



# Clark County Monitoring Program

APRIL 2008



strategic  solutions

  
Urban Environmental Research, LLC

**Clark County Monitoring Program: Community Survey  
April 2008**

**Contents:**

Executive Summary

Tab 1:	Appendix I.....	14
	Importance Score for Selected Services	
Tab 2:	Appendix II.....	93
	Performance Score for Selected Services	
Tab 3:	Appendix III.....	172
	Quality of Life Considerations	
Tab 4:	Appendix IV.....	203
	General Economic Considerations	
Tab 5:	Appendix V.....	221
	Property Value Considerations	
Tab 6:	Appendix VI.....	239
	Environmental Considerations	
Tab 7:	Appendix VII.....	258
	Yucca Mountain Considerations	
Tab 8:	Appendix VIII.....	312
	Community Profile	
Tab 9:	Appendix IX.....	317
	Local Government Interaction	
Tab 10:	Appendix X.....	367
	Local Distribution Summary	
Tab 11:	Appendix XI.....	370
	Respondent Demographic File	
Tab 12:	Appendix XII.....	378
	Importance/ Performance Comparisons	



---

TO: MS. IRENE NAVIS, AICP  
FROM: DR. SHEILA CONWAY/UER; DR. ALVIN MUSHKATEL/UER  
SUBJECT: CLARK COUNTY MONITORING PROGRAM | April 2008 COMMUNITY SURVEY  
DATE: April 29, 2008  
CC: JASON GRAY/STRATEGIC SOLUTIONS; BABS McGEHEE/CLARK COUNTY

---

This memorandum summarizes the key findings of the bi-annual April 2008 Clark County Monitoring Program Survey conducted by Urban Environmental Research and Strategic Solutions on behalf of the Nuclear Waste Division. A more detailed statistical assessment of our findings is available in the accompanying comprehensive assessment binder and will be posted to the Clark County Monitoring Program's website ([www.monitoringprogram.com](http://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 February 2008, Strategic Solutions, in coordination with Urban Environmental Research, administered a 156-question telephone survey to 600 Southern Nevada households. The survey, which touches on a broad number of topics, has a margin of error of  $\pm 4$  percent at the 95 percent confidence level. The principal purpose of the Clark County Monitoring Program, including this survey series, is to establish an analysis baseline from which the impacts of transporting high-level nuclear waste through the Las Vegas Valley, and ultimately storing the radioactive material at the proposed Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository, can be monitored, measured and assessed.

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

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

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

It is important to mention here that several study instrument modifications were implemented prior to data collection activities for the April 2008 cycle of the Clark County Monitoring Program Survey. The modifications were limited to two sections of the survey instrument: Yucca Mountain Considerations (APPENDIX VII) and Local Government Interactions (APPENDIX IX). Furthermore, these changes will not affect operations of longitudinal analysis applied to the importance and performance of public services matrices.

## **B. KEY FINDINGS**

- Strong public service importance and performance scores for fire and emergency medical services continue from Summer 2006 and Winter 2007.
- Notable trend in importance ratings for traffic service areas as reducing traffic congestion, improving road conditions, and access to freeways all increase in importance relative to Winter 2007.
- Concerns with regard to crime continue to show signs of stabilization among residents.
- Drought continues to be a pressing environmental concern.
- Notable increase in importance of increasing job opportunities continues from Winter 2007.
- Nearly seven of ten respondents (68.9%) felt that now was a good time to buy a home, a significant increase from Winter 2007 (57.7%).

## **C. YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUESTIONS**

- Opposition to the Yucca Mountain project remains stable with 75% indicating they would vote against the nuclear waste repository; 76% said the same in Winter 2007. 68.1% percent of respondents report that the storage site would have a negative impact on their quality of life, up from a low of 59% in 2005.
- Trust regarding the Yucca Mountain project remains a key concern. Roughly 68.4% 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. 74% of respondents indicated the same in Winter 2007.

- Approximately 87% percent 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. This figure remained unchanged from Winter 2007.
- In terms of public service importance measures, Yucca Mountain-related considerations, including those related to preparing for man-made accidents or terrorist events; those examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments; and those relating to the communication of Clark County's views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers all increased, in relation to other public services measured, since Winter 2007.
- As an urgent environmental concern, the Yucca Mountain facility's placement among major issues was materially unchanged. Approximately .9 percent of respondents identified the Yucca Mountain project as Southern Nevada's most pressing environmental concern; this was 0.7 percent lower than reported in the Winter 2007 series.
- Concerns about the repository are measurably higher than reported during the Winter 2007 cycle-as mean importance scores for all questions pertaining to Yucca Mountain increased during the current survey period. These importance rating increases continue the trend from Summer 2006 to Winter 2007.

#### **D. PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE CONSIDERATIONS (FIGURES 1 & 2)**

- Public service importance continued to be dominated by public safety considerations, which accounted for the top five and eight out of the top ten most highly-rated services. Traffic-related services also remained high on the list, increasing in terms of importance from Winter 2007.
- On a relative scale, only modest movement was noted in the majority of services. The data demonstrate, however, that "increasing job opportunities" tracked up four places overall (tracking up eight places since Summer 2006). This finding, combined with an increased importance rating for "improving the business climate" (up four places since Winter 2007 and four places since Summer 2006) suggest an overall continued increase in concern about the economic climate.
- The data suggest relative stabilization in the level of concern with youth/juvenile social service provision: "providing child protection services" (-2), "providing child welfare services" (+3) and "providing juvenile justice services" (+/-0).

#### **E. YUCCA MOUNTAIN WILLINGNESS TO PAY**

- In response to participating in the license application hearing, 45% of respondents indicated they "agree/strongly agree" if participation were to be funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for Yucca Mountain oversight activities, while 29.2% indicated they "disagree/strongly disagree."
- Regarding participation funded only by local taxpayer dollars, 44.6% of the

respondents indicated they “disagree/strongly disagree”, while 35.4% indicated they “agree/strongly agree.”

- Regarding participation funded partially by local taxpayer dollars, 36% of respondents indicated they “disagree/strongly disagree,” while 35.4% indicated they agree/strongly agree.”
- 46.1% of respondents indicated they “agree/strongly agree” with not supporting the use of any local taxpayer dollars to participate in hearings, while 36.3% indicated they “disagree/strongly disagree”.

## **F. LOCAL GOVERNMENT INTERACTIONS**

- 36.3% of respondents indicated they had inquired about or accessed services from Clark County while 63% indicated they had not.
- When compared with their previous local government interactions in other communities, 39.4% of respondents reported their interactions with Clark County as good or excellent.
- The overall customer experience with Clark County for 41.3% of respondents was good or excellent.
- 63 – 64.3 % of respondents indicated Clark County government’s performance met or exceeded their expectations in the following: “employee cared about and understood my needs,” “service delivery was timely and responsive,” and “policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained.”
- 70.5 – 74.9 % of respondents indicated performance met or exceeded expectations in the following: “employee was able to assist or direct me to an appropriate source,” “employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed,” and “transaction was handled in an appropriate manner.”
- 80.6% of respondents indicated performance on “accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)” met or exceeded expectations.
- The most common way for respondents to hear about Clark County services for both news (47.5%) and advertising (39.9%) was through television. The second most common way for both news (25.2%) and advertising (32.9%) was through newspaper.

SCALE:

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

FIGURE 1 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Public Service Importance Score Summary										
Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Mean					Mean Change			
		Summer	Winter	Summer	Winter	Winter	From Summer	From Winter	From Summer	From Winter
		'05	'06	'06	'07	'08	'05	'06	'06	'07
General Government	Road Maintenance	4.21	4.05	4.04	4.09	4.13	-.08	.08	.09	.04
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.59	3.41	3.52	3.36	3.57	-.02	.16	.05	.21
	Flood control	4.09	3.88	3.86	3.7	4.01	-.08	.16	.05	.21
	Budget management	4.29	3.99	4.23	4.11	4.41	.12	.42	.18	.30
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.86	3.67	3.58	3.63	3.83	-.03	.16	.25	.20
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	3.9	3.72	3.75	3.87	4.09	1	.37	.34	.20
	Water conservation programs	n/a	n/a	4.12	4.22	4.48	n/a	n/a	.36	.36
Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.17	4.30	.03	.24	.19	.13
	Providing child welfare services	4.15	3.98	3.98	3.99	4.21	.06	.23	.23	.22
	Providing juvenile justice services	4.08	3.93	3.87	3.98	4.15	.07	.22	.28	.17
	Providing attainable housing for working class families	n/a	3.72	3.77	3.76	3.96	n/a	.24	.19	.20
	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.7	3.56	3.64	3.67	3.83	.13	.27	.19	.16
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.38	3.33	3.54	3.53	3.78	.40	.45	.24	.25
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	4.12	3.92	3.91	4.02	4.18	.06	.26	.27	.16
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.94	3.74	3.74	3.75	4.00	.06	.26	.26	.25

	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.6	4.38	4.29	4.42	4.58	-.02	.20	.29	.16
Public Safety	Providing crime prevention programs	4.27	3.99	4.09	4.04	4.24	-.03	.25	.15	.20
	Enforcing traffic laws	4.25	3.91	4.07	4.09	4.10	-.15	.19	.03	.01
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.49	4.14	4.28	4.24	4.58	.09	.44	.30	.34
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	4.3	3.97	4.08	4.06	4.38	.08	.42	.30	.32
	Keeping police response times low	4.45	4.24	4.6	4.34	4.59	.14	.35	-.01	.25
	Keeping fire department response times low	4.45	4.54	4.47	4.59	4.73	.28	.19	.26	.14
	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.45	4.56	4.54	4.61	4.79	.34	.23	.25	.18
	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	n/a	4.64	4.57	4.67	4.79	n/a	.15	.22	.12
	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	4.05	3.69	3.79	3.79	4.05	0	.36	.26	.26
	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	4.04	3.75	3.87	3.84	4.10	.06	.35	.23	.26
	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	4.18	3.92	4.01	4.03	4.29	.11	.37	.28	.26
	Investigating criminal activity	4.47	4.03	4.24	4.18	4.46	-.01	.43	.22	.28
	Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.59	4.32	4.26	4.33	4.53	-.06	.21	.27	.20
	Providing emergency medical services	4.66	4.44	4.43	4.51	4.70	.04	.26	.27	.19
	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.81	3.54	3.58	3.51	3.70	-.11	.16	.12	.19
	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.88	3.68	3.65	3.66	3.99	.11	.31	.34	.33
	Regional justice services and facilities	n/a	n/a	3.6	3.69	3.93	n/a	n/a	.33	.24
Community Development	Providing affordable housing	n/a	n/a	3.68	3.64	3.86	n/a	n/a	.18	.22
	Managing growth	4.07	3.83	3.87	3.83	4.10	.03	.27	.23	.27
	Increasing job opportunities	4.07	3.95	3.82	3.84	4.13	.06	.18	.31	.29
	Improving the business climate	4.08	3.86	3.75	3.76	4.01	-.07	.15	.26	.25
	Planning for commercial development	3.82	3.7	3.56	3.55	3.72	-.10	.02	.16	.17

	Reducing traffic congestion	4.37	4.02	4.06	3.97	4.30	-.07	.28	.24	.33
	Access to freeways	4.12	3.83	3.92	3.83	4.11	-.01	.28	.19	.28
	Improving road conditions	4.29	3.97	4.04	3.95	4.18	-.11	.21	.14	.23
	Reducing travel time	4.01	3.77	3.83	3.82	3.96	-.05	.19	.13	.14
	Providing mass public transit	3.86	3.67	3.64	3.69	3.77	-.09	.10	.13	.08
	Adequate airport facilities	n/a	n/a	3.91	3.87	3.96	n/a	n/a	.05	.09
	Parks and recreation programs	n/a	n/a	4.02	4.04	4.18	n/a	n/a	.16	.14

FIGURE 2 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE RANKING

Descriptive Statistics	Ranking			Change	
	Winter	Winter	Summer	From Winter	From Summer
	'08	'07	'06	'07	'06
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	1	1	2	0	+1
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	1	2	3	+1	+2
Keeping fire department response times low	3	3	4	0	+1
Providing emergency medical services	4	4	5	0	+1
Keeping police response times low	5	6	1	+1	-4
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	6	5	6	-1	0
Maintaining a low crime rate	6	8	7	+2	+1
Providing fire protection & prevention services	8	7	8	-1	0
Water conservation programs	9	9	11	0	+2
Investigating criminal activity	10	10	9	0	-1
Budget management	11	12	10	-1	-1
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	12	15	14	+3	+2
Providing child protection services	13	11	12	-2	-1
Reducing traffic congestion	13	22	16	+9	+3
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	15	18	20	+3	+5
Providing crime prevention programs	16	17	13	+1	-3
Providing child welfare services	17	20	21	+3	+4
Parks and recreation programs	18	16	19	-2	+1
Providing affordable housing for seniors	18	19	23	+1	+5
Improving road conditions	18	23	18	+5	0
Providing juvenile justice services	21	21	25	0	+4
Road Maintenance	22	14	17	-8	-5
Increasing job opportunities	22	26	30	+4	+8
Access to freeways	24	28	22	+4	-2
Enforcing traffic laws	25	13	15	-12	-10
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	25	27	26	+2	+1
Managing growth	25	29	27	+4	+2
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	28	25	33	-3	-5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	29	31	31	+2	+2

Improving the business climate	30	32	34	+2	+4
Flood control	30	35	28	+5	-2
Providing medical care for the poor	32	34	35	+2	+3
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	33	39	37	+6	+4
Adequate airport facilities	34	24	24	-10	-10
Reducing travel time	34	30	29	-4	-5
Providing attainable housing for working class families	34	33	32	-1	-2
Regional justice services and facilities	37	37	40	0	+3
Providing affordable housing	38	40	36	+2	-2
Providing affordable housing for low income families	39	38	38	-1	-1
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	39	41	41	+2	+2
Providing shelter for the homeless	41	43	44	+2	+3
Providing mass public transit	42	36	39	-6	-3
Planning for commercial development	43	42	43	-1	0
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	44	44	42	0	-2
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	45	45	45	0	0

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 3 GOVERNMENT SERVICE PERFORMANCE SCORE

Government Service Performance Rating					
Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Mean		Disparity between Importance and Performance (Performance-Importance)	
		Importance	Performance	Current Disparity	Winter '07 Disparity
General Government	Road maintenance	4.13	3.14	-0.99	-1.15
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.57	2.59	-0.98	-0.79
	Flood control	4.01	3.60	-0.41	-0.22
	Budget management	4.41	2.72	-1.69	-1.55
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.86	3.01	-0.85	-0.81
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	4.09	2.60	-1.49	-1.37
Social and Judicial Services	Water conservation programs	4.48	3.44	-1.04	-1.00
	Providing child protection services	4.30	3.03	-1.27	-1.33
	Providing welfare services	4.21	3.03	-1.18	-1.20
	Providing juvenile justice services	4.15	2.96	-1.19	-1.15
	Provide attainable housing for working class families	3.96	2.59	-1.37	-1.24
	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.83	2.52	-1.31	-1.26
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.78	2.22	-1.56	-1.34
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	4.18	2.76	-1.46	-1.40
	Providing medical care for the poor	4.00	2.58	-1.42	-1.16
	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.58	3.42	-1.16	-1.16
Public Safety	Providing crime prevention programs	4.24	3.19	-1.05	-1.00
	Enforcing traffic laws	4.10	3.24	-0.86	-1.10
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.58	3.00	-1.58	-1.42
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	4.38	2.82	-1.56	-1.33
	Keeping police response times low	4.59	3.16	-1.43	-1.25
	Keeping fire department response times low	4.73	3.92	-0.81	-0.86
	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.79	3.94	-0.85	-0.78
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	4.79	4.11	-0.68	-0.74	
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	4.05	2.87	-1.18	-0.99	

	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	4.10	3.01	-1.09	-0.85
	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	4.29	3.05	-1.24	-1.08
	Investigating criminal activity	4.46	3.13	-1.33	-1.04
	Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.53	3.73	-.80	-0.68
	Providing emergency medical services	4.70	3.84	-.86	-0.74
	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.70	3.03	-.67	-0.50
	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.99	2.98	-1.01	-0.87
	Regional justice services and facilities	3.93	3.22	-.71	-0.62
<b>Community Development</b>	Providing affordable housing	3.86	2.62	-1.24	-1.09
	Managing growth	4.10	2.53	-1.57	-1.36
	Increasing job opportunities	4.13	2.84	-1.29	-0.93
	Improving the business climate	4.01	3.00	-1.01	-0.60
	Planning for commercial development	3.72	3.14	-.58	-0.33
	Reducing traffic congestion	4.30	2.59	-1.71	-1.54
	Access to freeways	4.11	3.28	-.83	-0.74
	Improving road conditions	4.18	3.12	-1.06	-1.05
	Reducing travel time	3.96	2.75	-1.21	-1.25
	Providing mass public transit	3.77	2.81	-.96	-0.99
	Adequate airport facilities	3.96	3.56	-.40	-0.49
	Parks and recreation programs	4.18	3.51	-.67	-0.52

SCALE:

<b>Importance Scale</b>	<b>Performance Scale</b>
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 4 YUCCA MOUNTAIN SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

<b>Yucca Mountain Service Importance Score Summary</b>			
<b>Descriptive Statistics</b>	<b>Public Service Importance Winter</b>	<b>Public Service Importance Winter</b>	<b>Public Service Importance Summer</b>
	<b>'08</b>	<b>'07</b>	<b>'06</b>
Keeping local decision makers up to date on Yucca Mountain	4.26	3.94	3.89
Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	4.32	3.98	3.93
Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology and hydrology	4.12	3.87	3.84
Identify public safety needs and impacts	4.28	4.04	3.96
Assess other government impacts	3.89	3.72	3.66
Assess impacts on the tourist sector	3.85	3.83	3.61
Assess impacts on the building, construction, and development sectors	3.85	3.79	3.57
Identify transportation impacts	3.99	3.85	3.68
Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain	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			Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
<b>General Government Services</b>												
Road maintenance	600	0	4.13	0.04	4	0.99	-0.987	0.1	0.391	0.199	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	591	9	3.57	0.05	4	1.222	-0.432	0.101	-0.791	0.201	1	5
Flood control	599	1	4.01	0.048	4	1.168	-0.951	0.1	-0.072	0.199	1	5
Budget management	590	10	4.41	0.038	5	0.918	-1.707	0.101	2.708	0.201	1	5
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	582	18	3.86	0.056	4	1.344	-0.903	0.101	-0.426	0.202	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	595	5	4.09	0.043	4	1.04	-1.072	0.1	0.569	0.2	1	
Water conservation programs	597	2	4.48	0.036	5	0.884	-1.868	0.1	3.176	0.2	1	5
<b>Social &amp; Judicial Services</b>												
Providing child protection services	595	5	4.3	0.044	5	1.065	-1.485	0.1	1.39	0.2	1	5
Providing child welfare services	595	5	4.21	0.044	5	1.071	-1.282	0.1	0.819	0.2	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services	591	9	4.15	0.043	5	1.052	-1.119	0.101	0.521	0.201	1	5
Provide attainable housing for working class families	594	6	3.96	0.05	4	1.229	-0.993	0.1	-0.065	0.2	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low income families	592	8	3.83	0.053	4	1.28	-0.837	0.1	-0.442	0.201	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless	596	4	3.78	0.056	4	1.356	-0.791	0.1	-0.639	0.2	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors	596	3	4.18	0.045	5	1.105	-1.318	0.1	0.894	0.2	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor	596	3	4	0.051	4.86	1.245	-1.065	0.1	0.026	0.2	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	594	5	4.58	0.033	5	0.813	-2.173	0.1	4.639	0.2	1	5

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


Importance Variable	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
<b>Public Safety Services</b>												
Providing crime prevention programs	597	3	4.24	0.041	5	0.998	-1.293	0.1	1.11	0.2	1	5
Enforcing traffic laws	599	0	4.1	0.045	4	1.094	-1.072	0.1	0.344	0.199	1	5
Maintaining a low crime rate	598	2	4.58	0.034	5	0.842	-2.381	0.1	5.779	0.2	1	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	598	1	4.38	0.037	5	0.91	-1.531	0.1	1.977	0.199	1	5
Keeping police response times low	594	5	4.59	0.031	5	0.753	-2.206	0.1	5.359	0.2	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low	599	1	4.73	0.023	5	0.555	-2.38	0.1	7.215	0.199	1	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	597	2	4.79	0.02	5	0.493	-2.587	0.1	7.06	0.2	2	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	594	5	4.79	0.022	5	0.538	-3.042	0.1	11.194	0.2	1	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	598	2	4.05	0.043	4	1.048	-0.954	0.1	0.28	0.2	1	5
Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	598	1	4.1	0.043	4	1.06	-1.005	0.1	0.211	0.199	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	597	2	4.29	0.042	5	1.036	-1.449	0.1	1.377	0.2	1	5
Investigating criminal activity	596	3	4.46	0.035	5	0.848	-1.614	0.1	2.395	0.2	1	5
Providing fire protection & prevention services	596	4	4.53	0.03	5	0.728	-1.46	0.1	1.441	0.2	1	5
Providing emergency medical services	599	1	4.7	0.026	5	0.642	-2.337	0.1	5.516	0.199	1	5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	576	24	3.7	0.049	4	1.172	-0.595	0.102	-0.434	0.203	1	5

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

Importance Variable	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
<b>Public Safety Services (cont.)</b>												
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	581	19	3.99	0.054	5	1.295	-1.059	0.101	-0.082	0.202	1	5
Regional justice services and facilities	585	15	3.93	0.042	4	1.014	-0.723	0.101	0	0.202	1	5
<b>Community Development Services</b>												
Providing affordable housing	593	6	3.86	0.054	4	1.305	-0.862	0.1	-0.456	0.2	1	5
Managing growth	591	8	4.1	0.049	5	1.197	-1.215	0.1	0.45	0.201	1	5
Increasing job opportunities	595	5	4.13	0.047	5	1.154	-1.264	0.1	0.666	0.2	1	5
Improving the business climate	591	9	4.01	0.045	4	1.098	-0.867	0.101	-0.156	0.201	1	5
Planning for commercial development	596	4	3.72	0.048	4	1.17	-0.673	0.1	-0.352	0.2	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion	599	1	4.3	0.045	5	1.1	-1.651	0.1	1.9	0.199	1	5
Access to freeways	598	2	4.11	0.043	4	1.055	-1.142	0.1	0.743	0.2	1	5
Improving road conditions	598	2	4.18	0.044	5	1.069	-1.269	0.1	0.942	0.2	1	5
Reducing travel time	597	3	3.96	0.05	4	1.213	-0.935	0.1	-0.139	0.2	1	5
Providing mass public transit	597	2	3.77	0.054	4	1.318	-0.788	0.1	-0.535	0.2	1	5
Adequate airport facilities	596	4	3.96	0.049	4	1.19	-1.037	0.1	0.177	0.2	1	5
Parks and recreation programs	598	2	4.18	0.04	4	0.977	-1.112	0.1	0.756	0.2	1	5

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


**Road Maintenance**



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

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


**Revitalizing Older Neighborhoods**



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

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


**Flood Control**



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

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


**Budget Management**



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

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


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



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

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


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



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

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


**Water Conservation Programs**



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

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


**Providing Child Protection Services**



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

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


**Providing Child Welfare Services**



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

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


**Providing Juvenile Justice Services**



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

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


**Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families**



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

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


**Providing Affordable Housing for Low Income Families**



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

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


**Providing Shelter for the Homeless**



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

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


**Providing Affordable Housing for Seniors**



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

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


**Providing Medical Care for the Poor**



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

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


**Providing 24-Hour Emergency Trauma Care**



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

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


**Providing Crime Prevention Programs**



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

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


**Enforcing Traffic Laws**



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

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


**Maintaining a Low Crime Rate**



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

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


**Maintaining Neighborhood Police Patrols**



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

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


**Keeping Police Response Times Low**



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

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


**Keeping Fire Department Response Times Low**



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

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


**Keeping Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Times Low**



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

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


**Well Trained Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Personnel**



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

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


**Facilitate Neighborhood Watch Programs**



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

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


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



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

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


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



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

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


**Investigating Criminal Activity**



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

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


**Providing Fire Protection and Prevention Services**



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

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


**Providing Emergency Medical Services**



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

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


**Providing Neighborhood Code Enforcement Services**



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

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


**Examining Potential Impacts from Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Shipments**



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

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


**Regional Justice Services and Facilities**



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

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


**Providing Affordable Housing**



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

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


**Managing Growth**



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

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


**Increasing Job Opportunities**



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

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


**Improving the Business Climate**



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

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


**Planning for Commercial Development**



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

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


**Reducing Traffic Congestion**



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

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


**Access to Freeways**



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

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


**Improving Road Conditions**



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

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


**Reducing Travel Time**



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

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


**Providing Mass Transit**



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

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


**Adequate Airport Facilities**



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

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

**Parks and Recreation Programs**



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

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	260	255	260	255	252	258	260
	Missing	0	5	0	5	8	3	0
Mean		4.09	3.62	3.89	4.34	3.9	4.11	4.5
Std. Error of Mean		0.063	0.077	0.076	0.061	0.081	0.061	0.05
Median		4	4	4	5	4	4	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.022	1.232	1.22	0.968	1.278	0.987	0.814
Variance		1.045	1.517	1.489	0.937	1.634	0.973	0.662
Skewness		-0.973	-0.466	-0.809	-1.574	-0.953	-1.066	-1.638
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.153	0.151	0.152	0.153	0.152	0.151
Kurtosis		0.403	-0.792	-0.356	2.154	-0.155	0.761	2.321
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.301	0.304	0.301	0.304	0.306	0.302	0.301
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**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	193	191	193	192	187	191	193
	Missing	0	2	0	1	6	2	0
Mean		4.22	3.51	4.04	4.49	3.87	4.12	4.4
Std. Error of Mean		0.067	0.088	0.078	0.063	0.1	0.075	0.071
Median		4	4	4	5	4	4	5
Mode		5	3	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.936	1.214	1.088	0.871	1.369	1.033	0.993
Variance		0.877	1.474	1.184	0.759	1.874	1.068	0.986
Skewness		-1.125	-0.334	-1.022	-2.011	-0.914	-1.208	-1.77
Std. Error of Skewness		0.175	0.176	0.175	0.176	0.178	0.176	0.175
Kurtosis		0.801	-0.864	0.407	4.21	-0.475	1.061	2.494
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.348	0.35	0.348	0.349	0.353	0.35	0.348
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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	68	68	68	67	67	68	67
	Missing	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		3.94	3.67	4.38	4.55	3.93	4.07	4.58
Std. Error of Mean		0.135	0.138	0.123	0.098	0.165	0.14	0.109
Median		4	4	5	5	4.68	5	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.114	1.135	1.015	0.802	1.352	1.155	0.891
Variance		1.241	1.288	1.029	0.642	1.827	1.335	0.794
Skewness		-0.794	-0.461	-1.422	-1.883	-1.047	-0.94	-2.594
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.291	0.291	0.294	0.292	0.291	0.292
Kurtosis		-0.2	-0.579	0.804	3.425	-0.184	-0.189	6.763
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.575	0.575	0.58	0.577	0.575	0.577
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**

<b>City of Henderson</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	66	66	66	66	63	66	65
	Missing	0	0	0	0	3	0	2
Mean		4.08	3.32	3.91	4.32	3.49	3.9	4.52
Std. Error of Mean		0.11	0.157	0.158	0.118	0.188	0.146	0.108
Median		4	4	4	5	3.96	4	5
Mode		5	4	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.895	1.269	1.286	0.953	1.495	1.186	0.865
Variance		0.8	1.611	1.653	0.907	2.235	1.406	0.749
Skewness		-0.547	-0.432	-0.771	-1.272	-0.435	-0.792	-1.994
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.296	0.295	0.296	0.302	0.295	0.298
Kurtosis		-0.682	-0.829	-0.76	1.035	-1.221	-0.375	3.62
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.584	0.582	0.584	0.595	0.582	0.588
Range		3	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		2	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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	9	8	8	7	9	9	9
	Missing	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
Mean		4.89	4.72	4.81	4.57	4.78	4.47	4.65
Std. Error of Mean		0.164	0.269	0.147	0.201	0.329	0.181	0.173
Median		5	5	5	4.97	5	4.21	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	4	5
Std. Deviation		0.483	0.745	0.419	0.535	0.965	0.531	0.509
Variance		0.233	0.555	0.175	0.286	0.932	0.281	0.259
Skewness		-4.806	-2.609	-1.962	-0.345	-4.806	0.168	-0.744
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.764	0.746	0.789	0.729	0.729	0.729
Kurtosis		27.642	6.479	2.381	-2.807	27.642	-2.674	-1.983
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.511	1.467	1.575	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		2	2	1	1	4	1	1
Minimum		3	3	4	4	1	4	4
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Mesquite</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	3	4	3
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.48	3.52	4	4.12	3.73	4.24	4.41
Std. Error of Mean		0.293	0.708	0.706	0.732	0.804	0.479	0.316
Median		4.43	3.57	4	4.43	4	4.43	4.2
Mode		4	3	4	5	4	5	4
Std. Deviation		0.579	1.399	1.395	1.445	1.488	0.946	0.585
Variance		0.336	1.956	1.945	2.087	2.215	0.894	0.342
Skewness		0.127	-1.169	-2.944	-3.052	-2.313	-0.828	0.73
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.108	1.028	1.108
Range		1	4	4	4	4	2	1
Minimum		4	1	1	1	1	3	4
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**

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Provide attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	259	258	258	260	258	258	259	259	257
	Missing	1	2	2	0	2	2	2	1	4
Mean		4.35	4.25	4.14	3.91	3.84	3.79	4.19	4	4.59
Std. Error of Mean		0.062	0.063	0.065	0.078	0.079	0.084	0.067	0.076	0.053
Median		5	5	5	4	4	4	5	4.62	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1	1.019	1.038	1.265	1.275	1.345	1.077	1.229	0.846
Variance		1	1.039	1.078	1.6	1.626	1.809	1.16	1.51	0.715
Skewness		-1.487	-1.302	-0.912	-0.905	-0.897	-0.739	-1.31	-1.029	-2.425
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.152	0.152	0.151	0.152	0.152	0.151	0.151	0.152
Kurtosis		1.492	1.036	-0.225	-0.301	-0.291	-0.748	0.947	-0.01	5.825
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.301	0.302	0.302	0.301	0.302	0.302	0.302	0.301	0.303
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Provide attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
		N	Valid	190	190	188	188	188	191	191
	Missing	3	3	5	5	5	2	2	2	1
Mean		4.23	4.2	4.07	3.95	3.78	3.77	4.1	3.97	4.58
Std. Error of Mean		0.082	0.08	0.082	0.091	0.094	0.1	0.084	0.091	0.056
Median		5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.133	1.1	1.121	1.248	1.288	1.388	1.167	1.26	0.769
Variance		1.285	1.21	1.256	1.557	1.66	1.926	1.362	1.586	0.592
Skewness		-1.438	-1.266	-1.171	-1.026	-0.748	-0.795	-1.187	-1.113	-1.977
Std. Error of Skewness		0.176	0.176	0.177	0.177	0.177	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.175
Kurtosis		1.209	0.706	0.699	-0.002	-0.579	-0.662	0.384	0.203	3.714
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.351	0.351	0.353	0.353	0.353	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.349
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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Provide attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	67	68	67	68	67	68	68	67	68
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.45	4.39	4.44	4.2	4	3.83	4.35	4.13	4.65
Std. Error of Mean		0.122	0.13	0.118	0.134	0.159	0.178	0.126	0.157	0.095
Median		5	5	5	5	5	4.27	5	5	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.002	1.073	0.965	1.099	1.308	1.465	1.035	1.289	0.78
Variance		1.003	1.152	0.931	1.208	1.71	2.147	1.072	1.66	0.609
Skewness		-1.935	-1.898	-2.02	-1.276	-1.014	-0.961	-1.792	-1.275	-2.424
Std. Error of Skewness		0.292	0.291	0.292	0.291	0.292	0.291	0.291	0.292	0.291
Kurtosis		3.045	2.841	4.014	0.774	-0.37	-0.515	2.839	0.295	5.716
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.577	0.575	0.577	0.575	0.577	0.575	0.575	0.577	0.575
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**

<b>City of Henderson</b>		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Provide attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.1	3.9	4.08	3.88	3.69	3.68	4.12	3.88	4.46
Std. Error of Mean		0.147	0.146	0.123	0.148	0.157	0.154	0.141	0.158	0.105
Median		5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.196	1.186	1	1.207	1.28	1.254	1.148	1.288	0.849
Variance		1.43	1.407	1	1.457	1.639	1.573	1.318	1.659	0.721
Skewness		-1.139	-0.807	-1.033	-0.896	-0.674	-0.748	-1.262	-0.85	-1.758
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.295	0.296	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.296
Kurtosis		0.27	-0.386	0.742	-0.067	-0.552	-0.311	0.869	-0.519	2.98
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.582	0.584	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.584
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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Provide attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.66	4.3	4.38	4.66	4.37	4.5	4.82	4.48	4.41
Std. Error of Mean		0.269	0.237	0.292	0.209	0.403	0.275	0.138	0.306	0.304
Median		5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mode		5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.79	0.696	0.834	0.614	1.185	0.808	0.406	0.898	0.893
Variance		0.624	0.485	0.696	0.377	1.405	0.652	0.165	0.807	0.798
Skewness		-3.123	-0.498	-0.964	-1.824	-2.101	-1.353	-2.068	-1.344	-1.092
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.729	0.746	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729
Kurtosis		13.241	-0.238	-0.583	3.572	5.264	0.478	2.912	-0.142	-0.724
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.467	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		3	2	2	2	4	2	1	2	2
Minimum		2	3	3	3	1	3	4	3	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Mesquite</b>		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Provide attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.36	4.24	4.12	4.24	4.24	3.86	4.24	4.36	4.36
Std. Error of Mean		0.403	0.559	0.45	0.479	0.479	0.783	0.479	0.403	0.282
Median		4.43	4.43	4	4.43	4.43	4.2	4.43	4.43	4
Mode		5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4
Std. Deviation		0.797	1.104	0.889	0.946	0.946	1.45	0.946	0.797	0.557
Variance		0.635	1.218	0.791	0.894	0.894	2.101	0.894	0.635	0.31
Skewness		-1.079	-2.363	-0.368	-0.828	-0.828	-1.297	-0.828	-1.079	1.02
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.108	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	1
Minimum		3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	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**

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		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	259	260	260	259	259	260	259	258
	Missing	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3
Mean		4.24	4.08	4.53	4.37	4.54	4.71	4.75	4.76
Std. Error of Mean		0.064	0.071	0.054	0.058	0.051	0.036	0.034	0.036
Median		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.03	1.14	0.871	0.933	0.818	0.582	0.542	0.576
Variance		1.061	1.3	0.758	0.87	0.67	0.339	0.294	0.332
Skewness		-1.286	-1.009	-2.258	-1.599	-2.099	-2.365	-2.367	-2.932
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.152
Kurtosis		1.006	0.031	5.071	2.338	4.427	7.522	5.716	10.655
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.301	0.301	0.301	0.301	0.302	0.301	0.301	0.302
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	259	260	260	260	257	260	249	251	253
	Missing	2	0	0	0	3	0	11	9	8
Mean		4.06	4.11	4.3	4.44	4.52	4.67	3.65	4.02	3.88
Std. Error of Mean		0.064	0.063	0.061	0.052	0.045	0.041	0.079	0.077	0.068
Median		4	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.023	1.015	0.978	0.833	0.727	0.664	1.241	1.225	1.078
Variance		1.046	1.031	0.957	0.694	0.528	0.441	1.54	1.5	1.162
Skewness		-0.874	-0.982	-1.378	-1.446	-1.451	-2.245	-0.534	-1.038	-0.726
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.152	0.151	0.154	0.154	0.153
Kurtosis		0.13	0.308	1.283	1.833	1.523	5.122	-0.726	-0.015	-0.192
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.302	0.301	0.301	0.301	0.303	0.301	0.307	0.306	0.305
Range		4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		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	191	193	191	193	189	193	192	190
	Missing	2	0	2	0	4	0	1	3
Mean		4.31	4.15	4.59	4.37	4.61	4.74	4.83	4.82
Std. Error of Mean		0.066	0.073	0.06	0.066	0.052	0.041	0.033	0.034
Median		5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.915	1.017	0.83	0.915	0.718	0.563	0.451	0.466
Variance		0.837	1.034	0.689	0.837	0.515	0.317	0.203	0.217
Skewness		-1.323	-1.153	-2.418	-1.596	-2.213	-2.49	-2.982	-3.431
Std. Error of Skewness		0.176	0.175	0.176	0.175	0.177	0.175	0.175	0.176
Kurtosis		1.406	0.891	6.231	2.284	5.668	7.556	10.461	16.511
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.35	0.348	0.35	0.348	0.351	0.349	0.349	0.351
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	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**

<b>City of Las Vegas (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	193	193	191	190	193	193	182	188	189
	Missing	0	0	2	3	0	0	11	5	4
Mean		3.93	4.15	4.3	4.47	4.56	4.74	3.74	4.04	4
Std. Error of Mean		0.08	0.076	0.076	0.064	0.049	0.041	0.082	0.095	0.069
Median		4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	4
Std. Deviation		1.115	1.055	1.058	0.883	0.686	0.575	1.108	1.299	0.946
Variance		1.244	1.114	1.119	0.779	0.471	0.331	1.228	1.688	0.895
Skewness		-0.951	-1.07	-1.501	-1.865	-1.358	-2.506	-0.648	-1.164	-0.82
Std. Error of Skewness		0.175	0.175	0.176	0.176	0.175	0.175	0.18	0.177	0.177
Kurtosis		0.275	0.327	1.483	3.494	0.83	6.838	-0.061	0.2	0.598
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.348	0.349	0.35	0.351	0.349	0.349	0.358	0.353	0.352
Range		4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		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	68	68	68	68	68	68
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.25	4.08	4.64	4.47	4.71	4.85	4.84	4.85
Std. Error of Mean		0.126	0.145	0.103	0.102	0.088	0.054	0.057	0.055
Median		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.04	1.196	0.847	0.842	0.726	0.441	0.466	0.454
Variance		1.081	1.431	0.718	0.709	0.527	0.194	0.217	0.206
Skewness		-1.391	-1.174	-2.771	-1.24	-3.127	-3.076	-2.948	-3.198
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291
Kurtosis		1.252	0.415	7.96	0.104	11.248	9.179	8.176	9.729
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575
Range		4	4	4	3	4	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	2	1	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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	67	68	68	68	68	68	68	63	65
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
Mean		4.38	4.15	4.38	4.54	4.56	4.75	3.8	3.88	3.93
Std. Error of Mean		0.112	0.138	0.124	0.1	0.095	0.088	0.154	0.173	0.136
Median		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.918	1.132	1.018	0.819	0.781	0.723	1.264	1.369	1.096
Variance		0.843	1.282	1.037	0.671	0.61	0.522	1.597	1.875	1.2
Skewness		-1.28	-1.07	-1.47	-1.563	-1.658	-2.94	-0.697	-0.909	-0.71
Std. Error of Skewness		0.292	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.302	0.297
Kurtosis		0.507	0.019	1.202	1.194	1.788	7.729	-0.601	-0.57	-0.217
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.577	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.595	0.586
Range		3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4
Minimum		2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>City of Henderson</b>		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	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.98	4.04	4.6	4.34	4.57	4.67	4.79	4.74
Std. Error of Mean		0.132	0.132	0.1	0.113	0.078	0.067	0.057	0.081
Median		4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.076	1.07	0.815	0.92	0.63	0.544	0.46	0.659
Variance		1.158	1.145	0.664	0.847	0.397	0.295	0.212	0.435
Skewness		-1.062	-0.951	-2.369	-1.267	-1.549	-1.712	-2.121	-2.578
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.296	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.295
Kurtosis		0.642	0.305	5.96	0.896	2.939	3.737	3.953	6.041
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.584	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.582
Range		4	4	4	4	3	3	2	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	2	3	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**

<b>City of Henderson (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	66	66	66	66	66	66	65	66	66
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Mean		4.08	3.86	4.07	4.38	4.42	4.59	3.63	3.75	3.87
Std. Error of Mean		0.131	0.149	0.154	0.11	0.103	0.084	0.131	0.186	0.11
Median		4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4
Std. Deviation		1.065	1.207	1.25	0.898	0.836	0.679	1.05	1.511	0.896
Variance		1.133	1.457	1.563	0.806	0.699	0.461	1.103	2.283	0.802
Skewness		-0.984	-0.802	-1.269	-1.453	-1.312	-1.67	-0.7	-0.834	-0.26
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.296	0.296	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.298	0.295	0.295
Kurtosis		0.378	-0.286	0.619	1.909	1.261	2.535	0.343	-0.816	-0.797
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.584	0.584	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.588	0.582	0.582
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2
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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		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	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.59	4.4	5	4.77	4.71	4.82	4.82	4.82
Std. Error of Mean		0.28	0.333	0	0.194	0.203	0.138	0.138	0.138
Median		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.821	0.977	0	0.571	0.595	0.406	0.406	0.406
Variance		0.674	0.954	0	0.326	0.354	0.165	0.165	0.165
Skewness		-1.788	-1.053		-2.734	-2.238	-2.068	-2.068	-2.068
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729
Kurtosis		1.765	-1.254		8.952	5.775	2.912	2.912	2.912
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		2	2	0	2	2	1	1	1
Minimum		3	3	5	3	3	4	4	4
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Boulder City (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.99	4.23	4.71	4.7	5	4.82	3.59	4.52	3.99
Std. Error of Mean		0.278	0.29	0.203	0.166	0	0.138	0.281	0.281	0.302
Median		4	4.21	5	5	5	5	3	5	4
Mode		4	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	3
Std. Deviation		0.817	0.853	0.596	0.488	0	0.406	0.824	0.827	0.887
Variance		0.668	0.727	0.355	0.239	0	0.165	0.68	0.683	0.786
Skewness		0.029	-0.547	-2.219	-1.053		-2.068	1.043	-1.469	0.032
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729
Kurtosis		-1.346	-1.35	5.662	-1.254		2.912	-0.393	0.677	-1.846
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		2	2	2	1	0	1	2	2	2
Minimum		3	3	3	4	5	4	3	3	3
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**

<b>Mesquite</b>		Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.76	4.52	4.64	4.4	4.48	4.6	5	4.6
Std. Error of Mean		0.251	0.411	0.403	0.499	0.293	0.287	0	0.287
Median		5	5	5	5	4.43	4.9	5	4.9
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.496	0.812	0.797	0.985	0.579	0.568	0	0.568
Variance		0.246	0.66	0.635	0.97	0.336	0.322	0	0.322
Skewness		-2.143	-1.975	-2.87	-1.518	0.127	-0.742		-0.742
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		1	2	2	2	1	1	0	1
Minimum		4	3	3	3	4	4	5	4
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Mesquite (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.08	4.48	4.6	4.88	4.6	4.6	4	4.52	4.59
Std. Error of Mean		0.467	0.293	0.287	0.191	0.287	0.287	0.336	0.502	0.316
Median		4	4.43	4.9	5	4.9	4.9	4	5	4.81
Mode		4(a)	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.921	0.579	0.568	0.378	0.568	0.568	0.622	0.992	0.585
Variance		0.849	0.336	0.322	0.143	0.322	0.322	0.387	0.984	0.342
Skewness		-0.269	0.127	-0.742	-4.126	-0.742	-0.742	0	-2.143	-0.73
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.108	1.028	1.108
Range		2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
Minimum		3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	259	256	259	257	260	260	259	260	260	259	260	259
	Missing	2	4	2	4	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2
Mean		3.88	4.09	4.1	3.98	3.71	4.26	3.99	4.18	3.88	3.72	3.87	4.19
Std. Error of Mean		0.082	0.076	0.072	0.071	0.077	0.069	0.07	0.068	0.078	0.086	0.079	0.062
Median		4	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4.25
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.312	1.215	1.165	1.13	1.244	1.106	1.131	1.09	1.261	1.391	1.278	0.992
Variance		1.722	1.475	1.357	1.278	1.547	1.224	1.278	1.188	1.59	1.935	1.634	0.984
Skewness		-0.884	-1.171	-1.165	-0.845	-0.609	-1.533	-1.021	-1.308	-0.86	-0.698	-0.964	-1.203
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.152	0.151	0.152	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151
Kurtosis		-0.448	0.291	0.415	-0.307	-0.635	1.568	0.386	1.008	-0.35	-0.832	-0.151	1.011
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.302	0.303	0.302	0.303	0.301	0.301	0.302	0.301	0.301	0.302	0.301	0.302
Range		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
Maximum		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**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	188	191	190	188	191	193	193	191	192	193	191	193
	Missing	4	2	3	5	2	0	0	2	1	0	2	0
Mean		3.73	4.02	4.06	3.92	3.72	4.26	4.15	4.14	3.95	3.8	4.07	4.07
Std. Error of Mean		0.097	0.089	0.085	0.078	0.083	0.083	0.074	0.075	0.084	0.091	0.074	0.067
Median		4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.326	1.225	1.171	1.066	1.149	1.149	1.031	1.042	1.168	1.266	1.02	0.935
Variance		1.759	1.502	1.372	1.136	1.32	1.32	1.064	1.085	1.364	1.604	1.041	0.875
Skewness		-0.74	-1.169	-1.241	-0.646	-0.789	-1.625	-1.16	-1.195	-0.951	-0.858	-0.99	-0.683
Std. Error of Skewness		0.177	0.176	0.176	0.177	0.176	0.175	0.175	0.176	0.176	0.175	0.176	0.175
Kurtosis		-0.638	0.352	0.677	-0.418	-0.077	1.693	0.819	0.921	0.146	-0.291	0.381	-0.262
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.352	0.35	0.351	0.353	0.35	0.348	0.349	0.35	0.349	0.349	0.35	0.348
Range		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
Maximum		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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	67	66	68	68	67	67	68	68	68	67	68	67
	Missing	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.28	4.36	4.3	4.15	3.77	4.59	4.32	4.22	4.04	3.74	3.82	4.3
Std. Error of Mean		0.131	0.134	0.141	0.138	0.13	0.112	0.12	0.14	0.161	0.155	0.163	0.131
Median		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.073	1.085	1.16	1.139	1.06	0.92	0.986	1.153	1.325	1.274	1.342	1.078
Variance		1.151	1.178	1.347	1.297	1.125	0.846	0.972	1.329	1.756	1.624	1.801	1.162
Skewness		-1.443	-1.721	-1.578	-1.183	-0.579	-2.632	-1.344	-1.296	-0.935	-0.835	-0.796	-1.66
Std. Error of Skewness		0.292	0.296	0.291	0.291	0.294	0.292	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.292	0.291	0.292
Kurtosis		1.363	2.041	1.346	0.52	-0.361	6.864	0.848	0.673	-0.633	-0.25	-0.604	2.256
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.577	0.584	0.575	0.575	0.58	0.577	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.577	0.575	0.577
Range		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
Maximum		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**

<b>City of Henderson</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	65	66
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		3.71	4.09	4.23	4.13	3.61	4.26	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.79	4.04	4.25
Std. Error of Mean		0.173	0.147	0.135	0.125	0.13	0.137	0.108	0.127	0.126	0.158	0.144	0.116
Median		4	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4.55
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.406	1.194	1.094	1.019	1.051	1.111	0.882	1.033	1.023	1.283	1.158	0.943
Variance		1.976	1.426	1.197	1.038	1.104	1.233	0.778	1.067	1.047	1.647	1.341	0.889
Skewness		-0.692	-1.189	-1.5	-1.189	-0.551	-1.54	-1.309	-1.311	-1.251	-0.767	-1.32	-1.373
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.296	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.296	0.295	0.297	0.295
Kurtosis		-0.858	0.574	1.552	0.97	0.061	1.697	2.119	1.355	1.092	-0.326	1.198	1.711
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.584	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.584	0.582	0.586	0.582
Range		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
Maximum		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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.07	4.28	4.45	4.44	4.03	4.59	4.3	4.54	3.96	4.66	4.41	4.59
Std. Error of Mean		0.361	0.32	0.321	0.364	0.418	0.28	0.298	0.281	0.434	0.209	0.28	0.28
Median		4.63	4.66	5	5	4	5	4.82	5	4.63	5	5	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.061	0.939	0.917	1.068	1.229	0.821	0.874	0.826	1.274	0.614	0.822	0.821
Variance		1.125	0.883	0.841	1.141	1.511	0.674	0.764	0.682	1.622	0.377	0.675	0.674
Skewness		-0.179	-1.297	-1.255	-2.763	-2.143	-1.788	-0.752	-1.538	-0.847	-1.824	-1.056	-1.788
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.729	0.746	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729
Kurtosis		-2.668	1.657	-0.461	10.687	5.792	1.765	-1.231	0.893	0.272	3.572	-0.347	1.765
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.467	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		2	3	2	4	4	2	2	2	4	2	2	2
Minimum		3	2	3	1	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	3
Maximum		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**

<b>Mesquite</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.08	3.96	4.64	4.64	4.4	4.64	4.64	4.64	4.59	4.4	4.64	4.52
Std. Error of Mean		0.548	0.492	0.403	0.403	0.407	0.574	0.282	0.403	0.461	0.499	0.403	0.411
Median		4.43	4	5	5	4.57	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mode		5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.083	0.91	0.797	0.797	0.804	1.133	0.557	0.797	0.854	0.985	0.797	0.812
Variance		1.173	0.829	0.635	0.635	0.646	1.283	0.31	0.635	0.729	0.97	0.635	0.66
Skewness		-0.299	0.14	-2.87	-2.87	-1.266	-4.126	-1.02	-2.87	-2.871	-1.518	-2.87	-1.975
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.108	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.108	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		2	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		3	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	3
Maximum		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										
<b>General Government Services</b>												
Road maintenance	596	4	3.14	0.042	3	1.036	-0.116	0.1	-0.334	0.2	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	589	11	2.59	0.042	3	1.024	0.365	0.101	-0.182	0.201	1	5
Flood control	581	19	3.6	0.046	4	1.1	-0.647	0.101	-0.091	0.202	1	5
Budget management	586	14	2.72	0.045	3	1.091	0.015	0.101	-0.555	0.202	1	5
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	575	25	3.01	0.05	3	1.202	-0.076	0.102	-0.755	0.203	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	575	24	2.6	0.046	3	1.094	0.126	0.102	-0.615	0.203	1	5
Water conservation programs	588	11	3.44	0.047	4	1.151	-0.486	0.101	-0.511	0.201	1	5
<b>Social &amp; Judicial Services</b>												
Providing child protection services	586	13	3.03	0.046	3	1.108	-0.07	0.101	-0.572	0.201	1	5
Providing child welfare services	587	13	3.03	0.045	3	1.091	-0.072	0.101	-0.549	0.201	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services	583	17	2.96	0.043	3	1.05	-0.086	0.101	-0.268	0.202	1	5
Providing attainable housing for working class families	584	16	2.59	0.045	3	1.096	0.355	0.101	-0.364	0.202	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low income families	577	22	2.52	0.046	2	1.113	0.403	0.102	-0.404	0.203	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless	586	14	2.22	0.047	2	1.128	0.618	0.101	-0.385	0.202	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors	580	19	2.76	0.047	3	1.139	0.075	0.101	-0.622	0.203	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor	577	23	2.58	0.051	3	1.226	0.371	0.102	-0.738	0.203	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	578	21	3.42	0.05	3	1.198	-0.306	0.102	-0.791	0.203	1	5

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


Performance Variables	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
<b>Public Safety Services</b>												
Providing crime prevention programs	579	21	3.19	0.042	3	1.011	-0.136	0.102	-0.241	0.203	1	5
Enforcing traffic laws	593	7	3.24	0.049	3	1.181	-0.279	0.1	-0.673	0.2	1	5
Maintaining a low crime rate	590	10	3	0.046	3	1.113	-0.056	0.101	-0.597	0.201	1	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	582	18	2.82	0.05	3	1.2	0.158	0.101	-0.827	0.202	1	5
Keeping police response times low	577	23	3.16	0.049	3	1.186	-0.279	0.102	-0.68	0.203	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low	575	24	3.92	0.039	4	0.93	-0.694	0.102	0.451	0.203	1	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	577	22	3.94	0.04	4	0.951	-0.85	0.102	0.744	0.203	1	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	578	22	4.11	0.039	4	0.929	-1.054	0.102	1.088	0.203	1	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	581	19	2.87	0.047	3	1.144	0.115	0.101	-0.615	0.202	1	5
Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc)	583	16	3.01	0.047	3	1.132	-0.064	0.101	-0.657	0.202	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	583	16	3.05	0.05	3	1.201	-0.094	0.101	-0.775	0.202	1	5
Investigating criminal activity	584	16	3.13	0.048	3	1.152	-0.193	0.101	-0.723	0.202	1	5
Providing fire protection & prevention services	582	18	3.73	0.041	4	0.983	-0.563	0.101	-0.018	0.202	1	5
Providing emergency medical services	579	20	3.84	0.041	4	0.98	-0.695	0.102	0.263	0.203	1	5

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

Performance Variables	N		Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
	Valid	Missing										
<b>Public Safety Services (cont.)</b>												
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	574	25	3.03	0.048	3	1.139	0.001	0.102	-0.569	0.204	1	5
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	577	22	2.98	0.049	3	1.172	-0.039	0.102	-0.706	0.203	1	5
Regional justice services and facilities	584	15	3.22	0.043	3	1.041	-0.256	0.101	-0.194	0.202	1	5
<b>Community Development Services</b>												
Providing affordable housing	583	17	2.62	0.045	3	1.092	0.271	0.101	-0.37	0.202	1	5
Managing growth	586	13	2.53	0.049	3	1.192	0.253	0.101	-0.875	0.201	1	5
Increasing job opportunities	585	15	2.84	0.046	3	1.119	0.064	0.101	-0.566	0.202	1	5
Improving the business climate	581	19	3	0.046	3	1.098	-0.141	0.101	-0.579	0.202	1	5
Planning for commercial development	582	18	3.14	0.049	3	1.174	-0.233	0.101	-0.741	0.202	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion	593	6	2.59	0.052	3	1.272	0.28	0.1	-0.992	0.2	1	5
Access to freeways	594	6	3.28	0.047	3	1.155	-0.272	0.1	-0.647	0.2	1	5
Improving road conditions	592	8	3.12	0.048	3	1.166	-0.131	0.1	-0.752	0.201	1	5
Reducing travel time	586	14	2.75	0.048	3	1.165	0.112	0.101	-0.699	0.202	1	5
Providing mass public transit	586	14	2.81	0.051	3	1.227	0.11	0.101	-0.896	0.202	1	5
Adequate airport facilities	586	13	3.56	0.046	4	1.125	-0.564	0.101	-0.27	0.201	1	5
Parks and recreation programs	586	14	3.51	0.046	4	1.118	-0.466	0.101	-0.416	0.202	1	5

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


**Road Maintenance**



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

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


**Revitalizing Older Neighbors**



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)**

**Flood Control**



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)**


**Communicate Clark County Local Government's Views about Yucca to Federal Decision Makers**



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

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


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



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

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


**Water Conservation Programs**



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

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


**Providing Child Protection Service**



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

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


**Providing Child Welfare Services**



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

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


**Providing Juvenile Justice Services**



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

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


**Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families**



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

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


**Providing Affordable Housing for Low Income Families**



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

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


**Providing Shelter for the Homeless**



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

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


**Providing Affordable Housing for Seniors**



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

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


**Providing Medical Care for the Poor**



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

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


**Providing 24-Hour Emergency Trauma Care**



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

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


**Providing Crime Prevention Programs**



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

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


**Enforcing Traffic Laws**



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

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


**Maintaining a Low Crime Rate**



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

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


**Maintaining Neighborhood Police Patrols**



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

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


**Keeping Police Response Times Low**



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

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


**Keeping Fire Department Response Times Low**



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

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


**Keeping Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Times Low**



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

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


**Well Trained Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Personnel**



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

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


**Facilitate Neighborhood Watch Programs**



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

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


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



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

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


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



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

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


**Investigating Criminal Activity**



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

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


**Providing Fire Protection and Prevention Services**



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

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


**Providing Emergency Medical Services**



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

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


**Providing Neighborhood Code Enforcement Services**



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

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


**Examining Potential Impacts from Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Shipments**



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

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


**Regional Justice Services and Facilities**



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

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


**Providing Affordable Housing**



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

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


**Managing Growth**



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

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


**Increasing Job Opportunities**



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

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


**Improving Business Climate**



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

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


**Planning for Commercial Development**



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

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


**Reducing Traffic Congestion**



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

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


**Access to Freeways**



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

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


**Improving Road Conditions**



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

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


**Reducing Travel Time**



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

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


**Providing Mass Public Transit**



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

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


**Adequate Airport Facilities**



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

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

**Parks and Recreation Programs**



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

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	257	257	255	255	250	248	256
	Missing	4	3	5	6	10	13	5
Mean		3.08	2.54	3.6	2.72	3	2.6	3.37
Std. Error of Mean		0.067	0.066	0.07	0.072	0.076	0.071	0.075
Median		3	3	4	3	3	3	4
Mode		3	3	4	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.07	1.065	1.122	1.15	1.203	1.115	1.193
Variance		1.145	1.135	1.259	1.322	1.447	1.244	1.423
Skewness		0.031	0.389	-0.599	0.028	-0.085	0.171	-0.457
Std. Error of Skewness		0.152	0.152	0.152	0.153	0.154	0.155	0.152
Kurtosis		-0.472	-0.228	-0.269	-0.717	-0.725	-0.607	-0.582
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.303	0.303	0.304	0.304	0.307	0.308	0.303
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**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	193	188	189	190	187	187	188
	Missing	0	5	4	2	6	6	5
Mean		3.3	2.69	3.7	2.82	3	2.71	3.58
Std. Error of Mean		0.073	0.072	0.072	0.076	0.084	0.077	0.079
Median		3	3	4	3	3	3	4
Mode		3	3	4	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.008	0.992	0.996	1.055	1.153	1.057	1.08
Variance		1.017	0.984	0.993	1.112	1.328	1.117	1.166
Skewness		-0.385	0.362	-0.701	-0.062	-0.024	-0.015	-0.53
Std. Error of Skewness		0.175	0.177	0.177	0.176	0.178	0.178	0.177
Kurtosis		-0.072	-0.173	0.257	-0.33	-0.657	-0.396	-0.346
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.348	0.353	0.351	0.35	0.354	0.353	0.352
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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	68	68	65	67	65	66	67
	Missing	0	0	3	0	3	2	1
Mean		2.98	2.35	3.48	2.66	3.21	2.52	3.39
Std. Error of Mean		0.124	0.1	0.144	0.119	0.161	0.127	0.138
Median		3	2	4	3	3	2.72	4
Mode		3	3	4	3	4	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.021	0.822	1.158	0.975	1.291	1.035	1.127
Variance		1.042	0.676	1.341	0.95	1.666	1.071	1.269
Skewness		0.142	-0.134	-0.653	0.139	-0.206	0.249	-0.342
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.291	0.298	0.292	0.298	0.295	0.293
Kurtosis		-0.04	-0.655	-0.03	0.004	-1.011	-0.444	-0.671
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.575	0.588	0.577	0.588	0.581	0.579
Range		4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	4	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>City of Henderson</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	66	65	61	62	62	62	66
	Missing	0	1	5	5	4	4	0
Mean		2.99	2.56	3.33	2.39	2.86	2.3	3.27
Std. Error of Mean		0.117	0.13	0.15	0.134	0.161	0.144	0.144
Median		3	2.15	3	2	3	2	3
Mode		3	2	3	3	3	1	4
Std. Deviation		0.955	1.047	1.173	1.048	1.271	1.13	1.167
Variance		0.911	1.096	1.376	1.099	1.616	1.278	1.363
Skewness		-0.301	0.463	-0.444	0.21	-0.022	0.398	-0.468
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.297	0.307	0.305	0.304	0.304	0.295
Kurtosis		0.042	-0.073	-0.303	-0.775	-0.825	-0.807	-0.548
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.586	0.604	0.602	0.599	0.599	0.582
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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	9	8	8	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.64	3.36	3.93	3.23	3.34	2.53	4.32
Std. Error of Mean		0.301	0.343	0.551	0.194	0.318	0.41	0.358
Median		3	3	4.44	3	3	3	4.8
Mode		3	3	5	3	3	3	5
Std. Deviation		0.885	0.979	1.575	0.57	0.933	1.205	1.052
Variance		0.784	0.958	2.479	0.325	0.87	1.453	1.107
Skewness		0.913	0.154	-1.591	0.158	-0.287	-0.241	-2.466
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.746	0.746	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729
Kurtosis		-1.034	-0.335	1.47	0.747	3.679	-1.48	9.441
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.467	1.467	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		2	3	4	2	4	3	4
Minimum		3	2	1	2	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	4	5	4	5

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

<b>Mesquite</b>		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	3	3	2	3	3	3	3
	Missing	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
Mean		4	3.84	4	4	3.05	3.45	3.36
Std. Error of Mean		0.475	0.744	0.503	0.569	0.998	0.572	0.777
Median		4	4	4	4	3.14	3.34	3.57
Mode		4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Std. Deviation		0.88	1.281	0.794	0.979	1.716	1.06	1.337
Variance		0.774	1.64	0.631	0.959	2.946	1.123	1.789
Skewness		0					0.293	
Std. Error of Skewness		1.108					1.108	
Range		2	3	2	2	4	3	3
Minimum		3	2	3	3	1	2	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		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	254	254	251	253	249	253	251	245	252
	Missing	6	6	9	7	12	7	9	15	8
Mean		2.97	2.98	2.97	2.53	2.48	2.15	2.72	2.46	3.4
Std. Error of Mean		0.069	0.07	0.068	0.07	0.073	0.069	0.075	0.077	0.076
Median		3	3	3	2.99	2	2	3	2	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.104	1.109	1.084	1.117	1.157	1.104	1.194	1.213	1.2
Variance		1.219	1.231	1.176	1.249	1.338	1.22	1.426	1.471	1.44
Skewness		-0.023	-0.024	-0.078	0.464	0.535	0.687	0.195	0.518	-0.305
Std. Error of Skewness		0.153	0.153	0.154	0.153	0.154	0.153	0.154	0.155	0.153
Kurtosis		-0.536	-0.63	-0.302	-0.252	-0.29	-0.105	-0.72	-0.552	-0.798
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.304	0.304	0.306	0.305	0.308	0.305	0.306	0.31	0.306
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		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	189	190	190	189	189	192	187	191	190
	Missing	4	3	2	4	4	1	6	2	3
Mean		3.02	3.11	2.96	2.65	2.53	2.34	2.75	2.63	3.52
Std. Error of Mean		0.077	0.077	0.072	0.082	0.081	0.085	0.08	0.087	0.083
Median		3	3	3	3	2.02	2	3	3	4
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.063	1.065	0.99	1.123	1.109	1.178	1.091	1.201	1.146
Variance		1.13	1.135	0.98	1.261	1.23	1.387	1.189	1.443	1.313
Skewness		-0.083	-0.128	-0.17	0.265	0.352	0.608	-0.04	0.274	-0.369
Std. Error of Skewness		0.177	0.176	0.176	0.177	0.177	0.175	0.178	0.176	0.176
Kurtosis		-0.446	-0.443	-0.153	-0.48	-0.506	-0.509	-0.551	-0.819	-0.609
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.351	0.351	0.35	0.352	0.352	0.349	0.354	0.35	0.351
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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		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	67	68	67	67	67	67	67	67	66
	Missing	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Mean		3.33	3.13	2.96	2.67	2.62	2.02	2.85	2.53	3.32
Std. Error of Mean		0.141	0.144	0.139	0.128	0.127	0.119	0.118	0.156	0.159
Median		3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Mode		4	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.148	1.184	1.132	1.046	1.035	0.974	0.964	1.274	1.283
Variance		1.318	1.402	1.281	1.095	1.071	0.949	0.929	1.622	1.647
Skewness		-0.247	-0.106	-0.017	0.252	0.038	0.436	-0.335	0.303	-0.213
Std. Error of Skewness		0.294	0.291	0.294	0.294	0.294	0.294	0.294	0.294	0.296
Kurtosis		-0.724	-0.525	-0.439	-0.431	-0.823	-0.995	-0.175	-0.844	-1.015
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.58	0.575	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.584
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5

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

<b>City of Henderson</b>		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	65	65	63	65	62	64	66	63	58
	Missing	2	2	3	2	4	3	0	3	8
Mean		2.85	2.83	2.9	2.51	2.54	2.3	2.77	2.79	3.19
Std. Error of Mean		0.136	0.122	0.125	0.125	0.133	0.15	0.151	0.157	0.167
Median		3	3	3	2.72	3	2	3	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.095	0.982	0.995	1.008	1.045	1.197	1.225	1.245	1.277
Variance		1.198	0.965	0.989	1.015	1.093	1.433	1.5	1.549	1.631
Skewness		-0.213	-0.181	0.013	0.345	0.306	0.384	0.169	0.301	-0.145
Std. Error of Skewness		0.298	0.298	0.3	0.298	0.304	0.3	0.296	0.302	0.313
Kurtosis		-0.553	-0.467	-0.076	-0.071	0.071	-0.98	-0.673	-0.758	-1.011
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.588	0.588	0.593	0.588	0.599	0.593	0.584	0.595	0.616
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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		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	9	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	9
	Missing	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0
Mean		3.69	3.17	3.04	2.43	1.7	1.93	3.04	3.19	3.88
Std. Error of Mean		0.521	0.371	0.397	0.393	0.279	0.39	0.493	0.496	0.349
Median		4.33	3.64	3	2	1.97	2.03	3	3	3.44
Mode		5	4	3	2	1(a)	1	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.531	0.988	1.058	1.047	0.744	1.04	1.314	1.321	1.026
Variance		2.344	0.975	1.12	1.095	0.553	1.082	1.727	1.745	1.052
Skewness		-0.563	-0.446	-1.181	0.604	0.613	0.171	-0.192	-0.212	0.303
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.789	0.789	0.789	0.789	0.789	0.789	0.789	0.729
Kurtosis		-1.651	-2.309	1.48	-0.287	-0.249	-2.765	-0.049	0.804	-2.473
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.575	1.575	1.575	1.575	1.575	1.575	1.575	1.428
Range		4	2	3	3	2	2	4	4	2
Minimum		1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
Maximum		5	4	4	4	3	3	5	5	5

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

<b>Mesquite</b>		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	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4
	Missing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean		3.16	3.41	3.36	3.27	3.24	2.88	3.32	3.69	3.84
Std. Error of Mean		0.846	0.815	0.813	0.286	0.559	0.607	0.659	0.735	0.543
Median		3	3.41	3	3	3	2.57	3	3.39	3.91
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.456	1.509	1.606	0.53	1.104	1.2	1.134	1.361	1.072
Variance		2.12	2.276	2.579	0.281	1.218	1.439	1.286	1.852	1.15
Range		4	4	4	1	3	3	3	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1	3	2	2	2	2	3
Maximum		5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
Skewness			-0.813	-0.213	2.045	0.605	1.585		0.179	0.557
Std. Error of Skewness			1.108	1.028	1.108	1.028	1.028		1.108	1.028

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		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	247	258	255	249	245	249	249	249
	Missing	14	3	5	12	15	11	11	11
Mean		3.13	3.12	2.96	2.82	3.09	3.88	3.86	4.05
Std. Error of Mean		0.066	0.076	0.069	0.079	0.08	0.06	0.063	0.063
Median		3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	4	5
Std. Deviation		1.03	1.221	1.109	1.241	1.247	0.948	0.993	0.989
Variance		1.06	1.49	1.23	1.539	1.555	0.898	0.987	0.979
Skewness		-0.08	-0.121	-0.02	0.134	-0.311	-0.774	-0.959	-0.965
Std. Error of Skewness		0.155	0.152	0.152	0.154	0.156	0.154	0.154	0.154
Kurtosis		-0.231	-0.821	-0.561	-0.867	-0.866	0.68	1.049	0.706
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.309	0.302	0.304	0.308	0.31	0.307	0.307	0.307
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**

<b>Unincorporated Clark County (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	250	253	253	249	249	249	248	248	249
	Missing	11	7	8	11	11	12	13	13	11
Mean		2.87	2.99	2.99	3.03	3.66	3.79	2.98	2.99	3.22
Std. Error of Mean		0.073	0.072	0.078	0.075	0.068	0.067	0.076	0.075	0.068
Median		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.156	1.14	1.243	1.189	1.079	1.055	1.193	1.173	1.08
Variance		1.336	1.299	1.544	1.414	1.164	1.114	1.424	1.375	1.166
Skewness		0.118	-0.103	0.025	-0.078	-0.558	-0.726	0.054	-0.049	-0.347
Std. Error of Skewness		0.154	0.153	0.153	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.155	0.155	0.154
Kurtosis		-0.646	-0.702	-0.878	-0.874	-0.34	0.187	-0.708	-0.687	-0.193
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.307	0.305	0.305	0.307	0.308	0.308	0.308	0.308	0.307
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 Public Safety**  
**Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		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	190	191	190	192	191	188	188	187
	Missing	3	2	2	1	2	5	5	6
Mean		3.22	3.37	3.08	2.83	3.29	4.06	4.12	4.21
Std. Error of Mean		0.073	0.082	0.079	0.086	0.084	0.069	0.067	0.065
Median		3	4	3	3	3	4	4	4
Mode		3	4	3	3	3	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.006	1.129	1.089	1.187	1.161	0.95	0.912	0.882
Variance		1.013	1.274	1.186	1.408	1.347	0.902	0.832	0.778
Skewness		-0.306	-0.541	-0.141	0.156	-0.305	-0.967	-1.039	-1.243
Std. Error of Skewness		0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.177	0.177	0.178
Kurtosis		-0.032	-0.276	-0.399	-0.835	-0.616	0.899	1.044	1.896
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.351	0.35	0.35	0.349	0.35	0.352	0.353	0.354
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**

<b>City of Las Vegas (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	188	189	189	192	190	188	185	190	191
	Missing	5	4	4	1	2	5	8	2	2
Mean		2.86	3.05	3.09	3.25	3.81	3.92	3.07	2.9	3.31
Std. Error of Mean		0.081	0.079	0.085	0.08	0.066	0.067	0.078	0.08	0.071
Median		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.118	1.084	1.168	1.107	0.911	0.92	1.055	1.101	0.983
Variance		1.249	1.176	1.364	1.226	0.829	0.846	1.113	1.212	0.966
Skewness		0.108	-0.038	-0.139	-0.394	-0.643	-0.892	-0.074	-0.107	-0.447
Std. Error of Skewness		0.177	0.177	0.177	0.175	0.176	0.177	0.179	0.176	0.176
Kurtosis		-0.503	-0.48	-0.772	-0.411	0.483	0.989	-0.245	-0.589	0.113
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.353	0.352	0.351	0.349	0.35	0.353	0.356	0.35	0.35
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 Public Safety**  
**Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		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	67	68	67	66	67	65	67	68
	Missing	1	0	0	2	1	3	0	0
Mean		3.2	3.28	2.85	2.5	2.98	3.74	3.79	4.1
Std. Error of Mean		0.126	0.147	0.142	0.128	0.133	0.102	0.104	0.101
Median		3	3	3	2	3	4	4	4
Mode		3	3	3	2	3	3	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.029	1.206	1.166	1.043	1.088	0.823	0.856	0.829
Variance		1.06	1.455	1.36	1.087	1.184	0.678	0.732	0.687
Skewness		0.143	-0.11	0.115	0.463	-0.008	0.34	-0.028	-0.785
Std. Error of Skewness		0.294	0.291	0.292	0.295	0.294	0.297	0.292	0.291
Kurtosis		-0.399	-0.942	-0.71	-0.105	-0.222	-1.093	-0.857	0.315
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.58	0.575	0.577	0.582	0.58	0.586	0.577	0.575
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>City of North Las Vegas (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	68	67	66	68	68	67	67	65	67
	Missing	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	0
Mean		2.69	3.05	3.24	3.09	3.69	3.72	2.87	3.1	3.18
Std. Error of Mean		0.129	0.142	0.141	0.139	0.124	0.12	0.141	0.174	0.129
Median		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.063	1.159	1.14	1.142	1.02	0.976	1.151	1.405	1.059
Variance		1.129	1.343	1.299	1.304	1.04	0.952	1.325	1.975	1.121
Skewness		0.085	0.062	-0.451	-0.031	-0.402	-0.086	0.115	-0.101	0.159
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.293	0.296	0.291	0.291	0.294	0.294	0.297	0.292
Kurtosis		-0.644	-0.689	-0.22	-0.654	-0.348	-1.059	-0.667	-1.21	-0.395
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.579	0.583	0.575	0.575	0.58	0.58	0.586	0.577
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>City of Henderson</b>		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	63	64	65	63	63	62	62	63
	Missing	3	2	2	3	3	4	4	3
Mean		3.26	3.25	2.99	3.01	3.17	3.82	3.81	4.06
Std. Error of Mean		0.117	0.145	0.143	0.145	0.138	0.111	0.12	0.12
Median		3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Mode		4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		0.929	1.158	1.147	1.154	1.101	0.878	0.942	0.951
Variance		0.864	1.342	1.315	1.332	1.211	0.77	0.888	0.905
Skewness		-0.117	-0.276	-0.06	-0.023	-0.365	-0.58	-0.671	-1.147
Std. Error of Skewness		0.301	0.299	0.298	0.301	0.3	0.304	0.304	0.301
Kurtosis		-0.536	-0.433	-0.813	-0.723	-0.261	0.643	0.551	1.446
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.595	0.59	0.588	0.595	0.593	0.599	0.599	0.595
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**

<b>City of Henderson (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	65	65	65	64	63	65	63	64	65
	Missing	2	2	2	2	4	2	3	3	2
Mean		3.07	2.82	2.94	3.05	3.76	3.87	3.09	2.97	3.03
Std. Error of Mean		0.148	0.147	0.14	0.142	0.096	0.111	0.141	0.143	0.134
Median		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.192	1.181	1.123	1.138	0.761	0.89	1.116	1.143	1.074
Variance		1.421	1.396	1.26	1.296	0.578	0.792	1.245	1.307	1.153
Skewness		0.052	-0.007	-0.108	-0.151	0.336	-0.431	-0.046	0.105	0.088
Std. Error of Skewness		0.298	0.298	0.298	0.299	0.303	0.298	0.302	0.3	0.298
Kurtosis		-0.711	-0.742	-0.297	-0.684	-0.974	-0.173	-0.296	-0.559	-0.312
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.588	0.588	0.588	0.59	0.597	0.588	0.595	0.593	0.588
Range		4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Boulder City</b>		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	9	9	9	9	8	7	7	7
	Missing	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	2
Mean		3.59	3.21	3.3	3.16	3.33	4.2	4.13	4.22
Std. Error of Mean		0.373	0.387	0.343	0.484	0.42	0.312	0.3	0.223
Median		3.8	3.8	3.8	4	3	4	4	4
Mode		4	4	4	4	3	5	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.095	1.138	1.007	1.421	1.154	0.832	0.8	0.594
Variance		1.199	1.295	1.013	2.019	1.332	0.691	0.639	0.353
Skewness		-0.109	-1.493	-0.299	-0.58	0.763	-0.453	-0.273	0.073
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.77	0.789	0.789	0.789
Kurtosis		-1.015	1.466	-1.257	-1.144	-0.595	-1.187	-0.992	1.185
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.525	1.575	1.575	1.575
Range		3	3	3	4	3	2	2	2
Minimum		2	1	2	1	2	3	3	3
Maximum		5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Boulder City (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	7	7	7	7	9	8	9	7	9
	Missing	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	2	0
Mean		3.13	3.64	3.28	3.59	4.12	4.06	3.89	3.78	3.04
Std. Error of Mean		0.572	0.442	0.652	0.42	0.267	0.167	0.426	0.347	0.283
Median		3	4	3.5	3.5	4	4	4	3.5	3
Mode		3	4	5	3	4	4	5	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.523	1.178	1.736	1.119	0.784	0.459	1.252	0.924	0.832
Variance		2.321	1.388	3.014	1.253	0.615	0.211	1.569	0.854	0.691
Skewness		-0.121	-0.695	-0.48	-0.687	-1.241	0.451	-0.782	0.56	1.587
Std. Error of Skewness		0.789	0.789	0.789	0.789	0.729	0.77	0.729	0.789	0.729
Kurtosis		-0.598	-0.83	-1.558	2.599	4.4	6.544	-0.967	-1.796	4.873
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.575	1.575	1.575	1.575	1.428	1.525	1.428	1.575	1.428
Range		4	3	4	4	3	2	3	2	3
Minimum		1	2	1	1	2	3	2	3	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Mesquite</b>		Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.84	3.6	3.84	3.45	3.64	3.96	4.08	3.96
Std. Error of Mean		0.46	0.499	0.615	0.78	0.761	0.492	0.548	0.511
Median		3.9	3	3.96	3.91	4	4	4.43	3.96
Mode		3	3	5	2	4	4	5	3
Std. Deviation		0.909	0.985	1.214	1.541	1.409	0.91	1.083	1.009
Variance		0.826	0.97	1.474	2.374	1.986	0.829	1.173	1.019
Skewness		0.499	1.518	-0.557	0.124	-0.845	0.14	-0.299	0.123
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.108	1.108	1.028	1.028
Range		2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2
Minimum		3	3	2	2	2	3	3	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**

<b>Mesquite (cont.)</b>		Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3
	Missing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3	3.48	3.24	3.96	3.96	3.96	3.55	3	3.27
Std. Error of Mean		0.95	0.968	0.75	0.511	0.492	0.587	0.463	0.582	0.554
Median		3	3.91	3	3.96	4	3.86	3.21	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.759	1.666	1.48	1.009	0.91	1.159	0.858	1.077	1.027
Variance		3.095	2.775	2.191	1.019	0.829	1.343	0.736	1.16	1.054
Skewness		0		-0.194	0.123	0.14	0.127	1.863	2.227	1.443
Std. Error of Skewness		1.108		1.028	1.028	1.108	1.028	1.108	1.108	1.108
Range		4	4	4	2	2	2	2	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	251	251	253	250	253	258	258	258	252	253	255	252
	Missing	9	9	7	10	8	3	3	3	8	7	6	8
Mean		2.44	2.48	2.75	2.91	3.1	2.41	3.28	3.02	2.54	2.79	3.46	3.41
Std. Error of Mean		0.07	0.077	0.073	0.074	0.074	0.077	0.078	0.071	0.074	0.079	0.074	0.075
Median		2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	3
Mode		3	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.107	1.215	1.163	1.173	1.178	1.23	1.249	1.143	1.182	1.262	1.186	1.195
Variance		1.225	1.475	1.353	1.375	1.389	1.513	1.561	1.307	1.396	1.592	1.406	1.428
Skewness		0.42	0.258	0.016	-0.049	-0.181	0.385	-0.286	-0.031	0.251	0.206	-0.477	-0.421
Std. Error of Skewness		0.154	0.154	0.153	0.154	0.153	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.153	0.153	0.153	0.153
Kurtosis		-0.313	-1.023	-0.767	-0.748	-0.74	-0.908	-0.831	-0.634	-0.722	-0.862	-0.45	-0.591
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.306	0.306	0.305	0.307	0.305	0.302	0.302	0.302	0.306	0.305	0.304	0.306
Range		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
Maximum		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**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	189	190	189	187	186	191	192	191	191	190	191	190
	Missing	4	2	4	6	7	2	1	2	2	3	2	3
Mean		2.82	2.62	2.94	3.06	3.16	2.86	3.3	3.27	2.96	2.95	3.75	3.62
Std. Error of Mean		0.078	0.089	0.079	0.075	0.083	0.094	0.081	0.083	0.083	0.084	0.072	0.076
Median		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.076	1.226	1.092	1.022	1.136	1.297	1.119	1.15	1.14	1.155	0.996	1.044
Variance		1.158	1.504	1.193	1.044	1.291	1.681	1.251	1.321	1.3	1.333	0.993	1.089
Skewness		0.241	0.299	0.188	-0.163	-0.33	0.084	-0.322	-0.428	0.062	-0.128	-0.841	-0.554
Std. Error of Skewness		0.177	0.176	0.177	0.178	0.178	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.177	0.176	0.176
Kurtosis		-0.217	-0.835	-0.384	-0.369	-0.644	-1.078	-0.603	-0.557	-0.677	-0.764	0.644	-0.071
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.352	0.35	0.352	0.354	0.354	0.35	0.349	0.35	0.35	0.351	0.35	0.351
Range		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
Maximum		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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	68	68	67	67	67	68	68	68	68	66	66	67
	Missing	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1
Mean		2.84	2.68	2.97	3.21	3.3	2.78	3.3	3.16	2.89	2.97	3.48	3.47
Std. Error of Mean		0.12	0.136	0.143	0.128	0.148	0.157	0.14	0.159	0.142	0.143	0.147	0.123
Median		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4
Mode		3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		0.984	1.116	1.163	1.047	1.206	1.29	1.154	1.305	1.166	1.166	1.186	1.008
Variance		0.968	1.245	1.353	1.096	1.455	1.665	1.332	1.703	1.36	1.359	1.407	1.017
Skewness		0.138	-0.12	0.053	-0.577	-0.433	0.029	-0.244	-0.099	-0.032	-0.139	-0.208	-0.222
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.291	0.294	0.294	0.294	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.295	0.296	0.293
Kurtosis		-0.147	-0.747	-0.837	-0.263	-0.609	-1.198	-0.718	-1.077	-0.543	-0.741	-0.891	-0.665
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.575	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.582	0.584	0.579
Range		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
Maximum		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**

<b>City of Henderson</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	63	65	65	65	64	65	65	63	64	65	63	65
	Missing	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2
Mean		2.5	2.26	2.7	2.91	3.01	2.17	3.13	2.87	2.64	2.3	3.45	3.58
Std. Error of Mean		0.133	0.127	0.12	0.124	0.148	0.135	0.115	0.135	0.127	0.153	0.135	0.14
Median		3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	4	4
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	1	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.053	1.018	0.963	0.998	1.181	1.085	0.923	1.069	1.021	1.226	1.074	1.124
Variance		1.109	1.036	0.927	0.995	1.394	1.178	0.852	1.143	1.042	1.503	1.154	1.263
Skewness		0.174	0.402	-0.03	0.137	0.015	0.755	-0.087	0.211	-0.061	0.697	-0.55	-0.464
Std. Error of Skewness		0.301	0.298	0.298	0.298	0.3	0.298	0.298	0.302	0.299	0.298	0.302	0.298
Kurtosis		-0.643	-0.297	-0.295	-0.189	-0.733	0.239	0.261	-0.547	-0.53	-0.474	-0.165	-0.445
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.595	0.588	0.588	0.588	0.593	0.588	0.588	0.595	0.59	0.588	0.595	0.588
Range		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
Maximum		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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.57	2.74	2.85	3.35	3.23	3.12	3.41	3.87	3.48	3	3.93	3.64
Std. Error of Mean		0.41	0.487	0.321	0.496	0.572	0.509	0.215	0.394	0.428	0.508	0.386	0.407
Median		2.19	3	3	3.8	4	3	3	4	3.8	2.39	4	4
Mode		2	3	3	4	4	3	3	5	4	2	5	4
Std. Deviation		1.206	1.43	0.917	1.458	1.682	1.494	0.63	1.156	1.258	1.492	1.135	1.196
Variance		1.454	2.044	0.84	2.124	2.828	2.233	0.397	1.337	1.582	2.225	1.288	1.431
Skewness		0.467	0.013	-0.517	-0.648	-0.369	-0.269	1.384	-0.409	-0.423	0.337	-0.584	-0.298
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.729	0.746	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729
Kurtosis		-0.181	-1.016	5.717	-0.524	-1.824	-0.789	1.736	-1.338	-0.467	-1.593	-0.963	-1.366
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.467	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	2	2
Maximum		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**

<b>Mesquite</b>		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	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	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		3.55	3.27	3.82	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.96	3.72	3.48	2.84	2.55	4.08
Std. Error of Mean		0.463	0.554	0.535	0.499	0.499	0.762	0.511	0.634	0.538	0.615	1.002	0.467
Median		3.21	3	3.71	3	3	3.91	3.96	3.91	3	2.46	2	4
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	4(a)
Std. Deviation		0.858	1.027	0.99	0.985	0.985	1.506	1.009	1.251	0.925	1.214	1.856	0.921
Variance		0.736	1.054	0.98	0.97	0.97	2.267	1.019	1.566	0.856	1.474	3.444	0.849
Skewness		1.863	1.443	0.692	1.518	1.518	-0.984	0.123	-0.016		1.673	1.562	-0.269
Std. Error of Skewness		1.108	1.108	1.108	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028		1.028	1.108	1.028
Range		2	3	2	2	2	4	2	3	2	3	4	2
Minimum		3	2	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	2	1	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Appendix III**  
**Quality of Life Considerations**


**Appendix III**  
**Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings**  
**Summary Statistics**

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

		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Recreational opportunities	Condition of streets & roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth
N	Valid	595	596	592	596	591	593	596	593	593
	Missing	5	4	8	4	9	6	3	7	7
Mean		3.99	4.07	3.78	4.07	3.46	3.73	4.15	4.02	4.05
Std. Error of Mean		.048	.049	.044	.039	.056	.053	.043	.047	.047
Median		4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.181	1.206	1.075	.957	1.352	1.289	1.044	1.134	1.150
Skewness		-.913	-1.155	-.574	-.790	-.433	-.648	-1.064	-1.033	-1.020
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.100	.100	.101	.100	.100	.100	.100
Kurtosis		-.193	.289	-.374	-.014	-.986	-.705	.364	.272	.078
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.200	.200	.201	.200	.201	.200	.200	.200	.200
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 III Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings

	1	2	3	4	5	DK/No answer	Total
Natural or man-made emergency	4.3	8.2	19.4	19.9	47.5	0.8	100
Quality of drinking water	5.7	6.7	14.7	20.1	52.3	0.6	100
Recreational opportunities	3	8.7	25.9	30.1	30.9	1.3	100
Condition of streets & roads	1.1	4.8	20.9	31.5	41.1	0.6	100
Availability of public transportation	11.8	12.3	22.9	21.5	30.1	1.4	100
Housing affordability	7.6	10.4	22.3	19.6	39.1	1	100
Air quality	2.3	5.2	18.6	23	50.5	0.5	100
Availability of job opportunities	4.5	5.6	18.5	24.7	45.6	1.2	100
Managing growth	3.9	7.5	17.2	21.6	48.7	1.1	100



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

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	257	258	257	258	256	257	258	257	257
	Missing	4	3	3	3	5	4	3	4	4
Mean		3.96	4.20	3.80	4.12	3.47	3.80	4.18	3.95	4.12
Std. Error of Mean		.075	.069	.071	.061	.089	.081	.066	.073	.073
Median		4.00	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		1.207	1.112	1.136	.980	1.415	1.295	1.065	1.164	1.168
Skewness		-.843	-1.308	-.665	-1.047	-.437	-.714	-1.264	-.946	-1.227
Std. Error of Skewness		.152	.152	.152	.152	.152	.152	.152	.152	.152
Kurtosis		-.429	.807	-.434	.635	-1.103	-.674	.960	.038	.533
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.303	.302	.303	.302	.304	.303	.302	.303	.303
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	193	192	190	192	190	192	193	190	190
	Missing	0	1	3	1	3	1	0	3	3
Mean		3.97	3.97	3.82	4.07	3.46	3.63	4.20	4.10	4.01
Std. Error of Mean		.083	.090	.071	.065	.094	.095	.070	.081	.080
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.147	1.246	.976	.902	1.300	1.319	.966	1.113	1.109
Skewness		-.929	-1.023	-.588	-.619	-.427	-.562	-.946	-1.248	-.922
Std. Error of Skewness		.175	.175	.176	.175	.176	.176	.175	.176	.176
Kurtosis		.043	-.011	.186	-.351	-.849	-.821	-.015	.938	-.040
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.349	.349	.351	.349	.351	.349	.349	.351	.351
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 III**  
**Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings**  
**Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	68	68	66	68	68	68	68	68	68
	Missing	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.07	3.90	3.77	3.91	3.47	3.93	4.09	4.23	4.07
Std. Error of Mean		.143	.148	.136	.121	.157	.141	.130	.125	.138
Median		5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.175	1.217	1.102	.991	1.291	1.162	1.066	1.031	1.138
Skewness		-.959	-.913	-.291	-.293	-.546	-.972	-.947	-1.280	-.890
Std. Error of Skewness		.291	.291	.295	.291	.291	.291	.291	.291	.291
Kurtosis		-.228	.031	-1.138	-1.157	-.734	.331	.109	1.008	-.324
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.575	.575	.582	.575	.575	.575	.575	.575	.575
Range		4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Henderson</b>		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	66	66	66	66	66	65	66	66	66
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		3.99	3.97	3.71	4.02	3.34	3.43	3.87	3.84	3.89
Std. Error of Mean		.152	.170	.124	.123	.169	.165	.142	.145	.151
Median		4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.18	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.240	1.380	1.011	.998	1.371	1.329	1.151	1.177	1.229
Skewness		-1.106	-1.078	-.422	-.753	-.241	-.306	-.614	-.671	-.715
Std. Error of Skewness		.295	.295	.295	.295	.296	.297	.295	.296	.295
Kurtosis		.251	-.286	-.309	-.025	-1.154	-1.078	-.605	-.428	-.498
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.582	.582	.582	.582	.584	.586	.582	.584	.582
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 III**  
**Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings**  
**Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction**

<b>Boulder City</b>		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.67	4.84	3.73	4.55	4.38	4.48	4.71	4.60	4.17
Std. Error of Mean		.268	.179	.461	.247	.221	.217	.203	.245	.371
Median		5.00	5.00	3.69	5.00	4.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	4.19
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.786	.527	1.355	.725	.632	.637	.595	.719	1.089
Skewness		-2.229	-3.674	-.198	-1.483	-.436	-.847	-2.238	-1.766	-1.925
Std. Error of Skewness		.729	.729	.729	.729	.746	.729	.729	.729	.729
Kurtosis		3.817	16.433	-2.129	1.481	-.077	.272	5.775	2.524	6.049
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.467	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum		3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Mesquite</b>		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.69	3.77	2.93	3.48	3.24	3.48	3.81	3.36	3.72
Std. Error of Mean		.561	1.024	.892	.502	.750	.411	.703	.574	.634
Median		3.41	4.90	2.96	3.43	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.91
Mode		3	5	1	3	3	3	4(a)	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.038	2.023	1.762	.992	1.480	.812	1.388	1.133	1.251
Skewness		1.324	-1.594	.106	.099	-.194	1.975	-1.054	1.379	-.016
Std. Error of Skewness		1.108	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		2	4	4	3	4	2	3	3	3
Minimum		3	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

			Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	10	26	49	47	124	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.9%	10.2%	19.1%	18.4%	48.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	13	39	47	84	192	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.7%	6.8%	20.3%	24.5%	43.8%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	6	13	10	37	68	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.9%	8.8%	19.1%	14.7%	54.4%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	5	4	11	15	32	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.5%	6.0%	16.4%	22.4%	47.8%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	1	0	7	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	87.5%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	0	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	26	49	115	119	285	594
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.4%	8.2%	19.4%	20.0%	48.0%	100.0%

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

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

**Chi-Square Tests (cont.)**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.142(a)	20	.513
Likelihood Ratio	20.682	20	.416
Linear-by-Linear Association	.523	1	.470
N of Valid Cases	594		

**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	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	9	16	35	51	146	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.5%	6.2%	13.6%	19.8%	56.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	13	14	32	41	92	192	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.8%	7.3%	16.7%	21.4%	47.9%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	3	17	14	29	68	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.4%	4.4%	25.0%	20.6%	42.6%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	6	8	4	13	36	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.0%	11.9%	6.0%	19.4%	53.7%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	0	8	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	1	0	0	0	2	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	34	41	88	119	313	595
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.7%	6.9%	14.8%	20.0%	52.6%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.178(a)	20	.041
Likelihood Ratio	34.407	20	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.833	1	.176
N of Valid Cases	595		

**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	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	10	29	54	78	87	258	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.9%	11.2%	20.9%	30.2%	33.7%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	5	7	59	66	54	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.6%	3.7%	30.9%	34.6%	28.3%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	9	19	14	23	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	13.8%	29.2%	21.5%	35.4%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	1	6	20	22	17	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.5%	9.1%	30.3%	33.3%	25.8%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	2	2	0	4	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	1	0	1	0	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.3%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	17	53	155	180	186	591
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.9%	9.0%	26.2%	30.5%	31.5%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.148(a)	20	.006
Likelihood Ratio	39.036	20	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	.413	1	.520
N of Valid Cases	591		

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

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

			Condition of streets & roads:					Total
			1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	5	13	42	85	113	258
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.9%	5.0%	16.3%	32.9%	43.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	1	7	44	65	75	192
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.5%	3.6%	22.9%	33.9%	39.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	5	21	17	25	68
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	7.4%	30.9%	25.0%	36.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	3	16	19	27	66
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.5%	4.5%	24.2%	28.8%	40.9%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	1	2	6	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	11.1%	22.2%	66.7%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	1	0	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	7	28	126	189	246	596
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.2%	4.7%	21.1%	31.7%	41.3%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.391(a)	20	.434
Likelihood Ratio	21.734	20	.355
Linear-by-Linear Association	.850	1	.356
N of Valid Cases	596		

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

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

			Availability of public transportation:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	35	32	55	47	87	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.7%	12.5%	21.5%	18.4%	34.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	20	22	51	44	53	190	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.5%	11.6%	26.8%	23.2%	27.9%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	7	8	14	21	17	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.4%	11.9%	20.9%	31.3%	25.4%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	8	11	16	12	19	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.1%	16.7%	24.2%	18.2%	28.8%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	4	4	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	0	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	70	73	138	128	181	590
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.9%	12.4%	23.4%	21.7%	30.7%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.126(a)	20	.334
Likelihood Ratio	25.169	20	.195
Linear-by-Linear Association	.149	1	.699
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: Housing affordability:**

			Housing affordability:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	18	28	54	45	112	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.0%	10.9%	21.0%	17.5%	43.6%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	18	21	46	38	70	193	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.3%	10.9%	23.8%	19.7%	36.3%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	2	16	17	28	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.0%	3.0%	23.9%	25.4%	41.8%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	6	11	16	13	19	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.2%	16.9%	24.6%	20.0%	29.2%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	4	5	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	1	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	46	62	134	118	234	594
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.7%	10.4%	22.6%	19.9%	39.4%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.878(a)	20	.206
Likelihood Ratio	29.601	20	.077
Linear-by-Linear Association	.516	1	.472
N of Valid Cases	594		

**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	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	9	10	42	60	136	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.5%	3.9%	16.3%	23.3%	52.9%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	1	10	36	47	98	192	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.5%	5.2%	18.8%	24.5%	51.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	4	15	15	33	69	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.9%	5.8%	21.7%	21.7%	47.8%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	2	6	18	13	27	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.0%	9.1%	27.3%	19.7%	40.9%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	2	7	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	1	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	33.3%	.0%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	14	31	111	138	302	596
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.3%	5.2%	18.6%	23.2%	50.7%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.284(a)	20	.325
Likelihood Ratio	23.128	20	.283
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.195	1	.138
N of Valid Cases	596		

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

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

			Availability of job opportunities:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	13	18	48	67	110	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.1%	7.0%	18.8%	26.2%	43.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	10	7	31	51	92	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.2%	3.7%	16.2%	26.7%	48.2%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	3	10	15	37	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.0%	4.5%	14.9%	22.4%	55.2%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	5	18	13	27	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	7.6%	27.3%	19.7%	40.9%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	1	2	6	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	11.1%	22.2%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	0	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	28	33	110	148	273	592
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.7%	5.6%	18.6%	25.0%	46.1%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.738(a)	20	.605
Likelihood Ratio	18.026	20	.586
Linear-by-Linear Association	.405	1	.524
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: Managing growth:**

			Managing growth:					Total	
			1	2	3	4	5		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	12	18	34	57	136	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.7%	7.0%	13.2%	22.2%	52.9%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	5	17	33	51	84	190	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.6%	8.9%	17.4%	26.8%	44.2%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	6	15	10	35	68	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.9%	8.8%	22.1%	14.7%	51.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	4	20	8	31	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.0%	6.0%	29.9%	11.9%	46.3%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	1	3	4	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	0	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	23	45	105	129	291	593
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.9%	7.6%	17.7%	21.8%	49.1%	100.0%


**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.102(a)	20	.107
Likelihood Ratio	28.066	20	.108
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.712	1	.191
N of Valid Cases	593		

### 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	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Scenery/geography/climate	188	31.3	31.3	31.3
	Family/friends/friendly people	87	14.4	14.4	45.8
	Entertainment/social climate	80	13.3	13.3	59.1
	Quiet/peaceful	24	3.9	3.9	63.1
	Personal/family safety	27	4.5	4.5	67.5
	Job opportunities	90	15	15	82.5
	Education	19	3.2	3.2	85.7
	Growth	5	0.8	0.8	86.5
	Low taxes	17	2.8	2.8	89.3
	Strong economy	9	1.6	1.6	90.8
	Nothing	29	4.9	4.9	95.7
	DK/No answer	26	4.3	4.3	100
	Total	600	100	100	




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	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Traffic Congestion	99	16.5	16.5	16.5
Overcrowding/unplanned growth	125	20.8	20.8	37.3
Cost of living/housing	39	6.5	6.5	43.8
Road conditions	11	1.8	1.8	45.5
Crime/violence/gangs	135	22.5	22.5	68.1
Air quality	37	6.1	6.1	74.2
Drought conditions	24	3.9	3.9	78.1
Education	18	2.9	2.9	81
Gaming	20	3.4	3.4	84.4
Illegal immigration	10	1.7	1.7	86.2
Politics/political corruption	7	1.2	1.2	87.3
Yucca Mountain	6	1	1	88.3
Inadequate social services	8	1.4	1.4	89.7
Weather/heat	11	1.8	1.8	91.5
Job market	6	1.1	1.1	92.6
Nothing	39	6.5	6.5	99.1
DK/No answer	6	0.9	0.9	100
Total	600	100	100	




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	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
More affordable housing	35	5.9	5.9	5.9
Less traffic congestion	79	13.1	13.1	19
Improve K-12 education	74	12.4	12.4	31.3
Improve higher education	23	3.8	3.8	35.2
Better services for the homeless	20	3.3	3.3	38.5
More efficient government/government officials	54	9	9	47.4
Stop growth	55	9.1	9.1	56.6
Slow growth	71	11.8	11.8	68.4
Better jobs/training	18	3	3	71.3
Increased access to health care	26	4.4	4.4	75.7
Lower crime rates	79	13.2	13.2	88.9
Stop Yucca Mountain	40	6.7	6.7	95.6
Improve air quality	11	1.8	1.8	97.4
Stop illegal immigration	7	1.2	1.2	98.7
No change	5	0.8	0.8	99.5
DK/No answer	3	0.5	0.5	100
Total	600	100	100	




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	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Getting better	114	19.1	19.4	19.4
	Staying about the same	205	34.1	34.6	54
	Getting worse	272	45.3	46	100
	Total	591	98.6	100	
Missing	DK/No answer	9	1.4		
Total		600	100		



■ Getting better  
 ■ Staying about the same  
 ■ Getting worse

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

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

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

			Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest positive impact on your quality of life?										Total		
			Scenery/ geography/ climate	Family/friends /friendly people	Entertainment/ social climate	Quiet/ peaceful	Personal/ family safety	Job opportunities	Education	Growth	Low taxes	Strong economy	Nothing		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	90	40	29	11	11	35	6	3	8	2	12	247	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	36.4%	16.2%	11.7%	4.5%	4.5%	14.2%	2.4%	1.2%	3.2%	.8%	4.9%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	59	23	25	6	10	40	3	2	4	4	9	185	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	31.9%	12.4%	13.5%	3.2%	5.4%	21.6%	1.6%	1.1%	2.2%	2.2%	4.9%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	12	15	15	4	3	5	5	0	3	2	2	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	18.2%	22.7%	22.7%	6.1%	4.5%	7.6%	7.6%	.0%	4.5%	3.0%	3.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	24	8	9	3	3	7	4	0	2	0	6	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	36.4%	12.1%	13.6%	4.5%	4.5%	10.6%	6.1%	.0%	3.0%	.0%	9.1%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.3%	.0%	14.3%	.0%	.0%	28.6%	.0%	.0%	14.3%	28.6%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	187	87	79	24	27	90	18	5	18	10	29	574
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	32.6%	15.2%	13.8%	4.2%	4.7%	15.7%	3.1%	.9%	3.1%	1.7%	5.1%	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.)**

**Chi-Square Tests (cont.)**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	77.818(a)	50	.007
Likelihood Ratio	59.278	50	.173
Linear-by-Linear Association	.449	1	.503
N of Valid Cases	574		

**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	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	36	62	17	3	55	19	10	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.00%	24.00%	6.60%	1.20%	21.30%	7.40%	3.90%	2.70%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	32	45	11	5	46	12	7	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.80%	23.70%	5.80%	2.60%	24.20%	6.30%	3.70%	4.20%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	14	9	3	2	21	0	2	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.30%	13.00%	4.30%	2.90%	30.40%	0.00%	2.90%	4.30%
	City of Henderson	Count	16	9	6	1	12	4	4	0
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	24.20%	13.60%	9.10%	1.50%	18.20%	6.10%	6.10%	0.00%
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	0.00%	22.20%	0.00%	0.00%	22.20%	0.00%	0.00%
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Total	Count	98	125	39	11	135	37	23	18
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.50%	21.00%	6.60%	1.80%	22.70%	6.20%	3.90%	3.00%

**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.)**

			Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest negative impact on your quality of life?							Total	
			Gaming	Illegal immigration	Politics/political corruption	Yucca Mountain	Inadequate social services	Weather/heat	Job market		Nothing
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	12	7	3	1	5	5	2	14	258
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.70%	2.70%	1.20%	0.40%	1.90%	1.90%	0.80%	5.40%	100.00%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	5	2	2	3	1	2	2	7	190
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.60%	1.10%	1.10%	1.60%	0.50%	1.10%	1.10%	3.70%	100.00%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	6	69
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.30%	4.30%	4.30%	8.70%	100.00%
	City of Henderson	Count	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	6	66
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.50%	1.50%	3.00%	3.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.10%	100.00%
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	11.10%	0.00%	44.40%	100.00%
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.70%	100.00%
		Count	20	10	7	6	9	11	7	39	595
	Total	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.40%	1.70%	1.20%	1.00%	1.50%	1.80%	1.20%	6.60%	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	118.214(a)	75	.001
Likelihood Ratio	109.251	75	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.103	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	595		

**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 <b>one</b> major change locally to improve the quality of life in Clark County, what would it be?														Total	
			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	Improve air quality	Stop illegal immigration		No change
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	14	33	36	6	9	24	27	38	5	10	30	15	5	5	2	259
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.4%	12.7%	13.9%	2.3%	3.5%	9.3%	10.4%	14.7%	1.9%	3.9%	11.6%	5.8%	1.9%	1.9%	.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	7	25	19	14	6	20	17	19	10	10	31	11	2	1	0	192
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.6%	13.0%	9.9%	7.3%	3.1%	10.4%	8.9%	9.9%	5.2%	5.2%	16.1%	5.7%	1.0%	.5%	.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	7	9	12	0	5	4	2	4	0	4	8	7	4	0	2	68
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.3%	13.2%	17.6%	.0%	7.4%	5.9%	2.9%	5.9%	.0%	5.9%	11.8%	10.3%	5.9%	.0%	2.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	11	8	3	0	6	7	9	1	2	10	4	0	1	0	67
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.5%	16.4%	11.9%	4.5%	.0%	9.0%	10.4%	13.4%	1.5%	3.0%	14.9%	6.0%	.0%	1.5%	.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	35	78	75	23	20	54	55	70	18	26	79	40	11	7	6	597
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.9%	13.1%	12.6%	3.9%	3.4%	9.0%	9.2%	11.7%	3.0%	4.4%	13.2%	6.7%	1.8%	1.2%	1.0%	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	169.818(a)	70	.000
Likelihood Ratio	111.330	70	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.579	1	.032
N of Valid Cases	597		

**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?**

			Overall would you say the quality of life in Clark County is getting better, worse, or staying the same?			Total	
			Getting better	Staying about the same	Getting worse		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	44	78	133	255	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.3%	30.6%	52.2%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	38	76	78	192	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.8%	39.6%	40.6%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	17	24	25	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.8%	36.4%	37.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	13	23	31	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.4%	34.3%	46.3%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	3	4	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	1	1	2	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	113	205	273	591
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.1%	34.7%	46.2%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.739(a)	10	.378
Likelihood Ratio	11.958	10	.288
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.401	1	.237
N of Valid Cases	591		

**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	593	587	584	585	591
	Missing	7	13	16	15	9
Mean		2.06	1.74	2.43	1.85	1.3
Std. Error of Mean		0.029	0.029	0.032	0.026	0.019
Median		2	2	2	2	1
Mode		2	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.714	0.711	0.781	0.631	0.459
Variance		0.51	0.506	0.61	0.398	0.211
Skewness		-0.09	0.415	0.052	0.126	0.873
Std. Error of Skewness		0.1	0.101	0.101	0.101	0.101
Kurtosis		-1.032	-0.96	-0.403	-0.555	-1.242
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.2	0.201	0.202	0.202	0.201
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
Better	134	22.5
About the same	289	48.8
Worse	170	28.7
DK/No answer	7	1.1
Total	600	100




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

## Appendix IV General Economic Conditions

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Better	242	40.4
	About the same	252	42.0
	Worse	92	15.4
	DK/No answer	13	2.2
	Total	600	100.0




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
Excellent	62	10.6
Good	255	43.6
Fair	223	38.1
Poor	44	7.6
DK/No answer	16	2.6
Total	600	100




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
Better	166	28.3
About the same	340	58.1
Worse	80	13.6
DK/No answer	15	2.5
Total	600	100




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
Valid	Good time	413	68.9
	Bad time	177	29.6
	DK/No answer	9	1.5
	Total	600	100.0



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

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		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	259	253	251	252	256
	Missing	2	7	9	8	4
Mean		2.09	1.8	2.45	1.86	1.33
Std. Error of Mean		0.045	0.046	0.053	0.04	0.03
Median		2	2	2	2	1
Mode		2	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.728	0.736	0.835	0.637	0.473
Variance		0.53	0.542	0.697	0.406	0.224
Skewness		-0.135	0.334	0.054	0.127	0.705
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.153	0.154	0.153	0.152
Kurtosis		-1.097	-1.095	-0.549	-0.574	-1.515
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.302	0.305	0.306	0.306	0.303
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**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		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	191	191	189	189	192
	Missing	2	2	4	4	1
Mean		2.09	1.69	2.43	1.89	1.28
Std. Error of Mean		0.05	0.049	0.056	0.044	0.032
Median		2	2	2	2	1
Mode		2	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.686	0.67	0.771	0.602	0.45
Variance		0.47	0.449	0.594	0.363	0.202
Skewness		-0.114	0.466	-0.089	0.049	0.994
Std. Error of Skewness		0.176	0.176	0.177	0.177	0.175
Kurtosis		-0.859	-0.761	-0.406	-0.28	-1.023
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.35	0.35	0.352	0.352	0.349
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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		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	68	68	67	67	68
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.99	1.57	2.23	1.73	1.3
Std. Error of Mean		0.093	0.081	0.094	0.084	0.056
Median		2	1	2	2	1
Mode		2	1	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.763	0.67	0.769	0.688	0.462
Variance		0.583	0.449	0.591	0.473	0.214
Skewness		0.017	0.777	0.208	0.402	0.884
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.291	0.292	0.292	0.291
Kurtosis		-1.262	-0.476	-0.235	-0.824	-1.257
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.575	0.577	0.577	0.575
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**

<b>City of Henderson</b>		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	65	64	65	66	65
	Missing	2	2	1	0	2
Mean		2.06	1.88	2.53	1.84	1.27
Std. Error of Mean		0.083	0.097	0.075	0.082	0.056
Median		2	2	2	2	1
Mode		2	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.668	0.774	0.603	0.664	0.447
Variance		0.446	0.599	0.364	0.441	0.2
Skewness		-0.071	0.209	0.657	0.183	1.065
Std. Error of Skewness		0.298	0.299	0.297	0.295	0.298
Kurtosis		-0.692	-1.287	-0.484	-0.702	-0.895
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.588	0.591	0.586	0.582	0.588
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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		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	7	7	7	7
	Missing	2	2	2	2	2
Mean		1.41	1.63	2.35	1.84	1.07
Std. Error of Mean		0.248	0.195	0.243	0.156	0.108
Median		1	2	2	2	1
Mode		1	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.661	0.52	0.647	0.401	0.279
Variance		0.436	0.271	0.419	0.161	0.078
Skewness		1.542	-0.709	1.946	-2.409	4.413
Std. Error of Skewness		0.789	0.789	0.789	0.811	0.811
Kurtosis		2.577	-2.263	4.491	5.418	25.48
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.575	1.575	1.575	1.637	1.637
Range		2	1	2	1	1
Minimum		1	1	2	1	1
Maximum		3	2	4	2	2

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

<b>Mesquite</b>		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	4	4	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.48	2	2.52	1.88	1
Std. Error of Mean		0.293	0	0.293	0.191	0
Median		1.43	2	2.57	2	1
Mode		1	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.579	0	0.579	0.378	0
Variance		0.336	0	0.336	0.143	0
Skewness		0.127		-0.127	-4.126	
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		1	0	1	1	0
Minimum		1	2	2	1	1
Maximum		2	2	3	2	1

**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
Respondent Jurisdiction		Better	About the same	Worse	
Unincorporated Clark County	Count	58	120	81	259
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.40%	46.30%	31.30%	100.00%
City of Las Vegas	Count	37	100	54	191
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.40%	52.40%	28.30%	100.00%
City of North Las Vegas	Count	20	29	19	68
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	29.40%	42.60%	27.90%	100.00%
City of Henderson	Count	12	36	16	64
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	18.80%	56.30%	25.00%	100.00%
Boulder City	Count	5	2	0	7
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	71.40%	28.60%	0.00%	100.00%
Mesquite	Count	2	2	0	4
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	Count	134	289	170	593
Total	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.60%	48.70%	28.70%	100.00%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.172(a)	10	0.052
Likelihood Ratio	18.294	10	0.05
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.875	1	0.049
N of Valid Cases	593		

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

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

		Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse, or about the same?			Total
Respondent Jurisdiction		Better	About the same	Worse	
Unincorporated Clark County	Count	99	107	48	254
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	39.00%	42.10%	18.90%	100.00%
City of Las Vegas	Count	82	87	22	191
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.90%	45.50%	11.50%	100.00%
City of North Las Vegas	Count	36	25	7	68
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	52.90%	36.80%	10.30%	100.00%
City of Henderson	Count	23	25	16	64
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	35.90%	39.10%	25.00%	100.00%
Boulder City	Count	3	4	0	7
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.90%	57.10%	0.00%	100.00%
Mesquite	Count	0	4	0	4
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>588</b>
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	41.30%	42.90%	15.80%	100.00%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.544(a)	10	0.034
Likelihood Ratio	21.752	10	0.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.113	1	0.737
N of Valid Cases	588		

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

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

		Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?				Total
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction						
Unincorporated Clark County	Count	31	103	93	26	253
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.30%	40.70%	36.80%	10.30%	100.00%
City of Las Vegas	Count	21	77	79	12	189
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.10%	40.70%	41.80%	6.30%	100.00%
City of North Las Vegas	Count	10	34	20	3	67
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.90%	50.70%	29.90%	4.50%	100.00%
City of Henderson	Count	0	34	28	4	66
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	51.50%	42.40%	6.10%	100.00%
Boulder City	Count	0	5	2	0	7
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	71.40%	28.60%	0.00%	100.00%
Mesquite	Count	0	2	2	0	4
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	Count	62	255	224	45	586
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.60%	43.50%	38.20%	7.70%	100.00%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.167(a)	15	0.132
Likelihood Ratio	29.769	15	0.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.051	1	0.822
N of Valid Cases	586		

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

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

		And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?			Total
		Better	About the same	Worse	
Respondent Jurisdiction					
Unincorporated Clark County	Count	71	145	36	252
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	28.20%	57.50%	14.30%	100.00%
City of Las Vegas	Count	46	118	25	189
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	24.30%	62.40%	13.20%	100.00%
City of North Las Vegas	Count	27	31	9	67
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.30%	46.30%	13.40%	100.00%
City of Henderson	Count	20	36	10	66
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	30.30%	54.50%	15.20%	100.00%
Boulder City	Count	1	6	0	7
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.30%	85.70%	0.00%	100.00%
Mesquite	Count	0	3	0	3
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	Count	165	339	80	584
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	28.30%	58.00%	13.70%	100.00%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.676(a)	10	0.307
Likelihood Ratio	13.466	10	0.199
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.287	1	0.592
N of Valid Cases	584		

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

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

		Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?		Total
		Good time	Bad time	
Respondent Jurisdiction				
Unincorporated Clark County	Count	170	86	256
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	66.40%	33.60%	100.00%
City of Las Vegas	Count	138	54	192
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	71.90%	28.10%	100.00%
City of North Las Vegas	Count	47	20	67
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	70.10%	29.90%	100.00%
City of Henderson	Count	47	17	64
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	73.40%	26.60%	100.00%
Boulder City	Count	6	0	6
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Mesquite	Count	4	0	4
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Total	Count	412	177	589
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	69.90%	30.10%	100.00%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.535(a)	5	0.258
Likelihood Ratio	9.369	5	0.095
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.895	1	0.048
N of Valid Cases	589		

**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	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	593	589	585	586	593	586	588	592	594
	Missing	7	10	15	14	7	14	12	8	6
Mean		1.84	2.36	1.12	1.57	2.57	1.95	1.79	1.09	1.14
Std. Error of Mean		0.035	0.027	0.018	0.031	0.026	0.037	0.034	0.016	0.017
Median		2	2	1	1	3	2	2	1	1
Mode		1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.851	0.645	0.423	0.753	0.645	0.887	0.834	0.39	0.42
Skewness		0.304	-0.515	3.626	0.891	-1.199	0.103	0.411	4.483	3.036
Std. Error of Skewness		0.1	0.101	0.101	0.101	0.1	0.101	0.101	0.1	0.1
Kurtosis		-1.555	-0.673	12.292	-0.685	0.259	-1.723	-1.442	18.719	8.812
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.2	0.201	0.202	0.202	0.2	0.202	0.201	0.201	0.2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

## Appendix V Property Value Conditions

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

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



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

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		Amusement 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	256	257	254	254	257	257	256	256	258
	Missing	4	4	6	7	3	4	4	4	2
Mean		1.91	2.42	1.12	1.6	2.62	1.96	1.72	1.08	1.15
Std. Error of Mean		0.053	0.042	0.027	0.049	0.039	0.055	0.051	0.024	0.028
Median		2	3	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
Mode		1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.854	0.665	0.435	0.787	0.631	0.874	0.818	0.378	0.453
Skewness		0.181	-0.733	3.775	0.83	-1.419	0.072	0.553	4.793	3.046
Std. Error of Skewness		0.152	0.152	0.153	0.153	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152
Kurtosis		-1.608	-0.547	13.074	-0.889	0.825	-1.693	-1.289	21.485	8.569
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.303	0.303	0.304	0.305	0.303	0.303	0.303	0.303	0.302
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sum		488	622	283	407	673	504	440	276	297

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		<b>Amusement Park</b>	<b>Day care center</b>	<b>Landfill</b>	<b>Non-polluting manufacturing facility</b>	<b>Public school</b>	<b>Highway/Freeway</b>	<b>Hotel-casino</b>	<b>Polluting manufacturing facility</b>	<b>High-level nuclear waste transportation route</b>
N	Valid	192	189	189	190	193	190	190	191	192
	Missing	1	4	4	3	0	2	3	2	1
Mean		1.77	2.27	1.09	1.53	2.49	2.02	1.91	1.1	1.14
Std. Error of Mean		0.06	0.045	0.026	0.053	0.048	0.064	0.061	0.03	0.029
Median		2	2	1	1	3	2	2	1	1
Mode		1	2	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.834	0.622	0.352	0.723	0.665	0.887	0.84	0.411	0.402
Skewness		0.46	-0.265	4.183	0.972	-0.947	-0.036	0.178	4.241	3.046
Std. Error of Skewness		0.175	0.177	0.177	0.177	0.175	0.176	0.177	0.176	0.175
Kurtosis		-1.412	-0.622	17.717	-0.439	-0.257	-1.736	-1.563	16.662	9.111
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.349	0.351	0.352	0.351	0.349	0.35	0.351	0.35	0.349
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sum		339	431	206	291	479	384	361	209	218

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		Amusement 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	68	67	65	68	68	64	68	68	68
	Missing	0	1	3	0	0	4	0	0	0
Mean		2.08	2.52	1.21	1.59	2.67	1.73	1.91	1.15	1.11
Std. Error of Mean		0.113	0.076	0.068	0.095	0.071	0.118	0.111	0.061	0.047
Median		2	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Mode		3	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.932	0.617	0.544	0.786	0.586	0.942	0.915	0.506	0.385
Skewness		-0.153	-0.928	2.604	0.865	-1.647	0.565	0.187	3.316	3.634
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.294	0.298	0.291	0.291	0.299	0.291	0.291	0.291
Kurtosis		-1.863	-0.116	5.685	-0.82	1.735	-1.663	-1.807	9.622	13.497
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.58	0.587	0.575	0.575	0.59	0.575	0.575	0.575
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sum		140	168	78	108	181	111	129	78	75

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

<b>City of Henderson</b>		Amusement 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	66	66	66	64	66	63	64	66	65
	Missing	0	0	0	2	0	3	2	0	1
Mean		1.62	2.25	1.14	1.57	2.45	1.89	1.61	1.04	1.17
Std. Error of Mean		0.093	0.076	0.052	0.086	0.085	0.109	0.093	0.03	0.05
Median		1	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
Mode		1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.756	0.617	0.426	0.691	0.688	0.865	0.745	0.24	0.4
Skewness		0.78	-0.209	3.31	0.8	-0.853	0.213	0.777	6.022	2.121
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.295	0.295	0.299	0.295	0.3	0.299	0.295	0.297
Kurtosis		-0.811	-0.534	10.788	-0.519	-0.442	-1.644	-0.768	40.236	3.637
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.582	0.582	0.59	0.582	0.593	0.591	0.582	0.586
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sum		107	149	75	101	162	120	103	69	76

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

<b>Boulder City</b>		Amusement 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	7	6	7	7	7	7
	Missing	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
Mean		1.41	2	1.07	1.26	3	1.89	1.5	1	1.07
Std. Error of Mean		0.248	0.241	0.101	0.232	0	0.389	0.335	0	0.101
Median		1	2	1	1	3	1.77	1	1	1
Mode		1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.661	0.619	0.268	0.617	0	1.036	0.894	0	0.268
Skewness		1.542	0	4.503	2.646		0.274	1.474		4.503
Std. Error of Skewness		0.789	0.811	0.789	0.789	0.872	0.789	0.789	0.789	0.789
Kurtosis		2.577	2.187	25.799	8.859		-2.698	0.409		25.799
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.575	1.637	1.575	1.575	1.833	1.575	1.575	1.575	1.575
Range		2	2	1	2	0	2	2	0	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	2
Sum		10	13	8	9	17	13	11	7	8

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction**

<b>Mesquite</b>		Amusement 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	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.12	2.48	1.24	1.36	2.48	2	1.88	1	1
Std. Error of Mean		0.346	0.293	0.382	0.403	0.293	0.408	0.346	0	0
Median		2	2.43	1	1	2.43	2	2	1	1
Mode		2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.683	0.579	0.755	0.797	0.579	0.805	0.683	0	0
Skewness		-0.058	0.127	4.126	2.87	0.127	0	0.058		
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		2	1	2	2	1	2	2	0	0
Minimum		1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1
Sum		8	10	5	5	10	8	7	4	4

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation**

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

			Amusement Park:			Total
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	106	68	82	256
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	41.4%	26.6%	32.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	94	49	49	192
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	49.0%	25.5%	25.5%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	27	9	32	68
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	39.7%	13.2%	47.1%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	36	19	11	66
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	54.5%	28.8%	16.7%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	5	2	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	71.4%	28.6%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	268	149	175	592
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	45.3%	25.2%	29.6%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.467(a)	10	.003
Likelihood Ratio	29.489	10	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.506	1	.113
N of Valid Cases	592		

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation**

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

			Day care center:			Total	
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	25	97	134	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.8%	37.9%	52.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	18	102	70	190	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.5%	53.7%	36.8%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	23	39	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.1%	34.8%	59.1%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	6	37	23	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.1%	56.1%	34.8%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	1	4	1	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	2	2	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	54	265	269	588
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.2%	45.1%	45.7%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.680(a)	10	.012
Likelihood Ratio	23.403	10	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.843	1	.175
N of Valid Cases	588		

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation**

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

			Landfill:			Total	
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	235	8	11	254	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	92.5%	3.1%	4.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	176	9	4	189	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	93.1%	4.8%	2.1%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	56	5	4	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	86.2%	7.7%	6.2%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	59	5	2	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	89.4%	7.6%	3.0%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	7	0	0	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	3	0	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	536	27	21	584
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	91.8%	4.6%	3.6%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.756(a)	10	.653
Likelihood Ratio	8.278	10	.602
Linear-by-Linear Association	.120	1	.729
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 effect, 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 effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	148	57	48	253	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	58.5%	22.5%	19.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	114	50	26	190	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	60.0%	26.3%	13.7%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	40	15	12	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	59.7%	22.4%	17.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	35	22	7	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	54.7%	34.4%	10.9%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	6	1	0	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	85.7%	14.3%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	3	0	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	346	145	93	584
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	59.2%	24.8%	15.9%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.046(a)	10	.354
Likelihood Ratio	13.028	10	.222
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.591	1	.207
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: Public school**

			Public school:			Total	
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	21	57	179	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.2%	22.2%	69.6%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	18	62	113	193	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.3%	32.1%	58.5%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	14	50	68	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.9%	20.6%	73.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	7	22	37	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.6%	33.3%	56.1%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	6	6	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	2	2	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	50	157	387	594
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.4%	26.4%	65.2%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.482(a)	10	.115
Likelihood Ratio	17.585	10	.062
Linear-by-Linear Association	.573	1	.449
N of Valid Cases	594		

## Appendix V Property Value Conditions Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

			Highway/Freeway:			Total	
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	103	61	93	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.1%	23.7%	36.2%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	73	41	76	190	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	38.4%	21.6%	40.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	39	4	22	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	60.0%	6.2%	33.8%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	27	16	20	63	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.9%	25.4%	31.7%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	4	0	3	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	57.1%	.0%	42.9%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	1	2	1	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	247	124	215	586
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	42.2%	21.2%	36.7%	100.0%

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.158(a)	10	.038
Likelihood Ratio	22.328	10	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.189	1	.275
N of Valid Cases	586		

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation**

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

			Hotel-casino:			Total	
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	131	65	60	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	51.2%	25.4%	23.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	76	55	59	190	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.0%	28.9%	31.1%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	31	11	25	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	46.3%	16.4%	37.3%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	35	19	10	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	54.7%	29.7%	15.6%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	5	0	2	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	71.4%	.0%	28.6%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	1	2	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	279	152	156	587
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	47.5%	25.9%	26.6%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.772(a)	10	.023
Likelihood Ratio	23.228	10	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	.031	1	.860
N of Valid Cases	587		

**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 effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	245	2	9	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	95.7%	.8%	3.5%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	180	3	8	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	94.2%	1.6%	4.2%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	62	2	4	68	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	91.2%	2.9%	5.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	64	2	0	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	97.0%	3.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	7	0	0	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	4	0	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	562	9	21	592
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	94.9%	1.5%	3.5%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.167(a)	10	.710
Likelihood Ratio	9.661	10	.471
Linear-by-Linear Association	.178	1	.673
N of Valid Cases	592		

**Appendix V**  
**Property Value Conditions**  
**Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation**

Respondent Jurisdiction: \* For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no effect, 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 effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	228	20	10	258	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	88.4%	7.8%	3.9%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	170	18	4	192	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	88.5%	9.4%	2.1%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	62	5	2	69	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	89.9%	7.2%	2.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	54	10	0	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	84.4%	15.6%	.0%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	7	0	0	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	4	0	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	525	53	16	594
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	88.4%	8.9%	2.7%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.798(a)	10	.551
Likelihood Ratio	11.093	10	.350
Linear-by-Linear Association	.457	1	.499
N of Valid Cases	594		

**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	589	597	590	599
	Missing	10	2	9	0
Mean		2.68	1.52	2.95	2.82
Std. Error of Mean		.035	.030	.038	.031
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		.852	.721	.931	.758
Skewness		-.114	1.535	-.436	-.033
Std. Error of Skewness		.101	.100	.101	.100
Kurtosis		-.634	2.450	-.797	-.623
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.201	.200	.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
Valid	Excellent	48	8
	Good	197	32.9
	Fair	243	40.5
	Poor	101	16.9
	DK/No answer	10	1.7
Total		600	100

Preserving Natural Areas



Excellent
  Good
  Fair
  Poor


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
Valid	Very concerned	349	58.3
	Somewhat concerned	205	34.2
	Somewhat unconcerned	23	3.9
	Not concerned	19	3.2
	DK/No answer	2	0.4
	Total	600	100

Drought




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
Valid	Excellent	42	7.1
	Good	144	24
	Fair	206	34.3
	Poor	199	33.1
	DK/No answer	9	1.5
	Total	600	100

Drinking Water




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
Valid	Excellent	15	2.4
	Good	190	31.6
	Fair	281	46.9
	Poor	114	19
	DK/No answer	0	0.1
	Total	600	100

Air Quality



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

**Appendix VI**  
**Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings**  
**Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction**

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		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	253	260	260	260
	Missing	7	0	0	0
Mean		2.73	1.50	2.87	2.86
Std. Error of Mean		.053	.045	.059	.049
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		.843	.729	.946	.785
Skewness		-.263	1.526	-.346	-.118
Std. Error of Skewness		.153	.151	.151	.151
Kurtosis		-.483	2.149	-.870	-.652
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.305	.301	.301	.301
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**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		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	190	191	185	193
	Missing	3	2	8	0
Mean		2.65	1.54	2.84	2.72
Std. Error of Mean		.062	.050	.069	.053
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		.856	.697	.935	.739
Skewness		-.069	1.540	-.289	.223
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.176	.179	.175
Kurtosis		-.645	3.102	-.878	-.694
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.351	.350	.355	.349
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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		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	67	68	68	68
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.58	1.60	3.31	2.90
Std. Error of Mean		.108	.096	.097	.077
Median		2.34	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		.885	.789	.802	.636
Skewness		.121	1.540	-1.014	-.303
Std. Error of Skewness		.292	.291	.291	.291
Kurtosis		-.733	2.512	.511	.556
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.577	.575	.575	.575
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**

<b>Henderson</b>		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	66	66	65	66
	Missing	0	0	1	0
Mean		2.65	1.43	3.17	2.82
Std. Error of Mean		.105	.086	.108	.094
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		.856	.696	.870	.761
Skewness		.047	1.770	-.794	-.208
Std. Error of Skewness		.295	.295	.297	.295
Kurtosis		-.690	3.230	-.122	-.247
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.582	.582	.586	.582
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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		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	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.59	1.53	3.00	3.46
Std. Error of Mean		.304	.281	.328	.256
Median		2.19	1.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		2	1	2(a)	4
Std. Deviation		.894	.826	.965	.751
Skewness		.426	1.258	.000	-1.146
Std. Error of Skewness		.729	.729	.729	.729
Kurtosis		-.263	.097	-2.286	.350
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		3	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	2	2
Maximum		4	3	4	4

**Appendix VI**  
**Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings**  
**Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction**

<b>Mesquite</b>		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	4	4	4	N
	Missing	0	0	0	
Mean		2.52	1.52	3.28	2.79
Std. Error of Mean		.411	.293	.564	.575
Median		3.00	1.57	4.00	2.20
Mode		3	2	4	2
Std. Deviation		.812	.579	1.114	1.135
Skewness		-1.975	-.127	-1.020	.742
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		2	1	2	2
Minimum		1	1	2	2
Maximum		3	2	4	4

**Appendix VI**  
**Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

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

			How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?				Total	
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	20	72	116	45	253	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.9%	28.5%	45.8%	17.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	16	67	76	32	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.4%	35.1%	39.8%	16.8%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	28	22	12	68	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.8%	41.2%	32.4%	17.6%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	5	26	24	12	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.5%	38.8%	35.8%	17.9%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	4	2	2	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	2	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	47	198	242	103	590
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.0%	33.6%	41.0%	17.5%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.506(a)	15	.787
Likelihood Ratio	11.857	15	.690
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.099	1	.294
N of Valid Cases	590		

**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	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	159	79	15	7	260	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	61.2%	30.4%	5.8%	2.7%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	104	78	2	7	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	54.5%	40.8%	1.0%	3.7%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	36	27	2	4	69	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	52.2%	39.1%	2.9%	5.8%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	44	18	3	2	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	65.7%	26.9%	4.5%	3.0%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	6	2	2	0	10	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	2	2	0	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	351	206	24	20	601
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	58.4%	34.3%	4.0%	3.3%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.106(a)	15	.082
Likelihood Ratio	21.911	15	.110
Linear-by-Linear Association	.057	1	.812
N of Valid Cases	601		

**Appendix VI**  
**Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

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

			In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?				Total	
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	22	69	90	79	260	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.5%	26.5%	34.6%	30.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	15	52	65	53	185	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.1%	28.1%	35.1%	28.6%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	8	25	33	68	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.9%	11.8%	36.8%	48.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	10	24	28	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.6%	15.4%	36.9%	43.1%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	4	2	4	10	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	2	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	42	144	206	199	591
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.1%	24.4%	34.9%	33.7%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.650(a)	15	.055
Likelihood Ratio	27.582	15	.024
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.738	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	591		

**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	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	8	78	118	57	261	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.1%	29.9%	45.2%	21.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	3	76	84	30	193	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.6%	39.4%	43.5%	15.5%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	14	43	9	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.5%	20.9%	64.2%	13.4%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	2	19	34	11	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.0%	28.8%	51.5%	16.7%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	1	2	5	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	12.5%	25.0%	62.5%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	2	0	2	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	14	190	281	114	599
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.3%	31.7%	46.9%	19.0%	100.0%


**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	31.026(a)	15	.009
Likelihood Ratio	29.795	15	.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	.484	1	.487
N of Valid Cases	599		

## 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
Valid	Water quality	65	10.8
	Water availability	202	33.6
	Air quality	71	11.8
	Preservation of natural areas/wildlife	21	3.5
	Development of open space	12	2.1
	Overpopulation	183	30.5
	Litter	24	4
	Yucca Mountain	5	0.9
	Traffic Congestion	3	0.5
	Energy Efficiency	7	1.2
	DK/No answer	7	1.2
	Total	600	100



**Appendix VI**  
**Environmental Considerations Perception Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

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

			In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?									Total		
			Water quality	Water availability	Air quality	Preservation of natural areas/wildlife	Development of open space	Overpopulation	Litter	Yucca Mountain	Traffic Congestion		Energy Efficiency	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	30	86	24	11	4	85	8	3	2	4	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.7%	33.5%	9.3%	4.3%	1.6%	33.1%	3.1%	1.2%	.8%	1.6%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	17	60	26	6	4	64	10	2	0	2	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.9%	31.4%	13.6%	3.1%	2.1%	33.5%	5.2%	1.0%	.0%	1.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	23	10	1	0	23	3	0	0	2	68	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.8%	33.8%	14.7%	1.5%	.0%	33.8%	4.4%	.0%	.0%	2.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	11	29	8	2	4	9	2	0	0	0	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.9%	44.6%	12.3%	3.1%	6.2%	13.8%	3.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	1	3	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.1%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	22.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	25.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	65	202	71	22	12	182	25	5	2	8	594
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.9%	34.0%	12.0%	3.7%	2.0%	30.6%	4.2%	.8%	.3%	1.3%	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	70.240(a)	45	.009
Likelihood Ratio	57.169	45	.105
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.792	1	.029
N of Valid Cases	594		

**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 about seismic, 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	591	590	582	590	585	583	587	586	594
	Missing	9	9	17	10	14	17	12	13	6
Mean		4.26	4.32	4.12	4.28	3.89	3.85	3.85	3.99	4.22
Std. Error of Mean		0.047	0.047	0.051	0.043	0.049	0.05	0.05	0.047	0.048
Median		5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.139	1.132	1.225	1.032	1.194	1.213	1.203	1.132	1.169
Skewness		-1.515	-1.675	-1.229	-1.447	-0.863	-0.856	-0.896	-0.989	-1.41
Std. Error of Skewness		0.101	0.101	0.101	0.101	0.101	0.101	0.101	0.101	0.1
Kurtosis		1.381	1.84	0.375	1.417	-0.158	-0.214	-0.034	0.207	0.967
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.201	0.201	0.202	0.201	0.202	0.202	0.201	0.201	0.2
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

## Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	31	5.1
	Two	22	3.7
	Three	76	12.7
	Four	97	16.3
	Five	365	60.8
	DK/No answer	9	1.4
	Total	600	100

Keeping Local Decision Makers Up to Date About Yucca Mountain



One
  Two
  Three
  Four
  Five


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

## Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	30	5.1
	Two	23	3.9
	Three	60	10.1
	Four	89	14.9
	Five	387	64.6
	DK/No answer	9	1.5
	Total	600	100

Keeping Public Up to Date About Yucca Mountain




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

## Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	35	5.8
	Two	40	6.7
	Three	78	13.1
	Four	100	16.6
	Five	330	55
	DK/No answer	17	2.9
	Total	600	100

Reviewing Technical, Scientific Studies About Seismic, Vulcanology, Geology, and Hydrology





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

## Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	17	2.8
	Two	26	4.4
	Three	75	12.6
	Four	127	21.1
	Five	345	57.5
	DK/No answer	10	1.6
	Total	600	100

Identify Public Safety Needs and Impacts




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

## Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	34	5.7
	Two	41	6.8
	Three	124	20.7
	Four	142	23.7
	Five	244	40.7
	DK/No answer	14	2.4
	Total	600	100

Asses Other Government Impacts




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

## Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	38	6.3
	Two	48	8
	Three	109	18.2
	Four	159	26.5
	Five	229	38.2
	DK/No answer	17	2.8
	Total	600	100

Assess Impacts on the Tourism Sector




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

## Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	42	7
	Two	32	5.4
	Three	125	20.9
	Four	158	26.4
	Five	230	38.3
	DK/No answer	12	2
	Total	600	100

Assess Impacts to the Building, Construction, and Development Sectors




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

## Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	27	4.5
	Two	36	6
	Three	110	18.4
	Four	159	26.5
	Five	255	42.5
	DK/No answer	13	2.2
	Total	600	100

Identify Transportation Impacts



One
  Two
  Three
  Four
  Five


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

## Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	31	5.2
	Two	29	4.8
	Three	81	13.5
	Four	90	15
	Five	363	60.5
	DK/No answer	6	1
	Total	600	100

Provide Information to the Public on All Facts of Yucca Mountain



One
  Two
  Three
  Four
  Five

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

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies about 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	258	257	256	259	254	254	258	255	259
	Missing	2	4	4	2	6	6	3	5	1
Mean		4.22	4.28	4.05	4.19	3.83	3.85	3.83	3.97	4.20
Std. Error of Mean		.075	.076	.077	.067	.077	.077	.076	.070	.074
Median		5.00	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		1.209	1.211	1.231	1.082	1.233	1.225	1.219	1.110	1.188
Skewness		-1.520	-1.708	-1.155	-1.357	-.866	-.886	-.872	-.975	-1.444
Std. Error of Skewness		.152	.152	.152	.151	.153	.153	.152	.152	.151
Kurtosis		1.246	1.853	.282	1.250	-.100	-.136	-.096	.322	1.081
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.302	.303	.303	.302	.304	.304	.302	.304	.302
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**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies about 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	192	191	185	189	189	187	189	190	190
	Missing	1	2	8	4	4	6	4	3	3
Mean		4.29	4.33	4.18	4.32	3.96	3.86	3.94	4.03	4.19
Std. Error of Mean		.080	.080	.088	.075	.088	.083	.082	.082	.085
Median		5.00	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		1.110	1.108	1.201	1.026	1.212	1.136	1.123	1.125	1.168
Skewness		-1.610	-1.580	-1.324	-1.500	-.900	-.782	-.999	-1.028	-1.273
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.176	.178	.177	.177	.178	.177	.176	.176
Kurtosis		1.812	1.474	.620	1.492	-.278	-.147	.480	.245	.525
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.349	.350	.355	.352	.351	.353	.352	.351	.351
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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies about 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	63	64	64	64	64	64	64	63	67
	Missing	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	1
Mean		4.25	4.26	4.00	4.43	3.89	3.68	3.79	3.95	4.20
Std. Error of Mean		.139	.124	.173	.123	.136	.172	.167	.142	.143
Median		5.00	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		1.099	.991	1.387	.987	1.087	1.380	1.334	1.128	1.166
Skewness		-1.288	-1.181	-1.048	-1.489	-.631	-.649	-.823	-.770	-1.343
Std. Error of Skewness		.302	.299	.299	.299	.299	.299	.299	.302	.293
Kurtosis		.655	.254	-.323	.817	-.728	-.900	-.532	-.392	.851
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.595	.590	.590	.590	.590	.590	.590	.595	.579
Range		4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Henderson</b>		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies about 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	66	66	65	66	66	65	65	66	66
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Mean		4.21	4.39	4.24	4.38	3.90	3.87	3.70	3.85	4.27
Std. Error of Mean		.125	.134	.134	.108	.139	.154	.153	.154	.142
Median		5.00	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		1.014	1.087	1.083	.881	1.132	1.241	1.232	1.255	1.158
Skewness		-1.167	-1.856	-1.310	-1.581	-.870	-.968	-.672	-.966	-1.606
Std. Error of Skewness		.295	.295	.297	.295	.295	.297	.297	.295	.295
Kurtosis		.643	2.616	.803	2.304	.115	-.135	-.446	.013	1.785
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.582	.582	.586	.582	.582	.586	.586	.582	.582
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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies about 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	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.78	5.00	4.62	4.60	4.15	4.25	4.37	4.71	5.00
Std. Error of Mean		.329	.000	.399	.342	.361	.332	.341	.203	.000
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.82	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.965	.000	1.173	1.005	1.031	.975	1.002	.595	.000
Skewness		-4.806		-3.203	-3.691	-2.276	-2.701	-2.898	-2.238	
Std. Error of Skewness		.729	.729	.729	.729	.746	.729	.729	.729	.729
Kurtosis		27.642		11.184	18.152	9.300	12.602	13.171	5.775	
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.467	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		4	0	4	4	4	4	4	2	0
Minimum		1	5	1	1	1	1	1	3	5
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

<b>Mesquite</b>		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies about 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	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.45	4.76	4.45	3.96	3.96	4.04	3.90	4.31	4.31
Std. Error of Mean		.526	.382	.882	.595	.595	.898	.927	.875	.875
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.20	4.81	4.61	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.038	.755	1.634	1.103	1.103	1.662	1.716	1.620	1.620
Skewness		-1.765	-4.126	-4.262	.163	.163	-2.571	-1.863	-3.790	-3.790
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.108	1.108	1.108	1.108	1.108	1.108	1.108
Range		2	2	4	2	2	4	4	4	4
Minimum		3	3	1	3	3	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

			Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain:					Total
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	18	9	30	41	160	258
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.0%	3.5%	11.6%	15.9%	62.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	6	24	33	120	192
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.7%	3.1%	12.5%	17.2%	62.5%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	4	10	9	38	63
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.2%	6.3%	15.9%	14.3%	60.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	4	11	15	35	66
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	1.5%	6.1%	16.7%	22.7%	53.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	0	8	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	0	3	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	75.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	30	23	76	98	364	591
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.1%	3.9%	12.9%	16.6%	61.6%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.918(a)	20	.658
Likelihood Ratio	20.666	20	.417
Linear-by-Linear Association	.426	1	.514
N of Valid Cases	591		

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

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

			Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain:					Total	
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	21	3	26	40	167	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.2%	1.2%	10.1%	15.6%	65.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	7	11	22	24	127	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.7%	5.8%	11.5%	12.6%	66.5%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	6	6	16	36	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	9.4%	9.4%	25.0%	56.3%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	3	6	9	46	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	4.5%	9.0%	13.4%	68.7%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	0	9	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	3	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	31	23	60	89	388	591
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.2%	3.9%	10.2%	15.1%	65.7%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.057(a)	20	.033
Likelihood Ratio	39.352	20	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.858	1	.173
N of Valid Cases	591		

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

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

			Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology:					Total	
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	17	16	39	52	133	257	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.6%	6.2%	15.2%	20.2%	51.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	14	22	30	110	185	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.9%	7.6%	11.9%	16.2%	59.5%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	6	10	5	38	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.2%	9.2%	15.4%	7.7%	58.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	2	5	9	12	38	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.0%	7.6%	13.6%	18.2%	57.6%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	0	8	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	3	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	34	41	80	99	330	584
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.8%	7.0%	13.7%	17.0%	56.5%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.402(a)	20	.496
Likelihood Ratio	24.234	20	.232
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.534	1	.111
N of Valid Cases	584		

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

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Identify public safety needs and impacts:**

		Identify public safety needs and impacts:					Total	
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	7	41	59	139	257
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.3%	2.7%	16.0%	23.0%	54.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	4	10	21	38	115	188
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.1%	5.3%	11.2%	20.2%	61.2%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	5	7	7	45	64
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	7.8%	10.9%	10.9%	70.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	0	4	4	21	37	66
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	6.1%	6.1%	31.8%	56.1%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	2	7	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	0	1	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>		<b>Count</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>587</b>
		<b>% within Respondent Jurisdiction</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>12.8%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>58.6%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.389(a)	20	.018
Likelihood Ratio	38.039	20	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.441	1	.064
N of Valid Cases	587		

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

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Assess other government impacts:**

			Assess other government impacts:					Total	
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	21	10	62	60	101	254	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.3%	3.9%	24.4%	23.6%	39.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	18	35	38	90	190	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.7%	9.5%	18.4%	20.0%	47.4%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	9	10	21	23	63	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	14.3%	15.9%	33.3%	36.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	4	15	19	25	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	6.1%	22.7%	28.8%	37.9%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	4	3	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	0	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	33	41	124	142	243	583
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.7%	7.0%	21.3%	24.4%	41.7%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.774(a)	20	.016
Likelihood Ratio	39.850	20	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	.761	1	.383
N of Valid Cases	583		

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

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Assess impacts on the tourism sector:**

			Assess impacts on the tourism sector:					Total	
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	18	17	51	66	102	254	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.1%	6.7%	20.1%	26.0%	40.2%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	8	14	43	52	70	187	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.3%	7.5%	23.0%	27.8%	37.4%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	9	9	14	25	63	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.5%	14.3%	14.3%	22.2%	39.7%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	8	6	22	25	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.2%	12.3%	9.2%	33.8%	38.5%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	5	4	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	2	2	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	36	48	109	159	228	580
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.2%	8.3%	18.8%	27.4%	39.3%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.086(a)	20	.239
Likelihood Ratio	27.141	20	.131
Linear-by-Linear Association	.231	1	.631
N of Valid Cases	580		

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

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

			Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors:					Total	
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	20	14	56	68	100	258	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.8%	5.4%	21.7%	26.4%	38.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	11	5	43	54	75	188	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.9%	2.7%	22.9%	28.7%	39.9%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	7	9	15	27	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.4%	10.9%	14.1%	23.4%	42.2%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	5	6	15	17	22	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.7%	9.2%	23.1%	26.2%	33.8%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	4	5	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	0	2	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	42	32	124	158	231	587
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.2%	5.5%	21.1%	26.9%	39.4%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.766(a)	20	.537
Likelihood Ratio	22.357	20	.321
Linear-by-Linear Association	.029	1	.865
N of Valid Cases	587		

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

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Identify transportation impacts:**

			Identify transportation impacts:					Total	
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	12	13	53	73	105	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.7%	5.1%	20.7%	28.5%	41.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	7	13	32	50	87	189	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.7%	6.9%	16.9%	26.5%	46.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	6	13	15	27	63	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.2%	9.5%	20.6%	23.8%	42.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	6	4	12	18	26	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.1%	6.1%	18.2%	27.3%	39.4%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	2	7	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	2	2	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	27	36	110	158	254	585
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.6%	6.2%	18.8%	27.0%	43.4%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.424(a)	20	.752
Likelihood Ratio	17.638	20	.611
Linear-by-Linear Association	.126	1	.723
N of Valid Cases	585		

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

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

			Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain:					Total	
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	16	11	33	44	155	259	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.2%	4.2%	12.7%	17.0%	59.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	8	13	29	26	115	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.2%	6.8%	15.2%	13.6%	60.2%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	4	10	10	40	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	6.0%	14.9%	14.9%	59.7%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	1	10	9	42	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.1%	1.5%	15.2%	13.6%	63.6%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	0	0	9	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	2	2	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	31	29	82	89	363	594
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.2%	4.9%	13.8%	15.0%	61.1%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.184(a)	20	.869
Likelihood Ratio	17.405	20	.627
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.462	1	.227
N of Valid Cases	594		

**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?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	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.
N	Valid	584	578	580
	Missing	15	21	20
Mean		1.77	3.04	2.62
Std. Error of Mean		0.017	0.039	0.027
Median		2	3	3
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		0.419	0.931	0.642
Skewness		-1.308	-0.537	-1.438
Std. Error of Skewness		0.101	0.102	0.101
Kurtosis		-0.29	-0.786	0.814
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.202	0.203	0.203
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	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	132	22.1	22.1	22.1
	Oppose	452	75.3	75.3	97.4
	DK/No answer	15	2.6	2.6	100
	Total	600	100	100	

If Given the Opportunity to Vote on Yucca Mountain, Would Your Vote Support or Oppose Locating a Nuclear Waste Repository at Yucca Mountain




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 public's safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	35	5.8	5.8	5.8
	Agree	134	22.3	22.3	28.1
	Disagree	181	30.2	30.2	58.3
	Strongly disagree	229	38.2	38.2	96.5
	DK/No answer	21	3.5	3.5	100
	Total	600	100	100	

Do You Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree  
With this Claim?



■ Strongly agree ■ Agree ■ Disagree ■ Strongly disagree


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	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Positive effect	51	8.5	8.5	8.5
	No effect	121	20.2	20.2	28.6
	Negative effect	408	68.1	68.1	96.7
	DK/No answer	20	3.3	3.3	100
	Total	600	100	100	

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.



Positive effect
  No effect
  Negative effect

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

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

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	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.
N	Valid	249	252	252
	Missing	11	8	8
Mean		1.78	3.08	2.62
Std. Error of Mean		.026	.059	.041
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.415	.931	.644
Skewness		-1.359	-.558	-1.443
Std. Error of Skewness		.154	.153	.153
Kurtosis		-.156	-.831	.830
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.307	.306	.305
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**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	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.
N	Valid	190	187	190
	Missing	3	6	3
Mean		1.79	3.01	2.58
Std. Error of Mean		.030	.070	.049
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.410	.954	.676
Skewness		-1.421	-.555	-1.341
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.177	.176
Kurtosis		.020	-.750	.453
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.351	.353	.351
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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	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.
N	Valid	67	62	62
	Missing	1	5	6
Mean		1.73	2.87	2.72
Std. Error of Mean		.055	.120	.071
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		.447	.944	.558
Skewness		-1.066	-.368	-1.911
Std. Error of Skewness		.294	.303	.304
Kurtosis		-.892	-.800	2.775
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.580	.598	.600
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**

<b>Henderson</b>		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	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.
N	Valid	66	65	65
	Missing	0	2	2
Mean		1.73	3.12	2.59
Std. Error of Mean		.055	.112	.078
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.445	.899	.626
Skewness		-1.090	-.504	-1.259
Std. Error of Skewness		.296	.298	.298
Kurtosis		-.839	-.957	.529
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.584	.588	.588
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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the public's safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	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.
N	Valid	9	9	7
	Missing	0	0	2
Mean		1.82	3.34	3.00
Std. Error of Mean		.138	.172	.000
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		.406	.504	.000
Skewness		-2.068	.823	
Std. Error of Skewness		.729	.729	.789
Kurtosis		2.912	-1.821	
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.575
Range		1	1	0
Minimum		1	3	3
Maximum		2	4	3

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

<b>Mesquite</b>		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The 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?	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.
N	Valid	4	3	4
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		1.88	3.14	2.52
Std. Error of Mean		.191	.402	.411
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		.378	.744	.812
Skewness		-4.126	-.220	-1.975
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.108	1.028
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?**

			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?		Total	
			Support	Oppose		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	55	195	250	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.0%	78.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	40	150	190	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	21.1%	78.9%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	18	49	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	26.9%	73.1%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	17	48	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	26.2%	73.8%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	2	7	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	3	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	132	452	584
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.6%	77.4%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.354(a)	5	.798
Likelihood Ratio	2.976	5	.704
Linear-by-Linear Association	.307	1	.579
N of Valid Cases	584		

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

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

			The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?				Total	
			Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	13	60	72	107	252	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.2%	23.8%	28.6%	42.5%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	14	41	60	72	187	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.5%	21.9%	32.1%	38.5%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	16	22	19	62	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.1%	25.8%	35.5%	30.6%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	2	16	18	28	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.1%	25.0%	28.1%	43.8%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	6	3	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	34	133	180	230	577
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.9%	23.1%	31.2%	39.9%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.522(a)	15	.486
Likelihood Ratio	16.966	15	.321
Linear-by-Linear Association	.008	1	.930
N of Valid Cases	577		

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

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

			Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative effect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.			Total	
			Positive effect	No effect	Negative effect		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	22	52	178	252	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.7%	20.6%	70.6%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	20	39	131	190	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.5%	20.5%	68.9%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	11	48	62	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.8%	17.7%	77.4%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	5	17	43	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.7%	26.2%	66.2%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	7	7	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	2	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	50	120	409	579
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.6%	20.7%	70.6%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.157(a)	10	.711
Likelihood Ratio	9.420	10	.493
Linear-by-Linear Association	.413	1	.521
N of Valid Cases	579		

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures**


The U.S. Department of Energy plans to submit a license application in order to gain approval for the storage of high level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain. If the State of Nevada, Clark County, and other local governments in Nevada want to formally oppose the storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain by participating in government hearings, it may cost millions of dollars over a period of several years to do so. I am going to read you four statements. After I finish with each statement, please tell me, on a scale of one to five, where one means “I strongly disagree” and five means “I strongly agree”, how much you disagree or agree with each statement.

		The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for the purpose of Yucca Mountain oversight activities.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is partially funded by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>but I do not support the use of any local taxpayer dollars to do so.</u>
N	Valid	582	580	580	579
	Missing	18	20	20	20
Mean		3.24	2.82	3.05	3.21
Std. Error of Mean		.063	.066	.065	.067
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		5	1	1	5
Std. Deviation		1.519	1.598	1.568	1.621
Skewness		-.281	.169	-.104	-.190
Std. Error of Skewness		.101	.101	.101	.102
Kurtosis		-1.327	-1.526	-1.493	-1.564
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.202	.203	.203	.203
Range		4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures**

**The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application hearings, even if it means participation is funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for the purpose of Yucca Mountain oversight activities.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One	132	22.1	22.1	22.1
	Two	42	7.1	7.1	29.1
	Three	137	22.8	22.8	51.9
	Four	93	15.4	15.4	67.4
	Five	178	29.6	29.6	97
	DK/No answer	18	3	3	100
	Total	600	100	100	




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

**Appendix VII  
Yucca Mountain Considerations  
Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures**

**The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, even if it means participation is funded only by local taxpayer dollars.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One	194	32.3	32.3	32.3
	Two	73	12.3	12.3	44.6
	Three	100	16.7	16.7	61.2
	Four	67	11.2	11.2	72.5
	Five	145	24.2	24.2	96.7
	DK/No answer	20	3.3	3.3	100
	Total	600	100	100	




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

**Appendix VII  
Yucca Mountain Considerations  
Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures**

**The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, even if it means participation is partially funded by local taxpayer dollars.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One	163	27.1	27.1	27.1
	Two	53	8.9	8.9	36
	Three	111	18.5	18.5	54.5
	Four	97	16.2	16.2	70.7
	Five	156	26	26	96.7
	DK/No answer	20	3.3	3.3	100
	Total	600	100	100	




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

**Appendix VII  
Yucca Mountain Considerations  
Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures**

**The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, but I do not support the use of any local taxpayer dollars to do so.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	One	143	23.9	23.9	23.9
	Two	74	12.4	12.4	36.3
	Three	85	14.3	14.3	50.5
	Four	69	11.5	11.5	62
	Five	208	34.6	34.6	96.6
	DK/No answer	20	3.4	3.4	100
	Total	600	100	100	



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

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for the purpose of Yucca Mountain oversight activities.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is partially funded by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>but I do not support the use of any local taxpayer dollars to do so.</u>
N	Valid	254	252	252	256
	Missing	7	8	8	4
Mean		3.27	2.79	3.01	3.24
Std. Error of Mean		.094	.101	.100	.103
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.65
Mode		5	1	1	5
Std. Deviation		1.498	1.606	1.594	1.654
Skewness		-.369	.174	-.088	-.238
Std. Error of Skewness		.153	.153	.153	.152
Kurtosis		-1.234	-1.531	-1.540	-1.593
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.305	.305	.305	.303
Range		4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>		The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for the purpose of Yucca Mountain oversight activities.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is partially funded by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>but I do not support the use of any local taxpayer dollars to do so.</u>
N	Valid	191	188	188	188
	Missing	2	5	4	5
Mean		3.28	2.86	3.11	3.32
Std. Error of Mean		.112	.118	.116	.113
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		5	1	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.552	1.627	1.587	1.547
Skewness		-.277	.159	-.105	-.278
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.177	.177	.177
Kurtosis		-1.418	-1.587	-1.527	-1.422
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.350	.352	.352	.353
Range		4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for the purpose of Yucca Mountain oversight activities.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is partially funded by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>but I do not support the use of any local taxpayer dollars to do so.</u>
N	Valid	64	64	64	62
	Missing	4	4	4	5
Mean		3.33	2.77	3.15	2.82
Std. Error of Mean		.185	.205	.185	.209
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		5	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		1.475	1.637	1.482	1.653
Skewness		-.254	.222	-.261	.224
Std. Error of Skewness		.300	.300	.300	.303
Kurtosis		-1.216	-1.590	-1.283	-1.586
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.591	.591	.591	.598
Range		4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>Henderson</b>		The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for the purpose of Yucca Mountain oversight activities.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is partially funded by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>but I do not support the use of any local taxpayer dollars to do so.</u>
N	Valid	61	62	62	61
	Missing	5	4	4	5
Mean		2.76	2.81	2.86	3.27
Std. Error of Mean		.191	.187	.187	.206
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.80
Mode		1	1	1	5
Std. Deviation		1.489	1.477	1.476	1.608
Skewness		.129	.207	.018	-.205
Std. Error of Skewness		.307	.303	.303	.307
Kurtosis		-1.309	-1.270	-1.391	-1.608
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.605	.598	.598	.605
Range		4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>Boulder City</b>		The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application hearings, even if <u>it means participation is funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for the purpose of Yucca Mountain oversight activities.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, even if <u>it means participation is funded only by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, even if <u>it means participation is partially funded by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, but I <u>do not support the use of any local taxpayer dollars to do so.</u>
N	Valid	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.54	3.48	4.05	2.56
Std. Error of Mean		.281	.461	.487	.638
Median		5.00	4.00	5.00	1.65
Mode		5	4	5	1
Std. Deviation		.826	1.354	1.430	1.873
Skewness		-1.538	-.719	-1.152	.536
Std. Error of Skewness		.729	.729	.729	.729
Kurtosis		.893	-.184	-.055	-1.861
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		2	4	4	4
Minimum		3	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>Mesquite</b>		The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for the purpose of Yucca Mountain oversight activities.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is partially funded by local taxpayer dollars.</u>	The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>but I do not support the use of any local taxpayer dollars to do so.</u>
N	Valid	4	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.69	2.21	2.33	2.93
Std. Error of Mean		.964	.998	.875	.981
Median		2.91	1.00	1.91	3.46
Mode		1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		1.904	1.970	1.728	1.937
Skewness		.524	1.518	.930	-.155
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application hearings, even if it means participation is funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for the purpose of Yucca Mountain oversight activities.**

		The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by dollars provided to local and/or state government specifically for the purpose of Yucca Mountain oversight activities.</u>							
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	58	12	60	51	73	254	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.8%	4.7%	23.6%	20.1%	28.7%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	41	22	35	29	64	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	21.5%	11.5%	18.3%	15.2%	33.5%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	11	5	21	4	22	63	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	17.5%	7.9%	33.3%	6.3%	34.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	20	3	19	7	11	60	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.3%	5.0%	31.7%	11.7%	18.3%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	2	1	6	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	22.2%	11.1%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	2	0	0	0	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	66.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	132	42	137	92	177	580
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.8%	7.2%	23.6%	15.9%	30.5%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.744(a)	20	.005
Likelihood Ratio	42.439	20	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	.880	1	.348
N of Valid Cases	580		

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, even if it means participation is funded only by local taxpayer dollars.**

				The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is funded only by local taxpayer dollars.</u>					
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	90	24	47	29	61	251	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	35.9%	9.6%	18.7%	11.6%	24.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	60	30	25	21	52	188	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	31.9%	16.0%	13.3%	11.2%	27.7%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	23	8	9	8	16	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	35.9%	12.5%	14.1%	12.5%	25.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	17	9	17	6	13	62	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	27.4%	14.5%	27.4%	9.7%	21.0%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	1	1	2	3	2	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.1%	11.1%	22.2%	33.3%	22.2%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	2	0	0	0	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	66.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	193	72	100	67	145	577
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.4%	12.5%	17.3%	11.6%	25.1%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.913(a)	20	.463
Likelihood Ratio	19.821	20	.469
Linear-by-Linear Association	.160	1	.689
N of Valid Cases	577		

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, even if it means participation is partially funded by local taxpayer dollars.**

		The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>even if it means participation is partially funded by local taxpayer dollars.</u>					Total		
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five			
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	79	17	46	45	65	252	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	31.3%	6.7%	18.3%	17.9%	25.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	48	24	34	25	58	189	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.4%	12.7%	18.0%	13.2%	30.7%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	15	5	15	14	15	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	23.4%	7.8%	23.4%	21.9%	23.4%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	18	7	13	13	11	62	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	29.0%	11.3%	21.0%	21.0%	17.7%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	1	2	0	6	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	11.1%	22.2%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	2	0	1	0	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	162	54	111	97	155	579
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	28.0%	9.3%	19.2%	16.8%	26.8%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.975(a)	20	.136
Likelihood Ratio	30.592	20	.061
Linear-by-Linear Association	.075	1	.785
N of Valid Cases	579		

**Appendix VII**  
**Yucca Mountain Considerations**  
**Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, but I do not support the use of any local taxpayer dollars to do so.**

				The storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain is an important issue for Clark County, and I believe Clark County should formally participate in the Yucca Mountain license application government hearings, <u>but I do not support the use of any local taxpayer dollars to do so.</u>					
				One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	67	28	33	32	96	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	26.2%	10.9%	12.9%	12.5%	37.5%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	37	25	35	23	68	188	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.7%	13.3%	18.6%	12.2%	36.2%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	21	9	10	4	18	62	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.9%	14.5%	16.1%	6.5%	29.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	12	12	6	8	22	60	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.0%	20.0%	10.0%	13.3%	36.7%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	4	0	2	0	3	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	44.4%	.0%	22.2%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	2	0	0	1	1	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	143	74	86	68	208	579
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	24.7%	12.8%	14.9%	11.7%	35.9%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.206(a)	20	.385
Likelihood Ratio	23.809	20	.251
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.067	1	.302
N of Valid Cases	579		


**Appendix VIII**  
**Community Profile**

## Appendix VIII Community Profile

**What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?**

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Car-Drive alone	474	79.0
	Car-Carpool with others	77	12.8
	CAT bus (or paratransit)	22	3.7
	MAX transit	9	1.6
	Motorcycle	2	.3
	Walk	14	2.3
	DK/No answer	2	.3
	Total	600	100.0

What is Your Most Frequently Used Mode of Transportation?



<span style="color: blue;">■</span> Car-Drive alone	<span style="color: maroon;">■</span> Car-Carpool with others	<span style="color: yellow;">■</span> CAT bus (or paratransit)
<span style="color: cyan;">■</span> MAX transit	<span style="color: purple;">■</span> Motorcycle	<span style="color: red;">■</span> Walk


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

## Appendix VIII Community Profile

**Do you currently commute on a daily basis?**

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Yes	336	56.0
	No	263	43.9
	DK/No answer	1	.2
	Total	600	100.0

Do You Currently Commute on a Daily Basis?



Yes
  No

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

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

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

			What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?						Total	
			Car-Drive alone	Car-Carpool with others	CAT bus (or paratransit)	MAX transit	Motorcycle	Walk		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	209	28	14	2	0	9	262	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	79.8%	10.7%	5.3%	.8%	.0%	3.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	158	23	2	3	0	5	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	82.7%	12.0%	1.0%	1.6%	.0%	2.6%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	46	12	5	4	0	0	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	68.7%	17.9%	7.5%	6.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	54	8	2	0	1	0	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	83.1%	12.3%	3.1%	.0%	1.5%	.0%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	3	5	0	0	0	0	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	37.5%	62.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	474	76	23	9	1	14	597
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	79.4%	12.7%	3.9%	1.5%	.2%	2.3%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	53.937(a)	25	.001
Likelihood Ratio	45.610	25	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	.430	1	.512
N of Valid Cases	597		

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

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

			Do you currently commute on a daily basis?		Total	
			Yes	No		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	140	121	261	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	53.6%	46.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	109	84	193	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	56.5%	43.5%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	46	21	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	68.7%	31.3%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	36	30	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	54.5%	45.5%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	4	4	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	3	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	335	263	598
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	56.0%	44.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.956(a)	5	.111
Likelihood Ratio	10.205	5	.070
Linear-by-Linear Association	.119	1	.730
N of Valid Cases	598		

## **Appendix IX**

### **Local Government Interaction**

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction General Impressions**  
**Summary Statistics**


		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?
N	Valid	592	596	218	594	598	238
	Missing	8	4	382	6	2	362
Mean		2.99	1.63	3.60	2.71	1.75	3.63
Std. Error of Mean		.039	.020	.091	.054	.018	.047
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		.942	.482	1.345	1.307	.435	1.144
Skewness		-.409	-.559	-.734	.159	-1.141	-.557
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.165	.100	.100	.101
Kurtosis		-.017	-1.694	-.667	-1.072	-.700	-.305
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.201	.200	.328	.200	.200	.202
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	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
Valid	One	54	9
	Two	86	14.3
	Three	284	47.4
	Four	150	25
	Five	18	3.1
	DK/No answer	8	1.3
	Total	600	100

What is Your Impression of Clark County Government?



■ One 
 ■ Two 
 ■ Three 
 ■ Four 
 ■ Five


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
Valid	Yes	218	36.3
	No	378	63
	DK/No answer	4	0.7
	Total	600	100

Have You Ever Inquired About or Accessed Services from Clark County?





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
Valid	Weekly	27	12.4
	Monthly	22	10.3
	4 to 6 times a year	28	12.9
	1 to 3 times a year	74	33.8
	Less than once a year	67	30.6
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	

How Often Do You Interact with Clark County Government?




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”, how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	149	24.8
	Two	109	18.1
	Three	166	27.6
	Four	108	18
	Five	63	10.5
	DK/No answer	6	1
	Total	600	100




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
Valid	Yes	151	25.2
	No	447	74.5
	DK/No answer	2	0.3
	Total	600	100

Do You Know Who Your County Commissioner Is?




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
Valid	One	38	6.3
	Two	41	6.9
	Three	180	30
	Four	165	27.5
	Five	158	26.3
	DK/No answer	18	3
	Total	600	100

How Satisfied Are You with Recreational Opportunities and Other Events Offered By Clark County?



One
  Two
  Three
  Four
  Five

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

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction General Impressions**  
**Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?
N	Valid	255	259	104	256	260	252
	Missing	5	1	157	4	0	8
Mean		2.88	1.60	3.44	2.57	1.75	3.60
Std. Error of Mean		.063	.031	.136	.083	.027	.071
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	1	2	3
Std. Deviation		1.007	.491	1.387	1.321	.431	1.131
Skewness		-.262	-.409	-.562	.278	-1.188	-.419
Std. Error of Skewness		.152	.151	.237	.152	.151	.153
Kurtosis		-.390	-1.847	-.969	-1.119	-.594	-.471
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.304	.302	.470	.303	.301	.306
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	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 government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?
N	Valid	191	191	65	191	193	186
	Missing	2	2	128	2	0	7
Mean		3.07	1.66	3.53	2.81	1.73	3.65
Std. Error of Mean		.063	.034	.177	.095	.032	.082
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		.876	.475	1.434	1.309	.447	1.122
Skewness		-.507	-.676	-.699	.059	-1.027	-.577
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.176	.297	.176	.175	.178
Kurtosis		.558	-1.559	-.897	-1.085	-.956	-.212
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.350	.350	.585	.350	.349	.354
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction General Impressions**  
**Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?
N	Valid	68	67	18	68	67	64
	Missing	0	1	50	0	1	4
Mean		3.16	1.73	3.69	2.86	1.71	3.49
Std. Error of Mean		.104	.055	.287	.157	.056	.147
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		.857	.449	1.224	1.293	.457	1.174
Skewness		-.224	-1.044	-.865	-.075	-.954	-.538
Std. Error of Skewness		.291	.294	.534	.291	.294	.299
Kurtosis		.380	-.940	.270	-.915	-1.125	-.246
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.575	.580	1.034	.575	.580	.590
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction General Impressions**  
**Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>Henderson</b>		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?
N	Valid	66	66	27	66	66	66
	Missing	0	0	40	0	0	0
Mean		2.95	1.60	4.24	2.87	1.84	3.83
Std. Error of Mean		.116	.061	.149	.154	.046	.142
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	5	3	2	4
Std. Deviation		.941	.494	.767	1.252	.373	1.151
Skewness		-.623	-.408	-.452	.247	-1.856	-1.044
Std. Error of Skewness		.295	.295	.451	.295	.295	.295
Kurtosis		-.187	-1.892	-1.111	-.799	1.489	.636
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.582	.582	.878	.582	.582	.582
Range		4	1	2	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	3	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction General Impressions**  
**Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>Boulder City</b>		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?
N	Valid	8	9	3	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	6	0	0	0
Mean		3.20	1.64	3.80	1.93	1.54	3.11
Std. Error of Mean		.266	.173	.945	.312	.181	.570
Median		3.00	2.00	4.49	2.00	1.82	3.80
Mode		3	2	5	1	2	1(a)
Std. Deviation		.761	.510	1.658	.918	.530	1.676
Skewness		-1.580	-.731	-1.074	.161	-.179	-.348
Std. Error of Skewness		.746	.729	1.198	.729	.729	.729
Kurtosis		7.056	-2.008		-2.012	-2.668	-1.737
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.467	1.428		1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		3	1	3	2	1	4
Minimum		1	1	2	1	1	1
Maximum		4	2	5	3	2	5

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction General Impressions**  
**Jurisdictional Summary Statistics**

<b>Mesquite</b>		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?
N	Valid	3	4	1	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	3	0	0	0
Mean		3.55	1.72	5.00	3.12	1.88	3.84
Std. Error of Mean		.463	.263		.672	.191	.543
Median		3.21	2.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	3.91
Mode		3	2	5	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		.858	.519		1.328	.378	1.072
Skewness		1.863	-1.765		-.419	-4.126	.557
Std. Error of Skewness		1.108	1.028		1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		2	1	0	4	1	2
Minimum		3	1	5	1	1	3
Maximum		5	2	5	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?

			On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?					Total	
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	31	46	111	59	9	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.1%	18.0%	43.4%	23.0%	3.5%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	13	21	102	49	6	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.8%	11.0%	53.4%	25.7%	3.1%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	9	34	19	3	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.0%	13.4%	50.7%	28.4%	4.5%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	7	10	30	19	0	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.6%	15.2%	45.5%	28.8%	.0%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	5	3	0	8	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	62.5%	37.5%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	1	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	53	86	284	150	18	591
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.0%	14.6%	48.1%	25.4%	3.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.745(a)	20	.412
Likelihood Ratio	26.240	20	.158
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.368	1	.066
N of Valid Cases	591		

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

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

			Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?		Total	
			Yes	No		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	104	155	259	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.2%	59.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	65	126	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	34.0%	66.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	18	48	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	27.3%	72.7%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	27	40	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	40.3%	59.7%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	3	6	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	1	3	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	218	378	596
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	36.6%	63.4%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.097(a)	5	.404
Likelihood Ratio	5.205	5	.391
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.009	1	.315
N of Valid Cases	596		

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

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

			How often do you interact with Clark County government?					Total	
			Weekly	Monthly	4 to 6 times a year	1 to 3 times a year	Less than once a year		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	15	13	14	34	27	103	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.6%	12.6%	13.6%	33.0%	26.2%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	10	7	5	23	20	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.4%	10.8%	7.7%	35.4%	30.8%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	1	4	6	5	18	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.1%	5.6%	22.2%	33.3%	27.8%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	0	0	5	10	11	26	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	19.2%	38.5%	42.3%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	1	0	0	2	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	1	1	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	27	22	28	73	66	216
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.5%	10.2%	13.0%	33.8%	30.6%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.115(a)	20	.451
Likelihood Ratio	26.777	20	.142
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.198	1	.007
N of Valid Cases	216		

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

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

		Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals “Not at all knowledgeable” and five equals “very knowledgeable”, how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?							
		One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	76	50	60	47	23	256	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	29.7%	19.5%	23.4%	18.4%	9.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	43	33	54	39	22	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.5%	17.3%	28.3%	20.4%	11.5%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	16	6	26	12	8	68	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	23.5%	8.8%	38.2%	17.6%	11.8%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	10	17	21	8	10	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.2%	25.8%	31.8%	12.1%	15.2%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	4	2	3	0	0	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	44.4%	22.2%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	2	1	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	149	108	166	107	63	593
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.1%	18.2%	28.0%	18.0%	10.6%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.555(a)	20	.120
Likelihood Ratio	31.698	20	.047
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.043	1	.153
N of Valid Cases	593		

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

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

			Do you know who your County Commissioner is?		Total	
			Yes	No		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	64	196	260	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	24.6%	75.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	53	140	193	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	27.5%	72.5%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	19	47	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	28.8%	71.2%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	11	55	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	4	5	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	3	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	151	446	597
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.3%	74.7%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.332(a)	5	.275
Likelihood Ratio	7.091	5	.214
Linear-by-Linear Association	.198	1	.657
N of Valid Cases	597		

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

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

				On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?						
				One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count		13	22	85	63	69	252	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction		5.2%	8.7%	33.7%	25.0%	27.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count		11	13	57	56	50	187	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction		5.9%	7.0%	30.5%	29.9%	26.7%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count		6	4	21	19	14	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction		9.4%	6.3%	32.8%	29.7%	21.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count		5	2	13	24	21	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction		7.7%	3.1%	20.0%	36.9%	32.3%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count		3	0	1	3	2	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction		33.3%	.0%	11.1%	33.3%	22.2%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count		0	0	2	0	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction		.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Total		Count		38	41	179	165	157	580
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction		6.6%	7.1%	30.9%	28.4%	27.1%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.062(a)	20	.164
Likelihood Ratio	23.643	20	.258
Linear-by-Linear Association	.085	1	.771
N of Valid Cases	580		


**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	203	212	213	212	214	215	214	216	216
	Missing	396	388	386	387	385	385	385	383	383
Mean		3.22	2.18	2.24	2.12	2.10	2.16	2.24	2.09	3.15
Std. Error of Mean		.083	.045	.043	.043	.042	.043	.043	.036	.085
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		1.176	.654	.635	.627	.612	.623	.626	.531	1.253
Skewness		-.382	-.206	-.255	-.093	-.056	-.124	-.230	.089	-.315
Std. Error of Skewness		.171	.167	.167	.167	.166	.166	.166	.165	.165
Kurtosis		-.493	-.701	-.649	-.487	-.348	-.501	-.609	.472	-.781
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.340	.333	.332	.332	.331	.330	.331	.329	.329
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
Valid	One	25	11.5
	Two	19	8.6
	Three	74	33.8
	Four	57	26.4
	Five	28	13
	DK/No answer	15	6.8
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	



One
  Two
  Three
  Four
  Five


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
Valid	Exceeded expectations	29	13.4
	Met expectations	115	52.6
	Did not meet expectations	68	31.2
	DK/No answer	6	2.8
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	

Employee Cared About and Understood My Needs



■ Exceeded expectations  
 ■ Met expectations  
 ■ Did not meet expectations


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
Valid	Exceeded expectations	23	10.6
	Met expectations	115	52.8
	Did not meet expectations	75	34.5
	DK/No answer	5	2.1
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	

Service Delivery Was Timely and Responsive



■ Exceeded expectations  
 ■ Met expectations  
 ■ Did not meet expectations


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
Valid	Exceeded expectations	30	14
	Met expectations	126	57.9
	Did not meet expectations	56	25.6
	DK/No answer	6	2.5
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	

Employee Was Able to Assist Me or Direct Me to an Appropriate Source



■ Exceeded expectations  
 ■ Met expectations  
 ■ Did not meet expectations


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
Valid	Exceeded expectations	30	13.9
	Met expectations	132	60.8
	Did not meet expectations	52	23.7
	DK/No answer	4	1.6
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	

Employee Was Qualified, Knowledgeable, and Well Informed



■ Exceeded expectations 
 ■ Met expectations 
 ■ Did not meet expectations


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
Valid	Exceeded expectations	27	12.5
	Met expectations	126	58
	Did not meet expectations	61	28.2
	DK/No answer	3	1.4
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	

Transaction was Handled in an Appropriate Manner



■ Exceeded expectations  
 ■ Met expectations  
 ■ Did not meet expectations


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
Valid	Exceeded expectations	22	10.1
	Met expectations	118	54.2
	Did not meet expectations	74	34.1
	DK/No answer	4	1.6
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	

Policies and Processes Were Easy to Follow and/or Clearly Explained



■ Exceeded expectations  
 ■ Met expectations  
 ■ Did not meet expectations


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
Valid	Exceeded expectations	22	10
	Met expectations	154	70.6
	Did not meet expectations	41	18.7
	DK/No answer	2	0.7
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	

Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)



■ Exceeded expectations ■ Met expectations ■ Did not meet expectations


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
Valid	One	34	15.5
	Two	22	10
	Three	71	32.5
	Four	58	26.6
	Five	32	14.7
	DK/No answer	2	0.7
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	

How Would You Rate Your Overall Customer Experience with Clark County Government?



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

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Summary**

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>		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	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid
	Missing	161	160	160	159	159	158	160	158	158
Mean		3.14	2.17	2.22	2.14	2.11	2.20	2.27	2.15	2.99
Std. Error of Mean		.123	.066	.063	.064	.062	.064	.062	.057	.130
Median		3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Std. Deviation		1.223	.659	.634	.647	.627	.642	.624	.578	1.315
Skewness		-.341	-.192	-.221	-.142	-.086	-.210	-.261	-.010	-.192
Std. Error of Skewness		.243	.241	.241	.240	.240	.239	.241	.239	.239
Kurtosis		-.540	-.703	-.603	-.609	-.449	-.626	-.606	-.106	-1.098
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.481	.477	.477	.475	.475	.474	.477	.474	.474
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**

<b>City of Las Vegas</b>	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	60	65	64	64	65	65	65	65
	Missing	133	128	129	129	128	128	128	128	
	Mean	3.19	2.18	2.25	2.13	2.13	2.20	2.25	2.08	3.18
	Std. Error of Mean	.158	.078	.074	.075	.074	.072	.079	.053	.163
	Median	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
	Mode	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
	Std. Deviation	1.219	.625	.593	.601	.594	.582	.635	.426	1.314
	Skewness	-.523	-.142	-.121	-.053	-.038	-.042	-.257	.470	-.300
	Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.298	.300	.300	.297	.297	.298	.297	.297
	Kurtosis	-.627	-.473	-.425	-.224	-.163	-.240	-.604	2.534	-.863
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	.610	.587	.592	.592	.585	.585	.587	.585	.585
	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**

<b>City of North Las Vegas</b>		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 ?
		Valid	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
	Missing	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Mean		3.29	2.52	2.55	2.20	2.22	2.25	2.29	1.97	3.14
Std. Error of Mean		.220	.156	.156	.181	.155	.158	.169	.133	.240
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	2(a)	2	2	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		.938	.665	.663	.772	.659	.672	.722	.569	1.022
Skewness		.586	-1.091	-1.236	-.368	-.257	-.343	-.511	-.017	.246
Std. Error of Skewness		.534	.534	.534	.534	.534	.534	.534	.534	.534
Kurtosis		-.215	.244	.576	-1.144	-.487	-.579	-.787	.769	.795
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034
Range		3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum		2	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**

<b>City of Henderson</b>		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 ?	
		Valid	22	24	27	25	25	25	27	27	27
		Missing	44	42	40	42	41	41	40	40	
Mean			3.54	1.98	2.07	1.96	1.92	1.88	2.10	2.05	3.71
Std. Error of Mean			.220	.135	.134	.113	.117	.108	.113	.104	.180
Median			4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode			4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Std. Deviation			1.034	.660	.689	.559	.588	.540	.581	.536	.930
Skewness			-.137	.020	-.087	-.024	.001	-.128	.009	.058	-.728
Std. Error of Skewness			.491	.472	.451	.467	.463	.463	.451	.451	.451
Kurtosis			-1.035	-.451	-.730	.688	.229	.684	.232	.976	1.571
Std. Error of Kurtosis			.953	.918	.878	.908	.901	.901	.878	.878	.878
Range			3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum			2	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**

<b>Boulder City</b>		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	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Mean		3.34	2.50	2.65	2.00	1.85	1.66	2.35	1.50	3.35
Std. Error of Mean		.505	.347	.331	.000	.249	.505	.331	.347	.331
Median		3.49	2.51	2.96	2.00	2.00	1.51	2.04	1.51	3.04
Mode		4	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	3
Std. Deviation		.887	.608	.581	.000	.438	.887	.581	.608	.581
Skewness		-1.483	-.030	-1.467		-4.528	1.483	1.467	-.030	1.467
Std. Error of Skewness		1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198
Range		2	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1
Minimum		2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	3
Maximum		4	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	4

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary**

<b>Mesquite</b>		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	Missing	Valid	Missing	Valid	Missing	Valid	Missing	Valid
	Valid	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Missing	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Mean		5.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	
Median		5.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	
Mode		5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	
Range		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Minimum		5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	
Maximum		5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

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

			On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?					Total	
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	16	5	41	23	14	99	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.2%	5.1%	41.4%	23.2%	14.1%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	6	17	22	6	60	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.0%	10.0%	28.3%	36.7%	10.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	0	3	9	3	3	18	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	0	4	6	8	4	22	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	18.2%	27.3%	36.4%	18.2%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	1	2	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	1	1	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	25	18	74	58	28	203
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.3%	8.9%	36.5%	28.6%	13.8%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.341(a)	20	.102
Likelihood Ratio	31.136	20	.053
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.728	1	.054
N of Valid Cases	203		

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

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

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	15	54	31	100	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.0%	54.0%	31.0%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	8	38	19	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.3%	58.5%	29.2%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	6	11	19	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.5%	31.6%	57.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	5	14	5	24	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.8%	58.3%	20.8%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	2	2	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	1	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	30	115	68	213
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.1%	54.0%	31.9%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.194(a)	10	.424
Likelihood Ratio	10.651	10	.385
Linear-by-Linear Association	.036	1	.849
N of Valid Cases	213		

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive**

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	56	34	101	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.9%	55.4%	33.7%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	5	38	21	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.8%	59.4%	32.8%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	5	12	19	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.5%	26.3%	63.2%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	5	14	7	26	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.2%	53.8%	26.9%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	1	2	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	1	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	23	115	76	214
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.7%	53.7%	35.5%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.442(a)	10	.257
Likelihood Ratio	12.621	10	.246
Linear-by-Linear Association	.014	1	.907
N of Valid Cases	214		

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source**

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	15	58	29	102	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.7%	56.9%	28.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	8	40	16	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	7	7	18	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.2%	38.9%	38.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	4	17	3	24	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.7%	70.8%	12.5%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	3	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	1	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	31	126	55	212
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.6%	59.4%	25.9%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.825(a)	10	.549
Likelihood Ratio	10.552	10	.393
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.068	1	.302
N of Valid Cases	212		

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed**

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	15	61	26	102	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.7%	59.8%	25.5%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	8	42	16	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.1%	63.6%	24.2%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	10	6	18	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.1%	55.6%	33.3%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	5	17	3	25	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.0%	68.0%	12.0%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	3	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	1	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	30	134	51	215
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.0%	62.3%	23.7%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.052(a)	10	.811
Likelihood Ratio	7.597	10	.668
Linear-by-Linear Association	.832	1	.362
N of Valid Cases	215		

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner**

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	13	56	33	102	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	12.7%	54.9%	32.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	6	41	19	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.1%	62.1%	28.8%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	9	7	18	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.1%	50.0%	38.9%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	5	18	2	25	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.0%	72.0%	8.0%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	2	1	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	1	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	28	126	61	215
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	13.0%	58.6%	28.4%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.591(a)	10	.084
Likelihood Ratio	15.842	10	.104
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.524	1	.019
N of Valid Cases	215		

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained**

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	10	55	37	102	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.8%	53.9%	36.3%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	7	35	23	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.8%	53.8%	35.4%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	8	8	19	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.8%	42.1%	42.1%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	18	6	27	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.1%	66.7%	22.2%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	2	1	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	1	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	23	119	75	217
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.6%	54.8%	34.6%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.651(a)	10	.913
Likelihood Ratio	5.436	10	.860
Linear-by-Linear Association	.783	1	.376
N of Valid Cases	217		

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)**

			Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)			Total	
			Exceeded expectations	Met expectations	Did not meet expectations		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	66	25	102	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.8%	64.7%	24.5%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	4	53	8	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	6.2%	81.5%	12.3%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	3	13	2	18	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.7%	72.2%	11.1%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	19	4	26	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.5%	73.1%	15.4%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	2	2	0	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	0	1	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	23	154	39	216
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.6%	71.3%	18.1%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.781(a)	10	.140
Likelihood Ratio	13.132	10	.216
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.083	1	.043
N of Valid Cases	216		

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Service Ratings**  
**Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?**

			On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?					Total	
			One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	20	14	26	29	13	102	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.6%	13.7%	25.5%	28.4%	12.7%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	11	6	21	15	12	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.9%	9.2%	32.3%	23.1%	18.5%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	1	2	11	2	3	19	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.3%	10.5%	57.9%	10.5%	15.8%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	1	0	10	11	5	27	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.7%	.0%	37.0%	40.7%	18.5%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	2	1	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	0	0	1	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	33	22	71	58	33	217
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.2%	10.1%	32.7%	26.7%	15.2%	100.0%


**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.285(a)	20	.230
Likelihood Ratio	29.101	20	.086
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.136	1	.023
N of Valid Cases	217		

## 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	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Newspaper	151	25.2	25.2	25.2
	Television	285	47.6	47.6	72.8
	Radio	33	5.5	5.5	78.3
	Internet	40	6.7	6.7	85
	Clark County 4 (CCTV)	36	6	6	91
	Newsletters	29	4.8	4.8	95.8
	County Commission	4	0.6	0.6	96.4
	Town hall meetings/open houses	11	1.9	1.9	98.3
	Word of Mouth (family/friends)	4	0.6	0.6	98.9
	DK/No answer	6	1.1	1.1	100
	Total	600	100	100	



<span style="color: blue;">■</span> Newspaper	<span style="color: maroon;">■</span> Television
<span style="color: yellow;">■</span> Radio	<span style="color: cyan;">■</span> Internet
<span style="color: purple;">■</span> Clark County 4 (CCTV)	<span style="color: orange;">■</span> Newsletters
<span style="color: blue;">■</span> County Commission	<span style="color: lightblue;">■</span> Town hall meetings/open houses
<span style="color: darkblue;">■</span> Word of Mouth (family/friends)	


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	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Newspaper	197	32.9	32.9	32.9
	Television	239	39.9	39.9	72.8
	Radio	66	11.1	11.1	83.9
	Internet	28	4.6	4.6	88.5
	Outdoor Billboards	51	8.4	8.4	96.9
	DK/No answer	18	3.1	3.1	100
	Total	600	100	100	

Advertising



■ Newspaper 
 ■ Television 
 ■ Radio 
 ■ Internet 
 ■ Outdoor Billboards

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

**Appendix IX**  
**Local Government Interaction Information Jurisdictional Cross-Tabulations**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often: NEWS & INFORMATION**

		Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often: NEWS & INFORMATION										Total
			Newspaper	Television	Radio	Internet	Clark County 4 (CCTV)	Newsletters	County Commission	Town hall meetings/open houses	Word of Mouth (family/friends)	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	64	134	11	16	15	12	0	3	2	257
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	24.9%	52.1%	4.3%	6.2%	5.8%	4.7%	.0%	1.2%	.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	52	89	11	11	13	5	4	5	2	192
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	27.1%	46.4%	5.7%	5.7%	6.8%	2.6%	2.1%	2.6%	1.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	18	32	4	5	3	5	0	2	0	69
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	26.1%	46.4%	5.8%	7.2%	4.3%	7.2%	.0%	2.9%	.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	14	28	6	7	4	5	0	0	0	64
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	21.9%	43.8%	9.4%	10.9%	6.3%	7.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	25.0%	12.5%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>		Count	151	285	33	40	35	29	4	12	4	593
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.5%	48.1%	5.6%	6.7%	5.9%	4.9%	.7%	2.0%	.7%	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	72.711(a)	40	.001
Likelihood Ratio	47.070	40	.206
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.879	1	.049
N of Valid Cases	593		

## Appendix IX

### Local Government Interaction Information Jurisdictional Cross-Tabulations

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often: ADVERTISING**

			Please tell me, of the following options, through which source you hear about Clark County services most often: ADVERTISING					Total	
			Newspaper	Television	Radio	Internet	Outdoor Billboards		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	90	97	30	12	21	250	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	36.0%	38.8%	12.0%	4.8%	8.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	64	81	15	7	19	186	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	34.4%	43.5%	8.1%	3.8%	10.2%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	22	27	10	2	6	67	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	32.8%	40.3%	14.9%	3.0%	9.0%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	17	30	9	7	2	65	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	26.2%	46.2%	13.8%	10.8%	3.1%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	4	3	0	2	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	44.4%	33.3%	.0%	22.2%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	3	0	0	0	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	196	239	67	28	50	580
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.8%	41.2%	11.6%	4.8%	8.6%	100.0%

#### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.032(a)	20	.087
Likelihood Ratio	31.128	20	.054
Linear-by-Linear Association	.573	1	.449
N of Valid Cases	580		

## **Appendix X**

### **Local Distribution Summary**

## Appendix X Local Distribution Summary

**Respondent zip code:**


	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
89004	2	.3	.3	.3	89123	29	4.8	4.8	66.3
89005	9	1.4	1.4	1.8	89128	35	5.9	5.9	72.1
89011	20	3.3	3.3	5.1	89129	4	.7	.7	72.8
89012	40	6.7	6.7	11.8	89130	2	.4	.4	73.2
89014	4	.7	.7	12.5	89132	3	.5	.5	73.7
89015	6	1.0	1.0	13.4	89133	0	.1	.1	73.7
89016	0	.1	.1	13.5	89134	44	7.4	7.4	81.1
89018	4	.7	.7	14.2	89135	5	.8	.8	81.9
89019	5	.9	.9	15.1	89139	12	2.1	2.1	83.9
89021	10	1.6	1.6	16.7	89141	12	2.0	2.0	85.9
89024	0	.1	.1	16.7	89142	8	1.3	1.3	87.2
89025	0	.1	.1	16.8	89144	3	.4	.4	87.7
89027	3	.6	.6	17.4	89145	29	4.8	4.8	92.4
89029	1	.2	.2	17.6	89146	1	.2	.2	92.6
89031	6	1.0	1.0	18.5	89147	19	3.2	3.2	95.8
89032	66	11.0	11.0	29.5	89148	8	1.4	1.4	97.2
89039	4	.7	.7	30.2	89149	2	.3	.3	97.4
89040	10	1.7	1.7	32.0	89150	3	.5	.5	97.9
89044	5	.9	.9	32.8	89156	10	1.6	1.6	99.6
89046	3	.4	.4	33.3	89162	0	.1	.1	99.7
89052	2	.4	.4	33.7	89178	2	.3	.3	99.9
89056	0	.1	.1	33.8	89183	0	.1	.1	100.0
89074	3	.5	.5	34.3	Total	600	100.0	100.0	
89084	2	.3	.3	34.5					
89101	0	.1	.1	34.6					
89102	5	.8	.8	35.4					
89103	19	3.2	3.2	38.7					
89104	0	.1	.1	38.7					
89106	0	.1	.1	38.8					
89107	13	2.2	2.2	41.0					
89108	4	.7	.7	41.7					
89109	0	.1	.1	41.8					
89110	2	.3	.3	42.0					
89113	13	2.2	2.2	44.2					
89117	10	1.6	1.6	45.8					
89118	14	2.4	2.4	48.2					
89119	13	2.2	2.2	50.4					
89120	10	1.7	1.7	52.1					
89121	35	5.9	5.9	57.9					
89122	21	3.5	3.5	61.4					

## Appendix X Local Distribution Summary

### Respondent Jurisdiction:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unincorporated Clark County	260	43.4	43.4	43.4
	City of Las Vegas	193	32.2	32.2	75.6
	City of North Las Vegas	68	11.3	11.3	86.9
	City of Henderson	66	11	11	97.9
	Boulder City	9	1.4	1.4	99.3
	Mesquite	4	0.7	0.7	100
	Total	600	100	100	

Respondent Jurisdiction



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
Valid	\$ 20,000 or under	50	8.3
	\$ 20,001 - \$ 40,000	103	17.1
	\$ 40,001 - \$ 60,000	125	20.8
	\$ 60,001 - \$ 80,000	108	17.9
	\$ 80,001 - \$100,000	60	10.1
	\$100,001 - \$120,000	36	6
	\$120,001 - \$140,000	19	3.2
	\$140,001 or more	31	5.2
	No answer/refused	68	11.4
	Total	600	100

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	

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
Valid	18 - 24	60	10
	25 - 44	196	32.7
	45 - 64	234	39.1
	65 or older	108	18
	No answer/refused	2	0.3
Total		600	100




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
Valid	Less than 1 year	42	7
	1- 5 years	130	21.7
	6 - 10 years	109	18.2
	11 - 15 years	98	16.3
	More than 15 years	176	29.3
	All my life	44	7.3
	No answer/refused	2	0.3
	Total	600	100




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

## Appendix XI Respondent Demographic Profile

### Gender observation

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Male	271	45.2
	Female	328	54.8
	Total	600	100

Gender



Male
  Female

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

**Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile  
Summary by Jurisdiction**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?**

			Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?								Total	
			\$ 20,000 or under	\$ 20,001 - \$ 40,000	\$ 40,001 - \$ 60,000	\$ 60,001 - \$ 80,000	\$ 80,001 - \$100,000	\$100,001 - \$120,000	\$120,001 - \$140,000	\$140,001 or more		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	21	42	58	43	26	15	7	13	225	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.3%	18.7%	25.8%	19.1%	11.6%	6.7%	3.1%	5.8%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	16	38	34	31	22	10	5	13	169	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.5%	22.5%	20.1%	18.3%	13.0%	5.9%	3.0%	7.7%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	11	17	13	7	3	3	3	63	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.5%	17.5%	27.0%	20.6%	11.1%	4.8%	4.8%	4.8%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	5	8	15	18	4	6	4	2	62	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.1%	12.9%	24.2%	29.0%	6.5%	9.7%	6.5%	3.2%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	2	0	3	2	2	0	0	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	22.2%	.0%	33.3%	22.2%	22.2%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	49	102	125	108	61	36	19	31	531
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	9.2%	19.2%	23.5%	20.3%	11.5%	6.8%	3.6%	5.8%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.243(a)	35	.857
Likelihood Ratio	28.995	35	.753
Linear-by-Linear Association	.104	1	.747
N of Valid Cases	531		

**Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile  
Summary by Jurisdiction**

**Respondent Jurisdiction \* In what age group do you fall?**

			In what age group do you fall?				Total	
			18 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 64	65 or older		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	30	77	113	40	260	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	11.5%	29.6%	43.5%	15.4%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	16	64	66	45	191	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	8.4%	33.5%	34.6%	23.6%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	11	28	23	7	69	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	15.9%	40.6%	33.3%	10.1%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	3	23	29	11	66	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	4.5%	34.8%	43.9%	16.7%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	0	5	2	2	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	55.6%	22.2%	22.2%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	1	3	4	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	60	197	234	108	599
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.0%	32.9%	39.1%	18.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.819(a)	15	.013
Likelihood Ratio	29.442	15	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	.408	1	.523
N of Valid Cases	599		

**Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile  
Summary by Jurisdiction**

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

		How long have you lived in Clark County?						Total	
		Less than 1 year	1 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 15 years	More than 15 years	All my life		
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	19	54	53	42	78	13	259
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.3%	20.8%	20.5%	16.2%	30.1%	5.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	14	31	31	38	65	13	192
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.3%	16.1%	16.1%	19.8%	33.9%	6.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	2	18	17	10	14	7	68
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	2.9%	26.5%	25.0%	14.7%	20.6%	10.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	23	7	7	16	8	66
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.6%	34.8%	10.6%	10.6%	24.2%	12.1%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	2	0	0	3	2	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.2%	22.2%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	22.2%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	43	130	109	97	176	43	598
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.2%	21.7%	18.2%	16.2%	29.4%	7.2%	100.0%


**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	41.244(a)	25	.022
Likelihood Ratio	43.393	25	.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	.842	1	.359
N of Valid Cases	598		

**Appendix XII**  
**Importance/Performance Comparisons**


## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Road Maintenance




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Revitalizing Older Neighborhoods




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Flood Control




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Budget Management




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

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




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

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




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Water Conservation Programs




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Child Protection Services




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Child Welfare Services




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Juvenile Justice Services




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Affordable Housing for Low Income Families




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Shelter for the Homeless




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Affordable Housing for Seniors




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Medical Care for the Poor




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing 24-Hour Emergency Trauma Care




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Child Protection Programs




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Enforcing Traffic Laws




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Maintaining a Low Crime Rate




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Maintaining Neighborhood Police Patrols




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Keeping Police Response Times Low




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Keeping Fire Department Response Times Low




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Keeping Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Times Low




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Well Trained Paramedic and Emergency Response Personnel




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Facilitate Neighborhood Watch Programs




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

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




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

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




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Investigating Criminal Activity




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Fire Protection & Prevention Services




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Emergency Medical Services




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Neighborhood Code Enforcement Services




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Examining Potential Impacts from Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Shipments




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Regional Justice Services and Facilities




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Affordable Housing




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Managing Growth




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Increasing Job Opportunities




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Improving Business Climate




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Planning for Commercial Development




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Reducing Travel Congestion




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Access to Freeways




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Improving Road Conditions




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Reducing Travel Time




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Providing Mass Public Transit




## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Adequate Airport Facilities



## Appendix XII Importance/Performance Comparisons

### Parks and Recreation Programs



**This page intentionally left blank  
-END OF REPORT-**