

10-31-1995

A Study of Community Interaction

Ernst W. Stromsdorfer
Washington State University

Grant Forsyth
Washington State University

Richard Oxley

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcepartnerships>

 Part of the [Service Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stromsdorfer, Ernst W.; Forsyth, Grant; and Oxley, Richard, "A Study of Community Interaction" (1995). *Partnerships/Community*. Paper 30.

<http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcepartnerships/30>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Barbara A. Holland Collection for Service Learning and Community Engagement (SLCE) at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Partnerships/Community by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



KITSAP COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM
PUBLIC AWARENESS COMMITMENT OF KITSAP (PACK)

A STUDY OF COMMUNITY INTERACTION

**Ernst W. Stromsdorfer
Department of Economics
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164-4860**

with the assistance of

**Grant Forsyth
Department of Economics
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164-4860**

and

**Richard Oxley
Port Orchard, Washington**

A study Sponsored by

**The Washington Service Corps
P.O. Box 9046
Olympia, Washington 98507-9046**

Based on Work Supported by the

**Corporation for National and Community Service
Grant No. 93DCSTWA0004**

FINAL REPORT: WAVES 1 AND 2 COMBINED

October 31, 1995

**NSLC
c/o ETR Associates
4 Carbonero Way
Scotts Valley, CA 95066**

ABSTRACT

KITSAP COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM PUBLIC AWARENESS COMMITMENT OF KITSAP (PACK) A STUDY OF COMMUNITY INTERACTION

This study analyses selected aspects of the community impact of the Kitsap Community Action Program projects entitled "The Public Awareness of Kitsap" (PACK). PACK was initiated as a response to a downsizing of Department of Defense activities in Kitsap County. With PACK, the Kitsap Community Action Program (KCAP) joined hands with the Washington Service Corps in an effort funded by the Defense Conversion Assistance program to revitalize the local Bremerton and Kitsap County economies.

This revitalization was to be achieved, in part, through economic diversification and job training as well as through the provision of new, or the enhancement of, existing community and social services. PACK incorporates both long range and short term goals. The short term goals reflect the need to enhance economic and social services to the community. The long range goals are intended to marshal continuing community support to the process of adjustment to economic and social change. Five distinct PACK teams were developed to bring these results about. They were:

- The Employment Diversification Team
- The Safe Street Team
- The YWCA Domestic Violence Team
- The Food/Shelter Team
- The Main Street Team

KCAP/PACK focused on securing the interest and cooperation of city and county government agencies, private nonprofit agencies, and private sector firms. Therefore, this study focuses on the impact of PACK actions and activities on these three groups of agencies and firms. A scientific sample of government agencies, private nonprofit agencies, and private sector firms was selected. The probability of selection was random within each sector but the method of selection varied between sectors. Since the data reported in this study are unweighted, comparisons can be made between sectors and within a sector, but a combined experience for all sectors cannot be reported. The failure to combine the three sectors into a common sample is done, however, because the economic conditions facing each sector as well as the incentives each sector responds to, and the behavior evidenced, are so different that combining all three is considered statistically and conceptually inappropriate. (See the appendix to Stromsdorfer et al., 1995 for a discussion of the sampling procedures.)

All three sector samples were interviewed, first in the summer and early fall of 1994 and then again in the late spring and summer of 1995. These two waves correspond with the first and second ten month cycles of the PACK Teams' operations. A questionnaire was designed and administered to this sample. It was revised slightly between the first and second waves to reflect the passage of time in the program. (The appendix to this study displays the detailed structure of the questionnaire and the way in which the questionnaire was coded. See the report on the first wave, Stromsdorfer et al., 1995, for the fully formatted questionnaire.)

Sample Attrition between Wave 1 and Wave 2. There was attrition of about 25% in the total sample between the two interview waves. A very small amount of this attrition--3 percentage points--was due to refusals to be interviewed a second time, largely by private sector firms. Six percentage points of the attrition were due to the closure of private sector firms. Only 11 government agencies had unusable data or dropped from the sample, from an initial base of 47. But 12 of the nonprofit agencies had unusable data or dropped from the sample, from an initial base of 67, while 24 of the private sector firms dropped from an initial base of 72--one third.

Summary of the Overall KCAP/PACK Experience

KCAP and its PACK teams generated a wide variety of goods and services in the Kitsap County and Bremerton environs. In the process of doing so, KCAP attempted to increase the involvement of relevant agencies and firms in the process of economic and social regeneration of the local economy. There are no measures available of similar programs in similar areas against which to compare the experience of KCAP/PACK. However, in terms of the provision of services, the data do suggest that in absolute terms, KCAP has accomplished a large part of which it set out to do. There were two broad types of output:

- First, by the end of the program, PACK Teams have provided approximately \$2,000,000 worth of additional economic and social services to the Kitsap County economy and polity, when these services are valued at the **cost of their inputs**. These direct benefits reflect largely the achievement of the short term goals of the several Teams.
- Second, the KCAP agency and its PACK Teams have largely succeeded in drawing some government agencies, private nonprofit agencies, and the private sector firms into the social and economic process of responding to adverse social and economic change, at least in the sense that these organizations are highly aware of the presence of KCAP/PACK and its mission in the community. Awareness of the KCAP/PACK was very high during the first 10 month program period--essentially universal, if one gives due allowance for sampling variation. This situation did not change materially for the analysis of the second 10 month program period.

A Broad Assessment

There was the intention that this \$2,000,000 infusion of services, plus the demonstration effect of the organization and provision of such services, would help slow or reverse the process of downward economic change in the immediate Bremerton area. The data in this report cannot address this question of economic development either in the positive or the negative. Surely, the services and the benefits people derived from them were provided that might otherwise not have been available. But the economic development issue simply cannot be addressed. In addition, to further obscure the detection of any net program impact, the economy overall has improved to the point that the local unemployment rate reflects essentially full employment, though pockets of structural unemployment may still exist. Any obvious effects of the program, if they exist, are most certainly overshadowed by the phenomenon of full employment. On the other hand, there likely was some increased social interaction, as documented in the data we present. This increased social interaction is a positive social benefit, even though its exact value to society is extremely difficult to quantify. The only remaining question is how intensive this interaction became and how long it will remain once the program ends.

KITSAP COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM
PUBLIC AWARENESS COMMITMENT OF KITSAP (PACK)
A STUDY OF COMMUNITY INTERACTION

Introduction

This study analyzes selected aspects of the community impact of the Kitsap Community Action Program projects entitled "The Public Awareness of Kitsap" (PACK). PACK was initiated in Kitsap County, Washington in 1993 in response to an incremental downsizing of Department of Defense activities in Kitsap County--in the immediate instance, the downsizing of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and several other facilities. The most recent incremental downsizing of the Shipyard alone resulted in more than 2,300 permanent layoffs. In addition to the direct economic effect of these layoffs, a negative multiplier effect had further depressing economic effects on the local and regional economy.¹

With PACK, the Kitsap Community Action Program (KCAP) joined with the Washington Service Corps in a \$2,000,000 effort funded by the Defense Conversion Assistance Program to revitalize the local Bremerton and Kitsap County economy.² This revitalization is to be achieved through economic diversification and job training as well as through the enhancement of community and social services.

The Washington Service Corps is the grant recipient and has subcontracted the development effort of the Kitsap County Community Action Program. The PACK project, operating in two ten month sequences, involves about 50 persons per sequence, divided into five separate teams as noted below. KCAP is their site coordinator. Each ten month sequence has a different set of participants distributed across the five teams. Thus, up to around 100 individuals are affected by the PACK project. KCAP initially subcontracted to four other organizations: The YWCA; the Economic Development Council; the Main Street Association; and, the Safe Streets program. The five components to the PACK project are:

- The Employment Diversification Team
- The Safe Street Team
- The YWCA Domestic Violence Team
- The Food/Shelter Team
- The Main Street Team

Exhibit 1 below sets forth the short term and long range goals of the PACK projects. The short term goals are operational in nature, involving efforts at direct actions to ameliorate the negative economic and social effects of the downsizing. Review of these short term goals reveals that a component of the strategy of these teams is to increase the service capacity of existing community organizations. The long range goals focus on bringing about fundamental changes in the behavior of the key social groups in the economy and polity of the Kitsap County area. In contrast to the long range goals of PACK, the five

¹ Across the national economy, the multiplier effect is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 2.0. Thus, for example, if the recent downsizing initially cut the flow of expenditures in the local economy by \$1,000,000, the final impact of the downsizing would be a drop in total economy-wide expenditures of \$2,000,000.

² To place these numbers in context, KCAP's annual budget was about \$4,000,000 in 1993. Total public expenditures in Kitsap County were \$71,230,630 in calendar year 1992. The total wages paid in the Kitsap County economy were about \$1,620 million in calendar year 1992. Clearly, the PACK effort, spread over 20-month period of actual program activity, can only have a small marginal effect--mainly one of providing seed money and demonstration effects.

Exhibit 1. Short Term and Long Range Goals of Public Awareness Commitment of Kitsap

Short Term Goals

- Engage a broad spectrum of community members in transforming their long-standing support of military service efforts to support community based national service efforts.
- Offer a diverse group of unemployed and out-of-school residents, especially those seeking ways to better their community, a constructive means to channel their enthusiasm.
- Secure the commitment of local units of government and community organizations to provide initial and ongoing resources to support this project.
- Challenge residents adversely affected by the downsizing to be part of a community supported local and national service effort.

Long Range Goals

- Significantly increase the willingness of the community at large to view all its members as people with talent and ability to make positive changes.
- Bridge the gap of understanding between the relative priority and importance of military and civilian national service efforts.
- Foster a long term commitment of local community financial support for the expansion and continuation of these efforts.
- Demonstrate the importance of balancing readjustment and retraining activities for impacted workers with community service priorities that assist others in the community at large.
- Develop leadership qualities among team members so they can help initiate and operate the member generated projects.

Source: Diana Theroux. 1993. "Revised Two Year Plan". Memo to William Basl. Bremerton, WA: Kitsap Community Action Program PACK. November 22.

team projects are oriented toward direct action. Each has a variety of measurable objectives that are specified for realization over the two year period of project operation. These outcomes are detailed in the source cited for Exhibit 1. They include such actions as:

- recruitment of new businesses for the local economy
- educating youth about the dangers of drug use
- supporting domestic violence victims through family advocacy activities
- construction of housing
- restoration of buildings
- restoration and maintenance of parks and building grounds

In addition to the above examples, there is a wide variety of comparable tasks and outcomes that were to be achieved during the program period.

This report focuses on the attempt to measure community response to the five long range goals and the last of the four short term goals of the PACK. This report is not a net impact study.³ Rather, it studies the process whereby a community action agency attempts to serve as a catalyst as well as a direct participant in a community's response to adverse economic change.

Key Questions of the Study

The study attempts to answer the following questions:

- What was the economic and social impact on the economy and society of the downsizing as perceived by key managers, directors, and owners of their respective governmental agencies, nonprofit agencies, and private sector firms?
- How were their organizations and firms affected?
- What was their response to the downsizing as it affected their organizations, the local area, or both?
- What role did KCAP and PACK play in the response of agencies and firms? How did these agencies and firms respond to the efforts of KCAP and PACK to provide economic and social services and effect economic change in the County and Bremerton?

The Economic Context for KCAP/PACK

The economic context of the local and county economy is a benchmark against which to compare the responses to the questionnaire that was administered during the two ten-month service periods of the PACK teams. This context will influence the ways in which government and nonprofit agencies and private sector firms respond to the incentives and services offered by the PACK. In particular, one can

³ A net impact study attempts to measure the effects of a program policy or treatment exclusive of the effects of all other intervening phenomena. The social costs of the policy or treatment are also measured and compared to the social benefits to see if the additional benefits of the program cover its additional costs. The present study does not use this method of analysis. There is no control or comparison group or agency or community in this analysis. None of the effects of intervening variables is accounted for, such as the continuous growth of the city of Silverdale, near to Bremerton, which clearly is drawing business away from downtown Bremerton. In this study we count the \$2,000,000 by KCAP as a community benefit attributable only to KCAP and accounting for no possible displacement or substitution of the services of these funds for other social program activities. Benefits are simply the sum of the resources expended. It is important to recognize that this assumption, in general, will not be correct. Net benefits generated by a social program may be equal to, larger than, or smaller than the resources expended to create them.

hypothesize that the more depressed the local economy becomes as a result of the downsizing, the more likely the community and its various organizations, agencies, and firms will respond to the positive efforts of the PACK teams.

Comprehensive economic data for the State of Washington at the county level are recorded in the *Data Book*, the most recent edition of which is that of 1994 and which reports on various economic phenomena up to and sometimes including 1993. Detailed data from various issues of the *Data Book* are shown in Exhibits 2, 3, and 4 in Stromsdorfer et al., 1995. The data will not be reproduced here. The results of that analysis are summarized as follows:

Broad Indices of Economic Well-being

- **The Sales Tax.** State and local governments in the State of Washington are heavily dependent on the sales tax for operating revenues since there is no state or local income tax. So, sales tax revenues are an index of the economic health of local government. Through 1993, sales tax revenues actually rose in Kitsap County, though the percent change between 1992 and 1993 was a small 1.32% compared to 12.02 percent between 1991 and 1992. This decline in growth of the sales tax revenue, other things equal, implies a decline in the growth of consumption in the area, both in the private sector and in the government sector. In 1993 the County had sales tax revenues of about \$9,560,000. Note that even though sales taxes rose a small amount, in the absence of the downsizing, they may have risen much more--to as much as a million dollars more, based on trends from the previous two years. Thus, the level of services could not increase in the County, other things equal, and in real terms must have fallen since inflation economy-wide was 3.9% between 1992 and 1993--three times more than 1.32%, thus lowering the purchasing power of public expenditures.
- **Per Capita Personal Income.** Per capita income rose in nominal terms (unadjusted for inflation) from \$10,880 in 1981 to \$17,488 in 1991. But in real terms (adjusted for inflation), per capita income was only \$11,659 in 1991. It thus rose only about \$72 per year in real terms--essentially unchanged from year to year. The economy's productivity was barely growing during this period. Jobs were being added, but people were not necessarily better off since real income per capita was not increasing. It is important to note, however, that this general condition characterizes much of the national economy during the period discussed (Cassidy, 1995).
- **Employment.** The periodic downsizing of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard has had a continuing depressing effect on government employment and earnings⁴ in the Bremerton and Kitsap County labor market areas. Between 1981 and 1995, government employment dropped from about 34,300 to about 26,200. It was about 29,200 in 1992. Private sector employment in 1981 was about 25,600. Non-governmental employment in 1995 was about 42,000.⁵ It was about 37,700 in 1992. Thus, the non-governmental sector increase in employment has more than compensated for the drop in public sector employment of about 8,100. The unemployment rate in the Bremerton labor market area was only 4.9% in August 1995, a very low historical figure that most economists would argue implies essentially full employment. One could argue from this statistic that the economy was essentially recovered from the most recent Shipyard downsizing, where it not for the less favorable data on earnings below.
- **Earnings.** As suggested above, increased employment does not necessarily mean that persons are better off. They must give up leisure, home production and other activities if they enter the labor

⁴ **Income** is defined as money resources that come from any source, such as rent, interest, profits, transfer payments of all types, and earnings. **Earnings** is money that is derived only from payment for work that an individual does in the market place.

⁵ Non-governmental employment is the sum of private and private nonprofit employment. Available data did not allow the direct reporting of private employment levels.

market and work. In fact, real earnings dropped in the private sector over the 1981 to 1992 period from \$16,030 to \$11,733. This is an average annual rate of drop of \$390 per year. Part of this drop is due to a broader trend in the economy at large, however, since in the past 20 years or so, real earnings have grown only about one percent across the national economy (Cassidy, 1995).

In summary, the economy is creating jobs, but structural change and possible stagnant productivity have resulted in stagnant per capita income and falling real wages. Per capita real income has not fallen because more family members have entered the labor market--in particular, married women with children. There is more market work, but less leisure and less home production, other things equal.

Indices of Government Activity

What has happened to government services? How have they changed during this period of downsizing? Is there a role for KCAP/PACK to compensate for any decline in government services?

- **Per Capita Government Expenditures.** Real (inflation adjusted) total per capita government expenditures have risen from about \$183 to \$249 between 1983 and 1992. Perhaps in response to worsening economic conditions, real per capita expenditures jumped by \$69, or about 27%, between 1990 and 1992.
- **Social Expenditures.** Crimes against property generally rise during hard times. Real expenditures per capita for security of persons and property rose from about \$49 in 1990 to about \$57 in 1992. Mental health of individuals suffers during periods of economic distress. The long term community response in real terms has been to cut expenditures per capita from about \$19 to about \$10 between 1983 and 1992, however. Finally, expenditures per capita on the environment have risen over this same time period from about \$3 to about \$14. The exact reasons for all three of these changes are not clear.

In summary, the above picture represents a period of considerable economic change. Public expenditures per capita are rising in the County, perhaps in response to worsening economic conditions and past reductions in public sector employment and drops in federal defense spending in the region. However, we have no way of verifying this assumption.

Economic and Social Experiences of Agencies and Firms Since the Downsizing

A Note on Method. As noted above, two waves of interviews were conducted of a random sample of private sector firms and government and nonprofit agencies. In the analysis to follow, the primary focus is on the first wave of interviews, where the sample size is larger, and, therefore, more informative. The second wave is discussed only when there appears to be a significant difference between the first and second wave. Finally, we should note that the pattern of changes is often confounded by differential nonresponse; the overall effective sample drops from 186 observations to 140 observations between Wave 1 and Wave 2.

Operation Levels. For the public and private nonprofit agencies responding, only a small percentage suffered a decrease in the provision of services to the community--17% during the first ten month period of PACK Team operation and a similar 12% during the second period. In each period, about half of the organizations (47% and 46% in the respective two periods) did not have their budget affected. In each period, about two-fifths of the organizations experienced an increase in their operations and service provision.

During the first wave, 40 agencies stated that their delivery of services increased, but about half indicated that they had no idea of the degree of the increase. A comparable number--35--had the same experience in the second wave, but only a small percent--11%--indicated they had no idea of the degree of

increase or the amount of dollars involved. The *expansion of services*, for those reporting, was 44% in the first wave, but dropped to about 15% in the second wave. Nonprofit agencies maintained a constant level of increase in their services over the two waves--from 21% in the first wave to 23% during the second wave.⁶

Government agencies that experienced a decrease in their service level had a drop of about 25% during the first wave, but reported a drop of only about 5% during the second wave. This pattern holds for private nonprofit agencies as well, with those experiencing a drop in the first wave suffering a decrease of 56%, but with that decrease, when it occurs in the second wave, falling by only 10% or so.

An overwhelming majority of the government and private nonprofit agencies whose service level did not increase felt that an increase in their service level was warranted. As a group, they argued for an increase in their service level from about one-third in the first wave to about two-fifths in the second wave. For those reporting a dollar amount as a need level during the first wave, the sums approached a third of a million dollars, on the average. This amount was scaled down dramatically during the second wave to just a few tens of thousands of dollars.

Employment Levels in Local Firms and Agencies. As Exhibit 2 shows, in both the first and second waves, the majority of government agencies and private nonprofit agencies have increased their employment over the approximate two year period of the program operation. There is little difference in the experience of agencies and private sector firms between the two waves when you give due allowance to attrition from the sample and expected sampling variation. About half of the private nonprofit agencies maintained their labor force over the full study period, but this group also suffered the largest decreases in employment among the three types of employers, when decreases did occur. Somewhere between a fourth to a sixth of the private sector firms did experience a decrease in their employment. This is certainly a nontrivial range of decrease, in particular if it holds for the private sector firms in the immediate Bremerton area. However, as we have seen above, the overall employment level in the county economy as a whole is extremely high by historical standards, estimated during this past August 1995 at less than 5%.⁷

Wage Rates in Local Firms and Agencies. Again, the proportionate changes in wage setting experience between the first and second waves of the program operation do not change much when due allowance is given to attrition from the sample and sampling variation. In the first wave, less than 10% of all of the organizations and firms were forced to cut wages. This drops to a trivial level in the second wave. However, over a third of the government agencies had no wage rate increase over the period. Since there has been inflation of 3% to 4% over this period, the workers in these agencies can be said to have had a fall in their real wages; that is, a drop in the effective purchasing power of their earnings.

On the other hand, over half of the government agencies, two fifths of the private nonprofit agencies and about 70% of private sector firms did experience increase in their money wage rates. Government agencies that did raise wages claimed to have raised them from between 4% to 6%; private nonprofit agencies, from about 6% to 8%; private nonprofit firms, from 8% to 9%. Thus, for these workers and organizations, real wage rates rose on net even in the presence of any measured inflation.

⁶ Note that while there is a percentage point change over time of two percentage points, due to the small sample and the fact of sample attrition, it is reasonable to assume that no effective change occurred.

⁷ Loss of employment due to a recession is a dead-weight loss. No necessary compensating social benefits accrue as a result of this type of unemployment. Unemployment brought about by structural change in the economy--domestic or international competition, technology, social policy changes such as the end of the Cold War--reflect a process of resource reallocation and potential productivity improvement in the economy. Some long term structural unemployment could still exist in the local economy, however. This type of chronic unemployment does represent a social cost.

Exhibit 2. Employment Levels in Firms and Agencies in Kitsap County

Impact	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
EMPLOYMENT						
Increase						
Wave 1	22	49	17	27	31	43
Wave 2	18	50	5	10	20	42
Decrease						
Wave 1	8	18	17	27	18	25
Wave 2	6	17	17	33	7	15
No Change						
Wave 1	15	33	30	47	23	32
Wave 2	12	33	29	57	21	44
WAGE RATES						
Increase						
Wave 1	24	53	26	41	50	70
Wave 2	23	68	18	41	32	70
Decrease						
Wave 1	4	9	6	9	4	6
Wave 2	0	0	2	5	1	2
No Change						
Wave 1	17	38	24	38	17	24
Wave 2	11	32	16	36	16	28

Note: Percentages are column percentages. Percentages may not add to 100.0 due to rounding. This note applies to all subsequent tables in the text.

In summary, there is evidence of some economic distress among firms in the private sector. Only about two fifths of the firms have experienced employment growth. Some workers have experienced a drop in real wage rates. There has been some employment cutback in a small plurality of government and private nonprofit agencies. At least the very local Bremerton economy has suffered adverse change, even though at this time, as noted above, the overall economy is performing well in terms of the simple index of the aggregate unemployment rate which is now less than 5% as of the late summer, 1995. In any case, there is clearly a role to play in this economy for an organization such as KCAP and its PACK projects, since the benefits of high employment are never uniformly distributed across the economy.

Perceptions of Social Conditions. It is possible that social well-being has deteriorated in the Kitsap County region over the period, though this condition does not seem to have changed in any clear cut way over the 20 month or so period of the Teams' operations. Large majorities of the respondents in the three sectors report that crime conditions appear to have worsened since the downsizing. However, this proportionate judgment was reduced among the private sector firms from 85% in the first wave to 71% in the second wave--less than a year later. In addition, *the direct experience* of the government agencies and of private sector firms with crime *decreased* between the two waves.

There is little change in the relative emphasis of the most frequent crime problems reported over the period of the PACK Teams' projects. This is particularly true of the private sector firms, for whom felony crime and vandalism are a major concern. Vandalism increased in importance and child abuse decreased in importance in the experience of government agencies. Private nonprofit agencies focused on felony crime, vandalism, and spouse abuse over the entire period.

The perceptions of government agencies and private sector firms have changed for the better over the period concerning observed increases of poverty and homelessness. However, over the project period about 85% of the private nonprofit agencies continue to believe that poverty and homelessness have increased. No one believes that these problems have decreased.

During the first wave, roughly one fifth of each of the three types of organizations believed that the quantity of social services delivered decreased; this pattern changed somewhat during the second wave, with the proportion increasing of government agencies expressing the feeling that services had decreased while this proportion changed from 18% to 13% for private sector firms. By the second wave, over three fifths of the private sector firms feel that the level of services has stayed the same over time--an increase from slightly less than 50% during the first wave.

Responses to Social Conditions. The general perception is that social conditions either have not changed over time or have worsened somewhat--depending on the sector one queries or the time period in question. In view of these perceptions, what has been the response of the key sectors of the community?

A comparison of Wave 1 with Wave 2 responses shows that increasing proportions of all three sectors have made no response to perceived community conditions. In particular, private nonprofit agencies increased their relative inaction from 42% to 82%. During Wave 1 there was a significant effort to attempt to serve more clients--with 32% of the private nonprofit agencies so responding. By the second wave, this particular response on the part of the private nonprofit agencies had dropped to 10%. However, we should note that the numbers of agencies involved in these responses is low, so the estimated percent count be subject to substantial sampling variation. *Even so, a condition of little response during the first wave has been reduced to one of almost no response during the second wave.*

Thus, KCAP and its PACK Teams continue to fill a need in the community, for there does not seem to be a headlong rush for other agencies and firms to change their traditional behavior. However, it is appropriate to point out that other government and private nonprofit agencies may not have the institutional flexibility, the appropriate legal structure, or the mandate to act in the same way that KCAP

Exhibit 3. Community Awareness of KCAP Program Components

NUMBER AND PERCENT AWARE OF KCAP PROGRAMS						
Program Component	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Kitsap Emergency Housing						
Wave 1	38	81	51	77	48	70
Wave 2	30	83	54	98	36	80
WIC						
Wave 1	40	85	57	86	35	51
Wave 2	28	78	55	100	26	58
Headstart/ECAP						
Wave 1	47	100	64	97	66	96
Wave 2	35	97	55	100	44	98
Energy/Weatherization Services						
Wave 1	38	81	55	83	40	58
Wave 2	23	64	49	89	28	62
Community Services						
Wave 1	34	72	43	65	35	51
Wave 2	28	78	47	85	27	60
Food Services						
Wave 1	32	68	52	79	51	74
Wave 2	25	69	46	84	37	82
Family Self Sufficiency						
Wave 1	20	43	28	43	13	19
Wave 2	16	44	32	58	6	13
Minor Home Repair						
Wave 1	24	51	36	55	21	30
Wave 2	16	44	39	71	17	38

Table 3. Continued.

NUMBER AND PERCENT AWARE OF KCAP PROGRAMS						
Program Component	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Volunteer Attorney Program						
Wave 1	30	64	42	65	26	38
Wave 2	23	64	43	78	18	40
Tenant Assistance Program						
Wave 1	32	68	47	71	26	38
Wave 2	22	61	42	76	23	51
Westpark Demonstration Childcare Program						
Wave 1	22	47	40	61	20	29
Wave 2	16	44	37	67	12	27
Community Outreach Services						
Wave 1	33	70	46	70	40	58
Wave 2	21	58	46	84	25	56

is able to do. This, however, reinforces the notion that KCAP/PACK can fill an important niche for the provision of social services in the community.

Community Awareness of KCAP

A key question in this study is the degree to which KCAP and its PACK projects are serving as catalysts for change in Bremerton and other areas of Kitsap County. There can be no effect by KCAP on the behavior of other agencies and firms if none of these organizations is aware of KCAP and its activities. *The continuing encouraging result is that there has been almost universal awareness by all three types of organizations of KCAP and its activities over the entire program period.*

A more specific measure of awareness is community knowledge of the various programs that are being operated by KCAP. We see from Exhibit 3 that almost all of the government and private nonprofit agencies and private sector firms have heard of Kitsap Emergency Housing and the HEADSTART and ECAP Child Development programs. For the other ten programs in the group, public awareness is more varied, but awareness changes in (usually) a positive direction between the first and the second waves. It is also difficult to rationalize a reduction in awareness between the first and second waves and it is most likely that we are simply observing sampling variation and nonresponse error between the two waves in the few situations where this occurs. The one common thread between the two waves is that private sector firms continue to be the least aware of the types of activities being undertaken or sponsored by KCAP, and, indeed, the proportion of firms that are aware of KCAP projects and programs between the two waves stays essentially unchanged by type of program for the private sector. And, as before, it is the private nonprofit agencies that have the highest awareness of the various activities of KCAP.

Sources of Contact

How have the various agency heads, directors, and managers, as well as the owners of firms, gained their knowledge of KCAP programs? Exhibit 4 details the sources of their interaction with KCAP. (Note in this exhibit that multiple responses are possible so that each cell in the exhibit is self-contained.) Government and private nonprofit agencies are most likely to have direct contact with an official of the Kitsap CAP in some official capacity. About two thirds of these agencies had such contact while only one fifth of the private sector firms did so. Negligible numbers and proportions of these three types of organizations ever heard about Kitsap CAP over the radio or television. About one fourth to two fifths of the government and private nonprofit agencies had actual contact with a participant in the Kitsap CAP. This proportion drops from 28% to 13% for private firms between the two waves. It is not clear what effect nonresponse bias has in this downward change. Finally, over time, from two fifths to seven tenths of the various organizations have read about Kitsap CAP in the newspaper and other printed media. Private firms are most likely to become aware of Kitsap CAP through the printed media; the other two groups are most likely to become aware of Kitsap CAP through direct contact with one of its officials.

Recency of Contact.

Recency of contact is another dimension of KCAP's impact on the local community. During the first wave, fully 43% of the government agencies had contact with KCAP during the interview week. This percent drops to 32% during the second wave. About two fifths of the private nonprofit agencies had contact with KCAP during the interview week over both waves. This type of contact drops from 21% to 14% for private firms between the two waves. Indeed, private firms may have reduced their recency of contact with KCAP. Between the first and second waves the percent of firms that report that their last contact was "some time ago" rises from 58% to 70%. The recency of contact of the government and private nonprofit agencies with respect to this latter recency of contact stays the same between the two waves. But it is still ranging from a quarter to three tenths of the samples.

Exhibit 4. Sources of Community Awareness of KCAP

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CONTACT SOURCES							
Type of Contact	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Direct contact with an official of Kitsap Cap in any official capacity							
Wave 1	33	70	36	55	18	26	
Wave 2	23	64	37	67	10	22	
Direct contact with a participant in the Kitsap PAC							
Wave 1	15	32	26	39	19	28	
Wave 2	9	25	22	40	6	13	
Read about Kitsap CAP in the newspaper or other printed media							
Wave 1	27	57	36	55	43	62	
Wave 2	14	39	30	55	32	71	
Heard about Kitsap PAC over the radio or TV							
Wave 1	5	11	11	17	5	7	
Wave 2	1	3	2	4	2	4	
Other							
Wave 1	10	21	15	23	34	49	
Wave 2	11	31	14	25	16	36	

Exhibit 5. Community Awareness of PACK Teams

NUMBER AND PERCENT AWARE OF PACK TEAMS							
Type of Contact	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Pack Overall							
Wave 1	35	74	49	73	48	67	
Wave 2	26	72	45	82	26	54	
Employment Diversification Team							
Wave 1	17	49	32	65	16	33	
Wave 2	9	35	19	42	6	23	
Safe Street Team							
Wave 1	26	74	31	63	19	40	
Wave 2	22	85	31	69	7	27	
YWCA Domestic Violence Team							
Wave 1	26	74	34	69	26	54	
Wave 2	11	42	37	82	13	50	
Food and Shelter Team							
Wave 1	11	31	25	51	19	40	
Wave 2	11	42	29	64	6	23	
Main Street Team							
Wave 1	14	40	22	45	22	46	
Wave 2	14	54	32	71	19	73	

Community Involvement with the PACK Teams.

The final focus of this report is the degree of community involvement with the PACK Teams. As noted above, these teams are designed to provide specific, concrete services directly to the community over a fixed program period. The Teams supplement many of the social services provided by other agencies in the community. Exhibit 5 details the nature of local awareness to the presence of the several PACK Teams.

The average level of awareness of the PACK Teams, taken as a whole, is high, but not universal. It is highest among the government and private nonprofit agencies and lowest among private sector firms. During the first wave, from two thirds to three fourths of the various organizations had heard of the PACK Teams. By the second wave, this level of awareness had increased to about four fifths for the private nonprofit agencies, stayed about the same for the government agencies, and ostensibly had fallen in the recent memory or experience of the private sector firms.

The level of awareness appears to have changed over time, as suggested by the above. Over the entire project period private sector firms profess to have become less aware of the PACK Teams, while the private nonprofit agencies have become more aware and government agencies have maintained about the same level of awareness. Looking at the separate teams, with the exception of the Main Street Team, respondents in the private sector profess to be less aware of each of the PACK Teams. With the exception of the Employment Diversification Team, a skill training activity, private nonprofit agencies generally have become more aware of the various teams. Government agency awareness of the Employment Diversification Team and the YWCA Domestic Violence Team has dropped sharply over time. Finally, overall, each of the three sectors has sharply increased its awareness of the Main Street Team. The reasons for these apparent changes over time are not clear, though in the case of the Main Street Team, among the five teams, this team is most likely to be involved in activities that private firms would notice.

Sources of Contact and Interaction

For the first wave of PACK Team operation, among those agencies or firms that respond to ever having heard of the projects, about half of the government agencies made their contact directly with an official of KCAP/PACK. By the second wave, awareness of KCAP through direct contact with a program official increased to more than three fifths for government and private nonprofit agencies, indicating more direct action between KCAP and these organizations. However, this type of contact decreased for private sector firms. Private sector firms were most familiar with KCAP Team activities through the more passive means of newspaper or other printed media. By the second wave, over three fourths of the private sector firms' knowledge of KCAP/PACK was through this source, while just one tenth of the private sector firms had some form of direct contact with the Team projects. This is a large drop from the experience of the first wave, when about 30% of the private sector firms had some form of direct contact with the PACK Teams, for those firms that were at all aware of the Teams and their activities. Finally, we should note that for all three types of organizations, direct contact with KCAP/PACK participants appeared to decline by the second wave of the project.

Recency of Contact with KCAP/PACK

Recency of contact with KCAP/PACK has declined over the course of the two team waves, especially for private sector firms. During the first wave, about half of the private sector firms stated that their last contact with KCAP/PACK was "some time ago". This response increased to 75% by the second wave--a further reduction in contact. In contrast, the structure of contact as a function of time changed very little with respect to both the government and private nonprofit agencies. One eighth of the government agencies that had any contact with PACK had this contact within the previous week for both the first and second waves of the project. This is true for about one third of the private nonprofit agencies as well.

Exhibit 6. Sources of Community Awareness of KCAP/PACK Teams

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CONTACT SOURCES							
Type of Contact	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Direct contact with an official of KCAP/PACK							
Wave 1	18	53	18	37	7	16	
Wave 2	16	62	28	64	2	9	
Direct contact with a participant of KCAP/PACK							
Wave 1	10	29	11	22	6	14	
Wave 2	5	19	8	18	0	0	
Read about KCAP/PACK in the newspaper or other printed media							
Wave 1	24	71	24	49	25	57	
Wave 2	11	42	16	36	17	77	
Heard about KCAP/PACK over radio or TV							
Wave 1	4	12	3	6	1	2	
Wave 2	0	0	2	5	4	18	
Other							
Wave 1	8	24	13	27	14	32	
Wave 2	9	35	7	16	5	23	

About two fifths of the government agencies had contact with PACK "within the past month" over the total project period, while this is true for about one third of the private nonprofit agencies. In summary, recency of contact is being maintained by government and private nonprofit agencies and is falling off for private sector firms.

Formal or Informal Work with PACK

Over the course of the projects, the percent of private sector firms increased that knew about KCAP/PACK and that worked with the project either formally or informally. This increase was from about 7% to about 14%; however, the sample base for this estimate is small. The experience of government and private nonprofit agencies changed little, with the experience of government agencies falling somewhat over time and that of private nonprofit agencies rising somewhat. The most common type of contact with KCAP/PACK for government agencies was the "provision of a single social service" or the "use of KCAP/PACK as a resource". This is also true with respect to private nonprofit agencies. Sample sizes are too small over the project time period to make any generalizations for private firms.

Experience in Achieving the Short Term and Long Range Goals of PACK

Based on the short term and long range goals listed in Exhibit 1, a series of questions was asked of all agencies and firms that had ever heard of PACK. Several are questions of fact; others are hypothetical and elicit opinion.

Personal Involvement. Of persons of authority in agencies and firms, we asked if they had every heard of PACK and whether they had ever been personally involved in any of the PACK projects in the past four months (as of the date of the interview for each wave). During Wave 1 only 6% of the government officials claimed to have direct personal experience with PACK while 20% of private nonprofit managers claimed to have done so. At the same time, 17% of the owners and managers of private sector firms indicated some form of personal involvement with PACK. During Wave 2, the situation with respect to private nonprofit firms essentially had not changed, but by this time 27% of government managers claimed to have had some personal involvement with PACK during the most recent four months. No private sector firm owner or managers responded in the positive during the second wave. Again, sample nonresponse may be at least a partial explanation for this phenomenon.

Agency or Firm Utilization. What has been the experience of firms or agencies within the past four months (as of the date of the interview) in terms of utilizing the services of PACK Teams? In both Wave 1 and Wave 2, about one fourth of the officials interviewed for both the government and private nonprofit agencies indicated that they had had some form of personal involvement in PACK during the most recent four months. Few, if any, managers or owners of private sector firms have had any recent personal involvement in PACK, particularly during the second wave.

Contribution of Resources. During the most recent four months of the first wave, 12% of the government agencies contributed either funds or goods in kind to the PACK Teams. This proportion rises to 31% for the private nonprofit agencies and is a respectable 23% for private sector firms. But, by the most recent four months (from date of interview) during the second wave, all of these percentages had fallen.

During the first wave, for those government agencies that contributed funds, the average contribution was \$200. For private nonprofit agencies the average contribution was about \$820 and for private sector firms, \$520. Three of the eight private firms contributing refused to disclose their contributions, while this was true of three of the nine nonprofit agencies. During the second wave, the average funds contributed had dropped sharply, to an undisclosed amount for government agencies, about \$120 for private nonprofit agencies and to about \$100 for private sector firms. These averages are very unreliable, however, since the data for six of 20 respondents was not ascertained.

Exhibit 7. Direct Agency and Firm Interaction with the Safe Street Team

NUMBER AND PERCENT DIRECTLY INVOLVED							
Type of Interaction	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Provision of any support to organizations such as Teen Recreation, Youth Care Westbound or Parent Teacher Associations							
Wave 1	12	38	17	53	3	9	
Wave 2	10	32	20	65	1	3	
Contributing speakers on issues of drugs, gangs, or other social problems							
Wave 1	10	29	22	65	2	6	
Wave 2	4	25	10	63	2	13	
Provision of mentoring for youth							
Wave 1	6	26	16	70	1	4	
Wave 2	9	50	7	39	2	11	
Developing mentoring programs for youth							
Wave 1	3	21	11	79	0	0	
Wave 2	9	60	6	40	0	0	
Identifying vacant and rental properties that are possible sites of crack houses							
Wave 1	1	25	3	75	0	0	
Wave 2	3	60	2	40	0	0	
Developing one or more Block Watch Security Programs							
Wave 1	6	60	4	40	0	0	
Wave 2	2	50	2	50	0	0	
Helping to beautify neighborhoods, such as by graffiti removal or trash removal							
Wave 1	8	57	5	36	1	7	
Wave 2	6	67	3	33	0	0	

Exhibit 7. Continued.

NUMBER AND PERCENT DIRECTLY INVOLVED							
Type of Interaction	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Sponsoring parenting groups and family support programs in local high school(s)							
Wave 1	6	50	6	50	0	0	
Wave 2	11	79	3	21	0	0	
Assisting in instruction in crime prevention and self protection techniques							
Wave 1	10	34	16	55	3	10	
Wave 2	10	56	8	44	0	0	
Sponsoring block parties to increase drug awareness and increase neighborhood security							
Wave 1	3	50	3	50	0	0	
Wave 2	0	0	1	100	0	0	
Other							
Wave 1	2	50	2	50	0	0	
Wave 2	0	0	2	100	0	0	

Note: These data are based on the number of agencies or firms that initially respond that they have ever heard of the PACK Teams.

Potential Use of PACK Services. During Wave 1 the PACK Teams, and by extension, KCAP, enjoyed considerable support in the community. One hundred percent of the government agencies sampled were aware of the Teams and were willing to cooperate with them. This unanimous willingness to support the Teams dropped to about four fifths during the second wave. There was a sharp drop in the willingness of private sector firms to cooperate between the two waves--from 69% to 27%. The willingness to cooperate of the private nonprofit agencies remained essentially unchanged at about 94% to 95%.

Willingness To Be Involved in New KCAP/PACK Initiatives during Wave 1. During Wave 1 agencies and firms were queried as to their willingness to be involved in any new, future initiatives of the KCAP/PACK to assist in community service and community development activities. The response by government and private nonprofit agencies was essentially unanimous in support of this suggestion (94% and 97%, respectively), while three quarters of the private sector firms indicated a willingness to collaborate. Since all firms and agencies were guaranteed anonymity in their responses, there is no particular reason to assume that anyone gave socially acceptable answers. Thus, at the time of the first wave, it does appear that KCAP/PACK did succeed in affecting the attitude and willingness of organizations to cooperate and collaborate in socially useful activities in the city and county. However, it is almost always the case that the number of those who intend to complete an action is always smaller than those who actually execute the action. With this fact in mind we move to the next section of the analysis.

Agency or Firm Involvement with Specific Short Term Goals of KCAP/PACK

This section of the study details the specific involvement of agencies and firms with the PACK Teams as they executed the various projects that comprised their short term goals. The responses in this section are predicated on the sample of agencies and firms that responded positively to a question concerning whether they had some form of positive knowledge concerning *any one* of the five PACK Teams. Thus, we analyze the actual direct involvement of those firms or agencies that state they are aware of some aspect of KCAP/PACK. As we will see, there is a difference between being aware of the project and of having actual, direct involvement with the project per se or any of its numerous activities that reflect its short term goals.

Employment and Diversification Team. During the first wave 65 agencies and firms were aware of the Employment Diversification Team while 121 were not. (See Section E of the Appendix.) Of this number of 65, 15 had some form of direct involvement with this Team: Seven government agencies, seven private nonprofit agencies, and one private sector firm. However, when asked to detail the nature of their experience or involvement, only seven of the total respondents gave usable answers. These answers were so widely diverse as to preclude any generalization from them. This situation had not changed materially during the second wave, when only 35 of 140 of the respondents reported any kind of involvement with this Team.

Safe Street Team. During the first wave, 78 agencies and firms had some form of contact with the Safe Street Team; 108 did not. During the second wave, this proportion remained about the same among the respondents, with 62 out of 140, or 44%, having some involvement. (See Section F of the Appendix and Exhibit 7.) During Wave 1, 33 of the 78 persons responding to positive knowledge of KCAP/PACK had some kind of direct interaction: Sixteen government officials; 15 private nonprofits; and respondents from two firms. Due to low response, the data for the second wave are meaningful for government and private nonprofits only; during this wave, direct involvement or awareness at a personal level dropped for both types of agencies. During the first wave only six respondents of any kind reported a direct involvement with a PACK individual. None so reported for the second wave.

Exhibit 7 details the direct agency and firm interaction with the Safe Street Team. Multiple responses are possible, so each row in the exhibit is independent of the other rows. The first point to

recognize is that very few private sector firms are involved in the first wave and even fewer in the second, when overall responses drop. Next, there is considerable consistency in the proportionate interaction for each type of involvement, though the cell sizes are often small. For example, during the first wave 38% of the government agencies and 53% of the private nonprofit agencies provided some sort of support to organizations such as Teen Recreation, Youth Care Westbound, or Parent Teacher Associations. These proportions were 32% and 65%, respectively, during the second wave. Similar consistency over time exists for the contribution of speakers on issues of drugs, gangs or other social problems and on developing block watch security programs. However, relative proportions of involvement for government versus private nonprofit agencies shift over time for the actual provision of mentoring for youth and the development of mentoring programs for youth, sponsoring parenting groups and family support programs in local high schools, and assisting in the instruction of crime prevention and self protection techniques.

In summary, while during the first wave the private nonprofit agencies were most likely to be involved with the Safe Street Team, during the second wave, government agencies undertook a more active role compared to their activities in Wave 1. Private firms were least likely to be involved in any aspect of the Safe Street Team.

The Domestic Violence Team. As shown in Exhibit 8 and Section G of the Appendix, about 83 of 186 respondents had ever heard of the Domestic Violence Team during Wave 1--about 45%; this proportion stayed relatively unchanged to about 44% during Wave 2--62/140. During Wave 1, of those 26 government agency respondents reporting positive knowledge of this Team, 19, or 73% had direct contact with some official of the Team. This proportion had dropped to 30% by Wave 2, however. In contrast, between Wave 1 and Wave 2, involvement by a private nonprofit agency representative in a direct official way with this Team increased from 31% to 51%. Direct involvement by the private sector was less than 10% during Wave 1 and negligible during Wave 2.

It is extremely rare to find a private firm involved in any of the activities that support the goals of the Domestic Violence Team. On reflection, however, you would not expect much involvement by the typical private firm in this sample in such activities, other than, say, fund raising, where involvement is also nonexistent, however. The private nonprofit agencies are the most intensely involved in this Team's activities. This is generally true for both the first and the second wave. During the second wave, the support activities of the government agencies drop to trivial levels for such activities as provision of training on the prevention of domestic violence, placing children in Headstart and other programs, assisting in fundraising for the Team, and speaking to schools and community groups on domestic violence. Private nonprofit agencies generally carry the burden. For example, by Wave 2, the private nonprofit agencies provide all of the assistance in the areas of provision of training to prevent domestic violence and speaking to schools and community groups on domestic violence.

In summary, private nonprofit agencies carry the primary burden of involvement in the activities carried on by the Domestic Violence Team.

The Food and Shelter Team. Only about three tenths of the total sample is aware of the Food and Shelter Team over the two year life of the project. There is a sharp contrast in the change of direct contact by sample respondents with any official of the Food and Shelter Team between the first and second wave of interviews. During Wave 1, nine out of ten officials responding for government agencies have had some kind of official contact with the Team. This drops to one out of three for Wave 2 among those who have ever heard of the Team. There is a drop from three out of five to two out of five in contact with a Team official among those respondents of private nonprofit agencies who have ever heard of the Team. Again, samples for the private firms are so low as to preclude any reliable discussion.

In summary, for both Wave 1 and Wave 2 the private nonprofit agencies carry most of the burden interaction with the Food and Shelter Team.

Exhibit 8. Direct Agency and Firm Interaction with the Domestic Violence Team

NUMBER AND PERCENT DIRECTLY INVOLVED							
Type of Interaction	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Supporting victims through family advocacy activities							
Wave 1	2	12	15	88	0	0	
Wave 2	2	20	8	80	0	0	
Taking training in how to prevent domestic violence							
Wave 1	5	36	8	57	1	7	
Wave 2	2	25	6	75	0	0	
Providing training in how to prevent domestic violence							
Wave 1	2	25	5	63	1	13	
Wave 2	0	0	7	100	0	0	
Placing children in Headstart and other related programs							
Wave 1	8	57	6	43	0	0	
Wave 2	1	10	9	90	0	0	
Assisting in fund raising for the Team							
Wave 1	1	33	2	67	0	0	
Wave 2	1	100	0	0	0	0	
Assisting in counseling battered women and their families							
Wave 1	5	26	14	74	0	0	
Wave 2	2	33	4	67	0	0	
Speaking to schools and community groups on domestic violence							
Wave 1	5	42	7	58	0	0	
Wave 2	0	0	5	100	0	0	

Exhibit 8. Continued.

NUMBER AND PERCENT DIRECTLY INVOLVED

Type of Interaction	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other						
Wave 1	3	100	0	0	0	0
Wave 2	0	0	4	100	0	0

Notes: These data are based on the number of agencies or firms that initially respond that they have ever heard of the PACK Teams.

The Main Street Team. Exhibit 10 and Section I of the Appendix detail the experiences of the Main Street Team with respect to involvement in its activities by government agencies, private nonprofit agencies and private firms. The Main Street Team is the only PACK Team with an unambiguous increase in public awareness of its activities between Wave 1 and Wave 2. Public awareness rises from 32% to 46%, or from about one third to one half of the community as represented by the three types of organizations sampled. This is partly due to the highly public nature of much of what the Team does: Cleaning streets and alleys, removing graffiti, restoring parking lots, assisting in downtown landscaping, renovating downtown buildings, and so forth. However, most of this increased awareness is, again, among the government and private nonprofit agencies. Of the 24 firms in the first wave with some involvement with the Team, only one firm has any direct involvement with an official of the Team. In Wave 2, only one of 19 firms who are aware of the Team have any direct involvement with an official of the Team. In contrast, for both waves, about four out of ten government and private nonprofit officials who are aware of the Team have had some involvement with an official of the Team. Again, the private sector knows of the Team largely through the passive medium of the printed press and media.

On the other hand, when there is direct involvement, it is private sector firms and government agencies, rather than the private nonprofit agencies, who get directly involved in the activities of the Team. Sample sizes are very small, however, and it is not clear just how much weight one can put on such sparse data.

Summary of the Overall KCAP/PACK Experience

Over the approximate two years of their operation, the KCAP/PACK Teams have generated a wide variety of goods and services in the Bremerton and Kitsap County areas. By project end, there was an expenditure of about \$2,000,000. In the process of expending these resources, KCAP has attempted to increase the involvement of relevant agencies and firms in the social process. We do not have any comparable measures of similar programs in other similar environments against which to compare the experience of KCAP/PACK. However, the data suggest that KCAP has accomplished at least some of what it set out to do, though, with the exception of the Main Street Team, there has not been a dramatic increase in such awareness and involvement between Wave 1 and Wave 2 of the project's life.

In terms of the provision of services, the data do suggest that in absolute terms, KCAP has accomplished a large part of which it set out to do. There were two broad types of output:

- First, as noted directly above, by the end of the program, PACK Teams provided approximately \$2,000,000 worth of additional economic and social services to the Kitsap County economy and polity, when these services are valued at the **cost of their inputs**. These direct benefits reflect largely the achievement of the short term goals of the several Teams.
- Second, the KCAP agency and its PACK Teams have largely succeeded in drawing some government agencies, private nonprofit agencies, and the private sector firms into the social and economic process of responding to adverse social and economic change, at least in the sense that these organizations are highly aware of the presence of KCAP/PACK and its mission in the community. Awareness of the KCAP/PACK was very high during the first 10 month project period--essentially universal, if one gives due allowance for sampling variation. This situation did not change materially for the analysis of the second 10 month program period, even though there was attrition of about 25% in the total sample between the two interview waves. Finally, awareness of PACK Team activities was partially a function of the type of services provided. For example, private nonprofit agencies were more involved in issues of domestic violence and so were more aware of the YWCA Domestic Violence Team. Private firms were little involved with this Team, but were very aware of the Main Street Team. The most uneven experience in the community was with the Employment Diversification Team, though the reasons for this are not clear.

Exhibit 9. Direct Agency and Firm Interaction with the Food and Shelter Team

NUMBER AND PERCENT DIRECTLY INVOLVED

Type of Interaction	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Assisting in the distribution of food from food banks						
Wave 1	0	0	8	89	1	11
Wave 2	2	29	5	71	0	0
Assisting in the upgrading of low income housing units						
Wave 1	0	0	1	100	0	0
Wave 2	0	0	2	100	0	0
Assisting in the provision of transitional housing						
Wave 1	0	0	4	100	0	0
Wave 2	2	23	4	67	0	0
Assisting in the development or provision of a homeless shelter						
Wave 1	0	0	5	100	0	0
Wave 2	2	50	2	50	0	0
Donating furniture						
Wave 1	2	25	6	75	0	0
Wave 2	0	0	1	100	0	0
Assisting the Salvation Army or any other church or social group with funds or goods in kind to provide good and meals to low income or homeless individuals						
Wave 1	2	25	5	63	1	13
Wave 2	2	33	4	67	0	0

Exhibit 9. Continued.

NUMBER AND PERCENT DIRECTLY INVOLVED

Type of Interaction	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Other						
Wave 1	0	0	2	100	0	0
Wave 2	2	50	2	50	0	0

Notes: These data are based on the number of agencies or firms that initially respond that they have ever heard of the PACK Teams.

Exhibit 10. Direct Agency and Firm Interaction with the Main Street Team

NUMBER AND PERCENT DIRECTLY INVOLVED

Type of Interaction	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Upgrading the city's old deteriorated buildings						
Wave 1	6	60	2	20	2	20
Wave 2	2	50	0	0	2	50
Cleaning streets and alleys						
Wave 1	5	56	2	22	2	22
Wave 2	3	100	0	0	0	0
Restoring parking lots						
Wave 1	2	40	2	40	1	20
Wave 2	0	0	1	50	1	50
Removing graffiti						
Wave 1	5	50	4	40	1	10
Wave 2	3	75	0	0	1	25
Donating equipment						
Wave 1	4	57	0	0	3	43
Wave 2	2	50	1	25	1	25
Assisting in the restoration of the Admiral Theater						
Wave 1	2	25	2	25	4	50
Wave 2	1	20	0	0	4	80
Assisting in landscaping the downtown Bremerton area						
Wave 1	3	60	0	0	2	40
Wave 2	3	60	0	0	2	40

Exhibit 10. Continued.

NUMBER AND PERCENT DIRECTLY INVOLVED							
Type of Interaction	Government		Nonprofit		Private Firm		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Assisting in the maintenance of the boardwalk area							
Wave 1	3	50	0	0	3	50	
Wave 2	1	50	0	0	1	50	
Other							
Wave 1	2	33	3	50	1	17	
Wave 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Notes: These data are based on the number of agencies or firms that initially respond that they have ever heard of the PACK Teams.

A Broad Assessment

There was the intention that this \$2,000,000 infusion of services, plus the demonstration effect of the organization and provision of such services, would help slow or reverse the process of downward economic change in the immediate Bremerton area. The data in this report cannot address this question of economic development either in the positive or the negative. Surely, the services and the benefits people derived from them were provided that might otherwise not have been available. But the economic development issue simply cannot be addressed. In addition, to further obscure the detection of any net program impact, the economy overall has improved to the point that the local unemployment rate reflects essentially full employment, though pockets of structural unemployment may still exist. Any obvious effects of the program, if they exist, are most certainly overshadowed by the phenomenon of full employment. On the other hand, there likely was some increased social interaction, as documented in the data we present. This increased social interaction is a positive social benefit, even though its exact value to society is extremely difficult to quantify. The only remaining question is how intensive this interaction became and how long it will remain once the program ends.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abt Associates Inc. 1993. *Evaluation Information System Manual: Defense Conversion Assistance Program*. Cambridge, MA: December.
- Cassidy, John. 1995. "Who Killed the Middle Class?" *The New Yorker*. October 16.
- Cheal, Beryl. 1993. "Community Needs Assessment: Head Start and Early Childhood Education Assistance Programs". Bremerton, WA: Kitsap Community Action Program. March.
- Office of Financial Management, Forecasting Division and Labor Market and Economic Analysis Branch, Employment Security Department. 1994. "1993 Long-term Economic and Labor Force Trends for Washington". Olympia, WA. March.
- Statistical Abstract of the United States*. 114 Edition. 1994. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce. Economics and Statistics Administration. Bureau of the Census. September.
- Stromsdorfer, Ernst W. with Grant Forsyth and Richard Oxley. 1995. *Kitsap Community Action Program. Public Awareness Commitment of Kitsap (PACK). A Study of Community Interaction*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University. Department of Economics. Final Draft. January 16.
- Theroux, Diana. 1993. "Program Time Lines, Year One and Two." Memorandum to Bill Basl, Washington Service Corps. Exhibit "AB". Bremerton, WA: Kitsap Community Action Program. November 29.
- Theroux, Diana. 1993. "Revised two year plan." Memorandum to Bill Basl, Washington Service Corps. Exhibit "AB". Bremerton, WA: Kitsap Community Action Program. November 22.
- Washington, State of. Various Years. *Data Book*. Olympia, WA: Office of Financial Management.
- Washington, State of. 1995. *Labor Area Summaries*. Olympia, WA: Department of Employment Security. Labor Market and Economic Analysis Branch. Vol. 10. No. 9. September.
- Washington Service Corps. Employment Security Department. State of Washington. 1993. *Kitsap County Community Service-Defense Conversion Assistance Program*. August.