Clark County Monitoring Program

Winter/2006

APPLIED ANALYSIS

strategic solutions

UER
Urban Environmental Research, LLC

APPLIED ANALYSIS strategic solutions Urban Environmental Research, LLC

TO: MS. IRENE NAVIS, AICP
FROM: DR. SHEILA CONWAY; JEREMY AGUERO
SUBJECT: CLARK COUNTY MONITORING PROGRAM | WINTER 2006
DATE: APRIL 6, 2006
CC: BRIAN GORDON/APPLIED ANALYSIS
DR. ALVIN MUSKATEL/UER;
JASON GRAY/STRATEGIC SOLUTIONS

This memorandum summarizes the key findings of the bi-annual Winter 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) 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 February 2006, Strategic Solutions, in coordination with Urban Environmental Research and Applied Analysis, administered a 137-question telephone survey to 607 Southern Nevada households. The survey, which touches on a broad number of topics, has a margin of error of ±4 percent at the 95 percent confidence level. The principal purpose of the Clark County Monitoring Program, including this survey series, is to establish an analysis baseline from which the impacts of transporting high-level nuclear waste through the Las Vegas Valley, and ultimately storing the radioactive material at the proposed Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository, can be monitored, measured and assessed.

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

It is easy to conceptualize how the transportation of high-level nuclear waste through a community might negatively impact property values. It is a bit more difficult to identify the nexus to child welfare programs, homelessness, flood protection or crime enforcement. In absence of mitigating funds, it is likely that Nevada's state and local governments will be required to shift resources away from existing programs and into efforts aimed at ensuring threats, patent and latent, sourced to storage and transportation of high-level nuclear waste are addressed. Shifts away from existing public services would be expected to reduce the quality of life 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.

FIGURE 1 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Public Service Importance Score Summary

Descriptive Statistics	Service Category	Mean Winter '06	Mean Summer '05	Change
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	Public Safety	4.64	n/a	n/a
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Public Safety	4.56	4.45	0.11
Keeping fire department response times low	Public Safety	4.54	4.45	0.09
Providing emergency medical services	Public Safety	4.44	4.66	-0.22
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	Social and Judicial Services	4.38	4.6	-0.22
Providing fire protection and prevention services	Public Safety	4.32	4.59	-0.27
Keeping police response times low	Public Safety	4.24	4.45	-0.21
Maintaining a low crime rate	Public Safety	4.14	4.49	-0.35
Providing child protection services	Social and Judicial Services	4.06	4.27	-0.21
Road maintenance	General Government	4.05	4.21	-0.16
Investigating criminal activity	Public Safety	4.03	4.47	-0.43
Reducing traffic congestion	Community Development	4.02	4.37	-0.34
Budget management	General Government	3.99	4.29	-0.3
Providing crime prevention programs	Public Safety	3.99	4.27	-0.28
Providing child welfare services	Social and Judicial Services	3.98	4.15	-0.17
Improving road conditions	Community Development	3.97	4.29	-0.32
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Public Safety	3.97	4.3	-0.33
Increasing job opportunities	Community Development	3.95	4.07	-0.12
Providing juvenile justice services	Social and Judicial Services	3.93	4.08	-0.15
Providing affordable housing for seniors	Social and Judicial Services	3.92	4.12	-0.2
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	Public Safety	3.92	4.18	-0.27
Enforcing traffic laws	Public Safety	3.91	4.25	-0.34
Flood control	General Government	3.88	4.09	-0.21
Improving the business climate	Community Development	3.86	4.08	-0.22
Access to freeways	Community Development	3.83	4.12	-0.29
Managing growth	Community Development	3.8	4.07	-0.26
Reducing travel time	Community Development	3.77	4.01	-0.25

Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc)	Public Safety	3.75	4.04	-0.29
Providing medical care for the poor	Social and Judicial Services	3.74	3.94	-0.21
Provide attainable housing for working class families	Social and Judicial Services	3.72	n/a	n/a
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	General Government	3.72	3.9	-0.18
Planning for commercial development	Community Development	3.7	3.82	-0.12
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Public Safety	3.69	4.05	-0.35
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Public Safety	3.68	3.88	-0.21
Providing mass public transit	Community Development	3.67	3.86	-0.19
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	General Government	3.59	3.77	-0.18
Providing affordable housing for low income families	Social and Judicial Services	3.56	3.7	-0.14
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Public Safety	3.54	3.81	-0.27
Evaluating impacts to property values as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain	Community Development	3.54	3.78	-0.24
Evaluating impacts to Southern Nevada's tourism economy as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain	Community Development	3.5	3.74	-0.24
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	General Government	3.41	3.59	-0.18
Providing shelter for the homeless	Social and Judicial Services	3.33	3.38	-0.05

FIGURE 2 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE RANKING

	Ranking		
Descriptive Statistics	**Winter '06**	**Summer '05**	**Change**
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	1	n/a	n/a
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	2	6	4
Keeping fire department response times low	3	6	3
Providing emergency medical services	4	1	-3
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	5	2	-3
Providing fire protection and prevention services	6	3	-3
Keeping police response times low	7	8	1
Maintaining a low crime rate	8	4	-4
Providing child protection services	9	13	4

Road maintenance	10	16	6
Investigating criminal activity	11	5	-6
Reducing traffic congestion	12	9	-3
Budget management	13	11	-2
Providing crime prevention programs	14	14	0
Providing child welfare services	15	18	3
Improving road conditions	16	12	-4
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	17	10	-7
Increasing job opportunities	18	24	6
Providing juvenile justice services	19	22	3
Providing affordable housing for seniors	20	19	-1
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	21	17	-4
Enforcing traffic laws	22	15	-7
Flood control	23	21	-2
Improving the business climate	24	23	-1
Access to freeways	25	20	-5
Managing growth	26	25	-1
Reducing travel time	27	28	1
Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc)	28	27	-1
Providing medical care for the poor	29	29	0
Provide attainable housing for working class families	30	n/a	n/a
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	31	30	-1
Planning for commercial development	32	33	1
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	33	26	-7
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	34	31	-3
Providing mass public transit	35	32	-3
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	36	36	0
Providing affordable housing for low income families	37	39	2
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	38	34	-4
Evaluating impacts to property values as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain	39	35	-4
Evaluating impacts to Southern Nevada's tourism economy as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain	40	37	-3
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	41	40	-2
Providing shelter for the homeless	42	41	-2

E. PUBLIC SERVICE PERFORMANCE (FIGURES 3 & 4)

- Public service performance scores were highest in the areas of fire and emergency response, flood control and economic development. Lower scores were assigned to a broader cross section of services including those related to housing affordability, traffic congestion and Yucca Mountain impact assessments.

- "Providing 24-hour emergency trauma care" was the only service in both the highest importance quartile and the lowest performance quartile. Over crowding at many area hospitals is becoming a recurring theme and long emergency room wait times appear to be an area of acute concern for local residents.

- "Maintaining a low crime rate" was the only public service to be in the highest importance quartile and the second-lowest performance quartile. It is likely that additional police officers will first increase the overall crime (more officers, more arrests), but lower crime rates over time. Even adjusted for tourist visitation, Southern Nevada's crime rates remain significantly higher than national averages, a concern that may be impacting the response profile.

- Traffic-related service areas also posted higher-than-average importance scores but lower-than-average performance scores. "Reducing traffic congestion" was the 12th highest ranked public service in terms of importance (second quartile) and the 3rd lowest in terms of performance (fourth quartile). This having been said, respondents seem to be more concerned with the flow of traffic than the time each trip takes. "Reducing travel times" was in the third quartile for both importance and performance.

FIGURE 3 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE AND PERFORMANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Descriptive Statistics	Mean Importance	Mean Performance
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	4.64	3.93
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.56	3.76
Keeping fire department response times low	4.54	3.73
Providing emergency medical services	4.44	3.65
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.38	2.55
Providing fire protection and prevention services	4.32	3.58
Keeping police response times low	4.24	3.01
Maintaining a low crime rate	4.14	2.76
Providing child protection services	4.06	2.82
Road maintenance	4.05	2.96
Investigating criminal activity	4.03	2.99
Reducing traffic congestion	4.02	2.38
Budget management	3.99	2.71
Providing crime prevention programs	3.99	2.9
Providing child welfare services	3.98	2.9
Improving road conditions	3.97	2.93
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	3.97	2.68
Increasing job opportunities	3.95	3.06
Providing juvenile justice services	3.93	2.79
Providing affordable housing for seniors	3.92	2.56

Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events	3.92	2.76
Enforcing traffic laws	3.91	2.9
Flood control	3.88	3.44
Improving the business climate	3.86	3.27
Access to freeways	3.83	2.98
Managing growth	3.8	2.45
Reducing travel time	3.77	2.67
Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc)	3.75	2.81
Providing medical care for the poor	3.74	2.56
Provide attainable housing for working class families	3.72	2.48
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	3.72	2.57
Planning for commercial development	3.7	3.26
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	3.69	2.69
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.68	2.69
Providing mass public transit	3.67	2.76
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	3.59	2.83
Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.56	2.39
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.54	2.86
Evaluating impacts to property values as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain	3.54	2.33
Evaluating impacts to Southern Nevada's tourism economy as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain	3.5	2.55
Providing affordable housing	3.47	2.43
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.41	2.56
Providing shelter for the homeless	3.33	2.1

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

FIGURE 4 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE AND PERFORMANCE MATRIX



F. QUALITY OF LIFE CONSIDERATIONS (FIGURE 5)

- Nearly 38 percent of all respondents indicated a general erosion in Clark County's quality of life. More than 56 percent of respondents identified "crime"; "overcrowding/unplanned growth"; or "traffic congestion" as the most pressing quality of life concern. Crime was the number one concern, cited by one in five respondents.

- When asked about factors positively impacting respondents' quality of life, availability of job opportunities moved from the middle of the pack to the highest score in the Winter 2006 series. Some categories did change during the period; however, several categories previously generating higher scores (e.g., air quality, managing growth and the condition of the streets and roads) reported lower relative values. As noted earlier, this adds to the concern that economic conditions may be softening. When asked what aspect of living in Clark County, if any has the greatest positive impact on your quality of life, one in five responded "job opportunities" second only to "scenery/geography/climate."

- "Water availability" ranked as the most urgent environmental concern during the quarter, stealing the top spot from "overpopulation." These two categories accounted for more than 52 percent of all responses.

- Concerns over drought conditions may be escalating. Approximately 52 percent of respondents reported that they were "very concerned" about the drought and its impact on Clark County, nearly five percentage points higher than reported in the Summer 2005 series. More than 88 percent of all respondents noted that they were "concerned" or "very concerned" about the drought.

- Winter months tend to increase concerns over air quality. During the Winter 2006 survey, 76.1 percent of respondents reported that Clark County's air quality was "fair" or "poor." This number is number is 10.2 percentage points higher than the 65.9 percent reported prior.

FIGURE 5 QUALTY OF LIFE FACTORS



G. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (FIGURE 6)

- While the number of respondents indicating that their financial condition improved during the past 12 months increased, so did the percentage of respondents indicating that there position worsened. Of greater concern are the economic expectations of respondents. Those indicating an expectation that their financial position will be worse one year out increased from 10.7 percent in the Summer 2005 survey to 18.6 percent in the Winter 2006 survey. Similar declines were noted when respondents were asked about business conditions. As noted previously in this summary, the frequency and consistency of this type of response is a concern.

- The percentage of respondents indicating it was a good time to buy a home remained above 50 percent but slid from 54.7 percent to 51.0 percent. This sentiment combined with lower population immigration figures and robust residential permitting appears to be fertile ground for a supply-demand imbalance in the residential construction sector.

Figure 6 Clark County Monitoring Program Financial Expectations (One Year From Today





H. LOCAL GOVERNMENT INTERACTIONS

- Local government interaction statistics were generally unremarkable in comparison to those reported previously. Fifty percent of respondents reported local government's timeliness of responses as "good" or "excellent;" courtesy and professionalism scores were above 60 percent. Competency reported the highest "poor" score at 14.7 percent, although nearly 59 percent of all respondents indicated that local government competency was "good" or "excellent."

- Those reporting visiting the local government website (41.0 percent) were materially unchanged.

- The metropolitan police department remained the most common point of contact with local governments, while 54.5 percent of respondents report no direct interaction with local governments.

APPENDICES

Appendix I
Importance Score for Selected Services

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

Importance Variable	N	Mean	Median	Std. Error of Mean	Min	Max	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis	Std Error of Kurtosis	Skewness	Std Error of Skewness
**General Government Services*											
Road Maintenance	606	4.05	4	0.043	1	5	1.053	0.530	0.198	-1.003	0.099
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	588	3.41	3	0.052	1	5	1.257	-0.881	0.201	-0.321	0.101
Flood Control	607	3.88	4	0.050	1	5	1.233	-0.152	0.198	-0.909	0.099
Budget management	594	3.99	4	0.049	1	5	1.183	0.121	0.200	-0.999	0.100
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	584	3.59	4	0.060	1	1	1.450	-0.968	0.202	-0.620	0.101
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	598	3.72	4	0.049	1	1	1.202	-0.514	0.200	-0.614	0.100
**Social and Judicial Services*											
Providing Child Protection Services	589	4.06	5	0.050	1	5	1.205	0.207	0.201	-1.120	0.101
Providing Child Welfare Services	583	3.98	4	0.049	1	5	1.189	-0.297	0.202	-0.891	0.101
Providing Juvenile Justice Services	577	3.93	4	0.049	1	5	1.172	-0.122	0.203	-0.897	0.102
Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families	600	3.72	4	0.055	1	5	1.338	-0.746	0.199	-0.702	0.100
Providing Affordable housing for Low Income Families	596	3.56	4	0.058	1	5	1.409	-1.060	0.200	-0.511	0.100
Providing shelter for the homeless	595	3.33	3	0.058	1	5	1.403	-1.169	0.200	-0.309	0.100
Providing affordable housing for seniors	599	3.92	4	0.051	1	5	1.251	-0.285	0.199	-0.914	0.100
Providing medical care for the poor	595	3.74	4	0.054	1	5	1.326	-0.685	0.200	-0.700	0.100
Providing 24-hour emergency trauma care	600	4.38	5	0.041	1	5	0.997	1.988	0.199	-1.645	0.100
Public Safety											
Providing crime prevention programs	599	3.99	4	0.047	1	5	1.141	0.094	0.199	-0.972	0.100
Enforcing traffic laws	607	3.91	4	0.049	1	5	1.200	-0.421	0.198	-0.794	0.099
Maintaining a low crime rate	606	4.14	5	0.050	1	5	1.221	0.470	0.198	-1.268	0.099
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	604	3.97	4	0.049	1	5	1.197	-0.277	0.199	-0.892	0.099
Keeping police response times low	592	4.24	5	0.044	1	5	1.077	1.061	0.201	-1.374	0.100
Keeping fire department response times low	593	4.54	5	0.033	1	5	0.792	3.928	0.200	-1.965	0.100
Keeping paramedic and emergency response times low	598	4.56	5	0.031	1	5	0.763	3.164	0.199	-1.865	0.100
Well trained paramedic and emergency response personnel	593	4.64	5	0.029	1	5	0.702	3.755	0.200	-2.044	0.100

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

Importance Variable	N	Mean	Median	Std. Error of Mean	Min	Max	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis	Std Error of Kurtosis	Skewness	Std Error of Skewness
**Public Safety (continued)*											
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	591	3.69	4	0.048	1	5	1.164	-0.392	0.201	-0.609	0.100
Preparing for natural disasters	597	3.75	4	0.053	1	5	1.301	-0.478	0.200	-0.781	0.100
Preparing for man-made accidents or terrorist events	597	3.92	4	0.052	1	5	1.282	-0.193	0.200	-0.597	0.100
Investigating criminal activity	592	4.03	4	0.045	1	5	1.104	0.039	0.200	-0.959	0.100
Providing fire protection and prevention services	600	4.32	5	0.037	1	5	0.900	0.581	0.199	-1.195	0.100
Providing emergency medical services	606	4.44	5	0.035	1	5	0.856	2.184	0.198	-1.606	0.099
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	571	3.54	4	0.049	1	5	1.182	-0.778	0.204	-0.324	0.102
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	581	3.68	4	0.059	1	5	1.421	-0.859	0.202	-0.690	0.101
**Community Development*											
Providing affordable housing	601	3.47	3	0.047	1	5	1.365	-1.078	0.211	-0.367	0.100
Managing growth	602	3.80	4	0.053	1	5	1.295	-0.494	0.209	-0.810	0.100
Increasing job opportunities	597	3.95	4	0.048	1	5	1.179	-0.082	0.200	-0.921	0.100
Improving the business climate	594	3.86	4	0.043	1	5	1.057	-0.480	0.200	-0.557	0.100
Planning for commercial development	590	3.70	4	0.046	1	5	1.113	-0.217	0.201	-0.608	0.101
Evaluating impacts to property values as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain	571	3.54	4	0.060	1	5	1.441	-1.120	0.204	-0.487	0.102
Evaluating impacts to Southern Nevada's tourism economy as a result of proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain	576	3.50	4	0.061	1	5	1.453	-1.159	0.203	-0.467	0.102
Reducing traffic congestion	605	4.02	5	0.051	1	5	1.261	-0.016	0.198	-1.091	0.099
Access to freeways	603	3.83	4	0.047	1	5	1.153	-0.482	0.199	-0.661	0.100
Improving road conditions	607	3.97	4	0.044	1	5	1.078	-0.101	0.198	-0.802	0.990
Reducing travel time	600	3.77	4	0.048	1	5	1.185	-0.464	0.199	-0.647	0.100
Providing mass public transit	599	3.67	4	0.052	1	5	1.272	-0.623	0.199	-0.641	0.100

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Road Maintenance



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Revitalizing Old Neighborhoods



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Flood Control



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Budget Management



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Communicate Clark County’s Local Government Views about Yucca Mountain to Federal Decision Makers



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Monitor and Report to the Public on How Well Government Services are Being Performed



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Child Protection Services



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Child Welfare Services



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Juvenile Justice Services



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Affordable Housing for Low-Income Families



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Shelter for the Homeless



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Affordable Housing for Seniors



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Medical Care for the Poor



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing 24-Hour Emergency Trauma Care



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Crime Prevention Programs



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Enforcing Traffic Laws



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Maintaining a Low Crime Rate



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Maintaining Neighborhood Police Patrols



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Keeping Police Response Times Low



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Keeping Fire Department Response Times Low



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Keeping Paramedic and Emergency Response Times Low



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Well Trained Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Personnel:



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Facilitate Neighborhood Watch Programs



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Preparing for Natural Disasters



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Preparing for Man-Made Accidents or Terrorists Events



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Investigating Criminal Activity



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Fire Protection and Prevention Services



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Emergency Medical Services



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Neighborhood Code Enforcement Services



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Examining Potential Impacts from Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Shipments



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Providing Affordable Housing



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Managing Growth



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Increasing Job Opportunities



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Improving the Business Climate



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Evaluating Impacts to Property Values as a Result of Shipment of Nuclear Waste to Yucca Mountain



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Evaluating Impacts to Southern Nevada’s Tourism Economy as a Result of the Proposed Shipment of Nuclear Waste to Yucca Mountain



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Reducing Traffic Congestion



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Access to Freeways



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Improving Road Conditions



Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Reducing Travel Time




Providing mass public transit
5
4
3
2
1
34.1%
24.1%
22.3%
9.6%
8.3%
0.0%
5.0%
10.0%
15.0%
20.0%
25.0%
30.0%
35.0%
40.0%

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

General Government Importance Measure		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Road maintenance:	Unincorporated Clark County	242	1	4.00	0.072	4	5	1.119	1.252	-1.076	0.157	0.572	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	196	1	4.04	0.076	4	5	1.058	1.120	-0.904	0.174	0.184	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	3.98	0.122	4	5	1.019	1.038	-0.700	0.286	0.170	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	84	0	4.26	0.090	4	5	0.824	0.679	-0.839	0.263	0.325	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.93	0.498	4	5	1.382	1.911	-1.500	0.764	2.371	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.35	0.396	5	5	0.965	0.930	-1.013	0.849	-1.297	2	2	3	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Unincorporated Clark County	236	7	3.29	0.085	3	3	1.300	1.691	-0.275	0.159	-0.944	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	7	3.49	0.090	4	5	1.237	1.531	-0.312	0.176	-0.922	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	3.43	0.144	3	3	1.205	1.451	-0.307	0.287	-0.706	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	80	4	3.60	0.134	4	5	1.198	1.434	-0.456	0.269	-0.758	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.56	0.393	3	3	1.046	1.094	0.511	0.790	-0.836	2	3	2	5
	Mesquite	6	0	2.97	0.672	3	1	1.636	2.676	-0.093	0.849	-1.572	2	4	1	5
Flood control:	Unincorporated Clark County	241	1	3.90	0.078	4	5	1.216	1.478	-0.880	0.157	-0.231	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	197	0	3.86	0.087	4	5	1.216	1.479	-0.902	0.173	-0.054	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	3.88	0.158	4	5	1.331	1.771	-0.903	0.286	-0.394	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	84	0	3.84	0.136	4	5	1.249	1.559	-0.972	0.263	0.138	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.32	0.537	5	5	1.490	2.219	-2.193	0.764	4.384	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.08	0.468	4	5	1.140	1.300	-1.457	0.849	2.419	2	3	2	5
Budget management:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	5	3.97	0.079	4	5	1.212	1.468	-1.026	0.158	0.156	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	194	3	3.82	0.089	4	5	1.240	1.537	-0.722	0.174	-0.466	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	4	4.07	0.136	4	5	1.123	1.260	-1.106	0.291	0.571	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	81	3	4.33	0.100	5	5	0.900	0.809	-1.445	0.268	2.056	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.53	0.310	5	5	0.860	0.740	-1.551	0.764	0.813	2	2	3	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.12	0.687	5	5	1.672	2.797	-1.849	0.849	2.752	2	4	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

General Government Importance Measure		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Unincorporated Clark County	234	8	3.58	0.096	4	5	1.464	2.142	-0.641	0.159	-0.967	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	7	3.46	0.108	4	5	1.489	2.218	-0.447	0.176	-1.198	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	6	3.86	0.167	4	5	1.350	1.822	-0.962	0.296	-0.247	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	81	3	3.84	0.149	4	5	1.339	1.793	-0.853	0.267	-0.424	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.15	0.633	3	5	1.686	2.843	-0.222	0.790	-1.677	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	2.87	0.623	3	3	1.516	2.299	0.118	0.849	-0.130	2	4	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	5	3.63	0.083	4	5	1.274	1.624	-0.638	0.158	-0.587	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	195	2	3.72	0.082	4	5	1.152	1.326	-0.442	0.174	-0.726	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	3.84	0.139	4	5	1.167	1.362	-0.797	0.285	-0.123	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	81	3	3.92	0.120	4	5	1.088	1.183	-0.663	0.267	-0.270	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.01	0.530	3	3	1.380	1.905	0.139	0.804	-0.480	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.99	0.584	5	5	1.421	2.019	-1.570	0.849	3.306	2	4	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Social and Judicial Services Importance Measure		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Providing child protection services:	Unincorporated Clark County	211	31	2.84	0.071	3	3	1.036	1.074	-0.018	0.167	0.450	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	7	3.95	0.092	5	5	1.276	1.672	-0.887	0.176	-0.456	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	3	4.18	0.129	5	5	1.075	1.156	-1.355	0.288	1.017	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	81	3	4.32	0.109	5	5	0.980	0.960	-1.435	0.267	1.569	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.41	0.308	5	5	0.855	0.731	-1.089	0.764	-0.428	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.30	0.293	4	4	0.713	0.509	-0.548	0.849	0.398	2	2	1	5
Providing child welfare services:	Unincorporated Clark County	229	13	3.95	0.080	4	5	1.212	1.468	-0.867	0.161	-0.328	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	191	6	3.91	0.089	4	5	1.231	1.516	-0.735	0.176	-0.699	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	4.02	0.145	4	5	1.215	1.477	-1.097	0.286	0.165	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	79	5	4.19	0.111	5	5	0.986	0.972	-1.056	0.270	0.399	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	4.44	0.333	5	5	0.887	0.786	-1.260	0.790	-0.167	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.95	0.575	4	5	1.401	1.963	-1.541	0.849	3.400	2	4	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services:	Unincorporated Clark County	228	15	3.96	0.076	4	5	1.153	1.330	-0.877	0.161	-0.252	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	11	3.80	0.093	4	5	1.264	1.597	-0.751	0.178	-0.524	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	4	3.98	0.150	4	5	1.233	1.520	-1.174	0.291	0.533	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	82	2	4.07	0.108	4	5	0.975	0.950	-0.965	0.266	0.723	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	7	1	4.31	0.325	5	5	0.866	0.750	-0.812	0.790	-1.014	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.82	0.392	4	3	0.955	0.911	0.478	0.849	-2.153	2	2	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Social and Judicial Services Importance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Provide attainable housing for working class families:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	4	3.71	0.086	4	5	1.334	1.779	-0.735	0.158	-0.660	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	195	3	3.59	0.100	4	5	1.394	1.944	-0.519	0.174	-1.052	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	4.02	0.149	5	5	1.259	1.586	-1.198	0.284	0.379	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	83	1	3.83	0.137	4	5	1.252	1.566	-0.802	0.264	-0.482	1	4	2	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.22	0.530	3	3	1.410	1.989	-0.078	0.790	-0.475	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.82	0.625	4	5	1.438	2.069	-0.466	0.890	-2.573	2	3	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low income families:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	5	3.58	0.091	4	5	1.399	1.958	-0.571	0.158	-0.967	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	193	4	3.47	0.104	3	5	1.444	2.086	-0.352	0.175	-1.259	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	3.84	0.167	4	5	1.407	1.979	-0.962	0.285	-0.412	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	81	3	3.51	0.151	4	5	1.356	1.838	-0.451	0.268	-0.966	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.33	0.518	4	4	1.436	2.063	-0.397	0.764	-0.987	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.36	0.618	3	5	1.505	2.266	-0.274	0.849	-1.178	2	4	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	4	3.30	0.093	3	5	1.429	2.043	-0.261	0.158	-1.251	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	192	5	3.30	0.101	3	5	1.406	1.976	-0.235	0.175	-1.200	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	5	3.56	0.166	4	5	1.356	1.839	-0.618	0.293	-0.791	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	84	0	3.37	0.151	4	4	1.387	1.923	-0.434	0.263	-1.036	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.21	0.435	3	3	1.207	1.457	-0.524	0.764	0.803	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	2.74	0.599	3	3	1.460	2.131	-0.087	0.849	-0.667	2	4	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Social and Judicial Services Importance Measure (continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Unincorporated Clark County	237	5	4.01	0.081	5	5	1.243	1.545	-1.068	0.158	0.023	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	194	3	3.84	0.091	4	5	1.270	1.614	-0.743	0.174	-0.609	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	3.84	0.163	4	5	1.366	1.865	-1.027	0.287	-0.154	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	84	0	3.95	0.124	4	5	1.133	1.284	-0.740	0.263	-0.561	1	4	2	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.77	0.477	4	4	1.323	1.750	-1.332	0.764	2.216	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.05	0.516	5	5	1.257	1.581	-0.723	0.849	-1.638	2	3	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	4	3.69	0.086	4	5	1.325	1.756	-0.654	0.158	-0.741	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	7	3.76	0.096	4	5	1.326	1.758	-0.729	0.176	-0.627	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	3.76	0.159	4	5	1.345	1.809	-0.779	0.283	-0.561	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	81	3	3.85	0.145	4	5	1.306	1.706	-0.794	0.267	-0.549	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.69	0.506	4	4	1.405	1.974	-1.108	0.764	0.706	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.02	0.640	3	3	1.560	2.432	0.134	0.849	-0.709	2	4	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	4	4.43	0.063	5	5	0.970	0.940	-1.891	0.158	3.178	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	194	3	4.27	0.073	5	5	1.012	1.025	-1.210	0.175	0.443	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	4.61	0.093	5	5	0.787	0.620	-2.512	0.285	7.018	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	83	1	4.32	0.118	5	5	1.073	1.150	-1.474	0.265	1.175	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.29	0.516	5	5	1.431	2.047	-2.183	0.764	4.740	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.06	0.721	5	5	1.755	3.079	-1.816	0.849	2.187	2	4	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Importance Measure		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Providing crime prevention programs:	Unincorporated Clark County	237	5	4.02	0.072	4	5	1.113	1.240	-0.899	0.158	-0.066	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	7	2.89	0.077	3	3	1.064	1.132	-0.111	0.176	-0.419	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	2	3.92	0.132	4	5	1.100	1.210	-0.815	0.288	-0.050	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	84	0	4.23	0.101	4	5	0.922	0.850	-1.175	0.263	1.024	1	4	2	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.61	0.510	4	4	1.414	2.000	-1.006	0.764	0.239	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.93	0.473	4	5	1.152	1.327	-0.553	0.849	-0.953	2	3	1	5
Enforcing traffic laws:	Unincorporated Clark County	241	1	3.97	0.073	4	5	1.134	1.285	-0.826	0.157	-0.227	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	196	1	3.79	0.090	4	5	1.265	1.600	-0.644	0.174	-0.727	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	3.89	0.137	4	5	1.159	1.344	-0.754	0.283	-0.262	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	84	0	4.07	0.136	5	5	1.247	1.554	-1.179	0.263	0.273	1	4	2	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.42	0.558	3	5	1.548	2.397	-0.332	0.764	-1.434	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.86	0.656	5	5	1.596	2.548	-0.685	0.849	-2.629	2	3	1	5
Maintaining a low crime rate:	Unincorporated Clark County	241	1	4.23	0.072	5	5	1.117	1.247	-1.453	0.157	1.262	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	195	2	3.91	0.098	5	5	1.375	1.890	-0.910	0.174	-0.538	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	4.19	0.143	5	5	1.212	1.468	-1.423	0.283	0.982	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	84	0	4.31	0.118	5	5	1.084	1.175	-1.547	0.263	1.484	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.05	0.539	5	5	1.494	2.232	-1.437	0.764	1.355	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.68	0.295	5	5	0.718	0.515	-2.515	0.849	7.883	2	2	1	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Unincorporated Clark County	242	1	4.04	0.076	4	5	1.175	1.380	-1.105	0.157	0.260	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	196	1	3.87	0.091	4	5	1.271	1.615	-0.717	0.174	-0.745	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	3.96	0.136	4	5	1.144	1.310	-0.791	0.286	-0.265	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	82	2	4.07	0.122	4	5	1.109	1.229	-0.942	0.266	0.021	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.72	0.415	3	3	1.152	1.328	0.015	0.764	-1.598	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.52	0.626	3	5	1.524	2.323	-0.384	0.849	-0.879	2	4	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Importance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Keeping police response times low:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	4	4.25	0.068	5	5	1.056	1.114	-1.369	0.158	1.104	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	191	7	4.17	0.085	5	5	1.173	1.375	-1.227	0.176	0.363	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	4.26	0.119	5	5	0.998	0.997	-1.540	0.287	2.343	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	81	3	4.31	0.112	5	5	1.010	1.021	-1.655	0.267	2.396	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	6	2	4.30	0.342	4	5	0.849	0.720	-0.771	0.835	-0.821	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	4.76	0.311	5	5	0.717	0.514	-3.418	0.890	16.173	2	2	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	3	4.54	0.049	5	5	0.758	0.574	-2.002	0.157	4.729	0	4	2	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	7	4.50	0.063	5	5	0.870	0.757	-1.903	0.176	3.221	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	3	4.54	0.088	5	5	0.731	0.534	-1.492	0.289	1.481	1	3	3	5
	Henderson	82	2	4.64	0.081	5	5	0.737	0.543	-2.464	0.266	6.688	1	4	2	5
	Boulder City	6	2	4.60	0.350	5	5	0.870	0.757	-2.057	0.835	3.205	2	2	2	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.37	0.420	5	5	1.022	1.045	-2.186	0.849	7.239	2	3	1	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Unincorporated Clark County	241	1	4.57	0.046	5	5	0.709	0.503	-1.750	0.157	2.749	0	3	2	5
	City of Las Vegas	192	5	4.50	0.063	5	5	0.877	0.769	-1.849	0.175	2.945	0	4	2	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	4.56	0.087	5	5	0.731	0.534	-1.553	0.287	1.612	1	3	3	5
	Henderson	83	1	4.67	0.074	5	5	0.675	0.456	-2.039	0.264	3.360	1	3	4	5
	Boulder City	6	2	4.70	0.280	5	5	0.696	0.484	-2.627	0.835	8.589	2	2	2	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.89	0.139	5	5	0.337	0.114	-3.526	0.849	16.121	2	1	1	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:	Unincorporated Clark County	236	6	4.64	0.047	5	5	0.719	0.517	-2.172	0.158	4.241	0	3	3	5
	City of Las Vegas	193	4	4.56	0.055	5	5	0.767	0.588	-1.733	0.175	2.502	0	4	2	5
	North Las Vegas	68	3	4.68	0.073	5	5	0.604	0.365	-1.749	0.290	1.965	1	2	4	5
	Henderson	82	2	4.75	0.065	5	5	0.589	0.348	-2.597	0.265	6.810	1	3	5	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.72	0.173	5	5	0.480	0.230	-1.259	0.764	-0.680	2	1	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	5.00	0.000	5	5	0.000	0.000		0.849		2	0	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Importance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	5	3.77	0.072	4	4	1.111	1.234	-0.668	0.158	-0.243	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	194	3	3.72	0.086	4	5	1.194	1.426	-0.649	0.175	-0.305	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	6	3.36	0.141	3	3	1.142	1.303	-0.118	0.296	-0.499	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	80	4	3.75	0.132	4	4	1.187	1.408	-0.777	0.268	-0.342	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.57	0.475	4	3	1.318	1.737	-0.834	0.764	1.029	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.24	0.700	4	5	1.705	2.907	-0.332	0.849	-1.855	2	4	1	5
Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Unincorporated Clark County	238	4	3.87	0.080	4	5	1.238	1.533	-0.953	0.158	-0.026	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	193	4	3.56	0.101	4	5	1.399	1.958	-0.531	0.175	-0.948	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	2	3.73	0.161	4	5	1.338	1.790	-0.795	0.288	-0.514	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	82	2	3.94	0.125	4	5	1.132	1.282	-0.953	0.265	0.179	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.61	0.449	4	4	1.245	1.551	-0.324	0.764	-1.538	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.29	0.737	3	5	1.795	3.224	-0.372	0.849	-1.756	2	4	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	4	4.00	0.079	4	5	1.218	1.483	-1.017	0.158	0.038	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	191	6	3.70	0.099	4	5	1.374	1.889	-0.716	0.176	-0.697	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	4.06	0.155	5	5	1.311	1.719	-1.256	0.283	0.405	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	82	2	4.14	0.127	5	5	1.147	1.315	-1.234	0.266	0.583	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.57	0.499	4	4	1.385	1.919	-0.876	0.764	0.298	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.52	0.554	3	3	1.349	1.821	-0.540	0.849	1.202	2	4	1	5
Investigating criminal activity:	Unincorporated Clark County	235	7	4.03	0.069	4	5	1.062	1.127	-0.908	0.159	0.067	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	192	5	4.01	0.086	4	5	1.193	1.423	-0.932	0.176	-0.320	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	4.00	0.127	4	5	1.063	1.130	-0.924	0.287	0.398	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	83	1	4.16	0.112	4	5	1.017	1.035	-1.145	0.264	0.682	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.70	0.509	4	4	1.356	1.839	-1.258	0.790	1.997	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.96	0.576	4	5	1.402	1.964	-1.567	0.849	3.500	2	4	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Importance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	4	4.40	0.056	5	5	0.860	0.739	-1.364	0.158	1.104	0	4	2	5
	City of Las Vegas	194	3	4.23	0.071	5	5	0.989	0.978	-1.070	0.175	0.139	0	4	2	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	4.13	0.111	4	5	0.938	0.881	-0.900	0.283	-0.037	1	3	3	5
	Henderson	82	2	4.48	0.080	5	5	0.724	0.525	-1.194	0.265	0.663	1	3	3	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.28	0.298	4	5	0.827	0.685	-0.661	0.764	-0.989	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.43	0.363	5	5	0.885	0.783	-1.264	0.849	0.062	2	2	1	5
Providing emergency medical services:	Unincorporated Clark County	240	2	4.49	0.054	5	5	0.833	0.694	-1.765	0.157	2.751	0	4	2	5
	City of Las Vegas	197	0	4.32	0.068	5	5	0.959	0.919	-1.412	0.173	1.432	0	4	2	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	4.32	0.102	5	5	0.856	0.732	-1.209	0.285	0.843	1	3	4	5
	Henderson	84	0	4.60	0.071	5	5	0.650	0.422	-1.567	0.263	1.928	1	3	5	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.72	0.173	5	5	0.480	0.230	-1.259	0.764	-0.680	2	1	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	5.00	0.000	5	5	0.000	0.000		0.849		2	0	1	5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Unincorporated Clark County	228	15	3.57	0.078	4	3	1.174	1.378	-0.322	0.161	-0.844	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	10	3.62	0.089	4	5	1.220	1.489	-0.377	0.178	-0.854	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	6	3.34	0.147	3	3	1.196	1.431	-0.380	0.295	-0.489	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	77	7	3.49	0.121	3	3	1.067	1.138	-0.203	0.273	-0.570	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.26	0.379	3	3	1.010	1.020	0.528	0.790	0.169	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.29	0.737	3	5	1.795	3.224	-0.372	0.849	-1.756	2	4	1	5
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Unincorporated Clark County	233	9	3.68	0.094	4	5	1.431	2.047	-0.710	0.159	-0.858	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	12	3.56	0.107	4	5	1.451	2.107	-0.559	0.178	-1.062	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	3.68	0.166	4	5	1.384	1.916	-0.762	0.288	-0.530	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	79	5	4.00	0.151	5	5	1.342	1.802	-1.121	0.270	-0.040	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.18	0.370	3	3	0.986	0.971	0.829	0.790	1.056	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.23	0.697	3	5	1.697	2.878	-0.157	0.849	-1.619	2	4	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Community Development Importance Measure		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Providing affordable housing:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	3	3.58	0.087	4	5	1.341	1.798	-0.488	0.157	-0.923	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	196	1	3.21	0.100	3	5	1.396	1.949	-0.075	0.174	-1.237	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	3.59	0.158	4	5	1.337	1.786	-0.440	0.283	-1.035	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	82	2	3.73	0.137	4	5	1.239	1.535	-0.703	0.266	-0.379	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.46	0.605	4	5	1.677	2.813	-0.302	0.764	-1.947	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.07	0.905	4	5	2.083	4.341	-0.096	0.890	-3.241	2	4	1	5
Managing growth:	Unincorporated Clark County	241	2	3.77	0.086	4	5	1.339	1.793	-0.782	0.157	-0.634	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	193	4	3.59	0.093	4	5	1.294	1.674	-0.543	0.175	-0.807	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	4.01	0.138	4	5	1.161	1.349	-1.155	0.284	0.651	1	4	4	5
	Henderson	83	1	4.06	0.135	5	5	1.235	1.524	-1.267	0.264	0.638	1	4	2	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.80	0.154	5	5	0.427	0.182	-1.917	0.764	2.185	2	1	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.29	0.537	5	5	1.307	1.709	-1.592	0.849	1.090	2	3	1	5
Increasing job opportunities:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	3	4.02	0.075	4	5	1.166	1.360	-1.144	0.157	0.490	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	192	5	3.78	0.090	4	5	1.246	1.552	-0.609	0.175	-0.781	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	4.01	0.146	4	5	1.217	1.482	-1.155	0.287	0.490	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	82	2	4.08	0.107	4	5	0.974	0.949	-0.839	0.265	0.159	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.87	0.367	4	3	1.018	1.036	0.327	0.764	-2.505	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.74	0.749	5	5	1.725	2.977	-0.867	0.890	-1.371	2	4	1	5
Improving the business climate:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	5	3.89	0.067	4	5	1.031	1.064	-0.618	0.158	-0.306	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	191	6	3.77	0.083	4	5	1.154	1.332	-0.540	0.176	-0.638	0	4	2	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	3.88	0.115	4	5	0.972	0.944	-0.390	0.284	-0.506	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	81	3	3.93	0.107	4	5	0.969	0.939	-0.453	0.267	-0.844	1	3	2	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.77	0.376	3	3	1.001	1.002	0.598	0.790	-2.215	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.87	0.509	4	5	1.239	1.535	-0.594	0.849	-1.173	2	3	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Community Development Importance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Planning for commercial development:	Unincorporated Clark County	236	6	3.63	0.072	4	4	1.101	1.212	-0.610	0.158	-0.070	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	189	8	3.66	0.083	4	3	1.146	1.313	-0.533	0.177	-0.390	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	3	3.87	0.124	4	5	1.029	1.059	-0.646	0.289	-0.099	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	82	2	3.79	0.128	4	5	1.154	1.332	-0.715	0.266	-0.247	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.91	0.288	4	4	0.798	0.637	0.185	0.764	-1.082	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.68	0.295	5	5	0.718	0.515	-2.515	0.849	7.883	2	2	1	5
Evaluating impacts to property values as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain:	Unincorporated Clark County	229	13	3.52	0.097	4	5	1.476	2.178	-0.535	0.161	-1.123	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	182	15	3.43	0.110	4	5	1.483	2.199	-0.351	0.180	-1.299	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	4	3.68	0.167	4	5	1.375	1.891	-0.645	0.291	-0.726	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	79	5	3.76	0.146	4	5	1.295	1.677	-0.558	0.271	-0.965	1	4	2	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.06	0.601	3	1	1.598	2.555	-0.230	0.790	-1.444	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.25	0.483	3	3	1.177	1.385	0.694	0.849	-0.380	2	3	1	5
Evaluating impacts to Southern Nevada's tourism economy as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain:	Unincorporated Clark County	233	10	3.46	0.097	4	5	1.482	2.196	-0.464	0.159	-1.184	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	181	16	3.47	0.113	4	5	1.524	2.323	-0.424	0.181	-1.333	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	3.44	0.170	4	5	1.423	2.024	-0.424	0.287	-1.081	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	79	5	3.75	0.139	4	5	1.238	1.532	-0.491	0.270	-1.004	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.39	0.514	4	4	1.368	1.872	-0.652	0.790	0.139	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.27	0.580	4	4	1.414	1.998	-1.103	0.849	0.798	2	4	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion:	Unincorporated Clark County	243	0	4.02	0.084	5	5	1.306	1.706	-1.084	0.156	-0.139	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	194	3	3.89	0.094	4	5	1.308	1.710	-0.872	0.174	-0.509	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	4.07	0.145	5	5	1.225	1.501	-1.260	0.283	0.601	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	83	1	4.32	0.109	5	5	0.992	0.984	-1.580	0.264	2.236	1	4	2	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.96	0.479	4	4	1.329	1.767	-1.786	0.764	3.843	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.98	0.569	5	5	1.387	1.923	-1.045	0.849	-0.880	2	3	1	5

Appendix I
Importance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Community Development Importance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Access to freeways:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	3	3.83	0.078	4	5	1.201	1.441	-0.766	0.157	-0.356	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	195	2	3.71	0.086	4	5	1.201	1.443	-0.445	0.174	-0.900	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	3.91	0.122	4	5	1.035	1.071	-0.417	0.283	-0.875	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	83	1	4.01	0.106	4	4	0.962	0.926	-0.860	0.264	0.475	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.95	0.528	5	5	1.463	2.141	-1.300	0.764	1.156	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.17	0.392	4	5	0.956	0.914	-0.462	0.849	-2.182	2	2	1	5
Improving road conditions:	Unincorporated Clark County	242	1	4.03	0.073	4	5	1.127	1.270	-1.040	0.157	0.334	0	4	2	5
	City of Las Vegas	197	0	3.85	0.079	4	5	1.114	1.241	-0.619	0.173	-0.484	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	4.00	0.109	4	5	0.925	0.857	-0.138	0.283	-1.556	1	3	2	5
	Henderson	83	1	4.01	0.108	4	5	0.982	0.964	-0.775	0.264	0.057	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.12	0.396	4	5	1.099	1.209	-1.137	0.764	0.609	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	4.41	0.303	5	5	0.738	0.545	-0.973	0.849	0.749	2	2	1	5
Reducing travel time:	Unincorporated Clark County	241	2	3.79	0.077	4	5	1.188	1.411	-0.678	0.157	-0.390	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	195	2	3.70	0.089	4	5	1.242	1.543	-0.610	0.174	-0.650	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	3.78	0.134	4	5	1.123	1.261	-0.556	0.287	-0.377	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	82	2	3.87	0.122	4	5	1.101	1.212	-0.735	0.266	-0.168	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.65	0.439	3	3	1.167	1.363	0.169	0.790	-1.594	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.62	0.648	4	4	1.404	1.970	-1.345	0.939	4.730	2	4	1	5
Providing mass public transit:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	3	3.67	0.084	4	5	1.293	1.673	-0.744	0.157	-0.472	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	195	2	3.64	0.092	4	5	1.289	1.662	-0.529	0.174	-0.849	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	2	3.77	0.147	4	5	1.221	1.490	-0.672	0.288	-0.408	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	82	2	3.69	0.135	4	5	1.224	1.497	-0.618	0.266	-0.558	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.83	0.417	4	5	1.157	1.339	-0.285	0.764	-1.467	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.26	0.683	3	5	1.662	2.764	-0.379	0.849	-1.443	2	4	1	5

Appendix II
Performance Score for Selected Services

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

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Std. Error of Mean	Min	Max	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis	Std Error of Kurtosis	Skewness	Std Error of Skewness
***General Government Services**											
Road Maintenance	598	3.59	3	0.045	1	5	1.093	-0.591	0.200	0.019	0.100
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	544	3.72	3	0.044	1	5	1.020	-0.041	0.209	0.419	0.105
Flood Control	593	3.44	4	0.046	1	5	1.127	-0.472	0.200	-0.452	0.100
Budget management	558	2.71	3	0.044	1	5	1.040	-0.280	0.207	0.134	0.103
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	564	2.83	3	0.054	1	1	1.272	-0.992	0.205	0.082	0.103
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	579	2.57	3	0.045	1	1	1.084	-0.530	0.203	0.219	0.102
*Social and Judicial Services											
Providing Child Protection Services	552	2.82	3	0.047	1	5	1.113	-0.545	0.208	0.094	0.104
Providing Child Welfare Services	543	2.90	3	0.048	1	5	1.121	-0.576	0.209	0.080	0.105
Providing Juvenile Justice Services	547	2.79	3	0.046	1	5	1.068	-0.493	0.208	0.048	0.104
Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families	562	2.48	2	0.047	1	5	1.108	-0.515	0.206	0.372	0.103
Providing Affordable housing for Low Income Families	566	2.39	2	0.047	1	5	1.150	-0.560	0.205	0.486	0.103
Providing shelter for the homeless	569	2.10	2	0.049	1	5	1.171	-0.165	0.205	0.853	0.102
Providing Affordable housing for seniors	557	2.56	3	0.049	1	5	1.151	-0.703	0.207	0.264	0.104
Providing medical care for the poor	558	2.56	3	0.052	1	5	1.226	-0.946	0.206	0.249	0.103
Providing 24-hour emergency trauma care	486	2.55	3	0.049	1	5	1.086	-0.624	0.221	0.211	0.110
*Public Safety											
Providing crime prevention programs	581	2.90	3	0.042	1	5	1.004	-0.277	0.202	1.009	-0.152
Enforcing traffic laws	599	2.90	3	0.049	1	5	1.210	-0.846	0.199	1.464	0.074
Maintaining a low crime rate	598	2.76	3	0.044	1	5	1.068	-0.531	0.200	0.003	0.100
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	591	2.68	3	0.045	1	5	1.092	-0.508	0.201	0.325	0.101
Keeping police response times low	567	3.01	3	0.048	1	5	1.150	-0.756	0.205	-0.054	0.103
Keeping fire department response times low	546	3.73	4	0.041	1	5	0.960	0.399	0.209	-0.689	0.105

Performance Variable	N	Mean	Median	Std. Error of Mean	Min	Max	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis	Std Error of Kurtosis	Skewness	Std Error of Skewness
Keeping paramedic and emergency response times low	560	3.76	4	0.041	1	5	0.960	0.052	0.206	-0.602	0.103
Well trained paramedic and emergency response personnel	549	3.93	4	0.038	1	5	0.892	0.613	0.208	-0.769	0.104
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	548	2.69	3	0.044	1	5	1.021	-0.232	0.208	0.246	0.104
Preparing for natural disasters	573	2.81	3	0.049	1	5	1.177	-0.808	0.204	0.023	0.102
Preparing for man-made accidents or terrorist events	575	2.76	3	0.049	1	5	1.176	-0.755	0.203	0.127	0.102
Investigating criminal activity	562	2.99	3	0.046	1	5	1.079	-0.467	0.206	-0.091	0.103
Providing fire protection and prevention services	574	3.58	4	0.039	1	5	0.940	-0.068	0.204	-0.330	0.102
Providing emergency medical services	582	3.65	4	0.041	1	5	0.991	0.011	0.202	-0.540	0.101
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	532	2.86	3	0.047	1	5	1.095	-0.559	0.211	0.170	0.106
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	545	2.69	3	0.053	1	5	1.232	-0.952	0.209	0.177	0.105
Community Development											
Providing affordable housing	568	2.43	2	0.044	1	5	1.060	-0.403	0.205	0.361	0.103
Managing growth	598	2.45	2	0.047	1	5	1.145	-0.571	0.199	0.418	0.100
Increasing job opportunities	588	3.06	3	0.048	1	5	1.152	-0.653	0.201	-0.095	0.101
Improving the business climate	586	3.27	3	0.041	1	5	0.998	-0.133	0.202	-0.335	0.101
Planning for commercial development	575	3.26	3	0.044	1	5	1.059	-0.277	0.204	-0.324	0.102
Evaluating impacts to property values as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain	543	2.33	2	0.051	1	5	1.183	-0.511	0.209	0.550	0.105
Evaluating impacts to Southern Nevada's tourism economy as a result of proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain	541	2.55	3	0.052	1	5	1.204	-0.736	0.210	0.323	0.104
Reducing traffic congestion	596	2.38	2	0.045	1	5	1.097	-0.410	0.200	0.503	0.100
Access to freeways	597	2.98	3	0.044	1	5	1.085	-0.553	0.200	-0.052	0.100
Improving road conditions	599	2.93	3	0.044	1	5	1.790	-0.580	0.199	-0.048	0.100
Reducing travel time	592	2.67	3	0.046	1	5	1.117	-0.602	0.201	0.225	0.100
Providing mass public transit	585	2.76	3	0.031	1	5	1.248	0.425	0.202	0.144	0.101

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Road Maintenance



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please Rank the following: Revitalizing Old Neighborhoods



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Flood Control



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Budget Management



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Communicate Clark County’s Local Government Views about Yucca Mountain to Federal Decision Makers



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Monitor and Report to the Public on how Well Government Services are Being Performed



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Child Protection Services



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Child Welfare Services



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Juvenile Justice Services



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Attainable Housing for Working Class Families



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Provide Affordable Housing for Low-Income Families



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Shelter for the Homeless



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Affordable Housing for Seniors



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Medical Care for the Poor



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing 24-Hour Emergency Trauma Care



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Crime Prevention Programs



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Enforcing Traffic Laws



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Maintaining a Low Crime Rate



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Maintaining Neighborhood Police Patrols



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Keeping Police Response Times Low



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Keeping Fire Department Response Times Low



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Keeping Paramedic and Emergency Response Times Low



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Well Trained Paramedic and Emergency Medical Response Personnel



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Facilitate Neighborhood Watch Programs



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Preparing for Natural Disasters



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Preparing for Man-Made Accidents or Terrorist Events



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Investigating Criminal Activity



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Fire Protection and Prevention Services



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Emergency Medical Services



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Neighborhood Code Enforcement Services



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Examining Potential Impacts from Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Shipments



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Affordable Housing



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Managing Growth



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Increasing Job Opportunities



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Improving the Business Climate



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Evaluating Impacts to Property Values as a Result of the Proposed Shipment of Nuclear Waste to Yucca Mountain:



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Evaluating Impacts to Southern Nevada’s Tourism Economy as a Result of the Proposed Shipment of Nuclear Waste to Yucca Mountain



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Reducing Traffic Congestion



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Access to Freeways



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Improving Road Conditions



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Reducing Travel Time



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
On a scale where 1 means “low importance” please rank the following: Providing Mass Public Transit



Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

General Government Performance Measure		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Road maintenance:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	3	2.81	0.067	3	3	1.043	1.087	0.023	0.157	-0.515	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	193	4	3.09	0.082	3	3	1.139	1.297	0.092	0.175	-0.783	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	2.90	0.130	3	3	1.094	1.197	0.075	0.286	-0.416	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	81	3	3.13	0.119	3	3	1.074	1.154	-0.347	0.267	-0.334	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.37	0.419	3	3	1.163	1.352	-0.965	0.764	2.221	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.01	0.503	3	3	1.226	1.503	-0.021	0.849	0.800	2	4	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	Unincorporated Clark County	218	25	2.42	0.066	2	3	0.972	0.945	0.350	0.165	-0.057	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	175	22	2.70	0.081	3	3	1.077	1.159	0.397	0.184	-0.262	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	4	2.66	0.116	3	3	0.955	0.912	0.303	0.291	0.241	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	72	11	2.48	0.118	2	2	1.005	1.009	0.565	0.282	0.310	1	4	2	5
	Boulder City	6	2	2.76	0.498	3	3	1.237	1.530	0.390	0.835	1.230	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.06	0.642	3	2	1.390	1.932	1.133	0.939	-0.325	2	3	1	5
Flood control:	Unincorporated Clark County	234	8	3.49	0.071	4	4	1.089	1.187	-0.589	0.159	-0.172	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	193	4	3.27	0.086	3	4	1.192	1.421	-0.362	0.175	-0.708	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	3.44	0.137	4	4	1.147	1.315	-0.217	0.286	-0.929	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	81	3	3.74	0.103	4	3	0.931	0.866	-0.265	0.267	-0.332	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.33	0.507	3	3	1.405	1.975	-0.250	0.764	-0.584	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	2.93	0.659	2	2	1.605	2.576	0.697	0.849	-1.473	2	4	1	5
Budget management:	Unincorporated Clark County	220	23	2.65	0.068	3	3	1.001	1.002	-0.001	0.164	-0.465	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	182	15	2.79	0.076	3	3	1.026	1.052	0.227	0.180	-0.183	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	65	7	2.66	0.144	3	3	1.159	1.343	0.229	0.298	-0.508	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	79	5	2.67	0.117	3	3	1.036	1.074	0.131	0.270	0.058	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.56	0.347	3	3	0.962	0.925	1.243	0.764	-0.735	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	4	2	2.42	0.769	3	1	1.597	2.550	0.770	0.977	1.398	2	4	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

General Government Performance Measure		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	Unincorporated Clark County	228	14	2.79	0.082	3	3	1.242	1.542	0.123	0.161	-0.952	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	183	15	2.90	0.099	3	3	1.333	1.777	0.041	0.180	-1.085	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	5	2.88	0.150	3	3	1.224	1.497	-0.141	0.293	-0.852	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	75	9	2.76	0.144	3	3	1.245	1.549	0.204	0.277	-0.851	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	6	2	2.62	0.529	3	4	1.316	1.731	-0.112	0.835	-2.004	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.01	0.834	3	5	1.807	3.266	0.130	0.939	-2.094	2	4	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	Unincorporated Clark County	231	11	2.38	0.067	2	3	1.012	1.025	0.304	0.160	-0.335	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	11	2.72	0.081	3	3	1.105	1.221	0.154	0.178	-0.468	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	2.68	0.128	3	3	1.068	1.140	0.170	0.287	-0.460	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	79	5	2.62	0.126	3	3	1.116	1.246	0.119	0.271	-0.796	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	2.69	0.595	3	1	1.651	2.726	-0.080	0.764	-2.315	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	2.74	0.599	3	3	1.460	2.131	-0.087	0.849	-0.667	2	4	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Social and Judicial Services Performance Measure		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Providing child protection services:	Unincorporated Clark County	219	24	2.81	0.068	3	3	1.003	1.005	-0.007	0.165	-0.248	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	179	18	2.87	0.088	3	3	1.173	1.376	0.182	0.182	-0.651	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	6	2.86	0.148	3	3	1.196	1.431	-0.050	0.296	-0.846	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	78	6	2.79	0.132	3	3	1.162	1.350	0.137	0.273	-0.620	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	2.65	0.485	3	3	1.292	1.669	0.304	0.790	0.068	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	1.95	0.745	1	1	1.611	2.596	1.808	0.941	4.504	2	4	1	5
Providing child welfare services:	Unincorporated Clark County	211	31	2.84	0.071	3	3	1.036	1.074	-0.018	0.167	-0.450	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	182	15	3.02	0.089	3	3	1.194	1.425	0.069	0.180	-0.715	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	6	2.98	0.141	3	3	1.148	1.317	-0.108	0.294	-0.742	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	73	11	2.83	0.131	3	3	1.115	1.243	0.268	0.282	-0.311	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	6	2	2.19	0.406	2	2	1.008	1.016	0.487	0.835	0.347	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.21	0.689	2	1	1.489	2.218	1.518	0.941	4.563	2	4	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services:	Unincorporated Clark County	221	21	2.74	0.069	3	3	1.027	1.054	0.128	0.164	-0.354	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	174	23	2.86	0.082	3	3	1.087	1.181	-0.035	0.184	-0.459	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	65	7	2.73	0.147	3	3	1.187	1.410	-0.082	0.297	-1.056	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	75	9	2.84	0.122	3	3	1.055	1.113	0.225	0.278	-0.328	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	2.57	0.374	3	3	0.996	0.991	-0.896	0.790	0.205	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.99	0.537	3	3	1.161	1.347	-0.009	0.941	8.538	2	4	1	5
Providing attainable housing for working class families:	Unincorporated Clark County	226	17	2.48	0.071	2	2	1.066	1.136	0.428	0.162	-0.313	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	181	16	2.55	0.085	3	3	1.140	1.299	0.264	0.180	-0.646	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	3	2.41	0.137	2	2	1.132	1.282	0.355	0.290	-0.762	1	4	1	3
	Henderson	76	8	2.46	0.133	2	3	1.163	1.353	0.445	0.275	-0.449	1	4	1	3
	Boulder City	6	2	2.05	0.324	2	2	0.805	0.648	-0.102	0.835	-0.894	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	1.61	0.371	1	1	0.802	0.644	1.119	0.941	1.497	2	2	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Social and Judicial Services Performance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Providing affordable housing for low income families:	Unincorporated Clark County	226	16	2.30	0.067	2	2	1.006	1.012	0.608	0.162	-0.030	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	11	2.53	0.087	2	2	1.185	1.405	0.371	0.178	-0.726	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	6	2.43	0.147	2	2	1.194	1.426	0.388	0.295	-1.086	1	4	1	3
	Henderson	77	7	2.36	0.133	2	1	1.166	1.361	0.385	0.274	-0.873	1	4	1	2
	Boulder City	6	2	1.96	0.381	2	1	0.948	0.898	0.098	0.835	-2.329	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	1.13	0.178	1	1	0.384	0.148	3.325	0.941	17.042	2	1	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless:	Unincorporated Clark County	224	18	1.99	0.074	2	1	1.108	1.228	1.010	0.163	0.291	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	11	2.29	0.087	2	1	1.181	1.395	0.707	0.178	-0.236	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	2	2.10	0.140	2	1	1.166	1.360	0.712	0.288	-0.513	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	78	6	2.05	0.146	2	1	1.290	1.664	0.944	0.272	-0.382	1	4	1	4
	Boulder City	7	1	1.74	0.398	1	1	1.060	1.123	1.396	0.790	1.606	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	1.77	0.685	1	1	1.481	2.192	1.714	0.941	1.305	2	3	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors:	Unincorporated Clark County	218	24	2.48	0.074	2	3	1.090	1.188	0.294	0.165	-0.557	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	184	14	2.64	0.086	3	3	1.159	1.342	0.204	0.179	-0.673	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	4	2.62	0.153	3	3	1.254	1.572	0.391	0.292	-0.676	1	4	1	3
	Henderson	76	8	2.69	0.137	3	4	1.197	1.433	0.064	0.275	-1.075	1	4	1	4
	Boulder City	7	1	1.92	0.395	2	1	1.030	1.060	0.204	0.804	-2.747	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	1.66	0.529	1	1	1.144	1.310	2.304	0.941	9.130	2	3	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor:	Unincorporated Clark County	222	20	2.47	0.080	2	1	1.193	1.424	0.289	0.163	-0.977	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	181	16	2.70	0.093	3	3	1.257	1.579	0.173	0.180	-0.960	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	68	3	2.70	0.152	3	3	1.258	1.583	0.030	0.290	-0.966	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	75	9	2.41	0.137	2	1	1.190	1.417	0.493	0.277	-0.585	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	6	2	2.16	0.466	2	1	1.158	1.341	0.237	0.835	-1.563	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.78	0.738	3	1	1.596	2.546	0.176	0.941	-1.513	2	4	1	5

Social and Judicial Services Performance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Providing 24-Hour Emergency Trauma Care	Unincorporated Clark County	195	47	2.44	0.072	2	3	1.012	1.024	0.313	0.174	-0.277	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	162	36	2.56	0.089	3	3	1.125	1.265	0.121	0.191	-0.948	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	58	14	2.78	0.154	3	3	1.174	1.378	0.001	0.314	-0.841	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	63	21	2.67	0.137	3	3	1.088	1.185	0.242	0.301	-0.194	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	4	4	2.16	0.700	2	1	1.341	1.797	0.656	1.064			3	1	5
	Mesquite	4	2	2.84	0.665	3	3	1.338	1.791	0.508	1.008	7.253	3	4	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Performance Measure		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
providing crime prevention programs:	Unincorporated Clark County	229	13	2.94	0.064	3	3	0.970	0.940	-0.079	0.161	-0.107	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	7	2.89	0.077	3	3	1.064	1.132	-0.111	0.176	-0.419	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	3	2.70	0.116	3	3	0.962	0.926	-0.240	0.289	-0.574	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	80	4	3.01	0.111	3	3	0.994	0.988	-0.353	0.269	-0.119	1	4	1	4
	Boulder City	8	0	2.92	0.308	3	3	0.854	0.729	-1.030	0.764	2.837	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.51	0.502	3	3	1.156	1.337	-0.759	0.890	-0.718	2	3	1	5
Enforcing traffic laws:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	3	2.86	0.077	3	3	1.197	1.433	0.015	0.157	-0.833	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	192	5	2.88	0.084	3	3	1.162	1.351	0.098	0.175	-0.804	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	3.10	0.147	3	3	1.248	1.558	0.018	0.283	-0.856	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	83	1	2.82	0.142	3	3	1.296	1.680	0.211	0.264	-0.946	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.37	0.375	3	3	1.041	1.085	0.642	0.764	-0.163	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.89	0.897	3	1	1.939	3.759	0.166	0.941	-2.704	2	4	1	5
Maintaining a low crime rate:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	3	2.77	0.062	3	3	0.955	0.912	0.126	0.157	-0.116	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	196	1	2.78	0.080	3	3	1.124	1.263	-0.048	0.174	-0.659	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	3	2.50	0.149	3	3	1.236	1.528	0.200	0.289	-1.011	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	81	3	2.94	0.120	3	3	1.081	1.168	-0.080	0.268	-0.600	1	4	1	4
	Boulder City	8	0	2.92	0.308	3	3	0.854	0.729	-1.030	0.764	2.837	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.28	0.545	3	3	1.255	1.576	-0.096	0.890	-2.311	2	3	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Performance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	Unincorporated Clark County	235	7	2.56	0.070	2	2	1.074	1.153	0.443	0.159	-0.384	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	194	3	2.73	0.078	3	3	1.089	1.185	0.250	0.175	-0.497	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	2.63	0.129	3	2	1.078	1.163	0.305	0.288	-0.501	1	4	2	4
	Henderson	80	4	2.93	0.123	3	3	1.101	1.212	0.312	0.269	-0.542	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.09	0.249	3	3	0.645	0.416	-0.040	0.808	1.384	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.96	0.828	4	1	1.911	3.651	-0.243	0.889	-2.959	2	4	1	5
Keeping police response times low:	Unincorporated Clark County	228	15	2.92	0.076	3	3	1.140	1.300	-0.080	0.161	-0.724	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	12	3.00	0.085	3	3	1.155	1.334	0.052	0.179	-0.789	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	65	7	2.89	0.146	3	3	1.175	1.382	0.096	0.297	-0.796	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	79	5	3.36	0.119	3	4	1.064	1.131	-0.305	0.270	-0.418	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	6	2	3.56	0.426	4	3	1.060	1.123	0.002	0.835	-0.438	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	4	2	2.80	0.953	3	1	1.918	3.677	0.321	1.008	-2.454	3	4	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low:	Unincorporated Clark County	219	24	3.70	0.066	4	4	0.981	0.962	-0.836	0.164	0.672	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	174	23	3.63	0.075	4	4	0.986	0.971	-0.411	0.184	-0.115	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	64	7	3.88	0.109	4	4	0.873	0.762	-0.850	0.298	1.223	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	77	7	3.89	0.103	4	4	0.904	0.818	-0.743	0.274	0.632	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	6	2	4.26	0.275	4	4	0.683	0.467	-0.352	0.835	0.537	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	4.00	0.402	4	5	0.925	0.856	-0.007	0.890	-2.167	2	2	1	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low:	Unincorporated Clark County	229	14	3.74	0.063	4	4	0.953	0.908	-0.603	0.161	0.243	0	4	2	5
	City of Las Vegas	177	20	3.71	0.075	4	4	0.998	0.996	-0.496	0.182	-0.228	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	65	7	3.88	0.098	4	4	0.792	0.627	-0.631	0.297	0.372	1	3	3	5
	Henderson	77	7	3.76	0.118	4	4	1.034	1.069	-0.681	0.273	-0.121	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	6	2	4.21	0.299	4	4	0.743	0.552	-0.399	0.835	-0.057	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	4.42	0.334	5	5	0.769	0.591	-1.115	0.890	1.213	2	2	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Performance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel:	Unincorporated Clark County	218	24	3.91	0.064	4	4	0.941	0.885	-0.966	0.165	1.016	0	4	2	5
	City of Las Vegas	176	21	3.97	0.065	4	4	0.868	0.754	-0.644	0.183	0.374	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	6	3.91	0.091	4	4	0.736	0.542	-0.088	0.295	-0.553	1	3	3	5
	Henderson	75	9	3.95	0.107	4	4	0.931	0.867	-0.740	0.277	0.145	1	4	2	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.13	0.316	4	5	0.876	0.767	-0.310	0.764	-1.678	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.86	0.527	4	5	1.214	1.473	-0.827	0.890	-0.111	2	3	1	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	Unincorporated Clark County	222	21	2.63	0.065	3	3	0.973	0.946	0.387	0.163	0.014	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	177	20	2.72	0.082	3	3	1.094	1.197	0.073	0.182	-0.590	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	66	6	2.67	0.112	3	3	0.907	0.823	-0.234	0.295	-0.288	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	72	12	2.76	0.127	3	3	1.074	1.153	0.542	0.284	0.070	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.18	0.366	3	3	0.953	0.909	0.567	0.804	0.761	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.57	0.629	3	3	1.359	1.848	0.908	0.941	3.916	2	4	1	5
Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	Unincorporated Clark County	233	10	2.70	0.073	3	3	1.120	1.254	0.048	0.159	-0.780	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	186	11	2.93	0.093	3	3	1.270	1.614	-0.042	0.178	-0.929	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	5	2.82	0.129	3	3	1.055	1.113	-0.098	0.292	-0.865	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	75	9	2.85	0.135	3	3	1.165	1.357	0.038	0.278	-0.542	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	2.83	0.517	3	4	1.376	1.892	-0.087	0.790	-0.927	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.43	0.783	2	1	1.692	2.863	0.626	0.941	-1.209	2	4	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	Unincorporated Clark County	231	12	2.77	0.075	3	3	1.137	1.293	0.158	0.160	-0.645	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	188	9	2.78	0.090	3	3	1.226	1.503	0.155	0.177	-0.822	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	4	2.68	0.140	3	3	1.147	1.315	-0.019	0.292	-0.940	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	78	6	2.81	0.134	3	3	1.181	1.394	0.098	0.273	-0.687	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	2.92	0.506	3	3	1.348	1.816	-0.327	0.790	-0.494	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.30	0.729	2	1	1.577	2.486	0.936	0.941	1.202	2	4	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Performance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Investigating criminal activity:	Unincorporated Clark County	223	20	2.98	0.069	3	3	1.030	1.060	-0.073	0.163	-0.295	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	12	3.00	0.088	3	3	1.192	1.421	-0.064	0.178	-0.670	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	67	5	2.98	0.111	3	3	0.911	0.830	-0.524	0.292	-0.206	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	75	9	2.92	0.125	3	3	1.078	1.162	-0.006	0.278	-0.675	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.28	0.335	3	3	0.873	0.762	0.621	0.804	1.579	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.38	0.643	4	4	1.482	2.195	-0.635	0.890	-0.420	2	4	1	5
Providing fire protection & prevention services:	Unincorporated Clark County	232	10	3.61	0.061	4	4	0.932	0.869	-0.393	0.160	0.105	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	183	14	3.56	0.072	3	3	0.977	0.954	-0.222	0.180	-0.210	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	3	3.57	0.111	4	4	0.922	0.851	-0.756	0.289	0.614	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	77	7	3.51	0.106	4	4	0.932	0.869	-0.126	0.273	-0.540	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.68	0.237	4	4	0.657	0.431	0.395	0.764	0.077	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.82	0.444	4	3	1.022	1.044	0.540	0.890	-2.724	2	2	1	5
Providing emergency medical services:	Unincorporated Clark County	230	13	3.69	0.066	4	4	1.003	1.006	-0.703	0.160	0.205	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	189	8	3.58	0.073	4	4	1.006	1.013	-0.407	0.177	-0.127	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	3	3.75	0.105	4	4	0.871	0.759	-0.367	0.289	-0.014	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	81	3	3.54	0.116	4	4	1.043	1.087	-0.433	0.267	-0.175	1	4	3	5
	Boulder City	8	0	4.08	0.242	4	4	0.671	0.451	-0.076	0.764	0.466	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.70	0.396	3	3	0.912	0.832	0.861	0.890	-1.118	2	2	1	5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	Unincorporated Clark County	220	23	2.81	0.075	3	3	1.111	1.234	0.249	0.164	-0.586	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	169	28	2.83	0.087	3	3	1.126	1.268	0.154	0.187	-0.697	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	64	8	2.92	0.114	3	3	0.916	0.839	0.228	0.299	0.511	1	4	3	5
	Henderson	69	15	2.96	0.134	3	3	1.112	1.236	0.098	0.289	-0.540	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	6	2	3.47	0.310	3	3	0.746	0.556	1.545	0.857	2.574	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	4	2	2.80	0.894	3	1	1.803	3.252	-0.093	1.006	-3.049	3	4	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Public Safety Performance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	Unincorporated Clark County	224	19	2.66	0.081	3	2	1.214	1.475	0.271	0.163	-0.885	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	176	21	2.77	0.096	3	3	1.269	1.610	0.050	0.183	-1.016	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	62	10	2.67	0.161	3	3	1.262	1.592	0.081	0.305	-1.030	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	73	11	2.64	0.134	3	3	1.146	1.314	0.242	0.281	-0.639	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	6	2	1.78	0.469	1	1	1.165	1.357	1.684	0.835	2.848	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.56	0.825	3	1	1.783	3.179	0.326	0.941	-2.671	2	4	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Community Development Performance Measure		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Providing affordable housing:	Unincorporated Clark County	229	13	2.33	0.069	2	2	1.042	1.085	0.443	0.161	-0.344	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	179	18	2.51	0.078	3	3	1.040	1.083	0.305	0.181	-0.347	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	2.62	0.136	3	3	1.143	1.306	0.312	0.286	-0.384	1	4	1	3
	Henderson	76	8	2.44	0.122	3	3	1.067	1.139	0.212	0.275	-0.594	1	4	1	2
	Boulder City	7	1	2.08	0.331	2	2	0.862	0.743	-0.187	0.804	-1.586	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	1.26	0.230	1	1	0.498	0.248	1.653	0.941	0.907	2	1	1	5
Managing growth:	Unincorporated Clark County	242	1	2.39	0.071	2	3	1.106	1.224	0.463	0.157	-0.379	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	8	2.51	0.083	2	3	1.148	1.318	0.273	0.177	-0.819	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	72	0	2.53	0.143	2	3	1.213	1.472	0.486	0.283	-0.488	1	4	1	5
	Henderson	82	2	2.41	0.129	2	2	1.163	1.353	0.538	0.266	-0.416	1	4	1	4
	Boulder City	8	0	2.67	0.561	2	2	1.555	2.418	0.680	0.764	-0.932	2	4	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	2.46	0.537	3	3	1.309	1.713	-0.267	0.849	-2.040	2	3	1	5
Increasing job opportunities:	Unincorporated Clark County	237	6	2.98	0.070	3	3	1.075	1.156	0.016	0.158	-0.534	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	10	3.10	0.091	3	3	1.245	1.549	-0.254	0.178	-0.809	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	3.34	0.146	3	3	1.225	1.501	-0.074	0.287	-0.924	1	4	2	4
	Henderson	81	3	3.00	0.116	3	3	1.040	1.081	-0.165	0.268	-0.175	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.04	0.276	3	3	0.766	0.587	-0.075	0.764	-0.768	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	2.67	0.758	3	1	1.846	3.407	0.256	0.849	-2.472	2	4	1	5
Improving the business climate:	Unincorporated Clark County	237	6	3.19	0.064	3	3	0.992	0.984	-0.367	0.158	-0.136	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	7	3.24	0.076	3	3	1.043	1.087	-0.266	0.176	-0.353	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	64	8	3.49	0.120	4	4	0.963	0.927	-0.538	0.299	0.441	1	4	2	4
	Henderson	81	3	3.38	0.097	3	3	0.879	0.773	-0.153	0.267	0.360	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.13	0.296	3	3	0.822	0.675	-0.291	0.764	-1.259	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.55	0.670	4	5	1.632	2.664	-0.944	0.849	-0.106	2	4	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Community Development Performance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Planning for commercial development:	Unincorporated Clark County	229	14	3.20	0.070	3	3	1.058	1.119	-0.197	0.161	-0.326	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	185	12	3.31	0.080	3	3	1.087	1.183	-0.438	0.179	-0.184	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	3	3.50	0.118	4	4	0.978	0.956	-0.445	0.289	0.130	1	4	2	4
	Henderson	79	5	3.10	0.116	3	3	1.033	1.067	-0.277	0.270	-0.365	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	7	1	3.37	0.295	4	4	0.767	0.589	-0.891	0.804	0.010	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.35	0.635	3	3	1.546	2.391	-0.665	0.849	-0.153	2	4	1	5
Evaluating impacts to property values as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain:	Unincorporated Clark County	226	16	2.26	0.076	2	1	1.150	1.322	0.624	0.162	-0.393	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	172	26	2.31	0.090	2	1	1.181	1.394	0.564	0.185	-0.453	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	62	10	2.35	0.157	2	1	1.234	1.522	0.475	0.304	-0.663	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	72	12	2.59	0.149	2	3	1.260	1.589	0.437	0.283	-0.695	1	4	1	4
	Boulder City	6	2	2.41	0.446	3	3	1.107	1.226	-0.425	0.835	-1.136	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.46	0.470	3	3	1.083	1.173	-0.392	0.890	-0.311	2	3	1	5
Evaluating impacts to Southern Nevada's tourism economy as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca M	Unincorporated Clark County	223	19	2.48	0.081	2	3	1.204	1.450	0.442	0.163	-0.606	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	172	25	2.47	0.092	3	3	1.206	1.456	0.322	0.185	-0.755	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	62	10	2.80	0.154	3	3	1.214	1.474	0.249	0.304	-0.661	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	71	13	2.74	0.136	3	2	1.146	1.314	0.154	0.285	-0.801	1	4	1	4
	Boulder City	7	1	2.54	0.520	3	1	1.383	1.912	-0.257	0.790	-2.185	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.05	0.561	2	1	1.291	1.667	0.521	0.890	-2.137	2	3	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	3	2.21	0.064	2	2	0.997	0.994	0.515	0.157	-0.271	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	190	7	2.41	0.084	2	2	1.156	1.336	0.526	0.176	-0.473	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	2.55	0.138	3	3	1.161	1.348	0.403	0.286	-0.428	1	4	1	4
	Henderson	82	2	2.60	0.126	2	2	1.135	1.288	0.359	0.266	-0.698	1	4	1	4
	Boulder City	8	0	2.49	0.408	3	3	1.133	1.283	-0.075	0.764	-1.146	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	2.64	0.466	2	2	1.135	1.289	0.288	0.849	-1.389	2	3	1	5

Appendix II
Performance scores for selected variables
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Community Development Performance Measure (Continued)		N	Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Range	Minimum	Maximum
Access to freeways:	Unincorporated Clark County	238	4	2.88	0.068	3	3	1.044	1.089	-0.055	0.158	-0.387	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	195	3	2.96	0.080	3	3	1.122	1.258	0.030	0.174	-0.633	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	70	2	2.98	0.136	3	3	1.142	1.303	-0.091	0.287	-0.591	1	4	2	5
	Henderson	81	3	3.28	0.112	3	4	1.005	1.011	-0.217	0.268	-0.571	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.12	0.366	3	3	1.014	1.028	0.405	0.764	-0.534	2	3	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.86	0.549	4	5	1.337	1.789	-1.515	0.849	3.949	2	4	1	5
Improving road conditions:	Unincorporated Clark County	239	3	2.77	0.063	3	3	0.974	0.950	-0.073	0.157	-0.424	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	194	3	3.08	0.085	3	3	1.184	1.401	-0.116	0.174	-0.748	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	2.83	0.121	3	3	1.014	1.029	-0.170	0.286	-0.716	1	4	3	4
	Henderson	82	2	3.05	0.123	3	3	1.113	1.238	-0.107	0.266	-0.695	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.28	0.173	3	3	0.480	0.230	1.259	0.764	-0.680	2	1	1	5
	Mesquite	6	0	3.50	0.656	4	5	1.597	2.549	-0.943	0.849	0.040	2	4	1	5
Reducing travel time:	Unincorporated Clark County	236	7	2.59	0.067	3	3	1.027	1.054	0.149	0.159	-0.419	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	192	5	2.73	0.088	3	2	1.225	1.502	0.276	0.175	-0.839	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	71	1	2.53	0.132	3	3	1.107	1.225	0.306	0.286	-0.497	1	4	2	4
	Henderson	81	3	2.84	0.124	3	3	1.119	1.252	0.075	0.267	-0.683	1	4	1	5
	Boulder City	8	0	3.08	0.265	3	3	0.735	0.541	-0.125	0.764	-0.409	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	2.93	0.615	3	3	1.332	1.773	0.232	0.939	1.904	2	4	1	5
Providing mass public transit:	Unincorporated Clark County	236	7	2.65	0.046	3	3	0.702	0.492	-0.043	0.158	0.046	0	4	1	5
	City of Las Vegas	187	10	2.81	0.057	3	3	0.774	0.599	0.218	0.178	0.294	0	4	1	5
	North Las Vegas	69	2	2.91	0.090	3	3	0.752	0.566	0.289	0.288	1.179	1	4	2	4
	Henderson	81	3	2.83	0.083	3	3	0.749	0.561	0.126	0.268	1.111	1	4	2	4
	Boulder City	7	1	2.79	0.290	3	3	0.772	0.596	0.435	0.790	-0.635	2	2	1	5
	Mesquite	5	1	3.13	0.361	3	3	0.834	0.695	-0.307	0.889	-0.911	2	2	1	6

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations
Summary Statistics

	Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	593	600	600	607	583	600	608	594	600
Missing	16	9	9	2	26	9	1	15	9
Mean	3.55	3.81	3.61	3.87	3.29	3.43	3.76	3.89	3.66
Std. Error of Mean	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05
Median	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation	1.35	1.34	1.08	1.00	1.26	1.35	1.30	1.13	1.31
Variance	1.84	1.80	1.17	1.00	1.60	1.83	1.69	1.28	1.70
Skewness	-0.47	-0.88	-0.40	-0.61	-0.29	-0.32	-0.70	-0.86	-0.57
Std. Error of Skewness	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Kurtosis	-0.97	-0.42	-0.52	-0.17	-0.91	-1.13	-0.65	0.01	-0.89
Std. Error of Kurtosis	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations

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

	1	2	3	4	5	DK/ No answer	Total
Quality of drinking water:	10.6	6.5	16.8	21.9	42.7	1.5	100.0
Recreational opportunities:	3.4	11.3	29.3	30.3	24.1	1.6	100.0
Condition of Streets and Roads	2.0	6.6	25.5	34.0	31.5	0.3	100.0
Availability of public transportation:	10.6	15.1	25.2	25.4	19.5	4.2	100.0
Housing affordability:	10.3	16.4	23.0	18.1	30.7	1.5	100.0
Air quality:	8.1	10.0	20.8	20.1	40.8	0.2	100.0
Availability of job opportunities:	4.7	6.6	20.5	28.7	37.1	2.5	100.0
Managing growth:	7.4	14.8	17.5	23.1	35.8	1.4	100.0



The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	Frequency	Percent
Support	135	22.2
Oppose	435	71.4
DK/No answer	39	6.4
Total	609	100.0



The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	55	9.0
Agree	121	19.8
Disagree	198	32.5
Strongly disagree	203	33.4
DK/No answer	32	5.2
Total	609	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 in Clark County, what would it be?	Frequency	Percent
Scenery/geography/climate	179	29.5
Family/friends/friendly people	40	6.6
Entertainment/social climate	99	16.3
Quiet/peaceful	30	5.0
Personal/family safety	29	4.8
Job opportunities	117	19.3
Education	20	3.3
Growth	10	1.6
Diversity	4	0.7
Low taxes	9	1.4
Strong Economy	14	2.2
Nothing	41	6.7
DK/No answer	16	2.5
Total	609	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 in Clark County, what would it be?	Frequency	Percent
Traffic Congestion	104	17.1
Overcrowding/unplanned growth	116	19.1
Cost of living/housing	48	7.9
Road conditions	14	2.3
Crime/violence/gangs	123	20.2
Air quality	43	7.0
Drought conditions	33	5.5
Education	19	3.1
Gaming	15	2.5
Illegal Immigration	8	1.3
Political Corruption	6	0.9
Yucca Mountain	20	3.2
Inadequate Social Services	3	0.6
Water quality	5	0.8
Nothing	39	6.4
DK/No answer	12	2.0
Total	609	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	54	8.8
Less traffic congestion	96	15.8
Improve K-12 education	76	12.4
Improve higher education	21	3.5
Better services for the homeless	7	1.2
More efficient government/government officials	44	7.2
Stop growth	42	6.9
Slow growth	66	10.9
Better jobs/training	13	2.1
Increased access to health care	20	3.3
Lower crime rates	78	12.8
Stop Yucca Mountain	66	10.8
Improve air quality	3	0.5
Improve water quality	4	0.7
Stop illegal immigration	2	0.2
Greater tax relief	2	0.4
No change	9	1.4
DK/No answer	6	1.0
Total	609	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 grow th
Slow grow th
Better jobs/training
Increased access to health care
Low er crime rates
Stop Yucca Mountain
Improve air quality
Improve w ater quality
Stop illegal immigration
Greater tax relief
No change
DK/No answ er

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations

Overall would you say the quality of life in Clark County is getting better, worse, or staying the same?	Frequency	Percent
Getting better	147	24.2
Staying about the same	217	35.6
Getting worse	230	37.8
DK/No answer	15	2.4
Total	609	100.0



Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	237	238	238	241	233	238	241	235	241
	Missing	6	5	4	1	9	4	1	8	2
Mean		3.59	3.89	3.57	3.95	3.27	3.48	3.85	4.04	3.70
Std. Error of Mean		0.087	0.083	0.068	0.064	0.089	0.090	0.081	0.072	0.085
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Std. Deviation		1.342	1.276	1.054	0.989	1.354	1.382	1.263	1.103	1.312
Variance		1.800	1.629	1.112	0.978	1.833	1.910	1.595	1.218	1.721
Skewness		-0.459	-0.960	-0.408	-0.658	-0.291	-0.375	-0.794	-1.093	-0.628
Std. Error of Skewness		0.158	0.158	0.158	0.157	0.159	0.158	0.157	0.159	0.157
Kurtosis		-0.996	-0.178	-0.336	-0.143	-1.174	-1.124	-0.494	0.510	-0.848
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.315	0.314	0.314	0.312	0.317	0.314	0.312	0.317	0.313
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	192	197	195	196	190	193	197	192	193
	Missing	5	0	2	1	7	4	0	5	4
Mean		3.30	3.56	3.64	3.71	3.26	3.25	3.53	3.76	3.55
Std. Error of Mean		0.098	0.105	0.080	0.072	0.093	0.095	0.097	0.083	0.093
Median		3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Std. Deviation		1.359	1.468	1.118	1.013	1.279	1.320	1.359	1.155	1.297
Variance		1.847	2.155	1.249	1.026	1.635	1.744	1.847	1.335	1.682
Skewness		-0.284	-0.650	-0.435	-0.284	-0.226	-0.148	-0.421	-0.642	-0.389
Std. Error of Skewness		0.176	0.173	0.174	0.174	0.177	0.175	0.173	0.175	0.175
Kurtosis		-1.022	-0.952	-0.619	-0.667	-0.909	-1.086	-1.017	-0.377	-1.043
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.349	0.345	0.346	0.345	0.351	0.348	0.345	0.349	0.348
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	72	71	72	72	66	72	72	71	69
	Missing	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	1	3
Mean		3.63	4.00	3.51	3.80	3.56	3.58	3.76	3.95	3.66
Std. Error of Mean		0.176	0.154	0.133	0.125	0.126	0.149	0.155	0.132	0.155
Median		4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Std. Deviation		1.495	1.293	1.131	1.057	1.029	1.265	1.313	1.108	1.283
Variance		2.236	1.672	1.279	1.117	1.059	1.600	1.724	1.227	1.646
Skewness		-0.577	-1.127	-0.340	-0.862	-0.268	-0.237	-0.650	-0.950	-0.473
Std. Error of Skewness		0.283	0.285	0.283	0.283	0.294	0.283	0.283	0.286	0.289
Kurtosis		-1.147	0.122	-0.801	0.458	-0.156	-1.307	-0.827	0.373	-1.036
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.560	0.563	0.560	0.560	0.580	0.560	0.560	0.564	0.571
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	80	81	81	84	81	83	84	83	84
	Missing	4	3	3	0	3	1	0	1	0
Mean		3.95	3.92	3.72	4.00	3.20	3.52	3.93	3.70	3.73
Std. Error of Mean		0.133	0.138	0.113	0.099	0.124	0.151	0.134	0.126	0.148
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Std. Deviation		1.193	1.237	1.013	0.912	1.115	1.377	1.230	1.151	1.353
Variance		1.424	1.529	1.026	0.831	1.243	1.897	1.514	1.324	1.830
Skewness		-0.953	-0.943	-0.269	-0.917	-0.236	-0.498	-1.159	-0.753	-0.841
Std. Error of Skewness		0.269	0.268	0.268	0.263	0.268	0.264	0.263	0.264	0.263
Kurtosis		-0.087	0.001	-0.545	0.849	-0.536	-1.024	0.521	-0.053	-0.491
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.532	0.529	0.529	0.520	0.530	0.522	0.520	0.521	0.520
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.33	4.44	4.12	3.80	3.20	3.87	4.12	3.72	4.01
Std. Error of Mean		0.432	0.246	0.313	0.447	0.434	0.514	0.477	0.454	0.487
Median		4.00	4.68	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.32	4.32	4.00	4.07
Std. Deviation		1.197	0.683	0.869	1.241	1.204	1.426	1.323	1.260	1.350
Variance		1.433	0.466	0.756	1.539	1.450	2.035	1.751	1.587	1.823
Skewness		-1.063	-0.898	-0.275	-1.814	-0.496	-1.226	-2.192	-1.510	-1.814
Std. Error of Skewness		0.764	0.764	0.764	0.764	0.764	0.764	0.764	0.764	0.764
Kurtosis		1.200	0.407	-1.648	4.447	0.823	1.204	5.752	3.157	3.808
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.510	1.510	1.510	1.510	1.510	1.510	1.510	1.510	1.510
Range		4	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	5	6	6	6	5	6	6	5	6
	Missing	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Mean		3.77	3.97	3.62	4.63	3.87	3.84	4.38	4.41	4.06
Std. Error of Mean		0.386	0.571	0.622	0.299	0.635	0.721	0.361	0.406	0.425
Median		3.71	5.00	3.99	5.00	4.28	4.95	5.00	5.00	4.00
Std. Deviation		0.890	1.391	1.514	0.727	1.464	1.755	0.880	0.938	1.034
Variance		0.792	1.936	2.293	0.529	2.143	3.080	0.774	0.879	1.070
Skewness		0.626	-0.736	-0.688	-2.105	-1.434	-1.336	-1.105	-1.286	-1.190
Std. Error of Skewness		0.890	0.849	0.849	0.849	0.889	0.849	0.849	0.889	0.849
Kurtosis		-1.301	-1.870	-0.412	5.336	3.132	0.366	-0.340	-0.210	2.270
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.903	1.754	1.754	1.754	1.898	1.754	1.754	1.898	1.754
Range		2	3	4	2	4	4	2	2	3
Minimum		3	2	1	3	1	1	3	3	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions

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 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 will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same?	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	599	595	588	590
	Missing	9	10	14	21	19
Mean		1.87	1.76	2.17	1.74	1.47
Std. Error of Mean		.030	.031	.031	.026	.021
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.740	.749	.766	.620	.500
Variance		.548	.560	.586	.385	.250
Skewness		.214	.421	.337	.242	.105
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.100	.101	.101
Kurtosis		-1.153	-1.116	-.136	-.619	-1.996
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.199	.199	.200	.201	.201
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

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 than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Frequency	Percent
Better	209	34.3
About the same	262	43.0
Worse	130	21.4
DK/No answer	9	1.4
Total	609	100.0



Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation and the financial situation of any family members will be better, worse or about the same?	Frequency	Percent
Better	256	42.0
About the same	230	37.7
Worse	113	18.6
DK/No answer	10	1.7
Total	609	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	103	17.0
Good	314	51.6
Fair	149	24.5
Poor	28	4.7
DK/No answer	14	2.3
Total	609	100.0



And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same?	Frequency	Percent
Better	209	34.4
About the same	322	52.8
Worse	56	9.2
DK/No answer	21	3.5
Total	609	100.0



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	310	51.0
Bad time	280	45.9
DK/No answer	19	3.1
Total	609	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 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 will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same?	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	238	238	238	232	234
	Missing	4	4	5	11	8
Mean		1.88	1.76	2.21	1.78	1.48
Std. Error of Mean		.048	.047	.052	.040	.033
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.737	.732	.809	.615	.501
Variance		.543	.536	.654	.378	.251
Skewness		.191	.411	.372	.167	.072
Std. Error of Skewness		.158	.158	.158	.160	.159
Kurtosis		-1.135	-1.046	-.234	-.529	-2.012
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.314	.314	.314	.319	.317
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

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 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 will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same?	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	196	196	191	193	190
	Missing	1	1	6	4	7
Mean		1.83	1.69	2.17	1.65	1.46
Std. Error of Mean		.053	.055	.052	.045	.036
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.746	.770	.712	.623	.500
Variance		.557	.592	.507	.388	.250
Skewness		.284	.589	.237	.417	.164
Std. Error of Skewness		.174	.174	.176	.175	.177
Kurtosis		-1.157	-1.078	-.059	-.655	-1.994
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.346	.346	.350	.348	.351
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

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 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 will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same?	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	70	69	70	69	70
	Missing	2	3	2	3	2
Mean		1.76	1.77	2.14	1.66	1.51
Std. Error of Mean		.087	.087	.078	.072	.060
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		.729	.727	.647	.597	.504
Variance		.531	.528	.418	.357	.254
Skewness		.407	.392	.060	.289	-.036
Std. Error of Skewness		.286	.289	.288	.290	.288
Kurtosis		-1.011	-1.006	-.112	-.625	-2.059
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.566	.570	.568	.572	.568
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

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 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 will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same?	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	83	82	84	81	83
	Missing	1	2	0	3	1
Mean		1.97	1.88	2.11	1.84	1.43
Std. Error of Mean		.081	.084	.092	.071	.055
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.740	.761	.840	.637	.498
Variance		.547	.580	.705	.406	.248
Skewness		.048	.202	.421	.142	.278
Std. Error of Skewness		.264	.266	.263	.267	.264
Kurtosis		-1.145	-1.235	-.317	-.545	-1.970
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.523	.526	.520	.527	.521
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

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 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 will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	7	8	8	8	7
	Missing	1	0	0	0	1
Mean		2.01	1.92	1.92	2.08	1.39
Std. Error of Mean		.294	.241	.242	.104	.197
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.782	.668	.671	.290	.525
Variance		.611	.447	.450	.084	.276
Skewness		-.023	.069	.070	3.925	.602
Std. Error of Skewness		.790	.764	.764	.764	.790
Kurtosis		-.834	.516	.484	18.266	-2.465
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.577	1.510	1.510	1.510	1.577
Range		2	2	2	1	1
Minimum		1	1	1	2	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	2

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 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 will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same?	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	6	6	5	5	6
	Missing	0	0	1	1	0
Mean		2.31	2.17	2.39	2.11	1.89
Std. Error of Mean		.292	.334	.498	.277	.139
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		.710	.813	1.147	.638	.337
Variance		.504	.661	1.315	.407	.114
Skewness		-.554	-.396	.602	-.002	-3.526
Std. Error of Skewness		.849	.849	.890	.890	.849
Kurtosis		.425	-.822	-.213	3.099	16.121
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.754	1.754	1.903	1.903	1.754
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

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 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 than you were a year ago, or about the same?			
			Better	About the same	Worse	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	80	106	52	238
		% within Jurisdiction	33.6%	44.5%	21.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	74	82	41	197
		% within Jurisdiction	37.6%	41.6%	20.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	29	29	12	70
		% within Jurisdiction	41.4%	41.4%	17.1%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	24	38	21	83
		% within Jurisdiction	28.9%	45.8%	25.3%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	3	2	7
		% within Jurisdiction	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	3	2	6
		% within Jurisdiction	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	210	261	130	601
		% within Jurisdiction	34.9%	43.4%	21.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.085(a)	10	.885
Likelihood Ratio	5.181	10	.879
Linear-by-Linear Association	.496	1	.481
N of Valid Cases	601		

a 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.30.

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

Jurisdiction * Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members 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 will be better, worse or about the same?			
			Better	About the same	Worse	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	99	97	42	238
		% within Jurisdiction	41.6%	40.8%	17.6%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	97	62	37	196
		% within Jurisdiction	49.5%	31.6%	18.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	28	29	12	69
		% within Jurisdiction	40.6%	42.0%	17.4%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	29	34	19	82
		% within Jurisdiction	35.4%	41.5%	23.2%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	5	1	8
		% within Jurisdiction	25.0%	62.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	2	2	5
		% within Jurisdiction	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	256	229	113	598
		% within Jurisdiction	42.8%	38.3%	18.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.233(a)	10	.340
Likelihood Ratio	11.073	10	.352
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.231	1	.135
N of Valid Cases	598		

a 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .94.

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

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

			Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?				
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	42	120	59	16	237
		% within Jurisdiction	17.7%	50.6%	24.9%	6.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	29	106	50	6	191
		% within Jurisdiction	15.2%	55.5%	26.2%	3.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	9	41	18	1	69
		% within Jurisdiction	13.0%	59.4%	26.1%	1.4%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	20	40	19	5	84
		% within Jurisdiction	23.8%	47.6%	22.6%	6.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	5	1	0	8
		% within Jurisdiction	25.0%	62.5%	12.5%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	2	1	1	5
		% within Jurisdiction	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	103	314	148	29	594
		% within Jurisdiction	17.3%	52.9%	24.9%	4.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.711(a)	15	.548
Likelihood Ratio	13.652	15	.552
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.100	1	.294
N of Valid Cases	594		

a 10 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .24.

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

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

			And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same?			
			Better	About the same	Worse	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	74	133	24	231
		% within Jurisdiction	32.0%	57.6%	10.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	83	95	15	193
		% within Jurisdiction	43.0%	49.2%	7.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	28	36	4	68
		% within Jurisdiction	41.2%	52.9%	5.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	24	47	11	82
		% within Jurisdiction	29.3%	57.3%	13.4%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	0	7	1	8
		% within Jurisdiction	.0%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	3	1	5
		% within Jurisdiction	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	210	321	56	587
		% within Jurisdiction	35.8%	54.7%	9.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.305(a)	10	.121
Likelihood Ratio	17.816	10	.058
Linear-by-Linear Association	.734	1	.392
N of Valid Cases	587		

a 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .48.

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross-Tabulations

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

			Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?		
			Good time	Bad time	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	121	113	234
		% within Jurisdiction	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	103	87	190
		% within Jurisdiction	54.2%	45.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	34	35	69
		% within Jurisdiction	49.3%	50.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	47	36	83
		% within Jurisdiction	56.6%	43.4%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	4	3	7
		% within Jurisdiction	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	5	6
		% within Jurisdiction	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	310	279	589
		% within Jurisdiction	52.6%	47.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.283(a)	5	.509
Likelihood Ratio	4.521	5	.477
Linear-by-Linear Association	.007	1	.931
N of Valid Cases	589		

a 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.84.

Appendix V
Property Value Considerations

		Amusement Park:	Day care center:	Landfill: non-polluting manufacturing facility:	Public school:	Highway/Freeway:	Hotel-casino:	Polluting manufacturing facility:	transportation route:
N	Valid	594	593	598	591	603	593	589	603	594
	Missing	15	16	11	18	6	16	20	6	15
Mean		1.78	2.39	1.13	1.66	2.61	2.00	1.88	1.17	1.18
Std. Error of Mean		0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.02
Median		2	2	1	1	3	2	2	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.83	0.68	0.41	0.77	0.63	0.87	0.84	0.52	0.46
Variance		0.70	0.46	0.17	0.59	0.40	0.76	0.71	0.27	0.21
Skewness		0.43	-0.65	3.28	0.66	-1.38	0.00	0.24	2.93	2.59
Std. Error of Skewness		0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
Kurtosis		-1.43	-0.67	10.39	-1.02	0.71	-1.68	-1.56	7.19	6.08
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

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?	Frequency	Percent
Positive effect	56	9.3
No effect	123	20.1
Negative effect	405	66.5
DK/No answer	25	4.1
Total	609	100.0



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

	Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	DK/No answer	Total
Amusement Park	46.9	25.1	25.5	2.5	100.0
Day Care Center	10.7	38.4	48.2	2.6	100.0
Landfill	88.0	7.6	2.6	1.8	100.0
Non-polluting manufacturing facility	50.7	28.4	17.9	3.0	100.0
Public School	7.9	22.8	68.2	1.1	100.0
Highway/ Freeway	36.7	23.8	36.7	2.7	100.0
Hotel/ Casino	88.2	4.7	6.1	0.9	100.0
Polluting Manufacturing Facility	88.2	4.7	6.1	0.9	100.0
High-level Nuclear Waste Transportation Route	83.1	11.3	3.2	2.5	100.0



Jurisdiction * Amusement Park:

			Amusement Park:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	121	61	57	239
		% within Jurisdiction	50.6%	25.5%	23.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	98	41	53	192
		% within Jurisdiction	51.0%	21.4%	27.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	30	12	26	68
		% within Jurisdiction	44.1%	17.6%	38.2%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	32	32	18	82
		% within Jurisdiction	39.0%	39.0%	22.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	3	2	7
		% within Jurisdiction	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	2	3	1	6
		% within Jurisdiction	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	285	152	157	594
		% within Jurisdiction	48.0%	25.6%	26.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.282(a)	10	.037
Likelihood Ratio	18.179	10	.052
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.367	1	.124
N of Valid Cases	594		

a 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.54.

Jurisdiction * Day care center:

			Day care center:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	16	103	118	237
		% within Jurisdiction	6.8%	43.5%	49.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	26	69	93	188
		% within Jurisdiction	13.8%	36.7%	49.5%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	9	25	38	72
		% within Jurisdiction	12.5%	34.7%	52.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	12	31	39	82
		% within Jurisdiction	14.6%	37.8%	47.6%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	0	4	4	8
		% within Jurisdiction	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	2	2	2	6
		% within Jurisdiction	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	65	234	294	593
		% within Jurisdiction	11.0%	39.5%	49.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.636(a)	10	.245
Likelihood Ratio	12.960	10	.226
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.727	1	.189
N of Valid Cases	593		

a 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .66.

Jurisdiction * Landfill:

			Landfill:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	216	20	3	239
		% within Jurisdiction	90.4%	8.4%	1.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	172	16	4	192
		% within Jurisdiction	89.6%	8.3%	2.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	65	5	2	72
		% within Jurisdiction	90.3%	6.9%	2.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	71	4	7	82
		% within Jurisdiction	86.6%	4.9%	8.5%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	8	0	0	8
		% within Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	5	1	0	6
		% within Jurisdiction	83.3%	16.7%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	537	46	16	599
		% within Jurisdiction	89.6%	7.7%	2.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.595(a)	10	.112
Likelihood Ratio	13.091	10	.219
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.190	1	.139
N of Valid Cases	599		

a 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.

Jurisdiction * Non-polluting manufacturing facility:

			Non-polluting manufacturing facility:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	119	70	47	236
		% within Jurisdiction	50.4%	29.7%	19.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	113	49	31	193
		% within Jurisdiction	58.5%	25.4%	16.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	37	14	16	67
		% within Jurisdiction	55.2%	20.9%	23.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	37	33	12	82
		% within Jurisdiction	45.1%	40.2%	14.6%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	1	3	2	6
		% within Jurisdiction	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	2	4	0	6
		% within Jurisdiction	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	309	173	108	590
		% within Jurisdiction	52.4%	29.3%	18.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.539(a)	10	.047
Likelihood Ratio	18.997	10	.040
Linear-by-Linear Association	.161	1	.689
N of Valid Cases	590		

a 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.10.

Jurisdiction * Public school:

			Public school:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	14	59	167	240
		% within Jurisdiction	5.8%	24.6%	69.6%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	21	44	130	195
		% within Jurisdiction	10.8%	22.6%	66.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	15	51	71
		% within Jurisdiction	7.0%	21.1%	71.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	7	21	54	82
		% within Jurisdiction	8.5%	25.6%	65.9%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	8	8
		% within Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	1	5	7
		% within Jurisdiction	14.3%	14.3%	71.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	48	140	415	603
		% within Jurisdiction	8.0%	23.2%	68.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.544(a)	10	.576
Likelihood Ratio	10.814	10	.372
Linear-by-Linear Association	.008	1	.929
N of Valid Cases	603		

a 5 cells (27.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .56.

Jurisdiction * Highway/Freeway:

			Highway/Freeway:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	89	64	83	236
		% within Jurisdiction	37.7%	27.1%	35.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	76	45	73	194
		% within Jurisdiction	39.2%	23.2%	37.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	22	14	32	68
		% within Jurisdiction	32.4%	20.6%	47.1%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	33	20	29	82
		% within Jurisdiction	40.2%	24.4%	35.4%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	1	4	7
		% within Jurisdiction	28.6%	14.3%	57.1%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	2	3	6
		% within Jurisdiction	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	223	146	224	593
		% within Jurisdiction	37.6%	24.6%	37.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.363(a)	10	.784
Likelihood Ratio	6.411	10	.780
Linear-by-Linear Association	.808	1	.369
N of Valid Cases	593		

a 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.48.

Jurisdiction * Hotel-casino:

			Hotel-casino:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	105	55	75	235
		% within Jurisdiction	44.7%	23.4%	31.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	73	58	59	190
		% within Jurisdiction	38.4%	30.5%	31.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	25	20	24	69
		% within Jurisdiction	36.2%	29.0%	34.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	41	23	18	82
		% within Jurisdiction	50.0%	28.0%	22.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	5	2	0	7
		% within Jurisdiction	71.4%	28.6%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	2	2	1	5
		% within Jurisdiction	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	251	160	177	588
		% within Jurisdiction	42.7%	27.2%	30.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.420(a)	10	.326
Likelihood Ratio	13.481	10	.198
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.755	1	.185
N of Valid Cases	588		

a 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.36.

Jurisdiction * Polluting manufacturing facility:

			Polluting manufacturing facility:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	221	8	13	242
		% within Jurisdiction	91.3%	3.3%	5.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	162	14	19	195
		% within Jurisdiction	83.1%	7.2%	9.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	63	5	2	70
		% within Jurisdiction	90.0%	7.1%	2.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	78	1	4	83
		% within Jurisdiction	94.0%	1.2%	4.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	8	0	0	8
		% within Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	5	1	0	6
		% within Jurisdiction	83.3%	16.7%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	537	29	38	604
		% within Jurisdiction	88.9%	4.8%	6.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.386(a)	10	.089
Likelihood Ratio	17.507	10	.064
Linear-by-Linear Association	.486	1	.486
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 7 cells (38.9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .29.

Jurisdiction * High-level nuclear waste transportation route:

			High-level nuclear waste transportation route:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	209	24	3	236
		% within Jurisdiction	88.6%	10.2%	1.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	156	23	10	189
		% within Jurisdiction	82.5%	12.2%	5.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	60	10	2	72
		% within Jurisdiction	83.3%	13.9%	2.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	71	9	4	84
		% within Jurisdiction	84.5%	10.7%	4.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	6	2	0	8
		% within Jurisdiction	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	5	1	0	6
		% within Jurisdiction	83.3%	16.7%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	507	69	19	595
		% within Jurisdiction	85.2%	11.6%	3.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.295(a)	10	.504
Likelihood Ratio	9.712	10	.466
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.034	1	.154
N of Valid Cases	595		

a 6 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .19.

Unincorporated Clark County		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	238	238	238	236	240	236	235	242	236
	Missing	5	5	4	7	3	6	7	1	6
Mean		1.73	2.43	1.11	1.69	2.64	1.97	1.87	1.14	1.13
Std. Error of Mean		.053	.040	.023	.051	.038	.056	.057	.030	.025
Median		1.00	2.11	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.822	.620	.352	.783	.590	.855	.867	.472	.377
Variance		.675	.384	.124	.612	.349	.731	.752	.223	.142
Skewness		.536	-.608	3.413	.601	-1.412	.052	.249	3.422	2.982
Std. Error of Skewness		.158	.158	.158	.159	.157	.158	.159	.157	.158
Kurtosis		-1.314	-.563	11.880	-1.118	.963	-1.634	-1.630	10.365	8.791
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.314	.314	.314	.316	.313	.316	.316	.312	.316
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

City of Las Vegas		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	192	188	192	192	195	193	189	195	188
	Missing	5	9	6	5	2	4	8	2	9
Mean		1.76	2.36	1.13	1.57	2.56	1.99	1.93	1.26	1.23
Std. Error of Mean		.062	.052	.029	.054	.049	.063	.061	.045	.039
Median		1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.856	.712	.397	.754	.680	.879	.833	.625	.531
Variance		.733	.507	.158	.568	.462	.772	.694	.390	.282
Skewness		.476	-.645	3.290	.885	-1.258	.029	.137	2.168	2.314
Std. Error of Skewness		.175	.177	.176	.175	.174	.175	.177	.174	.177
Kurtosis		-1.473	-.801	10.694	-.688	.256	-1.710	-1.548	3.124	4.371
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.349	.353	.350	.349	.346	.348	.351	.347	.352
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

City of North Las Vegas		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	69	72	72	67	71	68	69	70	72
	Missing	3	0	0	4	1	4	2	2	0
Mean		1.94	2.40	1.12	1.69	2.64	2.14	1.98	1.12	1.20
Std. Error of Mean		.110	.083	.046	.102	.074	.108	.102	.047	.056
Median		2.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.912	.703	.392	.840	.622	.887	.847	.395	.472
Variance		.832	.494	.153	.705	.387	.787	.717	.156	.223
Skewness		.114	-.749	3.465	.634	-1.561	-.290	.041	3.438	2.443
Std. Error of Skewness		.289	.283	.283	.292	.284	.291	.288	.287	.283
Kurtosis		-1.814	-.635	12.199	-1.288	1.313	-1.686	-1.613	11.987	5.486
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.570	.560	.560	.576	.562	.574	.569	.567	.560
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

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	82	82	82	83	82	82	82	83	84
	Missing	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	0
Mean		1.83	2.32	1.22	1.70	2.57	1.95	1.72	1.12	1.20
Std. Error of Mean		.084	.080	.064	.079	.072	.097	.089	.050	.055
Median		2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.27	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.763	.726	.585	.719	.650	.876	.810	.460	.502
Variance		.582	.527	.342	.517	.422	.767	.656	.211	.252
Skewness		.306	-.582	2.526	.519	-1.251	.098	.558	3.786	2.548
Std. Error of Skewness		.266	.266	.265	.264	.265	.266	.265	.264	.263
Kurtosis		-1.211	-.893	4.901	-.910	.405	-1.703	-1.251	12.980	5.742
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.525	.526	.524	.523	.524	.525	.524	.522	.520
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

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	7	8	8	7	8	7	7	8	8
	Missing	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
Mean		1.91	2.51	1.00	2.17	3.00	2.27	1.33	1.00	1.25
Std. Error of Mean		.289	.193	.000	.283	.000	.362	.195	.000	.167
Median		2.00	2.60	1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.770	.536	.000	.755	.000	.964	.509	.000	.462
Variance		.593	.287	.000	.569	.000	.930	.259	.000	.214
Skewness		.169	-.064		-.314		-.720	.954		1.477
Std. Error of Skewness		.790	.764	.764	.790	.764	.790	.804	.764	.764
Kurtosis		-.692	-2.846		-.499		-1.833	-1.735		.139
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.577	1.510	1.510	1.577	1.510	1.577	1.615	1.510	1.510
Range		2	1	0	2	0	2	1	0	1
Minimum		1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	1	3	3	3	2	1	2

City of Mesquite		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	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.69	1.99	1.20	1.69	2.69	2.28	1.84	1.11	1.21
Std. Error of Mean		.294	.356	.181	.209	.294	.353	.337	.139	.184
Median		1.97	2.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.41	2.00	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.717	.866	.441	.509	.717	.859	.821	.337	.448
Variance		.514	.750	.195	.259	.514	.737	.675	.114	.201
Skewness		.590	.013	2.027	-1.099	-2.538	-.734	.383	3.526	1.942
Std. Error of Skewness		.849	.849	.849	.849	.849	.849	.849	.849	.849
Kurtosis		.387	-1.575	3.076	-1.471	8.044	-.929	-.928	16.121	2.549
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.754	1.754	1.754	1.754	1.754	1.754	1.754	1.754	1.754
Range		2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics

		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	591	605	590	605
	Missing	18	4	19	4
Mean		2.74	1.65	3.14	2.99
Std. Error of Mean		.036	.033	.036	.030
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		.873	.822	.877	.731
Variance		.762	.675	.768	.535
Skewness		-.191	1.332	-.681	-.274
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.099	.101	.099
Kurtosis		-.685	1.380	-.460	-.344
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.201	.198	.201	.198
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations

In your opinion, what is the most important Environmental issue facing Clark County today?	Frequency	Percent
Traffic Congestion	11	1.8
Yucca Mountain	12	1.9
Development of open space	17	2.7
Preservation of natural areas/wildlife	26	4.2
Litter	28	4.6
Water quality	80	13.1
Air quality	111	18.2
Overpopulation	155	25.4
Water availability	167	27.4
DK/No answer	4	0.7
Total	609	100.0



How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	47	7.7
Good	181	29.7
Fair	242	39.8
Poor	122	20.0
DK/No answer	18	2.9
Total	609	100.0



Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	Frequency	Percent
Very concerned	315	51.7
Somewhat concerned	222	36.5
Somewhat unconcerned	35	5.7
Not concerned	33	5.5
DK/No answer	4	0.6
Total	609	100.0



In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	26	4.3
Good	111	18.2
Fair	205	33.6
Poor	248	40.7
DK/No answer	19	3.1
Total	609	100.0



In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	11	1.9
Good	130	21.4
Fair	316	51.9
Poor	147	24.2
DK/No answer	4	0.6
Total	609	100.0



Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	233	242	236	243
	Missing	9	1	6	0
Mean		2.77	1.63	3.14	3.02
Std. Error of Mean		.057	.050	.058	.045
Median		3.00	1.18	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		.864	.772	.892	.701
Variance		.746	.596	.796	.492
Skewness		-.302	1.389	-.691	-.163
Std. Error of Skewness		.159	.157	.158	.156
Kurtosis		-.533	2.012	-.485	-.537
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.317	.312	.315	.311
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	194	196	190	196
	Missing	3	1	7	1
Mean		2.76	1.62	3.19	2.96
Std. Error of Mean		.062	.061	.062	.052
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		.864	.858	.850	.725
Variance		.746	.737	.723	.525
Skewness		-.105	1.409	-.678	-.242
Std. Error of Skewness		.175	.174	.176	.173
Kurtosis		-.765	1.323	-.508	-.295
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.347	.346	.351	.345
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	69	71	69	71
	Missing	3	1	3	1
Mean		2.79	1.67	3.03	3.05
Std. Error of Mean		.106	.097	.112	.094
Median		3.00	1.37	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		.882	.818	.932	.792
Variance		.777	.670	.868	.628
Skewness		-.292	1.254	-.564	-.779
Std. Error of Skewness		.289	.284	.289	.284
Kurtosis		-.581	1.273	-.659	.627
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.571	.562	.571	.562
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	83	83	82	82
	Missing	1	1	2	2
Mean		2.55	1.67	3.20	2.97
Std. Error of Mean		.097	.092	.090	.084
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		.884	.835	.813	.765
Variance		.782	.697	.661	.585
Skewness		-.035	1.203	-.826	-.166
Std. Error of Skewness		.264	.264	.266	.266
Kurtosis		-.677	.925	.220	-.720
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.522	.522	.526	.525
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Boulder City		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	7	8	8	7
	Missing	1	0	0	1
Mean		2.90	1.82	2.56	2.63
Std. Error of Mean		.412	.371	.408	.336
Median		3.00	1.98	2.70	3.00
Std. Deviation		1.097	1.029	1.131	.894
Variance		1.203	1.060	1.279	.800
Skewness		-.369	1.562	-.090	-.152
Std. Error of Skewness		.790	.764	.764	.790
Kurtosis		-1.159	2.941	-1.119	.487
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.577	1.510	1.510	1.577
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Mesquite		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	5	6	6	6
	Missing	1	0	0	0
Mean		2.96	2.47	3.07	2.80
Std. Error of Mean		.453	.419	.373	.343
Median		3.10	2.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		1.044	1.021	.908	.835
Variance		1.089	1.043	.825	.697
Skewness		.106	.624	-.174	.495
Std. Error of Skewness		.890	.849	.849	.849
Kurtosis		-3.253	.171	-1.976	-.992
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.903	1.754	1.754	1.754
Range		2	3	2	2
Minimum		2	1	2	2
Maximum		4	4	4	4

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

			How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?				
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	19	63	104	47	233
		% within Jurisdiction	8.2%	27.0%	44.6%	20.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	12	64	75	42	193
		% within Jurisdiction	6.2%	33.2%	38.9%	21.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	5	19	29	15	68
		% within Jurisdiction	7.4%	27.9%	42.6%	22.1%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	10	30	31	12	83
		% within Jurisdiction	12.0%	36.1%	37.3%	14.5%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	1	2	2	3	8
		% within Jurisdiction	12.5%	25.0%	25.0%	37.5%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	2	1	2	5
		% within Jurisdiction	.0%	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	47	180	242	121	590
		% within Jurisdiction	8.0%	30.5%	41.0%	20.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.819(a)	15	.693
Likelihood Ratio	11.922	15	.685
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.253	1	.263
N of Valid Cases	590		

a 8 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

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

			Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?				
			Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Somewhat unconcerned	Not concerned	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	121	100	8	12	241
		% within Jurisdiction	50.2%	41.5%	3.3%	5.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	111	60	13	12	196
		% within Jurisdiction	56.6%	30.6%	6.6%	6.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	36	27	5	4	72
		% within Jurisdiction	50.0%	37.5%	6.9%	5.6%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	43	29	7	4	83
		% within Jurisdiction	51.8%	34.9%	8.4%	4.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	3	3	0	1	7
		% within Jurisdiction	42.9%	42.9%	.0%	14.3%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	3	1	1	6
		% within Jurisdiction	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	315	222	34	34	605
		% within Jurisdiction	52.1%	36.7%	5.6%	5.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.811(a)	15	.465
Likelihood Ratio	14.763	15	.469
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.632	1	.201
N of Valid Cases	605		

a 12 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34.

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

			In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?				
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	45	79	101	236
		% within Jurisdiction	4.7%	19.1%	33.5%	42.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	6	36	64	84	190
		% within Jurisdiction	3.2%	18.9%	33.7%	44.2%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	15	23	26	68
		% within Jurisdiction	5.9%	22.1%	33.8%	38.2%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	3	11	35	33	82
		% within Jurisdiction	3.7%	13.4%	42.7%	40.2%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	2	2	2	8
		% within Jurisdiction	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	2	2	2	6
		% within Jurisdiction	.0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	26	111	205	248	590
		% within Jurisdiction	4.4%	18.8%	34.7%	42.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.706(a)	15	.473
Likelihood Ratio	10.980	15	.754
Linear-by-Linear Association	.493	1	.483
N of Valid Cases	590		

a 10 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.

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

			In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?				
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	2	52	129	60	243
		% within Jurisdiction	.8%	21.4%	53.1%	24.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	4	44	105	44	197
		% within Jurisdiction	2.0%	22.3%	53.3%	22.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	9	38	20	71
		% within Jurisdiction	5.6%	12.7%	53.5%	28.2%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	1	21	38	21	81
		% within Jurisdiction	1.2%	25.9%	46.9%	25.9%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	1	2	3	1	7
		% within Jurisdiction	14.3%	28.6%	42.9%	14.3%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	2	2	1	5
		% within Jurisdiction	.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	12	130	315	147	604
		% within Jurisdiction	2.0%	21.5%	52.2%	24.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.378(a)	15	.243
Likelihood Ratio	14.591	15	.481
Linear-by-Linear Association	.741	1	.389
N of Valid Cases	604		

a 12 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

Appendix VII
Commute Profile

Appendix VII
Commute Profile

What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?		
	Frequency	Percent
Car-Drive alone	502	82.5
Car-Carpool with others	74	12.2
CAT bus (or paratransit)	19	3.2
MAX transit	1	0.1
Motorcycle	4	0.7
Walk	6	0.9
Bike	1	0.1
DK/No answer	2	0.3
Total	609	100.0



Appendix VII
Commute Profile

Do you currently commute on a daily basis?	Frequency	Percent
Yes	348	57.1
No	257	42.1
DK/No answer	5	0.8
Total	609	100.0



Appendix VIII
Local Government Interaction

Appendix VIII
Local Government Interaction

Which local government department, if any, have you interacted with in the past year?	Frequency	Percent
Commission/Council Offices	16	2.7
Manager's Office	3	0.4
Parks and Recreation/Community Services	20	3.3
Public Works	16	2.6
Social Services	21	3.5
Recorder's Office	22	3.6
Business License	22	3.6
Comprehensive Planning	13	2.1
Human Resources	10	1.7
Fire	11	1.8
Metro	61	10.0
Assessor's Office/Taxation	25	4.2
Water Authority (SNWA)	9	1.5
Juvenile Justice	5	0.9
Transportation Authority (RTC)	7	1.1
None	332	54.5
DK/NO answer	16	2.7
Total	609	100.0



Appendix VIII
Local Government Interaction

Timeliness of response:	Frequency	Valid Percent
Excellent	54	20.5
Good	80	30.5
Fair	85	32.5
Poor	34	13.1
DK/No answer	9	3.4
Total	261	100.0



Appendix VIII
Local Government Interaction

Courtesy:	Frequency	Valid Percent
Excellent	59	22.6
Good	105	40.3
Fair	65	25.1
Poor	26	9.9
DK/No answer	6	2.2
Total	261	100.0



Appendix VIII
Local Government Interaction

Competency in handling your issue:	Frequency	Valid Percent
Excellent	61	23.3
Good	92	35.4
Fair	67	25.8
Poor	38	14.7
DK/No answer	2	0.7
Total	261	100.0



Appendix VIII
Local Government Interaction

Professionalism:	Frequency	Valid Percent
Excellent	71	27.4
Good	100	38.3
Fair	57	21.8
Poor	32	12.1
DK/No answer	1	0.3
Total	261	100.0



Appendix VIII
Local Government Interaction

Have you ever visited your local government's website?	Frequency	Percent
Yes	249	41.0
No	357	58.7
DK/No answer	2	0.4
Total	609	100.0



Appendix VIII
Local Government Interaction

In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?	Frequency	Valid Percent
Once a week	15	6.2
Several times a week	15	6.1
Several times a month	35	14.2
Once a month	132	52.9
Less than once a month	47	18.7
Never	2	0.7
DK/No answer	2	0.7
Total	249	100.0



Appendix VIII
Local Government Interaction

All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair, or poor?	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	21	3.4
Good	248	40.7
Fair	279	45.8
Poor	55	9.0
DK/No answer	7	1.1
Total	609	100.0



Appendix IX
Local Distribution Summary

Appendix IX
Local Distribution Summary

Zip Code	Frequency	Percent
89005	7	1.2
89012	12	2.0
89014	14	2.3
89015	24	4.0
89017	1	0.2
89021	1	0.1
89027	5	0.9
89029	2	0.4
89030	18	3.0
89031	21	3.5
89032	9	1.6
89044	3	0.6
89052	12	1.9
89074	14	2.3
89081	7	1.2
89084	10	1.6
89086	1	0.2
89100	1	0.2
89101	5	0.8
89102	9	1.4
89103	12	2.0
89104	14	2.3
89105	3	0.5
89106	6	1.0
89107	14	2.3
89108	18	2.9
89109	3	0.5
89110	14	2.4
89112	1	0.2
89113	3	0.5
89115	12	2.0
89117	30	4.9
89119	10	1.6
89120	3	0.5
89121	34	5.6
89122	13	2.1
89123	40	6.6
89128	12	1.9
89129	19	3.1
89130	12	2.0
89131	12	2.0
89132	1	0.1
89134	26	4.3
89135	12	2.0
89138	10	1.6
89139	8	1.3
89141	4	0.6
89142	8	1.3
89143	2	0.3
89144	6	1.0
89145	17	2.8
89146	10	1.6
89147	13	2.1
89148	3	0.5
89149	6	1.0
89156	11	1.8
89211	2	0.3
89221	1	0.1
89704	1	0.1
DK/No Answer	6	1.0
Total	609	100.0

Appendix IX
Local Distribution Summary

Jurisdiction	Frequency	Percent
Unincorporated Clark County	243	39.8
City of Las Vegas	197	32.4
City of North Las Vegas	72	11.8
City of Henderson	84	13.8
Boulder City	8	1.3
Mesquite	6	1.0
Total	609	100.0



Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile

Appendix X
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	544	605	607	609
	Missing	65	4	2	0
Mean		3.77	2.65	3.57	1.53
Std. Error of Mean		.081	.036	.056	.020
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		1.897	.891	1.371	.499
Variance		3.598	.794	1.879	.249
Skewness		.596	-.048	.047	-.137
Std. Error of Skewness		.105	.099	.099	.099
Kurtosis		-.366	-.784	-1.097	-1.988
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.209	.198	.198	.198
Range		7	3	5	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		8	4	6	2

Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile

Clark County Tenure	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 year	25	4.1
1- 5 years	137	22.6
6 - 10 years	151	24.7
11 - 15 years	95	15.7
Over 15 years	157	25.8
All my life	42	6.8
No answer/refused	2	0.3
Total	609	100.0



Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile

Annual Household Income	Frequency	Percent
$ 20,000 or under	50	8.2
$ 20,001 - $ 40,000	104	17.1
$ 40,001 - $ 60,000	136	22.4
$ 60,001 - $ 80,000	68	11.2
$ 80,001 - $100,000	89	14.7
$100,001 - $120,000	44	7.2
$120,001 - $140,000	17	2.8
$140,001 or more	35	5.8
No answer/refused	65	10.7
Total	609	100.0



Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile

Age	Frequency	Percent
18 - 24	57	9.3
25 - 44	214	35.1
45 - 64	221	36.3
65 or older	114	18.7
No answer/refused	4	0.7
Total	609	100.0



Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	284	46.6
Female	325	53.4
Total	609	100.0



Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		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	213	242	243	243
	Missing	30	1	0	0
Mean		3.98	2.70	3.54	1.50
Std. Error of Mean		.126	.056	.085	.032
Median		4.00	3.00	3.00	1.32
Std. Deviation		1.835	.874	1.330	.501
Variance		3.367	.765	1.768	.251
Skewness		.522	-.058	.062	.003
Std. Error of Skewness		.167	.157	.156	.156
Kurtosis		-.381	-.774	-1.086	-2.017
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.332	.312	.311	.311
Range		7	3	5	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		8	4	6	2

Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary Statistics 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	178	194	197	197
	Missing	19	3	0	0
Mean		3.47	2.55	3.73	1.60
Std. Error of Mean		.143	.066	.102	.035
Median		3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		1.908	.919	1.427	.492
Variance		3.639	.845	2.036	.242
Skewness		.673	.003	-.064	-.393
Std. Error of Skewness		.182	.174	.173	.173
Kurtosis		-.344	-.819	-1.082	-1.865
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.362	.347	.345	.345
Range		7	3	5	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		8	4	6	2

Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North 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	66	72	72	72
	Missing	5	0	0	0
Mean		3.69	2.32	3.25	1.54
Std. Error of Mean		.217	.098	.165	.059
Median		3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00
Std. Deviation		1.764	.828	1.397	.502
Variance		3.113	.685	1.951	.252
Skewness		.716	.377	.331	-.144
Std. Error of Skewness		.294	.283	.283	.283
Kurtosis		-.010	-.258	-.886	-2.037
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.581	.560	.560	.560
Range		7	3	5	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		8	4	6	2

Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary Statistics 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	73	84	82	84
	Missing	11	0	2	0
Mean		3.95	2.88	3.48	1.49
Std. Error of Mean		.237	.089	.145	.055
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	1.03
Std. Deviation		2.033	.818	1.313	.503
Variance		4.132	.669	1.725	.253
Skewness		.643	-.300	.030	.023
Std. Error of Skewness		.280	.263	.265	.263
Kurtosis		-.365	-.435	-1.261	-2.049
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.554	.520	.524	.520
Range		7	3	5	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		8	4	6	2

Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary Statistics 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	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.73	3.40	4.68	1.45
Std. Error of Mean		.788	.189	.302	.192
Median		3.14	3.00	5.00	1.09
Std. Deviation		2.185	.525	.838	.533
Variance		4.775	.276	.703	.284
Skewness		.915	.522	-1.084	.273
Std. Error of Skewness		.764	.764	.764	.764
Kurtosis		1.053	-2.479	2.111	-2.750
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.510	1.510	1.510	1.510
Range		7	1	3	1
Minimum		1	3	3	1
Maximum		8	4	6	2

Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary Statistics 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	6	6	6	6
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.67	3.43	2.90	1.58
Std. Error of Mean		1.084	.363	.379	.223
Median		2.99	4.00	3.00	1.95
Std. Deviation		2.640	.885	.924	.542
Variance		6.969	.783	.854	.294
Skewness		.758	-1.264	1.691	-.427
Std. Error of Skewness		.849	.849	.849	.849
Kurtosis		-.736	.062	6.697	-3.079
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.754	1.754	1.754	1.754
Range		7	2	3	1
Minimum		1	2	2	1
Maximum		8	4	5	2

Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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	
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	11	38	51	32	40	21	6	15	214
		% within Jurisdiction	5.1%	17.8%	23.8%	15.0%	18.7%	9.8%	2.8%	7.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	26	38	44	19	22	14	8	7	178
		% within Jurisdiction	14.6%	21.3%	24.7%	10.7%	12.4%	7.9%	4.5%	3.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	4	16	17	7	13	5	1	4	67
		% within Jurisdiction	6.0%	23.9%	25.4%	10.4%	19.4%	7.5%	1.5%	6.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	7	10	21	10	12	4	2	8	74
		% within Jurisdiction	9.5%	13.5%	28.4%	13.5%	16.2%	5.4%	2.7%	10.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	1	2	2	1	2	0	0	1	9
		% within Jurisdiction	11.1%	22.2%	22.2%	11.1%	22.2%	.0%	.0%	11.1%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	7
		% within Jurisdiction	14.3%	28.6%	14.3%	.0%	14.3%	.0%	14.3%	14.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	50	106	136	69	90	44	18	36	549
		% within Jurisdiction	9.1%	19.3%	24.8%	12.6%	16.4%	8.0%	3.3%	6.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.408(a)	35	.594
Likelihood Ratio	33.586	35	.536
Linear-by-Linear Association	.200	1	.655
N of Valid Cases	549		

a 20 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .23.

Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Jurisdiction * In what age group do you fall?

			In what age group do you fall?				
			18 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 64	65 or older	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	18	85	90	49	242
		% within Jurisdiction	7.4%	35.1%	37.2%	20.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	25	70	67	32	194
		% within Jurisdiction	12.9%	36.1%	34.5%	16.5%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	10	36	19	7	72
		% within Jurisdiction	13.9%	50.0%	26.4%	9.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	4	22	39	19	84
		% within Jurisdiction	4.8%	26.2%	46.4%	22.6%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	5	3	8
		% within Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	1	1	4	6
		% within Jurisdiction	.0%	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	57	214	221	114	606
		% within Jurisdiction	9.4%	35.3%	36.5%	18.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.178(a)	15	.001
Likelihood Ratio	39.541	15	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.261	1	.133
N of Valid Cases	606		

a 8 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .56.

Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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	Total
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	9	56	62	40	63	13	243
		% within Jurisdiction	3.7%	23.0%	25.5%	16.5%	25.9%	5.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	9	38	45	32	51	22	197
		% within Jurisdiction	4.6%	19.3%	22.8%	16.2%	25.9%	11.2%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	6	19	21	7	14	4	71
		% within Jurisdiction	8.5%	26.8%	29.6%	9.9%	19.7%	5.6%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	2	23	18	14	23	2	82
		% within Jurisdiction	2.4%	28.0%	22.0%	17.1%	28.0%	2.4%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	1	1	5	1	8
		% within Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	12.5%	12.5%	62.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	2	3	0	1	0	6
		% within Jurisdiction	.0%	33.3%	50.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	26	138	150	94	157	42	607
		% within Jurisdiction	4.3%	22.7%	24.7%	15.5%	25.9%	6.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.992(a)	25	.225
Likelihood Ratio	32.027	25	.157
Linear-by-Linear Association	.204	1	.651
N of Valid Cases	607		

a 15 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.

Appendix X
Respondent Demographic Profile
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Jurisdiction * Gender observation:

			Gender observation:		Total
			Male	Female	
Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	121	121	242
		% within Jurisdiction	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	80	117	197
		% within Jurisdiction	40.6%	59.4%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	33	38	71
		% within Jurisdiction	46.5%	53.5%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	42	42	84
		% within Jurisdiction	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	4	3	7
		% within Jurisdiction	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	3	3	6
		% within Jurisdiction	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	283	324	607
		% within Jurisdiction	46.6%	53.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.696(a)	5	.454
Likelihood Ratio	4.715	5	.452
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.976
N of Valid Cases	607		

a 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.80.

Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons




45
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Provide attainable housing for working class families Importance
Provide attainable housing for working class families Performance


40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Providing affordable housing for low-income families Importance
Providing affordable housing for low-income families Performance

Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons




50
45
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Providing affordable housing for seniors Importance
Providing affordable housing for seniors Performance

Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons




70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
1
2
3
4
5
Providing 24-hour emergency trauma care Importance
Providing 24-hour emergency trauma care Performance

Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons





Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons


70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
1
2
3
4
5
Maintaining a low crime rate Importance
Maintaining a low crime rate Performance


50
45
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols Importance
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols Performance


60
50
40
30
20
10
0
1
2
3
4
5
Keeping police response times low Importance
Keeping police response times low Performance


70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
1
2
3
4
5
Keeping fire department response times low Importance
Keeping fire department response times low Performance


80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
1
2
3
4
5
Keeping paramedic and emergency response times low Imporance
Keeping paramedic and emergency response times low Performance


80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
1
2
3
4
5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel Importance
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel Performance


40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs Importance
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs Performance

Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons




50
45
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Preparing for man-made (such as hazardout or datiological materials) accidents or terrorist events
Preparing for man-made (such as hazardout or datiological materials) accidents or terrorist events


50
45
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Investigating criminal activity Importance
Investigating criminal activity Performance


60.0
50.0
40.0
30.0
20.0
10.0
0.0
1
2
3
4
5
Providing fire protection and prevention services:
Providing fire protection and prevention services:


70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
1
2
3
4
5
Providing emergency medical services Importance
Providing emergency medical services Performance


35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Providing neighborhood code enforcement services Importance
Providing neighborhood code enforcement services Performance


45
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain Nuclear waste shipments Importance
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain Nuclear waste shipmentsPerformance


35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Providing affordable housing Importance
Providing affordable housing Performance

Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons




40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Planning for commercial development Importance
Planning for commercial development Performance


40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Evaluating impacts to property values as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain Importance
Evaluating impacts to property values as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain


40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Evaluating Impacts to Southern Nevada's tourism economy as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to
Evaluating Impacts to Southern Nevada's tourism economy as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to

Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons




40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Access to freeways Importance
Access to freeways Performance


45
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
1
2
3
4
5
Improving road conditions Importance
Improving road conditions Performance

Appendix XI
Importance/Performance Comparisons




60
50
40
30
20
10
0
1
2
3
4
5
Providing mass public transit Importance
Providing mass public transit Performance

Appendix XII
Research Methods and Limitations

TO: DR. SHEILA CONWAY, URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

FROM: JASON GRAY, STRATEGIC SOLUTIONS

SUBJECT: CLARK COUNTY MONITORING PROGRAM/COMMUNITY INDICATOR SURVEY ANALYSIS

DATE: 01/30/2008

CC: JEREMY AGUERO, APPLIED ANALYSIS

I. Introduction:

Strategic Solutions has prepared the following report as a summary of survey methods applied to the second iteration of the Clark County Monitoring Program Community Survey.

II. Purpose and Limitations:

a. Survey Development and Design:

This report has been compiled based on findings from the second in a series of point-in-time community surveys intended to support the Clark County Monitoring Program. The initial, baseline community survey was conducted in June 2005. Although the survey instrument remained relatively static, evaluative objectives became more refined subsequent to the initial phase of data collection (as is the case in many longitudinal assessments), warranting revision and amendment of measurement variables prior to the follow-up survey in February 2006. Throughout this report you will find certain variables, primarily those related to the importance and provision of selected government services, were modified or expanded while others of limited applicability or utility were deleted altogether. Additionally, response value regimes have been modified in certain instances so as to facilitate a higher order of statistical analysis and more sophisticated reporting format moving forward. A review of the relevant February 2006 modifications has been provided in Appendix XIV.

b. Analysis Limitations:

As with the baseline community survey conducted during June of 2005, this research was not developed or designed to be a comparative diagnostic or a comprehensive performance assessment. Although data collected or analyzed by the Clark County Monitoring Program and community surveys may serve secondary purposes, we neither discourage nor promote these purposes, noting only that such actions are beyond the scope of this engagement.

III. Survey Methodology

a. Logistical Details:

The community survey was conducted at Strategic Solutions' survey research facility during the afternoon and evening hours of February 1-6, 2006. Interviewers called respondents from a representative sample of unincorporated Clark County, City of Las Vegas, City of North Las Vegas, City of Boulder City, and City of Mesquite residents. A stratified random sampling method was implemented for administration of the survey and respondent records were drawn to reflect Clark County's jurisdictional and municipal composition.

Survey administrators entered data directly into In2Quest for computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) database software. The average duration per completed response was twenty two minutes and forty-one seconds. Surveys were conducted in English and, when necessary, in Spanish. Survey administrators attempted to reach each selected contact four times before moving on to the next corresponding record in the sample.

b. Sampling Procedure:

The resident sample for the Clark County Monitoring Program Survey (Winter/2006) was compiled using geo-coding technology which generated contact information (including name, address and telephone number) for owner and renter-occupied residential units in Clark County. Data sources included telephone directories, real estate filings, census data, voter registration files, utility, warranty, and other transactional information.

A total of 607 Clark County resident surveys were drawn from a frame of 8,000 records for this study. The sample was carefully drawn to reflect general population trends within Clark County, Nevada. Respondents were randomly selected according to the following screening criteria:

- Alternate male/female eighteen years of age or older with next birthday in contacted household.

- In an effort to mitigate bias, respondents were subsequently asked whether they were currently running for political office or employed by a political party, candidate for office, television station, radio station, newspaper or local government agency. Respondents answering in the affirmative to the screening variable were disqualified from participation.

c. Survey Instrument:

The survey instrument was constructed in consultation with representatives from Applied Analysis and Urban Environmental Research. The instrument consisted of 137 measurement variables in addition to two screening questions. The instrument is composed primarily

of scale variables. Respondents were first asked the level of importance for selected local government services and community issues. These questions were followed by queries regarding the performance of government entities in addressing the same local government services and community issues. Additional questions were asked to gauge behavioral dispositions, such as mode of transit and commute patterns Furthermore, a series of questions were asked to ascertain the opinions and perceptions of Clark County residents as they relate to certain quality of life issues/concerns and community (household/business) economic performance.

d. Error Measurement:
Surveys take into account the opinions of a sample frame of the universe, or study population and are generalized to reflect the same trends in the study population as a whole. For the purpose of this study, the universe consists of all residents in Clark County. There is always a possibility that the sample frame will not reflect the actual opinions of the study population as a whole. A scientifically sound sample size relative to the study population is one of the most common ways to mitigate this type of error. If the entire study population consisted of 1000 units, researchers express confidence that greater accuracy is observed by studying 100 units than by studying 10 units. Error is applied in terms of levels of confidence. The 95% level of confidence is standard in social research. A 95% level of indicates that if we were to draw the same number of units from the same sample frame 100 times, 95 samples would yield a result within a given range or margin of error. A sample size of 607 is associated with a 95% level of confidence that the opinions of our sample will fall within 4% above or below the actual population value.

Table 1. Final Call Dispositions

Disposition	Count
Complete	609
Initial Refusal	1415
Mid-Terminate	14
Busy	53
Answering Machine/VM	434
Continuous Ring	235
Not In Service	625
Business	223
Fax Machine	252
Not Qualified	22
Requested Call Back	173
Total Calls	**4055**

e. Interpreting the Data:

The reader will find that data in this report are presented, for the greater portion of analysis, using four measurement tools:

- Frequency (top-line) tables
- Measure of Central Tendency (Mean, Median, and Mode)
- Cross Tabulations
- Independent Sample T-Test

Frequencies offer a count and corresponding valid percentage of response values for a particular variable. Frequencies can be presented in tables, charts, or graphs. The frequency tables are labeled with the variable name, count, and valid percentage for responses in each category. The data represent the number of respondents out of the total sample who answered affirmatively to a particular response value for a given variable. The reader will find that the total count will not add up to 607 for all variables. Such instances denote additional probing questions that follow a strict logic sequence, or the re-routing of respondents for whom the question does not logically apply. The valid percentage, however, will always total 100% (when rounded).

Three measures of central tendency allow readers to examine general trends in the data. The mode demonstrates the response value reported most frequently. This can be applied to any level of analysis from categorical variables to variables of scale measurement. Medians can be used to determine where the 50^{th} percentile score falls within a response value regime. Fifty percent of responses fall above the median, and fifty percent will fall below the median. The mean represents the numerical average of all responses values to a particular variable.

Cross tabulations allow the reader to interpret one variable in the context of another. The variable on the vertical axis is considered to be the independent variable. In other words, the vertical variable influences the variable assigned to the horizontal axis, or the dependent variable. The independent variable is typically descriptive or demographic nature.

Cross-tabulation tables are presented with percentages across rows to allow the reader a better understanding of how each category of the independent (demographic) variable influences the dependent variable. Percentages across rows should always add to 100% (rounded). There is limited utility in summing column percentages vertically.

Independent sample T-tests are used to compare mean values in different variables or distributions. For purposes of this assessment, tests were implemented to compare results from selected variables between the first

iteration of the study in June of 2005 and the second iteration of they survey in February 2006.

f. Rounding Procedures & Weighting:

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software can calculate to any number of decimal places. For purposes of this report, presentation values have been rounded to the first decimal place using standard rounding conventions. Any value that is less than .05 is rounded down, and any value greater than .05 is rounded up. For example, 0.14 is rounded down to 0.1, while 0.15 is rounded up to 0.2. The Clark County Monitoring Program Survey results have been post weighted to reflect general Clark County population trends. The final weighting procedure qualified for the observed age and gender delineations.

Appendix XIII
Longitudinal Significance Tests

***Note:**

Independent Samples T-Tests

Since this study has been completed at multiple points in time, the data permit the employment of longitudinal analysis. The first iteration of the Clark County Monitoring Program occurred during June of 2005. The survey was repeated in February 0f 2006. Though numerous changes were made between iterations of the survey, seventy variables were comparable between the two surveys. Notably, many of the importance variables were asked in both versions of the survey, however, since the reporting scheme for the performance measures changed between both surveys. In order to be eligible for mean testing, data must be collected at the interval , scale, or ordinal level, nominal data such as "religion" or "political party" yield meaningless results.

After identifying comparable variables, independent samples t-tests were preformed to measure statistically significant differences in mean values in June of 2005 and February of 2006. Differences were divided into the 95% level of confidence ($\alpha \leq .05$), the 99% level of confidence ($\alpha \leq .01$), and the 99.9% level of confidence ($\alpha \leq .001$). All independent samples t-tests included two-tailed analyses based on the null hypothesis that mean values are equal at time one and time two (H_O: $\overline{X}_{June05} = \overline{X}_{Feb06}$). Therefore the research hypotheses in these t-test are that mean values are not equal at time one and time two (H_A: $\overline{X}_{June05} = \overline{X}_{Feb06}$).

T-tests are presented in the body of the report in two tables. The first table presents importance variables from questions that were asked at time one and time two. The second table includes all other comparable measures.

Appendix XIII
Longitudinal Significance Tests

	June 2005			February 2006				
Measurement	N	Mean	Std Dev	N	Mean	Std Dev	T-value	P-Value
Road maintenance:	600	4.21	0.975	606	4.05	1.053	2.716	.007**
Revitalizing older neighborhoods:	592	3.59	0.975	606	1.05	1.053	2.460	.014*
Flood control:	594	4.09	1.152	607	3.88	1.233	3.063	.002**
Budget management:	585	4.29	1.060	594	3.99	1.183	4.551	.000***
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers:	581	3.77	1.396	584	3.59	1.452	2.136	.033*
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed:	594	3.90	1.168	598	3.72	1.202	2.634	.009**
Providing child protection services:	576	4.27	1.020	589	4.06	1.205	3.283	.001***
Providing child welfare services:	567	4.15	1.038	583	3.98	1.189	2.581	.010**
Providing juvenile justice services:	571	4.08	1.077	577	3.93	1.172	2.316	.021**
Providing affordable housing for low income families:	586	3.70	1.270	596	3.56	1.409	1.754	0.08
Providing affordable housing for seniors:	585	4.12	1.108	599	3.92	1.251	2.859	.004**
Providing medical care for the poor:	591	3.94	1.251	595	3.74	1.326	2.783	0.005
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care:	595	4.60	0.828	600	4.38	0.997	4.120	.000***
Providing crime prevention programs:	593	4.27	0.983	599	3.99	1.141	4.616	.000***
Enforcing traffic laws:	598	4.25	1.026	607	3.91	1.206	5.231	.000***
Maintaining a low crime rate:	598	4.49	0.970	606	4.14	1.221	5.543	.000***
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols:	598	4.30	1.024	604	3.97	1.197	5.144	.000***
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs:	591	4.05	1.083	591	3.69	1.164	5.390	.000***
Preparing for natural disasters, (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc):	589	4.05	1.113	597	3.75	1.301	4.117	.000***
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist events:	590	4.18	1.100	597	3.92	1.282	3.842	.000***
Investigating criminal activity:	594	4.47	0.882	592	4.03	1.108	7.446	.000***
Providing fire protection & prevention services:	599	4.59	0.750	600	4.32	0.900	5.594	.000***
Providing emergency medical services:	598	4.66	0.721	606	4.44	0.856	4.849	.000***
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services:	566	3.81	1.090	571	3.54	1.182	3.991	.000***
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments:	581	3.88	1.365	581	3.68	1.421	2.547	.011*
Providing affordable housing:	586	3.73	1.317	601	3.47	1.365	3.291	.001***
Managing growth:	596	602.00	1.293	602	3.80	1.295	3.541	.000***
Increasing job opportunities:	592	4.07	1.176	597	3.95	1.179	1.786	0.074
Improving the business climate:	590	4.08	1.036	594	3.86	1.057	3.623	.000***
Planning for commercial development:	587	3.82	1.173	590	3.70	1.113	1.743	0.082
Evaluating impacts to property values as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain:	561	3.78	1.378	571	3.54	1.441	2.254	.004**
Evaluating impacts to Southern Nevada's tourism economy as a result of the proposed shipment of nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain:	562	3.74	1.392	576	3.50	1.453	2.848	.004*
Reducing traffic congestion:	600	4.37	1.036	605	4.02	1.261	5.116	.000***
Access to freeways:	596	4.12	1.067	603	3.83	1.153	4.493	.000***
Improving road conditions:	600	4.29	0.920	607	3.97	1.078	5.492	.000***
Reducing travel time:	598	4.01	1.139	600	3.77	1.185	3.675	.000***
Providing mass public transit:	596	3.86	1.237	599	3.67	1.272	2.642	.008**

* Statistical Significance at p≤ .05

** Statistical Significance at p≤ .01

*** Statistical Significance at p≤ .001

Appendix XIII
Longitudinal Significance Tests

	June 2005			February 2006				
Measurement	N	Mean	Std Deviation	N	Mean	Std Deviation	T-value	P-Value
How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	575	2.64	0.898	591	2.74	0.873	-2.034	.042*
Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	598	1.67	0.760	605	1.65	0.822	0.473	0.637
In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	591	2.99	0.948	590	3.14	0.877	-2.797	.005*
In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?	600	2.82	0.777	605	2.99	0.731	-3.837	.000***
Timeliness of response:	244	2.32	1.040	252	2.39	0.969	-0.833	0.405
Courtesy:	247	2.04	0.955	255	2.23	0.918	-2.194	.029*
Competency in handling your issue:	247	2.26	0.987	259	2.32	0.993	-0.696	0.487
Professionalism:	249	2.04	0.939	260	2.19	0.974	-1.783	0.075
Quality of drinking water:	598	3.74	1.351	600	3.81	1.343	-0.926	0.355
Recreational opportunities:	594	3.74	1.100	600	3.61	1.081	1.947	0.052
Condition of streets & roads:	600	3.92	1.031	607	3.87	1.002	0.968	0.333
Availability of public transportation:	584	3.32	1.318	583	3.29	1.264	0.377	0.706
Housing affordability:	593	3.58	1.281	600	3.43	1.354	1.979	.048*
Air quality:	600	3.99	1.072	608	3.76	1.301	3.404	.001***
Availability of job opportunities:	589	3.84	1.176	594	3.89	1.253	-0.722	0.44
Managing growth:	595	3.97	1.253	600	3.66	1.306	4.171	.000***
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.	566	2.54	0.647	584	2.60	0.659	-0.150	0.133
Amusement Park:	584	2.09	0.843	594	1.78	0.834	6.414	.000***
Day care center:	592	1.61	0.677	593	2.39	0.677	-19.677	.000***
Landfill:	579	2.80	0.529	598	1.13	0.409	60.538	.000***
Non-polluting manufacturing facility:	581	2.19	0.843	591	1.66	0.770	11.275	.000***
Public school:	596	1.36	0.623	603	2.61	0.631	-34.533	.000***
Highway/Freeway:	585	1.87	0.884	593	2.00	870.000	-2.543	.011*
Hotel-casino:	589	2.15	0.843	589	1.88	0.845	5.614	.000***
Polluting manufacturing facility:	597	2.87	0.464	603	1.17	0.516	60.018	.000***
High-level nuclear waste transportation route:	589	2.81	0.476	594	1.18	0.462	59.834	.000***
Overall would you say the quality of life in Clark County is getting better, worse, or staying the same?	585	2.10	0.801	594	2.14	0.785	-0.944	0.345
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 than you were a year ago, or about the same?	594	1.86	0.696	600	1.87	0.740	-0.212	0.832
Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation and the financial situation of any family members will be better, worse or about the same?	586	1.66	0.666	599	1.76	0.749	-2.448	.015*
Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	575	1.66	0.660	599	1.76	0.749	-2.115	.035*
And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same?	576	1.72	0.597	288	1.74	0.620	-0.428	0.669
All things considered, would you rate your local government's performance in providing services as excellent, good, fair, or poor?	598	2.39	0.712	602	2.61	0.699	-5.354	.000***

* Statistical Significance at p≤ .05

** Statistical Significance at p≤ .01

*** Statistical Significance at p≤ .001

Appendix XIV
Instrument Modifications

TO: DR. SHEILA CONWAY, URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

FROM: JASON GRAY, STRATEGIC SOLUTIONS

AMANDA DEAN, STRATEGIC SOLUTIONS

SUBJECT: CLARK COUNTY MONITORING PROGRAM/DELINEATION OF INSTRUMENT AND SCALE PARAMETER MODIFICATIONS (APPENDIX XIV)

DATE: 01/30/2008

CC: JEREMY AGUERO, APPLIED ANALYSIS

I. Introduction:

Strategic Solutions has prepared the following technical memorandum as a summary of instrument modifications applied to the Clark County Monitoring Program community survey instrument subsequent to the inaugural survey conducted during June 2005. As mentioned in previous sections of this study report, although the survey instrument designed for the February 2006 study remained relatively similar to the inaugural instrument, evaluative objectives became more refined (as is the case in many longitudinal assessments), warranting revision and amendment of measurement variables and response values. More specifically, you will find certain variables, primarily those related to the importance and provision of selected government services, were adapted or expanded while others of limited applicability or utility were omitted altogether. Additionally, response value regimes have been modified in certain instances so as to facilitate a higher order of statistical analysis and more sophisticated reporting format moving forward.

II. Instrument Modifications:

The following description of instrument modifications is based on the structure of the June 2005 instrument. All series and variable identifiers will tie back to the June 2005 instrument and all omissions, changes, and additions applied to the February 2006 instrument are noted in the order of occurrence. The question labels (Q#/**Q#**) are formatted so that the non-bold label (Q#) corresponds to placement in the June 2005 survey instrument whereas the bold label (**Q#**) corresponds to placement in the February 2006 instrument, where applicable.

Importance/Performance of Select Government Services:

General Government Services Importance Series (Q2-Q10/**Q2-Q7**): “I am going to ask you about a number of local government services. On a scale of one to five, where one means “low importance” and five means “high importance,” please rate the level of importance for the following services.”

Series Status (Q2-Q10/**Q2-Q7**): No change to series language or variable response values. Three variables were omitted from this series for the February 2006 survey:

Variable (Q5/**N/A**): "Provide and maintain street lighting"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (Q8/**N/A**): "Inform the community about local government services"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (Q9/**N/A**): "Inform the community about local government events"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

General Government Services Performance Series (Q11-Q19/**Q8-Q13**): "In your opinion, based on what you know or what you have heard, would you say local government is doing an excellent, good, fair or poor job performing the following services:"

*Series Status (Q11-Q19/**Q8-Q13**): Series verbiage modified for February 2006 instrument: "In your opinion, based on what you know or what you have heard, please rate the following services on a scale of one to five, where one is "poor" and five is "excellent." Series response values were also modified. Three variables were omitted from the series for the February 2006 survey:

Variable (Q14/**N/A**): "Provide and maintain street lighting"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument:

Variable (Q17/**N/A**): "Inform the community about local government services"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument:

Variable (Q18/**N/A**): "Inform the community about local government events"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument:

Social and Judicial Services Importance Series (Q19-Q28/**Q14-Q22**): "I am going to ask you about a number of local government services. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services."

Series Status (Q19-Q28/**Q14-Q22**): No change to series language or variable response values. Two variables were omitted from the series for the February

2006 survey. Additionally, two variables were modified and one variable was added to this series for the February 2006 survey:

Variable (Q22/**N/A**): "Providing parenting skills classes"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (Q24/**Q19**): "Providing affordable housing for the homeless"
Variable Status: Modified for February 2006 survey to read: "Providing shelter for the homeless"

Variable (Q25/**Q20**): "Providing housing for seniors"
Variable Status: Modified for February 2006 survey to read: "Providing affordable housing for seniors"

Variable (Q27/**N/A**): "Providing services for mediating neighborhood disputes"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (N/A/**Q17)**: "Providing attainable housing for working class families"
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Social and Judicial Services Performance Series (Q29-Q37/**Q23-Q31**): "In your opinion, based on what you know or what you have heard, would you say local government is doing an excellent, good, fair or poor job performing the following services:"

*Series Status (Q29-Q37/**Q23-Q31**): Series verbiage modified for February 2006 instrument: "In your opinion, based on what you know or what you have heard, please rate the following services on a scale of one to five, where one is "poor" and five is "excellent." Series response values were also modified. Two variables were omitted from the series for the February 2006 survey. Additionally, two variables were modified and one variable was added to this series for the February 2006 survey:

Variable (Q32/**N/A**): "Providing parenting skills classes"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (Q34/**Q28**): "Providing affordable housing for the homeless"
Variable Status: Modified for February 2006 survey to read: "Providing shelter for the homeless"

Variable (Q35/**Q29**): "Providing housing for seniors"

Variable Status: Modified for February 2006 survey to read:
"Providing affordable housing for seniors"

Variable (Q37/**N/A**): "Providing services for mediating neighborhood disputes"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (N/A/**Q26**): "Providing attainable housing for working class families"
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Public Safety Issues Importance Series (Q38-Q51/**Q32-Q47**): "I am going to ask you about a number of local government services. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following services."

Series Status (Q38-Q51/**Q32-Q47**): No change to series language or variable response values. Two variables were omitted from the series for the February 2006 survey. Additionally, four variables were added to this series for the February 2006 survey:

Variable (Q40/**N/A**): "Enforcing animal control laws"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (Q43/**N/A**): "Keeping public safety response times low"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (N/A/**Q36**): "Keeping police response times low"
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Variable (N/A/**Q37**): "Keeping fire department response times low"
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Variable (N/A/**Q38**): "Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low"
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Variable (N/A/**Q39**): "Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel"
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Public Safety Issues Performance Series (Q52-Q65/**Q48-Q63**): "In your opinion, based on what you know or what you have heard, would you say local government is doing an excellent, good, fair or poor job performing the following services:"

*Series Status (Q52-Q65/**Q48-Q63**): Series verbiage modified for February 2006 instrument: “In your opinion, based on what you know or what you have heard, please rate the following services on a scale of one to five, where one is “poor” and five is excellent.” Series response values were also modified. Two variables were omitted from the series for the February 2006 survey. Additionally, four variables were added to this series for the February 2006 survey:

Variable (Q54/**N/A**): “Enforcing animal control laws”
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (Q57/**N/A**): “Keeping public safety response times low”
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (N/A/**Q52**): “Keeping police response times low”
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Variable (N/A/**Q53**): “Keeping fire department response times low”
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Variable (N/A/**Q54**): “Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low”
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Variable (N/A/**Q55**): “Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel”
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Community Development Issues Importance Series (Q66-Q83/**Q64-Q75**): “I am going to ask you about a number of local government services. On a scale of one to five, where one means “low importance” and five means “high importance,” please rate the level of importance for the following services.”

Series Status (Q66-Q83/**Q64-Q75**): No change to series language or variable response values. One variable was omitted from the series for the February 2006 survey.

Variable (Q83/**N/A**): “Quality of signs on area roadways”
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Community Development Issues Performance Series (Q84-Q101/**Q76-Q87**): “In your opinion, based on what you know or what you have heard, would you say local government is doing an excellent, good, fair or poor job performing the following services:”

*Series Status (Q84-Q101/**Q76-Q87**): Series verbiage modified for February 2006 instrument: “In your opinion, based on what you know or what you have heard, please rate the following services on a scale of one to five, where one is

"poor" and five is excellent." Series response values were also modified. One variable was omitted from the series for the February 2006 survey.

Variable (Q101/**N/A**): "Quality of signs on area roadways"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

**Series label was modified to bring the response value scale for all performance variables in line with importance response value scale. More specifically, performance was tested conceptually on a scale of 1-4, (excellent, good, fair, or poor respectively) during the June 2005 survey. All performance series were changed to a scale of 1-5 (where one means "poor" and five means "excellent") during the February 2006 survey. Importance variables were tested using the 1-5 (where one means "poor" and five means "excellent") scale during both the June 2005 and February 2006 surveys.*

Quality of Life:

Quality of Life Series (Q116-Q124/**Q102-Q110**): "Now I am going to ask you about different factors that may contribute to your quality of life. On a scale of one to five, where one means "low importance" and five means "high importance," please rate the level of importance for the following factors."

Series Status (Q116-Q124/**Q102-Q110**): No change to series language or variable response values. One variable was omitted from this series while one variable was added for the February 2006 survey:

Variable (Q116/**N/A**): "Overall feeling of safety"
Variable Status: Omitted from February 2006 instrument

Variable (N/A/**Q102**): "Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency"
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Yucca Mountain:

Two variables pertinent to the proposed repository at Yucca Mountain were added to the February 2006 instrument:

Variable (N/A/**Q111**): "The Federal government wants to build the nation's first high-level nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you vote to support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?"
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Variable (N/A/**Q112**): "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' safety is assured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?"
Variable Status: Added to series for February 2006 survey

Property Value Impacts:

Property Value Impacts Series (Q126-Q134/**Q114-Q122**): "Now I am going to read you a list of things that may or may not affect the value of residential property in Clark County. For each item please tell me whether you believe it would increase, decrease, or have no affect at all on the property value of nearby, privately owned homes."

Series Status (Q126-Q134/**Q114-Q122**):

Series language was modified for the February 2006 instrument to reflect the following:

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

*Series response value regime was amended as follows for the February 2006 survey:

June 2005	February 2006
1=Increase value	1=Decrease value
2=Decrease value	2=No affect on value
3=No affect on value	3=Increase value

General Economic Conditions:

Variable (Q138/**Q126**): Variable language was not modified for the February 2006 instrument: "Overall, would you say that the quality of life in Clark County is getting better, worse or staying about the same?

*Variable response value regime was amended as follows for the February 2006 survey:

June 2005	February 2006
1=Getting Better	1=Getting Better
2=Getting Worse	2=Staying about the same
3=Staying about the same	3=Getting worse

Variable (Q139/**Q127**): Variable language was not modified for the February 2006 instrument: "We are interested in how people are

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

*Variable response value regime was amended as follows for the February 2006 survey:

June 2005	February 2006
1=Better	1=Better
2=Worse	2=About the same
3=About the same	3=Worse

Variable (Q140/**Q128**): Variable language was not modified for the February 2006 instrument: "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?"

*Variable response value regime was amended as follows for the February 2006 survey:

June 2005	February 2006
1=Better	1=Better
2=Worse	2=About the same
3=About the same	3=Worse

Variable (Q142/**Q130**): Variable language was not modified for the February 2006 instrument: "And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?"

*Variable response value regime was amended as follows for the February 2006 survey:

June 2005	February 2006
1=Better	1=Better
2=Worse	2=About the same
3=About the same	3=Worse

**June 2005 survey response values for this variable were re-coded to bring the central value in position, facilitating measures of central tendency.*

###