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Welcome to Joint Venture’s 2001 Index of Silicon Valley.

Joint Venture developed the annual Index of Silicon Valley to provide a reliable source of information about the economy and quality of life in Silicon Valley. This information about our region has helped create a sense of regional identity. It has also helped Joint Venture and others to focus on improving important aspects of our community.

Through specific regional indicators, the Index of Silicon Valley measures progress toward the goals of Silicon Valley 2010: A Regional Framework for Growing Together, published in October 1998. The 17 goals of Silicon Valley 2010 were developed from the perspectives of more than 2,000 Silicon Valley residents. The goals have four main areas of focus: Innovative Economy, Livable Environment, Inclusive Society, and Regional Stewardship.

Last fall, as part of our commitment to the vision and goals of Silicon Valley 2010, Joint Venture launched the Silicon Valley Civic Action Network (SV CAN), a vehicle for engaging citizens in civic life and public policy in our region. In addition, Joint Venture is committed to developing a regionwide strategy aimed at bridging our Digital Divide — improving the quality of education and helping our residents obtain the skills they need to be successful in this new digital economy.

To access the full library of Joint Venture publications and initiatives, please visit us on the Web at www.jointventure.org. We wish you interesting reading and hope you will join us in working to improve the quality of life in Silicon Valley.

Ruben Barrales
President & CEO
Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network
Introduction

WHAT IS SILICON VALLEY?
Joint Venture defines Silicon Valley as Santa Clara County plus adjacent parts of San Mateo, Alameda and Santa Cruz counties (see map on page 4). This definition reflects the core location of the Valley’s driving industries and most of its workforce. With a population of more than 2.5 million people, this region has more residents than 18 U.S. states. The indicators reflect this definition of Silicon Valley, except where noted.

WHAT IS AN INDICATOR?
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. Good indicators:

• are bellwethers that reflect fundamentals of long-term regional health;
• reflect the interests and concerns of the community;
• are statistically measurable on a frequent basis;
• measure outcomes, rather than inputs.

The 35 indicators that follow were chosen in consultation with the Index Advisory Board, the Joint Venture Board, and more than 60 community experts.
Appendix A provides detail on data sources for each indicator.

WHAT IS AN INDUSTRY CLUSTER?
Several of the economic indicators relate to “industry clusters.” An industry cluster is a geographic concentration of interdependent firms in related industries, and includes a significant number of companies that sell their products and services outside the region.

Healthy, outward-oriented industry clusters are a critical prerequisite for a healthy economy. The driving clusters in Silicon Valley are:

• computers/communications
• semiconductors/semiconductor equipment
• software
• bioscience
• defense/space
• innovation services
• professional services.

Together, these clusters represent 40% of all jobs in Silicon Valley.

Clusters are dynamic. Over time, existing clusters will transform and new clusters will develop from our region’s talent and technology base. The Internet cluster is a good example. In October 2000, Joint Venture released the second analysis of the Internet cluster in Silicon Valley (for a copy, see www.jointventure.org). Prepared by A.T. Kearney, the report found that the Internet cluster comprises companies from established industry clusters such as computers/communications, software, financial services, and retail, as well as companies from the “dot-com” sector.

Although it is possible to identify local companies with Internet-related activities, government statistics do not yet track employment in these companies as a separate sector. The adoption of a new federal industry classification scheme, the North American Industry Classification System, over the next few years should improve our ability to track Internet-related companies as a sector.

In addition to tracking driving industry clusters, the Index provides employment and wage data for the other major industries in the Silicon Valley economy, such as local services and construction.

Appendix B identifies the specific subsectors constituting each cluster and the other industries.
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The 2001 Index of Silicon Valley tells the story of a region where prosperity for many has brought strain for all. The Index also shows signs of an economic slowdown. Indicators show that progress is being made in some areas: transit ridership, reading scores, philanthropic giving, health. Yet systemic problems have worsened: jobs growing faster than housing, rising housing costs, freeway congestion, widening income and educational divides.

**SIGNS POINT TO SLOWDOWN AMID PROSPERITY**

- Silicon Valley employment grew an estimated 3% in 2000, compared to an average of 4.6% for the five prior years.
- The number of publicly traded fast-growth companies dropped from 86 in 1999 to 66 in 2000.
- For the third year, Software added the most new jobs.
- Real per capita income, a measure of wealth creation, increased 6% in 2000, similar to 1999.
- Average wages in industry clusters continued sharp ascent with Software reaching $125,000 and Semiconductors $117,000.
- Venture capital investment more than doubled in 2000 to $17 billion.
- Silicon Valley was home to 48 of the 500 fastest-growing high-tech companies in the United States in 2000, a decline from 61 in 1999.

**ECONOMIC SUCCESS IS NOT RAISING LIVING STANDARD FOR ALL**

- In 2000, the region’s average wage increased 9% in real terms, from $60,800 to $66,400. This increase compares to a national increase of 2% to $36,200.
- Average wages in industry clusters increased 20%; wages in other industries increased 1%.
- A representative household at the bottom 20% of Silicon Valley’s income distribution has less income now than in 1993. A representative household in the bottom 20% earns an estimated $40,000.
- Incomes for the top-earning 20% of households rose an estimated 20% in inflation-adjusted terms since 1993 to $149,000.
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY PLUMMETS; JOB GROWTH OVERTAKES HOUSING GROWTH

- Only 16% of houses in Silicon Valley are affordable for households earning the median income, down from 31% in 1999. This contrasts with the national average of 60%.
- Average rents increased 26% at turnover in 2000; median household income increased 2%.
- The number of new housing units approved by Silicon Valley cities fell by more than 50%, from 12,060 in 1999 to 5,370 in 2000.
- Since 1992, jobs have grown four times faster than housing. To keep pace with job growth, the region would have had to build an additional 160,000 units.

DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSIT PATTERNS IMPROVE SLIGHTLY

- Thirty-seven percent of new housing units and 32% of new jobs were located near transit last year.
- In 2000, 24% of Silicon Valley and its perimeter were permanently protected open space — the same as in 1999.
- Last year, Silicon Valley cities approved new residential development at an average of 13 units per acre, compared with 10.3 units per acre in 1999.
- Per capita transit ridership increased for the first time in three years, because of increased ridership on Caltrain and light rail.
- Thirty percent of total freeway miles received the worst possible congestion rating, up from 27% in 1998.

EDUCATION SHOWS MIXED IMPROVEMENT, BUT HISPANIC ACHIEVEMENT GAP WIDENS

- Third-grade reading performance continues to improve, with 57% of students at or above the national median.
- The share of high school students enrolled in Intermediate Algebra declined from 35% in 1999 to 30% in 2000. Only 16% of Hispanic students were enrolled.
- On average, 44% of high school graduates completed the requirements for UC/CSU entrance in 1999. Of the 57% of Hispanic students who graduate high school, only 20% complete these requirements.
- More than 13% of K–12 teachers in Silicon Valley are not fully certified.

VALLEY FARES WELL ON HEALTH

- Santa Clara County maintains its leadership position nationally in immunization rates for children 18–35 months, and deaths due to coronary heart disease continue to decline.
- The share of low-weight births has increased incrementally in the last three years, from 5.9% in 1997 to 6.2%, away from the national objective of 5%.
- Juvenile felony arrests continue to decline below the state average.

GOVERNMENT REVENUE IS CATCHING UP WITH ECONOMIC GROWTH; PHILANTHROPY ACCELERATES

- Revenues for Silicon Valley cities are catching up with population and employment growth, though revenue sources have shifted away from sales and property tax.
- Since 1992, donors have contributed $1 billion to charitable funds at the two largest community foundations in Silicon Valley.
Silicon Valley’s influence on the San Francisco Bay Area has grown steadily since the region emerged from the recession and restructuring of the early 1990s. We now see Silicon Valley–like companies and industries throughout the Bay Area and a growing number of Bay Area residents working for companies in Silicon Valley.

For this year’s special analysis, we explored two questions about Silicon Valley and the Bay Area:
• Does industry cluster employment in other regions of the Bay Area look like that in Silicon Valley?
• Where do people who work in Silicon Valley live?

**SILICON VALLEY’S CONCENTRATION OF INDUSTRY CLUSTER EMPLOYMENT REMAINS UNIQUE IN BAY AREA**

In Silicon Valley, 40% of employment is in the seven driving industry clusters (for a definition of these clusters, see Appendix B). We examined the degree to which ten other regions in the Bay Area had concentrations of cluster employment similar to those of Silicon Valley.

We found that Silicon Valley’s employment in these industry clusters is double the share of employment in the three next-closest regions. Tri-Valley, Santa Cruz County and San Francisco have nearly 20% of their employees in these same industry clusters.

Although technology companies exist throughout the Bay Area, Silicon Valley remains distinguished for its concentration of technology-related employment.

---

**CLUSTER EMPLOYMENT AS A SHARE OF ALL INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT WITHIN EACH REGION, FIRST QUARTER 2000**

![Cluster Employment Chart](chart.png)

Source: Employment Development Department

---

**REGIONS OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA**

![Bay Area Regions Map](map.png)
20% OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY’S WORKFORCE LIVES OUTSIDE THE COUNTY, UP FROM 16% IN 1990

The number of workers commuting into Santa Clara County from surrounding counties increased from 144,000 in 1990 to 212,000 in 2000 — a 47% increase. The commuters’ share of total employment in Santa Clara County increased from 16% in 1990 to 20% in 2000.

Though the absolute number of commuters increased markedly, the shifts in the home counties of the commuters were only slight. The largest share of commuters, 48%, live east of Silicon Valley — the same as in 1990. The share of commuters from the Peninsula and points north declined from 36% to 32% between 1990 and 2000. The share of commuters from the west increased from 12% to 15%. The share from San Benito and Monterey Counties increased from 4% to 5%.

ORIGIN AND NUMBER OF COMMUTERS INTO SANTA CLARA COUNTY

IMPLICATION

While Tri-Valley, Santa Cruz County and San Francisco have developed significant concentrations of technology jobs, the greatest concentration of such jobs still remains in Silicon Valley.

Because 80% of the workforce lives in Santa Clara County, education and training of our residents remain key to future success.
**Regional Trend Indicators**

**Why Is This Important?**
Annual net job gains or losses are a basic measure of economic health. This indicator is from a unique set of employment data for the Silicon Valley region (see Appendix B for definition of the region).

**How Are We Doing?**
In 2000, Silicon Valley experienced an estimated net increase of 39,200 jobs, a 3.0% annual growth rate.

This rate represents slowed growth from the prior five years. At peak employment growth in 1996 and 1997, Silicon Valley added at least 60,000 jobs annually and grew faster than 5%.

Since 1992, the first year of the regional employment dataset, Silicon Valley has seen a net increase of more than 329,000 new jobs. The total number of jobs in the region is 1.35 million.

**Rate of Job Growth Slows**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>59,800</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Employment Development Department

*Estimate

**Software Adds the Most Jobs; Losses Reversed in Semiconductors and Bioscience**

**Why Is This Important?**
This indicator shows how employment in different clusters and other industries changed in the most recent annual period.

**How Are We Doing?**
For the third consecutive year, the Software cluster added the largest number of new jobs — 30,700 — from the second quarter of 1999 to the second quarter of 2000. This increase was more than double the 12,600 jobs added in 1998–99. The second-largest growth was in professional services with 9,900 new jobs, followed by innovation services with 6,900.


Of the other Silicon Valley industries, Government/Education showed the largest gains, adding 6,400 jobs. Another growth sector was Construction/Transportation/Public Utilities, adding 6,400 jobs. Miscellaneous Manufacturing gained 3,000 jobs in 1999–2000, after losing 5,700 jobs in 1998–99. Health Services and Finance/Insurance/Real Estate lost 2,800 and 1,000 jobs, respectively.

Source: Employment Development Department
Silicon Valley Wages Increase 9% Over 1999

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**
Growth of the average annual wage in inflation-adjusted terms is an indicator of job quality. It is as important a measure of Silicon Valley's economic vitality as job growth.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**
The estimated average wage in Silicon Valley grew 9.2% in the year 2000, after accounting for inflation. The average wage increased $5,600, from $60,800 in 1999 to $66,400 in 2000. Nationally, the increase was 2%.

Silicon Valley’s average wage is 84% above the nation’s average wage of $36,100. The Valley’s high productivity allows wages to increase faster than the rate of inflation; tight labor markets and high housing costs accelerate wage increases.

![Average Per Employee Wage, 2000 Dollars](chart)

Sources: Employment Development Department, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Economy.com

*Estimate

Cluster Wages Grow 20% Overall; Average Software Wage Reaches $125,000

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**
Average annual wage increases in driving cluster industries are an indicator of the wealth-generating impact that outward-oriented industries have on Silicon Valley. Healthy cluster industries stimulate local-serving industries, as companies and the people they employ spend money on goods and services offered within the region.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**
Software continues to have the highest average annual wages, reaching $124,700 in 1999, an increase of 25% from the prior year. The second-highest average wages are found in the Semiconductors/Equipment cluster at $117,000, followed by Computers/Communications at $110,100. Wages in the Semiconductors/Equipment cluster experienced the largest absolute change of $27,000; the Computers/Communication cluster showed the largest percent increase from the previous year, 32%.

Overall, average wages in cluster industries increased 20%; wages in other industries increased 1%.

Among the other industries in Silicon Valley, Finance/Insurance/Real Estate remains the highest at $60,400. The largest-employing sector, Government/Education, has the third-lowest wages per employee at $39,300.

![Average Per Employee Wage, Cluster Industries, 1999](chart)

![Average Per Employee Wage, Other Industries, 1999](chart)

Source: Employment Development Department
WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
Exports generate wealth and jobs for a region and are an important indicator of global competitiveness. Serving growing global demand for high-tech goods is key to employment and sales growth for existing and new Silicon Valley firms.

HOW ARE WE DOING?
In 1999, merchandise exports from Silicon Valley-based firms increased 5% from $33.6 billion to $35.2 billion. Statewide and nationally, exports grew 2%.

Silicon Valley companies accounted for 34% of California’s non-agricultural export sales in 1999, an increase from 33% in 1998.

The increase in Valley exports is attributable to a turnaround in the Semiconductors and Semiconductor Equipment sector as Asian economies recovered in the second half of 1999.

An important caveat in the data is that official government trade datasets do not include exports of services, including most software.

Office Vacancy Rates Fall by Half; Lease Rates Jump 50%

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
Vacancy rates are a leading indicator of economic activity. Declining vacancies for office space reflect strong demand by growing companies, leading typically to rate increases and investment in property development. Rising vacancies reflect slowing demand relative to supply.

HOW ARE WE DOING?
Vacancy rates for R&D office space dropped from 6.6% in 1999 to 2.8% in 2000. This is the lowest commercial vacancy rate in more than a decade.

Average R&D office lease rates jumped markedly, rising 56% from $2.41 in 1999 to $3.75 (average of first three quarters, 2000). In the third quarter of 2000, average lease rates climbed to $5.66 per square foot, with rates in northern Silicon Valley being the highest at $7.63.

Approximately 8 million square feet of new R&D office space were added to the total inventory in the last 12 months.
This second part of the *Index of Silicon Valley* is organized according to the four theme areas and 17 goals of *Silicon Valley 2010: A Regional Framework for Growing Together*. Joint Venture published *Silicon Valley 2010* in October 1998, after more than 2,000 residents and community leaders gave input on what they would like Silicon Valley to become by the year 2010. For more information about *Silicon Valley 2010* vision, goals, and recommended progress measures, call 408/271-7213, or visit our website at [www.jointventure.org](http://www.jointventure.org).
## Silicon Valley 2010 Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUR INNOVATIVE ECONOMY INCREASES PRODUCTIVITY AND BROADENS PROSPERITY</th>
<th>OUR INCLUSIVE SOCIETY CONNECTS PEOPLE TO OPPORTUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **GOAL 1: INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP.**  
Silicon Valley continues to lead the world in technology and innovation. | **GOAL 10: EDUCATION AS A BRIDGE TO OPPORTUNITY.**  
All students gain the knowledge and life skills required to succeed in the global economy and society. |
| **GOAL 2: QUALITY GROWTH.**  
Our economy grows from increasing skills and knowledge, rising productivity and more efficient use of resources. | **GOAL 11: TRANSPORTATION CHOICES.**  
We overcome transportation barriers to employment and increase mobility by investing in an integrated, accessible regional transportation system. |
| **GOAL 3: BROADENED PROSPERITY.**  
Our economic growth results in an improved quality of life for lower-income people. | **GOAL 12: HEALTHY PEOPLE.**  
All people have access to high-quality, affordable health care that focuses on disease and illness prevention. |
| **GOAL 4: ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY.**  
All people, especially the disadvantaged, have access to training and jobs with advancement potential. | **GOAL 13: SAFE PLACES.**  
All people are safe in their homes, workplaces, schools and neighborhoods. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUR COMMUNITIES PROTECT THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND PROMOTE LIVABILITY</th>
<th>OUR REGIONAL STEWARDSHIP DEVELOPS SHARED SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **GOAL 5: PROTECT NATURE.**  
We meet high standards for improving our air and water quality, protecting and restoring the natural environment and conserving natural resources. | **GOAL 15: CIVIC ENGAGEMENT.**  
All residents, business-people and elected officials think regionally, share responsibility and take action on behalf of our region’s future. |
| **GOAL 6: PRESERVE OPEN SPACE.**  
We increase the amount of permanently protected open space, publicly accessible parks and green space. | **GOAL 16: TRANSCENDING BOUNDARIES.**  
Local communities and regional authorities coordinate their transportation and land use planning for the benefit of everyone. City, county and regional plans, when viewed together, add up to a sustainable region. |
| **GOAL 7: EFFICIENT LAND REUSE.**  
Most residential and commercial growth happens through recycling land and buildings in existing developed areas. We grow inward, not outward, maintaining a distinct edge between developed land and open space. | **GOAL 17: MATCHING RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITY.**  
Valley cities, counties and other public agencies have reliable, sufficient revenue to provide basic local and regional public services. |
| **GOAL 8: LIVABLE COMMUNITIES.**  
We create vibrant community centers where housing, employment, schools, places of worship, parks and services are located together and are all linked by transit and other alternatives to driving alone. | **GOAL 18: ADDITIONAL GOALS.**  
These goals focus on improving the quality of life for all residents, business-people and employees. |
| **GOAL 9: HOUSING CHOICES.**  
We place a high priority on developing well-designed housing options that are affordable to people of all ages and income levels. We strive for balance between growth in jobs and housing. | **GOAL 19: ADDITIONAL GOALS.**  
These goals focus on improving the quality of life for all residents, business-people and employees. |
GOAL 1: INNOVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Silicon Valley continues to lead the world in technology and innovation.

Fast-Growth Public Companies Drop from 86 to 66

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

High numbers of fast-growth companies reflect high levels of innovation in the Valley. By generating accelerated increases in sales, these firms stimulate the development of other businesses and personal spending throughout the region.

HOW ARE WE DOING?

Gazelles are publicly traded companies that have grown at least 20% for each of the last four years, starting with at least $1 million in sales. In 2000, the number of gazelle firms decreased 23% to 66 from 86 in 1999. Fifteen percent of the Valley’s public firms were gazelles in 2000. This is a decline from 20% in 1999.

Of the fastest-growing technology companies in the United States, as measured by Deloitte & Touche LLP (includes mostly privately held companies), 48 were based in Silicon Valley in 2000, 10% of the total. Silicon Valley’s number of Fast 500 companies has declined from 62 in 1998 and 61 in 1999.

In 2000, Silicon Valley was home to three of the top ten fastest growing companies nationally: Yahoo! Inc., PC-TEL, Inc. and NVIDIA Corporation.

Venture Capital Investment Doubles to $17 Billion

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Companies that have passed the screen of venture capitalists are innovative, are entrepreneurial and have growth potential. Typically, only firms with potential for exceptionally high rates of growth over a five- to ten-year period will attract venture capital. These firms are usually highly innovative in their technology and market focus.

HOW ARE WE DOING?

In 2000, venture capitalists invested an estimated $17 billion in Silicon Valley companies. This figure is a 104% increase over total venture capital investment in 1999, $8.4 billion.

The size of the average investment was $17.7 million, almost double the average investment in 1999 of $9.6 million.

Investment in Software companies attracted the largest share of total investment at 28%, down from 33% in 1999. Telecommunications captured the second-largest investment share at 19%. Business Services increased its share of venture capital investment, from 8% in 1999 to 16% in 2000. Investment in Semiconductors/Equipment increased from 2% to 5% from 1999 to 2000.

Source: PricewaterhouseCoopers
*Estimate
IPOs Approach Previous Levels; M&As Increase 25%

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**

Through initial public offerings (IPOs) and mergers and acquisitions (M&As), companies access resources to develop technologies and products to their next level. Both IPOs and M&As are important routes to liquidity for entrepreneurs and investors in entrepreneurial companies.

The numbers of IPOs and M&As are indicators of successful entrepreneurship and future high-growth companies.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**

At 85, the estimated number of Silicon Valley IPOs in 2000 approaches the record level, 92, set in 1999. The number of IPOs remained high despite widespread volatility in the stock market and more realistic expectations for IPO valuation. Internet, wireless technology, bioscience and software companies dominate the IPOs.

The number of M&As increased 25%, from 194 in 1999 to 243 in 2000. This is in contrast to the national M&A market, which saw declines of 20% annually in 1999 and in 2000.

---

**GOAL 2: QUALITY GROWTH**

Our economy grows from increasing skills and knowledge, rising productivity and more efficient use of resources.

**Real Per Capita Income Grows Faster than the Nation’s**

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**

Growing real income per capita is a bottom-line measure of a wealth-creating, competitive economy. The indicator is total personal income from all sources (e.g., wages, investment earnings, self-employment) adjusted for inflation and divided by the total resident population.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**

During the last decade, real per capita income for Santa Clara County increased 36%, compared with 17% for the nation. The divergence in wealth creation started in 1995 and became more pronounced through the decade.

In 2000, real per capita income in Santa Clara County increased 4% compared to 2.5% for the nation. Regional real per capita income was $48,100 compared to $30,100 nationally.

Per capita income rises when a region generates wealth faster than the population increases.
Value Added per Employee Is Double National Average

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**

Value added is a proxy for productivity and reflects how much economic value companies create.

Increased value added is a prerequisite for increased wages. Innovation, process improvement and industry/product mix drive value added, which is derived by subtracting the costs of a company’s materials, inputs and contracted services from the revenue earned from its products.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**

Since 1994, Silicon Valley has experienced rapid increases in value added per employee, averaging 8.7% annually. Between 1999 and 2000, overall value added per employee increased 7% to $127,100. The national average is $60,800.

Four clusters have value added per employee significantly above the regional average. Computers/Communications had the highest value added at $274,400 per employee. Semiconductors/Equipment had the second-highest value added at $254,600. Software had $192,600, and Innovation Services had $180,200.

Value added by Silicon Valley clusters is higher than that of their national counterparts. This accounts for their exceptionally high wages.

Source: Economy.com
**GOAL 3: BROADENED PROSPERITY**  Our economic growth results in a higher standard of living for lower-income people.

**Economic Success Is Not Raising Income for All**

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**
This progress measure looks at change in household income at the top 20% and bottom 20% of the income distribution. Household income includes income from wages, investments, Social Security and welfare payments for all people in the household. The indicator compares the income available to a representative four-person household at identical points in the distribution over different periods of time.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**
Inflation-adjusted incomes of representative households at the lowest 20th percentile of the income distribution have been rising only since 1997. However, the 1999 income level, an estimated $40,000, is below the income level earned by the bottom 20% of households earlier in the 1990s.

Nationally, household incomes at the 20th percentile rose 20% between 1993 and 1999. In Santa Clara County, these incomes declined an estimated 7% in inflation-adjusted terms. Inflation-adjusted income of households at the 80th percentile increased 20% to an estimated $149,000 in Silicon Valley.

**GOAL 4: ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY**  All people, especially the disadvantaged, have access to training and jobs with advancement potential.

**High School Graduation Rate Declines**

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**
Accessing quality jobs requires not only graduating high school, but also additional education or training. The high school graduation rate is a risk indicator that warns of lost potential and future societal costs resulting from people being un- or underemployed. A multicultural, highly skilled workforce has unique advantages for a globally competitive region. Providing a quality education for all ethnic groups should be a prime objective in Silicon Valley.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**
In 2000, 70.3% of the students who enrolled as freshmen in public high schools in 1996 graduated as seniors. This is a decline from the 1999 rate of 75.3%. The Silicon Valley graduation rate was approximately two percentage points higher than the statewide average in 1999.

Graduation rates vary widely by ethnicity. Asian students achieved the highest graduation rate at 97% (1999 data). Eighty-two percent of Filipino students and 78% of White students graduated. The graduation rate among Hispanic students remained unchanged from 1998 levels at 57%.

Source: Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo County Offices of Education
GOAL 5: PROTECT NATURE We meet high standards for improving our air and water quality, protecting and restoring the natural environment and conserving natural resources.

Air Quality Shows Mixed Improvement

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
High-quality air is fundamental to the health of people, nature and our economy. The number of days that Silicon Valley air exceeds ozone and particulate matter standards is an indicator of air contamination.

Ozone is the main component of smog and vehicles are the primary source of ozone-creating emissions. The health consequences associated with fine particulate matter (PM10) are more severe than those associated with ozone. Fine particulate matter — including dust, smoke and soot — is generated primarily during construction and burning wood.

HOW ARE WE DOING?
Silicon Valley exceeded the state standard for ozone 5 days in 2000, down from 12 days in 1999. Silicon Valley exceeded the state standard for particulate matter (PM10) 5 days in 1999, up from 3 days in 1998. (PM10 is sampled only every sixth day, so actual days over the state standard could be six times the number shown, or 30 days.) Generally, levels of particulate matter have been decreasing since 1990.

Water Use Increases by 9% in Two Years; Less than 2% Is Recycled

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
Water is a limited resource because water supply is subject to changes in climate and state and federal regulation. The quantity and quality of water are essential to residents and to technology manufacturing industries. Sustainability in the long term requires that communities, workplaces and agricultural operations efficiently use and reuse water.

HOW ARE WE DOING?
Santa Clara County’s annual consumption of water increased in 1999 and 2000. Businesses, cities and households consumed an estimated 376,000 acre-feet of water, a 9% increase since 1998. Water use has increased 30% since 1991, a year noted for its low rainfall, extreme water use reduction efforts and an economic recession.

On a per capita basis, the county increased water use from 207 acre-feet per 1,000 residents in 1998 to 216 acre-feet per 1,000 residents, a 4% increase.

Less than 2% of water used is recycled water, up from 1% in 1998. Recycled water is used to irrigate parks and golf courses and for construction.
GOAL 6: PRESERVE OPEN SPACE. We increase the amount of permanently protected open space, publicly accessible parks and green space.

24% of Valley and Perimeter Is Permanently Protected Open Space

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
Preserving open space protects natural habitats, provides recreational opportunities, focuses development and safeguards the visual appeal of our region.

This indicator tracks lands permanently protected through public ownership or conservation easements in Silicon Valley and its perimeter.

HOW ARE WE DOING?
In 2000, 24% of Silicon Valley and its perimeter was permanently protected open space. This includes roughly 465,000 acres in Santa Clara, San Mateo and Santa Cruz counties and Alameda County south of Oakland.

Fifty-seven percent of this permanently protected open space is accessible to the public. Within these publicly accessible lands are 645 miles of trails for hiking, biking and horseback riding.

GOAL 7: EFFICIENT LAND REUSE. Most residential and commercial growth happens through recycling land and buildings in developed areas. We grow inward, not outward, maintaining a distinct edge between developed land and open space.

Efficiency of Land Used for Housing Increases

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
By directing growth to already developed areas, local jurisdictions can reinvest in existing neighborhoods, use transportation systems more efficiently and preserve nearby rural settings.

HOW ARE WE DOING?
A survey of 25 Silicon Valley cities found that new housing developments are using scarce land resources more efficiently. During 2000, Silicon Valley cities approved new residential developments at an average of 13 units per acre. This compares to an overall regional ratio of 4.9 housing units per acre.

The 2000 figures are a significant increase from the prior two years — 10.3 units per acre in 1999 and 6.6 units per acre in 1998. Urban service areas expand when cities annex land and provide infrastructure services such as water, sewer and roads. In 2000, Silicon Valley’s urban service area expanded by 234 acres within the City of Morgan Hill.
G O A L 8: L I V A B L E C O M M U N I T I E S

We create vibrant communities where housing, employment, places of worship, parks and services are located together, and are all linked by transit and other alternatives to driving alone.

37% of New Housing, 32% of New Jobs Are Located Near Transit

W H Y  I S  T H I S  I M P O R T A N T ?

Focusing new economic and housing development near rail stations and major bus corridors reinforces the creation of compact, walkable communities linked by transit. This helps to reduce traffic congestion on Silicon Valley freeways.

H O W  A R E  W E  D O I N G ?

A survey of 25 Silicon Valley cities found that 37% of all new housing units approved in 2000 were located within one-quarter mile of a rail station or major bus corridor. Thirty-two percent of new commercial/industrial developments were also located within one-quarter mile of transit, representing 15,700 potential new jobs. Approvals near transit declined from the previous year when 57% of new housing units and 35% of new jobs were located near transit.

Approvals for New Housing Fall by 50%; 1,600 New “Affordable” Units Approved

W H Y  I S  T H I S  I M P O R T A N T ?

Our economy and community life depend on a broad range of jobs. Building housing that is affordable to lower- and moderate-income households provides access to opportunity and maintains balance in our communities. This indicator measures housing units approved for development by Silicon Valley cities in each fiscal year; this is a more “upstream” measure than actual housing starts.

H O W  A R E  W E  D O I N G ?

The number of new housing units approved for development by Silicon Valley cities fell by more than 50%, from 12,060 in fiscal year 1999 to 5,370 in fiscal year 2000.

Despite this overall decrease, the number of new affordable housing units approved remained around 1,600. This number represents 31% of total net new housing units approved.

Affordable rental housing is for households making up to 60% of the median income. These units are primarily developed by nonprofit housing developers or units set aside as “affordable” in market-rate developments.
Why Is This Important?
Building housing commensurate with job growth helps mitigate commute traffic, moderate housing price increases and ease workforce shortages.

How Are We Doing?
Between 1992 and 2000, Silicon Valley was much better at creating jobs than at creating housing. Silicon Valley produced 329,000 new jobs but only 60,500 new housing units (1 home for every 5.5 jobs).

Within Silicon Valley, the overall ratio of jobs to housing varies widely by subregion. For example, North Santa Clara County has the largest number of jobs relative to housing (2:1). South Santa Clara County has significantly fewer jobs relative to its housing (0:1).

In the most recent year (July 1999 to June 2000), Silicon Valley produced an estimated 80,000 new jobs and 9,600 housing units. Already job-rich North Santa Clara County gained 16 new jobs for every one housing unit built. House-rich South Santa Clara County gained three new jobs for each housing unit.

Recent growth in jobs exceeded housing construction in all other subregions of the Valley as well: 6:1 in South San Mateo County; 5:1 in Central Santa Clara County; 10:1 in Southwest Alameda County; and 8:1 in Scotts Valley.

To keep pace with job growth, the region would have had to build 160,000 additional housing units since 1992.
WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The affordability, variety and location of housing affect a region's ability to maintain a viable economy and high quality of life. Lack of affordable housing in a region encourages longer commutes, which diminish productivity, curtail family time and increase traffic congestion. Lack of affordable housing also restricts the ability of service workers — such as teachers, registered nurses and police officers — to live in the communities in which they work.

HOW ARE WE DOING?

In 2000, 16% of Santa Clara County houses were affordable for households with the median income, a significant decrease from 31% in 1999. This number contrasts with the national average of 60%. Despite rising home prices, Silicon Valley’s home ownership rate of about 60% mirrors the national average for metropolitan areas. Between 1987 and 1999, home ownership rates have ranged from a low of 55% in 1987 to a high of 64% in 1998.

In 2000, average apartment rental rates at turnover increased by 26% in real dollars compared to a 2% increase in median income. The average monthly rent was $1,687 for all types of units. Occupancy rates are at 98.7%, up from 97% in 1999.

To live in an average one-bedroom apartment in Silicon Valley, a preschool teacher would have to set aside 80% of his or her monthly salary for rent payments. Rent would take up 30% to 38% of monthly pay for public school teachers, police officers and nurses earning average salaries.
GOAL 10: EDUCATION AS A BRIDGE TO OPPORTUNITY All students gain the knowledge and life skills required to succeed in the global economy and society.

Third-Grade Reading Performance Improves for Second Year

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
Research shows that students who do not achieve reading mastery by the end of third grade risk falling behind further in school. Silicon Valley does not have a standardized way to measure mastery of reading at the end of third grade. The only measure available regionally is the Stanford Achievement Test Series, Ninth Edition (SAT 9), which measures performance relative to a national distribution.

HOW ARE WE DOING?
Fifty-seven percent of Silicon Valley third graders scored at or above the national median for reading comprehension in 2000, an increase from 54% in 1999. Thirty-one percent of the third-grade readers scored at or above the top quartile, up from 29% in 1999. The share of students scoring below the lowest quartile declined from 28% in 1998 to 23% in 2000.

These aggregate scores contrast sharply with those of students with Limited English Proficiency (the SAT 9 tests reading in English only). More than 52% of the LEP students scored below the lowest quartile mark. This percentage is an improvement, however, from 57% in 1999.

Top-performing LEP students showed some gains in 2000, with 21% scoring at or above the national median, up from 19% in 1999. Since 1998, LEP students performing in the top quartile increased from 3% to 5% in 2000.

Overall Enrollment in Intermediate Algebra Is Down; Hispanic Enrollment Falls to 16%

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
Completing Algebra I and moving on to advanced math courses is important for students planning to enter postsecondary education as well as for students entering the workforce after high school, especially for technology jobs. This indicator shows the share of high school students enrolled in Intermediate Algebra, which follows Algebra I and is typically taken in tenth or eleventh grade.

HOW ARE WE DOING?
In 2000, some 30% of Silicon Valley high school students were enrolled in Intermediate Algebra — a decline from 35% in 1999. Enrollment disparity across ethnicity is wide. Forty-three percent of Asian students were enrolled, followed by Filipinos at 37%; 32% of White students were enrolled, down from 35% in 1999; 25% of African American students were enrolled, down from 29% in 1999. Only 16% of Hispanic students were enrolled in Intermediate Algebra, a sharp decline from 24% in 1999.

Compared with the percentage of California students, a larger percentage of Silicon Valley students were enrolled in Intermediate Algebra in every ethnic category except Hispanic.
Share of Graduates Meeting College Entrance Requirements Remains Steady; Disparity Across Ethnicity Is Wide

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**
Passing a breadth of core courses required for college entry is a measure of achievement, capacity and readiness. Completing some type of education beyond high school is increasingly important for participating in the high-wage sectors of the Silicon Valley economy.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**
The share of high school students who completed the courses required for entrance to the University of California (UC) or California State University (CSU) systems remained at 44% in 1999. The share of students completing the requirements in Silicon Valley has steadily increased since 1993–94, when 36% of students met the standard.

Silicon Valley completion rates compare favorably with statewide UC/CSU completion rates of 36%.

Performance, however, varies widely by ethnicity. Only 20% of Hispanic and 22% of Pacific Islander students completed these courses in 1999, compared to 66% of Asian students and 49% of White students. A larger percentage of Whites and African Americans completed UC/CSU requirements in 1999 than in 1998.

More Than 13% of Silicon Valley K–12 Teachers Are Not Fully Certified

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**
Teacher certification status is one indicator of a teacher’s qualifications. Teaching staff with emergency permits, certification waivers and those participating in various internship programs have not completed the relevant coursework required for state certification to teach in a public school classroom. National research shows that emergency and temporary certification is higher among teachers with three or fewer years of teaching experience.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**
In 1999–2000, 13.3% of Silicon Valley’s public school teachers were not fully certified. This is an increase from 1,578 teachers in 1997–98 to 2,415 in 1999–2000, or 53%.

The six regional school districts where 20% or more of the teaching staff lack full certification primarily serve low-income families. Total enrollment in these school districts is 37,000 and 66% of the students qualify for the Free and Reduced Price Meal Program.
**GOAL 11: TRANSPORTATION CHOICES** We overcome transportation barriers to employment and increase mobility by investing in an integrated, accessible regional transportation system.

**Per Capita Transit Ridership Shows Improvement**

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**

A larger share of workers using alternatives to driving alone indicates progress in increasing access to jobs and in improving the livability of our communities. Pedestrian- and transit-oriented development in neighborhoods and employment and shopping centers increases opportunities for walking, bicycling and using public transportation instead of driving.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**

Per capita transit ridership improved in 2000, increasing from 33.3 annual rides per person in 1999 to 34.3 in 2000. Total ridership increased 4%, from 81 million in 1999 to 84.6 million in 2000. Ridership increased on Caltrain, Light Rail and SamTrans bus service, but decreased slightly on VTA buses.

Not counted in the above per capita data is ridership on the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE). Train service from Stockton to San Jose started in October 1998. As of November 2000, ACE carries 2,100 westbound passengers daily.

A year 2000 survey of Valley commuters found that 78% drove to work alone, a 1% improvement since 1999. Two percent walked and biked, up from 1.5% in 1998. The share of commuters carpooling and using transit remained constant at 15% and 4%, respectively.

---

**Sources:** Valley Transportation Authority, SamTrans, Altamont Commuter Express, RIDES for Bay Area Commuters

*Estimate*
12% of Households Can Access Major Job Center by Transit in 45 Minutes

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**

The ability to access major job centers in Silicon Valley by transit is important for decreasing congestion and for connecting all people, including the working poor, to quality job opportunities. Regions increase opportunities for all workers to access quality jobs by investing in transit and by locating workplaces and housing close to transit.

This new measure of transit accessibility indicates the percentage of all Santa Clara County households that can access a major employment center within a 45-minute transit commute. There are 12 major employment centers in Santa Clara County. This indicator focuses on the Great America Parkway employment center located in the triangle between Highways 101, 237 and 880. The center was selected because of its concentration of high-tech workplaces and because its suburban location makes it representative of similar employment centers in the region.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**

Twelve percent of households in Santa Clara County could access the Great America Parkway employment center within a 45-minute commute by transit.

Since 80% of all households in the County are within a 1/4 mile of some type of transit stop, most households could reach this employment center by transit, but it would take longer than 45 minutes.

---

30% of Valley’s Freeway Miles Receive Worst Rating

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**

Traffic congestion is a key factor affecting quality of life. Traffic congestion is a function of overall economic activity and regional design — the location of jobs and housing and the availability of other travel options, such as public transit, carpooling, biking, walking and telecommuting.

This indicator shows the number and share of freeway miles operating at service level “F” during the afternoon peak travel time. Level “F” is the worst possible rating and means forced-flow traffic with travel speeds of less than 35 miles per hour.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**

In 2000, 30% of total freeway miles in Santa Clara County received the worst possible congestion rating. In 1991, only 15% of freeway miles were given a rating of F. Congestion dropped significantly in 1995 because of an increase in freeway capacity, including high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, but has increased ever since.
GOAL 12: HEALTHY PEOPLE All people have access to high-quality, affordable health care that focuses on disease and illness prevention.

Child Immunization and Heart Disease Show Improvement; Low-Weight Births Do Not

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
The proportion of children with low birth weight is a predictor of future costs that communities will incur for preventable health problems, special education and crime. Timely childhood immunizations promote long-term health, save lives, prevent significant disability and lower medical costs. Coronary heart disease is the cause of death that is most preventable through proper nutrition, exercise, not smoking and access to basic health care.

Disaggregating health data helps uncover areas of need and monitor at-risk populations. Poor health outcomes generally correlate with poverty, which correlates with poor access to preventive health care and education.

HOW ARE WE DOING?
The share of low-weight births increased incrementally during the past three years, from 5.9% in 1997 to 6.2% in 1999. The region is not showing improvement in reaching the Year 2000 objective of 5% set by the U.S. Public Health Service. Across ethnicity, Native American mothers experienced the highest rate of low-weight births at 10.6%, followed by African American mothers at 7.2%. White and Chinese-American mothers had the lowest rates, at 4.7% and 4.2%, respectively.

According to a National Centers for Disease Control Survey, Santa Clara County has maintained its leadership position in immunization rates for children ages 18–35 months, compared to rates in California and the United States. Immunization rates decreased slightly, however, from 85% in 1998 to 84% in 1999.

The county’s death rate due to coronary heart disease, 73 per 100,000, is more than 25% below the Year 2000 objective. Whites have the highest rates of deaths due to coronary heart disease.

Sources: California Department of Health Services, Centers for Disease Control, County of Santa Clara Public Health Department
GOAL 13: **SAFE PLACES** All people are safe in their homes, workplaces, schools and neighborhoods.

**GOAL 13:** **SAFE PLACES** All people are safe in their homes, workplaces, schools and neighborhoods.

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**
The level and perception of crime in a community are significant factors that affect quality of life. Crime has wide-ranging effects on communities. In addition to economic costs, the fear, frustration and instability resulting from crime chisel away at our sense of community and undermine people’s ability to prosper.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**
The violent crime rate continued its decline in Santa Clara County, from 434 crimes per 100,000 residents in 1999 to an estimated 408 in 2000. Preliminary violent crime estimates for 2000 indicate an increase of 1.6% for California, the first increase in the statewide violent crime rate since 1992.

Juvenile felony arrests for violent crimes in Santa Clara County fell 14% from 463 per 100,000 10- to 17-year olds in 1998 to 399 in 1999.

Silicon Valley began the 1990s with very low juvenile felony arrest rates relative to the California average. After rising through 1996 to above the state average, rates have declined in the most recent three years.

---

**GOAL 14: ARTS AND CULTURE THAT BIND COMMUNITY** Arts and cultural activities reach, link and celebrate the diverse communities of our region.

**GOAL 14:** **ARTS AND CULTURE THAT BIND COMMUNITY** Arts and cultural activities reach, link and celebrate the diverse communities of our region.

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**
Arts and cultural activities are important for Silicon Valley’s economic and civic future. Creative expression is an important foundation for an economy based on innovation. And participation in arts and cultural activities connects diverse people to each other and to their community.

In spring 2001, Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley will release the *Culture and Creativity Index*, which will include 30 progress measures about arts, culture and creativity in the region.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**
Overall, 43% of residents report that lack of arts and cultural resources is a problem in the community in which they live. Fifty-seven percent of Hispanic residents, 50% of Asian residents and 34% of White residents say that a lack of arts and cultural activities is a problem. Half of people under age 50, compared with 31% of those who are older, say that a lack of arts and cultural activities is a problem.

---

**SHARE OF RESIDENTS FOR WHOM LACK OF ARTS AND CULTURE ACTIVITIES IS AT LEAST A SMALL PROBLEM, 2000**

Source: Knight Foundation
**GOAL 15: CIVIC ENGAGEMENT** All residents, businesspeople and elected officials think regionally, share responsibility and take action on behalf of our region’s future.

### Giving to Community Foundations Reaches $1 Billion Since 1992

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**

Giving back to the community and helping others less fortunate are important parts of citizenship in a region. Asset-based philanthropy can play a strategic role in exploring new approaches to challenging social problems.

Community foundations help plan and administer charitable-giving activities for individuals, families and corporations.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**

Since 1992, donors have contributed $1 billion to these funds. In turn, the foundations granted $295 million from these funds to local charities during this period. Sixty-two percent of the contributions and 56% of the grants were made in 1999 and 2000.

Since 1992, individuals, families and several corporations established 946 new charitable funds at the two largest community foundations in Silicon Valley.

In addition to the charitable funds at community foundations, there are 172 independent family foundations in Silicon Valley.

---

**Local Elected Leadership Does Not Yet Reflect Valley’s Diversity**

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**

Elected office is an important platform for civic leadership and for encouraging civic involvement by others. Having elected officials who reflect the cultural diversity of Silicon Valley can help ensure that diverse people participate in policy decisions.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**

The elected leadership of local governments in Silicon Valley today is 82% White, though Whites constitute 52% of the adult population. Asians are 23% of the adult population and hold 4% of local offices. Hispanics are 21% of the adult population and hold 7% of local offices. African Americans are 4% of the adult population and serve in 7% of elected offices.
**GOAL 16: TRANSCENDING BOUNDARIES** Local communities and regional authorities coordinate their transportation and land use planning for the benefit of everyone. City, county and regional plans, when viewed together, add up to a sustainable region.

**Permit Streamlining Sets Stage for More Regional Collaboration**

**WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?**
Collaboration across government jurisdictions in Silicon Valley requires developing innovative approaches to sharing information, setting mutually beneficial goals and progressing together. This indicator tells the story of how local jurisdictions have collaborated to upgrade, standardize and link new approaches to permitting. This experience sets the stage for future collaboration in areas such as land use and infrastructure planning and management.

**HOW ARE WE DOING?**
A survey of 18 Silicon Valley cities found that 80% continue to use the standardized Uniform Building Code amendments that were developed during the mid 1990s jointly by municipal building officials and the Joint Venture Regulatory Streamlining Council, and that 45% use the recently developed standardized building permit form. Sixty percent of local cities are participating directly or indirectly in the Joint Venture Smart Permit Project with 45% already offering web-based permitting. (Web-based services include application submissions, payments, status tracking, information sharing and citizen response.)

Ninety percent of cities have or are developing a Geographic Information System for land use and infrastructure planning, infrastructure management, public safety and other municipal services. The next challenge will be to use the lessons from the Smart Permit Project to ensure that municipal GIS data is available for regional analysis and information sharing.

The 18 cities that participated in the survey include 84% of the Valley’s population.

---

**SHARE OF SILICON VALLEY CITIES RESPONDING “TRUE”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use Uniform Building Code Standard Amendments</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in Smart Permit Project</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Standardized Building Permit Form</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers Web-Based Permitting</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Geographic Information System</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Silicon Valley Cities
Government Revenue and Capital Expenditures Catching Up with Economic Growth; Revenue Sources Shift

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?
To maintain service levels, local government revenues and expenditures must keep pace with population and job growth. This indicator compares growth in the revenues and capital expenditures of Silicon Valley cities relative to growth in population and employment.

HOW ARE WE DOING?
Growth in the combined revenue of all cities in Silicon Valley has been catching up with population and employment growth. Adjusted for inflation, total revenue increased 49% from fiscal year 1988 to 1998, from $1.3 billion to $2.0 billion. During this period, demand for services, as measured by increases in population and employment, increased by 58%.

Cities increasingly rely on other taxes (e.g., utility, hotel) and on other revenue sources (e.g., fees) to stabilize and grow revenue aligned with demand for services. Sales and property taxes do not always track growth in population, employment and wealth. In 1998, 70% of total revenues were based on sources other than sales and property tax, compared with 63% in 1988.

Sales tax revenues are determined by retail expenditures and by sales tax-generating commercial and industrial activities. Property taxes lag economic growth, and have actually declined by 1% in real terms since 1988 because of Proposition 13 restrictions on increases in assessed valuation.

In 1998, capital expenditures continued their upward trend started in 1997. Between 1988 and 1996, annual capital expenditures of Valley communities did not keep pace with population and employment growth, decreasing in real terms by 10% overall. Since then, aggregate capital expenditures jumped 52%.
Appendix A: Data Sources

REGIONAL TREND INDICATORS

RATE OF JOB GROWTH SLOWS
The California Employment Development Department (EDD) and Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network have constructed a unique data set to track employment and wages in the Silicon Valley region on the basis of unemployment insurance filings. This data series begins in 1992 and is updated quarterly. This data set does not cover self-employment, agriculture workers or military personnel.

SOFTWARE ADDS THE MOST JOBS; LOSSES REVERSED IN SEMICONDUCTORS AND BIOSCIENCE
Cluster employment estimates are drawn from the EDD/Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network data set and are based on federal Standard Industrial Code (SIC) classifications. These codes track economic activity by sector and have been arranged by Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network to best encompass the employment activity in Silicon Valley’s driving clusters.

SILICON VALLEY WAGES INCREASE 9% OVER 1999
Data are derived from the EDD/Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network data set and the Average Annual Pay Levels in Metropolitan Areas report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and Economy.com. This information comes from individual firm reporting of payroll amounts in compliance with unemployment insurance rules. All wages have been adjusted into 2000 dollars using the San Francisco–Oakland–San Jose, California All Urban Consumers CPI published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

CLUSTER WAGES GROW 20% OVERALL; AVERAGE SOFTWARE WAGE Reaches $125,000
Mean payroll per employee wages for each cluster derived from the EDD/Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network data set.

MERCHANDISE EXPORTS RECOVER AND GROW 5%
Data are provided by the U.S. Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration, from the Exporter Location Series. Data are sales by exporters in the geographic area with ZIP codes beginning 940, 943, 950 and 951. Data include manufactured and nonmanufactured tangible goods, but not services.

OFFICE VACANCY RATES FALL BY HALF; LEASE RATES JUMP 50%
Data come from Cornish and Carey Commercial/Oncor International, Santa Clara office. Data cover Santa Clara County, plus the southern portions of Alameda and San Mateo Counties. Vacancy rate is calculated by dividing space available through either direct lease or sublease by total inventory. Data for R&D space lease rates are provided “triple net” or “NNN,” which is a base lease rate that excludes the costs of utilities, janitorial services, taxes, maintenance and insurance.

PROGRESS MEASURES FOR SILICON VALLEY 2010

FAST-GROWTH PUBLIC COMPANIES DROP FROM 86 TO 66
Data for deriving the number of gazelle firms are from the San Jose Mercury News, “How Local Companies Fared,” a quarterly report that tracks publicly traded firms in the Valley. Gazelles are measured from first quarter to first quarter. The Fast 500 program is sponsored by Deloitte & Touche LLP.

VENTURE CAPITAL INVESTMENT DOUBLES TO $17 BILLION
Data come from the quarterly report of the San Jose Mercury News, “The Money Tree,” based on research by PricewaterhouseCoopers. For the Index of Silicon Valley, only investments in firms located in Silicon Valley, based on Joint Venture’s zip code-defined region, were included. Collaborative Economics estimated the 2000 total venture capital funding level based on the first three quarters and historical growth patterns in the fourth quarter.

IPOs APPROACH PREVIOUS LEVELS; M&As INCREASE 25%
The number of initial public offerings is tracked throughout the year by the San Jose Mercury News. Data on mergers and acquisitions are provided by Securities Data Corporation. The 2000 estimate is based on actual numbers through November 14. M&As are assigned the location of the “acquiree.”
REAL PER CAPITA INCOME GROWS FASTER THAN THE NATION'S
Data are from the Bureau of Economic Analysis and Economy.com. Data for Santa Clara County are adjusted using the Bay Area regional Consumer Price Index. U.S. inflation adjustments used All Urban Consumers annual Consumer Price Index (CPI) estimates.

VALUE ADDED PER EMPLOYEE IS DOUBLE NATIONAL AVERAGE
Value added is derived by subtracting the total cost of inputs, other than direct labor costs, from the stated value of the final goods produced. Estimates are from Economy.com and are for Santa Clara County. Values are adjusted to 2000 dollars.

ECONOMIC SUCCESS IS NOT RAISING INCOME FOR ALL
Data are from the March Supplement of the Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS sample was determined to be generally representative of Santa Clara County by comparing variables of income, age, gender and race/ethnicity to data reported in the 1990 Census.

Household income includes both earned and unearned income for all persons living in the same household. Household income is adjusted for household size by doubling household income and dividing it by the square root of the number of household residents. All incomes are adjusted for inflation using the SF-OAK-SJ All Urban Consumers Consumer Price Index (CPI).

Though the data presented are the best available at the regional level, data are derived from an annual sample of as few as 200 households. Household incomes are averaged over a three-year period to increase the reliability of reported income estimates. Data are more useful for tracking long-term trends than for noting specific year-to-year movements. Over time, specific households move up and down the distribution. Data on this “mobility” are not available at the regional level.

For an in-depth analysis of income distribution in California, see The Distribution of Income (Reed, Haber, Mameesh, 1996) published by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC). Joint Venture followed this methodology to prepare this indicator. National household income statistics provided by Deborah Reed of PPIC.

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATE DECLINES
Data include the graduation rates for students in Silicon Valley school districts. Graduation rates are compiled by comparing the number of ninth graders enrolled to the number who receive their diplomas four years later. This information was provided by the Alameda, Santa Clara and San Mateo County Offices of Education and the California Department of Education in accordance with the California Basic Educational Data System.

AIR QUALITY SHOWS MIXED IMPROVEMENT
The Bay Area Air Quality Management District takes daily measurements of air quality at monitoring stations in Silicon Valley. The indicator reflects the number of days that at least one of these stations exceeded the state one-hour standard for ozone and the 24-hour standard for particulates. Stations include Fremont, Mountain View, Los Gatos, San Jose 4th Street, Gilroy, Redwood City, San Martin and San Jose East.

WATER USE INCREASES BY 9% IN TWO YEARS; LESS THAN 2% IS RECYCLED
Data is from the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

24% OF VALLEY AND PERIMETER IS PERMANENTLY PROTECTED OPEN SPACE
Data are from GreenInfo Network and are for Santa Clara, San Mateo and Santa Cruz counties and for all of Alameda county excluding the cities of Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland and Piedmont. Regularly updated information is not yet available for Monterey and San Benito counties. Data include lands owned by the public and lands in private ownership protected by conservation easement. Not included are lands that are protected as open space solely through local General Plans and zoning regulations. Parcels of open space land less than five acres are not included. “Publicly accessible open space” is defined as lands that are open to the public with no special permit required.

EFFICIENCY OF LAND USED FOR HOUSING INCREASES
Land use data for cities in Santa Clara County were compiled by the Valley Transportation Authority, Congestion Management Program, as part of the annual Land Use Monitoring Survey. Joint Venture also surveyed all cities outside Santa Clara County. Survey compilation and analysis were completed.
by VTA and Collaborative Economics. Participating cities include Atherton, Belmont, Campbell, Cupertino, East Palo Alto, Foster City, Fremont, Gilroy, Los Altos Hills, Los Gatos, Milpitas, Monte Sereno, Morgan Hill, Mountain View, Newark, Palo Alto, Redwood City, San Carlos, San Jose, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Scotts Valley, Sunnyvale and Union City. Unincorporated Santa Clara County is also included. Data are for fiscal year 1999–2000 (July ’99 – June ’00).

37% OF NEW HOUSING, 32% OF NEW JOBS ARE LOCATED NEAR TRANSIT
Same as previous indicator.

APPROVALS FOR NEW HOUSING FALL BY 50%; 1,600 NEW AFFORDABLE UNITS APPROVED
Joint Venture conducted an affordable housing survey of all cities within Silicon Valley. Survey compilation and analysis were completed by Collaborative Economics.

JOBS INCREASE FOUR TIMES FASTER THAN HOUSING
Data on total housing units are from the Department of Finance. Data on housing starts are from the Construction Industry Research Board. Data on employment are from the Employment Development Department. ABAG has estimated 1.6 workers, on average, per household. Housing need is estimated by dividing annual job growth by 1.6.

ONLY 16% OF HOUSES ARE AFFORDABLE TO MEDIAN-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS; RENTS AT TURNOVER RISE 26% IN 2000
Housing affordability data are from the National Association of Home Builders, Housing Opportunity Index. The Index is based on the median home price, median family income and interest rates. The 2000 figure is the average of the first three quarters. Home ownership rates are from the Current Population Survey and the California Association of Realtors.

Apartment data are from surveys conducted by RealFacts of all apartment complexes in Santa Clara County of 40 or more units. Excluded are subsidized housing, Section 8 or HUD housing and senior complexes. Rental rates are the average of all types of units. Rates are the prices charged to new residents when apartments turn over. The 2000 figure is as of September 30.

Critical service worker wages are from the Center for Child Care Workforce, the California Nurse’s Association, California Teachers Association and Silicon Valley Police and Sheriff Departments.

THIRD-GRADE READING PERFORMANCE IMPROVES FOR SECOND YEAR
Data are from the Stanford 9 test of the California Department of Education. The test is given annually in the spring. Stanford 9 is a norm-referenced test, rather than a criterion-referenced test. Student’s scores are compared to national norms; they do not reflect absolute achievement.

OVERALL ENROLLMENT IN INTERMEDIATE ALGEBRA IS DOWN; HISPANIC ENROLLMENT FALLS TO 16%
Data are from the California Department of Education. Data are the share of eleventh and twelfth grade students enrolled in Intermediate Algebra. Students in grade nine and ten are counted in the dividend if they are taking the courses, in order not to penalize schools or districts that offer these courses below grade 11.

SHARE OF GRADUATES MEETING COLLEGE ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS REMAINS STEADY; DISPARITY ACROSS ETHNICITY IS WIDE
Data are from the California Department of Education.

MORE THAN 13% OF SILICON VALLEY K–12 TEACHERS ARE NOT FULLY CERTIFIED
The percentage of teachers not fully certified is calculated by dividing the inverse of fully certified teachers by the total teaching staff. Staffing data is provided by the California Department of Education. Students whose families qualify for the Free and Reduced Price Meal Program must have an annual income that is within 130% to 185% of Federal Poverty Guidelines, or $22,165 to $31,543 for a family of four in 2000.

PER CAPITA TRANSIT RIDERSHIP SHOWS IMPROVEMENT
Data are the sum of the annual ridership on the light rail and bus systems in Santa Clara and San Mateo counties and Caltrain. The 2000 annual estimate is based on the first eight or nine months. Commute modes are from the RIDES for Bay Area Commuters Annual Survey.
12% OF HOUSEHOLDS CAN ACCESS MAJOR JOB CENTER BY TRANSIT IN 45 MINUTES
Data were developed by the Valley Transportation Authority, Congestion Management Program.

30% OF VALLEY’S FREEWAY MILES RECEIVE WORST RATING
Data are from the Valley Transportation Authority, Congestion Management Program. Data are for the afternoon peak period.

CHILD IMMUNIZATION AND HEART DISEASE SHOW IMPROVEMENT; LOW-WEIGHT BIRTHS DO NOT
Data on low birth-weight infants are from the State of California, Department of Health Services. Weight of less than 2500 grams (5 pounds, 6 ounces) for babies is considered “low birth weight.” Data on child immunizations are from the Centers for Disease Control. Children immunized with the 3:4:1 series immunizations between the ages of 18 and 35 months are included in the results. Data on coronary heart disease are from the County of Santa Clara Public Health Department; regional and time series data have been age adjusted using the 1940 standard population distribution.

JUVENILE CRIME RATE CONTINUES FALLING BELOW STATE AVERAGE
Violent crime data are from the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reports. Arrest data are from the California Attorney General’s Office, Department of Justice, “Juvenile Felony Arrests.” Violent offenses include homicide, forcible rape, assault and kidnapping.

LACK OF ARTS AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES IS REPORTED PROBLEMATIC BY 43% OF RESIDENTS
Data are from a Public Opinion Survey of San Jose residents conducted in January 2000 by Princeton Survey Research Associates on behalf of the Knight Foundation.

GIVING TO COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS REACHES $1 BILLION SINCE 1992
Data are aggregated for Community Foundation Silicon Valley and Peninsula Community Foundation. Gift data reflect money gifted from individuals, families and corporations. Monies from foundations or for special projects are excluded. Grant data reflect the money gifted from the individual, family and corporate funds. Competitive grants and special projects are excluded. Data are estimated for December 2000.

LOCAL ELECTED LEADERSHIP DOES NOT YET REFLECT VALLEY’S DIVERSITY
In this indicator, local elected leadership is composed of city council members in Silicon Valley cities. Data was obtained from the clerks of Silicon Valley cities. “Adult” is defined as 20 years of age and older. Population estimates by age and by ethnicity were provided by the California Department of Finance.

PERMIT STREAMLINING SETS STAGE FOR MORE REGIONAL COLLABORATION
Data are from a December 2000 survey by Joint Venture of the city managers of Silicon Valley cities. The following cities participated in the survey: Belmont, Campbell, Cupertino, East Palo Alto, Foster City, Fremont, Los Altos Hills, Los Gatos, Milpitas, Morgan Hill, Mountain View, Newark, Palo Alto, Redwood City, San Carlos, San Jose, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale.

GOVERNMENT REVENUE AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURES CATCHING UP WITH ECONOMIC GROWTH; REVENUE SOURCES SHIFT
Data are from State of California, Cities Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1987–88 to 1997–98, Employment Development Department, Department of Finance and Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data include all cities and towns and dependent special districts and do not include redevelopment agencies and independent special districts. Data include all revenue sources to cities except for utility-based services (which are self-supporting from fees and the sale of bonds: water, sewer, garbage, gas, electric, airport and cemeteries), voter-approved indebtedness property tax and sales of bonds and notes.

The growth in population and employment is calculated by adding to population growth 50% of the employment growth. The assumption is that two employees make demands on city services equivalent to those of one resident. This assumption about the support that cities provide to companies (e.g., police, fire, roads) is conservative.
### Silicon Valley

Where possible, Silicon Valley Indicators collected data for the economic region of Silicon Valley. This region includes all of Santa Clara County as its core and extends into the following adjacent ZIP codes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>ZIP Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>94536-39, 94555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>94587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>94560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>94025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>94027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>94061-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>94070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>94002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>94400-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>94404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>94303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>95066-67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Industry Clusters

#### Semiconductor/Semiconductor Equipment Industry
- 3559* Special industry machinery
- 3674 Semiconductors and related devices
- 3825 Instruments for measuring and testing electricity and electrical signals

#### Computers/Communications Industry
- 3571 Electronic computers
- 3572 Computer storage devices
- 3577 Computer peripheral equipment, n.e.c.**
- 3672 Printed circuit boards
- 3679 Electronic components, n.e.c.**
- 3695 Magnetic and optical recording media
- 3661 Telephone and telegraph apparatus
- 3663 Radio and television broadcasting and communications equipment
- 3669 Communications equipment, n.e.c.**

#### Bioscience Industry
- 283 Drugs
- 384 Surgical, medical and dental instruments and supplies
- 8071 Medical laboratories
- 382 Laboratory apparatus and analytical, optical, measuring and controlling instruments (except 3822, 3825 and 3826)

#### Defense/Aerospace Industry
- 348 Small arms ammunition
- 3671 Electron tubes
- 372 Aircraft and parts
- 376 Guided missiles and space vehicles
- 3795 Tanks and tank components
- 381 Search, detection, navigation, guidance, aeronautical and nautical systems, instruments and equipment

#### Software Industry
- 7371 Computer programming services
- 7372 Prepackaged software
- 7373 Computer integrated systems design
- 7374 Computer processing and data preparation and processing services
- 7375 Information retrieval services

#### Innovation/Manufacturing Related Services
- 5045 Computers and computer peripheral equipment and software (wholesale trade)
- 5065 Electronics parts and equipment, n.e.c.** (wholesale trade)
- 7376 Computer facilities management services
- 7377 Computer rental and leasing
- 7378 Computer maintenance and repair
- 7379 Computer related services, n.e.c.**
- 8711 Engineering services
- 873 Research and testing services

#### Professional Services
- 275 Printing
- 276 Manifold business forms
- 279 Service industries for the printing trade
- 731 Advertising
- 732 Consumer credit reporting agencies
- 733 Mailing, reproduction, commercial art and photography and stenographic services
- 736 Personnel supply services
- 81 Legal services
- 8712 Architectural services
- 8713 Surveying services
- 872 Accounting, auditing, and bookkeeping services
- 874 Management and public relations services

---

*The numbers correspond to federal Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes.

**N.E.C. means not elsewhere classified.
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