and the report includes findings on five peer regions: Denver, Minneapolis, Phoenix, San Diego, and the San Francisco Bay Area (comparisons to these regions’ states are provided when state-level data is used). Some indicators provide county-level data to support exploration of variation within the region. The publication is a professionally prepared document with rich graphics and tables.

¹⁷ Industry clusters are groups of companies, suppliers, and service providers that are physically proximate and work together to produce a product or service. For example, the auto cluster in Detroit includes manufacturers, parts suppliers, research and development entities, an array of training and higher education providers, and other specialized participants in auto-related economic activity.

¹⁸ Drew DeSilver, “Prosperity Partnership Aims to Add 100,000 Jobs to Region,” *The Seattle Times*, (October 16, 2004) <<http://community.seattletimes.nwsources.com/archive/?date=20041016&slug=prosperity16>>.

Sacramento

Center for Strategic Economic Research—The Prosperity Index: Measuring the Sacramento Region’s Competitive Position

<http://www.strategiceconomicresearch.org/prosperity-1.html>

Definition of the Region

This region is a six-county area around Sacramento: El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties.

Context

The Sacramento Area Commerce and Trade Organization (SACTO) is a private, nonprofit, member-supported economic development entity serving the greater Sacramento area. In partnership with the Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce, and with the staff support of Valley Vision, SACTO formed Partnership for Prosperity, which initiated a regional economic development strategic planning process in 2005. The resulting “Business Plan for the Sacramento Region” had five areas of focus: business development, clean energy technology, high school education, postsecondary education, and civic amenities.¹⁹

SACTO remains involved in the Partnership for Prosperity, primarily in support of its clean energy technology emphasis. The organization’s internal five-year plan, entitled *Building a First-Tier Economy*,²⁰ and developed during the same time frame as the broader Partnership for Prosperity regional business plan, includes a goal to benchmark the region’s economic performance. The resulting *Prosperity Index* was developed by the Center for Strategic Economic Research (CSER), a spin-off research and consulting entity originally formed at California State University, and now closely affiliated with SACTO.

Indicators

The region uses 19 indicators derived from publicly available sources from the public sector, private sector, and non-profit organizations. The indicators are grouped into three categories: business, people, and place. The indicators were selected for their fit and importance and on the basis of available comparison data from other regions. Additionally, the *2009 Prosperity Index* notes that all indicators “. . .reflect a balance of historical, current and future performance and relate to aspects that regional organizations can influence or directly affect.”²¹

¹⁹ Partnership for Prosperity, “A Business Plan for the Sacramento Region,” (2010) <http://www.valleyvision.org/partnership/pdf/PFP_BrochureFINAL.pdf>.

²⁰SACTO, *Building a First-Tier Economy: Annual Report 2008-2009*, (2009) <http://www.sacto.org/tasks/sites/sacto/assets/File/2008_2009FINAL.pdf>.

²¹Center for Strategic Economic Research, *2009 Prosperity Index: Measuring the Sacramento Region’s Competitive Position*, (2009) <<http://www.strategiceconomicresearch.org/pdf/2009ProsperityIndex.pdf>>, 1-2

Reporting

CSER has issued a *Prosperity Index* for the Sacramento region in each of the past five years. The full-color, graphic-intensive report is available in .pdf format on CSER's Web site. The entire *Prosperity Index* is updated annually, while the business component is updated on a quarterly basis, and ranks the Sacramento region's performance against national averages and ten competitor regions. The competitor regions are chosen "based on feedback from economic development organizations regarding metropolitan areas that often compete with the Region for business location and expansion projects."²² The ten regions identified as key competitors to the Sacramento region are: Austin, TX; Denver, CO; Inland Empire, CA; Phoenix, AZ; Portland, OR-WA; Salt Lake City, UT; San Diego, CA; Seattle, WA; San Francisco Bay Area, CA; and Stockton, CA.

Although traditional statistics such as raw numbers of jobs, or percentage of the population with a bachelor's degree, are included in the report, the primary emphasis in the document is on the Sacramento region's relative performance within its peer group. For each indicator, the top-performing region is scored at a "10," and the lowest-performing at a "0," with the remaining regions arrayed between depending on their relative performance. CSER aggregates across all 18 indicators to develop an overall Prosperity Index, and aggregates within the domains of business, people, and place to develop indices specific to these aspects of prosperity.

San Diego

San Diego Association of Governments—Building a Foundation to Achieve Global Competitiveness
http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1365_8011.pdf

Definition of the Region

The regional definition in use for this indicators product is San Diego County. Its largest cities are San Diego and Chula Vista. The county is a census-designated MSA (San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos) with more than three million residents.

Context

This indicators effort has been led by The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), the regional planning entity and consolidated transportation agency for San Diego County. SANDAG developed its indicator report as an effort to identify resources for economic growth in the region and to benchmark the region's economic performance. An advisory group of more than 50, representing business associations, higher education, specific industries, the nonprofit sector, municipalities, and utilities, supported and contributed to the effort.

²² Ibid., p. 1.

The indicator report was intended as a prelude to a county-wide economic development strategy that would be informed by the findings of the indicator report:

...the data and analysis contained in this Strategic Evaluation report will be used as a basis for a second report, San Diego's Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy. Together, the reports represent a complete package. The Strategic Evaluation report identifies the San Diego region's major economic strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and opportunities, and the Prosperity Strategy makes recommendations and assigns responsibilities designed to meet our challenges and take advantage of the opportunities.²³

Indicators

The region uses 43 indicators derived from publicly available sources from the public sector, private sector, and non-profit organizations. The indicators are grouped into four categories: economic and social performance, resources for economic growth, regional infrastructure capacity, and business vitality.

The indicators were chosen to allow exploration of the following questions:

- How well is the region performing?
- How well are the businesses in the region faring?
- What resources are available to support the region's future economic and social well-being?
- What is the capacity of the region's infrastructure to ensure its economic and social well-being in the future?²⁴

Reporting

The report, *Building a Foundation to Achieve Global Competitiveness*, is the third in a series of reports issued by SANDAG to assess economic competitiveness and sustainability, and make recommendations for the economic growth of the region. The report compares the San Diego region's performance to that of the U.S., the State of California, and 24 comparison regions selected on the basis of comparable population size and demographic and economic characteristics.

The black-and-white document is available in .pdf format on SANDAG's Web site. While the core report is approximately 100 pages long, the appended data tables bring the document's length to 300 pages.

²³ San Diego Association of Governments, *Building a Foundation to Achieve Global Competitiveness: Evaluating the Competition and Assessing our Strategic Position*, (2008) <http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1365_8011.pdf>, 2.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4-5.

Silicon Valley

Joint Venture: Silicon Valley—The Silicon Valley Index
<http://www.jointventure.org>

Definition of the Region

More so than other regions and indicator products profiled in this report, the Silicon Valley Region is demarcated by its economy and culture rather than as a set of political subdivisions. In the *2010 Silicon Valley Index*, Joint Venture: Silicon Valley notes that the region's core has typically been defined as Santa Clara County plus parts of San Mateo, Alameda, and Santa Cruz counties. Due to the geographic expansion of industry and employment, the 2010 index includes Santa Clara County and all of San Mateo County for indicators using county-level data; other indicators rely on area codes, school district codes, or MSA statistics, as available and appropriate. The area is 1,854 square miles and has a population of 2.52 million people.

Context

Joint Venture: Silicon Valley (JV:SV) is one of the oldest of California's collaborative regional efforts, many of which received support from the James Irvine Foundation's Collaborative Regional Initiatives (CRI) program, which ran from 1997-2004 and invested more than \$20 million into to formation of regional collaboratives. As described in evaluation materials for that effort, JV:SV was founded in 1993 by a coalition of business leaders from the high-tech sector who were concerned that the region was losing its competitive edge. These leaders worked with other members of the community and consulting support to develop a foundational report, *Blueprint for a 21st Century Community*, which outlined strategies to improve the region's competitive position. The organization has historically employed a "venture capital" model, in which the organization invested in good ideas regardless of their origin, developing projects around those ideas that resonated with its board.²⁵

JV:SV's current projects include:

- The Alliance for Teaching, an effort to recruit, develop, and certify top teachers for the K-12 system
- An effort to eliminate gaps in cell phone coverage in the region
- The Grand Boulevard Initiative, focused on the region's major street, El Camino Real
- Disaster planning and emergency preparedness
- Climate change efforts
- Creation of the Silicon Valley Economic Development Alliance, a region-wide consortium of economic development offices
- Wireless Silicon Valley, an effort to bring wireless service to the whole region
- Workforce development strategy

²⁵ Judith Innes and Jane Rongerude, *Collaborative Regional Initiatives: Civic Entrepreneurs work to Fill the Governance Gap*, The James Irvine Foundation, (November 2005). <http://www.irvine.org/assets/pdf/pubs/civic/insight_CRI.pdf>, 6-7

The Silicon Valley Index is a long-standing program of JV:SV and developed with the partnership and support of the Silicon Valley Community Foundation.

Indicators

For its 2009 report, JV:SV used 67 indicators derived from publicly available sources from the federal and state governmental sources, commercial data (particularly with regard to measures of innovation), national and area nonprofits, and some data derived from original research, including a land-use survey of area municipalities and economic data maintained by JV:SV. In recent years, the indicators have been grouped into five categories: people, society, place, governance, and economy.

As this report was in production, the *2010 Silicon Valley Index* was released. The 2010 product, as with several past products, contains a “special analysis” section. In 2010, this focuses on the need for appropriate state and federal policy related to R&D and higher education, continued access to venture capital from domestic and foreign sources, collaboration with global partners, and global talent attraction. Past versions have focused on mid-tier jobs and changing occupational structure in Silicon Valley.

Reporting

Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network has issued the *Silicon Valley Index* annually since 1995. The Silicon Valley Community Foundation became a lead partner and primary sponsor beginning in 2008. The report is released in conjunction with JV:SV’s annual “State of the Valley” conference (the Web site notes more than 1,200 attendees in 2009). The report is a full-color, professionally prepared document with many graphics, maps, charts, and other visual aids.

Ventura County

The Ventura County Community Alliance—State of the Region Report
<http://www.vccf.org/programs/civicalliance/reports.shtml>

Definition of the Region

Ventura County is a self-contained MSA in southern California with a population of approximately 800,000 and principal cities including Oxnard, Thousand Oaks, and Ventura.

Context

The Ventura County Community Alliance (VCCA) was founded in 2001 by the Ventura County Community Foundation. Its mission is “to promote a healthy and sustainable future for the Ventura County region,”²⁶ and its priority issue is regional sustainability. VCCA works to foster

²⁶ VCCA, “About Us,” (2010) <<http://www.vccf.org/programs/civicalliance/about.shtml>>.

broad-based community dialogue and collaboration and has a leadership structure that intentionally balances representation from economic, environmental, and social interests.

VCCA's current projects include:

- The *State of the Region* report
- The Livable Communities Initiative, focused on walkable communities and healthy land-use choices
- The Compact for a Sustainable Ventura County, a partnership effort involving the Ventura Council of Governments and the Southern California Council of Governments, to develop a vision for the county and consider future scenarios of regional growth
- A workforce initiative focused on youth, immigrants, displaced workers, and the underemployed

Indicators

The *2007 State of the Region* report contains 54 indicators in 12 categories: agriculture, civic engagement, cultural resources, economy, education, environmental quality, land use and housing, natural resources, public health, public safety, social services, and transportation. All measures were fulfilled with secondary data, including several indicators relying on federal and state data systems. However, VCCA also drew upon sources such as county-level agricultural reports, academic surveys and specialized reports, national data collections assembled by philanthropy, and reports and plans from area nonprofits and environmental organizations. The Ventura County report is the only indicator system here profiled to include data specific to agriculture.

Reporting

(VCCA)'s first *State of the Region* report was issued in 2002. The report was intended to be a "snapshot of the state of the quality of life in our region, to provide a reliable source of objective information about the economy and the quality of life in Ventura County." Further, VCCA leaders hoped the report would help to create a sense of shared identity and a collective interest in solving the region's problems.²⁷ To measure Ventura's progress since 2002 and set a course for future action, the *2007 State of the Region* was written.

The 2007 report is a full-color, professionally prepared document available in .pdf format on the Web site of the Ventura County Community Foundation. Several indicators present trend data, and a few include comparisons to other California counties, to the state, or to the nation.

²⁷ Ventura County Community Alliance. *2007 State of the Region Report*, (2007) <<http://www.vccf.org/programs/civicalliance/pdfs/2007sotr.pdf>>, Introduction

West Michigan

West Michigan Strategic Alliance—Vital Signs

http://www.wm-alliance.org/index.php?initiative_id=3

Definition of the Region

The West Michigan region, as defined by the West Michigan Strategic Alliance (WMSA), consists of 1.4 million people in the greater Grand Rapids, Holland, and Muskegon areas. By county, the region includes Allegan, Barry, Ionia, Kent, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, and Ottawa Counties.

Context

The West Michigan Strategic Alliance (WMSA) was formally organized in June 2000 by community leaders from the West Michigan region, including the Grand Rapids, Muskegon, and Holland areas. The effort originated in response to a Grand Rapids “Growing Communities” conference at which urban planner Michael Gallis described regions as the geographic unit of the new economy, a concept that resonated with many attendees. A group of approximately 40 community leaders began to discuss the value of strategic planning on a regional basis, and between 1998 and 2000, the group recruited more than 300 volunteers and implemented a comprehensive community-wide process to identify the changes needed to ensure a healthy future for the region. In addition to its work on priority setting, the group also conceptualized the organizational structure of the Alliance.²⁸

One of the leadership group’s earliest activities was to hire Michael Gallis to create an educational document for use in communications and outreach. This product, *The Common Framework: Information and Maps for Decision Makers*, was developed as the strategic planning process was unfolding, and considers the region’s competitiveness on ten essential activities considered in the strategic planning process. The document concludes with WMSA’s Priorities for Regional Collaboration, a list of six priorities that guide WMSA’s work. These are:

- Create a regional mindset
- Foster a prosperous economy
- Strengthen community through diversity
- Ensure a sustainable environment
- Revitalize our urban centers
- Develop a regional growth strategy

In pursuit of these priorities, WMSA is currently involved in a series of initiatives focused on green infrastructure, internships, regional sustainable manufacturing, clean cities, and talent, as well as a workforce effort funded by a U. S. Department of Labor WIRED grant (Workforce Innovation in Regional Economic Development). In each of its efforts, WMSA strives to

²⁸ This description is based largely on a personal interview with Jim Brooks, as reported in Public Policy Associates, “PAL Grantee Profile: Creating a Regional Mindset and Tri-Plex Growth Strategy,” p. A-149 in *People and Land Evaluation: Summary Report on Initiative and Grantee Achievements* (2005).

develop a balanced committee of volunteer leaders involving private, public, and nonprofit area organizations.

Indicators

The Regional Indicators Initiative was launched in 2006 through a stakeholder-driven effort to identify appropriate content. The document *Elements of Quality of Life in West Michigan*²⁹ on the WMSA Web site identifies key values and priorities of this group. With additional community dialogue, a list of 15 indicators in the categories of economic prosperity, environmental integrity, and social justice was shaped, and these were published as the *West Michigan Vital Signs* in 2007, 2008, and 2009. In 2010, the indicators will be updated to include 18 measures, six in each strand.

Reporting

The *Vital Signs* reports are professionally prepared, full-color and graphic-rich documents available in .pdf format on the WMSA Web site. Some indicators compare West Michigan's performance to the state and nation, and many include trend data. Beginning with the 2009 *Vital Signs* report, benchmarking data were added, comparing West Michigan's performance to performance in 26 other US regions. The initial 26 comparison regions were selected based on population size, number of counties, and number of core cities. Within this group, a set of five top-performing regions were identified for economic and social indicators (each), and a set of the five most environmentally similar regions was identified for environmental benchmarking. Beginning in 2010, the *Vital Signs* effort will report performance on key indicators by racial and ethnic subgroups as well as for the full regional population.

Other recent changes are intended to support the region in taking action where the measures show need or opportunity. In 2009, the technical team of the initiative conducted a series of stakeholder meetings to establish 2015 Achievement Targets for each indicator. In early 2010, a survey of WMSA's membership explored perceptions of the "key drivers" for attainment of these targets: the most viable opportunities to positively influence the region's "Vital Signs." The 2010 data and changes to the regional indicators product will be shared at WMSA's 2010 "State of the Region" meeting.

²⁹WMSA, "Elements for Quality of Life in West Michigan," (2009) <http://www.wm-alliance.org/documents/publications/Elements_for_West_MI_Sustainable_Quality-Life-4-3-09.pdf>.

Appendix A: Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Appendix A includes a listing of the titles of each indicator used in profiled regions' most recent comprehensive indicator reports.

The reader may be interested in indicators used in specialized publications described in this report, such as Chicago Metropolis 2020's indicator reports on housing and crime, the Jacksonville Community Council, Inc.'s annual indicator reports on race, and Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network's "special analysis" indicators, which change with each report. *The reader should consult these publications for indicator detail* as specifics regarding these measures are not incorporated in the Appendix.

A separate document provides methodological details related to data sources and measurement issues.

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
Boston Region	<p>CIVIC VITALITY <i>1.1 Metro Boston's Competitive Edge in Civic Health</i> 1.1.1 Racial and ethnic diversity 1.1.2 Massachusetts ranking on the Center for Wealth & Philanthropy Charitable Giving Indices 1.1.3 Opportunities for civic discourse, Metro Boston <i>1.2 High Rates of Social Capital</i> 1.2.1 Residents' trust in neighbors, Boston 1.2.2 Civic engagement and social and racial trust, Massachusetts 1.2.3 Volunteer activity, Boston and Massachusetts <i>1.3 Demographically Representative Leadership</i> 1.3.1 Leadership of top 100 companies by race and gender, Metro Boston and Massachusetts 1.3.2 Diversity of elected leadership by race and gender, Massachusetts Legislature <i>1.4 High Rates of Voter Participation</i> 1.4.1 Registered voters and participation rates, Boston 1.4.2 Contested Elections, Massachusetts Legislature <i>1.5 Healthy Race and Community Relations</i> 1.5.1 Reported Hate Crimes by Type, Boston neighborhood 1.5.2 Degree of residential segregation, Boston and Metro Boston <i>1.6 Stability and Investment in Neighborhoods</i> 1.6.1 People living at the same address by number of years, Boston neighborhood 1.6.2 Small business loans by race and gender, Boston neighborhood <i>1.7 Welcoming and Inclusive Environment</i> 1.7.1 Public buildings and amenities accessible to people with disabilities, Boston 1.7.2 Multi-lingual capacity in major public institutions, Boston <i>1.8 Access to Information</i> 1.8.1 Library books in circulation, Boston neighborhood 1.8.2 Community newspapers by linguistic group, Boston neighborhood and Metro Boston <i>1.9 Strength of the Nonprofit Sector</i> 1.9.1 Nonprofits by budget and type, Boston 1.9.2 Revenues for the 25 largest nonprofit organizations, Boston <i>1.10 Public Support and Philanthropy</i> 1.10.1 In- and out-of-state grants, Metro Boston</p>	<p>ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY <i>5.1 Environmental Stewardship</i> 5.1.1 The ecological footprint: per capita consumption of global resources, Massachusetts 5.1.2 Household recycling rates and solid waste generated, Boston vs. other Massachusetts cities 5.1.3 Friends groups for parks and greenspaces, Metro Boston <i>5.2 Clean Energy and Climate Stability</i> 5.2.1 Trends in climate change, Metro Boston and New England 5.2.2 Per capita greenhouse gas or CO2 emissions, Massachusetts 5.2.3 Energy from renewable sources, Massachusetts and Boston 5.2.4 Green buildings, Boston and Massachusetts <i>5.3 Productive and Efficient Use of Land</i> 5.3.1 Smart growth measured by trends in development, Metro Boston 5.3.2 Housing density and services within 1/4 mile of transit nodes, Boston and Metro Boston <i>5.4 Clean Air</i> 5.4.1 Changes in air quality – level of PM10 and PM 2.5 micron particles in the air, Suffolk County 5.4.2 Regional ozone (smog), Suffolk county and Massachusetts 5.4.3 Low emission vehicles, Massachusetts <i>5.5 Clean and Plentiful Water</i> 5.5.1 Aquifer/water table depletion caused by water runoff from impervious surfaces and combined sewer overflows (CSOs), Massachusetts and Metro Boston 5.5.2 Swimmable days and violations of safe swimming standards in Boston's rivers and harbor 5.5.3 Efficient and sustainable use of fresh water supplies within available means, Boston and Massachusetts <i>5.6 Sustainable and Healthy Ecosystems</i> 5.6.1 Acres of protected and restored urban wilds and natural areas, Boston 5.6.2 Biodiversity: number and volume of bird species, Boston 5.6.3 Harvestable shellfish beds, Boston Harbor areas <i>5.7 Environmental Justice and Equity</i> 5.7.1 Public health stresses on children, Boston neighborhood</p>	<p>ECONOMY <i>3.1 Maintaining the Region's Competitive Edge</i> 3.1.1 Share of young knowledge workers, Metro Boston vs. other regions 3.1.2 Innovation capacity measured by patents per capita, Massachusetts <i>3.2 Infrastructure to Support the Knowledge Economy</i> 3.2.1 Level of Federal Research and Development funding, Massachusetts vs. Leading Technology States 3.2.2 Share of the nation's venture capital investment, Massachusetts 3.2.3 Funding for public higher education, Massachusetts vs. competitor states <i>3.3 Economic Strength and Resilience</i> 3.3.1 Employment by industry sector, Metro Boston and Boston 3.3.2 Unemployment rate, Boston 3.3.3 Strong office and hotel markets, Boston <i>3.4 Affordable Cost of Living, Metro Boston</i> 3.4.1 Median household income adjusted by cost of living, Metro Boston 3.4.2 Family Self-Sufficiency Standard, Boston 3.4.3 Families and children living in poverty, Boston <i>3.5 A Skilled Workforce</i> 3.5.1 Educational attainment, Boston and Metro Boston 3.5.2 Job training, adult education and English language skills, Massachusetts and Boston <i>3.6 Economic Equity</i> 3.6.1 Income disparities between top and bottom quintile of population — the GINI Index, Boston and US 3.6.2 Income by race, educational attainment, Boston neighborhood 3.6.3 Unemployment by race/ethnicity, Boston and Massachusetts <i>3.7 Economic Mobility and Opportunity</i> 3.7.1 Number of Associates degrees awarded, Massachusetts TECHNOLOGY <i>9.1 Sustaining Metro Boston's Competitive Edge</i> 9.1.1 Research & Development and venture capital funding, Massachusetts 9.1.2 Patents per capita, Massachusetts versus other Leading Technology States</p>

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
	<p>1.10.2 Personal philanthropic support for the nonprofit sector, Massachusetts compared to all states</p> <p>1.10.3 Assets and grants of top 50 foundations, Massachusetts</p> <p>CULTURAL LIFE AND THE ARTS</p> <p><i>2.1 Contribution to Metro Boston's competitive edge</i></p> <p>2.1.1 "Creativity Index" ranking, Boston vs. other major cities</p> <p>2.1.2 Economic impact of Creative Cluster industries, Boston and Massachusetts</p> <p>2.1.3 Cultural sector funding, Metro Boston vs. other metro regions</p> <p><i>2.2 Boston as an exciting regional destination</i></p> <p>2.2.1 Rankings of Cultural Vitality, Boston and Select Metro Regions</p> <p>2.2.2 Attendance at major cultural events and spectacles, Boston and Massachusetts</p> <p>2.2.3 Impact on the local and regional tourist industry, Boston and Metro Boston</p> <p><i>2.3 Impact of arts organizations on community life</i></p> <p>2.3.1 Distribution of arts and cultural facilities in relationship to the concentration of children, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>2.3.2 Artists and visitors participating in Open Studios, Boston neighborhood</p> <p><i>2.4 Vibrant Expressions of Cultural Diversity</i></p> <p>2.4.1 Online Cultural Resources Survey</p> <p>2.4.2 Demographically representative cultural institution leadership, Massachusetts</p> <p>2.4.3 Public festivals and celebrations, Boston neighborhood</p> <p><i>2.5 Opportunities for arts education</i></p> <p>2.5.1 Teachers dedicated to visual arts, music, and theater in Boston's public schools</p> <p>2.5.2 Children and youth participation in after-school arts programs, Boston</p> <p>2.5.3 Students in degree-granting schools of visual and performing arts, Metro Boston</p> <p><i>2.6 Equitable access to cultural participation</i></p> <p>2.6.1 Cultural facilities seats to population ratio, Boston</p> <p>2.6.2 Free and reduced price tickets at cultural institutions and venues, Boston</p> <p>2.6.3 Access to cultural facilities for people with physical disabilities</p>	<p>5.7.2 Toxic emissions from smokestacks and tailpipes, Boston</p> <p><i>5.8 Accessible Green and Recreational Spaces</i></p> <p>5.8.1 Green space distribution, acres per 1,000 children, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>5.8.2 Access to and public use of Harborwalk and Harbor Islands National Park</p> <p><i>5.9 Beautiful Walkable Communities</i></p> <p>5.9.1 Tree cover and number of trees and bulbs/flowers planted, Boston</p> <p>5.9.2 Community gardens, Boston neighborhood</p> <p><i>5.10 Sustained Public Support for Environment and Open Space</i></p> <p>5.10.1 Funding for the environment and open space, Boston and Massachusetts</p> <p>HOUSING</p> <p><i>6.1 Retaining Boston's Competitive Advantage in Housing</i></p> <p>6.1.1 Housing costs as a percentage of the cost of living, Boston vs. selected cities</p> <p>6.1.2 Housing units within a 10-minute walk of rail transit, Boston</p> <p><i>6.2 Housing Affordable to All Residents</i></p> <p>6.2.1 Median home price vs. median household income, Metro region</p> <p>6.2.2 Median home price, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>6.2.3 Median advertised two-bedroom rental, Boston</p> <p><i>6.3 An Adequate Housing Supply</i></p> <p>6.3.1 Growth in population, households, housing units and jobs, Metro Boston</p> <p>6.3.2 Vacancy rates in Metro Boston, Inner Core Communities, and Boston</p> <p>6.3.3 Municipalities with the fastest and slowest growth in housing supply, Metro Boston</p> <p><i>6.4 Adequate Housing Production</i></p> <p>6.4.1 Market rate and subsidized housing production, Metro Boston</p> <p>6.4.2 Dormitory beds to students, Boston</p> <p><i>6.5 Homelessness Prevention</i></p> <p>6.5.1 Homelessness among men, women and children, Boston</p> <p><i>6.6 Equitable Distribution of Affordable Housing</i></p> <p>6.6.1 Communities with the highest and lowest percentage of affordable housing, Metro Boston</p> <p>6.6.2 Distribution of affordable housing units, Boston</p>	<p>9.1.3 Graduates with science and technology degrees, Massachusetts</p> <p><i>9.2 Universal Access to Technology</i></p> <p>9.2.1 In-home access to computers and the Internet, Boston and Metro Boston</p> <p>9.2.2 Public access to computers and the Internet, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>9.2.3 Number of neighborhoods/communities with available broadband and wireless access, Massachusetts and Boston</p> <p><i>9.3 Use of Technology for Teaching and Learning</i></p> <p>9.3.1 Ratio of students per computer, Boston Public Schools</p> <p>9.3.2 Schools wired for high-speed Internet access, Boston Public Schools and Massachusetts vs. Leading Technology States</p> <p>9.3.3 Teachers using technology in teaching, Boston Public Schools and Massachusetts vs. Leading Technology States</p> <p><i>9.4 Technologically Skilled Workforce</i></p> <p>9.4.1 Workforce with New Economy skills, Massachusetts</p> <p>9.4.2 Demand for information technology workers, Boston and Massachusetts</p> <p><i>9.5 Integration of Technology for Community Building and Information</i></p> <p>9.5.1 Use of the Internet for government and community information, Metro Boston</p> <p><i>9.6 Up-to-date Technology Infrastructure in the Nonprofit Sector</i></p> <p>9.6.1 Availability and use of technology in nonprofits, Metro Boston</p> <p>9.6.2 Use of technology for electronic advocacy, activism, lobbying and organizing, Metro Boston</p> <p><i>9.7 Financial and Other Support</i></p>

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
	<p>2.6.4 Comprehensive information about arts and culture activities and programs, Metro Boston</p> <p>2.7 <i>Public support and funding for the arts</i></p> <p>2.7.1 Levels of volunteering in arts and cultural organizations, Massachusetts</p> <p>2.7.2 Dedicated artists' housing units, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>2.7.3 Designated state and city funding for the arts</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>4.1 <i>Retaining the Region's Competitive Edge in Education</i></p> <p>4.1.1 Educational attainment rates, Boston and Metro Boston versus comparable regions</p> <p>4.2 <i>Higher Education and Advancement Opportunities</i></p> <p>4.2.1 Participation in Massachusetts' public higher education institutions by race and ethnicity</p> <p>4.2.2 Boston Public School graduates enrolled in college or skills training</p> <p>4.3 <i>Education for Economic Advancement</i></p> <p>4.3.1 Adult education and English language slots vs. length of time on waiting list</p> <p>4.4 <i>School Readiness and Ready Schools</i></p> <p>4.4.1 Enrollment in early, accredited childhood education and full day kindergarten, Boston, neighborhood and Massachusetts</p> <p>4.4.2 Students who qualify for free or reduced price lunch, Boston and Metro Boston</p> <p>4.5 <i>High Academic Achievement</i></p> <p>4.5.1 Third graders reading at 3rd grade reading level by race/ethnicity and income, Boston and Massachusetts</p> <p>4.5.2 MCAS scores of 10th graders by race/ethnicity and income, Boston and Massachusetts</p> <p>4.6 <i>School Choice</i></p> <p>4.6.1 Enrollment in public, private, parochial and charter schools, Boston</p> <p>4.7 <i>Parental and Community Involvement</i></p> <p>4.7.1 Parental involvement, Boston Public Schools</p> <p>4.7.2 Corporate involvement and partnerships, Boston Public Schools</p> <p>4.8 <i>High Quality Teaching</i></p> <p>4.8.1 Ratio of students to teachers in the regular education program, Boston Public Schools</p> <p>4.8.2 Teachers who have advanced degrees in the subjects they teach, Massachusetts</p>	<p>neighborhood</p> <p>6.7 <i>Fair Housing</i></p> <p>6.7.1 Homeownership and access to mortgages by race, Boston</p> <p>6.8 <i>Healthy Homes and Neighborhoods</i></p> <p>6.8.1 Mortgage foreclosures, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>6.8.2 Abandoned properties, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>6.8.3 Reported cases of lead poisoning, Boston</p> <p>6.9 <i>Public Funding for Housing</i></p> <p>6.9.1 Trend in public funding for housing, federal and state</p> <p>PUBLIC SAFETY</p> <p>8.1 <i>Balanced, Robust Strategies for Public Safety, Regional and Homeland Security</i></p> <p>8.1.1 Impact of terrorism on local public safety resources, Metro Boston</p> <p>8.1.2 Collaboration for preventive strategies and emergency preparedness, Metro Boston</p> <p>8.1.3 Trends in local public safety in Boston vs. Northeast, U.S. other large cities</p> <p>8.2 <i>Low Crime Rates in Boston</i></p> <p>8.2.1 Trends in reported citywide crime in Part One (Serious) Crime, Part Two (Quality of Life) Crimes and for Crimes in Public Housing, Boston</p> <p>8.2.2 Trends in reported Part One Crime per 1000 population, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>8.3 <i>Perception of Public Safety</i></p> <p>8.3.1 Resident public perception of safety and quality of life ranking, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>8.3.2 Public perception of threats to community by type, Boston</p> <p>8.4 <i>Strong Civic and Social Networks</i></p> <p>8.4.1 Residents who trust their neighbors, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>8.4.2 Domestic violence, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>8.4.3 Trends in reported hate crimes, Boston</p> <p>8.5 <i>Supportive Environment for Youth and Children</i></p> <p>8.5.1 Juvenile crime rates, Boston</p> <p>8.5.2 After school program availability, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>8.5.3 Permanent expulsion rates by race, gender, income and English proficiency, Boston Public Schools vs. Massachusetts</p> <p>8.6 <i>Partnerships for Violence Reduction</i></p> <p>8.6.1 Partnerships with law enforcement agencies by</p>	

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
	<p>4.9 <i>High Quality School Culture and Environment</i></p> <p>4.9.1 Schools with up-to-date technology and libraries, gyms, labs and renovated schoolyards, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>4.9.2 Ratio of students to guidance counselors, Boston</p> <p>4.9.3 Attendance, dropout and expulsion rates by level, Boston and Massachusetts</p> <p>4.10 <i>Out-of-School Opportunities</i></p> <p>4.10.1 Children and youth participation in after-school programs, Boston neighborhood vs. comparable cities</p> <p>4.11 <i>Public Support for Education</i></p> <p>4.11.1 Per student spending on early childhood education, K-12 and public higher education, Boston and Massachusetts</p> <p>HEALTH</p> <p>7.1 <i>Retaining the Region's Competitive Edge in the Health Sector</i></p> <p>7.1.1 Research funding, Massachusetts and Metro Boston</p> <p>7.1.2 "Right Start" rank in child health outcomes, Boston vs. 50 largest US cities</p> <p>7.2 <i>Unimpeded Access to Health Care Services</i></p> <p>7.2.1 Percentage of residents without health insurance by gender and race, Massachusetts</p> <p>7.2.2 Mental health services capacity for children and adults, Massachusetts</p> <p>7.2.3 Language interpreters at major hospitals and health centers, Boston</p> <p>7.3 <i>Low Rates of Disease and Mortality</i></p> <p>7.3.1 Leading causes of hospitalization and death, Boston</p> <p>7.3.2 Drug- and violence-related injuries and deaths, Boston</p> <p>7.3.3 Rates of STDs, hepatitis C and HIV infection, and AIDS mortality by race, Boston and neighborhood</p> <p>7.4 <i>Elimination of Racial/Ethnic Health Disparities in Health Outcomes</i></p> <p>7.4.1 Infant mortality and birth weight by race/ethnicity, Boston</p> <p>7.4.2 Asthma hospitalization rates by race/ethnicity and age, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>7.4.3 Hospitalization and mortality rates by race/ethnicity, Boston</p> <p>7.5 <i>Investment in Healthy Children and Adolescents</i></p> <p>7.5.1 Women receiving adequate prenatal care, Boston</p>	<p>type, Boston neighborhood</p> <p>8.7 <i>Police and Community Relations</i></p> <p>8.7.1 Respect and trust between residents and police officers, Boston</p> <p>8.8 <i>Public Funding and Support</i></p> <p>8.8.1 Trends in federal, state and city funding for the Boston Police Department</p> <p>TRANSPORTATION</p> <p>10.1 <i>Transportation that Enhances National and Global Competitiveness</i></p> <p>10.1.1 Metro Boston's global and national transportation capacity</p> <p>10.1.2 Household income spent on transportation: Boston vs. comparable cities</p> <p>10.2 <i>An Integrated Regional System</i></p> <p>10.2.1 Distribution of daily trips, Boston & Metro Boston</p> <p>10.2.2 Trends in rapid transit ridership by node, Metro Boston</p> <p>10.3 <i>Equitable and High Quality Transportation Access for All</i></p> <p>10.3.1 Residents within a 10-minute walk or short drive from transit nodes by race, income, age group and transit dependency, Boston and Metro Boston</p> <p>10.3.2 Convenience of service to bus riders, Boston and Metro Boston</p> <p>10.4 <i>Environmentally Sustainable Transportation</i></p> <p>10.4.1 Car ownership and vehicle miles traveled, Boston and Metro Boston</p> <p>10.4.2 Vehicular greenhouse gas emissions, Massachusetts</p> <p>10.4.3 Use of low-emissions vehicles, Massachusetts</p> <p>10.5 <i>Options that Enhance Civic and Community Life</i></p> <p>10.5.1 People walking and biking to work, Metro Boston</p> <p>10.5.2 Traffic and parking volume, Boston</p> <p>10.5.3 Hours spent stuck in traffic, Metro Boston</p> <p>10.6 <i>Adequate Public Funding</i></p> <p>10.6.1 Transportation funding by model</p>	

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
	and Massachusetts 7.5.2 Up-to-date vaccinations, Boston and Massachusetts vs. US 7.5.3 Suicide rates among youth, Boston 7.5.4 Youth who engage in risky behaviors, Boston 7.5.5 Youth who report a strong relationship with a parent or adult mentor by gender, grade and years lived in the US, Boston 7.6 <i>Healthy Behavior</i> 7.6.1 Percentage of residents who engage in healthy behavior, Metro Boston and Massachusetts 7.6.2 Obesity by age, gender and racial/ethnic group, Boston 7.7 <i>Low Rates of Environmental Hazards</i> 7.7.1 Location of children and recreation areas vs. exposure to environmental hazards, Boston neighborhood 7.8 <i>Public Funding for Public Health</i> 7.8.1 Trends in City, State and Federal public health funding levels		
Central Ohio	PEOPLE Population Growth Commuting Methods Recycling and Waste Local Food Grassroots Sustainability Efforts Child Obesity School Enrollment Limited English Proficiency Election Participation Assisted Living Facilities Hate Crimes	PLACE Parks and Conserved Land Air Quality Pollutant Emissions Water Quality Farmland Lost Agricultural Commodities Building Permits Bicycle Paths Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes Intermodal Lifts Sustainable Development Vehicle Crashes & Registrations Alternative Energy Sources	PROSPERITY Graduation and Employment Business Growth Unemployment Job Growth Wages Green Jobs Green Products Energy Consumption Energy Efficient Buildings Home Prices Foreclosures Weatherization Property Taxes Commercial Vacancies Industrial Vacancies Free School Lunch

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
Chicago Metropolis	<p>COMMUNITY LIFE SHARED PROSPERITY Household Income Distribution Children in Poverty Concentration by Race Geographic Distribution of Region's Ethnic Groups Tax Capacity by Municipality</p> <p>SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS Violent and Property Crime Rates</p> <p>HEALTHY PEOPLE Health Insurance Infant Mortality Child Immunization Stroke Rates</p> <p>EDUCATION SCHOOL READINESS Early Childhood Education Programs</p> <p>EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT Education Spending Student Achievement Graduation Rate Advanced Degrees</p>	<p>TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE EFFICIENT LAND USE Facility Planning Areas</p> <p>EFFICIENT MOBILITY Vehicle Mobility Highway Travel in Congestion Per Capita Transit Ridership Household Internet Usage International Non-Stop Destinations</p> <p>HOUSING HOUSING CHOICE AND AFFORDABILITY Rent Burden Affordability Index Jobs-Rental Housing Mismatch Change in Employment and Total Occupied Rental Units</p> <p>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP Protected Open Space Added, 2000 Air Quality Water Quality</p>	<p>REGIONAL ECONOMY GROWING ECONOMY Industry Sector Diversity Average Wage By Industry Sector Average Annual Wages by Industry Job Growth Corporate Headquarters</p> <p>INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP Venture Capital Technology Transfer</p>
Cincinnati	<p>HEALTHY PEOPLE AND HEALTHY COMMUNITIES 9 Healthy People Index. 10 Sense of community. 11 Violent crime rate in the region 12 Number of people using public transportation. 13 Percent of population that feels treated with fairness and respect in public interactions, reported by race, ethnicity, sexual orientation and disability status. 14 Racial and income segregation in the region measured by the index of dissimilarity</p>	<p>HEALTHY ECOSYSTEMS 5 Percent of land in the region devoted to people, habitat, car habitat, wildlife habitat, and agriculture. 6 Pounds of waste per capita sent to landfills or other disposal. 7 Number of days that air quality is unhealthy based on national standards. 8 Percent of stream miles meeting state water quality standards</p>	<p>ECONOMIC PROSPERITY 1 Entrepreneurial spirit as measured by new business starts. 2 Percent of workforce between 20 and 35 years of age. 3 Cumulative percent of students who finish high school and are "work ready" or prepared for higher education. 4 The percent of the eligible workforce earning enough to be self-sufficient.</p>

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
Jacksonville Community	<p>ACHIEVING EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE Public high school graduation rate (2008-09) Kindergarten Readiness (2008-09) Supporting Indicators: Third graders reading at grade level (2008-09) Tenth graders reading at grade level (2008-09) Students absent 21+ days (2007-08) [Middle school] School Safety Incidents per 1,000 Students (2008-09) Higher education degrees awarded (2007-08) Additional Indicators: Public school first grade promotions (2007-08) Tenth graders at grade level in math (2008-09) Students attending racially-diverse schools (2008-09) Public high school dropout rate (2008-09) 4 HS graduates prepared for college: Reading (2008) HS graduates prepared for college: Math (2008) Satisfaction with public education (2009) Exceptional students receive diplomas (2007-08)</p> <p>PROMOTING SOCIAL WELLBEING AND HARMONY Is racism a local problem? (2009) Births to single mothers (2008) Supporting Indicators: Do you volunteer? (2009) Philanthropy given to federated campaigns (2008) Foster children per 1,000 children (2009) Homeless count per 100,000 people (2009) Additional Indicators: Have you personally experienced racism? (2009) Volunteer more than 7 hours per week? (2009) Births to teen mothers per 1,000 teens (2008) Subsequent births to teen mothers (2008) Birth to mothers with 12 years education (2008) Children of divorcing parents (2008) Foster care children reunited within 12 months (2009) Foster care children adopted within 24 months (2009)</p> <p>KEEPING THE COMMUNITY SAFE People feel safe in their neighborhood (2009) Index crimes per 100,000 people (2008) Supporting Indicators: People report being victims of a crime (2009) Juvenile delinquents per 1,000 youth (2008) Murder rate (2008)</p>	<p>PRESERVING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT Days the Air Quality Index is “good” (2008) Average daily water consumption (gallons) (2008) Supporting Indicators: Streams meeting dissolved oxygen standards (2008) Streams meeting bacteria standards (2008) Residential recycling (pounds per person) (2009) Acres of conservation/preservation land (2009) Additional Indicators: Gallons of motor fuels sold per person (2008) New septic-tank permits issued (2008)</p> <p>MOVING AROUND EFFICIENTLY Moving Around Efficiently and Safely Commute times of 25 minutes or less (2009) Average weekday JTA bus ridership per 1,000 (2008) Supporting Indicators: Total JIA passengers (millions) (2008) Average weekday miles of JTA bus service (2008) Motor vehicle accidents per 1,000 people (2008) Additional Indicators: JTA bus headways within 30/60 minutes (2008) Average weekday Skyway ridership (2008) Nonstop flights destinations at JIA (2008) Average available seats on airplane flights (2009)</p> <p>MAINTAINING RESPONSIVE GOVERNMENT Voter turnout (2008) Satisfaction with basic city services (2009) Supporting Indicators: Racial diversity of elected officials (2009) Gender diversity of elected officials (2009) Neighborhood organizations (2009) Can you influence local government? (2009) Keeping up with local government news (2009) Additional Indicators: Voter registration (2008) Satisfaction with public-safety services (2009) Can you name two City Council members? (2009) Elected leadership rated as high quality (2009) School Board leadership rated as high quality (2009)</p> <p>ENJOYING ARTS, CULTURE, AND RECREATION Public and private arts support per person (2008) \$ Public performances and events (2008)</p>	<p>GROWING A VIBRANT ECONOMY Total employment (2008) Unemployment rate (2008) Per capita income (2007) Supporting Indicators: Adults with bachelor’s degrees or higher (2008) Households paying >30% for housing (2008) Total taxable value of real property (2008) JAXPORT tonnage (millions) (2009) Bed tax and sales tax collections (millions) (2008) Additional Indicators: Recipients of public assistance: TANF (2009) Recipients of public assistance: Food Stamps (2009) Average monthly household JEA utilities costs (2008) New housing starts (2008) Average annual wage (2008) Unemployment benefit claims (2008)</p>

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
	<p>Child abuse reports per 1,000 children (2008) Additional Indicators: Police-call response times (2008) Rescue-call response times under four minutes (2008) Fire-call response times under four minutes (2008) Juvenile alcohol/drug arrests per 1,000 youth (2008) Domestic violence crime reports (2008) Domestic-violence-related homicides (2008) Violent deaths per 10,000 youth (2008)</p> <p>SUSTAINING A HEALTHY COMMUNITY Infant mortality rate per 1,000 (2008) White (2008) Black (2008) People without health insurance (2008) Supporting Indicators: Cancer deaths per 100,000 people (2008) New HIV cases (2008) White (2008) Black (2008) STD reports per 100,000 people (2008) Suicide rates per 100,000 people (2008) Seniors (65 and older) (2008) Youth (10-19) (2008) Additional Indicators: Early prenatal care (2008) Newborns with healthy birth weights (2008) Seniors feel safe in their neighborhoods (2009) HIV/AIDS-related deaths per 100,000 (2008) Packs of cigarettes sold per person (2009) Lung cancer deaths per 100,000 people (2008) Heart disease deaths per 100,000 people (2008) Local health care seen as good or excellent (2009)</p>	<p>Supporting Indicators: Musical performances attendance per 1,000 (2008) Museum attendance per 1,000 people (2008) Zoo attendance per 1,000 people (2008) Attendance at sports events per 100,000 (2008) Park expenditures for activities/maintenance (2008) Library circulation per person (2009)</p>	

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
Puget Sound	QUALITY OF LIFE & SOCIAL CAPITAL Crime Rate Air Quality Index Arts Organizations Housing Affordability Charitable Giving EDUCATION & THE WORKFORCE Fourth Grade Math & Reading Proficiency High School Graduation Rate Science & Engineering Degrees Awarded Worker Productivity	TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE Travel Time Index Transportation Expenditures	TECHNOLOGY & INNOVATION R&D Expenditures Patents Issued SBIR Awards ENTERPRISE & INVESTMENT Venture Capital Small Business Administration Loans Minority-Owned Businesses Certifications EDC Activity BUSINESS CLIMATE Business Starts & Closures Tax Share
Sacramento	PEOPLE College Enrollment Educational Attainment High School Progress Median Household Income Household Income Spread Population Growth	PLACE Air Quality Charitable Contributions Commute Time Crime Rate Fair Market Growth Housing Affordability	PROSPERITY Job Growth Establishment Growth Office Vacancy Rate Payroll Growth Unemployment Rate Venture Capital Investment
San Diego	ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PERFORMANCE Population Growth Migration Age Ethnicity Employment Wages and Income Inflation and Cost of Living Air Quality Crime Rate Poverty Rate	RESOURCES FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH Educational Status Standardized Tests Pre-school Enrollment Expenditures per Student Housing Supply Housing Affordability Hospital Capacity Births to Teen Mothers Health Insurance Coverage Health Insurance Premiums Medical Costs Health Ranking REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY Highway and Transit Airport Maritime Port International Border Crossing Water Demand and Wastewater Flow Municipal Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste Energy Communications Technology Parks and Open Space	BUSINESS VITALITY Gross Regional Product Employment Trends Quality of Job Growth Engines of Economic Growth Output per Worker and Wages International Trade and Goods Movement Retail Sales High Technology Industries Venture Capital Investment Business Firm Size Minority and Women-Owned Businesses Business Formation and Bankruptcies

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
Silicon Valley (2009)	<p>PEOPLE AND SOCIETY</p> <p>Population Change and Net Migration Flows</p> <p>Age Distribution</p> <p>Household Size</p> <p>Educational Attainment</p> <p>Total Science and Engineering Degrees Conferred and Foreign Students</p> <p>High School Graduation Rates and Meeting UC/CSU Entrance Requirements</p> <p>High School Dropout Rates</p> <p>Share of Students who have taken Algebra II</p> <p>Preschool Enrollment</p> <p>Kindergarten Readiness and Teacher Expectations</p> <p>Third Grade Reading Ability and Reading Proficiency by Race/Ethnicity</p> <p>Contributions to the Arts</p> <p>Child Immunizations</p> <p>Overweight Youths and Adults</p> <p>Share of Youth in Health Fitness Zone by Age</p> <p>Share of Population with Diabetes</p> <p>Access to Health Insurance</p> <p>Preventable Hospitalizations</p> <p>Teen Birth Rate</p> <p>Child Abuse</p> <p>Adult and Juvenile Felony Offenses/Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Services</p> <p>School Safety</p>	<p>PLACE AND GOVERNANCE</p> <p>Protected Open Space</p> <p>Renewable Energy</p> <p>Water Resources</p> <p>South Bay Water Quality</p> <p>Trends in Waste Diversion</p> <p>Means of Commute</p> <p>Alternative Fuel Vehicles Registered</p> <p>Vehicle Miles of Travel per Capita & Gas Prices</p> <p>Fuel Consumption</p> <p>Transit Use</p> <p>Residential Density</p> <p>Housing and Development Near Transit</p> <p>Adoption of Green Building Policies</p> <p>Building Affordable Housing</p> <p>Rental Affordability</p> <p>Home Affordability</p> <p>Residential Foreclosure Activity</p> <p>Trends in Homelessness</p> <p>Commercial Space Vacancies, Rents, and Development</p> <p>Voter Participation</p> <p>Support for Local Bonds</p> <p>Immigrants Applying for Citizenship</p> <p>City Revenue</p> <p>County Financials</p> <p>Changing Share of City/County Budget for Pensions</p>	<p>ECONOMY</p> <p>Monthly Jobs and Change in Total Nonfarm</p> <p>Quarterly Job Growth</p> <p>Major Areas of Economic Activity</p> <p>Green Business Establishments and Jobs</p> <p>Real Per Capita Income</p> <p>Income Distribution</p> <p>Median Household Income</p> <p>Relative Cost of Living</p> <p>Employer Contributions to Employee Pensions and Insurance Funds</p> <p>Value Added per Employee</p> <p>Global Patent Collaboration and Silicon Valley</p> <p>Percentage of California & U.S. Patents</p> <p>Green Technology Patents</p> <p>Establishments from Foreign Countries in Silicon Valley</p> <p>Venture Capital</p> <p>Venture Capital Investment in Clean Technology & CleanTech Venture Capital Investment by Segment</p> <p>IPO Pricings in Clean Technology</p> <p>Mergers and Acquisitions</p> <p>Mergers and Acquisitions in Clean Technology</p> <p>FDA Approved Therapeutics Developed by Silicon Valley Companies</p> <p>Broadband Penetration</p>

Overview of Indicators at a Glance, Across Regions

Region	Industry Cluster		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Prosperity</i>
Ventura County	<p>CIVIC ENGAGEMENT Voter registration Voter turnout Party affiliation Volunteer activity</p> <p>CULTURAL RESOURCES Religious affiliation Public libraries Nonprofit sector</p> <p>EDUCATION Public school enrollment Annual per-pupil spending, public schools, 1998-2005. Academic performance High school dropout rate Number of English learners Community college enrollment</p> <p>PUBLIC HEALTH Health insurance Teen smoking Childhood obesity Asthma rates Births to teen mothers</p> <p>PUBLIC SAFETY Overall crime rate Crimes in county communities Juvenile felony arrests Domestic violence calls Calls to Ventura County Fire Dept</p> <p>SOCIAL SERVICES Calls to 211 for social service referral Child abuse Child care access Grants by charities Homelessness</p>	<p>AGRICULTURE Harvested Acres Crop value Acres in organic production Value of agricultural lands</p> <p>Agricultural employment data</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY Groundwater quality Air quality Ocean water quality Surface water quality</p> <p>LAND USE AND HOUSING Acres of urbanized land Urban density Housing affordability Housing tenure</p> <p>NATURAL RESOURCES Electricity use Solar power Parks and open space Waste and recycling</p> <p>TRANSPORTATION Means to work Congestion delays Vehicle miles traveled in relation to population Public transit ridership Transit costs in relation to population</p>	<p>ECONOMY Gross county product Employment growth Salaries by sector Unemployment</p>
West Michigan Strategic Alliance	<p>SOCIAL JUSTICE No Health Coverage Median Income by Race Disparity Index Voter Participation Housing Cost Burden Teens Not in School Violent and Property Crime Rates</p>	<p>ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY PBT (Persistent, Bio-Accumulative, and Toxic) Chemicals Closed Beach Days Commute Time Regional Type II Municipal Solid Waste Ground-Level Ozone Particulate Matter 2.5</p>	<p>ECONOMIC PROSPERITY Self-Employed Professionals Educational Attainment (Percentage of 25-34 Year Olds with a Bachelor's Degree or Higher) Per Capita Income Annual Percent Change in Employment Employment Rate (Age 16 and Older) Number of Children Living in Poverty</p>