

**CLARK COUNTY
YUCCA MOUNTAIN NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES
April 18, 2011**

There was no quorum.

Members present: Sharon Beesley, Peggy Maze Johnson, Caren Levenson, Irene Navis, Maria Rodriguez, Stephen Shoaff, and Ned Thomas. **Members excused:** Brok Armantrout, and Daryl Thomé. **Members absent:** Deanna Domingo, Melvin McCallum, and Holly Woodward (**Exhibit A**).

Irene Navis welcomed the attendees and introduced Stephen Shoaff, the newly appointed City of North Las Vegas Public Member.

Although there was no quorum, Irene briefed the attendees on the Washington, D.C., lawsuit filed by multiple states and private parties.

Next meeting date; Select agenda items: August 22, 2011, is the next tentatively scheduled meeting in the Pueblo Room, at 10:00 a.m.

Since there was no quorum, no action was taken.



Urban Environmental Research, LLC

TO: MS. IRENE NAVIS, AICP
FROM: DR. SHEILA CONWAY/UER; DR. ALVIN MUSHKATEL/UER
SUBJECT: CLARK COUNTY MONITORING PROGRAM | Winter 2010
DATE: FEB 2011
CC: Dr. Rebecca Thomas/UER

This memorandum summarizes the key findings of the annual Clark County Monitoring Program Survey conducted by Urban Environmental Research and Strategic Solutions on behalf of the Nuclear Waste Division. A more detailed statistical assessment of our findings is provided 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. As with previous cycles of the Clark County Monitoring Program Survey, the intent of this memorandum is to provide an executive level overview of our salient findings.

A. GENERAL OVERVIEW

During the month of December 2010, Urban Environmental Research administered a 163-question telephone survey to 600 Southern Nevada households. The survey, which touches on a broad number of topics, has a margin of error of ± 5 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 also is 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 it's 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 mitigating threats, patent and latent, sourced to storage and transportation of high-level nuclear waste are addressed. Shifts away from existing public services would be expected to reduce the quality of life within the community and may also have far-reaching economic, fiscal and social implications. Analyzing these questions requires not only an understanding of resource allocation to specific programs but also the relative importance and effectiveness of those programs. The Clark County Monitoring Program Survey series is designed to provide analysts with a more comprehensive framework from which impact assessments can be appropriately derived.

It is important to mention here that several study instrument modifications were implemented prior to data collection activities for the winter 2010 cycle of the Clark County Monitoring Program Survey. The modifications include additional variables designed to measure quality of life aspects (APPENDIX I and II).

B. KEY FINDINGS

- Notable trend in increasingly higher importance for budget management, improving the business climate, and increasing job opportunities.
- A similar number of respondents communicated now is a good time to buy a home in Clark County (at 81.4%) as compared to last year (88.4% in 2009).
- Respondents indicated the top three aspects that have the greatest positive impact on their quality of life as scenery/geography/climate (31.1%), the entertainment/social climate (15.4%), and family/friends/friendly (15.4%).
- The top three aspects that have the greatest negative impact on respondent's quality of life is economy/unemployment (15.4%), crime/violence/gangs (12.4%), and traffic congestion (7.9%). In 2009 these were crime/violence/gangs (13.2%), traffic congestion (12.7%), and overcrowding/unplanned growth (10.8%)
- The top issue to change at a local level to improve quality of life in Clark County is better jobs/training (17.1%), increase green and sustainable issues/water concerns (12.9%), improving K-12 education (10.3%), and economic improvement/unemployment (10.2%).
- Drought continues to be a pressing environmental concern as 93.3% (91.1% in 2009) of respondents communicate they are "somewhat concerned" or "very concerned" about the current drought and its impact on Clark County

C. YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUESTIONS (FIGURE 4)

- Opposition to the Yucca Mountain project remains stable with 69.2% indicating they would vote against the nuclear waste repository; with 72.3% opposing in 2009.
- 64.4% percent of respondents report that the storage site would have a negative impact on their quality of life, comparable to 63.7% in 2009 and 68.1% in 2008.
- Trust regarding the Yucca Mountain project remains a concern. Roughly 60% 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. 62.3% and 68.4% of respondents indicated the same in 2009 and 2008, respectively.

- Up from 80.3% in 2009, 88.3% 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.
- In terms of public service importance measures, Yucca Mountain impact assessments were "important" to "very important" the majority of respondents. Specifically, "identify public safety needs and impacts" were "important" to "very important" to 79% of persons, to 67.8% for "assess other government impacts", to 68.2% for "assess impacts on the tourist sector", to 67.1% for "assess impacts on the building, construction, and development sectors", and 67.8% for "identify transportation impacts".
- As an urgent environmental concern, the Yucca Mountain facility's placement among major issues decreased. Approximately 1.5% of respondents identified the Yucca Mountain project as Southern Nevada's most pressing environmental concern in 2009, 0.9 in the 2008, and 0.2 in 2010.
- 56.1% of respondents indicated it is "very important" to keep local decision makers up-to-date about Yucca Mountain and 58% indicated the same level of importance in keep the public up-to-date.

D. ECONOMY/BUSINESS

- The top four importance/performance disparity measurements were observed in the budget management, ability to attract jobs outside of the construction or hotel/gaming related employment sectors, improving the business climate, and increasing job opportunities service categories. The budget management disparity decreased from 2009, however increasing job opportunities, improving the business climate, and attracting jobs disparities increased from 2009.
- 39% of respondents indicated they are doing worse financially today compared to a year ago; down from 45% in 2009. Optimism for the next year remained steady as 43% of respondents believe they will be doing better financially one year from now compared to today; up from 39.7% in 2009.
- Respondents rating the Clark County business conditions as "poor" remained comparable from 29.3% in 2009 to 30% in 2010. However, 42.9% of respondents believe business conditions will be better in Clark County one year from now, compared to 37.9% of respondents during 2009.

E. PARKS AND RECREATION

- Providing and maintaining safe parks and recreational facilities were "very important" to 50.7% and "important" to 31.3% of respondents. Concurrently, only 1.5% indicated this was "not important at all"
- Providing parks and recreation programs were of the highest level of importance to 46.4% of respondents, and "not important at all" to only 3.1%

- Regarding governmental performance on providing parks and recreational programs, 54.7% indicated performance was "excellent" or "good", and only 7% indicated it was "poor".
- A similar trend was found for providing parks and recreational facilities with 50.9% indicating the performance as "excellent" or "good", and only 5.3% indicating the performance as "poor".
- Importance of providing parks, recreation, and cultural opportunities were "very important" or "important" to 65.4%, "neither important or not important" to 27.6%, and "not at all important" to 2.3% of respondents
- In regards to how satisfied respondents were with recreational opportunities, such as parks, playgrounds, music festivals, and other events offered by Clark County, 58.8 indicated they are "very satisfied" or "satisfied," (53.1% in 2009) and only 4.4% indicated they are "very unsatisfied" (4.7% in 2009).

F. PUBLIC SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

- Public service importance continued to be dominated by public safety and emergency responder considerations, which accounted for 8 out of 10 of the top ten most highly-rated services.
- Fire importance scores are similar to those in 2008. There was a decrease in importance of fire services with 68.3% of respondents indicating the highest level of importance in 2008, while 53.9% indicated the same level of importance in 2009, and 61.6% in 2010. Correspondingly, 78.8% of respondents indicated the highest level of importance in keeping response time low in 2008, while 60.3% indicated the same level of importance in 2009, and 73.4% in 2010.
- Respondents rated the importance for the following public safety service questions as "important" or "very important": providing crime prevention programs at 77.8% (68% in 2009), enforcing traffic laws at 71% (59.8% in 2009), maintaining a low crime rate at 87.8% (75.2% in 2009), and maintaining neighborhood police patrols at 81.3%(68.7% in 2009).
- Concurrently, respondents rated the governmental performance of the following services as "good" or "excellent": providing crime prevention programs (33.3%), enforcing traffic laws (52.5%), maintaining a low crime rate (34.6%), and maintaining neighborhood police patrols (30.3%).

G. SOCIAL SERVICE CONSIDERATIONS

- Social Service importance increased from 2009 to 2010 in all areas. Respondents indicated the importance of the following services as "very important": providing child protective services 67.6% (50.8% in 2009), providing child welfare services 61.4% (46.3% in 2009), providing juvenile justice services 49.8% (35.3% in 2009), providing attainable housing for working class families 48.6% (35.3% in 2009), providing affordable housing for low income families 47.1% (32.1% in 2009), providing shelter for the homeless 44.6% (32.4% in 2009), providing affordable housing for seniors 55.3% (42.7% in 2009), providing medical care for the poor 49.2% (35.4% in 2009), and providing 24 hour emergency trauma care 72.4% (61.8% in 2009).

- Social Service performance remained stable. Respondents indicated the governmental performance for the following services as either "good" or "excellent": providing child protective services 31.7% (30.5% in 2009), providing child welfare services 35.6% (29.4% in 2009), providing juvenile justice services 32.1 % (24.1% in 2009), providing attainable housing for working class families 16.3% (17.9% in 2009), providing affordable housing for low income families 17.7% (20.8% in 2009), providing shelter for the homeless 13% (12% in 2009), providing affordable housing for seniors 23.8% (23.9% in 2009), providing medical care for the poor 22.9% (22.3% in 2009), and providing 24 hour emergency trauma care 49.3% (51.7% in 2009).

H. LOCAL GOVERNMENT INTERACTIONS

- 39.9% of respondents indicated they had inquired about or accessed services from Clark County, down from 48.4% in 2009, while 60.1 % indicated they had not.
- When compared with their previous local government interactions in other communities, 36.6% of respondents reported their interactions with Clark County as good or excellent, comparable to 34.2% in 2009 and 39.4% in 2008.
- The overall customer experience with Clark County for 42.2% of respondents was good or excellent, comparable to 44.6% in 2009 and 41.3% in 2008.
- Respondents indicated Clark County government's performance increased in meeting or exceeding their expectations in the following: "policies and processes were easy to follow and/or clearly explained," 70.6% (67.4% in 2009), and "accessibility (i.e. facility, staff, hours of operation)" 84.5% (80% in 2009).
- Respondents indicated performance met or exceeded expectations in the following, slightly decreasing from the previous year: "employee cared about and understood my needs," 69.3% (72% in 2009); "service delivery was timely and responsive," 70.4% (72.8% in 2009); "employee was able to assist or direct me to an appropriate source," 78.8% (80.5% in 2009); "employee was qualified, knowledgeable, and well informed," 76.9% (83% in 2009); and "transaction was handled in an appropriate manner," 80% (81.7% in 2009).

I. SUMMARY

Overall, concerns remain about the current economic and business climates, though most people are optimistic. The economy and unemployment rates were found to be common concerns and have the greatest negative impacts to residents, in addition to the concerns over better training and attracting jobs outside of the hospitality and construction industries. A lower percentage of respondents indicated they are doing worse financially now than a year ago, and the vast majority of respondents believe it is a good time to buy a home.

Respondents are consistently opposed to the Yucca Mountain project and believe the project would have a negative effect on property values. Drought remains an environmental concern, and emergency responder issues remain important, such as those for police, fire, and medical responders. The greatest positive impacts to residents' quality of life include scenery/geography/climate and the entertainment/social climate.

Regarding social service considerations, the most important services reported overtime are well trained emergency medical response personnel, keeping response times low, and providing 24 hour emergency trauma care. The Clark County government's performances on local government interaction with residents were of notable quality with the majority of respondents reporting the interaction met or exceeded their expectations on all questions.

SCALE:

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

FIGURE 1 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Public Service Importance Score Summary														
Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Mean							Mean Change					
		Summer	Winter	Summer	Winter	Winter	Summer	Winter	From Summ	From Wint	From Summ	From Wint	From Wint	From Wint
		'05	'06	'06	'07	'08	'09	'10	'05	'06	'06	'07	'08	'09
General Government	Road Maintenance	4.21	4.05	4.04	4.09	4.13	3.93	4.01	-0.28	-0.12	-0.1	-0.16	-0.2	0.08
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.59	3.41	3.22	3.26	3.27	3.38	3.51	-0.26	-0.08	-0.2	-0.03	-0.2	0.18
	Flood control	4.09	3.88	3.86	3.7	4.01	3.65	3.99	-0.4	-0.19	-0.2	-0.01	-0.3	0.30
	Budget management	4.29	3.99	4.23	4.11	4.01	4.11	4.11	0.02	0.42	0.08	0.2	-0.1	-0.20
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.86	3.67	3.58	3.63	3.9	3.94	3.81	-0.42	-0.23	-0.1	-0.19	-0.4	0.19
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	3.9	3.72	3.75	3.87	4.09	3.75	4.01	-0.15	0.03	0	-0.12	-0.3	0.26
	Water conservation programs	n/a	n/a	4.12	4.22	4.48	4.12	4.24	n/a	n/a	0	-0.1	-0.4	0.12

Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.17	4.30	4.06	4.45	-0.21	0	-0.1	-0.11	-0.2	0.39
	Providing child welfare services	4.15	3.98	3.98	3.99	4.21	3.97	4.31	-0.18	-0.01	-0	-0.02	-0.2	0.34
	Providing juvenile justice services	4.08	3.93	3.87	3.98	4.15	3.81	4.17	-0.27	-0.12	-0.1	-0.17	-0.3	0.36
	Providing attainable housing for working class families	n/a	3.72	3.77	3.76	3.96	3.6	4.0	n/a	-0.12	-0.2	-0.16	-0.4	0.40
	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.75	3.56	3.61	3.67	3.85	3.5	3.93	-0.2	-0.06	-0.1	-0.17	-0.3	0.43
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.38	3.33	3.32	3.51	3.73	3.47	3.89	0.09	0.14	-0.1	-0.06	-0.3	0.42
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	4.12	3.92	3.91	4.03	4.18	3.84	4.25	-0.28	-0.08	-0.1	-0.18	-0.3	0.38
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.94	3.74	3.74	3.93	4.10	3.89	3.99	-0.37	-0.21	-0.2	-0.18	-0.4	0.42
	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.6	4.38	4.29	4.42	4.58	4.35	4.59	-0.25	-0.03	0.06	-0.07	-0.2	0.24
Public Safety	Providing crime prevention programs	4.27	3.99	4.09	4.04	4.24	3.91	4.23	-0.36	-0.08	-0.2	-0.13	-0.3	0.31
	Enforcing traffic laws	4.25	3.91	4.07	4.09	4.10	3.75	4.02	-0.52	-0.18	-0.3	-0.36	-0.4	0.29
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.49	4.14	4.28	4.24	4.38	4.13	4.50	-0.36	-0.01	-0.2	-0.11	-0.5	0.37
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	4.2	3.97	4.08	4.06	4.33	3.95	4.25	-0.35	-0.02	-0.1	-0.11	-0.4	0.30

Keeping police response times low	4.45	4.24	4.6	4.34	4.59	4.14	4.45	-0.31	-0.1	-0.5	-0.2	-0.5	0.31
Keeping fire department response times low	4.45	4.54	4.47	4.59	4.73	4.41	4.62	-0.04	-0.19	-0.2	-0.18	-0.3	0.21
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.45	4.56	4.54	4.61	4.79	4.53	4.71	0.08	-0.03	-0	-0.08	-0.3	0.18
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	n/a	4.64	4.57	4.67	4.79	4.63	4.75	n/a	-0.01	0.06	-0.04	-0.2	0.12
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	4.05	3.69	3.79	3.79	4.05	3.59	3.89	-0.46	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.30
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	4.04	3.75	3.87	3.87	4.10	3.68	3.85	-0.36	-0.07	-0.2	-0.16	-0.4	0.37
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	4.18	3.92	4.01	3.93	4.29	3.84	4.27	-0.34	-0.08	-0.2	-0.19	-0.5	0.43
Investigating criminal activity	4.47	4.03	4.24	4.18	4.46	4.17	4.47	-0.37	0.07	-0.1	-0.08	-0.4	0.31
Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.59	4.32	4.26	4.39	4.59	4.29	4.41	-0.3	-0.03	0.03	-0.04	-0.2	0.15
Providing emergency medical services	4.66	4.44	4.43	4.51	4.70	4.47	4.68	-0.19	0.03	0.04	-0.04	-0.2	0.21

	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	3.81	3.54	3.58	3.51	3.70	3.4	3.71	-0.41	-0.14	-0.2	-0.11	-0.3	0.31
	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.88	3.68	3.65	3.66	3.99	3.49	3.85	-0.49	-0.29	-0.3	-0.27	-0.6	0.46
	Regional justice services and facilities	n/a	n/a	3.6	3.69	3.93	3.63	3.94	n/a	n/a	0.03	-0.06	-0.3	0.31
	Providing and maintaining safe parks & recreation services	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.27	4.26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.29
Community Development	Providing affordable housing	n/a	n/a	3.63	3.64	3.86	3.47	3.88	n/a	n/a	-0.2	-0.17	-0.4	0.41
	Managing growth	4.07	3.83	3.87	3.83	4.10	3.73	3.96	-0.34	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.4	0.23
	Increasing job opportunities	4.07	3.95	3.82	3.84	4.13	3.93	4.11	-0.14	-0.02	0.11	0.09	-0.2	0.48
	Ability to attract jobs outside of the construction or hotel/gaming related employment	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.27	4.37	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.40
	Improving the business climate	4.08	3.85	3.75	3.76	4.0	4.0	4.33	-0.07	0.15	0.26	0.25	0	0.32
	Planning for commercial development	3.82	3.7	3.66	3.55	3.72	3.63	3.97	-0.14	-0.02	0.12	0.13	-0	0.29

Reducing traffic congestion	4.37	4.02	4.06	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.98	-0.41	-0.06	-0.1	-0.01	-0.3	0.02
Access to freeways	4.12	3.83	3.92	3.83	4.11	3.84	3.88	-0.28	0.01	-0.1	0.01	-0.3	0.04
Improving road conditions	4.29	3.97	4.04	3.95	4.18	3.89	3.93	-0.4	-0.08	-0.2	-0.06	-0.3	0.04
Reducing travel time	4.01	3.77	3.83	3.82	3.96	3.77	3.85	-0.24	0	-0.1	-0.05	-0.2	0.08
Providing mass public transit	3.86	3.67	3.64	3.69	3.77	3.63	3.89	-0.23	-0.04	-0	-0.06	-0.1	0.26
Adequate airport facilities	n/a	n/a	3.91	3.87	3.96	3.87	3.95	n/a	n/a	-0	0	-0.1	0.08
Parks and recreation programs	n/a	n/a	4.02	4.04	4.18	3.94	4.10	n/a	n/a	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2	0.16

FIGURE 2 PUBLIC SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE RANKING

Descriptive Statistics	Ranking					Change			
	Winter	Summer	Winter	Winter	Summer	From Summer	From Winter	From Winter	From Summer
	'10	'09	'08	'07	'06	'09	'08	'07	'06
Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	+1
Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	2	2	1	2	3	0	-1	0	+1
Keeping fire department response times low	4	4	3	3	4	0	-1	-1	0
Providing emergency medical services	3	3	4	4	5	0	+1	+1	+2
Keeping police response times low	7	8	5	6	1	+1	-3	-2	-7
Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	5	5	6	5	6	0	+1	0	+1
Maintaining a low crime rate	6	9	6	8	7	+3	-3	-1	-2
Providing fire protection & prevention services	8	7	8	7	8	-1	+1	0	+1
Water conservation programs	16	10	9	9	11	-6	-1	-1	+1
Investigating criminal activity	9	11	10	10	9	+2	-1	-1	-2
Budget management	19	6	11	12	10	-13	+5	+6	+4
Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	15	18	12	15	14	+3	-6	-3	-4
Providing child protection services	7	12	13	11	12	+5	+1	-1	0
Reducing traffic congestion	26	17	13	22	16	-9	-4	-5	-1
Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	13	25	15	18	20	+12	-10	-7	-5
Providing crime prevention programs	17	22	16	17	13	+5	-6	-5	-9
Providing child welfare services	11	14	17	20	21	+3	+3	+6	+7
Parks and recreation programs	20	19	18	16	19	-1	-1	-3	0

Providing affordable housing for seniors	17	25	18	19	23	+8	-7	-6	-2
Improving road conditions	31	23	18	23	18	-8	-5	0	-5
Providing juvenile justice services	18	28	21	21	25	+10	-7	-7	-3
Road Maintenance	23	20	22	14	17	-3	+2	-6	-3
Increasing job opportunities	9	20	22	26	30	+11	+2	+6	+10
Access to freeways	33	25	24	28	22	-8	-1	-3	-3
Enforcing traffic laws	22	31	25	13	15	+9	-6	-18	-16
Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	21	34	25	27	26	+13	-9	-7	-8
Managing growth	28	31	25	29	27	+3	-6	-2	-4
Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	23	30	28	25	33	+7	-2	-5	+3
Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	32	39	29	31	31	+7	-10	-8	-8
Improving the business climate	12	13	30	32	34	+1	+7	+19	+21
Flood control	25	33	30	35	28	+8	-3	2	-5
Providing medical care for the poor	25	40	32	34	35	+15	-8	-6	-5
Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	34	46	33	39	37	+12	-13	-7	-9
Adequate airport facilities	29	24	34	24	24	-5	10	0	0
Reducing travel time	34	29	34	30	29	-5	+5	+1	0
Providing attainable housing for working class families	24	38	34	33	32	+14	-4	-5	-6
Regional justice services and facilities	30	36	37	37	40	-6	+1	+1	+4
Providing affordable housing	33	42	38	40	36	+9	-4	-2	-6
Providing affordable housing for low income families	31	41	39	38	38	+10	-2	-3	-3
Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	36	44	39	41	41	+8	-5	-3	-3

Providing shelter for the homeless	32	42	41	43	44	+10	-1	+1	+2
Providing mass public transit	32	36	42	36	39	+4	+6	0	+3
Planning for commercial development	27	34	43	42	43	+7	+9	+8	+9
Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	35	45	44	44	42	+10	-1	-1	-3
Revitalizing older neighborhoods	37	47	45	45	45	+10	-2	-2	-2
Providing and maintaining safe parks & recreation services	14	16	n/a	n/a	n/a	+2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ability to attract jobs outside construction or hotel/gaming related employment	10	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	+4	n/a	n/a	n/a

FIGURE 3 PUBLIC SERVICE PERFORMANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Public Service Performance Score Summary					
Service Category	Descriptive Statistics	Mean		Disparity between Importance and Performance	
		Importance	Performance	(Performance-Importance)	
				Current Disparity	Winter '09 Disparity
General Government	Road maintenance	4.01	3.13	-0.88	-0.83
	Revitalizing older neighborhoods	3.51	2.40	-1.11	-0.75
	Flood control	3.99	3.57	-0.42	-0.05
	Budget management	4.11	2.40	-1.71	-1.83
	Communicate Clark County's local government views about Yucca Mountain to federal decision makers	3.63	2.74	-0.89	-0.52
	Monitor and report to the public on how well government services are being performed	4.01	2.46	-1.55	-1.25
	Water conservation programs	4.24	3.36	-0.88	-0.73
Social and Judicial Services	Providing child protection services	4.45	3.07	-1.38	-1.04
	Providing welfare services	4.31	3.15	-1.16	-0.96
	Providing juvenile justice services	4.17	3.03	-1.14	-0.87
	Provide attainable housing for working class families	4.0	2.59	-1.41	-0.99

	Providing affordable housing for low income families	3.93	2.57	-1.36	-0.89
	Providing shelter for the homeless	3.89	2.29	-1.60	-1.3
	Providing affordable housing for seniors	4.22	2.82	-1.40	-1.08
	Providing medical care for the poor	3.99	2.55	-1.44	-0.97
	Providing 24 hour emergency trauma care	4.59	3.45	-1.14	-0.9
Public Safety	Providing crime prevention programs	4.22	3.14	-1.08	-0.7
	Enforcing traffic laws	4.02	3.48	-0.54	-0.45
	Maintaining a low crime rate	4.50	3.10	-1.40	-1.08
	Maintaining neighborhood police patrols	4.25	2.91	-1.34	-1.05
	Keeping police response times low	4.45	3.28	-1.17	-0.89
	Keeping fire department response times low	4.62	4.86	-0.76	-0.45
	Keeping paramedic and emergency medical response times low	4.71	3.87	-0.84	-0.53
	Well trained paramedic and emergency medical response personnel	4.75	4.95	-0.70	-0.51
	Facilitate neighborhood watch programs	3.89	2.86	-1.03	-0.77

	Preparing for natural disasters (i.e. floods, earthquakes, etc.)	4.05	2.93	-1.12	-0.67
	Preparing for man made (such as hazardous or radiological materials) accidents or terrorist event	4.27	2.99	-1.28	-0.85
	Investigating criminal activity	4.41	3.26	-1.15	-0.91
	Providing fire protection & prevention services	4.44	3.55	-0.89	-0.54
	Providing emergency medical services	4.68	3.83	-0.85	-0.56
	Providing for neighborhood code enforcement services	5.71	3.01	-0.70	-0.42
	Examining potential impacts from Yucca Mountain nuclear waste shipments	3.85	2.79	-1.06	-0.59
	Regional justice services and facilities	3.94	3.31	-0.63	-0.44
	Providing and maintaining safe parks & recreation services	4.26	3.43	-0.83	-0.58
Community Development	Providing affordable housing	3.88	2.77	-1.11	-0.81
	Managing growth	3.96	2.67	-1.29	-1.15
	Increasing job opportunities	4.41	2.20	-2.21	-1.52
	Ability to attract jobs outside of the construction or hotel/gaming related employment	4.37	2.15	-2.22	-1.73

	Improving the business climate	4.33	2.45	-1.88	-1.48
	Planning for commercial development	3.97	2.68	-1.29	-0.98
	Reducing traffic congestion	3.98	2.91	-1.07	-1.27
	Access to freeways	3.88	3.51	-0.37	-0.62
	Improving road conditions	3.93	3.25	-0.68	-0.89
	Reducing travel time	3.85	3.09	-0.76	-0.94
	Providing mass public transit	3.89	2.90	-0.99	-0.96
	Adequate airport facilities	3.95	3.78	-0.17	-0.19
	Parks and recreation programs	4.10	3.52	-0.58	-0.37

FIGURE 4 YUCCA MOUNTAIN SERVICE IMPORTANCE SCORE SUMMARY

Yucca Mountain Service Importance Score Summary					
Descriptive Statistics	Public Service Importance Winter	Public Service Importance Summer	Public Service Importance Winter	Public Service Importance Winter	Public Service Importance Summer
	'10	'09	'08	'07	'06
Keeping local decision makers up to date on Yucca Mountain	4.18	3.29	4.26	3.94	3.89
Keeping the public up to date about Yucca Mountain	4.21	3.65	4.32	3.98	3.93
Reviewing technical, scientific studies about seismic, vulcanology, geology and hydrology	4.05	3.35	4.12	3.87	3.84
Identify public safety needs and impacts	4.26	3.65	4.28	4.04	3.96
Assess other government impacts	3.93	4.00	3.89	3.72	3.66
Assess impacts on the tourist sector	3.74	4.53	3.85	3.85	3.61
Assess impacts on the building, construction, and development sectors	3.93	4.76	4.35	3.79	3.57
Identify transportation impacts	3.97	4.53	3.99	3.85	3.68
Provide information to the public on all facts of Yucca Mountain	4.20	3.76	4.22	3.96	3.91

Appendix I
Importance Score for Selected Service



YUCCA MOUNTAIN NUCLEAR WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

	NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	TELE. NO.	E-MAIL ADDRESS	FAX NO.
			April 18, 2011			
1	Caren Lovenson	Citizen Member				
2	Stephen Shaaff	Citizen Member	5622 North Las Vegas			
3	BARBARA BLAMER	CC				
4	Aled Thomas	City of Henderson				
5	Phil Koworek	C.C.N.W.O.				
6	Sharon Beeden	citizen member - COH				
7	Reagan Johnson	Citizen Alert				
8	Maria Rodriguez	RTE	600 So. Grand Central Pkwy	876-1708	Rodriguezm@RTE.SNV.COM	
9	CASH JASZCZAK	Nye County			CASHJAZZ@Gmail.com	
10	HELEN VAYS					
11	Genefski					
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						