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)

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



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

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

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



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

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



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 governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	260	255	260	255	252	258	260
	Missing	0	5	0	5	8	3	0
Mean		4.09	3.62	3.89	4.34	3.9	4.11	4.5
Std. Error of Mean		0.063	0.077	0.076	0.061	0.081	0.061	0.05
Median		4	4	4	5	4	4	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.022	1.232	1.22	0.968	1.278	0.987	0.814
Variance		1.045	1.517	1.489	0.937	1.634	0.973	0.662
Skewness		-0.973	-0.466	-0.809	-1.574	-0.953	-1.066	-1.638
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.153	0.151	0.152	0.153	0.152	0.151
Kurtosis		0.403	-0.792	-0.356	2.154	-0.155	0.761	2.321
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.301	0.304	0.301	0.304	0.306	0.302	0.301
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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

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

City of Henderson		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	66	66	66	66	63	66	65
	Missing	0	0	0	0	3	0	2
Mean		4.08	3.32	3.91	4.32	3.49	3.9	4.52
Std. Error of Mean		0.11	0.157	0.158	0.118	0.188	0.146	0.108
Median		4	4	4	5	3.96	4	5
Mode		5	4	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.895	1.269	1.286	0.953	1.495	1.186	0.865
Variance		0.8	1.611	1.653	0.907	2.235	1.406	0.749
Skewness		-0.547	-0.432	-0.771	-1.272	-0.435	-0.792	-1.994
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.296	0.295	0.296	0.302	0.295	0.298
Kurtosis		-0.682	-0.829	-0.76	1.035	-1.221	-0.375	3.62
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.584	0.582	0.584	0.595	0.582	0.588
Range		3	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

City of Las Vegas		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Provide attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	190	190	188	188	188	191	191	191	192
	Missing	3	3	5	5	5	2	2	2	1
Mean		4.23	4.2	4.07	3.95	3.78	3.77	4.1	3.97	4.58
Std. Error of Mean		0.082	0.08	0.082	0.091	0.094	0.1	0.084	0.091	0.056
Median		5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.133	1.1	1.121	1.248	1.288	1.388	1.167	1.26	0.769
Variance		1.285	1.21	1.256	1.557	1.66	1.926	1.362	1.586	0.592
Skewness		-1.438	-1.266	-1.171	-1.026	-0.748	-0.795	-1.187	-1.113	-1.977
Std. Error of Skewness		0.176	0.176	0.177	0.177	0.177	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.175
Kurtosis		1.209	0.706	0.699	-0.002	-0.579	-0.662	0.384	0.203	3.714
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.351	0.351	0.353	0.353	0.353	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.349
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas		Providing child protection services	Providing child welfare services	Providing juvenile justice services	Provide attainable housing for working class families	Providing affordable housing for low income families	Providing shelter for the homeless	Providing affordable housing for seniors	Providing medical care for the poor	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care
N	Valid	67	68	67	68	67	68	68	67	68
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.45	4.39	4.44	4.2	4	3.83	4.35	4.13	4.65
Std. Error of Mean		0.122	0.13	0.118	0.134	0.159	0.178	0.126	0.157	0.095
Median		5	5	5	5	5	4.27	5	5	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.002	1.073	0.965	1.099	1.308	1.465	1.035	1.289	0.78
Variance		1.003	1.152	0.931	1.208	1.71	2.147	1.072	1.66	0.609
Skewness		-1.935	-1.898	-2.02	-1.276	-1.014	-0.961	-1.792	-1.275	-2.424
Std. Error of Skewness		0.292	0.291	0.292	0.291	0.292	0.291	0.291	0.292	0.291
Kurtosis		3.045	2.841	4.014	0.774	-0.37	-0.515	2.839	0.295	5.716
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.577	0.575	0.577	0.575	0.577	0.575	0.575	0.577	0.575
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	259	260	260	260	257	260	249	251	253
	Missing	2	0	0	0	3	0	11	9	8
Mean		4.06	4.11	4.3	4.44	4.52	4.67	3.65	4.02	3.88
Std. Error of Mean		0.064	0.063	0.061	0.052	0.045	0.041	0.079	0.077	0.068
Median		4	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.023	1.015	0.978	0.833	0.727	0.664	1.241	1.225	1.078
Variance		1.046	1.031	0.957	0.694	0.528	0.441	1.54	1.5	1.162
Skewness		-0.874	-0.982	-1.378	-1.446	-1.451	-2.245	-0.534	-1.038	-0.726
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.152	0.151	0.154	0.154	0.153
Kurtosis		0.13	0.308	1.283	1.833	1.523	5.122	-0.726	-0.015	-0.192
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.302	0.301	0.301	0.301	0.303	0.301	0.307	0.306	0.305
Range		4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	193	193	191	190	193	193	182	188	189
	Missing	0	0	2	3	0	0	11	5	4
Mean		3.93	4.15	4.3	4.47	4.56	4.74	3.74	4.04	4
Std. Error of Mean		0.08	0.076	0.076	0.064	0.049	0.041	0.082	0.095	0.069
Median		4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	4
Std. Deviation		1.115	1.055	1.058	0.883	0.686	0.575	1.108	1.299	0.946
Variance		1.244	1.114	1.119	0.779	0.471	0.331	1.228	1.688	0.895
Skewness		-0.951	-1.07	-1.501	-1.865	-1.358	-2.506	-0.648	-1.164	-0.82
Std. Error of Skewness		0.175	0.175	0.176	0.176	0.175	0.175	0.18	0.177	0.177
Kurtosis		0.275	0.327	1.483	3.494	0.83	6.838	-0.061	0.2	0.598
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.348	0.349	0.35	0.351	0.349	0.349	0.358	0.353	0.352
Range		4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	67	68	68	68	68	68	68	63	65
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
Mean		4.38	4.15	4.38	4.54	4.56	4.75	3.8	3.88	3.93
Std. Error of Mean		0.112	0.138	0.124	0.1	0.095	0.088	0.154	0.173	0.136
Median		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.918	1.132	1.018	0.819	0.781	0.723	1.264	1.369	1.096
Variance		0.843	1.282	1.037	0.671	0.61	0.522	1.597	1.875	1.2
Skewness		-1.28	-1.07	-1.47	-1.563	-1.658	-2.94	-0.697	-0.909	-0.71
Std. Error of Skewness		0.292	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.302	0.297
Kurtosis		0.507	0.019	1.202	1.194	1.788	7.729	-0.601	-0.57	-0.217
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.577	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.595	0.586
Range		3	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4
Minimum		2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	66	66	66	66	66	66	65	66	66
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Mean		4.08	3.86	4.07	4.38	4.42	4.59	3.63	3.75	3.87
Std. Error of Mean		0.131	0.149	0.154	0.11	0.103	0.084	0.131	0.186	0.11
Median		4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4
Std. Deviation		1.065	1.207	1.25	0.898	0.836	0.679	1.05	1.511	0.896
Variance		1.133	1.457	1.563	0.806	0.699	0.461	1.103	2.283	0.802
Skewness		-0.984	-0.802	-1.269	-1.453	-1.312	-1.67	-0.7	-0.834	-0.26
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.296	0.296	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.298	0.295	0.295
Kurtosis		0.378	-0.286	0.619	1.909	1.261	2.535	0.343	-0.816	-0.797
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.584	0.584	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.588	0.582	0.582
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.99	4.23	4.71	4.7	5	4.82	3.59	4.52	3.99
Std. Error of Mean		0.278	0.29	0.203	0.166	0	0.138	0.281	0.281	0.302
Median		4	4.21	5	5	5	5	3	5	4
Mode		4	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	3
Std. Deviation		0.817	0.853	0.596	0.488	0	0.406	0.824	0.827	0.887
Variance		0.668	0.727	0.355	0.239	0	0.165	0.68	0.683	0.786
Skewness		0.029	-0.547	-2.219	-1.053		-2.068	1.043	-1.469	0.032
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729
Kurtosis		-1.346	-1.35	5.662	-1.254		2.912	-0.393	0.677	-1.846
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		2	2	2	1	0	1	2	2	2
Minimum		3	3	3	4	5	4	3	3	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.76	4.52	4.64	4.4	4.48	4.6	5	4.6
Std. Error of Mean		0.251	0.411	0.403	0.499	0.293	0.287	0	0.287
Median		5	5	5	5	4.43	4.9	5	4.9
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.496	0.812	0.797	0.985	0.579	0.568	0	0.568
Variance		0.246	0.66	0.635	0.97	0.336	0.322	0	0.322
Skewness		-2.143	-1.975	-2.87	-1.518	0.127	-0.742		-0.742
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		1	2	2	2	1	1	0	1
Minimum		4	3	3	3	4	4	5	4
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.08	4.48	4.6	4.88	4.6	4.6	4	4.52	4.59
Std. Error of Mean		0.467	0.293	0.287	0.191	0.287	0.287	0.336	0.502	0.316
Median		4	4.43	4.9	5	4.9	4.9	4	5	4.81
Mode		4(a)	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
Std. Deviation		0.921	0.579	0.568	0.378	0.568	0.568	0.622	0.992	0.585
Variance		0.849	0.336	0.322	0.143	0.322	0.322	0.387	0.984	0.342
Skewness		-0.269	0.127	-0.742	-4.126	-0.742	-0.742	0	-2.143	-0.73
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.108	1.028	1.108
Range		2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
Minimum		3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	259	256	259	257	260	260	259	260	260	259	260	259
	Missing	2	4	2	4	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2
Mean		3.88	4.09	4.1	3.98	3.71	4.26	3.99	4.18	3.88	3.72	3.87	4.19
Std. Error of Mean		0.082	0.076	0.072	0.071	0.077	0.069	0.07	0.068	0.078	0.086	0.079	0.062
Median		4	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4.25
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.312	1.215	1.165	1.13	1.244	1.106	1.131	1.09	1.261	1.391	1.278	0.992
Variance		1.722	1.475	1.357	1.278	1.547	1.224	1.278	1.188	1.59	1.935	1.634	0.984
Skewness		-0.884	-1.171	-1.165	-0.845	-0.609	-1.533	-1.021	-1.308	-0.86	-0.698	-0.964	-1.203
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.152	0.151	0.152	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151	0.151
Kurtosis		-0.448	0.291	0.415	-0.307	-0.635	1.568	0.386	1.008	-0.35	-0.832	-0.151	1.011
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.302	0.303	0.302	0.303	0.301	0.301	0.302	0.301	0.301	0.302	0.301	0.302
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	188	191	190	188	191	193	193	191	192	193	191	193
	Missing	4	2	3	5	2	0	0	2	1	0	2	0
Mean		3.73	4.02	4.06	3.92	3.72	4.26	4.15	4.14	3.95	3.8	4.07	4.07
Std. Error of Mean		0.097	0.089	0.085	0.078	0.083	0.083	0.074	0.075	0.084	0.091	0.074	0.067
Median		4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.326	1.225	1.171	1.066	1.149	1.149	1.031	1.042	1.168	1.266	1.02	0.935
Variance		1.759	1.502	1.372	1.136	1.32	1.32	1.064	1.085	1.364	1.604	1.041	0.875
Skewness		-0.74	-1.169	-1.241	-0.646	-0.789	-1.625	-1.16	-1.195	-0.951	-0.858	-0.99	-0.683
Std. Error of Skewness		0.177	0.176	0.176	0.177	0.176	0.175	0.175	0.176	0.176	0.175	0.176	0.175
Kurtosis		-0.638	0.352	0.677	-0.418	-0.077	1.693	0.819	0.921	0.146	-0.291	0.381	-0.262
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.352	0.35	0.351	0.353	0.35	0.348	0.349	0.35	0.349	0.349	0.35	0.348
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	67	66	68	68	67	67	68	68	68	67	68	67
	Missing	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.28	4.36	4.3	4.15	3.77	4.59	4.32	4.22	4.04	3.74	3.82	4.3
Std. Error of Mean		0.131	0.134	0.141	0.138	0.13	0.112	0.12	0.14	0.161	0.155	0.163	0.131
Median		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.073	1.085	1.16	1.139	1.06	0.92	0.986	1.153	1.325	1.274	1.342	1.078
Variance		1.151	1.178	1.347	1.297	1.125	0.846	0.972	1.329	1.756	1.624	1.801	1.162
Skewness		-1.443	-1.721	-1.578	-1.183	-0.579	-2.632	-1.344	-1.296	-0.935	-0.835	-0.796	-1.66
Std. Error of Skewness		0.292	0.296	0.291	0.291	0.294	0.292	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.292	0.291	0.292
Kurtosis		1.363	2.041	1.346	0.52	-0.361	6.864	0.848	0.673	-0.633	-0.25	-0.604	2.256
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.577	0.584	0.575	0.575	0.58	0.577	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.577	0.575	0.577
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	65	66
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mean		3.71	4.09	4.23	4.13	3.61	4.26	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.79	4.04	4.25
Std. Error of Mean		0.173	0.147	0.135	0.125	0.13	0.137	0.108	0.127	0.126	0.158	0.144	0.116
Median		4	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4.55
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.406	1.194	1.094	1.019	1.051	1.111	0.882	1.033	1.023	1.283	1.158	0.943
Variance		1.976	1.426	1.197	1.038	1.104	1.233	0.778	1.067	1.047	1.647	1.341	0.889
Skewness		-0.692	-1.189	-1.5	-1.189	-0.551	-1.54	-1.309	-1.311	-1.251	-0.767	-1.32	-1.373
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.296	0.295	0.295	0.295	0.296	0.295	0.297	0.295
Kurtosis		-0.858	0.574	1.552	0.97	0.061	1.697	2.119	1.355	1.092	-0.326	1.198	1.711
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.584	0.582	0.582	0.582	0.584	0.582	0.586	0.582
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Boulder City		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	9	9	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.07	4.28	4.45	4.44	4.03	4.59	4.3	4.54	3.96	4.66	4.41	4.59
Std. Error of Mean		0.361	0.32	0.321	0.364	0.418	0.28	0.298	0.281	0.434	0.209	0.28	0.28
Median		4.63	4.66	5	5	4	5	4.82	5	4.63	5	5	5
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.061	0.939	0.917	1.068	1.229	0.821	0.874	0.826	1.274	0.614	0.822	0.821
Variance		1.125	0.883	0.841	1.141	1.511	0.674	0.764	0.682	1.622	0.377	0.675	0.674
Skewness		-0.179	-1.297	-1.255	-2.763	-2.143	-1.788	-0.752	-1.538	-0.847	-1.824	-1.056	-1.788
Std. Error of Skewness		0.729	0.729	0.746	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729	0.729
Kurtosis		-2.668	1.657	-0.461	10.687	5.792	1.765	-1.231	0.893	0.272	3.572	-0.347	1.765
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.467	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		2	3	2	4	4	2	2	2	4	2	2	2
Minimum		3	2	3	1	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Mesquite		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.08	3.96	4.64	4.64	4.4	4.64	4.64	4.64	4.59	4.4	4.64	4.52
Std. Error of Mean		0.548	0.492	0.403	0.403	0.407	0.574	0.282	0.403	0.461	0.499	0.403	0.411
Median		4.43	4	5	5	4.57	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mode		5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.083	0.91	0.797	0.797	0.804	1.133	0.557	0.797	0.854	0.985	0.797	0.812
Variance		1.173	0.829	0.635	0.635	0.646	1.283	0.31	0.635	0.729	0.97	0.635	0.66
Skewness		-0.299	0.14	-2.87	-2.87	-1.266	-4.126	-1.02	-2.87	-2.871	-1.518	-2.87	-1.975
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.108	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.108	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		2	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		3	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix II
Performance Score for Selected Services

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

Performance Variables	N Valid	N Missing	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error of Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
General Government Services												
Road maintenance	596	4	3.14	0.042	3	1.036	-0.116	0.1	-0.334	0.2	1	5
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	589	11	2.59	0.042	3	1.024	0.365	0.101	-0.182	0.201	1	5
Flood control	581	19	3.6	0.046	4	1.1	-0.647	0.101	-0.091	0.202	1	5
Budget management	586	14	2.72	0.045	3	1.091	0.015	0.101	-0.555	0.202	1	5
Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	575	25	3.01	0.05	3	1.202	-0.076	0.102	-0.755	0.203	1	5
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	575	24	2.6	0.046	3	1.094	0.126	0.102	-0.615	0.203	1	5
Water conservation programs	588	11	3.44	0.047	4	1.151	-0.486	0.101	-0.511	0.201	1	5
Social & Judicial Services												
Providing child protection services	586	13	3.03	0.046	3	1.108	-0.07	0.101	-0.572	0.201	1	5
Providing child welfare services	587	13	3.03	0.045	3	1.091	-0.072	0.101	-0.549	0.201	1	5
Providing juvenile justice services	583	17	2.96	0.043	3	1.05	-0.086	0.101	-0.268	0.202	1	5
Providing attainable housing for working class families	584	16	2.59	0.045	3	1.096	0.355	0.101	-0.364	0.202	1	5
Providing affordable housing for low income families	577	22	2.52	0.046	2	1.113	0.403	0.102	-0.404	0.203	1	5
Providing shelter for the homeless	586	14	2.22	0.047	2	1.128	0.618	0.101	-0.385	0.202	1	5
Providing affordable housing for seniors	580	19	2.76	0.047	3	1.139	0.075	0.101	-0.622	0.203	1	5
Providing medical care for the poor	577	23	2.58	0.051	3	1.226	0.371	0.102	-0.738	0.203	1	5
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	578	21	3.42	0.05	3	1.198	-0.306	0.102	-0.791	0.203	1	5

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

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

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

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

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



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

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)

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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



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

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	257	257	255	255	250	248	256
	Missing	4	3	5	6	10	13	5
Mean		3.08	2.54	3.6	2.72	3	2.6	3.37
Std. Error of Mean		0.067	0.066	0.07	0.072	0.076	0.071	0.075
Median		3	3	4	3	3	3	4
Mode		3	3	4	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.07	1.065	1.122	1.15	1.203	1.115	1.193
Variance		1.145	1.135	1.259	1.322	1.447	1.244	1.423
Skewness		0.031	0.389	-0.599	0.028	-0.085	0.171	-0.457
Std. Error of Skewness		0.152	0.152	0.152	0.153	0.154	0.155	0.152
Kurtosis		-0.472	-0.228	-0.269	-0.717	-0.725	-0.607	-0.582
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.303	0.303	0.304	0.304	0.307	0.308	0.303
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas		Road maintenance	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	Flood control	Budget management	Communicate Clark County's local governments' views about Yucca Mountain to Federal decision makers	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	Water conservation programs
N	Valid	193	188	189	190	187	187	188
	Missing	0	5	4	2	6	6	5
Mean		3.3	2.69	3.7	2.82	3	2.71	3.58
Std. Error of Mean		0.073	0.072	0.072	0.076	0.084	0.077	0.079
Median		3	3	4	3	3	3	4
Mode		3	3	4	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		1.008	0.992	0.996	1.055	1.153	1.057	1.08
Variance		1.017	0.984	0.993	1.112	1.328	1.117	1.166
Skewness		-0.385	0.362	-0.701	-0.062	-0.024	-0.015	-0.53
Std. Error of Skewness		0.175	0.177	0.177	0.176	0.178	0.178	0.177
Kurtosis		-0.072	-0.173	0.257	-0.33	-0.657	-0.396	-0.346
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.348	0.353	0.351	0.35	0.354	0.353	0.352
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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	189	190	190	189	189	192	187	191	190
	Missing	4	3	2	4	4	1	6	2	3
Mean		3.02	3.11	2.96	2.65	2.53	2.34	2.75	2.63	3.52
Std. Error of Mean		0.077	0.077	0.072	0.082	0.081	0.085	0.08	0.087	0.083
Median		3	3	3	3	2.02	2	3	3	4
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.063	1.065	0.99	1.123	1.109	1.178	1.091	1.201	1.146
Variance		1.13	1.135	0.98	1.261	1.23	1.387	1.189	1.443	1.313
Skewness		-0.083	-0.128	-0.17	0.265	0.352	0.608	-0.04	0.274	-0.369
Std. Error of Skewness		0.177	0.176	0.176	0.177	0.177	0.175	0.178	0.176	0.176
Kurtosis		-0.446	-0.443	-0.153	-0.48	-0.506	-0.509	-0.551	-0.819	-0.609
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.351	0.351	0.35	0.352	0.352	0.349	0.354	0.35	0.351
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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	65	65	63	65	62	64	66	63	58
	Missing	2	2	3	2	4	3	0	3	8
Mean		2.85	2.83	2.9	2.51	2.54	2.3	2.77	2.79	3.19
Std. Error of Mean		0.136	0.122	0.125	0.125	0.133	0.15	0.151	0.157	0.167
Median		3	3	3	2.72	3	2	3	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.095	0.982	0.995	1.008	1.045	1.197	1.225	1.245	1.277
Variance		1.198	0.965	0.989	1.015	1.093	1.433	1.5	1.549	1.631
Skewness		-0.213	-0.181	0.013	0.345	0.306	0.384	0.169	0.301	-0.145
Std. Error of Skewness		0.298	0.298	0.3	0.298	0.304	0.3	0.296	0.302	0.313
Kurtosis		-0.553	-0.467	-0.076	-0.071	0.071	-0.98	-0.673	-0.758	-1.011
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.588	0.588	0.593	0.588	0.599	0.593	0.584	0.595	0.616
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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

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

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	247	258	255	249	245	249	249	249
	Missing	14	3	5	12	15	11	11	11
Mean		3.13	3.12	2.96	2.82	3.09	3.88	3.86	4.05
Std. Error of Mean		0.066	0.076	0.069	0.079	0.08	0.06	0.063	0.063
Median		3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	4	5
Std. Deviation		1.03	1.221	1.109	1.241	1.247	0.948	0.993	0.989
Variance		1.06	1.49	1.23	1.539	1.555	0.898	0.987	0.979
Skewness		-0.08	-0.121	-0.02	0.134	-0.311	-0.774	-0.959	-0.965
Std. Error of Skewness		0.155	0.152	0.152	0.154	0.156	0.154	0.154	0.154
Kurtosis		-0.231	-0.821	-0.561	-0.867	-0.866	0.68	1.049	0.706
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.309	0.302	0.304	0.308	0.31	0.307	0.307	0.307
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	250	253	253	249	249	249	248	248	249
	Missing	11	7	8	11	11	12	13	13	11
Mean		2.87	2.99	2.99	3.03	3.66	3.79	2.98	2.99	3.22
Std. Error of Mean		0.073	0.072	0.078	0.075	0.068	0.067	0.076	0.075	0.068
Median		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.156	1.14	1.243	1.189	1.079	1.055	1.193	1.173	1.08
Variance		1.336	1.299	1.544	1.414	1.164	1.114	1.424	1.375	1.166
Skewness		0.118	-0.103	0.025	-0.078	-0.558	-0.726	0.054	-0.049	-0.347
Std. Error of Skewness		0.154	0.153	0.153	0.154	0.154	0.154	0.155	0.155	0.154
Kurtosis		-0.646	-0.702	-0.878	-0.874	-0.34	0.187	-0.708	-0.687	-0.193
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.307	0.305	0.305	0.307	0.308	0.308	0.308	0.308	0.307
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	188	189	189	192	190	188	185	190	191
	Missing	5	4	4	1	2	5	8	2	2
Mean		2.86	3.05	3.09	3.25	3.81	3.92	3.07	2.9	3.31
Std. Error of Mean		0.081	0.079	0.085	0.08	0.066	0.067	0.078	0.08	0.071
Median		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.118	1.084	1.168	1.107	0.911	0.92	1.055	1.101	0.983
Variance		1.249	1.176	1.364	1.226	0.829	0.846	1.113	1.212	0.966
Skewness		0.108	-0.038	-0.139	-0.394	-0.643	-0.892	-0.074	-0.107	-0.447
Std. Error of Skewness		0.177	0.177	0.177	0.175	0.176	0.177	0.179	0.176	0.176
Kurtosis		-0.503	-0.48	-0.772	-0.411	0.483	0.989	-0.245	-0.589	0.113
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.353	0.352	0.351	0.349	0.35	0.353	0.356	0.35	0.35
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	68	67	66	68	68	67	67	65	67
	Missing	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	0
Mean		2.69	3.05	3.24	3.09	3.69	3.72	2.87	3.1	3.18
Std. Error of Mean		0.129	0.142	0.141	0.139	0.124	0.12	0.141	0.174	0.129
Median		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.063	1.159	1.14	1.142	1.02	0.976	1.151	1.405	1.059
Variance		1.129	1.343	1.299	1.304	1.04	0.952	1.325	1.975	1.121
Skewness		0.085	0.062	-0.451	-0.031	-0.402	-0.086	0.115	-0.101	0.159
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.293	0.296	0.291	0.291	0.294	0.294	0.297	0.292
Kurtosis		-0.644	-0.689	-0.22	-0.654	-0.348	-1.059	-0.667	-1.21	-0.395
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.579	0.583	0.575	0.575	0.58	0.58	0.586	0.577
Range		4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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	63	64	65	63	63	62	62	63
	Missing	3	2	2	3	3	4	4	3
Mean		3.26	3.25	2.99	3.01	3.17	3.82	3.81	4.06
Std. Error of Mean		0.117	0.145	0.143	0.145	0.138	0.111	0.12	0.12
Median		3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Mode		4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Std. Deviation		0.929	1.158	1.147	1.154	1.101	0.878	0.942	0.951
Variance		0.864	1.342	1.315	1.332	1.211	0.77	0.888	0.905
Skewness		-0.117	-0.276	-0.06	-0.023	-0.365	-0.58	-0.671	-1.147
Std. Error of Skewness		0.301	0.299	0.298	0.301	0.3	0.304	0.304	0.301
Kurtosis		-0.536	-0.433	-0.813	-0.723	-0.261	0.643	0.551	1.446
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.595	0.59	0.588	0.595	0.593	0.599	0.599	0.595
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	65	65	65	64	63	65	63	64	65
	Missing	2	2	2	2	4	2	3	3	2
Mean		3.07	2.82	2.94	3.05	3.76	3.87	3.09	2.97	3.03
Std. Error of Mean		0.148	0.147	0.14	0.142	0.096	0.111	0.141	0.143	0.134
Median		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.192	1.181	1.123	1.138	0.761	0.89	1.116	1.143	1.074
Variance		1.421	1.396	1.26	1.296	0.578	0.792	1.245	1.307	1.153
Skewness		0.052	-0.007	-0.108	-0.151	0.336	-0.431	-0.046	0.105	0.088
Std. Error of Skewness		0.298	0.298	0.298	0.299	0.303	0.298	0.302	0.3	0.298
Kurtosis		-0.711	-0.742	-0.297	-0.684	-0.974	-0.173	-0.296	-0.559	-0.312
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.588	0.588	0.588	0.59	0.597	0.588	0.595	0.593	0.588
Range		4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	7	7	7	7	9	8	9	7	9
	Missing	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	2	0
Mean		3.13	3.64	3.28	3.59	4.12	4.06	3.89	3.78	3.04
Std. Error of Mean		0.572	0.442	0.652	0.42	0.267	0.167	0.426	0.347	0.283
Median		3	4	3.5	3.5	4	4	4	3.5	3
Mode		3	4	5	3	4	4	5	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.523	1.178	1.736	1.119	0.784	0.459	1.252	0.924	0.832
Variance		2.321	1.388	3.014	1.253	0.615	0.211	1.569	0.854	0.691
Skewness		-0.121	-0.695	-0.48	-0.687	-1.241	0.451	-0.782	0.56	1.587
Std. Error of Skewness		0.789	0.789	0.789	0.789	0.729	0.77	0.729	0.789	0.729
Kurtosis		-0.598	-0.83	-1.558	2.599	4.4	6.544	-0.967	-1.796	4.873
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.575	1.575	1.575	1.575	1.428	1.525	1.428	1.575	1.428
Range		4	3	4	4	3	2	3	2	3
Minimum		1	2	1	1	2	3	2	3	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.84	3.6	3.84	3.45	3.64	3.96	4.08	3.96
Std. Error of Mean		0.46	0.499	0.615	0.78	0.761	0.492	0.548	0.511
Median		3.9	3	3.96	3.91	4	4	4.43	3.96
Mode		3	3	5	2	4	4	5	3
Std. Deviation		0.909	0.985	1.214	1.541	1.409	0.91	1.083	1.009
Variance		0.826	0.97	1.474	2.374	1.986	0.829	1.173	1.019
Skewness		0.499	1.518	-0.557	0.124	-0.845	0.14	-0.299	0.123
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.108	1.108	1.028	1.028
Range		2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2
Minimum		3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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 events	Investigating criminal activity	Providing fire protection & prevention services	Providing emergency medical services	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	Regional justice services and facilities
N	Valid	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3
	Missing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3	3.48	3.24	3.96	3.96	3.96	3.55	3	3.27
Std. Error of Mean		0.95	0.968	0.75	0.511	0.492	0.587	0.463	0.582	0.554
Median		3	3.91	3	3.96	4	3.86	3.21	3	3
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.759	1.666	1.48	1.009	0.91	1.159	0.858	1.077	1.027
Variance		3.095	2.775	2.191	1.019	0.829	1.343	0.736	1.16	1.054
Skewness		0		-0.194	0.123	0.14	0.127	1.863	2.227	1.443
Std. Error of Skewness		1.108		1.028	1.028	1.108	1.028	1.108	1.108	1.108
Range		4	4	4	2	2	2	2	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	2
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	251	251	253	250	253	258	258	258	252	253	255	252
	Missing	9	9	7	10	8	3	3	3	8	7	6	8
Mean		2.44	2.48	2.75	2.91	3.1	2.41	3.28	3.02	2.54	2.79	3.46	3.41
Std. Error of Mean		0.07	0.077	0.073	0.074	0.074	0.077	0.078	0.071	0.074	0.079	0.074	0.075
Median		2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	3
Mode		3	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.107	1.215	1.163	1.173	1.178	1.23	1.249	1.143	1.182	1.262	1.186	1.195
Variance		1.225	1.475	1.353	1.375	1.389	1.513	1.561	1.307	1.396	1.592	1.406	1.428
Skewness		0.42	0.258	0.016	-0.049	-0.181	0.385	-0.286	-0.031	0.251	0.206	-0.477	-0.421
Std. Error of Skewness		0.154	0.154	0.153	0.154	0.153	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.153	0.153	0.153	0.153
Kurtosis		-0.313	-1.023	-0.767	-0.748	-0.74	-0.908	-0.831	-0.634	-0.722	-0.862	-0.45	-0.591
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.306	0.306	0.305	0.307	0.305	0.302	0.302	0.302	0.306	0.305	0.304	0.306
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Las Vegas		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	189	190	189	187	186	191	192	191	191	190	191	190
	Missing	4	2	4	6	7	2	1	2	2	3	2	3
Mean		2.82	2.62	2.94	3.06	3.16	2.86	3.3	3.27	2.96	2.95	3.75	3.62
Std. Error of Mean		0.078	0.089	0.079	0.075	0.083	0.094	0.081	0.083	0.083	0.084	0.072	0.076
Median		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
Mode		3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.076	1.226	1.092	1.022	1.136	1.297	1.119	1.15	1.14	1.155	0.996	1.044
Variance		1.158	1.504	1.193	1.044	1.291	1.681	1.251	1.321	1.3	1.333	0.993	1.089
Skewness		0.241	0.299	0.188	-0.163	-0.33	0.084	-0.322	-0.428	0.062	-0.128	-0.841	-0.554
Std. Error of Skewness		0.177	0.176	0.177	0.178	0.178	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.177	0.176	0.176
Kurtosis		-0.217	-0.835	-0.384	-0.369	-0.644	-1.078	-0.603	-0.557	-0.677	-0.764	0.644	-0.071
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.352	0.35	0.352	0.354	0.354	0.35	0.349	0.35	0.35	0.351	0.35	0.351
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of North Las Vegas		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	68	68	67	67	67	68	68	68	68	66	66	67
	Missing	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1
Mean		2.84	2.68	2.97	3.21	3.3	2.78	3.3	3.16	2.89	2.97	3.48	3.47
Std. Error of Mean		0.12	0.136	0.143	0.128	0.148	0.157	0.14	0.159	0.142	0.143	0.147	0.123
Median		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4
Mode		3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4
Std. Deviation		0.984	1.116	1.163	1.047	1.206	1.29	1.154	1.305	1.166	1.166	1.186	1.008
Variance		0.968	1.245	1.353	1.096	1.455	1.665	1.332	1.703	1.36	1.359	1.407	1.017
Skewness		0.138	-0.12	0.053	-0.577	-0.433	0.029	-0.244	-0.099	-0.032	-0.139	-0.208	-0.222
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.291	0.294	0.294	0.294	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.291	0.295	0.296	0.293
Kurtosis		-0.147	-0.747	-0.837	-0.263	-0.609	-1.198	-0.718	-1.077	-0.543	-0.741	-0.891	-0.665
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.575	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.575	0.582	0.584	0.579
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

City of Henderson		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	63	65	65	65	64	65	65	63	64	65	63	65
	Missing	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2
Mean		2.5	2.26	2.7	2.91	3.01	2.17	3.13	2.87	2.64	2.3	3.45	3.58
Std. Error of Mean		0.133	0.127	0.12	0.124	0.148	0.135	0.115	0.135	0.127	0.153	0.135	0.14
Median		3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	4	4
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	1	4	4
Std. Deviation		1.053	1.018	0.963	0.998	1.181	1.085	0.923	1.069	1.021	1.226	1.074	1.124
Variance		1.109	1.036	0.927	0.995	1.394	1.178	0.852	1.143	1.042	1.503	1.154	1.263
Skewness		0.174	0.402	-0.03	0.137	0.015	0.755	-0.087	0.211	-0.061	0.697	-0.55	-0.464
Std. Error of Skewness		0.301	0.298	0.298	0.298	0.3	0.298	0.298	0.302	0.299	0.298	0.302	0.298
Kurtosis		-0.643	-0.297	-0.295	-0.189	-0.733	0.239	0.261	-0.547	-0.53	-0.474	-0.165	-0.445
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.595	0.588	0.588	0.588	0.593	0.588	0.588	0.595	0.59	0.588	0.595	0.588
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

Mesquite		Providing affordable housing	Managing growth	Increasing job opportunities	Improving the business climate	Planning for commercial development	Reducing traffic congestion	Access to freeways	Improving road conditions	Reducing travel time	Providing mass public transit	Adequate airport facilities	Parks and recreation programs
N	Valid	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		3.55	3.27	3.82	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.96	3.72	3.48	2.84	2.55	4.08
Std. Error of Mean		0.463	0.554	0.535	0.499	0.499	0.762	0.511	0.634	0.538	0.615	1.002	0.467
Median		3.21	3	3.71	3	3	3.91	3.96	3.91	3	2.46	2	4
Mode		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	4(a)
Std. Deviation		0.858	1.027	0.99	0.985	0.985	1.506	1.009	1.251	0.925	1.214	1.856	0.921
Variance		0.736	1.054	0.98	0.97	0.97	2.267	1.019	1.566	0.856	1.474	3.444	0.849
Skewness		1.863	1.443	0.692	1.518	1.518	-0.984	0.123	-0.016		1.673	1.562	-0.269
Std. Error of Skewness		1.108	1.108	1.108	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028		1.028	1.108	1.028
Range		2	3	2	2	2	4	2	3	2	3	4	2
Minimum		3	2	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	2	1	3
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III

Quality of Life Considerations

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics

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

		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency	Quality of drinking water	Recreational opportunities	Condition of streets & roads	Availability of public transportation	Housing affordability	Air quality	Availability of job opportunities	Managing growth
N	Valid	595	596	592	596	591	593	596	593	593
	Missing	5	4	8	4	9	6	3	7	7
Mean		3.99	4.07	3.78	4.07	3.46	3.73	4.15	4.02	4.05
Std. Error of Mean		.048	.049	.044	.039	.056	.053	.043	.047	.047
Median		4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.181	1.206	1.075	.957	1.352	1.289	1.044	1.134	1.150
Skewness		-.913	-1.155	-.574	-.790	-.433	-.648	-1.064	-1.033	-1.020
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.100	.100	.101	.100	.100	.100	.100
Kurtosis		-.193	.289	-.374	-.014	-.986	-.705	.364	.272	.078
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.200	.200	.201	.200	.201	.200	.200	.200	.200
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Condition Ratings

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



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

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

Unincorporated Clark County		Overall sense of preparedness in the event of a large scale natural or man-made emergency:	Quality of drinking water:	Recreational opportunities:	Condition of streets & roads:	Availability of public transportation:	Housing affordability:	Air quality:	Availability of job opportunities:	Managing growth:
N	Valid	257	258	257	258	256	257	258	257	257
	Missing	4	3	3	3	5	4	3	4	4
Mean		3.96	4.20	3.80	4.12	3.47	3.80	4.18	3.95	4.12
Std. Error of Mean		.075	.069	.071	.061	.089	.081	.066	.073	.073
Median		4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.207	1.112	1.136	.980	1.415	1.295	1.065	1.164	1.168
Skewness		-.843	-1.308	-.665	-1.047	-.437	-.714	-1.264	-.946	-1.227
Std. Error of Skewness		.152	.152	.152	.152	.152	.152	.152	.152	.152
Kurtosis		-.429	.807	-.434	.635	-1.103	-.674	.960	.038	.533
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.303	.302	.303	.302	.304	.303	.302	.303	.303
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests (cont.)

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.126(a)	20	.334
Likelihood Ratio	25.169	20	.195
Linear-by-Linear Association	.149	1	.699
N of Valid Cases	590		

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.738(a)	20	.605
Likelihood Ratio	18.026	20	.586
Linear-by-Linear Association	.405	1	.524
N of Valid Cases	592		

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

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

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



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

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

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

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



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

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

In thinking about all of the issues we have talked about today, if you could make one major change locally to improve the quality of life in Clark County, what would it be?

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



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

Appendix III
Quality of Life Considerations Perception Measures

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests (cont.)

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

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

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

			Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest negative impact on your quality of life?							
			Traffic Congestion	Overcrowding/ Unplanned growth	Cost of living/ housing	Road conditions	Crime/ violence/ gangs	Air quality	Drought conditions	Education
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	36	62	17	3	55	19	10	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	14.00%	24.00%	6.60%	1.20%	21.30%	7.40%	3.90%	2.70%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	32	45	11	5	46	12	7	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.80%	23.70%	5.80%	2.60%	24.20%	6.30%	3.70%	4.20%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	14	9	3	2	21	0	2	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	20.30%	13.00%	4.30%	2.90%	30.40%	0.00%	2.90%	4.30%
	City of Henderson	Count	16	9	6	1	12	4	4	0
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	24.20%	13.60%	9.10%	1.50%	18.20%	6.10%	6.10%	0.00%
	Boulder City	Count	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	0.00%	22.20%	0.00%	0.00%	22.20%	0.00%	0.00%
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	33.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total		Count	98	125	39	11	135	37	23	18
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	16.50%	21.00%	6.60%	1.80%	22.70%	6.20%	3.90%	3.00%

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

Respondent Jurisdiction * Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest negative impact on your quality of life? (cont.)

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

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

Respondent Jurisdiction * Generally speaking, what aspect of living in Clark County, if any, has the greatest negative impact on your quality of life? (cont.)

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	118.214(a)	75	.001
Likelihood Ratio	109.251	75	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.103	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	595		

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

Respondent Jurisdiction * In thinking about all of the issues we have talked about today, if you could make one major change locally to improve the quality of life in Clark County, what would it be?

			In thinking about all of the issues we have talked about today, if you could make **one** major change locally to improve the quality of life in Clark County, what would it be?															Total
			More affordable housing	Less traffic congestion	Improve K-12 education	Improve higher education	Better services for the homeless	More efficient government/ government officials	Stop growth	Slow growth	Better jobs/ training	Increased access to health care	Lower crime rates	Stop Yucca Mountain	Improve air quality	Stop illegal immigration	No change	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	14	33	36	6	9	24	27	38	5	10	30	15	5	5	2	259
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.4%	12.7%	13.9%	2.3%	3.5%	9.3%	10.4%	14.7%	1.9%	3.9%	11.6%	5.8%	1.9%	1.9%	.8%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	7	25	19	14	6	20	17	19	10	10	31	11	2	1	0	192
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	3.6%	13.0%	9.9%	7.3%	3.1%	10.4%	8.9%	9.9%	5.2%	5.2%	16.1%	5.7%	1.0%	.5%	.0%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	7	9	12	0	5	4	2	4	0	4	8	7	4	0	2	68
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	10.3%	13.2%	17.6%	.0%	7.4%	5.9%	2.9%	5.9%	.0%	5.9%	11.8%	10.3%	5.9%	.0%	2.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	5	11	8	3	0	6	7	9	1	2	10	4	0	1	0	67
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	7.5%	16.4%	11.9%	4.5%	.0%	9.0%	10.4%	13.4%	1.5%	3.0%	14.9%	6.0%	.0%	1.5%	.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	8
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	35	78	75	23	20	54	55	70	18	26	79	40	11	7	6	597
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	5.9%	13.1%	12.6%	3.9%	3.4%	9.0%	9.2%	11.7%	3.0%	4.4%	13.2%	6.7%	1.8%	1.2%	1.0%	100.0%

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

Respondent Jurisdiction * In thinking about all of the issues we have talked about today, if you could make one major change locally to improve the quality of life in Clark County, what would it be?

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	169.818(a)	70	.000
Likelihood Ratio	111.330	70	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.579	1	.032
N of Valid Cases	597		

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IV

General Economic Considerations

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions Ratings
Summary Statistics

		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse, or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	593	587	584	585	591
	Missing	7	13	16	15	9
Mean		2.06	1.74	2.43	1.85	1.3
Std. Error of Mean		0.029	0.029	0.032	0.026	0.019
Median		2	2	2	2	1
Mode		2	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.714	0.711	0.781	0.631	0.459
Variance		0.51	0.506	0.61	0.398	0.211
Skewness		-0.09	0.415	0.052	0.126	0.873
Std. Error of Skewness		0.1	0.101	0.101	0.101	0.101
Kurtosis		-1.032	-0.96	-0.403	-0.555	-1.242
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.2	0.201	0.202	0.202	0.201
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions

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

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Better	134	22.5
About the same	289	48.8
Worse	170	28.7
DK/No answer	7	1.1
Total	600	100



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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions

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

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



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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions

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

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



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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions

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

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



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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions

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

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



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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse, or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	259	253	251	252	256
	Missing	2	7	9	8	4
Mean		2.09	1.8	2.45	1.86	1.33
Std. Error of Mean		0.045	0.046	0.053	0.04	0.03
Median		2	2	2	2	1
Mode		2	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.728	0.736	0.835	0.637	0.473
Variance		0.53	0.542	0.697	0.406	0.224
Skewness		-0.135	0.334	0.054	0.127	0.705
Std. Error of Skewness		0.151	0.153	0.154	0.153	0.152
Kurtosis		-1.097	-1.095	-0.549	-0.574	-1.515
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.302	0.305	0.306	0.306	0.303
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse, or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	191	191	189	189	192
	Missing	2	2	4	4	1
Mean		2.09	1.69	2.43	1.89	1.28
Std. Error of Mean		0.05	0.049	0.056	0.044	0.032
Median		2	2	2	2	1
Mode		2	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.686	0.67	0.771	0.602	0.45
Variance		0.47	0.449	0.594	0.363	0.202
Skewness		-0.114	0.466	-0.089	0.049	0.994
Std. Error of Skewness		0.176	0.176	0.177	0.177	0.175
Kurtosis		-0.859	-0.761	-0.406	-0.28	-1.023
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.35	0.35	0.352	0.352	0.349
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse, or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	68	68	67	67	68
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.99	1.57	2.23	1.73	1.3
Std. Error of Mean		0.093	0.081	0.094	0.084	0.056
Median		2	1	2	2	1
Mode		2	1	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.763	0.67	0.769	0.688	0.462
Variance		0.583	0.449	0.591	0.473	0.214
Skewness		0.017	0.777	0.208	0.402	0.884
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.291	0.292	0.292	0.291
Kurtosis		-1.262	-0.476	-0.235	-0.824	-1.257
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.575	0.577	0.577	0.575
Range		2	2	3	2	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse, or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	65	64	65	66	65
	Missing	2	2	1	0	2
Mean		2.06	1.88	2.53	1.84	1.27
Std. Error of Mean		0.083	0.097	0.075	0.082	0.056
Median		2	2	2	2	1
Mode		2	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.668	0.774	0.603	0.664	0.447
Variance		0.446	0.599	0.364	0.441	0.2
Skewness		-0.071	0.209	0.657	0.183	1.065
Std. Error of Skewness		0.298	0.299	0.297	0.295	0.298
Kurtosis		-0.692	-1.287	-0.484	-0.702	-0.895
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.588	0.591	0.586	0.582	0.588
Range		2	2	2	2	1
Minimum		1	1	2	1	1
Maximum		3	3	4	3	2

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Boulder City		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse, or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	7	7	7	7	7
	Missing	2	2	2	2	2
Mean		1.41	1.63	2.35	1.84	1.07
Std. Error of Mean		0.248	0.195	0.243	0.156	0.108
Median		1	2	2	2	1
Mode		1	2	2	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.661	0.52	0.647	0.401	0.279
Variance		0.436	0.271	0.419	0.161	0.078
Skewness		1.542	-0.709	1.946	-2.409	4.413
Std. Error of Skewness		0.789	0.789	0.789	0.811	0.811
Kurtosis		2.577	-2.263	4.491	5.418	25.48
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.575	1.575	1.575	1.637	1.637
Range		2	1	2	1	1
Minimum		1	1	2	1	1
Maximum		3	2	4	2	2

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Mesquite		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?	Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now your financial situation, and the financial situation of any family members living with you, will be better, worse, or about the same?	Now turning to business conditions in Clark County, would you say that business conditions in Clark County are excellent, good, fair, or poor?	And how about a year from now, do you expect that business conditions in Clark County will be better than they are today, worse than they are today, or about the same as they are today?	Generally speaking, do you think now is a good time or a bad time to buy a single-family home in Clark County?
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.48	2	2.52	1.88	1
Std. Error of Mean		0.293	0	0.293	0.191	0
Median		1.43	2	2.57	2	1
Mode		1	2	3	2	1
Std. Deviation		0.579	0	0.579	0.378	0
Variance		0.336	0	0.336	0.143	0
Skewness		0.127		-0.127	-4.126	
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		1	0	1	1	0
Minimum		1	2	2	1	1
Maximum		2	2	3	2	1

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

		We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you, and any family members living with you, are better or worse off financially than you were a year ago, or about the same?			Total
Respondent Jurisdiction		Better	About the same	Worse	
Unincorporated Clark County	Count	58	120	81	259
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.40%	46.30%	31.30%	100.00%
City of Las Vegas	Count	37	100	54	191
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	19.40%	52.40%	28.30%	100.00%
City of North Las Vegas	Count	20	29	19	68
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	29.40%	42.60%	27.90%	100.00%
City of Henderson	Count	12	36	16	64
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	18.80%	56.30%	25.00%	100.00%
Boulder City	Count	5	2	0	7
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	71.40%	28.60%	0.00%	100.00%
Mesquite	Count	2	2	0	4
	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	Count	134	289	170	593
Total	% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.60%	48.70%	28.70%	100.00%

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IV
General Economic Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix V

Property Value Considerations

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
(Summary Statistics)

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

		Amusement Park	Day care center	Landfill	Non-polluting manufacturing facility	Public school	Highway/Freeway	Hotel-casino	Polluting manufacturing facility	High-level nuclear waste transportation route
N	Valid	593	589	585	586	593	586	588	592	594
	Missing	7	10	15	14	7	14	12	8	6
Mean		1.84	2.36	1.12	1.57	2.57	1.95	1.79	1.09	1.14
Std. Error of Mean		0.035	0.027	0.018	0.031	0.026	0.037	0.034	0.016	0.017
Median		2	2	1	1	3	2	2	1	1
Mode		1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.851	0.645	0.423	0.753	0.645	0.887	0.834	0.39	0.42
Skewness		0.304	-0.515	3.626	0.891	-1.199	0.103	0.411	4.483	3.036
Std. Error of Skewness		0.1	0.101	0.101	0.101	0.1	0.101	0.101	0.1	0.1
Kurtosis		-1.555	-0.673	12.292	-0.685	0.259	-1.723	-1.442	18.719	8.812
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.2	0.201	0.202	0.202	0.2	0.202	0.201	0.201	0.2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions

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

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



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

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		Amusement Park	Day care center	Landfill	Non-polluting manufacturing facility	Public school	Highway/Freeway	Hotel-casino	Polluting manufacturing facility	High-level nuclear waste transportation route
N	Valid	256	257	254	254	257	257	256	256	258
	Missing	4	4	6	7	3	4	4	4	2
Mean		1.91	2.42	1.12	1.6	2.62	1.96	1.72	1.08	1.15
Std. Error of Mean		0.053	0.042	0.027	0.049	0.039	0.055	0.051	0.024	0.028
Median		2	3	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
Mode		1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.854	0.665	0.435	0.787	0.631	0.874	0.818	0.378	0.453
Skewness		0.181	-0.733	3.775	0.83	-1.419	0.072	0.553	4.793	3.046
Std. Error of Skewness		0.152	0.152	0.153	0.153	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152
Kurtosis		-1.608	-0.547	13.074	-0.889	0.825	-1.693	-1.289	21.485	8.569
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.303	0.303	0.304	0.305	0.303	0.303	0.303	0.303	0.302
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sum		488	622	283	407	673	504	440	276	297

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

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

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		Amusement Park	Day care center	Landfill	Non-polluting manufacturing facility	Public school	Highway/Freeway	Hotel-casino	Polluting manufacturing facility	High-level nuclear waste transportation route
N	Valid	68	67	65	68	68	64	68	68	68
	Missing	0	1	3	0	0	4	0	0	0
Mean		2.08	2.52	1.21	1.59	2.67	1.73	1.91	1.15	1.11
Std. Error of Mean		0.113	0.076	0.068	0.095	0.071	0.118	0.111	0.061	0.047
Median		2	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	1
Mode		3	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.932	0.617	0.544	0.786	0.586	0.942	0.915	0.506	0.385
Skewness		-0.153	-0.928	2.604	0.865	-1.647	0.565	0.187	3.316	3.634
Std. Error of Skewness		0.291	0.294	0.298	0.291	0.291	0.299	0.291	0.291	0.291
Kurtosis		-1.863	-0.116	5.685	-0.82	1.735	-1.663	-1.807	9.622	13.497
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.575	0.58	0.587	0.575	0.575	0.59	0.575	0.575	0.575
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sum		140	168	78	108	181	111	129	78	75

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

City of Henderson		Amusement Park	Day care center	Landfill	Non-polluting manufacturing facility	Public school	Highway/Freeway	Hotel-casino	Polluting manufacturing facility	High-level nuclear waste transportation route
N	Valid	66	66	66	64	66	63	64	66	65
	Missing	0	0	0	2	0	3	2	0	1
Mean		1.62	2.25	1.14	1.57	2.45	1.89	1.61	1.04	1.17
Std. Error of Mean		0.093	0.076	0.052	0.086	0.085	0.109	0.093	0.03	0.05
Median		1	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
Mode		1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.756	0.617	0.426	0.691	0.688	0.865	0.745	0.24	0.4
Skewness		0.78	-0.209	3.31	0.8	-0.853	0.213	0.777	6.022	2.121
Std. Error of Skewness		0.295	0.295	0.295	0.299	0.295	0.3	0.299	0.295	0.297
Kurtosis		-0.811	-0.534	10.788	-0.519	-0.442	-1.644	-0.768	40.236	3.637
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.582	0.582	0.582	0.59	0.582	0.593	0.591	0.582	0.586
Range		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sum		107	149	75	101	162	120	103	69	76

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Boulder City		Amusement Park	Day care center	Landfill	Non-polluting manufacturing facility	Public school	Highway/Freeway	Hotel-casino	Polluting manufacturing facility	High-level nuclear waste transportation route
N	Valid	7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7
	Missing	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
Mean		1.41	2	1.07	1.26	3	1.89	1.5	1	1.07
Std. Error of Mean		0.248	0.241	0.101	0.232	0	0.389	0.335	0	0.101
Median		1	2	1	1	3	1.77	1	1	1
Mode		1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.661	0.619	0.268	0.617	0	1.036	0.894	0	0.268
Skewness		1.542	0	4.503	2.646		0.274	1.474		4.503
Std. Error of Skewness		0.789	0.811	0.789	0.789	0.872	0.789	0.789	0.789	0.789
Kurtosis		2.577	2.187	25.799	8.859		-2.698	0.409		25.799
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.575	1.637	1.575	1.575	1.833	1.575	1.575	1.575	1.575
Range		2	2	1	2	0	2	2	0	1
Minimum		1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	2
Sum		10	13	8	9	17	13	11	7	8

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Summary Statistic by Jurisdiction

Mesquite		Amusement Park	Day care center	Landfill	Non-polluting manufacturing facility	Public school	Highway/Freeway	Hotel-casino	Polluting manufacturing facility	High-level nuclear waste transportation route
N	Valid	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.12	2.48	1.24	1.36	2.48	2	1.88	1	1
Std. Error of Mean		0.346	0.293	0.382	0.403	0.293	0.408	0.346	0	0
Median		2	2.43	1	1	2.43	2	2	1	1
Mode		2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1
Std. Deviation		0.683	0.579	0.755	0.797	0.579	0.805	0.683	0	0
Skewness		-0.058	0.127	4.126	2.87	0.127	0	0.058		
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028	1.028
Range		2	1	2	2	1	2	2	0	0
Minimum		1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
Maximum		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1
Sum		8	10	5	5	10	8	7	4	4

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.756(a)	10	.653
Likelihood Ratio	8.278	10	.602
Linear-by-Linear Association	.120	1	.729
N of Valid Cases	584		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

			Non-polluting manufacturing facility:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	148	57	48	253
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	58.5%	22.5%	19.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	114	50	26	190
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	60.0%	26.3%	13.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	40	15	12	67
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	59.7%	22.4%	17.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	35	22	7	64
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	54.7%	34.4%	10.9%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	6	1	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	85.7%	14.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	3	0	0	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	346	145	93	584
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	59.2%	24.8%	15.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.046(a)	10	.354
Likelihood Ratio	13.028	10	.222
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.591	1	.207
N of Valid Cases	584		

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

			Polluting manufacturing facility:			Total
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	245	2	9	256
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	95.7%	.8%	3.5%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	180	3	8	191
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	94.2%	1.6%	4.2%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	62	2	4	68
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	91.2%	2.9%	5.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	64	2	0	66
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	97.0%	3.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	7	0	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	4	0	0	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	562	9	21	592
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	94.9%	1.5%	3.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix V
Property Value Conditions
Jurisdiction Cross- Tabulation

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

			High-level nuclear waste transportation route:			
			Decrease property value of nearby homes	No effect on property value of nearby homes	Increase property value of nearby homes	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	228	20	10	258
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	88.4%	7.8%	3.9%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	170	18	4	192
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	88.5%	9.4%	2.1%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	62	5	2	69
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	89.9%	7.2%	2.9%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	54	10	0	64
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	84.4%	15.6%	.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	7	0	0	7
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	4	0	0	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	525	53	16	594
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	88.4%	8.9%	2.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VI

Environmental Considerations

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics

		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	589	597	590	599
	Missing	10	2	9	0
Mean		2.68	1.52	2.95	2.82
Std. Error of Mean		.035	.030	.038	.031
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		.852	.721	.931	.758
Skewness		-.114	1.535	-.436	-.033
Std. Error of Skewness		.101	.100	.101	.100
Kurtosis		-.634	2.450	-.797	-.623
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.201	.200	.201	.199
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Excellent	48	8
	Good	197	32.9
	Fair	243	40.5
	Poor	101	16.9
	DK/No answer	10	1.7
	Total	600	100

Preserving Natural Areas



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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings

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

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

Drought



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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings

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

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

Drinking Water



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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings

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

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

Air Quality



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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Unincorporated Clark County		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	253	260	260	260
	Missing	7	0	0	0
Mean		2.73	1.50	2.87	2.86
Std. Error of Mean		.053	.045	.059	.049
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		.843	.729	.946	.785
Skewness		-.263	1.526	-.346	-.118
Std. Error of Skewness		.153	.151	.151	.151
Kurtosis		-.483	2.149	-.870	-.652
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.305	.301	.301	.301
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of Las Vegas		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	190	191	185	193
	Missing	3	2	8	0
Mean		2.65	1.54	2.84	2.72
Std. Error of Mean		.062	.050	.069	.053
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		3	1	3	3
Std. Deviation		.856	.697	.935	.739
Skewness		-.069	1.540	-.289	.223
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.176	.179	.175
Kurtosis		-.645	3.102	-.878	-.694
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.351	.350	.355	.349
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

City of North Las Vegas		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	67	68	68	68
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.58	1.60	3.31	2.90
Std. Error of Mean		.108	.096	.097	.077
Median		2.34	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		.885	.789	.802	.636
Skewness		.121	1.540	-1.014	-.303
Std. Error of Skewness		.292	.291	.291	.291
Kurtosis		-.733	2.512	.511	.556
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.577	.575	.575	.575
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Henderson		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	66	66	65	66
	Missing	0	0	1	0
Mean		2.65	1.43	3.17	2.82
Std. Error of Mean		.105	.086	.108	.094
Median		3.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	1	4	3
Std. Deviation		.856	.696	.870	.761
Skewness		.047	1.770	-.794	-.208
Std. Error of Skewness		.295	.295	.297	.295
Kurtosis		-.690	3.230	-.122	-.247
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.582	.582	.586	.582
Range		3	3	3	3
Minimum		1	1	1	1
Maximum		4	4	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

Boulder City		How would you rate local government's performance in preserving natural areas within Clark County?	Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?	In general, how would you rate the quality of Clark County's drinking water?	In general, how would you rate Clark County's air quality?
N	Valid	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.59	1.53	3.00	3.46
Std. Error of Mean		.304	.281	.328	.256
Median		2.19	1.00	3.00	4.00
Mode		2	1	2(a)	4
Std. Deviation		.894	.826	.965	.751
Skewness		.426	1.258	.000	-1.146
Std. Error of Skewness		.729	.729	.729	.729
Kurtosis		-.263	.097	-2.286	.350
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		3	2	2	2
Minimum		1	1	2	2
Maximum		4	3	4	4

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Summary Statistics by Jurisdiction

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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

			Which of the following best describes your level of concern, if any, about the current drought and its impact on Clark County?				
			Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Somewhat unconcerned	Not concerned	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	159	79	15	7	260
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	61.2%	30.4%	5.8%	2.7%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	104	78	2	7	191
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	54.5%	40.8%	1.0%	3.7%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	36	27	2	4	69
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	52.2%	39.1%	2.9%	5.8%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	44	18	3	2	67
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	65.7%	26.9%	4.5%	3.0%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	6	2	2	0	10
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	2	2	0	0	4
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	351	206	24	20	601
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	58.4%	34.3%	4.0%	3.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Condition Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Perception Ratings

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

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



Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Perception Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Appendix VI
Environmental Considerations Perception Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

Chi-Square Tests (cont.)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	70.240(a)	45	.009
Likelihood Ratio	57.169	45	.105
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.792	1	.029
N of Valid Cases	594		

Appendix VII

Yucca Mountain Considerations

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Summary Statistics

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

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

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

Keeping Local Decision Makers Up to Date About Yucca Mountain



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

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

Keeping Public Up to Date About Yucca Mountain



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

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

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



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

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

Identify Public Safety Needs and Impacts



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

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

Asses Other Government Impacts



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

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

Assess Impacts on the Tourism Sector



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

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

Assess Impacts to the Building, Construction, and Development Sectors



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

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

Identify Transportation Impacts



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations

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

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

Provide Information to the Public on All Facts of Yucca Mountain



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

Unincorporated Clark County		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	258	257	256	259	254	254	258	255	259
	Missing	2	4	4	2	6	6	3	5	1
Mean		4.22	4.28	4.05	4.19	3.83	3.85	3.83	3.97	4.20
Std. Error of Mean		.075	.076	.077	.067	.077	.077	.076	.070	.074
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.209	1.211	1.231	1.082	1.233	1.225	1.219	1.110	1.188
Skewness		-1.520	-1.708	-1.155	-1.357	-.866	-.886	-.872	-.975	-1.444
Std. Error of Skewness		.152	.152	.152	.151	.153	.153	.152	.152	.151
Kurtosis		1.246	1.853	.282	1.250	-.100	-.136	-.096	.322	1.081
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.302	.303	.303	.302	.304	.304	.302	.304	.302
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

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 about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	192	191	185	189	189	187	189	190	190
	Missing	1	2	8	4	4	6	4	3	3
Mean		4.29	4.33	4.18	4.32	3.96	3.86	3.94	4.03	4.19
Std. Error of Mean		.080	.080	.088	.075	.088	.083	.082	.082	.085
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.110	1.108	1.201	1.026	1.212	1.136	1.123	1.125	1.168
Skewness		-1.610	-1.580	-1.324	-1.500	-.900	-.782	-.999	-1.028	-1.273
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.176	.178	.177	.177	.178	.177	.176	.176
Kurtosis		1.812	1.474	.620	1.492	-.278	-.147	.480	.245	.525
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.349	.350	.355	.352	.351	.353	.352	.351	.351
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

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 about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	63	64	64	64	64	64	64	63	67
	Missing	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	1
Mean		4.25	4.26	4.00	4.43	3.89	3.68	3.79	3.95	4.20
Std. Error of Mean		.139	.124	.173	.123	.136	.172	.167	.142	.143
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.099	.991	1.387	.987	1.087	1.380	1.334	1.128	1.166
Skewness		-1.288	-1.181	-1.048	-1.489	-.631	-.649	-.823	-.770	-1.343
Std. Error of Skewness		.302	.299	.299	.299	.299	.299	.299	.302	.293
Kurtosis		.655	.254	-.323	.817	-.728	-.900	-.532	-.392	.851
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.595	.590	.590	.590	.590	.590	.590	.595	.579
Range		4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

Henderson		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	66	66	65	66	66	65	65	66	66
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Mean		4.21	4.39	4.24	4.38	3.90	3.87	3.70	3.85	4.27
Std. Error of Mean		.125	.134	.134	.108	.139	.154	.153	.154	.142
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.014	1.087	1.083	.881	1.132	1.241	1.232	1.255	1.158
Skewness		-1.167	-1.856	-1.310	-1.581	-.870	-.968	-.672	-.966	-1.606
Std. Error of Skewness		.295	.295	.297	.295	.295	.297	.297	.295	.295
Kurtosis		.643	2.616	.803	2.304	.115	-.135	-.446	.013	1.785
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.582	.582	.586	.582	.582	.586	.586	.582	.582
Range		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

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 about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	9	9
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.78	5.00	4.62	4.60	4.15	4.25	4.37	4.71	5.00
Std. Error of Mean		.329	.000	.399	.342	.361	.332	.341	.203	.000
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.82	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		.965	.000	1.173	1.005	1.031	.975	1.002	.595	.000
Skewness		-4.806		-3.203	-3.691	-2.276	-2.701	-2.898	-2.238	
Std. Error of Skewness		.729	.729	.729	.729	.746	.729	.729	.729	.729
Kurtosis		27.642		11.184	18.152	9.300	12.602	13.171	5.775	
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.467	1.428	1.428	1.428	1.428
Range		4	0	4	4	4	4	4	2	0
Minimum		1	5	1	1	1	1	1	3	5
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

Mesquite		Keeping local Decision makers up to date about Yucca Mountain	Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology, and hydrology	Identify public safety needs and impacts	Assess other government impacts	Assess impacts on the tourism sector	Assess impacts to the building, construction, and development sectors	Identify transportation impacts	Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain
N	Valid	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.45	4.76	4.45	3.96	3.96	4.04	3.90	4.31	4.31
Std. Error of Mean		.526	.382	.882	.595	.595	.898	.927	.875	.875
Median		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.20	4.81	4.61	5.00	5.00
Mode		5	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	5
Std. Deviation		1.038	.755	1.634	1.103	1.103	1.662	1.716	1.620	1.620
Skewness		-1.765	-4.126	-4.262	.163	.163	-2.571	-1.863	-3.790	-3.790
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.028	1.108	1.108	1.108	1.108	1.108	1.108	1.108
Range		2	2	4	2	2	4	4	4	4
Minimum		3	3	1	3	3	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Identify public safety needs and impacts:

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Assess other government impacts:

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Assess impacts on the tourism sector:

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

Respondent Jurisdiction * Identify transportation impacts:

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures

		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative effect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.
N	Valid	584	578	580
	Missing	15	21	20
Mean		1.77	3.04	2.62
Std. Error of Mean		0.017	0.039	0.027
Median		2	3	3
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		0.419	0.931	0.642
Skewness		-1.308	-0.537	-1.438
Std. Error of Skewness		0.101	0.102	0.101
Kurtosis		-0.29	-0.786	0.814
Std. Error of Kurtosis		0.202	0.203	0.203
Range		1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	4	3

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures

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

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Support	132	22.1	22.1	22.1
	Oppose	452	75.3	75.3	97.4
	DK/No answer	15	2.6	2.6	100
	Total	600	100	100	

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



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures

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

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

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



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Quality of Life Measures

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

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

Do you Believe the Storage of High-level Nuclear Waste at Yucca Mountain Will Have a Positive or Negative Effect on the Quality of Life of Southern Nevada Residents? If You Feel it Will Have No Effect You Can Tell Me That Too.



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

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

Unincorporated Clark County		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative effect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.
N	Valid	249	252	252
	Missing	11	8	8
Mean		1.78	3.08	2.62
Std. Error of Mean		.026	.059	.041
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.415	.931	.644
Skewness		-1.359	-.558	-1.443
Std. Error of Skewness		.154	.153	.153
Kurtosis		-.156	-.831	.830
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.307	.306	.305
Range		1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	4	3

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

City of Las Vegas		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative effect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.
N	Valid	190	187	190
	Missing	3	6	3
Mean		1.79	3.01	2.58
Std. Error of Mean		.030	.070	.049
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.410	.954	.676
Skewness		-1.421	-.555	-1.341
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.177	.176
Kurtosis		.020	-.750	.453
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.351	.353	.351
Range		1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	4	3

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

City of North Las Vegas		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative effect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.
N	Valid	67	62	62
	Missing	1	5	6
Mean		1.73	2.87	2.72
Std. Error of Mean		.055	.120	.071
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		.447	.944	.558
Skewness		-1.066	-.368	-1.911
Std. Error of Skewness		.294	.303	.304
Kurtosis		-.892	-.800	2.775
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.580	.598	.600
Range		1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	4	3

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

Henderson		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative effect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.
N	Valid	66	65	65
	Missing	0	2	2
Mean		1.73	3.12	2.59
Std. Error of Mean		.055	.112	.078
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	4	3
Std. Deviation		.445	.899	.626
Skewness		-1.090	-.504	-1.259
Std. Error of Skewness		.296	.298	.298
Kurtosis		-.839	-.957	.529
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.584	.588	.588
Range		1	3	2
Minimum		1	1	1
Maximum		2	4	3

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

Boulder City		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative effect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.
N	Valid	9	9	7
	Missing	0	0	2
Mean		1.82	3.34	3.00
Std. Error of Mean		.138	.172	.000
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		.406	.504	.000
Skewness		-2.068	.823	
Std. Error of Skewness		.729	.729	.789
Kurtosis		2.912	-1.821	
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.428	1.428	1.575
Range		1	1	0
Minimum		1	3	3
Maximum		2	4	3

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

Mesquite		The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?	The Department of Energy (DOE) maintains that it can be trusted to manage the Yucca Mountain repository and the transportation of radioactive waste to the repository so that the publics' safety is ensured. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this claim?	Do you believe the storage of high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain will have a positive or negative effect on the quality of life of Southern Nevada residents? If you feel it will have no impact you can tell me that too.
N	Valid	4	3	4
	Missing	0	0	0
Mean		1.88	3.14	2.52
Std. Error of Mean		.191	.402	.411
Median		2.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	3
Std. Deviation		.378	.744	.812
Skewness		-4.126	-.220	-1.975
Std. Error of Skewness		1.028	1.108	1.028
Range		1	2	2
Minimum		1	2	1
Maximum		2	4	3

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

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

			The federal Department of Energy (DOE) wants to build the nation's first high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain in Southern Nevada. If given the opportunity to vote on this matter, would your vote support or oppose locating a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain?		
			Support	Oppose	Total
Respondent Jurisdiction	Unincorporated Clark County	Count	55	195	250
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.0%	78.0%	100.0%
	City of Las Vegas	Count	40	150	190
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	21.1%	78.9%	100.0%
	City of North Las Vegas	Count	18	49	67
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	26.9%	73.1%	100.0%
	City of Henderson	Count	17	48	65
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	26.2%	73.8%	100.0%
	Boulder City	Count	2	7	9
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
	Mesquite	Count	0	3	3
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	132	452	584
		% within Respondent Jurisdiction	22.6%	77.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures

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

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures

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

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



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures

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

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



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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures

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

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



One Two Three Four Five

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

Appendix VII
Yucca Mountain Considerations
Yucca Mountain Willingness to Pay Measures

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

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

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VIII

Community Profile

Appendix VIII
Community Profile

What is your most frequently used mode of transportation?

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

What is Your Most Frequently Used Mode of Transportation?



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

Appendix VIII
Community Profile

Do you currently commute on a daily basis?

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

Do You Currently Commute on a Daily Basis?



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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix VIII
Community Profile
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX

Local Government Interaction

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Summary Statistics

		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?
N	Valid	592	596	218	594	598	238
	Missing	8	4	382	6	2	362
Mean		2.99	1.63	3.60	2.71	1.75	3.63
Std. Error of Mean		.039	.020	.091	.054	.018	.047
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		.942	.482	1.345	1.307	.435	1.144
Skewness		-.409	-.559	-.734	.159	-1.141	-.557
Std. Error of Skewness		.100	.100	.165	.100	.100	.101
Kurtosis		-.017	-1.694	-.667	-1.072	-.700	-.305
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.201	.200	.328	.200	.200	.202
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions

On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	54	9
	Two	86	14.3
	Three	284	47.4
	Four	150	25
	Five	18	3.1
	DK/No answer	8	1.3
	Total	600	100

What is Your Impression of Clark County Government?



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions

Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?

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

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



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions

How often do you interact with Clark County government?

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

How Often Do You Interact with Clark County Government?



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions

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

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



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions

Do you know who your County Commissioner is?

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

Do You Know Who Your County Commissioner Is?



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions

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

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

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



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

Unincorporated Clark County		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?
N	Valid	255	259	104	256	260	252
	Missing	5	1	157	4	0	8
Mean		2.88	1.60	3.44	2.57	1.75	3.60
Std. Error of Mean		.063	.031	.136	.083	.027	.071
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	1	2	3
Std. Deviation		1.007	.491	1.387	1.321	.431	1.131
Skewness		-.262	-.409	-.562	.278	-1.188	-.419
Std. Error of Skewness		.152	.151	.237	.152	.151	.153
Kurtosis		-.390	-1.847	-.969	-1.119	-.594	-.471
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.304	.302	.470	.303	.301	.306
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

City of Las Vegas		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?	Have you ever inquired about or accessed services from Clark County?	How often do you interact with Clark County government?	Sometimes citizens confuse government programs and services provided by Clark County with those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas. Where one equals "Not at all knowledgeable" and five equals "very knowledgeable", how knowledgeable are you about the difference between programs and services provided by Clark County versus those provided by other local governments, such as the City of Las Vegas?	Do you know who your County Commissioner is?	On a scale of one to five, where one equals "very unsatisfied" and five equals "very satisfied", how satisfied are you with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals and other events offered by Clark County?
N	Valid	191	191	65	191	193	186
	Missing	2	2	128	2	0	7
Mean		3.07	1.66	3.53	2.81	1.73	3.65
Std. Error of Mean		.063	.034	.177	.095	.032	.082
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		3	2	4	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		.876	.475	1.434	1.309	.447	1.122
Skewness		-.507	-.676	-.699	.059	-1.027	-.577
Std. Error of Skewness		.176	.176	.297	.176	.175	.178
Kurtosis		.558	-1.559	-.897	-1.085	-.956	-.212
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.350	.350	.585	.350	.349	.354
Range		4	1	4	4	1	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	2	5	5	2	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Summary Statistics

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

Respondent Jurisdiction * On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, what is your impression of Clark County government?

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction General Impressions
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulation

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Summary Statistics

		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?
N	Valid	203	212	213	212	214	215	214	216	216
	Missing	396	388	386	387	385	385	385	383	383
Mean		3.22	2.18	2.24	2.12	2.10	2.16	2.24	2.09	3.15
Std. Error of Mean		.083	.045	.043	.043	.042	.043	.043	.036	.085
Median		3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Std. Deviation		1.176	.654	.635	.627	.612	.623	.626	.531	1.253
Skewness		-.382	-.206	-.255	-.093	-.056	-.124	-.230	.089	-.315
Std. Error of Skewness		.171	.167	.167	.167	.166	.166	.166	.165	.165
Kurtosis		-.493	-.701	-.649	-.487	-.348	-.501	-.609	.472	-.781
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.340	.333	.332	.332	.331	.330	.331	.329	.329
Range		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

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

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	One	25	11.5
	Two	19	8.6
	Three	74	33.8
	Four	57	26.4
	Five	28	13
	DK/No answer	15	6.8
	Total	218	100
Missing	System	382	
Total		600	



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

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

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

Employee Cared About and Understood My Needs



Exceeded expectations Met expectations Did not meet expectations

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

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

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

Service Delivery Was Timely and Responsive



Exceeded expectations Met expectations Did not meet expectations

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

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

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

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



Exceeded expectations Met expectations Did not meet expectations

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

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

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

Employee Was Qualified, Knowledgeable, and Well Informed



Exceeded expectations Met expectations Did not meet expectations

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

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

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

Transaction was Handled in an Appropriate Manner



Exceeded expectations Met expectations Did not meet expectations

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

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

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

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



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

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

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

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



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings

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

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

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



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Summary

Unincorporated Clark County		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?
N	Valid	99	101	101	102	102	102	101	102	102
	Missing	161	160	160	159	159	158	160	158	158
Mean		3.14	2.17	2.22	2.14	2.11	2.20	2.27	2.15	2.99
Std. Error of Mean		.123	.066	.063	.064	.062	.064	.062	.057	.130
Median		3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Std. Deviation		1.223	.659	.634	.647	.627	.642	.624	.578	1.315
Skewness		-.341	-.192	-.221	-.142	-.086	-.210	-.261	-.010	-.192
Std. Error of Skewness		.243	.241	.241	.240	.240	.239	.241	.239	.239
Kurtosis		-.540	-.703	-.603	-.609	-.449	-.626	-.606	-.106	-1.098
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.481	.477	.477	.475	.475	.474	.477	.474	.474
Range		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary

City of Las Vegas		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?
N	Valid	60	65	64	64	65	65	65	65	65
	Missing	133	128	129	129	128	128	128	128	128
Mean		3.19	2.18	2.25	2.13	2.13	2.20	2.25	2.08	3.18
Std. Error of Mean		.158	.078	.074	.075	.074	.072	.079	.053	.163
Median		3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Std. Deviation		1.219	.625	.593	.601	.594	.582	.635	.426	1.314
Skewness		-.523	-.142	-.121	-.053	-.038	-.042	-.257	.470	-.300
Std. Error of Skewness		.309	.298	.300	.300	.297	.297	.298	.297	.297
Kurtosis		-.627	-.473	-.425	-.224	-.163	-.240	-.604	2.534	-.863
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.610	.587	.592	.592	.585	.585	.587	.585	.585
Range		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary

City of North Las Vegas		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government ?
N	Valid	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
	Missing	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Mean		3.29	2.52	2.55	2.20	2.22	2.25	2.29	1.97	3.14
Std. Error of Mean		.220	.156	.156	.181	.155	.158	.169	.133	.240
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		3	3	3	2(a)	2	2	3	2	3
Std. Deviation		.938	.665	.663	.772	.659	.672	.722	.569	1.022
Skewness		.586	-1.091	-1.236	-.368	-.257	-.343	-.511	-.017	.246
Std. Error of Skewness		.534	.534	.534	.534	.534	.534	.534	.534	.534
Kurtosis		-.215	.244	.576	-1.144	-.487	-.579	-.787	.769	.795
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034	1.034
Range		3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum		2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary

City of Henderson		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government ?
N	Valid	22	24	27	25	25	25	27	27	27
	Missing	44	42	40	42	41	41	40	40	40
Mean		3.54	1.98	2.07	1.96	1.92	1.88	2.10	2.05	3.71
Std. Error of Mean		.220	.135	.134	.113	.117	.108	.113	.104	.180
Median		4.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Mode		4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Std. Deviation		1.034	.660	.689	.559	.588	.540	.581	.536	.930
Skewness		-.137	.020	-.087	-.024	.001	-.128	.009	.058	-.728
Std. Error of Skewness		.491	.472	.451	.467	.463	.463	.451	.451	.451
Kurtosis		-1.035	-.451	-.730	.688	.229	.684	.232	.976	1.571
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.953	.918	.878	.908	.901	.901	.878	.878	.878
Range		3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Minimum		2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum		5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary

Boulder City		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?
N	Valid	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Missing	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Mean		3.34	2.50	2.65	2.00	1.85	1.66	2.35	1.50	3.35
Std. Error of Mean		.505	.347	.331	.000	.249	.505	.331	.347	.331
Median		3.49	2.51	2.96	2.00	2.00	1.51	2.04	1.51	3.04
Mode		4	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	3
Std. Deviation		.887	.608	.581	.000	.438	.887	.581	.608	.581
Skewness		-1.483	-.030	-1.467		-4.528	1.483	1.467	-.030	1.467
Std. Error of Skewness		1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198	1.198
Range		2	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1
Minimum		2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	3
Maximum		4	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	4

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings Jurisdictional Summary

Mesquite		On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how did your interactions with Clark County government compare to previous local government interactions, if any, in other communities?	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee cared about and understood my needs	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Service delivery was timely and responsive	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was able to assist me or direct me to an appropriate source	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Transaction was handled in an appropriate manner	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained	Based on your experiences, how would you rate Clark County government's performance in the following area: Accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)	On a scale of one to five, where one equals poor and five equals excellent, how would you rate your overall customer experience with Clark County government?
N	Valid	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Missing	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Mean		5.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Median		5.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Mode		5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Range		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minimum		5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Maximum		5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Service Ratings
Jurisdictional Cross-tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Information

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

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



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Information

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

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

Advertising



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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Information Jurisdictional Cross-Tabulations

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

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

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Information Jurisdictional Cross-Tabulations

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

Chi-Square Tests (cont.)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	72.711(a)	40	.001
Likelihood Ratio	47.070	40	.206
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.879	1	.049
N of Valid Cases	593		

Appendix IX
Local Government Interaction Information Jurisdictional Cross-Tabulations

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix X

Local Distribution Summary

Appendix X
Local Distribution Summary

Respondent zip code:

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

Appendix X
Local Distribution Summary

Respondent Jurisdiction:

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

Respondent Jurisdiction



Unincorporated Clark County | City of Las Vegas
City of North Las Vegas | City of Henderson
Boulder City | Mesquite

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

Appendix XI

Respondent Demographic Profile

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile

Which category best describes your total household income before taxes?

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

Household Income Before Taxes



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

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile

In what age group do you fall?

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



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

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile

How long have you lived in Clark County?

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



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

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile

Gender observation

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

Gender



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

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction

Respondent Jurisdiction * In what age group do you fall?

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix XI
Respondent Demographic Profile
Summary by Jurisdiction

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

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

Chi-Square Tests

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

Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

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



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

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



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

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



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

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



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Improving Business Climate



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Planning for Commercial Development



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Reducing Travel Congestion



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Access to Freeways



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Improving Road Conditions



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Providing Mass Public Transit



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons



Appendix XII
Importance/Performance Comparisons

Parks and Recreation Programs



This page intentionally left blank
-END OF REPORT-

Attachment 14

UER, “Clark County Monitoring Program: Community Survey”

(May 2007).

Clark County Monitoring Program

Winter 2007

APPLIED ANALYSIS

strategic solutions

UER
Urban Environmental Research, LLC

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								
		Mean				Mean Change		
Service Category	**Descriptive Statistics**	**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

	Ranking		
Descriptive Statistics	**Winter '07**	**Summer '06**	**Change**
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					
		Mean		Disparity between Importance and Performance (Performance-Importance)	
Service Category	**Descriptive Statistics**	**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	-1.1
	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, vulcanology, 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
** General Government*											
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
** Social and Judicial Services*											
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
** Public Safety*											
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	581	3.69	0.046	4.00	1.107	-0.542	0.101	-0.402	0.202	1	5
** Community Development*											
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
N	Valid	241	240	241	238	227	239	239
	Missing	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
** General Government*											
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
** Social and Judicial Services*										1	5
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
** Public Safety*											
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	581	3.07	0.046	3.00	1.110	-0.215	0.101	-0.563	0.202	1	5
** Community Development*											
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

ppendix 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	19	19
	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	Valid	83	84	81	83	79	77	80	83
	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 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 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	242	241	236	236	235
	Missing	0	1	6	6	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
N	Valid	236	240	241	240	232	240	240	240	236	238
	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	180	182
	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
N	Valid	61	63	64	62	62	64	63	60	64	64
	Missing	3	1	0	2	2	0	1	4	0	0
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	-1.087	6.592	.610	-1.477	.444	.525	3.065	2.673
Std. Error of Skewness		.306	.301	.299	.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	82	83
	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	-1.023	4.099	-1.949	-1.189	-1.952	-1.852	49.865	.558
Std. Error of Kurtosis		1.023	1.012	1.012	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
N	Valid	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	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	241	239	242	241	242
	Missing	0	3	0	1	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	64	64	64	64	64
	Missing	0	0	0	0	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	19	19	19	19	19
	Missing	0	0	0	0	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	8	8	8	8	8
	Missing	0	0	0	0	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