

Clark County Parks & Recreation



1998 Community Needs Assessment

Survey results from residents in seven
Clark County Commissioner Districts

**CLARK COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION
1998 COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

**SURVEY RESULTS FROM RESIDENTS
IN SEVEN CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION DISTRICTS**

BY

**JAMES A. BUSSER, PH.D.
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS**

Clark County Board of Commissioners

Yvonne Atkinson Gates, Chair - Lorraine T. Hunt, Vice Chair

Erin Kenny, Mary J. Kincaid, Lance M. Malone,

Myrna Williams, Bruce L. Woodbury

Dale Askew, County Manager

Michael R. Alastuey, Assistant County Manager

Bonnie Rinaldi, Assistant County Manager

Glenn Trowbridge, Director of Parks and Recreation

Pat Marchese, Assistant Director of Parks and Recreation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I Executive Summary	1
Introduction	1
Method	1
Major Findings	1
Overall Opinion of Clark County and CCPR Department	1
Marketing	1
Parks	2
Recreation and Cultural Facilities	2
Recreation Programs	2
Community Needs for Improvement & Expansion and CCPR Department Priority Service Improvements	2
Policy Issues, Funding, and CCPR Department Evaluation	2
Recommendations	3
Section II Introduction to the Study	4
Section III Methods and Procedures	5
Development of Questionnaire	5
Method	5
Section IV Description of the Survey Sample	6
Clark County Commission Districts	6
Demographic Information	6
Gender	6
Length of Residence in Clark County	7
Age	7
Race/Ethnicity	8
Household Size	8
Age of Other Household Members	8
Income	9
Section V Survey Findings	10
Rating the Area of the County	10
Familiarity with Cultural, Recreational, or Senior Citizen Programs or Services	11
Source of Information	11
Overall Impression of Programs and Services Provided by CCPRD	12
Introduce Clark County Services Through Television Programming	13
Prime Cable Viewer	14
Cable Channel 4 Viewer	14
Clark County Parks and Recreation Department Slogan	15
Quality of Life	15

Awareness of Desert Wetland Park	16
Park Usage	16
Barriers to Park Usage	17
Most Visited Park	18
Second Most Visited Park.....	18
Third, Fourth, and Fifth Most Used Park	18
Frequency of Park Usage	18
Quality of Clark County Parks	19
Recreation or Cultural Facility Usage.....	20
Barriers to Recreation or Cultural Facility Usage	20
Facility Usage	21
Most Visited Facilities	23
Frequency of Recreation or Cultural Facilities Usage	23
Quality of Recreation or Cultural Facilities	24
Participation in Recreation Programs	24
Barriers to Participation in Recreation Programs	25
Program Participation During the Past Year	26
Rating of Recreation Classes	26
Community Needs for CCPRD Improvement & Expansion	27
Priorities for CCPRD	29
Future Directions of CCPRD	31
Evaluation of CCPRD and Funding Issues	33
Willingness to Volunteer for the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department	34
Primary Reason for Volunteering	34
Type of Volunteer Experience Desired	34
Barriers to Volunteering	34
Appendix A Map of Seven Geographic Commission Districts	36
Appendix B Needs Assessment Questionnaire	38
Appendix C Frequency Tables of Survey Questions for All Respondents	50
Appendix D Frequency Tables of Survey Questions for All Respondents by Commission District	Supplement

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1	Description of Sample by District	6
Table 2	Rating of County by Respondent's District	10
Table 3	Sources of Information Used by Respondent's District	12
Table 4	Rating of CCPRD by Respondent's District	13
Table 5	Facilities Contribute to Quality of Life by Respondent's District	16
Table 6	Barriers to Park Usage	17
Table 7	Park Most Visited by All Respondents and by District	18
Table 8	Frequency of Park Usage by Respondent's District	19
Table 9	Quality of Parks by Respondent's District	20
Table 10	Barriers to Recreation or Cultural Facility Usage	21
Table 11	Percentage of Facility Usage for All Respondents and by District	22
Table 12	Facilities Most Used for All Respondents and by District	22
Table 13	Frequency of Facility Usage by Respondent's District	23
Table 14	Quality of Recreation/Cultural Facilities by Respondent's District	24
Table 15	Barriers to Participation in Recreation Programs	25
Table 16	Overall Rating of Recreation Classes	26
Table 17	Need for Improved/Expanded Recreation Facilities and Programs for All Respondents	27
Table 18	Need for Improved/Expanded Recreation Facilities and Programs for All Respondents by District	29
Table 19	High & Medium Priorities Compared to Total Sample by Respondent District	31
Table 20	Comparison of Policy Issues Between 1995 and 1998 Surveys	32
Table 21	Policy Issues by District Compared to All Respondents	34
Figure 1	Gender of All Respondents	6
Figure 2	Length of Residence in Clark County for All Respondents	7
Figure 3	Age Groups for All Respondents	7
Figure 4	Race/Ethnicity for All Respondents	8
Figure 5	Size of Household for All Respondents	8
Figure 6	Income Level for All Respondents	9
Figure 7	Rating of County by All Respondents	10
Figure 8	Familiarity of CCPRD by All Respondents	11
Figure 9	Sources of Information Used by All Respondents	11
Figure 10	Rating of CCPRD by All Respondents	12
Figure 11	Television Programming of Services by All Respondents	13
Figure 12	Prime Cable Viewer by All Respondents	14
Figure 13	Cable Channel 4 Viewer by All Respondents	14
Figure 14	Awareness of Slogan by All Respondents	15
Figure 15	CCPRD Facilities Contributing to Quality of Life for All Respondents	15

Figure 16	Aware of Desert Wetlands Park for All Respondents	16
Figure 17	Visited Clark County Parks	16
Figure 18	Frequency of Park Usage by All Respondents	19
Figure 19	Overall Quality of Parks	19
Figure 20	Recreation or Cultural Facility Usage.....	20
Figure 21	Recreation or Cultural Facility Usage by All Respondents	23
Figure 22	Overall Quality of Recreation/Cultural Facilities	24
Figure 23	Participation in Recreation Programs for All Respondents	25
Figure 24	Overall Rating of Recreation Classes	26
Figure 25	High Priorities for All Respondents	30
Figure 26	High and Medium Priorities for All Respondents	30
Figure 27	All Respondents Rating of Strongly Agree	31
Figure 28	All Respondents Rating of Strongly Agree and Agree	32
Figure 29	Ratings of Strongly Agree by Respondents of CCPRD and Funding Issues	33
Figure 30	Ratings of Strongly Agree and Agree by Respondents of CCPRD and Funding Issues	33
Figure 31	Respondents Willingness to Volunteer	34

SECTION I

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The assessment of the leisure behaviors, attitudes, and opinions of Clark County residents serves as an important component in the development of a Comprehensive Plan for the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department. The information obtained through this assessment will assist the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department (CCPRD) in the formulation of goals and policies, and in the development of program areas and facilities for Clark County residents. The overall goal of this study was to gather and analyze information that would allow the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department to plan for and provide facilities and programs that adequately serve the current and future needs of the residents.

Method

A telephone survey of Clark County community residents in the urban unincorporated County area was conducted. The sample for this study was drawn from each of the seven Clark County Commission Districts. These Districts were chosen as a geographic reference. Six hundred and forty interviews were completed with county residents. A representative group of residents from each of the Districts was interviewed thereby allowing the opportunity to make comparisons between Districts as well as to assess the unincorporated County as a whole. The demographic makeup of the sample closely reflects the overall County in terms of age, gender, and ethnicity.

Major Findings of the 1998 Community Survey

This section summarizes the major findings of the Needs Assessment community Survey. Detailed results of the survey are presented in Section II.

Overall Opinion of Clark County and CCPR Department

- Over 70% of survey respondents expressed a positive opinion of their section of the County as a place to live.
- Overall, 82% of respondents indicated that the CCPR Department facilities in their community add to their quality of life.

Marketing

- A majority of respondents (54%) were familiar with CCPR Department cultural, recreational, or senior citizen programs or services.
- Most respondents (72%) received information about CCPR Department programs through word of mouth followed by television (47%) and posters/flyers (45%).
- The CCPR Department slogan "Parks and Recreation: What we do is good for you!" was recognized by 32% of respondents.
- Thirty seven percent of respondents were aware of the Desert Wetlands Park.
- Most respondents (88%) believe television programming that provided information on County services and events would be valuable.
- A majority of respondents (64%) indicated they were Prime Cable viewers.
- A majority of respondents indicated they were viewers of Government channel 4.

Parks

- Overall, 81% of respondents had a favorable impression of County parks.
- A majority of respondents (70%) indicated they had visited a Clark County park in the last year.
- A majority of respondents (52%) indicated that they visited parks at least once per month.
- The County park most visited by respondents was Sunset Park.
- Lack of time was the most important barrier to visiting a park.

Recreation and Cultural Facilities

- Thirty-eight percent of respondents indicated they had visited a Clark County recreation or cultural facility in the last year.
- A majority of the respondents (53%) reported that they visited a recreation or cultural facility at least six to seven times a year.
- The recreation and cultural facilities most visited by respondents were Camp Lee Canyon (32%), Desert Rose Golf Course (27%), McCarran Aviation Museum (26%), Heritage Museum (22%), and the Government Center Amphitheater (21%).
- Respondents who had visited a Clark County recreation or cultural facility in the last year rated their quality positively.
- Lack of time was the most important barrier to visiting a recreation or cultural facility.

Recreation Programs

- Respondents who had participated in a recreation program in the last year rated their program quality positively.
- Lack of time was the most important barrier to participating in a recreation program.

Community Needs for Improvement & Expansion and CCPR Department Priority

Service Improvements

- Respondents rated anti-drug/gang programs, activities for teens, outdoor performances/special events, education, and walking, hiking, and/or biking trails as the recreation facilities and programs most in need of improvement and expansion.
- Service improvement areas rated as a high or medium priority by at least 90% of respondents were: activities for all ages, youth outreach activities, major park improvements, and programs for low income and disabled individuals.

Policy Issues, Funding, and CCPR Department Evaluation

- Over 70% of respondents expressed a positive opinion of the CCPR Department and staff.
- Over 90% of respondents indicated that the CCPR Department has an important role in conservation and preservation and addressing social issues.
- Over 87% of respondents indicated that the CCPRD should develop more large parks and walking, hiking, and biking trails.
- A majority of respondents (60%) indicated that more current tax dollars should be allocated to the CCPR Department.

Recommendations

1. **Increase the marketing of CCPR Department with particular attention to information on parks, recreation and cultural facilities, and recreation and cultural programs.**
 - a. Continue to utilize cable channel 4 as a medium to provide information to residents
 - b. Increase the utilization of other media to market CCPR Department programs and facilities.

2. **Increase the role of CCPR Department in addressing social issues.**
 - a. Expand anti-drug/gang prevention programs
 - b. Expand youth outreach efforts
 - c. Offer more opportunities for low income individuals
 - d. Identify and expand the programs offered to individuals with disabilities

3. **Develop strategies for capital development projects**
 - a. Expand the conservation and preservation of open space
 - b. Develop walking, hiking, and biking trails
 - c. Develop more large parks
 - d. Target major building construction for the provision of recreation and cultural programs

4. **Increase program offerings**
 - a. Identify and expand the activities provided for teens
 - b. Continue to provide activities for all ages
 - c. Expand outdoor performances and special events
 - d. Increase the utilization of volunteers in specific roles that meet their interests

5. **Increase revenue to meet the expressed needs of residents**
 - a. Seek a larger share of existing tax dollar allocation from County government
 - b. Investigate additional funding sources

6. **Recognize and develop strategies to meet the needs of residents in each Clark County Commission District and the County as a whole**
 - a. Target park, recreation and cultural facilities and programs that meet the expressed needs of residents for each of the seven Commission Districts.
 - b. Expand cooperative agreements with other municipalities and the Clark County School District to address the needs of all Clark County residents and particularly those living in Districts C and D.

SECTION II

INTRODUCTION TO STUDY

The assessment of the leisure behaviors, attitudes, and opinions of Clark County residents serves as an important component in the development of a Comprehensive Plan for the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department. The information obtained through this assessment will assist the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department (CCPRD) in the formulation of goals and policies, and in the development of program areas and facilities for Clark County residents. The overall goal of this study was to gather and analyze information that would allow the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department to provide facilities and programs that adequately serve the current and future needs of the residents. The basic objectives of this study were as follows:

1. *To gather information that the Clark County Parks and Recreation staff can use to gain a better understanding of its constituency.*
2. *To assess the public's perception of the extent to which the Department's current recreation programs and services satisfy the needs of participants.*
3. *To determine the most effective methods of disseminating information to the public about recreation/cultural programs, facilities, and opportunities.*
4. *To assess the public's attitudes and opinions regarding the Department's programs and policies.*
5. *To determine the community's need for new programs and facilities.*
6. *To gain the public's input regarding important policy issues facing the Department.*
7. *To afford community residents the opportunity to offer suggestions, comments and concerns related to the recreational/cultural opportunities provided by the Department.*

SECTION III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Development Of Questionnaire

The development of the questionnaire began with meetings between the project staff and personnel of the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department to identify issues and concerns that should be addressed through the survey. The Project Director developed a draft of the questionnaire on the basis of these discussions which was reviewed by Department staff. Several revisions of the questionnaire were undertaken after receiving Department feedback. A pilot test of the questionnaire was conducted with selected residents of the Clark County community. A final refined version of the questionnaire was drafted which incorporated the comments of the pilot group.

The final questionnaire consisted of 12 pages. The first two and one-half pages were used to serve two purposes. First the purpose of the survey was conveyed to residents and they were asked to participate. Second, there were several questions that were aimed at determining the exact Clark County Commission District in which that individual resided. Commission Districts were used as a geographic reference. The remainder of the questionnaire addressed seven major content areas including (1) marketing information, (2) parks and recreation facility usage, (3) participation in recreation programs, (4) recreation facility and program expansion, (5) priorities for projects or service improvements, (6) future directions and (7) demographic make-up of respondents. A complete copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.

Method

A telephone survey of Clark County community residents in the unincorporated County area was conducted. Random digit dialing techniques were used to select respondent households. The sampling frame was constructed using the most current telephone exchange data available. Telephone exchanges refer to the 3 digit prefix included in any telephone number. A proportionate, stratified random sample based on the seven geographic locations of exchanges and on the proportion of residential listings in the exchange area were drawn. The seven geographic locations represent recreation and park service districts. Exchange digits were matched with randomly generated four-digit numbers to produce a seven-digit number called by interviewers.

Computer assisted telephone interviewing was used. Interviews were only conducted with adults 18 years and older. Interviewers called telephone numbers up to 10 different times in order to increase the probability of obtaining a valid respondent. The entire telephone interview lasted from 20 to 40 minutes.

SECTION IV

DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY SAMPLE

Clark County Commission Districts

The sample for this study was drawn from each of the seven Clark County Commission Districts which were chosen as geographic references. A map of the urban County with each District identified is provided in Appendix A. Six hundred and forty interviews were completed with county residents. A representative group of residents from each of the Districts was interviewed thereby allowing the opportunity to make comparisons between Districts as well as assess the urban County as a whole. Table 1 shows the population in each District, the corresponding percentage in relation to the urban unincorporated County as a whole, the number of survey respondents by District and the corresponding percentage of respondents compared to the entire sample. The population in District C reflects the large portion of residents who reside in the city of Las Vegas while most residents in District D reside in North Las Vegas. The final sample size is statistically sufficient to draw valid and reliable conclusions for the entire County as well as each Commission District.

Table 1. Description of Sample by District


District	District Population	Percentage of Population in District	Number of Survey Respondents	Percentage of Sample
A	58,589	16%	79	12%
B	48,779	11%	122	19%
C	6,078	1.4%	90	14%
D	10,902	2.5%	52	8%
E	103,425	28%	100	16%
F	91,794	25%	99	16%
G	111,791	31%	98	15%

Demographic Information

Gender (Question 31)

The gender makeup of the sample consisted of a larger percentage of males (58%) than females (42%). The 1996 Las Vegas Perspective Survey indicated that the gender makeup of the urban County consisted of 52.2% females and 47.8% males.


Figure 1. Gender of All Respondents (n=640)



Length of Residence in Clark County (Question 32a)

The respondents' length of residence in Clark County ranged from less than one year to sixty-nine years. More specifically, the respondents' length of residence was as follows: 5 years or less (31%), 6-10 years (17%), 11-15 years (10%), 16-20 years (14%), more than 20 years (28%).

Figure 2. Length of Residence in Clark County for All Respondents (n=640)




The 1996 Las Vegas Perspective indicated that the length of residence for the entire urban County was fairly similar to this sample as follows: 5 years or less (37%), 6-10 years (19%), 11-20 years (18%), more than 20 years (26%).

Age (Question 32b)

The sample consisted of adults whose age ranged from 18 years old to 93 years old. Forty-eight percent were between the ages of 18 and 40 years old with a slight majority (52%) over 40 years old. The figure below provides a further breakdown of the respondents' ages.

Figure 3. Age Groups for All Respondents (n=640)




The 1996 Las Vegas Perspective reported the ages of adults in the general population of Clark County as: 18-24 years (14%), 25-34 years (25%), 35-44 years (21%), 45-54 years (15%), 55-64 years (12%), and over 65 years (14%). While a direct comparison of the age represented in the sample versus the County is difficult because of the differences in grouping of the age categories used, it would appear that the sample is fairly representative of the age distribution in the community.

Race/Ethnicity (Question 33)

The ethnic makeup of the sample was predominantly Caucasian (77%). African Americans (11%), Hispanics (9%), and Asian Americans (3%) were also represented in the sample. The figure below shows the race/ethnicity of respondents.

Figure 4. Race/Ethnicity for All Respondents (n=640)




The 1996 Las Vegas Perspective reported the racial/ethnic backgrounds of residents of Clark County as: white (72%), African American (9%), Hispanic (12%), Asian (6%), and American Indian (1%). It appears that the respondents in this study reflect the race/ethnicity of the County.

Household Size (Question 34)

The size of respondents' households ranged from 1 to 11 people. The majority of households (53%) had three or more people in residence. Thirty two percent were two person households, and 15% were single households. The figure below provides further detail on the size of households of respondents.

Figure 5. Size of Household for All Respondents (n=640)



The 1996 Las Vegas Perspective reported similar household information. The majority of households (39%) consisted of two persons, 36% had three or more persons and 26% were single person households.


Age of Other Household Members (Question 35)

Respondents were asked to identify the ages of other member of their households. Most of the respondents had another adult living in the household (85%) while 15% were single parent households with one child under 18 years old. The majority of respondents (55%-66%) reporting three or more members in the household had children under the age of 18.

Income (Question 36)

The annual household income level of respondents ranged from below \$10,000 to above \$100,000. Most respondents (33%) were in the \$25,000 - \$50,000 category. The figure below provides further detail on the income of respondents with percentages for each category.

Figure 6. Income Level for All Respondents (n=640)



The 1996 Las Vegas Perspective reported the household income of residents of Clark County as: under \$15,000 (11%), \$15,000 - \$20,900 (8%), \$20,000 - \$25,000 (10%), \$25,000-\$35,000 (16%), \$35,000-\$50,000 (21%), \$50,000-\$75,000 (20%), \$75,000-\$100,000 (8%), over \$100,000 (7%). The respondents in this sample appear to be representative of the income levels throughout the County.

SECTION V SURVEY FINDINGS

Overall Rating of the Area of the County (Question 1)

Residents were asked to rate their respective section of the County as a place to live. They provided their rating on scale responses of excellent, good, fair, and poor. Twenty four percent of all respondents provided a rating of excellent, 47% good, 23% fair, and 5% poor.

Figure 7. Ratings (%) of County by All Respondents (n=640)



By district, residents in District C gave the highest rating of the county with 92% rating it as either excellent or good. The lowest rating was found in District D where only 41% of respondents rated it as excellent or good while 42% also rated it as fair. The figure below provides further detail on the respondents' rating of the County.


Table 2. Overall Ratings (%) of County by Respondent's District

District	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
A	29%	53%	14%	4%
B	16%	43%	30%	9%
C	50%	42%	7%	1%
D	12%	29%	42%	17%
E	15%	51%	30%	4%
F	22%	54%	22%	2%
G	22%	50%	20%	4%

Familiarity with Cultural, Recreational, or Senior Citizen Programs or Services (Question 2)

Residents were asked if they were familiar with the CCPRD cultural, recreational, or senior citizen programs or services. Forty six percent said that they were familiar with these programs and services, and 54% said they were not.

Figure 8. Familiarity of CCPRD by All Respondents (n=640)



The level of respondent familiarity with CCPRD varied by Clark County Commission District. The percentage of those familiar were as follows: District A (44%), District B (37%), District C (59%), District D (37%), District E (58%), District F (45%), and District G (42%). Districts C and E had the highest level of familiarity with CCPRD while District B and D were not as familiar with these programs and services. A high percentage of residents in District B and D reside in Las Vegas and North Las Vegas.

Source of Information (Questions 3a-3h)

Residents were asked what information sources they used to learn about CCPRD programs and services. Seventy two percent identified word of mouth; 47% identified television. Magazines were relied on the least by respondents (22%). The following figure and table provide further detail on the sources of information used by all respondents, as well as the sources of information by district.

Figure 9. Sources of Information (%) Used by All Respondents (n=291)





Table 3. Sources (%) of Information Used by Respondent's District

District	Guide	Mag.	Newspaper	TV	Radio	Direct Mail	Poster Flyer	Word of Mouth
A	46%	23%	37%	54%	34%	51%	49%	57%
B	32%	15%	34%	37%	37%	24%	27%	73%
C	40%	28%	49%	53%	45%	38%	60%	79%
D	53%	21%	37%	68%	42%	58%	37%	74%
E	35%	26%	43%	50%	41%	48%	47%	69%
F	34%	16%	50%	41%	34%	52%	43%	71%
G	37%	22%	56%	39%	27%	42%	44%	76%

Overall Impression of Programs and Services Provided by CCPRD (Question 4)

Respondents were asked their overall impression of programs and services provided by the CCPRD. Twenty three percent of residents gave a rating of excellent, 52% good, 18% fair, and 5% poor. This suggests that 75% of residents have a favorable impression of CCPRD.

Figure 10. Rating (%) of CCPRD by All Respondents (n=291)



The ratings of CCPRD by Clark County Commission District are provided in the following table. There was some variability in the ratings of respondents by district. District G had the largest number of respondents rating CCPRD as excellent. Thirty four percent of respondents in District G rated CCPRD as excellent. In Districts A, B, E, F, and G, over 75% of respondents rated CCPRD programs and services as excellent or good. The lowest ratings of CCPRD were in Districts C and D with 68% of respondents indicating excellent or good, while 29% or more rated the programs and services as fair or poor. It should be noted that Districts C and D have fewer County facilities.


Table 4. Rating (%) of CCPRD by Respondent's District

District	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
A	17%	60%	20%	-
B	24%	51%	12%	10%
C	19%	49%	25%	4%
D	21%	47%	21%	11%
E	22%	57%	19%	-
F	25%	52%	11%	7%
G	34%	44%	15%	5%

Introduce Clark County Services Through Television Programming (Question 5)

Residents were asked if it would be valuable to have programming on television that would introduce new residents to Clark County services, events, and other issues. A strong majority of residents (88%) indicated that this would be valuable. Only 9% did not think television programming would be valuable; 3% were unsure.

Figure 11. Television Programming of Services by All Respondents (n=640)




Respondents in each of the Commission Districts indicated that television programming to introduce new residents to Clark County services and events would be valuable. Specifically, the breakdown by District is as follows: District A (91%), District B (90%), District C (84%), District D (96%), District E (93%), District F (86%), and District G (81%).

Prime Cable Viewer (Question 6)

In order to determine if the County cable television channel is a medium through which county residents could be provided with information on CCPRD programs and services, respondents were asked if they were a prime cable subscriber. Most respondents (69%) indicated they were prime cable viewers, while 31% said they were not.

Figure 12. Prime Cable Viewer by All Respondents (n=640)




By Commission District, respondents in District C and E (78%) had the highest viewership of cable television, while District B had the lowest at 55%. The remaining breakdown was as follows: District A (65%), District D (62%), District F (75%), and District G (72%).

Cable Channel 4 Viewer (Question 7)

In order to determine if the Clark County Government's Channel (Cable Channel 4) was a medium through which county residents could be provided with information on CCPRD programs and services, respondents were asked if they were a cable channel 4 viewer. Most respondents (64%) indicated they were viewers of channel 4, while 36% said they were not.

Figure 13. Cable Channel 4 Viewer by All Respondents (n=442)




By Commission District, respondents in District D (72%) had the highest viewership of Channel 4, while District F had the lowest at 50%. The remaining breakdown was as follows: District A (65%), District B (67%), District C (67%), District E (68%), and District G (66%).

Clark County Parks and Recreation Department Slogan (Question 8)

As an indicator of CCPRD Department's pilot marketing campaign, respondents were asked if they recognized the CCPRD slogan "Parks and Recreation: What we do is good for you!" Thirty two percent of residents were aware of the slogan. This suggests that the marketing campaign achieved a 32% market penetration of residents.

Figure 14. Awareness of Slogan by All Respondents (n=640)




Recognition of the CCPRD slogan was fairly consistent across respondent districts with residents in District C having the most awareness (36%) and District G having the least recognition (27%). The remaining breakdown was as follows: District A (33%), District B (30%), District D (31%), District E (34%), and District F (29%).

Quality of Life (Question 9)

Respondents were asked how much CCPRD facilities in their community add to their quality of life. Thirty two percent of residents indicated that CCPRD facilities contributed very much; 50% somewhat; 16% not at all; and 2% did not know. This suggests that for 82% of respondents parks and recreation facilities in the community make a positive contribution to their quality of life.

Figure 15. CCPRD Facilities Contributing to Quality of Life for All Respondents (n=640)



The majority of respondents in all of the districts indicated that CCPRD facilities contributed to their quality of life. Over 83% of the respondents in Districts A, C, E, F, and G indicated that these facilities either contributed very much or somewhat. Respondents in District B (76%) and respondents in District D (64%) rated the contribution of CCPRD facilities less favorably.


Table 5. Facilities Contribute to Quality of Life by Respondent's District (%)

District	Very Much	Somewhat	Not at All	Don't Know
A	34%	51%	13%	3%
B	31%	45%	23%	1%
C	24%	61%	13%	1%
D	29%	35%	33%	4%
E	36%	47%	15%	2%
F	35%	52%	11%	2%
G	33%	53%	10%	4%

Awareness of Desert Wetland Park (Question 10)

Respondents were asked if they were aware of the natural conservation area, the Wetlands Park, located in the southeast part of the valley. Thirty seven percent of residents were aware of Wetlands Park, while the majority of residents (62%) were not aware of the park.

Figure 16. Aware of Wetlands Park for All Respondents (n=640)



The level of respondent awareness with the Wetlands park varied by Clark County Commission District. The percentages of those familiar were as follows: District A (35%), District B (41%), District C (44%), District D (33%), District E (44%), District F (29%), and District G (33%). Districts C and E respondents had the highest level of familiarity with the Wetlands, while District F residents were not as familiar with the Wetlands park.

Park Usage (Question 11)

Residents were asked if they had visited a Clark County park in the last year. Seventy percent of respondents stated that they had, while 30% stated they had not.

Figure 17. Visited Clark County Parks (n=640)



The level of respondent usage of parks varied by Clark County Commission District. The percentages of those visiting the parks last year were as follows: District A (75%), District B (63%), District C (77%), District D (69%), District E (74%), District F (70%), and District G (62%). District C had the highest level of park usage, while Districts G (62%) and B (63%) residents indicated lower usage rates.

Barriers to Park Usage (Question 12)

When respondents who had not visited a Clark County Park in the last year were asked why, most respondents stated that they did not have enough time (33%), interest (8%), or did not have children (8%). The safety of the parks was identified as a barrier by only 4% of respondents.

Table 6. Barriers to Park Usage

Barrier	Percentage of Respondents (n=139)
No time	33%
No interest	8%
Location not convenient	4%
No children	8%
No transportation	1%
No one to go with	1%
Just never think to use them	3%
Sites are not well maintained	4%
Parks are not safe	4%
Poor health or disability	2%
Hours are not convenient	6%
Don't know facility locations	6%
Am not familiar with facilities	4%
Don't know	9%
Other	12%

Because of the low numbers of individuals experiencing barriers in any specific district, barriers are reported only for those districts in which at least 10% of the respondents who did not visit parks in that district reported that barrier. The lack of time was a barrier across all districts but highest for District B (47%) and lowest for district D (9%) residents. The lack of time response for the remaining district respondents ranges from 15% to 38%. A lack of interest was indicated by 13% of District F and 14% of District G respondents. Adults without children was indicated as a barrier by 15% of District A, 13% of District F, and 11% of District G respondents. Health concerns were indicated as barriers by 16% of District E and 11% of District G residents. Also in district E, 11% of respondents were not familiar with park facilities, while 27% of district D residents were unaware of park locations.

Most Visited Park (Question 13)

Respondents were asked which parks they used in the last year. Respondents (41%) most often visited parks other than those operated by Clark County. Many residents, particularly those in District C and D, are in close proximity to City parks. Of the Clark County parks visited, Sunset Park was most visited (29%), followed by Desert Breeze (5%), Alexander Villas (3%), Paradise Park (3%) and Nellis Meadows (2%). All other Clark County parks were visited by 1% or less of respondents.

Visitation at parks varied by district (see Table 7). Alexander Villas Park and Nellis Meadows Park were most visited by respondents in Districts B and D. Desert Breeze Park received the most visitation from respondents in Districts D and F, while respondents in District D and G most visited Paradise Park. Respondents in District G used Sunset Park a great deal while individuals in District C had the lowest visitation there. The use of parks other than those operated by the County was highest in Districts C and D.

Table 7. Park Most Visited by All Respondents and by District (%)

Park	Total Sample	District A	District B	District C	District D	District E	District F	District G
Alex. Villas	3%	2%	8%	4%	3%	1%	-	-
Desert Breeze	5%	3%	-	4%	-	1%	25%	-
Nellis Meadow	2%	3%	7%	1%	6%	-	-	-
Paradise	3%	2%	3%	-	-	4%	-	10%
Sunset	29%	36%	21%	7%	14%	41%	19%	61%
Other	41%	31%	43%	77%	78%	28%	29%	15%

Second Most Visited Park (Question 14A)

Respondents were asked to indicate what other parks they used. Sunset park was the second most used park (31%), followed by Paradise Park (13%), parks other than Clark County's (12%), Desert Breeze Park (7%), and Lewis Park (6%).


Third, Fourth, and Fifth Most Used Park (Question 14B, 14C, 14D)

Most of the respondents visited a primary park (70%) with 15% of respondents also using a second park. The number of respondents using more than two parks dropped significantly (3%).

Frequency of Park Usage (Question 15)

When asked how often they visited a park in the last year, the majority of respondents (52%) indicated that they visited parks at least once per month, while 20% used parks more than once per week. The frequency of use for all respondents was as follows: more than once a week (20%), two or more times a month (20%), once a month (12%), six to seven times a year (19%), and less than six times a year (29%).

Figure 18. Frequency of Park Usage by All Respondents



The frequency of park usage was fairly similar across Clark County Commission Districts. Table 8 below shows the percentage of respondents and their park usage by district.


Table 8. Frequency of Park Usage by Respondents District

District	More than Once a Week	Two or More Times a Month	Once a Month	Six/Seven Times a Year	Less Than Six Times a Year
A	20%	20%	9%	15%	36%
B	22%	18%	8%	18%	33%
C	22%	23%	10%	23%	22%
D	14%	28%	6%	17%	36%
E	22%	10%	15%	23%	31%
F	16%	26%	16%	16%	26%
G	21%	19%	16%	18%	23%

Quality of Clark County Parks (Question 16)

Respondents were asked their overall impression of parks provided by the CCPRD. Twenty-one percent of residents gave a rating of excellent, 59% good, 16% fair, and 3% poor. This suggests that 81% of residents have a favorable impression of CCPRD parks.

Figure 19. Overall Quality of Parks (n=448)



The quality ratings of parks by respondents varied by Clark County Commission District. The percentages of those rating parks as excellent or good were as follows: District A (79%), District B (87%), District C (80%), District D (81%), District E (82%), District F (73%), and District G (84%). District E had the highest percentage of respondents rating parks as excellent (27%), while 14% of District D residents rated parks as excellent. Table 9 below provides the complete ratings for respondents by district.


Table 9. Quality of Parks by Respondent's District (%)

District	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
A	24%	54%	19%	3%
B	23%	64%	10%	1%
C	19%	61%	16%	3%
D	14%	67%	19%	-
E	27%	55%	16%	1%
F	18%	55%	18%	4%
G	21%	63%	13%	3%

Recreation or Cultural Facility Usage (Question 17)

In addition to the respondents' usage of parks, respondents were asked if they visited a recreation or cultural facility in the last year. The majority of respondents (61%) had not visited a recreation or cultural facility over the course of last year, while 38% had. One percent were not sure.

Figure 20. Recreation or Cultural Facility Usage (n=640)



Facility usage was fairly consistent across respondent districts with residents in District E using facilities the most (44%) and District G having the lowest level of use (32%). The remaining breakdown was as follows: District A (37%), District B (39%), District C (41%), District D (33%), and District F (38%).

Barriers to Recreation or Cultural Facility Usage (Question 18)

When respondents who had not visited a Clark County recreation or cultural facility in the last year were asked why, most respondents stated that they did not have enough time (38%), had no interest (16%), or were not familiar with facilities (11%).

Table 10. Barriers to Recreation or Cultural Facility Usage

Barrier	Percentage of Respondents (n=263)
No time.....	38%
No interest.....	16%
Location not convenient.....	2%
No children.....	2%
No transportation.....	2%
Just never think to use them.....	3%
Parks are not safe.....	less than 1%
Poor health or disability.....	5%
Hours are not convenient.....	2%
Too Expensive.....	1%
Don't know facility locations.....	3%
Am not familiar with facilities.....	11%
Other.....	9%

Because of the low numbers of individuals experiencing barriers in any specific district, barriers will be reported only for those districts in which at least 10% of the respondents who did not visit a recreation or cultural facility in that district reported that barrier. The lack of time was a barrier across all districts but highest for District F (43%) and B (42%) residents. For the remaining districts, the lack of time barrier ranges from 31% to 40%. A lack of interest was indicated by at least 10% of respondents from five Districts (A, C, D, F, G) and ranged from 13% to 27%. Health concerns were indicated as a barrier by 13% of District E and 11% of District G residents. Also in district E, 13% of respondents were not familiar with recreation facilities, while 11% of District G residents were unaware of facility locations. District D respondents indicated that the lack of transportation was a barrier (13%) as well as not knowing the locations of facilities (19%).

Facility Usage (Question 19)

Respondents were asked which recreation and cultural facilities they used in the last year. Respondents (32%) most visited Camp Lee Canyon followed by Desert Rose Golf Course (27%), McCarran Aviation Museum (26%), Heritage Museum (22%), and the Government Center Amphitheater (21%). The finding that most respondents visited Camp Lee Canyon is surprising. It is likely that respondents were indicating that they visited the Lee Canyon recreation area rather than Camp Lee Canyon administered by the County.

By district there was some variation in respondent use of recreation and cultural facilities. Respondents in Districts A (45%), E (41%), and G (39%) had the highest use of Desert Rose Golf Course. Respondents in Districts C (54%) and F (29%) most used Camp Lee Canyon. Respondents (28%) in District B used Sunrise Community Center most while individuals (24%) in District D used Orr Community Center most. Table 11 below provides the complete breakdown for all recreation and cultural facilities.

Table 11 Facility Usage During the Year for All Respondents and by District (n=243)

Facility	Total Sample	District A	District B	District C	District D	District E	District F	District G
Camp Lee Canyon	32%	38%	26%	54%	6%	30%	29%	29%
Heritage Museum	22%	24%	23%	24%	18%	30%	13%	16%
Desert Rose	27%	45%	9%	30%	6%	41%	16%	39%
Gov. Center	21%	35%	17%	16%	12%	21%	24%	26%
Guinn Center	5%	3%	2%	8%	6%	-	16%	-
Lowden Center	3%	3%	2%	-	-	5%	5%	-
Aviation Museum	26%	38%	26%	22%	18%	34%	21%	19%
Orr Center	6%	3%	2%	5%	24%	9%	3%	7%
Paradise Center	12%	14%	6%	8%	-	25%	3%	26%
Parkdale Center	7%	10%	6%	3%	-	14%	3%	10%
Sunrise Center	18%	31%	28%	3%	6%	30%	5%	13%
Von Tobel Center	5%	-	9%	5%	12%	9%	3%	-
Walnut Cecile	1%	-	2%	3%	-	-	3%	-
Whitney Center	10%	17%	-	5%	6%	18%	3%	19%
Winch Center	16%	17%	9%	11%	6%	34%	11%	16%

Table 12. Facilities Most Often Used for All Respondents and by District (n=243)

Facility	Total Sample	District A	District B	District C	District D	District E	District F	District G
Camp Lee Canyon	11%	17%	9%	22%	6%	5%	3%	16%
Heritage Museum	6%	-	6%	5%	12%	9%	5%	3%
Desert Rose	10%	14%	4%	16%	-	9%	8%	13%
Gov. Center	5%	-	6%	5%	12%	5%	3%	7%
Guinn Center	2%	-	-	3%	-	-	8%	-
Lowden Center	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aviation Museum	5%	7%	7%	5%	12%	2%	3%	-
Orr Center	1%	-	-	-	18%	-	-	-
Paradise Center	4%	3%	2%	-	-	7%	-	16%
Parkdale Center	1%	-	4%	-	-	2	-	-
Sunrise Center	7%	17%	13%	-	-	9%	-	3%
Von Tobel Center	1%	-	4%	-	-	2%	-	-
Walnut Cecile	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Whitney Center	5%	7%	-	3%	6%	9%	-	16%
Winch Center	8%	14%	4%	-	6%	23%	5%	3%


Most Visited Facilities (Question 20)

Those respondents who indicated they had visited a County recreation or cultural facility in the past year were asked to indicate which ones were used most often. Table 12 provides the recreation facilities most used by respondents by District

Frequency of Recreation or Cultural Facilities Usage (Question 21)

When asked how often they visited a recreation or cultural facility in the last year, the majority of respondents (62%) indicated that they visited recreation or cultural facilities six to seven times a year or less. The frequency of use for all respondents was as follows: more than once a week (10%), two or more times a month (14%), once a month (11%), six to seven times a year (15%), and less than six times a year (47%).

Figure 21. Recreation or Cultural Facility Usage by All Respondents (n=243)



The frequency of usage of recreation or cultural facilities varied by Clark County Commission District. The percentages of those using recreation or cultural facilities at least once a month last year were as follows: District A (44%), District B (21%), District C (35%), District D (18%), District E (41%), District F (34%), and District G (45%). District A had the highest frequency of recreation or cultural facility usage, while Districts D (18%) had the lowest. The table below provides a complete breakdown by respondent district.


Table 13. Frequency of Facility Usage by Respondents District (%)

District	More than Once a Week	Two or More Times a Month	Once a Month	Six/Seven Times a Year	Less Than Six Times a Year
A	14%	14%	14%	17%	41%
B	9%	6%	6%	13%	62%
C	11%	8%	16%	14%	46%
D	-	6%	12%	29%	47%
E	7%	23%	11%	16%	41%
F	5%	18%	11%	13%	47%
G	19%	16%	10%	13%	39%

Quality of Recreation or Cultural Facilities (Question 22)

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of recreation or cultural facilities provided by the CCPRD. Twenty percent of residents gave a rating of excellent, 57% good, 15% fair, 1% poor and 7% did not know. This suggests that 77% of residents have a favorable rating of CCPRD recreation or cultural facilities.

Figure 22. Overall Quality of Recreation/Cultural Facilities (n=245)



The frequency of usage of recreation or cultural facilities varied by Clark County Commission District. The percentages of those rating recreation or cultural facilities as excellent or good were as follows: District A (80%), District B (71%), District C (79%), District D (70%), District E (86%), District F (74%), and District G (78%). District D (29%) had the highest frequency of excellent ratings of recreation or cultural facilities, while Districts A (14%), B (15%), and C (16%) had a lower percentage of excellent ratings. The table below provides a complete breakdown by respondent district.

Table 14. Quality of Recreation/Cultural Facilities by Respondent District (%)

District	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
A	14%	66%	17%	3%	-
B	15%	56%	13%	2%	15%
C	26%	53%	13%	-	8%
D	29%	41%	24%	-	6%
E	25%	61%	11%	2%	-
F	16%	58%	18%	-	8%
G	23%	55%	16%	-	7%

Participation in Recreation Programs (Question 23)

In addition to respondents' usage of parks and recreation and cultural facilities, the study investigated whether respondents had participated in recreation programs. A significant majority of respondents (81%) had not participated in recreation programs, while 16% had participated over the past year and 3% of respondents did not know.

Figure 23. Participation in Recreation Programs for All Respondents (n=640)



The level of respondent participation in recreation programs varied by Clark County Commission District. The percentages of those participating in recreation programs last year were as follows: District A (11%), District B (12%), District C (16%), District D (12%), District E (21%), District F (18%), and District G (20%). District E had the highest level of participation in recreation programs, while Districts A (11%) and B (12%) residents indicated lower participation rates.

Barriers to Participation in Recreation Programs (Question 24)

When respondents who had not participated in a recreation program in the last year were asked why, most respondents stated that they had not time (37%), were not familiar with facilities (13%) or were not interested (12%).

Table 15. Barriers to Participation in Recreation Programs

Barrier	Percentage of Respondents (n=359)
No time	37%
No interest	12%
Location not convenient	2%
No children	5%
No transportation	2%
No one to go with	less than 1%
Just never think to use them	3%
Programs are not safe	1%
Poor health or disability	5%
Hours are not convenient	less than 1%
Don't know facility locations	4%
Am not familiar with facilities	13%
Don't Know	6%
Other	10%

Program Participation During the Past Year (Question 25; n=83)

Respondents were asked which recreation programs they had participated in during the past year. A total of 83 respondents (24%) identified a specific recreation program in which they were a participant in the past year. Of that group of 83 respondents, 39% indicated that they participated in two or more programs. The specific programs identified by respondents represented the diversity of classes, activities, and events sponsored by CCPRD. Programs identified by respondents included: Itty Bitty Programs, Recmobile, Craft Fair and Rib Burn Off, Dance, Karate, Tops Weight Loss, Sagebrush Soccer, Renaissance Fair, and a wide variety of sports.

Rating of Recreation Classes (Question 26)

Residents were asked to rate the quality of CCPRD recreation classes. Of those who responded to this question, 85% rated recreation classes as excellent or good, while 10% rated classes as fair, poor 1%, and 4% did not know.

Figure 24. Overall Rating of Recreation Classes (n=106)




Table 16 below provides the rating by respondents of recreation classes by district. Most respondents in each district rated recreation classes as excellent or good.

Table 16. Overall Rating of Recreation Classes (%)

District	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
A	36%	55%	-	-	9%
B	13%	67%	7%	-	13%
C	14%	71%	14%	-	-
D	17%	50%	33%	-	-
E	43%	48%	10%	-	-
F	17%	61%	11%	6%	6%
G	29%	62%	10%	-	-

Community Needs for CCPRD Improvement & Expansion (Question 27a-w)

Respondents were asked their opinion about 23 recreation facilities or programs that might be improved or expanded by CCPRD. For each recreation facility or program, respondents were asked if there was a need for 1) a lot of improvement, 2) some improvement, or 3) no improvement. The top five areas that respondents indicated a lot of improvement or expansion were: anti-drug or anti-gang programs for youth (63%), activities for teens (53%), safekey programs (42%), education (41%), and walking, hiking, and/or biking trails (41%). When the response categories of a lot of improvement and some improvement are combined the top five areas of community need were: anti-drug or anti-gang programs for youth (81%), activities for teens (76%), outdoor performances or special events (70%), education (69%), and walking, hiking, and/or biking trails (69%).

Table 17. Need for Improved/Expanded Recreation Facilities and Programs for All Respondents (n=640)

Community Need	A lot of Improvement	Some Improvement	No Improvement	Don't Know
Exercise/fitness	21%	33%	19%	27%
Swimming/water Sports	30%	30%	16%	25%
Arts/cultural Programs	22%	34%	20%	23%
Crafts/hobbies	20%	35%	17%	28%
Sports	25%	31%	23%	20%
Picnicking	28%	34%	24%	14%
Playground Programs	38%	28%	12%	22%
Education	41%	28%	12%	19%
Anti-drug/gang Programs	63%	18%	8%	11%
Outdoor Activities	20%	35%	24%	21%
Nature Trips	25%	39%	16%	20%
Golf Courses	24%	35%	15%	26%
Field Trips	11%	16%	51%	22%
Special Events	35%	35%	18%	13%
Walking/biking Trails	41%	28%	18%	13%
Films/lectures	20%	36%	21%	23%
History/museum Programs	28%	37%	19%	17%
Teen Activities	53%	23%	6%	18%
Art Exhibits	20%	42%	20%	18%
Senior Activities	37%	26%	12%	25%
Safekey Programs	42%	26%	13%	19%
Preschool Activities	36%	28%	12%	23%
Camping Sites	33%	31%	17%	19%

Respondents opinions about the need for improved or expanded recreation facilities and programs varied by district and are presented in Table 18. The top five areas that respondents indicated a lot of improvement and some improvement by district were as follows:

District A - anti-drug or anti-gang programs for youth (77%), walking, hiking, and/or biking trails (75%) activities for teens (70%), outdoor performances or special events (68%), and playground programs (68%);

District B - anti-drug or anti-gang programs for youth (84%), activities for teens (76%), safekey (74%), preschool programs (73%), and classes (71%);

District C - anti-drug or anti-gang programs for youth (84%), walking, hiking, and/or biking trails (78%) activities for teens (76%), camping (73%), and preschool programs (70%);

District D - anti-drug or anti-gang programs for youth (95%), activities for teens (90%), classes (85%), safekey programs (85%), and senior programs (79%);

District E - anti-drug or anti-gang programs for youth (76%), activities for teens (73%), safekey programs (69%), nature activities (65%) and outdoor performances or special events (65%);

District F - anti-drug or anti-gang programs for youth (84%), activities for teens (77%), outdoor performances or special events (68%) walking, hiking, and/or biking trails (68%), and safekey programs (67%);

District G - anti-drug or anti-gang programs for youth (83%), activities for teens (77%), outdoor performances or special events (77%), classes (70%), and safekey programs and arts (67%).


Table 18. Need for Improved/Expanded Recreation Facilities and Programs for All Respondents by District (n=640)

Need	Total Sample	District A	District B	District C	District D	District E	District F	District G
Fitness	54%	48%	49%	56%	56%	58%	53%	58%
Water Sports	60%	59%	57%	60%	69%	58%	60%	60%
Arts Program	56%	54%	52%	60%	62%	53%	48%	67%
Crafts	55%	48%	54%	59%	71%	52%	53%	55%
Sports	56%	47%	62%	60%	69%	52%	53%	54%
Picnic	62%	57%	64%	63%	69%	60%	60%	62%
Play-ground	66%	68%	66%	66%	67%	63%	65%	63%
Classes	69%	67%	71%	68%	85%	63%	65%	70%
Gang Program	81%	77%	84%	84%	96%	76%	72%	83%
Outdoor Activities	55%	49%	58%	55%	67%	53%	52%	55%
Nature	64%	65%	66%	68%	67%	65%	54%	64%
Field	59%	63%	62%	67%	60%	57%	52%	57%
Golf Courses	27%	24%	25%	31%	15%	27%	31%	29%
Sp Event	70%	68%	69%	69%	71%	65%	68%	77%
Trails	69%	75%	66%	78%	65%	63%	68%	65%
Films	56%	46%	56%	58%	71%	54%	56%	55%
Museum Program	65%	66%	63%	66%	75%	63%	63%	63%
Teens	76%	70%	76%	76%	90%	73%	73%	77%
Exhibits	62%	65%	64%	62%	65%	60%	59%	63%
Seniors	63%	61%	66%	59%	79%	63%	57%	60%
Safekey Program	68%	57%	74%	62%	85%	69%	67%	67%
Pre - School	64%	54%	73%	70%	83%	60%	63%	55%
Camping	64%	63%	63%	73%	62%	63%	62%	61%

Priorities for CCPRD (Question 28a-28j)

Respondents were asked which projects or service improvements should be given priority if additional funds became available to CCPRD. The two highest priority areas were youth outreach activities (68%) and services for individuals with low incomes or disabilities (64%). Athletic fields (38%) and walking/biking trails (47%) were less often rated as a high priority. See the figure below for the percentage of individuals who perceived each project or service improvement as a high priority.

Figure 25. High Priorities for All Respondents (n=640)



All of the projects or service improvements were considered a high or moderate priority by at least 80% of the respondents. Ninety percent or more of the respondents identified "Activities for all ages," "Low Income/Disabled Services," "Youth Outreach Activities," and "Major Park Improvements" as high to moderate priorities if additional funds become available to CCPRD. Respondents also indicated that Park Police (88%) and Major Building Construction (87%) were also important priorities. See figure below for the percentages of individuals who perceived each project or service project as either a high or moderate priority.

Figure 26. High and Medium Priorities for All Respondents (n=640)




Table 19 provides the percentage of respondents in each district that rated the community need as either a high or medium priority. The findings suggest that respondents have slightly different priorities depending on the geographic area in which they live.


**Table 19. High & Medium Priorities
Compared to Total Sample by Respondent District (%)**

Need	Total Sample	District A	District B	District C	District D	District E	District F	District G
Major Park	90%	90%	87%	87%	90%	92%	90%	89%
Athletic Fields	80%	72%	75%	84%	90%	82%	81%	79%
Youth Activities	91%	91%	89%	90%	96%	91%	90%	93%
Low Income	91%	91%	93%	90%	89%	95%	82%	92%
Activities All Ages	92%	95%	94%	90%	92%	92%	90%	95%
Major Building	87%	79%	88%	83%	96%	87%	83%	91%
Walking Trails	85%	87%	81%	89%	85%	82%	91%	83%
Park Police	88%	91%	85%	80%	92%	95%	90%	85%
Buy Land	84%	85%	80%	87%	89%	88%	85%	81%

Future Directions of CCPRD (Question 29a-i)

Respondents were asked their level of agreement with possible future directions of the CCPRD. Respondents were most likely to strongly agree that the Department should address social issues (50%), conserve and preserve open spaces/environment (46%), develop large parks (40%), and provide more hiking and biking trails (36%). They were least likely to strongly agree that the CCPRD should provide tourist activities. See figure below for the percentages of individuals who strongly agreed with each of the future directions.

Figure 27. All Respondents Rating of Strongly Agree (n=640)



When the respondents who either strongly agreed or agreed with each of the future directions were combined, 94% of the respondents agreed that CCPRD should conserve and preserve open spaces; and 93% agreed that CCPRD should address social issues. In addition, over 83% of the respondents agreed that CCPRD should develop large parks, develop hiking/biking trails, and develop medium sized parks. See figure below for the percentages of respondents who either strongly agreed or agreed with each of the future directions.

Figure 28. All Respondents Rating of Strongly Agree and Agree (n=640)




Table 20 provides a comparison of policy issues that were asked residents in the 1995 survey and the 1998 survey. In each of the eight policy issues that were repeated in the surveys, there was a positive increase in respondent attitudes. The development of medium parks had the highest percentage increase (25%) followed by addressing social issues (22%), and the development of large parks (21%).


Table 20. Comparison of Policy Issues between 1995 and 1998 Surveys (%)

Policy Issue	1995 Survey	1998 Survey	Percentage Change
Public/Private Partnerships	42%	52%	+10%
Provide Tourist Activities	19%	38%	+19%
Address Social Issues	71%	93%	+22%
Conservation & Open Space Preservation	81%	94%	+13%
Develop Small Parks	39%	57%	+16%
Develop Medium Parks	58%	83%	+25%
Develop Large Parks	68%	89%	+21%

Evaluation of CCPRD and Funding Issues (Question 29j-p)

The respondents were asked their level of agreement with statements regarding the quality of services, willingness to pay more for services, and increasing the allocation of tax revenue to parks and recreation. Twenty six percent of respondents strongly agreed that they would like more of their tax dollars allocated for parks, recreation, cultural and conservation uses. See figure below for the percentages of respondents who strongly agreed with each of these statements.

Figure 29. Ratings of Strongly Agree (%) by Respondents of CCPRD and Funding Issues (n=640)



The respondents who either strongly agreed or agreed with each of the statements regarding the quality of services, willingness to pay more for services, and increasing the allocation of tax revenue to parks and recreation were combined. Over 80% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that more tax revenue should be allocated to parks and recreation, and that the quality of services is good. Over 70% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the CCPRD staff was courteous and helpful; that CCPRD was responsive to their needs; that they were willing to pay a fee for programs, and that they found the fees affordable. Sixty percent strongly agreed or agreed that they would be willing to pay higher taxes to fund new parks. See figure below for the percentages of respondents who strongly agreed or agreed with each of these statements.

Figure 30. Ratings of Strongly Agree and Agree (%) by Respondents of CCPRD and Funding Issues (n=640)





Table 21. Policy Issues by District Compared to All Respondents (%)

CCPRD Policy	Total Sample	District A	District B	District C	District D	District E	District F	District G
Preserve	94%	87%	94%	97%	90%	95%	96%	93%
Large Parks	89%	87%	84%	87%	94%	92%	90%	89%
Medium Parks	83%	84%	77%	83%	85%	90%	88%	80%
Small Parks	57%	47%	52%	66%	58%	60%	62%	59%
Open Space	71%	70%	67%	66%	73%	69%	78%	72%
Social Issues	93%	87%	93%	91%	92%	95%	94%	91%
Tourist Activities	38%	37%	40%	28%	52%	36%	40%	40%
Hiking Trails	88%	87%	83%	89%	85%	88%	91%	86%
Public Private Projects	52%	52%	49%	51%	54%	48%	52%	60%
Higher Taxes	60%	58%	58%	61%	54%	66%	64%	56%
Respond to Needs	75%	72%	69%	69%	79%	79%	81%	76%
Quality Services	82%	85%	75%	82%	83%	85%	85%	82%
Helpful Staff	74%	70%	79%	71%	73%	79%	76%	71%
More Tax \$ Allocated	84%	79%	86%	86%	85%	84%	86%	82%
Afford Fees	75%	73%	71%	76%	73%	77%	76%	79%
Pay Fee	71%	61%	71%	77%	75%	71%	70%	71%

Willingness to Volunteer for the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department (Question 30)

Respondents were asked their willingness to volunteer for the local parks and recreation agency identified in the study. Of the total sample of 640 adults, 230 individuals (36%) indicated an interest in becoming a parks and recreation volunteer (Figure 31). The demographic information regarding those interested in volunteering included 41% male and 59% female. The median age was 37; the median number of household members was 3; and the median income was \$25,000 - \$50,000. The ethnicity of the respondents interested in volunteering were as follows: Caucasian (68%), African American (15%), Hispanic (10%), and Asian (4%). The ethnic makeup of those interested in volunteers closely resembles the ethnic makeup of the broader community.

Figure 31. Respondents Willingness to Volunteer (n=640)



Primary Reason for Volunteering (Question 30A)

Respondents were also asked their primary reason for volunteering. Among the 230 adults willing to volunteer, the majority identified two primary reasons; helping others (37%) and contributing to the community (30%). Other motivations to volunteer included achievement/personal growth (6.5%), gain experience (5.7%), increase social contact (5.7%), interest in recreation (4.5%), self expression (2%), fill leisure time (2%) and other (5.4%).

Type of Volunteer Experience Desired (Question 30B)

Respondents interested in volunteering (n=230) were also asked the type of volunteer experience desired. Volunteering as a youth sport coach was the choice of 20% of respondents. Other volunteer roles included serving individuals with disabilities in recreation programs (15.6%), maintaining parks (13.6%), special projects (12.8%), teaching classes (9.5%), serving on an advisory board (4.9%), senior day care (4.9%), and fundraising (3.3%).

Barriers to Volunteering (Question 30C)

The total sample of 640 adults indicated a number of barriers that could prevent them from volunteering. Time constraints were identified as the number one barrier (36%), followed by respondents indicating multiple barriers (32%) including time constraints, work demands, and home/children commitments. There were a number of other reasons provided which would prevent individuals from volunteering. Only a small group of adults (1%) indicated that they were simply not interested in volunteering.

APPENDIX A

**MAP OF SEVEN GEOGRAPHIC
CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION DISTRICTS**



Commission Districts

APPENDIX B

NEEDS ASSESSMENT TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE

Clark County Parks and Recreation Survey
December 1997

INTRODUCTION...

Hello, this is _____. I'm calling from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. We are conducting research about the parks and recreational facilities in Las Vegas and have selected your household for participation in this study. We are not selling anything and will not ask your name. The survey takes around 10 minutes to complete and all of your answers will be confidential. OK?

READ IF NECESSARY: You may verify the authenticity of this study by calling Dr. Grace Woo, Director of the Cannon Center for Survey Research at UNLV at 895-0167.

SCREENING QUESTIONS:

S1. Are you at least 18 years of age?

1=YES {S2}

2=NO, BUT WILL GET ANOTHER PERSON {S2}

3=NO {TERMINATE}

S2. What is the zip code of your residence so I will know the correct set of questions to ask?

1=89005 {DROP}

2=89011 {DROP}

3=89012 {DROP}

4=89014 {DROP}

5=89015 {DROP}

6=89030 {DROP}

7=89031 {DROP}

8=89101 {DROP}

9=89102 {S10}

10=89103 {S10}

11=89104 {S3}

12=89106 {DROP}

13=89107 {DROP}

14=89108 {S8}

15=89109 {S10}

16=89110 {S4}

17=89113 {S10}

18=89115 {S10}

19=89117 {S5}

20=89118 {S10}

21=89119 {S10}

22=89120 {S10}

23=89121 {S10}

24=89122 {S10}

25=89123 {S10}

26=89128 {DROP}

27=89129 {S8}

28=89130 {S8}

29=89131 {S8}

30=89134 {DROP}

31=89139 {S10}

32=OTHER { /ZIPSPEC }

97=DON'T KNOW {S10}

98=REFUSE {S10}

.if s2 is 32

.then goto s10

S3. Do you live East of Boulder Highway or West of Boulder Highway?

EAST OF BOULDER HWY IS AWAY FROM DOWNTOWN

1=EAST {S10}

2=WEST {DROP}

7=DON'T KNOW {S10}

S4. Do you live East of Nellis Blvd or West of Nellis Blvd?

EAST OF NELLIS IS AWAY FROM DOWNTOWN

AND CLOSER TO SUNRISE MOUNTAIN

1=EAST {S10}

2=WEST {DROP}

7=DON'T KNOW {S10}

S5. Do you live North of Desert Inn or South of Desert Inn?

1=NORTH

2=SOUTH {S10}

7=DON'T KNOW {S10}

S6. Do you live North of Sahara or South of Sahara?

1=NORTH {DROP}

2=SOUTH

7=DON'T KNOW {S10}

S7. Do you live East of Durango or west of Durango?

EAST OF SAHARA IS CLOSER DOWNTOWN

1=EAST {S10}

2=WEST {DROP}

7=DON'T KNOW {S10}

S8. Do you have sewer services or a septic tank system?

1=SEWER {DROP}

2=SEPTIC TANK {S10}

7=DON'T KNOW

IF ASKED: We are trying to determine if you live within the Las Vegas city limits or in Clark County. In your area, Las Vegas residents have sewer services and Clark County residents have septic tanks.

S9. *IF RESPONDENT IS UNSURE:* Do you know if you pay your sewer bills to the City of Las Vegas or Clark County?

1=LAS VEGAS {DROP}

2=CLARK COUNTY {S10}

3=DON'T KNOW {S10}

{DROP}

Based on the information that you've given me, you are a resident of an incorporated city (e.g., Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, or Boulder City). For this survey, however, we are trying to reach residents of unincorporated Clark County. We do appreciate your willingness to participate. Thank you for your time.

SKIP

PEND = GO TO LAST ENTRIES AND CODE CALL AS 'NOT ELIGIBLE'

S10. What are your nearest cross streets? _____

READ IF NECESSARY:

This information will not be used to identify you in any way. We are trying to determine which County Commission District you live in, so that we can compare the responses of all people in your district with all the people in the other districts.

IF RESPONDENT REFUSES:

I am unable to continue the survey without that information, but thank you for agreeing to participate in the first place. **SELECT THE REFUSE BUTTON AND CODE THE CALL AS 'TERMINATE.'**

SKIP

P6 = CONTINUE WITH SURVEY

PEND = REFUSE

COUNTY CODE (INTERVIEWER IGNORE AND ARROW DOWN):

- 1 = District A
 - 2 = District B
 - 3 = District C
 - 4 = District D
 - 5 = District E
 - 6 = District F
 - 7 = District G
 - 8 = City of Las Vegas
-

INTRODUCTION...

Q1. To begin with, overall, would you say the area of town where you live is excellent, good, fair or poor?

- 1 = EXCELLENT
 - 2 = GOOD
 - 3 = FAIR
 - 4 = POOR
 - 7 = DON'T KNOW
 - 8 = REFUSE
-

Now I'd like to ask you about how familiar you are with some Clark County services.

Q2. Are you familiar with any of Clark County Parks and Recreation Department's cultural, recreational, or senior citizen programs or services?

- 1=Yes
 - 2=No {Q5}
 - 7=DON'T KNOW {Q5}
 - 8=REFUSE {Q5}
-

Did you hear about these programs through any of these sources...

1=Yes

2=No

7=Don't know

Q3a. The department activity guide in the review journal newspaper?

Q3b. Magazines?

Q3c. Newspaper articles?

Q3d. Television?

Q3e. Radio?

Q3f. Direct mail to your home?

Q3g. Poster or flyer?

Q3h. Word of mouth?

Q3i. Any other source I did not mention?

1=Yes {/Q3spec}

2=No

7=Don't know

Q4. In general, do you feel that the programs and services provided by the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department are excellent, good, fair or poor?

1 = EXCELLENT

2 = GOOD

3 = FAIR

4 = POOR

7 = DON'T KNOW

8 = REFUSE

Q5. Do you believe that it would be valuable to have programming on television that would introduce new residents to Clark County services, events, and other issues?

1 = YES

2 = NO

7 = DON'T KNOW

8 = REFUSE

Q6. Are you a Prime Cable viewer?

1 = YES

2 = NO {Q8}

7 = DON'T KNOW {Q8}

8 = REFUSE {Q8}

Q7. Do you watch the Government Channel on cable channel 4?

1 = YES

2 = NO

7 = DON'T KNOW

8 = REFUSE

Q8. Have you heard or seen the slogan: "Parks and Recreation: What we do is good for you!"

1 = YES

2 = NO

7 = DON'T KNOW

8 = REFUSE

Q9. How much do you think parks and recreation facilities in your community add to your quality of life? Would you say...

- 1 = Very much
- 2 = Somewhat
- 3 = Not at all
- 7 = DON'T KNOW
- 8 = REFUSE

Q10. Are you aware of the natural conservation area, the Wetland Park, which is located in the southeast part of the valley?

- 1 = YES
 - 2 = NO
 - 7 = DON'T KNOW
 - 8 = REFUSE
-

Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about your use of Clark County parks and recreation facilities.

⇒ Q11. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household, including any children, used or visited Clark County parks?

- 1 = YES {Q13}
 - 2 = NO
 - 7 = DON'T KNOW {Q17}
 - 8 = REFUSE {Q17}
-

Q12+. Why not? *[DO NOT READ LIST. SELECT ALL THAT ARE MENTIONED.]*

- A=No time
- B=No interest
- C=Location not convenient
- D=No children
- E=No transportation
- F=No one to go with
- G=Just never think to use them
- H=Sites aren't well maintained
- I=Parks are not safe
- J=Poor health or disability
- K=Hours are not convenient
- L=Too expensive
- M=Don't know facility locations
- N=Am not familiar with facilities
- O=DON'T KNOW/NO REASON
- P=Other (specify below) {/Q12spec}

Q12spec *PLEASE SPECIFY:*

GO TO Q17

Q13. Which park did you use MOST OFTEN in the past year?

INTERVIEWER: REFER TO LIST IN APPENDIX B. TYPE IN THE NUMBER FOR EACH PARK MENTIONED. IF A PARK IS NOT ON THE LIST, TYPE IN NAME OF PARK. IF RESPONDENT DOESN'T KNOW NAME OF PARK, ENTER NEAREST CROSS STREETS OF ITS LOCATION.

Q14A 14A. What other parks have you used in the past year?

GO DOWN TO Q15 IF THERE ARE NO MORE PARKS USED.

Q14B 14B. Third park mentioned:

Q14C 14C. Fourth park mentioned:

Q14D 14D. Fifth park mentioned:

Q14spec (C200) SPECIFY OTHER PARKS NOT ON LIST OR CROSS STREETS:

Q15. About how often did you visit a park in the last year? Would you say...

1 = More than once a week

2 = Two or more times a month

3 = Once a month

4 = Six to seven times a year

5 = Less than six times a year

7 = DON'T KNOW

8 = REFUSE

Q16. Overall, would you say that the quality of Clark County Parks is excellent, good, fair, or poor?

1 = Excellent

2 = Good

3 = Fair

4 = Poor

7 = DON'T KNOW

8 = REFUSE

⇒ Q17. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household, including any children, used or visited Clark County recreation or cultural facilities such as community and senior centers, museums or golf courses?

1 = YES {Q19a}

2 = NO

7 = DON'T KNOW {Q23}

8 = REFUSE {Q23}

Q18+. Why not? *[DO NOT READ LIST. SELECT ALL THAT ARE MENTIONED]*

A=No time

B=No interest

C=Location not convenient

D=No children

E=No transportation

F=No one to go with

G=Just never think to use them

H=Sites aren't well maintained

I=Facilities are not safe

J=Poor health or disability

K=Hours are not convenient

L=Too expensive

M=Don't know facility locations

N=Am not familiar with facilities

O=DON'T KNOW/NO REASON

P=Other (specify below) {/Q18spec}

Q18spec SPECIFY OTHER REASON:

GO TO P10

I'm going to read you a list of Clark County recreation and cultural facilities. For each one, please tell me whether you have used it in the past year.

1=Yes

2=No

7=Don't know

- Q19a. Camp Lee Canyon/Potosi
- Q19b. Clark County Heritage Museum
- Q19c. Desert Rose Golf Course
- Q19d. Government Center Amphitheater
- Q19e. Guinn Community Center
- Q19f. Lowden Community Center
- Q19g. Mccarren Aviation Heritage Museum
- Q19h. Orr Community Center
- Q19i. Paradise Community Center
- Q19j. Parkdale Community Center
- Q19k. Sunrise Community Center
- Q19l. Von Tobel Community Center
- Q19m. Walnut-Cecile Community Center
- Q19n. Whitney Community Center
- Q19o. Winchester Community Center

Q20. Of the recreation or cultural facilities that I just read, which one did you use MOST OFTEN during the past year?

1=Camp Lee Canyon/Potosi

2=Clark County Heritage Museum

3=Desert Rose Golf Course

4=Government Center Amphitheater

5=Guinn Community Center

6=Lowden Community Center

7=Mccarren Aviation Heritage Museum

8=Orr Community Center

9=Paradise Community Center

10=Parkdale Community Center

11=Sunrise Community Center

12=Von Tobel Community Center

13=Walnut-Cecile Community Center

14=Whitney Community Center

15=Winchester Community Center

96=DIDN'T USE ANY OF THE ABOVE CENTERS

97=DON'T KNOW

98=REFUSE

Q21. About how often did you use a recreation or cultural facility in the past year? Would you say...

1 = More than once a week

2 = Two or more times a month

3 = Once a month

4 = Six to seven times a year

5 = Less than six times a year

7 = DON'T KNOW

8 = REFUSE

Q22. Overall, would you say that the quality of Clark County recreation and/or cultural facilities is excellent, good, fair, or poor?

1 = EXCELLENT

2 = GOOD

3 = FAIR

4 = POOR

7 = DON'T KNOW

8 = REFUSE

Now let's talk about recreation programs...

fi Q23. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household, including your children, participated in any recreation programs or classes sponsored by the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department?

1 = YES {Q25}

2 = NO

7 = DON'T KNOW {Q27a}

8 = REFUSE {Q27a}

Q24+. Why not? [DO NOT READ LIST. SELECT ALL THAT ARE MENTIONED.]

A=No time

B=No interest

C=Location not convenient

D=No children

E=No transportation

F=No one to go with

G=Just never think to use them

H=Sites aren't well maintained

I=Programs are not safe

J=Poor health or disability

K=Hours are not convenient

L=Too expensive

M=Don't know facility locations

N=Am not familiar with programs

O=DON'T KNOW/NO REASON

P=Other (specify below) {/Q24spec}

Q24spec PLEASE SPECIFY:

GO TO P11

Q25. Which recreation programs did you participate in during the past year? Examples include special events like the Craft Fair and Rib Burn Off, instructional programs, sports programs, or after-school programs. [PROBE FOR THREE PROGRAMS - ENTER EACH IN SEPARATE BOX. IF LESS THAN 3 PROGRAMS, ARROW DOWN. IF MORE THAN 3 PROGRAMS, INCLUDE REST OF DESCRIPTIONS IN THIRD BOX.]

Q25a. Second program mentioned:

Q25b. Third program mentioned:

Q26. Overall, would you say that the Clark County recreation programs and classes are excellent, good, fair, or poor?

1 = EXCELLENT

2 = GOOD

3 = FAIR

4 = POOR

7 = DON'T KNOW

8 = REFUSE

I'd now like to ask your opinion about recreation facilities and programs which might be improved or expanded by the County. As I read a list of facilities and programs, please indicate whether you think they need a lot of improvement or expansion, some improvement or expansion or no improvement or expansion. [REPEAT SCALE ABOUT EVERY THIRD ITEM]

- 1=A Lot of Improvement or Expansion
- 2=Some Improvement or Expansion
- 3=No Improvement or Expansion
- 7=DON'T KNOW
- 8=REFUSE

- Q27a. Exercise or fitness
- Q27b. Swimming or water sports
- Q27c. Arts or cultural programs
- Q27d. Crafts and hobbies
- Q27e. Sports
- Q27f. Picnicking
- Q27g. Playground programs for children
- Q27h. Education
- Q27i. Anti-drug or anti-gang programs for youth
- Q27j. Boating, fishing and/or outdoor activities
- Q27k. Nature programs
- Q27l. Field trips
- Q27m. Golf courses
- Q27n. Outdoor performances or special events
- Q27o. Walking, hiking, and/or biking trails
- Q27p. Films or lectures
- Q27q. History and/or museum programs
- Q27r. Activities for teens
- Q27s. Art exhibits
- Q27t. Activities for seniors
- Q27u. Safekey programs
- Q27v. Activities for pre-school kids
- Q27w. Camping sites

Q27x 27X. Do you have comments on any other programs or facilities?

1=YES {/Q27spec}

2=NO

Q27spec PLEASE SPECIFY:

If additional funds became available for the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department, which of the following projects or service improvements should be given priority? For each of the following, please indicate a high, medium, or low priority. [REPEAT SCALE ABOUT EVERY THIRD ITEM]

- 1=High Priority
- 2=Medium Priority
- 3=Low Priority
- 7=DON'T KNOW
- 8=REFUSE

- Q28a. Major park improvements such as new parks and open spaces
- Q28b. Additional athletic fields and outdoor sport courts
- Q28c. Major building constructions such as senior centers,
- Q28d. Increased walking, hiking, and bicycle trails
- Q28e. Increased park ranger patrols
- Q28f. Expanded youth outreach and playground activities
- Q28g. Increased services to people with low income and disabilities
- Q28h. Additional recreation and cultural activities for all ages
- Q28i. Buy more land for future parks and recreation spaces

Q28j 28J. Is there anything else you think is a priority that I did not mention?

1=YES {/Q28SPEC}

2=NO

Q28spec PLEASE SPECIFY:

I'd now like to ask your opinion about issues that will direct future decisions by the Clark County Parks and Recreation Department. As I read a list of statements, please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each. [REPEAT SCALE ABOUT EVERY THIRD ITEM]

4 = Strongly Agree

3 = Agree

2 = Disagree

1 = Strongly Disagree

7 = DON'T KNOW

8 = REFUSE

Q29a. Conservation and preservation of natural, open spaces and the environment is an important role for the Department.

Q29b. The Department should develop more large parks with a range of lighted activity areas such as Sunset Park or Desert Breeze Park.

Q29c. The Department should develop more medium sized parks with some lighted activity areas such as Paradise or Winterwood Park.

Q29d. The Department should develop more small neighborhood parks with limited non-lighted activity areas such as Davis Park.

Q29e. The Department should develop more parks with trees and landscaping as open natural spaces with no organized activity areas.

Q29f. The Department should continue to offer programs which help to address social issues such as substance abuse education, after school recreation and youth at risk programs.

Q29g. The Department should provide activities which will attract tourists.

Q29h. The Department should provide more hiking, walking, and bicycle trails.

Q29i. The Department should consider public/private projects such as allowing private business to locate in County parks in order to finance other parks and recreation services.

Q29j. I would be willing to pay higher taxes to fund new parks.

Q29k. The department is responsive to the recreation, cultural and outdoor space needs of the community.

Q29l. The quality of the services provided by the department is good.

Q29m. The department staff is courteous and helpful.

Q29n. I would like to see more of my tax dollars allocated for parks, recreation, cultural and conservation uses.

Q29o. The current fees and charges for using department facilities and programs are affordable.

Q29p. I am willing to pay a fee for new programs

Q30. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about volunteerism. Would you be interested in becoming a volunteer for Clark County Parks and Recreation?

1=YES

2=NO {Q30C}

7=DON'T KNOW

8=REFUSE {P14}

Q30a. If you were to volunteer, what would be your primary reason? Would you say...

- 1=To gain experience
- 2=Achievement / personal growth
- 3=To meet corporate expectations
- 4=To increase social contact
- 5=To contribute to the community
- 6=To help others
- 7=To gain personal recognition
- 8=To fill leisure time
- 9=For self-expression
- 10=Because of interest in recreation and parks
- 11=or Something else {/Q30Aspec}

Q30A spec SPECIFY:

Q30b. If you were to volunteer, in what type of volunteer experience would you be most interested? Would you say

- 1=Helping to maintain neighborhood parks
- 2=Programs for the disabled, like the Special Olympics
- 3=Being a youth sport coach
- 4=Serving on the advisory board
- 5=Senior day care
- 6=Fundraising
- 7=Teaching classes
- 8=Special projects, like graffiti removal
- 9=or Something else {/Q30bspec}

Q30bspec SPECIFY:

Q30c+. What would prevent (prevents) you from becoming a volunteer?

[DO NOT READ LIST. SELECT ALL THAT ARE MENTIONED.]

- A=No time
- B=No interest
- C=Location not convenient
- D=No children
- E=No transportation
- F=Work demands
- G=Home/children demands
- H=Safety concerns
- I=Poor health or disability
- J=Hours are not convenient
- K=Lack of skills to share
- L=DON'T KNOW/NO REASON
- M=Other (specify below) {/Q30cspec}

Q30cspec SPECIFY:

DEMOGRAPHICS...

Q31. Finally, I'd like to ask you some background information about yourself for statistical purposes only.

INTERVIEWER: RECORD GENDER OF RESPONDENT.

- 1=MALE
- 2=FEMALE

Q32A. How long have you lived in Clark County?

RECORD IN YEARS; USE 2 DIGITS; 00=LESS THAN ONE YEAR, 97=97+, 98=REFUSE

Q32B. What is your age? [RECORD IN YEARS; 97=97+; 98=REFUSE]

Q33. What racial or ethnic category would you say best describes yourself? INTERVIEWER: READ ONLY IF NECESSARY

- 1=CAUCASIAN / WHITE
- 2=BLACK / AFRICAN AMERICAN
- 3=HISPANIC OR LATINO
- 4=ASIAN AMERICAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
- 2=INDIAN/NATIVE AMERICAN/AMERICAN INDIAN
- 5=OTHER {/Q33spec }
- 7=DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION
- 8=REFUSED

Q33spec SPECIFY:

Q34. Including yourself, how many people live in your household?

What are the ages of the other people in your household?
TYPE UP TO 10 AGES, THEN GO DOWN TO Q36.

- Q35a Age of household member #1:
- Q35b Age of household member #2:
- Q35c Age of household member #3:
- Q35d Age of household member #4:
- Q35e Age of household member #5:
- Q35f Age of household member #6:
- Q35g Age of household member #7:
- Q35h Age of household member #8:
- Q35i Age of household member #9:
- Q35j Age of household member #10:

Q36. Please tell me when I reach the category that best describes your annual household income (before taxes).

- 1 = Under \$10,000
- 2 = \$10,000 to <\$15,000
- 3 = \$15,000 to <\$25,000
- 4 = \$25,000 to <\$50,000
- 5 = \$50,000 to <\$75,000
- 6 = \$75,000 to \$100,000
- 7 = Over \$100,000
- 97 = DON'T KNOW
- 98 = REFUSE

Closing Screen...

Those are all the questions. Thank you for your time. Your answers have been very helpful and we really appreciate your cooperation.

Call Information...

Select a call description for this call:

1=Complete

2=Refuse

3=Not in Service

4=No Answer

5=Answer Machine or Voice Mail

6=Busy Signal

7=Call Back

8=Business or Fax

9=Terminated

10=Language Barrier

11=Over Quota

12=Not Eligible

APPENDIX C

FREQUENCY TABLES OF SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

Clark County Commissioner Districts

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
District A	1	79	12.3	12.3
District B	2	122	19.1	31.4
District C	3	90	14.1	45.5
District D	4	52	8.1	53.6
District E	5	100	15.6	69.2
District F	6	99	15.5	84.7
District G	7	98	15.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

1. Rating the area of town

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Excellent	1	153	23.9	23.9	23.9
Good	2	301	47.0	47.0	70.9
Fair	3	148	23.1	23.1	94.1
Poor	4	34	5.3	5.3	99.4
Don't Know	7	3	.5	.5	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q2 Familiar

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	291	45.5	45.5	45.5
No	2	345	53.9	53.9	99.4
Don't Know	7	4	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q3A Activity Guide

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	110	17.2	37.8	37.8
no	2	181	28.3	62.2	100.0
	.	349	54.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Q3B Magazines

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	64	10.0	22.0	22.0
No	2	226	35.3	77.7	99.7
Don't Know	7	1	.2	.3	100.0
	.	349	54.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 291 Missing cases 349

Q3C Newspaper Articles

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	125	19.5	43.0	43.0
No	2	166	25.9	57.0	100.0
	.	349	54.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 291 Missing cases 349

Q3D Television

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	138	21.6	47.4	47.4
No	2	153	23.9	52.6	100.0
	.	349	54.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 291 Missing cases 349

Q3E Radio

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	109	17.0	37.5	37.5
No	2	182	28.4	62.5	100.0
	.	349	54.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 291 Missing cases 349

Q3F Direct Mail

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	127	19.8	43.6	43.6
No	2	164	25.6	56.4	100.0
	.	349	54.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 291 Missing cases 349

Q3G Poster/flyer

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	131	20.5	45.0	45.0
No	2	159	24.8	54.6	99.7
Don't Know	7	1	.2	.3	100.0
	.	349	54.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 291 Missing cases 349

Q3H Word of Mouth

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	208	32.5	71.5	71.5
No	2	83	13.0	28.5	100.0
	.	349	54.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 291 Missing cases 349

Q3I Other

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	44	6.9	15.1	15.1
No	2	246	38.4	84.5	99.7
Don't Know	7	1	.2	.3	100.0
	.	349	54.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 291 Missing cases 349

Q4 Services Provided

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Excellent	1	68	10.6	23.4	23.4
Good	2	151	23.6	51.9	75.3
Fair	3	51	8.0	17.5	92.8
Poor	4	13	2.0	4.5	97.3
Don't Know	7	8	1.3	2.7	100.0
	.	349	54.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 291 Missing cases 349

Q5 Television Valuable

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	565	88.3	88.3	88.3
No	2	58	9.1	9.1	97.3
Don't Know	7	16	2.5	2.5	99.8
	9	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q6 Cable Viewer

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	442	69.1	69.1	69.1
No	2	198	30.9	30.9	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q7 Channel 4

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	284	44.4	64.3	64.3
No	2	158	24.7	35.7	100.0
	.	198	30.9	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 442 Missing cases 198

Q8 Slogan

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	199	31.1	31.1	31.1
No	2	428	66.9	66.9	98.0
Don't Know	7	13	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q9 Life Quality

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very much	1	205	32.0	32.0	32.0
Somewhat	2	318	49.7	49.7	81.7
Not at all	3	103	16.1	16.1	97.8
Don't Know	7	14	2.2	2.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q10 Awareness Wetlands

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	240	37.5	37.5	37.5
No	2	395	61.7	61.7	99.2
Don't Know	7	5	.8	.8	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q11 Park Visits

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	445	69.5	69.5	69.5
No	2	191	29.8	29.8	99.4
Don't Know	7	4	.6	.6	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Q12 Barriers

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Time	1	46	7.2	33.1	33.1
No Interest	2	11	1.7	7.9	41.0
Location not Convien	3	6	.9	4.3	45.3
No Children	4	11	1.7	7.9	53.2
No Transportation	5	2	.3	1.4	54.7
No one to go with	6	1	.2	.7	55.4
Never Think to use t	7	4	.6	2.9	58.3
Parks not safe	9	5	.8	3.6	61.9
Poor Health	10	7	1.1	5.0	66.9
Hours not convenient	11	3	.5	2.2	69.1
Don't know locations	13	8	1.3	5.8	74.8
Not familiar with fa	14	6	.9	4.3	79.1
Other	15	13	2.0	9.4	88.5
	16	16	2.5	11.5	100.0
.		501	78.3	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	139	Missing cases	501		
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0		

Q13 Most visited park

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	2	.3	.4	.4
Alexander Villas	1	12	1.9	2.7	3.1
Cashman School	3	1	.2	.2	3.4
Davis	4	1	.2	.2	3.6
Desert Breeze	5	23	3.6	5.2	8.8
Desert Inn	6	2	.3	.4	9.2
Dog Fanciers	7	3	.5	.7	9.9
Horseman's	11	3	.5	.7	10.6
Joe Shoong	12	4	.6	.9	11.5
Laurelwood	13	5	.8	1.1	12.6
Lewis Family	14	5	.8	1.1	13.7
Maslow	15	1	.2	.2	13.9
Mountain View	16	2	.3	.4	14.4
Nellis Meadows	17	10	1.6	2.2	16.6
Paradise	19	12	1.9	2.7	19.3
Paradise Vista	20	3	.5	.7	20.0
Parkdale	21	2	.3	.4	20.4
Paul Meyer	22	4	.6	.9	21.3

Potosi	23	2	.3	.4	21.8
Shadow Rock	25	2	.3	.4	22.2
Silver Bowl	26	1	.2	.2	22.5
Spring Valley	27	4	.6	.9	23.4
Sunrise	28	7	1.1	1.6	24.9
Sunset	29	127	19.8	28.5	53.5
Von Tobel School	30	3	.5	.7	54.2
Whitney	32	6	.9	1.3	55.5
Winchester	33	6	.9	1.3	56.9
Winterwood	34	5	.8	1.1	58.0
Other	35	182	28.4	40.9	98.9
	36	1	.2	.2	99.1
	99	4	.6	.9	100.0
	.	195	30.5	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 445 Missing cases 195

Q14A Second most visited park

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Alexander Villas	1	1	.2	1.1	1.1
Cannon School	2	1	.2	1.1	2.1
Desert Breeze	5	7	1.1	7.4	9.5
Desert Inn	6	1	.2	1.1	10.5
Dog Fanciers	7	1	.2	1.1	11.6
Grapevine Springs	8	1	.2	1.1	12.6
Guinn School	9	1	.2	1.1	13.7
Hidden Palms	10	1	.2	1.1	14.7
Horseman's	11	4	.6	4.2	18.9
Joe Shoong	12	2	.3	2.1	21.1
Laurelwood	13	1	.2	1.1	22.1
Lewis	14	6	.9	6.3	28.4
Mountain View	16	1	.2	1.1	29.5
Nellis Meadows	17	4	.6	4.2	33.7
Paradise	19	12	1.9	12.6	46.3
Paradise Vista	20	1	.2	1.1	47.4
Paul Meyer	22	2	.3	2.1	49.5
Shadow Rock	25	3	.5	3.2	52.6
Sunrise	28	1	.2	1.1	53.7
Sunset	29	29	4.5	30.5	84.2
Wengert School	31	1	.2	1.1	85.3
Whitney	32	1	.2	1.1	86.3
Winchester	33	2	.3	2.1	88.4
Other	35	11	1.7	11.6	100.0
	.	545	85.2	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 95 Missing cases 545

Q14B Third most visited park

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Davis	4	1	.2	4.8	4.8
Desert Breeze	5	1	.2	4.8	9.5
Dog Fanciers	7	1	.2	4.8	14.3
Horseman's	11	2	.3	9.5	23.8
Laurelwood	13	1	.2	4.8	28.6
Mountain View	16	1	.2	4.8	33.3
Nellis Meadows	17	1	.2	4.8	38.1
Paradise	19	2	.3	9.5	47.6
Paradise Vista	20	1	.2	4.8	52.4
Potosi	23	1	.2	4.8	57.1
Prosperity	24	1	.2	4.8	61.9
Spring Valley	27	1	.2	4.8	66.7
Sunrise	28	1	.2	4.8	71.4
Sunset	29	2	.3	9.5	81.0
Winterwood	34	1	.2	4.8	85.7
Other	35	3	.5	14.3	100.0
.		619	96.7	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 21 Missing cases 619

Q14C Fourth most visited park

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Dog Fanciers	7	1	.2	12.5	12.5
Mountain View	16	1	.2	12.5	25.0
Paul Meyer	22	1	.2	12.5	37.5
Prosperity	24	1	.2	12.5	50.0
Winchester	33	1	.2	12.5	62.5
Other	35	3	.5	37.5	100.0
.		632	98.8	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 8 Missing cases 632

Q14D Fifth most visited park

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Other	35	2	.3	100.0	100.0
.		638	99.7	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 2 Missing cases 638

Q15 How often did you visit a park

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
More than once a wee	1	89	13.9	20.0	20.0
Two or more times a	2	89	13.9	20.0	39.9
Once a month	3	52	8.1	11.7	51.6
Six to seven times a	4	84	13.1	18.8	70.4
Less than six times	5	130	20.3	29.1	99.6
Don't Know	7	2	.3	.4	100.0
	.	194	30.3	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 446 Missing cases 194

Q16 Overall quality of parks

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Excellent	1	96	15.0	21.4	21.4
Good	2	266	41.6	59.4	80.8
Fair	3	70	10.9	15.6	96.4
Poor	4	11	1.7	2.5	98.9
Don't Know	7	5	.8	1.1	100.0
	.	192	30.0	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 448 Missing cases 192

Q17 Did you visit a recreation or cultural facility

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	243	38.0	38.0	38.0
No	2	391	61.1	61.1	99.1
Don't Know	7	6	.9	.9	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q18 Barriers

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Time	1	100	15.6	38.0	38.0
No Interest	2	42	6.6	16.0	54.0
Location not Convien	3	4	.6	1.5	55.5
No Children	4	5	.8	1.9	57.4
No Transportation	5	4	.6	1.5	58.9
Never Think to use t	7	8	1.3	3.0	62.0
Parks not safe	9	1	.2	.4	62.4
Poor Health	10	12	1.9	4.6	66.9
Hours not convenient	11	4	.6	1.5	68.4
Too expensive	12	3	.5	1.1	69.6
Don't know locations	13	7	1.1	2.7	72.2
Not familiar with fa	14	21	3.3	8.0	80.2
Other	15	28	4.4	10.6	90.9
	16	24	3.8	9.1	100.0
	.	377	58.9	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 263 Missing cases 377

Q19A Camp Lee Canyon

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	77	12.0	31.7	31.7
No	2	166	25.9	68.3	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q19B Heritage Museum

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	53	8.3	21.8	21.8
No	2	188	29.4	77.4	99.2
Don't Know	7	2	.3	.8	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q19C Desert Rose Golf

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	65	10.2	26.7	26.7
No	2	178	27.8	73.3	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q19D Government Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	52	8.1	21.4	21.4
No	2	189	29.5	77.8	99.2
Don't Know	7	2	.3	.8	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q19E Guinn Community Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	12	1.9	4.9	4.9
No	2	231	36.1	95.1	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q19F Lowden Community Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	6	.9	2.5	2.5
No	2	236	36.9	97.1	99.6
Don't Know	7	1	.2	.4	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q19G McCarran Aviation Heritage Museum

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	63	9.8	25.9	25.9
No	2	180	28.1	74.1	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q19H Orr Community Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	15	2.3	6.2	6.2
No	2	227	35.5	93.4	99.6
Don't Know	7	1	.2	.4	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q19I Paradise Community Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	30	4.7	12.3	12.3
No	2	213	33.3	87.7	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q19J Parkdale Community Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	17	2.7	7.0	7.0
No	2	226	35.3	93.0	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q19K Sunrise Community Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	43	6.7	17.7	17.7
No	2	199	31.1	81.9	99.6
Don't Know	7	1	.2	.4	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

 Q19L Von Tobel Community Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	13	2.0	5.3	5.3
No	2	228	35.6	93.8	99.2
Don't Know	7	2	.3	.8	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

 Q19M Walnut-Cecile Community Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	3	.5	1.2	1.2
No	2	238	37.2	97.9	99.2
Don't Know	7	2	.3	.8	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

 Q19N Whitney Community Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	23	3.6	9.5	9.5
No	2	219	34.2	90.1	99.6
Don't Know	7	1	.2	.4	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

 Q19O Winchester Community Center

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	38	5.9	15.6	15.6
No	2	203	31.7	83.5	99.2
Don't Know	7	2	.3	.8	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 243 Missing cases 397

Q20 Which facilities did you most often visit

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Camp Lee Canyon	1	26	4.1	10.7	10.7
Clark County Heritag	2	14	2.2	5.8	16.5
Desert Rose Golf Cou	3	23	3.6	9.5	25.9
Government Center Am	4	12	1.9	4.9	30.9
Guinn Community Cent	5	4	.6	1.6	32.5
McCarran Aviation He	7	11	1.7	4.5	37.0
Orr Community Center	8	3	.5	1.2	38.3
Paradise Community C	9	10	1.6	4.1	42.4
Parkdale Community C	10	3	.5	1.2	43.6
Sunrise Community Ce	11	16	2.5	6.6	50.2
Von Tobel Community	12	3	.5	1.2	51.4
Whitney Community Ce	14	13	2.0	5.3	56.8
Winchester Community	15	20	3.1	8.2	65.0
Didn't use	96	75	11.7	30.9	95.9
Don't Know	97	10	1.6	4.1	100.0
.		397	62.0	Missing	

		Total	640	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	243	Missing cases	397		

Q21 How often did you visit these facilities

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
More than once a wee	1	23	3.6	9.5	9.5
Two or more times a	2	33	5.2	13.6	23.0
Once a month	3	27	4.2	11.1	34.2
Six to seven times a	4	37	5.8	15.2	49.4
Less than six times	5	114	17.8	46.9	96.3
Don't Know	7	9	1.4	3.7	100.0
.		397	62.0	Missing	

		Total	640	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	243	Missing cases	397		

Q22 Overall what is the quality of recreation/cultural facilities

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Excellent	1	50	7.8	20.4	20.4
Good	2	139	21.7	56.7	77.1
Fair	3	37	5.8	15.1	92.2
Poor	4	3	.5	1.2	93.5
Don't Know	7	16	2.5	6.5	100.0
.		395	61.7	Missing	

		Total	640	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	245	Missing cases	395		

Q23 Participated in recreation programs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	102	15.9	15.9	15.9
No	2	522	81.6	81.6	97.5
Don't Know	7	16	2.5	2.5	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q24 Barriers

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
No Time	1	133	20.8	37.0	37.0
No Interest	2	43	6.7	12.0	49.0
Location not Convien	3	7	1.1	1.9	51.0
No Children	4	16	2.5	4.5	55.4
No Transportation	5	7	1.1	1.9	57.4
No one to go with	6	1	.2	.3	57.7
Never Think to use t	7	11	1.7	3.1	60.7
Programs are not saf	9	5	.8	1.4	62.1
Poor Health	10	18	2.8	5.0	67.1
Hours not convenient	11	3	.5	.8	68.0
Don't know locations	13	13	2.0	3.6	71.6
Not familiar with fa	14	46	7.2	12.8	84.4
Don't Know	15	21	3.3	5.8	90.3
Other	16	35	5.5	9.7	100.0
.	.	281	43.9	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 359 Missing cases 281

Q25 Did you participate in recreation programs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	2.00	94	14.7	100.0	100.0
.	.	546	85.3	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 94 Missing cases 546

Q25A Participate in two programs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	2.00	35	5.5	100.0	100.0
.	.	605	94.5	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 35 Missing cases 605

Q25B Participate in three programs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	2.00	19	3.0	100.0	100.0
.	.	621	97.0	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 19 Missing cases 621

Q26 Overall rating of recreation classes

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Excellent	1	27	4.2	25.5	25.5
Good	2	63	9.8	59.4	84.9
Fair	3	11	1.7	10.4	95.3
Poor	4	1	.2	.9	96.2
Don't Know	7	4	.6	3.8	100.0
.	.	534	83.4	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 106 Missing cases 534

Q27A Need for exercise or fitness

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	135	21.1	21.1	21.1
Some Improvement or	2	209	32.7	32.7	53.8
No Improvement or Ex	3	121	18.9	18.9	72.7
Don't Know	7	172	26.9	26.9	99.5
Refuse	8	2	.3	.3	99.8
	9	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27B Need for swimming or water sports

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	192	30.0	30.0	30.0
Some Improvement or	2	191	29.8	29.8	59.8
No Improvement or Ex	3	99	15.5	15.5	75.3
Don't Know	7	157	24.5	24.5	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27C Need for arts or cultural programs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	138	21.6	21.6	21.6
Some Improvement or	2	220	34.4	34.4	55.9
No Improvement or Ex	3	130	20.3	20.3	76.3
Don't Know	7	148	23.1	23.1	99.4
Refuse	8	4	.6	.6	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27D Need for crafts and hobbies

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	128	20.0	20.0	20.0
Some Improvement or	2	223	34.8	34.8	54.8
No Improvement or Ex	3	110	17.2	17.2	72.0
Don't Know	7	178	27.8	27.8	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27E Need for sports

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	160	25.0	25.0	25.0
Some Improvement or	2	199	31.1	31.1	56.1
No Improvement or Ex	3	150	23.4	23.4	79.5
Don't Know	7	130	20.3	20.3	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27F Need for picnicking

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	179	28.0	28.0	28.0
Some Improvement or	2	217	33.9	33.9	61.9
No Improvement or Ex	3	152	23.8	23.8	85.6
Don't Know	7	91	14.2	14.2	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27G Need for playground programs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	241	37.7	37.7	37.7
Some Improvement or	2	176	27.5	27.5	65.2
No Improvement or Ex	3	79	12.3	12.3	77.5
Don't Know	7	142	22.2	22.2	99.7
Refuse	8	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27H Need for education

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	262	40.9	40.9	40.9
Some Improvement or	2	178	27.8	27.8	68.8
No Improvement or Ex	3	76	11.9	11.9	80.6
Don't Know	7	122	19.1	19.1	99.7
Refuse	8	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27I Need for anti-drug/gang programs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	404	63.1	63.1	63.1
Some Improvement or	2	113	17.7	17.7	80.8
No Improvement or Ex	3	48	7.5	7.5	88.3
Don't Know	7	73	11.4	11.4	99.7
Refuse	8	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27J Need for boating, fishing and outdoor activities

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	129	20.2	20.2	20.2
Some Improvement or	2	223	34.8	34.8	55.0
No Improvement or Ex	3	152	23.8	23.8	78.8
Don't Know	7	135	21.1	21.1	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27K Need for nature trips

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	158	24.7	24.7	24.7
Some Improvement or	2	251	39.2	39.2	63.9
No Improvement or Ex	3	105	16.4	16.4	80.3
Don't Know	7	125	19.5	19.5	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27L Need for field trips

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	155	24.2	24.2	24.2
Some Improvement or	2	225	35.2	35.2	59.4
No Improvement or Ex	3	96	15.0	15.0	74.4
Don't Know	7	163	25.5	25.5	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27M Need for golf courses

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	72	11.3	11.3	11.3
Some Improvement or	2	100	15.6	15.6	26.9
No Improvement or Ex	3	327	51.1	51.1	78.0
Don't Know	7	140	21.9	21.9	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27N Need for outdoor performances or special events

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	221	34.5	34.5	34.5
Some Improvement or	2	223	34.8	34.8	69.4
No Improvement or Ex	3	113	17.7	17.7	87.0
Don't Know	7	82	12.8	12.8	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27O Need for walking/hiking or biking trails

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	259	40.5	40.5	40.5
Some Improvement or	2	179	28.0	28.0	68.4
No Improvement or Ex	3	115	18.0	18.0	86.4
Don't Know	7	86	13.4	13.4	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27P Need for films or lectures

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	125	19.5	19.5	19.5
Some Improvement or	2	231	36.1	36.1	55.6
No Improvement or Ex	3	137	21.4	21.4	77.0
Don't Know	7	145	22.7	22.7	99.7
Refuse	8	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27Q Need for history/museum programs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	176	27.5	27.5	27.5
Some Improvement or	2	238	37.2	37.2	64.7
No Improvement or Ex	3	119	18.6	18.6	83.3
Don't Know	7	106	16.6	16.6	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27R Need for activities for teens

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	339	53.0	53.0	53.0
Some Improvement or	2	144	22.5	22.5	75.5
No Improvement or Ex	3	38	5.9	5.9	81.4
Don't Know	7	117	18.3	18.3	99.7
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	99.8
	9	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27S Need for art exhibits

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	130	20.3	20.3	20.3
Some Improvement or	2	269	42.0	42.0	62.3
No Improvement or Ex	3	128	20.0	20.0	82.3
Don't Know	7	112	17.5	17.5	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0		

Q27T Need for activities for seniors

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	235	36.7	36.7	36.7
Some Improvement or	2	166	25.9	25.9	62.7
No Improvement or Ex	3	77	12.0	12.0	74.7
Don't Know	7	161	25.2	25.2	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0		

Q27U Need for safekey programs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	270	42.2	42.2	42.2
Some Improvement or	2	166	25.9	25.9	68.1
No Improvement or Ex	3	81	12.7	12.7	80.8
Don't Know	7	122	19.1	19.1	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0		

Q27V Need for activities for preschoolers

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	233	36.4	36.4	36.4
Some Improvement or	2	181	28.3	28.3	64.7
No Improvement or Ex	3	75	11.7	11.7	76.4
Don't Know	7	150	23.4	23.4	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0		

Q27w Need for camping sites

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
A lot of Improvement	1	210	32.8	32.8	32.8
Some Improvement or	2	199	31.1	31.1	63.9
No Improvement or Ex	3	110	17.2	17.2	81.1
Don't Know	7	121	18.9	18.9	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q27X Other needs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	135	21.1	21.1	21.1
No	2	505	78.9	78.9	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q28A Major park improvements

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
High Priority	1	331	51.7	51.7	51.7
Medium Priority	2	239	37.3	37.3	89.1
Low Priority	3	58	9.1	9.1	98.1
Don't Know	7	12	1.9	1.9	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q28B Additional athletic fields and outdoor sport courts

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
High Priority	1	241	37.7	37.7	37.7
Medium Priority	2	270	42.2	42.2	79.8
Low Priority	3	110	17.2	17.2	97.0
Don't Know	7	19	3.0	3.0	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q28C Major building construction

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
High Priority	1	318	49.7	49.7	49.7
Medium Priority	2	234	36.6	36.6	86.3
Low Priority	3	74	11.6	11.6	97.8
Don't Know	7	14	2.2	2.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q28D Increased walking, hiking, bicycle trails

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
High Priority	1	300	46.9	46.9	46.9
Medium Priority	2	246	38.4	38.4	85.3
Low Priority	3	79	12.3	12.3	97.7
Don't Know	7	15	2.3	2.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q28E Increased park ranger patrols

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
High Priority	1	371	58.0	58.0	58.0
Medium Priority	2	192	30.0	30.0	88.0
Low Priority	3	49	7.7	7.7	95.6
Don't Know	7	28	4.4	4.4	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q28F Expanded youth outreach/playground activities

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
High Priority	1	437	68.3	68.3	68.3
Medium Priority	2	146	22.8	22.8	91.1
Low Priority	3	37	5.8	5.8	96.9
Don't Know	7	20	3.1	3.1	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q28G Increased services to low income and disabled

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
High Priority	1	411	64.2	64.2	64.2
Medium Priority	2	169	26.4	26.4	90.6
Low Priority	3	47	7.3	7.3	98.0
Don't Know	7	13	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q28H Recreation and cultural activities for all ages

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
High Priority	1	338	52.8	52.8	52.8
Medium Priority	2	253	39.5	39.5	92.3
Low Priority	3	41	6.4	6.4	98.8
Don't Know	7	8	1.3	1.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q28I Buy more land for future parks

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
High Priority	1	341	53.3	53.3	53.3
Medium Priority	2	198	30.9	30.9	84.2
Low Priority	3	86	13.4	13.4	97.7
Don't Know	7	15	2.3	2.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0		

Q28J Other priorities

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	96	15.0	15.0	15.0
No	2	544	85.0	85.0	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0		

Q29A Conservation role

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	8	1.3	1.3	1.3
Disagree	2	24	3.8	3.8	5.0
Agree	3	305	47.7	47.7	52.7
Strongly Agree	4	294	45.9	45.9	98.6
Don't Know	7	9	1.4	1.4	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0		

Q29B Develop more large parks

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	8	1.3	1.3	1.3
Disagree	2	51	8.0	8.0	9.2
Agree	3	312	48.8	48.8	58.0
Strongly Agree	4	255	39.8	39.8	97.8
Don't Know	7	12	1.9	1.9	99.7
Refuse	8	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0		

Q29C Develop more medium parks

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	9	1.4	1.4	1.4
Disagree	2	69	10.8	10.8	12.2
Agree	3	393	61.4	61.4	73.6
Strongly Agree	4	141	22.0	22.0	95.6
Don't Know	7	26	4.1	4.1	99.7
Refuse	8	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0		

 Q29D Develop more small parks

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	58	9.1	9.1	9.1
Disagree	2	184	28.7	28.7	37.8
Agree	3	257	40.2	40.2	78.0
Strongly Agree	4	111	17.3	17.3	95.3
Don't Know	7	28	4.4	4.4	99.7
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	99.8
	9	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

 Q29E More parks with open natural spaces

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	27	4.2	4.2	4.2
Disagree	2	144	22.5	22.5	26.7
Agree	3	291	45.5	45.5	72.2
Strongly Agree	4	160	25.0	25.0	97.2
Don't Know	7	17	2.7	2.7	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

 Q29F Offer programs to address social issues

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	8	1.3	1.3	1.3
Disagree	2	32	5.0	5.0	6.3
Agree	3	274	42.8	42.8	49.1
Strongly Agree	4	317	49.5	49.5	98.6
Don't Know	7	8	1.3	1.3	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

 Q29G Provide activities to attract tourists

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	123	19.2	19.2	19.2
Disagree	2	262	40.9	40.9	60.2
Agree	3	181	28.3	28.3	88.4
Strongly Agree	4	64	10.0	10.0	98.4
Don't Know	7	9	1.4	1.4	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

 Q29H Provide more hiking, walking, biking trails

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	8	1.3	1.3	1.3
Disagree	2	60	9.4	9.4	10.6
Agree	3	330	51.6	51.6	62.2
Strongly Agree	4	227	35.5	35.5	97.7
Don't Know	7	14	2.2	2.2	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

 Q29I Consider more public/private projects

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	76	11.9	11.9	11.9
Disagree	2	195	30.5	30.5	42.3
Agree	3	239	37.3	37.3	79.7
Strongly Agree	4	94	14.7	14.7	94.4
Don't Know	7	34	5.3	5.3	99.7
Refuse	8	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

 Q29J Higher taxes for new parks

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	73	11.4	11.4	11.4
Disagree	2	160	25.0	25.0	36.4
Agree	3	340	53.1	53.1	89.5
Strongly Agree	4	44	6.9	6.9	96.4
Don't Know	7	21	3.3	3.3	99.7
Refuse	8	2	.3	.3	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

 Q29K Responsive to recreation, cultural and outdoor needs of community

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	19	3.0	3.0	3.0
Disagree	2	103	16.1	16.1	19.1
Agree	3	429	67.0	67.0	86.1
Strongly Agree	4	48	7.5	7.5	93.6
Don't Know	7	40	6.3	6.3	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q29L Quality of services provided is good

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	14	2.2	2.2	2.2
Disagree	2	49	7.7	7.7	9.8
Agree	3	460	71.9	71.9	81.7
Strongly Agree	4	64	10.0	10.0	91.7
Don't Know	7	52	8.1	8.1	99.8
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q29M Staff is courteous and helpful

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	5	.8	.8	.8
Disagree	2	22	3.4	3.4	4.2
Agree	3	393	61.4	61.4	65.6
Strongly Agree	4	84	13.1	13.1	78.8
Don't Know	7	132	20.6	20.6	99.4
Refuse	8	4	.6	.6	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q29N More tax dollars allocated for parks, recreation, cultural

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	17	2.7	2.7	2.7
Disagree	2	64	10.0	10.0	12.7
Agree	3	371	58.0	58.0	70.6
Strongly Agree	4	166	25.9	25.9	96.6
Don't Know	7	19	3.0	3.0	99.5
Refuse	8	3	.5	.5	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q29O Current fees are affordable

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	19	3.0	3.0	3.0
Disagree	2	56	8.8	8.8	11.7
Agree	3	420	65.6	65.6	77.3
Strongly Agree	4	60	9.4	9.4	86.7
Don't Know	7	82	12.8	12.8	99.5
Refuse	8	3	.5	.5	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q29P Willing to pay fee for new programs

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	36	5.6	5.6	5.6
Disagree	2	123	19.2	19.2	24.8
Agree	3	408	63.7	63.7	88.6
Strongly Agree	4	44	6.9	6.9	95.5
Don't Know	7	27	4.2	4.2	99.7
Refuse	8	1	.2	.2	99.8
	9	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q30 volunteers

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	230	35.9	35.9	35.9
No	2	394	61.6	61.6	97.5
Don't Know	7	13	2.0	2.0	99.5
Refuse	8	2	.3	.3	99.8
	9	1	.2	.2	100.0
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q30A primary reason

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Gain experience	1	14	2.2	5.7	5.7
Achievement/Personal	2	16	2.5	6.5	12.2
Meet Corporate Expec	3	1	.2	.4	12.6
Increase Social Cont	4	14	2.2	5.7	18.3
Contribute to Commun	5	73	11.4	29.7	48.0
Help Others	6	91	14.2	37.0	85.0
Gain Personal Recogn	7	3	.5	1.2	86.2
Fill Leisure Time	8	5	.8	2.0	88.2
Self-expression	9	5	.8	2.0	90.2
Interest in Recreati	10	11	1.7	4.5	94.7
Other	11	12	1.9	4.9	99.6
	99	1	.2	.4	100.0
	.	394	61.6	Missing	
Total		640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 246 Missing cases 394

Q30B volunteer experience

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Maintain Parks	1	33	5.2	13.6	13.6
Programs for Disable	2	38	5.9	15.6	29.2
Youth sport Coach	3	49	7.7	20.2	49.4
Advisory Board	4	12	1.9	4.9	54.3
Senior Day Care	5	12	1.9	4.9	59.3
Fundraising	6	8	1.3	3.3	62.6
Teaching Classes	7	23	3.6	9.5	72.0
Special Projects	8	31	4.8	12.8	84.8
Other	9	22	3.4	9.1	93.8
	99	15	2.3	6.2	100.0
	.	397	62.0	Missing	

		Total	640	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	243	Missing cases	397		

Q31 Gender

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Male	1	266	41.6	41.6	41.6
Female	2	374	58.4	58.4	100.0
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0
-------------	-----	---------------	---

Q32A How long have you lived in CC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	24	3.8	3.8	3.8
	1	31	4.8	4.8	8.6
	2	42	6.6	6.6	15.2
	3	35	5.5	5.5	20.6
	4	34	5.3	5.3	25.9
	5	32	5.0	5.0	30.9
	6	15	2.3	2.3	33.3
	7	24	3.8	3.8	37.0
	8	23	3.6	3.6	40.6
	9	20	3.1	3.1	43.8
	10	26	4.1	4.1	47.8
	11	10	1.6	1.6	49.4
	12	12	1.9	1.9	51.2
	13	14	2.2	2.2	53.4
	14	10	1.6	1.6	55.0
	15	17	2.7	2.7	57.7
	16	11	1.7	1.7	59.4
	17	16	2.5	2.5	61.9
	18	22	3.4	3.4	65.3
	19	10	1.6	1.6	66.9
	20	28	4.4	4.4	71.3
	21	9	1.4	1.4	72.7
	22	7	1.1	1.1	73.8
	23	7	1.1	1.1	74.8
	24	9	1.4	1.4	76.3
	25	15	2.3	2.3	78.6

26	5	.8	.8	79.4
27	9	1.4	1.4	80.8
28	6	.9	.9	81.7
29	3	.5	.5	82.2
30	21	3.3	3.3	85.5
31	2	.3	.3	85.8
32	5	.8	.8	86.6
33	7	1.1	1.1	87.7
34	4	.6	.6	88.3
35	10	1.6	1.6	89.8
36	5	.8	.8	90.6
37	2	.3	.3	90.9
38	6	.9	.9	91.9
40	12	1.9	1.9	93.8
41	2	.3	.3	94.1
42	4	.6	.6	94.7
44	3	.5	.5	95.2
45	7	1.1	1.1	96.3
46	3	.5	.5	96.7
47	1	.2	.2	96.9
48	3	.5	.5	97.3
49	2	.3	.3	97.7
50	3	.5	.5	98.1
54	1	.2	.2	98.3
55	1	.2	.2	98.4
57	2	.3	.3	98.8

Q32A How long have you lived in CC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
62	1	.2	.2	98.9	
	69	1	.2	.2	99.1
	98	6	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

Q32B Age

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Age in Years	18	10	1.6	1.6	1.6
	19	14	2.2	2.2	3.8
	20	12	1.9	1.9	5.6
	21	12	1.9	1.9	7.5
	22	12	1.9	1.9	9.4
	23	7	1.1	1.1	10.5
	24	8	1.3	1.3	11.7
	25	10	1.6	1.6	13.3
	26	11	1.7	1.7	15.0
	27	11	1.7	1.7	16.7
	28	14	2.2	2.2	18.9
	29	15	2.3	2.3	21.3
	30	17	2.7	2.7	23.9
	31	13	2.0	2.0	25.9
	32	17	2.7	2.7	28.6

33	18	2.8	2.8	31.4
34	15	2.3	2.3	33.8
35	16	2.5	2.5	36.3
36	15	2.3	2.3	38.6
37	12	1.9	1.9	40.5
38	12	1.9	1.9	42.3
39	10	1.6	1.6	43.9
40	26	4.1	4.1	48.0
41	8	1.3	1.3	49.2
42	15	2.3	2.3	51.6
43	16	2.5	2.5	54.1
44	7	1.1	1.1	55.2
45	11	1.7	1.7	56.9
46	8	1.3	1.3	58.1
47	10	1.6	1.6	59.7
48	16	2.5	2.5	62.2
49	7	1.1	1.1	63.3
50	23	3.6	3.6	66.9
51	9	1.4	1.4	68.3
52	12	1.9	1.9	70.2
53	12	1.9	1.9	72.0
54	9	1.4	1.4	73.4
55	13	2.0	2.0	75.5

 Q32B Age

Value Label Age in Years	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	56	5	.8	.8	76.3
	57	8	1.3	1.3	77.5
	58	5	.8	.8	78.3
	59	10	1.6	1.6	79.8
	60	8	1.3	1.3	81.1
	61	9	1.4	1.4	82.5
	62	5	.8	.8	83.3
	63	4	.6	.6	83.9
	64	10	1.6	1.6	85.5
	65	10	1.6	1.6	87.0
	66	8	1.3	1.3	88.3
	67	6	.9	.9	89.2
	68	4	.6	.6	89.8
	69	7	1.1	1.1	90.9
	70	8	1.3	1.3	92.2
	71	1	.2	.2	92.3
	72	5	.8	.8	93.1
	73	4	.6	.6	93.8
	74	5	.8	.8	94.5
	75	6	.9	.9	95.5
	76	2	.3	.3	95.8
	78	4	.6	.6	96.4
	79	1	.2	.2	96.6
	80	1	.2	.2	96.7
	81	2	.3	.3	97.0
	82	3	.5	.5	97.5
	83	4	.6	.6	98.1
	84	2	.3	.3	98.4
	88	1	.2	.2	98.6

		93	1	.2	.2	98.8
		98	8	1.3	1.3	100.0
		Total	640	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0			

 Q33 Ethnicity

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Caucasian/White	1	477	74.5	74.5	74.5
Black/African Americ	2	68	10.6	10.6	85.2
Hispanic or Latino	3	56	8.8	8.8	93.9
Asian American or Pa	4	20	3.1	3.1	97.0
Other	5	10	1.6	1.6	98.6
Refused	8	9	1.4	1.4	100.0
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0
-------------	-----	---------------	---

 Q34 Household

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	93	14.5	14.5	14.5
	2	206	32.2	32.2	46.7
	3	136	21.3	21.3	68.0
	4	107	16.7	16.7	84.7
	5	46	7.2	7.2	91.9
	6	35	5.5	5.5	97.3
	7	4	.6	.6	98.0
	8	6	.9	.9	98.9
	9	2	.3	.3	99.2
	10	1	.2	.2	99.4
	11	1	.2	.2	99.5
	98	2	.3	.3	99.8
	99	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases	640	Missing cases	0
-------------	-----	---------------	---

 Q35A Age of other household members

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	3	.5	.6	.6
	2	4	.6	.7	1.3
	3	8	1.3	1.5	2.8
	4	7	1.1	1.3	4.0
	5	7	1.1	1.3	5.3
	6	8	1.3	1.5	6.8
	7	4	.6	.7	7.5
	8	6	.9	1.1	8.6
	9	7	1.1	1.3	9.9
	10	4	.6	.7	10.7
	11	2	.3	.4	11.0
	12	3	.5	.6	11.6
	13	6	.9	1.1	12.7

14	4	.6	.7	13.4
15	4	.6	.7	14.2
16	3	.5	.6	14.7
17	4	.6	.7	15.4
18	3	.5	.6	16.0
19	6	.9	1.1	17.1
20	7	1.1	1.3	18.4
21	2	.3	.4	18.8
22	4	.6	.7	19.5
23	8	1.3	1.5	21.0
24	5	.8	.9	21.9
25	11	1.7	2.0	23.9
26	5	.8	.9	24.8
27	9	1.4	1.7	26.5
28	16	2.5	2.9	29.4
29	6	.9	1.1	30.5
30	14	2.2	2.6	33.1
31	8	1.3	1.5	34.6
32	15	2.3	2.8	37.3
33	6	.9	1.1	38.4
34	5	.8	.9	39.3
35	9	1.4	1.7	41.0
36	9	1.4	1.7	42.6
37	9	1.4	1.7	44.3
38	9	1.4	1.7	46.0
39	8	1.3	1.5	47.4
40	14	2.2	2.6	50.0
41	6	.9	1.1	51.1
42	11	1.7	2.0	53.1
43	12	1.9	2.2	55.3
44	8	1.3	1.5	56.8
45	10	1.6	1.8	58.6
46	9	1.4	1.7	60.3
47	12	1.9	2.2	62.5
48	7	1.1	1.3	63.8
49	11	1.7	2.0	65.8
50	26	4.1	4.8	70.6
51	11	1.7	2.0	72.6
52	5	.8	.9	73.5

 Q35A Age of other household members

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	53	5	.8	.9	74.4
	54	5	.8	.9	75.4
	55	7	1.1	1.3	76.7
	56	7	1.1	1.3	77.9
	57	4	.6	.7	78.7
	58	6	.9	1.1	79.8
	59	9	1.4	1.7	81.4
	60	12	1.9	2.2	83.6
	61	5	.8	.9	84.6
	62	8	1.3	1.5	86.0
	63	4	.6	.7	86.8
	64	5	.8	.9	87.7
	65	3	.5	.6	88.2
	66	5	.8	.9	89.2

67	8	1.3	1.5	90.6
68	4	.6	.7	91.4
69	1	.2	.2	91.5
70	8	1.3	1.5	93.0
71	2	.3	.4	93.4
72	3	.5	.6	93.9
73	6	.9	1.1	95.0
74	3	.5	.6	95.6
75	1	.2	.2	95.8
76	1	.2	.2	96.0
77	2	.3	.4	96.3
78	2	.3	.4	96.7
80	1	.2	.2	96.9
81	2	.3	.4	97.2
82	1	.2	.2	97.4
84	2	.3	.4	97.8
85	1	.2	.2	98.0
86	2	.3	.4	98.3
88	1	.2	.2	98.5
98	2	.3	.4	98.9
99	6	.9	1.1	100.0
.	96	15.0	Missing	

Total	640	100.0	100.0
-------	-----	-------	-------

Valid cases 544 Missing cases 96

 Q35B Age of other household members

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	3	.5	.9	.9
	1	17	2.7	5.0	5.9
	2	11	1.7	3.3	9.2
	3	7	1.1	2.1	11.2
	4	13	2.0	3.8	15.1
	5	8	1.3	2.4	17.5
	6	13	2.0	3.8	21.3
	7	10	1.6	3.0	24.3
	8	11	1.7	3.3	27.5
	9	12	1.9	3.6	31.1
	10	13	2.0	3.8	34.9
	11	9	1.4	2.7	37.6
	12	9	1.4	2.7	40.2
	13	11	1.7	3.3	43.5
	14	10	1.6	3.0	46.4
	15	8	1.3	2.4	48.8
	16	12	1.9	3.6	52.4
	17	10	1.6	3.0	55.3
	18	14	2.2	4.1	59.5
	19	4	.6	1.2	60.7
	20	8	1.3	2.4	63.0
	21	5	.8	1.5	64.5
	22	6	.9	1.8	66.3
	23	6	.9	1.8	68.0
	24	5	.8	1.5	69.5
	25	7	1.1	2.1	71.6
	26	3	.5	.9	72.5

27	5	.8	1.5	74.0
28	2	.3	.6	74.6
29	2	.3	.6	75.1
30	1	.2	.3	75.4
31	2	.3	.6	76.0
32	5	.8	1.5	77.5
33	3	.5	.9	78.4
34	3	.5	.9	79.3
35	5	.8	1.5	80.8
36	2	.3	.6	81.4
37	3	.5	.9	82.2
38	3	.5	.9	83.1
39	2	.3	.6	83.7
40	6	.9	1.8	85.5
42	3	.5	.9	86.4
43	1	.2	.3	86.7
45	1	.2	.3	87.0
46	2	.3	.6	87.6
47	2	.3	.6	88.2
48	2	.3	.6	88.8
49	3	.5	.9	89.6
50	4	.6	1.2	90.8
51	4	.6	1.2	92.0
52	2	.3	.6	92.6
54	1	.2	.3	92.9

 Q35B Age of other household members

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
55	1	.2	.3	93.2	
	56	1	.2	.3	93.5
	57	1	.2	.3	93.8
	60	4	.6	1.2	95.0
	61	1	.2	.3	95.3
	63	2	.3	.6	95.9
	64	1	.2	.3	96.2
	65	2	.3	.6	96.7
	66	1	.2	.3	97.0
	70	1	.2	.3	97.3
	75	1	.2	.3	97.6
	76	2	.3	.6	98.2
	78	1	.2	.3	98.5
	79	1	.2	.3	98.8
	80	1	.2	.3	99.1
	82	1	.2	.3	99.4
	98	1	.2	.3	99.7
	99	1	.2	.3	100.0
	.	302	47.2	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 338 Missing cases 302

 Q35C Age of other household members

Valid Cum

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
	0	3	.5	1.5	1.5
	1	11	1.7	5.5	7.0
	2	4	.6	2.0	9.0
	3	4	.6	2.0	10.9
	4	8	1.3	4.0	14.9
	5	10	1.6	5.0	19.9
	6	6	.9	3.0	22.9
	7	5	.8	2.5	25.4
	8	16	2.5	8.0	33.3
	9	8	1.3	4.0	37.3
	10	6	.9	3.0	40.3
	11	11	1.7	5.5	45.8
	12	7	1.1	3.5	49.3
	13	9	1.4	4.5	53.7
	14	4	.6	2.0	55.7
	15	8	1.3	4.0	59.7
	16	4	.6	2.0	61.7
	17	6	.9	3.0	64.7
	18	4	.6	2.0	66.7
	19	2	.3	1.0	67.7
	20	6	.9	3.0	70.6
	21	3	.5	1.5	72.1
	22	3	.5	1.5	73.6

Q35C Age of other household members

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	23	2	.3	1.0	74.6
	24	2	.3	1.0	75.6
	25	4	.6	2.0	77.6
	26	2	.3	1.0	78.6
	27	1	.2	.5	79.1
	28	4	.6	2.0	81.1
	30	1	.2	.5	81.6
	31	2	.3	1.0	82.6
	32	3	.5	1.5	84.1
	33	1	.2	.5	84.6
	34	2	.3	1.0	85.6
	35	3	.5	1.5	87.1
	36	1	.2	.5	87.6
	37	1	.2	.5	88.1
	38	2	.3	1.0	89.1
	39	1	.2	.5	89.6
	40	3	.5	1.5	91.0
	43	3	.5	1.5	92.5
	45	4	.6	2.0	94.5
	46	1	.2	.5	95.0
	48	2	.3	1.0	96.0
	49	1	.2	.5	96.5
	50	1	.2	.5	97.0
	53	2	.3	1.0	98.0
	54	1	.2	.5	98.5
	56	1	.2	.5	99.0
	60	1	.2	.5	99.5
	61	1	.2	.5	100.0
	.	439	68.6	Missing	

		Total	640	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	201	Missing cases	439		

Q35D Age of other household members					
Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	3	.5	3.2	3.2
	1	1	.2	1.1	4.3
	2	4	.6	4.3	8.5
	3	5	.8	5.3	13.8
	4	5	.8	5.3	19.1
	5	4	.6	4.3	23.4
	6	5	.8	5.3	28.7
	7	4	.6	4.3	33.0
	8	3	.5	3.2	36.2
	9	5	.8	5.3	41.5
	10	7	1.1	7.4	48.9
	11	3	.5	3.2	52.1
	12	5	.8	5.3	57.4
	13	1	.2	1.1	58.5
	14	4	.6	4.3	62.8
	16	2	.3	2.1	64.9
	17	1	.2	1.1	66.0
	20	1	.2	1.1	67.0
	22	2	.3	2.1	69.1
	24	2	.3	2.1	71.3
	27	1	.2	1.1	72.3
	28	1	.2	1.1	73.4
	30	1	.2	1.1	74.5
	34	1	.2	1.1	75.5
	35	3	.5	3.2	78.7
	36	2	.3	2.1	80.9
	37	2	.3	2.1	83.0
	38	1	.2	1.1	84.0
	39	2	.3	2.1	86.2
	40	2	.3	2.1	88.3
	42	3	.5	3.2	91.5
	49	1	.2	1.1	92.6
	50	1	.2	1.1	93.6
	52	2	.3	2.1	95.7
	58	1	.2	1.1	96.8
	65	1	.2	1.1	97.9
	99	2	.3	2.1	100.0
	.	546	85.3	Missing	

		Total	640	100.0	100.0
Valid cases	94	Missing cases	546		

Q35E Age of other household members					
				Valid	Cum

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
	0	2	.3	4.2	4.2
	1	3	.5	6.3	10.4
	2	4	.6	8.3	18.8
	3	6	.9	12.5	31.3
	4	2	.3	4.2	35.4
	5	2	.3	4.2	39.6
	6	1	.2	2.1	41.7
	7	2	.3	4.2	45.8
	9	4	.6	8.3	54.2
	10	3	.5	6.3	60.4
	11	1	.2	2.1	62.5
	12	1	.2	2.1	64.6
	14	1	.2	2.1	66.7
	17	2	.3	4.2	70.8
	22	1	.2	2.1	72.9
	24	2	.3	4.2	77.1
	25	1	.2	2.1	79.2
	36	2	.3	4.2	83.3
	39	1	.2	2.1	85.4
	42	1	.2	2.1	87.5
	44	1	.2	2.1	89.6
	49	2	.3	4.2	93.8
	50	1	.2	2.1	95.8
	72	1	.2	2.1	97.9
	84	1	.2	2.1	100.0
	.	592	92.5	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 48 Missing cases 592

 Q35F Age of other household members

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2	2	.3	15.4	15.4
	4	1	.2	7.7	23.1
	5	1	.2	7.7	30.8
	7	1	.2	7.7	38.5
	8	2	.3	15.4	53.8
	11	1	.2	7.7	61.5
	12	1	.2	7.7	69.2
	18	1	.2	7.7	76.9
	23	1	.2	7.7	84.6
	38	2	.3	15.4	100.0
	.	627	98.0	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 13 Missing cases 627

 Q35G Age of other household members

Valid Cum

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
	0	1	.2	10.0	10.0
	4	1	.2	10.0	20.0
	5	1	.2	10.0	30.0
	6	1	.2	10.0	40.0
	7	1	.2	10.0	50.0
	17	1	.2	10.0	60.0
	19	2	.3	20.0	80.0
	40	1	.2	10.0	90.0
	50	1	.2	10.0	100.0
	.	630	98.4	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 10 Missing cases 630

Q35H Age of other household members

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	6	1	.2	25.0	25.0
	9	1	.2	25.0	50.0
	14	1	.2	25.0	75.0
	19	1	.2	25.0	100.0
	.	636	99.4	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4 Missing cases 636

Q35I Age of other household members

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	5	1	.2	50.0	50.0
	45	1	.2	50.0	100.0
	.	638	99.7	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 2 Missing cases 638

Q35J Age of other household members

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	4	1	.2	50.0	50.0
	57	1	.2	50.0	100.0
	.	638	99.7	Missing	
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 2 Missing cases 638

Q36 Income

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Under \$10,000	1	26	4.1	4.1	4.1
\$10,000 to <\$15,000	2	54	8.4	8.4	12.5
\$15,000 to <\$25,000	3	88	13.8	13.8	26.3
\$25,000 to <\$50,000	4	212	33.1	33.1	59.4
\$50,000 to <\$75,000	5	112	17.5	17.5	76.9
\$75,000 to \$100,000	6	45	7.0	7.0	83.9
Over \$100,000	7	25	3.9	3.9	87.8
Don't Know	97	18	2.8	2.8	90.6
Refuse	98	60	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Total	640	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 640 Missing cases 0

*Cover and Report Design by Tina Smith
Graduate student in the Leisure Studies Program
University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

This report was printed June 19, 1998