



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

378.748
A472477
243

AE & RS 243

Department of
Agricultural Economics
and Rural Sociology

Dealing with Risk
Part III: Insights From
Open-ended Questions

WAITE MEMORIAL BOOK COLLECTION
DEPT. OF AG. AND APPLIED ECONOMICS
1994 BUFORD AVE. - 232 COB
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
ST. PAUL, MN 55108 U.S.A.

Atsushi Chitose
Ann Fisher

PENNSSTATE



College of Agricultural Sciences

378. 748
A472477
243

AE & RS 243

Dealing with Risk --
Part III: Insights from Open-ended Questions

Atsushi Chitose
Ann Fisher

The Pennsylvania State University

July 1993

The research reported in this document has been founded wholly or in part by the United State Department of Agriculture/Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service under Cooperative Agreement No. 34-WT-91-12-34-01-0002-CA.

Our thanks to Dr. Sue C. Hawkins and Dr. Philip S. Gipson for their helpful comments. Any remaining errors and omissions are, of course, the responsibilities of the authors.

The Pennsylvania State University, in compliance with federal and state laws, is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to programs, admission, and employment without regard to race, religion, sex, national origin, handicap, age, or status as disabled or Vietnam-era veteran. Direct all affirmative action inquiries to the Affirmative Action Office, 201 Willard Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802; (814) 863-0471.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Results of Analysis	5
Q14 and Q16	5
Q13	16
Q15i	18
Q15j	20
Q15k	22
Summary and Discussion	22
References	26

Appendices

Appendix A: Responses from Workshop Participants (n=90):

 Q14 and Q16

Appendix B: Risk Issues by Category for Q14 and Q16

Appendix C: Original Responses: Q13

Appendix D: Original Responses: Q15i

Appendix E: Original Responses: Q15j

Appendix F: Original Responses: Q15k

Introduction

In the Fall of 1991, the Pennsylvania State University administered a mail survey of APHIS professionals. The objective was to provide a baseline measure of their awareness and use of the risk analysis process, especially its risk communication component. Most of the questions were categorical in nature, so that standard statistical procedures could be used. The analysis of those questions is described in two reports: Dealing with Risk: A Baseline Survey of APHIS Professionals (Fisher, et al., 1992) and Dealing with Risk: Part II: Comparisons across APHIS Units and Locations (Chitose, et al., 1993). The first report also includes a reproduction of the questionnaire.

Some important topics are less amenable to categorical responses, so we used open-ended questions to explore these issues. Because analysis of the responses to open-ended questions is less straightforward, it was scheduled last so that the bulk of the analysis could be reported as quickly as possible. The results from the open-ended questions are, in many ways, as interesting as those presented in the two earlier reports. We think they also are timely, and present them here. This Part III report is intended to be a companion to the reports listed above.

This report investigates in more detail APHIS professionals' perceptions and expectations about the risk analysis process than could be revealed by analysis of categorical questions. The analysis relies on the random sample data set, because it is more representative of the professionals throughout APHIS.¹ But the data set for workshop

¹ We conducted two surveys of APHIS employees to establish a baseline of employee understanding and use of risk analysis. The first survey was of participants in a risk analysis workshop that was offered three times in the summer of 1991. The second

participants is used, when necessary, for the purpose of comparison or reference.

When the questionnaire was developed and pretested, we did not know whether APHIS professionals would feel that they are spending an appropriate amount of time assessing and communicating about risks for which the agency has some management responsibility. The categorical questions did not provide a definitive answer. For example, discussion of the responses to Q8 in the earlier reports indicated that APHIS professionals think communicating about risk is somewhat more important for their work than identifying hazards, contingency planning for risks, or understanding statistical methods for assessing risk. Responses to Q9, Q10, Q11 and Q12 suggest that APHIS professionals think they actually do, as well as should, spend relatively small shares of their work time assessing and communicating about risk. We anticipated that some respondents would prefer to spend more time on these activities, so open-ended Q13 asks which duties would receive less attention if they spent more time estimating or communicating about risk.

Because we expected that risk issues APHIS professionals were dealing with were greatly diversified, we designed open-ended questions to capture that diversity. Q14 asked each respondent what risk issue she/he dealt with most in the past year. Q16 asked what each expected

survey was administered to a random sample of 400 professionals, stratified to ensure a statistically adequate sample from each of the 11 units (now 10) of APHIS. Statistical comparisons of the workshop participants' responses with randomly selected employee's responses showed that the workshop participants were more knowledgeable about risk assessment and risk communication than the general APHIS sample. So, this Part III report, like the previous Part I and Part II reports, has emphasized results from the random sample survey as being more representative of APHIS professionals.

her/his biggest risk issue would be for the next year. Both questions allowed the respondent to list any number of risk issues.

Q15i and Q15j were designed to assess each respondent's evaluation regarding their efforts in dealing with risk issues identified in Q14. Q15i asked the respondent what she/he felt was done well in her/his effort, and Q15j asked what could have been improved. Q15k asked the respondent to describe anything else she/he felt is important regarding the specific risk issue.

Analysis of these six open-ended questions (Q13, Q14, Q16, Q15i, Q15j, and Q15k) reinforces the results obtained in the earlier reports. It also provides some new insights that are noteworthy and helpful for designing the agency's risk analysis program.

The rest of the Part III report is organized as follows. The results from the analysis of Q14 and Q16 are followed by those for Q13, Q15i, Q15j, and Q15k. In most cases, the analysis is based on comparisons across APHIS units, because the earlier report revealed that unit is the most important on the distribution of responses. Demographic characteristics and work location are not influential on the distribution of responses. Note that because of the small number of responses from International Services (IS), the responses from this unit were not used for comparisons across units.^{2 3} Most of results are described by self-

² As noted in the earlier report, we did not realize until after the data were collected that the computer data base we used for random sampling does not include those working for IS in foreign countries. As a result, we inadvertently contacted a sample of IS professionals only in the Washington/Hyattsville area, not those actually on foreign assignments. Additionally, several of IS professionals who were contacted work as budget analysts rather than having program responsibilities. Thus we judged that responses from IS were not representative of that unit and analysis of these responses would bias results.

³ APHIS work units and their acronyms used for the analysis are listed in the note to Table 4 (page 12).

4

explanatory tables, with some comments. The final section provides a brief summary and discussion.

Results of Analysis

Q14 *In the past year, what risk issue have you dealt with most?*

Q16 *What do you expect the biggest risk issue to be for you to deal with in the next year?*

These two open-ended questions (Q14 and Q16) were used to provide a context for detailed questions about risk communication experience and expectations. Out of 292 total respondents, 225 people (77%) answered Q14, and 217 people (74%) answered Q16. Each respondent was allowed to list any number of risks. A maximum of six risk issues were drawn from each respondent for the analysis of Q14, and up to three risk issues were used for analyzing Q16. Note that almost all respondents listed fewer than six for Q14 and fewer than three for Q16.

Table 1 summarizes the distribution of responses for Q14 and Q16. (Appendix A shows the distribution for Q14 and Q16 from workshop participants.) Percentages in Table 1 were computed by dividing the number listing a given risk issue by 292 (total respondents). Because many respondents listed several risk issues, the sum of the percentages is greater than 100% for Q14. The total number of risk issues is 327 from 225 people for Q14 and 257 from 217 people for Q16. These risk issues are grouped into 13 categories including "Don't know". Detailed issues for each category (except for "Don't know") are shown in Appendix B.

The risk issue that respondents dealt with most in the past year (Q14) is exotic plant pests (61 of 292 respondents, 21%), followed by domestic livestock/poultry diseases (57/292 or 20%) and exotic livestock/poultry diseases (51/292 or 17%). Another 34 or 12% dealt

Table 1: Responses from Random Sample Survey (n=292)

Q14 In the past year, what risk issue have you dealt with most?Q16 What do you expect the biggest risk issue to be for you to deal with in the next year?

unit: responses, (% [292=100%])

Category	Past	Next year
Animal damage control	16 (5.5)%	8 (2.7)%
Domestic livestock/poultry diseases	57 (19.5)	24 (8.2)
Exotic livestock/poultry diseases	51 (17.5)	22 (7.5)
Domestic plant pests	13 (4.5)	3 (1.0)
Exotic plant pests	61 (20.9)	32 (11.0)
Trade	15 (5.1)	28 (9.6)
Environmental monitoring/assessment	14 (4.8)	12 (4.1)
Biologics/biotechnology	14 (4.8)	18 (6.2)
Animal welfare	34 (11.6)	31 (10.6)
Human health	23 (7.9)	25 (8.6)
Public relations	9 (3.1)	17 (5.8)
Other	19 (6.5)	18 (6.2)
Don't know	1 (0.3)	19 (6.5)
<u>Total</u>	<u>327 (112.0)</u>	<u>257 (88.0)</u>
Did not answer	67 (22.9)	75 (25.7)

Note: Each respondent was allowed to list any number of risk issues. For this analysis, up to six for Q14 and three for Q16 were drawn from each respondent.

Percentages were based on 292 total respondents=100%, so the sum of the risk issues is not 100%.

with animal welfare, and 16 or 6% with animal damage control. These results indicate that the risk issues APHIS professionals dealt with most are related to animal health/welfare/damage control and plant health, which are recognized as traditional APHIS risk responsibilities.

Human health and environmental/wildlife management also are major APHIS risk responsibilities. Twenty-three or 8% of total respondents dealt with human health issues, and 14 or 5% were engaged in environmental monitoring/assessment. These are viewed as relatively new APHIS risk responsibilities, and were dealt with by APHIS professionals much less than traditional risk responsibilities.

Q14 provides baseline information about risk issues they had been dealing with. Q16 provides data about whether they expected to continue working on the same risk issue, or whether it would be displaced as other risk issues become more important. Responses to Q16 suggest that APHIS professionals expect traditional responsibilities will remain as primary APHIS missions. At the same time they expect the relatively new responsibilities to become more important. Twenty-five or 9% of respondents noted that human health, especially food safety, would be one of the biggest risk issues for them to deal with in the next year. Also, 12 or 4% of respondents thought that environmental monitoring/assessment was expected to be one of their biggest risk issues. Although this percentage is lower than that for Q14 (5%), because the total number of risk issues listed for Q16 (257) is substantially smaller than that for Q14 (327), we can say that respondents felt environmental monitoring/assessment would become relatively more important.

More striking is that respondents expect trade, biologics/biotechnology and public relations to become bigger risk issues for APHIS.

The increasing emphasis on trade probably reflects APHIS professionals' concern about the forthcoming free trade with Mexico under NAFTA, and globalization of the world economy under GATT. Their expectation that biologic/biotechnology will receive more attention reflects the current development of biotechnology and its wider application to agricultural products. The increasing importance of risks related to public relations might stem from APHIS professionals' perception that interactions with the public would have a more important role in the APHIS decision-making process.

Table 2 shows the distribution of responses across locations for Q14 and Q16. Of 126 total respondents from Washington/Hyattsville, 86 or 68% listed at least one risk issue for Q14, and 85 or 67% did for Q16. Of 62 total respondents from regional/state level offices or laboratories, 51 or 82% answered Q14, with 50 or 81% for Q16. Out of 97 total field staff respondents, 84 or 87% answered Q14, and 78 or 80% answered Q16. The total number of risk issues listed by respondents from Washington/Hyattsville is 121 (by 86 respondents) for Q14 and 101 (by 85 respondents) for Q16, respectively. The total number of risk issues obtained from regional/state level offices or laboratories is 76 (from 51 respondents) for Q14 and 59 (from 50 respondents) for Q16. The total number of risk issues from field staff is 125 (from 84 respondents) for Q14 and 91 (from 78 respondents) for Q16, respectively. This response distribution across locations supports our previous finding that field staff and regional/state level office or laboratory staff have been more involved in and more concerned about risk issues than professionals in Washington/Hyattsville.

Table 2 Distribution of Responses across Locations for Q14 and Q16: Random Sample Survey (n=292)

	Total respondents	Respondents to Q14	Respondents to Q16	Total risk issues for Q14	Total risk issues for Q16
Washington/Hyattsville	126	86	85	121	101
Regional/State level office & Laboratory	62	51	50	76	59
In the field	97	84	78	125	91
Total*	285	221	213	322	251

Note: * ---- 7 did not identify their work locations. Of that group of 7, 4 answered both Q14 and Q16.

Table 3 summarizes the distribution of risk issues (by the categories listed in Table 1) across locations for Q14 and Q16. Professionals in Washington/Hyattsville dealt with exotic diseases for both plants and animals most in the past year. Of 86 respondents, 29 or 34% reported exotic plant pests as the risk issue they dealt with most in the past year, and 19 or 22% listed exotic livestock/poultry diseases. Professionals at regional/state level offices and laboratories were most engaged in domestic livestock/poultry diseases (21 of 51 respondents or 41%). Risk issues dealt with by field staff most in the past year are domestic livestock/poultry diseases (27 of 84 respondents or 32%), followed by exotic plant pests (22/84 or 26%), animal welfare (16/84 or 19%), and exotic livestock/poultry diseases (15/84 or 18%).

Results for Q16 suggest that Washington/Hyattsville staff expect that risks they would deal with in the next year would be more diversified. Although exotic plant pests and exotic livestock/poultry diseases are expected to remain as big risk issues for them, they noted that relatively new risk responsibilities such as biologics/biotechnology, animal welfare, human health and trade are expected to become more important. This diversification also is expected among professionals at regional/state level offices and laboratories, especially for animal welfare and human health risk issues. Similarly, field staff expect the importance of their missions to shift from traditional to relatively new risk responsibilities, especially for risks related to trade and public relations.

Tables 4 shows the distribution of responses across APHIS units for Q14 and to Q16. Almost all respondents from such units as Animal Damage Control (ADC), Legislative and Public Affairs (LPA) and Biotechnology, Biologics and Environmental Protection (BBEP) listed at

Table 3 Distribution of Responses across Locations: Random Sample Survey (n=292)

Q14 In the past year, what risk issue have you dealt with most?

Q16 What do you expect the biggest risk issue to be for you to deal with in the next year?

unit: responses

Risk category	ADC	DL/PD	EL/PD	DPP	EPP	TR	EMA
Washington/Hyattsville	2, 2	7, 3	19, 9	8, 1	29, 16	8, 8	5, 2
Regional/State level office & Laboratory	4, 2	21, 7	14, 5	2, 0	10, 7	2, 6	3, 3
In the field	10, 4	27, 11	15, 7	3, 2	22, 9	5, 13	6, 7
Total*	16, 8	55, 21	48, 21	13, 3	61, 32	15, 27	14, 12
Risk category	BB	AW	HH	PR	Other	Don't know	Total
Washington/Hyattsville	10, 13	10, 11	4, 9	4, 5	15, 13	0, 9	121, 101
Regional/State level office & Laboratory	1, 2	8, 10	9, 9	0, 3	2, 1	0, 4	76, 59
In the field	3, 3	16, 10	10, 7	5, 9	3, 3	1, 6	125, 91
Total*	14, 18	34, 31	23, 25	9, 17	20, 17	1, 19	322, 251

Note: Risk categories (listed in bold) are:

ADC-----Animal damage control

EL/PD---Exotic livestock/poultry diseases

EPP-----Exotic plant pests

EMA-----Environmental monitoring/assessment

AW-----Animal welfare

PR-----Public relations

Other---see Appendix B

DL/PD---Domestic livestock/poultry diseases

DPP-----Domestic plant pests

TR-----Trade

BB-----Biologics/biotechnology

HH-----Human health

In each cell, the first number is for Q14 and the second for Q16.

* --- Responses from those who did not identify their work locations are omitted.

Table 4 Distribution of Responses across Units for Q14 and Q16: Random Sample Survey (n=292)

Work unit*	Total respondents	Respondents to Q14	Respondents to Q16	Total risk issues for Q14	Total risk issues for Q16
IS	9	7	5	8	5
ADC	33	31	30	39	35
PPQ	36	28	23	52	28
VS	45	39	37	64	46
REAC	24	17	20	24	26
LPA	21	20	19	29	23
PPD	25	19	16	32	18
BBEP	24	22	21	29	24
RD	25	13	15	19	20
MB	22	6	9	6	9
ST	24	21	20	23	21
Unidentified unit	4	2	2	2	2
Total	292	225	217	327	257

Note: Work units are the following:

IS-----International Services

ADC----Animal Damage Control

PPQ----Plant Protection and Quarantine

VS-----Veterinary Services

REAC---Regulatory Enforcement and Animal Care

LPA----Legislative and Public Affairs

PPD----Policy and Program Development

BBEP---Biotechnology, Biologics and Environmental Protection

RD-----Recruitment and Development

MB-----Management and Budget

SC-----Science and Technology

least one risk issue for both Q14 and Q16. For example, of 33 total respondents from ADC, 31 or 94% listed risk issue(s) for Q14, and 30 or 91% did for Q16. The response rates for Q14 and Q16 are lowest among respondents from Recruitment and Development (RD) and Management and Budget (MB). For example, only 6 (27%) from MB responded for Q14 and 9 (41%) for Q16 among 22 total MB respondents. Such findings are consistent with the Part I and Part II reports, if we assume that higher response rates to Q14 and Q16 reflect a higher degree of APHIS professionals' involvement in risk issues. These results are not surprising because professionals in RD and MB are primarily responsible for such missions as budgeting or recruiting rather than for program responsibilities that are more likely to involve professionals in risk issues.

Table 5 shows the distribution of risk issues (by categories listed in Tables 1 and 3) across APHIS units for Q14 and Q16. Results for Q14 indicate that in the previous year, APHIS professionals were engaged in risk issues for which their units are primarily responsible. For example, of 31 respondents from ADC, 13 or 42% dealt with animal damage control, followed by 8 or 26% for animal welfare. Of 28 respondents from Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ), 22 or 79% were most engaged in exotic plant pests. Of 39 from Veterinary Services (VS), 32 or 82% dealt with domestic livestock/poultry diseases most. Of 22 respondents from BBEP, 12 or 55% were engaged in biologics/biotechnology. These results are not surprising; APHIS professionals were dealing with risks for which their work units have responsibilities.

Risk issues listed by respondents from APHIS units that are not directly involved in program responsibilities are more diversified. But risk issues drawn from LPA respondents are concentrated on exotic plant

Table 5. Distribution of Responses across Units: Random Sample Survey (n=292)

Q14 In the past year, what risk issue have you dealt with most?Q16 What do you expect the biggest risk issue to be for you to deal with in the next year?

Risk category	unit: responses						
	ADC	DL/PD	EL/PD	DPP	EPP	TR	EMA
ADC	13, 5	1, 1	0, 0	0, 0	1, 1	0, 3	6, 7
PPQ	1, 0	7, 2	8, 2	4, 2	22, 9	3, 4	0, 0
VS	0, 0	32, 14	19, 9	0, 0	1, 2	2, 7	1, 1
REAC	0, 0	4, 2	3, 2	0, 0	2, 2	3, 6	0, 0
LPA	0, 0	4, 0	2, 2	2, 0	12, 7	2, 1	1, 0
PPD	0, 1	2, 1	8, 3	1, 0	9, 2	3, 3	1, 0
BBEP	2, 1	1, 0	0, 0	4, 1	3, 3	0, 0	2, 0
RD	0, 0	0, 0	5, 2	2, 0	4, 3	1, 1	0, 2
MB	0, 0	1, 1	0, 0	0, 0	0, 0	0, 0	0, 0
ST	0, 1	4, 2	4, 2	0, 0	2, 1	1, 1	3, 2
Other	0, 0	1, 1	2, 0	0, 0	5, 2	0, 2	0, 0
Total	16, 8	57, 24	51, 22	13, 3	61, 32	15, 28	14, 12

Note: Risk categories (listed across the top) are:

ADC-----Animal damage control

EL/PD---Exotic livestock/poultry diseases

EPP-----Exotic plant pests

EMA-----Environmental monitoring/assessment

DL/PD---Domestic livestock/poultry diseases

DPP-----Domestic plant pests

TR-----Trade

The first column shows the respondent's work unit, as identified in the note to Table 4. "Other" includes responses from IS and those who did not identify their work units.

In each cell, the first number is for Q14 and the second for Q16.

(continued on the next page)

(continued)

unit: responses

Risk category	BB	AW	HH	PR	Other	Don't know	Total
ADC	0, 0	8, 6	6, 4	4, 6	0, 0	0, 2	39, 35
PPQ	0, 0	0, 0	7, 5	0, 2	0, 1	0, 1	52, 28
VS	0, 0	3, 5	2, 3	0, 0	4, 3	0, 2	64, 46
REAC	0, 0	8, 8	0, 1	2, 2	1, 0	1, 3	24, 26
LPA	1, 1	2, 4	0, 3	2, 3	1, 0	0, 2	29, 23
PPD	0, 1	4, 2	1, 1	0, 0	3, 1	0, 3	32, 18
BBEP	12, 14	3, 2	1, 0	1, 1	0, 1	0, 1	29, 24
RD	0, 0	1, 0	1, 2	0, 2	5, 6	0, 2	19, 20
MB	0, 0	0, 0	1, 2	0, 0	4, 5	0, 1	6, 9
ST	1, 2	4, 3	4, 4	0, 1	0, 0	0, 2	23, 21
Other	0, 0	1, 1	0, 0	0, 0	1, 1	0, 0	10, 7
Total	14, 18	34, 31	23, 25	9, 17	19, 18	1, 19	327, 257

Note: Risk categories (listed across the top) are:

BB-----Biologics/biotechnology

AW-----Animal welfare

HH-----Human health

PR-----Public relations

Other---see Appendix B

The first column shows the respondent's work unit, as identified in the note to Table 4. "Other" includes responses from IS and those who did not identify their work units.

In each cell, the first number is for Q14 and the second for Q16.

pests (12 of 20 respondents or 60%), and most of the risk issues from Policy and Program Development (PPD) fall into exotic plant pests (9 of 19 respondents or 47%) and exotic livestock/poultry diseases (8/19 or 42%). These results suggest that LPA and PPD have been more involved in international issues than in domestic issues.

Risk issues listed across APHIS units for Q16 are more diversified than those for Q14, just as was the case for the overall data and across locations. The more diversified distribution is found for risk issues drawn from any APHIS unit. These results suggest that although each unit would keep its traditional risk responsibilities in the next year, professionals expect to deal with more diversified risk issues in response to changes in the economic and social environment surrounding the agency.

Q13 *If you were to spend more work time estimating or communicating about risks than you do now, from what duties should that time come?*

Table 6 shows the distribution of responses across units. Of 292 total respondents, 120 (41%) answered this question. Appendix C lists these responses as written in the survey questionnaires returned. The responses are grouped into five categories: administrative, specific tasks, communication, analysis/planning, and no more time needed.

About half of responses (61 or 51% of the responses to this question) are related to administrative work. Another 27 or 23% think that if they spent more time estimating and communicating about risks, additional time should come from some specific tasks with which they are currently involved. Such tasks are exemplified by operational animal damage work (listed by a respondent from ADC), agricultural quarantine inspection (from PPQ), and training (from RD). Eleven or 9% noted that

Table 6 Distribution of Responses across Units: Random Sample Survey (n=292)

Q13 If you were to spend more work time estimating or communicating about risks than you do now, from what duties should that time come?

unit: responses

Unit	Response Rate		Category **				
	Response to Survey	Response to Q13	Administrative	Specific tasks	Communication	Analysis/Planning	No more time
ADC	33	21	11	4	3	1	2
PPQ	36	17	7	5	0	1	2
VS	45	22	12	7	0	2	1
REAC	24	7	3	2	0	0	2
LPA	21	7	2	2	2	0	1
PPD	25	7	4	0	0	2	1
BBEP	24	14	8	3	0	3	0
RD	25	7	4	2	1	0	0
MB	22	4	2	1	0	0	1
ST	24	8	5	1	1	1	0
Other*	13	6	3	0	1	1	1
Total	292	120	61	27	8	11	11

Note: * ---- Other includes responses from IS and those who did not identify their work units.

** --- Categories are:

-Administrative includes budget, management and other general office work.

-Specific tasks are related to responsibilities assigned to specific units such as animal health and plant health.

-Communication represents both external and internal communication.

-Analysis/Planning are associated with assessment and planning, including risk assessment.

-In detail, see Appendix C.

time for risk estimation or risk communication should come from duties on analysis/planning, and 8 or 7% reported that time should come from communication. Also, 11 or 9% noted that any additional time would not be needed for risk estimation or risk communication, or that they could not allocate more time.

Regardless of their work units, respondents think that any additional time for risk estimation or risk communication should come from administrative work. They felt that some administrative work could be more efficient, such as routine paperwork, meetings, committee assignments, and computer work.

Q15i What do you feel was done well in the effort identified in Q14?

The results of the distribution of responses across units are shown in Table 7, and the original responses are reproduced (by units) in Appendix D. Out of 292 total respondents, 139 or 48% responded to this question. The responses are grouped into four categories: communication, specific tasks, analysis/planning, and management/policy.

Seventy-six people or 55% noted that they felt that communication was done well in their efforts for risk issues they dealt with most in the previous year. Twenty-five or 18% regarded analysis/planning responsibilities as being done well in their efforts. Regardless of respondents' work units, communication played the most important role in the process of risk-related activities and generally was viewed as being done well. Some responses noted: "Communication was most effective when it occurred early."; "We were quite forthright in communicating our position and responsibilities." The responses to Q15i show that APHIS

Table 7 Distribution of Responses across Units: Random Sample Survey (n=292)

Q15i What do you feel was done well in the effort identified in Q14?

unit: responses

Unit	Response Rate		Category**			
	Response to Survey	Response to Q15i	Communication	Specific tasks	Analysis/Planning	Management/Policy
ADC	33	21	10	3	6	2
PPQ	36	18	8	8	0	2
VS	45	27	13	8	5	0
REAC	24	9	5	0	0	3
LPA	21	13	11	0	2	0
PPD	25	7	5	0	1	1
BBEP	24	17	10	0	5	1
RD	25	5	1	1	2	1
MB	22	7	3	0	1	3
ST	24	9	6	0	3	0
Other*	13	6	4	0	0	2
Total	292	139	76	20	25	15

Note: * ---- Other includes responses from IS and those who did not identify their work units.

** --- Categories are:

- Communication represents both external and internal communication.
- Specific tasks are related to responsibilities assigned to specific units such as animal health and plant health.
- Analysis/Planning are associated with assessment and planning, including risk assessment.
- Management/Policy include designing or improving the agency policy or staff attitude.

-In detail, see Appendix D.

professionals recognized the importance of communication for the success of their risk responsibilities. They also believed that communication had been done somewhat well.

Q15j What about this effort do you feel could have been improved?

Table 8 summarizes the results of the response distribution (the same categories as for Q15i) across units. Appendix E provides these responses as written in the questionnaires. The response rate for this question is 40% (117/292). Forty-eight or 41% felt that communication could have been improved in their efforts in dealing with the risk issues in the previous year. Although responses to Q15i suggest that respondents generally felt that communication was done well in their efforts, many of them (including those who reported that communication was done well in Q15i) felt that there still had been room to improve communication in the process of dealing with risks. This is consistent with the previous finding drawn from the analysis of responses to Q15g and Q15h (which asked each respondent about their evaluation of what they had accomplished with their risk communication efforts.). The Part I report indicates as follows.

"They (respondents) view themselves as being moderately successful and effective -- but certainly not completely so. There does not seem to be a great deal of dissatisfaction, yet they recognize the need for improvement." (Fisher, et al., p. 47).

Another 39 or 33% noted that management/policy of the agency could have been improved. For example, some responses noted: "More authority to make change where change was needed."; "Sticking to

Table 8 Distribution of Responses across Units: Random Sample Survey (n=292)

Q15j What about this effort do you feel could have been improved?

unit: responses

Unit	Response Rate		Category**			
	Response to Survey	Response to Q15j	Communi-cation	Specific tasks	Analysis/Planning	Management/Policy
ADC	33	20	10	3	1	4
PPQ	36	17	5	6	0	6
VS	45	19	10	0	3	5
REAC	24	10	4	2	0	3
LPA	21	12	4	1	0	7
PPD	25	5	1	2	0	2
BBEP	24	14	7	0	3	4
RD	25	5	0	0	2	3
MB	22	5	3	0	0	2
ST	24	4	2	1	0	0
Other*	13	6	2	1	0	3
Total	292	117	48	16	9	39

Note: * ---- Other includes responses from IS and those who did not identify their work units.

** --- Categories are:

-Communication represents both external and internal communication.

-Specific tasks are related to responsibilities assigned to specific units such as animal health and plant health.

-Analysis/Planning are associated with assessment and planning, including risk assessment.

-Management/Policy include designing or improving the agency policy or staff attitude.

-In detail, see Appendix E.

logical/scientific decision making."; "Less time spent making final decision."

Q15k *Please describe anything else that you feel is important about this issue:*

The results of the response distribution across work units are shown in Table 9, and the original responses are reproduced in Appendix F. Of total 292 respondents, 54 or 18% answered this question. Responses are grouped into five categories such as the four categories listed in Q15i and Q15j plus external environment. Twenty-two or 41% identified management/policy related issues as being important in risk-related activities. One response noted: "Gull control - worked good because we didn't tell anyone anything!". Another noted: "Political influence and opposition is allowed to affect regulatory/legal issues too much and at too low a level". These responses suggest that some APHIS professionals felt somewhat dissatisfied with the present management/policy of the agency, and view it as an obstacle to their risk-related responsibilities. At the same time, they expect management to provide clear guidelines and a good work environment to improve achievement of their present risk responsibilities.

Another 15 or 28% felt that communication is important for their risk responsibilities. This result supports what has been described in the analysis of Q15j.

Summary and Discussion

Q14 and Q16 provide baseline information about APHIS professionals' experience and expectations regarding their risk

Table 9 Distribution of Responses across Units: Random Sample Survey (n=292)

Q15k Please describe anything else that you feel is important about this issue:

unit: responses

Unit	Response Rate		Category **				
	Response to Survey	Response to Q15k	Communication	Specific tasks	Analysis/Planning	Management/Policy	External Environment
ADC	33	8	4	0	1	2	1
PPQ	36	7	2	0	1	3	1
VS	45	9	3	0	3	2	1
REAC	24	4	0	0	0	3	1
LPA	21	6	0	0	1	5	0
PPD	25	1	1	0	0	0	0
BBEP	24	7	1	0	1	4	0
RD	25	1	1	0	0	0	0
MB	22	2	0	0	0	1	1
ST	24	5	2	0	3	0	0
Other*	13	4	1	1	0	2	0
Total	292	54	15	1	10	22	5

Note: * ---- Other includes responses from IS and those who did not identify their work units.

** --- Categories are:

-Communication represents both external and internal communication.

-Specific tasks are related to responsibilities assigned to specific units such as animal health and plant health.

-Analysis/Planning are associated with assessment and planning, including risk assessment.

-Management/Policy include designing or improving the agency policy or staff attitude.

-External environment includes changes in external organizations or in citizens.

-In detail, see Appendix F.

responsibilities. The risk issues that respondents dealt with most in the past year are traditional APHIS risk responsibilities such as animal health/welfare/damage control and plant health. The risk issues dealt with by APHIS professionals are expected to become more diversified due partly to changes in social and economic environment surrounding the agency. Although they expect traditional responsibilities to remain as primary APHIS missions, at the same time they expect the relatively new responsibilities to become more important. These relatively new responsibilities include human health, environmental monitoring/assessment, and biologics/biotechnology, animal welfare and trade. They also noted that public relations would become more important in the APHIS decision-making process.

Washington/Hyattsville staff were most likely to deal with exotic diseases for both plants and animals, while regional/state level office and laboratory staff were most likely to be engaged in domestic risk issues such as domestic animal diseases. Field staff were dealing with both exotic and domestic diseases in the previous year.

APHIS professionals were working mostly on risks for which their work units have primary responsibilities. For example, many ADC respondents dealt with animal damage control and animal welfare. PPQ respondents were most likely to be engaged in exotic plant pests; also VS respondents were most likely to deal with domestic livestock/poultry diseases. BBEP staff were most engaged in biologics/biotechnology.

The results from Q13 indicate that regardless of their work units, respondents think that any additional time for risk estimation or risk communication should come from administrative work such as routine paperwork, meetings, committee assignments and computer work.

The responses to Q15i, Q15j and Q15k suggest that respondents thought that communication was the most important component for the success of their work responsibilities. They viewed communication as being somewhat successful, but they also recognized the need for its improvement. They assigned importance to the role of the agency's management/policy for their risk responsibilities to be more successful and effective.

The results from the six open-ended questions have reinforced some results obtained in the earlier reports. Respondents felt that communication actually did and should play an important role for the success of APHIS risk responsibilities. Risk communication could become more important, partly because the APHIS mission is expected to shift from traditional responsibilities to relatively new responsibilities. These new responsibilities (such as human health, environmental monitoring/assessment, and biologics/biotechnology, animal welfare and trade) will be targeted at not only some limited groups but at a wide range of groups including foreign trading firms and the public.

The other significant insight is the importance of the management and policy of the agency. To succeed in the agency's risk responsibilities, respondents think the agency should provide clear overall policy guidelines and an internal communication system so that risk responsibilities can be more effectively performed at the field level.

References

Chitose, Atsushi, Ann Fisher, Philip S. Gipson and Donald J. Epp. 1993. Dealing with Risk: Part II: Comparisons across APHIS Units and Location. Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, AE & RS 240, the Pennsylvania State University.

Fisher, Ann, Atsushi Chitose, William J. Wheeler, Philip S. Gipson and Donald J. Epp. 1992. Dealing with Risk: A Baseline Survey of APHIS Professionals. Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, AE & RS 235, the Pennsylvania State University.

Appendix A: Responses from Workshop Participants (n=90): Q14 and Q16

Appendix A: Responses from Workshop Participants (n=90)

Q14 In the past year, what risk issue have you dealt with most?

Q16 What do you expect the biggest risk issue to be for you to deal with in the next year?

unit: responses, (% [90=100%])

Category	Past	Next year
Animal damage control	17 (18.9)%	13 (14.4)%
Domestic livestock/poultry diseases	22 (24.4)	9 (10.0)
Exotic livestock/poultry diseases	23 (25.6)	8 (8.9)
Domestic plant pests	5 (5.6)	1 (1.1)
Exotic plant pests	33 (36.7)	24 (26.7)
Trade	5 (5.6)	12 (13.3)
Environmental monitoring/assessment	12 (13.3)	7 (7.8)
Biologics/biotechnology	5 (5.6)	1 (1.1)
Animal welfare	1 (1.1)	5 (5.6)
Human health	4 (4.4)	4 (4.4)
Public relations	5 (5.6)	6 (6.7)
Other	- (0.0)	1 (1.1)
Don't know	- (0.0)	3 (3.3)
<u>Total</u>	<u>132 (146.7)</u>	<u>94 (104.4)</u>
Did not answer	3 (3.3)	18 (20.0)

Note: Each respondent was allowed to list any number of risk issues. For this analysis, up to six for Q14 and three for Q16 were drawn from each respondent.

Percentages were based on 90 total respondents=100%, so the sum of risk issues is not 100 %.

Appendix B: Risk Issues by Category for Q14 and Q16

Animal Damage Control

- use of M-44
- aerial hunting
- danger to non-target animals
- predator and animal damage control
- brown tree snake
- livestock protection collar
- risks to public from animal traps
- anything to do with airports

Domestic Livestock/Poultry Diseases

- brucellosis in bison/cattle
- bovine tuberculosis (TB)
- swine health
- salmonella enteriditis (SE)
- pseudorabies virus
- Equine influenza
- Eastern Equine Encephalomyelitis (EEE)

Exotic Livestock/Poultry Diseases

- importation of (restricted) animal products/animals
- BSE
- foreign animal diseases/exotic viruses
- VVND outbreak
- (Russian) reindeer
- importation of Russian byproducts
- veterinary blood transfusion products
- bluetongue
- (x-ray) inspection/agricultural quarantine

Domestic Plant Pests

- grasshopper control program
- boll weevil/pink boll worm program
- Gypsy moth
- honeybee pest
- chemical spray drift
- environmental risks to personnel, protected resources
- weed control

Exotic Plant Pests

- importation of (restricted) plant products
- Africanized honey bees (killer bees)
- loss of methyl bromide as a quarantine treatment
- potato virus
- fresh fruit and vegetable imports
- unshu orange export areas
- importation of Siberian logs
- Medfly introductions
- Q-37 (plant quarantine)
- unmanufactured wool imports
- Thrips palmii
- exotic fruit flies and other exotic pests
- golden nematode
- sharwil avocado program
- international travellers/transportation

Trade

- environmental risks in Central America
- free trade with Mexico/general issues with Mexico
- environmental risks in Europe
- scrapie and flock certification
- exempting materials from regulation
- import/export (restrictions)/agreement-trade general
- violation of permit protocols
- risks from changing protocols (regulations)/agency program polices

Environmental Monitoring/Assessment

- environmental assessments/impact statements
- environmental monitoring
- pollution from swine/poultry units
- endangered species
- conservation reserve program
- biological control/restricted use of pesticides/integrated pest management (IPM)
- evaluating resource management options

Biologics/Biotechnology

- biological vaccines in animals
- biotechnology
- pathogen spread via genetic engineering
- genetically engineered organisms

Animal Welfare

- animal safety/welfare/health/rights

Human Health

- food safety
- risk to human health from chemical agents
- public health issues, e.g., risks from hazardous wastes (asbestos)
- drug/chemical/pesticide residues or use

Public Relations

- public concerns/perceptions
- education general
- media
- risk task groups

Other

- affirmative action (discrimination/affirmative employment, workforce diversity)
- legal issues
- risk communication
- computer issues, e.g., computer security/errors, sampling methods
- training
- information risks

Appendix C: Original Responses: Q13

Q13 *If you were to spend more work time estimating or communicating about risks than you do now, from what duties should that time come?*

ADC

Administrative

- Administrative work. (4)
- Field duties or office duties. (3)
- Automated data processing (ADC).
- Administrative duties other than budget and personnel management.
- Time spent meeting requirements established by other federal agencies. (i.e., E.P.A, B.L.M., etc.)

Specific tasks

- It would ultimately come from operational field activities, the foundation of ADC.
- Operational animal damage work.
- We should have a risk analyst in each Regional office to provide this information.
- Risk is involved in so much of what we do it is considered in all duties. Every duty is uniformly associated with my work.

Communication

- Communications.
- Contact with field personnel.
- Explaining action already taken.

Analysis/Planning

- Working on in house survey or questions, with very short unreasonable turn around time.

No more time

- I don't think I need to devote much more time than I do.
- Not needed.

PPQ

Administrative

- Presently, the GS-11s in my port have to do all their clerical work. Time would come from hiring a GS-3 to do that work and letting GS-11s to do communication work.
- Administrative. (2)
- Communicating about risks should come from management - not offices at my level.
- Unnecessary paperwork.
- First line supervision.
- Get rid of the computers.

Specific tasks

- Agricultural quarantine inspection (AQI), Gypsy moth (GM).
- Inspection.
- Time should be taken from commercial produce inspections.
- I would make time by re-prioritizing current activities.
- Mechanic duties.

C-2

Analysis/Planning

- Through presentation of studies that inherently encompass risk estimates.

Other

- I think the time spent would be used better if a person was more knowledgeable.
- Work does not allow time to estimate risk.

No more time

- This is a quality problem for me - not quantity. I enforce regulations - I don't need more time to communicate - I need more reliable info to communicate.
- I would not take any time away from my other duties.

VS

Administrative

- Attending meetings that could be more efficiently conducted, or even handled in another way.
- Administrative support.
- Administrative. (2)
- Budgeting & personnel.
- Agency internal red tape.
- Management.
- Staff management and/or administrative duties.
- Routine paperwork. (3)
- Administrative officer work; work that should be performed by computer specialists.

Specific tasks

- The time should not be in lieu of other duties but in collaboration with those duties.
- Training time taken from data process, personnel given to training epidemiologists on statistics and analysis for Eastern Equine Encephalomyelitis (EEE), Pseudorabies Virus (PRV).
- From request testing.
- Pseudorabies work; import-restricted animals.
- Safety and health. Public relation.
- Field time on bleeding crews (for blood sampling).
- Individual program of concern.

Analysis/Planning

- Program planning.
- Development duties.

No more time

- None, should be incorporated into each type work.

REAC

Administrative

- Administrative duties.
- Routine paper work.
- Administrative/paperwork time.

Specific tasks

- Maintaining technical expertise. Training and presentation.
- Risk analysis is part of decision making process in duties.

No more time

- There aren't any that I would afford spending less time on.
- Already takes largest portion of time.

LPAAdministrative

- Other than minor administrative tasks. All my work time is spent on communicating risks.
- Routine paperwork, i.e., "IN" basket.

Specific tasks

- Writing/updating materials.
- Productive time, not planning time.

Communication

- Other information work.
- Document presentation.

No more time

- Could not happen to me.

PPDAdministrative

- Routine paper work.
- Management time.
- Meeting time; time spent responding to issues outside the primary interests of risk assessment.
- From having to pin down program staff re specifics of what they want.

Analysis/Planning

- From estimating risks.
- Planning activities.

No more time

- Already spend enough time; probably the communication should be more effective.

BBEPAdministrative

- Memos, reading memos and writing reports.
- Filing.
- Administrative procedures.
- Administrative.
- Typing letters and reports into word processor - clerical work.
- Clerical.
- Bureaucratic duties.
- Committee assignments not directly related to job.

Specific tasks

- Internal meetings to discuss environmental analysis and documentation (EAD) policy.
- Every facet of present duties.
- Hire more people to allow us to spend more time on duties.

C-4

Analysis/Planning

- Program activities- such as routine checking of input/output reports.
- Program development.
- No more time could possibly be dedicated to communication of risk due to time required to gather data to document risks.

RD

Administrative

- Administration of training.
- Attending useless meetings.
- Administrative duties.
- Secretarial work.

Specific tasks

- Training.
- Should be part of my training duties.

Communication

- Distribution.

MB

Administrative

- File and clerical activities.
- Automated data processing (ADP) security.

Specific tasks

- Operational support.

No more time

- I work with automated data processing (ADP) only. No risk information.

ST

Administrative

- Some of the mandatory equal employment opportunity (EEO) meetings.
- Administrative activities.
- Some low relevance staff meetings held to hold a scheduled meeting.
- Redundant paperwork time.
- Unnecessary paperwork (Survey and responding to).

Specific tasks

- Animal care and use concerns and employee relations.

Communication

- Consultancy.

Analysis/Planning

- Field research - gathering data - technical labor.

Other

Administrative

- Budgeting.
- Budget and reporting.

- Administrative/budgeting.

Communication

- Stating the agency position.

Analysis/Planning

- Assembling risk data.

No more time

- That's my job; that's what I am paid to do.

Appendix D: Original Responses: Q15i

Q15i What do you feel was done well in the effort identified in Q14?

ADC

Communication

- Information on character of disease.
- Presenting facts to my contacts.
- Inter-agency telephone discussions.
- Personal communication.
- Communication.
- Communication with industry.
- The positive aspects of ADC were publicized more.
- Presented factual information not formally available through biased articles.
- Communication with all parties involved.
- Forth rightness-honesty.

Specific tasks

- Interagency involvement in seminars. Interagency involvement in NEPA process.
- Successfully completed all projects which involved the use of pesticides.
- Training of employees in the proper use of equipment to minimize risk to non-target animals.

Analysis/Planning

- Worked with contractor to develop risk assessment for ADC environmental impact statement (EIS).
- On-site evaluation of potential problem.
- Identify common ground between groups listed in Q15f. List facts about the risk.
- Internal, program review of the risk assessment document.
- Identifying.
- Research to demonstrate the effectiveness of lower info concentration.

Management/Policy

- Goose vasectomy - good ground work laid via meeting with state and fed agencies.
- Gaining support from state agencies.

PPQ

Communication

- Personal meeting with key officials was highly effective.
- Public meetings with orange growers, college pesticide classes and news media during helicopter spray operations.
- Computer mail.
- Responded quickly to requests for info, even if my info was limited.
- Explanation as to who is affected, likelihood of risk, and laws pertaining to the risks.
- Good lines of communication were developed.
- Information which people requested was found--They got the questions they needed--If they could bring problems in and how.
- Communicate.

D-2

Specific tasks

- Large numbers of bags inspected--and significant numbers of quarantine materials intercepted.
- Visual inspections.
- Improvements in control.
- Restrictions on plant products and detection.
- Prevented introduction of imported plant and animal pests.
- Furnish safety equipment. Publish safety requirements to fumigators and officers.
- Work does not allow time to estimate risk.
- Officers knowing the job well enough to diffuse potentially difficult situations.

Management/Policy

- The organization and planning of all these emergency programs was done well.
- Total absence of negative attitude; created a reinforcing learning attitude.

VS

Communication

- Communication up front with industry and other stakeholders. Dissemination of information in unbiased manner/writing.
- Individual communication.
- Explaining to public why rules were put in place and how disease in animals affect people.
- Fully describe the risk before the person decides to import.
- Pamphlets --group meetings.
- Locating problems. Invitation to speak at Cattlemen Assn.
- I feel that personal meetings, group meetings and agency training were done well.
- Personal meetings.
- Verbally making points in an organized manner.
- Timely presentation of risk.
- Presentations.
- Communication between the 3 involved states.
- Better explanation of Brucellosis disease (latency, purchase additions (testing equipment)/isolation procedure and retest, etc.).

Specific tasks

- Identification of valid participants.
- Disease Eradication and containment.
- Assemble a good group of professionals to develop an Salmonella enteritidis (SE) program.
- Llama importation.
- Have reduced the disease almost 100%.
- Employees understanding risk. Cattle owners allowing us to test due to better understanding of our safety procedure to prevent risk.
- Good training.
- Obtaining a permit and giving the conditions thereon.

Analysis/Planning

- Planning, management and analysis of data.
- Identifying the risk and reducing the risk.
- Scientific basis for risk assessment.
- Identify the highest risk factors applied the major resources to reduce risk.
- We came out of the past and into the "today" scientifically and have made an "ok" start to being productive.

Other

- Poorly.

REACCommunication

- Was able to get ideas across to a couple of individuals and impress on them necessity for proper nutrition.
- All parties were contacted.
- Presentations, personal meetings and group meetings.
- Communication and adjustments to public and industry concerns.
- Explaining details and expected results.

Management/Policy

- Finally acknowledged the requirement under the law.
- Team work in agency.
- Genuinely trying to reach compromise - perhaps this is good.

Other

- This is an individual effort, not an APHIS program.

LPACommunication

- Info for general public are successful. Info for environmental groups are unsuccessful.
- We started providing information on the issue.
- Communication was most effective when it occurred early.
- The message and materials were simple and clear.
- I think our meetings made the public aware they could do something to help with the medfly problem.
- We were quite forthright in communicating our position and responsibilities.
- Communicated accurate info from USDA all the way down to local government. Reached many people at many different levels.
- Preparation of fact sheets, dissemination of materials.
- Alerting public of possible health threat through LPA-PI (public information).
- Agency seems instantly able to mobilize to communicate and deal with.
- Printed information distribution.

Analysis/Planning

- Careful planning on testing procedures for Salmonella enteritidis (SE).
- Environmental documentation. Integrating cooperation.

PPDCommunication

- All issues raised by commentators are addressed.
- Distribution of information to interested/affected decision makers.
- Explanation in regs of what trying to accomplish.
- Communicated with appropriate group about appropriate issues.
- Presented a coherent framework to quantify riskiness of options.

Analysis/Planning

- Group concerns of evaluation method, quantitative risk assessment (q.r.a.) process, solicitation of expert opinion.

D-4

Management/Policy

- Secretary's advisory committee management.

BBEP

Communication

- Public involvement before the decision.
- Public meetings well conducted and organized, scientific approach well planned and adequately considered.
- Communication.
- Stating current problem and some selected risk factors.
- All parties with APHIS and all units affected were notified of the risk assessment and invited to participate.
- Public meetings. Manuals and documents. F.O.I.A.
- Presentation of scientific data to/from professionals.
- Communicating risks to often APHIS professionals regarding risk to Grasshoppers (GH) Program relating to Endangered Species Act requirements.
- Telephone discussions with industry.
- Communicating financial risk of decisions.

Analysis/Planning

- Analysis and documentation. Public meeting.
- Scientific analysis.
- A thorough and readily understandable environmental assessment was produced.
- Scientific information gathered.
- Preparation of an environmental assessment.

Management/Policy

- APHIS units worked together well.

Other

- General trust and acceptance of APHIS competence in reviews.

RD

Communication

- Dissemination of info to the public at large.

Specific tasks

- Evaluation of risk at airports.

Analysis/Planning

- Design and development.
- Analysis of the problem.

Management/Policy

- Budget options were offered and outcomes were decided upon depending spending.

MB

Communication

- The issues were communicated quite extensively to various groups.
- Good presentation.
- Personal contact with staff affected by Lab.

Analysis/Planning

- Describing the procurement cycle and risks of someone (vendor) gaining a competitive edge, resulting in possible protest.

Management/Policy

- Developing the cooperation from APHIS program to solve the issues.
- Method established and automated data processing (ADP) security staff.
- Awareness of illegal activities engaged in by APHIS was increased somewhat.

ST

Communication

- Presentation.
- Vendors providing MSDS sheets to inform co-workers.
- My personal communication with individuals.
- Communication through presentation.
- Personal communication.
- All the biological facts were presented.

Analysis/Planning

- Statistical representation.
- Benefit vs risk. Long range consequences.
- Overall organization effort.

Other

Communication

- Early communication of single detection was effective.
- Clear explanation of situations/issues.
- Staff communications to stakeholders.
- I informed everybody affected to the best of my ability.

Management/Policy

- The decision was reversed.
- Gain cooperation.

Appendix E: Original Responses: Q15j

Q15j What about this effort do you feel could have been improved?

ADC

Communication

- We should have provided our own media coverage.
- Follow-up communication with Fish and Wildlife Service after the initial request for consultation.
- Need additional info in favor of audio-visuals and self study.
- A lot of misinformation is spread by antagonistic groups. Public education is needed via media.
- Communication.
- More contact with the media.
- Better available information.
- Additional public relations.
- Better public relations - broader use of new media.
- Nothing some people have a mental block concerning compound info.

Specific tasks

- More printed or visual material to work with.
- Coyote control = state agency had a closed mind.
- Have more professionally done aids (i.e., videos, etc.) in presenting risk and solutions.

Analysis/Planning

- Had some guidelines (with flexibility) to proceed from the beginning work with contractor.

Management/Policy

- Coordination with state/local health agencies.
- Relate to personal programs or projects as closely as possible.
- Solicit more feedback from producers (industry).
- Training procedures could have been improved.

Other

- Lack of control because of political situations.
- Other agencies having a better understanding of APHIS.

PPQ

Communication

- Dissemination of info, in writing, to the field.
- Literature handout to passengers.
- More detailed information for the public about the quarantine situation.
- Advance notification to traveling public and more public awareness of PPQ.
- Better communication with public and environmental groups on cost/benefit and long-term vs short-term pesticidal impacts.)

Specific tasks

- Better inspectional procedures and techniques.

E-2

- The method of treatment.
- Plant information manuals could be written clearer. Their present format isn't always easy to follow. Plant export/import section response time could be shortened.
- Sources of material were poor and so old.
- Survey personnel and equipment.
- Give training to the work unit to communicate better.

Management/Policy

- The length of time it took to get the new rule published in the Federal Register.
- There was little to no support by officer-in-charge (OIC) for the enforcement of the quarantines.
- Better logistical/supply support from upper management.
- I have very little confidence in the judgement of APHIS decision makers.
- Non-managerial professionals should have received more info as to how better answer citizens' concerns.
- A more serious attitude exhibited by line officers.

VS

Communication

- Maybe I could have included industry in the beginning.
- More formal presentations.
- Letters.
- Supporting communication.
- More personal contact with employees and cattle owners to explain risks.
- Timeliness (so we can respond faster).
- Group meetings to explain in person rather than via pamphlets or telephone.
- Field cooperation.
- Less interference from private sector.
- More knowledge to public.

Analysis/Planning

- Had to make some assumptions about time...not enough existing info to do precise risk assessment.
- More involvement from information management regarding risk analysis using computer technology.
- Stay with the guidelines and already defined risk.

Management/Policy

- Removal of political decisions from the practice of medicine.
- Increase time and resources in informing cooperators and reviewing problems.
- More authority to make change where change was needed.
- Sticking to logical/scientific decision making.
- Improve training for VS personnel.

Other

- More opportunities.

REAC

Communication

- Better communication of problem to wider segment of industry.
- Better communication in writing.
- Communicate our efforts to media and welfare groups.
- Needed were consistent information and also answers from headquarters. Also more

support and concern for field people is needed. Also enforcement is needed.

Specific tasks

- Video training. Intra staff communication and cooperation.
- More knowledge.

Management/Policy

- We need to focus our intents on fulfilling the intent of the law as passed by Congress, rather than on trying to placate industry and/or humane groups.
- Better support from higher levels in regard to opposition from other Federal agencies and industry.
- Could have done it sooner and not because we were threatened. - Less interference from private sector.

Other

- Improvement will come with more experience.

LPA

Communication

- Improve pro-active media activities.
- Better and documented coordination with FDA.
- More follow-up materials distributed regularly.
- More exposure to the community.

Specific tasks

- Not everyone, industry for instance, supported the APHIS position on the honey bee issue.

Management/Policy

- APHIS generally needs to return to biologically-based decision making.
- Decision-making process was slow.
- A speed of bureaucratic decisions.
- More open contact - the communication effort partially blocked at Assistant Secretary level.
- More program response.
- Buying radio/TV time - but it's prohibited by federal regulations.
- Started sooner.

PPD

Communication

- Ensuring that all affected public received proposed rule in order to give comments to APHIS.

Analysis/Planning

- Need to be better able to assess and estimate risk.
- More time could be allotted to performing comprehensive impact studies.

Management/Policy

- Some information dated due to long clearance time at higher levels.
- Efficiency at group meetings, more clear goal setting at outset.

E-4

BBEP

Communication

- Better notification of some interested parties, organization of comments from respondents, contractual agreement for risk analysis.
- Legal jargon.
- Public comment period.
- Start risk communication process earlier.
- Better Hyattsville-to-field-level communications.
- Acceptance by client other than what is forced or required.
- Better acceptance by environmental groups.

Analysis/Planning

- Hypotheses included in computer mathematical models explicitly stated; other alternatives to estimating exposure (i.e., using empirical data already collected) investigated.
- Better test to evaluate risk.
- Perhaps, more time to comment on preliminary environmental assessment.

Management/Policy

- Steering toward a decision by management and my supervisor but not controlling the choice.
- Need more balance, we favor the industry we regulate over other interest groups and this is readily perceived by the public.
- Everything else other than stating the problem.
- Amount of time spent to complete should be reduced.

RD

Analysis/Planning

- Improve services' evaluation of efforts to gain compliance with regulations.
- Needed study to get scientific valid data.

Management/Policy

- Follow through by responsible staffs.
- Less time spent making final decision.
- Timing and priority by other units.

MB

Communication

- More time for the public to comment on the decisions may have helped this effort.
- Information sharing by affected staff.
- I did not follow through to next groups in timely fashion.

Management/Policy

- More support from superiors.
- We should have more resources to train all ADP equipment users.

ST

Communication

- Give more information.
- More time could have been used in presentation, however the results may not have reflected the extra effort.

Specific tasks

- Need more biological information. Re: pest species i.e., trapping data.

Other

- Consequences.

Other

Communication

- More literature available.
- If there is risk, communicate that risk to the affected.

Specific tasks

- Their understanding of the risk of animal damage control.

Management/Policy

- Attitude of the higher management levels.
- Faster action on our part.
- Better general preparations.

Appendix F: Original Responses: Q15k

Q15k Please describe anything else that you feel is important about this issue:

ADC

Communication

- Biological explanation of carriers.
- More literature (i.e., pamphlets, fact sheets, etc.) need to be developed for field level personnel to disseminate. Also, we need more trained public relations and experts in ADC.
- Public education is needed to offset misinformation.
- Most people do not understand ADC program - all they have heard was negative, once we presented factual info most sensible people understand necessity of work.

Analysis/Planning

- Agencies and animal right groups (attacking ADC program). Keeping tools used to conduct programs.

Management/Policy

- Gull control - worked good because we didn't tell anyone anything!
- Need good strategies to effectively communicate voluntarily and involuntarily risks of ADC activities to the public.

External environment

- Thru animal rights groups already have their minds made up, and it is next to impossible for them to see the real world.

PPQ

Communication

- Status reports on risk assessment from staff to the field, as applicable to keep the field informed and relay info to concerned party. Be provided contacts for both the field and concerned parties, after the chain-of-command has been used to notify.
- I think the folks in journey should be better informed.

Analysis/Planning

- Where possible give adequate cost/benefit and pesticidal impact info before initiating pest management programs to extent you get public support.

Management/Policy

- Almost daily, someone in our work unit has a quarantine decision countermanded. It is not changed for any reason other than who it would anger, inconvenience or make more work for. Most PPQ officers have given up making decisions because of this and instead go to their supervisors for what should be a routine quarantine decision.
- Complex problems exist in how management decisions are made and communicated to the field.
- Resolve the conflicts between politics and risk assessment. Put more effort into prevention by informing traveling public in advance. I.e., videos on all foreign flights toward APHIS concerns. Information through international ticket listing APHIS concerns, etc.

F-2

External environment

- Public opinion.

VS

Communication

- I am still in the process of selling it to the industry.
- A special group of people should handle the communication of risk. Specialized personnel should play a role. More and better equipment and improve maintenance of it will increase public and employee's confidence in procedures to prevent risk. For example, a leaking pesticide sprayer tank is not a good indication to the public that we "care".
- Common sense coupled with professional training gains public understanding and support.

Analysis/Planning

- Standardization of state/fed policies in animal disease control.
- Establish the risk and adhere to prior assessments.
- We need to educate APHIS personnel about risk analysis methods using information data bases and computer technology.

Management/Policy

- Involving industry, practitioners, state extension, other agencies, media.
- State governments cooperation could be improved.

External environment

- Public does not understand why - new generation of people never exposed to animal diseases.

REAC

Management/Policy

- Politics plays too much significance on decisions instead of doing what the law says.
- Political influence and opposition is allowed to affect regulatory/legal issues to much and at to low a level.
- The lack of morale and incentive on the part of co-workers and supervisors, the main obstacles to success of my duties were derisiveness and apathy of the staff due to poor morale and poor leadership.

External environment

- Difficult to overcome peoples' notions of what is and is not adequate nutritionally, and to get them to change old habits (especially, if it costs more to change.)

LPA

Analysis/Planning

- There were, and continue to be, many schools of thought about these bees, but it could be anything like pesticide efficacy, quarantine development, ... It's all based on the research. But APHIS, or USDA, doesn't do all the research on these subjects. I often found university researchers saying the exact opposite of USDA researchers. Who knows why, maybe the university researcher gets more grant money by making an anti-govt case. At any rate, it makes communicating about a given risk difficult. The end result is that the target audience receives conflicting messages.

Management/Policy

- Industry completely understands own position and since the beginning of this issue, we have cooperated fully with them. They are assisting in decision-making process.
- Devote sufficient manpower and resources to information and communication activities.
- Agency's need departmental backing for decisions.
- APHIS needs to continue active risk assessment program.
- Opportunities were lost to stop this pest because of fundamental differences in scientific opinion of the risk association. While we debated, the bees moved steadily up Central America into Mexico and finally Texas.

PPDCommunication

- Need to be repeated and reminded.

BBEPCommunication

- In order to communicate risk effectively the communicator (BBEP) has to have a receptive audience. Many times it seems that other APHIS professionals are resistant to program modifications and perceive communication of risk as an impediment rather than something that can assist program planning and operations.

Analysis/Planning

- It was important to identify all interested parties.

Management/Policy

- APHIS must be willing to accept the responsibility for the authority it has delegated.
- Internal politics affects the method of exposure assessment chosen more than the opinions of APHIS professionals familiar with the area.
- Change traditional non-professional attitudes in APHIS.
- Risk decisions are made based on political and social assessments. This is true of internal management and outside decisions.

Other

- Books have already been written.

RDCommunication

- I don't deal with risk in all issues. I distributed regulatory documents and I may need to explain unclear items. I don't actually deal with the the assessment of the risk. I deal with the after the fact documents.

MBManagement/Policy

- New players develops too fast, management keeps changing.

External environment

- In ADP field, the most important is virus intrusion. It can destroy the information or system.

F-4

ST

Communication

- The need for restricting use of current pesticides and for the development of alternate control methods should have been impressed on the public through the media.
- See attached memo for the record.

Analysis/Planning

- Model should be tested.
- Restricted to lab setting.
- One must consider the amount of federal dollars spent on risk assessment and act accordingly.

Other

Communication

- Field personnel should be briefed on regular basis.

Specific tasks

- Risk assessment is a daily function of APHIS - IS employees and should be recognized as such.

Management/Policy

- USDA fails to move on actions of risk assessment and regulations as if the problem may go away - it doesn't and we appear indecisive.
- I can't solve anything until the attitude APHIS is changed to communicating risk and not acting like a big bully afraid of its shadow.

