

**2009 LINCOLN COUNTY  
LABOR MARKET SURVEY**

Prepared For:

Board of Lincoln County Commissioners  
P.O. Box 90  
Pioche, Nevada 89043

Prepared By:

Intertech Services Corporation  
P.O. Box 2008  
Carson City, Nevada 89702

May 24, 2010

## Table of Contents

Section Number	Section Title	Page Number
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	1
1.1	Methodology	2
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Demographic Survey Results</b>	3
2.1	Population Growth	3
2.2	Estimated Total Population by Age Group	3
2.3	Previous Place of Residence	4
2.4	Lincoln County Demographic Characteristics	6
2.5	Employment Status and Occupation by Living Location	6
2.6	Covered Employment by Job Sector	9
2.7	Employment Status by Highest Level of Education	9
2.8	Employment Status by Length of Residency	11
2.9	Highest Education Level Achieved and Gross Income Level for Lincoln County Residents that Successfully Started a Business	11
2.10	Employment Characteristics by Place of Residence	11
2.11	Desired Employment Status of Retired Residents	15
2.12	Income and Transportation Characteristics by Place of Residence	15
2.13	Survey Respondents for Each Education Level Category by Work Location	15
2.14	Desired Employment Status of Lincoln County Residents	18
2.15	Existing and Desired Employment at the Nevada Test Site and Nellis Range	18
2.16	Prior Lincoln County Residents that Left in the Past 5 Years for Employment Reasons but Would Be Willing to Return to the County for Job Opportunities at NTS or Nellis	18
2.17	Current Lincoln County Residents that are Willing to Work NTS or Nellis if Job Opportunities Were Made Available	18
2.18	Former Residents that Would Return to Lincoln County for Jobs Paying at Least \$21.00 Per Hour	21
2.19	Desired Training and Educational Opportunities by Location	21
2.20	Average Rating of Construction Related Training and Education Opportunities Based on Employment Status	22
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Community Satisfaction</b>	24
3.1	Average Rating of Community Attributes by Length of Residence	24
3.2	Average Rating of Community Attributes by Place of Residence	24
3.3	Average Rating of Community Attributes by Education Level	27
3.4	Average Rating of Community Attributes by Employment Status	27
3.5	Average Rating of the Quality of Roads by Community of Residence and Mode of Transportation to and from Work	30
3.6	Lincoln County Residents that Have Moved Away in the Last 5 Years and for What Reason	30

<b>4.0</b>	<b>Income</b>	32
4.1	Methodology and Household Income	32
4.2	Lincoln County Postal Zip Codes	33
4.3	Number of Responding Households Whose Household is Either Above or Below the HUD Median Income Level, by Zip Code	33
4.4	Individual Income Amounts by Work Location	34
<hr/>		
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Lincoln County Labor Market Trends: 1986 – 2009</b>	37
5.1	Desired Employment Status of Survey Respondents	37
5.2	Unemployment Status of Survey Respondents	37
5.3	Employment Characteristics of Survey Respondents	38
5.4	NTS/Nellis Employment	38
<hr/>		
<b>6.0</b>	<b>What Can be Done to Enhance Employment Opportunities for Lincoln County Residents</b>	40
6.1	Communicate Results of this Survey	40
6.2	Monitor Regional Employment Opportunities	41
6.3	Correlate Local Labor Supply with Employer Needs	41
6.4	Encourage Local Access to Job Training and Education	41
6.5	Establish Effective Labor Participation Programs	42
<hr/>		
<b>7.0</b>	<b>References</b>	43
<hr/>		
<b>Appendix A</b>	2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey Cover Sheet and Questionnaire	44
<hr/>		

## Report Tables

Section Number	Table Number	Table Name	Page Number
2.0	2-1	Population Growth: Lincoln County and the City of Caliente: 1980-2009	3
	2-2	Estimated Total Population by Age Group, Lincoln County and State of Nevada: 2009	4
	2-3	Previous Place of Residence of Survey Respondents Who Moved to Lincoln County in the Past 5 Years	5
	2-4	Lincoln County Demographic Characteristics by Respondent Households	7
	2-5	Employment Status, Reported Occupation and Unemployment Status by Place of Residence	8
	2-6	Covered Employment by Job Sector Lincoln County, 2008	9
	2-7	Employment Status by Highest Level of Education Achieved by Survey Respondents	10
	2-8	Primary Respondent Employment Status by Length of Residency in Lincoln County	12
	2-9	Highest Education Level Achieved and Gross Income Level for Survey Respondents that Successfully Started a Business	13
	2-10	Respondent Employment Characteristics by Place of Residence	14
	2-11	Desired Employment Status of Retired Survey Respondents	15
	2-12	Income and Transportation Characteristics of Respondents by Place of Residence	16
	2-13	Survey Respondents for Each Education Level Category by Work Location	17
	2-14	Desired Employment Status of Lincoln County Respondents	19
	2-15	Nevada Test Site or Nellis Range Employment by Place of Residence of Survey Respondents and Former Household Members Who Would Return to Work in Lincoln County for a Wage of at Least \$21.00/hr.	20
	2-16	Prior Lincoln County Residents that Left in the Past 5 Years for Employment Reasons But Would Be Willing to Return to the County for Job Opportunities at NTS or Nellis	21
	2-17	Current Lincoln County Residents that Are Willing to Work at NTS or Nellis if Job Opportunities Were Made Available	21
	2-18	Desired Training and Educational Opportunities as Indicated by the Respondent's Selected Priority	22
	2-19	Average Rating of Desired Construction Related Training and Education Based on Employment Status	23

## Report Tables Continued

Section Number	Table Number	Table Name	Page Number
3.0	3.1	Average Rating of Community Attributes by Length of Residence	25
	3.2	Average Rating of Community Attributes by Place of Residence	26
	3.3	Average Rating of Community Attributes by Education Level	28
	3.4	Average Rating of Community Attributes by Employment Status	29
	3.5	Average Respondent Rating of the Quality of Roads by Community of Residence and Mode of Transportation to and from Work	30
	3.6	Respondent Estimates of the Number of Lincoln County Residents That Have Moved Away in the Last 5 Years and For What Reason	31
4.0	4.1	HUD Grant Qualifying Household Income Levels	33
	4.2	Lincoln County Postal Zip Codes	33
	4.3	Number of Responding Households Whose Household Income is Either Above or Below the HUD Median Income Level by Zip Code	35
	4.4	Respondents Individual Income Amounts by Work Location	36
5.0	5.1	Desired Employment Status of Survey Respondents, 1986-2009	37
	5.2	Unemployment Status of Survey Respondents, 1986-2009	37
	5.3	Employment Characteristics of Survey Respondents, 1990-2009	38
	5.4	Respondent Reported NTS/Nellis Employment by Community	39

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report describes labor force characteristics and the availability of labor resources in Lincoln County, Nevada. The information contained in this document is useful to Lincoln County and the City of Caliente in evaluating potential impacts of the Department of Energy's (DOE) Yucca Mountain repository and related Caliente Rail Corridor. In addition, this document should support efforts to promote industrial development in the County and City. Information within this report was compiled from a survey of local residents conducted in December 2009. Survey results were combined with other sources of labor market information to characterize the labor supply in Lincoln County. These sources included the Nevada Employment Security Department, Nevada State Demographer, the University of Nevada Small Business Development Center, and the United States Census Bureau. The survey was specifically designed and implemented to provide the following information:

- Labor Availability - Number of unemployed desiring to work, number of employed who commute to other areas including the Nevada Test Site (NTS) and number of employed and unemployed who desire to work on the Nevada Test Site and Nellis Range Complex.
- Labor Abilities - Occupational skill descriptions, discouraged unemployed, underemployed, income and education levels.
- Household Demographics - Household size, income, commuting expense, marital status.
- Changes in Labor Market Conditions - Changes in labor availability, labor abilities, and household demographics since the previous labor market surveys conducted within Lincoln County in 1990, 1993, 1998, 2004 and 2009.

In addition to providing information about labor market characteristics in Lincoln County, this report summarizes responses to a series of questions intended to assess community satisfaction. Such information is necessary for future planning efforts as local government officials determine how best to improve local government services and the overall quality of living in Lincoln County and the City of Caliente.

This report contains seven sections. Following this Introduction (Section 1.0), Section 2.0 summarizes the results of the labor market survey; specifically the demographic characteristics of survey respondents, their employment characteristics, and labor skills. Section 2.0 also summarizes the employment characteristics of Nevada Test Site employees. Section 3.0 summarizes how local residents perceived the quality of community characteristics, services and amenities. Section 4.0 describes survey based household income information. Section 5.0 compares and contrasts results of labor market surveys conducted in Lincoln County in 1990, 1993, 1998, and 2004. Section 6.0 suggests ways to implement programs that help the Lincoln County labor supply and the local economy. Section 7.0 contains a list of references used throughout the document. Appendix A includes the survey instrument that was used to collect the 2009 Lincoln County labor market data.

Currently, very few Lincoln County residents are employed by DOE. From 1986 to 1992, DOE employed approximately 11,000 workers in Nevada. As of December 31, 2009 the DOE workforce at the Nevada Test Site (NTS) had declined to 1,643 employees (Morgan, 2010). Should the DOE construct and operate a geologic repository and related transportation systems for spent nuclear fuel and other high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain or other energy/defense related facilities at NTS or the Nellis Range, employment opportunities with DOE and DOD and their contractors may improve for Lincoln County residents.

## 1.1 Methodology

Funding for this survey was provided by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) pursuant to Section 116 (c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended.

The 2009 Labor Market Survey was designed to obtain labor force information from local residents throughout Lincoln County. Survey questions were designed to obtain information that is utilized in socioeconomic impact analyses by both the private industries and government sectors for use in location and staffing decisions. The survey provides data that can help justify the need for various State of Nevada and federal grants. In addition, the survey results should assist the design and implementation of local education and job-training programs.

The survey questionnaire was approved by the Board of Lincoln County Commissioners. Prior to survey distribution, a notice of the impending survey was provided through the Lincoln County Record (printed news media). Each household (2,300 according to U.S. Postal Service) in Lincoln County was mailed a survey with cover letter (see Appendix A) and 540 households completed and submitted the survey for a response rate of 23.5 percent. In addition to receiving a copy of the survey, each household also received a raffle ticket and information stating that by completing the survey and submitting their raffle ticket they would be eligible for a cash prize. Five winners were selected at random by the Board of Lincoln County Commissioners and each received a cash prize of \$150.

The survey allowed for a potential of five household member respondents (age 16 or older) to complete the survey questionnaire. Each respondent was considered independently in the tabulation of survey results. A total of 875 persons age 16 and older completed survey responses which represent 20.3% of the total population of Lincoln County, but more importantly represents up to 48 percent of the workforce (1,822 in December 2009, see Bureau of Labor Statistics in References). Due to missing cases, which resulted from incomplete questionnaires, “adjusted” relative frequencies are reported throughout the tables in this report.<sup>1</sup> Once the respondents returned the questionnaire their answers were entered into an Excel spreadsheet, tabulated and analyzed with the results included in this report.

---

1 / Adjusted relative frequencies are the ratios for the number of observations in a statistical category compared to the total number of observations received.

## 2.0 DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY RESULTS

This section discusses survey results that pertain to economics, demographics, and other sets of information needed to characterize the labor market and population of Lincoln County. Demographic survey results are presented by living location, length of residence, level of education, employment status, and others. Throughout this report, the County demographics will be presented from several different perspectives. For the most part, demographic numbers will reflect the total number of respondents (875 persons aged 16+). Reference is also made to total County population, 4,010 in 2009 as shown in Table 2-1, and total numbers of households in Lincoln County, 2,300 (See Nevada State Demographer, BLS). In each case it will be clearly stated if the later two types of data are used.

### 2.1 Population Growth

The population of Lincoln County has increased an estimated 7.4 percent in the last 28 years. Within the County, the City of Caliente, the County's only incorporated community, experienced a population increase of 14.3 percent since 1980. The Nevada State Demographer also estimates that the County will grow by an additional 1,107 residents or 28 percent by 2028. Estimated population numbers for Lincoln County and the City of Caliente are shown in Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1**  
**Population Growth: Lincoln County**  
**and the City of Caliente: 1980-2009**

	1980	1990	2000	2003	2009	Percent Change 1980-2009
Lincoln County	3,732	3,810	4,165	3,749	4,010	7.4
City of Caliente	982	1,120	1,123	1,184	1,122	14.3

Source: United States Census, 1980, 1990, 2000; Population Estimates of Nevada's Counties, Cities and Unincorporated Towns from July 2003 to July 2009, Nevada State Demographer,  
[http://www.nsbdc.org/what/data\\_statistics/demographer/pubs/](http://www.nsbdc.org/what/data_statistics/demographer/pubs/)

Population growth in many of Nevada's rural communities during the 1980s was related to mining activity. However, mining activity in Lincoln County has been relatively insignificant since the late 1980s, employing approximately 1.0 percent of the entire workforce. Lincoln County's modest population growth can be directly attributed to the narrow economic base which characterizes the area.

### 2.2 Estimated Total Population by Age Group

Lincoln County has a high concentration of residents 65 years and older. Residents that are over the age of 65, account for 18 percent of the County's total population. In comparison, residents age 65 and older only account for 11.6 percent of the total population of Nevada. Further details about the different age groups can be found in Table 2-2. When compared to Nevada as a whole,



Lincoln County has a lower percentage of residents between 18 and 64, which constitute the core work force and a higher percentage of population over 65. If the Lincoln County population continues to age, this may limit future labor availability in the area.

**Table 2-2**  
**Estimated Total Population by Age Group**  
**Lincoln County and State of Nevada: 2009**

Age	Estimated Total Number of Residents by Age Group	Estimated Percent of Lincoln County Total	Estimated Age Group as a Percent of Total Nevada, 2009
0-4	219	5.5	7.3
5-9	277	6.9	6.8
10-19	516	12.9	13.7
20-29	522	13.0	14.7
30-39	564	14.1	14.3
40-49	392	9.8	14.2
50-59	529	13.2	12.5
60-64	263	6.6	5.0
65+	729	18.2	11.6
Total	4,010	100.0	100.0

Source: ASRHO Estimates from 2000 to 2005 and Projections from 2006 to 2026 for Nevada and Its Counties, Nevada State Demographer, [http://www.nsbdc.org/what/data\\_statistics/demographer/pubs/](http://www.nsbdc.org/what/data_statistics/demographer/pubs/)

### 2.3 Previous Place of Residence

Forty-four percent of survey respondents who moved to Lincoln County within the last five years came from Las Vegas and 17 percent came from another Nevada location. Among all new arrivals, 33 percent of survey respondents reported relocating to Caliente. In contrast, just over 7 8 percent of the relocating survey respondents moved to Rachel, another Lincoln County location, or another Pahranaagat Valley location. Complete results of the survey respondents who are new residents by residential location in Lincoln County is provided in Table 2-3.

Table 2-3

**Previous Place of Residence of Survey Respondents Who  
Moved to Lincoln County in the Past 5 Years<sup>a</sup>**

Previous Place of Residence	Current Place of Residence														Total Respondents	
	Alamo		Panaca		Caliente		Pioche		Rachel		Other County		Other Pahrangat Valley			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Las Vegas	11	40.7	11	28.9	24	34.8	44	73.3	0	0.0	1	14.3	1	20.0	92	44.0
Utah	5	18.5	10	26.3	13	18.8	1	1.7	0	0.0	2	28.6	0	0.0	31	14.8
Other Nevada	5	18.5	3	7.9	14	20.3	5	8.3	2	66.7	4	57.1	4	80.0	37	17.7
Arizona	0	0.0	1	2.6	2	2.9	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	1.9
California	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	1.4	4	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	3.3
Other	4	14.8	13	34.2	15	21.7	5	8.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	38	18.2
<b>Total and Percent of Overall Total</b>	27	12.9	38	18.2	69	33.0	60	28.7	3	1.4	7	3.3	5	2.4	209	

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 10.

## 2.4 Lincoln County Demographic Characteristics

The distribution of survey respondents between the ages of 16 and 65 among Lincoln County communities has remained constant when compared to the 2004 Labor Market Survey. Caliente continues to have the largest share of survey respondents between the ages of 16 and 65 at about 29 percent while Rachel continues to have the lowest share of respondents within this age group at 2 percent. Of the survey respondents that answered the question regarding marital status, almost two-thirds are married and 22 percent reported being single. Comparing the highest level of education reached by County survey respondents those with a high school diploma continue to remain the largest group at 30 percent. Two-thirds of respondents from Rachel have a high school diploma. Among all survey respondents, 24 percent reported having some college experience. Detailed information about education level, marital status, and total number of residents by living location can be found in Table 2-4.

## 2.5 Employment Status and Occupation by Living Location

Table 2-5 shows employment and unemployment by living location. If survey respondents are representative of the entire County, the on-going economic downturn has resulted in just two-thirds of County residents being employed. This represents a 10 percent decrease in employment levels since 2004. During 2009, the most frequently reported occupation was in the state and local government category at 27 percent, and 22 percent of respondents reported occupations in the services sector. Half of unemployed respondents indicated they are looking for work. Respondents indicating they were retired and not interested in working were not considered as unemployed.

Throughout this report assumptions were made as to the application of the data collected from this survey. If one assumes that the data from the respondents is a valid representation of the entire workforce of Lincoln County, then certain numbers may be extrapolated<sup>2</sup> from the survey and applied to the workforce of the entire County. In such cases, it will be clearly stated that such data is extrapolated.

From Table 2-5, it can be seen that 198 of the respondents 16 years of age or older, or 32.7 percent, indicated they are unemployed. If an assumption is made that the respondents accurately reflect the response of the entire labor force in Lincoln County, then by extrapolation it may be inferred that there may be as many as 582 unemployed throughout the County rather than the 170 or 9.3 percent that the BLS listed for the County during for the same time period. Of the 198 unemployed respondents, 107 reported they were looking for work. Accordingly, across the entire Lincoln County work force, as many as 300 persons may be looking for work.

---

2 / To infer or estimate by extending or projecting known information.

**Table 2-4**  
**Lincoln County Demographic**  
**Characteristics by Respondent Households**

Characteristic	Alamo		Panaca		Caliente		Pioche		Rachel		Other County		Other Pahrnanagat Valley		Total Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Number of Household Members Between The Ages of 16 and 65 and Percent of Total<sup>a</sup></b>	136	15.5	196	22.4	253	28.9	196	22.4	20	2.3	35	4.0	39	4.5	875	
<b>Total Household Members and Percent of Total</b>	194	15.6	302	24.3	350	28.2	263	21.2	32	2.6	52	4.2	50	4.0	1,243	
<b>Marital Status<sup>b</sup></b>																
Single	24	23.5	30	18.9	50	26.6	29	20.7	3	23.1	3	10.7	7	21.2	146	22.0
Married	72	70.6	107	67.3	108	57.4	95	67.9	6	46.2	21	75.0	20	60.6	429	64.7
Divorced	3	2.9	13	8.2	18	9.6	12	8.6	4	30.8	2	7.1	4	12.1	56	8.4
Other	3	2.9	9	5.7	12	6.4	4	2.9	0	0.0	2	7.1	2	6.1	32	4.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>		<b>159</b>		<b>188</b>		<b>140</b>		<b>13</b>		<b>28</b>		<b>33</b>		<b>663</b>	
<b>Highest Education Level<sup>c</sup></b>																
Less Than High School	9	8.7	13	8.2	23	12.1	9	6.4	0	0.0	2	6.9	1	3.0	57	8.5
High School Graduate	34	33.0	45	28.3	50	26.3	46	32.9	8	61.5	8	27.6	7	21.2	198	29.7
Some College	26	25.2	43	27.0	42	22.1	35	25.0	1	7.7	5	17.2	9	27.3	161	24.1
2-Year College Degree	9	8.7	8	5.0	15	7.9	10	7.1	2	15.4	0	0.0	2	6.1	46	6.9
Vocational and Technical Degree	8	7.8	11	6.9	19	10.0	8	5.7	0	0.0	1	3.4	2	6.1	49	7.3
Four Year College Degree	8	7.8	22	13.8	24	12.6	18	12.9	0	0.0	10	34.5	5	15.2	87	13.0
Advanced Degree (Masters, Doctorate, Etc.)	9	8.7	15	9.4	15	7.9	12	8.6	1	7.7	3	10.3	5	15.2	60	9.0
Other	0	0.0	2	1.3	2	1.1	2	1.4	1	7.7	0	0.0	2	6.1	9	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>		<b>159</b>		<b>190</b>		<b>140</b>		<b>13</b>		<b>29</b>		<b>33</b>		<b>667</b>	

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 3.

b/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 15.

c/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 14.

**Table 2-5  
Employment Status, Reported Occupation and  
Unemployment Status by Place of Residence**

Characteristic	Alamo		Panaca		Caliente		Pioche		Rachel		Other County		Other Pahrnagat Valley		Total Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Employment Status<sup>a</sup></b>																
Employed	72	74.2	93	62.0	115	70.1	85	66.4	5	50.0	16	66.7	22	66.7	408	67.3
Unemployed	25	25.8	57	38.0	49	33.6	43	33.6	5	50.0	8	33.3	11	33.3	198	32.7
<b>Total and Percent of Overall Total</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>21.1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>606</b>	
<b>Reported Occupation<sup>b</sup></b>																
Agriculture/Forestry	11	14.7	11	9.3	9	6.6	3	2.8	6	66.7	3	12.5	8	32.0	51	10.3
Mining	1	1.3	6	5.1	2	1.5	4	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	2.6
Construction	9	12.0	11	9.3	14	10.2	12	11.1	1	11.1	4	16.7	2	8.0	53	10.7
Retail Trade	4	5.3	17	14.4	15	10.9	14	13.0	1	11.1	3	12.5	3	12.0	57	11.5
Wholesale Trade	1	1.3	1	0.8	2	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	0.8
Finance/Insurance Real Estate	3	4.0	8	6.8	8	5.8	2	1.9	1	11.1	0	0.0	1	4.0	23	4.6
Services (Business or Personal)	19	25.3	19	16.1	38	27.7	27	25.0	0	0.0	2	8.3	4	16.0	109	22.0
Manufacturing	2	2.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	4	0.8
Utilities	4	5.3	1	0.8	3	2.2	11	10.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.0	21	4.2
State and Local Govt.	14	18.7	42	35.6	35	25.5	31	28.7	0	0.0	7	29.2	5	20.0	134	27.0
Federal Govt. Civilian	7	9.3	1	0.8	9	6.6	3	2.8	0	0.0	4	16.7	0	0.0	24	4.8
Federal Govt. Military	0	0.0	1	0.8	2	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>		<b>118</b>		<b>137</b>		<b>108</b>		<b>9</b>		<b>24</b>		<b>25</b>		<b>496</b>	
<b>Unemployment Status<sup>a</sup></b>																
Looking	9	36.0	29	50.9	30	61.2	24	55.8	4	80.0	6	75.0	5	45.5	107	54.0
Not Looking	4	16.0	7	12.3	9	18.4	9	20.9	0	0.0	1	12.5	2	18.2	32	16.2
Homemaker	7	28.0	15	26.3	9	18.4	6	14.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	38	19.2
Student	5	20.0	6	10.5	1	2.0	4	9.3	1	20.0	1	12.5	3	27.3	21	10.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>		<b>57</b>		<b>49</b>		<b>43</b>		<b>5</b>		<b>8</b>		<b>11</b>		<b>198</b>	

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 11.

b/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 19. Occupations reported by employed and retired respondents.

## 2.6 Covered Employment by Job Sector

Table 2-6 shows the number of workers in Lincoln County covered by unemployment insurance for different employment job sectors, as reported by the Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation Research and Analysis Bureau. Over half (54.9 percent) of covered employees in the County employed by the private sector. The biggest percentage of covered employees in the private sector is 30 percent in the trade, transportation, and utilities sector.

**Table 2-6**  
**Covered Employment by Job Sector,**  
**Lincoln County, 2008**

<b>Industry</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Total Private Coverage	797	54.9
Natural Resources and Mining	36	4.5
Construction	34	4.3
Manufacturing	*	*
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	232	29.1
Information	27	3.4
Financial Activities	54	6.8
Professional and Business Services	*	*
Education and Health Services	37	4.6
Leisure and Hospitality	111	13.9
Other Services	*	*
Government	655	45.1
<b>Total (Private and Government)</b>	<b>1,452</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: State of Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation Research and Analysis Bureau; Nevada Employment and Payrolls, 2008

## 2.7 Employment Status by Highest Level of Education

The employment status of Lincoln County survey respondents compared to the highest level of education achieved is shown in Table 2-7. Overall the higher the education level the more likely a respondent is to be employed. Over 63 percent of the respondents with an advanced degree are employed full-time, whereas only 21 percent of the responding residents with less than high school are employed full-time. Additionally, the higher the level of education achieved the less likely a respondent is to be unemployed and looking for work.

Table 2-7

**Employment Status by Highest Level of Education Achieved By Survey Respondents<sup>a</sup>**

Employment Status	Less Than High School		High School Graduate		Some College		2 Year College Degree		Vocational/ Technical Degree		4-year College Degree		Advanced Degree (Master, PhD)		Other		Total for All Respondents Answering Both Questions 11 and 14	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Employed</b>																		
Full-Time	9	21.4	72	41.1	57	39.3	15	38.5	25	58.1	35	43.8	33	63.5	2	22.2	248	42.4
Part-Time	5	11.9	25	14.3	19	13.1	6	15.4	4	9.3	12	15.0	4	7.7	0	0.0	75	12.8
Retired (P-T)	1	2.4	11	6.3	12	8.3	5	12.8	3	7.0	11	13.8	7	13.5	0	0.0	50	8.5
Student (P-T)	5	11.9	1	0.6	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	1.4
Work w/o Pay Family Business	2	4.8	7	4.0	3	2.1	3	7.7	0	0.0	2	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	2.9
<b>Employed Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>66.3</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>63.4</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>74.4</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>74.4</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>76.3</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>68.0</b>
<b>Unemployed</b>																		
Unemployed Looking	9	21.4	38	21.7	29	20.0	5	12.8	7	16.3	11	13.8	2	3.8	3	33.3	104	17.8
Unemployed Not Looking	3	7.1	10	5.7	7	4.8	0	0.0	3	7.0	3	3.8	3	5.8	0	0.0	29	5.0
Homemaker	2	4.8	10	5.7	13	9.0	4	10.3	1	2.3	5	6.3	3	5.8	0	0.0	38	6.5
Student Unemployed	6	14.3	1	0.6	4	2.8	1	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	44.4	16	2.7
<b>Unemployed Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>47.6</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>33.7</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>36.6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>77.8</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>32.0</b>
<b>Total and Percent of Overall Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>29.9</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>585</b>	

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 11 and 14.

## 2.8 Employment Status by Length of Residency

Table 2-8 illustrates the relationship between a survey respondent's length of residency and his/her employment status. The largest segment (68 percent) of primary survey respondents that are employed full-time have lived in the County for 16-20 years. Part-time workers represent the largest group of respondents that have lived in the County for less than 5 years at 15 percent. Forty-seven percent of those unemployed and looking for work have lived in Lincoln County for less than 10 years.

## 2.9 Highest Education Level Achieved and Gross Income Level for Lincoln County Residents that Successfully Started a Business

Table 2-9 takes a closer look at labor market survey respondents that have successfully started a business. This analysis breaks down the information by six different types of businesses, highest education level achieved, and annual gross income. Overall 70 percent of the businesses that were started by respondents in the County have been successful. Twenty-five percent of responding entrepreneurs have a high school education and 20 percent had a 4-year college degree. Thirty-four percent of respondents who reported starting a business in Lincoln County also reported a gross income of over \$50,000 (although said incomes may or may not be related to said business activities). Over 44 percent of all attempted business starts were in sales. By comparison, only 8 percent of the attempted businesses were in agriculture.

## 2.10 Employment Characteristics by Place of Residence

Table 2-10 provides details information on employment characteristics by place of residence including employment status, work location, and desired employment status. Caliente has one of the largest groups employed full-time at 45 percent. Of the Caliente respondents that are employed over 70 percent are employed within the City. Over 64 percent of Alamo respondents are employed within their community. Regardless of living location, over 30 percent of the survey respondents are employed within the City of Caliente.

Table 2-10 also provides information about the desired employment status of survey respondents by living location. Overall 61 percent wish to be employed full-time or at an equivalent status. This desired full-time employment level is the highest in Panaca at 64.5 percent. The number of respondents desiring part-time employment is greatest in Pioche and Caliente, at 32 percent.



**Table 2-8**  
**Primary Respondent Employment Status**  
**by Length of Residency in Lincoln**  
**County<sup>a</sup>**

Employment Status	0-5 Years		6-10 Years		11-15 Years		16-20 Years		21 + Years		Total Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Employed</b>												
Employed Full Time	48	50.5	20	47.6	19	51.4	19	67.9	59	49.6	165	51.4
Employed Part Time	14	14.7	5	11.9	3	8.1	0	0.0	17	14.3	39	12.1
Retired (Employed Part-Time)	6	6.3	2	4.8	4	10.8	3	10.7	18	15.1	33	10.3
Student (Employed Part-Time)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	1	0.3
Working Without Pay In Family Business or Ranch	0	0.0	2	4.8	1	2.7	0	0.0	5	4.2	8	2.5
<b>Employed Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>71.6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>69.0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>73.0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>84.0</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>76.6</b>
<b>Unemployed</b>												
Unemployed (looking for work)	22	23.2	10	23.8	8	21.6	4	14.3	14	11.8	58	18.1
Unemployed (not looking for work)	3	3.2	1	2.4	1	2.7	1	3.6	2	1.7	8	2.5
Homemaker	2	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.7	1	3.6	3	2.5	7	2.2
Student (Unemployed)	0	0.0	2	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.6
<b>Unemployed Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28.4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>23.4</b>
<b>Total and Percent of Overall Total</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>29.6</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>13.1</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>321</b>	

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 7 (for primary respondent) and 11.

**Table 2-9**  
**Highest Education Level Achieved and Gross Income Level for Survey**  
**Respondents that Successfully Started a Business**

	Agriculture		Food		Mechanic/ Construction		Sales		Services		Other		Total Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Business Success<sup>a</sup></b>														
Succeeded	7	63.6	9	75.0	16	64.0	40	66.7	16	84.2	7	77.8	95	69.9
Failed	4	36.4	3	25.0	9	36.0	20	33.3	3	15.8	2	22.2	41	30.1
<b>Total and Percent of Overall Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>44.1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>136</b>	
<b>If the Business Succeeded</b>														
<b>Highest Education Level<sup>b</sup></b>														
Less than High School	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	10.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	4	5.4
High School Graduate	3	60.0	4	66.7	6	42.9	3	10.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	18	24.3
Some College	1	20.0	1	16.7	3	21.4	7	23.3	3	21.4	1	20.0	16	21.6
2-year College Degree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.1
Vocational and Technical Degree	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	10.0	2	14.3	0	0.0	5	6.8
Four-year College Degree	0	0.0	1	16.7	5	35.7	5	16.7	4	28.6	0	0.0	15	20.3
Adv. Degree (Master, Ph.D., etc.)	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	20.0	5	35.7	1	20.0	13	17.6
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Total and Percent of Overall Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>40.5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>74</b>	
<b>Gross Income Level<sup>c</sup></b>														
\$0 - \$10,000	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	14.8	2	13.3	2	40.0	9	12.9
\$10,000 - \$15,000	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	3	11.1	3	20.0	0	0.0	7	10.0
\$15,000 - \$20,000	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	4	14.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	7.1
\$20,000 - \$30,000	1	20.0	2	33.3	3	25.0	3	11.1	2	13.3	1	20.0	12	17.1
\$30,000 - \$50,000	2	40.0	3	50.0	2	16.7	3	11.1	3	20.0	0	0.0	13	18.6
\$50,000 or more	1	20.0	1	16.7	5	41.7	10	37.0	5	33.3	2	40.0	24	34.3
<b>Total and Percent of Overall Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>70</b>	

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 33 and 34.

b/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 14 (primary respondent) and 33.

c/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 18 (primary respondent) and 33.

Table 2-10

**Respondent Employment Characteristics By Place  
of Residence**

Characteristic	Alamo		Panaca		Caliente		Pioche		Rachel		Other County		Other Pahrnagat Valley		Total Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Employment Status<sup>a</sup></b>																
Unemployed	18	18.6	42	28.4	40	24.7	37	29.1	5	50.0	8	33.3	10	30.3	160	26.6
Employed Full-time	43	44.3	56	37.8	74	45.7	52	40.9	3	30.0	8	33.3	17	51.5	253	42.1
Employed Part-time	25	28.8	30	20.3	38	23.5	32	25.2	2	20.0	6	25.0	4	12.1	137	22.8
Homemaker	7	7.2	15	10.1	9	5.6	6	4.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.0	38	6.3
Working w/o Pay in Family Business	4	4.1	5	3.4	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.3	1	3.0	13	2.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>97</b>		<b>148</b>		<b>162</b>		<b>127</b>		<b>10</b>		<b>24</b>		<b>33</b>		<b>601</b>	
<b>Place of Employment<sup>b</sup></b>																
Alamo	49	63.6	0	0.0	4	3.1	1	1.1	1	10.0	0	0.0	7	29.2	62	13.5
Panaca	0	0.0	46	41.8	3	2.3	7	7.5	0	0.0	2	12.5	1	4.2	59	12.9
Caliente	6	7.8	31	28.2	91	70.5	7	7.5	0	0.0	5	31.3	1	4.2	141	30.7
Pioche	1	1.3	13	11.8	7	5.4	55	59.1	0	0.0	3	18.8	0	0.0	79	17.2
Nevada Test Site	1	1.3	0	0.0	2	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.7
Nellis Range	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Tonopah Test Range	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.4
Clark County	8	10.4	4	3.6	4	3.1	3	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.3	21	4.6
Other Lincoln County	0	0.0	2	1.8	7	5.4	2	2.2	0	0.0	6	37.5	3	12.5	20	4.4
Other	10	13.0	14	12.7	11	8.5	17	18.3	9	90.0	0	0.0	10	41.7	71	15.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>		<b>110</b>		<b>129</b>		<b>93</b>		<b>10</b>		<b>16</b>		<b>24</b>		<b>459</b>	
<b>Desired Employment Status<sup>c</sup></b>																
Full-Time	45	61.6	69	64.5	82	59.9	59	57.3	7	70.0	13	61.9	17	65.4	292	61.2
Part-Time	21	28.8	25	23.4	44	32.1	33	32.0	3	30.0	5	23.8	8	30.8	139	29.1
Other	7	9.6	13	12.1	11	8.0	11	10.7	0	0.0	3	14.3	1	3.8	46	9.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>		<b>107</b>		<b>137</b>		<b>103</b>		<b>10</b>		<b>21</b>		<b>26</b>		<b>477</b>	

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 11.

b/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 13.

c/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 12.

### 2.11 Desired Employment Status of Retired Residents

Table 2-11 quantifies the retired survey respondents that wish to work. Similar to the results of the 2004 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey, nearly two-thirds of those retired want to work.

<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>Total Respondents</b>	<b>%</b>
Retired Who Want to Work	108	32.9
Retired Who Do Not Want to Work	220	67.1
<b>Total Retired Survey Respondents</b>	<b>328</b>	

a/ Derived through analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey question 5.

### 2.12 Income and Transportation Characteristics by Place of Residence

In addition to looking at employment characteristics by location, respondent average gross income, modes of transportation, and annual transportation expenses are analyzed in Table 2-12. Overall 27 percent of respondents reported gross income of \$10,000 or less. The percentage of respondents reporting gross incomes less than \$10,000 was greatest in Rachel at 46 percent. Conversely, 32 percent of the Alamo residents responding to the survey reported making \$50,000 or more annually.

When looking at modes of transportation to and from work, over 90 percent of respondents use a personal vehicle. Over 50 percent of survey respondents reported spending less than \$500 annually on work related transportation expenses.

### 2.13 Survey Respondents for Each Education Level Category by Work Location

Table 2-13 evaluates the levels of education and annual gross incomes by work location. Over half of the survey respondents with less than a high school education are employed in Caliente. Among survey respondents with a vocational or technical degree, over 40 percent are also employed in Caliente. Of the survey respondents that provided their highest level of education, 30 percent reported having a high school diploma and 14 percent a college degree.

Table 2-12

**Income and Transportation Characteristics  
of Respondents By Place of Residence**

Characteristic	Alamo		Panaca		Caliente		Pioche		Rachel		Other County		Other Pahrnatag Valley		Total Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Respondent Reported</b>																
<b>Annual [Gross] Income<sup>a</sup></b>																
\$0-\$10,000	18	22.8	30	25.0	35	23.6	39	32.8	6	46.2	3	16.7	10	35.7	141	26.9
\$10,000-\$15,000	7	8.9	7	5.8	12	8.1	8	6.7	1	7.7	1	5.6	0	0.0	36	6.9
\$15,000-\$20,000	6	7.6	10	8.3	15	10.1	8	6.7	1	7.7	1	5.6	2	7.1	43	8.2
\$20,000-\$30,000	11	13.9	20	16.7	21	14.2	16	13.4	1	7.7	3	16.7	3	10.7	75	14.3
\$30,000-\$50,000	12	15.2	28	23.3	32	21.6	25	21.0	4	30.8	5	27.8	8	28.6	114	21.7
\$50,000-	25	31.6	25	20.8	33	22.3	23	19.3	0	0.0	5	27.8	5	17.9	116	22.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>		<b>120</b>		<b>148</b>		<b>119</b>		<b>13</b>		<b>18</b>		<b>28</b>		<b>525</b>	
<b>Form of Transportation</b>																
<b>(To and From Work)<sup>b</sup></b>																
Personal Vehicle	73	92.4	98	89.1	113	88.3	98	95.1	5	62.5	18	94.7	16	72.7	421	89.8
Car Pool	2	2.5	1	0.9	3	2.3	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6	10	2.1
Bicycle	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Walk	3	3.8	9	8.2	11	8.6	2	1.9	3	37.5	1	5.3	3	13.6	32	6.8
Employer Provided Bus	1	1.3	2	1.8	0	0.0	2	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	1.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>		<b>110</b>		<b>128</b>		<b>103</b>		<b>8</b>		<b>19</b>		<b>22</b>		<b>469</b>	
<b>Work Related Annual</b>																
<b>Transportation Expense<sup>c</sup></b>																
\$0-\$500	45	56.3	64	54.2	89	66.4	65	58.0	11	84.6	9	45.0	4	19.0	287	57.6
\$500-\$1,000	8	10.0	19	16.1	18	13.4	19	17.0	1	7.7	3	15.0	1	4.8	69	13.9
\$1,000-\$2,000	12	15.0	20	16.9	10	7.5	10	8.9	0	0.0	3	15.0	9	42.9	64	12.9
\$2,000-	15	18.8	15	12.7	17	12.7	18	16.1	1	7.7	5	25.0	7	33.3	78	15.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>		<b>118</b>		<b>134</b>		<b>112</b>		<b>13</b>		<b>20</b>		<b>21</b>		<b>498</b>	

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 18.

b/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 16.

c/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 17.

**Table 2-13**  
**Survey Respondents for Each**  
**Education Level Category By Work**  
**Location<sup>a</sup>**

<b>Work Location</b>	<b>Less Than High School</b>		<b>High School Graduate</b>		<b>Some College</b>		<b>2 Year Associate Degree</b>		<b>Vocational Technical Degree</b>		<b>Four-Year College Degree</b>		<b>Advanced Degree</b>		<b>Other</b>		<b>Total Respondents</b>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Alamo	4	16.0	18	13.1	16	15.5	7	21.2	3	7.7	4	6.3	9	19.6	0	0.0	61	13.5
Panaca	2	8.0	11	8.0	14	13.6	3	9.1	7	17.9	11	17.2	11	23.9	0	0.0	59	13.1
Caliente	13	52.0	32	23.4	29	28.2	12	36.4	16	41.0	21	32.8	14	30.4	2	50.0	139	30.8
Pioche	1	4.0	29	21.2	19	18.4	4	12.1	5	12.8	15	23.4	4	8.7	0	0.0	77	17.1
Nevada Test Site	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	2	5.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.7
Nellis Range	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Tonopah Test Range	1	4.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.4
Clark County	0	0.0	11	8.0	3	2.9	3	9.1	0	0.0	1	1.6	2	4.3	0	0.0	20	4.4
Other Lincoln County	0	0.0	7	5.1	6	5.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	10.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	4.4
Other	4	16.0	29	21.2	13	12.6	4	12.1	6	15.4	5	7.8	6	13.0	2	50.0	69	15.3
<b>Total and Percent of Overall Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>22.8</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100</b>

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 13 and 14.

#### 2.14 Desired Employment Status of Lincoln County Residents

Table 2-14 describes the desired employment status of survey respondents as compared to their current employment or unemployment status. Of the unemployed respondents 90 percent desire full-time employment and over half of the unemployed and looking wish for part-time work. Forty-seven percent of the retired respondents that are currently working part-time wish to remain employed part-time and 21 percent desire a different employment status than full-time or part-time.

#### 2.15 Existing and Desired Employment at the Nevada Test Site and Nellis Range

Since the 2004 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey, the number of survey respondents that are employed at either the Nevada Test Site or at Nellis Range has decreased from 24 to about 10, as indicated in Table 2-15. Caliente employs the most respondents (5) that work at either the Nevada Test Site (NTS) or Nellis Range. Respondents from Panaca, other Lincoln County, and other Pahrangat Valley locations reported no employment at NTS or Nellis. Of the survey respondents that reported working at either NTS or Nellis all respondents said they commute to and from work using their own personal vehicle. Two-hundred respondents indicated that they would be willing to work at either NTS or Nellis if jobs were made available. Panaca had the highest percentage (26) of respondents wanting to work at either location.

By extrapolation, it may be said that if the 200 respondents (22.9 percent of the Lincoln County workforce) accurately reflect the attitudes of all resident members of the Lincoln County workforce, there may be as many as 417 residents countywide willing to work at either NTS or Nellis if the jobs were available.

#### 2.16 Prior Lincoln County Residents That Left In the Past 5 Years for Employment Reasons but Would Be Willing to Return to the County for Job Opportunities at NTS or Nellis

The number of former residents that left the County in the last 5 years for employment reasons that might be willing to return to the County if job opportunities were made available at NTS or Nellis as estimated by survey respondents is shown in Table 2-16. Based on survey responses over one-third would be willing to return to the County.

#### 2.17 Current Lincoln County Residents that Are Willing to Work NTS or Nellis If Job Opportunities Were Made Available

Table 2-17 identifies the number of current Lincoln County respondents that would be willing to work at either NTS or Nellis if jobs were made available. Survey results indicated almost a quarter of these respondents would be interested in potential jobs at the two federal installations.

**Table 2-14**  
**Desired Employment Status of**  
**Lincoln County Respondents<sup>a</sup>**

<b>Desired Employment Status</b>	<b>Full Time</b>		<b>Part Time</b>		<b>Other</b>		<b>No Response</b>		<b>Total Respondents</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Employed Respondents</b>										
Full-Time	170	80.2	3	4.1	4	28.6	76	70.4	253	62.0
Part-Time	31	14.6	30	40.5	5	35.7	9	8.3	75	18.4
Retired (Part-Time)	5	2.4	35	47.3	3	21.4	10	9.3	53	13.0
Student (Part-Time)	2	0.9	6	8.1	1	7.1	0	0.0	9	2.2
Working w/o Pay (Family Business)	4	1.9	0	0.0	1	7.1	13	12.0	18	4.4
<b>Total Employed Respondents</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>73.6</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>57.4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>71.5</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>67.3</b>
<b>Unemployed Respondents</b>										
Unemployed –Looking	68	89.5	31	56.4	6	25.0	2	4.7	107	50.5
Unemployed –Not Looking	4	5.3	8	14.5	5	20.8	15	34.9	43	20.3
Homemaker	2	2.6	7	12.7	11	45.8	18	41.9	41	19.3
Student (Unemployed)	2	2.6	9	16.4	2	8.3	8	18.6	21	9.9
<b>Total Unemployed Respondents</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>63.2</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>32.7</b>
<b>Total and Percent of Overall Total</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>24.9</b>	<b>606</b>	

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 11 and 12.



**Table 2-15**  
**Nevada Test Site or Nellis Range Employment By**  
**Place of Residence of Survey Respondents and Former**  
**Household Members Who Would Return to Work in**  
**Lincoln County for a Wage of at Least \$21.00/hr.**

	Alamo		Panaca		Caliente		Pioche		Rachel		Other County		Other Pahrnagat Valley		Total Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Location of Job<sup>a</sup></b>																
Forward Area of NTS	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	40.0
Service Area (Mercury)	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	20.0
Other Location	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	40.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	40.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>5</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>10</b>	
<b>Gate Used for Access to Job<sup>b</sup></b>																
Valley Road/Gate 700	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	18.2
Mercury	2	50.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	27.3
Other	2	50.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	54.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>5</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>11</b>	
<b>Form of Transportation<sup>c</sup></b>																
Personal Vehicle	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100.0
Car Pool	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Bicycle	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Walk	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Employer Provided Bus	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>9</b>	
<b>Current household members willing to work at NTS or Nellis Range, if job opportunities were available</b>	37	18.0	53	25.7	50	24.3	41	19.9	10	4.9	7	3.4	8	3.9	206	
<b>Former household members would return to the County to live and work in the area at a wage of at least \$21.00 per hour</b>	79	29.3	68	25.2	77	28.5	28	10.4	6	2.2	2	0.7	10	3.7	270	

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 20.

b/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 21.

c/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1, 16 and 20.

d/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 26.

e/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 24.

**Table 2-16**  
**Prior Lincoln County Residents That Left In The Past 5 Years**  
**For Employment Reasons But Would Be Willing To Return To**  
**The County For Job Opportunities At NTS Or Nellis**

Residents that left for employment reasons	104
Number of former residents that would return for a job at NTS or Nellis	37
<b>Total Percentage</b>	<b>35.6</b>

**Table 2-17**  
**Current Lincoln County Residents Willing to Work at NTS or Nellis if Job Opportunities**  
**Were Made Available**

Total number of survey respondents	875
Survey respondents willing to work at NTS or Nellis	206
<b>Total Percentage of Respondents Willing to Work at NTS or Nellis</b>	<b>23.5</b>

#### 2.18 Former Residents that would Return to Lincoln County for Jobs Paying at Least \$21.00 Per Hour

Table 2-15 also presents survey respondent estimates for the number of former residents that would be willing to return to Lincoln County for jobs with a wage of at least \$21 per hour. The survey respondents estimated that 270 former residents would be willing to return to work in Lincoln County. This number would increase the total workforce in Lincoln County to 2,092 from the BLS December 2009 total of 1,822 workers. This represents a significant component of the available labor pool for businesses and industry considering expanding within or relocating to Lincoln County.

#### 2.19 Desired Training and Educational Opportunities by Location

Table 2-18 examines the desired training and educational opportunities that survey respondents wish to have available. Respondents were asked to rank *all* the training and educational options in order of preference with 1 being the most preferred option. However, most respondents did not rank all options and several provided similar rankings for more than one option. On average, of those who provided a numerical ranking, electrical training was reported as most preferred with an average of 2.6 out of a possible 8. Conversely of those who provided a numerical ranking, carpentry received the least desired average response of 4.8 out of 8.

When looking at the desired educational opportunities that residents would like to see offered through the College of Southern Nevada, vocational training was the most preferred option with an average response of 3.3 out of 10. In comparison, survey respondents were least interested in

receiving educational opportunities in the dental technician field with an average response of 6.3 out of 10.

**Table 2-18**  
**Desired Training and Educational**  
**Opportunities as Indicated by the**  
**Respondent's Selected Priority**

	Selected 1 or 2		Selected 3 or 4		Selected 5 or 6		Selected 7 or 8		Selected 9 or 10		Total Respondents	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	Average Response
<b>Training<sup>1</sup></b>												
Heavy Equipment Operations	117	43.0	58	21.3	70	25.7	27	9.9			<b>272</b>	<b>3.4</b>
Electrical	166	60.1	76	27.5	23	8.3	11	4.0			<b>276</b>	<b>2.6</b>
Plumbing	103	38.4	89	33.2	62	23.1	14	5.2			<b>268</b>	<b>3.4</b>
Environmental Control Technologies	56	21.7	68	26.4	80	31.0	54	20.9			<b>268</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Metal Iron Working	71	27.4	70	27.0	76	29.3	42	16.2			<b>259</b>	<b>4.1</b>
Heating/Ventilation/ Air Cond.	88	33.7	74	28.4	82	31.4	17	6.5			<b>261</b>	<b>3.7</b>
Carpentry	46	23.0	36	18.0	42	21.0	76	38.0			<b>200</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Other	16	41.0	2	5.1	3	7.7	18	46.2			<b>39</b>	<b>4.8</b>
<b>Educational Opportunities<sup>2</sup></b>												
Vocational Training	152	51.0	63	21.1	38	12.8	26	8.7	19	6.4	<b>298</b>	<b>3.3</b>
General Education	112	40.0	58	20.7	50	17.9	33	11.8	27	9.6	<b>280</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Business/Accounting/ Finance	90	31.8	75	26.5	73	25.8	36	12.7	9	3.2	<b>283</b>	<b>4.1</b>
Computers/Information Management	118	40.0	93	31.5	49	16.6	25	8.5	10	3.4	<b>295</b>	<b>3.6</b>
Dental Technician	37	13.9	32	12.0	48	18.0	91	34.2	58	21.8	<b>266</b>	<b>6.3</b>
Arts	55	20.8	47	17.7	48	18.1	49	18.5	66	24.9	<b>265</b>	<b>5.7</b>
Medical Technician	60	21.7	76	27.5	64	23.2	52	18.8	24	8.7	<b>276</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Automobile Mechanics	57	20.4	31	11.1	55	19.6	97	34.6	40	14.3	<b>280</b>	<b>5.7</b>
Drafting/Cartography	59	22.5	34	13.0	48	18.3	60	22.9	61	23.3	<b>262</b>	<b>5.6</b>
Environmental Technology	28	31.5	17	19.1	12	13.5	12	13.5	20	22.5	<b>89</b>	<b>5.0</b>
Other	10	40.0	3	12.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	48.0	<b>25</b>	<b>5.8</b>

<sup>1</sup> Scale: 1 (Highest Priority) to 8 (Lowest Priority)

<sup>2</sup> Scale: 1 (Highest Priority) to 10 (Lowest Priority)

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 27.

b/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 28.

## 2.20 Average Response to Construction Related Training Based on Employment Status

The average response of County residents for desired construction training compared to their current employment status can be found in Table 2-19. Both residents that are employed full-time or unemployed but looking for work indicated that electrical training is most preferred and carpentry is one of the least preferred.

**Table 2-19**  
**Average Response To Desired Construction Related**  
**Training and Education Opportunities Based on**  
**Employment Status<sup>a</sup>**

	Heavy Equipment Operations <sup>1</sup>	Electrical <sup>1</sup>	Plumbing <sup>1</sup>	Environmental Control Technologies <sup>1</sup>	Metal/Iron Working <sup>1</sup>	HVAC <sup>1</sup>	Carpentry <sup>1</sup>	Drafting/ Cartography <sup>2</sup>
<b>Employed Respondents</b>								
Employed Full-Time	3.7	2.4	3.4	4.7	4.2	3.8	4.7	3.5
Employed Part-Time	3.1	2.8	3.3	4.5	4.2	3.8	5.4	3.1
Working W/O Pay in Family Business	3.5	2.5	3.0	5.8	3.3	3.0	7.0	2.3
Retired (employed part-time)	3.1	1.9	4.4	3.5	4.8	4.1	5.5	4.1
Student (employed part-time)	2.0	6.0	5.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	1.0	0.0
<b>Unemployed Respondents</b>								
Unemployed (looking for work)	3.3	2.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.3	3.4
Unemployed (not looking for work)	2.7	2.3	2.5	4.0	3.2	2.5	3.4	3.7
Homemaker	3.0	3.4	4.5	3.8	3.9	4.5	5.3	2.8
Student (unemployed)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0

1/ Scale: 1 (Highest Priority) ; 8 (Lowest Priority)

2/ Scale: 1 (Highest Priority) ; 10 (Lowest Priority)

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 11 and 27.

### 3.0 COMMUNITY SATISFACTION

Survey respondents were asked to rank their satisfaction with certain community services/attributes such as quality of schools and education, medical care, community as a place to live, and quality of roads. Community services/attributes were to be ranked using a scale of 1 to 5. A reported rating of 1 indicated the respondent believes a service/attribute is poor, whereas a rating of 5 indicates excellent satisfaction with that service/attribute.

#### 3.1 Average Rating of Community Attributes by Length of Residence

Table 3-1 details average rating for community attributes for all Lincoln County communities based on the respondent's length of residency. Most all respondents rated Lincoln County communities as a place to live at least 4 out of a possible 5. Conversely, almost all respondents indicated that the County's employment opportunities, shopping opportunities, and available housing were some of the worst characteristics of the County, averaging about 2 or less out of a possible 5. In many categories, respondents with a shorter length of residency had more positive perceptions of the County's attributes than did those who had lived in the County for many years.

Community attributes receiving a below average to an average rating (2.0 to 3.0) generally include local government services, local medical care, overall standard of living, and garbage disposal. Respondents gave schools/education, public utilities, recreational opportunities, telephone services, electrical services, water and sewer services (where available), and the community as a place to live relatively high scores.

#### 3.2 Average Rating of Community Attributes by Place of Residence

Table 3-2 shows the average rating to community satisfaction among the different communities in Lincoln County. Overall, Pioche and Pahranaagat Valley had the highest rating and Panaca and Other County had the lowest score. Some of the categories contributing to the low score of Panaca are employment opportunities in general, shopping opportunities and job opportunities for others in the household (i.e. spousal employment). Respondents from Other County locations cited employment opportunities, job opportunities for others in the household and available housing as low-scored community attributes.

Overall, major concerns appear to center around economic opportunities and lack of employment opportunities. A reason for out-migration (Table 3-6) among former household's members confirms the general dissatisfaction with the lack of employment and education opportunities in Lincoln County. Overall, 41.1 percent of former household members moved from the County because of the lack of employment opportunities, and 30.8 percent moved for educational opportunities, presumably post-secondary education. However, the scores reported in Table 3-1 also indicate that local residents are fairly pleased with local schools/education and their community as a place to live while holding the lack of employment opportunities in low satisfaction. Such findings may suggest that survey respondents are willing to forgo certain economic advantages including employment opportunities in order to live in Lincoln County.

In fact, recent in-migrants who have lived in Lincoln County for five years or less, also gave high scores for the community as a place to live and the standard of living. Such findings suggest that the Lincoln County area, despite concerns about economic conditions and employment opportunities, continues to attract people from other areas in Nevada such as Clark County as well as from areas outside the State. With future economic development in the region, the attractiveness of Lincoln County as a place to live and work is likely to increase.

**Table 3-1**  
**Average Rating of Community Attributes**  
**By Length of Residence<sup>a</sup>**

Community Attributes	Length of Residence					
	<1 yr	2-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-20 yrs	21-30 yrs	30+ yrs
Employment Opportunities	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.5
Available housing	2.0	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.1
Quality of schools/education	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.2
Shopping opportunities	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.9	2.1
General Government	3.2	3.1	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.9
Police and Fire	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.4
Roads	3.4	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.0
Local Medical Care	2.6	3.1	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.2
Job opportunities for others in household	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.7
Community as a place to live	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0
Standard of Living (cost of living vs. wages)	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.1	2.9
Recreational opportunities	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.3
Telephone Services	3.3	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.8
Electrical Services	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.7	3.6
Garbage Disposal (Where Applicable)	3.3	3.2	3.1	2.5	2.7	2.6
Water/Sewer Services (Where Applicable)	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.2

Rating of 1 = Poor; Rating of 5 = Excellent

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey question 11 and primary respondents to question 30.

**Table 3-2**  
**Average Rating of Community Attributes by Place of Residence<sup>a</sup>**

<b>Community Attributes</b>	<b>Alamo</b>	<b>Panaca</b>	<b>Caliente</b>	<b>Pioche</b>	<b>Rachel</b>	<b>Other County</b>	<b>Other Pahrana-gat Valley</b>	<b>All Communities Average Score</b>
Employment Opportunities	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.8	1.5
Available housing	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.0
Quality of schools/education	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.2	3.6	3.3
Shopping opportunities	1.8	1.7	2.0	1.9	1.3	2.0	1.9	1.9
General Government	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.3	2.4	2.9	2.8
Police and Fire	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	1.8	3.2	3.6	3.3
Roads	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.1	1.9	2.8	3.5	3.0
Local Medical Care	2.7	2.9	3.3	3.0	1.7	2.5	3.1	3.0
Job opportunities for others in household	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.9	1.5	1.9	1.6
Community as a place to live	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.2	3.1	4.0	4.2	4.0
Standard of Living (cost of living vs. wages)	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.1	2.6	2.7	3.1	2.9
Recreational opportunities	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.8	3.0	4.0	3.7	3.3
Telephone Services	3.3	3.5	3.3	4.0	3.6	3.8	3.1	3.6
Electrical Services	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.9	3.2	3.6	3.3	3.4
Garbage Disposal (Where Applicable)	2.3	2.4	3.2	2.9	3.0	2.2	2.5	2.7
Water/Sewer Services (Where Applicable)	3.1	2.8	3.2	3.6	2.7	2.0	3.4	3.2
<b>Average Rating for all Attributes by Community</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>

Rating of 1 = Poor; Rating of 5 = Excellent

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey question 1 and primary respondents to question 30.

### 3.3 Average Rating of Community Attributes by Education Level

Table 3-3 reveals the respondents' community satisfaction level in relation to their education. Despite the level of education the lowest average scores are employment opportunities, job opportunities for others in the household and shopping opportunities. Highest satisfaction include the community as a place to live, telephone services, quality of schools/education, and recreational activities.

The average rating for all community services by education level only varies by .3 of a rating point across all community attributes which may indicate that the level of education impacts the perceptions of the community in a minor way. The greatest difference seems to be between those respondents that have less than a high school education and those with advanced degrees in how they view the community as a place to live, the standard of living and recreational areas. In each of these areas it appears that the more education one has the higher they rate these community attributes.

Overall, similar to comparisons of community satisfaction and location, respondents overwhelmingly feel that employment opportunities are not readily available for residents. When asked about the community as a place to live, respondents strongly agreed that Lincoln County is a good place to live. However, when all services were considered, the average response for the County rated 2.8 (out of a possible 5 points) or just above average.

### 3.4 Average Rating of Community Attributes by Employment Status

Table 3-4 compares the average community satisfaction by employment status. Respondents who were unemployed but looking for work generally provided lower ratings of community attributes. Whereas the unemployed but *not* looking for work provided comparable responses to those employed full-time. The highest community satisfaction came from those respondents who were retired but employed part-time and the lowest came from employed part-time students, unemployed looking for work, and unemployed students. There is a high rate of student respondents that have unfavorable feelings of community satisfaction. This may indicate a reason for youth out-migration from the County.



**Table 3-3**  
**Average Rating of Community Attributes by**  
**Education Level<sup>a</sup>**

<b>Community Attributes</b>	<b>Less Than High School</b>	<b>High School Graduate</b>	<b>Some College</b>	<b>Associate 2-year College Degree</b>	<b>Vocational Technical Degree</b>	<b>4-year College Degree</b>	<b>Advanced Degree</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>All Communities Average Score</b>
Employment Opportunities	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.5
Available Housing	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.7	2.0
Quality of Schools/ Education	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.5	3.4
Shopping Opportunities	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.3	1.8
General Government	2.7	2.7	2.8	3.1	2.8	3.1	3.0	2.0	2.8
Police and Fire	3.4	2.9	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.0	3.3
Roads	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.2	2.3	2.9
Local Medical Care	3.2	2.7	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.5	2.9
Job Opportunities for Others in Household	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.2	1.6
Community as a Place to Live	3.6	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.9
Standard of Living (cost of living vs. wages)	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.1	2.7	3.1	3.2	2.7	2.9
Recreational Opportunities	2.7	3.3	3.3	3.8	3.3	3.7	3.5	4.0	3.4
Telephone Services	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.8	3.2	3.5
Electrical Services	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.2	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.4
Garbage Disposal (where applicable)	2.8	2.6	2.7	3.1	2.7	2.7	2.6	3.3	2.8
Water/Sewer Services (where applicable)	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.6	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.2
<b>Average by Education Level</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.8</b>

Rating of 1 = Poor; Rating of 5 = Excellent

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey question 14 and each respondents to question 30.

**Table 3-4**  
**Average Rating of Community Attributes by**  
**Employment Status<sup>a</sup>**

<b>Community Attributes</b>	<b>Employed Full-Time</b>	<b>Employed Part-Time</b>	<b>Retired (employed part-time)</b>	<b>Student (employed part-time)</b>	<b>Working Without Pay</b>	<b>Unemployed (looking for work)</b>	<b>Unemployed (not looking for work)</b>	<b>Homemaker</b>	<b>Student (unemployed)</b>
Employment Opportunities	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.8	1.3	1.4	1.7	1.7
Available Housing	1.9	2.1	1.8	2.2	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.3	2.1
Quality of Schools/ Education	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.2	2.3	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.5
Shopping Opportunities	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.8	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.4
General Government	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.3	2.4	2.5	3.0	2.9	2.7
Police and Fire	3.3	3.2	3.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.4	3.2
Roads	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.7
Local Medical Care	2.8	3.2	2.8	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0	2.7
Job Opportunities for Others in Household	1.6	1.8	1.5	1.5	2.0	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.4
Community as a Place to Live	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.5	4.1	4.0	3.5
Standard of Living (cost of living vs. wages)	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.0	2.7	2.5	2.9	3.0	2.9
Recreational Opportunities	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.5	3.2	3.6
Telephone Services	3.5	3.7	4.0	3.0	4.2	3.1	3.7	3.5	2.6
Electrical Services	3.4	3.4	3.8	2.8	4.4	3.1	3.4	3.7	2.8
Garbage Disposal (where applicable)	2.7	2.8	3.1	2.8	2.4	2.7	2.5	2.2	3.1
Water/Sewer Services (where applicable)	3.2	3.2	3.3	2.4	3.7	2.8	3.1	3.0	2.3
<b>Average by Employment Status</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>

Rating of 1 = Poor; Rating of 5 = Excellent

a/ Derived through cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey question 11 and each respondents to question 30.

### 3.5 Average Rating of the Quality of Roads by Community of Residence and Mode of Transportation to and from Work

The quality of roads in a community has the potential of affecting resident perception of the quality of their living location. Table 3-5 presents the average community satisfaction response for quality of roads for each community broken down by the respondent's mode of transportation to and from work. Regardless of living location almost all residents ranked the quality of their roads as average. Those respondents who walk to and from work indicated that the quality of roads is above average, whereas those who car pool gave responses closer to the average/below average categories. In general the respondents of Rachel rate the quality of their roads highest and the respondents of Pioche rate them the lowest.

**Table 3-5**

**Average Rating of the Quality of Roads by Community of Residence and Mode of Transportation to and from Work<sup>a</sup>**

<b>Mode of Transportation to and from Work</b>	<b>Alamo</b>	<b>Panaca</b>	<b>Caliente</b>	<b>Pioche</b>	<b>Rachel</b>	<b>Other County</b>	<b>Other Pahrnagat Valley</b>	<b>Average Score All Areas</b>
Personal Vehicle	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.9
Car Pool	3.0	1.0	3.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5
Bicycle	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
Walk	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.3	5.0	4.0	3.4
Employer Provided Bus	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
Currently Unemployed, Not Commuting	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.8	1.5	3.0	1.0	2.9
<b>Total Average</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>3.0</b>

Rating of 1 = Poor; Rating of 5 = Excellent

a/ Derived from cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 16 and 30(subpart 5; roads) for each respondent.

### 3.6 Lincoln County Residents That Have Moved Away In the Last 5 Years and For What Reason

Table 3-6 focuses on the number of former residents that survey respondents estimated left the County in the last five years and for what reason. Employment was the number one reason identified by respondents for former residents leaving the County accounting for 41 percent of all that were reported to have left. Education was close behind employment as the stated reason for outmigration at 31 percent. Lack of employment and education were also cited as reasons employed and unemployed students rated satisfaction with the community so low, as indicated previously in Table 3-4. Joining the military and getting married were cited least often as reasons for leaving.

**Table 3-6**  
**Respondent Estimates of the Number**  
**of Lincoln County Residents That Have**  
**Moved Away in the Last 5 Years and**  
**For What Reason<sup>a</sup>**

Reason For Moving	Alamo		Panaca		Caliente		Pioche		Rachel		Other County		Other Pahranaagat Valley		Total Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Employment	36	58.1	34	40.0	22	36.7	9	34.6	1	16.7	2	40.0	0	0.0	104	41.1
Education	9	14.5	28	32.9	24	40.0	11	42.3	2	33.3	2	40.0	2	22.2	78	30.8
Military	9	14.5	1	1.2	1	1.7	2	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	5.1
Married	6	9.7	9	10.6	4	6.7	1	3.8	1	16.7	1	20.0	2	22.2	24	9.5
Other	2	3.2	13	15.3	9	15.0	3	11.5	2	33.3	0	0.0	5	55.6	34	13.4

a/ Derived from cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 1 and 23.

## 4.0 INCOME

The 2010 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey also asked respondents about their household incomes. This information was included to enable Lincoln County and the City of Caliente to better understand the number of households and persons living in homes with incomes at above or below federally designated low/moderate income levels. Information contained in this section can be useful to Lincoln County and City of Caliente staff in justifying the need for State of Nevada and federal grants for public infrastructure, community services and other community/economic development funding. In addition, as income opportunities are gained or lost in the County, the data in this section will be useful in gauging how such losses or gains will impact the number of households that are above or below federally established low/moderate income thresholds.

### 4.1 Methodology and Household Income

The survey questionnaire was finalized and approved by the Board of Lincoln County Commissioners. Prior to survey distribution, a notice of the impending survey was provided through the Lincoln County Record (printed news media). Each household (2,300 total) in Lincoln County was mailed a survey and 540 households completed and submitted the survey for a response rate of 23.5 percent. However, 875 work age respondents (16+) replied to the survey out of a workforce of 1,822 for a 48 percent response. In addition, the 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey contained a cover letter (see Appendix) which explained the purposes of the survey, assured the respondents of confidentiality and described how the results could help the County officials determine the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) requirements for qualifying for grants as explained above.

The survey allowed for a potential of five household member respondents (age 16 or older) to complete the survey questionnaire. Each respondent was considered independently in the tabulation of survey results. Due to missing cases, which resulted from incomplete questionnaires, “adjusted” relative frequencies are reported throughout the tables in this report.<sup>3</sup> Once the respondents returned the questionnaire the results were tabulated, recorded and analyzed with the results included in this report.

The 2009 qualifying household income levels for Lincoln County HUD/CDBG grant eligibility were obtained from the Lincoln County Grant Administrator who obtained them directly from HUD/CDBG officials. Grant criteria require that at least 51 percent of households residing in a community must be at or below the federally set income level in order for the community to qualify for HUD/CDBG grant consideration.

Table 4-1 illustrates the income thresholds established by HUD for households to qualify for federal and state grants.

---

3 Adjusted relative frequencies are the ratios for the number of observations in a statistical category compared to the total number of observations received.

**Table 4-1  
Grant Qualifying  
Household  
Income Levels**

Number of Persons in Household	Income Level
1	\$35,750
2	\$40,850
3	\$45,950
4	\$51,050
5	\$55,150
6	\$59,200
7	\$63,300
8	\$67,400

Source: HUD/CDBG, <http://www.hud.gov/local/nv/community/cdbg/>

#### 4.2 Lincoln County Postal Zip Codes

Table 4-2 contains the postal Zip Codes that were used to reach the 2300 families in Lincoln County.

**Table 4-2  
Lincoln County  
Postal Zip Codes**

89001	Alamo,
89008	Caliente, Carp, Elgin
89017	Hiko, Rachel
89042	Panaca, Lake Valley
89043	Atlanta, Bristol, Castleton, Dry Valley, Eagle Valley, Mt. Wilson, Pioche, Prince, Rose Valley

#### 4.3 Number of Responding Households Who's Household is Either Above or Below the HUD Median Income Level, by Zip Code

As shown in Table 4-3, about half of the households within four of the five zip code areas have household incomes below the HUD minimum income level and half above. Zip Code 89042 (Lake Valley, Panaca) has the largest percentage of households falling below the median income threshold (55 percent) and 45 above the threshold income level. Overall, single and double occupancy households account for the greatest number of respondent households. An

overwhelming majority of single occupancy households fall below their respective income threshold levels.

If the respondents accurately reflect the household income levels of all residents in Lincoln County, it appears that Zip Codes 89001 and 89042 qualify for CDBG grants based on 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey results (see Table 4-3). Because Zip Code areas 89008, 89017 and 89043 are just under the 51 percent threshold (see Table 4-3) further household income analysis in these areas may be warranted to determine eligibility for HUD-funded grants.

Impacts resulting in loss of income within any Lincoln County community would likely result in an increase in the number of households below the median income level. Conversely, new employment and income opportunities with wages exceeding existing prevailing levels would likely reduce the number of households below the median income levels.

#### 4.4 Individual Income Amounts by Work Location

Table 4-4 reflects the individual income levels as indicated by respondents by work location within the communities of Lincoln County. Of the respondents who answered this question, 50 percent reported making between \$0 and \$30,000. The highest paying jobs appear to be located in Caliente, but the results may be skewed because of the larger number of questionnaires returned from those working in Caliente.

When comparing the income levels of survey respondents by work location, the analysis identified that in all categories employees that work in Caliente have the highest percentages for all income levels. This is especially true in the \$30,000 - \$50,000 and \$50,000 or more categories at 37 and 31 percent respectively. Over half of all County residents that responded to the survey indicated that they make \$30,000 or more annually, regardless of work location.

**Table 4-3**  
**Number of Responding Households Whose**  
**Household Income is Either Above or Below the**  
**HUD Median Income Level, by Zip Code<sup>a</sup>**

	89001		89008		89017		89042		89043		Total	
	Below	Above	Below	Above	Below	Above	Below	Above	Below	Above	Below	Above
<b>Household Members</b>												
<b>(Median Income)</b>												
1 member (\$35,750)	17	4	36	9	4	3	18	6	31	12	106	34
As a percent of zip code	39.5	10.0	47.4	11.5	30.8	21.4	31.6	12.8	48.4	19.0	75.7	24.3
2 members (\$40,850)	17	26	27	44	4	8	24	18	21	35	93	131
As a percent of zip code	39.5	65.0	35.5	56.4	30.8	57.1	42.1	38.3	32.8	55.6	41.5	58.5
3 members (\$45,950)	4	4	4	10	1	1	8	5	3	8	20	28
As a percent of zip code	9.3	10.0	5.3	12.8	7.7	7.1	14.0	10.6	4.7	12.7	41.7	58.3
4 members (\$51,050)	2	2	5	3	2	2	3	7	5	4	17	18
As a percent of zip code	4.7	5.0	6.6	3.8	15.4	14.3	5.3	14.9	7.8	6.3	48.6	51.4
5 members (\$55,150)	0	2	2	6	0	0	1	6	2	1	5	15
As a percent of zip code	0.0	5.0	2.6	7.7	0.0	0.0	1.8	12.8	3.1	1.6	25.0	75.0
6 members (\$59,200)	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	7
As a percent of zip code	0.0	2.5	1.3	3.8	7.7	0.0	0.0	2.1	3.1	3.2	36.4	63.6
7 members (\$63,300)	3	0	1	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	6	5
As a percent of zip code	7.0	0.0	1.3	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.5	4.3	0.0	0.0	54.5	45.5
8 or more members (\$67,400)	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	2	4
As a percent of zip code	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	1.8	4.3	0.0	1.6	33.3	66.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>242</b>
<b>Percent of total zip code</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>49.4</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>48.1</b>	<b>51.9</b>	<b>54.8</b>	<b>45.2</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>49.6</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>48.9</b>

a/ Derived from cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey questions 29 and 31.



**Table 4-4**  
**Respondents Individual Income**  
**Amounts By Work Location<sup>a</sup>**

	<b>\$0 - \$10,000</b>		<b>\$10,000 - \$15,000</b>		<b>\$15,000 - \$20,000</b>		<b>\$20,000 - \$30,000</b>		<b>\$30,000 - \$50,000</b>		<b>Over \$50,000</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Alamo	12	12.8	6	21.4	7	18.4	6	10.7	15	14.0	9	8.3	55	12.8
Panaca	10	10.6	1	3.6	4	10.5	11	19.6	17	15.9	11	10.2	54	12.5
Caliente	24	25.5	13	46.4	10	26.3	16	28.6	40	37.4	33	30.6	136	31.6
Pioche	19	20.2	6	21.4	7	18.4	8	14.3	18	16.8	19	17.6	77	17.9
Nevada Test Site	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.8	3	0.7
Nellis Range	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9	1	0.2
Tonopah Test Range	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.9	2	0.5
Clark County	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.6	3	5.4	4	3.7	13	12.0	21	4.9
Other Lincoln County	3	3.2	0	0.0	2	5.3	3	5.4	4	3.7	6	5.6	18	4.2
Other	26	27.7	2	7.1	7	18.4	9	16.1	9	8.4	11	10.2	64	14.8
<b>Total and Percent of Overall Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>21.8</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>431</b>	

a/ Derived from cross-tab analysis of responses to 2009 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey question 13 and all responses to question 18.

## 5.0 LABOR MARKET TRENDS: 1986-2009

To fully understand the current economic conditions in Lincoln County, a look at the prior 20 plus years helps explain labor market trends in the County and provide an understanding of how the labor market may look in the future.

### 5.1 Desired Employment Status of Survey Respondents

Table 5-1 shows the desired employment status of survey respondents since 1986. This table looks at the desired status for all respondents both employed and unemployed. Due largely to aging of the Lincoln County population, the percentage of survey respondents desiring full-time employment has decreased, while those wanting to work part-time have shown a slight increase during the past 23 years.

**Table 5-1**  
**Desired Employment Status**  
**of Survey Respondents 1986-2009**

Status	1986	1990	1993	1998	2004	2009
Full-Time	70.0%	67.0%	68.0%	63.2%	65.9%	61.2%
Part-Time	24.0	22.0	26.0	29.6	28.6	29.1
Other	6.0	11.0	6.0	7.2	5.4	9.6

Sources: Intertech Services Corporation, 1993, 1998, 2004; Resource Concepts, Inc., 1986; RMA Research, 1990.

### 5.2 Unemployment Status of Survey Respondents

Trends in the percentage of survey respondents who are unemployed in the County are shown in Table 5-2. The percentage of homemakers among survey respondents has seen a substantial decrease since 1986. In 1986 the percent of homemakers accounted for 34 percent of unemployed respondents, while in 2009 homemakers only accounted for 19 percent of the unemployed respondents. Conversely, the percentage of unemployed respondents that are actively looking for work has almost tripled since 1986, growing from 14 percent to 54 percent in 2009.

**Table 5-2**  
**Unemployment Status**  
**of Survey Respondents 1986-2009**

Category	1986	1990	1993	1998	2004	2009
Homemaker	34.0%	39.0%	22.2%	23.6%	28.8%	19.2%
Student	17.0	21.0	25.0	8.9	18.6	10.6
Unemployed Looking	14.0	21.0	37.0	35.0	28.0	54.0
Other	32.0	19.0	16.0	32.5	24.6	16.2

Sources: Intertech Services Corporation, 1993, 1998, 2004; Resource Concepts, Inc., 1986; RMA Research, 1990.

### 5.3 Employment Characteristics of Survey Respondents

To better understand the different types of unemployed respondents, an analysis that looks at the three different types of unemployment was undertaken.

- **Discouraged Unemployed:** Person who wants and is available for a job, but who is not looking for one now because he or she feels there are no jobs available or none which he or she is qualified.
- **Underemployed:** A situation in which a worker is employed, but not in the desired capacity, whether in terms of compensation, hours, or level of skill and experience. While not technically unemployed, the underemployed are often competing for available jobs.
- **Unemployed:** Being involuntarily out of work. The government defines unemployment as people who are jobless, looking for jobs, and available for work.

Trends for these three unemployment categories are shown in Table 5-3 from 1990 to 2009. In the past 19 years the percentage of discouraged unemployed has slowly decreased from 14 percent in 1990 to just fewer than 11 percent in 2009. However, the percentage of unemployed has steadily increased from 6.8 percent in 1990 to almost 33 percent in 2009. Those respondents that were underemployed peaked during 1993 and 1998, but has since decreased.

If the number of respondents accurately reflect the actual percentage of workers unemployed in Lincoln County at 32.7 percent, through extrapolation and applied to the entire workforce of Lincoln County in December 2009, which was listed at 1,822 for Lincoln County by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), then the number of unemployed countywide could be 596 individuals rather than the 170 (9.3 percent) workers listed for Lincoln County by the BLS for the same time period.

**Table 5-3**  
**Employment Characteristics**  
**of Survey Respondents, 1990-2009**

Characteristic	1990	1993	1998	2004	2009
Discouraged Unemployed	14.3%	13.3%	10.6%	11.9%	8.6%
Underemployed	8.5	32.1	32.1	24.5	27.7
Unemployed	6.8	16.3	19.7	25.2	33.7

Sources: Intertech Services Corporation, 1993, 1998, 2004; RMA Research, 1990.

### 5.4 NTS/Nellis Employment

Concurrent with rising numbers of unemployed survey respondents, the number and percentages of respondents that are employed at either NTS or the Nellis Range has been decreasing. The 2009 survey identified a continuing reduction in employment by respondents between both sites by more than half from 24 in 2004 to 11 in 2009. A lack of data prevents knowing whether employment losses have occurred at Nellis. However, the labor force at the NTS has been reduced from approximately 11,000 in the late 1980s and early 1990s to 1,643 in December 2009.

When comparing these results to those listed throughout the report, NTS and the Nellis Range are both popular places for residents of Lincoln County to work. Increased employment at both NTS and Nellis could help to strengthen the Lincoln County economy.

**Table 5-4**  
**Respondent Reported NTS/Nellis Employment by Community**

	1986	1990	1993	1998	2004	2009
<b>Total Reported Number of NTS/Nellis Employees Among Survey Respondents</b>	79	170	117	50	24	11
<b>Percent of Total Respondent Reported Employment</b>	4.3%	9.3%	6.4%	4.3%	3.4%	2.7%

**NTS/Nellis Employment as a Percentage of Total Respondent Reported Employment by Place of Residence**

Alamo	7.0%	22.2%	7.4%	5.4%	5.3%	5.6%
Panaca	2.4	3.1	3.4	4.6	1.4	0.0
Caliente	1.5	6.9	3.1	2.9	2.3	4.3
Pioche	2.7	6.9	1.0	1.1	7.0	1.2
Other	12.1	11.8	6.7	11.1	2.2	2.3

Sources: Intertech Services Corporation, 1993, 1998, 2004; Resource Concepts, Inc., 1986; RMA Research, 1990.

## **6.0 WHAT CAN BE DONE TO ENHANCE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR LINCOLN COUNTY RESIDENTS?**

The information contained within this labor market report has the potential for application in formulating and implementing strategies that would enhance employment opportunities within Lincoln County. Attaining the full suite of benefits, which might be derived from applying information contained within this report, will be dependent upon follow-up actions taken by the County, the City of Caliente, and the Lincoln County Regional Development Authority, among others. Use of labor information within this report should include communication of the results; monitoring regional employment opportunities; matching local labor supply characteristics with employer needs; encouraging local access to job training and education; and establishment of effective labor participation programs. A description of these possible initiatives is provided in following sections. The availability of a local work force implied by the results contained herein is one important factor to be used in attracting new business and industry to Lincoln County.

### 6.1 Communicate Results of This Survey

Results of the Lincoln County Labor Market Survey will only be of value to the extent they are communicated to parties capable of assisting in improving employment opportunities locally and to business and industry considering locating in Lincoln County. Key entities to which the results should be conveyed include the Department of Energy and its contractors; the Department of Defense and its contractors; departments of the State of Nevada responsible for employment security, job creation, and economic development; and prospective employers presently or potentially considering expansion or re-location to Lincoln County.

Many respondents to the Lincoln County Labor Market Survey indicated an interest in working at NTS. Lincoln County should correlate County labor availability with NTS project worker requirements and communicate this information to DOE and its contractors. Similarly, employment opportunities at DOD's Nellis Range Complex should be evaluated. The availability of residents fitting Nellis worker requirements should be communicated to DOD officials. Provision of transportation from the County to NTS and Nellis might enhance resident interest in working at these sites. As was shown in Table 2-17, in excess of 206 County residents responded through the survey that they or a former resident they know would be interested in working at NTS or Nellis.

Agencies of the State of Nevada responsible for employment security, job training and economic development can each utilize information contained within this report in creating strategies to improve local employment and income opportunities. The Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) is responsible for collecting and reporting employment information. This information is used to monitor and structure mitigation strategies for excessive rates of unemployment. This Department can also use this information in providing new and expanding industries with data on local availability of prospective employees.

The Nevada Commission on Economic Development and the Lincoln County Regional Development Authority can use labor market data in targeting industry for relocation to the County. Further, the information can be used by state and local economic developers to provide

industrial prospects with labor supply data on the local area. Such data may serve to facilitate decisions to invest in Lincoln County.

## 6.2 Monitor Regional Employment Opportunities

Lincoln County should seek to carefully monitor potential employment opportunities within the region. Given past and current resident commuting patterns, prospective employment generating activities 90 miles from County communities may be considered candidates for employment of area residents. Proponents of all such activities should be formally presented with the results of the Labor Market Survey with a pitch for resident employment. Whenever possible, management of such projects should be encouraged to provide busing to facilitate resident employment. Any project for which Lincoln County may now or in the future have jurisdiction over granting of conditional land use permits should be encouraged to promote local labor participation and where appropriate, busing of resident employees. Activities which should be monitored include highway projects; mining exploration, development and operations; energy production and transmission projects; and activities of DOE and DOD.

A concerted effort should be made to encourage local business interests to apply for and participate in the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) HUBZone Program. SBA established the HUBZone program to promote job growth, capital investment, and economic development to historically underutilized business zones, referred to as HUBZones, by providing contracting assistance to small businesses located in these economically distressed communities. Lincoln County is certified as a HUBZone area and many businesses located in the County may be eligible to participate in the program.

## 6.3 Correlate Local Labor Supply with Employer Needs

Where pending employment opportunities are identified within the region, the County should seek to obtain labor requirements by job skill from project management. This information should be correlated with labor availability information contained within this report as updated periodically. In addition, the County may wish to establish a labor registry for residents available for employment in regional activities. Combined, labor market survey and registry data could be used to demonstrate the extent of local labor availability and job skills. Prospective employers could then be encouraged to draw upon local residents to meet worker requirements.

## 6.4 Encourage Local Access to Job Training and Education

The Labor Market Survey results documented within this report suggests that residents have a strong interest in education in information technologies. It is possible that through use of currently available data transmission technologies certain "back office" functions could be conducted at locations in Lincoln County.

The Nevada Job Training Office, WorkForce Connections, Nevada Commission on Economic Development and the University and Community College System of Nevada should be made aware of job training and education desires of Lincoln County residents. Distance learning technologies could be pursued to improve access to learning by County residents. The

Department of Energy and the Department of Defense should be approached to assist with facilitation and support for local job training and educational opportunities. In addition, labor unions should be approached about facilitating participation of County residents in apprenticeship programs. Target unions should include those having significant numbers of members employed in activities at NTS and Nellis. Barriers to resident participation in such programs should be identified and strategies for overcoming them devised and implemented.

#### 6.5 Establish Effective Labor Participation Programs

Collectively, the initiatives described above should be considered by the County as components to a labor participation program. The County should consider documenting a strategy for developing and implementing such a program. The over-arching goal of the program should be to increase employment of County residents in regional activities to decrease rates of unemployment, underemployment and discouraged unemployed documented within this report. The State of Nevada, Department of Energy, and Department of Defense should each be requested to commit to supporting implementation of the initiatives and accomplishment of program goals. A monitoring process should be established to enable measurement of progress in improving employment and income opportunities within Lincoln County.

## 7.0 REFERENCES

Intertech Services Corporation, *The 1993 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey and Update*, October 1994.

Intertech Services Corporation, *The 1998 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey and Update*, September 1998.

Intertech Services Corporation, *2004 Lincoln County Labor Market Survey*, May 2004.

Morgan, Darwin, Director, Office of Public Affairs, Nevada Test Site, Department of Energy, Personal Conversation, March, 2010

Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation Research and Analysis Bureau, State of Nevada, *Nevada Employment and Payrolls, 2008*, [http://www.nevadaworkforce.com/admin/uploadedPublications/2758\\_2008\\_E\\_and\\_P\\_web.pdf](http://www.nevadaworkforce.com/admin/uploadedPublications/2758_2008_E_and_P_web.pdf)

Nevada State Demographer, *ASRHO Estimates from 2000 to 2005 and Projections from 2006 to 2026 for Nevada and Its Counties*, [http://www.nsbdc.org/what/data\\_statistics/demographer/pubs/](http://www.nsbdc.org/what/data_statistics/demographer/pubs/)

Nevada State Demographer, *Population Estimates of Nevada's Counties, Cities and Unincorporated Towns from July 1986 to July 2009*, [http://www.nsbdc.org/what/data\\_statistics/demographer/pubs/](http://www.nsbdc.org/what/data_statistics/demographer/pubs/)

NVEnergy and NevadaWorks, *Labor Market Assessment of Western Nevada*, May 2009.

Resource Concepts, Inc., *Preliminary Report: Characteristics of the Labor Supply and Commuting Patterns of Workers Within Alamo, Panaca, Caliente, Pioche and Lincoln County Areas*, August 1986.

RMA Research, *Characteristics of the Labor Supply in Lincoln County Communities*, November 1990.

State of Nevada, Office of Community Development Block Grant Program, *2009 Family Income Thresholds*, U.S. Government, Department of Housing and Urban Development, <http://www.hud.gov/local/nv/community/cdbg/>

U.S Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), *Labor Force Data by County, not Seasonally Adjusted, November 2008-December 2009*, <http://www.bls.gov/lau/laucntycur14.txt>

U.S. Small Business Administration, *SBA HubZone Program*, March 2010, <http://www.sba.gov/hubzone/>

U.S. Postal Service, Caliente Office, Caliente, Nevada, November 2009



## **Appendix A**

### **2009 Lincoln County Labor Survey Cover Sheet and Questionnaire**

<b>Lincoln County 2009 Labor Market Survey</b>
--

Dear Lincoln County Resident:

As our nation begins to emerge from the recession, Lincoln County is poised to see renewed interest on the part of existing businesses to expand and for new business and industry to locate in the County. All existing businesses considering expansion within, and new businesses and industries considering locating to Lincoln County must consider the availability and skills of the local labor supply.

This survey is intended to define labor supply characteristics of Lincoln County residents so as to offer existing businesses wishing to expand within, and prospective businesses and industries wishing to relocate to the County the necessary labor information critical to their expansion/relocation decisions. The information obtained through the survey will also enable Lincoln County to work with its economic development partners in designing and implementing effective local continuing education and job training opportunities. **ALL** individual responses to the enclosed survey will remain completely anonymous.

This survey has been mailed to every household in Lincoln County. To ensure that an accurate picture of the Lincoln County labor supply is obtained and that continuing education and job-training needs of County residents are fully identified, it is imperative that as many Lincoln County households as possible complete and return the enclosed survey.

**Your completion and return of the enclosed survey by December 15, 2009 will qualify you for a drawing for one of five \$150.00 cash prizes.** These prizes have been donated by Intertech Services Corporation to encourage Lincoln County households to complete and return the 2009 Labor Market Survey. Included in this mailing is a raffle ticket that may be returned, with your completed survey. Only raffle tickets accompanying a **completed questionnaire** will be entered in the drawing.

A postage paid return envelope is enclosed for your use. Please complete the survey and enclose it in the return envelope. You may also drop-off the completed survey at the following locations:

Lincoln County Clerk's Office, Lincoln County Courthouse, Pioche  
Lincoln County Annex, Justice Court Office, Alamo  
City of Caliente Administrative Office, Caliente

You may also call Doug Bierman (775) 721-4939 or Mike Baughman (775) 315-2544 if you have any questions concerning this questionnaire.

Please return your completed questionnaire by **December 15, 2009**. The winning tickets for the five cash prizes will be drawn during the December 21, 2009 Board of Lincoln County Commissioners meeting in Pioche.

Thank you for your assistance in improving our understanding of labor availability, training desires and employment needs in Lincoln County.

Sincerely,  
Board of Lincoln County Commissioners

**Lincoln County  
LABOR MARKET SURVEY  
2009**

**I. Please complete the following questions for your household.**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Where is your household located? (Circle One)</b>
	1) Alamo 2) Panaca 3) Caliente 4) Pioche 5) Rachel 6) Other County 7) Other Pahranaagat Valley
<b>2.</b>	<b>How many persons presently live in your home?</b> _____
<b>3.</b>	<b>How many members of your household are between the ages of 16 and 65?</b> _____
<b>4.</b>	<b>How many members of your household are currently employed?</b> _____
<b>5.</b>	<b>If retired, do you wish to work?</b> _____
<b>6.</b>	<b>For the retired persons in your home, how many of them formerly worked at NTS or Nellis Range?</b> _____
<b>7.</b>	<b>How long have you lived in Lincoln County?</b> _____
<b>8.</b>	<b>Sex (number of each in household)</b> <div style="text-align: right;">           Male [ <input type="text"/> ]            Female [ <input type="text"/> ]         </div>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Age(s)</b> <div style="text-align: right;">           Male _____            Female _____         </div>

**II. For every employed and unemployed household member 16 years of age or older, please complete the following series of questions. Answer in the same column throughout the survey. Respondent should use Column #1. If no one in your home including yourself is interested in working please go to question 21.**

<b>10.</b>	<b>If you or members of your household have relocated to Lincoln County in the last five years, where was your previous residence?</b>					
		[ 1 ]	[ 2 ]	[ 3 ]	[ 4 ]	[ 5 ]
	1) Las Vegas	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	2) Utah	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	3) Other Nevada	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	4) Arizona	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	5) California	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	6) Other _____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
<b>11.</b>	<b>Please check the category which best describes current employment status. (If retired and not interested in working go to Question 21.)</b>					
		[ 1 ]	[ 2 ]	[ 3 ]	[ 4 ]	[ 5 ]
	1) Unemployed (looking for work)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	2) Unemployed ( <u>not</u> looking for work)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	3) Employed Full-time	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	4) Employed Part-time	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	5) Working without pay in family business or ranch	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	6) Homemaker	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	7) Retired (employed part-time)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	8) Student (employed part-time)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	9) Student (unemployed)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
<b>12.</b>	<b>Desired employment status</b>					
		[ 1 ]	[ 2 ]	[ 3 ]	[ 4 ]	[ 5 ]
	1) Full-time or equivalent	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	2) Part-time	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	3) Other _____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
<b>13.</b>	<b>Current place of employment</b>					
		[ 1 ]	[ 2 ]	[ 3 ]	[ 4 ]	[ 5 ]
	1) Alamo	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	2) Panaca	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	3) Caliente	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	4) Pioche	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	5) Nevada Test Site	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
	6) Nellis Range	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

7) Tonopah Test Range	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8) Clark County	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9) Other Lincoln County	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10) Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>14.</b>	<b>Education level achieved</b>				
------------	---------------------------------	--	--	--	--

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1) Less than High School	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) High School Graduate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Some College	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Associate 2-year College Degree	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) Vocational and Technical Degree	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6) Four-year College Degree	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7) Advanced Degree (Master, Professional, Doctorate, Etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8) Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>15.</b>	<b>Marital status</b>				
------------	-----------------------	--	--	--	--

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1) Single	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Married	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Divorced	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>16.</b>	<b>Transportation to and from work</b>				
------------	--	--	--	--	--

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1) Personal Vehicle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Car Pool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Bicycle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Walk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) Employer Provided Bus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6) Currently Unemployed, Not Commuting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>17.</b>	<b>Approximately what is the <u>annual</u> transportation expense for each member of your household to commute to and from work?</b>				
------------	--	--	--	--	--

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1) \$0 - \$500	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) \$500 - \$1,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) \$1,000 - \$2,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Over \$2,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>18.</b>	<b>What is the approximate <u>gross</u> income (before taxes) for <u>each</u> employed household member?</b>					
		[ 1 ]	[ 2 ]	[ 3 ]	[ 4 ]	[ 5 ]
	1) \$0 - \$10,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2) \$10,000 - \$15,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3) \$15,000 - \$20,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4) \$20,000 - \$30,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5) \$30,000- \$50,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	6) Over \$50,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>19.</b>	<b>Indicate the economic sector most closely related to each person's current occupation.</b>					
		[ 1 ]	[ 2 ]	[ 3 ]	[ 4 ]	[ 5 ]
	1) Agriculture/Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2) Mining	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3) Construction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4) Retail Trade	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5) Wholesale Trade	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	6) Finance/Insurance/Real Estate/Transp./Warehouse	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	7) Services (Business or Personal)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	8) Manufacturing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	9) Utilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	10) State and Local Government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	11) Federal Government – Civilian	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	12) Federal Government - Military	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>20.</b>	<b>If anyone in your household works at NTS or Nellis Range, where is the job site?</b>					
		[ 1 ]	[ 2 ]	[ 3 ]	[ 4 ]	[ 5 ]
	1) Forward Areas of NTS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2) Service Area (Mercury)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3) Other Location_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>21.</b>	<b>If anyone in your household works at NTS or Nellis Range, through which gate do they access the site?</b>					
		[ 1 ]	[ 2 ]	[ 3 ]	[ 4 ]	[ 5 ]
	1) Valley Road/Gate 700	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2) Mercury	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3) Other_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

22.	<p><b>If anyone in your household is a union member, please indicate the names(s) of the union.</b></p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
23.	<p><b>During the past 5 years, how many previous members of your household moved away from Lincoln County? Please indicate how many moved and for what reason.</b></p> <p>1) Employment _____</p> <p>2) Education _____</p> <p>3) Military _____</p> <p>4) Married _____</p> <p>5) Other _____</p>
24.	<p><b>If new employment opportunities became available in Lincoln County at a wage of at least \$21.00 per hour, how many former household members would return to the County to live and work in the area?</b> _____</p>
25.	<p><b>Of these possible returning household residents, how many would return for job opportunities at the NTS or the Nellis Range?</b> _____</p>
26.	<p><b>How many current household members would be willing to work at NTS or the Nellis Range, if job opportunities were available?</b> _____</p>
27.	<p><b>If union apprenticeship programs were available locally, what types of training would you like to see offered? (Please rank in order of priority, "1" being the highest and "8" being the least important)</b></p>
	<p>1) Heavy Equipment Operations _____</p> <p>2) Electrical _____</p> <p>3) Plumbing _____</p> <p>4) Environmental Control Technologies _____</p> <p>5) Metal/Iron Working _____</p> <p>6) Heating/Ventilation/Air Conditioning _____</p> <p>7) Carpentry _____</p> <p>8) Other _____</p>
28.	<p><b>If courses through the College of Southern Nevada in Lincoln County were expanded, what types of courses would you like to see offered? (Please rank in order of priority, "1" being the highest and "10" being the least important)</b></p>
	<p>1) Vocational Training _____</p> <p>2) General Education _____</p> <p>3) Business/Accounting/Finance _____</p> <p>4) Computers/Information Management _____</p> <p>5) Dental Technician _____</p> <p>6) Arts _____</p> <p>7) Medical Technician _____</p> <p>8) Automobile Mechanics _____</p> <p>9) Drafting/Cartography _____</p>

- 10) Environmental Technology (including const., \_\_\_\_\_ operation and/or maintenance of renewable energy systems)
- 11) Other \_\_\_\_\_

**29. In order to qualify for federal and state funds for projects needed by Lincoln County and the City of Caliente, we must determine the number of persons in your household and the income level of your family.**

Please indicate the number of persons in your family and whether your family's income is above or below the figure shown for the size of your family.

Please Check The Line Corresponding To The Number Of Persons In Your Household		Please Indicate If Your Family Income Is Below or Above The Amount Corresponding To The Number of Persons In Your Household	
		Below	Above
1_____	\$35,750	_____	_____
2_____	\$40,850	_____	_____
3_____	\$45,950	_____	_____
4_____	\$51,050	_____	_____
5_____	\$55,150	_____	_____
6_____	\$59,200	_____	_____
7_____	\$63,300	_____	_____
8+_____	\$67,400	_____	_____

**30. Please have members of your household rate the following community characteristics on a scale of 1 to 5. (1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=good, 5=excellent)**

	[ 1 ]	[ 2 ]	[ 3 ]	[ 4 ]	[ 5 ]
1) Employment Opportunities	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
2) Available Housing	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
3) Quality of Schools/Education	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
4) Shopping Opportunities	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
5) Local Government Services					
General Government	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Police and Fire	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Roads	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
6) Local Medical Care	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
7) Job Opportunities for others in household	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
8) Community as a place to live	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
9) Standard of Living (cost of living vs. wages)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
10) Recreational Opportunities	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
11) Telephone Services	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
12) Electrical Services	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
13) Garbage Disposal (where applicable)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
14) Water/Sewer Services (where applicable)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]



31. Please indicate the zip code for the location of your household. \_\_\_\_\_
32. Have you ever started a private business in Lincoln County? Y \_\_\_N\_\_\_
33. Did the business SUCCEED \_\_\_\_\_ FAIL \_\_\_\_\_
34. Type of Business \_\_\_\_\_
35. Reasons for Success or Failure \_\_\_\_\_
- 

**Thank You! By Completing and Returning This Survey By December 15, 2009 You Have Become Eligible to Win One of Five \$150 Cash Prizes!**

To participate in the drawing for one of five \$150 cash prizes, please include your phone number and/or address on one half of the raffle ticket included with this survey and return the raffle ticket with your completed survey in the envelope provided by either mailing the survey (no postage required) or dropping the survey off at one of the following locations:

Lincoln County Clerk's Office, Lincoln County Courthouse, Pioche  
 Lincoln County Annex, Justice Court Office, Alamo  
 City of Caliente Administrative Office, Caliente

To be eligible for the drawing, your completed survey **must be returned by December 15, 2009**. If your raffle ticket is one of five drawn during the December 21, 2009 Board of Lincoln County Commissioners meeting, you will be notified by telephone or mail that you are one of five winners of a \$150.00 cash prize.

**Thank You for Helping to Provide Community Facilities,  
 New Jobs and Income in Lincoln County!**