MAY 1-7, 2010 SHORE LEAVE SURVEY

During the of May 1-7, 2010, the Seaman’s Church Institute of New York and New Jersey (SCI) completed its ninth annual survey of seafarers’ shore leave detentions and restrictions on their access through terminals in United States ports. Seafarers’ centers in twenty-two U.S. ports participated, 16 of which reported instances of seafarers being denied shore leave.

The survey revealed that of 337 ships visited, 63 had at least one crewmember denied shore leave, or approximately 1 in every 5 ships. Out of an estimated 7,350 seafarers on board all of the surveyed ships, 734 did not receive shore leave, or about 1 in every 10 seafarers, primarily due to lack of visas. Seafarers also faced constraints imposed by ship management, terminal restrictions, investigations on vessels, and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) detentions. The number of reported terminal restrictions does not illustrate the full extent of the terminal or shore leave access issue, as chaplains could not collect shore leave data for vessels they did not have access to. Finally, some ship operators reportedly maintain a policy of prohibiting Burmese crewmembers from going ashore in the United States.

The reports revealed the great diversity of seafarers currently operating merchant vessels. Of the 101 ships with crew nationality information reported, seafarers from 37 different countries were represented. Filipinos comprised the largest contingent, with over one-half of the vessels

---

1 Some chaplain’s reports did not indicate the total number of seafarers aboard the ships they visited. In those cases, we estimated the crew size to be 22.
indicating that at least some Filipinos crewmembers. Other nationalities often represented in visited ships included Russians, Ukrainians, Indians, and Burmese.

The survey also asked chaplains to detail Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) implementation policies in their ports. The Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 mandated the TWIC program, implemented in all ports in April 2009. The program requires persons to have TWIC cards for unescorted access to secure areas within United States ports. This year’s survey indicates that many of the TWIC-related issues reported by ports in last year’s survey have been resolved. Last year, fourteen ports identified various problems and challenges after TWIC implementation; this year, only three ports reported ongoing issues with access for TWIC reasons. The reported problems included the inability of a Canadian ship visitor to obtain a TWIC, terminals relying on chaplains’ limited resources for escorting seafarers, and training issues with gate guards. Nearly every other port indicated no TWIC issues at all.

As reported every year since the survey began, lack of a visa is the primary reason for shore leave denials. Over the last five years, approximately 1 in every 5 ships visited has had seafarers detained on board, with only slight variation. Ports experienced various problems implementing the TWIC program in its first year, but it seems that most ports have successfully resolved these issues. Several port chaplains reported a dramatic change in their gaining access to terminals and reducing terminal-related obstacles to seafarers’ shore leave. It appears that last October’s ALCOAST 575/09² which instructed US Coast Guard Captains of the Port to ensure that Facility Security Plans provide procedures for adequate mariner and chaplain access has had its intended effect. Despite this success, some terminals, particularly petroleum product terminals, continue to place obstacles to seafarers’ and chaplains’ access through their terminals.

² Available at http://www.uscg.mil/announcements/alcoast/575-09_alcoast.txt
Reported Chaplain/Vessel/TWIC Access Issues

Oakland, CA
The terminal is slow when giving information on Agents so Chaplains can be delayed in gaining access to ships.

Brunswick, GA
A long-time volunteer from Canada is not able to get a TWIC because the Canadian visitors’ visa is not on the list of visas eligible for a TWIC.

Boston, MA
One terminal will not allow Seafarer’s Friend TWIC holders to escort non-TWIC interns, so they are unable visit ships with the Chaplains.

Baltimore, MD
Unless Seafarers’ Center escorts are available, most seafarers without TWICs docked in Baltimore have high escort fees, usually no less than $100.

TWIC procedures regarding acceptable identification are inconsistent at different terminals.

Newark, NJ
There are some terminals where Chaplains cannot access ships and seafarers cannot go ashore. There are other terminals Chaplains can access ships, but seafarers cannot go ashore. In one terminal Chaplains can only go aboard when they give notice 4 hours prior to going to the vessel, but seafarers cannot go ashore. Some petroleum product terminals provide free van service between 12:30 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. but charge a fee at other times.

Houston, TX
There are two terminals where seafarers cannot be picked up because there is no ‘line of sight’ from the van to the gangway because the ship docks are too far from where the van is allowed to park.

Texas City, TX
A Chaplain was denied access to a ship when a guard could not find the access permission letter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Number of Ships Visited</th>
<th>Number of Ships on Which Seafarers Were Detained</th>
<th>Number of Seafarers Detained</th>
<th>Reason(s), if any, for Detaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, BC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Company prohibits Burmese shore leave (5), No Visas (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>No Visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton, CA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No Visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, DE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>No Visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee, FL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No Visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick, GA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>No Visas (17), Captain did not allow crew anywhere but Seafarer’s Center because they were “busy” (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Charles, LA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>No Visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Terminal. Chaplains not available and port does not allow crew ashore unless escorted by Chaplain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>No Visas (79) Coast Guard investigation (22), Company Burmese Policy (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, ME</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No Visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth, NH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>No Visas (6), CBP crew detained for cook ‘jumping ship’ (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No Visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No Visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No Visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>No Visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas City, TX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>No Visas (64), Crewmembers ‘too young’ (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay WI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Ships Visited and Number of Ships with Detained Seafarers

- Ships Visited
- Ships with Denied Seafarers
Number of Seafarers Detained by Port
Percentage of Seafarers Without Visa by Nationality Compared with Percentage of Nationality Present on Ships Visited

- **Filipino**: 62%
- **Burmes**: 24.3%
- **Chinese**: 20.2%
- **Ukrainian**: 19.4%
- **Korean**: 15.9%
- **Indonesian**: 21%
- **Croatian**: 3.76%
- **Russian**: 3.43%
- **Turkish**: 2.36%
- **Azerbaijan**: 2.3%
- **Maldivian**: 1.41%
- **Romanian**: 1.41%
- **Indian**: 1.1%

**Legend**

- Blue bars: Percentage of seafarers without visas on ships visited of this nationality
- Red bars: Percentage of ships visited with this nationality represented in crew
% of Vessels with Seafarers of Stated Nationality

- Filipino: 62%
- Russian: 29%
- Ukranian: 21%
- Indian: 15%
- Myanmar: 13%
- Chinese: 9%
- German: 9%
- Polish: 8%
- Greek: 7%
- Latvian: 6%
- Croatian: 6%
- Korean: 5%
- Romanian: 4%
- Lithuanian: 4%
- Costa Rican: 3%
- Indonesian: 3%
- Swedish: 2%
- American: 2%
- Bangladeshi: 2%
- British: 2%
- Georgian: 2%
- Other: 16%

Example: 62% of ships visited had at least one Filipino crewmember
Five Year Comparison of Number of Ships Visited with Number of Detained Seafarers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ships With Denied Seafarers</th>
<th>Ships Visited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five Year Comparison of All Detentions with Detentions for Lack of Visa

- 2010: Total Seafarer's Detained 615, Seafarer's Detained for Lack of Visa 384
- 2009: Total Seafarer's Detained 625, Seafarer's Detained for Lack of Visa 134
- 2008: Total Seafarer's Detained 740, Seafarer's Detained for Lack of Visa 196
- 2007: Total Seafarer's Detained 1163, Seafarer's Detained for Lack of Visa 399
- 2006: Total Seafarer's Detained 1163, Seafarer's Detained for Lack of Visa 384
- 2005: Total Seafarer's Detained 740, Seafarer's Detained for Lack of Visa 399

Legend:
- Purple: Seafarer's Detained for Lack of Visa
- Orange: Total Seafarer's Detained