



Clark County Monitoring Program

Winter 2007



**Clark County Monitoring Program: Community Survey
Winter 2007**

Contents:

Executive Summary

Tab 1:	Appendix I.....	11
	Importance Score for Selected Services	
Tab 2:	Appendix II.....	97
	Performance Score for Selected Services	
Tab 3:	Appendix III.....	184
	Quality of Life Considerations	
Tab 4:	Appendix IV.....	201
	General Economic Considerations	
Tab 5:	Appendix V.....	221
	Property Value Considerations	
Tab 6:	Appendix VI.....	242
	Environmental Considerations	
Tab 7:	Appendix VII.....	259
	Yucca Mountain Considerations	
Tab 8:	Appendix VIII.....	291
	Community Profile	
Tab 9:	Appendix IX.....	297
	Local Government Interaction	
Tab 10:	Appendix X.....	321
	Local Distribution Summary	
Tab 11:	Appendix XI.....	324
	Respondent Demographic File	
Tab 12:	Appendix XII.....	341
	Importance/ Performance Comparisons	

TO: MS. IRENE NAVIS, AICP
FROM: DR. SHEILA CONWAY; JEREMY AGUERO
SUBJECT: CLARK COUNTY MONITORING PROGRAM | Winter 2007
DATE:
CC: BRIAN GORDON/APPLIED ANALYSIS
DR. ALVIN MUSKATEL/UER;
JASON GRAY/STRATEGIC SOLUTIONS

This memorandum summarizes the key findings of the bi-annual Winter 2007 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 May 2007, Strategic Solutions, in coordination with Urban Environmental Research and Applied Analysis, administered a 143-question telephone survey to 600 Southern Nevada households. The survey, which touches on a broad number of topics, has a margin of error of ± 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 continue from Summer 2006.
- Notable trend in importance ratings for traffic and transportation service areas as reducing traffic congestion, improving road conditions, and access to freeways all decline in importance relative to Summer 2006.
- Notable increases in importance assigned to monitoring and reporting to the public on how well government services are being performed.
- Notable decrease in the importance of providing flood control.
- Concerns with regard to crime show signs of stabilization among residents.
- Drought continues to be a pressing environmental concern
- Notable increases in importance of increasing job opportunities and providing affordable housing for seniors
- More than half of respondents (55.4%) felt that now was a good time to buy a home, a significant increase from Summer 2006 (49.3%).

C. YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUESTIONS

- Opposition to the Yucca Mountain project grows from 71% to 76% indicating they would vote against the nuclear waste repository. 72% percent of respondents report that the storage site would have a negative impact on their quality of life, up from a low of 59% in 2005.
- Trust regarding the Yucca Mountain project remains a key concern. Roughly 74% 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. 65% of respondents indicated the same in Summer 2006.
- Approximately 87% percent of respondents indicated an expectation that having a high-level nuclear waste transportation route near residential housing would have a negative impact on property values. This figure is not appreciably dissimilar from the 84% of respondents who indicated the same sentiment during Summer 2006.

- 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 since Summer 2006. 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, emergency first responder, and economic concerns.
- As an urgent environmental concern, the Yucca Mountain facility's placement among major issues was materially unchanged. Approximately 1.6 percent of respondents identified the Yucca Mountain project as Southern Nevada's most pressing environmental concern; this was 0.3 percent lower than reported in the Summer 2006 series.
- Concerns about the repository are measurably higher than reported during the Summer 2006 cycle-as mean importance scores for all questions pertaining to Yucca Mountain increased during the current survey period.

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

- Public service importance continued to be dominated by public safety considerations, which accounted for the top five and nine out of the top ten most highly-rated services. Traffic and transportation-related services also remained high on the list although declining measurably in terms of importance.
- On a relative scale, only modest movement was noted in the majority of services. The data demonstrate, however, that "increasing job opportunities" tracked up four places overall (in the last iteration it moved up six places). This finding, combined with an increased importance rating for "improving the business climate" (+2), suggest an overall increase in concern about the economic climate.
- The data suggest an increasing level of concern with youth/juvenile social service provision as "providing child protection services" (+1), "providing child welfare services" (+1) and "providing juvenile justice services" (+4) all tracked up in terms of service importance ranking compared to Summer 2006.

SCALE:

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

FIGURE 1 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Public Service Importance Score Summary								
Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Mean				Mean Change		
		Summer '05	Winter '06	Summer '06	Winter '07	From Summer '05	From Winter '06	From Summer '06
General Government	Road Maintenance	4.21	4.05	4.04	4.09	-0.12	0.04	0.05
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.59	3.41	3.52	3.36	-0.23	-0.05	-0.16
	Flood control	4.09	3.88	3.86	3.70	-0.39	-0.18	-0.16
	Budget management	4.29	3.99	4.23	4.11	-0.18	0.12	-0.12
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.86	3.67	3.58	3.63	-0.23	-0.04	0.05
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	3.90	3.72	3.75	3.87	-0.03	0.15	0.12
	Water conservation programs	n/a	n/a	4.12	4.22	n/a	n/a	0.1
Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.17	-0.1	0.11	0.06
	Providing child welfare services	4.15	3.98	3.98	3.99	-0.16	0.01	0.01
	Providing juvenile justice services	4.08	3.93	3.87	3.98	-0.1	0.05	0.11
	Providing attainable housing for working class families	n/a	3.72	3.77	3.76	n/a	0.04	-0.01
	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.70	3.56	3.64	3.67	-0.03	0.11	0.03
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.38	3.33	3.54	3.53	0.15	0.2	-0.01
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	4.12	3.92	3.91	4.02	-0.1	0.1	0.11
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.94	3.74	3.74	3.75	-0.19	0.01	0.01
	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.60	4.38	4.29	4.42	-0.18	0.04	0.13
Public Safety	Providing crime prevention programs	4.27	3.99	4.09	4.04	-0.23	0.05	-0.05
	Enforcing traffic laws	4.25	3.91	4.07	4.09	-0.16	0.18	0.02
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.49	4.14	4.28	4.24	-0.25	0.1	-0.04
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	4.30	3.97	4.08	4.06	-0.24	0.09	-0.02
	Keeping police response times low	4.45	4.24	4.60	4.34	-0.11	0.1	-0.26
	Keeping fire department response times low	4.45	4.54	4.47	4.59	0.14	0.05	0.12
	Keeping paramedic and emergency	4.45	4.56	4.54	4.61	0.16	0.05	0.07

	medical response times low							
	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	n/a	4.64	4.57	4.67	n/a	0.03	0.1
	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	4.05	3.69	3.79	3.79	-0.26	0.1	0
	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	4.04	3.75	3.87	3.84	-0.2	0.09	-0.03
	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	4.18	3.92	4.01	4.03	-0.15	0.11	0.02
	Investigating criminal activity	4.47	4.03	4.24	4.18	-0.29	0.15	-0.06
	Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.59	4.32	4.26	4.33	-0.26	0.01	0.07
	Providing emergency medical services	4.66	4.44	4.43	4.51	-0.15	0.07	0.08
	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.81	3.54	3.58	3.51	-0.3	-0.03	-0.07
	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.88	3.68	3.65	3.66	-0.22	-0.02	0.01
	Regional justice services and facilities	n/a	n/a	3.60	3.69	n/a	n/a	0.09
Community Development	Providing affordable housing	n/a	n/a	3.68	3.64	n/a	n/a	-0.04
	Managing growth	4.07	3.83	3.87	3.83	-0.24	0	-0.04
	Increasing job opportunities	4.07	3.95	3.82	3.84	-0.23	-0.11	0.02
	Improving the business climate	4.08	3.86	3.75	3.76	-0.32	-0.1	0.01
	Planning for commercial development	3.82	3.70	3.56	3.55	-0.27	-0.15	-0.01
	Reducing traffic congestion	4.37	4.02	4.06	3.97	-0.4	-0.05	-0.09
	Access to freeways	4.12	3.83	3.92	3.83	-0.29	0	-0.09
	Improving road conditions	4.29	3.97	4.04	3.95	-0.34	-0.02	-0.09
	Reducing travel time	4.01	3.77	3.83	3.82	-0.19	0.05	-0.01
	Providing mass public transit	3.86	3.67	3.64	3.69	-0.17	0.02	0.05
	Adequate airport facilities	n/a	n/a	3.91	3.87	n/a	n/a	-0.04
	Parks and recreation programs	n/a	n/a	4.02	4.04	n/a	n/a	0.02

FIGURE 2 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE RANKING

Descriptive Statistics	Ranking		Change
	Winter '07	Summer '06	
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	1	2	+1
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	2	3	+1
Keeping fire department response times low	3	4	+1
Providing emergency medical services	4	5	+1
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	5	6	+1
Keeping police response times low	6	1	-5
Providing fire protection & prevention services	7	8	+1
Maintaining a low crime rate	8	7	-1
Water conservation programs	9	11	+2
Investigating criminal activity	10	9	-1
Providing child protection services	11	12	+1
Budget management	12	10	-2

Enforcing traffic laws	13	15	+2
Road Maintenance	14	17	+3
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	15	14	-1
Parks and recreation programs	16	19	+3
Providing crime prevention programs	17	13	-4
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	18	20	+2
Providing affordable housing for seniors	19	23	+4
Providing child welfare services	20	21	+1
Providing juvenile justice services	21	25	+4
Reducing traffic congestion	22	16	-6
Improving road conditions	23	18	-5
Adequate airport facilities	24	24	0
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	25	33	+8
Increasing job opportunities	26	30	+4
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	27	26	-1
Access to freeways	28	22	-6
Managing growth	29	27	-2
Reducing travel time	30	29	-1
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	31	31	0
Improving the business climate	32	34	+2
Providing attainable housing for working class families	33	32	-1
Providing medical care for the poor	34	35	+1
Flood control	35	28	-7
Providing mass public transit	36	39	+3
Regional justice services and facilities	37	40	+3
Providing affordable housing for low income families	38	38	0
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	39	37	-2
Providing affordable housing	40	36	-4
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	41	41	0
Planning for commercial development	42	43	+1
Providing shelter for the homeless	43	44	+1
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	44	42	-2
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	45	45	0

FIGURE 3 GOVERNMENT SERVICE PERFORMANCE SCORE

Government Service Performance Rating					
Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Mean		Disparity between Importance and Performance (Performance-Importance)	
		Importance	Performance	Current Disparity	Summer '06 Disparity
General Government	Road maintenance	4.09	2.94	-1.15	-0.83
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.36	2.57	-0.79	-0.85
	Flood control	3.70	3.48	-0.22	-0.32
	Budget management	4.11	2.56	-1.55	-1.53
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.63	2.82	-0.81	-0.76
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	3.87	2.50	-1.37	-1.16
	Water conservation programs	4.22	3.22	-1	-0.81
Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.17	2.84	-1.33	-1.35
	Providing welfare services	3.99	2.79	-1.2	-1.18
	Providing juvenile justice services	3.98	2.83	-1.15	-0.99
	Provide attainable housing for working class families	3.76	2.52	-1.24	-1.24
	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.67	2.41	-1.26	-1.17
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.53	2.19	-1.34	-1.31
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	4.02	2.62	-1.4	-1.21
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.75	2.59	-1.16	-1.06
	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.42	3.26	-1.16	-1.05
	Public Safety	Providing crime prevention programs	4.04	3.04	-1
Enforcing traffic laws		4.09	2.99	-1.1	-1.08
Maintaining a low crime rate		4.24	2.82	-1.42	-1.46
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols		4.06	2.73	-1.33	-1.33
Keeping police response times low		4.34	3.09	-1.25	-1.58
Keeping fire department response times low		4.59	3.73	-0.86	-0.72
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low		4.61	3.83	-0.78	-0.82
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel		4.67	3.93	-0.74	-0.72
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs		3.79	2.80	-0.99	-0.92
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)		3.84	2.99	-0.85	-1
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event		4.03	2.95	-1.08	-1.11
Investigating criminal activity		4.18	3.14	-1.04	-1.16
Providing fire protection & prevention services		4.33	3.65	-0.68	-0.74
Providing emergency medical services	4.51	3.77	-0.74	-0.84	
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.51	3.01	-0.5	-0.57	
Examining potential impacts from Yucca	3.66	2.79	-0.87	-0.9	

	Mountain nuclear waste shipments				
	Regional justice services and facilities	3.69	3.07	-0.62	-0.5
Community Development	Providing affordable housing	3.64	2.55	-1.09	-1.12
	Managing growth	3.83	2.47	-1.36	-1.25
	Increasing job opportunities	3.84	2.91	-0.93	-0.86
	Improving the business climate	3.76	3.16	-0.6	-0.63
	Planning for commercial development	3.55	3.22	-0.33	-0.42
	Reducing traffic congestion	3.97	2.43	-1.54	-1.46
	Access to freeways	3.83	3.09	-0.74	-0.71
	Improving road conditions	3.95	2.90	-1.05	-0.93
	Reducing travel time	3.82	2.57	-1.25	-1.04
	Providing mass public transit	3.69	2.70	-0.99	-0.96
	Adequate airport facilities	3.87	3.38	-0.49	-0.32
	Parks and recreation programs	4.04	3.52	-0.52	-0.48

FIGURE 4 YUCCA MOUNTAIN SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

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

Appendix I
Importance Score for Selected Service

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


Importance Variable	N	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
<i>* General Government</i>											
Road Maintenance	598	4.09	0.044	4.00	1.081	-1.002	0.100	0.288	0.200	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	593	3.36	0.050	3.00	1.227	-0.218	0.100	-0.802	0.200	1	5
Flood control	595	3.70	0.051	4.00	1.247	-0.596	0.100	-0.654	0.200	1	5
Budget management	590	4.11	0.047	5.00	1.146	-1.189	0.101	0.527	0.201	1	5
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	576	3.63	0.057	4.00	1.367	-0.608	0.102	-0.844	0.203	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	595	3.87	0.049	4.00	1.199	-0.830	0.100	-0.214	0.200	1	5
Water conservation programs	597	4.22	0.044	5.00	1.086	-1.434	0.100	1.341	0.200	1	5
<i>* Social and Judicial Services</i>											
Providing child protection services	593	4.17	0.047	5.00	1.141	-1.221	0.100	0.517	0.200	1	5
Providing child welfare services	591	3.99	0.050	4.00	1.220	-1.008	0.100	-0.007	0.201	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services	581	3.98	0.048	4.00	1.149	-0.926	0.101	-0.018	0.202	1	5
Providing attainable housing for working class families	591	3.76	0.055	4.00	1.326	-0.750	0.101	-0.643	0.201	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low income families	591	3.67	0.055	4.00	1.344	-0.643	0.101	-0.840	0.201	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless	596	3.53	0.059	4.00	1.435	-0.557	0.100	-1.029	0.200	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors	588	4.02	0.049	4.00	1.181	-1.048	0.101	0.118	0.201	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor	594	3.75	0.056	4.00	1.364	-0.761	0.100	-0.709	0.200	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	596	4.42	0.040	5.00	0.967	-1.832	0.100	2.929	0.200	1	5

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

Importance Variable	N	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
<i>* Public Safety</i>											
Providing crime prevention programs	595	4.04	0.045	4.00	1.105	-1.039	0.100	0.303	0.200	1	5
Enforcing traffic laws	600	4.09	0.045	4.00	1.094	-1.112	0.100	0.498	0.199	1	5
Maintaining a low crime rate	599	4.24	0.045	5.00	1.109	-1.415	0.100	1.065	0.199	1	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	597	4.06	0.048	4.00	1.162	-1.170	0.100	0.486	0.200	1	5
Keeping police response times low	590	4.34	0.043	5.00	1.037	-1.681	0.101	2.205	0.201	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low	593	4.59	0.031	5.00	0.750	-2.033	0.100	4.149	0.200	1	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	592	4.61	0.030	5.00	0.727	-2.185	0.100	5.200	0.201	1	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	590	4.67	0.026	5.00	0.626	-2.092	0.101	4.578	0.201	1	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	586	3.79	0.048	4.00	1.171	-0.697	0.101	-0.366	0.201	1	5
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	587	3.84	0.049	4.00	1.188	-0.781	0.101	-0.296	0.201	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	588	4.03	0.049	4.00	1.196	-1.087	0.101	0.230	0.201	1	5
Investigating criminal activity	594	4.18	0.042	4.00	1.015	-1.197	0.100	0.832	0.200	1	5
Providing fire protection & prevention services	596	4.33	0.038	5.00	0.928	-1.478	0.100	1.886	0.200	1	5
Providing emergency medical services	595	4.51	0.032	5.00	0.789	-1.705	0.100	2.795	0.200	1	5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	571	3.51	0.052	4.00	1.242	-0.428	0.102	-0.714	0.204	1	5
	N	Mean	Std. Error	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum


Importance Variable											
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	571	3.66	0.059	4.00	1.417	-0.663	0.102	-0.894	0.204	1	5
Regional justice services and facilities <i>* Community Development</i>	581	3.69	0.046	4.00	1.107	-0.542	0.101	-0.402	0.202	1	5
Providing affordable housing	590	3.64	0.057	4.00	1.387	-0.598	0.101	-0.934	0.201	1	5
Managing growth	595	3.83	0.056	4.00	1.367	-0.850	0.100	-0.582	0.200	1	5
Increasing job opportunities	593	3.84	0.050	4.00	1.224	-0.810	0.100	-0.357	0.200	1	5
Improving the business climate	588	3.76	0.045	4.00	1.080	-0.589	0.101	-0.314	0.201	1	5
Planning for commercial development	592	3.55	0.049	4.00	1.203	-0.482	0.100	-0.642	0.201	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion	599	3.97	0.054	5.00	1.310	-1.014	0.100	-0.253	0.199	1	5
Access to freeways	597	3.83	0.050	4.00	1.221	-0.891	0.100	-0.134	0.200	1	5
Improving road conditions	596	3.95	0.048	4.00	1.172	-0.958	0.100	0.048	0.200	1	5
Reducing travel time	590	3.82	0.052	4.00	1.275	-0.788	0.101	-0.520	0.201	1	5
Providing mass public transit	591	3.69	0.054	4.00	1.313	-0.608	0.101	-0.803	0.201	1	5
Adequate airport facilities	594	3.87	0.049	4.00	1.187	-0.854	0.100	-0.140	0.200	1	5
Parks and recreation programs	596	4.04	0.042	4.00	1.030	-1.024	0.100	0.606	0.200	1	5

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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



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

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



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

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
		Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid	Valid
N	Missing	241	240	241	238	227	239	239
		0	2	0	4	14	3	2
Mean		4.03	3.40	3.67	4.24	3.70	3.98	4.24
Std. Error of Mean		.073	.080	.080	.067	.089	.076	.070
Median		4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	3	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.131	1.239	1.244	1.027	1.338	1.171	1.080
Skewness		-1.034	-.308	-.541	-1.314	-.740	-1.086	-1.516
Std. Error of Skewness		.157	.157	.157	.158	.161	.158	.157
Kurtosis		.338	-.735	-.709	.995	-.595	.457	1.661
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.312	.313	.312	.314	.322	.314	.314
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	181	179	180	180	180	182	182
	Missing	1	3	2	2	2	0	0
Mean		4.09	3.32	3.83	4.00	3.72	3.84	4.09
Std. Error of Mean		.075	.092	.090	.096	.103	.089	.088
Median		4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	3	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.005	1.233	1.212	1.288	1.385	1.195	1.187
Skewness		-.785	-.125	-.757	-1.087	-.653	-.687	-1.134
Std. Error of Skewness		.181	.181	.181	.181	.181	.180	.180
Kurtosis		-.166	-.842	-.375	.017	-.898	-.515	.261
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.359	.361	.360	.360	.360	.358	.358
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	64	64	64	63	62	63	64
	Missing	0	0	0	1	2	1	0
Mean		4.24	3.56	3.83	3.80	3.31	3.55	4.30
Std. Error of Mean		.140	.172	.147	.170	.181	.175	.121
Median		5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.119	1.375	1.173	1.351	1.429	1.392	.965
Skewness		-1.260	-.617	-.595	-.870	-.273	-.534	-1.784
Std. Error of Skewness		.299	.300	.300	.301	.303	.301	.299
Kurtosis		.765	-.734	-.494	-.423	-1.135	-.952	3.634
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.590	.592	.592	.594	.598	.595	.590
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	84	83	84	82	80	84	84
	Missing	0	1	0	2	4	0	0
Mean		4.29	3.18	3.45	4.18	3.39	3.83	4.39
Std. Error of Mean		.110	.126	.141	.109	.151	.122	.102
Median		5.00	3.00	4.00	4.50	3.17	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	3	4	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.010	1.147	1.288	.991	1.354	1.116	.938
Skewness		-1.323	.060	-.459	-1.043	-.398	-.614	-1.809
Std. Error of Skewness		.263	.264	.263	.265	.269	.262	.262
Kurtosis		1.014	-.744	-.851	.540	-.954	-.447	3.061
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.521	.522	.521	.525	.531	.519	.519
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Boulder City	Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N Valid	19	19	19	19	18	19	19
Missing	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean	3.83	3.20	3.39	4.02	3.77	3.84	4.28
Std. Error of Mean	.221	.188	.359	.231	.323	.273	.261
Median	4.00	3.00	3.19	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode	3	3	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	.967	.822	1.548	.997	1.377	1.194	1.139
Skewness	-.364	-.103	-.401	-.640	-.950	-.794	-1.811
Std. Error of Skewness	.523	.523	.528	.528	.534	.523	.523
Kurtosis	.248	-.832	-1.269	-.619	-.193	.100	3.091
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.012	1.012	1.023	1.023	1.033	1.012	1.012
Range	4	3	4	3	4	4	4
Minimum	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Mesquite		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	8	8	7	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.32	3.39	3.83	4.42	4.08	4.42	4.17
Std. Error of Mean		.507	.382	.472	.218	.340	.356	.363
Median		3.00	3.00	4.10	4.27	4.05	5.00	4.95
Mode		3	3	5	4(a)	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.467	1.075	1.290	.631	.957	1.029	1.023
Skewness		-.425	.391	-.487	-.569	-.196	-1.575	-.432
Std. Error of Skewness		.739	.755	.773	.739	.755	.739	.755
Kurtosis		-.470	-.651	-1.648	-.068	-2.247	1.437	-2.424
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.449	1.488	1.533	1.449	1.488	1.449	1.488
Range		4	3	3	2	2	3	2
Minimum		1	2	2	3	3	2	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	240	239	235	239	236	241	238	239	240
	Missing	2	3	7	3	6	1	4	2	2
Mean		4.22	4.07	4.00	3.91	3.80	3.56	4.12	3.82	4.49
Std. Error of Mean		.071	.075	.075	.084	.085	.091	.075	.086	.057
Median		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.098	1.157	1.151	1.300	1.307	1.418	1.156	1.337	.879
Skewness		-1.314	-1.080	-.907	-.924	-.862	-.598	-1.282	-.870	-1.994
Std. Error of Skewness		.157	.158	.159	.158	.159	.157	.158	.157	.157
Kurtosis		.898	.247	-.138	-.395	-.438	-.937	.749	-.452	4.076
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.313	.314	.317	.314	.316	.313	.315	.314	.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 I
Importance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Social and Judicial Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	180	180	179	179	180	181	181	181	180
	Missing	2	3	4	3	2	1	2	1	2
Mean		4.12	3.94	3.99	3.60	3.52	3.47	3.99	3.65	4.44
Std. Error of Mean		.091	.093	.087	.106	.105	.112	.090	.106	.069
Median		5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.219	1.253	1.157	1.414	1.416	1.505	1.207	1.424	.923
Skewness		-1.183	-.907	-1.053	-.606	-.425	-.468	-.982	-.675	-1.984
Std. Error of Skewness		.181	.181	.182	.181	.181	.180	.181	.180	.181
Kurtosis		.217	-.336	.380	-.953	-1.187	-1.241	-.108	-.921	3.966
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.360	.361	.361	.361	.360	.359	.360	.359	.360
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	63	62	61	61	63	64	59	63	64
	Missing	1	2	3	3	1	0	5	1	0
Mean		4.16	3.92	3.96	3.76	3.63	3.82	4.14	3.91	4.45
Std. Error of Mean		.150	.170	.153	.160	.171	.179	.146	.169	.134
Median		5.00	4.58	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.189	1.344	1.192	1.255	1.359	1.427	1.122	1.345	1.072
Skewness		-1.195	-1.025	-.770	-.672	-.538	-.934	-1.222	-.814	-1.946
Std. Error of Skewness		.302	.303	.306	.306	.301	.300	.311	.301	.299
Kurtosis		.437	-.086	-.538	-.568	-.932	-.481	.645	-.765	2.775
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.596	.598	.603	.603	.594	.592	.613	.594	.590
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84	84
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.23	4.01	4.01	3.81	3.83	3.41	3.79	3.62	4.23
Std. Error of Mean		.117	.129	.121	.126	.130	.139	.126	.147	.119
Median		5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.069	1.184	1.114	1.157	1.190	1.272	1.154	1.346	1.091
Skewness		-1.323	-1.073	-1.001	-.744	-.879	-.536	-.636	-.619	-1.268
Std. Error of Skewness		.262	.262	.262	.262	.262	.262	.262	.262	.262
Kurtosis		1.110	.357	.345	-.059	-.141	-.700	-.435	-.838	.631
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.519	.519	.519	.519	.519	.519	.519	.519	.519
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Boulder City		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	18	19	14	19	19	18	19	18	19
	Missing	1	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	0
Mean		3.83	3.63	3.52	3.36	2.75	3.26	3.76	3.66	4.17
Std. Error of Mean		.260	.305	.313	.355	.318	.369	.273	.313	.221
Median		4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.41	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		4	4	3	5	2	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.104	1.334	1.190	1.550	1.389	1.565	1.194	1.328	.964
Skewness		-.742	-.781	-.015	-.434	.351	-.140	-.669	-.740	-1.204
Std. Error of Skewness		.536	.523	.589	.523	.523	.536	.523	.536	.523
Kurtosis		-.027	-.388	-.889	-1.392	-1.081	-1.547	-.092	-.515	.923
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.038	1.012	1.137	1.012	1.012	1.038	1.012	1.038	1.012
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Mesquite	Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N Valid	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Missing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	3.75	3.53	4.16	3.49	3.91	3.49	3.72	4.23	3.95
Std. Error of Mean	.394	.540	.366	.491	.428	.620	.643	.429	.614
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.31	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.109	1.476	1.031	1.421	1.237	1.793	1.810	1.242	1.778
Skewness	-.661	-1.284	-2.306	-.204	-1.065	-.790	-.987	-1.807	-1.404
Std. Error of Skewness	.755	.773	.755	.739	.739	.739	.755	.739	.739
Kurtosis	-.412	.764	9.683	-1.463	1.181	-1.383	-.999	3.562	.096
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.488	1.533	1.488	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.488	1.449	1.449
Range	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Unincorporated Clark County	Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N Valid	241	242	242	240	238	241	239	239
Missing	1	0	0	2	4	1	3	3
Mean	3.95	4.01	4.16	3.98	4.23	4.54	4.56	4.64
Std. Error of Mean	.074	.075	.074	.077	.070	.052	.054	.043
Median	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.154	1.168	1.151	1.200	1.088	.803	.840	.666
Skewness	-.941	-1.069	-1.261	-1.088	-1.453	-1.796	-2.164	-1.972
Std. Error of Skewness	.157	.157	.157	.157	.158	.157	.157	.157
Kurtosis	.011	.349	.611	.290	1.397	2.601	4.666	3.651
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.313	.312	.312	.313	.314	.313	.314	.314
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Unincorporated Clark County (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	238	237	238	241	241	242	228	228	234
Missing	4	5	4	0	0	0	13	14	8
Mean	3.76	3.89	4.02	4.10	4.31	4.52	3.57	3.64	3.66
Std. Error of Mean	.077	.078	.082	.069	.060	.050	.080	.095	.075
Median	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	4
Std. Deviation	1.186	1.198	1.271	1.071	.924	.777	1.213	1.432	1.144
Skewness	-.690	-.805	-1.176	-1.100	-1.503	-1.696	-.448	-.675	-.552
Std. Error of Skewness	.158	.158	.158	.157	.157	.157	.161	.161	.159
Kurtosis	-.388	-.407	.258	.483	2.206	2.611	-.636	-.870	-.432
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.314	.315	.314	.312	.312	.312	.321	.321	.317
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas	Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N Valid	180	182	182	182	179	178	178	178
Missing	2	0	0	0	4	5	5	5
Mean	4.18	4.22	4.35	4.24	4.47	4.66	4.69	4.72
Std. Error of Mean	.082	.078	.082	.078	.069	.052	.049	.047
Median	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.102	1.049	1.104	1.056	.922	.692	.647	.624
Skewness	-1.340	-1.219	-1.651	-1.475	-2.077	-2.643	-2.329	-2.459
Std. Error of Skewness	.181	.180	.180	.180	.182	.182	.182	.182
Kurtosis	1.088	.596	1.667	1.566	4.375	8.666	5.666	6.102
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.360	.358	.358	.358	.361	.363	.363	.363
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
Valid	176	176	176	180	179	178	171	175	175
Missing	6	7	7	2	3	4	11	7	7
Mean	3.87	3.84	4.10	4.26	4.37	4.54	3.58	3.79	3.79
Std. Error of Mean	.088	.086	.085	.074	.070	.059	.096	.106	.083
Median	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4
Std. Deviation	1.162	1.144	1.128	.994	.932	.785	1.261	1.404	1.096
Skewness	-.802	-.798	-1.081	-1.415	-1.565	-1.850	-.457	-.797	-.657
Std. Error of Skewness	.183	.183	.183	.181	.181	.182	.186	.183	.183
Kurtosis	-.178	-.080	.293	1.573	2.118	3.529	-.787	-.756	-.291
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.364	.365	.365	.360	.361	.362	.369	.365	.365
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas	Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N Valid	64	64	64	64	62	63	63	62
Missing	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2
Mean	3.98	3.93	3.95	3.70	4.12	4.46	4.49	4.72
Std. Error of Mean	.142	.148	.161	.194	.172	.109	.097	.076
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.131	1.189	1.289	1.549	1.362	.863	.772	.597
Skewness	-.888	-.982	-1.061	-.713	-1.315	-1.672	-1.569	-2.922
Std. Error of Skewness	.300	.299	.300	.300	.303	.301	.301	.304
Kurtosis	-.097	.109	-.057	-1.140	.316	2.450	2.154	12.161
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.592	.590	.592	.592	.598	.594	.594	.599
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
Valid	63	64	63	63	64	64	63	61	61
Missing	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	3	3
Mean	3.79	3.58	3.79	4.08	4.17	4.31	3.41	3.35	3.62
Std. Error of Mean	.165	.183	.176	.144	.135	.114	.165	.206	.147
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.72	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.72	4.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	3
Std. Deviation	1.309	1.466	1.396	1.136	1.077	.908	1.302	1.604	1.149
Skewness	-.974	-.681	-.828	-1.080	-.981	-.866	-.231	-.367	-.242
Std. Error of Skewness	.301	.299	.301	.302	.300	.300	.302	.307	.306
Kurtosis	-.114	-.886	-.607	.280	-.294	-.703	-.924	-1.430	-.982
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.594	.590	.595	.597	.592	.592	.597	.605	.603
Range	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson	Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N Valid	84	84	84	84	83	84	84	84
Missing	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean	4.15	4.14	4.45	4.15	4.51	4.72	4.70	4.65
Std. Error of Mean	.100	.101	.096	.099	.090	.057	.056	.062
Median	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	.918	.927	.880	.912	.818	.527	.510	.564
Skewness	-.787	-.913	-1.585	-.805	-1.863	-1.738	-1.437	-1.399
Std. Error of Skewness	.263	.262	.262	.262	.264	.262	.262	.263
Kurtosis	-.329	.386	2.078	-.263	3.353	2.219	1.146	1.039
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.521	.519	.519	.519	.522	.519	.519	.521
Range	3	4	4	3	4	2	2	2
Minimum	2	1	1	2	1	3	3	3
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
Valid	82	83	84	83	84	84	82	81	83
Missing	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	1
Mean	3.69	3.89	4.05	4.34	4.44	4.55	3.30	3.69	3.65
Std. Error of Mean	.122	.115	.109	.081	.087	.086	.141	.142	.104
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	3	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	4
Std. Deviation	1.107	1.051	.998	.743	.802	.785	1.272	1.279	.948
Skewness	-.250	-.577	-.835	-.928	-2.013	-2.355	-.489	-.667	-.470
Std. Error of Skewness	.265	.264	.262	.264	.262	.263	.266	.267	.264
Kurtosis	-.949	-.343	.294	.424	5.512	6.969	-.637	-.646	.116
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.525	.522	.519	.522	.519	.521	.526	.528	.522
Range	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Boulder City	Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N Valid	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	3.73	4.04	4.33	3.91	4.23	4.46	4.53	4.58
Std. Error of Mean	.182	.227	.154	.213	.233	.155	.138	.127
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	.784	.992	.674	.929	1.017	.679	.602	.555
Skewness	.176	-.834	-.520	-.307	-.897	-.896	-.884	-.818
Std. Error of Skewness	.528	.523	.523	.523	.523	.523	.523	.523
Kurtosis	-.568	-.112	-.564	-.820	-.629	-.183	-.040	-.363
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.023	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012
Range	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2
Minimum	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	3
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Boulder City (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
Valid	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	18	19
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	3.84	3.81	4.13	3.95	4.09	4.50	3.38	3.41	3.51
Std. Error of Mean	.207	.247	.242	.218	.219	.147	.288	.324	.269
Median	4.00	4.00	4.41	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	3	5	5	3	4	5	3	3(a)	3
Std. Deviation	.892	1.077	1.055	.953	.957	.643	1.258	1.383	1.174
Skewness	.341	-.348	-.904	-.081	-1.041	-1.551	-.143	-.100	-.314
Std. Error of Skewness	.528	.523	.523	.523	.523	.523	.523	.534	.523
Kurtosis	-1.723	-1.116	-.395	-1.571	.581	4.844	-1.025	-1.209	-.413
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.023	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.033	1.012
Range	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Minimum	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Mesquite	Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	3.95	4.53	4.42	4.47	4.71	4.34	4.76	4.58
Std. Error of Mean	.578	.184	.312	.289	.167	.424	.157	.182
Median	5.00	4.72	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.671	.532	.902	.836	.484	1.226	.453	.526
Skewness	-1.293	-.133	-1.130	-1.293	-1.139	-1.750	-1.529	-.403
Std. Error of Skewness	.739	.739	.739	.739	.739	.739	.739	.739
Kurtosis	.146	-2.721	-.683	.146	-1.022	1.760	.358	-2.529
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449
Range	4	1	2	2	1	3	1	1
Minimum	1	4	3	3	4	2	4	4
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Mesquite (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	8
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.00	4.02	4.02	4.31	4.47	4.71	3.87	3.76	3.58
Std. Error of Mean	.404	.333	.333	.445	.289	.167	.243	.384	.496
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Std. Deviation	1.169	.963	.963	1.253	.836	.484	.703	1.049	1.435
Skewness	-1.023	-.052	-.052	-1.669	-1.293	-1.139	.178	-1.341	-1.238
Std. Error of Skewness	.739	.739	.739	.755	.739	.739	.739	.773	.739
Kurtosis	-.034	-2.289	-2.289	1.410	.146	-1.022	-.183	4.877	.819
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.488	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.533	1.449
Range	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	4	4
Minimum	2	3	3	2	3	4	3	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N	Valid	239	240	242	237	237	242
	Missing	3	2	0	5	5	0
	Mean	3.70	3.82	3.92	3.78	3.64	3.81
	Std. Error of Mean	.092	.089	.078	.071	.077	.088
	Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	Mode	5	5	5	4	4	5
	Std. Deviation	1.421	1.378	1.217	1.089	1.178	1.369
	Skewness	-.679	-.807	-.924	-.699	-.543	-.798
	Std. Error of Skewness	.158	.157	.157	.158	.158	.157
	Kurtosis	-.907	-.679	-.148	-.180	-.616	-.697
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	.314	.313	.312	.315	.315	.312
	Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Unincorporated Clark County (cont)	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	241	241	238	241	241	239
Missing	0	1	4	0	0	3
Mean	3.69	3.84	3.75	3.71	3.82	3.96
Std. Error of Mean	.083	.075	.085	.085	.076	.070
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.281	1.157	1.305	1.316	1.185	1.090
Skewness	-.794	-.782	-.720	-.583	-.721	-1.067
Std. Error of Skewness	.157	.157	.158	.157	.157	.157
Kurtosis	-.389	-.169	-.673	-.859	-.445	.688
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.312	.313	.314	.312	.312	.314
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas	Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N Valid	178	180	179	179	181	182
Missing	4	2	3	3	1	0
Mean	3.47	3.85	3.76	3.77	3.44	4.03
Std. Error of Mean	.106	.104	.093	.087	.098	.096
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.421	1.403	1.247	1.166	1.320	1.292
Skewness	-.405	-.910	-.742	-.655	-.446	-1.123
Std. Error of Skewness	.182	.181	.182	.182	.181	.180
Kurtosis	-1.162	-.560	-.501	-.367	-.845	.022
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.362	.360	.361	.361	.359	.358
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas (cont)	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
Valid	182	182	181	178	180	181
Missing	0	0	1	4	3	1
Mean	3.92	4.03	3.88	3.73	3.87	4.10
Std. Error of Mean	.091	.087	.095	.097	.090	.075
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.231	1.178	1.282	1.290	1.202	1.012
Skewness	-1.017	-1.052	-.879	-.740	-.871	-1.089
Std. Error of Skewness	.180	.180	.181	.182	.181	.181
Kurtosis	.069	.178	-.391	-.582	-.096	.742
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.358	.358	.359	.362	.361	.359
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas	Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N Valid	63	64	61	62	64	64
Missing	1	0	3	2	0	0
Mean	3.86	3.46	3.59	3.54	3.22	3.99
Std. Error of Mean	.173	.202	.165	.122	.146	.169
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00
Mode	5	5	5	3	3	5
Std. Deviation	1.373	1.612	1.289	.963	1.173	1.357
Skewness	-.987	-.529	-.525	-.180	-.257	-1.124
Std. Error of Skewness	.302	.300	.306	.304	.299	.299
Kurtosis	-.323	-1.338	-.704	-.432	-.541	-.032
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.596	.592	.603	.599	.590	.590
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas (cont)	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	64	64	61	64	64	64
Missing	0	0	3	0	0	0
Mean	3.80	4.10	3.84	3.61	4.16	4.11
Std. Error of Mean	.150	.142	.166	.178	.138	.117
Median	4.00	4.24	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.205	1.141	1.297	1.424	1.106	.935
Skewness	-.944	-1.338	-.983	-.591	-1.387	-.849
Std. Error of Skewness	.299	.299	.306	.300	.299	.299
Kurtosis	.198	1.305	-.090	-.934	1.510	.473
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.590	.590	.603	.592	.590	.590
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson	Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N Valid	83	84	84	83	83	84
Missing	2	0	0	1	1	0
Mean	3.76	3.99	3.96	3.91	3.76	4.29
Std. Error of Mean	.132	.116	.127	.101	.111	.121
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	4	5
Std. Deviation	1.201	1.063	1.158	.923	1.014	1.108
Skewness	-.588	-.685	-.937	-.173	-.372	-1.484
Std. Error of Skewness	.265	.263	.263	.264	.264	.262
Kurtosis	-.595	-.459	.000	-1.167	-.608	1.182
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.524	.521	.521	.522	.522	.519
Range	4	4	4	3	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	2	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson (cont)	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	84	83	83	81	81	84
Missing	0	2	1	4	3	0
Mean	4.06	4.06	3.93	3.77	3.99	4.07
Std. Error of Mean	.111	.134	.130	.136	.119	.105
Median	4.00	4.40	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.020	1.217	1.182	1.217	1.071	.964
Skewness	-.839	-1.241	-.874	-.562	-1.010	-.813
Std. Error of Skewness	.262	.265	.264	.268	.267	.262
Kurtosis	-.156	.521	-.073	-.827	.554	.050
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.519	.524	.522	.530	.528	.519
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Boulder City	Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N Valid	19	19	19	19	19	19
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	3.12	4.27	3.50	3.43	3.30	3.90
Std. Error of Mean	.327	.257	.291	.274	.245	.314
Median	3.00	5.00	3.45	3.64	3.18	4.86
Mode	3	5	5	4	4	5
Std. Deviation	1.430	1.125	1.257	1.184	1.058	1.373
Skewness	-.090	-1.309	-.308	-.351	.045	-.859
Std. Error of Skewness	.523	.523	.528	.528	.528	.523
Kurtosis	-1.013	.774	-.867	-.577	-1.257	-.697
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.012	1.012	1.023	1.023	1.023	1.012
Range	4	4	4	4	3	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	2	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Boulder City (cont)	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	18	19	19	19	19	19
Missing	2	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	3.84	3.67	3.58	3.12	3.34	4.41
Std. Error of Mean	.270	.277	.279	.322	.319	.216
Median	4.00	4.00	3.64	3.00	3.59	5.00
Mode	5	4	5	3	3	5
Std. Deviation	1.133	1.195	1.205	1.389	1.393	.945
Skewness	-.513	-.788	-.062	-.048	-.573	-1.374
Std. Error of Skewness	.542	.528	.528	.528	.523	.523
Kurtosis	-1.088	-.072	-1.567	-.974	-.668	.700
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.049	1.023	1.023	1.023	1.012	1.012
Range	3	4	3	4	4	3
Minimum	2	1	2	1	1	2
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Mesquite	Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.02	4.05	4.37	4.11	4.16	4.18
Std. Error of Mean	.354	.395	.177	.250	.261	.291
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	5	5	4	4	4	5
Std. Deviation	1.025	1.142	.513	.724	.754	.841
Skewness	-.501	-1.232	.688	-.168	-.297	-.413
Std. Error of Skewness	.739	.739	.739	.739	.739	.739
Kurtosis	-.986	.736	-2.116	-.411	-.716	-1.375
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449
Range	3	3	1	2	2	2
Minimum	2	2	4	3	3	3
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Mesquite (cont)	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	8	8	8	8	8	8
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	3.74	3.74	3.81	3.11	3.05	3.58
Std. Error of Mean	.411	.393	.472	.551	.528	.383
Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.73
Mode	5	4	5	3	3	3(a)
Std. Deviation	1.189	1.137	1.329	1.551	1.526	1.109
Skewness	-.332	-.464	-.295	-.248	-.116	-.089
Std. Error of Skewness	.739	.739	.755	.755	.739	.739
Kurtosis	-1.356	-.916	-2.079	-.982	-1.041	-1.070
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.449	1.449	1.488	1.488	1.449	1.449
Range	3	3	3	4	4	3
Minimum	2	2	2	1	1	2
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix II
Performance Score for Selected Services

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

Performance Variable	N	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
<i>* General Government</i>											
Road Maintenance	599	2.94	0.045	3.00	1.092	-0.087	0.100	-0.502	0.199	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	578	2.57	0.045	3.00	1.090	0.305	0.102	-0.524	0.203	1	5
Flood control	572	3.48	0.046	4.00	1.096	-0.442	0.102	-0.321	0.204	1	5
Budget management	589	2.56	0.046	3.00	1.125	0.208	0.101	-0.667	0.201	1	5
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	572	2.82	0.052	3.00	1.243	0.138	0.102	-0.884	0.204	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	585	2.50	0.043	3.00	1.049	0.335	0.101	-0.322	0.202	1	5
Water conservation programs	592	3.22	0.050	3.00	1.213	-0.350	0.100	-0.782	0.201	1	5
<i>* Social and Judicial Services</i>											
Providing child protection services	580	2.84	0.044	3.00	1.068	0.056	0.101	-0.455	0.203	1	5
Providing child welfare services	576	2.79	0.044	3.00	1.050	0.136	0.102	-0.325	0.203	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services	577	2.83	0.045	3.00	1.084	0.021	0.102	-0.465	0.203	1	5
Providing attainable housing for working class families	574	2.52	0.044	3.00	1.042	0.286	0.102	-0.405	0.204	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low income families	575	2.41	0.045	2.00	1.079	0.434	0.102	-0.463	0.203	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless	585	2.19	0.046	2.00	1.120	0.644	0.101	-0.401	0.202	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors	577	2.62	0.047	3.00	1.123	0.261	0.102	-0.609	0.203	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor	583	2.59	0.050	3.00	1.213	0.272	0.101	-0.846	0.202	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	578	3.26	0.051	3.00	1.229	-0.323	0.102	-0.786	0.203	1	5


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

Performance Variable	N	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
<i>* Public Safety</i>											
Providing crime prevention programs	583	3.04	0.042	3.00	1.018	-0.179	0.101	-0.114	0.202	1	5
Enforcing traffic laws	596	2.99	0.048	3.00	1.181	-0.086	0.100	-0.804	0.200	1	5
Maintaining a low crime rate	590	2.82	0.044	3.00	1.078	0.068	0.101	-0.557	0.201	1	5
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	587	2.73	0.048	3.00	1.170	0.171	0.101	-0.713	0.201	1	5
Keeping police response times low	572	3.09	0.050	3.00	1.192	-0.248	0.102	-0.762	0.204	1	5
Keeping fire department response times low	576	3.73	0.043	4.00	1.037	-0.756	0.102	0.270	0.203	1	5
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	581	3.83	0.042	4.00	1.012	-0.836	0.101	0.484	0.202	1	5
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	580	3.93	0.041	4.00	0.989	-0.919	0.101	0.694	0.203	1	5
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	575	2.80	0.047	3.00	1.117	0.135	0.102	-0.512	0.203	1	5
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	579	2.99	0.047	3.00	1.138	-0.061	0.102	-0.666	0.203	1	5
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	576	2.95	0.048	3.00	1.147	-0.010	0.102	-0.703	0.203	1	5
Investigating criminal activity	578	3.14	0.046	3.00	1.105	-0.131	0.102	-0.638	0.203	1	5
Providing fire protection & prevention services	579	3.65	0.042	4.00	1.017	-0.454	0.102	-0.287	0.203	1	5
Providing emergency medical services	579	3.77	0.042	4.00	1.020	-0.698	0.102	0.044	0.203	1	5
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	583	3.01	0.048	3.00	1.154	-0.059	0.101	-0.691	0.202	1	5
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	573	2.79	0.053	3.00	1.265	0.083	0.102	-1.009	0.204	1	5

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


Performance Variable	N	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Regional justice services and facilities <i>* Community Development</i>	581	3.07	0.046	3.00	1.110	-0.215	0.101	-0.563	0.202	1	5
Providing affordable housing	573	2.55	0.045	3.00	1.087	0.235	0.102	-0.523	0.204	1	5
Managing growth	588	2.47	0.050	2.00	1.221	0.397	0.101	-0.796	0.201	1	5
Increasing job opportunities	583	2.91	0.048	3.00	1.155	0.027	0.101	-0.708	0.202	1	5
Improving the business climate	581	3.16	0.045	3.00	1.078	-0.217	0.101	-0.420	0.202	1	5
Planning for commercial development	578	3.22	0.048	3.00	1.163	-0.259	0.102	-0.623	0.203	1	5
Reducing traffic congestion	591	2.43	0.049	2.00	1.201	0.494	0.101	-0.637	0.201	1	5
Access to freeways	588	3.09	0.048	3.00	1.173	-0.132	0.101	-0.759	0.201	1	5
Improving road conditions	596	2.90	0.048	3.00	1.172	-0.011	0.100	-0.756	0.200	1	5
Reducing travel time	587	2.57	0.046	3.00	1.106	0.235	0.101	-0.577	0.201	1	5
Providing mass public transit	581	2.70	0.053	3.00	1.286	0.241	0.101	-0.959	0.202	1	5
Adequate airport facilities	585	3.38	0.048	3.00	1.164	-0.428	0.101	-0.534	0.202	1	5
Parks and recreation programs	588	3.52	0.048	4.00	1.165	-0.583	0.101	-0.375	0.201	1	5

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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



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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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




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

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



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

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



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

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	242	233	228	240	232	239	240
	Missing	0	8	14	2	10	3	2
Mean		2.98	2.59	3.41	2.58	2.89	2.56	3.24
Std. Error of Mean		.074	.072	.079	.075	.082	.071	.083
Median		3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	4	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.153	1.094	1.186	1.156	1.246	1.097	1.290
Skewness		-.081	.349	-.492	.232	.138	.323	-.303
Std. Error of Skewness		.157	.159	.161	.157	.160	.157	.157
Kurtosis		-.638	-.435	-.475	-.684	-.836	-.291	-.910
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.312	.317	.321	.313	.318	.314	.313
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	181	170	173	177	172	176	178
	Missing	1	12	9	5	10	6	4
Mean		2.91	2.59	3.57	2.50	2.77	2.45	3.11
Std. Error of Mean		.078	.081	.079	.083	.097	.078	.083
Median		3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	4	3	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		1.048	1.054	1.043	1.103	1.272	1.037	1.105
Skewness		-.077	.177	-.302	.277	.133	.358	-.237
Std. Error of Skewness		.180	.186	.185	.183	.185	.183	.182
Kurtosis		-.401	-.521	-.599	-.665	-1.050	-.438	-.599
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.359	.370	.367	.363	.368	.364	.362
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	64	63	63	64	61	62	64
	Missing	0	1	1	0	3	3	0
Mean		2.87	2.34	3.60	2.53	2.68	2.57	3.33
Std. Error of Mean		.124	.134	.122	.151	.164	.125	.159
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		.991	1.062	.970	1.206	1.280	.983	1.276
Skewness		-.312	.501	-.629	.214	.126	-.129	-.581
Std. Error of Skewness		.299	.301	.301	.300	.306	.305	.299
Kurtosis		-.265	-.464	.552	-.881	-1.032	-.744	-.749
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.590	.594	.594	.592	.603	.601	.590
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	84	84	81	81	82	81	83
	Missing	0	0	3	3	3	3	2
Mean		2.90	2.58	3.45	2.63	2.84	2.50	3.39
Std. Error of Mean		.116	.124	.104	.113	.127	.117	.121
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	2	4
Std. Deviation		1.064	1.136	.941	1.022	1.145	1.054	1.103
Skewness		-.190	.266	-.233	-.096	.089	.570	-.757
Std. Error of Skewness		.262	.262	.267	.267	.266	.267	.265
Kurtosis		-.433	-.634	.087	-.388	-.418	-.028	-.108
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.519	.519	.528	.528	.527	.528	.524
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Boulder City		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
		N	Valid	19	19	19	19	18
	Missing	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mean		3.10	2.79	3.61	2.55	2.45	2.27	2.84
Std. Error of Mean		.260	.265	.293	.244	.263	.207	.299
Median		3.00	3.00	3.86	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	5	3	2	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.137	1.157	1.278	1.066	1.121	.903	1.291
Skewness		.003	.450	-.529	.125	.491	-.145	-.123
Std. Error of Skewness		.523	.523	.523	.523	.534	.523	.528
Kurtosis		.139	-.314	-.500	-.542	-.644	-.982	-1.423
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.033	1.012	1.023
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	4	5

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

Mesquite		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	8	8	7	8	7	8	8
	Missing	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Mean		3.34	2.43	2.45	3.24	3.55	2.36	3.08
Std. Error of Mean		.457	.460	.420	.409	.497	.223	.502
Median		3.73	2.10	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	3	3	5	2	3(a)
Std. Deviation		1.321	1.330	1.147	1.184	1.358	.628	1.451
Skewness		.088	.462	.293	.689	.118	1.728	-.168
Std. Error of Skewness		.739	.739	.773	.739	.773	.755	.739
Kurtosis		-2.029	-.774	1.395	-.807	-2.175	3.265	-1.073
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.449	1.449	1.533	1.449	1.533	1.488	1.449
Range		3	4	4	3	3	2	4
Minimum		2	1	1	2	2	2	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	4	5

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	234	236	232	234	235	234	233	237	232
	Missing	8	5	9	8	7	7	9	5	9
Mean		2.88	2.82	2.87	2.46	2.40	2.26	2.63	2.66	3.42
Std. Error of Mean		.070	.067	.075	.071	.075	.077	.074	.082	.081
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.72	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.072	1.027	1.136	1.086	1.152	1.175	1.125	1.269	1.231
Skewness		.094	.088	.133	.268	.408	.610	.208	.257	-.480
Std. Error of Skewness		.159	.158	.160	.159	.159	.159	.159	.158	.160
Kurtosis		-.550	-.231	-.474	-.592	-.721	-.506	-.583	-.964	-.552
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.317	.315	.318	.317	.316	.317	.318	.315	.318
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	179	174	175	171	175	178	177	175	176
	Missing	3	8	7	11	8	4	5	7	6
Mean		2.79	2.77	2.75	2.60	2.44	2.16	2.58	2.56	3.07
Std. Error of Mean		.081	.084	.082	.078	.079	.083	.087	.089	.094
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.080	1.114	1.081	1.021	1.040	1.113	1.156	1.182	1.246
Skewness		.138	.248	-.040	.269	.382	.575	.331	.228	-.187
Std. Error of Skewness		.182	.184	.183	.186	.184	.182	.183	.183	.183
Kurtosis		-.373	-.505	-.646	-.326	-.375	-.656	-.631	-.809	-.922
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.361	.366	.365	.369	.366	.362	.363	.365	.364
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

a

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

City of North Las Vegas		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	62	62	63	63	61	64	60	61	61
	Missing	2	2	1	1	4	0	5	3	3
Mean		2.48	2.51	2.71	2.34	2.32	2.13	2.57	2.37	3.20
Std. Error of Mean		.126	.131	.130	.124	.131	.146	.142	.158	.167
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	2	3	1	2	1	4
Std. Deviation		.988	1.028	1.032	.985	1.022	1.164	1.093	1.232	1.308
Skewness		-.190	-.068	.113	.410	.109	.876	.315	.495	-.198
Std. Error of Skewness		.305	.305	.301	.302	.307	.300	.310	.307	.306
Kurtosis		-1.002	-1.104	-.415	-.305	-1.127	-.032	-.616	-.728	-1.151
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.601	.601	.594	.596	.606	.592	.611	.605	.603
Range		3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	79	78	81	80	78	81	83	82	82
	Missing	5	6	3	4	6	3	1	2	2
Mean		3.16	3.01	3.05	2.68	2.36	2.14	2.68	2.61	3.19
Std. Error of Mean		.116	.114	.104	.106	.104	.102	.120	.117	.122
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.030	1.004	.936	.950	.921	.919	1.097	1.060	1.110
Skewness		-.146	.149	-.252	.262	.865	.290	.138	.221	-.250
Std. Error of Skewness		.270	.272	.267	.269	.271	.267	.264	.265	.265
Kurtosis		-.008	.270	.221	.199	1.114	-.630	-.646	-.350	-.608
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.535	.538	.528	.532	.537	.528	.522	.525	.525
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Boulder City		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	19	19	17	19	19	19	16	19	19
	Missing	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0
Mean		2.61	2.59	2.52	2.48	2.61	2.02	2.43	2.53	3.43
Std. Error of Mean		.252	.221	.282	.222	.274	.237	.229	.304	.269
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	4
Std. Deviation		1.086	.954	1.167	.958	1.181	1.034	.931	1.329	1.162
Skewness		.115	.506	.148	.444	.563	1.065	1.162	.039	-.530
Std. Error of Skewness		.528	.528	.548	.528	.528	.523	.557	.523	.528
Kurtosis		-.087	1.078	-.409	.316	-.300	1.032	2.565	-1.601	-.503
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.023	1.023	1.061	1.023	1.023	1.012	1.078	1.012	1.023
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Mesquite		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Providing attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	8	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.00	2.94	2.69	2.33	2.69	2.31	3.33	2.75	3.64
Std. Error of Mean		.298	.268	.377	.567	.536	.521	.439	.477	.394
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.50	2.00	3.05	2.00	3.50
Mode		3	3	3	2	1(a)	2	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		.838	.734	1.062	1.594	1.507	1.507	1.236	1.342	1.108
Skewness		.000	.097	-.678	1.162	.540	1.220	-.168	1.117	-.574
Std. Error of Skewness		.755	.773	.755	.755	.755	.739	.755	.755	.755
Kurtosis		-1.479	-.336	-.170	-.031	-.765	.585	-.369	.036	1.862
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.488	1.533	1.488	1.488	1.488	1.449	1.488	1.488	1.488
Range		2	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N	Valid	234	239	238	236	233	235	234	235
	Missing	8	3	4	5	8	7	7	6
	Mean	3.07	2.98	2.81	2.78	3.06	3.68	3.86	3.98
	Std. Error of Mean	.071	.081	.074	.077	.077	.073	.068	.064
	Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	Mode	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
	Std. Deviation	1.082	1.257	1.148	1.181	1.171	1.114	1.043	.983
	Skewness	-.161	-.081	.028	.133	-.314	-.732	-.869	-.868
	Std. Error of Skewness	.159	.158	.158	.158	.159	.159	.159	.159
	Kurtosis	-.302	-.967	-.800	-.694	-.740	-.026	.405	.399
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	.317	.314	.314	.315	.317	.316	.317	.316
	Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents and terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	230	233	227	234	236	235	235	235	238
Missing	12	8	14	7	6	7	7	7	4
Mean	2.81	3.03	3.05	3.19	3.68	3.87	3.05	2.84	3.13
Std. Error of Mean	.078	.079	.079	.071	.071	.068	.076	.083	.078
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Std. Deviation	1.182	1.212	1.189	1.082	1.084	1.047	1.162	1.271	1.198
Skewness	.162	-.107	-.046	-.172	-.412	-.742	-.062	.012	-.324
Std. Error of Skewness	.161	.159	.161	.159	.158	.159	.159	.159	.158
Kurtosis	-.656	-.847	-.799	-.644	-.641	-.072	-.704	-1.036	-.681
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.320	.317	.321	.317	.316	.316	.316	.316	.314
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N	Valid	178	182	180	177	170	174	175	175
	Missing	4	0	2	5	12	9	7	7
	Mean	2.95	2.89	2.79	2.59	3.03	3.79	3.88	3.99
	Std. Error of Mean	.073	.085	.083	.089	.093	.080	.078	.073
	Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	Mode	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
	Std. Deviation	.973	1.141	1.109	1.186	1.212	1.056	1.034	.964
	Skewness	-.062	-.030	.112	.260	-.230	-.887	-.974	-.926
	Std. Error of Skewness	.182	.180	.181	.182	.186	.184	.183	.183
	Kurtosis	-.057	-.747	-.494	-.761	-.762	.536	.743	.818
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	.362	.358	.360	.363	.370	.367	.365	.365
	Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents and terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	177	177	176	176	173	174	179	170	173
Missing	6	5	7	6	9	8	3	12	9
Mean	2.94	2.98	2.93	3.07	3.66	3.73	2.97	2.90	3.04
Std. Error of Mean	.083	.084	.086	.085	.070	.069	.086	.098	.082
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Std. Deviation	1.098	1.111	1.142	1.131	.922	.916	1.147	1.281	1.084
Skewness	.051	-.100	-.004	-.169	-.427	-.566	.054	.015	-.059
Std. Error of Skewness	.183	.183	.183	.183	.185	.184	.181	.186	.184
Kurtosis	-.501	-.615	-.795	-.587	.001	.111	-.644	-1.030	-.553
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.364	.363	.365	.364	.367	.366	.361	.370	.367
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N	Valid	63	64	63	64	63	64	64	60
	Missing	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	4
	Mean	3.08	2.96	2.75	2.53	3.01	3.59	3.66	3.79
	Std. Error of Mean	.143	.143	.124	.160	.179	.123	.138	.126
	Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	Mode	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	4
	Std. Deviation	1.131	1.145	.988	1.278	1.416	.982	1.104	.977
	Skewness	-.072	-.069	.301	.413	-.114	-.646	-.735	-.959
	Std. Error of Skewness	.302	.299	.301	.300	.302	.299	.299	.309
	Kurtosis	-.291	-.705	-.203	-.922	-1.244	.426	.205	1.219
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	.596	.590	.594	.592	.597	.590	.590	.608
	Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents and terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
Valid	64	62	63	64	63	64	62	63	62
Missing	0	2	2	0	1	0	2	1	2
Mean	2.69	2.78	2.60	3.25	3.48	3.42	2.99	2.51	2.86
Std. Error of Mean	.138	.151	.147	.171	.151	.154	.157	.173	.146
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Mode	3	3	3	5	4	4	3	1	3
Std. Deviation	1.103	1.187	1.159	1.366	1.200	1.229	1.237	1.369	1.150
Skewness	.336	.260	.184	-.152	-.405	-.478	-.215	.360	.209
Std. Error of Skewness	.300	.304	.302	.300	.301	.300	.304	.302	.304
Kurtosis	-.124	-.646	-.540	-1.191	-.727	-.786	-.911	-1.147	-.514
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.592	.599	.597	.592	.594	.592	.599	.596	.599
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson	Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N	83	84	81	83	79	77	80	83
Valid								
Missing	1	0	3	1	5	7	5	1
Mean	3.09	3.13	2.87	2.89	3.33	3.80	3.70	3.69
Std. Error of Mean	.099	.121	.100	.104	.114	.094	.096	.121
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation	.903	1.106	.899	.952	1.010	.821	.859	1.100
Skewness	-.773	-.096	.042	.191	-.076	-.419	-.305	-.896
Std. Error of Skewness	.264	.262	.267	.264	.270	.274	.270	.264
Kurtosis	.495	-.510	-.134	.047	-.442	.171	.102	.493
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.522	.519	.528	.522	.535	.541	.533	.522
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents and terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	79	81	84	78	80	79	79	79	81
Missing	6	4	0	6	5	5	5	5	3
Mean	2.59	3.07	3.00	3.12	3.62	3.75	3.04	2.70	3.16
Std. Error of Mean	.109	.105	.112	.100	.102	.109	.123	.132	.101
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	4
Std. Deviation	.966	.947	1.023	.886	.913	.973	1.093	1.173	.912
Skewness	-.156	.033	-.106	-.078	-.628	-.929	-.202	.126	-.737
Std. Error of Skewness	.271	.268	.263	.272	.270	.270	.270	.270	.267
Kurtosis	-.555	-.133	-.297	-.343	.772	1.105	-.323	-.666	-.085
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.536	.530	.521	.538	.533	.535	.535	.535	.528
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Boulder City		Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N	Valid	18	19	19	19	19	19	19	18
	Missing	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mean		3.28	3.13	3.06	2.92	3.06	3.93	4.19	4.34
Std. Error of Mean		.166	.219	.235	.277	.263	.216	.147	.148
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	4	2	3	2	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		.696	.956	1.026	1.195	1.149	.931	.643	.630
Skewness		.107	-.545	.248	.275	.362	-.779	-.810	-.387
Std. Error of Skewness		.542	.523	.523	.528	.523	.528	.523	.536
Kurtosis		4.222	-.105	-.677	-.469	-1.092	.210	3.009	-.469
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.049	1.012	1.012	1.023	1.012	1.023	1.012	1.038
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Boulder City (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents and terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	19	19	19	17	19	18	19	18	18
Missing	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1
Mean	2.95	3.15	2.78	2.76	3.93	4.01	2.74	2.44	2.92
Std. Error of Mean	.204	.265	.248	.271	.178	.210	.290	.229	.235
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.86	2.00	3.00
Mode	3	3	3	2	4	4	2	2	3
Std. Deviation	.879	1.146	1.084	1.116	.776	.895	1.268	.976	1.002
Skewness	.101	-.221	-.149	.534	.119	-.622	.196	.430	-.062
Std. Error of Skewness	.528	.528	.523	.551	.523	.534	.523	.534	.534
Kurtosis	-.320	-.047	-.164	-.075	-1.248	-.115	-1.023	-.685	.126
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.023	1.023	1.012	1.065	1.012	1.033	1.012	1.033	1.033
Range	4	4	4	4	2	3	4	3	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Mesquite		Providing crime prevention programs	Enforcing traffic laws	Maintaining a low crime rate	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	Keeping police response times low	Keeping fire department response times low	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.00	3.76	3.18	3.72	3.64	3.42	3.84	4.14
Std. Error of Mean		.349	.383	.280	.367	.402	.261	.287	.299
Median		3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	3	4	4	3	4	5
Std. Deviation		.981	1.109	.811	1.032	1.131	.734	.831	.841
Skewness		.000	-.814	-.394	-1.158	-.631	.360	-.481	-.306
Std. Error of Skewness		.755	.739	.739	.755	.755	.755	.739	.755
Kurtosis		1.675	2.006	6.593	4.121	-.728	1.206	1.042	-1.423
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.488	1.449	1.449	1.488	1.488	1.488	1.449	1.488
Range		4	4	4	4	3	3	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance for Selected Services
Importance scores for Public Services
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Mesquite (cont)	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents and terrorist events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection and prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	7	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Missing	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	2.43	2.82	2.75	3.40	3.61	3.98	3.22	3.08	3.17
Std. Error of Mean	.522	.341	.354	.248	.310	.286	.295	.414	.192
Median	2.28	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	1(a)	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Std. Deviation	1.427	.931	.997	.719	.898	.827	.854	1.165	.540
Skewness	.829	-.253	.118	.462	-.573	.046	.272	.594	3.651
Std. Error of Skewness	.773	.773	.755	.739	.739	.739	.739	.755	.755
Kurtosis	.402	5.649	2.707	1.278	.503	-1.407	.407	1.015	16.710
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.533	1.533	1.488	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.488	1.488
Range	4	4	4	3	3	2	3	4	2
Minimum	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	1	3
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N	Valid	234	236	236	233	232	241
	Missing	8	6	5	9	10	0
Mean		2.49	2.45	2.92	3.15	3.17	2.47
Std. Error of Mean		.077	.080	.077	.078	.082	.079
Median		2.55	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
Mode		3	1	3	3	3	2
Std. Deviation		1.178	1.234	1.187	1.193	1.244	1.234
Skewness		.372	.409	.061	-.238	-.195	.557
Std. Error of Skewness		.159	.159	.158	.159	.160	.157
Kurtosis		-.636	-.774	-.721	-.752	-.820	-.578
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.317	.316	.315	.318	.319	.312
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Unincorporated Clark County (cont)	Access to free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	239	241	236	236	237	239
Missing	3	0	6	5	5	3
Mean	3.04	2.91	2.58	2.80	3.39	3.50
Std. Error of Mean	.076	.078	.074	.086	.077	.072
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.87	4.00
Mode	3	3	3	3	4	4
Std. Deviation	1.180	1.217	1.139	1.323	1.181	1.114
Skewness	-.104	-.027	.232	.184	-.446	-.653
Std. Error of Skewness	.158	.157	.158	.158	.158	.157
Kurtosis	-.746	-.879	-.673	-1.020	-.538	-.101
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.314	.312	.316	.315	.315	.314
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N	Valid	169	178	177	178	173	180
	Missing	14	4	5	4	9	2
Mean		2.59	2.37	2.95	3.17	3.27	2.36
Std. Error of Mean		.080	.091	.085	.080	.087	.087
Median		3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
Mode		3	1	3	3	3	2
Std. Deviation		1.044	1.208	1.135	1.064	1.141	1.169
Skewness		.234	.426	.016	-.154	-.316	.552
Std. Error of Skewness		.187	.182	.183	.182	.185	.181
Kurtosis		-.379	-.914	-.658	-.376	-.558	-.496
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.372	.362	.363	.362	.367	.360
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas (cont)	Access to free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	176	180	181	171	178	174
Missing	6	2	2	11	5	8
Mean	3.04	2.82	2.47	2.61	3.35	3.45
Std. Error of Mean	.084	.085	.080	.095	.089	.091
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode	3	3	3	3	4	4
Std. Deviation	1.111	1.148	1.071	1.238	1.189	1.198
Skewness	-.171	.131	.256	.345	-.371	-.489
Std. Error of Skewness	.183	.181	.181	.186	.182	.184
Kurtosis	-.683	-.616	-.461	-.806	-.657	-.591
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.364	.360	.360	.369	.363	.366
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N	Valid	63	63	62	62	64	62
	Missing	1	1	2	2	0	2
Mean		2.53	2.25	2.87	3.26	3.25	2.19
Std. Error of Mean		.132	.138	.148	.116	.134	.141
Median		3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
Mode		3	3	2	3	4	1
Std. Deviation		1.049	1.097	1.165	.913	1.067	1.110
Skewness		.107	.636	.150	-.366	-.365	.491
Std. Error of Skewness		.302	.302	.304	.304	.300	.305
Kurtosis		-.647	-.003	-.821	.239	-.464	-.832
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.596	.596	.600	.599	.592	.601
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas (cont)	Access to free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	64	64	61	64	62	64
Missing	0	0	4	0	2	0
Mean	3.17	2.60	2.35	2.53	3.34	3.61
Std. Error of Mean	.163	.144	.136	.167	.153	.160
Median	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.53	4.00
Mode	4	3	2	1	4	5
Std. Deviation	1.303	1.151	1.056	1.341	1.203	1.281
Skewness	-.103	-.056	.384	.398	-.512	-.554
Std. Error of Skewness	.300	.299	.307	.299	.304	.300
Kurtosis	-1.193	-.974	-.716	-1.081	-.475	-.720
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.592	.590	.606	.590	.599	.592
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N	Valid	81	84	82	81	82	81
	Missing	4	0	2	3	2	3
Mean		2.75	2.71	3.02	3.20	3.31	2.63
Std. Error of Mean		.103	.124	.122	.099	.120	.134
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		.924	1.136	1.108	.888	1.089	1.209
Skewness		-.071	.113	-.255	-.159	-.514	.151
Std. Error of Skewness		.268	.262	.265	.267	.265	.267
Kurtosis		.119	-.691	-.434	.644	.086	-.924
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.530	.519	.525	.528	.525	.528
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson (cont)	Access to free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	84	83	84	83	81	84
Missing	0	2	0	2	3	0
Mean	3.39	3.15	2.71	2.85	3.58	3.62
Std. Error of Mean	.124	.117	.117	.139	.119	.124
Median	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	3	3	3	3	4	4
Std. Deviation	1.131	1.066	1.077	1.261	1.071	1.135
Skewness	-.362	-.029	.108	.044	-.664	-.811
Std. Error of Skewness	.263	.265	.262	.265	.267	.263
Kurtosis	-.320	-.463	-.339	-.880	.191	.190
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.521	.524	.519	.524	.528	.521
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Boulder City		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N	Valid	19	19	18	19	19	19
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		2.28	3.27	2.32	2.92	2.82	2.31
Std. Error of Mean		.247	.351	.227	.226	.214	.304
Median		2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
Mode		2	5	3	3	3	1
Std. Deviation		1.077	1.533	.954	.976	.934	1.310
Skewness		.487	-.136	-.040	-.090	.802	.880
Std. Error of Skewness		.523	.523	.540	.528	.523	.528
Kurtosis		-.284	-1.520	-.907	.370	.741	-.024
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.012	1.012	1.044	1.023	1.012	1.023
Range		4	4	3	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	4	5	5	5

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

Boulder City (cont)	Access to free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	18	19	18	19	19	19
Missing	1	0	2	0	0	0
Mean	2.93	3.43	2.99	2.39	3.03	3.99
Std. Error of Mean	.275	.223	.250	.248	.216	.241
Median	3.00	3.14	3.00	2.14	3.00	4.00
Mode	3	3	3	3	3	5
Std. Deviation	1.166	.973	1.045	1.085	.943	1.051
Skewness	.218	-.246	.076	.260	-.270	-.611
Std. Error of Skewness	.536	.523	.542	.523	.523	.523
Kurtosis	-.032	.017	.201	-.524	-.386	-.835
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.038	1.012	1.049	1.012	1.012	1.012
Range	4	4	4	4	4	3
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	2
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Mesquite		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion
N	Valid	7	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.61	2.31	2.53	2.69	3.45	3.05
Std. Error of Mean		.370	.474	.479	.370	.420	.339
Median		2.73	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	2	2	2	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.012	1.333	1.349	1.071	1.216	.981
Skewness		-.037	.885	.436	.414	.281	-.131
Std. Error of Skewness		.773	.755	.755	.739	.739	.739
Kurtosis		-.497	-.113	-1.014	-1.640	-1.493	1.273
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.533	1.488	1.488	1.449	1.449	1.449
Range		3	4	4	3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	1
Maximum		4	5	5	4	5	5

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

Mesquite (cont)	Access to free ways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	8	8	8	8	8	8
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	2.54	2.74	3.31	2.67	2.74	2.61
Std. Error of Mean	.463	.461	.456	.475	.337	.393
Median	2.10	3.00	3.00	2.95	3.00	3.00
Mode	2	4	3	1(a)	3	3
Std. Deviation	1.340	1.334	1.284	1.337	.975	1.138
Skewness	.655	-.078	.081	.058	.656	.224
Std. Error of Skewness	.739	.739	.755	.755	.739	.739
Kurtosis	-.081	-1.183	-.582	-1.072	1.797	.550
Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.449	1.449	1.488	1.488	1.449	1.449
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5

This page intentionally left blank


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 and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth
N	Valid	582	594	596	599	591	594	599	592	598
	Missing	17	5	3	1	9	6	1	8	2
Mean		3.98	3.99	3.83	3.96	3.44	3.56	4.04	3.76	3.84
Std. Error of Mean		.049	.050	.044	.044	.054	.055	.047	.049	.052
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.187	1.220	1.073	1.075	1.323	1.346	1.157	1.202	1.268
Variance		1.409	1.489	1.151	1.156	1.751	1.813	1.338	1.444	1.607
Skewness		-.978	-1.107	-.719	-.789	-.396	-.443	-1.078	-.717	-.886
Std. Error of Skewness		.101	.100	.100	.100	.101	.100	.100	.100	.100
Kurtosis		.064	.272	-.065	-.211	-.940	-1.028	.257	-.420	-.293
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.202	.200	.200	.199	.201	.200	.199	.200	.199
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

	1	2	3	4	5	DK/ No answer	Total
Preparing for a man-made disaster	5.6	5.2	20.4	20.8	45.2	2.9	100.0
Quality of drinking water	7.1	5.3	15.6	24.7	46.3	0.9	100.0
Recreational opportunities	3.6	7.1	23.9	32.8	32.0	0.6	100.0
Condition of streets and roads	2.3	8.6	20.0	28.9	40.0	0.2	100.0
Availability of public transportation	11.3	12.1	25.5	21.6	28.0	1.5	100.0
Housing affordability	9.3	13.9	23.2	17.1	35.6	0.9	100.0
Air Quality	4.7	6.7	16.4	23.8	48.3	0.2	100.0
Availability of job opportunities	5.9	10.1	20.1	28.5	34.1	1.3	100.0
Managing growth	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9	100.0




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

**Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations**

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

	Frequency	Percent
Support	123	20.5
Oppose	457	76.2
Total	580	96.7
DK/No answer	20	3.3
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations

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

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	51	8.5
Agree	90	15.1
Disagree	158	26.3
Strongly disagree	285	47.5
Total	583	97.3
DK/No answer	16	2.7
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations

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

	Frequency	Percent
Positive effect	56	9.3
No effect	100	16.7
Negative effect	430	71.7
Total	586	97.8
DK/No answer	13	2.2
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations

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

	Frequency	Percent
Scenery/geography/climate	131	21.9
Family/friends/friendly people	84	14.0
Entertainment/social climate	68	11.3
Quiet/peaceful	31	5.1
Personal/family safety	57	9.5
Job opportunities	115	19.2
Education	32	5.3
Growth	12	2.0
Low taxes	10	1.7
Strong economy	8	1.3
Nothing	32	5.4
Total	580	96.7
DK/No answer	20	3.3
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations

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

	Frequency	Percent
Traffic Congestion	91	15.3
Overcrowding/unplanned growth	147	24.4
Cost of living/housing	45	7.6
Road conditions	20	3.4
Crime/violence/gangs	112	18.6
Air quality	41	6.8
Drought conditions	48	8.0
Education	13	2.1
Gaming	11	1.8
Illegal Immigration	5	.9
Political corruption	3	.5
Yucca Mountain	2	.3
Inadequate social services	2	.3
Water quality	6	.9
Weather/heat	21	3.5
Job market	2	.3
Nothing	20	3.4
Total	589	98.2
DK/No answer	11	1.8
Total	600	100.0




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

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	45	7.4
Less traffic congestion	80	13.3
Improve K-12 education	76	12.6
Improve higher education	19	3.1
Better services for the homeless	9	1.5
More efficient government/government officials	47	7.8
Stop growth	57	9.5
Slow growth	74	12.3
Better jobs/training	27	4.5
Increased access to health care	19	3.2
Lower crime rates	73	12.2
Stop Yucca Mountain	46	7.7
Improve air quality	5	.9
Stop illegal immigration	8	1.3
No change	12	2.0
Total	596	99.3
DK/No answer	4	.7
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix III Quality of Life Considerations

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

	Frequency	Percent
Getting better	112	18.7
Staying about the same	201	33.6
Getting worse	277	46.3
Total	591	98.6
DK/No answer	9	1.4
Total	600	100.0



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

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Recreational opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth
N	Valid	233	240	241	241	239	240	241	240	241
	Missing	9	2	0	0	2	2	1	2	0
Mean		4.12	3.97	3.91	3.93	3.52	3.65	4.03	3.83	3.84
Std. Error of Mean		.069	.080	.071	.072	.088	.089	.074	.076	.081
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.057	1.243	1.096	1.119	1.361	1.380	1.154	1.177	1.259
Skewness		-1.117	-1.066	-.822	-.765	-.499	-.525	-1.031	-.833	-.828
Std. Error of Skewness		.160	.157	.157	.157	.157	.157	.157	.157	.157
Kurtosis		.607	.106	.053	-.363	-.915	-1.080	.155	-.159	-.382
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.318	.313	.312	.312	.313	.313	.313	.313	.312
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 Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Recreational opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth
N	Valid	179	179	180	182	178	181	182	180	181
	Missing	3	4	2	0	4	2	0	2	1
Mean		3.83	4.01	3.77	3.91	3.28	3.28	3.97	3.68	3.84
Std. Error of Mean		.094	.093	.080	.080	.098	.100	.088	.092	.096
Median		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	4	5	3	3	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.264	1.245	1.078	1.080	1.305	1.338	1.189	1.233	1.287
Skewness		-.755	-1.192	-.825	-.674	-.277	-.197	-.991	-.723	-.873
Std. Error of Skewness		.181	.182	.181	.180	.182	.181	.180	.181	.181
Kurtosis		-.422	.427	.261	-.475	-.939	-1.075	.041	-.382	-.371
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.361	.361	.360	.358	.362	.360	.358	.360	.359
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 Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Recreational opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth
N	Valid	62	64	63	64	63	63	64	62	64
	Missing	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	0
Mean		3.86	3.67	3.80	3.88	3.43	3.55	3.88	3.64	3.56
Std. Error of Mean		.188	.169	.137	.149	.178	.170	.161	.161	.181
Median		4.81	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.473	1.357	1.088	1.194	1.414	1.350	1.293	1.268	1.449
Skewness		-1.013	-.881	-.574	-.785	-.288	-.575	-.880	-.471	-.683
Std. Error of Skewness		.305	.299	.301	.299	.302	.301	.299	.304	.299
Kurtosis		-.472	-.292	-.464	-.316	-1.235	-.763	-.304	-1.010	-.902
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.601	.590	.595	.590	.596	.594	.590	.599	.590
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 Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Recreational opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth
N	Valid	82	84	84	84	83	83	84	84	84
	Missing	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Mean		3.96	4.18	3.80	4.16	3.55	3.84	4.30	3.80	4.01
Std. Error of Mean		.121	.110	.110	.094	.130	.130	.111	.126	.118
Median		4.00	4.05	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.095	1.013	1.006	.860	1.185	1.183	1.016	1.156	1.085
Skewness		-.828	-1.160	-.547	-.950	-.551	-.684	-1.619	-.714	-1.186
Std. Error of Skewness		.265	.262	.262	.262	.264	.264	.262	.262	.262
Kurtosis		.074	.579	-.251	1.056	-.478	-.497	2.194	-.282	.988
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.525	.519	.519	.519	.522	.522	.519	.519	.519
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 Statistic by Jurisdiction

Boulder City		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Recreational opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth
N	Valid	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	18	19
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Mean		3.76	3.76	3.51	4.09	3.07	3.51	4.07	3.35	4.17
Std. Error of Mean		.307	.234	.220	.207	.272	.306	.228	.278	.258
Median		4.00	3.86	3.59	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	5.00
Mode		5	3	3(a)	4	3	3(a)	5	3	5
Std. Deviation		1.325	1.024	.960	.904	1.189	1.337	.998	1.167	1.126
Skewness		-.639	-.238	-.007	-.969	.187	-.099	-.826	.123	-.894
Std. Error of Skewness		.528	.523	.523	.523	.523	.523	.523	.542	.523
Kurtosis		-.801	-.258	-.760	.693	-.705	-1.249	.613	-.962	-.809
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.023	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.049	1.012
Range		4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3
Minimum		1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Mesquite		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Recreational opportunities	Condition of streets and roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.52	4.89	3.91	4.20	3.94	4.60	4.78	4.55	3.76
Std. Error of Mean		.229	.114	.392	.340	.458	.342	.194	.343	.536
Median		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.91	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.645	.330	1.134	.983	1.324	.961	.560	.966	1.550
Skewness		-1.083	-3.124	-.448	-.512	-1.715	-2.440	-2.966	-2.193	-1.245
Std. Error of Skewness		.755	.739	.739	.739	.739	.755	.739	.755	.739
Kurtosis		.897	10.217	-1.254	-2.131	3.032	6.032	10.791	4.841	.501
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.488	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.488	1.449	1.488	1.449
Range		2	1	3	2	4	3	2	3	4
Minimum		3	4	2	3	1	2	3	2	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix IV
General Economic Considerations


**Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
(Summary Statistics)**

		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse of financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?
N	Valid	598	593	581	584
	Missing	2	7	19	16
Mean		1.95	1.75	2.19	1.81
Std. Error of Mean		.029	.027	.031	.024
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mode		2	2	2	2
Std. Deviation		.701	.648	.755	.587
Skewness		.071	.299	.197	.063
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.101	.101
Kurtosis		-.963	-.718	-.312	-.332
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.200	.200	.202	.202
Range		2	2	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3

Appendix IV General Economic Conditions

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

	Frequency	Percent
Better	163	27.2
About the same	303	50.5
Worse	132	22.1
Total	598	99.7
DK/No answer	2	.3
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix IV General Economic Conditions

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

	Frequency	Percent
Better	218	36.3
About the same	307	51.1
Worse	69	11.4
Total	593	98.9
DK/No answer	7	1.1
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix IV General Economic Conditions

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

	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	98	16.4
Good	295	49.1
Fair	166	27.7
Poor	22	3.7
Total	581	96.9
DK/No answer	19	3.1
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix IV General Economic Conditions

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

	Frequency	Percent
Better	165	27.6
About the same	363	60.5
Worse	56	9.4
Total	584	97.4
DK/No answer	16	2.6
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions

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

	Frequency	Percent
Good time	332	55.4
Bad time	244	40.7
Total	576	96.1
DK/No answer	23	3.9
Total	600	100.0



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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse of financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	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?	Would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	A year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid Missing	242 0	241 1	236 6	236 6	235 7
Mean		2.03	1.69	2.23	1.86	1.46
Std. Error of Mean		.046	.041	.049	.040	.033
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		.717	.643	.757	.621	.499
Skewness		-.047	.393	.101	.104	.175
Std. Error of Skewness		.157	.157	.158	.158	.159
Kurtosis		-1.044	-.699	-.407	-.468	-1.986
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.312	.313	.316	.316	.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 Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		.Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse of financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	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?	Would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	A year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	181	177	174	174	173
	Missing	2	5	8	8	9
Mean		1.86	1.76	2.16	1.80	1.37
Std. Error of Mean		.050	.049	.056	.043	.037
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		.668	.653	.738	.574	.484
Skewness		.166	.297	.368	.024	.540
Std. Error of Skewness		.181	.182	.184	.184	.184
Kurtosis		-.763	-.721	.065	-.258	-1.728
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.360	.363	.366	.366	.367
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

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

City of North Las Vegas		Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse of financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	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?	Would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	A year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	64	64	61	63	62
	Missing	0	0	4	2	2
Mean		2.04	1.91	2.13	1.89	1.50
Std. Error of Mean		.085	.079	.096	.069	.064
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.22
Mode		2	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		.680	.636	.744	.548	.504
Skewness		-.049	.071	.178	-.072	.018
Std. Error of Skewness		.299	.299	.307	.302	.304
Kurtosis		-.771	-.462	-.310	.331	-2.067
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.590	.590	.606	.597	.599
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse of financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	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?	Would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	A year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	84	84	83	84	81
	Missing	0	0	2	0	3
Mean		1.80	1.71	2.10	1.65	1.32
Std. Error of Mean		.076	.072	.081	.064	.052
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Mode		2	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		.699	.657	.740	.585	.470
Skewness		.290	.383	.201	.256	.774
Std. Error of Skewness		.263	.262	.265	.263	.267
Kurtosis		-.909	-.713	-.309	-.662	-1.437
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.521	.519	.524	.521	.528
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Boulder City		Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse of financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	A year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	A year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	19	19	19	19	17
	Missing	0	0	0	0	2
Mean		2.05	1.97	2.37	1.92	1.53
Std. Error of Mean		.171	.129	.175	.064	.124
Median		2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.95
Mode		2	2	3	2	2
Std. Deviation		.745	.557	.764	.279	.515
Skewness		-.078	-.027	-.773	-3.362	-.116
Std. Error of Skewness		.523	.528	.523	.523	.548
Kurtosis		-1.056	.927	-.757	10.385	-2.268
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.012	1.023	1.012	1.012	1.061
Range		2	2	2	1	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	2	2

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

Mesquite		Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse of financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	A year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.95	1.89	2.75	1.71	1.83
Std. Error of Mean		.267	.250	.373	.167	.143
Median		2.00	2.00	2.91	2.00	2.00
Mode		2	2	2	2	2
Std. Deviation		.771	.724	1.079	.484	.402
Skewness		.100	.168	-.139	-1.139	-2.192
Std. Error of Skewness		.739	.739	.739	.739	.755
Kurtosis		-.908	-.411	-1.149	-1.022	3.698
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.488
Range		2	2	3	1	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	2	2

This page intentionally left blank

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

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

		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse of financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?			Total
		Better	About the same	Worse	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	58	118	66	242
		24.0%	48.8%	27.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	54	97	29	180
		30.0%	53.9%	16.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	13	35	16	64
		20.3%	54.7%	25.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	30	40	14	84
		35.7%	47.6%	16.7%	100.0%
	Boulder City	5	9	5	19
		26.3%	47.4%	26.3%	100.0%
	Mesquite	2	4	2	8
		25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Total		162	303	132	597
		27.1%	50.8%	22.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.170(a)	10	.214
Likelihood Ratio	13.272	10	.209
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.389	1	.122
N of Valid Cases	597		

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

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

		Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse or about the same?			Total
		Better	About the same	Worse	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	99	118	24	241
		41.1%	49.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	65	91	21	177
		36.7%	51.4%	11.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	16	38	10	64
		25.0%	59.4%	15.6%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	34	41	9	84
		40.5%	48.8%	10.7%	100.0%
	Boulder City	3	13	2	18
		16.7%	72.2%	11.1%	100.0%
	Mesquite	2	4	2	8
		25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Total		219	305	68	592
		37.0%	51.5%	11.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.654(a)	10	.309
Likelihood Ratio	11.901	10	.292
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.280	1	.070
N of Valid Cases	592		

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

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

		Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?				Total
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	38	115	75	9	237
		16.0%	48.5%	31.6%	3.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	28	97	41	7	173
		16.2%	56.1%	23.7%	4.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	12	31	16	2	61
		19.7%	50.8%	26.2%	3.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	17	43	21	2	83
		20.5%	51.8%	25.3%	2.4%	100.0%
	Boulder City	3	6	10	0	19
		15.8%	31.6%	52.6%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	1	3	2	3	9
		11.1%	33.3%	22.2%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		99	295	165	23	582
		17.0%	50.7%	28.4%	4.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.043(a)	15	.006
Likelihood Ratio	20.228	15	.163
Linear-by-Linear Association	.008	1	.930
N of Valid Cases	582		

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

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

		And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?			Total
		Better	About the same	Worse	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	65	141	31	237
		27.4%	59.5%	13.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	49	110	15	174
		28.2%	63.2%	8.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	13	43	6	62
		21.0%	69.4%	9.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	34	45	5	84
		40.5%	53.6%	6.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	2	18	0	20
		10.0%	90.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	2	6	0	8
		25.0%	75.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		165	363	57	585
		28.2%	62.1%	9.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.495(a)	10	.034
Likelihood Ratio	22.238	10	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.668	1	.102
N of Valid Cases	585		

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

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

		Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?		Total
		Good time	Bad time	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	127	107	234
		54.3%	45.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	109	64	173
		63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	31	31	62
		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	55	26	81
		67.9%	32.1%	100.0%
	Boulder City	8	9	17
		47.1%	52.9%	100.0%
	Mesquite	1	7	8
		12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
Total		331	244	575
		57.6%	42.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.549(a)	5	.008
Likelihood Ratio	16.076	5	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.999
N of Valid Cases	575		

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix V
Property Value Considerations

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

		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	590	596	589	581	594	593	584	589	594
	Missing	9	3	10	19	5	6	15	11	6
Mean		1.88	2.41	1.12	1.66	2.61	1.94	1.81	1.09	1.16
Std. Error of Mean		.036	.027	.016	.032	.025	.037	.036	.016	.018
Median		2.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		.873	.671	.400	.773	.619	.894	.859	.380	.444
Skewness		.227	-.696	3.430	.678	-1.363	.115	.367	4.203	2.910
Std. Error of Skewness		.101	.100	.101	.101	.100	.100	.101	.101	.100
Kurtosis		-1.651	-.612	11.445	-1.015	.723	-1.742	-1.548	17.032	7.879
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.201	.200	.201	.202	.200	.200	.202	.201	.200
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


Appendix V
Property Value Conditions

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

	Frequency	Percent
Positive effect	56	9.3
No effect	100	16.7
Negative effect	430	71.7
Total	586	97.8
DK/No answer	13	2.2
Total	600	100.0

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions

	Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	DK/No answer	Total
Amusement Park	43.8	22.3	32.4	1.6	100.0
Day care Center	10.4	38.3	50.8	0.6	100.0
Landfill	88.8	6.9	2.6	1.7	100.0
Non-polluting manufacturing facility	51.3	27.6	18.0	3.1	100.0
Public School	7.2	23.9	68.0	0.9	100.0
Highway/ Freeway	42.6	19.6	36.8	1.1	100.0
Hotel/Casino	46.6	22.3	28.5	2.6	100.0
Polluting Manufacturing Facility	91.9	3.5	2.9	1.8	100.0
High-level nuclear Waste Transportation Route	86.6	9.2	3.2	1.0	100.0



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

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Positive or negative effect of Yucca Mountain on quality of life	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
		Valid	240	241	240	232	240	240	240	236	238
N	Missing	6	2	0	2	10	2	2	2	6	4
Mean		2.71	1.98	2.46	1.19	1.64	2.65	1.99	1.85	1.10	1.14
Std. Error of Mean		.038	.057	.044	.033	.050	.038	.058	.058	.026	.029
Median		3.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		3	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		.591	.888	.684	.507	.760	.581	.893	.903	.392	.443
Skewness		-1.932	.031	-.876	2.666	.716	-1.436	.013	.298	4.006	3.206
Std. Error of Skewness		.159	.157	.157	.157	.160	.157	.157	.157	.159	.158
Kurtosis		2.533	-1.738	-.435	6.090	-.921	1.056	-1.752	-1.713	15.496	9.592
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.316	.313	.312	.313	.319	.313	.313	.313	.316	.314
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		Positive or negative effect of Yucca Mountain on quality of life	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	179	177	181	178	178	181	181	179
	Missing	4	5	1	4	4	1	1	4	2	0
	Mean	2.60	1.83	2.32	1.10	1.66	2.53	1.96	1.83	1.09	1.18
	Std. Error of Mean	.051	.064	.049	.024	.058	.050	.066	.062	.028	.034
	Median	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
	Mode	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
	Std. Deviation	.682	.854	.661	.320	.779	.669	.888	.834	.370	.460
	Skewness	-1.425	.340	-.464	3.250	.676	-1.118	.085	.335	4.412	2.596
	Std. Error of Skewness	.182	.182	.180	.182	.182	.181	.181	.182	.181	.180
	Kurtosis	.621	-1.549	-.731	10.538	-1.032	.025	-1.735	-1.483	19.021	6.176
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	.361	.363	.359	.362	.362	.359	.359	.361	.360	.358
	Range	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Positive or negative effect of Yucca Mountain on quality of life	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
		Valid	Missing								
N	61	3	63	64	62	62	64	63	60	64	64
Mean	2.66		1.85	2.51	1.04	1.69	2.61	1.79	1.73	1.16	1.10
Std. Error of Mean	.082		.106	.087	.029	.099	.082	.115	.104	.063	.038
Median	3.00		2.00	3.00	1.00	1.49	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
Mode	3		1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation	.642		.840	.694	.230	.777	.656	.912	.803	.501	.307
Skewness	-1.680		.287	-	6.592	.610	-1.477	.444	.525	3.065	2.673
Std. Error of Skewness	.306		.301	1.087	.304	.304	.300	.301	.309	.299	.300
Kurtosis	1.571		-1.530	-.092	48.149	-1.072	.937	-1.675	-1.246	8.398	5.310
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.603		.595	.590	.599	.599	.592	.595	.609	.590	.592
Range	2		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
Minimum	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	3		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Positive or negative effect of Yucca Mountain on quality of life	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	84	83	82	82	82	83	83	81
	Missing	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
	Mean	2.52	1.82	2.43	1.02	1.62	2.76	1.91	1.76	1.04	1.12
	Std. Error of Mean	.077	.099	.065	.018	.085	.054	.097	.091	.030	.041
	Median	3.00	1.20	2.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00
	Mode	3	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
	Std. Deviation	.707	.901	.588	.166	.767	.495	.879	.817	.272	.376
	Skewness	-1.152	.357	-.464	10.911	.766	-1.952	.187	.475	7.255	3.444
	Std. Error of Skewness	.262	.265	.265	.266	.265	.265	.265	.267	.265	.265
	Kurtosis	-.041	-1.690	-.665	126.280	-.876	3.126	-1.694	-1.339	51.895	12.161
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	.519	.524	.525	.526	.525	.524	.524	.528	.525	.524
	Range	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Boulder City		Positive or negative effect of Yucca Mountain on quality of life	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	19	19	19	19	19	19	18	16	19	19
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0
Mean		2.51	1.58	2.21	1.27	1.86	2.30	1.85	1.77	1.02	1.43
Std. Error of Mean		.173	.184	.172	.133	.217	.189	.225	.237	.036	.177
Median		3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.41	2.86	1.23	1.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		3	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		.748	.803	.750	.575	.949	.825	.953	.960	.156	.773
Skewness		-1.214	.950	-.372	2.140	.298	-.650	.329	.519	6.828	1.472
Std. Error of Skewness		.528	.523	.523	.528	.523	.523	.536	.557	.523	.523
Kurtosis		.085	-.685	-	4.099	-1.949	-1.189	-1.952	-1.852	49.865	.558
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.023	1.012	1.023	1.023	1.012	1.012	1.038	1.078	1.012	1.012
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Mesquite		Positive or negative effect of Yucca Mountain on quality of life	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
		Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
N		Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.73	1.71	2.24	1.00	1.73	2.66	1.84	1.67	1.18	1.24
Std. Error of Mean		.236	.278	.272	.000	.279	.175	.364	.298	.142	.157
Median		3.00	1.73	2.00	1.00	1.95	3.00	1.00	1.09	1.00	1.00
Mode		3	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		.684	.806	.788	.000	.786	.506	1.052	.861	.412	.453
Skewness		-2.627	.662	-.502		.596	-.809	.403	.833	2.024	1.529
Std. Error of Skewness		.739	.739	.739	.739	.755	.739	.739	.739	.739	.739
Kurtosis		6.980	-.877	-.899		-.754	-1.875	-2.529	-1.011	2.694	.358
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.488	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449
Range		2	2	2	0	2	1	2	2	1	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	2	2

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative affect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.			Total
		Positive effect	No effect	Negative effect	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	17	32	161	210
		8.1%	15.2%	76.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	23	40	146	209
		11.0%	19.1%	69.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	6	12	39	57
		10.5%	21.1%	68.4%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	7	20	52	79
		8.9%	25.3%	65.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	3	5	14	22
		13.6%	22.7%	63.6%	100.0%
	Mesquite	2	1	7	10
		20.0%	10.0%	70.0%	100.0%
Total		58	110	419	587
		9.9%	18.7%	71.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.864(a)	10	.642
Likelihood Ratio	7.605	10	.667
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.285	1	.070
N of Valid Cases	587		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Amusement Park			Total
		Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	89	51	72	212
		42.0%	24.1%	34.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	106	48	53	207
		51.2%	23.2%	25.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	27	17	15	59
		45.8%	28.8%	25.4%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	42	16	20	78
		53.8%	20.5%	25.6%	100.0%
	Boulder City	15	4	4	23
		65.2%	17.4%	17.4%	100.0%
	Mesquite	4	4	2	10
		40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		283	140	166	589
		48.0%	23.8%	28.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.255(a)	10	.338
Likelihood Ratio	11.041	10	.354
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.960	1	.026
N of Valid Cases	589		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Day care center			Total
		Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	25	70	118	213
		11.7%	32.9%	55.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	29	100	83	212
		13.7%	47.2%	39.2%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	9	18	33	60
		15.0%	30.0%	55.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	3	38	36	77
		3.9%	49.4%	46.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	4	11	8	23
		17.4%	47.8%	34.8%	100.0%
	Mesquite	1	5	4	10
		10.0%	50.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total		71	242	282	595
		11.9%	40.7%	47.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.344(a)	10	.013
Likelihood Ratio	23.965	10	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	.746	1	.388
N of Valid Cases	595		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Landfill			Total
		Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	181	20	11	212
		85.4%	9.4%	5.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	189	18	1	208
		90.9%	8.7%	.5%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	55	2	1	58
		94.8%	3.4%	1.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	74	1	1	76
		97.4%	1.3%	1.3%	100.0%
	Boulder City	16	5	1	22
		72.7%	22.7%	4.5%	100.0%
	Mesquite	10	0	0	10
		100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		525	46	15	586
		89.6%	7.8%	2.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.819(a)	10	.004
Likelihood Ratio	27.860	10	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.994	1	.046
N of Valid Cases	586		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Non-polluting manufacturing facility			Total
		Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	113	57	38	208
		54.3%	27.4%	18.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	115	57	37	209
		55.0%	27.3%	17.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	29	17	11	57
		50.9%	29.8%	19.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	40	21	16	77
		51.9%	27.3%	20.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	11	3	9	23
		47.8%	13.0%	39.1%	100.0%
	Mesquite	4	2	3	9
		44.4%	22.2%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		312	157	114	583
		53.5%	26.9%	19.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.414(a)	10	.588
Likelihood Ratio	7.653	10	.663
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.285	1	.131
N of Valid Cases	583		

a 4 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.76.

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Public school			Total
		Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	16	56	140	212
		7.5%	26.4%	66.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	24	63	124	211
		11.4%	29.9%	58.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	8	12	39	59
		13.6%	20.3%	66.1%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	3	18	57	78
		3.8%	23.1%	73.1%	100.0%
	Boulder City	4	5	14	23
		17.4%	21.7%	60.9%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	4	6	10
		.0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Total		55	158	380	593
		9.3%	26.6%	64.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.986(a)	10	.224
Likelihood Ratio	14.089	10	.169
Linear-by-Linear Association	.144	1	.704
N of Valid Cases	593		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Highway/freeway			Total
		Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	87	45	81	213
		40.8%	21.1%	38.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	94	47	72	213
		44.1%	22.1%	33.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	30	9	20	59
		50.8%	15.3%	33.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	34	15	29	78
		43.6%	19.2%	37.2%	100.0%
	Boulder City	13	2	7	22
		59.1%	9.1%	31.8%	100.0%
	Mesquite	6	0	4	10
		60.0%	.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total		264	118	213	595
		44.4%	19.8%	35.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.190(a)	10	.610
Likelihood Ratio	10.366	10	.409
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.288	1	.256
N of Valid Cases	595		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Hotel-casino			Total
		Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	109	39	64	212
		51.4%	18.4%	30.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	96	61	52	209
		45.9%	29.2%	24.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	28	16	14	58
		48.3%	27.6%	24.1%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	39	23	15	77
		50.6%	29.9%	19.5%	100.0%
	Boulder City	12	3	5	20
		60.0%	15.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	4	2	4	10
		40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total		288	144	154	586
		49.1%	24.6%	26.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.954(a)	10	.288
Likelihood Ratio	12.200	10	.272
Linear-by-Linear Association	.361	1	.548
N of Valid Cases	586		

a 4 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.46.

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: Polluting manufacturing facility			Total
		Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	193	10	7	210
		91.9%	4.8%	3.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	198	6	6	210
		94.3%	2.9%	2.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	52	4	4	60
		86.7%	6.7%	6.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	76	0	1	77
		98.7%	.0%	1.3%	100.0%
	Boulder City	22	1	0	23
		95.7%	4.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	9	1	0	10
		90.0%	10.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		550	22	18	590
		93.2%	3.7%	3.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.416(a)	10	.326
Likelihood Ratio	14.239	10	.162
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.059	1	.303
N of Valid Cases	590		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		For each item please tell me if you believe it would decrease, have no affect, or increase the property value of nearby, privately owned homes: High level nuclear waste transportation route			Total
		Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	187	16	9	212
		88.2%	7.5%	4.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	184	23	6	213
		86.4%	10.8%	2.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	52	7	0	59
		88.1%	11.9%	.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	70	7	1	78
		89.7%	9.0%	1.3%	100.0%
	Boulder City	18	2	3	23
		78.3%	8.7%	13.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	8	2	0	10
		80.0%	20.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		519	57	19	595
		87.2%	9.6%	3.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.036(a)	10	.171
Likelihood Ratio	13.135	10	.216
Linear-by-Linear Association	.142	1	.706
N of Valid Cases	595		

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	594	600	593	598
	Missing	6	0	7	2
Mean		2.69	1.53	3.06	2.96
Std. Error of Mean		.034	.032	.039	.033
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		.823	.793	.950	.805
Skewness		-.098	1.649	-.497	-.296
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.100	.100
Kurtosis		-.563	2.393	-.977	-.608
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.200	.199	.200	.199
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 urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?

	Frequency	Percent
Water quality	102	17.0
Water availability	170	28.3
Air quality	90	15.0
Preservation of natural areas/wildlife	9	1.4
Development of open space	15	2.5
Overpopulation	181	30.2
Litter	15	2.6
Yucca Mountain	10	1.6
Traffic congestion	4	.7
Energy efficiency	4	.6
Total	599	99.8
DK/No answer	1	.2
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix VI Environmental Considerations

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

	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	40	6.6
Good	202	33.6
Fair	255	42.5
Poor	97	16.2
Total	594	99.1
DK/No answer	6	.9
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix VI Environmental Considerations

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	363	60.5
Somewhat concerned	184	30.7
Somewhat unconcerned	22	3.7
Not concerned	30	5.1
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix VI Environmental Considerations

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

	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	32	5.4
Good	154	25.7
Fair	155	25.8
Poor	252	42.0
Total	593	98.8
DK/No answer	7	1.2
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix VI Environmental Considerations

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

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Excellent	19	3.2
	Good	149	24.8
	Fair	267	44.5
	Poor	164	27.3
	Total	598	99.7
Missing	DK/No answer	2	.3
Total		600	100.0



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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural 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 Missing	241 0	239 3	242 0	241 1	242 0
Mean		3.47	2.85	1.51	2.98	2.97
Std. Error of Mean		.148	.051	.049	.061	.050
Median		2.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		2.292	.794	.758	.941	.773
Skewness		.679	-.104	1.631	-.346	-.282
Std. Error of Skewness		.157	.157	.157	.157	.157
Kurtosis		-.671	-.674	2.523	-1.080	-.495
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.312	.314	.312	.313	.312
Range		9	3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		10	4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural 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	182	180	182	176	181
	Missing	0	3	0	6	1
Mean		3.87	2.62	1.54	3.09	2.95
Std. Error of Mean		.157	.061	.063	.072	.060
Median		3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		6	3	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		2.121	.813	.845	.952	.814
Skewness		.321	.003	1.764	-.543	-.134
Std. Error of Skewness		.180	.181	.180	.183	.181
Kurtosis		-1.165	-.531	2.554	-.956	-.986
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.358	.361	.358	.364	.359
Range		9	3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		10	4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural 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 Missing	64 0	64 0	64 0	64 0	64 0
Mean		3.97	2.75	1.56	3.08	3.04
Std. Error of Mean		.284	.113	.115	.121	.103
Median		3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		6	3	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		2.276	.909	.918	.969	.821
Skewness		.042	-.484	1.651	-.549	-.430
Std. Error of Skewness		.299	.299	.299	.299	.299
Kurtosis		-1.550	-.422	1.752	-.982	-.527
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.590	.590	.590	.590	.590
Range		8	3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		9	4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural 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	84	84	84	84	84
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.34	2.43	1.59	3.14	2.95
Std. Error of Mean		.212	.076	.070	.104	.093
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	2	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		1.943	.698	.640	.951	.846
Skewness		.474	-.054	.880	-.783	-.586
Std. Error of Skewness		.262	.263	.262	.262	.263
Kurtosis		-1.504	-.206	.957	-.472	-.085
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.519	.521	.519	.519	.521
Range		5	3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		6	4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Boulder City		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural 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 Missing	19 0	19 0	19 0	19 0	19 0
Mean		2.64	2.20	1.24	3.01	2.75
Std. Error of Mean		.447	.220	.128	.221	.206
Median		2.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		1	3	1	4	2
Std. Deviation		1.954	.961	.559	.967	.899
Skewness		.958	.125	2.383	-.389	.103
Std. Error of Skewness		.523	.523	.523	.523	.523
Kurtosis		-.570	-1.018	5.299	-1.110	-.955
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012	1.012
Range		5	3	2	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		6	4	3	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Mesquite		In your opinion, what is the most urgent environmental issue affecting the quality of life in Clark County?	How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural 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 Missing	8 0	8 0	8 0	8 0	8 0
Mean		4.31	3.02	1.95	3.57	2.86
Std. Error of Mean		.669	.310	.447	.326	.308
Median		5.00	3.00	1.28	4.00	3.00
Mode		6	4	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		1.883	.897	1.292	.943	.892
Skewness		-.246	-.050	1.109	-2.272	-1.026
Std. Error of Skewness		.755	.739	.739	.739	.739
Kurtosis		-2.339	-1.915	-.439	5.222	2.038
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.488	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449
Range		4	2	3	3	3
Minimum		2	2	1	1	1
Maximum		6	4	4	4	4

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

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

		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?				Total
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	8	74	106	52	240
		3.3%	30.8%	44.2%	21.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	13	68	74	25	180
		7.2%	37.8%	41.1%	13.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	8	13	31	12	64
		12.5%	20.3%	48.4%	18.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	6	39	35	4	84
		7.1%	46.4%	41.7%	4.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	5	6	7	1	19
		26.3%	31.6%	36.8%	5.3%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	3	2	3	8
		.0%	37.5%	25.0%	37.5%	100.0%
Total		40	203	255	97	595
		6.7%	34.1%	42.9%	16.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.665(a)	15	.000
Likelihood Ratio	43.393	15	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.682	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	595		

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

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

		Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?				Total
		Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Somewhat unconcerned	Not concerned	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	147	75	10	10	242
		60.7%	31.0%	4.1%	4.1%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	114	52	4	13	183
		62.3%	28.4%	2.2%	7.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	42	14	4	5	65
		64.6%	21.5%	6.2%	7.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	41	38	4	1	84
		48.8%	45.2%	4.8%	1.2%	100.0%
	Boulder City	16	2	1	0	19
		84.2%	10.5%	5.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	4	2	0	2	8
		50.0%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Total		364	183	23	31	601
		60.6%	30.4%	3.8%	5.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.804(a)	15	.013
Likelihood Ratio	29.355	15	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	.210	1	.647
N of Valid Cases	601		

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

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

		In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?				Total
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	13	70	66	91	240
		5.4%	29.2%	27.5%	37.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	9	45	44	78	176
		5.1%	25.6%	25.0%	44.3%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	4	17	15	29	65
		6.2%	26.2%	23.1%	44.6%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	6	15	24	39	84
		7.1%	17.9%	28.6%	46.4%	100.0%
	Boulder City	1	6	5	8	20
		5.0%	30.0%	25.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	1	0	7	8
		.0%	12.5%	.0%	87.5%	100.0%
Total		33	154	154	252	593
		5.6%	26.0%	26.0%	42.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.048(a)	15	.599
Likelihood Ratio	15.025	15	.450
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.237	1	.072
N of Valid Cases	593		

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

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

		In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?				Total
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	6	57	116	62	241
		2.5%	23.7%	48.1%	25.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	4	54	72	52	182
		2.2%	29.7%	39.6%	28.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	2	14	27	21	64
		3.1%	21.9%	42.2%	32.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	6	15	41	22	84
		7.1%	17.9%	48.8%	26.2%	100.0%
	Boulder City	1	8	6	5	20
		5.0%	40.0%	30.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	1	1	5	2	9
		11.1%	11.1%	55.6%	22.2%	100.0%
Total		20	149	267	164	600
		3.3%	24.8%	44.5%	27.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.472(a)	15	.291
Likelihood Ratio	16.122	15	.374
Linear-by-Linear Association	.379	1	.538
N of Valid Cases	600		

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations


**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Summary Statistics**

	Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N Valid	574	581	577	589	578	581	575	580	586
Missing	25	19	22	11	21	18	24	19	13
Mean	3.94	3.98	3.87	4.04	3.72	3.83	3.79	3.85	3.96
Std. Error of Mean	.057	.057	.055	.050	.052	.053	.051	.053	.058
Median	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation	1.366	1.368	1.326	1.224	1.258	1.278	1.213	1.281	1.415
Skewness	-1.024	-1.094	-.902	-1.141	-.633	-.827	-.734	-.798	-1.048
Std. Error of Skewness	.102	.101	.102	.101	.102	.101	.102	.101	.101
Kurtosis	-.280	-.148	-.398	.257	-.632	-.402	-.372	-.517	-.352
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.204	.202	.203	.201	.203	.202	.203	.203	.201
Range	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

	Frequency	Percent
Positive effect	56	9.3
No effect	100	16.7
Negative effect	430	71.7
Total	586	97.8
DK/No answer	13	2.2
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

	Frequency	Percent
Support	123	20.5
Oppose	457	76.2
Total	580	96.7
DK/No answer	20	3.3
Total	600	100.0




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

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations**

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

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	51	8.5
Agree	90	15.1
Disagree	158	26.3
Strongly disagree	285	47.5
Total	583	97.3
DK/No answer	16	2.7
Total	600	100.0



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

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations**

Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain

	Frequency	Percent
1	59	9.8
2	39	6.4
3	84	14.0
4	89	14.8
5	304	50.7
Total	574	95.8
DK/No answer	25	4.2
Total	600	100.0

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations**

Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain

	Frequency	Percent
1	61	10.2
2	34	5.7
3	80	13.3
4	85	14.2
5	321	53.5
Total	581	96.9
DK/No answer	19	3.1
Total	600	100.0

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations**

Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology

	Frequency	Percent
1	53	8.8
2	43	7.2
3	103	17.2
4	105	17.5
5	274	45.7
Total	577	96.3
DK/No answer	22	3.7
Total	600	100.0

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations**

Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Identify public safety needs and impacts

	Frequency	Percent
1	38	6.4
2	37	6.1
3	89	14.8
4	123	20.5
5	302	50.4
Total	589	98.2
DK/No answer	11	1.8
Total	600	100.0

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Assess other government impacts

	Frequency	Percent
1	42	7.0
2	56	9.4
3	140	23.3
4	125	20.8
5	215	35.9
Total	578	96.4
DK/No answer	21	3.6
Total	600	100.0

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations**

Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Assess impacts on the tourism sector

	Frequency	Percent
1	46	7.7
2	47	7.8
3	115	19.1
4	127	21.3
5	246	41.0
Total	581	96.9
DK/No answer	18	3.1
Total	600	100.0

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors

	Frequency	Percent
1	38	6.3
2	44	7.3
3	138	23.0
4	139	23.2
5	217	36.2
Total	575	96.0
DK/No answer	24	4.0
Total	600	100.0

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations**


Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Identify transportation impacts

	Frequency	Percent
1	41	6.8
2	54	9.0
3	118	19.6
4	105	17.5
5	263	43.8
Total	580	96.8
DK/No answer	19	3.2
Total	600	100.0

Appendix VII Yucca Mountain Considerations

Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain

	Frequency	Percent
1	67	11.2
2	42	7.0
3	72	12.0
4	75	12.5
5	331	55.2
Total	586	97.8
DK/No answer	13	2.2
Total	600	100.0



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

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdiction**

Unincorporated Clark County		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
		N	Valid	Missing						
N	Valid	229	231	237	238	234	237	235	234	234
	Missing	12	11	4	4	8	5	7	8	8
Mean		3.85	3.97	3.83	4.06	3.71	3.80	3.85	3.87	3.97
Std. Error of Mean		.092	.093	.088	.082	.085	.086	.081	.085	.092
Median		4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.399	1.406	1.363	1.266	1.304	1.320	1.241	1.302	1.408
Skewness		-.901	-1.077	-.902	-1.242	-.657	-.823	-.902	-.892	-1.065
Std. Error of Skewness		.161	.160	.158	.158	.159	.158	.159	.159	.159
Kurtosis		-.520	-.262	-.393	.404	-.673	-.495	-.141	-.330	-.311
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.320	.319	.315	.314	.317	.315	.317	.317	.317
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdiction**

City of Las Vegas		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	175	177	175	178	173	173	171	174	179
	Missing	7	5	8	4	9	9	11	8	3
Mean		3.95	3.99	3.76	3.90	3.70	3.72	3.65	3.74	3.89
Std. Error of Mean		.107	.104	.104	.094	.095	.100	.097	.102	.107
Median		5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.412	1.383	1.373	1.253	1.251	1.318	1.265	1.352	1.428
Skewness		-1.060	-1.145	-.720	-.902	-.586	-.689	-.571	-.679	-.982
Std. Error of Skewness		.183	.183	.184	.182	.185	.185	.186	.184	.181
Kurtosis		-.299	-.059	-.779	-.194	-.632	-.645	-.612	-.782	-.472
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.365	.363	.366	.362	.367	.367	.369	.366	.361
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdiction**

City of North Las Vegas		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	60	63	62	63	63	63	62	63	63
	Missing	4	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1
Mean		3.87	3.85	4.04	4.19	3.87	4.04	3.88	4.12	3.95
Std. Error of Mean		.185	.191	.154	.150	.140	.149	.140	.147	.199
Median		4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.00	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.439	1.512	1.212	1.187	1.105	1.180	1.100	1.166	1.581
Skewness		-1.066	-1.043	-.919	-1.247	-.465	-1.104	-.458	-1.060	-1.122
Std. Error of Skewness		.308	.302	.304	.302	.302	.302	.305	.302	.301
Kurtosis		-.235	-.451	-.492	.318	-1.016	.426	-1.029	-.231	-.477
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.608	.597	.599	.597	.597	.597	.601	.597	.595
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdiction**

City of Henderson		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	83	83	76	83	82	82	82	83	83
	Missing	2	1	8	1	3	2	2	1	1
Mean		4.19	4.07	4.07	4.09	3.67	3.84	3.75	3.74	4.04
Std. Error of Mean		.127	.128	.144	.125	.139	.138	.134	.134	.143
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.159	1.170	1.261	1.140	1.259	1.248	1.216	1.221	1.301
Skewness		-1.222	-1.033	-1.321	-1.275	-.736	-.794	-.638	-.530	-1.066
Std. Error of Skewness		.265	.264	.275	.264	.266	.266	.265	.264	.264
Kurtosis		.324	.180	.733	.939	-.429	-.424	-.552	-.831	-.144
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.524	.522	.543	.522	.527	.526	.525	.522	.522
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdiction**

Boulder City		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	19	19	19	19	19	19	18	18	19
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Mean		3.92	3.92	3.92	4.20	3.54	4.29	4.12	4.15	3.81
Std. Error of Mean		.279	.293	.274	.236	.302	.181	.181	.225	.354
Median		4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.86	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.220	1.279	1.182	1.019	1.305	.783	.772	.959	1.547
Skewness		-.743	-.479	-.532	-1.003	-.266	-.935	-.226	-.326	-.910
Std. Error of Skewness		.523	.523	.528	.528	.528	.528	.534	.534	.523
Kurtosis		-.668	-1.632	-1.299	-.152	-1.064	.737	-1.198	-1.972	-.641
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.012	1.012	1.023	1.023	1.023	1.023	1.033	1.033	1.012
Range		4	3	3	3	4	3	2	2	4
Minimum		1	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdiction**

Mesquite		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.52	4.57	4.42	4.60	4.04	4.13	3.89	4.22	4.41
Std. Error of Mean		.319	.326	.218	.217	.425	.307	.265	.326	.317
Median		5.00	5.00	4.27	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.05	5.00
Mode		5	5	4(a)	5	4(a)	5	4	5	5
Std. Deviation		.898	.943	.631	.628	1.230	.887	.747	.919	.893
Skewness		-2.255	-2.272	-.569	-1.466	-1.657	-.302	.198	-1.210	-1.840
Std. Error of Skewness		.755	.739	.739	.739	.739	.739	.755	.755	.755
Kurtosis		6.429	5.222	-.068	2.087	3.020	-1.766	-.586	2.030	4.759
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.488	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.449	1.488	1.488	1.488
Range		3	3	2	2	4	2	2	3	3
Minimum		2	2	3	3	1	3	3	2	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

		Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative affect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.			Total
		Positive effect	No effect	Negative effect	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	17	34	185	236
		7.2%	14.4%	78.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	20	32	127	179
		11.2%	17.9%	70.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	5	10	46	61
		8.2%	16.4%	75.4%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	10	20	54	84
		11.9%	23.8%	64.3%	100.0%
	Boulder City	3	4	12	19
		15.8%	21.1%	63.2%	100.0%
	Mesquite	1	0	7	8
		12.5%	.0%	87.5%	100.0%
Total		56	100	431	587
		9.5%	17.0%	73.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.581(a)	10	.391
Likelihood Ratio	11.692	10	.306
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.196	1	.041
N of Valid Cases	587		

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

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

		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would you support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain		Total
		Support	Oppose	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	36	201	237
		15.2%	84.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	47	132	179
		26.3%	73.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	16	42	58
		27.6%	72.4%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	19	61	80
		23.8%	76.3%	100.0%
	Boulder City	3	14	17
		17.6%	82.4%	100.0%
	Mesquite	1	7	8
		12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
Total		122	457	579
		21.1%	78.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.122(a)	5	.072
Likelihood Ratio	10.312	5	.067
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.071	1	.150
N of Valid Cases	579		

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

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

		The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you agree or disagree with this claim?				Total
		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	21	35	67	111	234
		9.0%	15.0%	28.6%	47.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	20	23	49	88	180
		11.1%	12.8%	27.2%	48.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	5	9	12	34	60
		8.3%	15.0%	20.0%	56.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	5	15	26	36	82
		6.1%	18.3%	31.7%	43.9%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	5	3	11	19
		.0%	26.3%	15.8%	57.9%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	3	1	5	9
		.0%	33.3%	11.1%	55.6%	100.0%
Total		51	90	158	285	584
		8.7%	15.4%	27.1%	48.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.295(a)	15	.503
Likelihood Ratio	16.448	15	.353
Linear-by-Linear Association	.278	1	.598
N of Valid Cases	584		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain

		Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	27	14	40	34	114	229
		11.8%	6.1%	17.5%	14.8%	49.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	20	12	22	25	97	176
		11.4%	6.8%	12.5%	14.2%	55.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	9	2	7	13	30	61
		14.8%	3.3%	11.5%	21.3%	49.2%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	2	7	11	12	50	82
		2.4%	8.5%	13.4%	14.6%	61.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	3	4	4	9	20
		.0%	15.0%	20.0%	20.0%	45.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	0	0	2	5	7
		.0%	.0%	.0%	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
Total		58	38	84	90	305	575
		10.1%	6.6%	14.6%	15.7%	53.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.698(a)	20	.304
Likelihood Ratio	28.029	20	.109
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.479	1	.034
N of Valid Cases	575		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain

		Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	26	15	29	31	130	231
		11.3%	6.5%	12.6%	13.4%	56.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	20	10	20	29	98	177
		11.3%	5.6%	11.3%	16.4%	55.4%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	11	2	5	13	32	63
		17.5%	3.2%	7.9%	20.6%	50.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	4	3	20	11	45	83
		4.8%	3.6%	24.1%	13.3%	54.2%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	4	5	0	10	19
		.0%	21.1%	26.3%	.0%	52.6%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	0	1	0	7	8
		.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	87.5%	100.0%
Total		61	34	80	84	322	581
		10.5%	5.9%	13.8%	14.5%	55.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.436(a)	20	.010
Likelihood Ratio	40.292	20	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	.438	1	.508
N of Valid Cases	581		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology

		Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Reviewing technical, scientific studies including seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	28	11	47	43	109	238
		11.8%	4.6%	19.7%	18.1%	45.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	17	18	33	28	79	175
		9.7%	10.3%	18.9%	16.0%	45.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	2	9	9	10	33	63
		3.2%	14.3%	14.3%	15.9%	52.4%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	7	3	10	16	41	77
		9.1%	3.9%	13.0%	20.8%	53.2%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	3	4	3	9	19
		.0%	15.8%	21.1%	15.8%	47.4%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	0	0	4	4	8
		.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		54	44	103	104	275	580
		9.3%	7.6%	17.8%	17.9%	47.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.790(a)	20	.092
Likelihood Ratio	32.062	20	.043
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.435	1	.064
N of Valid Cases	580		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Identify public safety needs and impacts

		Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Identify public safety needs and impacts					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	19	14	28	50	128	239
		7.9%	5.9%	11.7%	20.9%	53.6%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	13	10	39	34	81	177
		7.3%	5.6%	22.0%	19.2%	45.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	2	7	7	9	38	63
		3.2%	11.1%	11.1%	14.3%	60.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	4	4	11	23	40	82
		4.9%	4.9%	13.4%	28.0%	48.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	2	3	4	10	19
		.0%	10.5%	15.8%	21.1%	52.6%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	0	0	2	5	7
		.0%	.0%	.0%	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
Total		38	37	88	122	302	587
		6.5%	6.3%	15.0%	20.8%	51.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.942(a)	20	.245
Likelihood Ratio	26.164	20	.160
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.167	1	.280
N of Valid Cases	587		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Assess other government impacts

		Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Assess other government impacts					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	21	21	55	46	91	234
		9.0%	9.0%	23.5%	19.7%	38.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	13	15	49	33	64	174
		7.5%	8.6%	28.2%	19.0%	36.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	0	8	15	14	24	61
		.0%	13.1%	24.6%	23.0%	39.3%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	7	8	15	26	26	82
		8.5%	9.8%	18.3%	31.7%	31.7%	100.0%
	Boulder City	1	3	6	2	6	18
		5.6%	16.7%	33.3%	11.1%	33.3%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	1	0	4	4	9
		.0%	11.1%	.0%	44.4%	44.4%	100.0%
Total		42	56	140	125	215	578
		7.3%	9.7%	24.2%	21.6%	37.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.542(a)	20	.312
Likelihood Ratio	28.768	20	.092
Linear-by-Linear Association	.132	1	.716
N of Valid Cases	578		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Assess impacts on the tourism sector

		Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Assess impacts on the tourism sector					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	22	21	42	52	101	238
		9.2%	8.8%	17.6%	21.8%	42.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	16	15	40	34	69	174
		9.2%	8.6%	23.0%	19.5%	39.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	4	3	13	13	31	64
		6.3%	4.7%	20.3%	20.3%	48.4%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	5	8	16	19	34	82
		6.1%	9.8%	19.5%	23.2%	41.5%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	0	2	8	8	18
		.0%	.0%	11.1%	44.4%	44.4%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	0	2	2	4	8
		.0%	.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		47	47	115	128	247	584
		8.0%	8.0%	19.7%	21.9%	42.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.038(a)	20	.774
Likelihood Ratio	18.493	20	.555
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.613	1	.106
N of Valid Cases	584		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors

		Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	18	16	44	62	94	234
		7.7%	6.8%	18.8%	26.5%	40.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	15	12	51	33	60	171
		8.8%	7.0%	29.8%	19.3%	35.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	0	7	16	13	25	61
		.0%	11.5%	26.2%	21.3%	41.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	5	9	19	20	30	83
		6.0%	10.8%	22.9%	24.1%	36.1%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	0	4	8	6	18
		.0%	.0%	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	0	2	4	2	8
		.0%	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
Total		38	44	136	140	217	575
		6.6%	7.7%	23.7%	24.3%	37.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.228(a)	20	.158
Likelihood Ratio	32.601	20	.037
Linear-by-Linear Association	.069	1	.792
N of Valid Cases	575		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Identify transportation impacts

		Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Identify transportation impacts					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	20	15	48	43	109	235
		8.5%	6.4%	20.4%	18.3%	46.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	16	18	37	27	76	174
		9.2%	10.3%	21.3%	15.5%	43.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	1	9	5	13	34	62
		1.6%	14.5%	8.1%	21.0%	54.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	4	11	19	17	31	82
		4.9%	13.4%	23.2%	20.7%	37.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	0	7	2	9	18
		.0%	.0%	38.9%	11.1%	50.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	0	1	3	4	8
		.0%	.0%	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		41	53	117	105	263	579
		7.1%	9.2%	20.2%	18.1%	45.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.245(a)	20	.083
Likelihood Ratio	34.700	20	.022
Linear-by-Linear Association	.327	1	.567
N of Valid Cases	579		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain

		Please rank the following in terms of the importance of each activity, where one is "low" and five is "high": Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain					Total
		1	2	3	4	5	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	26	17	29	28	134	234
		11.1%	7.3%	12.4%	12.0%	57.3%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	22	14	22	28	95	181
		12.2%	7.7%	12.2%	15.5%	52.5%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	11	3	3	7	39	63
		17.5%	4.8%	4.8%	11.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	5	7	14	9	48	83
		6.0%	8.4%	16.9%	10.8%	57.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	3	0	4	1	11	19
		15.8%	.0%	21.1%	5.3%	57.9%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	0	0	2	5	7
		.0%	.0%	.0%	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
Total		67	41	72	75	332	587
		11.4%	7.0%	12.3%	12.8%	56.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests


	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.328(a)	20	.501
Likelihood Ratio	23.304	20	.274
Linear-by-Linear Association	.539	1	.463
N of Valid Cases	587		

Appendix VIII
Community Profile

Appendix VIII Community Profile

What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?

	Frequency	Percent
Car-Drive alone	491	81.9
Car-Carpool with others	63	10.5
CAT bus (or paratransit)	24	4.0
MAX transit	6	1.0
Motorcycle	6	.9
Walk	7	1.1
Bike	3	.5
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix VIII Community Profile

Do you currently commute on a daily basis?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	351	58.6
No	248	41.4
Total	600	100.0



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

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

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

		What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?							Total
		Car-Drive alone	Car-Carpool with others	CAT bus (or paratransit)	MAX transit	Motorcycle	Walk	Bike	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	189	30	11	4	0	4	3	241
		78.4%	12.4%	4.6%	1.7%	.0%	1.7%	1.2%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	158	13	7	2	1	1	0	182
		86.8%	7.1%	3.8%	1.1%	.5%	.5%	.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	51	6	5	0	1	2	0	65
		78.5%	9.2%	7.7%	.0%	1.5%	3.1%	.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	72	11	0	0	2	0	0	85
		84.7%	12.9%	.0%	.0%	2.4%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	19
		94.7%	.0%	5.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	3	4	0	0	2	0	0	9
		33.3%	44.4%	.0%	.0%	22.2%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		491	64	24	6	6	7	3	601
		81.7%	10.6%	4.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.2%	.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	82.477(a)	30	.000
Likelihood Ratio	57.943	30	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	.120	1	.729
N of Valid Cases	601		

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

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

			Do you currently commute on a daily basis?		Total	
			Yes	No		
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	152	89	241	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	63.1%	36.9%	100.0%	
	City of Las Vegas	Count	100	83	183	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	54.6%	45.4%	100.0%	
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	37	27	64	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	57.8%	42.2%	100.0%	
	City of Henderson	Count	51	33	84	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%	
	Boulder City	Count	9	10	19	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%	
	Mesquite	Count	3	6	9	
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	352	248	600
			% within Respondent Jurisdiction:	58.7%	41.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.695(a)	5	.244
Likelihood Ratio	6.653	5	.248
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.363	1	.124
N of Valid Cases	600		

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction

**Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction
Summary Statistics**


		Timeliness of response	Courtesy	Competency in handling your issue	Professionalism	Have you ever visited your local government's website?	In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?
N	Valid	294	291	290	294	579	238
	Missing	306	308	310	306	20	362
Mean		2.26	1.99	2.23	2.03	1.58	3.62
Std. Error of Mean		.055	.054	.058	.055	.021	.066
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		2	2	2	2	2	4
Std. Deviation		.951	.922	.992	.947	.494	1.010
Skewness		.319	.618	.359	.591	-.322	-1.066
Std. Error of Skewness		.142	.143	.143	.142	.101	.158
Kurtosis		-.802	-.482	-.905	-.574	-1.903	.706
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.283	.285	.285	.283	.203	.314
Range		3	3	3	3	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4	2	5

**Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction**

Which local government department, if any, have you interacted with in the past year?

	Frequency	Percent
Commission/Council Offices	24	4.1
Manager's Office	8	1.3
Parks and Recreation/Community Services	46	7.7
Public Works	14	2.4
Social Services	47	7.8
Recorder's Office	18	3.0
Business License	19	3.2
Comprehensive Planning	4	.7
Human Resources	24	4.0
Fire	17	2.9
Police/Metro	61	10.1
Assessor's/taxation	4	.6
Water Authority (SNWA)	4	.6
Juvenile Justice	3	.4
Transportation Authority (RTC)	1	.2
Voter Registrar	3	.4
None	279	46.6
DK/No answer	23	3.9
Total	600	100.0

**Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction**




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

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction

Timeliness of response

	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	69	11.4
Good	116	19.4
Fair	73	12.2
Poor	36	5.9
Total	294	49.0
DK/No answer	3	.5
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction

Courtesy

	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	101	16.9
Good	113	18.8
Fair	54	9.0
Poor	23	3.8
Total	291	48.6
DK/No answer	6	.9
Total	600	100.0




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

**Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction**

Competency in handling your issue

	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	78	13.1
Good	106	17.7
Fair	67	11.1
Poor	39	6.4
Total	290	48.4
DK/No answer	7	1.1
Total	600	100.0




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

**Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction**

Professionalism

	Frequency	Percent
Excellent	99	16.6
Good	112	18.7
Fair	55	9.2
Poor	27	4.5
Total	294	49.0
DK/No answer	3	.5
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction

Have you ever visited your local government's website?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	244	40.7
No	336	56.0
Total	579	96.6
DK/No answer	20	3.4
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix IX Local Government Interaction

In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Once a week	13	2.2	5.6	5.6
	Several times a week	23	3.8	9.6	15.2
	Several times a month	35	5.8	14.7	29.9
	Once a month	137	22.8	57.5	87.4
	Less than once a month	30	5.0	12.6	100.0
	Total	238	39.6	100.0	
Missing	DK/No answer	6	1.0		
	System	356	59.3		
	Total	362	60.4		
Total		600	100.0		



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

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Timeliness of response	Courtesy	Competency in handling your issue	Professionalism	In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?
N	Valid	112	109	109	112	93
	Missing	130	132	132	130	149
Mean		2.24	2.02	2.24	2.06	3.35
Std. Error of Mean		.086	.083	.091	.086	.117
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		2	2	2	2	4
Std. Deviation		.914	.863	.954	.910	1.130
Skewness		.437	.459	.339	.612	-.827
Std. Error of Skewness		.229	.231	.231	.229	.250
Kurtosis		-.530	-.515	-.778	-.332	-.247
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.453	.459	.459	.453	.495
Range		3	3	3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4	5

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

City of Las Vegas		Timeliness of response	Courtesy	Competency in handling your issue	Professionalism	In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?
N	Valid	87	87	86	87	79
	Missing	95	95	96	95	103
Mean		2.35	2.01	2.21	2.02	3.90
Std. Error of Mean		.103	.102	.111	.102	.102
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		2	1	2	1	4
Std. Deviation		.967	.950	1.033	.950	.905
Skewness		.186	.549	.362	.410	-1.198
Std. Error of Skewness		.258	.258	.259	.258	.271
Kurtosis		-.901	-.682	-1.020	-.968	1.817
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.510	.510	.513	.510	.535
Range		3	3	3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4	5

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

City of North Las Vegas		Timeliness of response	Courtesy	Competency in handling your issue	Professionalism	In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?
N	Valid	37	37	37	37	18
	Missing	28	28	28	28	46
Mean		2.38	2.09	2.45	2.17	3.86
Std. Error of Mean		.163	.163	.171	.183	.184
Median		2.00	2.00	2.35	2.00	4.00
Mode		2	2	3	2	4
Std. Deviation		.984	.988	1.033	1.104	.784
Skewness		.244	.574	.005	.599	-.980
Std. Error of Skewness		.390	.390	.390	.390	.535
Kurtosis		-.870	-.610	-1.109	-.921	1.621
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.763	.763	.763	.763	1.036
Range		3	3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2
Maximum		4	4	4	4	5

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

City of Henderson		Timeliness of response	Courtesy	Competency in handling your issue	Professionalism	In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?
N	Valid	42	42	42	42	38
	Missing	42	42	42	42	46
Mean		1.96	1.74	1.97	1.87	3.55
Std. Error of Mean		.155	.145	.149	.148	.147
Median		2.00	1.80	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		1	1	2	1	4
Std. Deviation		1.001	.939	.965	.954	.909
Skewness		.550	1.326	.782	1.015	-1.349
Std. Error of Skewness		.367	.367	.367	.367	.381
Kurtosis		-.951	1.078	-.244	.263	1.284
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.719	.719	.719	.719	.746
Range		3	3	3	3	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4	5

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

Boulder City		Timeliness of response	Courtesy	Competency in handling your issue	Professionalism	In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?
N	Valid	13	13	13	13	9
	Missing	7	7	7	7	10
Mean		2.38	1.89	2.27	2.00	3.75
Std. Error of Mean		.246	.205	.251	.247	.253
Median		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		2	2	2	2	4
Std. Deviation		.870	.726	.889	.875	.748
Skewness		.517	.900	.577	.416	-.608
Std. Error of Skewness		.626	.626	.626	.626	.726
Kurtosis		.129	2.703	.269	-.419	1.846
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.211	1.211	1.211	1.211	1.420
Range		3	3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2
Maximum		4	4	4	4	5

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

Mesquite		Timeliness of response	Courtesy	Competency in handling your issue	Professionalism	In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	0
	Missing	4	4	4	4	8
Mean		2.16	2.93	2.66	2.27	
Std. Error of Mean		.446	.660	.643	.379	
Median		2.05	3.05	2.10	2.05	
Mode		2(a)	3(a)	2	2	
Std. Deviation		.887	1.314	1.280	.755	
Skewness		-.487	-1.391	.347	-.603	
Std. Error of Skewness		1.020	1.020	1.020	1.020	
Range		2	3	3	2	
Minimum		1	1	1	1	
Maximum		3	4	4	3	

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Which local government department, if any, have you interacted with in the past year?

		Which local government department, if any, have you interacted with in the past year?																Total	
		Commiss./ Councils	Manager's Office	Recreation/ Community Services	Public Works	Social Services	Recorder's Office	Business License	Comprehen- sive Planning	Human Resources	Fire	Police/Metr o	Assessor's/ taxation water	Authority Authority (SNWA)	Juvenile Justice	Authority (RTC)	Voter Registrar	None	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	9	3	22	6	18	6	12	0	11	7	17	0	2	0	0	0	117	230
		3.9%	1.3%	9.6%	2.6%	7.8%	2.6%	5.2%	.0%	4.8%	3.0%	7.4%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	5	3	10	1	15	7	4	1	6	4	22	2	2	2	1	2	87	174
		2.9%	1.7%	5.7%	.6%	8.6%	4.0%	2.3%	.6%	3.4%	2.3%	12.6%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	.6%	1.1%	50.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	3	0	3	2	7	0	2	2	5	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	25	61
		4.9%	.0%	4.9%	3.3%	11.5%	.0%	3.3%	3.3%	8.2%	3.3%	14.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.6%	41.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	4	2	8	2	4	4	2	0	2	3	11	1	0	1	0	0	39	83
		4.8%	2.4%	9.6%	2.4%	4.8%	4.8%	2.4%	.0%	2.4%	3.6%	13.3%	1.2%	.0%	1.2%	.0%	.0%	47.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	3	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	19
		15.8%	.0%	15.8%	10.5%	10.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	10.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	36.8%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	8
	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
Total	24	8	46	15	46	17	20	3	24	18	61	3	4	3	1	3	279	575	
	4.2%	1.4%	8.0%	2.6%	8.0%	3.0%	3.5%	.5%	4.2%	3.1%	10.6%	.5%	.7%	.5%	.2%	.5%	48.5%	100.0%	

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	93.182(a)	80	.149
Likelihood Ratio	88.532	80	.241
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.537	1	.215
N of Valid Cases	575		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Timeliness of response

		Timeliness of response				Total
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	23	52	24	13	112
		20.5%	46.4%	21.4%	11.6%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	18	32	25	12	87
		20.7%	36.8%	28.7%	13.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	7	14	9	6	36
		19.4%	38.9%	25.0%	16.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	18	10	10	3	41
		43.9%	24.4%	24.4%	7.3%	100.0%
	Boulder City	1	7	3	2	13
		7.7%	53.8%	23.1%	15.4%	100.0%
	Mesquite	1	2	2	0	5
		20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		68	117	73	36	294
		23.1%	39.8%	24.8%	12.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.157(a)	15	.255
Likelihood Ratio	17.929	15	.266
Linear-by-Linear Association	.323	1	.570
N of Valid Cases	294		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Courtesy

		Courtesy				Total
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	34	46	24	6	110
		30.9%	41.8%	21.8%	5.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	31	30	19	7	87
		35.6%	34.5%	21.8%	8.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	12	14	7	4	37
		32.4%	37.8%	18.9%	10.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	21	15	2	4	42
		50.0%	35.7%	4.8%	9.5%	100.0%
	Boulder City	3	8	1	0	12
		25.0%	66.7%	8.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	1	0	2	2	5
		20.0%	.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total		102	113	55	23	293
		34.8%	38.6%	18.8%	7.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.311(a)	15	.046
Likelihood Ratio	26.012	15	.038
Linear-by-Linear Association	.110	1	.740
N of Valid Cases	293		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Competency in handling your issue

		Competency in handling your issue				Total
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	26	43	27	13	109
		23.9%	39.4%	24.8%	11.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	26	28	20	12	86
		30.2%	32.6%	23.3%	14.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	8	10	12	6	36
		22.2%	27.8%	33.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	16	16	6	4	42
		38.1%	38.1%	14.3%	9.5%	100.0%
	Boulder City	2	7	3	1	13
		15.4%	53.8%	23.1%	7.7%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	2	0	2	4
		.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		78	106	68	38	290
		26.9%	36.6%	23.4%	13.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.765(a)	15	.333
Likelihood Ratio	16.998	15	.319
Linear-by-Linear Association	.054	1	.817
N of Valid Cases	290		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Professionalism

		Professionalism				Total
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	33	50	19	10	112
		29.5%	44.6%	17.0%	8.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	33	26	24	5	88
		37.5%	29.5%	27.3%	5.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	12	14	4	7	37
		32.4%	37.8%	10.8%	18.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	17	16	4	4	41
		41.5%	39.0%	9.8%	9.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	4	5	3	0	12
		33.3%	41.7%	25.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	2	2	0	4
		.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		99	113	56	26	294
		33.7%	38.4%	19.0%	8.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.675(a)	15	.117
Likelihood Ratio	23.220	15	.080
Linear-by-Linear Association	.111	1	.739
N of Valid Cases	294		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Have you ever visited your local government's website?

		Have you ever visited your local government's website?		Total
		Yes	No	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	98	134	232
		42.2%	57.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	80	98	178
		44.9%	55.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	18	45	63
		28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	38	42	80
		47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
	Boulder City	9	10	19
		47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	6	6
		.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		243	335	578
		42.0%	58.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.862(a)	5	.054
Likelihood Ratio	13.251	5	.021
Linear-by-Linear Association	.248	1	.618
N of Valid Cases	578		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?

		In any given month, how often would you say you visit your local government's website?					Total
		Once a week	Several times a week	Several times a month	Once a month	Less than once a month	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	10	11	17	48	8	94
		10.6%	11.7%	18.1%	51.1%	8.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	2	5	9	46	17	79
		2.5%	6.3%	11.4%	58.2%	21.5%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	0	2	2	12	3	19
		.0%	10.5%	10.5%	63.2%	15.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	2	5	5	26	2	40
		5.0%	12.5%	12.5%	65.0%	5.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	0	2	5	1	8
		.0%	.0%	25.0%	62.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	0	0	0	0	0
	
Total		14	23	35	137	31	240
		5.8%	9.6%	14.6%	57.1%	12.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.763(a)	20	.411
Likelihood Ratio	22.761	20	.301
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.224	1	.136
N of Valid Cases	240		

Appendix X
Local Distribution Summary

Appendix X Local Distribution Summary


Respondent zip code:

Zip Code	Frequency	Percent	Zip Code	Frequency	Percent
89000	2	.3	89120	14	2.3
89002	4	.7	89121	33	5.5
89005	16	2.7	89122	17	2.9
89011	25	4.1	89123	24	4.0
89012	39	6.4	89124	1	.2
89014	7	1.2	89128	22	3.6
89015	11	1.8	89129	5	.9
89016	1	.2	89130	9	1.5
89018	3	.5	89131	2	.3
89019	4	.7	89132	2	.3
89021	3	.4	89134	38	6.3
89025	2	.3	89135	2	.3
89027	5	.9	89138	2	.3
89029	1	.2	89139	8	1.3
89030	8	1.4	89141	5	.9
89031	0	.1	89142	6	1.0
89032	50	8.3	89143	2	.4
89040	4	.7	89144	3	.5
89044	1	.2	89145	14	2.3
89046	0	.1	89146	2	.3
89052	5	.9	89147	25	4.1
89074	5	.8	89148	9	1.5
89084	3	.4	89149	2	.3
89086	2	.3	89156	9	1.5
89101	1	.2	89161	0	.1
89102	6	1.1	89169	3	.5
89103	16	2.7	89183	3	.5
89104	8	1.3	89302	0	.1
89105	4	.6	89412	0	.1
89106	6	.9	89444	0	.1
89107	18	3.0	98110	1	.2
89108	14	2.4	Refused	6	.9
89109	3	.5	Total	600	100.0
89110	9	1.5			
89113	4	.7			
89115	3	.5			
89117	17	2.8			
89118	8	1.3			
89119	17	2.8			

Appendix X Local Distribution Summary

Respondent Jurisdiction:

	Frequency	Percent
Unincorporated Clark County	242	40.3
City of Las Vegas	182	30.4
City of North Las Vegas	64	10.7
City of Henderson	84	14.0
Boulder City	19	3.2
Mesquite	8	1.4
Total	600	100.0



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

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile


Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary Statistics

		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	In what age group do you fall?	How long have you lived in Clark County?
N	Valid	520	598	598
	Missing	80	1	2
Mean		3.72	2.62	3.72
Std. Error of Mean		.076	.037	.058
Median		3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		3	3	5
Std. Deviation		1.742	.897	1.408
Skewness		.647	-.094	-.126
Std. Error of Skewness		.107	.100	.100
Kurtosis		.009	-.759	-1.165
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.214	.199	.199
Range		7	3	5
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		8	4	6

Appendix XI Respondent Demographic Profile

Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?

	Frequency	Percent
\$ 20,000 or under	42	7.1
\$ 20,001 - \$ 40,000	80	13.3
\$ 40,001 - \$ 60,000	154	25.6
\$ 60,001 - \$ 80,000	95	15.9
\$ 80,001 - \$100,000	67	11.2
\$100,001 - \$120,000	43	7.1
\$120,001 - \$140,000	15	2.5
\$140,001 or more	24	4.1
Total	520	86.7
Refused/No answer	80	13.3
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix XI Respondent Demographic Profile

In what age group do you fall?

	Frequency	Percent
18 - 24	65	10.8
25 - 44	200	33.4
45 - 64	228	38.0
65 or older	105	17.6
Total	598	99.8
Refused/No answer	1	.2
Total	600	100.0




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

Appendix XI Respondent Demographic Profile

How long have you lived in Clark County?

	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 year	25	4.1
1- 5 years	123	20.5
6 - 10 years	131	21.8
11 - 15 years	83	13.8
More than 15 years	188	31.3
All my life	49	8.2
Total	598	99.7
Refused/No answer	2	.3
Total	600	100.0




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

**Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile**

Gender observation

	Frequency	Percent
Male	266	44.4
Female	334	55.6
Total	600	100.0



Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary 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	208	242	240	242
	Missing	34	0	2	0
Mean		3.53	2.42	3.79	1.55
Std. Error of Mean		.116	.059	.091	.032
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	2.00
Mode		3	3	5	2
Std. Deviation		1.674	.924	1.413	.499
Skewness		.743	.031	-.101	-.182
Std. Error of Skewness		.169	.157	.157	.157
Kurtosis		.108	-.842	-1.194	-1.983
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.336	.312	.313	.312
Range		7	3	5	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		8	4	6	2

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

City of Las Vegas		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	In what age group do you fall?	How long have you lived in Clark County?	Gender observation:
N	Valid	157	182	182	182
	Missing	25	0	0	0
Mean		4.03	2.99	3.90	1.57
Std. Error of Mean		.145	.052	.099	.037
Median		4.00	3.00	4.00	2.00
Mode		3	3	5	2
Std. Deviation		1.824	.706	1.335	.496
Skewness		.657	.010	-.417	-.287
Std. Error of Skewness		.194	.180	.180	.180
Kurtosis		-.149	-.979	-.997	-1.939
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.385	.358	.358	.358
Range		7	2	5	1
Minimum		1	2	1	1
Maximum		8	4	6	2

**Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary 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	54	64	64	64
	Missing	10	0	0	0
Mean		3.50	2.48	3.66	1.65
Std. Error of Mean		.214	.116	.188	.060
Median		4.00	2.00	4.00	2.00
Mode		4	2	2	2
Std. Deviation		1.568	.927	1.507	.479
Skewness		-.044	.087	-.023	-.667
Std. Error of Skewness		.325	.299	.299	.299
Kurtosis		-1.057	-.796	-1.313	-1.606
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.640	.590	.590	.590
Range		5	3	5	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		6	4	6	2

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?	In what age group do you fall?	How long have you lived in Clark County?	Gender observation:
N	Valid	77	83	84	84
	Missing	7	1	0	0
Mean		3.80	2.44	3.27	1.51
Std. Error of Mean		.217	.102	.152	.055
Median		3.00	2.00	3.00	1.97
Mode		3	2	2	2
Std. Deviation		1.905	.931	1.399	.503
Skewness		.672	.219	.208	-.023
Std. Error of Skewness		.274	.264	.262	.262
Kurtosis		-.064	-.778	-.972	-2.049
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.541	.522	.519	.519
Range		7	3	5	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		8	4	6	2

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction

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	16	19	19	19
	Missing	3	0	0	0
Mean		3.65	2.94	3.83	1.44
Std. Error of Mean		.278	.183	.255	.117
Median		4.00	3.00	3.23	1.00
Mode		3	3	3	1
Std. Deviation		1.118	.790	1.114	.510
Skewness		-.444	.117	.360	.269
Std. Error of Skewness		.561	.528	.523	.523
Kurtosis		1.215	-1.323	-1.039	-2.168
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.085	1.023	1.012	1.012
Range		5	2	4	1
Minimum		1	2	2	1
Maximum		6	4	6	2

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction

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	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.45	2.77	2.76	1.60
Std. Error of Mean		.668	.334	.610	.180
Median		3.95	2.09	2.00	2.00
Mode		5	2	2	2
Std. Deviation		1.880	.965	1.764	.522
Skewness		.055	.567	1.363	-.515
Std. Error of Skewness		.755	.739	.739	.739
Kurtosis		-.795	-1.984	1.145	-2.393
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.488	1.449	1.449	1.449
Range		6	2	5	1
Minimum		1	2	1	1
Maximum		7	4	6	2

**Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation**

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

		Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?								Total
		Under 20k	20-40k	40-60k	60-80k	80-100k	100-120k	\$120,001 - \$140,000	Over 140k	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	16	43	61	36	23	14	9	5	207
		7.7%	20.8%	29.5%	17.4%	11.1%	6.8%	4.3%	2.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	8	20	48	28	23	16	2	14	159
		5.0%	12.6%	30.2%	17.6%	14.5%	10.1%	1.3%	8.8%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	7	10	9	12	10	6	0	0	54
		13.0%	18.5%	16.7%	22.2%	18.5%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	9	5	28	13	7	7	3	6	78
		11.5%	6.4%	35.9%	16.7%	9.0%	9.0%	3.8%	7.7%	100.0%
	Boulder City	1	0	6	5	3	0	0	0	15
		6.7%	.0%	40.0%	33.3%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	8
		25.0%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		43	80	152	96	68	43	14	25	521
		8.3%	15.4%	29.2%	18.4%	13.1%	8.3%	2.7%	4.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	55.881(a)	35	.014
Likelihood Ratio	66.794	35	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.148	1	.701
N of Valid Cases	521		

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

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

		In what age group do you fall?				Total
		18 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 64	65 or older	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	43	84	84	30	241
		17.8%	34.9%	34.9%	12.4%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	0	46	92	45	183
		.0%	25.1%	50.3%	24.6%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	9	24	21	10	64
		14.1%	37.5%	32.8%	15.6%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	12	35	23	13	83
		14.5%	42.2%	27.7%	15.7%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	6	8	5	19
		.0%	31.6%	42.1%	26.3%	100.0%
	Mesquite	0	5	1	3	9
		.0%	55.6%	11.1%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		64	200	229	106	599
		10.7%	33.4%	38.2%	17.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	66.778(a)	15	.000
Likelihood Ratio	87.056	15	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.660	1	.198
N of Valid Cases	599		

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

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

		How long have you lived in Clark County?						Total
		Less than 1 year	1 - 5 years	6 - 10 years	11 - 15 years	More than 15 years	All my life	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	8	48	56	29	75	24	240
		3.3%	20.0%	23.3%	12.1%	31.3%	10.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	6	29	37	25	74	11	182
		3.3%	15.9%	20.3%	13.7%	40.7%	6.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	3	19	7	12	16	7	64
		4.7%	29.7%	10.9%	18.8%	25.0%	10.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	7	22	20	14	17	4	84
		8.3%	26.2%	23.8%	16.7%	20.2%	4.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	0	1	9	3	6	1	20
		.0%	5.0%	45.0%	15.0%	30.0%	5.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	2	4	2	0	0	2	10
		20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	20.0%	100.0%
Total		26	123	131	83	188	49	600
		4.3%	20.5%	21.8%	13.8%	31.3%	8.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	51.299(a)	25	.001
Likelihood Ratio	53.106	25	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.745	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	600		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction: * Gender observation:

		Gender observation:		Total
		Male	Female	
Respondent Jurisdiction:	Unincorporated Clark County	110	132	242
		45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	78	104	182
		42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	22	42	64
		34.4%	65.6%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	42	43	85
		49.4%	50.6%	100.0%
	Boulder City	11	8	19
		57.9%	42.1%	100.0%
	Mesquite	3	5	8
		37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Total		266	334	600
		44.3%	55.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests


	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.311(a)	5	.379
Likelihood Ratio	5.355	5	.374
Linear-by-Linear Association	.112	1	.738
N of Valid Cases	600		

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons


Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Road Maintenance




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Revitalizing older neighborhoods




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Flood control




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Budget management




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Budget management




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

**Monitor and report to the public on how well
government services are being performed**




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Water conservation programs




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing child protection services




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing child welfare services




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing juvenile justice services




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing attainable housing for working class




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing affordable housing for low income individuals




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing shelter for the homeless




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing affordable housing for seniors




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing medical care for the poor




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing crime prevention programs




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Enforcing traffic laws




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Maintaining a low crime rate




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Maintaining neighborhood police patrols




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Keeping police response times low




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Keeping fire department response times low




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Well trained paramedic and emergency medical personnel




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Neighborhood watch programs




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Preparing for natural disasters




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Preparing for man-made disasters




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Investigating criminal activity




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing fire protection and prevention services




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing emergency medical services




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing for neighborhood code enforcement




Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Regional justice services and facilities



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