

Summary from Suzanne's Survey (what was in the mail buoy)-
Developing policy around standards of behavior is no easy task - the policies have to address problems encountered with a very small percentage of observers without offending the majority for whom regulation of behavior is not necessary. Specific questions addressing the details of standards of behavior displayed no significantly strong results. When asked about a minimum drug policy observer opinions varied greatly - from the opinion that drug testing was an infringement of basic civil liberties to advocating drug testing before, during or after a cruise (see details of answers below). The question addressing an alcohol policy had similar results that may just reflect the difficult nature of addressing the issue.

The only standards of behavior policy question with a clear answer was the definition of job site - 83.3% of respondents believe that they are on the job when they are on the vessel or plant they have been assigned. A curious result for the standard of behavior questions is that while 59% felt they understand how the standards of behavior apply to their experience of cruise situations 52% feel a little or not at all confident of how standards of behavior are enforced.

Another interesting link between questions occurred with the sexual behavior standards questions - while only 66.7 % felt they the new regulatory language is clear, 82.8% felt the regulation is appropriate. 78.9% of those who felt the policy is unclear identified the second part of the regulatory language of " with any vessel or processing plant personnel who may be substantially affected by the performance or non-performance of the observers official duties" as ambiguous. And 55.9% of respondents felt that " any other activities that would reflect negatively on their image as professional scientists, on other observers, or on the observer program as a whole" cannot be generally understood or defined.

More details on specific questions (specifics Q&A not in the last mail buoy):

31. How important do you feel establishing guidelines and reporting procedures for what levels of illness, injury, and code of conduct problems to be reported under the proposed requirements for contractors is, before this becomes regulation?

Very Important - 17 (34%)
Fairly Important - 29 (58%)
A little important - 3 (6%)
Not at all important - 1 (2%)

35. Has the requirement that contractors report harassment complaints within 24 hours affected how comfortable you feel about reporting harassment or what you may report to your contractor?

yes - 10 (20%)
no - 21 (42%)
didn't know about this requirement - 19 (38%)

37. Do you feel confident that you understand how the Observer Program's stated standards of behavior apply to your experience of cruise situations?

Very confident - 38 (59.4%)
Fairly confident - 15 (23.4%)

A little confident - 8 (12.5%)
Not at all confident - 3 (4.7%)

38. Do you feel confident that you understand how the Observer Program's stated standards of behavior are enforced?

Very confident - (14.1%) 9
Fairly confident - (32.8%) 21
A little confident - (26.6%) 17
Not at all confident - (26.6%) 17

39. What do you think is the most acceptable minimum drug policy? (select all that apply)

Observers may be chosen at random to be drug tested before they are deployed - (15.9%) 10
Observers may be chosen at random to be drug tested during a cruise - (9.5%) 6
Observers may be chosen randomly to be drug tested after a cruise - (17.5%) 11
Observers may be chosen randomly to be drug tested before, during or after a cruise - (39.7%) 25
Observer may be drug tested with the rest of the crew if it's the fishing company's drug policy - (38.1%) 24
Observers may be drug tested if NMFS has reason to believe they have used drugs while on contract - (30.2%) 19
Observers maybe drug tested if the contractor has reason to believe they have used drugs while on contract - (33.3%) 21
Observers may be drug tested if the vessel has reason to believe they have used drugs while onboard or in port - (23.8%) 15
Observers may be drug tested if NMFS or the contractor has reason to believe they have used drugs while not under contract (6.3%) 4
Observers may be drug tested if NMFS or the contractor has reason to believe they have ever used drugs - (4.8%) 3
Other (please specify) - (15.9%) 10
1. 'reason to believe' leaves it too open for me. however, if an observer is in possession, then a drug test could be appropriate.
2. drug testing annually
3. observers should not be drug tested unless behavior is obvious
4. no drug testing
5. none
6. i am against drug testing we are professionals held in the public trust; i have always felt drug testing is a breach of privacy
7. observers may not be drug tested.
8. all observers should be drug tested before they are deployed
9. none in general-testing if using on a vessel and its effecting job performance
10. One caveat to testing suspected users: there must be probable cause. If the vessel suspects an observer, they should go through NMFS and/or the Contractor.

40. What do you think is the most acceptable minimum alcohol policy? An observer would be considered guilty of excessive drinking in the following situations: (select all that apply)

Appearing drunk to NMFS staff in port assigned to a while vessel - (37.5%) 24
 Appearing drunk to contractor personnel in port while assigned to a vessel - (32.8%) 21
 Appearing drunk to NMFS staff in port while unassigned to any vessel - (10.9%) 7
 Appearing drunk to contractor personnel in port while unassigned to any vessel - (14.1%) 9
 Appearing drunk to fishing industry personnel in port while assigned to a vessel - (31.2%) 20
 Appearing drunk to fishing industry personnel in port while unassigned to any vessel - (14.1%) 9
 Appearing drunk to NMFS staff on their vessel - (50%) 32
 Appearing drunk to vessel personnel on their vessel - (51.6%) 33
 Appearing drunk to contractor personnel on their vessel - (46.9%) 30
 Having a blood alcohol level above 0.1 while on their vessel - (51.6%) 33
 Having a blood alcohol level above 0.1 while in port on contract - (18.8%) 12
 Injured while intoxicated during a contract - (59.4%) 38
 Arrested while intoxicated during a contract - (71.9%) 46
 Disruptive to the point of complaint by other observers or neighbors at company housing - (48.4%) 31
 Assault of another observer while intoxicated - (73.4%) 47
 Assault of anyone while intoxicated - (75%) 48
 Other (please specify) - (9.4%) 6

1. 'appearing' is too vague for me and leaves the door open for abuse on the part of authority, but drunk on the docks is not good.

4. when a persons drinking affects their ability to perform observer duties

5. if your company is paying you-assigned or unassigned-follow thier policy, vessels have a right to refuse a drunk observer on the vessel

6. As long as it does not interfere with your work or relationship with crew, I don't think becoming inibriated on occassion should be a problem, but in any case, the wording needs to be specific (appearance of being drunk doesn't cut it - give me something impirical).

41. Where and when do you feel you should be considered "on the job site"? (select all that apply)

At company housing - 25.4% 16
 At the start of briefing until I finish debriefing - 30.2% 19
 Anywhere in port while assigned to a vessel - 39.7% 25
 Anywhere in port while on contract and unassigned - 22.2% 14
 Anytime I am interacting with the crew of my assigned vessel - 36.5% 23
 Anytime I am interacting with anyone in the fishing industry - 20.6% 13
 Anytime I am interacting with my contractor - 39.7% 25
 On the vessel or at the plant I'm assigned too - 84.1% 53
 On any vessel or at a plant - 49.2% 31
 While in transit to the field or home - 9.5% 6
 Other (please specify) - 1.6% 1

1.While under contract and in the field but excluding briefing/debriefing.

42. Do you think it is appropriate for contractors to have different standards of behavior in relation to drug and alcohol policies than the observer program?

Yes when pertaining to behavior and use of company housing - 54.7% 35
Yes, when pertaining to travel to and from a field site - 20.3% 13
Yes, when pertaining to paid periods of debriefing or briefing - 18.8% 12
Yes, however, it should be inclusive of the observer program's policy - 15.6% 10
Yes, however, termination from a contractor should not necessarily result in decertification - 32.8% 21
No, they should be identical with the same ramifications - 25% 16
Don't know - 17.2% 11

43. Does the re-wording of the "sexual relations" code of behavior seem clear to you?

Yes - 66.7% 42
No - 33.3% 21

44. If not, which part seems ambiguous? (select all that apply)

"Engaging in sexual relations with personnel of the vessel or processing facility to which the observer is assigned" - 25% 5

" with any vessel or processing plant personnel who may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of the observer's official duties." - 80% 16

Other (please specify) - 25% 5

1. i have mixed feelings about "vague" wording in this regard...it leaves room for interpretation...which can be good and bad...such an odd behavior to regulate...just not sure where i stand on this issue...ability to perform duties seems most important...the focus seems potentially out of adjustment.

2. include entire fishery

3. same fishery or same company?

4. what is the point of the code if it is never enforced?

5. Does this include other observers?

45. Does the re-wording of the "sexual relations" code of behavior seem reasonable to you?

Yes - 83.3% 50
No - 16.7% 10

46. In the context of the Observer Program's sexual relations code of behavior, what would you define as sexual relations? (select all that apply)

Talking dirty/making sexual jokes - 6.5% 4

Flirting - 4.8% 3

Hand holding - 27.4% 17

Kissing - 50% 31

Sleeping in the same bunk with clothes on - 45.2% 28

Sleeping in the same bunk without clothes on - 64.5% 40
 Hanging out in a room together watching TV or talking - 4.8% 3
 Having a romantic relationship without any sexual relations - 40.3%
 25
 Sex - 96.8% 60
 Other (please specify) - 4.8% 3

47. Are you confident that "... or any other activities that would reflect negatively on their image as professional scientists, on other observers, or on the Observer Program as a whole" can be generally understood or defined?

Yes - 43.5% 27
 No - 56.5% 35

48. How important do you think observer participation is in development of standards of behavior guidelines?

Very important - 73% 46
 Fairly important - 22.2% 14
 A little important - 3.2% 2
 Not at all important - 1.6% 1

49. If you were able to, would you attend meetings to discuss the particulars and the enforcement policies of standards of behavior? Please check one answer for each type of meeting:

	Yes	Probably	Maybe	NO	Response	Total			
Observer organized	50%	(31)	24%	(15)	19%	(12)	8%	(5)	62
NMFS organized	33%	(20)	26%	(16)	30%	(18)	11%	(7)	61
Contractor organized	32%	(19)	31%	(18)	25%	(15)	12%	(7)	59

Additional comments re: standards of behavior:

1. micromanagement of behavior not desirable; case by case component needs to remain open to enforcement bodies; circumstances around cases need to be considered.
2. would be nice to know what guideline are; are nmfs staff held to the same?; where do they apply
3. maybe the contractor should terminate employment to individuals who are proven to engage in unacceptable behavior standards with vessel personnel while on the vessel. these inappropriate behavior commonly remove observer objectivity.
4. policy makers need to remember that a contract is a large portion of your life that year(or many years) and an observer still needs freedom to live and have fun. i think it is healthy to work hard and also play hard. by limiting freedoms during "playtime"/time off while on contract will cause observers to burn out faster and bad working habits and data collection will follow
5. the people who constitute the largest problem regarding behavior are not the people that would attend such(soc related) meetings
6. Personally, I think the current standards are too vague, and any clarity of intention and repercussions are good.

51. Would you feel comfortable with a background check that looked for previous felonies?

Yes - 82.8% 53
No - 17.2% 11