Clark County Monitoring Program

Winter 2010

Urban Environmental Research, LLC

Clark County Monitoring Program: Community Survey
Winter 2010

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

Urban Environmental Research, LLC

TO: MS. IRENE NAVIS, AICP
FROM: DR. SHEILA CONWAY/UER; DR. ALVIN MUSHKATEL/UER
SUBJECT: CLARK COUNTY MONITORING PROGRAM | Winter 2010
DATE: FEB 2011
CC: Dr. Rebecca Thomas/UER

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 provided 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 December 2010, Urban Environmental Research administered a 163-question telephone survey to 600 Southern Nevada households. The survey, which touches on a broad number of topics, has a margin of error of ±5 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 also is 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 it's 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 mitigating 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 winter 2010 cycle of the Clark County Monitoring Program Survey. The modifications include additional variables designed to measure quality of life aspects (APPENDIX I and II).

B. KEY FINDINGS

- Notable trend in increasingly higher importance for budget management, improving the business climate, and increasing job opportunities.
- A similar number of respondents communicated now is a good time to buy a home in Clark County (at 81.4%) as compared to last year (88.4% in 2009).
- Respondents indicated the top three aspects that have the greatest positive impact on their quality of life as scenery/geography/climate (31.1%), the entertainment/social climate (15.4%), and family/friends/friendly (15.4%).
- The top three aspects that have the greatest negative impact on respondent's quality of life is economy/unemployment (15.4%), crime/violence/gangs (12.4%), and traffic congestion (7.9%). In 2009 these were 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 better jobs/training (17.1%), increase green and sustainable issues/water concerns (12.9%), improving K-12 education (10.3%), and economic improvement/unemployment (10.2%).
- Drought continues to be a pressing environmental concern as 93.3% (91.1% in 2009) of respondents communicate they are "somewhat concerned" or "very concerned" about the current drought and its impact on Clark County

C. YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUESTIONS (FIGURE 4)

- Opposition to the Yucca Mountain project remains stable with 69.2% indicating they would vote against the nuclear waste repository; with 72.3% opposing in 2009.
- 64.4% percent of respondents report that the storage site would have a negative impact on their quality of life, comparable to 63.7% in 2009 and 68.1% in 2008.
- Trust regarding the Yucca Mountain project remains a concern. Roughly 60% 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. 62.3% and 68.4% of respondents indicated the same in 2009 and 2008, respectively.

- Up from 80.3% in 2009, 88.3% 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 were “important” to “very important” the majority of respondents. Specifically, “identify public safety needs and impacts” were “important” to “very important” to 79% of persons, to 67.8% for “assess other government impacts”, to 68.2% for “assess impacts on the tourist sector”, to 67.1% for “assess impacts on the building, construction, and development sectors”, and 67.8% for “identify transportation impacts”.
- As an urgent environmental concern, the Yucca Mountain facility’s placement among major issues decreased. Approximately 1.5% of respondents identified the Yucca Mountain project as Southern Nevada’s most pressing environmental concern in 2009, 0.9 in the 2008, and 0.2 in 2010.
- 56.1% of respondents indicated it is “very important” to keep local decision makers up-to-date about Yucca Mountain and 58% indicated the same level of importance in keep the public up-to-date.

D. ECONOMY/BUSINESS

- The top four importance/performance disparity measurements were observed in the budget management, ability to attract jobs outside of the construction or hotel/gaming related employment sectors, improving the business climate, and increasing job opportunities service categories. The budget management disparity decreased from 2009, however increasing job opportunities, improving the business climate, and attracting jobs disparities increased from 2009.
- 39% of respondents indicated they are doing worse financially today compared to a year ago; down from 45% in 2009. Optimism for the next year remained steady as 43% of respondents believe they will be doing better financially one year from now compared to today; up from 39.7% in 2009.
- Respondents rating the Clark County business conditions as “poor” remained comparable from 29.3% in 2009 to 30% in 2010. However, 42.9% of respondents believe business conditions will be better in Clark County one year from now, compared to 37.9% of respondents during 2009.

E. PARKS AND RECREATION

- Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities were “very important” to 50.7% and “important” to 31.3% of respondents. Concurrently, only 1.5% indicated this was “not important at all”
- Providing parks and recreation programs were of the highest level of importance to 46.4% of respondents, and “not important at all” to only 3.1%

- Regarding governmental performance on providing parks and recreational programs, 54.7% indicated performance was “excellent” or “good”, and only 7% indicated it was “poor”.
- A similar trend was found for providing parks and recreational facilities with 50.9% indicating the performance as “excellent” or “good”, and only 5.3% indicating the performance as “poor”.
- Importance of providing parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities were “very important” or “important” to 65.4%, “neither important or not important” to 27.6%, and “not at all important” to 2.3% 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, 58.8 indicated they are “very satisfied” or “satisfied,” (53.1% in 2009) and only 4.4% indicated they are “very unsatisfied” (4.7% in 2009).

F. PUBLIC SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

- Public service importance continued to be dominated by public safety and emergency responder considerations, which accounted for 8 out of 10 of the top ten most highly-rated services.
- Fire importance scores are similar to those in 2008. 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, and 61.6% in 2010. 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, and 73.4% in 2010.
- Respondents rated the importance for the following public safety service questions as “important” or “very important”: providing crime prevention programs at 77.8% (68% in 2009), enforcing traffic laws at 71% (59.8% in 2009), maintaining a low crime rate at 87.8% (75.2% in 2009), and maintaining neighborhood police patrols at 81.3%(68.7% in 2009).
- Concurrently, respondents rated the governmental performance of the following services as “good” or “excellent”: providing crime prevention programs (33.3%), enforcing traffic laws (52.5%), maintaining a low crime rate (34.6%), and maintaining neighborhood police patrols (30.3%).

G. SOCIAL SERVICE CONSIDERATIONS

- Social Service importance increased from 2009 to 2010 in all areas. Respondents indicated the importance of the following services as “very important”: providing child protective services 67.6% (50.8% in 2009), providing child welfare services 61.4% (46.3% in 2009), providing juvenile justice services 49.8% (35.3% in 2009), providing attainable housing for working class families 48.6% (35.3% in 2009), providing affordable housing for low income families 47.1% (32.1% in 2009), providing shelter for the homeless 44.6% (32.4% in 2009), providing affordable housing for seniors 55.3% (42.7% in 2009), providing medical care for the poor 49.2% (35.4% in 2009), and providing 24 hour emergency trauma care 72.4% (61.8% in 2009).

- Social Service performance remained stable. Respondents indicated the governmental performance for the following services as either “good” or “excellent”: providing child protective services 31.7% (30.5% in 2009), providing child welfare services 35.6% (29.4% in 2009), providing juvenile justice services 32.1 % (24.1% in 2009), providing attainable housing for working class families 16.3% (17.9% in 2009), providing affordable housing for low income families 17.7% (20.8% in 2009), providing shelter for the homeless 13% (12% in 2009), providing affordable housing for seniors 23.8% (23.9% in 2009), providing medical care for the poor 22.9% (22.3% in 2009), and providing 24 hour emergency trauma care 49.3% (51.7% in 2009).

H. LOCAL GOVERNMENT INTERACTIONS

- 39.9% of respondents indicated they had inquired about or accessed services from Clark County, down from 48.4% in 2009, while 60.1 % indicated they had not.
- When compared with their previous local government interactions in other communities, 36.6% of respondents reported their interactions with Clark County as good or excellent, comparable to 34.2% in 2009 and 39.4% in 2008.
- The overall customer experience with Clark County for 42.2% of respondents was good or excellent, comparable to 44.6% in 2009 and 41.3% in 2008.
- Respondents indicated Clark County government’s performance increased in meeting or exceeding their expectations in the following: “policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained,” 70.6% (67.4% in 2009), and “accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)” 84.5% (80% in 2009).
- Respondents indicated performance met or exceeded expectations in the following, slightly decreasing from the previous year: “employee cared about and understood my needs,” 69.3% (72% in 2009); “service delivery was timely and responsive,” 70.4% (72.8% in 2009); “employee was able to assist or direct me to an appropriate source,” 78.8% (80.5% in 2009); “employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed,” 76.9% (83% in 2009); and “transaction was handled in an appropriate manner,” 80% (81.7% in 2009).

I. SUMMARY

Overall, concerns remain about the current economic and business climates, though most people are optimistic. The economy and unemployment rates were found to be common concerns and have the greatest negative impacts to residents, in addition to the concerns over better training and attracting jobs outside of the hospitality and construction industries. A lower percentage of respondents indicated they are doing worse financially now than a year ago, and the vast majority of respondents believe it is a good time to buy a home.

Respondents are consistently opposed to the Yucca Mountain project and believe the project would have a negative effect on property values. Drought remains an environmental concern, and emergency responder issues remain important, such as those for police, fire, and medical responders. The greatest positive impacts to residents’ quality of life include scenery/geography/climate and the entertainment/social climate.

Regarding social service considerations, the most important services reported overtime are well trained emergency medical response personnel, keeping response times low, and providing 24 hour emergency trauma care. The Clark County government's performances on local government interaction with residents were of notable quality with the majority of respondents reporting the interaction met or exceeded their expectations on all questions.

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														
		Mean							Mean Change					
Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Summer '05	Winter '06	Summer '06	Winter '07	Winter '08	Summer '09	Winter '10	From Summ '05	From Wint '06	From Summ '06	From Wint '07	From Wint '08	From Wint '09
General Government	Road Maintenance	4.21	4.05	4.04	4.09	4.13	3.93	4.01	-0.28	-0.12	-0.1	-0.16	-0.2	0.08
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.59	3.41	3.52	3.36	3.57	3.33	3.51	-0.26	-0.08	-0.2	-0.03	-0.2	0.18
	Flood control	4.09	3.88	3.86	3.7	4.01	3.69	3.99	-0.4	-0.19	-0.2	-0.01	-0.3	0.30
	Budget management	4.29	3.99	4.23	4.11	4.41	4.31	4.11	0.02	0.42	0.08	0.2	-0.1	-0.20
	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	3.63	-0.42	-0.23	-0.1	-0.19	-0.4	0.19
	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	4.01	-0.15	0.03	0	-0.12	-0.3	0.26
	Water conservation programs	n/a	n/a	4.12	4.22	4.48	4.12	4.24	n/a	n/a	0	-0.1	-0.4	0.12

Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.17	4.30	4.06	4.45	-0.21	0	-0.1	-0.11	-0.2	0.39
	Providing child welfare services	4.15	3.98	3.98	3.99	4.21	3.97	4.31	-0.18	-0.01	-0	-0.02	-0.2	0.34
	Providing juvenile justice services	4.08	3.93	3.87	3.98	4.15	3.81	4.17	-0.27	-0.12	-0.1	-0.17	-0.3	0.36
	Providing attainable housing for working class families	n/a	3.72	3.77	3.76	3.96	3.6	4.0	n/a	-0.12	-0.2	-0.16	-0.4	0.40
	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.7	3.56	3.64	3.67	3.83	3.5	3.93	-0.2	-0.06	-0.1	-0.17	-0.3	0.43
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.38	3.33	3.54	3.53	3.78	3.47	3.89	0.09	0.14	-0.1	-0.06	-0.3	0.42
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	4.12	3.92	3.91	4.02	4.18	3.84	4.22	-0.28	-0.08	-0.1	-0.18	-0.3	0.38
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.94	3.74	3.74	3.75	4.00	3.57	3.99	-0.37	-0.21	-0.2	-0.18	-0.4	0.42
	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.6	4.38	4.29	4.42	4.58	4.35	4.59	-0.25	-0.03	0.06	-0.07	-0.2	0.24
Public Safety	Providing crime prevention programs	4.27	3.99	4.09	4.04	4.24	3.91	4.22	-0.36	-0.08	-0.2	-0.13	-0.3	0.31
	Enforcing traffic laws	4.25	3.91	4.07	4.09	4.10	3.73	4.02	-0.52	-0.18	-0.3	-0.36	-0.4	0.29
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.49	4.14	4.28	4.24	4.58	4.13	4.50	-0.36	-0.01	-0.2	-0.11	-0.5	0.37
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	4.3	3.97	4.08	4.06	4.38	3.95	4.25	-0.35	-0.02	-0.1	-0.11	-0.4	0.30

	Keeping police response times low	4.45	4.24	4.6	4.34	4.59	4.14	4.45	-0.31	-0.1	-0.5	-0.2	-0.5	0.31
	Keeping fire department response times low	4.45	4.54	4.47	4.59	4.73	4.41	4.62	-0.04	-0.19	-0.2	-0.18	-0.3	0.21
	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.45	4.56	4.54	4.61	4.79	4.53	4.71	0.08	-0.03	-0	-0.08	-0.3	0.18
	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	n/a	4.64	4.57	4.67	4.79	4.63	4.75	n/a	-0.01	0.06	-0.04	-0.2	0.12
	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	4.05	3.69	3.79	3.79	4.05	3.59	3.89	-0.46	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.30
	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	4.04	3.75	3.87	3.84	4.10	3.68	4.05	-0.36	-0.07	-0.2	-0.16	-0.4	0.37
	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	4.27	-0.34	-0.08	-0.2	-0.19	-0.5	0.43
	Investigating criminal activity	4.47	4.03	4.24	4.18	4.46	4.1	4.41	-0.37	0.07	-0.1	-0.08	-0.4	0.31
	Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.59	4.32	4.26	4.33	4.53	4.29	4.44	-0.3	-0.03	0.03	-0.04	-0.2	0.15
	Providing emergency medical services	4.66	4.44	4.43	4.51	4.70	4.47	4.68	-0.19	0.03	0.04	-0.04	-0.2	0.21

	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.81	3.54	3.58	3.51	3.70	3.4	3.71	-0.41	-0.14	-0.2	-0.11	-0.3	0.31
	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.88	3.68	3.65	3.66	3.99	3.39	3.85	-0.49	-0.29	-0.3	-0.27	-0.6	0.46
	Regional justice services and facilities	n/a	n/a	3.6	3.69	3.93	3.63	3.94	n/a	n/a	0.03	-0.06	-0.3	0.31
	Providing and maintaining safe parks & recreation services	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.97	4.26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.29
Community Development	Providing affordable housing	n/a	n/a	3.68	3.64	3.86	3.47	3.88	n/a	n/a	-0.2	-0.17	-0.4	0.41
	Managing growth	4.07	3.83	3.87	3.83	4.10	3.73	3.96	-0.34	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.4	0.23
	Increasing job opportunities	4.07	3.95	3.82	3.84	4.13	3.93	4.41	-0.14	-0.02	0.11	0.09	-0.2	0.48
	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	4.37	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.40
	Improving the business climate	4.08	3.86	3.75	3.76	4.01	4.01	4.33	-0.07	0.15	0.26	0.25	0	0.32
	Planning for commercial development	3.82	3.7	3.56	3.55	3.72	3.68	3.97	-0.14	-0.02	0.12	0.13	-0	0.29

	Reducing traffic congestion	4.37	4.02	4.06	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.98	-0.41	-0.06	-0.1	-0.01	-0.3	0.02
	Access to freeways	4.12	3.83	3.92	3.83	4.11	3.84	3.88	-0.28	0.01	-0.1	0.01	-0.3	0.04
	Improving road conditions	4.29	3.97	4.04	3.95	4.18	3.89	3.93	-0.4	-0.08	-0.2	-0.06	-0.3	0.04
	Reducing travel time	4.01	3.77	3.83	3.82	3.96	3.77	3.85	-0.24	0	-0.1	-0.05	-0.2	0.08
	Providing mass public transit	3.86	3.67	3.64	3.69	3.77	3.63	3.89	-0.23	-0.04	-0	-0.06	-0.1	0.26
	Adequate airport facilities	n/a	n/a	3.91	3.87	3.96	3.87	3.95	n/a	n/a	-0	0	-0.1	0.08
	Parks and recreation programs	n/a	n/a	4.02	4.04	4.18	3.94	4.10	n/a	n/a	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2	0.16

FIGURE 2 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE RANKING

		Ranking					Change		
Descriptive Statistics	Winter	Summer	Winter	Winter	Summer	From Summer	From Winter	From Winter	From Summer
	'10	'09	'08	'07	'06	'09	'08	'07	'06
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	+1
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	2	2	1	2	3	0	-1	0	+1
Keeping fire department response times low	4	4	3	3	4	0	-1	-1	0
Providing emergency medical services	3	3	4	4	5	0	+1	+1	+2
Keeping police response times low	7	8	5	6	1	+1	-3	-2	-7
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	5	5	6	5	6	0	+1	0	+1
Maintaining a low crime rate	6	9	6	8	7	+3	-3	-1	-2
Providing fire protection & prevention services	8	7	8	7	8	-1	+1	0	+1
Water conservation programs	16	10	9	9	11	-6	-1	-1	+1
Investigating criminal activity	9	11	10	10	9	+2	-1	-1	-2
Budget management	19	6	11	12	10	-13	+5	+6	+4
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	15	18	12	15	14	+3	-6	-3	-4
Providing child protection services	7	12	13	11	12	+5	+1	-1	0
Reducing traffic congestion	26	17	13	22	16	-9	-4	-5	-1
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	13	25	15	18	20	+12	-10	-7	-5
Providing crime prevention programs	17	22	16	17	13	+5	-6	-5	-9
Providing child welfare services	11	14	17	20	21	+3	+3	+6	+7
Parks and recreation programs	20	19	18	16	19	-1	-1	-3	0

Providing affordable housing for seniors	17	25	18	19	23	+8	-7	-6	-2
Improving road conditions	31	23	18	23	18	-8	-5	0	-5
Providing juvenile justice services	18	28	21	21	25	+10	-7	-7	-3
Road Maintenance	23	20	22	14	17	-3	+2	-6	-3
Increasing job opportunities	9	20	22	26	30	+11	+2	+6	+10
Access to freeways	33	25	24	28	22	-8	-1	-3	-3
Enforcing traffic laws	22	31	25	13	15	+9	-6	-18	-16
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	21	34	25	27	26	+13	-9	-7	-8
Managing growth	28	31	25	29	27	+3	-6	-2	-4
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	23	30	28	25	33	+7	-2	-5	+3
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	32	39	29	31	31	+7	-10	-8	-8
Improving the business climate	12	13	30	32	34	+1	+7	+19	+21
Flood control	25	33	30	35	28	+8	-3	2	-5
Providing medical care for the poor	25	40	32	34	35	+15	-8	-6	-5
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	34	46	33	39	37	+12	-13	-7	-9
Adequate airport facilities	29	24	34	24	24	-5	10	0	0
Reducing travel time	34	29	34	30	29	-5	+5	+1	0
Providing attainable housing for working class families	24	38	34	33	32	+14	-4	-5	-6
Regional justice services and facilities	30	36	37	37	40	-6	+1	+1	+4
Providing affordable housing	33	42	38	40	36	+9	-4	-2	-6
Providing affordable housing for low income families	31	41	39	38	38	+10	-2	-3	-3
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	36	44	39	41	41	+8	-5	-3	-3

Providing shelter for the homeless	32	42	41	43	44	+10	-1	+1	+2
Providing mass public transit	32	36	42	36	39	+4	+6	0	+3
Planning for commercial development	27	34	43	42	43	+7	+9	+8	+9
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	35	45	44	44	42	+10	-1	-1	-3
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	37	47	45	45	45	+10	-2	-2	-2
Providing and maintaining safe parks & recreation services	14	16	n/a	n/a	n/a	+2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ability to attract jobs outside construction or hotel/gaming related employment	10	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	+4	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 '09 Disparity
General Government	Road maintenance	4.01	3.13	-0.88	-0.83
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.51	2.40	-1.11	-0.75
	Flood control	3.99	3.57	-0.42	-0.05
	Budget management	4.11	2.40	-1.71	-1.83
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.63	2.74	-0.89	-0.52
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	4.01	2.46	-1.55	-1.25
	Water conservation programs	4.24	3.36	-0.88	-0.73
Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.45	3.07	-1.38	-1.04
	Providing welfare services	4.31	3.15	-1.16	-0.96
	Providing juvenile justice services	4.17	3.03	-1.14	-0.87
	Provide attainable housing for working class families	4.0	2.59	-1.41	-0.99

	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.93	2.57	-1.36	-0.89
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.89	2.29	-1.60	-1.3
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	4.22	2.82	-1.40	-1.08
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.99	2.55	-1.44	-0.97
	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.59	3.45	-1.14	-0.9
Public Safety	Providing crime prevention programs	4.22	3.14	-1.08	-0.7
	Enforcing traffic laws	4.02	3.48	-0.54	-0.45
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.50	3.10	-1.40	-1.08
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	4.25	2.91	-1.34	-1.05
	Keeping police response times low	4.45	3.28	-1.17	-0.89
	Keeping fire department response times low	4.62	3.86	-0.76	-0.45
	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.71	3.87	-0.84	-0.53
	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	4.75	4.05	-0.70	-0.51
	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	3.89	2.86	-1.03	-0.77

	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	4.05	2.93	-1.12	-0.67
	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	4.27	2.99	-1.28	-0.85
	Investigating criminal activity	4.41	3.26	-1.15	-0.91
	Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.44	3.55	-0.89	-0.54
	Providing emergency medical services	4.68	3.83	-0.85	-0.56
	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.71	3.01	-0.70	-0.42
	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.85	2.79	-1.06	-0.59
	Regional justice services and facilities	3.94	3.31	-0.63	-0.44
	Providing and maintaining safe parks & recreation services	4.26	3.43	-0.83	-0.58
Community Development	Providing affordable housing	3.88	2.77	-1.11	-0.81
	Managing growth	3.96	2.67	-1.29	-1.15
	Increasing job opportunities	4.41	2.20	-2.21	-1.52
	Ability to attract jobs outside of the construction or hotel/gaming related employment	4.37	2.15	-2.22	-1.73

	Improving the business climate	4.33	2.45	-1.88	-1.48
	Planning for commercial development	3.97	2.68	-1.29	-0.98
	Reducing traffic congestion	3.98	2.91	-1.07	-1.27
	Access to freeways	3.88	3.51	-0.37	-0.62
	Improving road conditions	3.93	3.25	-0.68	-0.89
	Reducing travel time	3.85	3.09	-0.76	-0.94
	Providing mass public transit	3.89	2.90	-0.99	-0.96
	Adequate airport facilities	3.95	3.78	-0.17	-0.19
	Parks and recreation programs	4.10	3.52	-0.58	-0.37

FIGURE 4 YUCCA MOUNTAIN SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

	Yucca Mountain Service Importance Score Summary				
Descriptive Statistics	Public Service Importance Winter	Public Service Importance Summer	Public Service Importance Winter	Public Service Importance Winter	Public Service Importance Summer
	'10	'09	'08	'07	'06
Keeping local decision makers up to date on Yucca Mountain	4.18	3.29	4.26	3.94	3.89
Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	4.21	3.65	4.32	3.98	3.93
Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology and hydrology	4.05	3.35	4.12	3.87	3.84
Identify public safety needs and impacts	4.26	3.65	4.28	4.04	3.96
Assess other government impacts	3.93	4	3.89	3.72	3.66
Assess impacts on the tourist sector	3.94	4.53	3.85	3.83	3.61
Assess impacts on the building, construction, and development sectors	3.93	4.76	3.85	3.79	3.57
Identify transportation impacts	3.97	4.53	3.99	3.85	3.68
Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain	4.20	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 Valid	N Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
General Government												
Road maintenance:	599	4	4.01	0.041	4	1.015	-0.899	0.100	0.392	0.199	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	593	10	3.51	0.049	4	1.193	-0.378	0.100	-0.701	0.200	1	5
Flood control:	600	3	3.99	0.046	4	1.129	-0.842	0.100	-0.223	0.199	1	5
Budget management:	596	7	4.41	0.040	5	.970	-1.758	0.100	2.607	0.200	1	5
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	575	28	3.63	0.054	4	1.296	-0.550	0.102	-0.825	0.203	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	592	11	4.01	0.048	4	1.161	-1.069	0.100	-0.310	0.201	1	5
Water conservation programs:	602	1	4.24	0.041	5	.999	-1.285	0.100	1.202	0.199	1	5
Social Judicial Services												
Providing child protection services:	588	15	4.45	0.039	5	.936	-1.801	0.101	2.805	0.201	1	5
Providing child welfare services:	588	15	4.31	0.043	5	1.040	-1.503	0.101	1.539	0.201	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services:	579	24	4.17	0.043	4	1.033	-1.220	0.102	0.964	0.203	1	5
Provide attainable housing for working class families:	600	3	4.00	0.049	4	1.200	-0.998	0.100	-0.027	0.199	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low-income families:	596	7	3.93	0.051	4	1.235	-0.880	0.100	-0.351	0.200	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless:	595	8	3.89	0.051	4	1.250	-0.862	0.100	-0.370	0.200	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors:	597	6	4.22	0.044	5	1.066	-1.310	0.100	0.913	0.200	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor:	598	5	3.99	0.050	4	1.218	-0.968	0.100	-0.148	0.200	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:	596	7	4.59	0.033	5	0.793	-2.259	0.100	5.425	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:	599	4	4.22	0.041	5	1.013	-1.238	0.100	0.913	0.199	1	5
Enforcing traffic laws:	603	0	4.02	0.045	4	1.094	-0.971	0.100	-0.222	0.199	1	5
Maintaining a low crime rate:	600	3	4.50	0.035	5	0.860	-1.976	0.100	3.924	0.199	1	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	602	1	4.25	0.041	5	1.017	-1.425	0.100	1.455	0.199	1	5
Keeping police response times low:	599	4	4.45	0.037	5	0.900	-1.814	0.100	3.031	0.199	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low:	599	4	4.62	0.031	5	0.748	-2.459	0.100	6.766	0.199	1	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	601	2	4.71	0.026	5	0.648	-2.790	0.100	9.079	0.199	1	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:	601	2	4.75	0.026	5	0.640	-3.192	0.100	12.091	0.199	1	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	599	4	3.89	0.046	4	1.132	-0.806	0.100	-0.168	0.199	1	5
Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	602	1	4.05	0.046	4	1.136	-1.010	0.100	-0.069	0.199	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	602	1	4.27	0.043	5	1.044	-1.403	0.100	1.231	0.199	1	5
Investigating criminal activity:	600	3	4.41	0.034	5	0.839	-1.522	0.100	2.260	0.199	1	5
Providing fire protection & prevention services:	600	3	4.44	0.035	5	0.861	-1.767	0.100	3.300	0.199	1	5
Providing emergency medical services:	600	3	4.68	0.025	5	0.623	-2.360	0.100	6.668	0.199	1	5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	587	16	3.71	0.051	4	1.223	-0.642	0.101	-.578	0.199	1	5

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

	N											
	Valid	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Public Safety Services (cont.)												
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	583	20	3.385	0.054	4	1.311	-0.866	0.101	-0.427	0.202	1	5
Regional justice services and facilities:	591	12	3.94	0.041	4	0.990	-0.657	0.101	-0.071	0.201	1	5
Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities:	602	1	4.26	0.038	5	0.927	-1.280	0.100	1.325	0.199	1	5
Community Development Services												
Providing affordable housing:	595	8	3.88	0.053	4	1.300	-0.902	0.100	-0.324	0.200	1	5
Managing growth:	589	14	3.96	0.046	4	1.119	-0.941	0.101	0.227	0.201	1	5
Increasing job opportunities:	601	2	4.41	0.045	5	1.100	-1.907	0.100	2.625	0.199	1	5
Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment:	601	2	4.37	0.045	5	1.098	-1.781	0.100	2.199	0.199	1	5
Improving the business climate:	601	2	4.33	0.042	5	1.028	-1.644	0.100	2.157	0.199	1	5
Planning for commercial development:	600	3	3.97	0.046	4	1.130	-0.895	0.100	-0.085	0.199	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion:	602	1	3.98	0.046	4	1.140	-0.898	0.100	-0.024	0.199	1	5
Access to freeways:	602	1	3.88	0.046	4	1.127	-0.746	0.100	-0.245	0.199	1	5
Improving road conditions:	602	1	3.93	0.043	4	1.063	-0.705	0.100	-0.255	0.199	1	5
Reducing travel time:	600	3	3.85	0.045	4	1.107	-0.597	0.100	-0.473	0.199	1	5
Providing mass public transit:	599	4	3.89	0.051	4	1.244	-0.920	0.100	-0.174	0.199	1	5
Adequate airport facilities:	597	6	3.95	0.046	4	1.127	-0.917	0.100	-0.115	0.200	1	5
Providing parks and recreational facilities:	602	1	4.10	0.043	4	1.061	-1.118	0.100	0.598	0.199	1	5

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



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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 government 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	230	227	229	228	219	228	230
	Missing	0	3	2	2	11	2	0
Mean		4.03	3.62	3.97	4.45	3.74	4.09	4.31
Std. Error of Mean		.068	.073	.070	.055	.082	.071	.056
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	3	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.026	1.096	1.054	.831	1.211	1.068	.847
Skewness		-.967	-.352	-.612	-1.728	-.672	-1.126	-.911
Std. Error of Skewness		.161	.161	.161	.161	.164	.161	.160
Kurtosis		.562	-.574	-.593	3.367	-.465	.695	-.089
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.320	.321	.321	.321	.327	.321	.320
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 government 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	155	155	158	159	150	153	158
	Missing	4	4	0	0	8	5	0
Mean		4.02	3.46	4.04	4.45	3.59	3.94	4.19
Std. Error of Mean		.085	.101	.089	.081	.114	.104	.089
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	4	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.055	1.260	1.121	1.017	1.397	1.289	1.117
Skewness		-.871	-.426	-1.008	-1.896	-.598	-1.077	-1.336
Std. Error of Skewness		.195	.195	.193	.193	.198	.196	.193
Kurtosis		.101	-.790	.231	2.826	-.941	.021	1.105
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.388	.387	.383	.383	.393	.389	.383
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 government 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	91	88	91	89	86	91	91
	Missing	0	3	0	2	5	0	0
Mean		4.04	3.63	4.22	4.29	3.62	4.05	4.32
Std. Error of Mean		.103	.145	.110	.109	.138	.127	.100
Median		4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.04	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.977	1.367	1.045	1.032	1.278	1.207	.954
Skewness		-.746	-.573	-1.249	-1.514	-.441	-1.182	-1.573
Std. Error of Skewness		.253	.256	.253	.255	.259	.253	.253
Kurtosis		-.009	-.841	.656	1.849	-.978	.443	2.345
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.501	.507	.501	.505	.513	.501	.501
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 Henderson		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local government 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	98	96	97	95	94	94	97
	Missing	0	2	1	2	4	3	1
Mean		3.91	3.34	3.71	4.41	3.41	3.96	4.14
Std. Error of Mean		.092	.113	.134	.109	.141	.113	.112
Median		4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.71
Mode		4	3	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.913	1.109	1.319	1.069	1.361	1.097	1.099
Skewness		-1.085	-.104	-.577	-1.914	-.224	-.831	-1.285
Std. Error of Skewness		.244	.246	.245	.247	.249	.248	.245
Kurtosis		1.829	-.776	-.859	2.748	-1.181	.006	1.043
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.483	.487	.486	.489	.494	.492	.485
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 Boulder City		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local government 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	8	8	8	7	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		4.17	3.10	3.71	4.03	3.60	2.93	4.17
Std. Error of Mean		.337	.375	.515	.501	.404	.410	.337
Median		4.41	3.00	4.00	4.76	4.00	3.00	4.41
Mode		5	3	5	5	4	3	5
Std. Deviation		.944	1.051	1.444	1.339	1.131	1.150	.944
Skewness		-.423	.171	-.849	-1.093	-.830	-.040	-.423
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.758	.787	.758	.758	.758
Kurtosis		-2.036	1.353	-.352	-.615	1.468	1.550	-2.036
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	1.495	1.569	1.495	1.495	1.495
Range		2	4	4	3	4	4	2
Minimum		3	1	1	2	1	1	3
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 Mesquite		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local government 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	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.77	2.63	4.38	4.24	3.52	3.88	3.68
Std. Error of Mean		.504	.412	.312	.347	.451	.503	.618
Median		4.15	3.00	4.97	4.68	3.00	4.00	4.37
Mode		5	3	5	5	3	4	5
Std. Deviation		1.355	1.108	.838	.931	1.213	1.351	1.661
Skewness		-.396	-.303	-.996	-.631	.314	-1.713	-.858
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-1.981	2.024	-.459	-1.753	-1.542	3.261	-.668
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		3	4	2	2	3	4	4
Minimum		2	1	3	3	2	1	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	Providing 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	226	226	224	229	230	227	228	229	228
	Missing	4	4	6	1	0	3	2	1	2
Mean		4.51	4.25	4.13	4.06	3.93	3.92	4.20	3.93	4.63
Std. Error of Mean		.057	.072	.067	.075	.079	.082	.070	.081	.048
Median		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.859	1.079	1.005	1.133	1.191	1.242	1.065	1.220	.726
Skewness		-1.990	-1.447	-1.107	-1.051	-.803	-.929	-1.284	-.889	-2.329
Std. Error of Skewness		.162	.162	.163	.161	.161	.161	.161	.161	.161
Kurtosis		4.129	1.410	.773	.172	-.516	-.264	.864	-.294	6.114
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.322	.322	.324	.320	.320	.321	.321	.320	.321
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	Providing 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	157	156	154	158	158	158	158	158	159
	Missing	2	3	5	1	1	1	0	1	0
Mean		4.46	4.40	4.18	3.95	3.94	3.85	4.18	3.97	4.51
Std. Error of Mean		.073	.077	.083	.100	.098	.097	.087	.099	.074
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.914	.955	1.026	1.254	1.229	1.224	1.097	1.242	.931
Skewness		-1.766	-1.500	-1.182	-.939	-.941	-.765	-1.354	-.888	-2.283
Std. Error of Skewness		.193	.194	.195	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193
Kurtosis		2.792	1.399	.823	-.152	-.072	-.461	1.191	-.343	5.171
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.385	.387	.388	.384	.384	.384	.383	.384	.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 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	Providing 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	88	88	86	91	87	90	88	88	88
	Missing	3	3	5	0	4	1	3	3	3
Mean		4.56	4.54	4.48	4.19	4.14	4.04	4.51	4.33	4.68
Std. Error of Mean		.102	.095	.097	.112	.123	.130	.100	.111	.070
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.953	.892	.895	1.069	1.146	1.233	.937	1.047	.656
Skewness		-2.213	-2.181	-2.042	-1.304	-1.268	-1.042	-2.139	-1.851	-2.014
Std. Error of Skewness		.257	.256	.260	.253	.258	.255	.256	.256	.256
Kurtosis		4.016	4.480	4.106	1.027	.889	.014	4.278	3.151	3.224
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.509	.508	.514	.501	.511	.504	.508	.508	.508
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	Providing 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	93	92	91	97	96	95	96	97	95
	Missing	5	5	7	1	2	3	2	1	3
Mean		4.17	4.10	3.95	3.70	3.68	3.64	4.00	3.79	4.47
Std. Error of Mean		.114	.117	.117	.134	.138	.134	.111	.127	.087
Median		5.00	5.00	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		1.103	1.129	1.109	1.321	1.358	1.308	1.084	1.250	.848
Skewness		-1.322	-1.167	-1.011	-.638	-.561	-.662	-.814	-.673	-1.676
Std. Error of Skewness		.250	.251	.253	.245	.246	.247	.246	.245	.247
Kurtosis		1.010	.647	.584	-.757	-1.011	-.614	-.368	-.623	2.505
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.495	.497	.501	.485	.487	.490	.487	.485	.490
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	Providing 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	7	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.47	4.53	4.51	4.14	4.14	4.33	3.96	4.33	4.58
Std. Error of Mean		.351	.305	.317	.454	.425	.345	.485	.381	.327
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	4.41	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.984	.853	.824	1.273	1.190	.967	1.358	1.067	.917
Skewness		-1.848	-1.536	-1.504	-1.505	-1.773	-1.411	-1.197	-1.274	-2.389
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.806	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758
Kurtosis		3.056	.792	1.161	2.279	4.230	1.780	.603	.225	6.462
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	1.621	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495
Range		3	2	2	4	4	3	4	3	3
Minimum		2	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	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 Mesquite		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing 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	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.34	4.34	3.79	3.99	3.99	3.97	4.23	3.63	4.76
Std. Error of Mean		.376	.374	.544	.535	.535	.527	.402	.665	.172
Median		5.00	5.00	4.44	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.85	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.982	1.005	1.462	1.438	1.438	1.415	1.079	1.785	.461
Skewness		-.953	-1.461	-.872	-.946	-.946	-.747	-1.050	-.742	-1.549
Std. Error of Skewness		.803	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-1.530	1.790	-.067	-1.394	-1.394	-1.796	-.250	-1.614	.432
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.612	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		2	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	1
Minimum		3	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	4
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	228	230	230	229	229	228	229	229
	Missing	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	1
Mean		4.21	3.98	4.48	4.19	4.39	4.65	4.70	4.77
Std. Error of Mean		.064	.073	.061	.068	.062	.045	.041	.035
Median		5.00	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		.966	1.112	.919	1.027	.942	.678	.615	.532
Skewness		-1.094	-.935	-2.086	-1.423	-1.772	-2.179	-2.322	-2.376
Std. Error of Skewness		.161	.160	.160	.161	.161	.161	.161	.161
Kurtosis		.566	.140	4.302	1.669	2.933	4.635	5.734	5.011
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.321	.320	.320	.320	.320	.321	.320	.320
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 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 event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and 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 & Maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	230	229	230	228	230	230	220	223	225	230
	Missing	0	1	0	2	0	0	10	7	5	0
Mean		3.85	4.01	4.26	4.42	4.41	4.62	3.65	3.81	3.86	4.24
Std. Error of Mean		0.077	0.073	0.069	0.051	0.055	0.043	0.083	0.084	0.068	0.059
Median		4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.175	1.109	1.051	0.776	0.828	0.647	1.234	1.254	1.015	0.9
Skewness		-0.788	-0.914	-1.375	-1.39	-1.561	-1.747	-0.532	-0.78	-0.558	-1.219
Std. Error of Skewness		0.16	0.161	0.16	0.161	0.16	0.16	0.164	0.163	0.162	0.16
Kurtosis		-0.23	0.047	1.168	2.01	2.572	2.923	-0.708	-0.393	-0.213	1.408
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.32	0.32	0.32	0.321	0.32	0.32	0.327	0.325	0.323	0.32
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	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 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	159	159	159	159	157	158	158	159
	Missing	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0
Mean		4.19	4.05	4.54	4.33	4.54	4.60	4.76	4.72
Std. Error of Mean		.091	.092	.067	.074	.066	.061	.047	.054
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.151	1.154	.838	.934	.825	.760	.596	.680
Skewness		-1.359	-.989	-2.042	-1.398	-1.925	-2.652	-3.480	-3.216
Std. Error of Skewness		.193	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193
Kurtosis		.924	.043	4.081	1.385	3.326	8.592	15.683	12.567
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.383	.383	.383	.383	.385	.384	.384	.383
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 event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and 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 & Maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	159	159	159	158	156	156	156	155	154	158
	Missing	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	4	5	0
Mean		3.87	3.97	4.20	4.38	4.38	4.72	3.58	3.75	4.01	4.24
Std. Error of Mean		.090	.098	.087	.074	.072	.049	.103	.119	.085	.079
Median		4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.131	1.233	1.102	.927	.893	.606	1.294	1.483	1.057	1.000
Skewness		-.810	-.886	-1.249	-1.530	-1.455	-2.840	-.492	-.802	-.939	-1.312
Std. Error of Skewness		.193	.193	.193	.193	.194	.194	.194	.195	.196	.193
Kurtosis		-.091	-.486	.568	1.989	1.846	10.521	-.881	-.843	.287	1.173
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.383	.383	.383	.384	.387	.387	.386	.388	.389	.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 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	91	91	88	91	90	90	91	91
	Missing	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0
Mean		4.34	4.18	4.59	4.37	4.52	4.70	4.72	4.71
Std. Error of Mean		.097	.111	.087	.115	.099	.072	.069	.075
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.928	1.054	.821	1.092	.940	.685	.661	.716
Skewness		-1.390	-1.338	-2.364	-1.717	-2.012	-2.634	-2.459	-3.106
Std. Error of Skewness		.253	.253	.256	.253	.254	.254	.253	.253
Kurtosis		1.562	1.383	5.985	1.972	3.357	6.950	5.606	11.119
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.501	.501	.508	.501	.502	.502	.501	.501
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 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 event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and 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 & Maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	90	90	90	91	91	91	89	89	90	91
	Missing	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
Mean		4.10	4.45	4.52	4.47	4.67	4.79	4.13	4.20	4.08	4.51
Std. Error of Mean		.105	.092	.090	.089	.058	.060	.101	.116	.089	.073
Median		4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
Std. Deviation		.998	.876	.852	.845	.548	.570	.951	1.093	.845	.693
Skewness		-1.085	-1.880	-2.434	-1.962	-1.412	-3.177	-1.031	-1.272	-.487	-1.331
Std. Error of Skewness		.254	.254	.254	.253	.253	.253	.255	.256	.253	.253
Kurtosis		.619	3.770	6.812	4.464	1.094	10.926	.510	.729	-.652	1.409
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.503	.502	.502	.501	.501	.501	.505	.506	.502	.501
Range		4	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	2	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 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	96	98	98	98	97	98	98	97
	Missing	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		4.11	3.87	4.36	4.14	4.30	4.51	4.68	4.77
Std. Error of Mean		.098	.098	.086	.101	.095	.094	.078	.069
Median		4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.963	.964	.846	.998	.931	.926	.775	.677
Skewness		-.900	-.650	-1.181	-1.022	-1.545	-2.320	-3.031	-3.757
Std. Error of Skewness		.246	.244	.244	.244	.246	.244	.244	.245
Kurtosis		.137	-.024	1.017	.222	2.456	5.627	10.297	15.783
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.487	.483	.483	.483	.486	.483	.483	.484
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 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 event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and 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 & Maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	95	98	98	98	98	98	97	95	96	97
	Missing	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0
Mean		3.82	3.90	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.68	3.60	3.71	3.74	4.07
Std. Error of Mean		.110	.115	.110	.084	.112	.062	.124	.134	.092	.101
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5
Std. Deviation		1.073	1.142	1.084	.833	1.107	.617	1.225	1.306	.901	.994
Skewness		-.509	-.820	-1.041	-1.205	-1.748	-2.656	-.638	-.703	-.321	-1.120
Std. Error of Skewness		.248	.244	.244	.244	.244	.244	.245	.247	.246	.245
Kurtosis		-.690	-.164	.335	1.111	2.469	10.481	-.456	-.613	.015	.898
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.491	.483	.483	.483	.483	.483	.484	.490	.487	.484
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 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	96	98	98	98	97	98	98	97
	Missing	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		4.11	3.87	4.36	4.14	4.30	4.51	4.68	4.77
Std. Error of Mean		.098	.098	.086	.101	.095	.094	.078	.069
Median		4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.963	.964	.846	.998	.931	.926	.775	.677
Skewness		-.900	-.650	-1.181	-1.022	-1.545	-2.320	-3.031	-3.757
Std. Error of Skewness		.246	.244	.244	.244	.246	.244	.244	.245
Kurtosis		.137	-.024	1.017	.222	2.456	5.627	10.297	15.783
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.487	.483	.483	.483	.486	.483	.483	.484
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 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 event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and 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 & Maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	6	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
Mean		3.98	3.99	4.26	4.63	4.58	4.44	3.59	3.99	4.04	4.21
Std. Error of Mean		.438	.502	.505	.245	.277	.399	.625	.617	.354	.370
Median		4.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.88	4.12	4.82
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.226	1.406	1.415	.686	.776	1.118	1.671	1.480	.991	1.036
Skewness		-1.431	-1.334	-1.931	-1.883	-1.728	-2.112	-.819	-1.364	-.111	-.962
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.787	.859	.758	.758
Kurtosis		2.445	1.259	3.300	3.515	2.074	4.081	-.908	1.283	-2.456	-.238
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.569	1.789	1.495	1.495
Range		4	4	4	2	2	3	4	4	2	3
Minimum		1	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	3	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 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	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.96	3.53	4.85	3.78	4.64	4.45	4.62	4.81
Std. Error of Mean		.500	.610	.144	.719	.235	.299	.262	.237
Median		4.44	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.344	1.638	.388	1.932	.631	.802	.705	.636
Skewness		-1.181	-.838	-2.471	-1.132	-1.831	-1.218	-1.913	-3.508
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		.943	-.889	5.653	-1.035	3.997	.365	3.726	14.382
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		4	4	1	4	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	4	1	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 event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and 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 & Maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		3.33	3.28	4.20	4.14	4.70	4.82	4.22	4.05	4.38	3.97
Std. Error of Mean		.673	.550	.297	.473	.228	.156	.421	.537	.384	.522
Median		3.93	3.79	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.47	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	2	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.807	1.477	.797	1.270	.612	.418	1.021	1.442	1.031	1.401
Skewness		-.456	-.229	-.437	-1.250	-2.262	-2.083	-1.325	-1.202	-1.539	-.796
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.852	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-1.785	-1.564	-.900	.068	6.456	3.166	2.310	.249	1.711	-1.620
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.764	1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		4	4	2	3	2	1	3	4	3	3
Minimum		1	1	3	2	3	4	2	1	2	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 and maintain 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 recreation programs
N	Valid	229	226	230	230	230	229	230	230	229	229	230	227	229
	Missing	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3	1
Mean		3.98	4.01	4.38	4.39	4.29	3.86	3.80	3.79	3.84	3.75	3.85	3.95	4.11
Std. Error of Mean		.081	.072	.074	.071	.067	.076	.081	.076	.071	.077	.084	.079	.072
Median		4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.223	1.078	1.118	1.079	1.011	1.155	1.224	1.148	1.070	1.171	1.277	1.197	1.085
Skewness		-1.063	-.941	-1.915	-1.942	-1.572	-.801	-.778	-.670	-.535	-.542	-.911	-1.082	-1.218
Std. Error of Skewness		.161	.162	.160	.161	.161	.161	.161	.160	.161	.161	.160	.161	.161
Kurtosis		.182	.342	2.708	3.039	2.097	-.183	-.288	-.326	-.518	-.566	-.247	.394	.834
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.320	.322	.320	.320	.320	.321	.320	.320	.320	.320	.320	.321	.320
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 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 and maintain 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 recreation programs
N	Valid	155	155	158	158	159	159	159	158	159	158	158	157	159
	Missing	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
Mean		3.78	3.88	4.42	4.33	4.28	3.95	4.06	3.85	4.04	3.90	3.83	3.83	3.98
Std. Error of Mean		.111	.100	.092	.094	.091	.093	.090	.093	.087	.091	.104	.095	.089
Median		4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.387	1.239	1.157	1.186	1.152	1.169	1.131	1.168	1.091	1.144	1.312	1.196	1.123
Skewness		-.769	-.911	-1.946	-1.733	-1.658	-.914	-1.021	-.785	-.955	-.694	-.904	-.642	-.986
Std. Error of Skewness		.195	.195	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193	.193
Kurtosis		-.738	-.128	2.614	1.908	1.930	-.067	.179	-.211	.132	-.504	-.293	-.612	.242
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.387	.388	.384	.383	.383	.383	.383	.384	.383	.384	.383	.385	.383
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 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 and maintain 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 recreation programs
N	Valid	91	87	91	91	91	90	91	91	90	90	91	91	91
	Missing	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.90	3.92	4.52	4.50	4.47	4.34	4.14	4.05	4.10	4.12	4.29	4.01	4.33
Std. Error of Mean		.120	.106	.099	.098	.091	.093	.106	.105	.111	.094	.099	.106	.093
Median		4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.148	.990	.943	.937	.864	.880	1.014	1.001	1.051	.894	.944	1.015	.891
Skewness		-.618	-.907	-2.253	-1.893	-1.701	-1.278	-.798	-.656	-.945	-.652	-1.132	-.864	-1.076
Std. Error of Skewness		.253	.258	.253	.253	.253	.254	.253	.253	.254	.253	.253	.253	.253
Kurtosis		-.457	.957	4.751	2.638	2.483	.887	-.475	-.553	.144	-.234	.459	.251	.077
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.501	.512	.501	.501	.501	.503	.501	.501	.502	.502	.501	.501	.501
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	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

City of Henderson		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Ability to attract and maintain 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 recreation programs
N	Valid	94	96	97	97	97	97	97	98	98	97	95	98	98
	Missing	3	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0
Mean		3.69	3.99	4.33	4.31	4.34	3.85	4.02	3.86	3.79	3.73	3.73	4.10	4.04
Std. Error of Mean		.151	.113	.115	.116	.103	.120	.103	.116	.099	.107	.127	.092	.099
Median		4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.466	1.109	1.135	1.144	1.016	1.188	1.011	1.149	.975	1.052	1.245	.909	.984
Skewness		-.759	-.993	-1.537	-1.496	-1.591	-.632	-.758	-.771	-.457	-.373	-.620	-.795	-.943
Std. Error of Skewness		.248	.247	.245	.246	.245	.245	.245	.244	.244	.245	.247	.244	.244
Kurtosis		-.833	.385	1.239	.958	1.954	-.670	-.100	-.259	-.279	-.557	-.643	.128	.489
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.492	.488	.485	.486	.485	.484	.485	.483	.483	.485	.489	.483	.483
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 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 and maintain 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 recreation programs
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.24	4.17	4.70	4.37	4.24	4.44	4.42	4.61	4.47	4.15	3.84	4.12	3.99
Std. Error of Mean		.412	.377	.276	.433	.437	.344	.410	.283	.329	.397	.510	.436	.417
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.41	5.00	4.12
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.155	1.055	.773	1.214	1.226	.940	1.149	.794	.921	1.113	1.429	1.223	1.169
Skewness		-1.243	-.431	-3.515	-1.674	-1.313	-1.888	-2.393	-2.899	-1.961	-.740	-.843	-1.002	-.795
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.774	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758
Kurtosis		.190	-2.572	17.180	1.387	.161	4.246	7.606	12.576	4.523	-1.329	-.684	-.615	-.670
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.536	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495
Range		3	2	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	3
Minimum		2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
Maximum		5	5	5	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

City of Mesquite		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Ability to attract and maintain 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 recreation programs
N	Valid	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		4.43	3.68	4.13	4.05	4.52	4.09	4.29	4.13	3.70	3.69	3.79	3.26	4.00
Std. Error of Mean		.408	.597	.487	.483	.336	.305	.469	.374	.589	.501	.386	.563	.625
Median		5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.56	4.00	3.87	4.00	3.06	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	3	5
Std. Deviation		1.065	1.604	1.307	1.298	.904	.821	1.261	1.005	1.583	1.308	1.037	1.365	1.680
Skewness		-3.232	-.537	-1.290	-.864	-2.317	-.192	-1.831	-.336	-1.206	-.120	-1.409	-.495	-1.571
Std. Error of Skewness		.803	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.803	.784	.852	.784
Kurtosis		16.810	-1.968	.062	-1.198	7.191	-1.242	3.997	-2.481	.438	-2.066	5.514	.671	1.150
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.612	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.612	1.561	1.764	1.561
Range		4	4	3	3	3	2	4	2	4	3	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	2	2	2	3	1	3	1	2	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	590	13	3.13	.044	3.00	1.063	-.125	.101	-.490	.201	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	535	68	2.40	.043	2.00	1.001	.339	.106	-.327	.211	1	5
Flood control	583	20	3.57	.046	4.00	1.110	-.575	.101	-.277	.202	1	5
Budget management	565	38	2.40	.048	2.00	1.145	.452	.103	-.526	.205	1	5
Communicate Clark County's views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	530	73	2.74	.052	3.00	1.205	.149	.106	-.821	.212	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	575	28	2.46	.046	2.00	1.112	.460	.102	-.324	.203	1	5
Social and Judicial Services												
Water conservation programs	592	11	3.36	.045	3.00	1.104	-.330	.100	-.464	.200	1	5
Providing child protection services	531	72	3.07	.047	3.00	1.085	-.102	.106	-.382	.212	1	5
Providing child welfare services	529	74	3.15	.046	3.00	1.057	-.126	.106	-.392	.212	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services	521	82	3.03	.046	3.00	1.040	-.192	.107	-.360	.214	1	5
Providing attainable housing for working class families	552	51	2.59	.044	3.00	1.045	.289	.104	-.286	.208	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low income families	556	47	2.57	.046	3.00	1.091	.376	.104	-.391	.207	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless	557	46	2.29	.047	2.00	1.109	.620	.104	-.242	.207	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors	539	64	2.82	.048	3.00	1.118	.204	.105	-.499	.210	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor	565	38	2.55	.052	3.00	1.234	.290	.103	-.908	.205	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	570	33	3.45	.049	3.00	1.178	-.392	.102	-.581	.204	1	5

Appendix II Continued
Performance 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	573	30	3.14	.042	3.00	1.011	-.110	.102	-.179	.204	1	5
Enforcing traffic laws	597	6	3.48	.047	4.00	1.155	-.480	.100	-.458	.200	1	5
Maintaining a low crime rate	595	8	3.10	.043	3.00	1.051	-.076	.100	-.470	.200	1	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	591	12	2.91	.048	3.00	1.157	.152	.101	-.766	.201	1	5
Keeping police response times low	560	43	3.28	.047	3.00	1.117	-.285	.103	-.467	.206	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low	563	40	3.86	.040	4.00	.937	-.667	.103	.447	.206	1	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	570	33	3.87	.042	4.00	1.013	-.826	.102	.457	.204	1	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	562	41	4.05	.039	4.00	.928	-.929	.103	.780	.206	1	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	564	39	2.86	.047	3.00	1.127	.086	.103	-.660	.205	1	5
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	557	46	2.93	.050	3.00	1.177	.025	.104	-.738	.207	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents and terrorist events	546	56	2.99	.052	3.00	1.221	-.054	.104	-.861	.209	1	5
Investigating criminal activity	569	34	3.26	.044	3.00	1.054	-.296	.102	-.333	.204	1	5
Providing fire protection and prevention services	574	29	3.55	.045	4.00	1.086	-.542	.102	-.177	.204	1	5
Providing emergency medical services	585	18	3.83	.042	4.00	1.006	-.717	.101	.223	.202	1	5
Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	534	69	3.01	.046	3.00	1.071	.045	.106	-.422	.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	517	86	2.79	.053	3.00	1.196	.132	.107	-.735	.215	1	5
Regional justice services and facilities	550	53	3.31	.044	3.00	1.042	-.349	.104	-.179	.208	1	5
Providing & maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities	591	12	3.43	.044	4.00	1.068	-.402	.101	-.382	.201	1	5
Community Development Services												
Providing affordable housing	564	39	2.77	.050	3.00	1.179	.151	.103	-.661	.205	1	5
Managing growth	571	32	2.67	.046	3.00	1.095	.229	.102	-.536	.204	1	5
Increasing job opportunities	588	15	2.20	.046	2.00	1.105	.773	.101	.027	.201	1	5
Ability to attract jobs outside of construction or hotel/gaming related employment	586	17	2.15	.046	2.00	1.103	.873	.101	.216	.201	1	5
Improving the business climate	576	27	2.45	.047	2.00	1.120	.418	.102	-.457	.203	1	5
Planning for commercial development	576	27	2.68	.046	3.00	1.111	.149	.102	-.501	.203	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion	597	6	2.91	.048	3.00	1.172	-.096	.100	-.858	.200	1	5
Access to free ways	593	10	3.51	.044	4.00	1.078	-.432	.100	-.235	.200	1	5
Improving road conditions	597	6	3.25	.045	3.00	1.112	-.289	.100	-.514	.200	1	5
Reducing travel time	587	16	3.09	.045	3.00	1.094	-.174	.101	-.489	.201	1	5
Providing mass public transit	581	22	2.90	.051	3.00	1.238	-.032	.101	-.950	.202	1	5
Adequate airport facilities	587	16	3.78	.042	4.00	1.019	-.716	.101	.231	.201	1	5
Providing parks and recreation programs	594	9	3.52	.046	4.00	1.119	-.560	.100	-.234	.200	1	5

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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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)



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
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 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	226	205	225	219	201	221	227
	Missing	4	25	5	11	29	9	3
Mean		3.20	2.40	3.65	2.34	2.78	2.57	3.41
Std. Error of Mean		.065	.072	.070	.078	.085	.077	.070
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	4	1	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		.974	1.027	1.056	1.151	1.204	1.138	1.049
Skewness		.162	.508	-.616	.520	.098	.315	-.463
Std. Error of Skewness		.162	.170	.162	.164	.171	.164	.162
Kurtosis		-.573	-.255	-.092	-.557	-.773	-.486	-.001
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.322	.338	.323	.327	.341	.326	.322
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 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	157	141	151	147	141	146	158
	Missing	2	18	8	12	18	13	1
Mean		3.11	2.43	3.50	2.31	2.66	2.32	3.32
Std. Error of Mean		.089	.080	.099	.096	.102	.088	.094
Median		3.00	2.26	4.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	4	1	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.116	.953	1.219	1.166	1.215	1.059	1.181
Skewness		-.218	.183	-.578	.496	.300	.502	-.251
Std. Error of Skewness		.194	.204	.198	.200	.204	.201	.193
Kurtosis		-.593	-.226	-.558	-.562	-.703	-.104	-.800
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.385	.405	.393	.398	.406	.399	.384
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 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	89	86	89	84	79	89	91
	Missing	2	5	2	7	11	2	0
Mean		3.00	2.34	3.56	2.65	2.92	2.55	3.57
Std. Error of Mean		.126	.114	.094	.129	.129	.117	.103
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.191	1.059	.892	1.179	1.150	1.102	.985
Skewness		-.047	.233	-.298	.409	.034	.493	.024
Std. Error of Skewness		.255	.260	.255	.263	.270	.256	.253
Kurtosis		-.659	-.658	.193	-.457	-.688	-.166	-.595
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.505	.514	.505	.520	.534	.507	.501
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 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	94	80	93	92	87	96	95
	Missing	4	18	4	6	11	2	3
Mean		3.11	2.41	3.58	2.44	2.68	2.38	3.13
Std. Error of Mean		.110	.105	.117	.112	.129	.114	.125
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	3	2	4
Std. Deviation		1.064	.935	1.128	1.076	1.206	1.121	1.214
Skewness		-.344	.354	-.506	.401	.150	.688	-.239
Std. Error of Skewness		.249	.269	.250	.251	.258	.246	.248
Kurtosis		-.296	.027	-.428	-.224	-.967	-.118	-.961
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.494	.533	.494	.498	.511	.487	.491
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 Boulder City		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's 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	8	7	7	6	7	7	6
	Missing	0	1	1	2	1	1	2
Mean		3.05	2.36	4.19	2.57	2.34	2.09	3.69
Std. Error of Mean		.333	.317	.274	.285	.468	.405	.360
Median		3.00	2.88	4.00	2.47	3.00	2.06	3.33
Mode		3	3	4	2	3	1	3
Std. Deviation		.933	.849	.732	.685	1.252	1.083	.886
Skewness		-1.135	-.934	-.321	.880	-.124	.206	.840
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.787	.787	.859	.787	.787	.842
Kurtosis		2.224	-.659	-.273	1.025	-1.990	-1.629	-1.018
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.569	1.569	1.789	1.569	1.569	1.732
Range		3	2	2	2	3	3	2
Minimum		1	1	3	2	1	1	3
Maximum		4	3	5	4	4	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 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	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.16	2.64	2.46	3.03	3.14	2.76	3.17
Std. Error of Mean		.417	.456	.533	.301	.531	.575	.317
Median		3.05	3.00	2.15	3.00	3.03	2.79	3.00
Mode		2	3	1	3	4	1	4
Std. Deviation		1.120	1.189	1.431	.809	1.426	1.544	.852
Skewness		.259	-.697	.880	-1.098	-.233	.340	-.400
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.803	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-1.363	-.838	.524	4.128	-.842	-1.111	-1.409
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.612	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		3	3	4	3	4	4	2
Minimum		2	1	1	1	1	1	2
Maximum		5	4	5	4	5	5	4

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	Providing 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	203	202	199	217	216	218	205	218	221
	Missing	27	28	31	13	14	12	25	12	9
Mean		3.25	3.26	3.22	2.60	2.58	2.27	2.97	2.57	3.53
Std. Error of Mean		.072	.072	.070	.071	.075	.071	.078	.081	.072
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.41
Mode		3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.024	1.029	.993	1.044	1.097	1.043	1.121	1.198	1.063
Skewness		-.136	-.145	-.281	.373	.426	.483	.139	.220	-.305
Std. Error of Skewness		.171	.171	.172	.165	.165	.165	.170	.165	.164
Kurtosis		-.224	-.213	-.202	-.220	-.382	-.349	-.562	-.861	-.418
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.340	.340	.343	.329	.329	.328	.338	.328	.326
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	Providing 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	141	140	141	144	145	150	147	150	150
	Missing	18	19	18	14	14	9	11	9	9
Mean		3.01	3.05	2.88	2.68	2.61	2.41	2.72	2.63	3.45
Std. Error of Mean		.090	.089	.083	.090	.093	.094	.088	.108	.102
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.070	1.048	.981	1.084	1.121	1.150	1.073	1.317	1.245
Skewness		-.160	-.117	-.026	.159	.409	.628	.363	.301	-.415
Std. Error of Skewness		.204	.205	.204	.202	.201	.198	.200	.198	.198
Kurtosis		-.324	-.478	-.216	-.492	-.398	-.201	-.113	-.989	-.810
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.405	.407	.406	.401	.400	.394	.397	.394	.394
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	Providing 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	80	81	78	82	81	83	82	83	86
	Missing	11	9	13	9	10	8	9	8	5
Mean		2.95	3.24	3.06	2.61	2.54	2.21	2.75	2.47	3.43
Std. Error of Mean		.141	.126	.135	.111	.119	.132	.133	.143	.142
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	4	4	3	3	1	3	1	3
Std. Deviation		1.260	1.137	1.196	1.001	1.069	1.202	1.203	1.303	1.318
Skewness		.022	-.405	-.463	-.106	.112	.764	.211	.196	-.438
Std. Error of Skewness		.268	.267	.272	.266	.268	.265	.266	.264	.260
Kurtosis		-.985	-.587	-.773	-.366	-.573	-.303	-.770	-1.267	-.708
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.531	.527	.538	.527	.530	.524	.526	.522	.515
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	Providing 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	86	84	83	88	91	83	84	91	89
	Missing	11	13	15	10	7	15	14	7	9
Mean		2.83	2.94	2.84	2.53	2.55	2.22	2.76	2.53	3.37
Std. Error of Mean		.107	.110	.112	.108	.111	.123	.114	.121	.119
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		.993	1.014	1.018	1.015	1.057	1.121	1.047	1.148	1.122
Skewness		.054	.198	.097	.572	.407	.733	.152	.420	-.379
Std. Error of Skewness		.259	.262	.265	.257	.253	.265	.262	.253	.256
Kurtosis		.341	.218	.074	.320	-.102	-.073	-.307	-.665	-.415
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.513	.518	.523	.509	.502	.523	.519	.502	.507
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	Providing 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	6	6	7	7	7	7
	Missing	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	0
Mean		3.18	3.32	3.27	2.09	2.09	2.11	2.46	2.69	3.07
Std. Error of Mean		.380	.401	.224	.361	.447	.384	.528	.268	.462
Median		3.00	3.70	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		4	4	3	3	1	1	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		.855	.903	.497	.918	1.137	1.028	1.412	.717	1.261
Skewness		-.478	-.955	1.553	-.232	.643	.236	.183	-.929	-.619
Std. Error of Skewness		.908	.908	.918	.820	.820	.787	.787	.787	.774
Kurtosis		-.955	-.729	.334	-2.034	-.566	-1.110	-1.208	3.057	.703
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.978	1.978	2.021	1.662	1.662	1.569	1.569	1.569	1.536
Range		2	2	1	2	3	3	4	3	4
Minimum		2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	3	4	4	5	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	Providing 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	7	7	6	7	7	7	6	7	7
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean		2.74	2.94	2.09	1.98	2.32	1.77	2.69	1.30	3.46
Std. Error of Mean		.501	.474	.400	.307	.348	.345	.357	.239	.584
Median		3.00	2.77	2.38	2.00	2.00	1.58	3.00	1.00	3.97
Mode		3	2	3	2	2	1	3	1	5
Std. Deviation		1.308	1.236	1.012	.801	.935	.900	.902	.623	1.568
Skewness		-.046	.377	-.241	.037	.473	.593	-.700	2.313	-.725
Std. Error of Skewness		.803	.803	.823	.803	.784	.803	.823	.803	.784
Kurtosis		.583	-.670	-2.691	-1.001	.572	-1.577	1.642	6.954	-.670
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.612	1.612	1.672	1.612	1.561	1.612	1.672	1.612	1.561
Range		4	4	2	2	3	2	3	2	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	3	3	4	3	4	3	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	219	228	225	227	215	212	215	214
	Missing	11	2	5	3	15	18	15	16
Mean		3.22	3.55	3.07	2.89	3.20	3.87	3.91	4.02
Std. Error of Mean		.062	.075	.072	.074	.077	.058	.066	.064
Median		3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		.918	1.130	1.072	1.112	1.131	.849	.969	.932
Skewness		.050	-.477	-.015	.191	-.193	-.340	-.785	-.785
Std. Error of Skewness		.164	.161	.162	.162	.166	.167	.166	.166
Kurtosis		-.320	-.364	-.668	-.584	-.637	-.207	.448	.367
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.327	.321	.323	.322	.331	.332	.330	.331
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 manmade (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents and terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities	Providing & maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	214	213	211	219	219	224	201	206	210	225
	Missing	16	17	20	11	11	6	29	24	20	5
Mean		2.89	2.97	2.97	3.25	3.61	3.85	3.03	2.87	3.30	3.42
Std. Error of Mean		.077	.084	.086	.071	.070	.062	.070	.080	.070	.070
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		1.128	1.225	1.245	1.051	1.029	.930	.995	1.151	1.012	1.051
Skewness		.054	.048	-.073	-.156	-.425	-.458	.241	.126	-.136	-.253
Std. Error of Skewness		.166	.167	.168	.164	.164	.163	.171	.169	.168	.162
Kurtosis		-.599	-.799	-.918	-.423	-.282	-.212	-.235	-.579	-.262	-.496
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.331	.332	.334	.327	.327	.324	.341	.337	.334	.323
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	153	156	157	152	147	147	146	143
	Missing	6	3	2	6	12	11	12	16
Mean		3.14	3.38	3.06	2.90	3.25	3.84	3.85	4.09
Std. Error of Mean		.092	.098	.082	.096	.097	.082	.081	.081
Median		3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	4	3	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.136	1.227	1.029	1.186	1.181	.992	.984	.969
Skewness		-.166	-.552	.045	.046	-.232	-.697	-.667	-1.246
Std. Error of Skewness		.196	.194	.193	.197	.200	.200	.200	.203
Kurtosis		-.389	-.515	-.403	-.801	-.506	.378	.273	1.677
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.390	.386	.385	.391	.397	.397	.398	.403
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 and terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities	Providing & maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	146	145	138	150	146	150	141	131	143	155
	Missing	13	13	21	9	13	8	17	27	15	4
Mean		2.79	2.87	3.13	3.31	3.50	3.94	2.95	2.70	3.23	3.37
Std. Error of Mean		.096	.099	.111	.086	.095	.086	.099	.113	.093	.086
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	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.160	1.200	1.304	1.056	1.150	1.054	1.182	1.295	1.118	1.072
Skewness		.248	-.004	-.041	-.490	-.558	-1.051	.026	.216	-.211	-.344
Std. Error of Skewness		.201	.201	.206	.198	.201	.198	.204	.211	.202	.195
Kurtosis		-.694	-.905	-1.043	-.199	-.257	.809	-.724	-.895	-.441	-.317
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.399	.399	.410	.394	.399	.393	.405	.420	.402	.388
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	84	91	90	91	83	87	90	87
	Missing	7	0	0	0	8	4	1	3
Mean		3.03	3.66	3.11	2.89	3.26	3.86	3.83	4.23
Std. Error of Mean		.110	.126	.115	.131	.126	.110	.123	.077
Median		3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	4	3	2	4	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.015	1.204	1.096	1.249	1.151	1.025	1.164	.718
Skewness		-.159	-.679	-.256	.185	-.390	-.993	-1.033	-.372
Std. Error of Skewness		.262	.253	.253	.253	.264	.259	.255	.258
Kurtosis		-.068	-.509	-.343	-1.063	-.518	.964	.461	-.982
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.519	.501	.502	.501	.522	.512	.504	.510
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	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 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 and terrorst events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities	Providing & maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	89	84	85	84	89	90	82	79	83	91
	Missing	2	7	6	7	2	1	9	12	8	0
Mean		2.89	2.84	2.83	3.14	3.40	3.69	3.06	2.68	3.40	3.25
Std. Error of Mean		.126	.125	.137	.116	.120	.123	.126	.138	.121	.127
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.190	1.146	1.259	1.065	1.133	1.166	1.144	1.222	1.102	1.209
Skewness		-.088	.009	.045	-.373	-.661	-.755	-.250	.329	-.711	-.509
Std. Error of Skewness		.255	.263	.262	.263	.256	.255	.266	.271	.265	.253
Kurtosis		-.835	-.682	-.919	-.018	-.104	-.105	-.365	-.671	.100	-.765
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.505	.520	.518	.520	.506	.504	.525	.537	.523	.501
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 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	92	97	97	95	94	95	96	94
	Missing	6	1	1	3	4	3	2	3
Mean		3.07	3.37	3.12	2.88	3.42	3.83	3.86	3.92
Std. Error of Mean		.102	.102	.099	.117	.097	.098	.104	.105
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	2	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		.975	1.004	.979	1.145	.942	.956	1.022	1.016
Skewness		.013	-.265	-.100	.296	-.350	-.713	-.821	-.808
Std. Error of Skewness		.251	.245	.245	.247	.249	.247	.246	.248
Kurtosis		.012	-.171	.019	-.793	.225	.623	.489	.362
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.497	.485	.485	.490	.493	.490	.488	.492
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 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 and terrorst events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities	Providing & maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	91	93	93	94	96	97	86	80	90	97
	Missing	7	5	5	3	2	1	12	17	7	1
Mean		2.84	3.00	2.95	3.27	3.60	3.74	3.05	2.76	3.36	3.62
Std. Error of Mean		.110	.107	.102	.104	.107	.097	.110	.123	.104	.098
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	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.047	1.027	.980	1.012	1.049	.948	1.017	1.103	.987	.966
Skewness		.067	.051	-.166	-.231	-.478	-.620	.180	-.097	-.585	-.504
Std. Error of Skewness		.252	.250	.250	.248	.246	.246	.260	.268	.254	.246
Kurtosis		-.499	-.177	-.407	-.400	-.277	.488	-.316	-.743	.280	-.103
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.500	.496	.496	.492	.488	.486	.515	.531	.502	.486
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 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	6	6	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1
Mean		3.41	3.12	3.58	3.78	3.77	3.84	3.93	4.07
Std. Error of Mean		.320	.419	.248	.344	.411	.436	.378	.407
Median		3.00	3.00	3.47	3.18	3.30	3.59	4.00	4.12
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	3	4	5
Std. Deviation		.896	1.173	.694	.963	.986	1.045	1.012	1.088
Skewness		1.173	-.294	.828	.565	.656	.452	-.726	-.900
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.758	.758	.859	.859	.787	.787
Kurtosis		1.036	.066	.204	-2.000	-2.182	-2.871	.417	.009
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.789	1.789	1.569	1.569
Range		3	4	2	2	2	2	3	3
Minimum		2	1	3	3	3	3	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 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 and terrorst events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities	Providing & maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	6	5	6	6	8	8	7	6	8	8
	Missing	2	3	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	0
Mean		2.81	3.13	3.23	3.95	4.11	4.06	3.19	3.05	3.41	3.87
Std. Error of Mean		.337	.247	.328	.297	.300	.331	.275	.414	.188	.207
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	4	4	5	5	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		.808	.572	.807	.756	.841	.928	.736	.993	.526	.580
Skewness		.442	.251	-.536	.097	-.250	-.144	-.344	1.235	.474	-.108
Std. Error of Skewness		.859	.887	.842	.820	.758	.758	.787	.859	.758	.758
Kurtosis		-.664	4.827	-.670	-.334	-1.446	-2.096	-.315	3.363	-2.520	1.801
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.789	1.889	1.732	1.662	1.495	1.495	1.569	1.789	1.495	1.495
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	2
Minimum		2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3
Maximum		4	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	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	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean		2.72	3.14	3.20	3.36	3.68	4.51	4.54	4.35
Std. Error of Mean		.526	.605	.621	.417	.443	.215	.207	.327
Median		3.00	2.67	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.56	4.77	4.82
Mode		4	2	5	3	4	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.412	1.627	1.668	1.121	1.155	.544	.540	.853
Skewness		-.507	.275	-.086	.692	-.468	-.051	-.205	-.927
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.784	.784	.784	.803	.823	.803	.803
Kurtosis		-2.019	-2.122	-1.771	-.492	-.832	-3.173	-2.989	-.664
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.612	1.672	1.612	1.612
Range		3	4	4	3	3	1	1	2
Minimum		1	1	1	2	2	4	4	3
Maximum		4	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 manmade (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents and terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities	Providing & maintaining safe parks and recreation facilities
N	Valid	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.81	2.49	2.72	2.93	3.57	3.53	2.60	3.17	3.41	3.96
Std. Error of Mean		.553	.661	.620	.558	.609	.409	.438	.612	.363	.389
Median		2.64	2.00	3.00	2.79	4.15	3.56	2.64	3.36	4.00	4.15
Mode		2	1	3	2	5	3	2	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		1.442	1.726	1.618	1.500	1.636	1.098	1.143	1.597	.977	1.046
Skewness		.567	.890	.237	.420	-.746	-.025	-.081	-.492	-2.160	.102
Std. Error of Skewness		.803	.803	.803	.784	.784	.784	.803	.803	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-.412	-.923	-1.218	-1.018	-.741	-.896	-1.114	-1.084	6.248	-2.793
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.612	1.612	1.612	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.612	1.612	1.561	1.561
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	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 free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Providing parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	219	223	226	225	219	221	228	226	226	221	226	224	225
	Missing	11	7	4	5	11	9	2	4	4	9	4	7	5
Mean		2.90	2.72	2.23	2.20	2.48	2.64	2.93	3.51	3.26	3.14	2.92	3.85	3.46
Std. Error of Mean		.081	.072	.073	.075	.076	.076	.078	.070	.074	.073	.082	.065	.072
Median		3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.45
Mode		3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3
Std. Deviation		1.195	1.074	1.097	1.121	1.120	1.131	1.182	1.053	1.109	1.087	1.235	.967	1.088
Skewness		.014	.100	.757	.905	.371	.253	-.063	-.384	-.234	-.120	.017	-.695	-.401
Std. Error of Skewness		.165	.163	.162	.162	.164	.164	.161	.162	.162	.164	.162	.163	.162
Kurtosis		-.684	-.579	.158	.307	-.439	-.445	-.903	-.265	-.598	-.419	-.911	.172	-.320
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.328	.325	.323	.323	.327	.326	.321	.322	.322	.326	.322	.324	.323
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 free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Providing parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	146	152	154	152	155	153	158	156	158	156	154	154	157
	Missing	12	7	4	6	4	6	1	3	1	3	5	5	2
Mean		2.82	2.56	2.12	2.16	2.46	2.77	2.80	3.52	3.27	3.03	2.90	3.73	3.53
Std. Error of Mean		.097	.091	.089	.095	.094	.095	.090	.090	.089	.090	.105	.086	.093
Median		3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	2	1	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.171	1.120	1.103	1.172	1.172	1.170	1.128	1.120	1.118	1.127	1.300	1.072	1.165
Skewness		.218	.480	1.015	.874	.487	.125	-.080	-.583	-.382	-.107	-.023	-.565	-.635
Std. Error of Skewness		.200	.197	.195	.197	.195	.196	.193	.195	.193	.195	.196	.196	.194
Kurtosis		-.549	-.325	.636	.024	-.517	-.702	-.759	-.122	-.428	-.611	-1.095	-.181	-.135
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.398	.392	.388	.391	.388	.390	.384	.387	.384	.387	.389	.389	.385
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 free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Providing parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	86	81	88	88	86	85	90	91	91	91	86	90	91
	Missing	5	10	3	3	5	6	1	0	0	0	5	1	0
Mean		2.79	2.73	2.23	2.11	2.47	2.78	2.97	3.45	3.19	3.11	3.01	3.70	3.41
Std. Error of Mean		.127	.117	.120	.119	.115	.126	.132	.125	.128	.113	.132	.118	.134
Median		3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	1	1	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.176	1.048	1.123	1.115	1.066	1.158	1.253	1.190	1.218	1.076	1.226	1.119	1.277
Skewness		.204	.114	.689	.763	.149	-.132	-.240	-.418	-.270	-.372	-.313	-.800	-.553
Std. Error of Skewness		.259	.268	.256	.256	.260	.261	.254	.253	.253	.253	.260	.254	.253
Kurtosis		-.696	-.381	-.114	-.112	-.561	-.581	-.987	-.458	-.668	-.353	-.806	.340	-.581
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.513	.529	.508	.508	.515	.517	.502	.501	.501	.501	.514	.502	.501
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 free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Providing parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	91	92	94	95	91	92	96	96	97	95	93	97	96
	Missing	7	5	3	3	7	6	2	2	1	2	5	1	2
Mean		2.44	2.62	2.17	2.07	2.30	2.51	2.97	3.61	3.27	3.09	2.81	3.90	3.71
Std. Error of Mean		.119	.118	.117	.100	.116	.097	.118	.096	.104	.109	.122	.095	.097
Median		3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.138	1.132	1.133	.979	1.111	.932	1.157	.942	1.021	1.063	1.174	.940	.952
Skewness		.252	.262	.720	.996	.792	-.011	-.094	-.150	-.284	-.268	.022	-.899	-.658
Std. Error of Skewness		.253	.251	.248	.247	.252	.251	.246	.246	.245	.247	.250	.245	.246
Kurtosis		-.678	-.596	-.393	.959	.189	-.185	-.845	-.460	-.259	-.353	-.869	.926	.129
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.501	.497	.492	.490	.500	.497	.487	.487	.485	.489	.496	.485	.487
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 free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Providing parks and recreation programs
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		2.25	3.04	2.15	2.01	2.15	2.47	2.17	2.77	2.66	2.27	1.95	3.64	4.05
Std. Error of Mean		.278	.582	.401	.343	.346	.423	.480	.469	.460	.444	.346	.276	.414
Median		2.00	2.44	2.18	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.06	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.73	4.06
Mode		3	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	1	3	5
Std. Deviation		.779	1.632	1.124	.962	.970	1.185	1.344	1.315	1.290	1.245	.969	.717	1.160
Skewness		-.536	.284	.202	.903	.525	.227	.945	.016	.115	1.013	.124	.728	-1.134
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.806	.758
Kurtosis		-.744	-1.927	-1.568	1.130	.150	-1.365	.805	-.428	.040	1.819	-2.340	.182	.368
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.621	1.495
Range		2	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	2	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2
Maximum		3	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	3	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 free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Providing parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		2.89	2.83	2.18	1.98	2.77	2.81	3.18	3.20	3.45	2.89	2.93	2.51	3.45
Std. Error of Mean		.514	.366	.414	.288	.374	.429	.488	.417	.433	.444	.396	.531	.497
Median		3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.97
Mode		3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
Std. Deviation		1.340	.984	1.112	.774	1.004	1.152	1.312	1.121	1.164	1.158	1.063	1.289	1.336
Skewness		.701	-1.111	.896	.032	-.863	.249	-.029	-.028	.378	.399	.639	-.273	-.089
Std. Error of Skewness		.803	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.803	.784	.852	.784
Kurtosis		.348	1.765	.204	-.773	.873	2.382	-.265	2.805	-1.157	1.873	2.384	-1.809	-2.085
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.612	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.612	1.561	1.764	1.561
Range		4	3	3	2	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
Maximum		5	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	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 preparedness in the event of a natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth	Green and sustainable issues
N	Valid	597	599	601	601	599	596	601	601	597	593
	Missing	6	4	2	2	4	7	2	2	6	10
Mean		4.15	4.32	3.91	4.07	3.75	3.97	4.31	4.24	3.92	3.92
Std. Error of Mean		.046	.040	.041	.038	.051	.048	.036	.049	.048	.047
Median		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.114	.991	1.008	.935	1.248	1.173	.884	1.189	1.162	1.152
Skewness		-1.178	-1.516	-.642	-.800	-.698	-.980	-1.224	-1.529	-.910	-.901
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.100	.100	.100	.100	.100	.100	.100	.100
Kurtosis		.536	1.789	-.105	.113	-.551	.088	1.028	1.222	-.010	.028
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.200	.199	.199	.199	.199	.200	.199	.199	.200	.200
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 Manmade Emergency	3.8	4.8	18.2	18.9	54.3
Availability of Drinking water	2.5	3.4	12.7	22.1	59.2
Recreational opportunities	2.3	4.7	27.6	30.4	35
Condition of streets & roads	1.1	4.7	19.9	34.8	39.5
Availability of Public transportation	6.9	10.3	20.8	24.7	37.2
Housing affordability	5.4	6.4	18.8	25	44.4
Air quality	0.8	3.5	13.1	29.1	53.4
Job opportunities	5.8	6.2	7.8	18.6	61.5
Managing growth	5.2	7	19.7	26.7	41.5
Green & Sustainability Issues	5.1	6.1	21.2	26.5	41

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 preparedness in the event of a natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth	Green and sustainable issues
N	Valid	230	228	229	228	229	228	229	230	228	229
	Missing	0	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	2	1
Mean		4.08	4.37	3.92	4.11	3.79	4.06	4.34	4.39	4.03	3.93
Std. Error of Mean		.075	.060	.065	.059	.085	.074	.055	.069	.072	.075
Median		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.141	.911	.979	.885	1.281	1.113	.839	1.042	1.094	1.128
Skewness		-1.051	-1.490	-.457	-.768	-.749	-1.144	-1.069	-1.779	-1.042	-.891
Std. Error of Skewness		.160	.161	.161	.161	.161	.161	.161	.160	.161	.161
Kurtosis		.181	1.903	-.444	.152	-.562	.648	.409	2.425	.450	.069
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.320	.321	.320	.321	.320	.321	.320	.320	.321	.321
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 preparedness in the event of a natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth	Green and sustainable issues
N	Valid	158	157	158	159	157	156	158	158	158	154
	Missing	1	2	1	0	2	3	0	1	1	5
Mean		4.19	4.29	3.86	4.13	3.71	3.88	4.29	4.17	3.81	3.78
Std. Error of Mean		.091	.080	.085	.073	.101	.101	.075	.101	.098	.103
Median		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.145	1.006	1.067	.919	1.267	1.259	.948	1.270	1.233	1.284
Skewness		-1.356	-1.452	-.718	-.979	-.587	-.968	-1.529	-1.398	-.703	-.795
Std. Error of Skewness		.193	.194	.193	.193	.193	.194	.193	.193	.193	.195
Kurtosis		.954	1.564	-.069	.811	-.749	-.058	2.141	.667	-.583	-.434
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.384	.385	.384	.383	.385	.386	.383	.384	.384	.388
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 preparedness in the event of a natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth	Green and sustainable issues
N	Valid	87	91	91	91	91	90	91	91	88	88
	Missing	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	3
Mean		4.28	4.27	4.06	4.01	3.76	4.05	4.29	4.21	3.91	4.14
Std. Error of Mean		.113	.114	.110	.114	.128	.116	.096	.121	.119	.093
Median		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.047	1.091	1.049	1.090	1.219	1.096	.911	1.155	1.121	.868
Skewness		-1.380	-1.494	-1.051	-.835	-.929	-.795	-.981	-1.513	-.940	-.541
Std. Error of Skewness		.259	.253	.253	.253	.253	.255	.253	.253	.256	.257
Kurtosis		1.221	1.426	.684	-.182	.064	-.475	-.196	1.352	.375	-.812
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.512	.501	.501	.501	.501	.504	.501	.501	.508	.510
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2
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 preparedness in the event of a natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth	Green and sustainable issues
N	Valid	97	98	98	98	97	97	98	97	97	97
	Missing	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
Mean		4.12	4.28	3.82	3.95	3.67	3.83	4.30	4.12	3.89	3.92
Std. Error of Mean		.108	.107	.097	.090	.122	.124	.089	.131	.121	.122
Median		4.45	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.066	1.058	.955	.891	1.201	1.225	.883	1.289	1.188	1.201
Skewness		-1.088	-1.498	-.580	-.539	-.490	-.824	-1.263	-1.363	-.885	-.944
Std. Error of Skewness		.245	.244	.244	.244	.245	.245	.244	.245	.245	.245
Kurtosis		.579	1.663	.147	-.404	-.759	-.236	1.325	.605	-.088	.093
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.485	.483	.483	.483	.485	.485	.483	.485	.485	.485
Range		4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	2	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 preparedness in the event of a natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth	Green and sustainable issues
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.12	4.26	3.18	3.76	4.01	3.82	4.27	3.92	4.35	4.40
Std. Error of Mean		.458	.446	.322	.411	.451	.470	.327	.530	.396	.319
Median		4.82	5.00	3.00	3.30	4.35	4.12	4.82	4.12	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.285	1.249	.902	1.152	1.206	1.317	.916	1.485	1.109	.895
Skewness		-1.579	-2.325	.685	.068	-.891	-.482	-.698	-1.568	-1.872	-1.078
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.758	.758	.787	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758
Kurtosis		2.437	6.933	1.144	-1.855	-.575	-1.734	-1.556	1.758	3.209	-.737
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.569	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495
Range		4	4	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	2
Minimum		1	1	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	3
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 Mesquite		Overall preparedness in the event of a natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities	Condition of streets and roads:	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth	Green and sustainable issues
N	Valid	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.85	4.27	4.36	3.58	3.52	3.72	4.34	2.94	3.11	3.15
Std. Error of Mean		.360	.302	.271	.411	.542	.468	.269	.723	.615	.501
Median		3.56	4.15	4.32	3.97	4.00	3.69	4.15	2.74	3.56	3.27
Mode		3	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	1	2
Std. Deviation		.967	.810	.729	1.104	1.457	1.257	.723	1.942	1.653	1.347
Skewness		.392	-.618	-.754	-.224	-1.224	-.177	-.670	.161	-.433	.088
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-2.230	-.851	.001	-.849	.844	-1.815	-.057	-2.549	-1.532	-1.443
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		2	2	2	3	4	3	2	4	4	4
Minimum		3	3	3	2	1	2	3	1	1	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: <u>Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency</u>:

Respondent Jurisdiction * Overall preparedness in the event of a natural or man-made emergency Crosstabulation								
			Overall preparedness in the event of a natural or man-made emergency					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	1	2	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%	25.00%	50.00%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	3	3	20	22	48	96
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.10%	3.10%	20.80%	22.90%	50.00%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	8	7	23	29	91	158
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.10%	4.40%	14.60%	18.40%	57.60%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	4	1	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	0.00%	57.10%	14.30%	28.60%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	3	15	15	52	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.30%	3.40%	17.20%	17.20%	59.80%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	9	14	44	45	118	230
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.90%	6.10%	19.10%	19.60%	51.30%	100.00%
Total		Count	22	28	107	114	315	586
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.80%	4.80%	18.30%	19.50%	53.80%	100.%

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.)

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.089	20	.711
Likelihood Ratio	14.845	20	.785
Linear-by-Linear Association	.237	1	.626
N of Valid Cases	586		

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	1	0	0	2	5	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	62.50%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	4	3	14	19	58	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.10%	3.10%	14.30%	19.40%	59.20%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	4	7	20	36	90	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.50%	4.50%	12.70%	22.90%	57.30%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	3	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	0.00%	14.30%	42.90%	42.90%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	5	11	17	55	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.30%	5.50%	12.10%	18.70%	60.40%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	3	6	28	55	135	227
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.30%	2.60%	12.30%	24.20%	59.50%	100.00%
Total		Count	15	21	74	132	346	588
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.60%	3.60%	12.60%	22.40%	58.80%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.533	20	.897
Likelihood Ratio	12.560	20	.895
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.142	1	.285
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: Recreational opportunities:

			Recreational opportunities:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	2	4	2	1	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	22.20%	44.40%	22.20%	11.10%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	2	5	27	38	26	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.00%	5.10%	27.60%	38.80%	26.50%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	5	11	39	50	54	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.10%	6.90%	24.50%	31.40%	34.00%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	3	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	0.00%	14.30%	42.90%	42.90%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	4	18	27	39	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.30%	4.40%	19.80%	29.70%	42.90%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	4	7	75	60	83	229
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.70%	3.10%	32.80%	26.20%	36.20%	100.00%
Total		Count	14	29	164	180	206	593
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.40%	4.90%	27.70%	30.40%	34.70%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.104	20	.162
Likelihood Ratio	24.790	20	.210
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.307	1	.129
N of Valid Cases	593		

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	1	4	0	3	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	12.50%	50.00%	0.00%	37.50%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	0	7	20	42	29	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	7.10%	20.40%	42.90%	29.60%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	3	4	30	56	66	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.90%	2.50%	18.90%	35.20%	41.50%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	2	3	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	12.50%	25.00%	37.50%	25.00%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	7	19	22	40	90
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	2.20%	7.80%	21.10%	24.40%	44.40%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	2	7	45	83	91	228
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.90%	3.10%	19.70%	36.40%	39.90%	100.00%
Total		Count	7	27	120	206	231	591
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.20%	4.60%	20.30%	34.90%	39.10%	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: <u>Availability of public transportation</u>:

			Availability of public transportation:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	1	2	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	14.30%	14.30%	28.60%	42.90%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	13	24	24	31	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.20%	13.40%	24.70%	24.70%	32.00%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	10	18	37	32	59	156
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.40%	11.50%	23.70%	20.50%	37.80%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	0	1	3	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	14.30%	0.00%	14.30%	42.90%	28.60%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	8	5	16	32	29	90
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.90%	5.60%	17.80%	35.60%	32.20%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	17	24	44	50	94	229
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.40%	10.50%	19.20%	21.80%	41.00%	100.00%
Total		Count	41	61	123	143	218	586
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.00%	10.40%	21.00%	24.40%	37.20%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.921	20	.593
Likelihood Ratio	18.742	20	.539
Linear-by-Linear Association	.601	1	.438
N of Valid Cases	586		

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	2	1	1	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	12.50%	50.00%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	7	7	21	24	39	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.10%	7.10%	21.40%	24.50%	39.80%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	13	10	27	40	66	156
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.30%	6.40%	17.30%	25.60%	42.30%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	2	1	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	14.30%	28.60%	14.30%	42.90%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	7	20	16	44	88
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.10%	8.00%	22.70%	18.20%	50.00%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	11	38	63	105	228
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.80%	4.80%	16.70%	27.60%	46.10%	100.00%
Total		Count	32	38	109	145	261	585
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.50%	6.50%	18.60%	24.80%	44.60%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.987	20	.459
Likelihood Ratio	20.242	20	.443
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.035	1	.045
N of Valid Cases	585		

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	2	2	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	4	12	31	50	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.00%	4.10%	12.20%	31.60%	51.00%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	3	8	12	53	83	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	1.90%	5.00%	7.50%	33.30%	52.20%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	3	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	0.00%	14.30%	42.90%	42.90%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	4	16	21	50	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	4.40%	17.60%	23.10%	54.90%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	1	5	35	63	125	229
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.40%	2.20%	15.30%	27.50%	54.60%	100.00%
Total		Count	5	21	78	173	315	592
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.80%	3.50%	13.20%	29.20%	53.20%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.690	20	.673
Likelihood Ratio	18.104	20	.581
Linear-by-Linear Association	.398	1	.528
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: <u>Availability of job opportunities</u>:

			Availability of job opportunities:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	1	0	0	3	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	37.50%	50.00%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	8	7	7	19	56	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.20%	7.20%	7.20%	19.60%	57.70%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	11	12	12	25	97	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.00%	7.60%	7.60%	15.90%	61.80%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	1	0	0	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	42.90%	14.30%	0.00%	0.00%	42.90%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	7	5	23	51	90
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.40%	7.80%	5.60%	25.60%	56.70%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	8	10	22	38	153	231
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.50%	4.30%	9.50%	16.50%	66.20%	100.00%
Total		Count	35	37	46	108	364	590
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.90%	6.30%	7.80%	18.30%	61.70%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.236	20	.019
Likelihood Ratio	28.350	20	.101
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.381	1	.036
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	0	2	5	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	12.50%	0.00%	25.00%	62.50%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	8	19	26	40	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.10%	8.20%	19.40%	26.50%	40.80%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	18	33	35	64	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.70%	11.30%	20.80%	22.00%	40.30%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	0	1	2	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	28.60%	0.00%	14.30%	28.60%	28.60%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	3	20	26	33	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.70%	3.40%	23.00%	29.90%	37.90%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	9	12	42	64	100	227
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.00%	5.30%	18.50%	28.20%	44.10%	100.00%
Total		Count	30	42	115	155	244	586
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.10%	7.20%	19.60%	26.50%	41.60%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.354	20	.322
Likelihood Ratio	20.790	20	.410
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.769	1	.184
N of Valid Cases	586		

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	0	0	2	1	5	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	62.50%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	6	4	23	21	43	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.20%	4.10%	23.70%	21.60%	44.30%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	13	13	31	36	62	155
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	8.40%	8.40%	20.00%	23.20%	40.00%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	3	1	2	1	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	42.90%	14.30%	28.60%	14.30%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	2	20	28	37	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	2.30%	23.00%	32.20%	42.50%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	10	15	48	64	92	229
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.40%	6.60%	21.00%	27.90%	40.20%	100.00%
Total		Count	29	37	125	152	240	583
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.00%	6.30%	21.40%	26.10%	41.20%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.963	20	.020
Likelihood Ratio	32.707	20	.036
Linear-by-Linear Association	.480	1	.488
N of Valid Cases	583		

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	177	31.1	31.1
	Family/friends/friendly people	59	10.4	41.4
	Entertainment/social climate	88	15.4	56.8
	Quiet/peaceful	8	1.5	58.3
	Personal/family safety	15	2.6	60.9
	Job opportunities	82	14.4	75.3
	Education	21	3.7	79.0
	Green and sustainable issues	4	.7	79.7
	Nothing	48	8.4	88.1
	Taxes	16	2.8	91.0
	Other (specify)	51	9.0	100.0
	Total	571	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	32		
Total		603		



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	45	7.9	7.9
	Overcrowding/unplanned growth	43	7.6	15.5
	Cost of living/housing	13	2.3	17.8
	Road conditions	3	.6	18.4
	Crime/violence/gangs	70	12.4	30.9
	Air quality	22	4.0	34.8
	Drought conditions	27	4.8	39.6
	Education	22	3.9	43.5
	Taxes	5	.9	44.4
	A lack of government services	43	7.6	52.0
	Green and sustainable issues	13	2.3	54.3
	Nothing	72	12.8	67.1
	Economy/Unemployment	87	15.4	82.4
	Yucca Mountain	4	.7	83.1
	Weather/Heat	30	5.3	88.4
	Gaming/Casinos	42	7.5	95.9
	Other (specify)	23	4.1	100.0
	Total	564	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	39		
Total		603		



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

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

If you do not plan to stay in Clark County, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, would be the reason you would leave?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Traffic Congestion	11	2.0	2.0
	Overcrowding/unplanned growth	36	6.7	8.6
	Cost of living/housing	35	6.4	15.1
	Crime/violence/gangs	33	6.1	21.2
	Air quality	11	2.0	23.1
	Drought conditions	26	4.8	28.0
	Education	28	5.2	33.2
	Taxes	9	1.7	34.8
	A lack of government services	10	1.8	36.6
	Green and sustainable issues	6	1.2	37.8
	Nothing	69	12.7	50.4
	Economy/Unemployment	173	31.8	82.3
	Weather/Heat	20	3.7	86.0
	Yucca Mountain	24	4.4	90.5
	Other (specify)	52	9.5	100.0
	Total	543	100.0	
Missing	DK/No Answer*	60		
	System	0		
	Total	60		
Total		603		



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	31	5.5	5.5
	Less traffic congestion/Better public transit	44	7.8	13.3
	Improve K-12 education	58	10.3	23.7
	Improve higher education	12	2.1	25.8
	Better services for the homeless	18	3.3	29.1
	More efficient government/government officials	45	8.0	37.1
	Stop growth	10	1.8	38.9
	Slow growth	6	1.1	40.0
	Better jobs/training	96	17.1	57.1
	Increased access to health care	7	1.3	58.5
	Lower crime rates	36	6.4	64.8
	Stop Yucca Mountain	17	3.0	67.8
	Increase green and sustainable efforts/Water Concerns	73	12.9	80.7
	More public parks	10	1.7	82.4
	No change	10	1.8	84.2
	Economic Improvement/Unemployment	58	10.2	94.5
	Other (specify)	31	5.5	100.0
	Total	562	100.0	
Missing	DK/No Answer*	41		
Total		603		



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	125	21.0	21.0
	Good	235	39.4	60.4
	Fair	185	31.0	91.4
	Poor	51	8.6	100.0
	Total	596	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	7		
Total		603		



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	109	18.5	18.5
	Staying about the same	227	38.5	56.9
	Getting worse	254	43.1	100.0
	Total	589	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	14		
Total		603		



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

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

How long do you plan to stay in Clark County?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 year	18	3.2	3.2
	1 - 5 years	138	24.6	27.8
	6 - 10 years	73	13.0	40.8
	11 - 15 years	28	5.0	45.8
	Over 15 years	58	10.4	56.2
	All my life	245	43.8	100.0
	Total	560	100.0	
Missing	No answer/refused*	43		
Total		603		



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?

			Scenery/geography/climate	Family/friends/friendly people	Entertainment/social climate	Quiet/peaceful	Personal/family safety	Job opportunities	Education	Green and sustainable issues	Nothing	Taxes	Other	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	7
		% within	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	40	8	13	1	7	12	2	0	5	1	3	92
		% within	43.5%	8.7%	14.1%	1.1%	7.6%	13.0%	2.2%	0.0%	5.4%	1.1%	3.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	54	12	26	2	1	18	3	1	16	5	13	151
		% within	35.8%	7.9%	17.2%	1.3%	0.7%	11.9%	2.0%	0.7%	10.6%	3.3%	8.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	6
		% within	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	24	9	12	0	3	15	4	2	4	1	11	85
		% within	28.2%	10.6%	14.1%	0.0%	3.5%	17.6%	4.7%	2.4%	4.7%	1.2%	12.9%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	50	26	36	5	4	33	11	0	22	8	23	218
		% within	22.9%	11.9%	16.5%	2.3%	1.8%	15.1%	5.0%	0.0%	10.1%	3.7%	10.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	174	56	88	8	16	80	20	4	47	15	51	559
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	31.1%	10.0%	15.7%	1.4%	2.9%	14.3%	3.6%	0.7%	8.4%	2.7%	9.1%	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.)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	78.964	50	.006
Likelihood Ratio	66.846	50	.056
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.295	1	.038
N of Valid Cases	559		

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	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	42.9%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	8	5	2	0	10	2	9	7	1
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	.1	.1	.0	.0	.1	.0	.1	.1	.0
	City of Las Vegas	Count	11	14	6	0	16	9	8	6	2
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.5%	9.6%	4.1%	0.0%	11.0%	6.2%	5.5%	4.1%	1.4%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	8	5	1	0	14	5	6	3	1
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	9.4%	5.9%	1.2%	0.0%	16.5%	5.9%	7.1%	3.5%	1.2%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	13	16	5	3	25	7	4	6	1
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.0%	7.3%	2.3%	1.4%	11.5%	3.2%	1.8%	2.8%	0.5%
Total		Count	43	41	14	3	66	23	27	22	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.8%	7.4%	2.5%	0.5%	12.0%	4.2%	4.9%	4.0%	.9%

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?								
			A lack of government services	Green and sustainable issues	Nothing	Economy	Yucca Mountain	Weather/heat	Gaming	Other	Totals
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	6	2	10	9	2	6	9	2	90
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.70%	2.20%	11.10%	10.00%	2.20%	6.70%	10.00%	2.20%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	3	19	19	1	8	12	3	146
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.20%	2.10%	13.00%	13.00%	0.70%	5.50%	8.20%	2.10%	100.00%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	20.00%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	2	11	14	1	1	4	3	85
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.10%	2.40%	12.90%	16.50%	1.20%	1.20%	4.70%	3.50%	100.00%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	22	5	28	40	0	13	15	15	218
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	10.10%	2.30%	12.80%	18.30%	0.00%	6.00%	6.90%	6.90%	100.00%
Total		Count	43	13	68	85	4	28	42	24	551
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	7.80%	2.40%	12.30%	15.40%	0.70%	5.10%	7.60%	4.40%	100.00%

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	87.525	80	.264
Likelihood Ratio	82.521	80	.401
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.601	1	.010
N of Valid Cases	551		

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	No Change	Improve economy	Other	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction:	City of Boulder City	Count	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	4	17	10	1	0	5	3	100.0%	15	1	3	5	20	0	1	6	3	95
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	4.2%	17.9%	10.5%	1.1%	0.0%	5.3%	3.2%	1.1%	15.8%	1.1%	3.2%	5.3%	21.1%	0.0%	1.1%	6.3%	3.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	10	11	15	2	6	15	3	2	22	2	11	2	18	1	1	18	10	149
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	6.7%	7.4%	10.1%	1.3%	4.0%	10.1%	2.0%	1.3%	14.8%	1.3%	7.4%	1.3%	12.1%	0.7%	0.7%	12.1%	6.7%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	9	4	5	2	4	3	0	1	13	0	7	3	11	1	3	9	5	80
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	11.3%	5.0%	6.3%	2.5%	5.0%	3.8%	0.0%	1.3%	16.3%	0.0%	8.8%	3.8%	13.8%	1.3%	3.8%	11.3%	6.3%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	8	10	27	6	8	21	4	3	41	2	12	4	21	7	4	23	11	212
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	3.8%	4.7%	12.7%	2.8%	3.8%	9.9%	1.9%	1.4%	19.3%	0.9%	5.7%	1.9%	9.9%	3.3%	1.9%	10.8%	5.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	31	44	57	11	18	45	10	7	95	6	34	16	71	9	9	58	29	550
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	5.6%	8.0%	10.4%	2.0%	3.3%	8.2%	1.8%	1.3%	17.3%	1.1%	6.2%	2.9%	12.9%	1.6%	1.6%	10.5%	5.3%	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	97.593	80	.088
Likelihood Ratio	94.490	80	.128
Linear-by-Linear Association	.355	1	.551
N of Valid Cases	550		

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	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	5	3	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	21	36	41	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	21.4%	36.7%	41.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	27	62	65	154
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.5%	40.3%	42.2%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	4	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	20	22	46	88
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.7%	25.0%	52.3%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	38	94	93	225
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.9%	41.8%	41.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	107	223	250	580
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	18.4%	38.4%	43.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.434	10	.257
Likelihood Ratio	14.078	10	.169
Linear-by-Linear Association	.085	1	.771
N of Valid Cases	580		

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?

			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	1	7	0	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.5%	87.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	34	35	19	5	93
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	36.6%	37.6%	20.4%	5.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	31	67	46	15	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.5%	42.1%	28.9%	9.4%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	2	2	1	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	15	29	42	5	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.5%	31.9%	46.2%	5.5%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	40	90	74	25	229
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.5%	39.3%	32.3%	10.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	123	230	183	51	587
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	21.0%	39.2%	31.2%	8.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.711	15	.001
Likelihood Ratio	37.785	15	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.319	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	587		

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	603	586	590	580	583
	Missing	0	17	13	23	20
Mean		2.24	1.71	3.02	1.69	1.19
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	1	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		.699	.703	.775	.675	.389
Skewness		-.361	.467	-.149	.462	1.619
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.101	.101	.101	.101
Kurtosis		-.925	-.901	-1.015	-.791	.624
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.199	.202	.201	.202	.202
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	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Better	93	15.3	15.3
	About the same	275	45.6	61.0
	Worse	235	39.0	100.0
	Total	603	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	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Better	253	43.1	43.1
	About the same	249	42.4	85.6
	Worse	85	14.4	100.0
	Total	586	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	17		
Total		603		



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	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	5	.9	.9
	Good	156	26.3	27.2
	Fair	252	42.8	70.0
	Poor	177	30.0	100.0
	Total	590	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	13		
Total		603		



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	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Better	249	42.9	42.9
	About the same	261	45.1	87.9
	Worse	70	12.1	100.0
	Total	580	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	23		
Total		603		



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	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good time	475	81.4	81.4
	Bad time	108	18.6	100.0
	Total	583	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	20		
Total		603		



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	230	223	226	217	226
	Missing	0	7	4	13	4
Mean		2.21	1.72	3.03	1.77	1.18
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	1	3	1	1
Std. Deviation		.735	.721	.786	.740	.386
Skewness		-.351	.469	-.202	.406	1.669
Std. Error of Skewness		.160	.163	.162	.165	.162
Kurtosis		-1.084	-.970	-.977	-1.083	.793
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.320	.324	.323	.329	.322
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	91	88	88	86	87
	Missing	0	3	3	5	4
Mean		2.26	1.69	2.97	1.69	1.23
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	1	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		.703	.738	.789	.568	.423
Skewness		-.412	.575	-.155	.094	1.306
Std. Error of Skewness		.253	.257	.257	.259	.259
Kurtosis		-.897	-.949	-.877	-.584	-.301
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.501	.510	.509	.513	.512
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	159	156	157	157	154
	Missing	0	3	2	2	5
Mean		2.28	1.65	3.05	1.62	1.15
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	1	3	1	1
Std. Deviation		.687	.683	.724	.652	.357
Skewness		-.428	.563	-.076	.586	1.996
Std. Error of Skewness		.193	.194	.194	.194	.196
Kurtosis		-.839	-.751	-1.072	-.633	2.011
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.383	.387	.385	.385	.389
Range		2	2	2	2	1
Minimum		1	1	2	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	98	98	95	96	93
	Missing	0	0	2	2	5
Mean		2.20	1.78	2.91	1.65	1.21
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	3	1	1
Std. Deviation		.671	.678	.832	.663	.407
Skewness		-.260	.299	.011	.526	1.472
Std. Error of Skewness		.244	.244	.247	.247	.250
Kurtosis		-.777	-.812	-1.224	-.691	.170
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.483	.483	.489	.489	.495
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		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	7	8	6
	Missing	0	0	0	0	1
Mean		2.14	1.73	3.42	1.85	1.23
Median		2.00	2.00	3.33	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	4	2	1
Std. Deviation		.585	.586	.639	.624	.461
Skewness		.091	-.061	-.611	.041	1.667
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.774	.758	.820
Kurtosis		1.647	.499	.111	.941	.980
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	1.536	1.495	1.662
Range		2	2	2	2	1
Minimum		1	1	2	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	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	7	6	7	7	7
	Missing	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		2.47	1.84	3.39	1.82	1.29
Median		2.26	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		.537	.572	.527	.554	.489
Skewness		.173	-.245	.552	-.303	1.191
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.852	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-2.906	3.353	-2.520	2.024	-.951
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.764	1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		1	2	1	2	1
Minimum		2	1	3	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	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	1	5	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	14	50	34	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.3%	51.0%	34.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	21	72	66	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.2%	45.3%	41.5%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	4	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	13	40	37	90
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.4%	44.4%	41.1%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	43	96	91	230
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	18.7%	41.7%	39.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	92	267	233	592
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.5%	45.1%	39.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.686	10	.755
Likelihood Ratio	7.710	10	.657
Linear-by-Linear Association	.098	1	.755
N of Valid Cases	592		

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?			
			Better	About the same	Worse	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	3	5	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	37.5%	62.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	35	49	14	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	35.7%	50.0%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	72	65	18	155
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	46.5%	41.9%	11.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	4	0	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	42	32	14	88
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	47.7%	36.4%	15.9%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	97	91	36	224
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	43.3%	40.6%	16.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	250	246	82	578
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	43.3%	42.6%	14.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.735	10	.378
Likelihood Ratio	12.357	10	.262
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.948
N of Valid Cases	578		

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?				
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	3	4	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	33	33	28	95
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.1%	34.7%	34.7%	29.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	0	37	75	45	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	23.6%	47.8%	28.7%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	4	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	24	38	25	88
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.1%	27.3%	43.2%	28.4%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	3	58	94	71	226
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.3%	25.7%	41.6%	31.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	5	152	247	176	580
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.9%	26.2%	42.6%	30.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.102	15	.518
Likelihood Ratio	18.561	15	.234
Linear-by-Linear Association	.009	1	.925
N of Valid Cases	580		

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?			
			Better	About the same	Worse	Total
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	43	42	10	95
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	45.3%	44.2%	10.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	75	67	15	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	47.8%	42.7%	9.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	5	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	28.6%	71.4%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	31	50	5	86
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	36.0%	58.1%	5.8%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	91	87	40	218
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	41.7%	39.9%	18.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	244	256	71	571
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.7%	44.8%	12.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.710	10	.023
Likelihood Ratio	21.335	10	.019
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.107	1	.078
N of Valid Cases	571		

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?		
			Good time	Bad time	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	5	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	74	19	93
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	79.6%	20.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	131	23	154
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	85.1%	14.9%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	5	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	67	20	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	77.0%	23.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	185	41	226
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	81.9%	18.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	467	107	574
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	81.4%	18.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.623	5	.605
Likelihood Ratio	3.543	5	.617
Linear-by-Linear Association	.014	1	.905
N of Valid Cases	574		

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	586	593	584	583	584	591	584	583	595	591
	Missing	17	10	19	20	19	12	19	20	8	12
Mean		1.97	2.70	2.43	1.20	1.81	2.66	2.03	1.87	1.10	1.15
Std. Error of Mean		.035	.023	.029	.022	.035	.024	.038	.036	.017	.019
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		1	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		.856	.555	.689	.537	.856	.587	.925	.873	.407	.453
Skewness		.053	-1.691	-.799	2.570	.382	-1.567	-.053	.260	4.007	3.022
Std. Error of Skewness		.101	.100	.101	.101	.101	.100	.101	.101	.100	.101
Kurtosis		-1.635	1.889	-.561	5.333	-1.530	1.386	-1.833	-1.641	15.042	8.386
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.202	.200	.202	.202	.202	.201	.202	.202	.200	.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	Total
Amusement Park	38	26.8	35.2	100
Public Park	4.9	20.4	74.8	100
Day care center	11.5	34.2	54.3	100
Landfill	85.9	7.8	6.3	100
Non-polluting manufacturing facility	48.1	23.1	28.8	100
Public school	6.1	21.4	72.6	100
Highway/Freeway	41.4	14.5	44.1	100
Hotel-casino	45.5	22.2	32.3	100
Polluting manufacturing facility	93.3	3.1	3.6	100
High-level nuclear waste transportation route	88.3	8	3.7	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	223	228	225	222	226	229	226	221	227	226
	Missing	7	2	5	8	4	1	4	9	3	4
Mean		1.99	2.71	2.50	1.20	1.85	2.65	1.97	1.82	1.15	1.11
Std. Error of Mean		.056	.037	.044	.036	.057	.040	.060	.058	.033	.026
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		1	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		.834	.551	.656	.531	.857	.598	.906	.863	.492	.391
Skewness		.011	-1.783	-.943	2.577	.290	-1.530	.053	.354	3.263	3.884
Std. Error of Skewness		.163	.161	.162	.163	.162	.161	.162	.164	.162	.162
Kurtosis		-1.565	2.232	-.235	5.476	-1.581	1.257	-1.786	-1.568	9.221	14.691
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.325	.321	.323	.325	.322	.321	.322	.326	.322	.322
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	155	157	152	150	152	154	150	157	158	158
	Missing	3	2	7	8	7	5	8	2	1	0
Mean		1.97	2.69	2.35	1.18	1.74	2.61	2.02	1.86	1.10	1.23
Std. Error of Mean		.070	.041	.056	.044	.069	.050	.077	.070	.031	.043
Median		2.00	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		.870	.509	.694	.536	.847	.619	.947	.882	.392	.539
Skewness		.061	-1.371	-.603	2.817	.533	-1.375	-.050	.283	3.961	2.295
Std. Error of Skewness		.195	.194	.197	.198	.197	.196	.198	.194	.193	.193
Kurtosis		-1.683	.902	-.764	6.542	-1.401	.783	-1.898	-1.663	15.278	4.249
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.387	.385	.391	.393	.392	.389	.393	.385	.384	.383
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	89	87	86	91	84	88	87	84	88	87
	Missing	2	3	5	0	7	3	4	6	3	4
Mean		2.04	2.69	2.56	1.19	1.70	2.74	2.21	1.93	1.03	1.16
Std. Error of Mean		.097	.063	.073	.048	.094	.052	.100	.098	.017	.049
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		3	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		.916	.585	.676	.459	.863	.490	.927	.899	.163	.453
Skewness		-.083	-1.734	-1.264	2.409	.629	-1.720	-.443	.149	5.941	2.939
Std. Error of Skewness		.255	.258	.260	.253	.262	.256	.259	.262	.256	.258
Kurtosis		-1.824	1.986	.319	5.327	-1.370	2.162	-1.711	-1.765	34.062	8.182
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.506	.510	.514	.501	.519	.508	.512	.518	.508	.511
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	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	95	98	97	97	98	96	97	95	98	96
	Missing	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	2
Mean		1.88	2.69	2.26	1.20	1.85	2.71	1.98	1.92	1.08	1.14
Std. Error of Mean		.086	.061	.074	.055	.086	.058	.093	.088	.037	.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	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		.836	.606	.727	.546	.850	.569	.919	.855	.367	.447
Skewness		.239	-1.841	-.452	2.651	.284	-1.818	.038	.151	4.782	3.271
Std. Error of Skewness		.248	.244	.246	.245	.244	.246	.245	.247	.244	.246
Kurtosis		-1.532	2.208	-.990	5.772	-1.565	2.334	-1.835	-1.622	22.224	10.098
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.491	.483	.486	.484	.483	.487	.484	.489	.483	.488
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	7	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Mean		1.85	2.91	2.50	1.00	2.16	2.90	1.81	1.49	1.00	1.00
Std. Error of Mean		.310	.115	.191	.000	.276	.117	.396	.322	.000	.000
Median		2.00	3.00	2.47	1.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		1	3	2	1	2	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		.869	.313	.535	.000	.773	.327	1.059	.862	.000	.000
Skewness		.349	-3.549	.020		-.319	-3.245	.489	1.526		
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.774	.758	.758	.758	.758	.787	.787	.758	.787
Kurtosis		-1.609	14.607	-2.824		-.824	11.492	-2.625	.811		
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.536	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.569	1.569	1.495	1.569
Range		2	1	1	0	2	1	2	2	0	0
Minimum		1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	1	1

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	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.87	2.58	2.72	1.82	2.40	2.77	2.02	1.98	1.23	1.41
Std. Error of Mean		.330	.198	.181	.429	.341	.168	.378	.353	.254	.197
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00	1.44	3.00	3.00	2.15	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		1	3	3	1	3	3	3	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		.886	.532	.486	1.041	.917	.451	1.014	.947	.683	.530
Skewness		.315	-.416	-1.232	.499	-1.121	-1.674	-.043	.042	3.129	.460
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.784	.784	.852	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-1.742	-2.705	-.810	-2.756	-.745	.998	-2.648	-2.264	10.842	-2.651
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.561	1.561	1.764	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1
Minimum		1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	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	3	3	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	39	28	28	95
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	41.1%	29.5%	29.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	61	38	56	155
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	39.4%	24.5%	36.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	2	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	35	15	39	89
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	39.3%	16.9%	43.8%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	78	68	77	223
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	35.0%	30.5%	34.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	219	154	204	577
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	38.0%	26.7%	35.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.411	10	.494
Likelihood Ratio	9.774	10	.461
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.167	1	.280
N of Valid Cases	577		

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	1	7	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	7	15	75	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.2%	15.5%	77.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	4	41	112	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.5%	26.1%	71.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	3	4	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	17	65	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.7%	19.5%	74.7%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	44	173	228
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.8%	19.3%	75.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	27	121	436	584
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.6%	20.7%	74.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.355	10	.410
Likelihood Ratio	10.740	10	.378
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.951
N of Valid Cases	584		

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	0	4	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	16	39	41	96
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.7%	40.6%	42.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	19	60	73	152
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.5%	39.5%	48.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	5	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	9	20	57	86
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.5%	23.3%	66.3%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	20	74	132	226
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.8%	32.7%	58.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	64	199	312	575
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.1%	34.6%	54.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.617	10	.045
Likelihood Ratio	20.297	10	.027
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.423	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	575		

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	8	0	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	84	7	7	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	85.7%	7.1%	7.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	133	7	10	150
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	88.7%	4.7%	6.7%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	0	2	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	76	13	2	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	83.5%	14.3%	2.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	190	19	13	222
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	85.6%	8.6%	5.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	494	46	34	574
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	86.1%	8.0%	5.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.346	10	.019
Likelihood Ratio	17.516	10	.064
Linear-by-Linear Association	.064	1	.801
N of Valid Cases	574		

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	2	4	3	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	43	26	29	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	43.9%	26.5%	29.6%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	79	33	39	151
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	52.3%	21.9%	25.8%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	1	5	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	12.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	47	15	22	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	56.0%	17.9%	26.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	102	56	68	226
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	45.1%	24.8%	30.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	275	135	166	576
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	47.7%	23.4%	28.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.555	10	.250
Likelihood Ratio	12.013	10	.284
Linear-by-Linear Association	.006	1	.937
N of Valid Cases	576		

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	1	7	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	17	73	95
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.3%	17.9%	76.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	11	37	106	154
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.1%	24.0%	68.8%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	6	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	19	68	89
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.2%	21.3%	76.4%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	15	50	164	229
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.6%	21.8%	71.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	33	126	424	583
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.7%	21.6%	72.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.055	10	.811
Likelihood Ratio	7.510	10	.677
Linear-by-Linear Association	.124	1	.724
N of Valid Cases	583		

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	4	0	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	57.1%	0.0%	42.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	42	16	40	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.9%	16.3%	40.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	65	16	69	150
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	43.3%	10.7%	46.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	1	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	30	9	48	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	34.5%	10.3%	55.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	95	41	89	225
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.2%	18.2%	39.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	239	83	252	574
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	41.6%	14.5%	43.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.448	10	.324
Likelihood Ratio	12.413	10	.258
Linear-by-Linear Association	.020	1	.887
N of Valid Cases	574		

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	5	1	1	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	38	26	31	95
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.0%	27.4%	32.6%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	73	32	51	156
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	46.8%	20.5%	32.7%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	2	3	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	37.5%	25.0%	37.5%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	37	17	31	85
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	43.5%	20.0%	36.5%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	105	50	66	221
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	47.5%	22.6%	29.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	261	128	183	572
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	45.6%	22.4%	32.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.490	10	.856
Likelihood Ratio	5.508	10	.855
Linear-by-Linear Association	.174	1	.677
N of Valid Cases	572		

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	8	0	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	93	2	3	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	94.9%	2.0%	3.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	146	7	5	158
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	92.4%	4.4%	3.2%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	6	0	1	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	85.7%	0.0%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	86	2	0	88
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	97.7%	2.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	206	7	13	226
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	91.2%	3.1%	5.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	545	18	22	585
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	93.2%	3.1%	3.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.680	10	.383
Likelihood Ratio	13.516	10	.196
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.190	1	.275
N of Valid Cases	585		

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	7	0	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	86	6	4	96
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	89.6%	6.3%	4.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	131	19	9	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	82.4%	11.9%	5.7%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	4	3	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	57.1%	42.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	76	8	3	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	87.4%	9.2%	3.4%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	209	11	7	227
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	92.1%	4.8%	3.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	513	47	23	583
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	88.0%	8.1%	3.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.631	10	.017
Likelihood Ratio	17.520	10	.064
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.361	1	.124
N of Valid Cases	583		

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	590	599	589	600
	Missing	13	4	14	3
Mean		2.56	1.60	2.89	2.81
Std. Error of Mean		.035	.029	.039	.033
Median		3.00	1.02	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		.839	.713	.942	.810
Skewness		.060	1.307	-.353	-.117
Std. Error of Skewness		.101	.100	.101	.100
Kurtosis		-.604	2.097	-.892	-.659
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.201	.199	.201	.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	54	9.1	9.1
	Good	236	40.0	49.1
	Fair	219	37.2	86.3
	Poor	81	13.7	100.0
	Total	590	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	13		
Total		603		



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	300	50.1	50.1
	Somewhat concerned	258	43.2	93.2
	Somewhat unconcerned	21	3.5	96.7
	Not concerned	20	3.3	100.0
	Total	599	100.0	
Missing	DK/No Answer*	4		
Total		603		



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	46	7.8	7.8
	Good	157	26.7	34.5
	Fair	199	33.8	68.2
	Poor	187	31.8	100.0
	Total	589	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	14		
Total		603		



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	25	4.1	4.1
	Good	188	31.4	35.5
	Fair	260	43.4	79.0
	Poor	126	21.0	100.0
	Total	600	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	3		
Total		603		



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	226	230	224	230
	Missing	4	0	6	0
Mean		2.50	1.61	2.82	2.81
Std. Error of Mean		.058	.044	.067	.055
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.866	.661	.998	.838
Skewness		.019	1.063	-.304	-.097
Std. Error of Skewness		.162	.160	.163	.161
Kurtosis		-.648	1.800	-1.025	-.778
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.322	.320	.324	.320
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	155	159	154	159
	Missing	4	0	5	0
Mean		2.70	1.57	2.95	2.85
Std. Error of Mean		.067	.055	.074	.059
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		.832	.688	.922	.746
Skewness		-.178	1.330	-.338	.048
Std. Error of Skewness		.195	.193	.195	.193
Kurtosis		-.502	2.417	-.941	-.770
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.388	.383	.389	.383
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	89	87	90	89
	Missing	2	4	1	2
Mean		2.59	1.57	2.95	2.83
Std. Error of Mean		.084	.069	.086	.085
Median		2.90	1.95	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		.793	.641	.817	.799
Skewness		.220	1.045	-.423	-.304
Std. Error of Skewness		.256	.259	.254	.255
Kurtosis		-.516	1.701	-.306	-.283
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.506	.512	.502	.505
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	95	98	97	98
	Missing	3	0	1	0
Mean		2.42	1.65	2.97	2.78
Std. Error of Mean		.083	.096	.095	.086
Median		2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		.809	.948	.938	.852
Skewness		.320	1.435	-.437	-.139
Std. Error of Skewness		.248	.244	.245	.244
Kurtosis		-.332	1.046	-.852	-.699
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.491	.483	.485	.483
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		2.13	1.32	2.97	3.23
Std. Error of Mean		.177	.178	.351	.227
Median		2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		.495	.499	.983	.637
Skewness		.544	.977	-.791	-.158
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.758	.758
Kurtosis		3.800	-1.527	.597	.425
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495
Range		2	1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1	2
Maximum		3	2	4	4

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	7	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.07	1.57	2.54	2.07
Std. Error of Mean		.395	.199	.459	.319
Median		3.26	1.97	2.00	2.00
Mode		4	2	2	2
Std. Deviation		1.062	.534	1.234	.856
Skewness		-.634	-.338	.246	-.170
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-.945	-2.788	-1.677	-1.567
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		3	1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	2	4	3

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?				
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	6	1	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	9	47	29	10	95
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.5%	49.5%	30.5%	10.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	49	69	25	155
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.7%	31.6%	44.5%	16.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	1	3	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	33.3%	16.7%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	39	33	12	89
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.6%	43.8%	37.1%	13.5%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	27	86	84	29	226
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.9%	38.1%	37.2%	12.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	53	229	217	79	578
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.2%	39.6%	37.5%	13.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.072	15	.028
Likelihood Ratio	26.456	15	.033
Linear-by-Linear Association	.028	1	.868
N of Valid Cases	578		

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	3	0	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	62.5%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	58	26	5	9	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	59.2%	26.5%	5.1%	9.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	81	69	4	5	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.9%	43.4%	2.5%	3.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	4	0	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.9%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	43	39	3	1	86
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	45.3%	3.5%	1.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	107	110	8	5	230
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	46.5%	47.8%	3.5%	2.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	297	251	20	20	588
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.5%	42.7%	3.4%	3.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.650	15	.055
Likelihood Ratio	23.881	15	.067
Linear-by-Linear Association	.013	1	.908
N of Valid Cases	588		

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?					
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	1	1	3	3	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.5%	12.5%	37.5%	37.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	6	25	31	35	97	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.2%	25.8%	32.0%	36.1%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	43	50	52	154	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.8%	27.9%	32.5%	33.8%	100.0%	
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	3	0	2	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.7%	50.0%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	20	43	24	91	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.4%	22.0%	47.3%	26.4%	100.0%	
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	25	61	69	69	224	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.2%	27.2%	30.8%	30.8%	100.0%	
Total		Count	46	153	196	185	580	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.9%	26.4%	33.8%	31.9%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.568	15	.234
Likelihood Ratio	19.902	15	.176
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.409	1	.121
N of Valid Cases	580		

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	0	1	5	3	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	6	31	40	21	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.1%	31.6%	40.8%	21.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	2	51	74	32	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.3%	32.1%	46.5%	20.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	3	3	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	37.5%	37.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	23	44	17	89
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.6%	25.8%	49.4%	19.1%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	10	75	92	52	229
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.4%	32.8%	40.2%	22.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	25	184	258	125	592
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.2%	31.1%	43.6%	21.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.455	15	.155
Likelihood Ratio	19.554	15	.190
Linear-by-Linear Association	.108	1	.743
N of Valid Cases	592		

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	72	12.0	12.0
	Water availability	226	38.0	50.0
	Air quality	74	12.4	62.4
	Preservation of natural areas/wildlife	28	4.7	67.0
	Development of parks, trails, and open space acreage	14	2.3	69.4
	Overpopulation	50	8.5	77.8
	Litter	33	5.5	83.3
	Energy use	39	6.5	89.9
	Green and sustainable issues	41	6.8	96.7
	Yucca Mountain	1	.2	96.9
	Other	19	3.1	100.0
	Total	596	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	7		
Total		603		



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?

			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 Moutain	Other	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	41	13	4	3	9	5	7	6	1	4	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.1%	41.8%	13.3%	4.1%	3.1%	9.2%	5.1%	7.1%	6.1%	1.0%	4.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	23	63	18	5	4	16	7	6	10	0	1	153
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.0%	41.2%	11.8%	3.3%	2.6%	10.5%	4.6%	3.9%	6.5%	0.0%	0.7%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.9%	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	14	20	10	5	1	11	4	13	5	0	5	88
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.9%	22.7%	11.4%	5.7%	1.1%	12.5%	4.5%	14.8%	5.7%	0.0%	5.7%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	24	90	29	13	5	13	15	12	20	0	8	229
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.5%	39.3%	12.7%	5.7%	2.2%	5.7%	6.6%	5.2%	8.7%	0.0%	3.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	69	222	73	27	14	49	31	38	41	1	18	583
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.8%	38.1%	12.5%	4.6%	2.4%	8.4%	5.3%	6.5%	7.0%	0.2%	3.1%	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	64.201	50	.085
Likelihood Ratio	64.445	50	.082
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.218	1	.270
N of Valid Cases	583		

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, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other govern ment impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transpor tation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	583	593	585	591	577	584	584	582	590
	Missing	20	10	18	12	26	19	19	21	13
Mean		4.18	4.21	4.05	4.26	3.93	3.94	3.93	3.97	4.20
Std. Error of Mean		.047	.047	.047	.044	.048	.051	.047	.047	.048
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		1.134	1.144	1.147	1.069	1.142	1.227	1.145	1.130	1.167
Skewness		-1.298	-1.442	-1.046	-1.453	-.903	-.982	-.884	-.914	-1.394
Std. Error of Skewness		.101	.100	.101	.100	.102	.101	.101	.101	.101
Kurtosis		.763	1.157	.182	1.400	.057	-.016	-.011	.079	.921
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.202	.200	.202	.201	.203	.202	.202	.202	.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: <u>Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain</u>

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	25	4.3	4.3
	2	34	5.8	10.1
	3	81	13.9	24.0
	4	116	19.9	43.9
	5	327	56.1	100.0
	Total	583	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	20		
Total		603		



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: <u>Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain</u>:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	30	5.0	5.0
	2	31	5.3	10.3
	3	66	11.1	21.4
	4	123	20.7	42.0
	5	344	58.0	100.0
	Total	593	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	10		
Total		603		



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: <u>Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology:</u>

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	25	4.2	4.2
	2	39	6.7	10.9
	3	104	17.7	28.7
	4	130	22.3	50.9
	5	287	49.1	100.0
	Total	585	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	18		
Total		603		



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: <u>Identify public safety needs and impacts:</u>

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	22	3.7	3.7
	2	24	4.1	7.8
	3	78	13.2	21.0
	4	124	20.9	41.9
	5	343	58.1	100.0
	Total	591	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	12		
Total		603		



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: <u>Assess other government impacts:</u>

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	29	5.0	5.0
	2	35	6.0	11.0
	3	122	21.2	32.2
	4	156	27.0	59.2
	5	236	40.8	100.0
	Total	577	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	26		
Total		603		



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: <u>Assess impacts on the tourism sector:</u>

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	40	6.8	6.8
	2	36	6.1	13.0
	3	110	18.8	31.8
	4	131	22.5	54.3
	5	267	45.7	100.0
	Total	584	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	19		
Total		603		



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: <u>Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:</u>

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	28	4.8	4.8
	2	36	6.1	10.9
	3	128	21.9	32.8
	4	147	25.2	58.1
	5	245	41.9	100.0
	Total	584	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	19		
Total		603		



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: <u>Identify transportation impacts:</u>

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	26	4.5	4.5
	2	31	5.3	9.8
	3	131	22.4	32.2
	4	141	24.3	56.5
	5	253	43.5	100.0
	Total	582	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	21		
Total		603		



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: <u>Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:</u>

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	30	5.1	5.1
	2	35	5.9	11.0
	3	69	11.6	22.7
	4	109	18.5	41.1
	5	348	58.9	100.0
	Total	590	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	13		
Total		603		



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 inlcuding seismic, vulcanology, 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	222	226	224	225	221	222	221	223	224
	Missing	8	4	6	5	9	8	9	7	6
Mean		4.19	4.17	4.00	4.26	3.87	3.94	3.82	3.88	4.13
Std. Error of Mean		.070	.077	.075	.069	.075	.077	.080	.079	.077
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		1.046	1.152	1.122	1.034	1.122	1.152	1.191	1.175	1.148
Skewness		-1.280	-1.460	-.880	-1.452	-.801	-.911	-.746	-.752	-1.253
Std. Error of Skewness		.163	.162	.163	.162	.164	.163	.164	.163	.163
Kurtosis		1.057	1.276	-.067	1.679	-.051	.053	-.295	-.258	.699
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.325	.323	.324	.323	.326	.325	.326	.324	.324
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 inlcuding seismic, vulcanology, 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	154	156	156	156	153	156	155	155	157
	Missing	4	3	3	2	6	3	4	4	2
Mean		4.32	4.37	4.19	4.27	3.93	3.95	4.04	4.02	4.34
Std. Error of Mean		.088	.085	.087	.089	.098	.108	.095	.089	.090
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.093	1.056	1.089	1.117	1.206	1.350	1.176	1.106	1.123
Skewness		-1.597	-1.836	-1.365	-1.523	-1.012	-1.050	-1.174	-1.110	-1.816
Std. Error of Skewness		.195	.194	.194	.194	.196	.194	.195	.195	.194
Kurtosis		1.729	2.774	1.218	1.345	.177	-.168	.616	.705	2.444
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.388	.386	.386	.386	.390	.386	.388	.388	.385
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 inlcuding seismic, vulcanology, 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	87	90	84	89	83	85	87	83	89
	Missing	4	1	7	2	8	6	4	8	2
Mean		4.04	4.14	4.04	4.26	4.04	3.99	4.00	4.11	4.18
Std. Error of Mean		.130	.125	.129	.118	.125	.127	.111	.115	.131
Median		4.32	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.212	1.185	1.176	1.111	1.134	1.168	1.033	1.052	1.228
Skewness		-1.164	-1.229	-.997	-1.584	-1.080	-.971	-.650	-1.061	-1.318
Std. Error of Skewness		.258	.254	.263	.256	.265	.262	.259	.264	.256
Kurtosis		.342	.486	-.030	1.738	.362	.172	-.605	.467	.447
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.512	.502	.521	.507	.524	.517	.512	.522	.507
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 inlcuding seismic, vulcanology, 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	96	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97
	Missing	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Mean		4.07	4.14	3.98	4.21	3.94	3.98	3.98	3.95	4.15
Std. Error of Mean		.126	.121	.124	.106	.112	.120	.111	.117	.123
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		1.239	1.193	1.223	1.048	1.103	1.188	1.094	1.158	1.215
Skewness		-1.112	-1.205	-1.022	-1.296	-.856	-1.091	-.936	-.926	-1.333
Std. Error of Skewness		.246	.245	.245	.245	.245	.245	.245	.245	.245
Kurtosis		.010	.383	-.029	1.151	.116	.259	.178	-.057	.730
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.488	.484	.484	.484	.486	.484	.486	.484	.484
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 inlcuding seismic, vulcanology, 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	8	7	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		3.83	3.83	3.71	3.92	3.65	3.30	3.60	4.07	3.92
Std. Error of Mean		.491	.491	.486	.456	.422	.579	.378	.348	.488
Median		4.18	4.18	3.88	4.47	3.59	3.00	3.59	4.00	4.88
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.377	1.377	1.360	1.276	1.182	1.622	1.060	.930	1.367
Skewness		-.651	-.651	-.585	-.591	-.093	-.223	-.006	-.162	-.639
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.758	.787	.758
Kurtosis		-.697	-.697	-.691	-1.534	-1.461	-1.530	-.837	-2.128	-1.759
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.495	1.569	1.495
Range		4	4	4	3	3	4	3	2	3
Minimum		1	1	1	2	2	1	2	3	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	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 inlcuding seismic, vulcanology, 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	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.65	4.33	4.39	4.59	3.85	3.68	4.10	4.15	4.18
Std. Error of Mean		.523	.455	.385	.306	.470	.466	.449	.370	.458
Median		3.97	5.00	4.97	5.00	4.15	3.00	4.56	4.15	4.97
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.404	1.223	1.033	.822	1.263	1.251	1.205	.994	1.231
Skewness		-.569	-2.058	-3.083	-2.840	-.702	-.280	-1.493	-.931	-1.451
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-.882	5.534	15.645	12.473	.573	.135	3.483	.424	1.010
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	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:

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	3	0	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	12.5%	37.5%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	11	11	18	52	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.2%	11.3%	11.3%	18.6%	53.6%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	6	5	21	21	101	154
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.9%	3.2%	13.6%	13.6%	65.6%	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	7	10	21	43	86
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.8%	8.1%	11.6%	24.4%	50.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	7	9	35	55	117	223
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.1%	4.0%	15.7%	24.7%	52.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	23	34	81	116	320	574
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.0%	5.9%	14.1%	20.2%	55.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.730	20	.093
Likelihood Ratio	28.933	20	.089
Linear-by-Linear Association	.011	1	.918
N of Valid Cases	574		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	3	0	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	12.5%	37.5%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	7	15	15	56	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.1%	7.1%	15.3%	15.3%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	7	4	15	29	101	156
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	2.6%	9.6%	18.6%	64.7%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	0	5	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	83.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	6	13	16	51	90
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.4%	6.7%	14.4%	17.8%	56.7%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	13	13	18	62	120	226
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.8%	5.8%	8.0%	27.4%	53.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	29	31	65	122	337	584
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.0%	5.3%	11.1%	20.9%	57.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.164	20	.106
Likelihood Ratio	30.029	20	.069
Linear-by-Linear Association	.305	1	.581
N of Valid Cases	584		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	2	1	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	14.3%	28.6%	14.3%	42.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	10	13	24	46	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.1%	10.2%	13.3%	24.5%	46.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	6	6	23	36	84	155
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.9%	3.9%	14.8%	23.2%	54.2%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	3	4	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	7	15	16	42	83
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.6%	8.4%	18.1%	19.3%	50.6%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	8	14	50	50	102	224
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.6%	6.3%	22.3%	22.3%	45.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	22	38	103	130	281	574
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.8%	6.6%	17.9%	22.6%	49.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.087	20	.711
Likelihood Ratio	17.857	20	.597
Linear-by-Linear Association	.455	1	.500
N of Valid Cases	574		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Identify public safety needs and impacts:

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	2	1	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	3	3	18	21	53	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.1%	3.1%	18.4%	21.4%	54.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	6	11	13	31	95	156
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.8%	7.1%	8.3%	19.9%	60.9%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	2	5	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	5	7	21	52	89
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	5.6%	7.9%	23.6%	58.4%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	8	3	37	47	128	223
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.6%	1.3%	16.6%	21.1%	57.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	21	23	77	123	337	581
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.6%	4.0%	13.3%	21.2%	58.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.043	20	.287
Likelihood Ratio	25.066	20	.199
Linear-by-Linear Association	.267	1	.605
N of Valid Cases	581		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Assess other government impacts:

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	2	2	3	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	12.5%	25.0%	25.0%	37.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	4	5	23	26	39	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.1%	5.2%	23.7%	26.8%	40.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	11	8	29	40	65	153
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.2%	5.2%	19.0%	26.1%	42.5%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	3	0	3	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	6	13	23	38	83
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.6%	7.2%	15.7%	27.7%	45.8%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	10	14	52	63	82	221
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	6.3%	23.5%	28.5%	37.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	28	34	122	154	230	568
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.9%	6.0%	21.5%	27.1%	40.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.319	20	.905
Likelihood Ratio	14.187	20	.821
Linear-by-Linear Association	.073	1	.787
N of Valid Cases	568		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Assess impacts on the tourism sector:

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	1	1	2	0	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.3%	14.3%	28.6%	0.0%	42.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	9	11	30	43	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.1%	9.2%	11.2%	30.6%	43.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	15	9	24	25	82	155
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.7%	5.8%	15.5%	16.1%	52.9%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	4	0	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	57.1%	0.0%	42.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	4	20	17	39	85
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.9%	4.7%	23.5%	20.0%	45.9%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	13	48	56	93	221
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.0%	5.9%	21.7%	25.3%	42.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	37	36	109	128	263	573
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.5%	6.3%	19.0%	22.3%	45.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.559	20	.048
Likelihood Ratio	33.313	20	.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.914
N of Valid Cases	573		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
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	3	7	18	29	40	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.1%	7.2%	18.6%	29.9%	41.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	10	5	28	37	74	154
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.5%	3.2%	18.2%	24.0%	48.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	1	4	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	14.3%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	7	20	22	37	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.1%	8.0%	23.0%	25.3%	42.5%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	13	15	56	52	86	222
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.9%	6.8%	25.2%	23.4%	38.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	27	35	127	143	243	575
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.7%	6.1%	22.1%	24.9%	42.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.179	20	.641
Likelihood Ratio	19.398	20	.496
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.984	1	.159
N of Valid Cases	575		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Identify transportation impacts:

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	2	2	3	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	28.6%	42.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	4	9	16	27	41	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.1%	9.3%	16.5%	27.8%	42.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	8	5	30	44	68	155
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.2%	3.2%	19.4%	28.4%	43.9%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	2	3	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	5	15	22	40	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.4%	6.0%	17.9%	26.2%	47.6%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	12	11	64	42	95	224
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.4%	4.9%	28.6%	18.8%	42.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	26	30	128	139	250	573
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	5.2%	22.3%	24.3%	43.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.215	20	.508
Likelihood Ratio	20.300	20	.439
Linear-by-Linear Association	.713	1	.398
N of Valid Cases	573		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	2	1	0	4	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	57.1%	1.0
	City of Henderson	Count	6	5	13	17	57	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.1%	5.1%	13.3%	17.3%	58.2%	1.0
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	5	13	28	102	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.7%	3.2%	8.3%	17.8%	65.0%	1.0
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	2	4	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	28.6%	57.1%	1.0
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	9	7	14	54	88
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	10.2%	8.0%	15.9%	61.4%	1.0
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	12	33	49	119	224
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.9%	5.4%	14.7%	21.9%	53.1%	1.0
Total		Count	30	34	67	110	340	581
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.2%	5.9%	11.5%	18.9%	58.5%	1.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.309	20	.229
Likelihood Ratio	23.785	20	.252
Linear-by-Linear Association	.686	1	.408
N of Valid Cases	581		

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 publics' 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	534	556	563
	Missing	69	47	40
Mean		1.69	2.86	2.49
Std. Error of Mean		.020	.042	.031
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.462	.992	.746
Skewness		-.836	-.259	-1.081
Std. Error of Skewness		.106	.104	.103
Kurtosis		-1.305	-1.128	-.364
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.211	.207	.205
Range		1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	4	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	164	30.8	30.8
	Oppose	370	69.2	100.0
	Total	534	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	69		
Total		603		



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	49	8.9	8.9
	Agree	170	30.6	39.5
	Disagree	147	26.5	65.9
	Strongly Disagree	189	34.1	100.0
	Total	556	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer/Refused*	47		
Total		603		



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	86	15.3	15.3
	No effect	114	20.3	35.6
	Negative effect	363	64.4	100.0
	Total	563	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	40		
Total		603		



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 publics' 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	206	213	213
	Missing	24	17	17
Mean		1.74	2.92	2.53
Std. Error of Mean		.031	.066	.049
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.439	.966	.717
Skewness		-1.114	-.262	-1.196
Std. Error of Skewness		.170	.167	.167
Kurtosis		-.767	-1.161	-.027
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.338	.332	.332
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 publics' 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	143	144	150
	Missing	16	15	9
Mean		1.60	2.71	2.34
Std. Error of Mean		.041	.088	.066
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.491	1.057	.804
Skewness		-.418	-.150	-.701
Std. Error of Skewness		.203	.202	.198
Kurtosis		-1.851	-1.238	-1.096
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.403	.401	.394
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 publics' 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	87	83
	Missing	7	4	8
Mean		1.73	2.94	2.53
Std. Error of Mean		.049	.102	.086
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.447	.949	.781
Skewness		-1.055	-.447	-1.262
Std. Error of Skewness		.263	.259	.264
Kurtosis		-.909	-.808	-.139
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.521	.512	.523
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 publics' 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	82	91	95
	Missing	16	7	2
Mean		1.68	2.89	2.57
Std. Error of Mean		.052	.102	.070
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.469	.976	.681
Skewness		-.791	-.237	-1.319
Std. Error of Skewness		.266	.253	.247
Kurtosis		-1.409	-1.172	.410
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.525	.501	.489
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 publics' 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	5	6	5
	Missing	3	1	3
Mean		1.74	2.71	2.60
Std. Error of Mean		.219	.489	.243
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.492	1.242	.547
Skewness		-1.588	-.343	-.597
Std. Error of Skewness		.908	.820	.908
Kurtosis		.547	-1.478	-3.305
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.978	1.662	1.978
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 publics' 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	7	6	7
	Missing	0	1	0
Mean		1.58	2.79	2.39
Std. Error of Mean		.198	.443	.317
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		2	2	3
Std. Deviation		.532	1.074	.851
Skewness		-.416	.582	-1.029
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.852	.784
Kurtosis		-2.705	-2.854	-.482
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.764	1.561
Range		1	2	2
Minimum		1	2	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?

			Support	Oppose	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	1	4	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	26	56	82
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	31.7%	68.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	57	86	143
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	39.9%	60.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	4	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	23	61	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	27.4%	72.6%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	53	153	206
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.7%	74.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	163	364	527
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.212	5	.101
Likelihood Ratio	9.077	5	.106
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.634	1	.031
N of Valid Cases	527		

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?

			Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	1	1	2	2	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.7%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	6	29	23	32	90
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.7%	32.2%	25.6%	35.6%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	21	44	35	44	144
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.6%	30.6%	24.3%	30.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	4	0	2	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	7	21	29	30	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.0%	24.1%	33.3%	34.5%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	14	68	54	77	213
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.6%	31.9%	25.4%	36.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	49	167	143	187	546
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.0%	30.6%	26.2%	34.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.786	15	.332
Likelihood Ratio	17.595	15	.285
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.383	1	.240
N of Valid Cases	546		

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.

			Positive effect	No effect	Negative effect	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	2	3	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	10	20	65	95
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.5%	21.1%	68.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	31	36	82	149
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.8%	24.2%	55.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	2	4	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	15	10	59	84
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.9%	11.9%	70.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	28	44	141	213
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.1%	20.7%	66.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	85	114	354	553
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.4%	20.6%	64.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.144	10	.167
Likelihood Ratio	15.188	10	.125
Linear-by-Linear Association	.711	1	.399
N of Valid Cases	553		

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 ...	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...
N	Valid	585	601	543
	Missing	18	2	60
Mean		2.42	3.33	2.97
Std. Error of Mean		.039	.037	.058
Median		2.00	4.00	2.00
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		.950	.916	1.354
Skewness		.556	-1.192	.241
Std. Error of Skewness		.101	.100	.105
Kurtosis		-.760	.361	-1.326
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.202	.199	.209
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	68	11.6	11.6
	Generally aware that there is a proceeding, but do not fo	325	55.6	67.2
	Not at all aware and not concerned about the proceeding	68	11.6	78.7
	Not at all aware and thought the project was cancelled	124	21.3	100.0
	Total	585	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	18		
Total		603		



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	38	6.3	6.3
	Aware	71	11.9	18.2
	Somewhat aware	147	24.5	42.7
	Not at all aware	344	57.3	100.0
	Total	601	100.0	
Missing	DK/No Answer	2		
Total		603		



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	63	11.6	11.6
	Supportive and do not follow the details of the licensing	210	38.8	50.3
	Not Supportive and follow the details of the licensing proceedings	54	10.0	60.3
	Not supportive and do not follow the details of the licensing	110	20.3	80.6
	Not supportive and believe we should negotiate benefits instead	105	19.4	100.0
	Total	543	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	60		
Total		603		



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 ...	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...
N	Valid	223	228	207
	Missing	7	2	24
Mean		2.46	3.39	3.05
Std. Error of Mean		.067	.056	.094
Median		2.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		.997	.843	1.354
Skewness		.446	-1.361	.128
Std. Error of Skewness		.163	.161	.169
Kurtosis		-.977	1.156	-1.374
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.325	.321	.337
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 ...	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...
N	Valid	153	159	145
	Missing	6	0	14
Mean		2.40	3.31	2.84
Std. Error of Mean		.074	.073	.117
Median		2.00	4.00	2.00
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		.921	.923	1.414
Skewness		.593	-1.136	.328
Std. Error of Skewness		.196	.193	.201
Kurtosis		-.578	.207	-1.311
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.390	.383	.400
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 ...	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...
N	Valid	90	91	86
	Missing	1	0	5
Mean		2.33	3.37	3.11
Std. Error of Mean		.094	.098	.133
Median		2.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		.888	.934	1.233
Skewness		.831	-1.378	.349
Std. Error of Skewness		.254	.253	.260
Kurtosis		-.136	.840	-1.289
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.502	.501	.515
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 ...	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...
N	Valid	95	97	85
	Missing	3	0	13
Mean		2.39	3.15	2.87
Std. Error of Mean		.094	.107	.146
Median		2.00	4.00	2.00
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		.911	1.056	1.346
Skewness		.678	-.809	.331
Std. Error of Skewness		.248	.245	.261
Kurtosis		-.482	-.782	-1.320
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.491	.484	.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 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 ...	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...
N	Valid	7	8	5
	Missing	1	0	3
Mean		2.69	3.49	2.33
Std. Error of Mean		.385	.360	.645
Median		2.76	4.00	2.00
Mode		2	4	2
Std. Deviation		1.030	1.008	1.393
Skewness		-.026	-2.192	1.500
Std. Error of Skewness		.787	.758	.942
Kurtosis		-.740	5.137	3.904
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.569	1.495	2.144
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 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 ...	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...
N	Valid	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		2.49	2.96	3.20
Std. Error of Mean		.457	.271	.570
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	5
Std. Deviation		1.227	.729	1.530
Skewness		.427	.062	.149
Std. Error of Skewness		.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		-1.547	-.208	-1.430
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.561	1.561	1.561
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:

			Very aware and follow the details of the proceeding	Generally aware that there is a proceeding,	Not at all aware and not concerned about the proceeding	Not at all aware and thought the project was cancelled	Total
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	10	56	11	18	95
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.5%	58.9%	11.6%	18.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	18	86	21	29	154
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.7%	55.8%	13.6%	18.8%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	3	0	2	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.7%	50.0%	0.0%	33.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	10	57	8	16	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.0%	62.6%	8.8%	17.6%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	29	116	25	53	223
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.0%	52.0%	11.2%	23.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	69	321	67	120	577
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.0%	55.6%	11.6%	20.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.075	15	.921
Likelihood Ratio	8.444	15	.905
Linear-by-Linear Association	.148	1	.701
N of Valid Cases	577		

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:

			Very aware	Aware	Somewhat aware	Not at all aware	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	1	0	1	6	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	75.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	9	20	15	53	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.3%	20.6%	15.5%	54.6%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	10	21	38	90	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.3%	13.2%	23.9%	56.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	4	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	7	8	20	55	90
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.8%	8.9%	22.2%	61.1%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	12	19	66	131	228
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.3%	8.3%	28.9%	57.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	39	70	144	337	590
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.6%	11.9%	24.4%	57.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.686	15	.054
Likelihood Ratio	25.225	15	.047
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.040	1	.081
N of Valid Cases	590		

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:

			Supportive and follow the details of the licensing	Supportive and do not follow the details of the licensing	Not Supportive and follow the details of the licensing	Not supportive and do not follow the details	Not supportive and believe we should negotiate benefits	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	1	2	0	1	0	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	10	37	3	20	13	83
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.0%	44.6%	3.6%	24.1%	15.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	25	54	12	26	28	145
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.2%	37.2%	8.3%	17.9%	19.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	2	2	0	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.3%	28.6%	28.6%	0.0%	28.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	35	15	16	17	86
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.5%	40.7%	17.4%	18.6%	19.8%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	22	75	20	48	41	206
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.7%	36.4%	9.7%	23.3%	19.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	62	205	52	111	101	531
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.7%	38.6%	9.8%	20.9%	19.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.757	20	.115
Likelihood Ratio	30.795	20	.058
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.198	1	.074
N of Valid Cases	531		

Appendix VIII

Community Profile

Appendix VIII
Community Profile

What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Car-Drive alone	486	80.7	80.7
	Car-Carpool with others	45	7.5	88.2
	CAT bus (or paratransit)	45	7.5	95.7
	MAX transit	13	2.1	97.9
	Motorcycle	3	.4	98.3
	Walk	5	.8	99.1
	Bike	5	.9	100.0
	Total	602	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	1		
Total		603		



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

Appendix VIII
Community Profile

Do you currently commute on a daily basis?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	380	63.1	63.1	63.1
	No	222	36.8	36.9	100.0
	Total	602	99.9	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	1	.1		
Total		603	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?

			Car-Drive alone	Car-Carpool with others	CAT bus (or paratransit)	MAX transit	Motorcycle	Walk	Bike	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	75.0%	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	83	11	1	0	0	1	0	96
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	86.5%	11.5%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	130	16	9	2	0	3	0	160
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	81.3%	10.0%	5.6%	1.3%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	76	1	11	3	0	0	0	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	83.5%	1.1%	12.1%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	177	16	21	7	3	2	5	231
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	76.6%	6.9%	9.1%	3.0%	1.3%	0.9%	2.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	479	45	43	12	3	6	5	593
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	80.8%	7.6%	7.3%	2.0%	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	40.365	30	.098
Likelihood Ratio	51.655	30	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.303	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	593		

Appendix VIII
Community Profile
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

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

			Yes	No	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	4	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	53	44	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	54.6%	45.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	99	59	158
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	62.7%	37.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	6	1	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	56	35	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	156	74	230
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	67.8%	32.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	374	217	591
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	63.3%	36.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.431	5	.190
Likelihood Ratio	7.602	5	.180
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.414	1	.036
N of Valid Cases	591		

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 govern ment?	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?	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'...	Do you know who your County Commi ssioner 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?
N	Valid	587	583	229	230	591	599	587
	Missing	16	20	374	373	12	4	16
Mean		2.94	1.60	3.60	3.29	2.72	1.83	3.66
Std. Error of Mean		.041	.020	.084	.071	.054	.015	.046
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	3	2	4
Std. Deviation		.999	.490	1.269	1.083	1.311	.379	1.110
Skewness		-.235	-.413	-.739	-.389	.204	-1.734	-.541
Std. Error of Skewness		.101	.101	.161	.161	.100	.100	.101
Kurtosis		-.166	-1.836	-.515	-.161	-1.053	1.009	-.400
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.201	.202	.320	.320	.201	.199	.201
Range		4	1	4	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	5	2	5

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	64	10.9	10.9
	Two	93	15.8	26.6
	Three	277	47.1	73.8
	Four	126	21.4	95.2
	Five	28	4.8	100.0
	Total	587	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	16		
Total		603		



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	233	39.9	39.9
	No	350	60.1	100.0
	Total	583	100.0	
Missing	DK/no answer*	20		
Total		603		



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	23	9.9	9.9
	Monthly	27	11.7	21.6
	4 to 6 times a year	31	13.6	35.2
	1 to 3 times a year	87	38.0	73.2
	Less than once a year	61	26.8	100.0
	Total	229	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	3		
	System	370		
	Total	374		
Total		603		



Note- Chart & 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 poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One	20	8.7	8.7
	Two	20	8.8	17.6
	Three	93	40.3	57.9
	Four	67	29.1	86.9
	Five	30	13.1	100.0
	Total	230	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	3		
	System	370		
	Total	373		
Total		603		



Note- 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'...

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	141	23.9	23.9
	2	123	20.8	44.7
	3	157	26.6	71.3
	4	102	17.2	88.5
	5	68	11.5	100.0
	Total	591	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	12		
Total		603		



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	104	17.3	17.3
	No	495	82.7	100.0
	Total	599	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	4		
Total		603		



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	26	4.4	4.4
	2	61	10.5	14.9
	3	154	26.3	41.2
	4	189	32.3	73.5
	5	155	26.5	100.0
	Total	587	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	16		
Total		603		



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

Unincorporated Clark County		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?	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?	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'...	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?
N	Valid	226	220	70	70	228	227	225
	Missing	4	10	160	160	2	3	5
Mean		2.91	1.68	3.74	3.49	2.57	1.87	3.44
Std. Error of Mean		.068	.031	.154	.131	.087	.022	.076
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	5	3	1	2	4
Std. Deviation		1.028	.467	1.294	1.099	1.308	.332	1.133
Skewness		-.127	-.778	-.858	-.262	.355	-2.271	-.372
Std. Error of Skewness		.162	.164	.286	.286	.161	.161	.162
Kurtosis		-.075	-1.408	-.311	-.321	-.937	3.183	-.636
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.322	.326	.564	.564	.321	.321	.323
Range		4	1	4	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	5	2	5

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 governm ent?	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?	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'...	Do you know who your County Commiss ioner 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?
N	Valid	154	158	70	70	153	157	155
	Missing	5	1	89	89	6	1	4
Mean		2.82	1.55	3.57	3.02	2.76	1.77	3.73
Std. Error of Mean		.076	.040	.153	.143	.109	.034	.092
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	3	2	5
Std. Deviation		.947	.500	1.272	1.201	1.352	.423	1.143
Skewness		-.447	-.185	-.870	-.331	.231	-1.285	-.594
Std. Error of Skewness		.196	.193	.288	.286	.196	.193	.195
Kurtosis		-.525	-1.991	-.204	-.626	-1.072	-.353	-.442
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.389	.384	.568	.566	.390	.384	.388
Range		4	1	4	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	5	2	5

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, 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?	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?	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'...	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?
N	Valid	88	89	49	50	89	91	90
	Missing	3	2	42	41	2	0	1
Mean		3.08	1.44	3.62	3.47	2.88	1.79	3.67
Std. Error of Mean		.113	.053	.162	.121	.138	.043	.118
Median		3.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	1	4	4	4	2	4
Std. Deviation		1.055	.499	1.130	.856	1.305	.407	1.120
Skewness		-.314	.261	-.536	-.648	-.040	-1.475	-.661
Std. Error of Skewness		.257	.256	.341	.336	.255	.253	.254
Kurtosis		-.175	-1.977	-.714	.780	-1.224	.178	-.177
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.509	.506	.670	.662	.505	.501	.504
Range		4	1	4	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	5	2	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of Henderson		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?	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?	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'...	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?
N	Valid	96	91	30	29	97	98	93
	Missing	2	7	68	69	1	0	5
Mean		3.06	1.67	3.64	3.10	2.85	1.87	3.99
Std. Error of Mean		.099	.050	.231	.187	.121	.034	.094
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	3	2	4
Std. Deviation		.969	.473	1.270	1.000	1.188	.338	.909
Skewness		-.293	-.734	-.826	-.160	.123	-2.235	-.599
Std. Error of Skewness		.246	.252	.426	.436	.245	.244	.250
Kurtosis		.012	-1.495	-.407	.284	-.742	3.057	.160
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.487	.500	.831	.850	.485	.483	.496
Range		4	1	4	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	5	2	5

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?	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?	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'...	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?
N	Valid	8	8	5	5	8	8	6
	Missing	0	0	3	3	0	0	1
Mean		2.68	1.37	3.09	3.15	2.24	1.77	3.98
Std. Error of Mean		.178	.185	.845	.467	.470	.161	.335
Median		3.00	1.00	3.76	3.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	1	1	3	1	2	4
Std. Deviation		.499	.517	1.878	1.038	1.317	.450	.851
Skewness		-.977	.672	-.400	.471	.502	-1.611	.038
Std. Error of Skewness		.758	.758	.918	.918	.758	.758	.820
Kurtosis		-1.527	-2.211	-2.586	.716	-1.653	.705	-1.485
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.495	1.495	2.021	2.021	1.495	1.495	1.662
Range		1	1	4	3	3	1	2
Minimum		2	1	1	2	1	1	3
Maximum		3	2	5	5	4	2	5

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 governme nt?	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?	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'...	Do you know who your County Commis sioner 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?
N	Valid	7	7	3	3	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	4	4	0	0	0
Mean		2.83	1.57	1.70	3.43	3.54	1.66	3.61
Std. Error of Mean		.377	.198	.478	.344	.515	.190	.317
Median		3.00	2.00	1.70	3.30	4.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	1	3	4	2	3
Std. Deviation		.984	.533	.840	.603	1.385	.510	.851
Skewness		-.626	-.381	1.112	.629	-1.067	-.878	1.029
Std. Error of Skewness		.803	.784	1.198	1.198	.784	.784	.784
Kurtosis		.633	-2.744			1.128	-1.863	-.482
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.612	1.561			1.561	1.561	1.561
Range		3	1	2	1	4	1	2
Minimum		1	1	1	3	1	1	3
Maximum		4	2	3	4	5	2	5

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?

			One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	3	5	0	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	7	14	44	25	5	95
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.4%	14.7%	46.3%	26.3%	5.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	18	30	68	37	1	154
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.7%	19.5%	44.2%	24.0%	0.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	1	3	2	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.3%	14.3%	42.9%	28.6%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	9	11	38	23	7	88
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.2%	12.5%	43.2%	26.1%	8.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	27	33	114	38	15	227
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.9%	14.5%	50.2%	16.7%	6.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	62	92	272	125	28	579
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.7%	15.9%	47.0%	21.6%	4.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.652	20	.215
Likelihood Ratio	30.257	20	.066
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.949
N of Valid Cases	579		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

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

			Yes	No	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	5	3	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	30	61	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.0%	67.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	72	86	158
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	45.6%	54.4%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	3	4	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	50	39	89
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	56.2%	43.8%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	70	150	220
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	31.8%	68.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	230	343	573
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.1%	59.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.444	5	.001
Likelihood Ratio	21.366	5	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.479	1	.224
N of Valid Cases	573		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

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

			Weekly	Monthly	4 to 6 times a year	1 to 3 times a year	Less than once a year	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	2	0	0	1	1	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	2	5	2	13	8	30
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.7%	16.7%	6.7%	43.3%	26.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	4	11	29	16	69
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.0%	5.8%	15.9%	42.0%	23.2%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	1	0	0	0	2
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	9	7	20	11	48
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.1%	18.8%	14.6%	41.7%	22.9%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	7	6	11	22	25	71
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.9%	8.5%	15.5%	31.0%	35.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	22	25	31	85	61	224
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.8%	11.2%	13.8%	37.9%	27.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.343	20	.064
Likelihood Ratio	28.221	20	.104
Linear-by-Linear Association	.949	1	.330
N of Valid Cases	224		

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, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?

			One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	2	1	0	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	2	4	14	6	2	28
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.1%	14.3%	50.0%	21.4%	7.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	6	27	18	7	70
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.1%	8.6%	38.6%	25.7%	10.0%	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	1	4	18	23	4	50
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.0%	8.0%	36.0%	46.0%	8.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	4	5	30	15	16	70
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.7%	7.1%	42.9%	21.4%	22.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	19	20	93	64	29	225
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.4%	8.9%	41.3%	28.4%	12.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.936	20	.071
Likelihood Ratio	29.430	20	.080
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.453	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	225		

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?

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	3	2	1	2	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	37.5%	25.0%	12.5%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	14	23	32	17	10	96
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.6%	24.0%	33.3%	17.7%	10.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	36	32	41	22	22	153
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	23.5%	20.9%	26.8%	14.4%	14.4%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	0	2	3	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.5%	0.0%	25.0%	37.5%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	17	20	16	26	9	88
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.3%	22.7%	18.2%	29.5%	10.2%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	65	46	63	29	24	227
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	28.6%	20.3%	27.8%	12.8%	10.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	136	123	155	99	67	580
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	23.4%	21.2%	26.7%	17.1%	11.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.576	20	.048
Likelihood Ratio	32.775	20	.036
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.159	1	.142
N of Valid Cases	580		

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?		
			Yes	No	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	2	6	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	13	85	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	36	121	157
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.9%	77.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	5	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	19	72	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.9%	79.1%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	29	199	228
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.7%	87.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	101	488	589
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.1%	82.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.764	5	.082
Likelihood Ratio	9.639	5	.086
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.812	1	.178
N of Valid Cases	589		

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?

			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	0	2	3	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	1	26	32	32	92
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.1%	1.1%	28.3%	34.8%	34.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	7	16	39	44	49	155
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	10.3%	25.2%	28.4%	31.6%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	0	4	2	1	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	0.0%	57.1%	28.6%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	9	21	32	23	90
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.6%	10.0%	23.3%	35.6%	25.6%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	13	35	60	74	43	225
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.8%	15.6%	26.7%	32.9%	19.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	26	61	152	187	150	576
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	10.6%	26.4%	32.5%	26.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.284	20	.040
Likelihood Ratio	39.305	20	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.071	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	576		

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	209	227	227	231	230	232	228	231	230
	Missing	394	376	376	372	373	371	375	372	373
Mean		3.09	2.19	2.20	2.04	2.04	2.03	2.14	2.02	3.29
Std. Error of Mean		.084	.041	.040	.041	.043	.040	.043	.036	.071
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		1.221	.624	.597	.617	.647	.609	.656	.541	1.083
Skewness		-.224	-.159	-.099	-.026	-.041	-.014	-.154	.014	-.389
Std. Error of Skewness		.168	.161	.162	.160	.161	.160	.161	.160	.161
Kurtosis		-.700	-.543	-.401	-.350	-.595	-.276	-.693	.462	-.161
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.335	.322	.322	.319	.320	.318	.321	.319	.320
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	32	15.1	15.1
	Two	23	10.8	25.9
	Three	78	37.6	63.5
	Four	48	22.8	86.2
	Five	29	13.8	100.0
	Total	209	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	24		
	System	370		
	Total	394		
Total		603		



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	26	11.7	11.7
	Met expectations	131	57.6	69.2
	Did not meet expectations	70	30.8	100.0
	Total	227	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	5		
	System	370		
	Total	376		
Total		603		



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	22	9.8	9.8
	Met expectations	137	60.6	70.3
	Did not meet expectations	67	29.7	100.0
	Total	227	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	6		
	System	370		
	Total	376		
Total		603		



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	39	16.9	16.9
	Met expectations	143	61.9	78.8
	Did not meet expectations	49	21.2	100.0
	Total	231	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	2		
	System	370		
	Total	372		
Total		603		



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	43	18.8	18.8
	Met expectations	133	58.1	76.9
	Did not meet expectations	53	23.1	100.0
	Total	230	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	3		
	System	370		
	Total	373		
Total		603		



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	39	17.0	17.0
	Met expectations	146	63.0	80.0
	Did not meet expectations	46	20.0	100.0
	Total	232	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	1		
	System	370		
	Total	371		
Total		603		



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	35	15.4	15.4
	Met expectations	126	55.2	70.6
	Did not meet expectations	67	29.4	100.0
	Total	228	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	4		
	System	370		
	Total	375		
Total		603		



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	32	13.7	13.7
	Met expectations	164	70.8	84.5
	Did not meet expectations	36	15.5	100.0
	Total	231	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	2		
	System	370		
	Total	372		
Total		603		



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	20	8.7	8.7
	Two	20	8.8	17.6
	Three	93	40.3	57.9
	Four	67	29.1	86.9
	Five	30	13.1	100.0
	Total	230	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer*	3		
	System	370		
	Total	373		
Total		603		



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	65	70	70	70	70	70	69	70	70
	Missing	166	160	160	160	160	160	161	160	160
Mean		3.16	2.15	2.10	2.07	2.12	2.10	2.11	2.07	3.49
Std. Error of Mean		.147	.074	.066	.067	.070	.066	.072	.060	.131
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		1.184	.621	.552	.563	.584	.557	.594	.507	1.099
Skewness		-.131	-.107	.054	.023	-.017	.043	-.030	.132	-.262
Std. Error of Skewness		.298	.286	.287	.286	.286	.286	.289	.286	.286
Kurtosis		-.410	-.415	.305	.242	-.078	.258	-.133	.990	-.321
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.588	.564	.567	.564	.564	.564	.571	.564	.564
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	64	70	70	70	71	71	69	70	70
	Missing	94	89	89	89	88	88	90	89	89
Mean		2.87	2.28	2.36	2.04	1.99	1.91	2.27	2.01	3.02
Std. Error of Mean		.158	.076	.073	.074	.088	.080	.089	.077	.143
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	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		1.267	.633	.611	.617	.735	.674	.740	.641	1.201
Skewness		-.010	-.306	-.377	-.023	.017	.102	-.482	-.005	-.331
Std. Error of Skewness		.298	.287	.286	.287	.286	.285	.289	.286	.286
Kurtosis		-.870	-.626	-.628	-.278	-1.117	-.746	-1.019	-.482	-.626
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.589	.568	.566	.567	.564	.563	.570	.566	.566
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 North 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	46	47	47	50	49	50	50	50	50
	Missing	45	44	44	41	42	41	41	41	41
Mean		3.20	2.05	2.23	1.93	1.95	2.02	1.93	2.02	3.47
Std. Error of Mean		.178	.095	.096	.097	.085	.091	.089	.074	.121
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		1.204	.647	.658	.683	.594	.645	.629	.522	.856
Skewness		-.418	-.044	-.277	.082	.011	-.016	.054	.032	-.648
Std. Error of Skewness		.351	.348	.348	.336	.341	.336	.336	.336	.336
Kurtosis		-.569	-.492	-.670	-.778	-.010	-.481	-.360	.937	.780
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.688	.683	.683	.662	.670	.662	.662	.662	.662
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 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	24	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	29
	Missing	73	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	69
Mean		3.16	2.30	2.08	2.20	2.17	2.17	2.26	1.96	3.10
Std. Error of Mean		.231	.094	.091	.095	.102	.086	.095	.053	.187
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		1.139	.515	.497	.519	.559	.469	.524	.291	1.000
Skewness		-.633	.340	.198	.281	.071	.598	.275	-1.250	-.160
Std. Error of Skewness		.470	.426	.426	.426	.426	.426	.426	.426	.436
Kurtosis		.002	-.647	1.441	.299	.195	1.039	-.220	10.615	.284
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.913	.831	.831	.831	.831	.831	.831	.831	.850
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 Boulder City		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	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Missing	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Mean		3.22	2.01	1.93	1.79	1.87	1.93	2.15	1.93	3.15
Std. Error of Mean		.859	.427	.400	.431	.462	.400	.460	.400	.467
Median		3.68	2.00	2.00	1.53	1.76	2.00	2.53	2.00	3.00
Mode		1	3	2	1	1	2	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		1.828	.949	.889	.957	1.028	.889	1.024	.889	1.038
Skewness		-.592	-.034	.191	.630	.387	.191	-.460	.191	.471
Std. Error of Skewness		.954	.918	.918	.918	.918	.918	.918	.918	.918
Kurtosis		-1.849	-2.447	-1.611	-2.028	-3.089	-1.611	-2.967	-1.611	.716
Std. Error of Kurtosis		2.207	2.021	2.021	2.021	2.021	2.021	2.021	2.021	2.021
Range		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Maximum		5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5

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	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Missing	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mean		3.27	2.43	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.43	1.57	3.43
Std. Error of Mean		.799	.344	.000	.646	.646	.000	.344	.344	.344
Median		3.41	2.30	2.00	2.30	2.30	2.00	2.30	1.70	3.30
Mode		2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	3
Std. Deviation		1.402	.603	.000	1.133	1.133	.000	.603	.603	.603
Skewness		-.023	.629		.000	.000		.629	-.629	.629
Std. Error of Skewness		1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198
Range		3	1	0	2	2	0	1	1	1
Minimum		2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	3
Maximum		5	3	2	3	3	2	3	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?

			One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	1	0	1	1	1	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	3	1	10	8	2	24
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.5%	4.2%	41.7%	33.3%	8.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	13	9	23	12	8	65
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.0%	13.8%	35.4%	18.5%	12.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	1	0	2
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	5	14	15	6	46
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.0%	10.9%	30.4%	32.6%	13.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	8	6	30	10	11	65
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.3%	9.2%	46.2%	15.4%	16.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	31	22	78	47	28	206
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.0%	10.7%	37.9%	22.8%	13.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.799	20	.601
Likelihood Ratio	17.971	20	.589
Linear-by-Linear Association	.513	1	.474
N of Valid Cases	206		

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

			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	2	1	2	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	20	10	31
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.2%	64.5%	32.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	7	37	26	70
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.0%	52.9%	37.1%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	8	27	11	46
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.4%	58.7%	23.9%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	9	42	20	71
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.7%	59.2%	28.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	27	129	70	226
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.9%	57.1%	31.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.801	10	.373
Likelihood Ratio	10.982	10	.359
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.769	1	.184
N of Valid Cases	226		

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

			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	2	2	1	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	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	5	35	30	70
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.1%	50.0%	42.9%	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	6	24	16	46
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.0%	52.2%	34.8%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	7	48	14	69
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.1%	69.6%	20.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	23	135	66	224
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.3%	60.3%	29.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.054	10	.029
Likelihood Ratio	19.440	10	.035
Linear-by-Linear Association	.412	1	.521
N of Valid Cases	224		

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

			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	2	1	1	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	2	21	8	31
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.5%	67.7%	25.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	43	15	70
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.1%	61.4%	21.4%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	0	1	2
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	13	27	10	50
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	26.0%	54.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	9	48	14	71
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.7%	67.6%	19.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	39	140	49	228
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.1%	61.4%	21.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.368	10	.204
Likelihood Ratio	13.726	10	.186
Linear-by-Linear Association	.236	1	.627
N of Valid Cases	228		

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

			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations	
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	2	1	2	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	2	20	8	30
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.7%	66.7%	26.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	19	33	18	70
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	27.1%	47.1%	25.7%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	0	1	2
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	10	32	7	49
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.4%	65.3%	14.3%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	8	46	17	71
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.3%	64.8%	23.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	42	132	53	227
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	18.5%	58.1%	23.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.985	10	.055
Likelihood Ratio	19.692	10	.032
Linear-by-Linear Association	.013	1	.908
N of Valid Cases	227		

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

			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	2	2	1	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	23	6	30
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.3%	76.7%	20.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	19	39	13	71
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	26.8%	54.9%	18.3%	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	10	30	11	51
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.6%	58.8%	21.6%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	8	48	15	71
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.3%	67.6%	21.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	40	145	46	231
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.3%	62.8%	19.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.601	10	.147
Likelihood Ratio	16.625	10	.083
Linear-by-Linear Association	.779	1	.377
N of Valid Cases	231		

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

			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	2	1	3	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.3%	16.7%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	20	9	30
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.3%	66.7%	30.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	27	30	69
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.4%	39.1%	43.5%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	12	30	8	50
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	24.0%	60.0%	16.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	9	44	16	69
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.0%	63.8%	23.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	36	124	67	227
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.9%	54.6%	29.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.405	10	.009
Likelihood Ratio	25.538	10	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.330	1	.037
N of Valid Cases	227		

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)

			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	2	2	1	5
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	2	28	1	31
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.5%	90.3%	3.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	14	42	14	70
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	1	2	0	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	37	7	50
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.0%	74.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	7	52	12	71
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.9%	73.2%	16.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	32	163	35	230
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.9%	70.9%	15.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.655	10	.110
Likelihood Ratio	16.594	10	.084
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.440	1	.230
N of Valid Cases	230		

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?

			One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	2	1	0	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	2	4	14	6	2	28
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.1%	14.3%	50.0%	21.4%	7.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	6	27	18	7	70
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.1%	8.6%	38.6%	25.7%	10.0%	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	1	4	18	23	4	50
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.0%	8.0%	36.0%	46.0%	8.0%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	4	5	30	15	16	70
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.7%	7.1%	42.9%	21.4%	22.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.936	20	.071
Likelihood Ratio	29.430	20	.080
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.453	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	225		

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	165	27.7	27.7
	Television	250	42.1	69.8
	Radio	26	4.4	74.2
	Internet	104	17.5	91.7
	Clark County 4 (CCTV)	32	5.4	97.1
	Newsletters	6	1.0	98.0
	Town hall meetings/Open houses	4	.6	98.7
	Other (specify):	8	1.3	100.0
	Total	594	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	9		
Total		603		



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	153	26.2	26.2
	Television	242	41.5	67.7
	Radio	50	8.6	76.3
	Internet	71	12.1	88.4
	Outdoor Billboards	55	9.4	97.8
	Other (specify):	13	2.2	100.0
	Total	583	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	20		
Total		603		



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

			Newspaper	Television	Radio	Internet	Clark County 4 (CCTV)	Newsletters	Town hall meetings/Open houses	Other	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	37.5%	50.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	30	34	5	21	4	0	1	2	97
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	30.9%	35.1%	5.2%	21.6%	4.1%	0.0%	1.0%	2.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	41	50	9	30	16	6	2	2	156
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	26.3%	32.1%	5.8%	19.2%	10.3%	3.8%	1.3%	1.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	71.4%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	28	37	4	16	0	0	0	2	87
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	32.2%	42.5%	4.6%	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	54	116	8	37	10	0	0	2	227
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	23.8%	51.1%	3.5%	16.3%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	161	242	26	105	30	6	4	8	582
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	27.7%	41.6%	4.5%	18.0%	5.2%	1.0%	0.7%	1.4%	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	76.146	35	.000
Likelihood Ratio	67.386	35	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.575	1	.448
N of Valid Cases	582		

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

			News paper	Television	Radio	Internet	Outdoor Billboards	Other	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	2	3	1	1	0	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	28.6%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	25	31	9	15	10	2	92
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	27.2%	33.7%	9.8%	16.3%	10.9%	2.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	53	51	12	22	13	3	154
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	34.4%	33.1%	7.8%	14.3%	8.4%	1.9%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	4	2	0	0	0	1	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	57.1%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	27	36	8	11	8	1	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	29.7%	39.6%	8.8%	12.1%	8.8%	1.1%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	38	114	20	23	24	5	224
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.0%	50.9%	8.9%	10.3%	10.7%	2.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	149	237	50	72	55	12	575
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.9%	41.2%	8.7%	12.5%	9.6%	2.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.634	25	.077
Likelihood Ratio	35.545	25	.079
Linear-by-Linear Association	.262	1	.609
N of Valid Cases	575		

Appendix X

Local Distribution Summary

Appendix X
Local Distribution Summary

Respondent zip code:

What is your zip code?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	89002.00	23	3.8	3.9	3.9
	89005.00	8	1.3	1.3	5.2
	89011.00	7	1.1	1.2	6.4
	89012.00	16	2.7	2.8	9.1
	89014.00	9	1.5	1.5	10.6
	89015.00	12	2.0	2.0	12.7
	89020.00	3	.4	.5	13.1
	89021.00	7	1.2	1.2	14.3
	89025.00	1	.2	.2	14.5
	89027.00	6	1.1	1.1	15.6
	89029.00	1	.2	.2	15.8
	89030.00	7	1.2	1.2	17.0
	89031.00	24	4.0	4.1	21.1
	89032.00	13	2.2	2.3	23.4
	89034.00	1	.1	.1	23.5
	89039.00	1	.1	.1	23.6
	89040.00	0	.1	.1	23.7
	89044.00	2	.3	.3	24.0
	89052.00	20	3.4	3.4	27.4
	89074.00	9	1.5	1.5	28.9
	89081.00	13	2.1	2.1	31.0
	89084.00	4	.7	.7	31.7
	89086.00	3	.4	.5	32.1
	89101.00	2	.3	.3	32.5
	89102.00	4	.6	.6	33.1
	89103.00	8	1.3	1.3	34.4
	89104.00	14	2.4	2.4	36.9
	89106.00	5	.8	.8	37.7
	89107.00	9	1.5	1.5	39.1
	89108.00	18	3.0	3.1	42.2
	89109.00	1	.2	.2	42.5
	89110.00	22	3.7	3.7	46.2
	89113.00	5	.8	.9	47.1
	89114.00	1	.2	.2	47.3
	89115.00	27	4.4	4.5	51.8

	89117.00	15	2.5	2.6	54.4
	89118.00	2	.3	.4	54.7
	89119.00	16	2.6	2.7	57.4
	89120.00	14	2.3	2.3	59.7
	89121.00	20	3.3	3.3	63.0
	89122.00	4	.6	.6	63.6
	89123.00	13	2.2	2.2	65.9
	89128.00	10	1.6	1.7	67.5
	89129.00	15	2.4	2.5	70.0
	89130.00	15	2.6	2.6	72.6
	89131.00	20	3.3	3.3	75.9
	89132.00	3	.4	.5	76.4
	89134.00	13	2.1	2.1	78.5
	89135.00	15	2.4	2.5	81.0
	89138.00	1	.1	.1	81.1
	89139.00	3	.5	.5	81.6
	89141.00	9	1.4	1.5	83.1
	89142.00	12	2.0	2.0	85.1
	89143.00	4	.7	.7	85.8
	89144.00	9	1.4	1.4	87.3
	89145.00	8	1.3	1.3	88.5
	89146.00	9	1.5	1.5	90.1
	89147.00	9	1.6	1.6	91.7
	89148.00	12	1.9	1.9	93.6
	89149.00	11	1.8	1.8	95.4
	89156.00	6	.9	1.0	96.4
	89166.00	4	.6	.6	97.0
	89169.00	3	.6	.6	97.6
	89178.00	8	1.3	1.4	99.0
	89183.00	6	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	593	98.3	100.0	
Missing	99999.00	10	1.7		
Total		603	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	98	16.5	17.8
	City of Las Vegas	159	26.8	44.6
	City of Mesquite	7	1.2	45.8
	City of North Las Vegas	91	15.3	61.2
	Unincorporated Clark County	230	38.8	100.0
	Total	593	100.0	
Missing	Missing	10		
Total		603		



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	94	18.6	18.6
	$20,001 - $ 40,000	113	22.4	41.0
	$40,001 - $ 60,000	84	16.6	57.7
	$60,001 - $ 80,000	82	16.3	74.0
	$80,001 - $100,000	56	11.2	85.1
	$100,001 - $120,000	28	5.6	90.7
	$120,001 - $140,000	16	3.2	93.9
	$140,001 or more	31	6.1	100.0
	Total	505	100.0	
Missing	No answer/refused*	98		
Total		603		



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	75	12.6	12.6
	25 - 44	248	41.5	54.2
	45 - 64	190	31.7	85.9
	65 or older	84	14.1	100.0
	Total	598	100.0	
Missing	No answer/refused*	5		
Total		603		



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	22	3.7	3.7
	1 - 5 years	120	19.9	23.6
	6 - 10 years	119	19.7	43.3
	11 - 15 years	86	14.3	57.6
	Over 15 years	207	34.3	91.9
	All my life	49	8.1	100.0
	Total	602	100.0	
Missing	No answer/refused*	1		
Total		603		



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

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile

Gender observation:

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	281	46.5	46.5
	Female	322	53.5	100.0
	Total	603	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?

			$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	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	6
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	10	11	14	14	6	3	6	12	76
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.2%	14.5%	18.4%	18.4%	7.9%	3.9%	7.9%	15.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	14	24	24	28	17	12	4	11	134
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.4%	17.9%	17.9%	20.9%	12.7%	9.0%	3.0%	8.2%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	28.6%	28.6%	28.6%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	23	20	12	13	5	4	1	1	79
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	29.1%	25.3%	15.2%	16.5%	6.3%	5.1%	1.3%	1.3%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	45	53	31	24	27	8	5	7	200
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.5%	26.5%	15.5%	12.0%	13.5%	4.0%	2.5%	3.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	95	112	84	81	56	27	16	31	502
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	18.9%	22.3%	16.7%	16.1%	11.2%	5.4%	3.2%	6.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	58.343	35	.008
Likelihood Ratio	58.612	35	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	23.523	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	502		

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction

Respondent Jurisdiction * In what age group do you fall?

			18 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 64	65 or older	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	5	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	8	36	38	14	96
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.3%	37.5%	39.6%	14.6%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	26	52	50	30	158
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.5%	32.9%	31.6%	19.0%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	3	2	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	8	51	26	5	90
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.9%	56.7%	28.9%	5.6%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	33	105	63	29	230
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.3%	45.7%	27.4%	12.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	75	248	184	82	589
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.7%	42.1%	31.2%	13.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.597	15	.005
Likelihood Ratio	35.108	15	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.887	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	589		

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction

Respondent Jurisdiction * How long have you lived in Clark County?

			Less than 1 year	1 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 15 years	Over 15 years	All my life	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	0	1	1	1	5	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	62.5%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	3	21	24	13	33	4	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.1%	21.4%	24.5%	13.3%	33.7%	4.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	5	31	27	17	69	10	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.1%	19.5%	17.0%	10.7%	43.4%	6.3%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	0	2	3	1	1	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	28.6%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	21	25	14	22	9	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.0%	23.1%	27.5%	15.4%	24.2%	9.9%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	14	41	38	38	73	25	229
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.1%	17.9%	16.6%	16.6%	31.9%	10.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	22	117	118	84	203	48	592
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.7%	19.8%	19.9%	14.2%	34.3%	8.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.443	25	.080
Likelihood Ratio	39.575	25	.032
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.912
N of Valid Cases	592		

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction

Respondent Jurisdiction * Gender observation:

			Male	Female	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	City of Boulder City	Count	4	4	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	42	56	98
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	76	83	159
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	47.8%	52.2%	100.0%
	City of Mesquite	Count	5	2	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	35	56	91
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	113	117	230
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	49.1%	50.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	275	318	593
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	46.4%	53.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.420	5	.367
Likelihood Ratio	5.482	5	.360
Linear-by-Linear Association	.216	1	.642
N of Valid Cases	593		

Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



This page intentionally left blank
-END OF REPORT-