



Dist. 2/11/04

United States  
CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20207

BALLOT VOTE SHEET

DATE: FEB 6 2004

TO : The Commission  
Todd Stevenson, Secretary

FROM : John G. Mullan, General Counsel *JGM*  
Lowell F. Martin, Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs *L.F.M.*

SUBJECT: Residential Fire Survey

BALLOT VOTE DUE: FEB 19 2004

In the attached memorandum from the Office of Planning and Evaluation and the Office of Hazard Identification and Reduction, the staff recommends that the Commission approve publication of the second Federal Register notice for the planned residential fire survey, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA). Such a survey is a collection of information subject to approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the PRA. The first step in obtaining OMB approval is publication of a Federal Register notice providing the opportunity for public comment on the proposed collection of information. That Federal Register notice was published on April 16, 2003. 68 FR 18599. Comments were received from the National SafeKids Campaign and the National Fire Protection Association. The attached memorandum describes the staff's disposition of those comments.

A draft of the second Federal Register notice required under the PRA is attached for Commission consideration.

Please indicate your vote on the following options:

- I. APPROVE THE FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE AS DRAFTED.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

~~CPSA 6(E)(1) CLEARLY FOR PUBLIC~~  
~~OR 2/16/04~~  
~~NO MFERS/PRVT LERS OR~~  
~~PRODUCTS IDENTIFIED~~  
~~EXCEPTED BY: PETITION~~  
~~RULEMAKING ADMIN. PROC.~~

NOTE: This document has not been reviewed or accepted by the Commission.  
Initial rh Date 2/6/04

II. APPROVE THE FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE WITH CHANGES. (Please specify.)

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

III. DO NOT APPROVE THE FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

IV. TAKE OTHER ACTION. (Please specify.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

Attachments:

1. P&E/HIR memorandum *Request for Commission Approval to Publish FR Notice Announcing CPSC's Submission of Request to OMB for Clearance of Residential Fire Survey.*
2. Draft second Federal Register notice required pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

(Draft of 2/3/04)

Billing Code 6355-01-P

**CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION**

**Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request -- Residential Fire Survey**

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In the April 16, 2003, Federal Register (68 FR 18599), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (Commission or CPSC) published a notice in accordance with provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-21) to announce the agency's intention to seek approval of a collection of information to evaluate (1) the causes of residential fires and (2) the role of smoke alarms, sprinklers, and fire extinguishers in those fires. The Commission now announces that it is submitting to the Office of Management and Budget a request for approval of that collection of information.

The collection of information consists of a random digit dialing telephone survey to identify households that had a fire within the previous three months. Data collection will take place over a 12-month period and will identify consumer products

(Draft of 2/3/04)

place over a 12-month period and will identify consumer products involved in fire causes. The information will help CPSC and its federal partners, the U.S. Fire Administration and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to focus efforts to reduce residential fire losses.

**Additional Information About the Request for Approval of a Collection of Information**

*Agency address:* Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207.

*Title of information collection:* Residential Fire Survey.

*Type of request:* Approval of a collection of information.

*General description of respondents:* Households that have had a fire within the previous three months.

*Estimated number of respondents:* 82,000.

*Estimated average number of hours per respondent:* 0.05 hours (3 minutes).

*Estimated number of hours for all respondents:* 4,400 hours.

*Comments:* Comments on this request for approval of information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to (1) Alex Hunt, Desk Officer, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503; telephone: (202) 395-7860, and (2) the Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission,

(Draft of 2/3/04)

supporting documentation are available from Linda Glatz, Office of Planning and Evaluation, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207; telephone: (301) 504-7671, e-mail [lglatz@cpsc.gov](mailto:lglatz@cpsc.gov).

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

Todd A. Stevenson, Secretary,  
Consumer Product Safety Commission



UNITED STATES  
CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20207

Memorandum

FEB 6 2004

TO : The Commission

THROUGH: Todd Stevenson, Secretary *TS*  
John Gibson Mullan, General Counsel *JGM*  
*For* Patricia Semple, Executive Director *PS*  
Jacqueline Elder, Assistant Executive Director, Office of Hazard Identification and Reduction *JE*  
N.J. Scheers, Director, Office of Planning and Evaluation *NJS*

FROM : Linda L. Glatz, Office of Planning and Evaluation *LLG*  
Linda E. Smith, Division of Hazard Analysis, Directorate for Epidemiology *LES*

SUBJECT : Request for Commission Approval to Publish FR Notice Announcing CPSC's Submission of Request to OMB for Clearance of Residential Fire Survey

This memorandum seeks Commission approval to publish the second Federal Register Notice for this survey, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA). Under this act, Federal agencies must obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for each collection of information they conduct or sponsor.

On April 8, 2003, The Commission approved the Federal Register Notice announcing the agency's intention to seek OMB approval to conduct a residential fire survey and requesting public comments. (Copy attached, Tab A.) This was the first step in the OMB approval process.

In response to the FR notice, we received comments from two organizations concerning our proposed survey. Both commenters supported the survey and suggested additional questions or changes to the proposed questions. One commenter, the National SafeKids Campaign, suggested that we include questions to explore the usefulness of previous fire education and knowledge. Despite our interest in this information, we felt it was beyond the scope of our planned survey and may be more appropriate to include in other ongoing surveys of behavior risk factors being conducted by the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The second commenter, The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), submitted 100 detailed comments on the CPSC draft questionnaire. Several of NFPA's comments raised questions about what kinds of incidents were in-scope for the survey, e.g., whether we wanted to include vehicle fires, nearby wildfires, severity of the fire, and fires on the exterior of the home. Many other comments added detail to clarify the kinds of incidents that could occur and how they would be coded. For example, they suggested adding more examples of electrical components, lighters, and other products in question responses. Many comments suggested changes to question wording to decrease the likelihood that the

CPSC 6(b)(1) CLEARED for PUBLIC  
NO FRIS/PRVTLBLS OR  
PRODUCTS IDENTIFIED  
EXCEPTED BY: PETITION  
RULEMAKING ANNUAL REPORT

CPSC Hotline: 1-800-638-CPSC (2772) H CPSC's Web Site: <http://www.cpsc.gov>

NOTE: This document has not been  
reviewed or accepted by the Commission.  
Initial *rh* Date *2/6/04*

question could be misunderstood, suggesting terms they felt were more widely used. They also suggested changes to some responses to capture detail. CPSC staff accepted most of their comments, changing the draft questionnaire to respond to their concerns. The staff reviewed the comments and responded to the requestors. (Copy of comments and responses attached, Tab B.) The next step in the OMB clearance process is to submit our request for PRA clearance to OMB and publish a second Federal Register Notice announcing this action.

A draft Federal Register Notice for Commission consideration is being provided separately by the Office of the General Counsel.

Tab A - First FR Notice, dated April 16, 2003

Tab B - Comments from National SafeKids Campaign and NFPA with CPSC staff response.

TAB A



<sup>8</sup> Category 359-C: only HTS numbers 6103.42.2025, 6103.49.8034, 6104.62.1020, 6104.69.8010, 6114.20.0048, 6114.20.0052, 6203.42.2010, 6203.42.2090, 6204.62.2010, 6211.32.0010, 6211.32.0025 and 6211.42.0010; Category 659-C: only HTS numbers 6103.23.0055, 6103.43.2020, 6103.43.2025, 6103.49.2000, 6103.49.8038, 6104.63.1020, 6104.63.1030, 6104.69.1000, 6104.69.8014, 6114.30.3044, 6114.30.3054, 6203.43.2010, 6203.43.2090, 6203.49.1010, 6203.49.1090, 6204.63.1510, 6204.69.1010, 6210.10.9010, 6211.33.0010, 6211.33.0017 and 6211.43.0010.

<sup>9</sup> Category 659-H: only HTS numbers 6502.00.9030, 6504.00.9015, 6504.00.9060, 6505.90.5090, 6505.90.6090, 6505.90.7090 and 6505.90.8090.

<sup>10</sup> Category 359pt.: all HTS numbers except 6103.42.2025, 6103.49.8034, 6104.62.1020, 6104.69.8010, 6114.20.0048, 6114.20.0052, 6203.42.2010, 6203.42.2090, 6204.62.2010, 6211.32.0010, 6211.32.0025 and 6211.42.0010 (Category 359-C); 6115.19.8010, 6117.10.6010, 6117.20.9010, 6203.22.1000, 6204.22.1000, 6212.90.0010, 6214.90.0010, 6406.99.1550, 6505.90.1525, 6505.90.1540, 6505.90.2060 and 6505.90.2545.

<sup>11</sup> Category 459pt.: all HTS numbers except 6115.19.8020, 6117.10.1000, 6117.10.2010, 6117.20.9020, 6212.90.0020, 6214.20.0000, 6405.20.6030, 6405.20.6060, 6405.20.6090, 6406.99.1505 and 6406.99.1560.

<sup>12</sup> Category 631pt.: all HTS numbers except 6116.10.1730, 6116.10.4820, 6116.10.5520, 6116.10.7520, 6116.93.8800, 6116.93.9400, 6116.99.4800, 6116.99.5400 and 6116.99.9530.

<sup>13</sup> Category 659-S: only HTS numbers 6112.31.0010, 6112.31.0020, 6112.41.0010, 6112.41.0020, 6112.41.0030, 6112.41.0040, 6211.11.1010, 6211.11.1020, 6211.12.1010 and 6211.12.1020.

<sup>14</sup> Category 659pt.: all HTS numbers except 6103.23.0055, 6103.43.2020, 6103.43.2025, 6103.49.2000, 6103.49.8038, 6104.63.1020, 6104.63.1030, 6104.69.1000, 6104.69.8014, 6114.30.3044, 6114.30.3054, 6203.43.2010, 6203.43.2090, 6203.49.1010, 6203.49.1090, 6204.63.1510, 6204.69.1010, 6210.10.9010, 6211.33.0010, 6211.33.0017, 6211.43.0010 (Category 659-C); 6112.31.0010, 6112.31.0020, 6112.41.0010, 6112.41.0020, 6112.41.0030, 6112.41.0040, 6211.11.1010, 6211.11.1020, 6211.12.1010 and 6211.12.1020 (Category 659-S); 6115.11.0010, 6115.12.2000, 6117.10.2030, 6117.20.9030, 6212.90.0030, 6214.30.0000, 6214.40.0000, 6406.99.1510 and 6406.99.1540.

The limits set forth above are subject to adjustment pursuant to the provisions of the ATC and administrative arrangements notified to the Textiles Monitoring Body.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception of the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,  
James C. Leonard, III  
Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 03-9351 Filed 4-15-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-S

## CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request—Residential Fire Survey

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) requests comments on a proposed survey to evaluate (1) the causes of residential fires and (2) the role of smoke alarms, sprinklers, and fire extinguishers in those fires. The study will consist of a random digit dialing (RDD) telephone survey to identify households that had a fire within the previous three months. The survey will include both fires reported to the fire service and those not reported. Data collection will take place over a 12-month period and will identify consumer products involved in fire causes. The information will help CPSC and its federal partners, the U.S. Fire Administration and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to focus efforts to reduce residential fire losses. CPSC will consider all comments received in response to this notice

before requesting approval for this telephone survey from the Office of Management and Budget.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received by the Office of the Secretary not later than June 16, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be captioned "Residential Fire Survey" and mailed to the Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207, or delivered to the attention of that office, room 419, North Tower, 4330 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Maryland, 20814. Written comments may also be sent to the Office of the Secretary by facsimile at (301) 504-0127 or by e-mail at [cpssc-ops@cpssc.gov](mailto:cpssc-ops@cpssc.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For information about the proposed collection of information, or to obtain a copy of the questions to be used for this collection of information, call or write Linda E. Smith, Division of Hazard Analysis, Directorate for Epidemiology, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, 4330 East-West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20814 telephone (301) 504-7310, or email [lsmith@cpssc.gov](mailto:lsmith@cpssc.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### A. Background

Reduction of fire deaths is one of CPSC's strategic goals. An estimated 396,500 residential fires were attended by the fire service in 2001 and resulted in 3,140 deaths, 15,575 injuries, and \$5.6 billion in property loss. Although residential fire losses have decreased greatly over the past 15 years, the U.S. continues to have one of the highest fire death rates per capita in the world.

One of the reasons for the observed reduction in fire deaths is thought to be the increased prevalence of smoke alarms, which are intended to give early warning of a fire and allow more time for the occupants to escape unharmed. Since 1984 when CPSC last conducted

a survey of residential fires, the prevalence of smoke alarms in U.S. households has greatly increased. Prevalence, however, does not mean that the alarms will be operational. In 1992, a CPSC study of smoke alarms installed in residences showed that among households that had smoke alarms, 20 percent of the households had no alarms that worked. Changes continue to be made to smoke alarm technology and installation requirements with the intent of increasing the number of households with an adequate number of working alarms.

In 1984, it was estimated that fires that were not attended by the fire service accounted for 97 percent of all U.S. residential fires. CPSC and its fire partners wish to determine the current magnitude of the overall fire problem, including the prevalence of fires both attended and unattended by the fire service. In addition, CPSC wishes to learn if there has been a further reduction in the percentage of fires that are serious enough to warrant the attendance of the fire service, and the extent to which the involvement of smoke alarms has contributed to the reduced number of such fires.

The reduction of fire deaths, the most severe result of residential fires, is part of a collaborative effort by CPSC, the U.S. Fire Administration, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The resulting data are expected to provide statistically-based support and focus for integrated national programs, including the benefits derived by the use of smoke alarms, sprinklers, and fire extinguishers. The resulting data also will provide current estimates of all residential fires that involve specific types of consumer products, providing more comprehensive fire data upon which to target prevention activities.

### B. Description of the Collection of Information

This collection of information will consist of a random digit dialing (RDD) telephone survey. Use of RDD will result in a probability sample of all U.S. households, ensuring that the estimates will be representative of the U.S. population. Selected high-risk subsets of the population will be over-sampled to ensure that the fire problem in those groups can be adequately characterized. These include rural households, and low socioeconomic households. Data collection will take place over a 12-month period to account for variation in the number and causes of fire that occur over the course of a year.

The intention of the survey is to contact both households that have experienced a fire during the previous 3 months and households that have not experienced a fire. Demographic data on fire and non-fire households will be collected so that fire risk can be calculated for different demographic groups.

Households that have had fires will be asked about the cause of the fire, the products involved in starting the fire, and the items that burned. Information about the severity of the fire will be collected, including deaths, non-fatal injuries, medical treatment, property damage, and whether the fire was attended by the fire service. Information will be obtained on the number, characteristics, and performance of smoke alarms. CPSC is particularly interested in obtaining information on the role of the smoke alarm in warning the occupants that there was a fire. Information also will be obtained on the presence and performance of fire sprinklers and fire extinguishers.

A contractor will conduct a cognitive pre-test of the telephone questionnaire using a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) program. Revisions to the CATI programming will be made based on the pretest. Data collection for the survey will be conducted over a one-year period. The contractor will then review and edit the data and construct a database for CPSC analysis.

### C. Burden on Respondents

Households will be screened using RDD methodology to identify 1,500 households who have had a fire within the previous three months. The estimated incidence of fire households is approximately 2.5%. Screening to identify household qualification is expected to take an average of approximately 2 minutes. It is estimated that the study will require screening of

86,680 households to yield 1,500 qualified, cooperative respondents.

The interview with fire households is estimated to take an average of 22 minutes to administer over the telephone. In addition, a sub-sample of 2,000 non-fire households will be interviewed using a 6-minute demographic survey.

Given these estimates, the burden on respondents is calculated to be:

- 86,680 screening interviews @ 2 minutes = 173,360 minutes;
- 1,500 interviews with fire households @ 22 minutes = 33,000 minutes; and
- 2,000 interviews with non-fire households @ 6 minutes = 12,000 minutes,

for a total of 218,360 minutes, or 3,639.3 interviewing hours of burden for respondents. The staff estimates that the annualized cost to respondents for the hour burden for the collection of information is \$85,305, based on \$23.44 per hour (September 2002 Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor cost for employee compensation, private industry, state and local government.)

### D. Requests for Comments

The Commission solicits written comments from all interested persons about the proposed survey to determine residential fire cause and smoke alarm performance. The Commission specifically seeks information relevant to the following topics:

- Whether the survey described above is necessary for the proper performance of the Commission's functions, including whether the information would have practical utility;
- Whether the estimated burden of the proposed collection of information is accurate;
- Whether the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected could be enhanced; and
- Whether the burden imposed by the collection of information could be minimized by use of automated, electronic or other technological collection techniques, or other forms of information technology.

Dated: April 9, 2003.

**Todd Stevenson,**

*Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.*

[FR Doc. 03-9256 Filed 4-15-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-P

### CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

#### Senior Executive Service; Performance Review Board; Membership

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of names of members.

**SUMMARY:** This notice lists the individuals who have been appointed to the Commission's Senior Executive Service Performance Review Board.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 16, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Consumer Product Safety Commission, Office of the Secretary, Washington, DC 20207.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Shawn Blain, Office of Human Resources Management, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207, telephone (301) 504-7220.

Members of the Performance Review Board are listed below:

Mary Sheila Gall, Thomas Hill Moore, Susan W. Ahmed, Mary Ann T. Danello (alternate), William H. DuRoss, III (non-voting), Jacqueline Elder, Hugh McLaurin (alternate), Ronald L. Medford (alternate), Thomas W. Murr, Jr., Alan H. Schoem (alternate), Marc J. Schoem (alternate), Patricia M. Semple, Andrew G. Stadnik, Patrick D. Weddle.

Alternate members may be designated by the Chairman or the Chairman's designee to serve in the place of regular members who are unable to serve for any reason.

Dated: April 11, 2003.

**Todd A. Stevenson,**

*Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.*

[FR Doc. 03-9363 Filed 4-15-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-M

### CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

#### Availability of Funds for Grants to Support New Senior Companion and Foster Grandparent Projects

**AGENCY:** Corporation for National and Community Service.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of funds.

**SUMMARY:** The Corporation for National and Community Service (hereinafter, the "Corporation") announces the availability of funding for grants to support, for twelve months, two new Senior Companion projects in geographic areas that do not fall within approved service areas of current Corporation-funded Senior Companion

TAB B

June 16, 2003  
Linda E. Smith  
Division of Hazard Analysis  
Directorate for Epidemiology  
Consumer Product Safety Commission  
4330 East-West Highway  
Bethesda, MD 20814

Dear Dr.. Smith,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Residential Fire Survey posted in the Federal Register on April 16, 2003. As you know, the National SAFE KIDS Campaign promotes fire safety in the home through public awareness and consumer education efforts conducted by 600 coalitions and chapters nationwide.

Although the survey will evaluate causes of residential fires and the role of smoke alarms, sprinklers, and fire extinguishers in home fires, we would like to recommend two additional questions related to previous education that would provide valuable data:

- 1) During a fire, were you able to respond to the fire based on information you had learned previously?
  - 2) Were you and your family able to carry out a previously-discussed fire escape plan during a "real" fire?
- We believe that this information would assist CPSC to further evaluate the effectiveness of consumer fire safety education efforts.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this important survey.

Sincerely,

Carol Kennedy

---

*Carol Kennedy, RN, MA*  
Manager, Programs  
National SAFE KIDS Campaign  
1301 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 662-0625  
Fax: (202) 393-2072  
<mailto:ckennedy@safekids.org>

G:\USERS\EPHA\LES\Word\Smoke Alarms\comment resident fire survey 06162003.doc



U.S. CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20207

Linda Smith  
Project Manager, Residential Fire Survey  
Division of Hazard Analysis  
Directorate for Epidemiology

Tel: 301-504-7310  
Fax: 301-504-0811  
Email: lsmith@cpsc.gov

August 28, 2003

Ms. Carol Kennedy  
Manager, Programs  
National SAFE KIDS Campaign  
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Ms. Kennedy:

Thank you for your comments on the draft questionnaire for the CPSC staff's Residential Fire Survey. As you stated, the primary purposes of this survey are to estimate and evaluate the causes of residential fires and to evaluate the role of smoke alarms, fire sprinklers, and fire extinguishers in those fires.

The two questions you suggested explore the usefulness of previous fire education and knowledge and are of interest to CPSC staff and the fire prevention community. However, in the staff's view, this subject is outside the scope of this survey and is broad enough that it would warrant a survey of its own to evaluate properly. The National Center for Injury Prevention and Control/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is conducting surveys of behavior risk factors and sequence of events associated with fires. These studies are more likely to address the topics you mentioned. You may wish to contact Dr. Christine Branche, Director of NCIPC, for further information at (770) 448-4652.

Thank you for your response.

Sincerely,

Linda Smith

\\HQ1\DATA\USERS\EPHA\LES\Word\Smoke Alarms\Kennedy SAFE KIDS response.doc  
8/22/03

**Stevenson, Todd A.**

---

*Residential  
Fire Survey  
comment*

**From:** Smith, Linda E.  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 17, 2003 8:10 AM  
**To:** Stevenson, Todd A.  
**Subject:** FW: Residential Fire Survey FR Notice



Comments on CPSC  
Survey.doc

FYI

Comments in Response to FR Notice, Residential Fire Survey

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Hall, John [mailto:jhall@NFPA.org]

**Sent:** Thursday, June 12, 2003 5:53 PM

**To:** Smith, Linda E.

**Cc:** Ahrens, Marty; Rohr, Kim; Fahy, Rita; Karter, Mike; Schwartz, Nancy

**Subject:**

<<Comments on CPSC Survey.doc>>

Linda -- Here are our comments. Hope they're helpful. Feel free to call if you want to discuss further or if any of our comments are not clear.

Good luck! -- John Hall

## Comments on CPSC National Residential Fire Survey

from Marty Ahrens, Kim Rohr, Rita Fahy, Mike Karter, Nancy Schwartz, and John Hall  
NFPA

The early references to the time commitment required for the survey are misleading, i.e., the interview will NOT be brief. Suggest some combination of "I will try to keep the interview as brief as possible" and (preferred) a pilot-based estimate of the average or maximum time that will be required. That way you'll get informed consent to participate and your results won't be compromised by a lot of people quitting part-way through or shading their answers out of annoyance over an unexpectedly lengthy process.

We assume this will be run as a computer prompted, menu-driven telephone survey. Otherwise, there are some complicated branching rules that are ripe for interviewer error. Also, some of the "please, specify" blanks are too short for answers, if this were a hard-copy form.

Q.2 The first "the" in the question is a typo.

Your definition of "fire" does not include either of the concepts of "unwanted" and "uncontrolled". Strictly speaking, a controlled fireplace fire or cooking with a fueled cooking device would satisfy the definition.

Do you want to include or exclude a car fire? In the garage? In the driveway? Parked on the street? In a group parking lot? In a separate parking structure? On the road away from home? Whatever you want, you'll want to clarify the definition and instruct the interviewers.

Do you want to include or exclude a brushfire or wildfire in the area? (Consider the phrase "around your home", which need not mean limited to your yard or your complex.) How close? This could be significant in California.

Do you really want an incident with smoke but no flames? Again, ordinary cooking can create such a condition. So can electrical overheat conditions that never become fires, and those are specifically excluded from the definition of "fire" in NFPA 901.

If you do want to include these marginal conditions, do you want to ask all your questions about every fire? How will you know which type of fire (or fire-like condition) they are referring to if they report on more than one fire?

Q.5. Your first probe may suggest by omission that you really don't want to include something smoking but not flaming on the stove or in the oven. Clarify. If you want something smoking, can you be sure you've excluded visible fumes not associated with combustion, e.g., a chemical oven cleaner application. Also, why limit to stove or oven, instead of saying "stove or any cooking appliance"?

If you want the third probe to refer to clothing on a person, need to say so.

Your fourth probe includes a phrase, "smoking mattress," that struck one of us odd, as if the mattress was engaged in smoking a cigarette. We assume "smoking" is meant to explain the less-familiar term of "smoldering," but it might help to rephrase so that's clear. Also, smoldering can happen with other fabrics, like clothes in a dryer. Suggest: "Smoldering fabric, that is, smoke with no flame involving a mattress, rug, couch or other fabric".

Q.7. Do you plan to infer day of the week from month and date? If they can't remember the date but can remember the day, would the latter be useful to you anyway? Do you even need the date for analysis if you have the month and day?

Q.8. Might help to change "Enter Time" to "Enter Estimated Time" as a reminder to everyone that these are estimates. Can you handle a range as an answer?

Q.9. Clarify whether "in your home" is meant to include exterior features and surfaces, including porch, balcony, deck, roof, exterior walls, outsides of windows and doors, etc. Even a garage might be unclear to some.

Also, if you want people to specify "some other place," it might save time to list, and assign codes in advance to, the major examples, including yard and shed.

Q.12. If you don't read the list, how can you be sure respondents will specify finished vs. unfinished attic or basement? If they are finished, do you want them coded in terms of use (e.g., bedroom, rec room), which would involve a different code on your list? Or would it be better to list only the unfinished areas separately, list the finished ones as what they are, and probe for the necessary details.

If possible, there would be value in splitting adult bedrooms from child bedrooms, as this is useful in analysis of issues such as detector response, child-playing as a cause, etc.

What about hallways, entry ways, and means of egress? What about fires starting in crawl spaces or substructure spaces of a manufactured home? What about fires starting on exterior surfaces? Note that some people will report a concealed-space fire as such and others will assign it to the adjacent room where it was first seen; you may need probes or definitions if you want consistency.

Q.14. The question suggests this is about cause, but the choices are all heat sources. Intentional or playing fires tend to be identified by behavioral cause first and may not have a known heat source. This may not require a change, but your interviewers need to know how to handle such a response.

Note under "Cooking" that you're interested in unattended cooking as well as fires due to equipment problems, because your examples may steer interviewers toward the latter only.



You may need a longer list of examples under “Electrical wiring or lighting”, e.g., other cords, plugs, switches, fuses, circuit breakers, light bulbs vs. light fixtures (can’t be sure “lighting” will mean both to everyone).

Forest fires and lightning are quite different and should be split.

The listing for “Lighter – cigarette or multipurpose” could be misread to mean cigarettes are to be listed with lighters. Rephrase as “Cigarette lighter or multipurpose lighter”.

Is “other open flame or spark” worth a separate code if you’ve already got matches, lighters, and candles? Consider either “torch” by itself or, going a different way, “other or unknown-type open flame or spark,” so you can sort the partial unknowns.

It would be useful to separate dryers and electronic equipment (or just TVs) from the omnibus “other appliances and equipment” category, if you have room.

Why specify spread of fire from another household? Why not spread of fire from another building or property?

Q.15 You might want to ask this question regardless of the answer in Q.14 or at least expand it to include all appliance and equipment choices, e.g., the latchkey child who tries to cook for himself or use electronic equipment for herself.

Q.16. The question sounds counter-intuitive, since one doesn’t normally think of the heat source as something that also catches fire. (Even an appliance may have one part that’s the heat source and another – the housing – that may catch fire.) Change to “What caught fire?”, combine Q.17 and 17a, and add “Appliance housing of the heat source” to both lists.

Q.17 and 17a. Change first listing to “Bedding (including blankets), mattresses.” Blankets can be used on chairs or couches, and that’s not what you want.

Because both have long lists in alphabetical order, it’s not clear what is meant to be excluded in the two “Other” entries. Reword as “Fabrics or textiles other than clothing, bedding, or furniture (e.g., towel)” and “Non-upholstered furniture” [if that’s even worth its own category].

Drapes are window treatments, not wall coverings. Give drapes and curtains their own category.

You mean wire insulation, not wiring.

Q.20. In the mapping instructions before Q.20, you want to autopunch yes in Q25 if Q17 or 17a = 4 OR 5 (cooking grease, etc.) and make similar change to the next line of instructions.

In the list for Q.20, where do you put a chimney for a fireplace or a chimney whose purpose is not known?

“Other fixed local or room heater” could be read as “Fixed local heater or room heater” which would include portable heaters. Suggest instead “Fixed space heater excluding heating stove”.

Q.21. Why are pellets put with coal? Aren't pellets often a form of wood?

Q.23. Consider asking about age of equipment, even if it's only a few ranges.

How does audio-visual equipment differ from home entertainment and home office equipment? Seems like a small and ambiguous category you don't need.

You've got torch listed here and under heat source earlier. Is that going to complicate the analysis? Remember that the British use “torch” to mean a flashlight. May need to clarify if respondent sounds British or is ambiguous in response.

All the items listed here are heat sources – with the possible exception of toys, which could use an example or two for clarity. Maybe clarify in question that you mean “provided the heat to start the fire” because “involved in starting the fire” is broader, e.g., the TV fell over and the candle on it started a fire.

Q.24. Consider adding “acetylene” for torches.

Q.31. Do you want to ask about indicators that the equipment was working properly just before fire began, or more generally before the fire? Consider adding a list of indicators – e.g., smell, lights dimming or flickering, overheating you can feel, etc.

Also, does this question make as much sense if the item is a candle? Your flow patterns will ask the question for candle fires. Will people understand what “working properly” means in that context?

Q.32. Not sure that the flows will bring the right people to this question. For example, why are you uninterested in the ignition of flammable liquids, gases, vapors, if equipment seemed to be working properly? A furnace pilot light igniting gasoline vapors can easily occur when there's nothing wrong with the furnace.

Q.35a. This assumes fires will be discussed from earliest to most recent. Q.7. queues fires from most recent to earliest. Need to reconcile.

Q.36. This question should identify the presence of heat detectors and CO detectors, if only to make sure they are excluded from subsequent questions (assuming you want to exclude them).

Q.39c. What about plug-in smoke alarms? Is that an AC “connection” or do you need another choice?

Q.42. Suggest a shorter, clearer question: “How was fire discovered?”. This is used in the UK. Also, change “smoke detector alarm went off” to “smoke alarm activated”; technical jargon is okay since you’re not reading it. What if a heat detector or CO detector gave first notification? Consider whether feeling the heat or smoke irritation to eyes will have a clear place for coding if they provide first notification.

Q.42b. There might be a category between answers 2 and 3: “Considerable smoke but still limited to only part of room”. The idea is that “a little smoke” may cut off at a much lower threshold than we would use.

Q.42d. Do you want to deal with doors that are not fully closed but are mostly closed, i.e., not snug in the door jamb, but abutting the jamb?

Q.49a. Some may not be familiar with the 10-year battery detector and may think you mean a 10-year-old ordinary battery. Reword for clarity, e.g., Did this detector have a battery designed to last 10 years?

Q.50a and Q.58. It would be useful to ask whether detectors or sprinklers are connected to a monitoring service or system.

Q.50b. Why is the first fire extinguisher question numbered as part of the smoke detector question? Why not make Q50b into Q51 and Q51 into Q51a?

Q.54. Might consider another choice, namely, extinguisher reduced the fire but then ran out, allowing fire to grow again. This also should be reflected in Q.55, which seems to anticipate only an empty extinguisher or a fire too big for a fully charged extinguisher, which leaves out a fire that overwhelms a partially filled extinguisher.

Q.56. If the answer is Yes, you might want to ask how many extinguishers they tried to use.

Q.59a. The phrase “in the room” might be subject to interpretation. A hallway sprinkler head would cover much of the adjoining room(s), subject to walls and doors.

Q.60. This question may be hard to answer for a fire that begins on the exterior or in a concealed space.

Q.62. Same as Q.54, i.e., a sprinkler need not be all or nothing, and it could reduce the fire before running out, for whatever reason.

Q.65. Consider separating out flour if its effectiveness in suppression is sufficiently different from other common home products.

Consider distinguishing bringing tap water to fire vs. bringing burning item to tap water, and, more generally, you may move the item but not outside.

Q.67. This should be preceded by asking whether the fire department was called and if so, how (e.g., from phone in home, from phone elsewhere, by neighbor, by passerby, by monitored system overseers).

Q.72. The preamble to this question could come across as cold or brusque. The respondents may still be traumatized by the harm done to a loved one. Consider more sensitive wording and an option to stop this part of the questioning if it becomes too painful to continue.

Q.78. Add to question "as a result of the fire." Some of these injuries could have applied before the fire. (Try to find a young boy without cuts or bruises.)

Q.80. Consider asking about pre-existing conditions that might have contributed to any decision to reduce activity.

Q.81. Change "duplex" to "two-family dwelling including duplex." Many people use "duplex" only for buildings where the families live side by side, not for homes where they live top and bottom.

Clarify choice 4 as: "Apartment or flat in a building containing 3 or more housing units". More people will recognize the term "apartment" than the more abstract sounding phrase that appears alone there now.

Q.82. Consider whether people might be more easily able to tell you what year the building was built than to convert that year to an age.

Q.85. This question needs to be clarified regarding heat detectors and CO detectors, like its earlier counterpart.

Q.87. Same comment about monitored systems cited earlier.

Q.94. Add a break for 15 to 17 or 15 to 20, to capture the age breaks defining juvenile or child used most places.

Q.98. Consider whether this should follow Q.99.

Q.99. Do you consider someone from India to be black, Asian, or other? Will "Native American" be recognized by everyone? Isn't Alaskan native a subset of Native American? Canada uses the term "First Nations"; aboriginal is sometimes applied; and "American Indian" may be deprecated but it may also be clear to some people who aren't attuned to the listed choices.

Q.100. How often do you have to smoke to be a "smoker"?



U.S. CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20207

Linda Smith  
Project Manager, Residential Fire Survey  
Division of Hazard Analysis  
Directorate for Epidemiology

Tel: 301-504-7310  
Fax: 301-504-0811  
Email: lsmith@cpsc.gov

August 28, 2003

Dr. John Hall  
Assistant Vice President  
Fire Analysis and Research Division  
National Fire Protection Association  
1 Batterymarch Park  
P.O. Box 9101  
Quincy, MA 02269-9101

Dear John:

Thank you for your detailed comments on the CPSC staff's draft questionnaire for the National Residential Fire Survey. CPSC staff's response to each comment is contained in the attached document.

In addition to the specific issues you raised, we have made some additional changes.

1) We have added a new question on cause, as shown below.

*In your opinion, what contributed to this fire? Was it... (READ RESPONSES) Record multiple responses.*

*Equipment or product failure  
Child/children playing  
Falling asleep  
Didn't expect that a fire could occur  
Distracted by unexpected event.  
Item too close to heat  
Intentionally set  
Something else (specify)*

2) We have removed question 66 as being unnecessary in view of the several other questions that explore the severity of the fire.

Dr. John Hall  
Page 2

3) We intend to repeat Q. 11, which asks for the best respondent, to follow Q. 12 and Q. 14, to be asked if the respondent is not knowledgeable about the fire.

The skip patterns as shown will be modified to take all the changes into account. Also, it is possible that additional changes will occur as a result of the pilot study.

Again, thank you for your comments. The expertise of you and your staff in this area has been most helpful to CPSC staff and will result in an improved survey. Please let me know if you wish to discuss any of the issues raised here.

Sincerely,

Linda Smith

Enclosure(s)  
Response to NFPA Comments

August 28, 2003

**CPSC Staff Response to Comments on CPSC National Residential Fire Survey from Marty Ahrens, Kim Rohr, Rita Fahy, Mike Karter, Nancy Schwartz, and John Hall, NFPA**

The early references to the time commitment required for the survey are misleading, i.e., the interview will NOT be brief. Suggest some combination of "I will try to keep the interview as brief as possible" and (preferred) a pilot-based estimate of the average or maximum time that will be required. That way you'll get informed consent to participate and your results won't be compromised by a lot of people quitting part-way through or shading their answers out of annoyance over an unexpectedly lengthy process.

*R. We agree that the interview will not be brief for those reporting fires. We will include the NFPA language, "I will try to keep the interview as brief as possible."*

We assume this will be run as a computer prompted, menu-driven telephone survey. Otherwise, there are some complicated branching rules that are ripe for interviewer error. Also, some of the "please, specify" blanks are too short for answers, if this were a hard-copy form.

*R. The survey will use a computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) program to achieve the desired flow pattern.*

Q.2 The first "the" in the question is a typo.

*R. Agree*

Your definition of "fire" does not include either of the concepts of "unwanted" and "uncontrolled". Strictly speaking, a controlled fireplace fire or cooking with a fueled cooking device would satisfy the definition.

*R. The definition of fire will be changed to read, "any incident- large or small- that resulted in unwanted flames or smoke, and could have caused damage to life or property if left unchecked."*

Do you want to include or exclude a car fire? In the garage? In the driveway? Parked on the street? In a group parking lot? In a separate parking structure? On the road away from home? Whatever you want, you'll want to clarify the definition and instruct the interviewers.

*R. We want to include a fire that started in a motor vehicle if it started on, or extended to the respondent's property. If it did not spread to the home or vacation home, Q. 10 further cause information will not be collected. If it did spread to the home, the source will be captured in Q. 14 by adding a response line "motor vehicle."*

Note: These responses are those of CPSC staff, have not been reviewed by, and do not necessarily reflect, the view of the Commission.

Do you want to include or exclude a brushfire or wildfire in the area? (Consider the phrase "around your home", which need not mean limited to your yard or your complex.) How close? This could be significant in California.

*R. We want to include any exposure fires that started on, or extended to, the respondent's home or property. This could include brushfires or wildfires. We will add the following to Q. 3. "This includes any fire that started somewhere elsewhere but spread to your property."*

Do you really want an incident with smoke but no flames? Again, ordinary cooking can create such a condition. So can electrical overheat conditions that never become fires, and those are specifically excluded from the definition of "fire" in NFPA 901.

*R. It is in situations such as unwanted smoking of cooking oil that a smoke alarm could prevent progression to fire. If we remove smoke-only situations, we lose the ability to identify smoke alarm operations that prevented progression to fires. The incidents we want to capture don't always meet the definition of fire used by the fire department. As discussed earlier, we will add the term "unwanted" to the definition.*

If you do want to include these marginal conditions, do you want to ask all your questions about every fire? How will you know which type of fire (or fire-like condition) they are referring to if they report on more than one fire?

*R. The full sequence of questions describing an incident will be completed before discussion of a second incident begins so that only the appropriate questions will be asked.*

Q.5. Your first probe may suggest by omission that you really don't want to include something smoking but not flaming on the stove or in the oven. Clarify.

*R. Response 1 will be revised to read: "Unwanted flaming or smoking on the stove or another cooking appliance."*

If you want something smoking, can you be sure you've excluded visible fumes not associated with combustion, e.g., a chemical oven cleaner application.

*R. It does not seem likely that such a situation would be included by respondents since they would realize after the event that a fire hazard was not involved.*

Also, why limit to stove or oven, instead of saying "stove or any cooking appliance"?

*R. Response 1 will be changed to incorporate this as discussed above.*

If you want the third probe to refer to clothing on a person, need to say so.

*R. Response 3 will be revised to read: "Burning or smoldering clothing, either being worn or not being worn."*



Your fourth probe includes a phrase, "smoking mattress," that struck one of us odd, as if the mattress was engaged in smoking a cigarette. We assume "smoking" is meant to explain the less-familiar term of "smoldering," but it might help to rephrase so that's clear. Also, smoldering can happen with other fabrics, like clothes in a dryer. Suggest: "Smoldering fabric, that is, smoke with no flame involving a mattress, rug, couch or other fabric".

R. Response 4 will be revised to read: "Smoldering fabric, mattress, rug, or upholstered furniture"

Response 7 will be revised to read: "Any other fire that produced unwanted flames or smoke."

Q.7. Do you plan to infer day of the week from month and date? If they can't remember the date but can remember the day, would the latter be useful to you anyway? Do you even need the date for analysis if you have the month and day?

R. We will change "day" to "date." We primarily care about the correct month and being assured that we are counting separate incidents.

Q.8. Might help to change "Enter Time" to "Enter Estimated Time" as a reminder to everyone that these are estimates. Can you handle a range as an answer?

R. The question already states "about what time." Interviewer could probe for morning, afternoon, evening, night if needed.

Q.9. Clarify whether "in your home" is meant to include exterior features and surfaces, including porch, balcony, deck, roof, exterior walls, outsides of windows and doors, etc. Even a garage might be unclear to some.

R. We will change the question to read: "in your primary home" which should include exterior locations.

Also, if you want people to specify "some other place," it might save time to list, and assign codes in advance to, the major examples, including yard and shed.

R. The categories will not be read to the respondents, but we can add "yard," "other structure," or "vehicle not in an attached garage" as separate responses for the use of the interviewer.

Q.12. If you don't read the list, how can you be sure respondents will specify finished vs. unfinished attic or basement? If they are finished, do you want them coded in terms of use (e.g., bedroom, rec room), which would involve a different code on your list? Or would it be better to list only the unfinished areas separately, list the finished ones as what they are, and probe for the necessary details.

R. We will remove the distinction between finished and unfinished for both attic & basement options.

We also will add the following responses: "Crawl space, including under mobile home," "Other exterior locations," and "Hall, entryway".

If possible, there would be value in splitting adult bedrooms from child bedrooms, as this is useful in analysis of issues such as detector response, child-playing as a cause, etc.

**R. We do not feel it is useful to separate bedrooms by occupancy. Smoke alarms are recommended for inclusion in all bedrooms already. We will learn additional cause information, such as children playing, from other questions.**

What about hallways, entry ways, and means of egress? What about fires starting in crawl spaces or substructure spaces of a manufactured home? What about fires starting on exterior surfaces? Note that some people will report a concealed-space fire as such and others will assign it to the adjacent room where it was first seen; you may need probes or definitions if you want consistency.

**R. These responses have been added as described above.**

Q.14. The question suggests this is about cause, but the choices are all heat sources. Intentional or playing fires tend to be identified by behavioral cause first and may not have a known heat source. This may not require a change, but your interviewers need to know how to handle such a response.

**R. We will change this question to read "What provided the heat that started the fire?"**

Note under "Cooking" that you're interested in unattended cooking as well as fires due to equipment problems, because your examples may steer interviewers toward the latter only.

**R. Note that the choices will not be read to the respondents. However, we will change the cooking line to read "cooking-kitchen appliance or equipment including normal use, negligence, misuse, or product malfunction."**

You may need a longer list of examples under "Electrical wiring or lighting", e.g., other cords, plugs, switches, fuses, circuit breakers, light bulbs vs. light fixtures (can't be sure "lighting" will mean both to everyone).

**R. We will change the examples to the following: power cords, plugs, installed branch circuit wiring, outlets, fuses, circuit breakers, lamps, light fixtures, light bulbs, etc."**

Forest fires and lightning are quite different and should be split.

**R. We will separate forest fires and lightning into two separate responses.**

*The listing for "Lighter – cigarette or multipurpose" could be misread to mean cigarettes are to be listed with lighters. Rephrase as "Cigarette lighter or multipurpose lighter".*

**R. The listing will be revised as suggested.**

Is "other open flame or spark" worth a separate code if you've already got matches, lighters, and candles? Consider either "torch" by itself or, going a different way, "other or unknown-type open flame or spark," so you can sort the partial unknowns.

**R. A separate response will be added for torch. The "other open flame or spark" response will remain.**

It would be useful to separate dryers and electronic equipment (or just TVs) from the omnibus “other appliances and equipment” category, if you have room.

R. Q. 14 is a first stage grouping. The specific products involved will be identified separately in Q. 23.

Why specify spread of fire from another household? Why not spread of fire from another building or property?

R. The response will be changed to read “Spread of fire from another household or property.”

Q.15 You might want to ask this question regardless of the answer in Q.14 or at least expand it to include all appliance and equipment choices, e.g., the latchkey child who tries to cook for himself or use electronic equipment for herself.

R. The instructions will be modified to ask Q. 15 for all responses except lightning.

Q.16. The question sounds counter-intuitive, since one doesn’t normally think of the heat source as something that also catches fire. (Even an appliance may have one part that’s the heat source and another – the housing – that may catch fire.)

R. We will delete Q.16 in view of other changes that capture fire sequence.

Change to “What caught fire?”, combine Q.17 and 17a, and add “Appliance housing of the heat source” to both lists.

Q. We will add appliance housing as a separate response in both Q. 17 and 17a. We will reverse the order of 17 and 17a so that the more general question is asked first “Other than the item providing the heat, what items caught fire?” followed by “Which of these items caught fire first?” Two questions are needed to capture situations where fire ignition was not observed, since it is often very difficult for someone to know what caught fire first if they didn’t observe the sequence.

Q.17 and 17a. Change first listing to “Bedding (including blankets), mattresses.” Blankets can be used on chairs or couches, and that’s not what you want.

R. We will separate these items. “Mattress” will be one response. “Bedding and blankets” will be a separate response. We are interested in ignition of blankets regardless of whether they were in use on a bed.

Because both have long lists in alphabetical order, it’s not clear what is meant to be excluded in the two “Other” entries. Reword as “Fabrics or textiles other than clothing, bedding, or furniture (e.g., towel)” and “Non-upholstered furniture” [if that’s even worth its own category].

R. We will revise the response categories to have two lines for furniture. “Furniture upholstered” and “Furniture, not upholstered.” We will revise the “other fabric...” line to read “Fabric and textiles, except clothing, mattresses, bedding/blankets, upholstered furniture, curtains/drapes, and carpets.”

Drapes are window treatments, not wall coverings. Give drapes and curtains their own category.

R. "Drapes, curtains" will become a separate response. "Rugs, carpets, and floor coverings" will become a separate response. "Wall coverings" will be a separate response

You mean wire insulation, not wiring.

R. Since the wiring itself can flame, produce arcing, etc., this response will be retained to read including "insulation"

We will also add responses for "whole room" and "whole house". The response line "kitchen cabinets" will be changed to "cabinets". The term "roof" will be added to the Structural component response

20. In the mapping instructions before Q.20, you want to autopunch yes in Q25 if Q17 or 17a = 4 OR 5 (cooking grease, etc.) and make similar change to the next line of instructions.

R. The autopunch will be changed to apply only if 17 or 17a = cooking materials (5), no clothing (4). The response numbers will change as we modify responses

In the list for Q.20, where do you put a chimney for a fireplace or a chimney whose purpose is not known?

R. This question will be modified to include the phrase "including chimney or exhaust vent" for current responses 2, 4, 6, and 7. Those responses will trigger a follow-up question, "Did the fire occur in the chimney or exhaust vent or in the heating equipment itself?" listing responses of "chimney" and "heating equipment". The "chimney" response will trigger the follow-up question "What type of heating equipment was connected to the chimney or exhaust vent?" with the four heating system types currently listed in Q. 20 as the possible responses.

"Other fixed local or room heater" could be read as "Fixed local heater or room heater" which would include portable heaters. Suggest instead "Fixed space heater excluding heating stove".

R. This response will be revised to read "Other fixed local heater"

Q.21. Why are pellets put with coal? Aren't pellets often a form of wood?

R. Pellets will be moved to become "Wood pellets"

Q.23. Consider asking about age of equipment, even if it's only a few ranges.

R. Our experience indicates that responses to this question tend to be either "unknown", "old," or specific ages that are quite new. As such, this variable is rarely useful

How does audio-visual equipment differ from home entertainment and home office equipment? Seems like a small and ambiguous category you don't need.

R. The audio-visual response will be deleted

You've got torch listed here and under heat source earlier. Is that going to complicate the analysis? Remember that the British use "torch" to mean a flashlight. May need to clarify if respondent sounds British or is ambiguous in response.

R. The torches cited in Q. 23 will be a subset of torches included in Q. 14. "Torch" will become a separate response in Q. 14. The torch response in Q. 23 will read "Torch cutting or welding".

All the items listed here are heat sources – with the possible exception of toys, which could use an example or two for clarity. Maybe clarify in question that you mean "provided the heat to start the fire" because "involved in starting the fire" is broader, e.g., the TV fell over and the candle on it started a fire.

R. Question 23 will be changed to read "What kind of item or equipment provided the heat that started the fire?"

Q.24. Consider adding "acetylene" for torches.

R. "Acetylene" will be added.

Q.31. Do you want to ask about indicators that the equipment was working properly just before fire began, or more generally before the fire? Consider adding a list of indicators – e.g., smell, lights dimming or flickering, overheating you can feel, etc.

Also, does this question make as much sense if the item is a candle? Your flow patterns will ask the question for candle fires. Will people understand what "working properly" means in that context?

R. Indicators would depend upon the item involved. We want to know if the respondent thought there was a problem. It is not considered feasible to explore the merits of that judgement. The list would be long, difficult to code, and probably not helpful in evaluating the problem. To provide consistency with other changes, Q. 31 will read "Did the item that provided the heat starting the fire seem to be working properly just before the fire?"

Q.32. Not sure that the flows will bring the right people to this question. For example, why are you uninterested in the ignition of flammable liquids, gases, vapors, if equipment seemed to be working properly? A furnace pilot light igniting gasoline vapors can easily occur when there's nothing wrong with the furnace.

R. See skip pattern. The question will be asked in all situations except when food or cooking oil ignited.

Q.35a. This assumes fires will be discussed from earliest to most recent. Q.7. queues fires from most recent to earliest. Need to reconcile.

R. We will remove the term "earlier" from Q. 35a.

Q.36. This question should identify the presence of heat detectors and CO detectors, if only to make sure they are excluded from subsequent questions (assuming you want to exclude them).

R. The second sentence of the question will read "Do not include heat detectors or CO detectors".

Q.39c. What about plug-in smoke alarms? Is that an AC "connection" or do you need another choice?

R. We intend to include plug-in alarms with other AC-powered alarms. The second response will read "Operated by AC connection without battery back-up. The same change will be made to Q. 39".

Q.42. Suggest a shorter, clearer question: "How was fire discovered?". This is used in the UK. Also, change "smoke detector alarm went off" to "smoke alarm activated"; technical jargon is okay since you're not reading it. What if a heat detector or CO detector gave first notification? Consider whether feeling the heat or smoke irritation to eyes will have a clear place for coding if they provide first notification.

R. We will change this question to read "What alerted someone in the household that there was a fire? Additional responses will read  
'Noticed/smelled smoke'  
'Felt heat from the fire'  
'Heat detector sounded'  
'CO detector sounded'  
Response 1 will read "Smoke detector alarm sounded"

Q.42b. There might be a category between answers 2 and 3: "Considerable smoke but still limited to only part of room". The idea is that "a little smoke" may cut off at a much lower threshold than we would use.

R. Responses will be changed to  
'No visible smoke'  
'Smoke only around the fire source'  
'Smoke filled the room of origin'  
'Smoke spread outside the room of origin'

Q.42d. Do you want to deal with doors that are not fully closed but are mostly closed, i.e., not snug in the door jamb, but abutting the jamb?

R. Responses will be changed to  
'Door fully closed'  
'Door partially closed'  
'Door fully open'

Q.49a. Some may not be familiar with the 10-year battery detector and may think you mean a 10-year-old ordinary battery. Reword for clarity, e.g., Did this detector have a battery designed to last 10 years?

R. The question will be revised to read "Did this detector contain a long-life battery that does not need to be replaced every year?"

Q.50a and Q.58. It would be useful to ask whether detectors or sprinklers are connected to a monitoring service or system.

R. We will add the questions "Were your detectors (Was your sprinkler system) connected to an outside monitoring system?"

Q.50b. Why is the first fire extinguisher question numbered as part of the smoke detector question? Why not make Q50b into Q51 and Q51 into Q51a?

R. The questions will be renumbered when the questionnaire is finalized.

Q.54. Might consider another choice, namely, extinguisher reduced the fire but then ran out, allowing fire to grow again.

R. We believe that the response "Minimize the fire, but not put it out completely" captures this situation adequately.

This also should be reflected in Q.55, which seems to anticipate only an empty extinguisher or a fire too big for a fully charged extinguisher, which leaves out a fire that overwhelms a partially filled extinguisher.

R. We will add a response "It was partially empty" to Q.55.

Q.56. If the answer is Yes, you might want to ask how many extinguishers they tried to use.

R. The question will be revised to read "How many fire extinguishers did you try to use on this fire?"

Q.59a. The phrase "in the room" might be subject to interpretation. A hallway sprinkler head would cover much of the adjoining room(s), subject to walls and doors.

R. The question will be revised to read "Was there a sprinkler head in the room or immediate area where the fire started?"

Q.60. This question may be hard to answer for a fire that begins on the exterior or in a concealed space.

R. We will modify the skip program to ask Q. 60 only when the fire occurred in an indoor room, not in an exterior area, concealed space, or crawl space (Q. 12).

Q.62. Same as Q.54, i.e., a sprinkler need not be all or nothing, and it could reduce the fire before running out, for whatever reason.

R. We believe that the response "Minimize the fire, but not put it out completely" captures this situation adequately.

Q.65. Consider separating out flour if its effectiveness in suppression is sufficiently different from other common home products.

R. Flour will be removed from the current list of common home products and given a response by itself.

Consider distinguishing bringing tap water to fire vs. bringing burning item to tap water, and, more generally, you may move the item but not outside.

R. Add "brought burning item to tap water" and "brought tap water to fire" (replacing current response 2).

Q.67. This should be preceded by asking whether the fire department was called and if so, how (e.g., from phone in home, from phone elsewhere, by neighbor, by passerby, by monitored system overseers).

R. Our primary purpose here is to provide an indicator of whether fires were attended by the fire service or were among the fires unreported to the fire service. Knowing who called the fire service would provide little useful information about the fire.

Q.72. The preamble to this question could come across as cold or brusque. The respondents may still be traumatized by the harm done to a loved one. Consider more sensitive wording and an option to stop this part of the questioning if it becomes too painful to continue.

R. We will revise the preamble to read "Now I'd like to ask you about anyone who was injured or became ill as a result of this fire."

Q.78. Add to question "as a result of the fire." Some of these injuries could have applied before the fire. (Try to find a young boy without cuts or bruises.)

R. The question will be revised to read "What type of fire-related injury/illness did this person have?"

Q.80. Consider asking about pre-existing conditions that might have contributed to any decision to reduce activity

R. This question will be revised to read "As a result of the fire-related injury or illness did he/she cut down on the things he/she usually does for one or more days?"

Q.81. Change "duplex" to "two-family dwelling including duplex." Many people use "duplex" only for buildings where the families live side by side, not for homes where they live top and bottom.

R. This response will be revised to read "2-family dwelling."

Clarify choice 4 as: "Apartment or flat in a building containing 3 or more housing units". More people will recognize the term "apartment" than the more abstract sounding phrase that appears alone there now.

R. This response will be revised to read "Apartment building". We will also add a response "Townhouse/rowhouse" and add the term "detached" to the single-family response.



Q.82. Consider whether people might be more easily able to tell you what year the building was built than to convert that year to an age.

R. We will add a question that asks for year built when the respondent has difficulty with age of the building.

Q.85. This question needs to be clarified regarding heat detectors and CO detectors, like its earlier counterpart.

R. The statement "Do not include heat detectors or CO detectors" will be added to the question.

Q.87. Same comment about monitored systems cited earlier.

R. We will add the same question added to follow Q. 50a.

Q.94. Add a break for 15 to 17 or 15 to 20, to capture the age breaks defining juvenile or child used most places.

R. We will add a category for 15 to 17 capturing juveniles below the age of consent.

Q.98. Consider whether this should follow Q.99.

R. This order retains the order used in the census.

Q.99. Do you consider someone from India to be black, Asian, or other? Will "Native American" be recognized by everyone? Isn't Alaskan native a subset of Native American? Canada uses the term "First Nations"; aboriginal is sometimes applied; and "American Indian" may be deprecated but it may also be clear to some people who aren't attuned to the listed choices.

R. This response will be revised to use the 2000 census term "American Indian."

Q.100. How often do you have to smoke to be a "smoker"?

R. Change question to: "How many people in your household smoke tobacco at least once a day?"

\\HQ1\DATA\USERS\EPHA\LES\Word\Smoke Alarms\NFPA Comments on CPSC  
Survey1.R4.doc  
7/21/03 1:45 PM