



# Clark County Monitoring Program

## Summer 2006



## **Clark County Monitoring Program: Community Survey Summer 2006**

### **Contents:**

Executive Summary

Tab 1:       Appendix I  
                  Importance Score for Selected Services

Tab 2:       Appendix II  
                  Performance Score for Selected Services

Tab 3:       Appendix III  
                  Quality of Life Considerations

Tab 4:       Appendix IV  
                  General Economic Considerations

Tab 5:       Appendix V  
                  Property Value Considerations

Tab 6:       Appendix VI  
                  Environmental Considerations

Tab 7:       Appendix VII  
                  Yucca Mountain Considerations

Tab 8:       Appendix VIII  
                  Community Profile

Tab 9:       Appendix IX  
                  Local Government Interaction

Tab 10:      Appendix X  
                  Local Distribution Summary

Tab 11:      Appendix XI  
                  Respondent Demographic File

Tab 12:      Appendix XII  
                  Importance/ Performance Comparisons



TO: MS. IRENE NAVIS, AICP  
FROM: DR. SHEILA CONWAY; JEREMY AGUERO  
SUBJECT: CLARK COUNTY MONITORING PROGRAM | Summer 2006  
DATE: October 18, 2006  
CC: BRIAN GORDON/APPLIED ANALYSIS  
DR. ALVIN MUSKATEL/UER;  
JASON GRAY/STRATEGIC SOLUTIONS

---

This memorandum summarizes the key findings of the bi-annual Summer 2006 Clark County Monitoring Program Survey conducted by Urban Environmental Research, Applied Analysis and Strategic Solutions on behalf of the Nuclear Waste Division. A more detailed statistical assessment of our methodology and 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. The intent of this memorandum is to provide an executive level overview of our salient findings.

## **A. GENERAL OVERVIEW**

During the month of September 2006, Strategic Solutions, in coordination with Urban Environmental Research and Applied Analysis, administered a 143-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 with the community and may also have far-reaching economic, fiscal and social implications. Analyzing these questions requires not only an understanding of resource allocations 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 this more comprehensive framework from which impact assessments can be appropriately derived.

## **B. KEY FINDINGS**

- Strong public service importance and performance scores for fire and emergency medical services.
- Economic conditions showing signs of weakening.
- Notable increases in the importance assigned to child-related public service categories.
- Crime appears to be an increasing concern among respondents.
- Drought remains the most pressing environmental issue.
- Housing market weakening; housing affordability /attainability not cited as a primary area of concern.

## **C. YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUESTIONS**

- Respondents overwhelmingly oppose the Yucca Mountain project, with 71.4 percent indicating that given the opportunity to vote on the matter, they would vote against it. More than two-thirds of respondents indicated a belief that the facility will have a negative impact on their quality of life. When asked the same question in the Summer 2005 survey, 59 percent of respondents expected a negative impact.
- Trust regarding the Yucca Mountain project remains a key concern. Roughly 66 percent 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.
- When asked what one change would most improve the quality of life in Southern Nevada, one out every nine respondents indicated "stop Yucca Mountain." While some technical changes were made to this question, the number responding similarly in the Summer 2005 survey was one out of every 11 respondents.
- Approximately 83 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 is consistent with those reported previously. Nuclear waste transportation remains in the same general perception category as a landfill or polluting manufacturing facility.

- 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 remained fairly consistent. On a one-to-five rating scale, these considerations tend to receive above-average scores, but are valued significantly lower than more immediate public safety, transportation and economic concerns.
- As an urgent environmental concern, the Yucca Mountain facility's placement among major issues was materially unchanged. Approximately 1.9 percent of respondents identified the Yucca Mountain project as Southern Nevada's most pressing environmental concern; this was 0.1 percent higher than reported in the Summer 2005 series.

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

- Public service importance continued to be dominated by public safety considerations, which accounted for four of the top five and seven out of the top ten most highly-rated services. Traffic and transportation-related services also remained high on the list.
- On a relative scale, only modest movement was noted in the majority of services. We did note, however, that "increasing job opportunities" tracked up six places overall. This, combined with reduced optimism regarding economic conditions and significant movement in job availability as a quality-of-life factor (both discussed later), may be an early indication of softening in the economy.
- Also increasing on an ordinal basis was "providing child protective services" and "providing child welfare services." This may be partially the result of increased media coverage in these areas, although the direction of this relationship is unclear. A closer examination of this service area is warranted.

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 1 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY**

Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Public Service Importance Score Summary			Change	Change	
		Mean '05	Mean '06	Mean '06		from Winter '06	from Summer '05
General Government	Road Maintenance	4.21	4.05	-0.16	4.04	-0.01	-0.17
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.59	3.41	-0.18	3.52	0.11	-0.07
	Flood control	4.09	3.88	-0.21	3.86	-0.02	-0.23
	Budget management	4.29	3.99	-0.3	4.23	0.24	-0.06
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.86	3.67	-0.19	3.58	-0.09	-0.28
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	3.90	3.72	-0.18	3.75	0.03	-0.15
	Water conservation programs	n/a	n/a		4.12		
Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.27	4.06	-0.21	4.11	0.05	-0.16
	Providing child welfare services	4.15	3.98	-0.17	3.98	0	-0.17
	Providing juvenile justice services	4.08	3.93	-0.15	3.87	-0.06	-0.21
	Providing attainable housing for working class families	n/a	3.72		3.77	0.05	
	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.70	3.56	-0.14	3.64	0.08	-0.06
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.38	3.33	-0.05	3.54	0.21	0.16
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	4.12	3.92	-0.2	3.91	-0.01	-0.21
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.94	3.74	-0.2	3.74	0	-0.2
Public Safety	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.60	4.38	-0.22	4.29	-0.09	-0.31
	Providing crime prevention programs	4.27	3.99	-0.28	4.09	0.1	-0.18
	Enforcing traffic laws	4.25	3.91	-0.34	4.07	0.16	-0.18
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.49	4.14	-0.35	4.28	0.14	-0.21
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	4.30	3.97	-0.33	4.08	0.11	-0.22
	Keeping police response times low	4.45	4.24	-0.21	4.60	0.36	0.15
	Keeping fire department response times low	4.45	4.54	0.09	4.47	-0.07	0.02
	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.45	4.56	0.11	4.54	-0.02	0.09
	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	n/a	4.64		4.57	-0.07	
	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	4.05	3.69	-0.36	3.79	0.1	-0.26
	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	4.04	3.75	-0.29	3.87	0.12	-0.17
	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	4.18	3.92	-0.26	4.01	0.09	-0.17
	Investigating criminal activity	4.47	4.03	-0.44	4.24	0.21	-0.23
	Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.59	4.32	-0.27	4.26	-0.06	-0.33
	Providing emergency medical services	4.66	4.44	-0.22	4.43	-0.01	-0.23
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.81	3.54	-0.27	3.58	0.04	-0.23	
Examining potential impacts from Yucca	3.88	3.68	-0.2	3.65	-0.03	-0.23	

Community Development	Mountain nuclear waste shipments						
	Regional justice services and facilities	n/a	n/a		3.60		
	Providing affordable housing	n/a	n/a		3.68		
	Managing growth	4.07	3.83	-0.24	3.87	0.04	-0.2
	Increasing job opportunities	4.07	3.95	-0.12	3.82	-0.13	-0.25
	Improving the business climate	4.08	3.86	-0.22	3.75	-0.11	-0.33
	Planning for commercial development	3.82	3.70	-0.12	3.56	-0.14	-0.26
	Reducing traffic congestion	4.37	4.02	-0.35	4.06	0.04	-0.31
	Access to freeways	4.12	3.83	-0.29	3.92	0.09	-0.2
	Improving road conditions	4.29	3.97	-0.32	4.04	0.07	-0.25
	Reducing travel time	4.01	3.77	-0.24	3.83	0.06	-0.18
	Providing mass public transit	3.86	3.67	-0.19	3.64	-0.03	-0.22
	Adequate airport facilities	n/a	n/a		3.91		
Parks and recreation programs	n/a	n/a		4.02			

FIGURE 2 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE RANKING

Descriptive Statistics	Ranking		Change
	Winter (Feb) '06	Summer (Sept) '06	
Keeping police response times low	7	1	6
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	1	2	-1
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	2	3	-1
Keeping fire department response times low	3	4	-1
Providing emergency medical services	4	5	-1
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	5	6	-1
Maintaining a low crime rate	8	7	1
Providing fire protection & prevention services	6	8	-2
Investigating criminal activity	11	9	2
Budget management	13	10	3
Water conservation programs	n/a	11	n/a
Providing child protection services	9	12	-3
Providing crime prevention programs	14	13	1
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	17	14	3
Enforcing traffic laws	22	15	7
Reducing traffic congestion	12	16	-4
Road Maintenance	10	17	-7
Improving road conditions	16	18	-2
Parks and recreation programs	n/a	19	n/a
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	21	20	1
Providing child welfare services	15	21	-6
Access to freeways	25	22	3
Providing affordable housing for seniors	20	23	-3
Adequate airport facilities	n/a	24	n/a
Providing juvenile justice services	19	25	-6
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	28	26	2
Managing growth	26	27	-1
Flood control	23	28	-5
Reducing travel time	27	29	-2
Increasing job opportunities	18	30	-12
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	33	31	2
Providing attainable housing for working class families	30	32	-2
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	31	33	-2

Improving the business climate	24	34	-10
Providing medical care for the poor	29	35	-6
Providing affordable housing	n/a	36	n/a
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	34	37	-3
Providing affordable housing for low income families	37	38	-1
Providing mass public transit	35	39	-4
Regional justice services and facilities	n/a	40	n/a
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	36	41	-5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	38	42	-4
Planning for commercial development	32	43	-11
Providing shelter for the homeless	42	44	-2
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	41	45	-4

FIGURE 3 GOVERNMENT SERVICE PERFORMANCE SCORE

Government Service Performance Rating		Mean		
Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Importance	Performance	Disparity
General Government	Road maintenance	4.04	3.21	-0.83
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.52	2.67	-0.85
	Flood control	3.86	3.54	-0.32
	Budget management	4.23	2.70	-1.53
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.58	2.82	-0.76
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	3.75	2.59	-1.16
	Water conservation programs	4.12	3.31	-0.81
Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.11	2.76	-1.35
	Providing welfare services	3.98	2.80	-1.18
	Providing juvenile justice services	3.87	2.88	-0.99
	Provide attainable housing for working class families	3.77	2.53	-1.24
	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.64	2.47	-1.17
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.54	2.23	-1.31
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	3.91	2.70	-1.21
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.74	2.68	-1.06
Public Safety	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.29	3.24	-1.05
	Providing crime prevention programs	4.09	2.99	-1.1
	Enforcing traffic laws	4.07	2.99	-1.08
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.28	2.82	-1.46
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	4.08	2.75	-1.33
	Keeping police response times low	4.60	3.02	-1.58
	Keeping fire department response times low	4.47	3.75	-0.72
	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.54	3.72	-0.82
	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	4.57	3.85	-0.72
	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	3.79	2.87	-0.92
	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	3.87	2.87	-1
	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	4.01	2.90	-1.11
Investigating criminal activity	4.24	3.08	-1.16	
Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.26	3.52	-0.74	

Community Development	Providing emergency medical services	4.43	3.59	-0.84
	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.58	3.01	-0.57
	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.65	2.75	-0.9
	Regional justice services and facilities	3.60	3.10	-0.5
	Providing affordable housing	3.68	2.56	-1.12
	Managing growth	3.87	2.62	-1.25
	Increasing job opportunities	3.82	2.96	-0.86
	Improving the business climate	3.75	3.12	-0.63
	Planning for commercial development	3.56	3.14	-0.42
	Reducing traffic congestion	4.06	2.60	-1.46
	Access to freeways	3.92	3.21	-0.71
	Improving road conditions	4.04	3.11	-0.93
	Reducing travel time	3.83	2.79	-1.04
	Providing mass public transit	3.64	2.68	-0.96
Adequate airport facilities	3.91	3.59	-0.32	
Parks and recreation programs	4.02	3.54	-0.48	

FIGURE 4 YUCCA MOUNTAIN SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Yucca Mountain Service Importance Score Summary	
Descriptive Statistics	Public Service Importance
Keeping local decision makers up to date on Yucca Mountain	3.89
Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	3.93
Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology and hydrology	3.84
Identify public safety needs and impacts	3.96
Assess other government impacts	3.66
Assess impacts on the tourist sector	3.61
Assess impacts on the building, construction, and development sectors	3.57
Identify transportation impacts	3.68
Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain	3.91

## **Appendix I**

### **Performance Score for Selected Services**

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

<b>Importance Variable</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Error of Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>	<b>Std Error of Kurtosis</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Std. Error of Skewness</b>
<i>* General Government</i>											
Road Maintenance	596	4.04	.045	4	1	5	1.10	.23	.200	-.987	.10
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	586	3.52	.051	4	1	5	1.233	-.848	.202	-.358	.101
Flood control	596	3.86	.048	4	1	5	1.172	-.437	.200	-.729	.100
Budget management	576	4.23	.044	5	1	5	1.053	1.24	.206	-1.370	.102
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	574	3.58	.061	4	1	5	1.452	.102	-1.087	-.567	.102
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	584	3.75	.052	4	1	5	1.263	-.688	.202	-.647	.101
Water conservation programs	591	4.12	.046	5	1	5	1.108	.531	.201	-1.154	.201
<i>* Social and Judicial Services</i>											
Providing child protection services	588	4.11	.052	5	1	5	1.250	.422	.201	-1.259	.101
Providing child welfare services	584	3.98	.50	4	1	5	1.205	-.149	.202	-.957	.101
Providing juvenile justice services	582	3.87	.048	4	1	5	1.156	-.217	.202	-.795	.101
Providing attainable housing for working class families	592	3.77	.056	4	1	5	1.350	-.723	.201	-.747	.100
Providing affordable housing for low income families	589	3.64	.056	4	1	5	1.367	-.866	.201	-.620	.101
Providing shelter for the homeless	591	3.54	.058	4	1	5	1.411	-1.089	.201	-.472	.100
Providing affordable housing for seniors	587	3.91	.051	4	1	5	1.231	-.255	.201	-.891	.101
Providing medical care for the poor	590	3.74	.054	4	1	5	1.313	-.642	.201	-.722	.100
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	591	4.29	.043	5	1	5	1.038	1.090	.201	-1.40	.101
<i>* Public Safety</i>											
Providing crime prevention programs	592	4.09	.045	4	1	5	1.094	.514	.201	-1.115	.100
Enforcing traffic laws	598	4.07	.045	4	1	5	1.110	.457	.199	-1.104	.100

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


<b>Importance Variable</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Error of Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>	<b>Std Error of Kurtosis</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Std. Error of Skewness</b>
Maintaining a low crime rate	599	4.28	.045	5	1	5	1.106	1.246	.199	-1.491	.100
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	598	4.08	.047	5	1	5	1.106	.304	.200	-1.111	.100
Keeping police response times low	593	4.30	.041	5	1	5	1.155	1.408	.200	-1.456	.100
Keeping fire department response times low	593	4.47	.039	5	1	5	1.009	2.798	.200	-1.830	.100
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	595	4.54	.034	5	1	5	.913	4.487	.200	-2.088	.100
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	594	4.57	.034	5	1	5	.832	4.938	.200	-2.226	.100
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	589	3.79	.046	4	1	5	.824	-.280	.200	-.650	.101
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	593	3.89	.049	4	1	5	1.120	-.321	.200	-.793	.100
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	596	4.01	.049	4	1	5	1.189	.031	.200	-1.018	.100
Investigating criminal activity	595	4.24	.041	5	1	5	1.189	1.251	.200	-1.342	.100
Providing fire protection & prevention services	592	4.26	.040	5	1	5	1.011	1.014	.200	-1.255	.100
Providing emergency medical services	593	4.43	.037	5	1	5	.975	2.583	.200	-1.716	.100
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	582	3.58	.049	4	1	5	.912	-.633	.202	-.448	.101
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	575	3.65	.60	4	1	5	1.179	-1.037	.203	-.594	.102
Regional justice services and facilities	580	3.60	.045	4	1	5	1.443	-.361	.200	-.417	.101
<i>* Community Development</i>											
Providing affordable housing	593	3.68	.056	4	1	5	1.357	-.788	.200	-.656	.100
Managing growth	590	3.87	.054	4	1	5	1.315	-.279	.201	-.944	.101

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

<b>Importance Variable</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Error of Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>	<b>Std. Error of Kurtosis</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Std. Error of Skewness</b>
Increasing job opportunities	591	3.82	.051	4	1	5	1.239	-.366	.201	-.799	.101
Improving the business climate	592	3.75	.048	4	1	5	1.173	-.278	.200	-.716	.100
Planning for commercial development	595	3.56	.049	4	1	5	1.193	-.591	.200	-.492	.100
Reducing traffic congestion	598	4.06	.051	5	1	5	1.242	.269	.199	-1.184	.100
Access to freeways	598	3.92	.046	4	1	5	1.125	-.018	.200	-.869	.100
Improving road conditions	599	4.04	.045	4	1	5	1.100	.324	.199	-1.017	.100
Reducing travel time	592	3.83	.049	4	1	5	1.193	-.312	.201	-.772	.100
Providing mass public transit	587	3.64	.053	4	1	5	1.289	-.722	.201	-.600	.101
Adequate airport facilities	588	3.71	.045	4	1	5	1.092	-.005	.201	-.803	.101
Parks and recreation programs	591	4.02	.044	4	1	5	1.081	.193	.201	-.933	.101


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

**Road Maintenance**




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

**Revitalizing Old Neighborhoods**




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

**Flood Control**




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

**Building Management**




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

**Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers**




**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**




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

**Water conservation**




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

**Providing Child Protection Services**




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

**Providing Child Welfare Services**




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

**Providing Juvenile Justice Services**




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

**Provide Attainable Housing for Working Class Families**




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

**Provide Affordable Housing for Low Income Families**




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

**Provide Shelter for the Homeless**




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

**Provide Affordable Housing for Seniors**




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

**Provide Medical Care for the Poor**




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

**Provide 24-hour Emergency Trauma Care**




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

**Providing Crime Prevention Services**




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

**Enforcing Traffic Laws**




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

**Maintaining a Low Crime Rate**




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




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

**Keeping Police Response Times Low**




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

**Keeping Fire Department Response Times Low**




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

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




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

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




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

**Facilitate Neighborhood Watch Programs**




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

**Preparing for Natural Disasters**




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

**Preparing for Man-Made Accidents or Terrorist Events**




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

**Investigating Criminal Activity**




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

**Providing Fire Protection and Prevention Services**




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

**Providing Emergency Medical Services**




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

**Providing for Neighborhood Code Enforcement Services**




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

**Examining Potential Impacts from Yucca Mountain Waste Transportation**




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




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

**Providing Affordable Housing**




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

**Managing Growth**




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

**Increasing Job Opportunities**




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

**Improving Business Climate**




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




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

**Reducing Traffic Congestion**




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

**Access to Freeways**




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

**Improving Road Conditions**




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

**Reducing Travel Times**




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

**Providing Mass Public Transit**




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

**Adequate Airport Facilities**



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

**Parks and Recreation Programs**



Appendix I  
Importance scores for selected variables  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

General Government Importance Measure	Region	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Road maintenance	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	4.09	0.067	4.00	5	1.025	-0.886	0.159	0.027	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	3	3.90	0.090	4.00	5	1.226	-0.885	0.177	-0.170	0.353	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.20	0.138	5.00	5	1.147	-1.521	0.288	1.650	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.03	0.113	4.00	5	1.016	-0.827	0.268	-0.131	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.15	0.230	4.00	4	0.860	-0.909	0.597	0.834	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.08	0.256	4.00	4	0.772	-0.153	0.715	-0.969	1.395	3	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Unincorporated Clark County	233	3	3.51	0.084	4.00	5	1.283	-0.454	0.160	-0.823	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	182	9	3.51	0.088	3.00	3	1.182	-0.271	0.180	-0.770	0.359	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	3.88	0.133	4.00	5	1.097	-0.428	0.292	-1.199	0.575	2	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.31	0.135	3.00	3	1.209	-0.044	0.268	-0.919	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.25	0.393	3.00	5	1.472	-0.228	0.597	-1.246	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.59	0.466	4.00	4	1.401	-0.938	0.715	-0.100	1.395	1	5
Flood control	Unincorporated Clark County	236	0	3.92	0.077	4.00	5	1.184	-0.784	0.158	-0.449	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	188	3	3.74	0.090	4.00	5	1.233	-0.678	0.177	-0.558	0.353	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	1	4.04	0.123	4.00	5	1.015	-0.644	0.290	-0.807	0.573	2	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.97	0.109	4.00	5	0.979	-0.499	0.268	-0.602	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.53	0.388	3.71	5	1.451	-0.448	0.597	-1.125	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.07	0.468	3.00	3	1.409	-0.400	0.715	-0.564	1.395	1	5
Budget management	Unincorporated Clark County	231	5	4.25	0.067	5.00	5	1.022	-1.381	0.160	1.382	0.319	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	178	12	4.25	0.077	5.00	5	1.022	-1.331	0.182	1.136	0.362	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	3.97	0.154	4.97	5	1.287	-1.076	0.288	0.122	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	77	4	4.30	0.115	5.00	5	1.006	-1.578	0.274	2.231	0.542	1	5

	Boulder City	13	1	4.38	0.279	5.00	5	0.989	-1.643	0.625	2.106	1.207	2	5
	Mesquite	8	1	4.73	0.260	5.00	5	0.729	-2.696	0.758	7.059	1.496	3	5
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Unincorporated Clark County	228	8	3.71	0.092	4.00	5	1.392	-0.668	0.161	-0.913	0.321	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	181	10	3.47	0.107	4.00	5	1.442	-0.472	0.181	-1.137	0.360	1	5
	North Las Vegas	65	5	3.75	0.179	4.00	5	1.440	-0.807	0.298	-0.716	0.588	1	5
	Henderson	78	2	3.46	0.179	4.00	5	1.584	-0.427	0.272	-1.408	0.537	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.29	0.425	4.00	4	1.589	-0.507	0.597	-1.316	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.06	0.584	2.79	5	1.757	0.073	0.715	-2.040	1.395	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Unincorporated Clark County	233	3	3.88	0.079	4.00	5	1.200	-0.840	0.160	-0.195	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	181	9	3.66	0.092	4.00	5	1.237	-0.497	0.180	-0.886	0.359	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	3	3.79	0.161	4.00	5	1.311	-0.594	0.294	-0.933	0.581	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.74	0.148	4.00	5	1.332	-0.604	0.268	-0.898	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.11	0.366	3.00	4	1.370	-0.390	0.597	-0.908	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	2.90	0.577	3.32	1	1.737	-0.030	0.715	-2.115	1.395	1	5

Appendix I  
Importance scores for selected variables  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

General Government Importance Measure	Region	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Water conservation programs	Unincorporated Clark County	234	3	4.26	0.066	5.00	5	1.012	-1.214	0.159	0.611	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	5	4.04	0.085	4.00	5	1.160	-1.134	0.178	0.469	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.00	0.140	4.00	5	1.169	-1.024	0.288	0.298	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	80	1	4.02	0.132	4.00	5	1.176	-1.111	0.269	0.426	0.532	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.94	0.323	4.00	5	1.208	-1.107	0.597	0.691	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.12	0.333	4.00	5	1.004	-1.094	0.715	0.919	1.395	2	5
Providing child protection services	Unincorporated Clark County	235	2	4.20	0.079	5.00	5	1.204	-1.441	0.159	0.976	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	6	4.04	0.092	5.00	5	1.247	-1.177	0.179	0.326	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	3	3.99	0.173	5.00	5	1.412	-1.052	0.294	-0.364	0.581	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.09	0.141	5.00	5	1.267	-1.222	0.268	0.303	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	4.05	0.284	4.00	5	1.042	-1.233	0.608	2.377	1.174	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.04	0.507	5.00	5	1.527	-1.402	0.715	0.884	1.395	1	5
Providing child welfare services	Unincorporated Clark County	233	3	4.13	0.075	5.00	5	1.140	-1.176	0.159	0.396	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	6	3.96	0.087	4.00	5	1.181	-0.865	0.179	-0.228	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	65	5	3.87	0.177	5.00	5	1.428	-0.949	0.298	-0.555	0.587	1	5
	Henderson	80	1	3.79	0.142	4.00	5	1.270	-0.789	0.269	-0.498	0.532	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	3.32	0.216	3.00	3	0.785	0.153	0.613	0.173	1.185	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.95	0.381	4.00	5	1.147	-0.646	0.715	-0.917	1.395	2	5
Providing juvenile justice services	Unincorporated Clark County	232	4	3.97	0.072	4.00	5	1.100	-0.827	0.160	-0.079	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	6	3.74	0.088	4.00	5	1.199	-0.663	0.179	-0.457	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	4	3.87	0.167	4.00	5	1.358	-0.975	0.295	-0.251	0.583	1	5
	Henderson	77	3	3.92	0.124	4.00	4	1.091	-0.847	0.273	-0.188	0.540	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	3.66	0.265	4.00	4	0.967	-0.300	0.611	-0.533	1.180	2	5

	Mesquite	9	0	3.87	0.260	4.00	4	0.782	0.248	0.715	-1.036	1.395	3	5
Providing attainable housing for working class families	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	3.94	0.082	4.00	5	1.254	-0.916	0.159	-0.293	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	4	3.66	0.105	4.00	5	1.435	-0.676	0.178	-0.948	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	3.82	0.168	5.00	5	1.388	-0.694	0.291	-0.921	0.574	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	3.61	0.151	4.00	5	1.336	-0.584	0.271	-0.803	0.536	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.20	0.374	3.32	2	1.401	-0.038	0.597	-1.484	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.77	0.485	4.00	4	1.459	-1.261	0.715	0.571	1.395	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low income families	Unincorporated Clark County	232	4	3.76	0.086	4.00	5	1.306	-0.732	0.160	-0.659	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	188	2	3.60	0.104	4.00	5	1.430	-0.628	0.177	-0.954	0.352	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	3.77	0.168	4.00	5	1.378	-0.681	0.293	-0.782	0.578	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	3.38	0.154	3.92	5	1.367	-0.394	0.271	-1.009	0.536	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.08	0.331	3.00	2	1.239	0.020	0.597	-0.843	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.52	0.470	4.00	4	1.416	-0.875	0.715	-0.234	1.395	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	3.65	0.087	4.00	5	1.340	-0.544	0.159	-0.923	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	6	3.50	0.105	4.00	5	1.430	-0.505	0.179	-1.059	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	3.56	0.188	4.00	5	1.543	-0.497	0.292	-1.323	0.577	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.35	0.159	3.00	5	1.426	-0.227	0.268	-1.265	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.02	0.411	3.00	1	1.538	-0.115	0.597	-1.479	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.51	0.483	3.87	5	1.453	-0.555	0.715	-0.826	1.395	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	4.11	0.070	4.00	5	1.066	-1.056	0.159	0.305	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	7	3.76	0.100	4.00	5	1.354	-0.702	0.179	-0.793	0.357	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	4	3.82	0.164	4.00	5	1.332	-0.972	0.296	-0.173	0.584	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	3.84	0.141	4.00	5	1.253	-0.908	0.270	-0.070	0.535	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.28	0.347	3.00	2	1.298	0.191	0.597	-1.269	1.154	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor	Mesquite	9	0	3.84	0.326	3.31	3	0.983	0.384	0.715	-2.207	1.395	3	5
	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	3.95	0.080	4.00	5	1.235	-0.918	0.159	-0.224	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	4	3.64	0.101	4.00	5	1.371	-0.635	0.178	-0.889	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	3	3.80	0.157	4.00	5	1.281	-0.873	0.294	-0.129	0.581	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	3.52	0.146	4.00	4	1.294	-0.607	0.271	-0.663	0.535	1	5
Boulder City	14	0	3.04	0.314	3.00	3	1.174	-0.083	0.597	-0.520	1.154	1	5	

	Mesquite	9	0	2.79	0.559	2.00	2	1.683	0.521	0.715	-1.554	1.395	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	Unincorporated Clark County	236	1	4.47	0.056	5.00	5	0.867	-1.589	0.159	1.692	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	4	4.29	0.076	5.00	5	1.044	-1.354	0.178	0.878	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	4.13	0.136	5.00	5	1.114	-1.161	0.293	0.491	0.578	1	5
	Henderson	79	1	4.10	0.140	5.00	5	1.249	-1.395	0.270	0.916	0.533	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.58	0.320	3.88	5	1.196	-0.105	0.597	-1.524	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.53	0.387	3.66	4	1.165	-0.060	0.715	-1.357	1.395	2	5

Appendix I  
Importance scores for selected variables  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Importance Measure	Region	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Providing crime prevention programs	Unincorporated Clark County	232	4	4.14	0.070	5.00	5	1.068	-1.197	0.160	0.790	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	188	3	4.02	0.081	4.00	5	1.110	-1.017	0.177	0.308	0.353	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.21	0.130	5.00	5	1.079	-1.200	0.288	0.531	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	80	1	4.11	0.129	4.41	5	1.147	-1.342	0.270	1.226	0.533	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.73	0.294	4.00	4	1.102	-0.363	0.597	-1.069	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.85	0.362	4.00	5	1.091	-0.543	0.715	-0.704	1.395	2	5
Enforcing traffic laws	Unincorporated Clark County	235	2	4.11	0.070	4.00	5	1.067	-1.187	0.159	0.876	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	191	0	4.00	0.083	4.00	5	1.141	-1.036	0.176	0.219	0.350	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.20	0.137	5.00	5	1.144	-1.335	0.288	0.912	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.04	0.122	4.00	5	1.093	-1.043	0.268	0.415	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.73	0.281	4.00	4	1.052	-0.505	0.597	-0.706	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.90	0.511	5.00	5	1.537	-1.107	0.715	-0.146	1.395	1	5
Maintaining low crime rates	Unincorporated Clark County	236	0	4.34	0.067	5.00	5	1.037	-1.585	0.158	1.765	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	1	4.21	0.086	5.00	5	1.187	-1.448	0.177	0.992	0.351	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.16	0.148	5.00	5	1.231	-1.263	0.288	0.322	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.45	0.105	5.00	5	0.939	-1.602	0.268	1.739	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.10	0.254	4.00	5	0.950	-0.878	0.597	0.224	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.95	0.537	5.00	5	1.618	-1.115	0.715	-0.514	1.395	1	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Unincorporated Clark County	236	1	4.14	0.073	5.00	5	1.116	-1.191	0.159	0.562	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	189	1	3.96	0.088	4.00	5	1.204	-0.890	0.177	-0.261	0.352	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.09	0.142	5.00	5	1.184	-1.208	0.288	0.644	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.19	0.117	5.00	5	1.054	-1.324	0.268	1.266	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.15	0.288	4.43	5	1.076	-1.086	0.597	0.106	1.154	2	5

	Mesquite	9	0	3.91	0.600	5.00	5	1.806	-1.292	0.715	-0.329	1.395	1	5
Keeping police response times low	Unincorporated Clark County	235	2	4.44	0.057	5.00	5	0.870	-1.645	0.159	2.509	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	188	2	4.16	0.080	5.00	5	1.101	-1.214	0.177	0.567	0.352	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	4.18	0.146	5.00	5	1.206	-1.270	0.291	0.370	0.575	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	4.42	0.106	5.00	5	0.940	-1.862	0.271	3.226	0.535	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.09	0.259	4.00	5	0.968	-0.819	0.597	-0.044	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.08	0.352	4.00	5	1.059	-1.031	0.715	0.430	1.395	2	5
Keeping fire department response times low	Unincorporated Clark County	236	1	4.56	0.054	5.00	5	0.830	-2.104	0.159	4.133	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	4	4.42	0.071	5.00	5	0.975	-1.750	0.178	2.560	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.43	0.116	5.00	5	0.970	-1.730	0.288	2.283	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.47	0.100	5.00	5	0.894	-1.773	0.268	2.708	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	4.31	0.283	5.00	5	1.025	-1.315	0.613	0.657	1.185	2	5
	Mesquite	8	1	3.98	0.430	4.43	5	1.205	-0.662	0.758	-1.213	1.496	2	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Unincorporated Clark County	236	0	4.62	0.048	5.00	5	0.730	-2.180	0.158	5.244	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	3	4.47	0.063	5.00	5	0.865	-1.962	0.178	4.138	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.45	0.108	5.00	5	0.898	-1.739	0.288	2.639	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.57	0.095	5.00	5	0.856	-2.364	0.268	5.803	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.36	0.291	5.00	5	1.089	-1.535	0.597	1.054	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	8	1	4.46	0.521	5.00	5	1.458	-2.696	0.758	7.059	1.496	1	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	Unincorporated Clark County	236	1	4.68	0.044	5.00	5	0.682	-2.532	0.159	7.531	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	5	4.50	0.064	5.00	5	0.867	-1.804	0.178	2.572	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	1	4.59	0.095	5.00	5	0.787	-1.918	0.290	2.814	0.572	2	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.51	0.110	5.00	5	0.991	-2.494	0.268	5.974	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.37	0.270	5.00	5	1.009	-1.457	0.597	1.050	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.17	0.468	5.00	5	1.408	-1.817	0.715	2.891	1.395	1	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Unincorporated Clark County	233	3	3.82	0.072	4.00	5	1.099	-0.732	0.159	-0.015	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	5	3.73	0.083	4.00	5	1.127	-0.594	0.178	-0.317	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	3.94	0.145	4.00	5	1.184	-0.841	0.292	-0.284	0.577	1	5
	Henderson	80	1	3.71	0.122	4.00	3	1.092	-0.463	0.269	-0.463	0.532	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.74	0.276	4.00	4	1.033	-0.263	0.597	-0.934	1.154	2	5

	Mesquite	9	0	3.74	0.505	4.03	5	1.520	-0.913	0.715	-0.553	1.395	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	3.93	0.079	4.00	5	1.213	-0.992	0.159	0.068	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	188	2	3.74	0.086	4.00	5	1.176	-0.558	0.177	-0.635	0.352	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	3.84	0.155	4.00	5	1.290	-0.731	0.288	-0.673	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	4.01	0.126	4.00	5	1.119	-0.838	0.271	-0.211	0.535	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	3.89	0.260	4.00	3	0.934	-0.164	0.617	-1.019	1.193	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.10	0.312	4.00	4	0.940	-1.447	0.715	3.038	1.395	2	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	4.15	0.074	5.00	5	1.137	-1.305	0.159	0.898	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	188	3	3.85	0.090	4.00	5	1.235	-0.721	0.177	-0.631	0.353	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.03	0.148	4.91	5	1.237	-1.121	0.288	0.185	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.10	0.125	4.00	5	1.119	-1.211	0.268	0.835	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.66	0.383	3.92	5	1.432	-0.555	0.597	-1.006	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.62	0.367	3.00	3	1.105	0.238	0.715	-1.356	1.395	2	5
Investigating criminal activity	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	4.32	0.063	5.00	5	0.962	-1.554	0.159	2.213	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	189	2	4.20	0.073	5.00	5	1.000	-1.146	0.177	0.562	0.352	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	4.25	0.134	5.00	5	1.105	-1.342	0.291	0.831	0.574	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.21	0.113	4.41	5	1.016	-1.449	0.268	1.893	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.84	0.304	4.00	4	1.139	-1.044	0.597	1.005	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.73	0.465	3.87	5	1.399	-0.864	0.715	0.241	1.395	1	5
Providing fire protection & prevention services	Unincorporated Clark County	233	3	4.32	0.060	5.00	5	0.910	-1.279	0.159	1.359	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	5	4.19	0.074	5.00	5	1.005	-1.151	0.178	0.708	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.27	0.140	5.00	5	1.168	-1.435	0.288	0.872	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.30	0.096	5.00	5	0.865	-0.961	0.268	-0.096	0.530	2	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.15	0.274	4.00	5	1.025	-1.210	0.597	0.785	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.87	0.428	4.00	4	1.287	-1.576	0.715	2.824	1.395	1	5
Providing emergency medical services	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	4.47	0.059	5.00	5	0.901	-2.037	0.159	4.364	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	5	4.44	0.064	5.00	5	0.872	-1.554	0.178	2.014	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	1	4.40	0.130	5.00	5	1.074	-1.653	0.290	1.429	0.572	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.46	0.099	5.00	5	0.890	-1.608	0.268	1.996	0.530	1	5

	Boulder City	14	0	3.82	0.271	4.00	3	1.015	-0.134	0.597	-1.214	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.52	0.176	4.66	5	0.530	-0.086	0.715	-2.651	1.395	4	5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Unincorporated Clark County	229	7	3.61	0.080	4.00	5	1.213	-0.536	0.161	-0.560	0.320	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	5	3.56	0.086	4.00	4	1.178	-0.454	0.178	-0.614	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	3.77	0.138	4.00	5	1.128	-0.481	0.293	-0.748	0.578	1	5
	Henderson	77	3	3.50	0.132	4.00	3	1.159	-0.358	0.273	-0.651	0.540	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.90	0.219	3.00	3	0.819	-0.629	0.597	0.770	1.154	1	4
	Mesquite	8	1	3.47	0.386	3.06	3	1.106	0.178	0.744	-1.013	1.461	2	5
	Unincorporated Clark County	227	10	3.69	0.096	4.00	5	1.445	-0.623	0.162	-1.019	0.322	1	5
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	City of Las Vegas	179	11	3.61	0.108	4.00	5	1.444	-0.563	0.181	-1.095	0.361	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	3	3.62	0.189	4.36	5	1.543	-0.546	0.294	-1.232	0.581	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.66	0.156	4.00	5	1.397	-0.667	0.268	-0.824	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	3.50	0.388	3.36	3	1.414	-0.625	0.611	-0.433	1.180	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.69	0.461	3.66	5	1.388	-0.786	0.715	0.170	1.395	1	5

Appendix I  
Importance scores for selected variables  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

<b>Community Development Importance Measure</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Missing</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Error of Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Mode</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Std. Error of Skewness</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>	<b>Std. Error of Kurtosis</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Regional justice services and facilities	Unincorporated Clark County	234	2	3.71	0.067	4.00	3	1.024	-0.466	0.159	-0.153	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	176	15	3.53	0.082	4.00	3	1.090	-0.370	0.183	-0.462	0.365	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	3.59	0.148	3.00	3	1.215	-0.361	0.293	-0.663	0.578	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.45	0.125	4.00	4	1.124	-0.478	0.268	-0.347	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	3.33	0.263	3.00	3	0.947	0.955	0.617	0.217	1.193	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.18	0.274	4.00	5	0.824	-0.397	0.715	-1.291	1.395	3	5
Providing affordable housing	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	3.79	0.085	4.00	5	1.306	-0.721	0.159	-0.687	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	188	3	3.57	0.100	4.00	5	1.368	-0.574	0.177	-0.814	0.353	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	4.11	0.158	5.00	5	1.292	-1.236	0.292	0.288	0.577	1	5
	Henderson	80	1	3.43	0.153	4.00	5	1.366	-0.474	0.269	-0.968	0.532	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	3.29	0.428	3.74	5	1.560	-0.458	0.611	-1.239	1.180	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	2.79	0.516	2.66	1	1.554	0.359	0.715	-1.267	1.395	1	5
Managing Growth	Unincorporated Clark County	234	3	3.97	0.082	4.00	5	1.255	-0.995	0.159	-0.167	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	4	3.77	0.101	4.00	5	1.378	-0.874	0.178	-0.463	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	4	3.70	0.181	4.00	5	1.467	-0.667	0.296	-0.925	0.583	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.02	0.132	4.00	5	1.184	-1.325	0.268	1.039	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.09	0.296	4.57	5	1.106	-0.853	0.597	-0.622	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.14	0.505	3.00	3	1.520	-0.383	0.715	-0.989	1.395	1	5
Increasing job opportunities	Unincorporated Clark County	234	2	3.96	0.076	4.00	5	1.159	-0.933	0.159	0.032	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	5	3.69	0.094	4.00	5	1.282	-0.714	0.178	-0.522	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	4.09	0.150	5.00	5	1.228	-1.032	0.292	-0.203	0.577	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.72	0.140	4.00	5	1.256	-0.673	0.268	-0.615	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.75	0.341	3.00	3	1.274	-0.205	0.597	-0.871	1.154	1	5

	Mesquite	9	0	3.44	0.394	3.66	3	1.186	-0.922	0.715	1.591	1.395	1	5
Improving the business climate	Unincorporated Clark County	236	0	3.84	0.078	4.00	5	1.193	-0.919	0.158	0.065	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	6	3.71	0.083	4.00	4	1.135	-0.618	0.179	-0.329	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	1	4.02	0.139	4.00	5	1.154	-0.992	0.289	0.064	0.571	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	3.52	0.128	4.00	3	1.136	-0.326	0.270	-0.623	0.534	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.15	0.313	3.00	3	1.170	-0.598	0.597	0.424	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.42	0.454	3.66	4	1.368	-0.536	0.715	-0.442	1.395	1	5
Planning for commercial development	Unincorporated Clark County	236	0	3.63	0.074	4.00	4	1.144	-0.544	0.158	-0.379	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	4	3.52	0.088	4.00	4	1.200	-0.424	0.178	-0.708	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	1	3.73	0.150	4.00	5	1.245	-0.649	0.289	-0.688	0.571	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.42	0.136	3.00	3	1.223	-0.438	0.268	-0.545	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.60	0.274	3.00	3	1.027	-0.426	0.597	-0.759	1.154	1	4
	Mesquite	9	0	3.98	0.440	4.00	5	1.324	-1.692	0.715	3.021	1.395	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion	Unincorporated Clark County	236	0	4.20	0.074	5.00	5	1.143	-1.525	0.158	1.543	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	1	4.04	0.092	5.00	5	1.273	-1.106	0.176	-0.036	0.351	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	1	3.76	0.179	5.00	5	1.485	-0.751	0.289	-0.928	0.571	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	4.02	0.134	4.00	5	1.200	-1.023	0.268	0.014	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.07	0.352	4.99	5	1.317	-1.479	0.597	1.477	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.66	0.373	3.03	3	1.122	0.136	0.715	-1.479	1.395	2	5
Access to freeways	Unincorporated Clark County	236	0	3.99	0.072	4.00	5	1.104	-0.943	0.158	0.092	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	189	1	3.92	0.082	4.00	5	1.127	-0.826	0.177	-0.149	0.352	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	3.96	0.144	4.00	5	1.200	-0.873	0.288	-0.250	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.68	0.124	4.00	4	1.113	-0.841	0.268	0.378	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	3.90	0.316	4.00	5	1.151	-1.037	0.611	1.085	1.180	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.97	0.374	4.00	4	1.126	-1.426	0.715	3.498	1.395	1	5
Improving road conditions	Unincorporated Clark County	236	0	4.10	0.068	4.00	5	1.050	-0.984	0.158	0.291	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	1	4.10	0.078	4.00	5	1.071	-1.136	0.176	0.712	0.351	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	4.11	0.148	5.00	5	1.234	-1.294	0.288	0.606	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.76	0.123	4.00	4	1.103	-0.807	0.268	0.166	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.69	0.316	4.00	3	1.183	-0.541	0.597	-0.140	1.154	1	5

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

	Mesquite	9	0	3.70	0.498	4.04	5	1.500	-0.602	0.715	-1.046	1.395	1	5
Reducing travel time	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	4.02	0.071	4.00	5	1.087	-0.960	0.159	0.189	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	4	3.83	0.091	4.00	5	1.244	-0.850	0.178	-0.227	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	3.79	0.160	4.00	5	1.334	-0.756	0.288	-0.681	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	3.39	0.128	3.00	3	1.141	-0.333	0.270	-0.542	0.534	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.53	0.319	3.00	3	1.194	-0.493	0.597	0.362	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	8	1	3.32	0.392	3.00	3	1.124	0.257	0.744	-1.071	1.461	2	5
Providing mass public transit	Unincorporated Clark County	235	2	3.80	0.081	4.00	5	1.245	-0.794	0.159	-0.381	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	7	3.65	0.092	4.00	5	1.248	-0.650	0.179	-0.518	0.357	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	3	3.76	0.161	4.00	5	1.309	-0.649	0.295	-0.692	0.582	1	5
	Henderson	79	1	3.22	0.151	3.00	4	1.345	-0.150	0.270	-1.191	0.533	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.78	0.371	3.00	3	1.388	0.098	0.597	-0.998	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.37	0.475	3.00	3	1.428	-0.260	0.715	-0.914	1.395	1	5
Adequate airport facilities	Unincorporated Clark County	232	4	3.97	0.070	4.00	5	1.063	-0.867	0.160	0.161	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	6	3.95	0.080	4.00	5	1.087	-0.939	0.179	0.377	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	1	4.01	0.129	4.00	5	1.068	-0.608	0.289	-0.745	0.571	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.82	0.121	4.00	4	1.083	-0.751	0.268	0.062	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.09	0.348	3.00	3	1.303	-0.056	0.597	-0.784	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	8	1	2.86	0.371	3.00	3	1.063	-0.086	0.744	1.843	1.461	1	5
Parks and Recreation Programs	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	4.12	0.070	4.00	5	1.071	-1.126	0.159	0.643	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	4	3.90	0.080	4.00	5	1.089	-0.812	0.178	0.032	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	4.18	0.124	5.00	5	1.018	-0.885	0.292	-0.274	0.577	1	5
	Henderson	79	1	3.77	0.127	4.00	5	1.130	-0.730	0.270	-0.003	0.533	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	4.19	0.284	4.92	5	1.034	-0.994	0.611	-0.157	1.180	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.52	0.244	5.00	5	0.736	-1.336	0.715	0.899	1.395	3	5

<b>Importance Variable</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Error of Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>	<b>Std Error of Kurtosis</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Std. Error of Skewness</b>	
<i>* General Government</i>												
Road Maintenance	595	3.21	0.044	3.00	1	5	1.084	-0.199	0.100	-0.395	0.200	
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	578	2.67	0.046	3.00	1	5	1.104	0.346	0.102	-0.429	0.203	
Flood control	578	3.54	0.042	4.00	1	5	1.015	-0.458	0.102	-0.140	0.203	
Budget management	579	2.70	0.045	3.00	1	5	1.092	0.120	0.102	-0.546	0.203	
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	582	2.82	0.051	3.00	1	5	1.240	0.139	0.101	-0.885	0.202	
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	578	2.59	0.044	3.00	1	5	1.066	0.348	0.102	-0.311	0.203	
Water conservation programs	580	3.31	0.048	3.00	1	5	1.154	-0.358	0.101	-0.592	0.203	
<i>* Social and Judicial Services</i>												
Providing child protection services	580	2.76	0.051	3.00	1	5	1.218	0.211	0.101	-0.798	0.203	
Providing child welfare services	585	2.80	0.046	3.00	1	5	1.124	0.155	0.101	-0.586	0.202	
Providing juvenile justice services	583	2.88	0.045	3.00	1	5	1.082	0.179	0.101	-0.307	0.202	
Providing attainable housing for working class families	585	2.53	0.047	2.00	1	5	1.129	0.457	0.101	-0.354	0.202	
Providing affordable housing for low income families	582	2.47	0.047	2.00	1	5	1.144	0.572	0.101	-0.295	0.202	
Providing shelter for the homeless	581	2.23	0.050	2.00	1	5	1.206	0.680	0.101	-0.505	0.202	
Providing affordable housing for seniors	575	2.70	0.047	3.00	1	5	1.128	0.265	0.102	-0.555	0.203	
Providing medical care for the poor	578	2.68	0.051	3.00	1	5	1.233	0.288	0.102	-0.836	0.203	
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	578	3.24	0.050	3.00	1	5	1.203	-0.268	0.102	-0.779	0.203	
<i>* Public Safety</i>												
Providing crime prevention programs	575	2.99	0.044	3.00	1	5	1.061	0.007	0.102	-0.351	0.203	
Enforcing traffic laws	590	2.99	0.050	3.00	1	5	1.210	0.074	0.101	-0.847	0.201	

## **Appendix II**

### **Performance Score for Selected Services**


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

<b>Importance Variable</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Error of Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>	<b>Std Error of Kurtosis</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Std. Error of Skewness</b>
Maintaining a low crime rate	592	2.82	0.047	3.00	1	5	1.154	0.235	0.100	-0.658	0.200
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	583	2.78	0.049	3.00	1	5	1.178	0.163	0.101	-0.721	0.202
Keeping police response times low	581	3.02	0.049	3.00	1	5	1.185	-0.117	0.101	-0.740	0.202
Keeping fire department response times low	577	3.75	0.041	4.00	1	5	0.980	-0.642	0.102	0.168	0.203
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	582	3.72	0.042	4.00	1	5	1.007	-0.693	0.101	0.260	0.202
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	574	3.85	0.042	4.00	1	5	1.008	-0.724	0.102	0.124	0.204
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	581	2.87	0.048	3.00	1	5	1.164	0.166	0.101	-0.676	0.202
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	581	2.87	0.047	3.00	1	5	1.129	0.039	0.101	-0.561	0.202
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	585	2.90	0.049	3.00	1	5	1.192	0.076	0.101	-0.766	0.202
Investigating criminal activity	589	3.08	0.045	3.00	1	5	1.101	-0.110	0.101	-0.453	0.201
Providing fire protection & prevention services	587	3.52	0.042	4.00	1	5	1.024	-0.360	0.101	-0.226	0.201
Providing emergency medical services	587	3.59	0.043	4.00	1	5	1.037	-0.503	0.101	-0.088	0.201
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	579	3.01	0.047	3.00	1	5	1.126	-0.019	0.101	-0.639	0.203
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	577	2.75	0.050	3.00	1	5	1.206	0.171	0.102	-0.832	0.203
Regional justice services and facilities	577	3.10	0.044	3.00	1	5	1.056	-0.225	0.102	-0.264	0.203
<i>* Community Development</i>											
Providing affordable housing	580	2.56	0.048	2.00	1	5	1.158	0.415	0.101	-0.516	0.203

Managing growth	587	2.62	0.049	3.00	1	5	1.195	0.300	0.101	-0.714	0.201
Increasing job opportunities	584	2.96	0.046	3.00	1	5	1.103	-0.025	0.101	-0.478	0.202
Improving the business climate	582	3.12	0.044	3.00	1	5	1.067	-0.140	0.101	-0.318	0.202
Planning for commercial development	579	3.14	0.048	3.00	1	5	1.148	-0.132	0.102	-0.591	0.203
Reducing traffic congestion	593	2.60	0.049	3.00	1	5	1.203	0.243	0.100	-0.836	0.200
Access to freeways	592	3.21	0.047	3.00	1	5	1.147	-0.136	0.100	-0.718	0.200
Improving road conditions	597	3.11	0.048	3.00	1	5	1.161	-0.190	0.100	-0.752	0.200
Reducing travel time	589	2.79	0.047	3.00	1	5	1.150	0.158	0.101	-0.658	0.201
Providing mass public transit	579	2.68	0.051	3.00	1	5	1.224	0.271	0.102	-0.803	0.203
Adequate airport facilities	581	3.59	0.045	4.00	1	5	1.076	-0.542	0.101	-0.179	0.202
Parks and recreation programs	581	3.54	0.046	4.00	1	5	1.097	-0.495	0.101	-0.319	0.202


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

**Road Maintenance**




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

**Revitalizing Older Neighborhoods**




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

**Flood Control**




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

**Budget Management**




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

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




**Appendix II Continued**  
**Performance Score 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**




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

**Water Conservation Programs**




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

**Providing Child Protection Services**




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

**Providing Child Welfare Services**




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

**Providing Juvenile Justice Services**




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

**Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families**




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

**Providing Affordable Housing for Low Income Families**




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

**Providing Shelter for the Homeless**




**Appendix II Continued**  
**Performance Score for Selected Services**  
**Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)**  
**Providing Affordable Housing for Seniors**




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

**Providing Medical Care for the Poor**




**Appendix II Continued**  
**Performance Score for Selected Services**  
**Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)**  
**Providing 24-Hour Emergency Trauma Care**




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

**Providing Crime Prevention Programs**




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

**Enforcing Traffic Laws**




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

**Maintaining a Low Crime Rate**




**Appendix II Continued**  
**Performance Score for Selected Services**  
**Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)**  
**Maintaining Neighborhood Police Patrols**




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

**Keeping Police Response Times Low**




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

**Keeping Fire Department Response Times Low**




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

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




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

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




**Appendix II Continued**  
**Performance Score for Selected Services**  
**Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)**  
**Facilitate Neighborhood Watch Programs**




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

**Preparing for Natural Disasters**




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

**Preparing for Man Made Accidents and Terrorist Acts**




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

**Investigating Criminal Activity**




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

**Providing Fire Protection and Prevention Services**




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




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

**Providing Neighborhood Code Enforcement Services**




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

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




**Appendix II Continued**  
**Performance Score for Selected Services**  
**Ranking 1-5 (1 being low 5 being high)**  
**Regional Justice Services and Facilities**




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

**Providing Affordable Housing**




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

**Managing Growth**




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

**Increasing Job Opportunities**




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

**Improving the Business Climate**




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




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

**Reducing Traffic Congestion**




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

**Access to Freeways**




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

**Improving Road Conditions**




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

**Reducing Travel Time**




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

**Providing Mass Public Transit**




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

**Adequate Airport Facilities**



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

**Parks and Recreation Programs**



Appendix II  
Performance Score for Selected Services  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

General Government Importance Measure	Region	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Road maintenance	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	3.18	0.069	3.00	3	1.056	-0.126	0.159	-0.362	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	189	2	3.23	0.077	3.00	3	1.063	-0.199	0.177	-0.291	0.352	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	3.13	0.145	3.00	3	1.209	-0.221	0.288	-0.620	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	78	2	3.20	0.122	3.00	3	1.083	-0.304	0.272	-0.145	0.537	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.41	0.334	4.00	2	1.249	-0.010	0.597	-1.724	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.75	0.370	4.00	4	1.113	-1.697	0.715	4.432	1.395	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Unincorporated Clark County	227	10	2.63	0.072	3.00	3	1.087	0.368	0.162	-0.347	0.322	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	183	7	2.65	0.080	3.00	2	1.081	0.463	0.179	-0.285	0.357	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	2.63	0.147	3.00	3	1.208	0.187	0.292	-0.839	0.577	1	5
	Henderson	78	3	2.84	0.127	3.00	3	1.124	0.322	0.273	-0.378	0.539	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.92	0.256	3.00	3	0.958	0.346	0.597	0.438	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	2.68	0.438	3.00	3	1.319	-0.022	0.715	-0.913	1.395	1	5
Flood control	Unincorporated Clark County	228	8	3.55	0.068	4.00	4	1.033	-0.446	0.161	-0.250	0.321	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	180	11	3.63	0.073	4.00	4	0.982	-0.645	0.181	0.382	0.360	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	3.45	0.114	4.00	4	0.936	-0.362	0.293	-0.065	0.578	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.50	0.116	3.73	3	1.043	-0.201	0.268	-0.641	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.02	0.311	3.00	3	1.163	-0.272	0.597	0.141	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.42	0.410	3.03	3	1.235	-0.632	0.715	0.932	1.395	1	5
Budget management	Unincorporated Clark County	224	12	2.76	0.074	3.00	3	1.102	0.059	0.163	-0.643	0.324	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	5	2.71	0.081	3.00	3	1.098	0.144	0.178	-0.461	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	2.75	0.137	3.00	3	1.127	-0.114	0.291	-0.572	0.574	1	5
	Henderson	80	1	2.42	0.113	2.00	2	1.009	0.380	0.270	-0.163	0.533	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	2.59	0.231	3.00	3	0.844	-0.446	0.611	0.098	1.180	1	4



Appendix II  
Performance Score for Selected Services  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

General Government Importance Measure	Region	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Water conservation programs	Unincorporated Clark County	228	8	2.80	0.082	3.00	3	1.233	0.230	0.161	-0.833	0.321	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	6	2.78	0.087	3.00	3	1.180	0.193	0.179	-0.720	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	2.77	0.159	3.00	3	1.312	0.114	0.291	-1.011	0.575	1	5
	Henderson	78	3	2.54	0.136	3.00	3	1.198	0.365	0.273	-0.644	0.539	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	2.89	0.237	3.00	3	0.861	0.238	0.613	1.667	1.185	1	5
	Mesquite	8	1	3.12	0.548	3.00	3	1.570	-0.235	0.744	-1.094	1.461	1	5
Providing child protection services	Unincorporated Clark County	229	7	2.85	0.075	3.00	3	1.128	0.151	0.161	-0.522	0.320	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	6	2.84	0.081	3.00	3	1.094	0.222	0.179	-0.492	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	2.71	0.153	3.00	2	1.271	0.176	0.288	-1.055	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	80	1	2.60	0.121	3.00	3	1.083	0.078	0.269	-0.555	0.531	1	5
	Boulder City	12	2	2.83	0.250	3.00	3	0.882	-0.255	0.627	-0.331	1.213	1	4
	Mesquite	9	0	2.85	0.377	3.00	3	1.136	0.045	0.715	0.014	1.395	1	5
Providing child welfare services	Unincorporated Clark County	230	7	2.96	0.073	3.00	3	1.101	0.191	0.161	-0.383	0.320	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	6	2.89	0.077	3.00	3	1.049	0.189	0.179	-0.180	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	2.88	0.148	3.00	3	1.233	0.095	0.288	-0.729	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	78	3	2.67	0.117	3.00	3	1.030	0.046	0.273	-0.153	0.539	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.64	0.192	3.00	3	0.720	-0.308	0.597	0.518	1.154	1	4
	Mesquite	8	1	2.64	0.281	2.24	2	0.807	0.875	0.744	-0.556	1.461	2	4
Providing juvenile justice services	Unincorporated Clark County	232	4	2.61	0.076	2.00	2	1.152	0.552	0.160	-0.301	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	5	2.54	0.083	3.00	3	1.135	0.434	0.178	-0.363	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	2.48	0.131	3.00	3	1.090	0.083	0.288	-0.675	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	75	6	2.32	0.124	2.00	2	1.071	0.464	0.277	-0.430	0.548	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.47	0.289	2.36	3	1.081	0.389	0.597	0.113	1.154	1	5

	Mesquite	9	0	2.29	0.422	2.00	2	1.269	0.844	0.715	0.276	1.395	1	5
Providing attainable housing for working class families	Unincorporated Clark County	230	6	2.60	0.079	2.00	2	1.205	0.604	0.160	-0.423	0.320	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	6	2.41	0.081	2.00	2	1.105	0.586	0.179	-0.200	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	2.36	0.141	2.00	1	1.160	0.246	0.292	-1.060	0.577	1	5
	Henderson	78	2	2.38	0.118	2.00	3	1.043	0.459	0.272	-0.022	0.537	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	2.22	0.264	2.00	2	0.957	0.993	0.613	2.747	1.185	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	1.99	0.381	2.00	1	1.147	1.446	0.715	3.319	1.395	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low income families	Unincorporated Clark County	230	6	2.31	0.082	2.00	1	1.252	0.652	0.160	-0.609	0.319	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	182	8	2.19	0.084	2.00	1	1.132	0.676	0.180	-0.308	0.358	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	2.15	0.150	2.00	1	1.246	0.612	0.288	-0.810	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	76	5	2.20	0.147	2.00	1	1.282	0.763	0.276	-0.551	0.546	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	1.95	0.255	2.00	1	0.953	0.536	0.597	-0.721	1.154	1	4
	Mesquite	9	0	2.03	0.306	2.00	2	0.922	0.610	0.715	0.262	1.395	1	4
Providing shelter for the homeless	Unincorporated Clark County	226	10	2.81	0.078	3.00	3	1.171	0.246	0.162	-0.638	0.322	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	6	2.67	0.077	3.00	3	1.048	0.255	0.179	-0.347	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	65	5	2.62	0.155	3.00	3	1.245	0.128	0.297	-1.032	0.587	1	5
	Henderson	77	4	2.56	0.127	2.00	2	1.120	0.389	0.274	-0.466	0.541	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	2.72	0.269	3.00	3	0.983	0.260	0.611	1.558	1.180	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	2.52	0.340	2.00	2	1.022	1.317	0.715	2.408	1.395	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors	Unincorporated Clark County	230	6	2.84	0.086	3.00	3	1.309	0.190	0.160	-0.992	0.319	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	181	10	2.64	0.087	3.00	2	1.164	0.282	0.181	-0.738	0.359	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	2.59	0.156	2.88	1	1.298	0.346	0.288	-0.929	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	75	5	2.50	0.132	2.00	2	1.144	0.301	0.277	-0.757	0.547	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.49	0.230	2.36	2	0.862	0.036	0.597	-0.230	1.154	1	4
Providing medical care for the poor	Mesquite	8	1	1.97	0.311	2.00	2	0.891	0.949	0.744	1.814	1.461	1	4
	Unincorporated Clark County	228	9	3.36	0.080	3.00	3	1.206	-0.326	0.161	-0.736	0.321	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	7	3.33	0.086	3.00	4	1.164	-0.317	0.179	-0.662	0.357	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	3	2.95	0.159	3.00	3	1.295	-0.048	0.294	-0.968	0.581	1	5
	Henderson	78	3	3.01	0.134	3.00	4	1.181	-0.244	0.273	-0.937	0.539	1	5
Boulder City	14	0	2.95	0.287	3.00	3	1.075	-0.282	0.597	-0.009	1.154	1	5	

	Mesquite	9	1	2.93	0.390	3.00	3	1.138	-0.026	0.734	-0.019	1.438	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	Unincorporated Clark County	228	8	2.80	0.082	3.00	3	1.233	0.230	0.161	-0.833	0.321	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	6	2.78	0.087	3.00	3	1.180	0.193	0.179	-0.720	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	2.77	0.159	3.00	3	1.312	0.114	0.291	-1.011	0.575	1	5
	Henderson	78	3	2.54	0.136	3.00	3	1.198	0.365	0.273	-0.644	0.539	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	2.89	0.237	3.00	3	0.861	0.238	0.613	1.667	1.185	1	5
	Mesquite	8	1	3.12	0.548	3.00	3	1.570	-0.235	0.744	-1.094	1.461	1	5

Appendix II  
Performance Score for Selected Services  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Importance Measure	Region	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Providing crime prevention programs	Unincorporated Clark County	226	10	3.01	0.073	3.00	3	1.099	0.055	0.162	-0.426	0.322	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	177	13	3.00	0.075	3.00	3	1.003	-0.185	0.182	-0.086	0.363	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	2.84	0.142	3.00	3	1.179	0.234	0.288	-0.674	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	80	1	2.95	0.108	3.00	3	0.963	-0.023	0.269	-0.069	0.532	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.23	0.235	3.00	3	0.877	0.505	0.597	0.156	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	1	3.85	0.398	4.00	5	1.160	-0.458	0.734	-1.192	1.438	2	5
Enforcing traffic laws	Unincorporated Clark County	234	2	2.98	0.081	3.00	3	1.247	0.146	0.159	-0.840	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	6	3.03	0.088	3.00	3	1.200	-0.064	0.179	-0.869	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	3.13	0.137	3.00	3	1.128	0.055	0.291	-0.768	0.574	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	2.75	0.132	3.00	3	1.183	0.271	0.268	-0.670	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.33	0.309	3.39	4	1.155	-0.282	0.597	-0.594	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.03	0.443	3.00	3	1.332	0.163	0.715	-0.703	1.395	1	5
Maintaining low crime rates	Unincorporated Clark County	234	2	2.79	0.077	3.00	3	1.180	0.262	0.159	-0.687	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	4	2.78	0.081	3.00	3	1.101	0.264	0.178	-0.403	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	3.02	0.147	3.00	4	1.210	-0.051	0.291	-0.982	0.574	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	2.67	0.116	3.00	3	1.042	0.345	0.268	-0.186	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.17	0.381	3.00	4	1.426	-0.236	0.597	-1.149	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.65	0.449	4.00	5	1.352	-0.266	0.715	-1.965	1.395	2	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	2.83	0.075	3.00	3	1.146	0.072	0.159	-0.639	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	180	10	2.75	0.088	3.00	3	1.177	0.280	0.181	-0.511	0.360	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	2.79	0.160	3.00	4	1.316	0.061	0.292	-1.310	0.577	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	2.52	0.125	2.52	3	1.107	0.318	0.271	-0.527	0.535	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	3.38	0.293	3.00	3	1.063	-0.301	0.613	0.448	1.185	1	5

	Mesquite	8	1	3.41	0.467	3.00	2	1.340	0.228	0.744	-1.968	1.461	2	5
Keeping police response times low	Unincorporated Clark County	230	6	3.03	0.081	3.00	3	1.228	-0.116	0.161	-0.856	0.320	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	183	8	2.95	0.084	3.00	3	1.135	-0.108	0.180	-0.583	0.358	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	2.88	0.155	3.00	3	1.270	-0.038	0.293	-0.985	0.578	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	3.02	0.120	3.00	3	1.066	-0.140	0.271	-0.343	0.536	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.90	0.230	4.00	4	0.861	-0.383	0.597	-0.156	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.47	0.474	3.00	3	1.426	-0.214	0.715	-1.008	1.395	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low	Unincorporated Clark County	226	10	3.76	0.067	4.00	4	1.014	-0.747	0.162	0.224	0.322	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	6	3.70	0.070	4.00	4	0.946	-0.449	0.179	-0.048	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	65	4	3.75	0.134	4.00	4	1.078	-0.647	0.297	-0.073	0.586	1	5
	Henderson	78	3	3.72	0.102	4.00	4	0.900	-0.827	0.272	1.280	0.538	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.10	0.190	4.00	4	0.712	-0.147	0.597	-0.709	1.154	3	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.80	0.393	4.00	5	1.182	-0.446	0.715	-1.236	1.395	2	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Unincorporated Clark County	230	6	3.78	0.068	4.00	4	1.026	-0.798	0.160	0.253	0.319	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	7	3.67	0.068	4.00	4	0.926	-0.545	0.179	0.407	0.357	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	3	3.65	0.140	4.00	4	1.146	-0.578	0.294	-0.304	0.579	1	5
	Henderson	78	2	3.61	0.119	4.00	3	1.053	-0.701	0.272	0.540	0.537	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	4.06	0.214	4.00	4	0.801	-0.995	0.597	1.995	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	1	4.26	0.243	4.00	4	0.707	-0.434	0.734	-0.305	1.438	3	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	Unincorporated Clark County	231	5	3.94	0.066	4.00	4	1.011	-0.825	0.160	0.260	0.319	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	6	3.70	0.076	4.00	4	1.029	-0.606	0.179	-0.024	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	63	6	4.02	0.106	4.00	4	0.848	-0.502	0.301	-0.395	0.593	2	5
	Henderson	73	8	3.76	0.124	4.00	4	1.056	-0.807	0.282	0.377	0.557	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.87	0.244	4.00	4	0.911	-0.314	0.597	-0.527	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.13	0.359	4.31	5	1.082	-1.113	0.715	0.434	1.395	2	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Unincorporated Clark County	225	11	2.91	0.079	3.00	3	1.183	0.208	0.162	-0.673	0.323	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	4	2.89	0.082	3.00	3	1.122	0.053	0.178	-0.696	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	2.97	0.153	3.00	3	1.259	0.207	0.292	-0.913	0.577	1	5
	Henderson	80	1	2.65	0.127	3.00	3	1.131	0.232	0.269	-0.438	0.532	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.77	0.300	3.00	3	1.122	0.049	0.597	-0.150	1.154	1	5

	Mesquite	9	1	3.02	0.416	3.00	3	1.212	-0.051	0.734	0.338	1.438	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Unincorporated Clark County	232	5	2.85	0.076	3.00	3	1.154	0.115	0.160	-0.596	0.319	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	5	2.90	0.082	3.00	3	1.117	-0.065	0.178	-0.518	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	3	2.85	0.132	3.00	3	1.072	0.018	0.295	-0.306	0.581	1	5
	Henderson	77	3	2.83	0.136	3.00	3	1.195	0.111	0.273	-0.649	0.541	1	5
	Boulder City	12	2	2.81	0.238	3.00	3	0.831	-0.367	0.632	0.253	1.222	1	4
	Mesquite	8	1	3.44	0.365	3.83	4	1.046	-0.188	0.744	-0.840	1.461	2	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	Unincorporated Clark County	230	6	2.91	0.081	3.00	3	1.226	0.072	0.160	-0.835	0.320	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	4	2.85	0.085	3.00	3	1.165	0.143	0.178	-0.636	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	1	2.91	0.147	3.00	3	1.214	0.259	0.290	-0.781	0.573	1	5
	Henderson	79	1	2.93	0.133	3.00	3	1.186	-0.147	0.270	-0.781	0.533	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	3.02	0.303	3.00	3	1.080	-0.387	0.622	0.506	1.201	1	5
	Mesquite	9	1	2.74	0.410	3.00	3	1.195	-0.527	0.734	-1.113	1.438	1	4
Investigating criminal activity	Unincorporated Clark County	232	4	3.16	0.070	3.00	3	1.070	-0.123	0.160	-0.210	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	6	2.99	0.080	3.00	3	1.085	0.043	0.179	-0.396	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	3.03	0.157	3.00	3	1.309	-0.022	0.288	-1.055	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	79	1	2.96	0.117	3.00	3	1.039	-0.538	0.270	-0.485	0.534	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.35	0.255	4.00	4	0.954	-0.329	0.597	-1.022	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.68	0.351	3.69	3	1.056	-0.025	0.715	-1.041	1.395	2	5
Providing fire protection & prevention services	Unincorporated Clark County	232	4	3.49	0.069	3.00	3	1.059	-0.366	0.160	-0.250	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	188	3	3.55	0.074	4.00	3	1.014	-0.403	0.177	-0.111	0.353	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	3.47	0.135	4.00	4	1.106	-0.426	0.292	-0.382	0.576	1	5
	Henderson	78	3	3.56	0.103	4.00	4	0.909	-0.142	0.272	-0.451	0.538	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.76	0.211	4.00	3	0.791	0.484	0.597	-1.135	1.154	3	5
	Mesquite	8	1	3.58	0.417	3.00	3	1.153	0.445	0.765	-1.534	1.514	2	5
Providing emergency medical services	Unincorporated Clark County	232	4	3.62	0.068	4.00	4	1.041	-0.460	0.160	-0.189	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	3	3.54	0.074	4.00	3	1.008	-0.427	0.178	0.060	0.353	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	3.52	0.146	4.00	4	1.203	-0.614	0.291	-0.506	0.574	1	5
	Henderson	77	4	3.58	0.115	4.00	4	1.007	-0.655	0.274	0.235	0.541	1	5

	Boulder City	14	0	3.85	0.219	4.00	3	0.821	0.303	0.597	-1.412	1.154	3	5
	Mesquite	8	1	3.87	0.271	4.00	4	0.768	0.249	0.752	-0.810	1.480	3	5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Unincorporated Clark County	229	7	3.00	0.074	3.00	3	1.124	-0.096	0.161	-0.707	0.320	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	5	3.01	0.081	3.00	3	1.102	0.056	0.178	-0.414	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	64	5	3.04	0.146	3.00	3	1.170	0.061	0.299	-0.780	0.591	1	5
	Henderson	78	2	2.99	0.134	3.00	3	1.186	0.008	0.272	-0.766	0.537	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.12	0.299	3.00	3	1.119	-0.366	0.597	0.175	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	1	2.91	0.386	3.00	3	1.127	0.018	0.734	0.134	1.438	1	5
	Unincorporated Clark County	226	10	2.74	0.080	3.00	3	1.203	0.180	0.162	-0.816	0.322	1	5
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	City of Las Vegas	181	9	2.77	0.091	3.00	3	1.225	0.164	0.180	-0.812	0.359	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	2.85	0.157	3.00	3	1.293	0.012	0.291	-1.071	0.574	1	5
	Henderson	80	1	2.68	0.126	3.00	3	1.130	0.296	0.269	-0.558	0.532	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	2.38	0.296	2.00	2	1.056	0.152	0.622	-1.000	1.201	1	4
	Mesquite	9	0	3.07	0.415	3.00	4	1.250	-0.050	0.715	-0.749	1.395	1	5

Appendix II  
Performance Score for Selected Services  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Community Development Importance Measure	Region	N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Regional justice services and facilities	Unincorporated Clark County	228	8	3.21	0.069	3.00	3	1.044	-0.287	0.161	-0.091	0.321	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	180	10	3.03	0.079	3.00	3	1.056	-0.175	0.181	-0.322	0.360	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	3.20	0.139	3.00	3	1.143	-0.164	0.291	-0.413	0.574	1	5
	Henderson	77	3	2.88	0.113	3.00	3	0.990	-0.380	0.273	-0.413	0.540	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.29	0.235	3.00	3	0.881	0.006	0.597	-0.549	1.154	2	5
	Mesquite	9	0	2.41	0.355	3.00	3	1.068	-0.424	0.715	-1.202	1.395	1	4
Providing affordable housing	Unincorporated Clark County	232	5	2.64	0.077	3.00	3	1.174	0.396	0.160	-0.514	0.319	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	182	8	2.45	0.082	2.00	3	1.107	0.380	0.180	-0.478	0.358	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	2.79	0.150	3.00	3	1.252	0.188	0.288	-0.913	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	74	7	2.34	0.125	2.00	2	1.074	0.684	0.279	0.062	0.552	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	2.43	0.316	2.00	2	1.154	0.693	0.611	0.321	1.180	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	2.88	0.461	3.00	3	1.386	0.260	0.715	-0.617	1.395	1	5
Managing Growth	Unincorporated Clark County	234	2	2.62	0.079	3.00	3	1.214	0.422	0.159	-0.608	0.317	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	6	2.52	0.086	3.00	3	1.165	0.280	0.179	-0.779	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	2.85	0.153	3.00	3	1.253	0.030	0.292	-0.737	0.577	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	2.48	0.120	2.00	3	1.063	0.260	0.271	-0.609	0.536	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.13	0.339	3.00	4	1.269	-0.387	0.597	-0.604	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.41	0.457	3.87	4	1.377	-0.558	0.715	-0.536	1.395	1	5
Increasing job opportunities	Unincorporated Clark County	232	4	2.93	0.074	3.00	3	1.123	0.077	0.160	-0.468	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	4	2.92	0.079	3.00	3	1.075	-0.064	0.178	-0.514	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	4	3.19	0.164	3.00	3	1.326	-0.316	0.296	-0.898	0.583	1	5
	Henderson	78	3	2.95	0.092	3.00	3	0.814	-0.143	0.272	0.652	0.538	1	5
	Boulder City	12	2	2.59	0.294	3.00	3	1.037	-0.312	0.627	-0.825	1.213	1	4

	Mesquite	9	0	3.31	0.514	3.69	5	1.548	-0.523	0.715	-1.050	1.395	1	5
Improving the business climate	Unincorporated Clark County	230	6	3.04	0.071	3.00	3	1.074	-0.123	0.161	-0.307	0.320	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	6	3.08	0.078	3.00	3	1.066	-0.090	0.179	-0.340	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	2	3.27	0.147	3.00	3	1.203	-0.226	0.292	-0.663	0.576	1	5
	Henderson	78	3	3.29	0.094	3.00	3	0.830	0.002	0.273	0.339	0.540	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	2.94	0.330	3.00	3	1.203	-0.421	0.611	-0.572	1.180	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.50	0.460	3.20	5	1.383	-0.398	0.715	-0.689	1.395	1	5
Planning for commercial development	Unincorporated Clark County	230	6	3.14	0.078	3.00	3	1.186	-0.138	0.160	-0.658	0.319	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	182	9	3.15	0.082	3.00	3	1.101	-0.176	0.180	-0.538	0.358	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	2	3.14	0.136	3.00	3	1.121	-0.147	0.291	-0.274	0.575	1	5
	Henderson	78	3	3.09	0.134	3.00	3	1.188	-0.037	0.272	-0.662	0.538	1	5
	Boulder City	12	2	2.72	0.257	3.00	3	0.907	-0.618	0.627	0.219	1.213	1	4
	Mesquite	9	1	3.92	0.390	4.00	5	1.138	-0.556	0.734	-1.027	1.438	2	5
Reducing traffic congestion	Unincorporated Clark County	235	1	2.68	0.083	3.00	3	1.267	0.219	0.159	-1.012	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	5	2.53	0.083	3.00	3	1.128	0.158	0.178	-0.807	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	1	2.60	0.158	3.00	3	1.312	0.383	0.289	-0.799	0.571	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	2.43	0.110	2.23	3	0.992	0.131	0.268	-0.581	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.61	0.314	3.00	3	1.176	-0.011	0.597	-0.659	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	9	0	3.70	0.499	4.00	5	1.501	-1.156	0.715	0.382	1.395	1	5
Access to freeways	Unincorporated Clark County	236	0	3.24	0.080	3.00	3	1.234	-0.147	0.158	-0.978	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	4	3.09	0.078	3.00	3	1.059	-0.103	0.178	-0.395	0.354	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	3.11	0.132	3.00	3	1.097	0.219	0.288	-0.592	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	3.48	0.121	4.00	3	1.077	-0.484	0.270	-0.104	0.534	1	5
	Boulder City	12	2	2.98	0.344	3.00	3	1.213	-0.500	0.627	-0.233	1.213	1	5
	Mesquite	9	1	3.88	0.360	4.00	4	1.049	-0.803	0.734	0.174	1.438	2	5
Improving road conditions	Unincorporated Clark County	236	0	3.15	0.077	3.00	4	1.176	-0.282	0.158	-0.756	0.316	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	188	3	3.04	0.087	3.00	3	1.190	-0.135	0.177	-0.809	0.353	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	2.97	0.150	3.00	3	1.248	0.102	0.288	-0.801	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	81	0	3.16	0.107	3.00	3	0.957	-0.214	0.268	-0.452	0.530	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.29	0.294	3.53	4	1.100	-0.400	0.597	-0.427	1.154	1	5

	Mesquite	9	0	3.89	0.369	4.00	5	1.111	-0.572	0.715	-0.793	1.395	2	5
Reducing travel time	Unincorporated Clark County	232	4	2.76	0.077	3.00	3	1.170	0.190	0.160	-0.738	0.318	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	5	2.75	0.085	3.00	3	1.158	0.205	0.178	-0.620	0.355	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	0	2.82	0.152	3.00	3	1.269	0.157	0.288	-0.820	0.569	1	5
	Henderson	79	2	2.83	0.106	3.00	3	0.941	0.000	0.270	0.048	0.534	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	2.64	0.330	2.74	4	1.197	-0.120	0.613	-1.551	1.185	1	4
	Mesquite	9	0	3.65	0.351	3.87	3	1.055	-0.102	0.715	-0.917	1.395	2	5
Providing mass public transit	Unincorporated Clark County	231	5	2.67	0.084	3.00	3	1.277	0.338	0.160	-0.863	0.319	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	6	2.59	0.082	3.00	3	1.116	0.307	0.179	-0.501	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	3	2.91	0.153	3.00	3	1.246	0.023	0.294	-0.758	0.579	1	5
	Henderson	75	5	2.72	0.144	3.00	3	1.253	0.158	0.277	-1.000	0.547	1	5
	Boulder City	13	1	2.37	0.341	2.00	1	1.237	0.268	0.613	-1.574	1.185	1	4
	Mesquite	9	0	3.41	0.448	3.48	5	1.348	-0.241	0.715	-1.102	1.395	1	5
Adequate airport facilities	Unincorporated Clark County	227	9	3.71	0.072	4.00	4	1.080	-0.652	0.162	-0.040	0.322	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	6	3.51	0.077	4.00	4	1.049	-0.481	0.179	-0.159	0.356	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	1	3.56	0.138	4.00	4	1.142	-0.516	0.289	-0.366	0.571	1	5
	Henderson	79	1	3.67	0.112	4.00	4	0.998	-0.666	0.270	0.528	0.534	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	2.93	0.277	3.00	2	1.037	0.226	0.597	-0.366	1.154	1	5
	Mesquite	8	1	3.05	0.496	3.00	3	1.373	-0.026	0.765	-0.384	1.514	1	5
Parks and Recreation Programs	Unincorporated Clark County	231	5	3.53	0.075	4.00	4	1.135	-0.575	0.160	-0.253	0.319	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	182	8	3.53	0.076	4.00	4	1.020	-0.449	0.180	-0.235	0.358	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	1	3.39	0.137	3.00	3	1.136	-0.058	0.289	-0.818	0.571	1	5
	Henderson	75	6	3.63	0.134	4.00	4	1.160	-0.703	0.277	-0.072	0.548	1	5
	Boulder City	14	0	3.96	0.203	4.00	4	0.760	0.067	0.597	-1.084	1.154	3	5
	Mesquite	9	0	4.00	0.385	4.31	5	1.158	-0.638	0.715	-1.128	1.395	2	5




## **Appendix III**

### **Quality of Life Considerations**




Appendix III  
Quality of Life Considerations

	1	2	3	4	5	DK/ No answer	Total
Preparing for a man-made disaster	6.3	9.7	21.0	21.3	39.1	2.5	100.0
Quality of drinking water	10.4	8.0	20.3	20.4	39.7	1.1	100.0
Recreational opportunities	4.5	9.7	28.2	30.8	25.1	1.6	100.0
Condition of streets and roads	4.1	7.1	24.4	30.8	33.1	0.5	100.0
Availability of public transportation	10.8	13.3	28.3	21.8	22.8	2.9	100.0
Housing affordability	9.8	12.9	24.6	20.2	30.5	2.0	100.0
Air Quality	5.8	8.8	21.7	21.6	41.7	0.4	100.0
Availability of job opportunities	5.7	7.6	27.7	25.5	31.2	2.3	100.0
Managing growth	8.0	8.6	23.0	20.4	37.8	2.2	100.0




Appendix III  
Quality of Life Considerations

The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	Frequency	Percent
Support	163	27.2
Oppose	407	67.9
DK/No answer	29	4.9
Total	600	100.0




Appendix III  
Quality of Life Considerations

The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	46	7.7
Agree	137	22.8
Disagree	175	29.2
Strongly disagree	217	36.1
DK/No answer	25	4.2
Total	600	100.0




Appendix III  
Quality of Life Considerations

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.	Frequency	Percent
Positive effect	72	11.9
No effect	153	25.5
Negative effect	359	59.9
DK/No answer	16	2.7
Total	600	100.0




### Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations

Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest positive impact on your quality of life?	Frequency	Percent
Scenery/geography/climate	162	27.0
Family/friends/friendly people	59	9.9
Entertainment/social climate	108	18.0
Quiet/Peaceful	20	3.3
Personal/Family safety	23	3.8
Job opportunities	107	17.9
Education	32	5.3
Growth	3	.6
Low taxes	14	2.4
Strong economy	12	1.9
Nothing	43	7.2
DK/No answer	16	2.7
Total	600	100.0




### Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations

Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest negative impact on your quality of life?	Frequency	Percent
Traffic congestion	97	16.2
Overcrowding/unplanned growth	114	19.0
Cost of living/housing	76	12.7
Road conditions	13	2.1
Crime/violence/gangs	103	17.2
Air quality	43	7.1
Drought conditions	35	5.8
Education	22	3.7
Gaming	23	3.8
Illegal immigration	12	2.0
Political corruption	6	.9
Yucca Mountain	7	1.2
Inadequate social services	5	.9
Water quality	3	.5
Nothing	25	4.2
DK/No answer	17	2.8
Total	600	100.0



### Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations


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
More affordable housing	70	11.6
Less traffic congestion	72	12.0
Improve K-12 education	64	10.7
Improve higher education	28	4.6
Better services for the homeless	13	2.2
More efficient government/government officials	35	5.8
Stop growth	36	6.1
Slow growth	61	10.2
Better jobs/training	34	5.6
Increased access to health care	16	2.6
Lower crime rates	93	15.5
Stop Yucca Mountain	47	7.8
Improve air quality	9	1.4
Stop illegal immigration	7	1.2
Nothing	7	1.2
DK/No answer	8	1.3
Total	600	100.0



- 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
- Nothing
- DK/No answer

Appendix III  
Quality of Life Considerations

Overall would you say the quality of life in Clark County is getting better, staying the same or getting worse?	Frequency	Percent
Getting better	105	17.6
Staying about the same	238	39.6
Getting worse	246	41.1
DK/No answer	11	1.8
Total	600	100.0



Appendix III  
Quality of Life Considerations

<b>Unincorporated Clark County</b>	Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man made disaster	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	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	5.77	4.95	4.84	3.81	4.91	4.13	3.87	4.74	4.31
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Std. Deviation	13.366	10.785	10.488	1.080	12.066	7.377	1.229	9.638	7.362
Skewness	6.758	8.450	8.740	-.691	7.558	12.362	-.819	9.517	12.368
Std. Error of Skewness	.158	.158	.158	.158	.158	.158	.158	.158	.158
Kurtosis	44.440	71.193	75.978	.038	56.328	157.096	-.332	90.699	157.209
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.316	.316	.316	.316	.316	.316	.316	.316	.316
Range	97	97	97	4	97	97	4	97	97
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	98	98	98	5	98	98	5	98	98

Appendix III  
Quality of Life Considerations

City of Las Vegas		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man made disaster	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	191	191	191	191	191	191	191	191	191
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		7.74	3.70	4.40	4.11	6.11	6.57	4.65	7.63	6.77
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Std. Deviation		19.084	1.336	8.917	5.243	15.926	17.100	8.725	19.151	16.905
Skewness		4.546	-.701	10.352	17.126	5.623	5.181	10.503	4.538	5.235
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.176	.176	.176	.176	.176	.176	.176	.176
Kurtosis		18.971	-.676	107.993	310.501	30.137	25.302	111.820	18.882	25.858
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.350	.350	.350	.350	.350	.350	.350	.350	.350
Range		97	4	97	97	97	97	97	97	97
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	5	98	98	98	98	98	98	98



Appendix III  
Quality of Life Considerations

<b>City of Henderson</b>		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man made disaster	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	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.89	3.76	5.05	3.78	5.41	3.53	3.92	4.89	3.88
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Std. Deviation		1.299	1.348	11.635	1.018	14.610	1.324	1.192	10.819	1.232
Skewness		-.908	-.748	8.000	-.522	6.282	-.469	-.809	8.607	-.757
Std. Error of Skewness		.268	.268	.268	.268	.268	.268	.268	.268	.268
Kurtosis		-.377	-.600	64.132	-.464	38.802	-.901	-.293	74.833	-.540
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.530	.530	.530	.530	.530	.530	.530	.530	.530
Range		4	4	97	4	97	4	4	97	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	98	5	98	5	5	98	5

Appendix III  
Quality of Life Considerations

<b>City of Boulder City</b>		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man made disaster	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	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.68	3.90	3.59	4.09	8.33	13.69	3.93	2.82	4.07
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.95	4.00	3.00	4.71
Std. Deviation		1.123	1.184	1.117	.777	23.478	30.798	1.058	1.175	1.283
Skewness		-.546	-.855	-.541	-.162	4.158	2.791	-.213	-.024	-1.479
Std. Error of Skewness		.597	.597	.597	.597	.597	.597	.597	.597	.597
Kurtosis		.324	.567	.251	-1.190	17.926	6.771	-1.559	-.630	1.583
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154
Range		4	4	4	2	97	97	3	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	98	98	5	5	5

Appendix III  
Quality of Life Considerations

City of Mesquite		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man made disaster	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	9	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.75	3.99	12.78	4.14	3.71	3.23	3.57	4.01	3.90
Median		4.00	4.87	4.10	4.00	3.24	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Std. Deviation		1.058	1.467	28.899	.761	1.136	1.140	1.284	.859	.923
Skewness		-.370	-1.372	3.392	-.266	.035	.838	-.946	-.017	.244
Std. Error of Skewness		.715	.715	.715	.715	.715	.715	.715	.715	.715
Kurtosis		-.718	.684	12.251	-.858	-1.564	-.401	.467	-1.669	-1.997
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395
Range		3	4	96	2	3	3	4	2	2
Minimum		2	1	2	3	2	2	1	3	3
Maximum		5	5	98	5	5	5	5	5	5



## **Appendix IV**

### **General Economic Considerations**




Appendix IV  
General Economic Conditions  
(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?	About a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	600	600	600	600	600
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.79	3.32	4.61	4.31	5.05
Std. Error of Mean		.376	.509	.614	.632	.744
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		9.219	12.470	15.041	15.470	18.215
Skewness		10.203	7.463	6.055	5.902	4.920
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.100	.100	.100
Kurtosis		103.082	54.056	34.865	33.004	22.302
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.199	.199	.199	.199	.199
Range		97	97	97	97	97
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	98	98	98


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 off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Frequency	Percent
Better	182	30.4
About the same	287	47.8
Worse	125	20.9
DK/No answer	6	.9
Total	600	100.0




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	Percent
Better	263	43.9
About the same	250	41.7
Worse	76	12.7
DK/No answer	10	1.7
Total	600	100.0




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	Percent
Excellent	80	13.3
Good	327	54.6
Fair	161	26.9
Poor	16	2.7
DK/No answer	15	2.5
Total	600	100.0




Appendix IV  
General Economic Conditions

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	Percent
Better	190	31.7
About the same	343	57.2
Worse	51	8.5
DK/No answer	16	2.6
Total	600	100.0



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	Percent
Good time	296	49.3
Bad time	282	47.0
DK/No answer	22	3.7
Total	600	100.0



Appendix IV  
 General Economic Conditions  
 Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County	We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	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	236	236	236	236
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.68	3.86	4.16	5.26
Std. Error of Mean		.544	.936	.882	1.254
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		8.353	14.381	13.549	19.269
Skewness		11.341	6.434	6.821	4.615
Std. Error of Skewness		.158	.158	.158	.158
Kurtosis		128.619	39.832	45.043	19.485
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.316	.316	.316	.316
Range		97	97	97	97
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	98	98

Appendix IV  
 General Economic Conditions  
 Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	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	191	191	191
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.86	2.55	4.00	2.97	4.13
Std. Error of Mean		.052	.656	.945	.766	1.148
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.718	9.050	13.039	10.572	15.849
Skewness		.217	10.504	7.126	8.943	5.810
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.176	.176	.176	.176
Kurtosis		-1.037	110.112	49.442	79.074	32.129
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.350	.350	.350	.350	.350
Range		2	97	97	97	97
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	98	98	98	98

Appendix IV  
 General Economic Conditions  
 Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas	We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	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	69	69	69	69
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.97	5.07	7.81	5.13
Std. Error of Mean		2.042	2.151	2.695	2.163
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		17.010	17.921	22.450	18.018
Skewness		5.436	5.135	3.879	5.105
Std. Error of Skewness		.288	.288	.288	.288
Kurtosis		28.427	25.140	13.455	24.803
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.569	.569	.569	.569
Range		97	97	97	97
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	98	98

Appendix IV  
 General Economic Conditions  
 Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	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	81	81	81	81	81
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.72	2.52	5.29	2.61	4.33
Std. Error of Mean		1.476	1.004	1.956	1.002	1.818
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		13.257	9.018	17.570	9.001	16.333
Skewness		7.125	10.691	5.211	10.721	5.698
Std. Error of Skewness		.268	.268	.268	.268	.268
Kurtosis		50.194	115.941	25.837	116.376	31.281
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.530	.530	.530	.530	.530
Range		97	97	97	97	97
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	98	98	98

Appendix IV  
 General Economic Conditions  
 Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	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	14	14	14	14	14
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.75	1.70	2.25	1.95	6.42
Std. Error of Mean		.182	.178	.193	.172	5.831
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		.679	.665	.723	.643	21.812
Skewness		.352	.417	.378	.038	4.638
Std. Error of Skewness		.597	.597	.597	.597	.597
Kurtosis		-.515	-.454	.775	-.014	22.794
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154
Range		2	2	3	2	97
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	98

Appendix IV  
 General Economic Conditions  
 Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair or poor?	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	9	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean	1.79	1.51	1.98	7.69	1.23
	Std. Error of Mean	.243	.215	.161	8.167	.149
	Median	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
	Std. Deviation	.732	.648	.484	24.582	.447
	Skewness	.369	.957	-.111	4.401	1.539
	Std. Error of Skewness	.715	.715	.715	.715	.715
	Kurtosis	-.578	.435	4.512	22.411	.403
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395
	Range	2	2	2	97	1
	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	3	3	3	98	2

Appendix IV  
General Economic Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**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 off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?**

		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?				Total
		Better	About the same	Worse	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	61	122	51	2	236
	City of Las Vegas	64	89	37	0	190
	City of North Las Vegas	19	34	14	2	69
	City of Henderson	29	30	20	2	81
	City of Boulder City	5	7	2	0	14
	City of Mesquite	3	4	1	0	8
Total		181	286	125	6	598

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.085(a)	15	.519
Likelihood Ratio	15.067	15	.447
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.069	1	.301
N of Valid Cases	598		

a 11 cells (45.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .08.

Appendix IV  
 General Economic Conditions  
 Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

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

		Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?				Total
		Better	About the same	Worse	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	104	97	30	5	236
	City of Las Vegas	79	86	23	2	190
	City of North Las Vegas	31	26	9	2	68
	City of Henderson	38	30	12	1	81
	City of Boulder City	6	7	1	0	14
	City of Mesquite	5	3	1	0	9
Total		263	249	76	10	598

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.888(a)	15	.993
Likelihood Ratio	5.238	15	.990
Linear-by-Linear Association	.355	1	.551
N of Valid Cases	598		

a 10 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .15.

Appendix IV  
 General Economic Conditions  
 Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	32	122	73	5	5	237
	City of Las Vegas	22	110	49	6	4	191
	City of North Las Vegas	8	31	23	3	4	69
	City of Henderson	15	49	11	2	3	80
	City of Boulder City	2	8	4	1	0	15
	City of Mesquite	1	7	1	0	0	9
Total		80	327	161	17	16	601

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.592(a)	20	.422
Likelihood Ratio	21.550	20	.365
Linear-by-Linear Association	.320	1	.572
N of Valid Cases	601		

a 13 cells (43.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .24.

Appendix IV  
General Economic Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**Respondent Jurisdiction: \* 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?**

		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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	77	133	16	10	236
	City of Las Vegas	57	112	20	2	191
	City of North Las Vegas	24	39	4	2	69
	City of Henderson	26	46	8	1	81
	City of Boulder City	3	9	2	0	14
	City of Mesquite	3	5	1	1	10
Total		190	344	51	16	601

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.430(a)	15	.722
Likelihood Ratio	11.363	15	.726
Linear-by-Linear Association	.652	1	.419
N of Valid Cases	601		

a. 8 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.

Appendix IV  
 General Economic Conditions  
 Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	112	115	9	236
	City of Las Vegas	98	87	5	190
	City of North Las Vegas	37	28	5	70
	City of Henderson	37	41	2	80
	City of Boulder City	5	8	1	14
	City of Mesquite	7	2	0	9
Total		296	281	22	599

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.380(a)	10	.496
Likelihood Ratio	9.339	10	.500
Linear-by-Linear Association	.003	1	.959
N of Valid Cases	599		

a. 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .33.


## **Appendix V**

### **Property Value Considerations**



Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions

	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	42.6	24.7	29.8	2.9	100.0
Day care Center	12.3	42.5	42.9	2.3	100.0
Landfill	82.6	10.1	5.7	1.5	100.0
non-polluting manufacturing facility	48.0	28.5	19.9	3.6	100.0
Public School	8.2	24.3	65.2	2.4	100.0
Highway/ Freeway	40.8	21.2	35.5	2.5	100.0
Hotel/Casino	42.3	28.4	26.5	2.7	100.0
Polluting Manufacturing Facility	92.2	3.6	3.2	1.1	100.0
High-level nuclear Waste Transportation Route	84.4	10.0	3.9	1.6	100.0



Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**Jurisdiction \* 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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	108	47	74	6	235
	City of Las Vegas	83	52	49	6	190
	City of North Las Vegas	17	22	26	4	69
	City of Henderson	35	22	23	1	81
	City of Boulder City	7	3	4	0	14
	City of Mesquite	6	2	2	0	10
	Total	256	148	178	17	599

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.970(a)	15	.264
Likelihood Ratio	19.190	15	.205
Linear-by-Linear Association	.188	1	.665
N of Valid Cases	599		

a. 9 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.

Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**Jurisdiction \* 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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	23	109	99	5	236
	City of Las Vegas	28	74	84	4	190
	City of North Las Vegas	7	31	27	4	69
	City of Henderson	10	33	38	0	81
	City of Boulder City	4	5	5	1	15
	City of Mesquite	2	3	4	0	9
Total		74	255	257	14	600

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.528(a)	15	.414
Likelihood Ratio	15.528	15	.414
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.982
N of Valid Cases	600		

a 9 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .21.

Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**Jurisdiction \* Landfill**

		Landfill				Total
		Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	198	24	13	2	237
	City of Las Vegas	158	22	7	4	191
	City of North Las Vegas	54	4	8	4	70
	City of Henderson	70	7	4	0	81
	City of Boulder City	11	2	1	0	14
	City of Mesquite	5	3	1	0	9
	Total	496	62	34	10	602

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.930(a)	15	.066
Likelihood Ratio	20.892	15	.140
Linear-by-Linear Association	.063	1	.802
N of Valid Cases	602		

a 12 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .15.

Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**Jurisdiction \* 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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	104	70	55	8	237
	City of Las Vegas	99	56	31	5	191
	City of North Las Vegas	25	20	21	4	70
	City of Henderson	49	19	10	3	81
	City of Boulder City	7	3	2	1	13
	City of Mesquite	4	4	2	0	10
	Total	288	172	121	21	602

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.930(a)	15	.217
Likelihood Ratio	18.995	15	.214
Linear-by-Linear Association	.137	1	.711
N of Valid Cases	602		

a. 9 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .35.

Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**Jurisdiction \* 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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	22	55	157	2	236
	City of Las Vegas	20	41	124	6	191
	City of North Las Vegas	4	15	46	4	69
	City of Henderson	2	25	51	2	80
	City of Boulder City	1	5	8	0	14
	City of Mesquite	1	4	4	0	9
	Total	50	145	390	14	599

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.695(a)	15	.279
Likelihood Ratio	18.667	15	.229
Linear-by-Linear Association	.929	1	.335
N of Valid Cases	599		

a. 9 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .21.

Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**Jurisdiction \* 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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	102	47	84	4	237
	City of Las Vegas	77	36	72	6	191
	City of North Las Vegas	25	14	26	4	69
	City of Henderson	29	25	25	2	81
	City of Boulder City	9	1	4	0	14
	City of Mesquite	4	3	2	0	9
	Total	246	126	213	16	601

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.009(a)	15	.451
Likelihood Ratio	14.815	15	.465
Linear-by-Linear Association	.172	1	.678
N of Valid Cases	601		

a. 9 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .24.

Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**Jurisdiction \* 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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	95	63	76	3	237
	City of Las Vegas	84	51	47	8	190
	City of North Las Vegas	24	20	21	5	70
	City of Henderson	37	30	14	0	81
	City of Boulder City	10	4	0	0	14
	City of Mesquite	4	3	2	0	9
	Total	254	171	160	16	601

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.314(a)	15	.020
Likelihood Ratio	32.908	15	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.912
N of Valid Cases	601		

a. 9 cells (37.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .24.

Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**Jurisdiction \* 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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	220	9	6	0	235
	City of Las Vegas	176	6	7	1	190
	City of North Las Vegas	59	4	3	5	71
	City of Henderson	76	2	3	1	82
	City of Boulder City	13	1	0	0	14
	City of Mesquite	9	0	0	0	9
	Total	553	22	19	7	601

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.002(a)	15	.016
Likelihood Ratio	21.669	15	.117
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.605	1	.058
N of Valid Cases	601		

a. 14 cells (58.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

**Jurisdiction \* 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	DK/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	205	22	7	2	236
	City of Las Vegas	162	16	9	3	190
	City of North Las Vegas	52	7	6	4	69
	City of Henderson	66	13	2	0	81
	City of Boulder City	13	1	0	0	14
	City of Mesquite	8	1	0	0	9
	Total	506	60	24	9	599

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.532(a)	15	.121
Likelihood Ratio	19.322	15	.200
Linear-by-Linear Association	.078	1	.780
N of Valid Cases	599		

a 12 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .14.







Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		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	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.31	2.35	1.19	5.30	5.11	3.79	1.71	1.92	1.20
Std. Error of Mean		1.318	.077	.057	2.108	1.702	1.475	.083	1.008	.050
Median		2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		11.836	.687	.511	18.938	15.290	13.250	.743	9.052	.452
Skewness		8.035	-.590	2.703	4.805	6.055	7.120	.524	10.769	2.210
Std. Error of Skewness		.268	.268	.268	.268	.268	.268	.268	.268	.268
Kurtosis		64.505	-.730	6.399	21.663	35.598	50.149	-1.007	117.082	4.366
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.530	.530	.530	.530	.530	.530	.530	.530	.530
Range		97	2	2	97	97	97	2	97	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	3	3	98	98	98	3	98	3

Appendix V  
Property Value Conditions  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		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	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.73	5.92	1.30	10.24	2.49	1.68	1.26	1.05	1.05
Std. Error of Mean		.234	5.220	.173	7.660	.178	.249	.122	.060	.060
Median		1.12	2.00	1.00	1.01	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.876	19.527	.646	28.655	.664	.933	.455	.226	.226
Skewness		.608	5.262	2.167	3.217	-.986	.755	1.232	4.642	4.642
Std. Error of Skewness		.597	.597	.597	.597	.597	.597	.597	.597	.597
Kurtosis		-1.453	30.070	3.959	9.744	.141	-1.514	-.589	22.821	22.821
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154
Range		2	97	2	97	2	2	1	1	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	98	3	98	3	3	2	2	2



## **Appendix VI**

### **Environmental Considerations**

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Summary Statistics


---

		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural resources in Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought in 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	600	600	600	600	600
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		5.86	4.28	2.19	3.97	3.28
Std. Error of Mean		.567	.503	.269	.378	.197
Median		3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		13.876	12.312	6.584	9.258	4.821
Skewness		6.356	7.467	14.297	9.984	19.183
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.100	.100	.100
Kurtosis		39.554	54.237	206.435	99.113	376.503
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.199	.199	.199	.199	.199
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	98	98	98

---


## Appendix VI Environmental Considerations

In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	Frequency	Percent
Water quality	58	9.7
Water availability	152	25.3
Air quality	137	22.9
Preservation of natural areas/wildlife	14	2.4
Development of open spaces	19	3.1
Overpopulation	166	27.8
Litter	23	3.8
Yucca Mountain	7	1.2
Traffic congestion	9	1.6
DK/No answer	13	2.2
Total	600	100.0




Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations

How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural resources in Clark County?	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	46	7.7
Good	215	35.8
Fair	213	35.6
Poor	116	19.3
DK/No answer	10	1.7
Total	600	100.0




Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations

Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought in Clark County?	Frequency	Percent
Very concerned	268	44.7
Somewhat concerned	244	40.6
Somewhat unconcerned	51	8.5
Not concerned	34	5.6
DK/No answer	3	.5
Total	600	100.0




Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations

In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	43	7.1
Good	120	20.0
Fair	184	30.7
Poor	247	41.2
DK/No answer	6	.9
Total	600	100.0



Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations

In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	16	2.7
Good	108	18.0
Fair	310	51.7
Poor	164	27.3
DK/No answer	2	.3
Total	600	100.0



Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural resources in Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought in 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?
Unincorporated Clark County						
N	Valid	236	236	236	236	236
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		5.09	4.09	2.03	4.96	3.07
Std. Error of Mean		.724	.760	.310	.881	.048
Median		3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		11.131	11.686	4.766	13.534	.733
Skewness		7.996	7.944	19.609	6.753	-.380
Std. Error of Skewness		.158	.158	.158	.158	.158
Kurtosis		64.939	61.921	398.546	44.222	-.276
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.316	.316	.316	.316	.316
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	98	98	4

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural resources in Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought in 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	191	191	191	191	191
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		6.51	4.62	1.68	3.48	2.99
Std. Error of Mean		1.119	.971	.063	.462	.058
Median		3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		15.443	13.404	.864	6.382	.797
Skewness		5.697	6.863	1.328	14.541	-.542
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.176	.176	.176	.176
Kurtosis		31.501	45.817	1.214	217.029	-.017
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.350	.350	.350	.350	.350
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	4	98	4

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural resources in Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought in 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?
City of North Las Vegas						
N	Valid	69	69	69	69	69
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		7.19	4.09	3.76	3.26	5.16
Std. Error of Mean		2.163	1.412	1.702	.100	1.676
Median		3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		18.017	11.764	14.174	.830	13.965
Skewness		4.921	8.038	6.678	-1.009	6.676
Std. Error of Skewness		.288	.288	.288	.288	.288
Kurtosis		23.242	64.935	43.968	.529	43.957
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.569	.569	.569	.569	.569
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	98	4	98

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural resources in Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought in 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	81	81	81	81	81
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		5.92	4.69	1.79	3.17	3.14
Std. Error of Mean		1.684	1.528	.092	.103	.075
Median		3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		15.128	13.723	.829	.928	.673
Skewness		5.968	6.791	.909	-.647	-.381
Std. Error of Skewness		.268	.268	.268	.268	.268
Kurtosis		35.156	45.470	.345	-.851	.087
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.530	.530	.530	.530	.530
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	4	4	4

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural resources in Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought in 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?
City of Boulder City						
N	Valid	14	14	14	14	14
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.03	2.39	6.91	2.78	2.71
Std. Error of Mean		.628	.268	5.802	.294	.211
Median		3.00	2.00	2.00	2.53	2.85
Std. Deviation		2.350	1.003	21.704	1.100	.790
Skewness		.897	.147	4.632	-.057	.603
Std. Error of Skewness		.597	.597	.597	.597	.597
Kurtosis		.742	-.814	22.756	-1.520	-1.027
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2
Maximum		10	4	98	4	4

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural resources in Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought in 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	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.54	2.85	1.72	2.85	2.42
Std. Error of Mean		.733	.311	.307	.404	.312
Median		5.07	2.69	1.80	3.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		2.207	.936	.923	1.216	.939
Skewness		-.089	.370	1.718	-.506	.494
Std. Error of Skewness		.715	.715	.715	.715	.715
Kurtosis		-2.249	-1.994	4.138	-1.346	-.013
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395
Minimum		2	2	1	1	1
Maximum		7	4	4	4	4

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

**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 spaces	Over population	Litter	Yucca Mountain	Traffic congestion	DK/No answer	
Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	25	60	52	4	8	74	4	4	3	3	237
	City of Las Vegas	16	46	44	6	5	49	12	2	5	5	190
	City of North Las Vegas	7	18	16	2	3	17	3	2	0	3	71
	City of Henderson	9	23	20	1	3	20	1	0	1	2	80
	City of Boulder City	1	3	3	1	1	4	1	0	1	0	15
	City of Mesquite	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	8
	<b>Total</b>		58	152	137	14	20	166	23	8	10	13

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.467(a)	45	.814
Likelihood Ratio	34.270	45	.878
Linear-by-Linear Association	.282	1	.596
N of Valid Cases	601		

a 38 cells (63.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .11.

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

**Jurisdiction: \* How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural resources in Clark County?**

		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural resources in Clark County?					Total
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	DK/No answer	
Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	12	89	99	32	4	236
	City of Las Vegas	15	68	58	45	4	190
	City of North Las Vegas	9	19	26	14	1	69
	City of Henderson	7	28	24	19	2	80
	City of Boulder City	3	5	4	2	0	14
	City of Mesquite	0	4	2	3	0	9
Total		46	213	213	115	11	598

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.824(a)	20	.208
Likelihood Ratio	24.871	20	.206
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.947
N of Valid Cases	598		

a. 14 cells (46.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .17.

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

**Jurisdiction: \* Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought in Clark County?**

		Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought in Clark County?					Total
		Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Somewhat unconcerned	Not concerned	DK/No answer	
Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	99	99	23	15	1	237
	City of Las Vegas	98	69	11	13	0	191
	City of North Las Vegas	30	32	5	1	2	70
	City of Henderson	34	33	10	4	0	81
	City of Boulder City	2	8	2	1	1	14
	City of Mesquite	4	4	0	1	0	9
Total		267	245	51	35	4	602

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.176(a)	20	.041
Likelihood Ratio	28.320	20	.102
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.143	1	.143
N of Valid Cases	602		

a. 14 cells (46.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

**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	DK/No answer	
Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	17	49	79	86	5	236
	City of Las Vegas	16	37	55	82	1	191
	City of North Las Vegas	3	8	27	32	0	70
	City of Henderson	3	19	19	39	0	80
	City of Boulder City	1	6	2	5	0	14
	City of Mesquite	2	2	2	4	0	10
Total		42	121	184	248	6	601

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.973(a)	20	.202
Likelihood Ratio	25.481	20	.184
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.410	1	.065
N of Valid Cases	601		

a 14 cells (46.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

Appendix VI  
Environmental Considerations  
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

**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	DK/No answer	
Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	4	43	121	68	0	236
	City of Las Vegas	9	35	97	50	0	191
	City of North Las Vegas	2	8	40	18	2	70
	City of Henderson	1	11	46	23	0	81
	City of Boulder City	0	7	5	3	0	15
	City of Mesquite	1	5	2	1	0	9
Total		17	109	311	163	2	602

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	43.274(a)	20	.002
Likelihood Ratio	32.708	20	.036
Linear-by-Linear Association	.676	1	.411
N of Valid Cases	602		

a 15 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.


## **Appendix VII**

### **Yucca Mountain Considerations**




Appendix VII  
Yucca Mountain Considerations

The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	Frequency	Percent
Support	163	27.2
Oppose	407	67.9
DK/No answer	29	4.9
Total	600	100.0




Appendix VII  
Yucca Mountain Considerations

The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	46	7.7
Agree	137	22.8
Disagree	175	29.2
Strongly disagree	217	36.1
DK/No answer	25	4.2
Total	600	100.0




Appendix VII  
Yucca Mountain Considerations

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.	Frequency	Percent
Positive effect	72	11.9
No effect	153	25.5
Negative effect	359	59.9
DK/No answer	16	2.7
Total	600	100.0



## Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

	1	2	3	4	5	DK/ No answer	Total
Keeping local decision makers up to date on Yucca Mountain	7.3	10.6	15.5	15.6	47.8	3.2	100.0
Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	7.8	8.6	14.9	15.3	48.3	5.1	100.0
Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	8.9	7.0	18.4	19.3	43.2	3.2	100.0
Identify public safety needs and impacts	6.1	7.4	16.8	20.2	46.5	3.0	100.0
Assess other government impacts	8.2	8.7	22.7	22.7	32.8	4.8	100.0
Assess impacts on the tourist sector	9.3	11.1	20.5	22.9	32.6	3.6	100.0
Assess impacts on the building, construction, and development sectors	8.5	8.8	27.4	22.8	29.1	3.4	100.0
Identify transportation impacts	7.9	7.8	25.2	21.7	34.0	3.5	100.0
Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain	9.2	7.9	13.2	18.7	48.0	3.0	100.0

















Appendix VII  
Yucca Mountain Considerations  
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.**

**If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?**

		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?			
		Support	Oppose	DK/No answer	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	71	154	11	236
	City of Las Vegas	49	128	13	190
	City of North Las Vegas	17	50	3	70
	City of Henderson	21	58	2	81
	City of Boulder City	2	12	0	14
	City of Mesquite	4	5	0	9
Total		164	407	29	600

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.045(a)	10	.624
Likelihood Ratio	9.165	10	.516
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.351	1	.245
N of Valid Cases	600		

a. 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .44.

**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 public's safety is ensured. Do you agree or 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 public's safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?					
		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	DK/No answer	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	18	54	74	81	9	236
	City of Las Vegas	16	38	60	65	12	191
	City of North Las	5	16	25	21	2	69

Vegas							
City of Henderson	6	24	13	36	2	81	
City of Boulder City	0	1	1	11	0	13	
City of Mesquite	1	3	1	4	0	9	
Total	46	136	174	218	25	599	

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.195(a)	20	.067
Likelihood Ratio	31.855	20	.045
Linear-by-Linear Association	.883	1	.347
N of Valid Cases	599		

a 12 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .38.

**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.				
		Positive effect	No effect	Negative effect	DK/No answer	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	31	65	135	5	236
	City of Las Vegas	23	46	116	5	190
	City of North Las Vegas	10	12	45	2	69
	City of Henderson	5	25	48	3	81
	City of Boulder City	0	3	11	0	14
	City of Mesquite	2	2	3	2	9
Total		71	153	358	17	599

**Chi-Square Tests**


	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.276(a)	15	.061
Likelihood Ratio	19.742	15	.182
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.416	1	.065
N of Valid Cases	599		

a 8 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.

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


Appendix VIII  
Community Profile

What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?	Frequency	Percent
Car-Drive alone	458	76.3
Car-Carpool with others	86	14.3
CAT bus (or paratransit)	27	4.5
MAX transit	6	1.0
Motorcycle	3	.5
Walk	13	2.2
Bike	8	1.3
Total	600	100.0



Appendix VIII  
Community Profile

Do you currently commute on a daily basis?	Frequency	Percent
Yes	358	59.7
No	242	40.3
Total	600	100.0




## **Appendix IX**

### **Local Government Interaction**


Appendix IX  
Local Government Interaction

Which government department, if any, have you interacted with in the past year?	Frequency	Percent
Commission/Council offices	13	2.2
Manager's office	9	1.6
Parks and Recreation/Community services	27	4.5
Public works	28	4.6
Social services	36	6.0
Recorder's office	20	3.3
Business license	20	3.4
Comprehensive planning	6	1.0
Human resources	6	1.0
Fire	20	3.3
Police/metro	59	9.9
Assessor's/taxation	7	1.1
Water Authority (SNWA)	5	.8
Juvenile justice	4	.7
Transportation Authority (RTC)	5	.8
None	322	53.7
DK/No answer	12	2.1
Total	600	100.0




Appendix IX  
Local Government Interaction

Timeliness of response	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	55	20.9
Good	99	37.4
Fair	60	22.6
Poor	39	14.7
DK/No answer	12	4.5
Total	265	100.0




Appendix IX  
Local Government Interaction

Courtesy	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	67	25.1
Good	97	36.6
Fair	66	25.0
Poor	28	10.7
DK/No answer	7	2.5
Total	265	100.0




Appendix IX  
Local Government Interaction

Professionalism	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	59	22.4
Good	88	33.2
Fair	75	28.4
Poor	36	13.5
DK/No answer	7	2.5
Total	265	100.0




Appendix IX  
Local Government Interaction

For the following questions please rate the service levels provided by your local government's employees as excellent, good, fair, or poor: Professionalism	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	68	25.8
Good	107	40.5
Fair	54	20.4
Poor	29	11.0
DK/No answer	6	2.3
Total	265	100.0




Appendix IX  
Local Government Interaction

Have you ever visited your local government's website?	Frequency	Percent
Yes	266	44.4
No	330	55.1
DK/No answer	3	.5
Total	600	100.0



## Appendix IX Local Government Interaction

In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?	Frequency	Percent
Once a week	11	3.9
Several times a week	26	9.9
Several times a month	44	16.5
Once a month	132	49.4
Less than once a month	49	18.3
DK/No answer	5	2.0
Total	266	100.0




## **Appendix X**

### **Local Distribution Summary**

Appendix X  
Local Distribution Summary

Jurisdiction	Frequency	Percent
Unincorporated Clark County	236	39.4
City of Las Vegas	191	31.8
City of North Las Vegas	69	11.6
City of Henderson	81	13.5
City of Boulder City	14	2.3
City of Mesquite	9	1.5
Total	600	100.0



**Appendix XI**  
**Respondent Demographic Profile**

Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile  
Summary Statistics


---

		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	In what age group do you fall?	How long have you lived in Clark County?	Gender observation:
N	Valid	600	600	600	600
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		13.35	3.17	3.86	1.53
Std. Error of Mean		1.175	.287	.215	.020
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		28.770	7.028	5.275	.499
Skewness		2.599	13.248	16.654	-.129
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.100	.100
Kurtosis		4.811	176.978	296.347	-1.990
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.199	.199	.199	.199
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	98	2

---


## Appendix XI Respondent Demographic Profile

Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
\$20,000 or under	61	10.2	10.2	10.2
\$20,001-\$40,000	97	16.2	16.2	26.4
\$40,001-\$60,000	143	23.8	23.8	50.1
\$60,001-\$80,000	86	14.4	14.4	64.6
\$80,001-\$100,000	67	11.1	11.1	75.7
\$100,001-\$120,000	29	4.9	4.9	80.6
\$120,001-\$140,000	23	3.9	3.9	84.4
\$140,001 or more	32	5.3	5.3	89.7
Refused/No answer	62	10.3	10.3	100.0
Total	600	100.0	100.0	




Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile

In what age group do you fall?	Frequency	Percent
18-24 years old	54	9.0
25-44 years old	209	34.9
45-64 years old	220	36.7
65 years of age or older	113	18.9
Refused/No answer	3	.5
Total	600	100.0




## Appendix XI Respondent Demographic Profile

How long have you lived in Clark County?	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 year	16	2.7
1-5 years	154	25.6
6-10 years	132	22.1
11-15 years	92	15.3
Over 15 years	166	27.7
All my life	38	6.3
Refused/No answer	2	.3
Total	600	100.0



Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile

Gender observation	Frequency	Percent
Male	281	46.8
Female	319	53.2
Total	600	100.0



Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile  
Summary by Jurisdiction

		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	In what age group do you fall?	How long have you lived in Clark County?	Gender observation:
Unincorporated Clark County					
N	Valid	236	236	236	236
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		13.39	3.09	4.04	1.53
Std. Error of Mean		1.891	.457	.345	.033
Median		3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		29.059	7.027	5.309	.500
Skewness		2.580	13.311	16.636	-.130
Std. Error of Skewness		.158	.158	.158	.158
Kurtosis		4.735	179.876	296.703	-2.000
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.316	.316	.316	.316
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	98	2

Appendix XI  
 Respondent Demographic Profile  
 Summary by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	In what age group do you fall?	How long have you lived in Clark County?	Gender observation:
N	Valid	191	191	191	191
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		11.47	3.43	3.50	1.49
Std. Error of Mean		1.915	.594	.098	.036
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		26.440	8.205	1.347	.501
Skewness		2.984	11.423	.088	.034
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.176	.176	.176
Kurtosis		7.036	131.460	-1.196	-2.020
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.350	.350	.350	.350
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	6	2

Appendix XI  
 Respondent Demographic Profile  
 Summary by Jurisdiction

		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	In what age group do you fall?	How long have you lived in Clark County?	Gender observation:
City of North Las Vegas					
N	Valid	69	69	69	69
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		19.30	3.34	3.49	1.54
Std. Error of Mean		4.260	1.037	.177	.060
Median		4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		35.483	8.639	1.478	.502
Skewness		1.820	11.088	.181	-.159
Std. Error of Skewness		.288	.288	.288	.288
Kurtosis		1.368	125.711	-1.193	-2.034
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.569	.569	.569	.569
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	98	6	2

Appendix XI  
 Respondent Demographic Profile  
 Summary by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	In what age group do you fall?	How long have you lived in Clark County?	Gender observation:
N	Valid	81	81	81	81
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		12.74	2.65	4.49	1.61
Std. Error of Mean		2.958	.090	1.211	.055
Median		5.00	2.34	3.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		26.572	.812	10.875	.490
Skewness		2.957	.375	8.587	-.480
Std. Error of Skewness		.268	.268	.268	.268
Kurtosis		6.979	-.806	74.577	-1.815
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.530	.530	.530	.530
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		98	4	98	2

Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile  
Summary by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	In what age group do you fall?	How long have you lived in Clark County?	Gender observation:
N	Valid	14	14	14	14
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		19.29	3.30	4.10	1.57
Std. Error of Mean		9.822	.215	.347	.137
Median		3.39	3.36	5.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		36.742	.803	1.297	.514
Skewness		1.986	-.632	-.374	-.304
Std. Error of Skewness		.597	.597	.597	.597
Kurtosis		2.273	-1.065	-1.283	-2.256
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.154	1.154	1.154	1.154
Minimum		1	2	2	1
Maximum		98	4	6	2

Appendix XI  
 Respondent Demographic Profile  
 Summary by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	In what age group do you fall?	How long have you lived in Clark County?	Gender observation:
N	Valid	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.88	2.99	3.87	1.54
Std. Error of Mean		.525	.179	.585	.176
Median		3.00	3.00	4.13	1.83
Std. Deviation		1.582	.539	1.762	.529
Skewness		.730	-.023	.077	-.177
Std. Error of Skewness		.715	.715	.715	.715
Kurtosis		.932	2.781	-2.069	-2.620
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.395	1.395	1.395	1.395
Minimum		1	2	2	1
Maximum		6	4	6	2



Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile  
Crosstabulations by Jurisdiction

**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	Refused/No answer	
Respondent Jurisdictions:	Unincorporated	25	41	61	32	25	11	6	11	25	237
	Clark County										
	City of Las Vegas	20	38	45	30	19	5	8	9	16	190
	City of North Las Vegas	8	10	13	10	8	4	4	2	12	71
	City of Henderson	3	7	15	13	13	8	6	8	7	80
	City of Boulder City	3	1	3	1	2	1	0	1	2	14
	City of Mesquite	2	1	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	9
Total		61	98	141	87	67	30	24	31	62	601

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.651(a)	40	.358
Likelihood Ratio	44.422	40	.291
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.911
N of Valid Cases	601		

a 24 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .36.

Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile  
Crosstabulations by Jurisdiction

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

		In what age group do you fall?				Refused/No answer	Total
		18-24 years old	25-44 years old	45-64 years old	65 years of age or older		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	29	84	80	43	1	237
	City of Las Vegas	17	55	78	39	1	190
	City of North Las Vegas	5	29	26	9	1	70
	City of Henderson	3	38	26	15	0	82
	City of Boulder City	0	3	4	7	0	14
	City of Mesquite	0	1	7	1	0	9
Total		54	210	221	114	3	602

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.193(a)	20	.032
Likelihood Ratio	33.272	20	.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.949
N of Valid Cases	602		

a. 13 cells (43.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile  
Crosstabulations by Jurisdiction

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

		How long have you lived in Clark County?							
		Less than 1 year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Over 15 years	All my life	Refused/No answer	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	6	49	50	39	74	17	1	236
	City of Las Vegas	6	51	43	30	51	9	0	190
	City of North Las Vegas	3	20	14	10	15	7	0	69
	City of Henderson	1	28	20	12	17	2	1	81
	City of Boulder City	0	2	4	1	7	1	0	15
	City of Mesquite	0	3	1	1	2	2	0	9
Total		16	153	132	93	166	38	2	600

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.171(a)	30	.614
Likelihood Ratio	27.084	30	.619
Linear-by-Linear Association	.002	1	.962
N of Valid Cases	600		

a. 21 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

Appendix XI  
Respondent Demographic Profile  
Crosstabulations by Jurisdiction

**Respondent Jurisdiction: \* Gender observation:**

		Gender observation:		Total
		Male	Female	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	110	126	236
	City of Las Vegas	97	94	191
	City of North Las Vegas	32	37	69
	City of Henderson	31	50	81
	City of Boulder City	6	8	14
	City of Mesquite	4	5	9
Total		280	320	600

**Chi-Square Tests**


	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.698(a)	5	.594
Likelihood Ratio	3.723	5	.590
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.163	1	.281
N of Valid Cases	600		

a. 2 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.20.


## **Appendix XII**

### **Importance/ Performance Comparisons**


Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons




Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII  
Importance/Performance Comparisons

