California
Regional
Network

Lake Tahoe clarity
in decline

Nearly 1% of Bay Area
population is homeless

Teen smoking
reduced by ½ in
Ventura County

california's regional collaboratives:

inventory and analysis of community indicator reports

draft summary report

June 2, 2003

CCRL CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR REGIONAL LEADERSHIP

california's regional collaboratives:
inventory and analysis of community indicator reports

draft summary report

prepared by:
Trish Kelly, Program Consultant
Kala Venugopal, Program Officer
Stephanie Dodaro, Program Associate

table of contents

i. introduction

This report is an inventory and preliminary analysis of the growing field of practice on Community Indicators by California's Regional Collaboratives (for information see www.calregions.org). California's Regional Collaboratives (RCs) are region-based civic organizations working to improve the state's economy, quality of life, and opportunity for all. The RCs are conveners and coordinators of civic governance and community initiatives within their regions.

The report includes a summary of the main types of indicators used in reports, a listing of the most common - or "core" - indicators across the projects, project characteristics derived from "profiles" of and interviews with the RCs, new or unusual indicators, and data and information desired for future indicators.

Community Indicator reporting is a long-standing interest of the RCs. As of May 2003 there are 22 Regional Collaboratives (RC) and 12 Community Indicator reports, with a new report due this summer. The Great Valley Center, a regional stewardship organization for the Central Valley region and an alliance partner in the RC network, has published a series of reports that also are included in this inventory, for a total of 13 projects. These Indicator reports in total include more than 200 indicators.

During our process of updating a 1998 inventory of California Community Indicator Projects by Redefining Progress, we learned that several projects undertaken by a variety of organizations during the 1990's had either been terminated for technical reasons or lack of sponsorship/funding, or had been merged into other regional projects. The RCs stand out as the one group that are adding projects and improving their capacity to implement meaningful projects. The roles that the RCs play within their regions - as information providers/storytellers, neutral conveners, boundary crossers, and mobilizers of community leadership and action – lend themselves to the needs of Community Indicator projects.

The purposes of this report are to:
- Provide a best practices and technical resource for both the RCs and others interested in undertaking a community indicator project or enhancing existing projects
- Link the RCs within their network, and with other regional and statewide partners, in particular the First Five (Children and Families Commissions) so they can collaborate for greater efficiencies and partnerships in project development and community mobilization
- Link the regions and the State for better planning, data acquisition, policy development, and resource targeting
- Lay the groundwork to possibly develop a region-based statewide indicators report and methods to identify desired measurable outcomes and track progress

The final report will include project profiles and will be available later in the summer of 2003.

ii. background

why this project?

The impetus for this project came from several directions. The Community Indicators movement is growing nationally and internationally as communities, regions, states and institutions seek to understand and benchmark conditions for prosperity and quality of life, identify areas that need to be addressed for improvement, set priorities, mobilize action, and track progress. According to Redefining Progress, an early leader in documenting and supporting Community Indicator projects, there are more than 200 projects nationally and internationally, and this number is literally increasing every week.

Underlying most of these efforts is the goal of ensuring sustainable vitality, quality and inclusion for the economy, the environment and people (equity) – the three E's. A more recently added fourth E is for civic engagement of community leaders and citizens.

Many Community Indicator projects were initiated in the late 1980's, inspired by the U. N. World Summit on Sustainable Development, where in 1987 the Bruntland Commission (the World Commission on Environment and Development) called for: *"Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."* These projects had a strong environmental sustainability emphasis.

In California, early Community Indicator projects were primarily focused on environmental topics or healthy communities. The RCs have had an interest in Community Indicators since the first RC report, the *Index of Silicon Valley*, published by Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network in 1994. This report, which led with economic indicators, was groundbreaking. Social and environmental indicators were added subsequently as leaders realized that economic progress could not occur at the expense of equity and environmental considerations.

The Sierra Business Council followed with a rural version on an Index in 1996 – *The Sierra Nevada Wealth Index*. The Index explicitly linked three types of wealth – social, environmental and financial – as the foundation for the future health and prosperity of the Sierra Nevada.

By the 1998 Civic Entrepreneur Summit, the annual convening of the RCs, there were 4 RC Community Indicator reports. Because these reports covered a spectrum of issues, and the relationships between them, they were viewed as Quality of Life reports within a sustainability framework. At the Summit, the first session on "Regional Progress Indicators" took place, including an inventory of existing California Indicator projects by Redefining Progress. The Redefining Progress inventory covered three types of reports: environmental sustainability, healthy community, and quality of life, with approximately 25 projects in total.

Between 1998 and 2000, several more RCs released Community Indicator reports. At the 2000 Civic Entrepreneur Summit, RCs affirmed an interest in beginning to build a community of practice, as projects evolved and new projects got underway. Areas of interest included: identifying and selecting appropriate indicators, technical capacity, data accessibility, use in measuring regional progress, engaging community leaders, funding, and communications.

In August 2001 and January 2002 (at the 2002 Civic Entrepreneur Summit) the California Center for Regional Leadership and the Foundation Consortium convened meetings of RC leaders and others from state agencies and regional research entities and non-profits, in particular, representatives from selected Children and Families Commissions (funded by Proposition 10 tobacco funds). The "First Five" Commissions participate in county children's report cards projects. Participants were very interested in building a community of practice for indicator projects, and linking efforts across networks and systems.

To support this process, the Director of the Orange County Children and Families Commission, who is the Project Director for the Orange County Community Indicators Project, partnered with the California Center for Regional Leadership to prepare this inventory as the next step. This project connects the RC network and the First Five Commissions, using the Community Indicator reports as the bridge. In this way, the issues identified by the First Five Commissions can be integrated into the broader quality of life community indicator reports. In turn, the RCs can deepen their relationships with social equity partners.

why regional community indicators?

California faces great challenges over the next twenty years. As documented in the RC Community Indicator reports, California's regions have sustained major economic and demographic shifts in the past decade. There are approximately 600,000 new Californians each year, and, as the first majority minority state, our population is becoming increasing more diverse. Each of California's regions is unique in its diversity, priorities and challenges. Community indicators tracked regionally offers regions a tool to measure their own distinct strengths and challenges.

While California's people are its greatest resource, these demographic shifts have profound implications in terms of meeting future needs for schools, affordable and accessible housing, mobility, trained workforce, infrastructure systems, and precious natural resources.   Our infrastructure systems are strained due to years of underinvestment, our housing gap increases each year, and our land is under pressure due to urbanization and other development forces. The rising economic tide of the later 1990's did not lift all boats – poverty remains and the gap between the rich and the poor is increasing.

How will we prepare to grow better in the future than we have in the past? Californians increasingly are focused on strategies to improve the livability and sustainability of their communities and regions. They are seeking more efficient use of land, reduced income inequities, jobs and skills that can pay better wages and provide for a good quality of life, and stewardship of natural resources. They are seeking to create the foundations for a competitive economy through a prepared workforce and sound infrastructure - in short, in creating better places for us to live and work.

RCs are using Community Indicators to help achieve these quality of life goals. The fundamental premise of the RCs is to work at the scale on which natural systems, economies, and social networks function in an interrelated way, and where current jurisdictional boundaries do not match up for benchmarking and problem solving. This of course is the regional level, with many different types of partners at the table collaborating for overall regional progress.

According to Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network, indicators are "measurements that tell us how we are doing: whether we are going up or down, going forward or backward, getting better or worse, or staying the same." Evaluating Quality of Life Indicators tells us how we are doing as a region; they help us to monitor changes and achieve quality of life goals. A good indicator has several characteristics (Great Valley Center):

- It reflects the fundamentals of long-term regional or community well-being
- It is clear, understandable and acceptable
- It can be statistically measured at regular intervals, and provide a reliable source of objective information
- It is easy to communicate in concept as well as in terms of its value and its importance to the region
- It indicates an outcome rather than an input

Good indicator projects provide the opportunity to:

- Convene stakeholders to understand and measure key components of health, prosperity and quality of life
- Track community conditions and systems
- Inform policy, strategic planning and investment choices, especially for the public sector
- Mobilize for action, and
- Improve accountability for results

As part of this Inventory, CCRL updated the 1998 Redefining Progress Inventory of Community Indicators projects, adding projects from its year 2000 web-based data repository. As mentioned in the Introduction to this report, a number of projects from the 1998 Inventory have since been terminated or consolidated. However, there also are several new reports, including those prepared by the RCs. By last fall, there were more than 30 regional and community projects throughout the State, and several more have been released since then. In addition, there are several new reports at the State level,

including *Environmental Protection Indicators for California* (EPIC), prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (20020, and *California's Index of Inclusion 2002*, prepared by the Joint Committee on Preparing California for the 21st Century (State Legislature).

The increase in Community Indicator Projects throughout the State and the growing interest in their use by many different types of entities underscore their perceived value in helping Californians meet the coming challenges and achieve healthy, prosperous and inclusive communities. The RC Community Indicator Projects are increasingly a core part of this growing field of practice.

methodology

In the fall of 2002 CCRL updated the Redefining Progress Inventory and database of Community Indicator reports. Follow up was conducted to verify status of the projects, by website, phone calls to the projects and queries to other entities, including research organizations, United Ways, councils of governments, and others in the regions or at the State level – both if projects could not be located, and to identify new projects.

Through the RC network, the RC Community Indicator projects were identified. Background information was gathered from websites and publications, and an interview protocol developed for interviews with RC project leaders. The interviews were conducted from October 2002 through April 2003, and profiles prepared for each project. Several RCs released updated versions of reports in 2003, so indicator inventories were updated to reflect changes in data, special features, and new indicator sets. The reports, interviews and profiles were used to identify project characteristics, the listing of indicators used, and to guide the sorting of the indicators into subject areas. Please see Appendix A for the contact list of those interviewed and the copy of the interview protocol, which was used as a guide for the profile summary.

The next section of this report presents information on the regions and population base covered by the RC reports, some general characteristics of the projects, types of indicators used in the reports, and the most commonly used indicator types across regions.

iii.   rc community indicator project characteristics

population base

RC Community Indicator projects cover a significant portion of the State's geographic areas and population base. While the depth and consistency of the indicators varies across region, there is nonetheless a baseline of information that has begun to be generated in most of the State's key regions. Table 1 following is a summary of the population base addressed in the RC Community Indicator reports, based on the Regional Collaborative Area. The total population covered, based on the year 2000 Census data, is 67.4%.

There is some overlap of counties covered across RC Areas, showing the cross-regional nature of the projects. For example, most of the Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network region and the Tri-Valley region fall within the broader 9 county Bay Area region, although the indicators vary quite a bit. The Sierra Business Council, Valley Vision in Sacramento, and the Great Valley Center include overlap in the Sacramento Area region (6 counties). The total calculation eliminates duplication.

Some major portions of the State have yet to be covered by RC indicator reports, either because their RCs do not have indicator projects, or because there is no RC in the region. The Inland Empire (Riverside and San Bernardino Counties) will be treated in a forthcoming report by the RC, Inland Empire Economic Partnership. This will cover another 10% of the State's population base. Large parts of the Los Angeles region are not included in RC reports, although the Southern California Council of Governments has a recent report on the State of the Regions that includes indicator information for the 7 county region.

Other areas of the State that do not have RC Indicator reports include the Central Coast, the far northern part of the State, and the Imperial Valley. There have been other indicator reports in some of these regions, such as those sponsored by the United Way in Monterey and Santa Cruz counties.   The final report will provide information on other types of Community Indicators reports for California's regions.

table 1
population base covered by regional collaborative community indicator reports
for the year 2000

Regional Collaborative Area	Population
Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities (9 counties of the Bay Area)	6,784,000
Economic Alliance of San Fernando Valley	1,700,000
Gateway Cities Partnership	1,700,000
Great Valley Center (a regional stewardship organization – 18 counties, 3 subregions)*	5,586,300
Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network (includes Santa Clara County & adjacent parts of San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Alameda Counties)	(2.3 million in 2001 –included as part of the Bay Area Counties)
Institute of the North Coast (Humboldt County)	128,000
Orange County Business Council	2,846,000
Regional Civic Alliance for Ventura County	753,000
Santa Barbara Regional Economic Project	South Coast: 150,000 (Santa Barbara County: 410,000)
San Diego Regional Economic Development Corp.	2,814,000
Sierra Business Council (12 counties of the Sierra Nevada, 4 subregions)*	660,000
Tri Valley Business Council	(included as part of the Bay Area Counties)
Valley Vision (Sacramento Region, 6 counties)*	1,936,000
Total	22,836,600*
California Total	33,872,000
Regional Collaborative Area as Percent of California Total	67.4%

Source: California Dept. of Finance, 2000 U.S. Census

Note: * - Sierra Nevada and Valley Vision Regions both include El Dorado and Placer Counties; Great Valley Center total includes Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties. The summary total includes only one tabulation for each county. The summary does not include the portion of Santa Cruz County that is included in the Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Region.

report partners/framework/focus

RC Community Indicator reports have a variety of partners and report focus, but a common conceptual framework in most cases. All are focused on integrated quality of life and prosperity measures, with an emphasis on long-term sustainability.   These reports are supplemented by special features within reports or additional reports on priority issues.

There are two types of partners: core partners in the production of the reports, and partners who serve as advisors, contribute data and information, and participate in the civic engagement aspects that occur when the reports are presented and discussed for follow up action. In some cases, partners change as projects and their focus evolve based on changing regional conditions and needs. The most typical "sponsor" partners include councils of government, universities, and non-profit organizations. Most projects also work with government, private consultants, educational and public policy institutions for technical support. Partners bring a rich array of technical, data, community engagement and in some cases financial resources to the table.

Almost all projects have an Advisory Team, sometimes comprised of Board members, and often with a wide range of technical and community representatives. They most typically guide and advise the process of selecting indicators, reviewing data, and identifying priority issues for focus. They work in concert with consultants and other technical advisors. The ability to engage technical support and manage an advisory process depends on the availability of financial and management resources, often a challenge for the RCs.

Some reports cover a small number of topics and statistical data is supplemented by community surveys, as well as periodic updates from partners on general community conditions. For example, the Economic Alliance of the San Fernando Valley has an annual "Information Summit" with information in 2003 provided by the United Way, the Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation, and the Rose Institute at Claremont McKenna College.

Others indicator projects are very in-depth analyses of ongoing indicators, supplemented by special features on important current issues. Both Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network and the Orange County Indicators Project included special features in the most recent reports, based on the availability of 2000 Census data, new economic information, and information from other projects. These included the use of the new North American Industrial Classification system to replace the prior system for analyzing the economic base and changing economic structure of the region in Silicon Valley, the first of its kind in California, and a "report card" on the condition of Orange County's core infrastructure systems, also the first of its kind in California.

Gateway Cities Partnership prepared special reports on the workforce and immigration, based on issues identified in the original Indicators report. The Great Valley Center prepared an integrated baseline report and then followed up with specific topic reports. Other reports are linked to regional vision and growth planning projects, either internally or in collaboration with regional partners. This is the case where regional visioning and growth projects are underway, such as in the Bay Area, Sacramento, and San Diego regions.

As noted, the primary framework for most of the Community Indicator report projects is rooted in the concept of sustainability, with economy, environment and equity (social inclusion) – the three E's - linked inextricably. For example, the conceptual framework for the San Diego Region, Indicators of Sustainable Competitiveness, is based on the paradigm that competitiveness is multi-dimensional and determined by the potential for the region to achieve balanced, sustained success in the three E's. The interrelationship of these elements is the foundation for sustained regional prosperity and quality of life. In the Sierra Nevada Wealth Index and the Institute of the North Coast Report, the premise is that community capital – financial, human, and environmental – is the basis for the wealth of the region. No one capital can succeed at the expense of the others.

Several of the projects are also addressing elements of the fourth E – civic engagement. The increasing focus on this area flows from the understanding that the community must be engaged in the stewardship of the region. Communications strategies are increasingly important factor for several of the projects. While some reports are geared to the regional community, other regions are moving beyond the region. In their first indicator report, the Regional Civic Alliance for Ventura County focused one of their 12 domains of study on civic engagement. Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network is using their Index to report on the long-term prospects for the region and to `help outside investors and analysts understand better the structural changes occurring in the Valley.

Table 2 below summarizes some of the key characteristics for the RC projects. The partners listed are those who are report "sponsors." There are many more partners involved in the actual process of the developing and preparing the reports. This information will be available in the RC Profiles.

table 2
regional community indicator reports
partners & focus

Regional Collaborative area	partners	report focus/framework
Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities	Northern California Council for the Community (commissioned by the United Way of the Bay Area, in collaboration with the Bay Area Partnership)	Sustainable Development Progress report, linked to the Draft Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area
Economic Alliance of San Fernando Valley	The Alliance includes several partners: chambers of commerce, trade associations, cities, other business & educational entities	Quality of Life, focused on 12 core issues identified through community surveys
Gateway Cities Partnership	Gateway Cities Council of Governments, California State University Long Beach, Southern California Edison	Comprehensive report on key indictors for region's vitality, supplemented by focused reports on key issues
Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network		Since 1998, keyed to tracking progress aligned with the JVSV 2010 Vision
Institute of the North Coast		Community wellbeing survey with statistical indicators
Orange County Business Council	County of Orange, Orange County Children & Families Commission	Quality of Life, with special feature reports – 2003 – Workforce, Infrastructure, Pediatric Asthma
Regional Civic Alliance for Ventura County	Ventura Community Foundation and broad coalition of civic leaders	3 E's
Santa Barbara Regional Economic Project	U.C. Santa Barbara , Economic Forecast Project	3 E's, 2002 focus on community health and wellbeing, includes community surveys
San Diego Regional Economic Development Corp.	San Diego Council of Governments (SANDAG)	3 E's , linked with SANDAG regional comprehensive planning, benchmarked to other regions
Sierra Business Council		3 E's
Tri Valley Business Council		Based on Tri-Valley regional vision/plan, to measure progress for goals
Valley Vision	Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), California State University	Quality of life based on the three E's, Will be expanding the partnership process for the next planning cycle, linked to the SACOG Blueprint Growth Vision process

time frame/measurement cycle

The time frame and measurement cycle for the RC Community Indicator reports varies depending on financial resources, technical capacity, need, and community interest. The first report, the *Index of Silicon Valley*, has been published annually since 1994. Two other reports are also published on an annual basis – the Orange County Indicators Report and the Santa Barbara South Coast Community Indicators Project. Gateway Cities Partnership and Valley Vision reports are published every other year. Other reports are planned for a periodic basis. As can been seen below, there have been three new projects initiated in the last year alone.

table 3
time frame/measurement cycle
regional collaborative community indicator reports

Regional Collaborative area	year report published/frequency
Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities	2002, to be updated regularly companion document to the Draft Compact for a Sustainable Bay Area
Economic Alliance of San Fernando Valley	2000, next report date to be determined supplemented with the annual Information Summit
Gateway Cities Partnership	2001, 2003 – will be published every 2 years, topic-focused reports as need identified: 2002 – workforce indicators report 2003 – immigration indicators report
Great Valley Center	1999 – Benchmark Statistical Indicators 2001 – Environment Report 2002-Community Well-being report 2003 – Public Health and Access to Care report reports will be updated in 5 yr. increments
Institute of the North Coast	1999 Economic Index is published annually
Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network	Annually since 1995 (for 1994 on)
Orange County Business Council	Annually since 2000 (for 1999 on)
Regional Civic Alliance for Ventura County	2003 - to be updated on regular basis; priority issues will have annual report
Santa Barbara Regional Economic Project	Annually since 1998
San Diego Regional Economic Development Corp.	2002 linked with SANDAG regional planning process
Sierra Business Council	1996, 1999-2000 timing, scope & process for next version are under discussion
Tri Valley Business Council	1999, update 2003
Valley Vision	2000, 2002 – every two years planning is underway for 2004 version, linked to the SACOG Blueprint growth planning

iv. indicators

This section of the report provides an overview of the types of indicators that are used in projects, some of the most commonly used indicators, some new and/or unusual indicators, and what kinds of data people would like to have for future indicator reports. It concludes with a detailed listing of indicator data sets used by each Regional Collaborative, by type of indicator area.

how many and what kind?

Common questions for an indicator project are: "How many indicators does a typical report contain? How are the indicators organized and presented by subject area (3 E's)?" These not easy questions to answer. Although we counted the number of indicators in each report, and looked at how the indicators were organized, it quickly became apparent that indicator reports, like regions, are highly diverse.

Regional Collaboratives select and organize the presentation of indicators based on many different factors: community values and interests, data availability, resources for analysis and report production, technical capacity, and intended use, among others. Often, the community wants to benchmark and measure something, but proxies must be found because data are not available. Changes in priorities can affect what indictors are tracked over time, as well as data availability. On the plus side, this can often lead to new ways to collect data and measure for important community priorities.

There are approximately 200 types of indicator topics that are covered by the RC reports. Of these, most indicator reports feature between about 25 and 50 indicators. Some reports include regional trend indicators such as demographics and basic economic information, as well as special features, in the front section of reports, further increasing the number of overall indicators used. Within each indicator area, there may be multiple data sets, sometimes increasing the number of data points significantly. The same indicator, such as housing affordability, may have several different ways of being reported, using different methods of indexing.

Some reports attempt to balance the number of indicators between each of the three E's and other focus on where priority issues are most prominent. Some RCs report that environmental measures like open space calculations have variable data bases and are often difficult to quantify and track. Some reports keep the same indictors over time for consistency of tracking purposes, while others have a "pool" of indicators they draw from.

While the reports are based implicitly or explicitly on the conceptual framework of the three E's (or 4, with civic engagement), the reports are organized in several different ways. Some are organized by the three E's (Sierra Business Council, Institute of the North Coast, San Diego Regional EDC), some by the 3 E's with sub-groupings for topics (Valley Vision), some according to progress measures for regional goals (Bay Area Alliance, Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network, Tri-Valley Business Council), and some by domains

(subject areas)(Orange County Business Council, Regional Civic Alliance of Ventura County).

Within these broad groupings, specific indicators are sorted in different ways. For example, transportation and mobility may be included as economic indicators in one report and environmental indicators in another report. Housing may be included as an economic vitality issue in one report and as a social equity issue in another.

Therefore, in an initial grouping of RC projects, the indicators are organized by 13 subject areas under 5 overall types of indicators – demographic, economic, social, environmental, and civic engagement. There is some slight overlap of indicators. For example, open space/urbanization measures are included in both natural resources and housing/land use indicators sets. The following table summarizes the distribution of indicators by indicator subject areas and number of data sets.

**table 4
indicator subject areas
by number of data sets**

indicator	number of data sets	
Demographic		6
Economic		86
Employment and income	17	
Business Vitality	15	
Technology & innovation	12	
Working Landscapes	16	
Housing & urban land use	11	
Transportation & mobility	15	
Social		60
Education & training	19	
Young children & families	16	
Health, human services & public safety	25	
Environmental		34
Air & water quality & use, energy, Solid waste	20	
Natural resources	14	
Civic Engagement		17
Total	**203**	

core indicators

The other frequently asked question is: "What are the most commonly used indicators across projects?" There has been an interest to assess if there are core indicators commonly used across the regions, so that they might be aggregated for measures to track statewide and comparative regional progress on important issues.

There are indicator areas that are used by almost all the Regional Collaboratives, and there are others that are less frequently used. However, some of these are available across all regions of the State; they are just not used by all the projects. Examples include teenage pregnancy birth rates and low birth weight infants.

Some indicators are new and have been pioneered by the projects, developing new methodologies and/or using new data sources, including customized surveys. These types of indicators tend to address emerging issues of concern, such as childhood obesity, pediatric asthma and school readiness. Other indicators reflect local conditions, like risk of flood hazard for the Sacramento region, and the health of natural resources such as the San Francisco Bay, Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake.

Table 5 below summarizes the indicator areas that are most frequently used by the RC Indicator reports, determined by 8 or more of the 13 RC projects using the same type of indicator. It should be remembered that the data sets reflect potentially different time points and data sources. Any discussion of common core indicators needs to review all the indicators sets and data sources to see where data availability and consistency reside. The individual indicator reports contain detail on data sources and methodologies for each type of indicator.

new or unusual indicators

Community indicator projects are an evolving field of practice, both from a technical standpoint and from a community development perspective. In the initial phase of a project, the focus is most often on creating the team that will lead and advise the process, selecting the indicators, assessing their meaning, communicating the findings to the community, and engaging leadership in next steps. A difficult element is determining which indicators will constitute the baseline for future tracking of progress or emerging challenges.

Once a project has been underway, there is the opportunity to see how relevant the indicators are, to identify emerging issues, and to engage new community partners who can help broaden the understanding of issues. During this process, the learning from the previous indicator report influences the next cycle of the update in a variety of ways, including the development of specialized topic reports (such as on workforce, immigration, or infrastructure), and the development of new indicators.

table 5
most commonly used indicators
by types of data sets

indicator	data set
Demographic	Population trends, ethnic diversity & age
Economic	
Employment and income	Employment & labor force trends, job growth/loss by sector/cluster, wages, unemployment rate, household income, income distribution/disparity
Business Vitality	
Technology & innovation	
Working Landscapes	
Housing & urban land use	Urban footprint (extent of urbanization, population density, efficient land reuse, land conversion)*, housing affordability
Transportation & mobility	
Social	
Education & training	School academic performance
Young children & families	
Health, human services & public safety	Violent & property crime/arrest rates
Environmental	
Air & water quality & use, energy, Solid waste	Bad air days
Natural resources	Urban footprint –(urbanization, etc.)*
Civic Engagement	Voter participation rates
	* same indicator for both areas

Reflecting the bottoms up nature of the projects, reports often contain customized indicators for specific local or regional conditions and characteristics. This is most clearly seen with economic indicators and natural resources indicators. For example, rural areas have indicators that relate to important economic activities related to agriculture, fishing, timber and other resource-related functions. Natural resources indicators reflect geographic differences.

Table 6 following illustrates some of the newest indicators developed by RC Community Indicator Projects and some unusual customized indicators.   The newest indicators tend to be developed by the projects that have been through several planning cycles, such as Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network, the Orange County Indicators Project, and the Santa Barbara Region Community Economic Project, or new projects such as the Regional Civic Alliance of Ventura County that have taken advantage of the learning curve of other indicator projects.

table 6
new or unusual indicators
by type of indicator and RC

indicator	new/unusual indicator	regional collaborative
Demographic	Domestic migration flows	Joint Venture
Economic		
Employment and income	Structural analysis of economy using NAICS data Living wage income Value added per employee	Joint Venture Bay Area Alliance Joint Venture
Business Vitality	Demand for downtown office space	Valley Vision
Technology & innovation	E-commerce, domain name concentration Technology-related degrees	Orange County Joint Venture, Orange County
Working Landscapes	Organic agricultural production Agricultural water use	Great Valley Great Valley
Housing & urban land use	Urban footprint mapping New jobs/housing near transit Brownfields Homelessness Building permits in urban core	Bay Area Alliance, Santa Barbara, Valley Vision Joint Venture, Tri-Valley Bay Area Alliance, Gateway Cities Partnership Bay Area Alliance, Orange Cty. Valley Vision
Transportation & mobility	Access to jobs by transit Capital outlays for infrastructure Report card on infrastructure	Valley Vision San Diego Orange County
Social		
Education & training	Match of graduates to employer demand School Capacity Music/arts education to new state standards	Joint Venture, Orange County Tri-Valley Joint Venture
Young children & families	Child obesity Pediatric Asthma School readiness	Orange County, Ventura Great Valley, Joint Venture, Orange County, Ventura Joint Venture
Health, human services & public safety	Life satisfaction/community wellbeing	Institute of the North Coast
Environmental		
Air & water quality & use, energy, solid waste	Water recycling Health of San Francisco Bay	Great Valley Bay Area Alliance
Natural resources	Ocean Fishery Health Sierra fire hazard	Ventura Sierra Business Council
Civic Engagement	Non-profit giving	Santa Barbara

It should be noted that the San Diego Indicators report, *Indicators of Sustainable Competitiveness, San Diego Region*, is a somewhat different type of report. The RC and SANDAG developed indices to benchmark the region against other regions, for Economic, Environment and Equity Elements. This includes a new and innovative indicator – the Balance Element – to test and tract the conceptual underpinning of the project, which is that sustainable regional prosperity requires that the three E's be in balance or regional competitiveness suffers. There is also a Competitiveness Index.

information we'd like to have

Indicators provide a window in important community issues, but the data is not always available, affordable, or technically easy to come by. The Regional Civic Alliance of Ventura County calls this the Nth Domain – "What we wish we could know today." Nonetheless, several RCs have identified areas for future information and are working to develop data sources or methodologies. Here are some areas where better information is desired or research is underway:

 ➢ Genuine Progress Indicator
 ➢ Neighborhood integrity/gentrification
 ➢ Profitability of farming in Ventura County – net return to farmers
 ➢ Application rates of most toxic pesticides
 ➢ The number of people who understand how tax revenues flow
 ➢ Match between education and job training and employers' workforce needs
 ➢ Arts/music programs in elementary and secondary school
 ➢ "Motel" families – single parent families living in motels due to lack of affordable housing

a word about funding

In the end, much of what can happen in a community indicator project comes down to resources. The final report will provide more detail about funding sources, but in summary, the most dominant source of support for projects is foundation funding. The James Irvine Foundation, through its Sustainable Communities program, has been a core funder. Other foundations, including community foundations, have been strong sponsors and partners. Other funders, either direct or in-kind, include local governments, councils of governments, business organizations, universities, and non-profits, including local First Five Commissions in a few cases.

Funding will continue to be a core challenge for Community Indicator Projects, especially if they are to be able to develop the kinds of information needed to assess and monitor important community conditions. Regional collaboration will help all partners create the efficiencies and common data base necessary for responsive public policy and long-term sustainability.

v. indicator matrices

This section of the report contains summary matrices for each of the 13 domain areas, organized under five main types of indicators: demographic, economic, social, environmental, and civic engagement. The matrices contain a notation for which of the RC projects include a specific type of indicator. The domain areas are:

- ➢ Demographic
- ➢ Employment and Income
- ➢ Business Vitality
- ➢ Technology and Innovation
- ➢ Working Landscapes
- ➢ Housing and Urban Land Use
- ➢ Transportation and Mobility
- ➢ Education and Mobility
- ➢ Young Children and Families
- ➢ Health, Human Service and Public Safety
- ➢ Air and Water Quality/use, Energy, Solid Waste
- ➢ Natural Resources
- ➢ Civic Engagement – Citizenship, Community Participation and Culture

Indicator data sets are grouped together for indicators that address a specific topic or issue. As noted earlier in the report, the number of indictors totals approximately 200, but there is a great deal more variability within indicator areas than this number suggests. Some indicators have only one type of data set but others have several different ways the information is calculated and displayed. Some are straightforward presentations of data sets and others are indexed or are presented in greater detail. There are also a few data sets that are replicated across matrices due to their relevance to more than one topic. These are noted in the introduction to each section.

As an example of this variability, in the 6 county Sacramento region, information from the Valley Vision *Quality of Life Index* is aggregated to the regional level. In other reports, such as the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Development's Bay Area Indicators: A Sustainable Development Progress Report for the nine counties, information is sometimes presented at the county level so that regional disparities are seen. Some county level reports are at the county level, while others include information for cities or school districts at the sub-regional level. The challenge is always to present relevant information in a clear and easily understood manner, while covering the issue in sufficient depth.

The matrices follow with an overview of key points for each area. This analysis is a first step is developing a useful typology for cross-referencing and organizing the information. Cataloguing the indicators by data sources, time frames and analytic methodologies are areas for future work, as well as discussion on best approaches and sorting overall.

demographic indicators

This information is most often presented in the introduction section of the Community Indicator reports. There are six general categories of indicators in this section. While the level of analytic depth varies, this is the place where demographic shifts over the past ten years have been noted, with California becoming the first majority minority State. These shifts have profound implications for our future, including huge challenges for infrastructure capacity, land use, environmental quality, and access to opportunity. Ethnic diversity, and age and gender changes and projections are a highlight. Population density relates to the Economic Indicator domain area of housing and urban land use issues and is included in that matrix as well, under "Urban Footprint." Educational attainment is also included under the Social Indicators – education and training matrix.

Some of the RC projects do not include much demographic information in the reports, but supplement with information from other sources or reports, such as other Council of Government reports. Here are some the key highlights of this information:

➢ California's regions are in great transition demographically
➢ Diversity is increasing, which is both a challenge and an opportunity
➢ In most regions, youth and older populations will be increasing
➢ There is geographic segregation at the municipal level within regions, leading to disparities in income, access to jobs and affordable housing, good education and so forth

matrix of demographic indicators

Demographic Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. Population trends		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X
2. Components of change (migration, natural increase)		X				X	X	X		X			
3. Ethnicity & Age/Diversity			X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X
4. Density	X	X	X				X	X					X
5. Domestic migration flows				X		X							
6. Educational attainment			X			X	X	X				X	

Regional Collaborative Legend:

BAASD – Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Development
EASFV – Economic Alliance of the San Fernando Valley
GCP – Gateway Cities Partnership
GVC – Great Valley Center*
INC- Institute of the North Coast
JVSVN – Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network
OCBC- Orange County Business Council
RCAVC – Regional Civic Alliance for Ventura County

SRCECP – Santa Barbara Region Community Economic Project
SBC – Sierra Business Council
SDREDC – San Diego Regional Economic Development Corp
Business Council
TVBC – Tri-Valley Business Council
VV- Valley Vision

a regional stewardship organization for the Central Valley

economic indicators

This section has the greatest number of indicators topics and indicators, with 86 indicators overall and six subject areas – Employment and Income, Business Vitality, Technology and Innovation, Working Landscapes, Housing and Urban Land use, and Transportation and Mobility. These subject areas are grouped together because they show the interrelationships of housing, land use, mobility for people and products, access to jobs, job growth and quality, income and poverty, and aligning workforce demand with future employer needs.

These indicators are sorted differently in individual RC reports. For example, housing is sometimes an economic indicator and sometimes a social equity indicator. Many of the Working Landscape indicators relate to agriculture, which is sometimes treated as a separate domain and sometimes in environmental indicators. They are included here to distinguish them from other types of natural resources and to emphasize their economic importance to regional economies. There also is a great deal of diversity in how many of the employment and industry sector indicators are treated. Some are at fairly general levels, while others focus on detailed analysis of industry clusters (technology and non-technology) and areas for greatest business, job, and wage growth.

The following economic indicators are included in more than one matrix: technology-related degrees (also in the Social indicators – Education and Training matrix) acres of open space/protected open space (housing) (also in Environmental Indicators – Natural Resources matrix), Urban Footprint (housing) (also in Demographic Indicators matrix), homelessness (housing) (also in Social Indicators – Health Human Services and Public Safety matrix), gasoline consumption (transportation) (also in Environmental Indicators – for Energy), and new housing and jobs within a ¼ mile of transit – (both Housing and Transportation matrices).

Some key highlights:

➢ Industry clusters, technology and non-technology, are increasingly the focus for understanding the changing structure of the regional economy and opportunities for quality job and income growth
➢ There is a great deal of concern about concentrations of poverty and income disparities within and across regions
➢ Some of the newer indicators are in the Technology and Innovation realm, and Housing and Land Use
➢ Technology and innovation are key for productivity and prosperity improvements
➢ Agriculture and other working landscapes are vital to many regional economies and are at risk in many areas which are urbanizing; there is growing emphasis on high value products and reducing negative environmental impacts
➢ There is great concern for using and reusing scarce land resources more efficiently, a better balance between jobs and housing, greater housing choice and affordability, reducing sprawl, and creating more livable communities
➢ Other new housing indicators are focusing on emerging issues of overcrowding and homelessness

matrix of economic indicators for employment & income

Economic Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. Job growth/labor force growth/employment trends overall (high & low paying industries)		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X		
2. Employment by sector/industry cluster (technology/non-technology), public/private sector (top sectors by gain/loss)			X		X	X		X		X	X		X
3. Job growth (loss) by sector/industry cluster (technology/non-technology), diversification			X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4. Shift from goods producing to services producing sectors, shift in economic structure						X				X			
5. Occupational data			X										
6. Workforce concentration/size of firm							X			X			
7. Average hourly/annual wages (also for farm workers compared to other workers), growth in real wages (clusters vs. non-clusters, technology vs. non-technology)				X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X
8. Job Quality & Opportunity - Clusters with highest annual wages, higher average industry salaries							X	X	X	X	X	X	X
9. Value added per employee						X							
10. Unemployment rate (seasonal)	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X		
11. Local jobs for residents												X	
12. Per capita income	X		X		X	X	X			X	X		
13. Average/median household/family income	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X		X
14. Living wage income (hourly wage required for self-sufficiency, jobs paying self-sufficiency wage)	X												
15. Sources of personal income (wages as %)										X			
16. Income distribution/disparity (gap between rich and poor)	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X		X
17. Poverty (adult/children/families) (geographic concentration)	X			X	X	X	X	X		X			

matrix of economic indicators for technology & innovation

Economic Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. Venture capital funding (share of gross metropolitan product), investments by cluster						X	X				X		X
2. Initial public offerings, by industry cluster											X		
3. Patenting activity, by industrial cluster, by patent holders											X		X
4. Research & development expenditures											X		
5. New business starts, industry clusters												X	X
6. Gazelle companies (fast-growth companies with high levels of innovation)						X							
7. Internet usage, by cultural & ethnic groups				X			X						
8. K-12 students per computers, classrooms with internet access							X			X			
9. E-commerce (business presence on internet)							X						
10. Domain name concentration (dot.com)							X						
11. Investment in high-speed internet infrastructure										X			
12. Technology-related degrees conferred by local universities						X	X						

matrix of economic indicators for working landscapes

Economic Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. Number of crop producing acres, acreage of grapes & other high value crops, timber					X			X			X	X	X
2. Crop value/% of total economy/crop value per acre, timber harvest				X				X					X
3. Land value (tree crop, row crop)								X					
4. Cattle production/value											X		
5. Organic agricultural production				X									
6. Commodities, export markets				X									
7. Employment/earnings in agriculture and other natural resources including fishing & timber				X	X			X	X	X			X
8. Contribution to jobs & income overall				X									
9. Pesticide use in agriculture				X					X				
10. Annexation/conversion of farmland to other uses				X									
11. Prime farmland/grazing land as source of urbanized land				X									
12. Acres of open space/protected open space (includes farms as well as major protected habitats), land at risk, land trust holdings	X			X		X		X	X			X	X
13. Acres enrolled in Williamson Act											X		
14. Soil drainage capacity				X									
15. Agricultural water use				X									
16. Land ownership pattern											X		

matrix of economic indicators for housing and urban land use

Economic Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
Land Use:													
1. Urban footprint – extent of urbanization, population density, rate of undeveloped land conversion for urban uses, efficient land reuse	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
2. Housing/jobs within ¼ mile of transit						X						X	
3. Brownfields	X		X										
Housing:													
4. Growth of households/housing stock, housing quality, tenure (owner vs. renter-occupied units) (by city), home ownership rate	X		X	X				X			X	X	
5. Residential building permits/approvals, permits in the urban core/residential density of new units			X	X		X				X		X	X
6. Affordability Index (% who can purchase median-priced home, households spending 35%+ on housing, income required for median priced home), median home price/value	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
7. Rental Affordability Index (by income, households spending 30-35%+ on housing), rental rates, vacancy rates, hourly wage needed						X	X	X	X	X		X	X
8. New low & moderate-income housing units (built/approved)						X						X	
9. Overcrowding		X					X	X					
10. Homelessness	X						X	X					
11. Jobs/Housing Balance/Demand – new jobs created per housing permit/built, (imbalance within region)	X						X					X	X

matrix of economic indicators for transportation & mobility

Economic Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. Growth in vehicle miles traveled, new lane-miles, population, number of cars	X						X	X	X	X			
2. Levels of service, key intersections		X										X	
3. Vehicle hours of delay per congested freeway mile/Roadway Congestion Index											X	X	X
4. Gasoline consumption	X					X							
5. Average commute time	X			X			X	X	X		X	X	
6. Primary mode of commuting to work (alone, walk, bike, transit, carpool, etc.)	X					X	X	X	X			X	X
7. Access to jobs by transit													X
8. Transit ridership (passenger bus, commuter rail, demand response)				X		X	X	X	X		X	X	
9. Transit system operating costs per boarding, bus boardings & system expenditures per capita, demand response service							X	X					
10. Increase in rail network						X							
11. New housing units and new jobs within ¼ mile of rail stations or major bus corridors						X						X	
12. Incentives for transit-oriented development						X							
13. Capital facilities investment in air transport, sea & inland ports, highways, mass transit											X		
14. "Report card" on aviation and transportation infrastructure systems							X						
15. Passenger Traffic at Commercial Service Airports				X									

social indicators

Overall, there are 60 indicators included in three areas: Education and Training, Young Children and Families, and Health, Human Services and Public Safety. These areas too are linked with progress in other areas. Education and training help prepare youth and adults for successful working careers and providing companies with the skilled workers they need to compete in a global economy. The ability of families and communities to provide a strong foundation for children is linked to educational and employment opportunities, income that can adequately support families, affordable and accessible housing and health, and a safe and healthy environment.

The Young Children and Families matrix was developed to illustrate the opportunity for enriching these indicators through collaboration with the First Five Commissions. The Orange County Community Indicators report has the richest array of indicators in this area, because of the partnership with the Orange County Children and Families Commission as project director. The first school readiness indicator was developed by Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network in collaboration with area First Five Commissions, community foundations, and other organizations working on a Children's School Readiness Project.

As noted previously, there are some indicators that are included in other matrix areas. In addition, cancer risk from toxic air pollution exposure is included in the Environmental Indicators matrix for Air Quality.

Some key highlights:

➢ There are disparities in student/school performance for grade school, SAT scores, and graduates meeting the requirements for the CSU/UC system, both within and across regions
➢ English learners are an area of focus
➢ There is an increasing emphasis on tracking students for math, science and technology courses and degrees, especially to match the projected needs of growth areas in key sectors and clusters
➢ Childhood poverty is a continuing area of concern
➢ New indicators are focusing on children's health issues, especially obesity and asthma in low income and minority communities, and which are linked to other factors
➢ There has been progress in several areas of health and public safety, but homelessness is increasing, as is dependency on social programs at a time when non-profits are experiencing funding challenges

matrix of social indicators for education & training

Social Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. School readiness/% in pre-school						X					X		
2. K-12 school capacity, class size, ethnic diversity								X			X	X	
3. SAT 9 performance of students, School Academic Performance Index, Similar School Rank	X	X	X				X	X	X			X	X
4. 10th-11th grade students in intermediate algebra						X							
5. English Learners (reading scores, proficiency)		X				X	X	X					X
6. Expenditures for public school students	X				X			X					
7. K-12 students per computer/classrooms with internet access							X				X		
8. School Districts aligning music/visual arts education with new State standards						X							
9. SAT Score Performance (by ethnic group)				X	X		X			X	X		
10. High school seniors taking the SAT (by ethnic group, school district)				X						X	X		
11. High school dropout rate, graduation rate			X	X		X	X	X					X
12. Graduates who meet UC/CSU course requirements, representation at U. of California				X		X	X						X
13. Technology & math/science related degrees (gender, race/ethnicity), degree subject shifts						X	X						
14. # of Higher Ed institutions, rank of students in higher ed, degrees awarded											X		
15. Educational attainment levels of adults			X			X	X				X		
16. Education/training required for jobs in fastest-growth occupations						X	X						
17. Workforce supply/demand assessment with entering workforce							X						
18. Enrollment in Community College Adult Ed									X				
19. Adult literacy skills											X		

matrix of social indicators for young children and families

Social Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. Child care quality, affordability, availability						(X)	(X)	(X)					(X)
- average child care cost per year, infant & pre-school, licensed child care centers & family care centers							X						X
- accredited early care and education centers, demand/unmet need							X	X					
- child care costs vs. household income/capacity, child care worker pay							X						X
- child care provider education level						X							
2. Early pre-natal care (by race and ethnicity)				X			X		X				
3. Teenage pregnancy birth rate				X					X	X			
4. Low birth weight infants		X		X		X							X
5. Death rate for young children, infant mortality, causes of death				X			X		X				
6. Child immunization rates, and diseases				X		X	X						
7. Pediatric asthma – new diagnosis, prevalence				X		X	X	X					
8. Childhood obesity							X	X					
9. Percent of children eligible for free or reduced price school lunches							X		X				X
10. Children living in poverty				X	X					X			
11. Homeless families with children							X						
12. Health insurance coverage (children specifically)	X			X				X					
13. Children removed from home (child abuse & neglect)/cases reported to Child Welfare Services						X	X		X				
14. Elementary school capacity												X	
15. Percent of 3 & 4 year olds enrolled in early childhood education programs											X		
16. School readiness						X							

matrix of social indicators for health, human services and public safety

Social Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. Health insurance coverage	X			X			X	X	X		X		X
2. Dental insurance				X									
3. Health status (mortality rates, causes of death, communicable diseases, chronic diseases, suicide rate)		X		X	X		X		X	X			
4. Mental health status/needs/assistance							X		X				
5. Obesity									X				
6. Tobacco use/teen smoking				X				X	X				
7. Number of hospital beds per 1000 residents/number of persons per physician				X						X	X		
8. Domestic Violence				X	X			X	X				
9. Senior wellbeing, adult abuse, fatal & non-fatal falls, disabilities, immunization rates				X			X						
12. Major public assistance program caseloads							X						
13. Charitable support for social services								X					
14. Homelessness/Greatest needs by homeless shelter occupants	X						X	X					
15. 911 Emergency assistance calls								X					
16. Police/Fire Emergency Response times, law enforcement per capita, fire class ratings		X		X				X					
17. Violent & property crime/arrest rates	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
18. Rape/sexual assault rates									X				
19. School crime				X									
20. Juvenile felony arrests				X		X	X	X	X				
21. Gang-related homicides							X						
22. Hate crimes, workplace discrimination				X			X						
23. Alcohol/drug-related arrests & treatment rates/alcohol consumption				X			X		X				
24. At risk from major flood event													X
25. Cancer risk from toxic air pollution exposure			X				X						

environmental indicators

There are 34 indicators in the area of environmental quality. However, as noted, many of the indicators that may be included in this realm in individual RC reports are grouped in other indicator areas for this typology. Rather than limiting the importance of the environmental element, this approach underscores the linkage of the environment with other elements. Many of the indicators in this section relate to specific environmental resources such as Lake Tahoe, Mono Lake and the Bay Area.

This is a challenging area because information for many of the indicators is not available from standardized state sources, as are some of the health and education indicators, and because they must be science-based. As an example, information relating to land use, such as amount of protected open space, depends on local inventories and capacity to collect and aggregate data to the appropriate regional level. Natural systems are also complicated and are sometimes more difficult to track over time.

Health in this realm relate to outcomes in other areas. For example, adequate infrastructure for stormwater runoff and water treatment systems reduces the number of beach closures, which in turn affects public health and tourism. Agricultural and other practices impact water quality and safety. Increased commute times and gasoline consumption affect air quality.

Indicator outcomes are also affected by other factors that must be accounted for in the analysis. For example, a drought year may cause a problem for water supplies, but could lead to increases in conservation and reductions in the number of beach closures (due to less storm runoff).

Other key highlights:

➢ There is great concern about the health of the natural systems and our use of resources
➢ The true costs of environmental degradation are lacking
➢ Air quality is a core concern, even with improvements in the number of "bad air days;" there is increasing attention to the components contributing to air pollution, and the link with land use and location of jobs and housing
➢ Other than for waste recycling, there are few indicators in use for other natural resources, including water and energy conservation, and water recycling
➢ More efficient use of urban lands or greenspace would reduce pressure on open space resources
➢ Water supply and demand is a difficult area to measure but a critical element for future consideration

matrix of environmental indicators for natural resources

Environmental Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	*SBC*	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. Urban footprint – extent of urbanization, population density, rate of undeveloped land conversion for urban uses, efficient land reuse	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
2. Natural habitat– acres of protected open space (parklands, land trusts including agricultural lands, major protected habitats owned by conservancies), (inside/outside growth boundaries), habitat restoration programs	X			X		X	X	X					X
3. Natural habitat – unprotected acres (by habitat type for oak woodlands and low elevation riparian areas in the Sierra)	X						X	X		X			X
4. Habitat conservation plans				X									
5. Wetlands Inventory				X									
6. Parks & open space per person							X		X				
7. Connected open space (miles of regional trails, bikeways))							X					X	
8. Private & public land ownership pattern										X			
9. Endangered, threatened bird species/habitat				X				X	X				
10. Endangered, threatened overall species/habitat, mammals, and plants				X	X					X			
11. Remaining old-growth forest										X			
12. Ocean fisheries health								X					
13. Fire Hazard										X			
14. Flood prone areas													X

matrix of environmental indicators for air and water quality/use, energy, solid waste

Environmental Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. Days in violation of federal/state air quality standards, bad air days, ozone exposure	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X
2. Emissions of particulate matter/nitrogen oxide	X			X	X						X		
3. Cancer risk from air pollution, businesses releasing toxic air pollutants			X			X	X		X				
4. Carbon monoxide emissions & hydrocarbons	X			X									
5. Gasoline consumption	X				X								
6. Per capita water usage, urban water usage	X	X		X			X		X		X		
7. Agricultural water use				X									
8. Water supply (by source), demand				X			X		X				
9. Water recycling				X									
10. Quality of rivers & streams (impairment), lakes, reservoirs (surface water), watersheds				X	X				X	X	X		X
11. Ground water & drinking water quality/levels of MTBE in excess of state standards					X			X			X		X
12. Ocean water quality, beach closures/causes							X	X	X				
13. Unauthorized waste discharges							X						
14. Capital outlays for water utilities/sewer/waste											X		
15. Mono Lake Level, Lake Tahoe clarity											X		
16. Ecological Health of San Francisco Bay (toxic & biological contaminants)	X												
17. Pesticide use				X					X				
18. Electricity & gas use, per capita/total	X			X				X					
19. Solid waste generated/recycled/diversion	X			X			X	X	X				X
20. Household hazardous waste collected							X						

civic engagement indicators

This is the fourth and complementary "E," which measures the health of civic life and culture. There are 17 indicators in this realm for citizenship, community participation and culture. While indicators like voter participation of registered voters has been a core indicator for several years, newer indicators measure household giving, volunteerism, involvement in community activities, religious organizations, and other organizations, as well as funding for the arts, activities of charitable organizations, and residents' sense of community wellbeing.

Some key highlights:

➢ There has been a continuing decline in that participation of registered and eligible voters in recent elections
➢ Most residents report general satisfaction with life in the regions, but greater dissatisfaction with how things are going at the State level
➢ Libraries are an important element of the community's social fabric
➢ Indicators are beginning to look at the diversity and representation of elected officials
➢ Some indicators for community participating spiked up after the events of September 11

matrix of civic engagement indicators – citizenship, community participation & culture

Civic Engagement Indicator	BAASD	EASFV	GCP	GVC*	INC	JVSVN	OCBC	RCAVC	SBRECP	SBC	SDREDC	TVBC	VV
1. Voter participation of registered/eligible voters	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
2. Household giving and individual volunteerism, value of household charitable donations				X	X	X	X		X				
3. Formal civic/neighborhood involvement, service club membership, PTA membership, League of Women Voters				X	X		X						
4. Religious congregations/organizations & involvement				X	X		X	X					
5. Youth organizations				X									
6. Share of non-profits' contributed income that comes from corporations						X							
7. United Way giving									X				
8. Public charities & their financial support & charitable purposes, per capita grants				X				X	X				
9. Clients served by non-profits, financial condition, support for social services								X	X				
10. Sense of community wellbeing (region, state)					X		X						
11. Residents' attitudes about major institutions (trust)							X						
12. Representation in elected office, diversity of officials	X			X									
13. Library card holders, use of public library resources, spending on public libraries				X				X	X				X
14. Arts, cultural and humanities organizations				X									
15. Funding for the Arts, applications for funding											X		X
16. Performing arts attendance at major venues, programs offered, recreational/cultural venues								X	X				
17. Census response				X									

appendices

contact list – California Regional Network

regional collaborative profile format

contact list

california regional network – regional collaboratives contact list

ORGANIZATION	FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	TITLE	ADDRESS	CITY	ZIP	PHONE	FAX	E-MAIL	WEBSITE
Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities	Andrew	Michael	Vice President, Bay Area Council	200 Pine Street, Suite 300	San Francisco	94104	(415) 981-6600	(415) 981-6408	amichael@bayareacouncil.org	www.bayareacouncil.org
Economic Alliance of the San Fernando Valley	Bob	Scott	Project Director, Civic Center Group	23679 Calabasas Road, #507	Calabasas	91302	(818) 712-9500	(818) 712-9182	scott@civiccenter.com	www.economicalliance.org
Gateway Cities Partnership, Inc.	Richard	Hollinsgworth	President & CEO	7300 Alondra Boulevard Suite 202	Paramount	90723	(562) 817-0825	(562) 817-0826	rhollin588@msn.com	www.gateway-partnership.org
Great Valley Center	Doug	Jackson	Project Director	911 13th St.	Modesto		209-522-5103			ww.greatvalley.org
Institute of the North Coast	Kathy	Moxon	Director	Post Office Box 99	Bayside	95524	(707) 442-2993 x308	(707) 442-9072	kmoxon@hafoundation.org	www.northcoastprosperity.com
Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network	Marguerite	Wilbur	President & CEO	84 West Santa Clara St., Suite 440	San Jose	95113	(408) 271-7213	(408) 271-0414	m_wilbur@jointventure.org	www.jointventure.org
Orange County Business Council	Wallace	Walrod	Vice President, Research & Communications	2 Park Plaza, Suite 100	Irvine	92614	(949) 476-2242	(949) 476-0443	wwalrod@ocbc.org	www.ocbc.org
Regional Civic Alliance for Ventura County	Kate	McLean	President, Ventura County Community Foundation	1317 Del Norte Road, Ste. 150	Camarillo	93010	(805) 988-0196, x 26	(805) 988-3397	kmclean@vccf.org	www.vccf.org/regionalcivic.html
San Diego Regional Economic Development Corp.	Marney	Cox	Chief Economist SANDAG	401 B St., Suite 800	San Diego	92101-4231	(619)595-5300			www.sandag.org

Santa Barbara Region Community Economic Project	Eric	Sondquist	U.C. Santa Barbara Economic Forecast Project						sonquist@msn.com	www.ucsb-efp.com/indicators
Sierra Business Council	Amy	Horne	Research Director	P.O. Box 2428	Truckee	96160	(530) 582-4800	(530) 582-1230	ahorne@sbcouncil.org	www.sierrabusinesscouncil.org
Tri-Valley Business Council	Tom	O'Malley	President	Post Office Box 3258	Livermore	94551-3258	(925) 890-1892		Tjomalley1@aol.com	www.tri-valley.org
Valley Vision	Susan	Frazier	CEO/Director	1321 Garden Highway, Suite 110	Sacramento	95833	916-925-1973		Susan.frazier@valleyvision.org	www.valleyvision.org

regional collaborative profile format

1	**Organization**
2	**Contact Person:** Name, title, address, phone, fax, e-mail, website
3	**Demographics of Region:** Number and type of jurisdictions (number of cities/counties), Setting (rural vs. urban), Population, Ethnic makeup
4	**Title of Report:**
5	**Genesis of the Project:** Why did your organization decide to pursue an indicators project? What is the background and context for how the project came about? What role did the RC play?
6	**Project Objectives:** What is the key purpose of the project, what do the indicators measure in a broad sense?
7	**Partnerships and Stakeholder**s: Who is involved in the development process, who does the technical work on the indicators, what kind of advisory bodies are there?
8	**Time Frame/Measurement Cycle:** How often will the report come out? List all indicators reports that your organization has published previously.
9	**Findings** *Project Summary*: Overview of the process to develop report (key methodology aspects-- how long was the process, how often did stakeholders meet), structure of development/data gathering/analysis/write-up) *Framework for the Indicator Set*: How many indicators were included? How were they selected/grouped? (The full list will be shown in the appendix for each RC.) Were 4 Es considered in developing indicators? (sustainability, quality of life, the 4 E's, economy, environment, equity, engagement.) *Major Findings:* What were the major trends found in the area? What did the indicators suggest about your region?
10	**Changes in Indicators:** What indicators are new, what have been dropped, and why? What would you like to measure that you do not yet? Is the data available for indicators you would like to measure?
11	**Post-Report Follow-Up Activities** *Community Outreach/Civic Engagement Process:* How is the information disseminated, what are media strategies, how is the community engaged in discussing the findings, what happens regarding next steps – taking action? *Creative Uses of the Information*: Example: Economic Development Administration accepts the Orange County Indicators report as its required strategy document *Other projects:* Did the report lead to any unexpected collaborations or projects?
12	**Layout of the information and indicators:** How is info presented (graphics, tables, charts, etc., format and how info is available?
13	**Data sources:** List all agencies or organizations where you obtained data.
14	**Key Funding Sources:** Who funded the report?
15	**Future areas of work:** Has the current report prompted a more in-depth study of particular indicators, and/or new indicators?
16	**Other Indicators Projects:** Are there any other indicator reports in your region that you're aware of?
17	**Prop 10 Commission Linkage:** Are you working with/aware of Prop 10 commissions in your area?