

Response to: **Consumer Focus Groups Information Collection (FSIS)**

- 1) Under the estimate of burden, in the Supporting Statement, it is stated that collectively respondents will spend 240 hours annually in response time at \$12/hour which is a total of \$2,880 but the reported total value is \$2,860 (quest 12 page 4) It is recommended that the cost discrepancies be rectified.
- 2) The screening question referring to how many times a respondent prepares or cooks meals at home would seem to screen out everyone. It appears that the interview is to be terminated if respondents prepare meals less than 3 times a week, however choice 2 (“At least once a week”) would include those preparing meals three or more times a week and thus the interview for these respondents may be terminated. It is recommended that the choices be modified in order to improve understanding and avoid premature termination of the interview.
- 3) The answer to question 11 of the Supporting Statement states that applicants are not asked any information of a sensitive nature. However, question five of the Underserved Population questionnaire asks about gross annual household income. This question might be interpreted as sensitive. It is recommended that this be clarified
- 4) It is stated in the Supporting Statement that respondents will not receive any gifts or payments. However, during the introductory of each questionnaire respondents are informed that if they participate they will receive \$75 along with a free gift. It is recommended that this be clarified.
- 5) Under Appendix C (Moderator Guide) it is stated that “Although we are talking about food safety topics, we are not food safety experts so we may not be able to answer all of your questions”. It is recommended that respondents be informed that any questions unable to be answered in the session will be forwarded to FSIS personnel and list of all answers will be compiled sent to respondents.
- 6) It is recommended that FSIS explicitly state how statistical analysis will be used to interpret results and how those interpretations may be used (Example – determining the frequency at which groups of different race prepare ‘chicken and mashed potatoes’ within each subpopulation might reveal racial tendencies that might be helpful when delivering public health messages and considering modes of delivery in order to increase effectiveness).