

2009 SUPPORTING STATEMENT

Farmers Market Questionnaire OMB NO. 0581-0169

Terms of Clearance with 2006 Approval:

OMB approves this collection for three years. Following an analysis of the survey results, please provide a copy of the report to OMB. The survey analysis must discuss the methodology used to detect non-response bias and the potential effects of that bias, as agreed to by the survey contractor. Finally, all public dissemination, including internet publication, concerning the sale of organic foods at farmers' markets should note that the survey did not ask whether the organic foods sold are USDA "certified organic" products.

The final report for this survey has been completed and a copy of the final report has been attached. The final report can also be obtained online at:

[http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSV1.0/getfile?
dDocName=STELPRDC5077203&acct=wdmgeninfo](http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSV1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5077203&acct=wdmgeninfo)

A response bias survey was developed and disseminated to farmers market managers who did not respond to the survey. The results of the non-response survey were intended to identify any bias that might exist in our sample pool. The non-response survey was mailed to 1,000 non-respondents with the expectation that at least 100 questionnaires would be returned; 239 were actually received. The respondents to the non-response survey were asked:

- How many years has your market been open?
- Is your market manager a paid employee?
- How many vendors did your market have in 2005?
- How many customers attended your market weekly?
- What were the annual sales of your market in 2005?
- Which one of the following statements about your market was most true in 2005?
 - We had more demand than supply – we need more vendors
 - During 2005 our supply exceeded demand – we needed more customers
 - Supply and demand of products were roughly equal in 2005

The non-response survey markets reported lower mean value of sales, number of vendors and number of customers served, which suggests that the results of this study may overestimate the magnitude of the farmers market sector. Both the non-response survey and the original survey displayed large variation within these variables and for this reason median values are used in this report to describe the sector.

The one group that appeared to be underrepresented in the survey was individuals that managed two or more farmers markets. The response rate for managers of multiple

markets was only 10.3 percent. Our efforts to account for the increased paperwork burden faced by managers of multiple markets by redirecting the survey to a secondary point of contact proved largely unsuccessful. Out of the 965 managers of multiple markets in the population listed on our contact sheet, only 99 responded to the survey—10.3 percent, compared to an average response rate of 34.5 percent. Many of them—7.7 percent of all managers—were located in California. California reported that 57 percent of its markets had managers who managed two or more markets. The relative unwillingness of this group of managers to participate in the survey resulted in an overall underrepresentation of the Far West region in the survey population.

A. Justification.

1. EXPLAIN THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT MAKE THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION NECESSARY. IDENTIFY ANY LEGAL OR ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS THAT NECESSITATE THE COLLECTION.

The primary legislative basis for conducting farmers market research is the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627). This act broadened the scope of USDA activities to include the entire spectrum of agricultural marketing, including direct marketing. Sec. 203a of the Act states that the Secretary of Agriculture is directed and authorized, “to determine the needs and develop or assist in the development of plans for efficient facilities and methods of operating such facilities for the proper assembly, processing, storage, transportation, distribution, and handling of agricultural products...” In addition, the Farmer-to-Consumer Direct Marketing Act of 1976 supports USDA’s work to enhance the effectiveness of direct marketing, such as the development of modern farmers markets.

The Transportation and Marketing Program (TMP), Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) conducts research to develop techniques and operating methods for farmers markets under the Agency’s Marketing Services Division (MSD). Recommendations are made available to local decision makers interested in establishing or improving farmers markets to serve area producers and consumers. AMS maintains the most robust database of U.S. farmers markets known to exist, which currently contains information on approximately 5,200 markets in 2009. The strong interest in farmers market data corresponds with the growth in the size of direct marketing nationally and the expansion in the number of farmers markets. The 2002 Census of Agriculture reported that in 1997, consumers purchased \$591.8 million in farm products directly from farmers for human consumption. By 2002, the level of direct to consumer purchases had grown to \$812.2 million, representing a +37.2 percent increase. Over a similar time period, the number of farmers markets increased from 2,746 in 1998 to 3,137 in 2002, representing a +14.2 percent growth rate.

The 2007 Census of Agriculture reported that direct to consumer sales in 2007 had grown to \$1.2 billion, representing a +49.1 percent increase over the level reported in 2002. Farmers markets continue to show strong growth, with approximately 5,200 markets in

operation in 2009 representing a +65.8 percent growth rate since 2002. This indicates the continued viability of this industry and the continued need for market trend data.

The role of Marketing Services Division (MSD) of United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) is to facilitate distribution of U.S. agricultural products. We identify marketing opportunities, provide analysis to help take advantage of those opportunities and develop and evaluate solutions including improving farmers markets and other direct-to-consumer marketing activities. Various types of farmers markets serve different parts of the food marketing chain, but all focus on the small-to medium-sized agricultural producers that have difficulty obtaining access to large-scale commercial distribution channels. Markets are maintained by State Departments of Agriculture, local public authorities, grower organizations and non-profit organizations. Some markets were developed as a part of an ongoing effort to provide alternative marketing channels for small and medium-sized producers moving from cash crops, and allotment based marketing, and bulk commodities.

Direct marketing through the nation's farmers markets provides an opportunity to increase the utilization of successful USDA programs, such as the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program, WIC Farmers Market Nutrition Program, Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) (formally called "food stamps"). They also provide a "teachable moment" for diet, health, and nutrition services and programs. Efforts to enhance direct marketing opportunities supplement a continuing cross-Departmental program that promotes food access, economic development, enhances the quality of life in disadvantaged communities, and works to combat obesity by providing a convenient and affordable source of fresh fruits and vegetables to underserved populations.

2. INDICATE HOW, BY WHOM, AND FOR WHAT PURPOSE THE INFORMATION IS TO BE USED. EXCEPT FOR A NEW COLLECTION, INDICATE THE ACTUAL USE THE AGENCY HAS MADE OF THE INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM THE CURRENT COLLECTION.

Data and reports developed from the 2005 survey of farmers markets have been utilized by State Departments of Agriculture, farmer groups, various USDA agencies and non-profit organizations to improve market intelligence, market operations and evaluate the impact of federal nutrition programs on farmers market sales. Data extracted from survey results has been presented and shared by AMS personnel at the request of a variety of agricultural stakeholders including the Farmers Market Consortium, Board members of the Farmers Market Coalition, Food Distribution Research Society, Arkansas Land Development Corporation, the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Roots of Change, VISA, Office of Budget and Program Analysis various mainstream news media and State Departments of Agriculture. The Farmers Market Consortium is a public/private sector partnership, comprised of several USDA and other Federal agencies involved in farmers

market assistance, along with representatives from other private foundations and non-profit organizations, that is dedicated to supporting the farmers market community by sharing information about funding opportunities and available technical resources.

Using TM-6, data is collected once every three years from a national survey of the farmers market industry to provide researchers and planners with a national overview of the current conditions and resource requirements giving them the opportunity to develop informed plans and business strategies. The large number of respondents (1,292) to the 2006 survey provide sufficient depth to develop accurate analysis of markets of different age groups, size (in terms of the number of vendors), and regional location. Information from this study provides market managers and market organizers pertinent information regarding the typical product mix at markets, budget requirements, and changes in months of operation and other data to assist them in their planning decisions. Members of the farmers market sector displayed their interest in the importance of this data collection by their strong response rate of 34.5 percent to our voluntary survey conducted in 2006.

If our data collection request is approved, data obtained from markets will represent a varied range of sizes, geographical locations, types, ownership, and structure. These markets will provide a valid overview of farmers markets in the United States. The information collected by this survey will evaluate the growth of the farmers market sector, provide the resource requirements of markets and outline strategies that can be used to revitalize existing markets.

A number of changes have occurred since the last survey of farmers markets in 2005. The number of farmers markets across the country has continued to increase substantially from 4,093 markets in the 2005 season, (the period of time covered by the 2006 survey) to 5,200 in 2009, representing a +27.0 percent increase. Product mix and offerings at farmers markets have adapted to consumer demands and new government programs have emerged that have exerted influence on farmers market sales. Government programs affecting farmers markets include the creation of the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program in March 2003 and the modernization of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, (formerly titled the Food Stamp Program), delivery system to Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) in 2002. The vast majority of supplemental nutrition assistance benefits are currently being issued electronically. The Women, Infants, and Children Farmers Market program has increased in funding since 2000 and continues to influence farmers market sales. The Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program will be expanded in October 1, 2009 to allow recipients to make purchases of fresh fruits and vegetables at farmers markets. The collection instrument has been designed to gain a better understanding of the growth, composition and effect of such government programs on this alternative marketing outlet. The collection modification attachment describes the changes made with a brief explanation of why these changes were made to the collection instrument.

There were five questions in the previous questionnaire that were not used in the current questionnaire proposed. The questions removed were: Part 2 question 13, Part 2 question 18, Part 3 question 27, Part 3 question 28, and Part 3 question 36 a)

3. DESCRIBE WHETHER, AND TO WHAT EXTENT, THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION INVOLVES THE USE OF AUTOMATED, ELECTRONIC, MECHANICAL, OR OTHER TECHNOLOGICAL COLLECTION TECHNIQUES OR OTHER FORMS OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, E.G. PERMITTING ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF RESPONSES, AND THE BASIS FOR THE DECISION FOR ADOPTING THIS MEANS OF COLLECTION. ALSO DESCRIBE ANY CONSIDERATION OF USING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TO REDUCE BURDEN.

Market managers with computer access will be informed of the availability of filling and returning this form electronically via the Internet <http://www.msuresearch.com/se.ashx?s=251137453A041669>

Managers that have computer access can complete the form and submit it electronically. AMS has made every effort to gather a complete listing of e-mail addresses of farmers markets. The number of respondents that have provided AMS with e-mail addresses is 2,878; this represents 54.5 percent of the approximately 5,200 markets known to exist. Questionnaires will be sent by surface mail to market managers that do not have e-mail addresses.

4. DESCRIBE EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY DUPLICATION. SHOW SPECIFICALLY WHY ANY SIMILAR INFORMATION ALREADY AVAILABLE CANNOT BE USED OR MODIFIED FOR USE FOR THE PURPOSE(S) DESCRIBED IN ITEM 2 ABOVE.

No other information collection on the Farmers market industry has the breadth of our information collection because it will attempt to reach each farmers market in the country. Consequently we expect that data from this survey will be comprehensive enough to carry out national analysis, regional and scale comparisons.

5. IF THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION IMPACTS SMALL BUSINESSES OR OTHER SMALL ENTITIES (ITEM 5 OF THE OMB FORM 83-1), DESCRIBE THE METHODS USED TO MINIMIZE BURDEN.

The Small Business Administration defines, in 13 CFR Part 121, small agricultural producers as those having annual receipts of no more than \$750,000 and small agricultural service firms (handlers and importers) as those having annual receipts of no more than \$6.5 million. Based on respondents of the 2006 survey 100 percent of farmers markets were classified as small businesses. As all of our survey respondents are

subjected to the same level of burden, there is no variance in the estimate of the burden across our expected group of respondents.

6. DESCRIBE THE CONSEQUENCE TO FEDERAL PROGRAM OR POLICY ACTIVITIES IF THE COLLECTION IS NOT CONDUCTED OR IS CONDUCTED LESS FREQUENTLY, AS WELL AS ANY TECHNICAL OR LEGAL OBSTACLES TO REDUCING BURDEN.

Previous research studies undertaken by MSD have been utilized by State Departments of Agriculture, farmer groups, various USDA agencies and non-profit organizations. Without this study both governmental and non-governmental organizations who contact our agency frequently for objective national and regional information on farmers markets would be deprived of a strategic marketing resource that facilitates effective planning, business development, resource allocation and policy formulation in the rapidly growing and evolving direct farm marketing sector. The frequent compilation of a robust national database on farmers market activities allows for in-depth analysis of farmers market performance and operations by region and size of operation, and provides essential guidance to market stakeholders at all stages of business development, as well as to policymakers who seek to support the expansion of farmers market activities. MSD plans to conduct a similar study every three years to identify trends in farmers market operations.

7. EXPLAIN ANY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WOULD CAUSE AN INFORMATION COLLECTION TO BE CONDUCTED IN A MANNER:

- **REQUIRING RESPONDENTS TO REPORT INFORMATION TO THE AGENCY MORE OFTEN THAN QUARTERLY;**
- **REQUIRING RESPONDENTS TO PREPARE A WRITTEN RESPONSE TO A COLLECTION OF INFORMATION IN FEWER THAN 30 DAYS AFTER RECEIPT OF IT;**
- **REQUIRING RESPONDENTS TO SUBMIT MORE THAN AN ORIGINAL AND TWO COPIES OF ANY DOCUMENT;**
- **REQUIRING RESPONDENTS TO RETAIN RECORDS, OTHER THAN HEALTH, MEDICAL, GOVERNMENT CONTRACT, GRANT-IN-AID, OR TAX RECORDS FOR MORE THAN 3 YEARS;**
- **IN CONNECTION WITH A STATISTICAL SURVEY, THAT IS NOT DESIGNED TO PRODUCE VALID**

AND RELIABLE RESULTS THAT CAN BE GENERALIZED TO THE UNIVERSE OF STUDY;

- **REQUIRING THE USE OF A STATISTICAL DATA CLASSIFICATION THAT HAS NOT BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY OMB;**
- **THAT INCLUDES A PLEDGE OF CONFIDENTIALITY THAT IS NOT SUPPORTED BY AUTHORITY ESTABLISHED IN STATUE OR REGULATION, THAT IS NOT SUPPORTED BY DISCLOSURE AND DATA SECURITY POLICIES THAT ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE PLEDGE, OR WHICH UNNECESSARILY IMPEDES SHARING OF DATA WITH OTHER AGENCIES FOR COMPATIBLE CONFIDENTIAL USE; OR**
- **REQUIRING RESPONDENTS TO SUBMIT PROPRIETARY TRADE SECRET, OR OTHER CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION UNLESS THE AGENCY CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT IT HAS INSTITUTED PROCEDURES TO PROTECT THE INFORMATION'S CONFIDENTIALITY TO THE EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW.**

There are no special circumstances. Data collection plans are consistent with 5 CFR 1320.6

8. **IF APPLICABLE, PROVIDE A COPY AND IDENTIFY THE DATE AND PAGE NUMBER OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER OF THE AGENCY'S NOTICE, REQUIRED BY 5 CFR 1320.8(d), SOLICITING COMMENTS ON THE INFORMATION COLLECTION PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO OMB. SUMMARIZE PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THAT NOTICE AND DESCRIBE ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE AGENCY IN RESPONSE TO THESE COMMENTS. SPECIFICALLY ADDRESS COMMENTS RECEIVED ON COST AND HOUR BURDEN.**

The agency published a notice in the Federal Register on 26, August 2008, Vol. 73, No.166, page 50299, requesting a revision to a currently approved information collection and a request for comments. The Agency did not receive any comments.

DESCRIBE EFFORTS TO CONSULT WITH PERSONS OUTSIDE THE AGENCY TO OBTAIN THEIR VIEWS ON THE AVAILABILITY OF DATA, FREQUENCY OF COLLECTION, THE CLARITY OF INSTRUCTIONS AND RECORD KEEPING, DISCLOSURE, OR REPORTING FORMAT (IF ANY), AND ON THE DATA ELEMENTS TO BE RECORDED, DISCLOSED, OR REPORTED.

CONSULTATION WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THOSE FROM WHOM INFORMATION IS TO BE OBTAINED OR THOSE WHO MUST COMPILE RECORDS SHOULD OCCUR AT LEAST ONCE EVERY 3 YEARS -- EVEN IF THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION ACTIVITY IS THE SAME AS IN PRIOR PERIODS. THERE MAY BE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT MAY PRECLUDE CONSULTATION IN A SPECIFIC SITUATION. THESE CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD BE EXPLAINED.

The following reviewers were asked to critique the questionnaire for relevance and their ability to answer the questions as written.

Stacy Miller
Executive Director
Farmers Market Coalition
304-263-6396

Diane Eggert
Farmers Market Federation of New York
315-475-1101

9. EXPLAIN ANY DECISION TO PROVIDE ANY PAYMENT OR GIFT TO RESPONDENTS, OTHER THAN REMUNERATION OF CONTRACTORS OR GRANTEEES.

No payments or gifts are provided to respondents.

10. DESCRIBE ANY ASSURANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PROVIDED TO RESPONDENTS AND THE BASIS FOR THE ASSURANCE IN STATUTE, REGULATION, OR AGENCY POLICY.

There are no unique confidentiality policies.

11. PROVIDE ADDITIONAL JUSTIFICATION FOR ANY QUESTIONS OF A SENSITIVE NATURE, SUCH AS SEXUAL BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDES, RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, AND OTHER MATTERS THAT ARE COMMONLY CONSIDERED PRIVATE. THIS

JUSTIFICATION SHOULD INCLUDE THE REASONS WHY THE AGENCY CONSIDERS THE QUESTIONS NECESSARY, THE SPECIFIC USES TO BE MADE OF THE INFORMATION, THE EXPLANATION TO BE GIVEN TO PERSONS FROM WHOM THE INFORMATION IS REQUESTED, AND ANY STEPS TO BE TAKEN TO OBTAIN THEIR CONSENT.

Two questions ask farmers market managers to estimate the percentage of their producers/vendors that belong to specific racial categories and ethnic groups. These questions are being asked to determine if various ethnic communities are being adequately served by the farmers market in their local area and to determine the degree that minorities farmers participate in farmers markets and are able to use farmers markets to generate farm income. These questions comply with OMB Federal Regulation V62 #210, pp. 58781-58790.

12. PROVIDE ESTIMATES OF THE HOUR BURDEN OF THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.

THE STATEMENT SHOULD:

- INDICATE THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS, FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE, ANNUAL HOUR BURDEN, AND AN EXPLANATION OF HOW THE BURDEN WAS ESTIMATED. UNLESS DIRECTED TO DO SO, AGENCIES SHOULD NOT CONDUCT SPECIAL SURVEYS TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ON WHICH TO BASE HOUR BURDEN ESTIMATES. CONSULTATION WITH A SAMPLE (FEWER THAN 10) OF POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS IS DESIRABLE. IF THE HOUR BURDEN ON RESPONDENTS IS EXPECTED TO VARY WIDELY BECAUSE OF DIFFERENCE IN ACTIVITY, SIZE, OR COMPLEXITY, SHOW THE RANGE OF ESTIMATED HOUR BURDEN, AND EXPLAIN THE REASONS FOR THE VARIANCE. GENERALLY, ESTIMATES SHOULD NOT INCLUDE BURDEN HOURS FOR CUSTOMARY AND USUAL BUSINESS PRACTICES.

- IF THIS REQUEST FOR APPROVAL COVERS MORE THAN ONE FORM, PROVIDE SEPARATE HOUR BURDEN ESTIMATES FOR EACH FORM AND AGGREGATE THE HOUR BURDENS IN ITEM 13 OF OMB FORM 83-I.

There are approximately 5,200 markets nationwide. It is estimated that it will take 21 minutes to complete the primary questionnaire. The estimated amount of time used by non-respondents to review the long form questionnaire before deciding not to complete the questionnaire will take 2 minutes. A portion of non-respondents to the primary

survey (1,000) will be sent an 8 question short form questionnaire in order to determine the characteristics of the farmers markets that did not respond and to measure potential survey bias caused by the lack of participation in the primary survey. We estimate respondents to the response bias survey (short form), will require 5 minutes to complete this 8 question survey. We estimate that non-respondents to the response bias survey (short form) will review our request for their participation for 2 minutes before they decline to complete the response bias questionnaire. Time estimates for the primary survey are based on conversations with test respondents that were provided the questionnaire to review. Estimates for the non-respondents and the response bias survey were estimated by staff.

This survey is conducted once every three years. Therefore, for burden calculation purposes 0.33 is used for “number of responses per respondent.” Total burden for this study is estimated to be 273 hours. The estimated cost incurred is:

1,820 X .350 hour X \$19.75 = \$12,581 (respondents to the primary survey) plus
3,380 X .033 hour X \$19.75 = \$ 2,203 (non-respondents to the primary survey) plus
240 X .083 hour X \$19.75 = \$ 393 (respondents to the response bias survey) plus
760 X .033 hour X \$19.75 = \$ 495 (non-respondents to the response bias survey)
Total = \$15,672

This calculation was based on the wage rate for occupation code 45-1011 (First-Line Supervisor/Managers of Farming, Fishing and Forestry Workers) reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (\$19.75 per hour). There is no variance in the estimate of the burden across our group of respondents. All respondents are asked to complete the same form; therefore, all respondents have the same level of burden. All questions asked in the questionnaire refer to data that market managers can be expected to have ready access to as part of their normal routine.

13. PROVIDE AN ESTIMATE OF THE TOTAL ANNUAL COST BURDEN TO RESPONDENTS OR RECORD KEEPERS RESULTING FROM THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION. (DO NOT INCLUDE THE COST OF ANY HOUR BURDEN SHOWN IN ITEMS 12 AND 14).

- **THE COST ESTIMATE SHOULD BE SPLIT INTO TWO COMPONENTS: (a) A TOTAL CAPITAL AND START-UP COST COMPONENT (ANNUALIZED OVER ITS EXPECTED USEFUL LIFE); AND (b) A TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND PURCHASE OF SERVICES COMPONENT. THE ESTIMATES SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH GENERATING, MAINTAINING, AND DISCLOSING OR PROVIDING THE INFORMATION. INCLUDE DESCRIPTIONS OF METHODS USED TO ESTIMATE MAJOR COST FACTORS INCLUDING SYSTEM AND**

TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION, EXPECTED USEFUL LIFE OF CAPITAL EQUIPMENT, THE DISCOUNT RATE(S), AND THE TIME PERIOD OVER WHICH COSTS WILL BE INCURRED. CAPITAL AND START-UP COSTS INCLUDE, AMONG OTHER ITEMS, PREPARATIONS FOR COLLECTING INFORMATION SUCH AS PURCHASING COMPUTERS AND SOFTWARE; MONITORING, SAMPLING, DRILLING AND TESTING EQUIPMENT; AND RECORD STORAGE FACILITIES.

- **IF COST ESTIMATES ARE EXPECTED TO VARY WIDELY, AGENCIES SHOULD PRESENT RANGES OF COST BURDENS AND EXPLAIN THE REASONS FOR THE VARIANCE. THE COST OF PURCHASING OR CONTRACTING OUT INFORMATION COLLECTION SERVICES SHOULD BE A PART OF THIS COST BURDEN ESTIMATE. IN DEVELOPING COST BURDEN ESTIMATES, AGENCIES MAY CONSULT WITH A SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS (FEWER THAN 10), UTILIZE THE 60-DAY PRE-OMB SUBMISSION PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS AND USE EXISTING ECONOMIC OR REGULATORY IMPACT ANALYSIS ASSOCIATED WITH THE RULEMAKING CONTAINING THE INFORMATION COLLECTION, AS APPROPRIATE.**

- **GENERALLY, ESTIMATES SHOULD NOT INCLUDE PURCHASES OF EQUIPMENT OR SERVICES, OR PORTIONS THEREOF, MADE: (1) PRIOR TO OCTOBER 1, 1995, (2) TO ACHIEVE REGULATORY COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS NOT ASSOCIATED WITH THE INFORMATION COLLECTION, (3) FOR REASONS OTHER THAN TO PROVIDE INFORMATION OR KEEPING RECORDS FOR THE GOVERNMENT, OR (4) AS PART OF CUSTOMARY AND USUAL BUSINESS OR PRIVATE PRACTICES.**

There is no capital/start up or ongoing operation/maintenance costs associated with this information collection. All questions asked in the questionnaire refer to data that market managers would have at their access as the result of their normal routine as a market manager.

- 14. PROVIDE ESTIMATES OF ANNUALIZED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. ALSO, PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE METHOD USED TO ESTIMATE COST, WHICH SHOULD INCLUDE QUANTIFICATION OF HOURS, OPERATION EXPENSES (SUCH AS EQUIPMENT, OVERHEAD, PRINTING,**

AND SUPPORT STAFF), AND ANY OTHER EXPENSE THAT WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN INCURRED WITHOUT THIS COLLECTION OF INFORMATION. AGENCIES ALSO MAY AGGREGATE COST ESTIMATES FROM ITEMS 12, 13, AND 14 IN A SINGLE TABLE.

The project cost estimate for the survey is \$71,958, a +\$39,188 increase over the 2006 survey. Changes in the projected cost reflect an increase in the number of respondents, higher hourly wage rates, and the cost to have the survey converted to a primarily web based survey.

Cooperative Research Agreement with Land Grant University and Personnel

Phase I Cooperative Agreement

III. Budget

Purpose	Cost Estimate
Transforming farmers market survey instrument into web-based survey (incorporating artwork)	\$6,000
Designing a new home page	\$2,000
Developing printable survey linked to home page	\$1,000
Developing a new web-based data entry form to enter responses from printed surveys	\$2,000
Programming that will enable survey to be completed over multiple sessions, and for data to be recalled/updated in subsequent years	\$6,000
Formatting database and developing data definition dictionary	\$2,000
Developing capacity that permits Federal Agency to remotely download the survey database	\$2,000
Travel Expense (Cooperator travel from Lansing, Michigan to Washington, DC for onsite meeting with FMDMRB staff)	\$1,000
Total	\$22,000

Phase II Cooperative agreement

Purpose	Cost Estimate
Send invitations and reminder e-mails; monitor returns; answer questions and resolve technical problems, provide Federal Agency with invalid e-mail addresses and additional farmers market contact information that may be provided	\$9,000
Send up to 2,500 printed survey questionnaire and cover sheet to farmers market managers that do not have accurate e-mail addresses and/or only have mailing addresses, and provide the Federal Agency with a list of undeliverable mailing addresses	\$6,000
Send three reminder postcards to markets that have not responded to e-mails and/or the mailed invitation letter and survey questionnaire	\$2,400
Design and send non-respondent questionnaire by certified mail to 300 mail and non-email non-respondents, reminder surveys also certified	\$2,800
Develop mail merge database for each mailing	\$2,000
Clean data and provide Federal Agency with Excel and SAS or SPSS ready data files	\$2,000
Code 1,200 printed surveys that are returned through mail	\$4,800
Data analysis	\$7,800

Total	\$36,800
--------------	-----------------

Total cost of Phase I and Phase II cooperative agreements: **\$58,800**
Oversight of Cooperative agreement by MSD staff
(20 percent of the salary of GS 12 step 7 for nine months)
\$87,717 x 0.75 x 0.20 = **\$13,158**
\$71,958

15. EXPLAIN THE REASON FOR ANY PROGRAM CHANGES OR ADJUSTMENTS REPORTED IN ITEMS 13 OR 14 OF THE OMB FORM 83-I.

The 2009 questionnaire will be sent to approximately 5,200 managers compared to 3,700 managers during the 2006 survey. Increased number of respondents from 2006 to 2009 is due to the larger number of farmers markets listed in the “National Directory of Farmers Markets” in 2009. The Directory which is maintained by USDA’s Agricultural Marketing Service is the most comprehensive national listing for farmers markets. Though there is an increase in the number of respondents from the last submission, the combination of the corrections explained below for this submission have resulted in an overall reduction in burden of -313 hours.

This survey is done once every three years. In the previous submission .5 was used instead of .33 to calculate the “number of responses per respondent.” This decrease still resulted in an increase of total responses because of the increase in respondents since 2006 and accounting for the non-respondents.

The allotted “per response time” to complete the survey increased from 19 minutes in 2006 to 21 minutes for this submission. In addition, the 2006 submission did not separate out non-respondents from respondents and therefore calculated the non-respondents time at the same “per response time” of 19 minutes as the respondents resulting in an inaccurate higher burden hour figure. The delineation in the “per response time” between respondents and non-respondents has been corrected decreasing the burden hours with this submission.

Comparison of the 2006 versus the 2009 burden hours calculation					
	No. of Respondents	No. of responses per respondent	Total annual responses	Per response time	Total hours
Farmers Market Questionnaire (2006)	3,700	0.500	1,850	0.3167	586
Total hours 2006 survey					586
	No. of	No. of	Total annual	Per	Total

	Respondents	responses per respondent	responses	response time	hours
Farmers Market Questionnaire (2009)	5,200				
Respondents (long form)	1,820	0.33	607	0.350	212
Non-respondents (long form)	3,380	0.33	1,127	0.033	38
Response bias survey (short form)	1,000				
Respondents	240	0.33	120	0.083	10
Non-respondents to response bias survey	760	0.33	380	0.033	13
Total hours 2009 survey					273

16. FOR COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION WHOSE RESULTS WILL BE PUBLISHED, OUTLINE PLANS FOR TABULATION, AND PUBLICATION. ADDRESS ANY COMPLEX ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUES THAT WILL BE USED. PROVIDE THE TIME SCHEDULE FOR THE ENTIRE PROJECT, INCLUDING BEGINNING AND ENDING DATES OF THE COLLECTION OF INFORMATION, COMPLETION OF REPORT, PUBLICATION DATES, AND OTHER ACTIONS.

The proposed form will be entered into an Access data base. Data will be exported into SPSS and summarized. Summarized data will be published in USDA reports. Information will be distributed externally. Summary statistical reports and cross tabulation reports will be prepared to examine the differences in data responses across regions, size, years of operation and comparisons will be made to identical data collected in previous years. The projected timeline for this project is as follows.

Dissemination of survey questionnaire	March 2010
Completion of data collection	June 2010
Data analysis complete	September 2010
Draft report completed	May 2011
Report released	September 2011

Data will be reported in the aggregate to preserve the confidentiality of respondents. The report will be distributed as a published report and published on the MSD website.

17. IF SEEKING APPROVAL TO NOT DISPLAY THE EXPIRATION DATE FOR OMB APPROVAL OF THE INFORMATION COLLECTION, EXPLAIN THE REASONS THAT DISPLAY WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE.

The agency plans to print the expiration date of OMB approval of the information collection on all instruments.

18. EXPLAIN EACH EXCEPTION TO THE CERTIFICATION STATEMENT IDENTIFIED IN ITEM 19, "CERTIFICATION FOR PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSIONS," OF OMB FORM 83-I.

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.