



Clark County Monitoring Program

Summer 2009

strategic  solutions


Urban Environmental Research, LLC

**Clark County Monitoring Program: Community Survey
Summer 2009**

Contents:

Executive Summary

Tab 1:	Appendix I.....	20
	Importance Score for Selected Services	
Tab 2:	Appendix II.....	101
	Performance Score for Selected Services	
Tab 3:	Appendix III.....	182
	Quality of Life Considerations	
Tab 4:	Appendix IV.....	216
	General Economic Considerations	
Tab 5:	Appendix V.....	234
	Property Value Considerations	
Tab 6:	Appendix VI.....	253
	Environmental Considerations	
Tab 7:	Appendix VII.....	272
	Yucca Mountain Considerations	
Tab 8:	Appendix VIII.....	325
	Community Profile	
Tab 9:	Appendix IX.....	330
	Local Government Interaction	
Tab 10:	Appendix X.....	381
	Local Distribution Summary	
Tab 11:	Appendix XI.....	384
	Respondent Demographic File	
Tab 12:	Appendix XII.....	393
	Importance/ Performance Comparisons	

TO: MS. IRENE NAVIS, AICP
FROM: DR. SHEILA CONWAY/UER; DR. ALVIN MUSHKATEL/UER
SUBJECT: CLARK COUNTY MONITORING PROGRAM | Summer 2009
DATE: OCTOBER 13, 2009
CC: JASON GRAY/STRATEGIC SOLUTIONS

This memorandum summarizes the key findings of the annual Clark County Monitoring Program Survey conducted by Urban Environmental Research and Strategic Solutions on behalf of the Nuclear Waste Division. A more detailed statistical assessment of our findings is available in the accompanying comprehensive assessment binder and will be posted to the Clark County Monitoring Program's website (www.monitoringprogram.com) upon your approval of this deliverable. As with previous cycles of the Clark County Monitoring Program Survey, the intent of this memorandum is to provide an executive level overview of our salient findings.

A. GENERAL OVERVIEW

During the month of July 2009, Strategic Solutions, in coordination with Urban Environmental Research, administered a 161-question telephone survey to 600 Southern Nevada households. The survey, which touches on a broad number of topics, has a margin of error of ± 4 percent at the 95 percent confidence level. The principal purpose of the Clark County Monitoring Program, including this survey series, is to establish an analysis baseline from which the impacts of transporting high-level nuclear waste through the Las Vegas Valley, and ultimately storing the radioactive material at the proposed Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository, can be monitored, measured and assessed.

Generally speaking, the survey is segmented into seven areas of inquiry: 1) public service importance; 2) public service performance; 3) quality-of-life considerations; 4) general economic considerations; 5) property value impact considerations; 6) environmental considerations; and 7) local government interaction. In addition to these general areas of inquiry, information on the demographic and socio-economic profile of respondents is also routinely gathered.

It is easy to conceptualize how the transportation of high-level nuclear waste through a community might negatively impact property values. It is a bit more difficult to identify the nexus to child welfare programs, homelessness, flood protection or crime enforcement. In absence of mitigating funds, it is likely that Nevada's state and local

governments will be required to shift resources away from existing programs and into efforts aimed at ensuring threats, patent and latent, sourced to storage and transportation of high-level nuclear waste are addressed. Shifts away from existing public services would be expected to reduce the quality of life within the community and may also have far-reaching economic, fiscal and social implications. Analyzing these questions requires not only an understanding of resource allocation to specific programs but also the relative importance and effectiveness of those programs. The Clark County Monitoring Program Survey series is designed to provide analysts with a more comprehensive framework from which impact assessments can be appropriately derived.

It is important to mention here that several study instrument modifications were implemented prior to data collection activities for the summer 2009 cycle of the Clark County Monitoring Program Survey. The modifications include additional variables designed to measure parks and recreation services and efforts to attract jobs outside of construction and hotel/gaming employment (APPENDIX I and II), and revisions to variables pertaining to Yucca Mountain considerations (APPENDIX VII).

B. KEY FINDINGS

- Notable trend in higher importance rankings for budget management, improving the business climate, and planning for commercial development services
- An uptick in the frequency of respondents communicating that now is a good time to buy a home in Clark County, up to nearly nine of ten respondents (88.4%) from 68.9% in 2008
- Respondents indicated the top three aspects that have the greatest positive impact on their quality of life as scenery/geography/climate (34.7%), the entertainment/social climate (15.7%), and a tie for family/friends/friendly people and job opportunities (both 10.6%)
- The top three aspects that have the greatest negative impact on respondent's quality of life is crime/violence/gangs (13.2%), traffic congestion (12.7%), and overcrowding/unplanned growth (10.8%)
- The top issue to change at a local level to improve quality of life in Clark County is traffic congestion (12.8%); with better jobs/training (11.7%), improving K-12 education (11.5%), and lower crime rates (11%) following closely behind
- Drought continues to be a pressing environmental concern as 91.1% of respondents communicate they are "somewhat concerned" or "very concerned" about the current drought and its impact on Clark County
- An underlying trend was observed among nearly all local government service importance ratings, as 2009 levels closely resemble those observed during the 2007 survey. 2009 and 2007 levels were lower than 2008. This trend would suggest that the 2008 survey data reflected a spike in the public's anxiety over the impending recession with a greater willingness to accommodate governmental action to stave off deleterious impacts on service levels, and implied importance for all services across the board

C. YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUESTIONS (FIGURE 4)

- Opposition to the Yucca Mountain project remains stable with 72.3% indicating they would vote against the nuclear waste repository; 76% said the same in 2007. 63.7% percent of respondents report that the storage site would have a negative impact on their quality of life, down slightly from 68.1% during 2008
- Trust regarding the Yucca Mountain project remains a key concern. Roughly 62.3% of all respondents indicate that they “disagree” or “strongly disagree” that the U.S. Department of Energy can be trusted to ensure the public’s safety as it relates to transportation and storage of high-level nuclear waste. 68.4% of respondents indicated the same in 2008
- 80.3% of respondents indicated an expectation that having a high-level nuclear waste transportation route near residential housing would have a negative impact on property values
- In terms of public service importance measures, Yucca Mountain impact assessments addressing infrastructure and commerce transitioned from “important” to “very important”. The importance scores for “assess other government impacts”, “assess impacts on the tourist sector”, “assess impacts on the building, construction, and development sectors”, and “assess transportation impacts” all increased from 2008
- As an urgent environmental concern, the Yucca Mountain facility’s placement among major issues was materially unchanged. Approximately 1.5% of respondents identified the Yucca Mountain project as Southern Nevada’s most pressing environmental concern; this was 0.9 in the 2008 series dropping in rank from #9 out of 10, to #10.
- Regarding the licensing proceeding, the majority of people, 61.1%, stated they are generally aware of the proceeding but do not follow details
- 41.8% of respondents stated that they were not at all aware that the licensing proceedings are covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used

D. ECONOMY/BUSINESS

- The top three importance/performance disparity measurements were observed in the budget management, ability to attract jobs outside of the construction or hotel/gaming related employment sectors, and increasing job opportunities service categories. The budget management and increasing job opportunities disparities increased from 2008
- 45% of respondents indicated they are doing worse financially today compared to a year ago, up from 28.7% in 2008. However, optimism for the next year remained steady as 39.7% of respondents believe they will be doing better financially one year from now compared to today. 40.4% of respondents communicated the same in 2008
- 29.3% of respondents rated business conditions in Clark County as “poor” compared to 7.6% in 2008. However, 37.9% of respondents believe business conditions will be better in Clark County one year from now, compared to 28.3% of respondents during 2008

E. PARKS AND RECREATION

- Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities were “very important” to 17.8% and “important” to 30.1% of respondents. Concurrently, only 5.6% indicated this was “not important at all”
- Providing parks and recreation programs were of the highest level of importance to over one-third of respondents, and “not important at all” to only 4.9%
- Regarding governmental performance on providing parks and recreational programs, 22.8% indicated performance was “excellent”, and only 5.4% indicated it was “poor”
- A similar trend was found for providing parks and recreational facilities with 67.9% indicating the performance as “excellent” or “good”, and only 6.3% indicating the performance as “poor”
- Importance of providing parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities were “very important” or “important” to 56.1%, “neither important or not important” to 31%, and “not at all important” to 2.8% of respondents
- In regards to how satisfied respondents were with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals, and other events offered by Clark County, 53.1% indicated they are “very satisfied” or “satisfied,” and only 4.7% indicated they are “very unsatisfied”

F. PUBLIC SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

- Public service importance continued to be dominated by public safety and emergency responder considerations, which accounted for the top five and nine out of the top ten most highly-rated services
- There was a decrease in importance of fire services with 68.3% of respondents indicating the highest level of importance in 2008, while 53.9% indicated the same level of importance in 2009. Correspondingly, 78.8% of respondents indicated the highest level of importance in keeping response time low in 2008, while 60.3% indicated the same level of importance in 2009
- Respondents rated the importance for the following public safety service questions as “important” or “very important”: providing crime prevention programs (68%), enforcing traffic laws (59.8%), maintaining a low crime rate (75.2%), and maintaining neighborhood police patrols (68.7%)
- Concurrently, respondents rated the governmental performance of the following services as “good” or “excellent”: providing crime prevention programs (34.3%), enforcing traffic laws (43.5%), maintaining a low crime rate (30.4%), and maintaining neighborhood police patrols (29.8%)

G. SOCIAL SERVICE CONSIDERATIONS

- Respondents indicated the importance of the following services as “very important”: providing child protective services (50.8%), providing child welfare services (46.3%), providing juvenile justice services (35.3%), providing attainable housing for working class families (35.3%), providing affordable housing for low income families

(32.1%), providing shelter for the homeless (32.4%), providing affordable housing for seniors (42.7%), providing medical care for the poor (35.4%), and providing 24 hour emergency trauma care (61.8%)

- Respondents indicated the governmental performance for the following services as either “good” or “excellent”: providing child protective services (30.5%), providing child welfare services (29.4%), providing juvenile justice services (24.1%), providing attainable housing for working class families (17.9%), providing affordable housing for low income families (20.8%), providing shelter for the homeless (12%), providing affordable housing for seniors (23.9%), providing medical care for the poor (22.3%), and providing 24 hour emergency trauma care (51.7%)

H. LOCAL GOVERNMENT INTERACTIONS

- 48.4% of respondents indicated they had inquired about or accessed services from Clark County, up from 36.3% in 2008, while 51.6 % indicated they had not

- When compared with their previous local government interactions in other communities, 34.2% of respondents reported their interactions with Clark County as good or excellent, down from 39.4% in 2008

- The overall customer experience with Clark County for 44.6% of respondents was good or excellent, up from 41.3% in 2008

- Respondents indicated Clark County government’s performance met or exceeded their expectations in the following: “employee cared about and understood my needs,” (72%); “service delivery was timely and responsive,” (72.8%); and “policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained,” (67.4%), up from an average of 63.5% on each question in 2008

- Respondents indicated performance met or exceeded expectations in the following: “employee was able to assist or direct me to an appropriate source,” (80.5%); “employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed,” (83%); and “transaction was handled in an appropriate manner,” (81.7%); up from an average of 72.5 % on each question in 2008

- Nearly 80% of respondents indicated performance on “accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)” met or exceeded expectations, consistent with 80.6% in 2008

I. SUMMARY

Overall, there were concerns about the current economic and business climate, though most people are optimistic. This was found to be true for both personal financial situations and business conditions in Clark County.

Respondents are consistently opposed to the Yucca Mountain project and believe the project would have a negative effect on property values. In addition, the majority of people are generally aware of the proceedings but do not follow details. Drought is by far the most pressing environmental concern and low crime rates are important in terms of public health and safety, both this year and in years past.

Regarding social service considerations, the most important service reported was providing 24 hour emergency trauma care and the majority of people indicated the governmental performance as good. The Clark County government’s performance on

local government interaction questions were of notable quality in almost all areas including employee interactions, facility information, and policies and processes. In difficult economic times interactions with local governments increase. This is demonstrated in the current report. Noteworthy is the reaction of the Clark County government during this economic climate and the positive response from participants.

SCALE:

Importance Scale	Performance Scale
Very Important (4.0 -5.0)	Excellent (4.0 – 4.99)
Important (3.0 – 3.99)	Good (3.0 – 3.99)
Neither Important or Not Important (2.0 – 2.99)	Average (2.0 – 2.99)
Not Very Important (1.0 – 1.99)	Fair (1.0 – 1.99)
Not Important At All (< 1.0)	Poor (<1.0)

FIGURE 1 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Public Service Importance Score Summary												
Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Mean						Mean Change				
		Summer	Winter	Summer	Winter	Winter	Summer	From Summer	From Winter	From Summer	From Winter	From Winter
		'05	'06	'06	'07	'08	'09	'05	'06	'06	'07	'08
General Government	Road Maintenance	4.21	4.05	4.04	4.09	4.13	3.93	-0.28	-0.12	-0.1	-0.16	-0.2
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.59	3.41	3.52	3.36	3.57	3.33	-0.26	-0.08	-0.19	-0.03	-0.24
	Flood control	4.09	3.88	3.86	3.7	4.01	3.69	-0.4	-0.19	-0.17	-0.01	-0.32
	Budget management	4.29	3.99	4.23	4.11	4.41	4.31	0.02	0.42	0.08	0.2	-0.1
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.86	3.67	3.58	3.63	3.83	3.44	-0.42	-0.23	-0.14	-0.19	-0.39
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	3.9	3.72	3.75	3.87	4.09	3.75	-0.15	0.03	0	-0.12	-0.34
	Water conservation programs	n/a	n/a	4.12	4.22	4.48	4.12	n/a	n/a	0	-0.1	-0.36
Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.17	4.30	4.06	-0.21	0	-0.05	-0.11	-0.24
	Providing child welfare services	4.15	3.98	3.98	3.99	4.21	3.97	-0.18	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.24
	Providing juvenile justice services	4.08	3.93	3.87	3.98	4.15	3.81	-0.27	-0.12	-0.06	-0.17	-0.34
	Providing attainable housing for working class families	n/a	3.72	3.77	3.76	3.96	3.60	n/a	-0.12	-0.17	-0.16	-0.36
	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.7	3.56	3.64	3.67	3.83	3.50	-0.2	-0.06	-0.14	-0.17	-0.33
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.38	3.33	3.54	3.53	3.78	3.47	0.09	0.14	-0.07	-0.06	-0.31

	Providing affordable housing for seniors	4.12	3.92	3.91	4.02	4.18	3.84	-0.28	-0.08	-0.07	-0.18	-0.34
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.94	3.74	3.74	3.75	4.00	3.57	-0.37	-0.21	-0.17	-0.18	-0.43
	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.6	4.38	4.29	4.42	4.58	4.35	-0.25	-0.03	0.06	-0.07	-0.23
Public Safety	Providing crime prevention programs	4.27	3.99	4.09	4.04	4.24	3.91	-0.36	-0.08	-0.18	-0.13	-0.33
	Enforcing traffic laws	4.25	3.91	4.07	4.09	4.10	3.73	-0.52	-0.18	-0.34	-0.36	-0.37
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.49	4.14	4.28	4.24	4.58	4.13	-0.36	-0.01	-0.15	-0.11	-0.45
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	4.3	3.97	4.08	4.06	4.38	3.95	-0.35	-0.02	-0.13	-0.11	-0.43
	Keeping police response times low	4.45	4.24	4.6	4.34	4.59	4.14	-0.31	-0.1	-0.46	-0.2	-0.45
	Keeping fire department response times low	4.45	4.54	4.47	4.59	4.73	4.41	-0.04	-0.19	-0.16	-0.18	-0.32
	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.45	4.56	4.54	4.61	4.79	4.53	0.08	-0.03	-0.01	-0.08	-0.26
	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	n/a	4.64	4.57	4.67	4.79	4.63	n/a	-0.01	0.06	-0.04	-0.16
	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	4.05	3.69	3.79	3.79	4.05	3.59	-0.46	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.46
	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	4.04	3.75	3.87	3.84	4.10	3.68	-0.36	-0.07	-0.19	-0.16	-0.42
	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	4.18	3.92	4.01	4.03	4.29	3.84	-0.34	-0.08	-0.17	-0.19	-0.45
	Investigating criminal activity	4.47	4.03	4.24	4.18	4.46	4.10	-0.37	0.07	-0.14	-0.08	-0.36
	Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.59	4.32	4.26	4.33	4.53	4.29	-0.3	-0.03	0.03	-0.04	-0.24
	Providing emergency medical services	4.66	4.44	4.43	4.51	4.70	4.47	-0.19	0.03	0.04	-0.04	-0.23
	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.81	3.54	3.58	3.51	3.70	3.40	-0.41	-0.14	-0.18	-0.11	-0.3

	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.88	3.68	3.65	3.66	3.99	3.39	-0.49	-0.29	-0.26	-0.27	-0.6
	Regional justice services and facilities	n/a	n/a	3.6	3.69	3.93	3.63	n/a	n/a	0.03	-0.06	-0.3
	Providing and maintaining safe parks & recreation services	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.97	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Community Development	Providing affordable housing	n/a	n/a	3.68	3.64	3.86	3.47	n/a	n/a	-0.21	-0.17	-0.39
	Managing growth	4.07	3.83	3.87	3.83	4.10	3.73	-0.34	-0.1	-0.14	-0.1	-0.37
	Increasing job opportunities	4.07	3.95	3.82	3.84	4.13	3.93	-0.14	-0.02	0.11	0.09	-0.2
	Ability to attract jobs outside of the construction or hotel/gaming related employment	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.97	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Improving the business climate	4.08	3.86	3.75	3.76	4.01	4.01	-0.07	0.15	0.26	0.25	0
	Planning for commercial development	3.82	3.7	3.56	3.55	3.72	3.68	-0.14	-0.02	0.12	0.13	-0.04
	Reducing traffic congestion	4.37	4.02	4.06	3.97	4.30	3.96	-0.41	-0.06	-0.1	-0.01	-0.34
	Access to freeways	4.12	3.83	3.92	3.83	4.11	3.84	-0.28	0.01	-0.08	0.01	-0.27
	Improving road conditions	4.29	3.97	4.04	3.95	4.18	3.89	-0.4	-0.08	-0.15	-0.06	-0.29
	Reducing travel time	4.01	3.77	3.83	3.82	3.96	3.77	-0.24	0	-0.06	-0.05	-0.19
	Providing mass public transit	3.86	3.67	3.64	3.69	3.77	3.63	-0.23	-0.04	-0.01	-0.06	-0.14
	Adequate airport facilities	n/a	n/a	3.91	3.87	3.96	3.87	n/a	n/a	-0.04	0	-0.09
	Parks and recreation programs	n/a	n/a	4.02	4.04	4.18	3.94	n/a	n/a	-0.08	-0.1	-0.24

FIGURE 2 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE RANKING

Descriptive Statistics	Ranking				Change		
	Summer	Winter	Winter	Summer	From Winter	From Winter	From Summer
	'09	'08	'07	'06	'08	'07	'06
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	1	1	1	2	0	0	+1
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	2	1	2	3	-1	0	+1
Keeping fire department response times low	4	3	3	4	-1	-1	0
Providing emergency medical services	3	4	4	5	+1	+1	+2
Keeping police response times low	8	5	6	1	-3	-2	-7
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	5	6	5	6	+1	0	+1
Maintaining a low crime rate	9	6	8	7	-3	-1	-2
Providing fire protection & prevention services	7	8	7	8	+1	0	+1
Water conservation programs	10	9	9	11	-1	-1	+1
Investigating criminal activity	11	10	10	9	-1	-1	-2
Budget management	6	11	12	10	+5	+6	+4
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	18	12	15	14	-6	-3	-4
Providing child protection services	12	13	11	12	+1	-1	0
Reducing traffic congestion	17	13	22	16	-4	-5	-1
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	25	15	18	20	-10	-7	-5

Providing crime prevention programs	22	16	17	13	-6	-5	-9
Providing child welfare services	14	17	20	21	+3	+6	+7
Parks and recreation programs	19	18	16	19	-1	-3	0
Providing affordable housing for seniors	25	18	19	23	-7	-6	-2
Improving road conditions	23	18	23	18	-5	0	-5
Providing juvenile justice services	28	21	21	25	-7	-7	-3
Road Maintenance	20	22	14	17	+2	-6	-3
Increasing job opportunities	20	22	26	30	+2	+6	+10
Access to freeways	25	24	28	22	-1	-3	-3
Enforcing traffic laws	31	25	13	15	-6	-18	-16
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	34	25	27	26	-9	-7	-8
Managing growth	31	25	29	27	-6	-2	-4
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	30	28	25	33	-2	-5	+3
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	39	29	31	31	-10	-8	-8
Improving the business climate	13	30	32	34	+7	+19	+21
Flood control	33	30	35	28	-3	2	-5
Providing medical care for the poor	40	32	34	35	-8	-6	-5
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	46	33	39	37	-13	-7	-9
Adequate airport facilities	24	34	24	24	10	0	0
Reducing travel time	29	34	30	29	+5	+1	0
Providing attainable housing for working class families	38	34	33	32	-4	-5	-6
Regional justice services and facilities	36	37	37	40	+1	+1	+4

Providing affordable housing	42	38	40	36	-4	-2	-6
Providing affordable housing for low income families	41	39	38	38	-2	-3	-3
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	44	39	41	41	-5	-3	-3
Providing shelter for the homeless	42	41	43	44	-1	+1	+2
Providing mass public transit	36	42	36	39	+6	0	+3
Planning for commercial development	34	43	42	43	+9	+8	+9
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	45	44	44	42	-1	-1	-3
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	47	45	45	45	-2	-2	-2
Providing and maintaining safe parks & recreation services	16	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ability to attract jobs outside construction or hotel/gaming related employment	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

FIGURE 3 PUBLIC SERVICE PERFORMANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Public Service Performance Score Summary					
		Mean		Disparity between Importance and Performance	
				(Performance-Importance)	
Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Importance	Performance	Current Disparity	Winter '08 Disparity
General Government	Road maintenance	3.93	3.10	-0.83	-0.99
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.33	2.58	-0.75	-0.98
	Flood control	3.69	3.64	-0.05	-0.41
	Budget management	4.31	2.48	-1.83	-1.69
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.44	2.92	-0.52	-0.85
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	3.75	2.50	-1.25	-1.49
	Water conservation programs	4.12	3.39	-0.73	-1.04
Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.06	3.02	-1.04	-1.27
	Providing welfare services	3.97	3.01	-0.96	-1.18
	Providing juvenile justice services	3.81	2.94	-0.87	-1.19
	Provide attainable housing for working class families	3.60	2.61	-0.99	-1.37

	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.50	2.61	-0.89	-1.31
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.47	2.17	-1.3	-1.56
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	3.84	2.76	-1.08	-1.46
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.57	2.60	-0.97	-1.42
	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.35	3.45	-0.9	-1.16
Public Safety	Providing crime prevention programs	3.91	3.21	-0.7	-1.05
	Enforcing traffic laws	3.73	3.28	-0.45	-0.86
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.13	3.05	-1.08	-1.58
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	3.95	2.90	-1.05	-1.56
	Keeping police response times low	4.14	3.25	-0.89	-1.43
	Keeping fire department response times low	4.41	3.96	-0.45	-0.81
	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.53	4.00	-0.53	-0.85
	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	4.63	4.12	-0.51	-0.68
	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	3.59	2.82	-0.77	-1.18

	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	3.68	3.01	-0.67	-1.09
	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	3.84	2.99	-0.85	-1.24
	Investigating criminal activity	4.10	3.19	-0.91	-1.33
	Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.29	3.75	-0.54	-0.8
	Providing emergency medical services	4.47	3.91	-0.56	-86
	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.40	2.98	-0.42	-0.67
	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.39	2.80	-0.59	-1.01
	Regional justice services and facilities	3.63	3.19	-0.44	-0.71
	Providing and maintaining safe parks & recreation services	3.97	3.39	-0.58	n/a
Community Development	Providing affordable housing	3.47	2.66	-0.81	-1.24
	Managing growth	3.73	2.58	-1.15	-1.57
	Increasing job opportunities	3.93	2.41	-1.52	-1.29
	Ability to attract jobs outside of the construction or hotel/gaming related employment	3.97	2.24	-1.73	n/a

	Improving the business climate	4.01	2.53	-1.48	-1.01
	Planning for commercial development	3.68	2.70	-0.98	-0.58
	Reducing traffic congestion	3.96	2.69	-1.27	-1.71
	Access to freeways	3.84	3.22	-0.62	-0.83
	Improving road conditions	3.89	3.00	-0.89	-1.06
	Reducing travel time	3.77	2.83	-0.94	-1.21
	Providing mass public transit	3.63	2.67	-0.96	-0.96
	Adequate airport facilities	3.87	3.68	-0.19	-0.4
	Parks and recreation programs	3.94	3.57	-0.37	-0.67

FIGURE 4 YUCCA MOUNTAIN SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Yucca Mountain Service Importance Score Summary				
Descriptive Statistics	Public Service Importance Summer	Public Service Importance Winter	Public Service Importance Winter	Public Service Importance Summer
	'09	'08	'07	'06
Keeping local decision makers up to date on Yucca Mountain	3.29	4.26	3.94	3.89
Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	3.65	4.32	3.98	3.93
Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology and hydrology	3.35	4.12	3.87	3.84
Identify public safety needs and impacts	3.65	4.28	4.04	3.96
Assess other government impacts	4	3.89	3.72	3.66
Assess impacts on the tourist sector	4.53	3.85	3.83	3.61
Assess impacts on the building, construction, and development sectors	4.76	3.85	3.79	3.57
Identify transportation impacts	4.53	3.99	3.85	3.68
Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain	3.76	4.22	3.96	3.91

Appendix I

Importance Score for Selected Service

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)

Importance Variable	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
General Government												
Road maintenance:	600	0	3.929	0.045	4	1.105	-0.850	0.100	-0.013	0.199	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	595	5	3.331	0.050	3	1.227	-0.183	0.100	-0.844	0.200	1	5
Flood control:	594	6	3.693	0.050	4	1.213	-0.567	0.100	-0.649	0.200	1	5
Budget management:	592	8	4.308	0.042	5	1.028	-1.442	0.100	1.313	0.200	1	5
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	574	26	3.435	0.062	4	1.482	-0.415	0.102	-1.206	0.204	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	594	6	3.749	0.051	4	1.232	-0.706	0.100	-0.457	0.200	1	5
Water conservation programs:	599	1	4.120	0.045	4	1.095	-1.207	0.100	0.753	0.199	1	5
Social Judicial Services												
Providing child protection services:	592	8	4.063	0.048	5	1.169	-1.083	0.100	0.216	0.201	1	5
Providing child welfare services:	588	12	3.969	0.049	4	1.192	-0.957	0.101	-0.039	0.201	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services:	580	20	3.807	0.048	4	1.154	-0.761	0.101	-0.136	0.203	1	5
Provide attainable housing for working class families:	589	11	3.597	0.056	4	1.348	-0.565	0.101	-0.882	0.201	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	588	12	3.498	0.057	4	1.380	-0.502	0.101	-0.986	0.201	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless:	594	6	3.468	0.058	4	1.416	-0.489	0.100	-1.063	0.200	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors:	591	9	3.841	0.052	4	1.273	-0.837	0.101	-0.416	0.201	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor:	587	13	3.565	0.057	4	1.378	-0.537	0.101	-0.967	0.201	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:	593	7	4.353	0.040	5	0.981	-1.520	0.100	1.651	0.200	1	5

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
Public Safety Services												
Providing crime prevention programs:	593	7	3.905	0.044	4	1.083	-0.823	0.100	0.043	0.200	1	5
Enforcing traffic laws:	600	1	3.733	0.048	4	1.165	-0.642	0.100	-0.364	0.199	1	5
Maintaining a low crime rate:	598	2	4.126	0.046	5	1.126	-1.250	0.100	0.789	0.200	1	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	599	1	3.946	0.048	4	1.168	-0.966	0.100	0.120	0.199	1	5
Keeping police response times low:	591	9	4.137	0.047	5	1.147	-1.324	0.100	0.927	0.201	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low:	594	6	4.409	0.036	5	0.868	-1.595	0.100	2.454	0.200	1	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	595	5	4.534	0.033	5	0.794	-2.017	0.100	4.483	0.200	1	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:	596	4	4.633	0.028	5	0.685	-2.171	0.100	5.376	0.200	1	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	595	5	3.589	0.048	4	1.165	-0.446	0.100	-0.564	0.200	1	5
Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	595	5	3.676	0.049	4	1.194	-0.556	0.100	-0.589	0.200	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	592	8	3.837	0.049	4	1.183	-0.772	0.100	-0.303	0.201	1	5
Investigating criminal activity:	593	7	4.102	0.040	4	0.977	-1.046	0.100	0.750	0.200	1	5
Providing fire protection & prevention services:	594	6	4.286	0.036	5	0.877	-1.040	0.100	0.378	0.200	1	5
Providing emergency medical services:	596	4	4.472	0.033	5	0.800	-1.552	0.100	2.104	0.200	1	5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	575	25	3.397	0.050	3	1.190	-0.305	0.102	-0.660	0.203	1	5

**Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)**

	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
Public Safety Services (cont.)												
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	585	15	3.393	0.060	4	1.448	-0.396	0.101	-1.182	0.202	1	5
Regional justice services and facilities:	583	17	3.629	0.044	4	1.061	-0.486	0.101	-0.197	0.202	1	5
Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:	598	2	3.965	0.042	4	1.019	-0.854	0.100	0.246	0.199	1	5
Community Development Services												
Providing affordable housing:	592	8	3.465	0.055	4	1.341	-0.414	0.100	-0.950	0.200	1	5
Managing growth:	594	6	3.729	0.053	4	1.294	-0.696	0.100	-0.589	0.200	1	5
Increasing job opportunities:	596	4	3.929	0.053	4	1.296	-0.972	0.100	-0.251	0.200	1	5
Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	595	5	3.971	0.053	4	1.286	-1.083	0.100	0.015	0.200	1	5
Improving the business climate:	592	8	4.009	0.048	4	1.168	-1.119	0.100	0.431	0.200	1	5
Planning for commercial development:	595	5	3.68	0.049	4	1.202	-0.620	0.100	-0.475	0.200	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion:	598	2	3.959	0.050	4	1.216	-1.037	0.100	0.108	0.200	1	5
Access to freeways:	597	3	3.837	0.045	4	1.095	-0.710	0.100	-0.165	0.200	1	5
Improving road conditions:	599	1	3.886	0.044	4	1.074	-0.750	0.100	-0.090	0.199	1	5
Reducing travel time:	596	4	3.774	0.049	4	1.204	-0.680	0.100	-0.490	0.200	1	5
Providing mass public transit:	593	7	3.634	0.054	4	1.322	-0.654	0.100	-0.685	0.200	1	5
Adequate airport facilities:	592	8	3.866	0.047	4	1.146	-0.869	0.100	-0.004	0.200	1	5
Providing parks and recreational facilities:	595	5	3.94	0.044	4	1.065	-0.855	0.100	0.201	0.200	1	5

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Road Maintenance



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Revitalizing Older Neighborhoods



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Flood Control



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Budget Management



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Communicate Clark County Local Government's Views About Yucca Mountain to Federal Decision Makers



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Monitor and Report to the Public on How Well Government Services are Being Performed



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Water Conservation Programs



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Child Protection Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Child Welfare Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Juvenile Justice Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Affordable Housing for Low Income Families



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Shelter for the Homeless



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Affordable Housing for Seniors



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Medical Care for the Poor



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing 24-Hour Emergency Trauma Care



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Crime Prevention Programs



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Enforcing Traffic Laws



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Maintaining a Low Crime Rate



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Maintaining Neighborhood Police Patrols



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Keeping Police Response Times Low



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Keeping Fire Department Response Times Low



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Keeping Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Times Low



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Well Trained Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Personnel



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Facilitate Neighborhood Watch Programs



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Preparing for Natural Disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Preparing for Man-Made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) Accidents or Terrorist Events



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Investigating Criminal Activity



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Fire Protection and Prevention Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Emergency Medical Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Neighborhood Code Enforcement Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Examining Potential Impacts from Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Shipments



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Regional Justice Services and Facilities



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing and Maintaining Safe Parks and Recreational Facilities



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Affordable Housing



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Managing Growth



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Increasing Job Opportunities



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


**Ability to Attract Jobs Outside of Construction or
Hotel/Gaming Related Employment**



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Improving the Business Climate



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Planning for Commercial Development



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Reducing Traffic Congestion



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Access to Freeways



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Improving Road Conditions



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Reducing Travel Time



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Mass Transit



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Adequate Airport Facilities



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I Continued
Importance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)

Parks and Recreation Programs



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
N	Valid	263	262	259	260	249	261	263
	Missing	0	1	5	4	14	2	0
Mean		3.92	3.30	3.70	4.28	3.52	3.72	4.10
Std. Error of Mean		0.070	0.076	0.076	0.065	0.092	0.075	0.072
Median		4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	3	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.136	1.231	1.218	1.053	1.452	1.219	1.176
Skewness		-0.896	-0.117	-0.535	-1.453	-0.520	-0.628	-1.214
Std. Error of Skewness		0.150	0.150	0.151	0.151	0.154	0.151	0.150
Kurtosis		0.050	-0.859	-0.730	1.441	-1.060	-0.550	0.531
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.299	0.300	0.302	0.301	0.307	0.300	0.299
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
N	Valid	162	161	161	159	155	159	162
	Missing	0	1	1	3	7	2	0
Mean		3.97	3.30	3.83	4.28	3.46	3.75	4.10
Std. Error of Mean		0.084	0.100	0.095	0.083	0.114	0.103	0.082
Median		4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	3	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.071	1.265	1.204	1.040	1.423	1.296	1.046
Skewness		-0.850	-0.249	-0.698	-1.412	-0.386	-0.675	-1.246
Std. Error of Skewness		0.191	0.191	0.191	0.193	0.195	0.192	0.191
Kurtosis		0.030	-0.875	-0.437	1.355	-1.140	-0.675	1.252
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.379	0.381	0.381	0.383	0.388	0.382	0.379
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
N	Valid	85	84	85	85	83	85	84
	Missing	0	1	0	1	2	1	1
Mean		4.04	3.57	3.65	4.50	3.21	3.89	4.19
Std. Error of Mean		0.105	0.128	0.135	0.100	0.173	0.116	0.106
Median		4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.08
Mode		5	3	5	5	5	4	5
Std. Deviation		0.971	1.173	1.244	0.920	1.573	1.064	0.973
Skewness		-0.675	-0.214	-0.602	-1.776	-0.203	-1.121	-0.959
Std. Error of Skewness		0.261	0.263	0.261	0.262	0.264	0.262	0.263
Kurtosis		-0.400	-0.889	-0.517	1.966	-1.488	1.167	-0.170
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.517	0.519	0.517	0.518	0.522	0.518	0.519
Range		4	4	4	3	4	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	2	1	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
N	Valid	77	76	77	77	74	77	77
	Missing	0	1	0	1	3	0	0
Mean		3.85	3.30	3.51	4.28	3.41	3.70	4.19
Std. Error of Mean		0.126	0.125	0.132	0.112	0.185	0.149	0.119
Median		4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	3	4	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.104	1.088	1.161	0.984	1.595	1.307	1.048
Skewness		-0.734	-0.207	-0.597	-1.224	-0.431	-0.696	-1.372
Std. Error of Skewness		0.274	0.276	0.274	0.274	0.278	0.274	0.274
Kurtosis		-0.260	-0.539	-0.468	0.373	-1.366	-0.557	1.479
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.541	0.546	0.541	0.542	0.550	0.541	0.541
Range		4	4	4	3	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	2	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
City of Boulder City								
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.51	3.22	3.18	3.82	3.13	3.80	3.66
Std. Error of Mean		0.512	0.546	0.420	0.515	0.420	0.517	0.353
Median		3.28	3.00	3.22	4.28	3.00	4.00	3.28
Mode		3	5	2	5	3	5	3
Std. Deviation		1.431	1.526	1.174	1.441	1.174	1.447	0.987
Skewness		-0.537	0.083	0.244	-1.081	0.046	-1.202	0.304
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		-0.384	-1.403	-1.604	0.703	2.052	0.784	-0.877
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		4	4	3	4	4	4	3
Minimum		1	1	2	1	1	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
City of Mesquite								
N	Valid	5	5	5	5	4	4	5
	Missing	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Mean		3.11	2.47	3.68	4.47	2.65	3.29	4.00
Std. Error of Mean		0.916	0.938	0.731	0.423	1.024	0.680	0.627
Median		3.25	1.50	4.25	5.00	2.50	3.38	4.13
Mode		5	1	5	5	1	2	5
Std. Deviation		1.996	2.045	1.594	0.921	2.110	1.401	1.366
Skewness		-0.158	0.832	-0.321	-1.636	0.588	0.319	-2.167
Std. Error of Skewness		0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.984	0.984	0.934
Kurtosis		-3.036	-2.355	-3.681	1.710	-3.566	-2.640	9.910
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.390	2.390	2.100
Range		4	4	3	2	4	3	4
Minimum		1	1	2	3	1	2	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Social and Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	261	256	256	257	256	259	259	256	260
	Missing	3	7	8	7	7	4	5	8	4
Mean		4.16	3.98	3.85	3.68	3.61	3.57	3.84	3.64	4.40
Std. Error of Mean		0.071	0.077	0.072	0.087	0.086	0.088	0.079	0.086	0.060
Median		5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.154	1.232	1.144	1.390	1.383	1.420	1.278	1.371	0.969
Skewness		-1.330	-1.015	-0.789	-0.624	-0.597	-0.592	-0.764	-0.623	-1.785
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.151	0.151	0.152	0.151
Kurtosis		0.936	0.012	-0.037	-0.944	-0.923	-0.994	-0.615	-0.879	2.831
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.301	0.303	0.303	0.303	0.303	0.301	0.302	0.303	0.301
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Social and Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	158	158	152	159	157	160	158	157	158
	Missing	3	3	9	2	4	1	4	4	3
Mean		3.97	3.89	3.66	3.47	3.37	3.31	3.81	3.49	4.30
Std. Error of Mean		0.101	0.100	0.103	0.104	0.111	0.117	0.106	0.117	0.081
Median		4.70	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.268	1.261	1.266	1.315	1.395	1.484	1.325	1.462	1.013
Skewness		-0.972	-0.801	-0.735	-0.498	-0.353	-0.357	-0.815	-0.439	-1.329
Std. Error of Skewness		0.193	0.193	0.197	0.193	0.194	0.192	0.193	0.194	0.193
Kurtosis		-0.219	-0.503	-0.398	-0.801	-1.075	-1.288	-0.544	-1.197	0.952
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.383	0.383	0.392	0.383	0.385	0.381	0.384	0.385	0.384
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Social and Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	85	84	84	84	85	85	85	85	85
	Missing	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Mean		4.04	4.15	3.96	3.69	3.49	3.66	3.93	3.57	4.30
Std. Error of Mean		0.122	0.112	0.112	0.133	0.142	0.152	0.135	0.131	0.101
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5
Std. Deviation		1.118	1.021	1.024	1.215	1.304	1.394	1.247	1.205	0.930
Skewness		-1.040	-1.293	-0.654	-0.468	-0.524	-0.628	-0.941	-0.446	-1.052
Std. Error of Skewness		0.262	0.263	0.263	0.263	0.262	0.262	0.261	0.261	0.261
Kurtosis		0.270	1.313	-0.139	-0.966	-0.854	-0.888	-0.139	-0.757	-0.085
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.518	0.521	0.521	0.520	0.518	0.518	0.517	0.517	0.517
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Social and Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	75	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77
	Missing	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.03	3.95	3.74	3.50	3.48	3.35	3.91	3.58	4.47
Std. Error of Mean		0.120	0.123	0.128	0.160	0.157	0.142	0.135	0.156	0.105
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.12	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.038	1.082	1.122	1.403	1.383	1.244	1.180	1.366	0.926
Skewness		-0.612	-0.919	-0.568	-0.590	-0.588	-0.468	-1.249	-0.650	-1.929
Std. Error of Skewness		0.277	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274
Kurtosis		-0.771	0.393	-0.533	-0.861	-0.854	-0.617	0.985	-0.701	3.229
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.547	0.541	0.542	0.541	0.541	0.542	0.542	0.542	0.541
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Social and Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.00	3.76	4.16	3.92	3.30	2.95	3.30	3.11	4.00
Std. Error of Mean		0.346	0.333	0.271	0.309	0.535	0.342	0.394	0.520	0.346
Median		4.00	3.28	4.00	4.00	3.28	3.00	3.28	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	4	3	5	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.967	0.932	0.759	0.863	1.496	0.957	1.101	1.454	0.967
Skewness		0.000	0.609	-0.300	0.184	-0.209	-0.475	-1.160	0.251	0.000
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		-2.346	-1.774	-0.688	-1.643	-1.350	4.944	2.662	-0.940	-2.346
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	2
Minimum		3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Social and Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.26	3.47	4.00	2.68	2.68	2.47	3.16	2.68	3.26
Std. Error of Mean		0.765	0.737	0.474	0.871	0.871	0.844	0.754	0.934	0.801
Median		2.38	4.13	4.00	3.13	3.13	2.25	3.25	2.50	3.25
Mode		2	2	4	1	1	1	2	1	5
Std. Deviation		1.667	1.607	1.033	1.899	1.899	1.839	1.644	2.035	1.745
Skewness		0.491	-0.002	-1.254	0.267	0.267	0.794	0.200	0.484	0.099
Std. Error of Skewness		0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934
Kurtosis		-3.827	-3.886	4.535	-2.966	-2.966	-1.607	-2.233	-3.217	-2.929
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100
Range		3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	260	263	263	263	261	259	259	260
	Missing	4	0	1	0	3	5	5	4
Mean		4.02	3.78	4.16	3.98	4.14	4.42	4.57	4.63
Std. Error of Mean		0.065	0.070	0.069	0.073	0.072	0.058	0.052	0.044
Median		4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.047	1.143	1.120	1.178	1.169	0.933	0.844	0.702
Skewness		-0.985	-0.580	-1.279	-1.039	-1.246	-1.749	-2.250	-2.180
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.150	0.150	0.150	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151
Kurtosis		0.443	-0.526	0.801	0.302	0.630	2.772	5.101	5.172
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.301	0.299	0.300	0.299	0.301	0.302	0.302	0.301
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	261	261	260	259	259	261	253	256	257	263
	Missing	2	3	4	5	4	3	11	8	7	0
Mean		3.70	3.78	3.97	4.20	4.31	4.51	3.51	3.46	3.75	4.10
Std. Error of Mean		0.071	0.074	0.072	0.062	0.054	0.048	0.076	0.091	0.065	0.063
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	3	5
Std. Deviation		1.152	1.188	1.154	0.995	0.876	0.778	1.216	1.456	1.048	1.016
Skewness		-0.518	-0.581	-0.952	-1.342	-1.114	-1.650	-0.402	-0.484	-0.508	-1.115
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.153	0.152	0.152	0.150
Kurtosis		-0.566	-0.707	0.035	1.469	0.589	2.557	-0.707	-1.108	-0.235	0.848
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.300	0.301	0.301	0.302	0.301	0.301	0.305	0.303	0.303	0.299
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	158	161	161	162	158	160	161	162
	Missing	3	1	1	0	4	1	1	0
Mean		3.82	3.78	4.00	3.81	4.00	4.30	4.44	4.61
Std. Error of Mean		0.090	0.088	0.094	0.099	0.097	0.074	0.068	0.057
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.139	1.124	1.190	1.260	1.216	0.931	0.860	0.731
Skewness		-0.701	-0.632	-1.031	-0.859	-1.128	-1.323	-1.763	-2.068
Std. Error of Skewness		0.193	0.191	0.191	0.191	0.193	0.192	0.191	0.191
Kurtosis		-0.305	-0.228	0.185	-0.246	0.331	1.373	3.411	4.540
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.383	0.380	0.381	0.379	0.384	0.381	0.380	0.379
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	160	161	159	160	160	161	154	158	155	161
	Missing	2	1	2	2	2	1	8	4	7	1
Mean		3.63	3.60	3.65	3.99	4.26	4.40	3.35	3.36	3.49	3.73
Std. Error of Mean		0.091	0.097	0.101	0.077	0.074	0.069	0.093	0.114	0.089	0.089
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	3	5
Std. Deviation		1.151	1.233	1.281	0.975	0.940	0.877	1.161	1.437	1.103	1.124
Skewness		-0.458	-0.480	-0.477	-0.716	-1.143	-1.498	-0.323	-0.300	-0.375	-0.544
Std. Error of Skewness		0.192	0.191	0.192	0.192	0.192	0.191	0.195	0.193	0.195	0.191
Kurtosis		-0.545	-0.708	-0.929	-0.186	0.633	1.875	-0.491	-1.223	-0.289	-0.407
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.382	0.381	0.382	0.381	0.382	0.380	0.388	0.384	0.388	0.381
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	85	85	85	85	85	85	85	85
	Missing	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Mean		3.94	3.60	4.09	4.06	4.20	4.59	4.62	4.71
Std. Error of Mean		0.118	0.138	0.129	0.119	0.127	0.064	0.062	0.054
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.086	1.274	1.190	1.094	1.170	0.591	0.574	0.493
Skewness		-0.682	-0.695	-1.414	-1.047	-1.706	-1.313	-1.583	-1.376
Std. Error of Skewness		0.261	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.262	0.261	0.261	0.262
Kurtosis		-0.440	-0.381	1.301	0.200	2.128	1.694	3.512	0.864
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.517	0.517	0.517	0.517	0.518	0.517	0.517	0.518
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	85	84	85	85	85	85	84	84	83	85
	Missing	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	0
Mean		3.56	3.72	3.82	4.09	4.33	4.45	3.29	3.52	3.67	3.99
Std. Error of Mean		0.120	0.126	0.126	0.104	0.090	0.086	0.134	0.144	0.104	0.102
Median		3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	4	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.103	1.148	1.161	0.958	0.828	0.786	1.231	1.316	0.949	0.936
Skewness		-0.474	-0.607	-0.767	-0.743	-0.887	-1.397	-0.230	-0.558	-0.516	-0.912
Std. Error of Skewness		0.262	0.263	0.262	0.261	0.261	0.262	0.263	0.263	0.264	0.262
Kurtosis		0.014	-0.452	-0.143	0.053	-0.375	1.417	-0.630	-0.821	-0.049	0.540
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.518	0.521	0.518	0.517	0.517	0.518	0.520	0.521	0.522	0.518
Range		4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	77	77	77	77	75	77	77	77
	Missing	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
Mean		3.79	3.75	4.32	4.01	4.33	4.41	4.57	4.68
Std. Error of Mean		0.116	0.130	0.109	0.115	0.105	0.087	0.078	0.079
Median		4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.017	1.141	0.954	1.009	0.911	0.765	0.684	0.692
Skewness		-1.022	-0.857	-1.544	-0.789	-1.590	-1.199	-1.559	-2.773
Std. Error of Skewness		0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.277	0.274	0.274	0.274
Kurtosis		1.149	0.154	2.110	0.050	2.413	0.953	1.980	9.752
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.541	0.541	0.541	0.542	0.547	0.541	0.541	0.541
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological accidents or terrorist events):	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	77	77	77	76	77	77	72	77	77	77
	Missing	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	1	0	0
Mean		3.25	3.48	3.73	4.04	4.29	4.56	3.32	3.21	3.50	4.05
Std. Error of Mean		0.143	0.136	0.127	0.110	0.089	0.079	0.126	0.178	0.122	0.091
Median		3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	4	4	4	5	5	3	5	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.256	1.193	1.113	0.958	0.786	0.697	1.068	1.556	1.066	0.798
Skewness		-0.227	-0.662	-0.878	-1.315	-0.815	-1.759	-0.154	-0.258	-0.583	-0.385
Std. Error of Skewness		0.274	0.274	0.274	0.275	0.274	0.274	0.282	0.274	0.274	0.274
Kurtosis		-0.851	-0.128	0.435	2.302	-0.126	3.219	-0.415	-1.429	-0.048	-0.554
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.541	0.541	0.541	0.544	0.541	0.541	0.557	0.542	0.542	0.541
Range		4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.01	2.98	3.93	3.74	4.00	4.06	4.06	4.29
Std. Error of Mean		0.327	0.426	0.355	0.430	0.232	0.210	0.210	0.290
Median		3.00	2.44	3.97	3.72	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.28
Mode		3	2	3	3	4	4	4	5
Std. Deviation		0.914	1.192	0.962	1.203	0.650	0.587	0.587	0.811
Skewness		-1.473	0.712	0.171	-0.713	0.000	0.046	0.046	-0.668
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		3.880	-1.137	-2.319	1.230	0.848	2.052	2.052	-0.862
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		3	3	2	4	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	2	3	1	3	3	3	3
Maximum		4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.85	3.23	3.86	4.00	3.49	3.78	2.67	2.62	3.42	3.59
Std. Error of Mean		0.405	0.363	0.142	0.232	0.331	0.282	0.294	0.482	0.267	0.188
Median		3.00	3.28	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.41	2.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.134	1.015	0.372	0.650	0.925	0.788	0.821	1.347	0.746	0.526
Skewness		0.027	-1.658	-2.758	0.000	0.747	0.476	0.794	1.184	1.680	-0.470
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.799	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		0.506	3.371	7.926	0.848	0.111	-0.871	-0.765	0.891	2.175	-2.529
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.603	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		4	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	2	1
Minimum		1	1	3	3	2	3	2	1	3	3
Maximum		5	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5
	Missing	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.26	2.89	4.32	3.94	4.68	4.68	4.79	4.42
Std. Error of Mean		0.688	0.819	0.337	0.554	0.337	0.337	0.317	0.348
Median		3.25	3.13	4.13	3.75	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.63
Mode		2	1	4	3	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.499	1.785	0.735	1.142	0.735	0.735	0.691	0.759
Skewness		0.481	-0.099	-0.660	0.195	-2.819	-2.819	-3.948	-1.140
Std. Error of Skewness		0.934	0.934	0.934	0.984	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934
Kurtosis		-2.906	-2.252	1.390	-5.116	12.848	12.848	25.365	2.088
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.100	2.100	2.100	2.390	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100
Range		3	4	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4
	Missing	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Mean		3.59	3.74	4.53	3.95	4.21	4.79	3.12	2.87	3.12	3.53
Std. Error of Mean		0.468	0.526	0.386	0.488	0.317	0.317	1.005	1.076	1.005	0.740
Median		3.00	3.63	5.00	4.13	4.00	5.00	3.63	2.88	3.63	3.75
Mode		3	3	5	3	4	5	1	1	1	2
Std. Deviation		0.965	1.146	0.796	1.063	0.691	0.691	2.071	2.083	2.071	1.525
Skewness		1.478	-0.085	-1.903	0.161	-0.244	-3.948	-0.388	-0.019	-0.388	-0.227
Std. Error of Skewness		0.984	0.934	0.984	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.984	1.050	0.984	0.984
Kurtosis		0.859	-0.954	6.672	-3.706	2.278	25.365	-4.019		-4.019	-3.758
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.390	2.100	2.390	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.390		2.390	2.390
Range		2	3	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	3
Minimum		3	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		2.57	3.33	3.61	3.80	3.90	3.01	3.01	3.18	3.20	3.41	3.87	4.00	3.55
Std. Error of Mean		0.437	0.390	0.378	0.411	0.434	0.398	0.415	0.296	0.353	0.408	0.227	0.202	0.370
Median		2.41	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.28	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.222	1.090	1.057	1.149	1.214	1.113	1.161	0.828	0.986	1.142	0.635	0.545	1.036
Skewness		-0.009	0.447	0.560	-1.441	-1.413	0.355	-0.728	-0.414	0.647	0.302	0.055	0.000	-0.617
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759
Kurtosis		-1.596	-0.630	-1.255	3.351	2.757	1.047	-0.882	-1.247	0.390	-1.074	0.881	3.695	-0.413
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498
Range		3	3	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	2	2	3
Minimum		1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	2
Maximum		4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		2.57	3.33	3.61	3.80	3.90	3.01	3.01	3.18	3.20	3.41	3.87	4.00	3.55
Std. Error of Mean		0.437	0.390	0.378	0.411	0.434	0.398	0.415	0.296	0.353	0.408	0.227	0.202	0.370
Median		2.41	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.28	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.222	1.090	1.057	1.149	1.214	1.113	1.161	0.828	0.986	1.142	0.635	0.545	1.036
Skewness		-0.009	0.447	0.560	-1.441	-1.413	0.355	-0.728	-0.414	0.647	0.302	0.055	0.000	-0.617
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759
Kurtosis		-1.596	-0.630	-1.255	3.351	2.757	1.047	-0.882	-1.247	0.390	-1.074	0.881	3.695	-0.413
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498
Range		3	3	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	2	2	3
Minimum		1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	2
Maximum		4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		2.57	3.33	3.61	3.80	3.90	3.01	3.01	3.18	3.20	3.41	3.87	4.00	3.55
Std. Error of Mean		0.437	0.390	0.378	0.411	0.434	0.398	0.415	0.296	0.353	0.408	0.227	0.202	0.370
Median		2.41	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.28	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.222	1.090	1.057	1.149	1.214	1.113	1.161	0.828	0.986	1.142	0.635	0.545	1.036
Skewness		-0.009	0.447	0.560	-1.441	-1.413	0.355	-0.728	-0.414	0.647	0.302	0.055	0.000	-0.617
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759
Kurtosis		-1.596	-0.630	-1.255	3.351	2.757	1.047	-0.882	-1.247	0.390	-1.074	0.881	3.695	-0.413
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498
Range		3	3	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	2	2	3
Minimum		1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	2
Maximum		4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson	Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	2.57	3.33	3.61	3.80	3.90	3.01	3.01	3.18	3.20	3.41	3.87	4.00	3.55
Std. Error of Mean	0.437	0.390	0.378	0.411	0.434	0.398	0.415	0.296	0.353	0.408	0.227	0.202	0.370
Median	2.41	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.28	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation	1.222	1.090	1.057	1.149	1.214	1.113	1.161	0.828	0.986	1.142	0.635	0.545	1.036
Skewness	-0.009	0.447	0.560	-1.441	-1.413	0.355	-0.728	-0.414	0.647	0.302	0.055	0.000	-0.617
Std. Error of Skewness	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759
Kurtosis	-1.596	-0.630	-1.255	3.351	2.757	1.047	-0.882	-1.247	0.390	-1.074	0.881	3.695	-0.413
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498
Range	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	2	2	3
Minimum	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	2
Maximum	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		2.57	3.33	3.61	3.80	3.90	3.01	3.01	3.18	3.20	3.41	3.87	4.00	3.55
Std. Error of Mean		0.437	0.390	0.378	0.411	0.434	0.398	0.415	0.296	0.353	0.408	0.227	0.202	0.370
Median		2.41	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.28	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.222	1.090	1.057	1.149	1.214	1.113	1.161	0.828	0.986	1.142	0.635	0.545	1.036
Skewness		-0.009	0.447	0.560	-1.441	-1.413	0.355	-0.728	-0.414	0.647	0.302	0.055	0.000	-0.617
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759
Kurtosis		-1.596	-0.630	-1.255	3.351	2.757	1.047	-0.882	-1.247	0.390	-1.074	0.881	3.695	-0.413
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498
Range		3	3	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	2	2	3
Minimum		1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	2
Maximum		4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
	Missing	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		2.88	2.68	3.68	4.41	4.29	4.00	4.68	3.58	3.00	3.21	2.47	1.94	3.32
Std. Error of Mean		0.968	0.903	0.582	0.603	0.595	0.474	0.337	0.697	0.838	0.926	0.774	0.772	0.671
Median		2.75	2.25	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.13	3.63	4.13	2.25	1.00	3.00
Mode		1	1	4	5	5	4	5	5	1	5	1	1	3
Std. Deviation		1.995	1.968	1.268	1.244	1.226	1.033	0.735	1.519	1.826	2.019	1.688	1.592	1.463
Skewness		0.188	0.478	-1.728	-2.343	-1.946	-1.254	-2.819	-0.159	-0.341	-0.403	0.437	1.903	-0.037
Std. Error of Skewness		0.984	0.934	0.934	0.984	0.984	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.984	0.934
Kurtosis		-3.240	-2.588	8.343	8.398	5.973	4.535	12.848	-3.342	-2.569	-3.077	-1.964	6.672	0.474
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.390	2.100	2.100	2.390	2.390	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.390	2.100
Range		4	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance Score for Selected Services

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)

Performance Variables	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
General Government Services												
Road maintenance:	596	4	3.095	0.045	3	1.093	-0.122	0.100	-0.466	0.200	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	573	27	2.578	0.043	3	1.030	0.495	0.102	0.065	0.204	1	5
Flood control:	590	10	3.639	0.045	4	1.093	-0.661	0.101	-0.133	0.201	1	5
Budget management:	576	24	2.476	0.048	2	1.155	0.398	0.102	-0.621	0.203	1	5
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	564	36	2.921	0.050	3	1.197	0.002	0.103	-0.785	0.205	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	586	14	2.503	0.047	3	1.129	0.379	0.101	-0.457	0.202	1	5
Water conservation programs:	597	3	3.389	0.045	3	1.101	-0.453	0.100	-0.269	0.200	1	5
Social and Judicial Services												
Providing child protection services:	558	42	3.024	0.046	3	1.097	-0.083	0.103	-0.429	0.207	1	5
Providing child welfare services:	557	43	3.007	0.046	3	1.088	-0.032	0.104	-0.414	0.207	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services:	540	60	2.940	0.044	3	1.034	0.091	0.105	-0.245	0.210	1	5
Provide attainable housing for working class families:	562	38	2.614	0.047	3	1.105	0.406	0.103	-0.331	0.206	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	556	44	2.607	0.048	2	1.137	0.448	0.104	-0.500	0.207	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless:	558	42	2.169	0.048	2	1.144	0.722	0.103	-0.258	0.206	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors:	555	45	2.758	0.048	3	1.126	0.311	0.104	-0.566	0.207	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor:	558	42	2.595	0.052	3	1.236	0.348	0.103	-0.786	0.207	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:	579	21	3.446	0.050	4	1.211	-0.419	0.101	-0.699	0.203	1	5

**Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)**


Performance Variables	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
Public Safety Services												
Providing crime prevention programs:	577	23	3.208	0.040	3	0.973	-0.050	0.102	-0.084	0.203	1	5
Enforcing traffic laws:	597	3	3.282	0.048	3	1.175	-0.232	0.100	-0.711	0.200	1	5
Maintaining a low crime rate:	588	12	3.047	0.045	3	1.097	-0.033	0.101	-0.421	0.201	1	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	592	8	2.896	0.049	3	1.184	0.151	0.100	-0.789	0.201	1	5
Keeping police response times low:	577	23	3.247	0.050	3	1.205	-0.219	0.102	-0.796	0.203	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low:	569	31	3.958	0.039	4	0.936	-0.806	0.102	0.490	0.204	1	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	570	30	3.998	0.038	4	0.911	-0.817	0.102	0.515	0.204	1	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:	571	29	4.122	0.038	4	0.912	-1.068	0.102	1.103	0.204	1	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	565	35	2.816	0.048	3	1.151	0.256	0.103	-0.537	0.205	1	5
Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	564	36	3.011	0.048	3	1.145	0.025	0.103	-0.672	0.205	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	561	39	2.990	0.052	3	1.223	0.034	0.103	-0.877	0.206	1	5
Investigating criminal activity:	574	26	3.185	0.045	3	1.086	-0.162	0.102	-0.476	0.204	1	5
Providing fire protection & prevention services:	580	20	3.747	0.041	4	0.991	-0.484	0.101	-0.294	0.203	1	5
Providing emergency medical services:	589	11	3.907	0.039	4	0.952	-0.675	0.101	0.100	0.201	1	5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	536	64	2.978	0.047	3	1.092	0.069	0.106	-0.489	0.211	1	5

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)

Performance Variables	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
Public Safety Services (cont.)												
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	546	54	2.795	0.053	3	1.233	0.129	0.105	-0.852	0.209	1	5
Regional justice services and facilities:	558	42	3.185	0.047	3	1.100	-0.116	0.103	-0.460	0.206	1	5
Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:	592	8	3.386	0.045	3	1.107	-0.317	0.100	-0.523	0.200	1	5
Community Development Services												
Providing affordable housing:	579	21	2.657	0.046	3	1.104	0.341	0.102	-0.370	0.203	1	5
Managing growth:	591	9	2.582	0.047	3	1.138	0.307	0.100	-0.516	0.201	1	5
Increasing job opportunities:	590	10	2.411	0.046	2	1.114	0.624	0.101	-0.087	0.201	1	5
Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	588	12	2.239	0.047	2	1.136	0.780	0.101	0.008	0.201	1	5
Improving the business climate:	581	19	2.527	0.046	2	1.106	0.469	0.101	-0.267	0.202	1	5
Planning for commercial development:	585	15	2.696	0.046	3	1.109	0.221	0.101	-0.389	0.202	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion:	598	2	2.694	0.049	3	1.206	0.296	0.100	-0.694	0.200	1	5
Access to freeways:	596	4	3.216	0.047	3	1.157	-0.253	0.100	-0.645	0.200	1	5
Improving road conditions:	599	1	3.001	0.047	3	1.162	-0.080	0.100	-0.673	0.199	1	5
Reducing travel time:	593	8	2.830	0.048	3	1.163	0.154	0.100	-0.667	0.200	1	5
Providing mass public transit:	585	15	2.670	0.053	3	1.280	0.281	0.101	-0.950	0.202	1	5
Adequate airport facilities:	587	13	3.676	0.044	4	1.060	-0.694	0.101	0.062	0.201	1	5
Providing parks and recreational facilities:	592	8	3.574	0.045	4	1.092	-0.434	0.100	-0.359	0.200	1	5

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Road Maintenance



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer


Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)

Revitalizing Older Neighborhoods



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer


Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Budget Management



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Communicate Clark County Local Government's Views About Yucca Mountain to Federal Decision Makers



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Monitor and Report to the Public on How Well Government Services are Being Performed



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)**


Water Conservation Programs



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Child Protection Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Child Welfare Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Juvenile Justice Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Affordable Housing for Low Income Families



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Shelter for the Homeless



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Affordable Housing for Seniors



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Medical Care for the Poor



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing 24-Hour Emergency Trauma Care



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Crime Prevention Programs



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Enforcing Traffic Laws



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Maintaining a Low Crime Rate



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Maintaining Neighborhood Police Patrols



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Keeping Police Response Times Low



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Keeping Fire Department Response Times Low



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Keeping Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Times Low



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Well Trained Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Personnel



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Facilitate Neighborhood Watch Programs



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Preparing for Natural Disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Preparing for Man-Made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) Accidents or Terrorist Events



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Investigating Criminal Activity



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Fire Protection and Prevention Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Emergency Medical Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Neighborhood Code Enforcement Services



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Examining Potential Impacts from Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Shipments



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)**


Regional Justice Services and Facilities



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing and Maintaining Safe Parks and Recreational Facilities



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Affordable Housing



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Managing Growth



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)**


Increasing Job Opportunities



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


**Ability to Attract Jobs Outside of Construction or
Hotel/Gaming Related Employment**



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Improving the Business Climate



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Planning for Commercial Development



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Reducing Traffic Congestion



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Access to Freeways



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Improving Road Conditions



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Reducing Travel Time



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Providing Mass Transit



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)


Adequate Airport Facilities



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II Continued
Performance for Selected Services
Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)

Parks and Recreation Programs



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
N	Valid	262	251	257	246	245	253	263
	Missing	2	13	6	17	19	11	1
Mean		2.96	2.52	3.55	2.30	2.94	2.39	3.31
Std. Error of Mean		0.067	0.067	0.070	0.073	0.074	0.071	0.070
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	4	1	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.086	1.069	1.116	1.140	1.154	1.127	1.138
Skewness		-0.018	0.584	-0.485	0.543	-0.062	0.552	-0.394
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.154	0.152	0.155	0.156	0.153	0.150
Kurtosis		-0.459	0.086	-0.435	-0.506	-0.681	-0.181	-0.487
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.300	0.306	0.303	0.309	0.310	0.305	0.299
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
N	Valid	160	157	159	158	154	161	160
	Missing	1	4	2	3	8	1	2
Mean		3.16	2.58	3.78	2.57	2.84	2.53	3.37
Std. Error of Mean		0.082	0.084	0.086	0.095	0.096	0.091	0.083
Median		3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	4	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.043	1.053	1.089	1.196	1.191	1.154	1.049
Skewness		-0.150	0.563	-0.793	0.353	-0.009	0.313	-0.428
Std. Error of Skewness		0.192	0.193	0.192	0.193	0.195	0.191	0.192
Kurtosis		-0.254	0.127	0.150	-0.696	-0.805	-0.623	0.091
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.381	0.385	0.382	0.383	0.388	0.381	0.382
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
N	Valid	84	81	84	84	80	82	85
	Missing	1	4	1	2	5	3	1
Mean		3.13	2.57	3.67	2.72	3.02	2.69	3.63
Std. Error of Mean		0.130	0.117	0.112	0.121	0.145	0.122	0.111
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.188	1.054	1.028	1.109	1.298	1.103	1.022
Skewness		-0.115	0.655	-0.956	0.181	0.131	0.280	-0.741
Std. Error of Skewness		0.263	0.267	0.263	0.263	0.270	0.265	0.262
Kurtosis		-0.687	0.283	0.726	-0.412	-0.985	-0.279	0.401
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.519	0.529	0.521	0.521	0.533	0.525	0.518
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
N	Valid	77	73	77	75	74	77	77
	Missing	0	4	0	2	4	0	0
Mean		3.28	2.74	3.65	2.55	2.93	2.52	3.41
Std. Error of Mean		0.118	0.095	0.121	0.125	0.150	0.125	0.130
Median		3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	4	2	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.034	0.810	1.060	1.087	1.287	1.098	1.146
Skewness		-0.315	-0.287	-0.708	0.272	-0.019	0.269	-0.392
Std. Error of Skewness		0.274	0.280	0.274	0.277	0.280	0.274	0.274
Kurtosis		-0.118	-0.283	-0.006	-0.718	-1.012	-0.507	-0.427
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.541	0.554	0.541	0.547	0.553	0.541	0.541
Range		4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	4	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
City of Boulder City								
N	Valid	8	7	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.08	2.88	3.26	2.84	2.54	2.82	3.42
Std. Error of Mean		0.456	0.253	0.528	0.426	0.268	0.354	0.442
Median		3.72	3.00	4.00	2.28	3.00	3.00	3.28
Mode		4	3	4	2	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		1.275	0.664	1.477	1.192	0.749	0.989	1.236
Skewness		-1.194	0.096	-0.884	1.404	-1.483	-0.143	-0.762
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.799	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		-0.091	0.845	-0.684	0.990	1.458	-0.814	1.426
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.603	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		3	2	4	3	2	3	4
Minimum		1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	5	5	3	4	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for General Government
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		Road maintenance:	Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Flood control:	Budget management:	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Water conservation programs:
N	Valid	5	4	5	5	4	5	5
	Missing	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Mean		4.58	3.07	3.89	2.37	3.59	3.47	3.68
Std. Error of Mean		0.348	0.677	0.371	0.695	0.468	0.423	0.475
Median		5.00	3.13	4.00	2.13	3.00	4.00	3.88
Mode		5	2	4	1	3	4	4
Std. Deviation		0.759	1.312	0.808	1.515	0.965	0.921	1.036
Skewness		-2.026	0.794	0.243	0.928	1.478	-1.636	-0.222
Std. Error of Skewness		0.934	1.050	0.934	0.934	0.984	0.934	0.934
Kurtosis		6.418		-0.047	0.959	0.859	1.710	0.905
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.100		2.100	2.100	2.390	2.100	2.100
Range		2	3	2	4	2	2	3
Minimum		3	2	3	1	3	2	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	4	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Social & Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	243	242	233	245	243	240	244	241	252
	Missing	21	21	30	18	20	23	19	23	12
Mean		2.99	2.97	2.93	2.57	2.51	2.08	2.69	2.50	3.31
Std. Error of Mean		0.069	0.068	0.065	0.067	0.068	0.074	0.067	0.080	0.077
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	2	1	2	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.068	1.060	0.999	1.046	1.061	1.149	1.053	1.245	1.222
Skewness		-0.046	-0.047	0.106	0.325	0.412	0.924	0.435	0.427	-0.375
Std. Error of Skewness		0.156	0.156	0.159	0.156	0.156	0.157	0.156	0.157	0.153
Kurtosis		-0.285	-0.388	-0.075	-0.271	-0.349	0.132	-0.221	-0.730	-0.690
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.311	0.311	0.317	0.310	0.311	0.313	0.310	0.313	0.306
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Social & Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	150	152	147	150	153	155	152	155	156
	Missing	12	10	15	12	9	7	10	6	6
Mean		2.90	2.91	2.87	2.53	2.61	2.19	2.76	2.68	3.55
Std. Error of Mean		0.099	0.097	0.095	0.093	0.093	0.094	0.098	0.101	0.093
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.65	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.209	1.195	1.144	1.137	1.154	1.166	1.211	1.258	1.160
Skewness		-0.032	0.062	0.033	0.426	0.510	0.636	0.230	0.259	-0.463
Std. Error of Skewness		0.198	0.197	0.200	0.198	0.196	0.195	0.197	0.195	0.194
Kurtosis		-0.792	-0.661	-0.519	-0.385	-0.405	-0.523	-0.831	-0.898	-0.545
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.393	0.392	0.398	0.394	0.390	0.387	0.391	0.387	0.386
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Social & Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	76	76	76	82	75	78	76	75	82
	Missing	9	9	9	3	10	7	9	10	3
Mean		3.09	3.06	3.05	2.89	2.90	2.17	2.79	2.73	3.60
Std. Error of Mean		0.114	0.120	0.107	0.126	0.141	0.126	0.142	0.137	0.134
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	4
Std. Deviation		0.998	1.045	0.930	1.139	1.228	1.115	1.238	1.184	1.213
Skewness		0.124	0.150	0.227	0.465	0.091	0.765	0.377	0.290	-0.630
Std. Error of Skewness		0.275	0.276	0.276	0.265	0.277	0.273	0.276	0.277	0.265
Kurtosis		-0.285	-0.107	0.127	-0.605	-1.057	0.059	-0.751	-0.747	-0.510
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.543	0.545	0.545	0.525	0.547	0.539	0.545	0.548	0.525
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Social & Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	75	74	72	74	73	72	71	74	77
	Missing	2	3	5	3	4	5	6	3	1
Mean		3.30	3.26	2.95	2.62	2.53	2.32	2.92	2.50	3.50
Std. Error of Mean		0.120	0.113	0.121	0.131	0.136	0.128	0.130	0.135	0.142
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	5
Std. Deviation		1.045	0.972	1.027	1.126	1.158	1.085	1.094	1.168	1.247
Skewness		-0.381	-0.164	0.215	0.508	0.734	0.509	0.029	0.490	-0.312
Std. Error of Skewness		0.277	0.278	0.283	0.279	0.281	0.282	0.285	0.278	0.274
Kurtosis		0.032	0.095	-0.455	-0.134	-0.058	-0.170	-0.558	-0.390	-0.983
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.547	0.550	0.560	0.552	0.555	0.558	0.563	0.550	0.542
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Social & Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.06	2.80	3.34	2.07	2.82	2.46	2.59	2.86	3.18
Std. Error of Mean		0.312	0.353	0.322	0.355	0.544	0.432	0.188	0.371	0.398
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.03	2.97	2.72	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	2
Std. Deviation		0.871	0.986	0.900	0.962	1.473	1.208	0.526	1.038	1.112
Skewness		1.551	-0.647	0.624	-0.171	0.084	-0.056	-0.470	-1.156	0.340
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.780	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		4.549	0.390	0.805	-2.319	-1.255	-1.526	-2.529	1.262	-1.083
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.550	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		3	3	3	2	4	3	1	3	3
Minimum		2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2
Maximum		5	4	5	3	5	4	3	4	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Social & Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		Providing child protection services:	Providing child welfare services:	Providing juvenile justice services:	Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	Providing shelter for the homeless:	Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Providing medical care for the poor:	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:
N	Valid	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	5
	Missing	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
Mean		2.89	3.26	2.71	3.82	3.63	3.37	3.65	3.59	4.05
Std. Error of Mean		0.553	0.623	0.595	0.666	0.609	0.418	0.536	0.952	0.720
Median		3.00	3.88	2.00	4.13	3.75	3.88	4.00	4.63	4.88
Mode		3	4	2	5	5	4	4	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.205	1.359	1.226	1.372	1.327	0.910	1.105	1.963	1.569
Skewness		0.322	-0.790	1.946	-0.785	-0.042	-1.173	-1.338	-0.996	-1.931
Std. Error of Skewness		0.934	0.934	0.984	0.984	0.934	0.934	0.984	0.984	0.934
Kurtosis		3.895	0.510	5.973	-1.180	-2.195	-0.020	3.578	-1.903	4.831
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.100	2.100	2.390	2.390	2.100	2.100	2.390	2.390	2.100
Range		4	4	3	3	3	2	3	4	4
Minimum		1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	257	262	258	262	253	251	248	251
	Missing	7	2	6	2	10	12	15	13
Mean		3.17	3.30	2.91	2.85	3.19	3.88	3.94	4.06
Std. Error of Mean		0.059	0.072	0.065	0.072	0.074	0.058	0.057	0.057
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		0.950	1.157	1.038	1.172	1.184	0.916	0.896	0.906
Skewness		-0.080	-0.261	-0.010	0.140	-0.222	-0.837	-0.900	-0.992
Std. Error of Skewness		0.152	0.151	0.152	0.151	0.153	0.154	0.155	0.154
Kurtosis		0.107	-0.653	-0.341	-0.701	-0.729	0.892	1.120	1.003
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.303	0.300	0.302	0.300	0.305	0.306	0.308	0.306
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	249	246	243	251	259	260	237	234	243	259
	Missing	14	17	21	12	4	3	26	29	20	4
Mean		2.85	2.99	2.91	3.18	3.64	3.79	2.88	2.75	3.14	3.32
Std. Error of Mean		0.073	0.074	0.081	0.066	0.062	0.061	0.070	0.078	0.070	0.066
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.154	1.155	1.261	1.054	1.001	0.989	1.077	1.196	1.084	1.064
Skewness		0.267	0.098	0.149	-0.064	-0.347	-0.649	0.215	0.163	-0.058	-0.229
Std. Error of Skewness		0.154	0.155	0.156	0.154	0.151	0.151	0.158	0.159	0.156	0.151
Kurtosis		-0.533	-0.732	-0.908	-0.472	-0.489	0.225	-0.382	-0.753	-0.404	-0.430
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.307	0.309	0.311	0.306	0.301	0.301	0.315	0.317	0.311	0.301
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	154	161	161	161	157	154	156	157
	Missing	8	1	1	1	4	7	5	5
Mean		3.13	3.20	3.10	2.84	3.14	3.97	4.02	4.09
Std. Error of Mean		0.086	0.096	0.091	0.096	0.099	0.080	0.075	0.075
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	2	3	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.072	1.223	1.153	1.218	1.246	0.992	0.937	0.943
Skewness		-0.064	-0.239	-0.056	0.264	-0.075	-0.791	-0.744	-0.915
Std. Error of Skewness		0.196	0.191	0.191	0.191	0.193	0.195	0.194	0.194
Kurtosis		-0.294	-0.706	-0.482	-0.816	-0.950	0.267	0.293	0.551
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.389	0.381	0.381	0.381	0.384	0.388	0.386	0.385
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	158	152	153	158	154	159	146	147	151	159
	Missing	4	10	8	4	7	3	16	15	11	3
Mean		2.74	3.02	3.06	3.22	3.79	3.93	3.01	2.93	3.11	3.26
Std. Error of Mean		0.097	0.098	0.102	0.091	0.085	0.079	0.093	0.102	0.090	0.096
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.217	1.208	1.260	1.144	1.051	0.991	1.125	1.231	1.105	1.210
Skewness		0.295	-0.123	-0.023	-0.136	-0.739	-0.689	-0.023	0.185	-0.157	-0.191
Std. Error of Skewness		0.193	0.197	0.196	0.193	0.195	0.193	0.201	0.200	0.197	0.193
Kurtosis		-0.669	-0.725	-0.919	-0.614	0.192	-0.192	-0.474	-0.833	-0.390	-0.857
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.384	0.391	0.389	0.384	0.388	0.383	0.399	0.398	0.392	0.383
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	79	85	82	83	81	76	78	78
	Missing	6	1	3	2	4	9	7	7
Mean		3.31	3.23	3.06	2.95	3.41	4.13	4.18	4.20
Std. Error of Mean		0.115	0.137	0.136	0.135	0.145	0.116	0.101	0.113
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	5	4	5
Std. Deviation		1.023	1.262	1.227	1.231	1.303	1.012	0.894	1.000
Skewness		0.263	-0.003	0.077	0.032	-0.401	-1.137	-1.108	-1.620
Std. Error of Skewness		0.270	0.262	0.266	0.265	0.268	0.276	0.273	0.273
Kurtosis		-0.879	-0.991	-0.788	-0.931	-0.801	0.579	0.712	2.694
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.534	0.518	0.526	0.523	0.530	0.545	0.539	0.539
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	77	82	81	77	79	81	76	80	78	85
	Missing	8	3	4	8	6	5	9	5	7	1
Mean		2.75	2.87	2.91	2.99	3.88	4.11	2.96	2.66	3.35	3.41
Std. Error of Mean		0.122	0.127	0.130	0.132	0.103	0.092	0.137	0.144	0.139	0.116
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.071	1.150	1.167	1.157	0.917	0.825	1.199	1.281	1.232	1.070
Skewness		0.219	0.130	-0.083	-0.236	-0.355	-0.459	0.071	0.256	-0.227	-0.404
Std. Error of Skewness		0.274	0.266	0.267	0.274	0.271	0.268	0.276	0.270	0.272	0.262
Kurtosis		-0.263	-0.621	-0.826	-0.725	-0.754	-0.745	-0.828	-0.886	-0.869	-0.358
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.541	0.526	0.529	0.541	0.536	0.530	0.545	0.533	0.537	0.518
Range		4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	76	77	75	75	74	75	76	73
	Missing	1	0	2	2	3	2	1	4
Mean		3.35	3.42	3.38	3.10	3.52	4.04	4.01	4.38
Std. Error of Mean		0.091	0.118	0.112	0.129	0.122	0.090	0.101	0.083
Median		3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.37
Mode		3	4	3	3	4	4	4	5
Std. Deviation		0.790	1.040	0.970	1.123	1.045	0.782	0.875	0.708
Skewness		-0.210	-0.348	-0.361	0.077	-0.368	-0.494	-0.651	-0.932
Std. Error of Skewness		0.276	0.274	0.277	0.277	0.279	0.278	0.276	0.281
Kurtosis		0.661	-0.453	0.449	-0.806	-0.330	-0.125	-0.162	0.489
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.546	0.541	0.548	0.547	0.552	0.549	0.546	0.554
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	70	72	73	75	75	77	66	74	74	77
	Missing	8	5	5	2	2	0	12	4	3	0
Mean		2.83	3.18	3.20	3.35	3.89	4.04	3.19	2.84	3.26	3.81
Std. Error of Mean		0.135	0.113	0.125	0.106	0.103	0.091	0.111	0.152	0.119	0.114
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.128	0.953	1.066	0.922	0.893	0.803	0.899	1.301	1.025	0.998
Skewness		0.327	0.188	-0.111	-0.172	-0.493	-0.780	-0.220	-0.096	-0.201	-0.755
Std. Error of Skewness		0.288	0.283	0.282	0.277	0.278	0.274	0.296	0.280	0.279	0.274
Kurtosis		-0.392	-0.166	-0.496	0.157	-0.419	0.569	0.074	-1.027	-0.199	0.514
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.568	0.560	0.557	0.547	0.549	0.541	0.583	0.553	0.552	0.541
Range		4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.36	3.23	3.24	3.07	3.20	3.55	3.39	3.74
Std. Error of Mean		0.296	0.406	0.284	0.360	0.378	0.300	0.393	0.343
Median		3.00	3.22	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.829	1.134	0.795	1.006	1.058	0.840	1.100	0.959
Skewness		1.048	0.166	1.689	0.908	0.424	1.218	0.226	0.679
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		1.775	-1.392	4.405	0.872	-0.566	-0.023	-0.898	-1.835
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2
Minimum		2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean		3.16	2.85	2.79	2.98	3.42	3.49	2.90	2.39	3.42	3.53
Std. Error of Mean		0.196	0.423	0.407	0.478	0.300	0.331	0.221	0.441	0.267	0.268
Median		3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.548	1.182	1.138	1.337	0.838	0.925	0.618	1.194	0.746	0.749
Skewness		0.281	1.051	1.300	-0.346	0.756	0.747	0.007	-0.327	1.680	1.195
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		2.128	-0.353	0.688	-0.008	1.023	0.111	1.260	-1.724	2.175	0.612
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498	1.498
Range		2	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	2	2
Minimum		2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	3
Maximum		4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		Providing crime prevention programs:	Enforcing traffic laws:	Maintaining a low crime rate:	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Keeping police response times low:	Keeping fire department response times low:	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:
N	Valid	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	5
	Missing	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Mean		3.35	4.05	2.74	2.80	3.06	4.00	4.00	4.00
Std. Error of Mean		0.464	0.542	0.623	0.668	0.698	0.474	0.538	0.474
Median		3.00	4.38	2.25	2.25	2.75	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	5	2	2	2	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		0.956	1.182	1.359	1.293	1.440	1.033	1.109	1.033
Skewness		0.777	-0.999	0.790	1.815	0.986	-1.254	-1.277	-1.254
Std. Error of Skewness		0.984	0.934	0.934	1.050	0.984	0.934	0.984	0.934
Kurtosis		4.994	0.481	0.510		-1.366	4.535	4.848	4.535
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.390	2.100	2.100		2.390	2.100	2.390	2.100
Range		3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3
Minimum		2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Public Safety
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite (cont.)		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Investigating criminal activity:	Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Providing emergency medical services:	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Regional justice services and facilities:	Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	5
	Missing	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
Mean		3.73	3.88	3.47	3.47	3.89	4.41	4.47	3.41	3.47	3.58
Std. Error of Mean		0.515	0.499	0.759	0.718	0.500	0.603	0.618	0.603	0.542	0.634
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	3	4
Std. Deviation		0.997	1.029	1.469	1.565	1.089	1.244	1.196	1.244	1.118	1.382
Skewness		-1.370	-1.215	-1.706	-1.359	-0.745	-2.343	-3.251	-2.343	0.761	-1.328
Std. Error of Skewness		1.050	0.984	1.050	0.934	0.934	0.984	1.050	0.984	0.984	0.934
Kurtosis			6.459		2.101	1.266	8.398		8.398	1.191	3.459
Std. Error of Kurtosis			2.390		2.100	2.100	2.390		2.390	2.390	2.100
Range		3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4
Minimum		2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	254	259	260	259	253	258	261	261	263	261	258	258	259
	Missing	9	4	3	4	11	5	2	3	1	3	5	5	4
Mean		2.70	2.48	2.37	2.15	2.49	2.66	2.63	3.11	2.89	2.71	2.72	3.59	3.50
Std. Error of Mean		0.072	0.071	0.069	0.068	0.070	0.070	0.074	0.073	0.071	0.071	0.081	0.068	0.068
Median		3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3
Std. Deviation		1.142	1.149	1.111	1.097	1.106	1.124	1.203	1.173	1.154	1.143	1.300	1.099	1.092
Skewness		0.340	0.298	0.644	0.917	0.469	0.272	0.326	-0.141	0.027	0.200	0.204	-0.579	-0.308
Std. Error of Skewness		0.153	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.153	0.152	0.151	0.151	0.150	0.151	0.152	0.152	0.151
Kurtosis		-0.487	-0.637	-0.068	0.452	-0.187	-0.377	-0.667	-0.695	-0.595	-0.504	-1.020	-0.157	-0.474
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.304	0.301	0.301	0.301	0.305	0.302	0.300	0.301	0.299	0.301	0.302	0.302	0.301
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas	Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:	
N	Valid	157	162	160	158	160	161	162	160	162	160	157	160	159
	Missing	5	0	1	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	5	2	2
	Mean	2.55	2.57	2.34	2.17	2.44	2.52	2.74	3.23	3.03	2.88	2.56	3.70	3.51
	Std. Error of Mean	0.088	0.090	0.088	0.089	0.093	0.093	0.098	0.095	0.090	0.094	0.100	0.086	0.089
	Median	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.96	4.00	3.00
	Mode	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3
	Std. Deviation	1.096	1.149	1.112	1.126	1.171	1.175	1.247	1.200	1.140	1.194	1.258	1.091	1.123
	Skewness	0.374	0.365	0.596	0.849	0.577	0.393	0.243	-0.364	-0.174	0.012	0.360	-0.779	-0.398
	Std. Error of Skewness	0.194	0.191	0.192	0.193	0.192	0.191	0.191	0.192	0.191	0.192	0.194	0.192	0.192
	Kurtosis	-0.304	-0.448	-0.164	0.119	-0.330	-0.511	-0.817	-0.696	-0.692	-0.835	-0.841	0.156	-0.367
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	0.385	0.379	0.381	0.383	0.381	0.380	0.379	0.381	0.379	0.381	0.385	0.382	0.382
	Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas	Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	80	81	81	83	81	82	85	85	85	81	85	85
	Missing	5	4	5	2	4	4	0	0	0	4	0	1
Mean	2.80	2.67	2.47	2.42	2.63	2.96	2.67	3.19	2.96	2.80	2.81	3.87	3.73
Std. Error of Mean	0.123	0.124	0.117	0.124	0.111	0.112	0.131	0.127	0.134	0.123	0.138	0.105	0.110
Median	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.05	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	4	4
Std. Deviation	1.099	1.114	1.048	1.129	0.995	1.007	1.209	1.168	1.237	1.133	1.246	0.969	1.012
Skewness	0.362	0.427	0.750	0.525	0.708	0.253	0.427	-0.046	0.021	0.494	0.271	-0.866	-0.510
Std. Error of Skewness	0.269	0.267	0.268	0.265	0.267	0.266	0.261	0.261	0.261	0.262	0.267	0.261	0.262
Kurtosis	-0.351	-0.161	0.535	-0.344	0.379	0.054	-0.517	-0.676	-0.756	-0.430	-0.865	0.424	-0.232
Std. Error of Kurtosis	0.533	0.529	0.530	0.523	0.529	0.527	0.517	0.517	0.517	0.518	0.529	0.517	0.518
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson	Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:	
N	Valid	76	77	77	75	75	73	77	77	77	75	77	73	76
	Missing	1	1	1	2	2	5	0	0	0	2	1	4	1
Mean		2.59	2.75	2.60	2.51	2.72	2.83	2.78	3.45	3.18	3.04	2.45	3.68	3.80
Std. Error of Mean		0.118	0.121	0.133	0.141	0.122	0.113	0.128	0.110	0.126	0.138	0.143	0.108	0.128
Median		3.00	3.00	2.29	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	2	2	2	3	3	4	3	3	2	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.027	1.058	1.161	1.222	1.059	0.965	1.124	0.964	1.110	1.192	1.251	0.918	1.122
Skewness		0.189	0.130	0.560	0.527	0.186	-0.105	0.213	-0.423	-0.259	0.049	0.551	-0.704	-0.929
Std. Error of Skewness		0.275	0.274	0.274	0.277	0.277	0.282	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.277	0.274	0.281	0.275
Kurtosis		-0.197	-0.519	-0.234	-0.522	-0.634	-0.170	-0.510	-0.143	-0.473	-0.871	-0.605	0.571	0.447
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.544	0.542	0.542	0.547	0.548	0.556	0.541	0.541	0.541	0.548	0.542	0.556	0.544
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City	Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	7	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	2.29	2.90	2.81	2.48	2.89	2.99	2.94	3.75	3.75	3.53	2.83	3.69	3.53
Std. Error of Mean	0.256	0.372	0.498	0.476	0.373	0.381	0.273	0.250	0.250	0.268	0.526	0.273	0.268
Median	2.00	3.00	2.72	2.72	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.77	3.97	3.00
Mode	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	3
Std. Deviation	0.715	1.039	1.393	1.332	1.043	1.030	0.763	0.700	0.700	0.749	1.470	0.738	0.749
Skewness	-0.509	1.251	0.231	0.668	0.740	0.548	0.117	0.382	0.382	1.195	0.079	0.615	1.195
Std. Error of Skewness	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759
Kurtosis	-0.231	1.580	-0.992	0.644	2.999	3.767	-0.746	-0.135	-0.135	0.612	-1.451	-0.243	0.612
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498
Range	2	3	4	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	4	2	2
Minimum	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	3	1	3	3
Maximum	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Performance Scores for Community Development
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite	Providing affordable housing:	Managing growth:	Increasing job opportunities:	Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	Improving the business climate:	Planning for commercial development:	Reducing traffic congestion:	Access to freeways:	Improving road conditions:	Reducing travel time:	Providing mass public transit:	Adequate airport facilities:	Providing parks and recreational facilities:	
N	Valid	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	5
	Missing	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Mean	3.24	3.74	2.42	1.94	2.18	3.35	3.00	4.58	4.58	3.71	3.89	3.59	3.58	
Std. Error of Mean	0.447	0.645	0.538	0.724	0.718	0.378	0.933	0.348	0.348	0.457	0.440	0.914	0.538	
Median	3.00	3.75	2.00	1.38	1.88	3.00	3.25	5.00	5.00	3.38	4.00	4.25	3.88	
Mode	3	5	2	1	1	3	5	5	5	3	4	5	4	
Std. Deviation	0.922	1.407	1.173	1.492	1.480	0.779	2.033	0.759	0.759	0.942	0.959	1.883	1.173	
Skewness	1.476	-0.216	2.036	2.279	1.606	2.741	0.082	-2.026	-2.026	0.975	-1.257	-0.975	-0.323	
Std. Error of Skewness	0.984	0.934	0.934	0.984	0.984	0.984	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.984	0.934	0.984	0.934	
Kurtosis	9.623	-2.865	10.718	11.471	6.848	14.082	-3.407	6.418	6.418	-0.805	6.021	-0.805	-0.398	
Std. Error of Kurtosis	2.390	2.100	2.100	2.390	2.390	2.390	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.390	2.100	2.390	2.100	
Range	3	3	4	4	4	2	4	2	2	2	3	4	3	
Minimum	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	3	3	3	2	1	2	
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics


Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services:

		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets and roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:	Green & Sustainability Issues
N	Valid	592	598	598	600	590	592	600	588	591	583
	Missing	8	2	2	0	10	8	0	12	9	17
Mean		3.73	3.88	3.66	3.76	3.35	3.52	3.87	3.70	3.63	3.43
Std. Error of Mean		0.051	0.051	0.041	0.043	0.053	0.050	0.047	0.056	0.053	0.054
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		5	5	4	4	4	3	5	5	5	3
Std. Deviation		1.237	1.243	1.012	1.052	1.279	1.214	1.158	1.347	1.286	1.292
Skewness		-0.599	-0.910	-0.423	-0.621	-0.332	-0.340	-0.787	-0.614	-0.539	-0.383
Std. Error of Skewness		0.100	0.100	0.100	0.100	0.101	0.100	0.100	0.101	0.100	0.101
Kurtosis		-0.639	-0.217	-0.322	-0.139	-0.948	-0.836	-0.303	-0.931	-0.860	-0.876
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.201	0.199	0.199	0.199	0.201	0.200	0.199	0.201	0.201	0.202
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings

	1	2	3	4	5
Natural or man-made emergency	6.5	9.4	26.4	20.2	37.4
Quality of drinking water	6.9	8.6	16.4	25.6	42.4
Recreational opportunities	2.6	9.4	30.4	34.8	22.8
Condition of streets & roads	3.4	8	26	34.8	27.7
Availability of public transportation	10.4	16.3	23.4	27.3	22.6
Housing affordability	6.4	14	29.2	22.4	28.1
Air quality	4.2	10.1	18.9	28.4	38.4
Availability of job opportunities	8.1	14.7	17	19.1	41.2
Managing growth	7.3	14.2	20.3	23.6	34.4
Green & Sustainability Issues	10.7	12.2	27.5	22.9	26.7

Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer



Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets and roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:	Green & Sustainability Issues:
N	Valid	260	263	263	263	261	260	263	259	255	255
	Missing	3	1	0	0	3	3	0	5	8	8
Mean		3.79	3.91	3.62	3.70	3.37	3.60	3.96	3.77	3.65	3.42
Std. Error of Mean		0.077	0.078	0.063	0.068	0.078	0.075	0.072	0.084	0.084	0.084
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.236	1.267	1.021	1.111	1.254	1.204	1.169	1.350	1.355	1.350
Skewness		-0.651	-0.957	-0.335	-0.605	-0.385	-0.421	-0.889	-0.648	-0.566	-0.466
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.150	0.150	0.150	0.151	0.151	0.150	0.151	0.152	0.152
Kurtosis		-0.592	-0.202	-0.601	-0.305	-0.892	-0.814	-0.223	-0.958	-0.972	-0.883
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.301	0.300	0.299	0.299	0.301	0.301	0.299	0.302	0.302	0.304
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets and roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:	Green & Sustainability Issues:
N	Valid	158	161	161	162	157	159	162	157	159	156
	Missing	4	1	1	0	4	3	0	5	2	5
Mean		3.51	3.98	3.62	3.81	3.34	3.49	3.81	3.56	3.50	3.46
Std. Error of Mean		0.106	0.092	0.077	0.079	0.108	0.101	0.094	0.112	0.102	0.100
Median		3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.86
Mode		5	5	4	4	5	3	5	5	5	3
Std. Deviation		1.332	1.161	0.972	1.009	1.355	1.271	1.193	1.400	1.288	1.253
Skewness		-0.366	-1.026	-0.403	-0.544	-0.252	-0.388	-0.846	-0.490	-0.407	-0.356
Std. Error of Skewness		0.193	0.191	0.191	0.191	0.193	0.193	0.191	0.194	0.192	0.194
Kurtosis		-0.995	0.217	-0.054	-0.157	-1.122	-0.821	-0.144	-1.083	-0.947	-0.858
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.384	0.381	0.381	0.379	0.385	0.383	0.379	0.385	0.382	0.386
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets and roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:	Green & Sustainability Issues:
N	Valid	85	85	85	85	83	85	85	84	85	84
	Missing	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	1	1
Mean		4.05	3.85	3.91	3.88	3.59	3.57	3.97	3.88	3.94	3.67
Std. Error of Mean		0.120	0.141	0.103	0.118	0.128	0.133	0.107	0.146	0.124	0.134
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.24
Mode		5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.103	1.304	0.951	1.084	1.162	1.222	0.983	1.341	1.138	1.221
Skewness		-1.072	-0.836	-0.389	-0.772	-0.706	-0.377	-0.481	-1.001	-0.889	-3.74
Std. Error of Skewness		0.262	0.261	0.262	0.261	0.265	0.262	0.261	0.263	0.262	0.263
Kurtosis		0.457	-0.486	-0.516	-0.224	-0.195	-0.852	-0.753	-0.216	-0.128	-0.847
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.518	0.517	0.518	0.517	0.523	0.518	0.517	0.520	0.518	0.521
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets and roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:	Green & Sustainability Issues:
N	Valid	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	75
	Missing	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2
Mean		3.55	3.60	3.68	3.71	3.00	3.26	3.56	3.65	3.49	3.18
Std. Error of Mean		0.125	0.137	0.120	0.102	0.144	0.127	0.138	0.144	0.136	0.140
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		3	4	4	4	3	3	4	5	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.097	1.207	1.058	0.898	1.260	1.109	1.211	1.260	1.196	1.218
Skewness		-0.379	-0.690	-0.792	-0.705	0.077	-0.080	-0.515	-0.494	-0.434	-0.146
Std. Error of Skewness		0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.274	0.277
Kurtosis		-0.414	-0.337	0.461	0.982	-0.905	-0.481	-0.829	-0.916	-0.646	-0.977
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.541	0.541	0.541	0.541	0.542	0.542	0.541	0.542	0.541	0.547
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets and roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:	Green & Sustainability Issues:
N	Valid	8	8	7	8	8	7	8	7	8	8
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Mean		3.80	3.62	2.51	3.67	3.20	2.72	3.76	3.50	3.49	3.17
Std. Error of Mean		0.517	0.649	0.351	0.349	0.506	0.307	0.333	0.319	0.331	0.355
Median		4.00	4.72	2.53	3.00	3.72	2.66	3.28	3.03	3.00	3.00
Mode		5	5	2	3	4	2	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.447	1.816	0.950	0.975	1.414	0.831	0.932	0.863	0.925	0.993
Skewness		-1.202	-0.800	-0.002	0.868	-0.806	0.678	0.609	0.464	0.747	-1.557
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759	0.780	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		0.784	-1.540	0.003	-1.620	-0.265	-0.958	-1.774	0.584	0.111	3.274
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498	1.550	1.498	1.498
Range		4	4	3	2	4	2	2	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	3	1	2	3	2	2	1
Maximum		5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	4

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets and roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:	Green & Sustainability Issues:
N	Valid	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
	Missing	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean		4.47	4.11	3.95	3.89	4.26	4.16	3.89	3.06	4.05	2.58
Std. Error of Mean		0.277	0.371	0.516	0.553	0.526	0.562	0.602	0.698	0.592	0.809
Median		4.38	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.88	4.88	4.00	2.75	4.38	2.25
Mode		4	4	5	4	5	5	4	2	5	1
Std. Deviation		0.571	0.808	1.124	1.205	1.146	1.225	1.311	1.440	1.290	1.763
Skewness		0.195	-0.243	-0.812	-2.835	-1.753	-1.235	-2.137	0.986	-1.446	0.721
Std. Error of Skewness		0.984	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.984	0.934	0.934
Kurtosis		-5.116	-0.047	0.856	17.484	4.597	0.644	10.519	-1.366	1.938	-1.343
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.390	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.390	2.100	2.100
Range		1	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	4
Minimum		4	3	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:

			Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	1	1	2	3	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	25.0%	37.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	4	8	25	22	18	77
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.2%	10.4%	32.5%	28.6%	23.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	15	19	47	22	54	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.6%	12.1%	29.9%	14.0%	34.4%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	2	2	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	5	14	24	38	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.6%	6.0%	16.7%	28.6%	45.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	16	22	69	47	106	260
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.2%	8.5%	26.5%	18.1%	40.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	39	55	156	119	221	590
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.6%	9.3%	26.4%	20.2%	37.5%	100.0%

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency: (cont.)

Chi-Square Tests (cont.)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.544	20	0.048
Likelihood Ratio	33.421	20	0.030
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.501	1	0.011
N of Valid Cases	590		

a. 10 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Quality of drinking water:

		Quality of drinking water:					Total		
		1	2	3	4	5			
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	2	1	0	1	4	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	25.0%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	50.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	6	8	16	27	20	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.8%	10.4%	20.8%	35.1%	26.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	8	11	27	44	71	161	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.0%	6.8%	16.8%	27.3%	44.1%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	2	2	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	9	15	17	38	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.1%	10.6%	17.6%	20.0%	44.7%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	19	23	39	62	119	262	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.3%	8.8%	14.9%	23.7%	45.4%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	41	52	98	153	254	598
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.9%	8.7%	16.4%	25.6%	42.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.751	20	0.412
Likelihood Ratio	21.942	20	0.344
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.925	1	0.336
N of Valid Cases	598		

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Recreational opportunities:

			Recreational opportunities:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	3	3	1	0	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.5%	37.5%	37.5%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	4	21	31	17	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.2%	5.2%	27.3%	40.3%	22.1%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	4	12	55	58	31	160	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.5%	7.5%	34.4%	36.3%	19.4%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	1	2	2	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	3	28	24	29	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.2%	3.5%	32.9%	28.2%	34.1%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	5	34	75	92	58	264	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.9%	12.9%	28.4%	34.8%	22.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	15	57	183	208	137	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.5%	9.5%	30.5%	34.7%	22.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.899	20	0.021
Likelihood Ratio	32.922	20	0.034
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.564	1	0.453
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Condition of streets & roads:

			Condition of streets and roads:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	5	1	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	62.5%	12.5%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	2	3	23	36	13	77
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.6%	3.9%	29.9%	46.8%	16.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	4	10	47	53	48	162
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.5%	6.2%	29.0%	32.7%	29.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	0	0	3	1	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	10	14	30	29	85
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.4%	11.8%	16.5%	35.3%	34.1%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	12	25	67	86	74	264
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.5%	9.5%	25.4%	32.6%	28.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	21	48	156	209	167	600
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.5%	8.0%	26.0%	34.8%	27.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.651	20	0.047
Likelihood Ratio	32.053	20	0.043
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.182	1	0.670
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Availability of public transportation:

			Availability of public transportation:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	2	0	2	3	1	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	37.5%	12.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	10	17	24	13	12	76	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	13.2%	22.4%	31.6%	17.1%	15.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	19	26	39	30	44	158	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.0%	16.5%	24.7%	19.0%	27.8%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	1	1	3	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	8	18	32	19	83	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.2%	9.6%	21.7%	38.6%	22.9%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	25	44	54	82	55	260	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.6%	16.9%	20.8%	31.5%	21.2%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	62	96	138	161	134	591
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.5%	16.2%	23.4%	27.2%	22.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.884	20	0.045
Likelihood Ratio	33.449	20	0.030
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.503	1	0.061
N of Valid Cases	591		

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Housing affordability:

			Housing affordability:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	2	1	0	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	5	12	31	16	13	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.5%	15.6%	40.3%	20.8%	16.9%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	14	18	48	32	46	158	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.9%	11.4%	30.4%	20.3%	29.1%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	1	1	3	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	12	23	19	25	84	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.0%	14.3%	27.4%	22.6%	29.8%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	14	37	67	63	79	260	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.4%	14.2%	25.8%	24.2%	30.4%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	38	84	172	132	166	592
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.4%	14.2%	29.1%	22.3%	28.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.836	20	0.171
Likelihood Ratio	24.724	20	0.212
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.422	1	0.020
N of Valid Cases	592		

**Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Air quality:

			Air quality:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	4	1	2	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	57.1%	14.3%	28.6%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	15	11	28	19	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.2%	19.5%	14.3%	36.4%	24.7%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	10	14	29	52	57	162	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.2%	8.6%	17.9%	32.1%	35.2%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	0	1	2	2	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	5	24	23	33	86	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.2%	5.8%	27.9%	26.7%	38.4%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	10	26	45	64	118	263	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.8%	9.9%	17.1%	24.3%	44.9%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	26	60	114	170	231	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.3%	10.0%	19.0%	28.3%	38.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.471	20	0.008
Likelihood Ratio	36.781	20	0.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.812	1	0.009
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Availability of job opportunities:

			Availability of job opportunities:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	4	2	1	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	12.5%	50.0%	25.0%	12.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	13	15	18	26	76	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.3%	17.1%	19.7%	23.7%	34.2%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	17	23	30	28	59	157	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.8%	14.6%	19.1%	17.8%	37.6%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	1	1	1	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	8	7	11	20	39	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.4%	8.2%	12.9%	23.5%	45.9%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	18	42	40	43	116	259	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.9%	16.2%	15.4%	16.6%	44.8%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	47	88	101	112	242	590
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.0%	14.9%	17.1%	19.0%	41.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.842	20	0.249
Likelihood Ratio	23.586	20	0.261
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.521	1	0.112
N of Valid Cases	590		

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Managing growth:

			Managing growth:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	4	1	1	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	14.3%	57.1%	14.3%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	10	20	23	18	76
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.6%	13.2%	26.3%	30.3%	23.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	13	25	36	38	47	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.2%	15.7%	22.6%	23.9%	29.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	2	2	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	9	13	25	34	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.6%	10.7%	15.5%	29.8%	40.5%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	23	38	46	50	100	257
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.9%	14.8%	17.9%	19.5%	38.9%	100.0%
	Total	Count	44	84	119	139	202	588
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.5%	14.3%	20.2%	23.6%	34.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.340	20	0.155
Likelihood Ratio	27.408	20	0.124
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.367	1	0.124
N of Valid Cases	588		

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Now I'd like to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services: Green & Sustainability Issues:

			Green & sustainability issues:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	0	4	3	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.5%	0.0%	50.0%	37.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	7	18	17	22	11	75
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.3%	24.0%	22.7%	29.3%	14.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	13	23	42	37	41	156
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.3%	14.7%	26.9%	23.7%	26.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	1	1	1	1	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	8	30	10	31	83
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.8%	9.6%	36.1%	12.0%	37.3%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	36	22	67	60	71	256
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.1%	8.6%	26.2%	23.4%	27.7%	100.0%
	Total	Count	63	72	161	133	155	584
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.8%	12.3%	27.6%	22.8%	26.5%	100.0%


Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.133	20	0.001
Likelihood Ratio	45.962	20	0.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.609	1	0.205
N of Valid Cases	584		

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest positive impact on your quality of life?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Scenery/geography/climate	174	32.6	32.6
	Family/friends/friendly people	67	12.4	45.0
	Entertainment/social climate	90	16.9	61.9
	Quiet/peaceful	19	3.5	65.4
	Personal/family safety	5	0.9	66.3
	Job opportunities	67	12.5	78.8
	Education	15	2.7	81.5
	Green and sustainable issues	21	3.9	85.4
	Growth	4	0.7	86.1
	Low Taxes	21	3.8	90.0
	Nothing	54	10.0	100.0
	Total	535	100.0	
	DK/No answer	65		
Total	600			




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest negative impact on your quality of life?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Traffic Congestion	65	11.9	11.9
	Overcrowding/unplanned growth	52	9.4	21.3
	Cost of living/housing	32	5.9	27.1
	Road conditions	19	3.4	30.6
	Crime/violence/gangs	70	12.8	43.3
	Air quality	52	9.4	52.7
	Drought conditions	35	6.4	59.2
	Education	28	5.1	64.2
	Taxes	15	2.6	66.9
	A lack of government services	19	3.4	70.3
	Green and sustainable issues	15	2.8	73.1
	Gaming	20	3.5	76.7
	Illegal immigration	6	1.2	77.8
	Yucca Mountain	5	0.9	78.8
	Weather/heat	30	5.5	84.3
	Lack of jobs/unemployment	29	5.2	89.5
	Economy/recession	15	2.7	92.2
	Nothing	43	7.8	100.0
	Total	550	100.0	
	DK/No answer	50		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

In thinking about all of the issues we have talked about today, if you could make one major change locally to improve the quality of life in Clark County, what would it be?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	More affordable housing	30	5.4	5.4
	Less traffic congestion	64	11.5	16.9
	Improve K-12 education	73	13.1	30.0
	Improve higher education	7	1.2	31.2
	Better services for the homeless	15	2.7	33.9
	More efficient government/government officials	34	6.1	39.9
	Stop growth	24	4.3	44.2
	Slow growth	26	4.7	49.0
	Better jobs/training	72	12.9	61.9
	Increased access to health care	10	1.8	63.7
	Lower crime rates	59	10.6	74.4
	Stop Yucca Mountain	21	3.7	78.1
	Increase green and sustainable efforts	44	7.8	85.9
	More public parks	16	2.9	88.8
	Stop Illegal Immigration	7	1.2	90.0
	Improve economy	48	8.6	98.6
	No change	8	1.4	100.0
Total	559	100.0		
	DK/No answer	41		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

How would you rate local government's performance in providing parks and recreation facilities?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	128	21.6	21.6
	Good	269	45.2	66.8
	Fair	159	26.8	93.6
	Poor	38	6.4	100.0
	Total	594	100.0	
	DK/No answer	6		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

Overall would you say the quality of life in Clark County is getting better, worse, or staying the same?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Getting better	97	16.3	16.3
	Staying about the same	230	38.7	55.1
	Getting worse	267	44.9	100.0
	Total	594	100.0	
	DK/No answer	6		
Total		600		



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest positive impact on your quality of life?

			Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest POSITIVE impact on your quality of life?											
			Scenery/geography/climate	Family/friends/friendly people	Entertainment/social climate	Quiet/peaceful	Personal/family safety	Job opportunities	Education	Green and sustainable issues	Growth	Low Taxes	Nothing	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.7%	0.0%	33.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	30	8	8	1	1	11	1	2	1	3	4	70
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	42.9%	11.4%	11.4%	1.4%	1.4%	15.7%	1.4%	2.9%	1.4%	4.3%	5.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	49	13	24	8	2	21	4	5	0	10	12	148
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	33.1%	8.8%	16.2%	5.4%	1.4%	14.2%	2.7%	3.4%	0.0%	6.8%	8.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	###	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	20	12	20	5	2	5	2	4	0	1	5	76
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	26.3%	15.8%	26.3%	6.6%	2.6%	6.6%	2.6%	5.3%	0.0%	1.3%	6.6%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	73	33	36	3	1	28	8	10	3	6	32	233
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	31.3%	14.2%	15.5%	1.3%	0.4%	12.0%	3.4%	4.3%	1.3%	2.6%	13.7%	100.0%
	Total	Count	174	67	90	19	6	67	15	21	5	21	54	539
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	32.3%	12.4%	16.7%	3.5%	1.1%	12.4%	2.8%	3.9%	0.9%	3.9%	10.0%	100.0%

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest positive impact on your quality of life? (cont.)

Chi-Square Tests (cont.)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	74.018	50	0.015
Likelihood Ratio	64.053	50	0.087
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.781	1	0.377
N of Valid Cases	539		

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest negative impact on your quality of life?

			Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest NEGATIVE impact on your quality of life?								
			Traffic Congestion	Overcrowding/unplanned growth	Cost of living/housing	Road conditions	Crime/violence/gangs	Air quality	Drought conditions	Education	Taxes
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	10	8	0	2	7	9	12	0	1
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	13.7%	11.0%	0.0%	2.7%	9.6%	12.3%	16.4%	0.0%	1.4%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	18	17	10	6	27	10	8	6	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.0%	11.3%	6.7%	4.0%	18.0%	6.7%	5.3%	4.0%	6.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	12	5	5	3	10	5	4	5	0
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	15.0%	6.3%	6.3%	3.8%	12.5%	6.3%	5.0%	6.3%	0.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	25	20	15	7	25	28	12	17	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.4%	8.3%	6.2%	2.9%	10.4%	11.6%	5.0%	7.1%	1.2%
Total		Count	65	52	33	18	71	52	36	28	15
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.7%	9.3%	5.9%	3.2%	12.7%	9.3%	6.5%	5.0%	2.7%

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest negative impact on your quality of life?
(cont.)

			Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest NEGATIVE impact on your quality of life?								Total	
			A lack of government services	Green and sustainable issues	Gaming	Illegal immigration	Yucca Mountain	Weather/heat	Lack of jobs/unemployment	Economy/recession		Nothing
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	3	4	1	2	2	1	1	9	73
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.4%	4.1%	5.5%	1.4%	2.7%	2.7%	1.4%	1.4%	12.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	2	2	5	1	2	4	9	4	10	150
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.3%	1.3%	3.3%	0.7%	1.3%	2.7%	6.0%	2.7%	6.7%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	2	3	2	1	6	5	4	3	80
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.3%	2.5%	3.8%	2.5%	1.3%	7.5%	6.3%	5.0%	3.8%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	9	9	3	1	18	13	6	19	241
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.6%	3.7%	3.7%	1.2%	0.4%	7.5%	5.4%	2.5%	7.9%	100.0%
	Total	Count	19	16	21	7	6	31	29	15	43	557
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.4%	2.9%	3.8%	1.3%	1.1%	5.6%	5.2%	2.7%	7.7%	100.0%

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest negative impact on your quality of life? (cont.)

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	114.118	85	0.019
Likelihood Ratio	110.847	85	0.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.081	1	0.149
N of Valid Cases	557		

Appendix III

Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * In thinking about all of the issues we have talked about today, if you could make one major change locally to improve the quality of life in Clark County, what would it be?

			In thinking about all of the issues we have talked about today, if you could make one major change locally to improve the quality of life in Clark County, what would it be?																	
			More affordable housing	Less traffic congestion	Improve K-12 education	Improve higher education	Better services for the homeless	More efficient government/government officials	Stop growth	Slow growth	Better jobs/training	Increased access to health care	Lower crime rates	Stop Yucca Mountain	Increase green and sustainable efforts	More public parks	Stop Illegal Immigration	Improve economy	No change	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	3	11	10	1	0	3	4	3	5	3	8	3	7	2	1	5	2	71
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.2%	15.5%	14.1%	1.4%	0.0%	4.2%	5.6%	4.2%	7.0%	4.2%	11.3%	4.2%	9.9%	2.8%	1.4%	7.0%	2.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	5	19	12	0	4	15	8	12	23	1	27	7	10	6	1	5	1	156
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.2%	12.2%	7.7%	0.0%	2.6%	9.6%	5.1%	7.7%	14.7%	0.6%	17.3%	4.5%	6.4%	3.8%	0.6%	3.2%	0.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	8	9	0	3	1	2	4	11	1	7	6	6	1	0	16	2	83
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.2%	9.6%	10.8%	0.0%	3.6%	1.2%	2.4%	4.8%	13.3%	1.2%	8.4%	7.2%	7.2%	1.2%	0.0%	19.3%	2.4%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	16	26	40	6	7	14	10	8	31	5	16	5	19	8	5	22	4	242
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.6%	10.7%	16.5%	2.5%	2.9%	5.8%	4.1%	3.3%	12.8%	2.1%	6.6%	2.1%	7.9%	3.3%	2.1%	9.1%	1.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	30	65	73	7	14	34	24	27	73	11	60	21	44	17	7	49	10	566
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.3%	11.5%	12.9%	1.2%	2.5%	6.0%	4.2%	4.8%	12.9%	1.9%	10.6%	3.7%	7.8%	3.0%	1.2%	8.7%	1.8%	100.0%

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * In thinking about all of the issues we have talked about today, if you could make one major change locally to improve the quality of life in Clark County, what would it be?

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	102.096	80	0.049
Likelihood Ratio	104.825	80	0.033
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.100	1	0.752
N of Valid Cases	566		

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Overall would you say the quality of life in Clark County is getting better, worse, or staying the same?

			Getting better	Staying about the same	Getting worse	DK/No answer	Total	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	4	0	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	14	36	27	0	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	18.2%	46.8%	35.1%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	27	56	77	2	162	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.7%	34.6%	47.5%	1.2%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	3	1	0	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	12	33	39	1	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.1%	38.8%	45.9%	1.2%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	43	98	119	4	264	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.3%	37.1%	45.1%	1.5%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	97	230	267	7	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.1%	38.3%	44.4%	1.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.811	15	0.887
Likelihood Ratio	11.214	15	0.737
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.008	1	0.315
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

How would you rate local government's performance in providing parks and recreation facilities?

			How would you rate local government's performance in providing parks and recreational facilities?				Total
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	6	1	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.5%	75.0%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	26	34	11	4	75
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	34.7%	45.3%	14.7%	5.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	35	65	50	10	160
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	21.9%	40.6%	31.3%	6.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	1	1	1	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	14	43	20	7	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.7%	51.2%	23.8%	8.3%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	49	119	77	17	262
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	18.7%	45.4%	29.4%	6.5%	100.0%
	Total	Count	127	268	160	39	594
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	21.4%	45.1%	26.9%	6.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.154	15	0.104
Likelihood Ratio	22.037	15	0.107
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.708	1	0.030
N of Valid Cases	594		

Appendix IV
General Economic Considerations


Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions Ratings
Summary Statistics

		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	600	596	591	590	594
	Missing	1	4	9	10	6
Mean		2.38	1.76	3.03	1.77	1.12
Std. Error of Mean		0.025	0.029	0.032	0.028	0.013
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.613	0.702	0.774	0.690	0.320
Skewness		-0.447	0.377	-0.285	0.336	2.406
Std. Error of Skewness		0.100	0.100	0.100	0.101	0.100
Kurtosis		-0.654	-0.934	-0.665	-0.890	3.802
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.199	0.200	0.201	0.201	0.200
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

Appendix IV General Economic Conditions

We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse of financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Better	42	7.0
	About the same	288	48.0
	Worse	270	45.0
	Total	600	100.0




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IV General Economic Conditions

Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Better	236	39.7
	About the same	268	44.9
	Worse	92	15.4
	Total	596	100.0
	DK/No answer	4	
Total		600	




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IV General Economic Conditions

Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Excellent	11	1.9
	Good	136	23.1
	Fair	271	45.8
	Poor	173	29.3
	Total	591	100.0
	DK/No answer	9	
Total		600	




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IV General Economic Conditions

And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Better	223	37.9
	About the same	279	47.2
	Worse	88	14.9
	Total	590	100.0
	DK/No answer	10	
Total		600	




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IV General Economic Conditions

Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
	Good time	525	88.4
	Bad time	69	11.6
	Total	594	100.0
	DK/No answer	6	
Total		600	



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

Unincorporated Clark County		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	263	262	258	258	260
	Missing	1	2	6	5	3
Mean		2.37	1.76	3.02	1.78	1.14
Std. Error of Mean		0.037	0.044	0.051	0.044	0.021
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.598	0.714	0.819	0.710	0.345
Skewness		-0.372	0.394	-0.389	0.342	2.122
Std. Error of Skewness		0.150	0.150	0.152	0.152	0.151
Kurtosis		-0.671	-0.976	-0.601	-0.976	2.521
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.299	0.300	0.302	0.302	0.301
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

City of Las Vegas		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	162	159	161	159	160
	Missing	0	2	1	2	1
Mean		2.44	1.75	3.09	1.80	1.12
Std. Error of Mean		0.050	0.058	0.060	0.053	0.026
Median		3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.633	0.727	0.758	0.668	0.328
Skewness		-0.693	0.417	-0.196	0.254	2.333
Std. Error of Skewness		0.191	0.192	0.191	0.192	0.192
Kurtosis		-0.497	-1.014	-1.099	-0.776	3.484
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.379	0.382	0.381	0.382	0.381
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

City of North Las Vegas		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	85	85	84	85	85
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0
Mean		2.34	1.70	2.92	1.68	1.07
Std. Error of Mean		0.064	0.065	0.076	0.069	0.028
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.587	0.601	0.699	0.638	0.259
Skewness		-0.237	0.230	-0.270	0.389	3.389
Std. Error of Skewness		0.261	0.261	0.263	0.261	0.261
Kurtosis		-0.638	-0.577	0.048	-0.659	9.714
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.517	0.517	0.519	0.517	0.517
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

City of Henderson		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	77	77	77	76	76
	Missing	0	0	0	1	1
Mean		2.31	1.84	3.00	1.81	1.07
Std. Error of Mean		0.076	0.083	0.083	0.084	0.030
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.666	0.732	0.733	0.736	0.262
Skewness		-0.452	0.261	-0.096	0.311	3.347
Std. Error of Skewness		0.274	0.274	0.274	0.275	0.275
Kurtosis		-0.727	-1.080	-0.815	-1.083	9.449
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.541	0.541	0.541	0.544	0.544
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

City of Boulder City		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	8	8	8	7	8
	Missing	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		2.47	1.83	3.00	1.56	1.12
Std. Error of Mean		0.191	0.236	0.232	0.197	0.125
Median		2.28	2.00	3.00	1.97	1.00
Mode		2	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.535	0.660	0.650	0.534	0.348
Skewness		0.141	0.151	0.000	-0.331	2.931
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.759
Kurtosis		-2.803	0.405	0.848	-2.772	8.869
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.498
Range		1	2	2	1	1
Minimum		2	1	2	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	2	2

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

City of Mesquite		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	5	5	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	1	1	1
Mean		2.21	1.53	3.60	1.27	1.24
Std. Error of Mean		0.211	0.258	0.429	0.267	0.235
Median		2.00	1.63	4.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.459	0.562	0.831	0.516	0.485
Skewness		2.179	-0.162	-2.687	1.936	2.062
Std. Error of Skewness		0.934	0.934	1.050	1.050	0.984
Kurtosis		4.750	-4.236			4.250
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.100	2.100			2.390
Range		1	1	2	1	1
Minimum		2	1	2	1	1
Maximum		3	2	4	2	2

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation**

Respondent Jurisdiction: * We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse of financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?

			We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?			Total	
			Better	About the same	Worse		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	4	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	9	36	33	78	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.5%	46.2%	42.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	66	84	162	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.4%	40.7%	51.9%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	4	1	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	46	34	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.9%	54.1%	40.0%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	16	132	115	263	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.1%	50.2%	43.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	42	288	271	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.0%	47.9%	45.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.669	10	0.384
Likelihood Ratio	11.228	10	0.340
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.096	1	0.757
N of Valid Cases	600		

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation**

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?

			Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?			Total
			Better	About the same	Worse	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	2	5	1	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	25.0%	62.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	28	34	15	77
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	36.4%	44.2%	19.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	66	66	27	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	41.5%	41.5%	17.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	3	0	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	32	47	6	85
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	37.6%	55.3%	7.1%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	106	113	42	261
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	40.6%	43.3%	16.1%	100.0%
	Total	Count	236	268	91	595
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	39.7%	45.0%	15.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.194	10	0.424
Likelihood Ratio	11.698	10	0.306
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.538	1	0.463
N of Valid Cases	595		

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation**

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?

			Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?				Total	
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	5	1	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	1	19	38	20	78	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.3%	24.4%	48.7%	25.6%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	1	38	69	53	161	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.6%	23.6%	42.9%	32.9%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	1	3	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	19	48	15	84	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.4%	22.6%	57.1%	17.9%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	8	59	110	81	258	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.1%	22.9%	42.6%	31.4%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	12	137	271	173	593
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.0%	23.1%	45.7%	29.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.400	15	0.356
Likelihood Ratio	17.280	15	0.302
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.163	1	0.686
N of Valid Cases	593		

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation**

Respondent Jurisdiction: * And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?

			And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?			Total	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	3	4	0	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	29	33	15	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	37.7%	42.9%	19.5%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	55	82	23	160	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	34.4%	51.3%	14.4%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	1	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	35	42	8	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	41.2%	49.4%	9.4%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	99	116	43	258	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	38.4%	45.0%	16.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	224	278	89	591
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	37.9%	47.0%	15.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.021	10	0.530
Likelihood Ratio	10.611	10	0.389
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.117	1	0.733
N of Valid Cases	591		

**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation**

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?

		Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?		Total		
		Good time	Bad time			
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	7	1	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	71	6	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	92.2%	7.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	141	20	161	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	87.6%	12.4%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	1	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	79	6	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	224	36	260	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	86.2%	13.8%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	525	70	595
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.815	5	0.439
Likelihood Ratio	5.026	5	0.413
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.852	1	0.356
N of Valid Cases	595		

Appendix V
Property Value Considerations

**Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
(Summary Statistics)**


“Now I am going to read you a list of things that may or may not affect the value of residential (homes) property in Clark County. For each item please tell me whether you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes.”

		Amusement Park:	Public Park:	Day care center:	Landfill:	Non-polluting manufacturing facility:	Public school:	Highway/Freeway:	Hotel-casino:	Polluting manufacturing facility:	High level nuclear waste transportation route:
N	Valid	587	594	587	596	588	596	591	587	595	590
	Missing	13	6	13	4	12	4	9	13	5	10
Mean		1.97	2.69	2.30	1.15	1.74	2.63	2.00	1.85	1.16	1.24
Std. Error of Mean		0.034	0.025	0.028	0.018	0.033	0.025	0.036	0.034	0.020	0.022
Median		2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		1	3	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.835	0.604	0.685	0.439	0.789	0.622	0.882	0.817	0.497	0.526
Skewness		0.061	-1.778	-0.467	3.098	0.500	-1.479	0.003	0.275	3.112	2.100
Std. Error of Skewness		0.101	0.100	0.101	0.100	0.101	0.100	0.100	0.101	0.100	0.101
Kurtosis		-1.562	1.939	-0.828	8.965	-1.224	1.005	-1.716	-1.450	8.295	3.489
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.201	0.200	0.201	0.200	0.201	0.200	0.201	0.201	0.200	0.201
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix V Property Value Conditions

“Now I am going to read you a list of things that may or may not affect the value of residential (homes) property in Clark County. For each item please tell me whether you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes.”

	Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	DK/No answer	Total
Amusement Park	44.7	24.9	29.2	1.2	100
Day care center	9	44.5	44.8	1.7	100
Landfill	89.4	4.6	3.6	2.4	100
Non-polluting manufacturing facility	57.6	24.4	15.7	2.3	100
Public school	8.4	26.2	64.3	1.1	100
Highway/Freeway	41.1	20.7	35.9	2.3	100
Hotel-casino	46.5	25.7	25.9	1.9	100
Polluting manufacturing facility	93.7	1.4	3.6	1.3	100
High-level nuclear waste transportation route	87.4	9	2.6	1	100



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Amusement Park:	Public Park:	Day care center:	Landfill:	Non-polluting manufacturing facility:	Public school:	Highway/Freeway:	Hotel-casino:	Polluting manufacturing facility:	High level nuclear waste transportation route:
N	Valid	260	262	259	262	258	262	261	258	262	260
	Missing	4	1	5	1	5	1	2	6	2	4
Mean		2.07	2.65	2.33	1.18	1.78	2.64	2.02	1.86	1.21	1.25
Std. Error of Mean		0.052	0.038	0.040	0.028	0.049	0.037	0.054	0.051	0.035	0.034
Median		2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		3	3	2	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.831	0.613	0.637	0.453	0.787	0.602	0.877	0.822	0.567	0.548
Skewness		-0.139	-1.559	-0.409	2.639	0.419	-1.470	-0.031	0.255	2.572	2.091
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.150	0.151	0.150	0.152	0.150	0.151	0.152	0.150	0.151
Kurtosis		-1.539	1.269	-0.682	6.408	-1.267	1.075	-1.703	-1.474	5.101	3.352
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.301	0.300	0.302	0.300	0.302	0.300	0.300	0.302	0.300	0.301
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Amusement Park:	Public Park:	Day care center:	Landfill:	Non-polluting manufacturing facility:	Public school:	Highway/Freeway:	Hotel-casino:	Polluting manufacturing facility:	High level nuclear waste transportation route:
N	Valid	156	159	156	160	157	160	159	156	158	158
	Missing	6	3	6	2	4	2	2	6	3	4
Mean		1.73	2.65	2.23	1.16	1.70	2.54	2.06	1.85	1.16	1.29
Std. Error of Mean		0.067	0.053	0.061	0.038	0.064	0.053	0.071	0.067	0.041	0.047
Median		1.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		1	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.831	0.669	0.766	0.484	0.803	0.676	0.898	0.839	0.520	0.585
Skewness		0.537	-1.697	-0.423	3.072	0.605	-1.150	-0.122	0.291	3.072	1.866
Std. Error of Skewness		0.194	0.193	0.194	0.192	0.193	0.192	0.192	0.194	0.193	0.193
Kurtosis		-1.346	1.389	-1.179	8.393	-1.188	0.062	-1.758	-1.522	7.923	2.369
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.386	0.383	0.386	0.382	0.384	0.382	0.382	0.386	0.383	0.384
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Amusement Park:	Public Park:	Day care center:	Landfill:	Non-polluting manufacturing facility:	Public school:	Highway/ Freeway:	Hotel-casino:	Polluting manufacturing facility:	High level nuclear waste transportation route:
N	Valid	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	85	84
	Missing	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
Mean		2.08	2.88	2.35	1.02	1.67	2.78	1.87	1.84	1.02	1.16
Std. Error of Mean		0.089	0.045	0.073	0.023	0.086	0.056	0.093	0.092	0.023	0.044
Median		2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		3	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.817	0.408	0.669	0.212	0.790	0.516	0.851	0.845	0.211	0.400
Skewness		-0.153	-3.516	-0.549	9.464	0.661	-2.326	0.264	0.306	9.492	2.404
Std. Error of Skewness		0.263	0.263	0.263	0.263	0.263	0.263	0.263	0.263	0.262	0.263
Kurtosis		-1.486	12.240	-0.693	89.705	-1.081	4.629	-1.577	-1.538	90.237	5.303
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.520	0.520	0.521	0.520	0.520	0.520	0.521	0.520	0.518	0.521
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Amusement Park:	Public Park:	Day care center:	Landfill:	Non-polluting manufacturing facility:	Public school:	Highway/Freeway:	Hotel-casino:	Polluting manufacturing facility:	High level nuclear waste transportation route:
N	Valid	75	77	76	77	76	77	75	77	77	76
	Missing	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	1
Mean		1.96	2.71	2.35	1.08	1.72	2.64	1.93	1.79	1.10	1.18
Std. Error of Mean		0.095	0.066	0.080	0.036	0.086	0.077	0.105	0.081	0.041	0.046
Median		2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		1	3	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.825	0.584	0.697	0.319	0.752	0.675	0.907	0.712	0.361	0.400
Skewness		0.068	-1.875	-0.599	4.310	0.508	-1.636	0.144	0.331	3.820	2.054
Std. Error of Skewness		0.278	0.274	0.275	0.274	0.275	0.274	0.278	0.274	0.274	0.275
Kurtosis		-1.530	2.473	-0.759	19.835	-1.057	1.242	-1.793	-0.961	15.135	3.240
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.549	0.541	0.544	0.542	0.544	0.542	0.549	0.542	0.541	0.544
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		Amusement Park:	Public Park:	Day care center:	Landfill:	Non-polluting manufacturing facility:	Public school:	Highway/ Freeway:	Hotel-casino:	Polluting manufacturing facility:	High level nuclear waste transportation route:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.94	2.53	1.78	1.75	2.12	2.69	2.02	1.99	1.36	1.49
Std. Error of Mean		0.094	0.191	0.160	0.305	0.368	0.177	0.295	0.370	0.263	0.268
Median		2.00	2.72	2.00	1.72	2.72	3.00	2.00	2.22	1.00	1.00
Mode		2	3	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.262	0.535	0.446	0.853	1.028	0.496	0.824	1.036	0.735	0.750
Skewness		-4.473	-0.141	-1.663	0.594	-0.303	-1.018	-0.036	0.019	2.040	1.369
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		24.420	-2.803	0.937	-1.268	-2.554	-1.418	-1.350	-2.683	3.737	1.095
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		Amusement Park:	Public Park:	Day care center:	Landfill:	Non-polluting manufacturing facility:	Public school:	Highway/ Freeway:	Hotel-casino:	Polluting manufacturing facility:	High level nuclear waste transportation route:
N	Valid	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.95	2.58	2.35	1.42	1.79	2.68	2.37	2.37	1.00	1.11
Std. Error of Mean		0.458	0.348	0.265	0.348	0.317	0.240	0.418	0.344	0.000	0.158
Median		1.88	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.88	2.38	1.00	1.00
Mode		1	3	2	1	2	3	3	3	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.998	0.759	0.546	0.759	0.691	0.523	0.910	0.749	0.000	0.345
Skewness		0.158	-2.026	1.017	2.026	0.244	-1.216	-1.173	-0.892		3.948
Std. Error of Skewness		0.934	0.934	0.984	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934	0.934
Kurtosis		-3.036	6.418	-2.902	6.418	2.278	-1.471	-0.020	1.549		25.365
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.100	2.100	2.390	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100	2.100
Range		2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	0	1
Minimum		1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	2

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction: * For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Amusement Park

			Amusement Park:			Total	
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No affect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	7	0	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.5%	87.5%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	27	24	24	75	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	36.0%	32.0%	32.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	80	38	38	156	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	51.3%	24.4%	24.4%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	1	2	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	25	28	31	84	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	29.8%	33.3%	36.9%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	80	80	100	260	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	30.8%	30.8%	38.5%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	215	178	195	588
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	36.6%	30.3%	33.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.924	10	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	33.627	10	0.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.635	1	0.001
N of Valid Cases	588		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction: * For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Public Park

			Public Park:			Total
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No affect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	13	60	78
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.4%	16.7%	76.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	17	20	121	158
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.8%	12.7%	76.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	1	3	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	6	76	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.4%	7.1%	90.5%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	19	53	190	262
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.3%	20.2%	72.5%	100.0%
Total	Count		44	97	454	595
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction:		7.4%	16.3%	76.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.366	10	0.007
Likelihood Ratio	24.442	10	0.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.028	1	0.868
N of Valid Cases	595		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction: * For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Day care center

			Day care center:			Total
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No affect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	2	6	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	10	30	36	76
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	13.2%	39.5%	47.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	32	57	68	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.4%	36.3%	43.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	3	2	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	9	36	38	83
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.8%	43.4%	45.8%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	24	127	108	259
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.3%	49.0%	41.7%	100.0%
Total	Count		77	259	252	588
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction:		13.1%	44.0%	42.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.158	10	0.020
Likelihood Ratio	24.226	10	0.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.721	1	0.190
N of Valid Cases	588		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction: * For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Landfill

			Landfill:			Total	
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No affect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	4	2	2	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	72	4	1	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	93.5%	5.2%	1.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	142	10	8	160	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	88.8%	6.3%	5.0%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	1	1	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	83	0	1	84	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	98.8%	0.0%	1.2%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	224	30	8	262	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	85.5%	11.5%	3.1%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	528	47	21	596
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	88.6%	7.9%	3.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.146	10	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	34.884	10	0.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.018	1	0.895
N of Valid Cases	596		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction: * For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Non-polluting manufacturing facility

			Non-polluting manufacturing facility:			Total
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No affect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	3	1	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	37.5%	12.5%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	35	28	14	77
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	45.5%	36.4%	18.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	81	42	34	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	51.6%	26.8%	21.7%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	3	1	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	44	23	17	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	52.4%	27.4%	20.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	115	86	57	258
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	44.6%	33.3%	22.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		280	183	127	590
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction:		47.5%	31.0%	21.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.531	10	0.483
Likelihood Ratio	8.919	10	0.540
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.144	1	0.705
N of Valid Cases	590		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction: * For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Public school

			Public school:			Total	
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No affect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	2	5	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	8	11	57	76	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.5%	14.5%	75.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	16	41	102	159	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.1%	25.8%	64.2%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	3	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	11	69	84	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.8%	13.1%	82.1%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	17	60	185	262	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.5%	22.9%	70.6%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	45	127	421	593
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.6%	21.4%	71.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.229	10	0.163
Likelihood Ratio	15.438	10	0.117
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.240	1	0.266
N of Valid Cases	593		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction: * For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Highway/freeway

			Highway/freeway:			Total	
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No affect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	2	3	2	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	33	14	28	75	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	44.0%	18.7%	37.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	59	31	69	159	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	37.1%	19.5%	43.4%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	1	3	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	36	22	25	83	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	43.4%	26.5%	30.1%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	98	61	102	261	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	37.5%	23.4%	39.1%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	229	132	229	590
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	38.8%	22.4%	38.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.251	10	0.604
Likelihood Ratio	8.113	10	0.618
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.008	1	0.930
N of Valid Cases	590		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction: * For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Hotel-casino

			Hotel-casino:			Total
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No affect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	4	1	4	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	44.4%	11.1%	44.4%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	29	35	13	77
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	37.7%	45.5%	16.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	68	43	45	156
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	43.6%	27.6%	28.8%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	2	2	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	37	23	24	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	44.0%	27.4%	28.6%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	106	80	72	258
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	41.1%	31.0%	27.9%	100.0%
Total	Count		245	184	160	589
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction:		41.6%	31.2%	27.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.066	10	0.220
Likelihood Ratio	13.276	10	0.209
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.139	1	0.710
N of Valid Cases	589		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction: * For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Polluting manufacturing facility

			Polluting manufacturing facility:			Total	
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No affect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	6	1	1	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	75.0%	12.5%	12.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	71	5	1	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	92.2%	6.5%	1.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	143	5	10	158	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	90.5%	3.2%	6.3%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	5	0	0	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	84	0	1	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	98.8%	0.0%	1.2%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	227	14	20	261	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	87.0%	5.4%	7.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	536	25	33	594
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	90.2%	4.2%	5.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.256	10	0.069
Likelihood Ratio	22.823	10	0.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.127	1	0.288
N of Valid Cases	594		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction: * For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: High level nuclear waste transportation route

			High level nuclear waste transportation route:			Total
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No affect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	5	2	1	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	62.5%	25.0%	12.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	63	12	1	76
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	82.9%	15.8%	1.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	122	25	10	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	77.7%	15.9%	6.4%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	4	1	0	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	71	12	1	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	84.5%	14.3%	1.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	208	37	14	259
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	80.3%	14.3%	5.4%	100.0%
Total	Count		473	89	27	589
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction:		80.3%	15.1%	4.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.218	10	0.608
Likelihood Ratio	9.479	10	0.487
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.094	1	0.759
N of Valid Cases	589		

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations


Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics

		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	594	600	588	600
	Missing	6	0	12	0
Mean		2.52	1.60	2.79	2.83
Std. Error of Mean		0.036	0.032	0.040	0.032
Median		2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.866	0.774	0.972	0.783
Skewness		0.062	1.406	-0.249	-0.156
Std. Error of Skewness		0.100	0.100	0.101	0.100
Kurtosis		-0.670	1.882	-0.989	-0.520
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.200	0.199	0.201	0.199
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings

How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	66	11.0	11.0
	Good	235	39.5	50.6
	Fair	211	35.5	86.0
	Poor	83	14.0	100.0
	Total	594	100.0	
	DK/No answer	6		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VI Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings

Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very concerned	318	53.1	53.1
	Somewhat concerned	228	38.0	91.1
	Somewhat unconcerned	26	4.4	95.5
	Not concerned	27	4.5	100.0
	Total	600	100.0	




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VI Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings

In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	61	10.3	10.3
	Good	169	28.8	39.1
	Fair	190	32.3	71.5
	Poor	168	28.5	100.0
	Total	588	100.0	
	DK/No answer	12		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VI Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings

In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	22	3.7	3.7
	Good	177	29.5	33.2
	Fair	282	47.0	80.2
	Poor	119	19.8	100.0
	Total	600	100.0	



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	261	263	256	263
	Missing	2	0	7	0
Mean		2.53	1.62	2.88	2.85
Std. Error of Mean		0.053	0.049	0.060	0.050
Median		2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.859	0.800	0.960	0.810
Skewness		0.102	1.432	-0.370	-0.206
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.150	0.152	0.150
Kurtosis		-0.650	1.876	-0.902	-0.571
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.300	0.299	0.303	0.299
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	161	162	161	162
	Missing	1	0	1	0
Mean		2.62	1.60	2.62	2.87
Std. Error of Mean		0.074	0.058	0.080	0.063
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.934	0.734	1.020	0.799
Skewness		-0.044	1.419	-0.119	-0.223
Std. Error of Skewness		0.191	0.191	0.191	0.191
Kurtosis		-0.885	2.425	-1.098	-0.517
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.381	0.379	0.381	0.379
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	85	85	85	85
	Missing	1	0	0	0
Mean		2.54	1.57	2.93	2.85
Std. Error of Mean		0.089	0.076	0.100	0.070
Median		2.84	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		0.821	0.705	0.920	0.643
Skewness		0.071	0.929	-0.313	-0.110
Std. Error of Skewness		0.262	0.261	0.261	0.261
Kurtosis		-0.493	0.018	-0.943	0.003
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.518	0.517	0.517	0.517
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	76	77	73	77
	Missing	1	0	4	0
Mean		2.31	1.57	2.72	2.67
Std. Error of Mean		0.089	0.096	0.104	0.091
Median		2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	2	2
Std. Deviation		0.780	0.848	0.892	0.801
Skewness		-0.071	1.675	0.063	0.214
Std. Error of Skewness		0.275	0.274	0.281	0.274
Kurtosis		-0.530	2.379	-0.945	-0.696
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.544	0.541	0.555	0.541
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.47	1.53	2.58	2.63
Std. Error of Mean		0.191	0.268	0.370	0.263
Median		2.28	1.00	2.28	3.00
Mode		2	1	2	3
Std. Deviation		0.535	0.749	1.034	0.736
Skewness		0.141	1.195	0.165	-1.993
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		-2.803	0.612	-0.743	3.518
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		1	2	3	2
Minimum		2	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	4	5	5	5
	Missing	1	0	0	0
Mean		1.80	2.00	2.47	2.89
Std. Error of Mean		0.502	0.410	0.613	0.371
Median		1.63	2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		1	2	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.972	0.894	1.335	0.808
Skewness		0.712	1.931	-0.339	0.243
Std. Error of Skewness		1.050	0.934	0.934	0.934
Range		2	3	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1	2
Maximum		3	4	4	4
Kurtosis			12.516	-2.176	-0.047
Std. Error of Kurtosis			2.100	2.100	2.100

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?

			How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?				Total
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	4	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	12	32	29	3	76
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	15.8%	42.1%	38.2%	3.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	19	56	54	32	161
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.8%	34.8%	33.5%	19.9%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	1	1	0	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	7	35	32	10	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.3%	41.7%	38.1%	11.9%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	26	107	91	37	261
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.0%	41.0%	34.9%	14.2%	100.0%
	Total	Count	66	235	211	82	594
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.1%	39.6%	35.5%	13.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.173	15	0.081
Likelihood Ratio	24.690	15	0.054
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.588	1	0.443
N of Valid Cases	594		

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?

			Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?				Total
			Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Somewhat unconcerned	Not concerned	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	5	2	1	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	62.5%	25.0%	12.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	46	24	2	5	77
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	59.7%	31.2%	2.6%	6.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	82	69	4	7	162
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	50.6%	42.6%	2.5%	4.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	3	0	1	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	60.0%	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	46	29	9	1	85
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	54.1%	34.1%	10.6%	1.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	139	100	10	14	263
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	52.9%	38.0%	3.8%	5.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	319	227	26	28	600
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	53.2%	37.8%	4.3%	4.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.267	15	0.101
Likelihood Ratio	20.576	15	0.151
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.209	1	0.648
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?

			In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?				Total	
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	3	2	2	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.5%	37.5%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	29	23	17	73	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.5%	39.7%	31.5%	23.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	26	47	50	38	161	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.1%	29.2%	31.1%	23.6%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	0	2	1	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	40.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	24	28	28	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.9%	28.2%	32.9%	32.9%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	23	67	85	82	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.9%	26.1%	33.1%	31.9%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	61	170	190	168	589
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.4%	28.9%	32.3%	28.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.869	15	0.087
Likelihood Ratio	22.200	15	0.103
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.758	1	0.009
N of Valid Cases	589		

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?

			In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?				Total	
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	1	6	0	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.5%	12.5%	75.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	33	29	13	78	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.8%	42.3%	37.2%	16.7%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	6	45	75	36	162	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.7%	27.8%	46.3%	22.2%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	2	1	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	22	51	11	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.2%	25.9%	60.0%	12.9%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	75	119	58	263	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.2%	28.5%	45.2%	22.1%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	22	178	282	119	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.7%	29.6%	46.9%	19.8%	100.0%


Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.822	15	0.143
Likelihood Ratio	22.088	15	0.106
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.439	1	0.230
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix VI Environmental Considerations Perception Ratings

In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Water quality	74	12.9	12.9
	Water availability	188	32.8	45.6
	Air quality	88	15.3	60.9
	Preservation of natural areas/wildlife	17	3.0	63.9
	Development of parks, trails, and open space acreage	15	2.6	66.5
	Overpopulation	94	16.3	82.8
	Litter	17	2.9	85.8
	Energy use	36	6.2	92.0
	Green and sustainable issues	26	4.5	96.5
	Yucca Mountain	8	1.5	97.9
	Traffic Congestion	12	2.1	100.0
	Total	573	100.0	
DK/No answer		27		
Total		600		



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Perception Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?

			In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?										Total	
			Water quality	Water availability	Air quality	Preservation of natural areas/wildlife	Development of parks, trails, and open space acreage	Overpopulation	Litter	Energy use	Green and sustainable issues	Yucca Mountain		Traffic Congestion
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	25.0%	62.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	4	32	14	2	1	13	0	3	0	2	2	73
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.5%	43.8%	19.2%	2.7%	1.4%	17.8%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	13	52	29	5	3	27	5	9	3	1	4	151
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.6%	34.4%	19.2%	3.3%	2.0%	17.9%	3.3%	6.0%	2.0%	0.7%	2.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	33.3%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	8	22	11	5	1	16	2	5	11	1	0	82
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.8%	26.8%	13.4%	6.1%	1.2%	19.5%	2.4%	6.1%	13.4%	1.2%	0.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	44	76	34	4	9	37	10	19	11	5	5	254
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	17.3%	29.9%	13.4%	1.6%	3.5%	14.6%	3.9%	7.5%	4.3%	2.0%	2.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	73	188	88	17	15	94	18	36	25	9	11	574
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.7%	32.8%	15.3%	3.0%	2.6%	16.4%	3.1%	6.3%	4.4%	1.6%	1.9%	100.0%

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Perception Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

**Respondent Jurisdiction * In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County? (cont.) **

Chi-Square Tests (cont.)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	77.049	50	0.008
Likelihood Ratio	77.618	50	0.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.894	1	0.169
N of Valid Cases	574		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Summary Statistics**


Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high.

		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, volcanology, geology, and hydrology:	Identify public safety needs and impacts:	Assess other government impacts:	Assess impacts on the tourism sector:	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:	Identify transportation impacts:	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:
N	Valid	580	587	573	587	571	578	579	585	588
	Missing	20	13	27	13	29	22	21	15	12
Mean		3.95	3.93	3.82	3.99	3.58	3.69	3.59	3.64	3.83
Std. Error of Mean		0.055	0.057	0.057	0.052	0.051	0.055	0.051	0.053	0.058
Median		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.314	1.374	1.353	1.254	1.229	1.326	1.238	1.281	1.407
Skewness		-0.996	-1.022	-0.879	-1.089	-0.529	-0.687	-0.545	-0.617	-0.857
Std. Error of Skewness		0.101	0.101	0.102	0.101	0.102	0.102	0.101	0.101	0.101
Kurtosis		-0.232	-0.323	-0.465	0.118	-0.595	-0.709	-0.641	-0.605	-0.672
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.203	0.201	0.204	0.201	0.204	0.203	0.203	0.202	0.201
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high: Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	49	8.5	8.5
	2	41	7.0	15.5
	3	98	16.9	32.4
	4	95	16.3	48.7
	5	298	51.3	100.0
	Total	580	100.0	
	DK/No answer	20		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high: Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	60	10.2	10.2
	2	49	8.3	18.5
	3	68	11.6	30.1
	4	104	17.7	47.8
	5	306	52.2	100.0
	Total	587	100.0	
	DK/No answer	13		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high: Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	61	10.6	10.6
	2	41	7.2	17.8
	3	96	16.7	34.5
	4	118	20.6	55.1
	5	257	44.9	100.0
	Total	573	100.0	
	DK/No answer	27		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high: Identify public safety needs and impacts:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	45	7.6	7.6
	2	33	5.6	13.2
	3	96	16.3	29.6
	4	121	20.6	50.2
	5	292	49.8	100.0
	Total	587	100.0	
	DK/No answer	13		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high: Assess other government impacts:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	47	8.2	8.2
	2	52	9.2	17.4
	3	161	28.2	45.6
	4	142	24.9	70.5
	5	168	29.5	100.0
	Total	571	100.0	
	DK/No answer	29		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high: Assess impacts on the tourism sector:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	55	9.6	9.6
	2	62	10.8	20.4
	3	106	18.2	38.6
	4	138	23.8	62.4
	5	217	37.6	100.0
	Total	578	100.0	
	DK/No answer	22		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high: Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	47	8.1	8.1
	2	62	10.7	18.7
	3	146	25.2	43.9
	4	154	26.6	70.6
	5	171	29.4	100.0
	Total	579	100.0	
	DK/No answer	21		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high: Identify transportation impacts:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	56	9.6	9.6
	2	44	7.5	17.1
	3	155	26.4	43.5
	4	132	22.5	66.0
	5	199	34.0	100.0
	Total	585	100.0	
	DK/No answer	15		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high: Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	63	10.8	10.8
	2	61	10.5	21.2
	3	74	12.6	33.9
	4	101	17.2	51.0
	5	288	49.0	100.0
	Total	588	100.0	
	DK/No answer	12		
Total		600		



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

Unincorporated Clark County		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, volcanology, geology, and hydrology:	Identify public safety needs and impacts:	Assess other government impacts:	Assess impacts on the tourism sector:	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:	Identify transportation impacts:	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:
N	Valid	252	256	252	258	251	252	254	256	257
	Missing	11	8	12	6	12	12	10	7	6
Mean		3.97	3.95	3.81	3.98	3.58	3.65	3.60	3.59	3.85
Std. Error of Mean		0.082	0.088	0.086	0.080	0.079	0.084	0.078	0.083	0.089
Median		5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.295	1.409	1.359	1.287	1.259	1.329	1.242	1.324	1.435
Skewness		-1.010	-1.085	-0.898	-1.078	-0.531	-0.685	-0.549	-0.583	-0.913
Std. Error of Skewness		0.153	0.152	0.153	0.152	0.154	0.153	0.153	0.152	0.152
Kurtosis		-0.173	-0.251	-0.404	0.069	-0.649	-0.663	-0.611	-0.720	-0.610
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.306	0.303	0.306	0.302	0.306	0.306	0.305	0.303	0.303
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

City of Las Vegas		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, volcanology, geology, and hydrology:	Identify public safety needs and impacts:	Assess other government impacts:	Assess impacts on the tourism sector:	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:	Identify transportation impacts:	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:
N	Valid	156	159	155	159	152	156	155	157	158
	Missing	6	3	7	3	10	6	7	4	3
Mean		3.96	3.92	3.81	4.02	3.66	3.77	3.59	3.56	3.90
Std. Error of Mean		0.104	0.105	0.112	0.100	0.099	0.107	0.099	0.101	0.108
Median		4.85	4.00	4.00	4.72	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.304	1.321	1.397	1.266	1.225	1.335	1.236	1.266	1.360
Skewness		-1.067	-1.002	-0.834	-1.175	-0.683	-0.841	-0.618	-0.591	-1.003
Std. Error of Skewness		0.194	0.193	0.195	0.193	0.197	0.195	0.195	0.193	0.193
Kurtosis		0.002	-0.212	-0.645	0.265	-0.392	-0.472	-0.466	-0.549	-0.293
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.386	0.383	0.387	0.383	0.392	0.387	0.388	0.385	0.383
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

City of North Las Vegas		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, volcanology, geology, and hydrology:	Identify public safety needs and impacts:	Assess other government impacts:	Assess impacts on the tourism sector:	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:	Identify transportation impacts:	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:
N	Valid	83	83	81	82	81	83	82	83	83
	Missing	2	2	4	4	4	2	3	2	2
Mean		4.10	4.14	4.07	4.17	3.68	3.65	3.67	3.93	3.92
Std. Error of Mean		0.142	0.138	0.138	0.134	0.132	0.146	0.141	0.124	0.142
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.296	1.258	1.242	1.210	1.182	1.330	1.283	1.130	1.294
Skewness		-1.268	-1.391	-1.145	-1.352	-0.457	-0.526	-0.487	-0.709	-0.926
Std. Error of Skewness		0.264	0.264	0.268	0.266	0.268	0.264	0.265	0.264	0.264
Kurtosis		0.349	0.804	0.277	0.876	-0.698	-0.968	-1.032	-0.368	-0.383
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.522	0.522	0.530	0.527	0.530	0.522	0.525	0.522	0.522
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

City of Henderson		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, volcanology, geology, and hydrology:	Identify public safety needs and impacts:	Assess other government impacts:	Assess impacts on the tourism sector:	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:	Identify transportation impacts:	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:
N	Valid	77	77	73	77	75	76	77	77	77
	Missing	1	0	4	1	2	1	0	1	0
Mean		3.73	3.69	3.63	3.85	3.32	3.62	3.36	3.56	3.55
Std. Error of Mean		0.158	0.166	0.163	0.137	0.143	0.154	0.136	0.153	0.171
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.59	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	3	5	4	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.385	1.456	1.395	1.201	1.239	1.340	1.195	1.337	1.501
Skewness		-0.682	-0.627	-0.725	-0.823	-0.295	-0.504	-0.435	-0.583	-0.425
Std. Error of Skewness		0.274	0.274	0.280	0.274	0.277	0.276	0.274	0.274	0.274
Kurtosis		-0.806	-1.096	-0.799	-0.252	-0.678	-1.058	-0.591	-0.769	-1.365
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.542	0.541	0.554	0.542	0.547	0.546	0.541	0.542	0.541
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

City of Boulder City		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, volcanology, geology, and hydrology:	Identify public safety needs and impacts:	Assess other government impacts:	Assess impacts on the tourism sector:	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:	Identify transportation impacts:	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Mean		3.86	4.02	3.98	3.98	3.46	4.26	4.10	3.75	3.54
Std. Error of Mean		0.493	0.553	0.323	0.263	0.235	0.372	0.346	0.364	0.564
Median		4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.72	5.00	4.00	3.97	4.00
Mode		5	5	3	4	4	5	4	3	5
Std. Deviation		1.378	1.548	0.903	0.735	0.657	1.039	0.937	0.984	1.577
Skewness		-1.379	-1.409	0.058	0.039	-0.870	-1.190	-1.048	-0.036	-0.862
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.759	0.780	0.780	0.759
Kurtosis		1.962	0.832	-1.958	-0.425	0.413	0.553	1.794	-0.683	-0.579
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.550	1.550	1.498
Range		4	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

City of Mesquite		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, volcanology, geology, and hydrology:	Identify public safety needs and impacts:	Assess other government impacts:	Assess impacts on the tourism sector:	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:	Identify transportation impacts:	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Missing	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mean		3.29	3.65	3.35	3.65	4.00	4.53	4.76	4.53	3.76
Std. Error of Mean		0.908	0.783	0.657	0.783	0.381	0.386	0.235	0.386	0.819
Median		3.13	4.38	3.00	4.38	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.63
Mode		5	5	3	5	4	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.871	1.614	1.355	1.614	0.784	0.796	0.485	0.796	1.688
Skewness		0.009	-0.393	-0.469	-0.393	0.000	-1.903	-2.062	-1.903	-0.592
Std. Error of Skewness		0.984	0.984	0.984	0.984	0.984	0.984	0.984	0.984	0.984
Kurtosis		-4.163	-4.228	5.229	-4.228	1.625	6.672	4.250	6.672	-4.420
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.390	2.390	2.390	2.390	2.390	2.390	2.390	2.390	2.390
Range		4	3	4	3	2	2	1	2	3
Minimum		1	2	1	2	3	3	4	3	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Clark County receives money from the federal government to conduct specific activities related to Yucca Mountain. These activities include overseeing technical scientific studies; assessing a broad array of impacts that may result from Yucca Mountain; analyzing transportation impacts; conducting public outreach. From the list below please rank the importance of each activity where 1 is low and 5 is high:

Respondent Jurisdiction * Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain:

			Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	0	1	2	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	28.6%	42.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	8	7	17	10	34	76
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.5%	9.2%	22.4%	13.2%	44.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	14	8	27	29	78	156
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.0%	5.1%	17.3%	18.6%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	2	0	0	2	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	6	9	14	48	83
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.2%	7.2%	10.8%	16.9%	57.8%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	19	18	44	40	131	252
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.5%	7.1%	17.5%	15.9%	52.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		49	41	98	95	296	579
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction:		8.5%	7.1%	16.9%	16.4%	51.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.529	20	0.488
Likelihood Ratio	17.501	20	0.620
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.525	1	0.217
N of Valid Cases	579		

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:

			Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	1	1	1	5	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%	55.6%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	8	12	10	11	35	76	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.5%	15.8%	13.2%	14.5%	46.1%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	14	13	22	33	77	159	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.8%	8.2%	13.8%	20.8%	48.4%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	0	1	2	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	5	9	15	48	83	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.2%	6.0%	10.8%	18.1%	57.8%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	30	17	26	43	139	255	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.8%	6.7%	10.2%	16.9%	54.5%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	59	50	68	104	306	587
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.1%	8.5%	11.6%	17.7%	52.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.881	20	0.465
Likelihood Ratio	17.431	20	0.625
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.597	1	0.206
N of Valid Cases	587		

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology:

			Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, volcanology, geology, and hydrology:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	3	2	3	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	25.0%	37.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	9	9	7	23	25	73
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.3%	12.3%	9.6%	31.5%	34.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	17	14	24	27	73	155
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.0%	9.0%	15.5%	17.4%	47.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	0	2	1	1	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	4	15	12	44	80
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.3%	5.0%	18.8%	15.0%	55.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	29	14	44	54	111	252
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.5%	5.6%	17.5%	21.4%	44.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	61	41	95	119	257	573
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.6%	7.2%	16.6%	20.8%	44.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.278	20	0.157
Likelihood Ratio	26.995	20	0.135
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.603	1	0.437
N of Valid Cases	573		

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Identify public safety needs and impacts:

			Identify public safety needs and impacts:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	2	4	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	4	8	14	21	30	77
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.2%	10.4%	18.2%	27.3%	39.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	11	18	38	80	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.5%	6.9%	11.3%	23.9%	50.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	0	1	2	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	2	14	11	48	80
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.3%	2.5%	17.5%	13.8%	60.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	23	10	48	46	131	258
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.9%	3.9%	18.6%	17.8%	50.8%	100.0%
Total	Count		44	33	96	121	293	587
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction:		7.5%	5.6%	16.4%	20.6%	49.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.638	20	0.010
Likelihood Ratio	33.318	20	0.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.229	1	0.633
N of Valid Cases	587		

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Assess other government impacts:

			Assess other government impacts:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	3	4	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	8	8	27	16	16	75
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.7%	10.7%	36.0%	21.3%	21.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	13	35	45	46	151
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.9%	8.6%	23.2%	29.8%	30.5%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	2	1	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	9	24	18	27	82
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.9%	11.0%	29.3%	22.0%	32.9%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	23	22	71	57	78	251
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.2%	8.8%	28.3%	22.7%	31.1%	100.0%
Total	Count		47	53	161	142	168	571
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction:		8.2%	9.3%	28.2%	24.9%	29.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.538	20	0.618
Likelihood Ratio	20.714	20	0.414
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.635	1	0.426
N of Valid Cases	571		

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Assess impacts on the tourism sector:

			Assess impacts on the tourism sector:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	1	1	4	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	6	14	12	17	28	77
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.8%	18.2%	15.6%	22.1%	36.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	16	13	25	39	62	155
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.3%	8.4%	16.1%	25.2%	40.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	1	3	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	12	17	15	32	82
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.3%	14.6%	20.7%	18.3%	39.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	27	23	50	64	88	252
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.7%	9.1%	19.8%	25.4%	34.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	55	63	106	137	217	578
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.5%	10.9%	18.3%	23.7%	37.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.700	20	0.793
Likelihood Ratio	15.748	20	0.732
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.370	1	0.543
N of Valid Cases	578		

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:

			Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	1	3	3	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	37.5%	37.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	7	10	21	25	14	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.1%	13.0%	27.3%	32.5%	18.2%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	14	12	40	44	44	154	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.1%	7.8%	26.0%	28.6%	28.6%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	1	3	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	15	15	18	30	82	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.9%	18.3%	18.3%	22.0%	36.6%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	21	24	68	63	77	253	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.3%	9.5%	26.9%	24.9%	30.4%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	46	62	145	154	171	578
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.0%	10.7%	25.1%	26.6%	29.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.007	20	0.288
Likelihood Ratio	24.684	20	0.214
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.429	1	0.512
N of Valid Cases	578		

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Identify transportation impacts:

			Identify transportation impacts:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	3	2	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	12.5%	37.5%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	9	8	17	19	24	77
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.7%	10.4%	22.1%	24.7%	31.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	16	11	43	41	46	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.2%	7.0%	27.4%	26.1%	29.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	1	3	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	6	23	16	36	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.6%	7.1%	27.4%	19.0%	42.9%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	29	19	69	52	88	257
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.3%	7.4%	26.8%	20.2%	34.2%	100.0%
	Total	Count	57	45	156	131	199	588
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.7%	7.7%	26.5%	22.3%	33.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.643	20	0.796
Likelihood Ratio	16.859	20	0.662
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.258	1	0.612
N of Valid Cases	588		

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:

			Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	1	1	2	3	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	25.0%	37.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	9	15	12	8	34	78	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.5%	19.2%	15.4%	10.3%	43.6%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	16	13	19	33	77	158	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.1%	8.2%	12.0%	20.9%	48.7%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	0	0	3	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	10	11	17	40	83	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.0%	12.0%	13.3%	20.5%	48.2%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	31	22	31	41	131	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.1%	8.6%	12.1%	16.0%	51.2%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	62	63	74	101	288	588
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.5%	10.7%	12.6%	17.2%	49.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.897	20	0.346
Likelihood Ratio	21.871	20	0.348
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.106	1	0.293
N of Valid Cases	588		


Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures

		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative affect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents?
N	Valid	564	600	578
	Missing	36	0	22
Mean		1.72	3.05	2.53
Std. Error of Mean		0.019	0.059	0.029
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.448	1.448	0.688
Skewness		-0.999	1.998	-1.125
Std. Error of Skewness		0.103	0.100	0.102
Kurtosis		-1.006	6.932	-0.054
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.205	0.199	0.203
Range		1	8	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	9	3

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures**

The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation’s first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	156	27.7	27.7
	Oppose	408	72.3	100.0
	Total	564	100.0	
	DK/No answer	36		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures**

The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	57	9.8	9.8
	Agree	149	25.7	35.5
	Disagree	200	34.4	69.9
	Strongly Disagree	174	30.0	100.0
	Total	580	100.0	
	No answer/Refused	20		
	Total	600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures

Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative effect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no effect you can tell me that too.

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Positive effect	65	11.2	11.2
	No effect	145	25.1	36.3
	Negative effect	368	63.7	100.0
	Total	578	100.0	
	DK/No answer	22		
Total		600		



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

Unincorporated Clark County		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative affect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents?
N	Valid	235	263	247
	Missing	28	0	17
Mean		1.75	3.10	2.60
Std. Error of Mean		0.028	0.090	0.041
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.432	1.458	0.651
Skewness		-1.182	2.156	-1.358
Std. Error of Skewness		0.159	0.150	0.155
Kurtosis		-0.609	7.365	0.596
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.316	0.299	0.309
Range		1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	4	3

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of Las Vegas		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative affect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents?
N	Valid	158	162	157
	Missing	3	0	4
Mean		1.69	2.88	2.43
Std. Error of Mean		0.037	0.094	0.058
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.464	1.199	0.729
Skewness		-0.825	1.326	-0.867
Std. Error of Skewness		0.193	0.191	0.193
Kurtosis		-1.336	6.472	-0.612
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.383	0.379	0.385
Range		1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	4	3

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of North Las Vegas		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative affect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents?
N	Valid	84	85	85
	Missing	1	0	0
Mean		1.77	3.15	2.51
Std. Error of Mean		0.046	0.165	0.079
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.422	1.520	0.725
Skewness		-1.317	1.880	-1.129
Std. Error of Skewness		0.263	0.261	0.261
Kurtosis		-0.273	6.434	-0.160
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.519	0.517	0.517
Range		1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	4	3

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of Henderson		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative affect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents?
N	Valid	75	77	77
	Missing	3	0	0
Mean		1.64	3.09	2.51
Std. Error of Mean		0.056	0.199	0.077
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.484	1.745	0.681
Skewness		-0.587	2.091	-1.065
Std. Error of Skewness		0.278	0.274	0.274
Kurtosis		-1.702	5.497	-0.086
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.550	0.541	0.541
Range		1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	4	3

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of Boulder City		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative affect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents?
N	Valid	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		1.63	3.26	2.70
Std. Error of Mean		0.185	0.369	0.176
Median		2.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		0.516	1.033	0.493
Skewness		-0.685	-0.685	-1.067
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		-2.190	-2.190	-1.279
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		1	3	1
Minimum		1	1	2
Maximum		2	4	3

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of Mesquite		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative affect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents?
N	Valid	4	5	4
	Missing	1	0	1
Mean		2.00	2.89	2.27
Std. Error of Mean		0.000	1.230	0.410
Median		2.00	2.25	2.13
Mode		2	1	2
Std. Deviation		0.000	2.681	0.794
Kurtosis			12.317	
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.390	2.100	
Skewness			2.451	-0.713
Std. Error of Skewness		0.984	0.934	1.050
Range		0	3	2
Minimum		2	1	1
Maximum		2	4	3

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?

			The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?			
			Support	Oppose	Total	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	3	5	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	27	48	75	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	36.0%	64.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	49	109	158	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	31.0%	69.0%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	4	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	19	65	84	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	22.6%	77.4%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	58	177	235	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	24.7%	75.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	156	408	564
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	27.7%	72.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.520	5	0.185
Likelihood Ratio	8.472	5	0.132
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.017	1	0.025
N of Valid Cases	564		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?

			The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?				
			Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	3	0	5	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	62.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	9	20	26	18	73
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.3%	27.4%	35.6%	24.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	18	43	51	48	160
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.3%	26.9%	31.9%	30.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	1	1	1	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	9	16	28	28	81
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.1%	19.8%	34.6%	34.6%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	20	66	94	74	254
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.9%	26.0%	37.0%	29.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	58	149	200	174	581
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.0%	25.6%	34.4%	29.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.189	15	0.308
Likelihood Ratio	18.275	15	0.248
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.901	1	0.342
N of Valid Cases	581		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative effect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.

			Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative affect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents?			Total	
			Positive effect	No effect	Negative effect		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	2	5	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	8	22	47	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.4%	28.6%	61.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	22	45	90	157	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.0%	28.7%	57.3%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	2	2	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	11	19	55	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.9%	22.4%	64.7%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	22	55	169	246	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.9%	22.4%	68.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	64	145	368	577
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.1%	25.1%	63.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.859	10	0.545
Likelihood Ratio	9.534	10	0.482
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.259	1	0.071
N of Valid Cases	577		


Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Measures

		Rate the level of your awareness of the details of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your awareness that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your support that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding
N	Valid	600	600	600
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		2.18	3.07	3.04
Std. Error of Mean		0.034	0.040	0.054
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		0.841	0.988	1.313
Skewness		0.832	-0.792	0.094
Std. Error of Skewness		0.100	0.100	0.100
Kurtosis		0.312	-0.447	-1.248
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.199	0.199	0.199
Range		3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Measures

Rate the level of your awareness of the details of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very aware and follow the details of the proceeding	97	16.2	16.2
	Generally aware that there is a proceeding, but do not follow the details	367	61.1	77.4
	Not at all aware and not concerned about the proceeding	66	11.0	88.3
	Not at all aware and thought the project was cancelled	70	11.7	100.0
	Total	600	100.0	




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Measures

Rate the level of your AWARENESS that Clark County’s active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County’s position in the licensing proceeding:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very aware	63	10.5	10.5
	Aware	84	14.1	24.6
	Somewhat aware	202	33.7	58.2
	Not at all aware	251	41.8	100.0
	Total	600	100.0	




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Measures

Rate the level of your SUPPORT that Clark County’s active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County’s position in the licensing proceeding:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Supportive and follow the details of the licensing proceedings	68	11.4	11.4
	Supportive and do not follow the details of the licensing proceedings	191	31.8	43.2
	Not Supportive and follow the details of the licensing proceedings	95	15.9	59.0
	Not supportive and do not follow the details of the licensing proceedings	138	23.0	82.0
	Not supportive and believe we should negotiate benefits instead	108	18.0	100.0
	Total	600	100.0	



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Jurisdiction Summary Measures

Unincorporated Clark County		Rate the level of your awareness of the details of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your AWARENESS that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your SUPPORT that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:
N	Valid	263	263	263
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		2.26	3.21	3.24
Std. Error of Mean		0.053	0.057	0.081
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		0.865	0.919	1.322
Skewness		0.790	-0.942	-0.052
Std. Error of Skewness		0.150	0.150	0.150
Kurtosis		0.035	-0.070	-1.320
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.299	0.299	0.299
Range		3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Jurisdiction Summary Measures

City of Las Vegas		Rate the level of your awareness of the details of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your AWARENESS that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your SUPPORT that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:
N	Valid	162	162	162
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		2.15	2.93	2.82
Std. Error of Mean		0.068	0.083	0.105
Median		2.00	3.00	2.00
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		0.861	1.050	1.338
Skewness		0.808	-0.596	0.351
Std. Error of Skewness		0.191	0.191	0.191
Kurtosis		0.245	-0.857	-1.144
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.379	0.379	0.379
Range		3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Jurisdiction Summary Measures

City of North Las Vegas		Rate the level of your awareness of the details of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your AWARENESS that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your SUPPORT that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:
N	Valid	85	85	85
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		1.99	2.80	3.11
Std. Error of Mean		0.084	0.113	0.133
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	4
Std. Deviation		0.773	1.045	1.228
Skewness		1.100	-0.619	-0.153
Std. Error of Skewness		0.261	0.261	0.261
Kurtosis		1.688	-0.754	-1.036
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.517	0.517	0.517
Range		3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Jurisdiction Summary Measures

City of Henderson		Rate the level of your awareness of the details of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your AWARENESS that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your SUPPORT that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:
N	Valid	77	77	77
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		2.16	3.14	2.84
Std. Error of Mean		0.086	0.109	0.144
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		0.759	0.959	1.261
Skewness		0.754	-0.895	0.206
Std. Error of Skewness		0.274	0.274	0.274
Kurtosis		0.740	-0.182	-1.146
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.541	0.541	0.541
Range		3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Jurisdiction Summary Measures

City of Boulder City		Rate the level of your awareness of the details of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your AWARENESS that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your SUPPORT that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:
N	Valid	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		2.36	3.08	2.53
Std. Error of Mean		0.296	0.277	0.361
Median		2.00	3.00	2.72
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		0.829	0.773	1.009
Skewness		1.048	-0.153	0.760
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		1.775	-0.856	3.537
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498	1.498
Range		3	2	4
Minimum		1	2	1
Maximum		4	4	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Jurisdiction Summary Measures

City of Mesquite		Rate the level of your awareness of the details of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your AWARENESS that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:	Rate the level of your SUPPORT that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:
N	Valid	5	5	5
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		2.32	3.58	2.74
Std. Error of Mean		0.475	0.421	0.623
Median		2.00	4.00	2.25
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		1.036	0.918	1.359
Skewness		1.464	-2.179	0.790
Std. Error of Skewness		0.934	0.934	0.934
Kurtosis		3.807	4.750	0.510
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.100	2.100	2.100
Range		3	2	4
Minimum		1	2	1
Maximum		4	4	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Jurisdiction Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Rate the level of your awareness of the details of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding:

			Rate the level of your awareness of the details of the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding:				Total	
			Very aware and follow the details of the proceeding:	Generally aware that there is a proceeding, but do not follow the details:	Not at all aware and not concerned about the proceeding:	Not at all aware and thought the project was cancelled:		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	5	1	1	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.5%	62.5%	12.5%	12.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	11	48	12	6	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.3%	62.3%	15.6%	7.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	30	95	18	19	162	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	18.5%	58.6%	11.1%	11.7%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	3	0	1	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	60.0%	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	19	55	4	7	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	22.4%	64.7%	4.7%	8.2%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	36	160	30	37	263	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	13.7%	60.8%	11.4%	14.1%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	98	366	65	71	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.3%	61.0%	10.8%	11.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.756	15	0.621
Likelihood Ratio	13.909	15	0.532
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.695	1	0.405
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Jurisdiction Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * : Rate the level of your AWARENESS that Clark County’s active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County’s position in the licensing proceedings:

		Rate the level of your awareness that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceedings:				Total	
		Very aware	Aware	Somewhat aware	Not at all aware		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	2	4	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	7	11	25	35	78
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.0%	14.1%	32.1%	44.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	23	27	52	60	162
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.2%	16.7%	32.1%	37.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	4	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	16	8	38	23	85
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	18.8%	9.4%	44.7%	27.1%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	17	37	83	127	264
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.4%	14.0%	31.4%	48.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	63	86	202	251	600
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.5%	14.3%	33.6%	41.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.549	15	0.005
Likelihood Ratio	34.835	15	0.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.249	1	0.071
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Awareness
Yucca Mountain Awareness Jurisdiction Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Rate the level of your support that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:

			Rate the level of your support that Clark County's active participation in the Yucca Mountain licensing proceeding is covered 100% by federal oversight funding provided to Clark County, and that no local taxpayer dollars are being used to defend Clark County's position in the licensing proceeding:					Total	
			Supportive and follow the details of the licensing proceeding:	Supportive and do not follow the details of the licensing proceeding:	Not Supportive and follow the details of the licensing proceeding:	Not supportive and do not follow the details of the licensing proceeding:	Not supportive and believe we should negotiate benefits instead:		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	3	4	0	1	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.1%	33.3%	44.4%	0.0%	11.1%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	11	27	11	20	8	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.3%	35.1%	14.3%	26.0%	10.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	25	59	23	28	26	161	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	15.5%	36.6%	14.3%	17.4%	16.1%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	2	1	1	1	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	9	21	17	27	11	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.6%	24.7%	20.0%	31.8%	12.9%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	22	78	40	61	62	263	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.4%	29.7%	15.2%	23.2%	23.6%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	69	190	96	137	109	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.5%	31.6%	16.0%	22.8%	18.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests


	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.672	20	0.060
Likelihood Ratio	31.299	20	0.051
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.032	1	0.000
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix VIII
Community Profile

Appendix VIII Community Profile

What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Car-Drive alone	516	86.0
	Car-Carpool with others	38	6.4
	CAT bus (or paratransit)	23	3.9
	MAX transit	6	0.9
	Motorcycle	4	0.6
	Walk	10	1.7
	Bike	3	0.6
	Total	600	100.0




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix VIII Community Profile

Do you currently commute on a daily basis?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Yes	345	57.4
	No	255	42.6
	Total	600	100.0



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix VIII
Community Profile
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation**

Respondent Jurisdiction: * What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?

			What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?						Total	
			Car-Drive alone	Car-Carpool with others	CAT bus (or paratransit)	MAX transit	Motorcycle	Walk		Bike
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	67	6	1	0	0	3	1	78
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	85.9%	7.7%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	1.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	140	7	10	3	0	1	1	162
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	86.4%	4.3%	6.2%	1.9%	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	73	5	3	0	1	3	0	85
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	85.9%	5.9%	3.5%	0.0%	1.2%	3.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	223	21	10	2	3	3	1	263
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	84.8%	8.0%	3.8%	0.8%	1.1%	1.1%	0.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	516	39	24	5	4	10	3	600
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	85.9%	6.5%	4.0%	0.8%	0.7%	1.7%	0.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.149	30	0.883
Likelihood Ratio	24.993	30	0.725
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.002	1	0.963
N of Valid Cases	600		

**Appendix VIII
Community Profile
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation**

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Do you currently commute on a daily basis?

			Do you currently commute on a daily basis?		Total	
			Yes	No		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	6	2	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	46	31	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	59.7%	40.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	88	74	162	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	2	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	49	36	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	57.6%	42.4%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	153	110	263	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	58.2%	41.8%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	345	255	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.893	5	0.864
Likelihood Ratio	1.954	5	0.856
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.004	1	0.952
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix IX

Local Government Interaction


Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Summary Statistics

		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals 'Not at all knowledgeable' and five equals 'very knowledgeable' are you about the difference between services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals 'very unsatisfied' and five equals 'very satisfied', how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?	All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair or poor?
N	Valid	594	587	283	592	592	582	596
	Missing	6	13	317	8	8	18	4
Mean		2.84	1.52	3.33	2.95	1.73	3.62	2.67
Std. Error of Mean		0.043	0.021	0.082	0.053	0.018	0.045	0.030
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	2	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.040	0.500	1.372	1.301	0.443	1.081	0.731
Skewness		-0.248	-0.065	-0.497	-0.021	-1.057	-0.413	0.168
Std. Error of Skewness		0.100	0.101	0.145	0.100	0.100	0.101	0.100
Kurtosis		-0.535	-2.003	-1.023	-1.028	-0.885	-0.392	-0.514
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.200	0.201	0.289	0.200	0.200	0.202	0.200
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5	4

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction General Impressions

On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One	85	14.2	14.2
	Two	104	17.4	31.7
	Three	251	42.3	74.0
	Four	134	22.6	96.6
	Five	20	3.4	100.0
	Total	594	100.0	
	DK/No answer	6		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions**

Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	284	48.4	48.4
	No	303	51.6	100.0
	Total	587	100.0	
	DK/no answer	13		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions**

How often do you interact with Clark County government?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Weekly	46	16.3	16.3
	Monthly	35	12.4	28.7
	4 to 6 times a year	41	14.5	43.2
	1 to 3 times a year	100	35.5	78.6
	Less than once a year	60	21.4	100.0
	Total	283	100.0	
	DK/No answer	1		
	Total	284		




Note- Chart & Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction General Impressions

Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals “Not at all knowledgeable” and five equals “very knowledgeable”, how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	110	18.5	18.5
	2	100	16.9	35.4
	3	177	29.9	65.3
	4	119	20.1	85.5
	5	86	14.5	100.0
	Total	592	100.0	
	DK/No answer	8		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions**

Do you know who your County Commissioner is?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	158	26.7	26.7
	No	434	73.3	100.0
	Total	592	100.0	
	DK/No answer	8		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction General Impressions

On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	24	4.1	4.1
	2	50	8.6	12.7
	3	195	33.6	46.3
	4	164	28.2	74.4
	5	149	25.6	100.0
	Total	582	100.0	
	DK/No answer	18		
Total		600		



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals 'very unsatisfied' and five equals 'very satisfied', how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?	All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair or poor?
Unincorporated Clark County								
N	Valid	262	260	121	259	261	258	261
	Missing	1	3	142	4	2	6	2
Mean		2.81	1.53	3.35	2.91	1.73	3.61	2.74
Std. Error of Mean		0.062	0.031	0.118	0.082	0.027	0.067	0.046
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	2	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.011	0.500	1.295	1.326	0.444	1.077	0.736
Skewness		-0.247	-0.140	-0.503	0.062	-1.048	-0.424	0.184
Std. Error of Skewness		0.150	0.151	0.220	0.151	0.151	0.152	0.151
Kurtosis		-0.426	-1.996	-0.818	-1.041	-0.909	-0.305	-0.682
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.300	0.301	0.436	0.301	0.300	0.302	0.300
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5	4

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of Las Vegas		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals 'very unsatisfied' and five equals 'very satisfied', how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?	All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair or poor?
N	Valid	159	159	86	160	161	159	161
	Missing	2	3	75	2	1	3	1
Mean		2.73	1.45	3.36	3.21	1.66	3.53	2.72
Std. Error of Mean		0.088	0.040	0.153	0.101	0.037	0.088	0.061
Median		3.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		3	1	4	3	2	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.114	0.499	1.424	1.277	0.475	1.114	0.780
Skewness		-0.177	0.202	-0.627	-0.316	-0.683	-0.365	0.037
Std. Error of Skewness		0.192	0.193	0.259	0.192	0.191	0.193	0.191
Kurtosis		-0.840	-1.984	-0.965	-0.811	-1.553	-0.471	-0.580
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.382	0.383	0.513	0.382	0.381	0.383	0.380
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5	4

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of North Las Vegas		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals 'very unsatisfied' and five equals 'very satisfied', how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?	All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair or poor?
N	Valid	38	81	38	85	82	82	84
	Missing	47	4	47	0	3	3	1
Mean		3.31	1.53	3.01	2.78	1.78	3.67	2.56
Std. Error of Mean		0.189	0.056	0.220	0.137	0.046	0.115	0.071
Median		4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		4	2	4	3	2	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.163	0.502	1.354	1.262	0.414	1.046	0.652
Skewness		-0.545	-0.118	-0.057	-0.045	-1.410	-0.285	0.031
Std. Error of Skewness		0.383	0.268	0.383	0.261	0.265	0.266	0.263
Kurtosis		-0.459	-2.037	-1.367	-1.087	-0.014	-0.613	-0.188
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.750	0.530	0.750	0.517	0.525	0.525	0.521
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5	4

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals 'very unsatisfied' and five equals 'very satisfied', how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?	All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair or poor?
City of Henderson								
N	Valid	75	75	31	76	76	73	77
	Missing	2	2	46	1	1	5	0
Mean		2.86	1.59	3.62	2.80	1.86	3.80	2.52
Std. Error of Mean		0.108	0.057	0.264	0.138	0.040	0.125	0.077
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00
Mode		3	2	5	2	2	5	2
Std. Deviation		0.938	0.496	1.473	1.201	0.346	1.064	0.674
Skewness		-0.507	-0.356	-0.811	0.288	-2.153	-0.559	0.218
Std. Error of Skewness		0.277	0.277	0.419	0.276	0.276	0.282	0.274
Kurtosis		-0.321	-1.925	-0.761	-0.774	2.706	-0.239	-0.182
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.547	0.547	0.819	0.546	0.546	0.556	0.541
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5	4

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of Boulder City		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals 'very unsatisfied' and five equals 'very satisfied', how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?	All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair or poor?
N	Valid	8	8	4	8	7	8	8
	Missing	0	0	4	0	1	0	0
Mean		2.90	1.53	2.20	2.65	1.56	3.75	2.47
Std. Error of Mean		0.372	0.191	0.903	0.495	0.197	0.250	0.191
Median		3.00	1.72	1.63	2.30	1.97	4.00	2.28
Mode		2	2	1	2	2	4	2
Std. Deviation		1.039	0.535	1.735	1.383	0.534	0.700	0.535
Skewness		1.251	-0.141	1.676	0.232	-0.331	0.382	0.141
Std. Error of Skewness		0.759	0.759	1.060	0.759	0.780	0.759	0.759
Kurtosis		1.580	-2.803		-1.318	-2.772	-0.135	-2.803
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.498	1.498		1.498	1.550	1.498	1.498
Range		3	1	4	4	1	2	1
Minimum		2	1	1	1	1	3	2
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5	3

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of Mesquite		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals 'very unsatisfied' and five equals 'very satisfied', how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?	All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair or poor?
N	Valid	5	4	3	5	5	3	5
	Missing	0	1	2	0	0	2	0
Mean		2.16	1.35	4.36	2.79	1.63	3.77	1.89
Std. Error of Mean		0.537	0.265	0.364	0.985	0.249	1.051	0.158
Median		2.13	1.00	4.13	3.25	2.00	4.63	2.00
Mode		1	1	4	1	2	5	2
Std. Deviation		1.170	0.546	0.603	2.147	0.543	1.895	0.345
Skewness		0.374	1.017		0.254	-0.837	-1.719	-3.948
Std. Error of Skewness		0.934	0.984		0.934	0.934	1.150	0.934
Kurtosis		-0.961	-2.902		-3.890	-2.952		25.365
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.100	2.390		2.100	2.100		2.100
Range		3	1	1	4	1	4	1
Minimum		1	1	4	1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	2	5	5	2	5	2

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction * On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?

			On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?					
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	3	3	1	1	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	37.5%	37.5%	12.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	8	13	35	18	1	75
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.7%	17.3%	46.7%	24.0%	1.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	32	26	62	35	5	160
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	16.3%	38.8%	21.9%	3.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	1	2	1	0	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	7	14	32	26	6	85
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.2%	16.5%	37.6%	30.6%	7.1%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	36	47	118	54	8	263
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	13.7%	17.9%	44.9%	20.5%	3.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		85	104	252	135	21	597
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction:		14.2%	17.4%	42.2%	22.6%	3.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.945	20	0.292
Likelihood Ratio	22.217	20	0.329
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.239	1	0.625
N of Valid Cases	597		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction * Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County

			Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?		Total	
			Yes	No		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	4	4	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	31	44	75	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	41.3%	58.7%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	87	72	159	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	54.7%	45.3%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	2	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	38	43	81	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	46.9%	53.1%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	121	139	260	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	46.5%	53.5%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	284	304	588
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	48.3%	51.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.748	5	0.447
Likelihood Ratio	4.759	5	0.446
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.285	1	0.593
N of Valid Cases	588		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction * How often do you interact with Clark County government?

			How often do you interact with Clark County government?					Total
			Weekly	Monthly	4 to 6 times a year	1 to 3 times a year	Less than once a year	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	2	1	0	1	1	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	3	2	10	11	31
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.1%	9.7%	6.5%	32.3%	35.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	17	6	11	34	19	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	19.5%	6.9%	12.6%	39.1%	21.8%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	2	1	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	11	3	13	5	38
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	15.8%	28.9%	7.9%	34.2%	13.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	16	15	24	42	24	121
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	13.2%	12.4%	19.8%	34.7%	19.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	46	36	40	102	61	284
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.1%	12.6%	14.0%	35.8%	21.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.046	20	0.134
Likelihood Ratio	26.566	20	0.148
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.212	1	0.645
N of Valid Cases	284		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction * Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals “Not at all knowledgeable” and five equals “very knowledgeable”, how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?

			Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals “Not at all knowledgeable” and five equals “very knowledgeable”, how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?						
			1	2	3	4	5	Total	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	2	2	1	2	1	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	25.0%	25.0%	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	11	23	21	13	8	76	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.5%	30.3%	27.6%	17.1%	10.5%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	24	16	51	40	28	159	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	15.1%	10.1%	32.1%	25.2%	17.6%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	0	0	1	2	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	19	14	24	21	6	84	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	22.6%	16.7%	28.6%	25.0%	7.1%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	51	45	80	42	41	259	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	19.7%	17.4%	30.9%	16.2%	15.8%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	110	100	177	119	86	592
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	18.6%	16.9%	29.9%	20.1%	14.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.178	20	0.019
Likelihood Ratio	36.701	20	0.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.811	1	0.368
N of Valid Cases	592		

**Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Do you know who your County Commissioner is?

			Do you know who your County Commissioner is?		Total	
			Yes	No		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	3	4	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	10	65	75	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	55	106	161	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	34.2%	65.8%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	3	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	18	65	83	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	21.7%	78.3%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	70	191	261	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	26.8%	73.2%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	158	434	592
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.884	5	0.016
Likelihood Ratio	14.615	5	0.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.004	1	0.947
N of Valid Cases	592		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction * On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?

			On a scale of one to five, where one equals 'very unsatisfied' and five equals 'very satisfied', how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?						
			1	2	3	4	5	Total	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	3	4	1	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	37.5%	50.0%	12.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	2	5	22	21	23	73	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.7%	6.8%	30.1%	28.8%	31.5%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	8	17	53	44	37	159	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.0%	10.7%	33.3%	27.7%	23.3%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	1	0	1	2	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	8	28	22	22	82	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.4%	9.8%	34.1%	26.8%	26.8%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	20	89	73	64	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.3%	7.8%	34.6%	28.4%	24.9%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	24	51	195	165	149	584
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.1%	8.7%	33.4%	28.3%	25.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.420	20	0.859
Likelihood Ratio	14.294	20	0.815
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.102	1	0.749
N of Valid Cases	584		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction * All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair or poor?

			All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair or poor?				Total
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	4	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	3	37	33	5	78
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.8%	47.4%	42.3%	6.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	6	59	70	26	161
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.7%	36.6%	43.5%	16.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	4	0	0	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	36	40	5	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.6%	42.9%	47.6%	6.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	5	99	116	41	261
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.9%	37.9%	44.4%	15.7%	100.0%
	Total	Count	18	239	263	77	597
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.0%	40.0%	44.1%	12.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.652	15	0.071
Likelihood Ratio	25.845	15	0.040
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.726	1	0.099
N of Valid Cases	597		


Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Summary Statistics

		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?
N	Valid	245	275	277	280	279	278	279	282	283
	Missing	355	325	323	320	321	322	321	318	317
Mean		3.09	2.23	2.15	2.04	2.03	2.01	2.22	2.09	3.18
Std. Error of Mean		0.071	0.032	0.037	0.036	0.034	0.036	0.037	0.033	0.070
Median		3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Std. Deviation		1.118	0.526	0.613	0.596	0.561	0.600	0.617	0.548	1.180
Skewness		-0.251	0.190	-0.094	-0.011	0.009	-0.003	-0.179	0.054	-0.374
Std. Error of Skewness		0.156	0.147	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.146	0.145	0.145
Kurtosis		-0.384	-0.184	-0.422	-0.163	0.205	-0.196	-0.550	0.249	-0.685
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.310	0.293	0.292	0.290	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.289	0.289
Range		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One	29	12.0	12.0
	Two	28	11.4	23.4
	Three	104	42.4	65.8
	Four	58	23.7	89.5
	Five	26	10.5	100.0
	Total	245	100.0	
	DK/No answer	39		
	Total	284		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area:
Employee cared about and understood my needs

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Exceeded expectations	14	4.9	4.9
	Met expectations	184	67.1	72.0
	Did not meet expectations	77	28.0	100.0
	Total	275	100.0	
	DK/No answer	9		
	Total	284		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area:
Service delivery was timely and responsive

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Exceeded expectations	34	12.4	12.4
	Met expectations	167	60.4	72.8
	Did not meet expectations	75	27.2	100.0
	Total	277	100.0	
	DK/No answer	7		
	Total	284		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area:
Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Exceeded expectations	45	16.0	16.0
	Met expectations	180	64.5	80.5
	Did not meet expectations	55	19.5	100.0
	Total	280	100.0	
	DK/No answer	4		
	Total	284		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area:
Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Exceeded expectations	40	14.4	14.4
	Met expectations	191	68.6	82.9
	Did not meet expectations	48	17.1	100.0
	Total	279	100.0	
	DK/No answer	5		
	Total	284		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area:
Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Exceeded expectations	49	17.6	17.6
	Met expectations	178	64.1	81.7
	Did not meet expectations	51	18.3	100.0
	Total	278	100.0	
	DK/No answer	6		
	Total	284		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area:
Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Exceeded expectations	29	10.3	10.3
	Met expectations	159	57.1	67.5
	Did not meet expectations	91	32.5	100.0
	Total	279	100.0	
	DK/No answer	5		
	Total	284		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area:
Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Exceeded expectations	30	10.7	10.7
	Met expectations	195	69.2	79.9
	Did not meet expectations	57	20.1	100.0
	Total	282	100.0	
	DK/No answer	2		
	Total	284		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One	34	12.2	12.2
	Two	39	13.9	26.1
	Three	83	29.3	55.4
	Four	93	33.0	88.4
	Five	33	11.6	100.0
	Total	283	100.0	
	DK/No answer	1		
	Total	284		



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Summary

Unincorporated Clark County		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?
N	Valid	104	117	119	119	120	120	119	121	121
	Missing	160	146	144	144	144	144	144	142	142
Mean		2.98	2.30	2.19	2.03	1.98	2.00	2.24	2.11	2.99
Median		3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Std. Deviation		1.049	0.531	0.581	0.623	0.573	0.616	0.643	0.564	1.221
Skewness		-0.264	0.147	-0.039	-0.022	-0.002	0.000	-0.274	0.025	-0.202
Std. Error of Skewness		0.237	0.223	0.222	0.222	0.221	0.221	0.222	0.220	0.220
Kurtosis		0.097	-0.598	-0.252	-0.369	0.121	-0.305	-0.668	0.090	-0.877
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.470	0.443	0.440	0.440	0.439	0.439	0.440	0.436	0.436
Range		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary

City of Las Vegas	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?	
N	Valid	74	83	83	85	84	84	85	85	86
	Missing	88	79	79	76	77	78	76	76	75
Mean	3.05	2.20	2.13	1.98	2.06	2.00	2.18	2.03	3.29	
Median	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.27	
Mode	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	
Std. Deviation	1.255	0.559	0.660	0.617	0.576	0.670	0.650	0.552	1.236	
Skewness	-0.192	0.040	-0.145	0.013	0.005	0.001	-0.191	0.021	-0.425	
Std. Error of Skewness	0.280	0.265	0.264	0.261	0.262	0.263	0.261	0.261	0.259	
Kurtosis	-0.815	-0.137	-0.676	-0.292	0.101	-0.715	-0.644	0.399	-0.733	
Std. Error of Kurtosis	0.553	0.524	0.522	0.516	0.518	0.521	0.516	0.516	0.513	
Range	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Maximum	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary

	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?
N	Valid	36	38	38	38	38	38	38	38
	Missing	49	47	47	47	47	47	47	47
Mean	3.29	2.18	2.05	2.12	2.11	2.08	2.32	2.35	3.31
Median	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Std. Deviation	1.004	0.421	0.622	0.531	0.564	0.447	0.524	0.485	1.163
Skewness	-0.148	1.163	-0.032	0.143	0.040	0.412	0.226	0.634	-0.545
Std. Error of Skewness	0.392	0.383	0.383	0.383	0.383	0.383	0.383	0.383	0.383
Kurtosis	-0.582	1.095	-0.233	0.630	0.282	2.262	-0.772	-1.690	-0.459
Std. Error of Kurtosis	0.767	0.750	0.750	0.750	0.750	0.750	0.750	0.750	0.750
Range	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Maximum	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary

City of Henderson		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?
N	Valid	25	31	31	31	31	31	30	31	31
	Missing	52	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47
Mean		3.49	2.07	2.04	2.11	2.03	1.97	2.09	1.96	3.42
Median		4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Std. Deviation		1.110	0.513	0.568	0.575	0.539	0.586	0.531	0.450	0.897
Skewness		-0.696	0.136	0.017	0.018	0.036	-0.001	0.112	-0.212	-0.681
Std. Error of Skewness		0.463	0.423	0.423	0.423	0.423	0.423	0.429	0.423	0.423
Kurtosis		0.259	1.196	0.436	0.221	0.871	0.232	0.871	2.609	0.498
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.900	0.825	0.825	0.825	0.825	0.825	0.836	0.825	0.825
Range		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary

		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained
City of Boulder City								
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Missing	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean		2.80	2.73	2.73	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.73
Median		2.63	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3	2	2	2	3
Std. Deviation		0.983	0.521	0.521	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.521
Skewness		0.740	-1.921	-1.921				-1.921
Std. Error of Skewness		1.060	1.060	1.060	1.060	1.060	1.060	1.060
Range		2	1	1	0	0	0	1
Minimum		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Maximum		4	3	3	2	2	2	3

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary

City of Mesquite	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?
N	Valid	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
	Missing	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
Mean	2.64	2.00	2.78	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.36	3.18
Median	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.13	3.00
Mode	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	3
Std. Deviation	0.967	0.000	0.558	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.603	0.483
Range	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Minimum	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	3
Maximum	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	4

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?

			On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?						
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	2	1	1	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	2	2	7	10	4	25	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.0%	8.0%	28.0%	40.0%	16.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	9	26	17	10	74	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.2%	12.2%	35.1%	23.0%	13.5%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	0	2	0	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	33.3%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	8	11	13	4	37	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.7%	21.6%	29.7%	35.1%	10.8%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	14	8	56	18	8	104	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	13.5%	7.7%	53.8%	17.3%	7.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	30	29	103	59	26	247
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.1%	11.7%	41.7%	23.9%	10.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.735	20	0.028
Likelihood Ratio	33.667	20	0.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.991	1	0.320
N of Valid Cases	247		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	3	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	23	5	31	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.7%	74.2%	16.1%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	6	54	23	83	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.2%	65.1%	27.7%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	3	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	30	7	38	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.6%	78.9%	18.4%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	4	74	39	117	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.4%	63.2%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	14	185	77	276
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.1%	67.0%	27.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.390	10	0.156
Likelihood Ratio	14.979	10	0.133
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.997	1	0.158
N of Valid Cases	276		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	3	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	21	6	31	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.9%	67.7%	19.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	13	46	24	83	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	15.7%	55.4%	28.9%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	2	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	24	8	38	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	15.8%	63.2%	21.1%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	75	33	119	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.2%	63.0%	27.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	34	168	76	278
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.2%	60.4%	27.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.297	10	0.335
Likelihood Ratio	10.998	10	0.358
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.061	1	0.805
N of Valid Cases	278		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	20	7	30	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.0%	66.7%	23.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	17	53	15	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	20.0%	62.4%	17.6%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	3	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	27	8	38	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.9%	71.1%	21.1%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	21	73	25	119	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	17.6%	61.3%	21.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	44	180	55	279
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	15.8%	64.5%	19.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.248	10	0.605
Likelihood Ratio	10.870	10	0.368
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.021	1	0.884
N of Valid Cases	279		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	22	5	31	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.9%	71.0%	16.1%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	57	16	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.1%	67.1%	18.8%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	3	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	26	8	38	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.5%	68.4%	21.1%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	21	81	18	120	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	17.5%	67.5%	15.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	41	193	47	281
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.6%	68.7%	16.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.342	10	0.867
Likelihood Ratio	7.383	10	0.689
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.497	1	0.481
N of Valid Cases	281		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	6	20	5	31	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	19.4%	64.5%	16.1%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	19	47	19	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	22.4%	55.3%	22.4%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	3	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	30	5	37	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.4%	81.1%	13.5%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	23	75	22	120	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	19.2%	62.5%	18.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	50	179	51	280
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	17.9%	63.9%	18.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.336	10	0.263
Likelihood Ratio	15.702	10	0.108
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.026	1	0.872
N of Valid Cases	280		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	3	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	21	5	29	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.3%	72.4%	17.2%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	47	27	86	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.0%	54.7%	31.4%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	3	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	24	13	38	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.6%	63.2%	34.2%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	13	63	43	119	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.9%	52.9%	36.1%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	29	159	91	279
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.4%	57.0%	32.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.396	10	0.202
Likelihood Ratio	15.692	10	0.109
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.123	1	0.289
N of Valid Cases	279		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	25	2	31	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.9%	80.6%	6.5%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	11	60	14	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.9%	70.6%	16.5%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	1	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	25	13	38	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	65.8%	34.2%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	13	81	26	120	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.8%	67.5%	21.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	30	196	55	281
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.7%	69.8%	19.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.596	10	0.006
Likelihood Ratio	25.843	10	0.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.107	1	0.043
N of Valid Cases	281		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?

			On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?					Total
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	3	1	0	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	4	10	14	2	31
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.2%	12.9%	32.3%	45.2%	6.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	10	12	22	29	14	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.5%	13.8%	25.3%	33.3%	16.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	1	0	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	5	9	15	5	38
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.5%	13.2%	23.7%	39.5%	13.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	20	19	37	33	12	121
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	16.5%	15.7%	30.6%	27.3%	9.9%	100.0%
	Total	Count	35	40	83	93	33	284
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.3%	14.1%	29.2%	32.7%	11.6%	100.0%


Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.017	20	0.586
Likelihood Ratio	20.045	20	0.455
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.133	1	0.042
N of Valid Cases	284		

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Information

Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often: NEWS & INFORMATION

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Newspaper	174	29.0	29.0
	Television	238	39.7	68.7
	Radio	47	7.9	76.6
	Internet	92	15.3	91.9
	Clark County 4 (CCTV)	15	2.4	94.3
	Newsletters	20	3.3	97.6
	County Commission	1	0.1	97.7
	Word of Mouth (family/friends)	14	2.3	100.0
	Total	600	100.0	




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction Information

Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often: ADVERTISING

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Newspaper	169	29.0	29.0
	Television	236	40.6	69.6
	Radio	62	10.6	80.1
	Internet	66	11.4	91.5
	Outdoor Billboards	50	8.5	100.0
	Total	583	100.0	
	DK/No answer	17		
Total		600		



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Information Jurisdictional Cross-Tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often: NEWS & INFORMATION

			Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often: NEWS & INFORMATION								Total	
			Newspaper	Television	Radio	Internet	Clark County 4 (CCTV)	Newsletters	County Commission	Word of Mouth (family/friends)		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	22.2%	44.4%	11.1%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	27	30	5	9	1	3	1	2	78	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	34.6%	38.5%	6.4%	11.5%	1.3%	3.8%	1.3%	2.6%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	52	59	12	27	6	3	0	3	162	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	32.1%	36.4%	7.4%	16.7%	3.7%	1.9%	0.0%	1.9%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	19	34	6	15	2	6	0	3	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	22.4%	40.0%	7.1%	17.6%	2.4%	7.1%	0.0%	3.5%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	73	111	23	37	6	8	0	5	263	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	27.8%	42.2%	8.7%	14.1%	2.3%	3.0%	0.0%	1.9%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	175	240	47	92	15	20	1	13	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	29.0%	39.8%	7.8%	15.3%	2.5%	3.3%	0.2%	2.2%	100.0%

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Information Jurisdictional Cross-Tabulations

**Respondent Jurisdiction * Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often:
NEWS & INFORMATION (cont.)**

Chi-Square Tests (cont.)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.337	35	0.934
Likelihood Ratio	21.270	35	0.967
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.215	1	0.643
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix IX

Local Government Interaction Information Jurisdictional Cross-Tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often: ADVERTISING

			Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often: ADVERTISING					Total
			Newspaper	Television	Radio	Internet	Outdoor Billboards	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	5	0	2	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.5%	62.5%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	28	22	9	8	7	74
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	37.8%	29.7%	12.2%	10.8%	9.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	44	79	12	16	6	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	28.0%	50.3%	7.6%	10.2%	3.8%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	1	0	2	0	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	19	28	9	14	14	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	22.6%	33.3%	10.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	74	102	31	25	23	255
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	29.0%	40.0%	12.2%	9.8%	9.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		168	237	61	67	50	583
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction:		28.8%	40.7%	10.5%	11.5%	8.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.032(a)	20	.087
Likelihood Ratio	31.128	20	.054
Linear-by-Linear Association	.573	1	.449
N of Valid Cases	580		

Appendix X

Local Distribution Summary

Appendix X Local Distribution Summary


Respondent zip code:

Zip Code	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	Zip Code	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
81289	1	0.2	0.3	89115	12	2.1	50.3
81934	1	0.1	0.4	89117	22	3.7	54.0
83134	1	0.1	0.5	89118	2	0.4	54.4
85009	1	0.1	0.6	89119	14	2.3	56.7
85074	1	0.1	0.6	89120	7	1.2	57.9
85106	2	0.3	0.9	89121	17	2.9	60.8
89002	12	2.0	2.9	89122	13	2.1	62.9
89004	2	0.3	3.2	89123	14	2.3	65.1
89005	7	1.2	4.4	89128	9	1.5	66.6
89011	2	0.4	4.8	89129	18	3.0	69.7
89012	8	1.4	6.2	89130	7	1.2	70.9
89014	10	1.7	7.9	89131	19	3.2	74.1
89015	19	3.2	11.1	89133	1	0.1	74.2
89018	3	0.5	11.7	89134	17	2.8	77.0
89019	1	0.2	11.8	89135	7	1.2	78.2
89020	3	0.5	12.3	89138	2	0.3	78.5
89021	1	0.2	12.5	89139	5	0.8	79.3
89025	4	0.7	13.2	89141	3	0.4	79.7
89027	4	0.7	13.9	89142	8	1.3	81.0
89028	1	0.2	14.0	89143	2	0.4	81.4
89029	2	0.3	14.3	89144	5	0.8	82.2
89030	17	2.9	17.2	89145	5	0.8	83.0
89031	50	8.3	25.5	89146	9	1.4	84.5
89032	13	2.2	27.8	89147	11	1.8	86.2
89034	1	0.1	27.8	89148	13	2.1	88.3
89040	1	0.2	28.0	89149	8	1.4	89.7
89042	1	0.2	28.2	89156	16	2.6	92.3
89044	2	0.3	28.5	89164	1	0.1	92.4
89052	12	2.0	30.5	89169	5	0.8	93.2
89074	14	2.3	32.9	89178	16	2.6	95.8
89081	8	1.3	34.2	89179	2	0.3	96.1
89084	8	1.3	35.5	89183	13	2.2	98.3
89085	1	0.1	35.6	89281	2	0.3	98.6
89101	10	1.7	37.3	Ref/No answer	11	1.8	98.8
89102	6	1.0	38.3	Total	600	100.0	

Appendix X Local Distribution Summary

Respondent Jurisdiction:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	City of Boulder City	8	1.3	1.3
	City of Henderson	77	12.9	14.2
	City of Las Vegas	162	27.0	41.1
	City of Mesquite	5	0.8	41.9
	City of North Las Vegas	85	14.2	56.1
	Unincorporated Clark County	263	43.9	100.0
	Total	600	100.0	




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile

Appendix XI Respondent Demographic Profile

Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	\$ 20,000 or under	44	8.0	8.0
	\$ 20,001 - \$ 40,000	94	17.2	25.2
	\$ 40,001 - \$ 60,000	136	24.9	50.1
	\$ 60,001 - \$ 80,000	98	18.0	68.0
	\$ 80,001 - \$100,000	76	13.9	81.9
	\$100,001 - \$120,000	44	8.0	89.9
	\$120,001 - \$140,000	21	3.8	93.7
	\$140,001 or more	34	6.3	100.0
	Total	547	100.0	
No answer/refused	53			
Total	600			




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix XI Respondent Demographic Profile

In what age group do you fall?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18 - 24	50	8.3	8.3
	25 - 44	205	34.3	42.7
	45 - 64	240	40.2	82.9
	65 or older	102	17.1	100.0
	Total	596	100.0	
	No answer/refused	4		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

Appendix XI Respondent Demographic Profile

How long have you lived in Clark County?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 year	6	0.9	0.9
	1 - 5 years	114	19.1	20.0
	6 - 10 years	116	19.5	39.5
	11 - 15 years	99	16.7	56.1
	Over 15 years	209	35.2	91.3
	All my life	51	8.7	100.0
	Total	595	100.0	
	No answer/refused	5		
Total		600		




Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile**

Gender observation:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	296	49.3	49.3
	Female	304	50.7	100.0
	Total	600	100.0	



Note- Graph does not include Don't Know/ No Answer

**Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?

			Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?							Total	
			\$ 20,000 or under	\$ 20,001 - \$ 40,000	\$ 40,001 - \$ 60,000	\$ 60,001 - \$ 80,000	\$ 80,001 - \$100,000	\$100,001 - \$120,000	\$120,001 - \$140,000		\$140,001 or more
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	1	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.1%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	4	5	16	8	20	8	2	8	71
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.6%	7.0%	22.5%	11.3%	28.2%	11.3%	2.8%	11.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	18	26	26	19	26	15	5	11	146
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.3%	17.8%	17.8%	13.0%	17.8%	10.3%	3.4%	7.5%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	7	5	28	18	9	5	4	3	79
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.9%	6.3%	35.4%	22.8%	11.4%	6.3%	5.1%	3.8%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	14	57	60	50	20	16	9	12	238
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.9%	23.9%	25.2%	21.0%	8.4%	6.7%	3.8%	5.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	44	94	135	99	76	44	20	35	547
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.0%	17.2%	24.7%	18.1%	13.9%	8.0%	3.7%	6.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	66.573	35	0.001
Likelihood Ratio	70.308	35	0.000
Linear-by- Linear Association	8.567	1	0.003
N of Valid Cases	547		

**Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction**

Respondent Jurisdiction * In what age group do you fall?

			In what age group do you fall?				Total
			18 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 64	65 or older	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	4	3	2	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	6	25	31	16	78
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.7%	32.1%	39.7%	20.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	37	74	41	161
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.6%	23.0%	46.0%	25.5%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	0	3	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	9	37	32	7	85
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.6%	43.5%	37.6%	8.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	25	102	100	35	262
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.5%	38.9%	38.2%	13.4%	100.0%
	Total	Count	49	207	240	104	596
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.2%	34.5%	40.0%	17.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.110	15	0.002
Likelihood Ratio	38.186	15	0.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.943	1	0.000
N of Valid Cases	596		

**Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction**

Respondent Jurisdiction * How long have you lived in Clark County?

			How long have you lived in Clark County?						Total	
			Less than 1 year	1 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 15 years	Over 15 years	All my life		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	2	0	1	5	1	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	11.1%	55.6%	11.1%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	0	13	17	14	26	7	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	16.9%	22.1%	18.2%	33.8%	9.1%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	2	15	29	38	68	7	159	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.3%	9.4%	18.2%	23.9%	42.8%	4.4%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	2	1	0	2	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	28	19	7	21	8	84	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.2%	33.3%	22.6%	8.3%	25.0%	9.5%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	3	54	51	39	90	27	264	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.1%	20.5%	19.3%	14.8%	34.1%	10.2%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	6	113	118	100	210	52	599
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.0%	18.9%	19.7%	16.7%	35.1%	8.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	47.769	25	0.004
Likelihood Ratio	51.495	25	0.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.800	1	0.094
N of Valid Cases	599		

**Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction**

Respondent Jurisdiction * Gender observation:

			Gender Observation:		Total	
			Male	Female		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	4	4	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	41	36	77	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	53.2%	46.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	83	79	162	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	51.2%	48.8%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	2	5	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	47	38	85	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	55.3%	44.7%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	119	144	263	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	45.2%	54.8%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	297	303	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	49.5%	50.5%	100.0%


Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.893	5	0.565
Likelihood Ratio	3.900	5	0.564
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.754	1	0.185
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons


Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Road Maintenance




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Revitalizing Older Neighborhoods




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Flood Control




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Budget Management




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Communicate Clark County Local Government's Views About Yucca Mountain to Federal Decision Makers




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Monitor and Report to the Public on How Well Government Services are Being Performed




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Water Conservation Programs




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Child Protection Services




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Child Welfare Services




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Juvenile Justice Services




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Affordable Housing for Low Income Families




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Shelter for the Homeless




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Affordable Housing for Seniors




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Medical Care for the Poor




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing 24-Hour Emergency Trauma Care




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Crime Prevention Programs




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Enforcing Traffic Laws




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Maintaining a Low Crime Rate




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Maintaining Neighborhood Police Patrols




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Keeping Police Response Times Low




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Keeping Fire Department Response Times Low




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Keeping Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Times Low




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Well Trained Paramedic and Emergency Response Personnel




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Facilitate Neighborhood Watch Programs




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Preparing for Natural Disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Preparing for Man-Made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) Accidents or Terrorist Events




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Investigating Criminal Activity




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Fire Protection & Prevention Services




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Emergency Medical Services




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Neighborhood Code Enforcement Services




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Examining Potential Impacts from Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Shipments




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Regional Justice Services and Facilities




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing and Maintaining Safe Parks and Recreational Facilities




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Affordable Housing




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Managing Growth




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Increasing Job Opportunities




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Ability to Attract Jobs Outside of Construction or Hotel/Gaming Related Employment




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Improving the Business Climate




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Planning for Commercial Development




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Reducing Traffic Congestion




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Access to Freeways




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Improving Road Conditions




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Reducing Travel Time




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Mass Transit




Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Adequate Airport Facilities



Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

Parks and Recreation Programs



**This page intentionally left blank
-END OF REPORT-**