

City of Las Vegas 2009 Community Assessment Survey

By: Pamela Gallion, M.Ed.
Cannon Survey Center
University of Nevada, Las Vegas



Methodology

- ⦿ Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI)
- ⦿ Conducted between August 12 and October 10, 2009
- ⦿ 1049 interviews completed
- ⦿ 972 interviews included in analysis
- ⦿ Respondents were screened by zip code and by nearest major cross streets
- ⦿ Interviewers made up to seven (7) attempts on each number
- ⦿ Included a telephone frame

Ward Representation of Respondents

Ward	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Total Respondents –
Ward 1	152	15.6%
Ward 2	163	16.8%
Ward 3	140	14.4%
Ward 4	179	18.4%
Ward 5	147	15.1%
Ward 6	191	19.7%
TOTAL (N)	972	100%

Satisfaction with City Services

For each of the following city services indicate if you are satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or dissatisfied with the service. If you have not used or are not familiar with the service select N/A.

- ◎ Assess resident satisfaction of 28 City Services
 - 18 – 27% of respondents did not use each service
- ◎ High Levels of Satisfaction are measured by combining “satisfied” and “very satisfied” responses
- ◎ Percentages are presented overall and by ward

Satisfaction with City Services

◎ Services with Highest Satisfaction

- Communication Received from the City (82%)
- Emergency Medical Services (82%)
- Availability of Programs and Services Offered to Youths (81%)
- Availability of Programs and Services Offered (80%)
- Function and Reliability of the Sewer System (80%)
- Variety of Programs and Services Offered to Youths (80%)
- Animal Control (80%)

Good/Bad City Services to Reduce

Due to a cut in budget, some services may have to be reduced, for each of the following services please indicate whether this would be a very good, good, bad, or very bad service to reduce

- ⦿ Respondents considered 22 services for reduction
 - 1.5 – 3.7% non-response for each item
- ⦿ “Bad” and “Very Bad” responses are combined to measure services respondents do not want reduced
- ⦿ Percentages are presented overall and by ward

Good/Bad Services to Reduce

- Services Residents Do Not Want Reduced
 - Safety Services (87%)
 - Response Time to Traffic Occurrences (86%)
 - Youth Programming (86%)
 - Response Time to Medical Emergencies (86%)
 - Response Rates to Violent Crime (86%)
 - Fire Prevention (86%)
 - Senior Programming (86%)
 - Traffic Enforcement (86%)
 - Response Time to Violent and Non-Violent Crime (86%)

Actions the CLV Should Consider During An Economic Downturn

Keeping in mind the current economic downturn, which items, if any should the city of Las Vegas be considering at this time?

- ⦿ Respondents consider moving money from other programs to fund 12 City Services
- ⦿ Percentages are presented overall and by ward
- ⦿ 20% indicate all city services should be reduced
- ⦿ 8% indicate that none of the items should receive funds from other programs

Actions the CLV Should Consider During Economic Downturn

- Programs Respondents Most Want Funds Moved to:
 - Programs for Seniors (62%)
 - After School Programming (60%)
 - Services for Low Income Families (57%)
- Programs Respondents Least Want Funds Moved to:
 - Cultural Programs (26%)
 - Parks and Recreation (20%)

Emphasis CLV Should Place on Service Items During an Economic Downturn

For the following items please indicate if during a recession the City should have "more", "less" or "about the same" emphasis on each

- Measure Level of Emphasis for 18 City Services
- Percentages are presented overall

Emphasis CLV Should Place on Service Items During an Economic Downturn

- City of Las Vegas should place more emphasis on:
 - Economic Development to Create More Jobs (72%)
 - Foreclosure Prevention Services (56%)
 - Services for Seniors (55%)
 - Services for Low Income Families (54%)
 - After School Programming (53%)

Emphasis CLV Should Place on Service Items During an Economic Downturn

- City of Las Vegas should place less emphasis on:
 - Cultural Opportunities (38%)
 - Government Access TV (31%)
- City of Las Vegas should maintain the same level of emphasis on:
 - Fire Response Services (77%)
 - Streetlight Maintenance (72%)
 - Medical Emergency Services (69%)

Employment Status

- 43% of Respondents are Employed
 - 31% Work Full-Time
 - 11% Work Part-time
- 20% of Respondents are Not Employed
 - 10.5% are Looking for Work
 - 9% are not Presently Looking for Work
- 16% of Respondents are Employed in Seasonal or Temporary Jobs

Employment Status

A variable was created to represent those who self-define as either under employed or unemployed. The variable was created by summing the total of respondents who indicated that they were unemployed and looking for work and employed full or part time and looking for additional work to supplement household income.

Twenty-two percent (22%) of the total sample fell into this category.

Among this subsample:

- 48% are unemployed and looking for work
- 17% are working part-time and looking for work
- 34% are working full-time and looking for work

QUESTIONS?