

2015 Conference Attendee Survey Results

OPEN/WRITTEN RESPONSES, ONLY

56 Respondents:

Alan Plummer Assoc. Inc., Mike Wagner
*American Standard, Jaci Evers
*American Standard, Mark Malatesta
*Bradley Corp., Kris Alderson
*Bradley Corp., Misty Guard
*CSA Group, Ramiro Mata
*CSA Group, Todd Lumpkin
Canadian Institute of Plumbing and Heating (CIPH), Ralph Suppa
*Chase Brass, Dan Borkowski
Chicago Faucet Co., Larry Himmelblau
Denver Water, Chris Piper
*International Code Council, Chris Ochoa
*International Code Council, Dawn LaFleur-Qualley
*International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials, Pete DeMarco
*Fisher Mfg., Stephen Sebahar
Flex-Fluss Partners, Frederick Desborough
*Fluidmaster, Krishna Arkalgud
*Franke, Lars Christensen
*Franke, Will Powell
*Hansgrohe, Michael Klueh
*Kohler Co., Cambria McLeod
*Kohler Co., Rick Reles
*Kohler Co., Shabbir Rawalpindiwala
*Kohler Co., Stewart Yang
*Lavelle Industries, Chip Way

*LSP Products, Michael Miller
Mechanical-Hub, John Mesenbrink
*Moen, John Bertrand
*Moen, Michael Reffner
*NEOPERL, Belinda Wise
*NEOPERL, Fredrick Fraise
*NEOPERL, Jörg Rudolph
*NEOPERL, Marie-Helene Pernin
*NSF International, Dann Holmes
*NSF International, Terry Burger
*Similor AG, Holger Fehrholz
*Sloan Valve, Pete Jahrling
*Sloan Valve, Mariana Nicolae
*Symmons Industries, Kirk Mellits
*T&S Brass and Bronze Works, Jeff Baldwin
*TOTO USA, Kristen Girts
*TOTO USA, William Strang
U.S. Department of Commerce, Salim Bhabhrawala
Valek and Company, Ray Valek
*Viega LLC, Mark Fasel
*WCM Industries, Jon Medved
*WCM Industries, Paul Olson
*WCM Industries, William Ball

NOTE: 8 anonymous

**Denotes a PMI Member Company*

1) Would you recommend the PMI Conference?

Yes (53 of 54 responding) = 98%

No (1 of 54 responding)

Comments:

- Excellent networking opportunities.
- The PMI Conference is one of the best venues to interact with key people who influence our plumbing industry.
- Yes, but I wish the technical content next time would be beefed up a bit with more recaps by PMI staff supported by slides and handouts possibly. Would also love to have more overall info about market trends in general (GMP Research?).
- Always informative and well organized. Also an excellent networking opportunity regardless of your job function.
- Our company's participation has doubled from 2 to 4 with this year's conference alone. One strategy has been to involve members in more committee roles.
- This is a valuable source of information. It is a great way to get insight into the trends, challenges and other activities affecting our industry.
- Excellent conference with interesting topics; a great avenue to be in touch with the latest news in the industry.
- Great time with good college *[Editor's Note: content?]*
- Thank you for the opportunity to attend... San Antonio worked well
- Very professional trade association with a wide array of topics and discussions for the Plumbing Industry. Covers all aspects of industry, codes, standards, regulations, as well as many other points that are both relevant and important.
- Great conference, jam-packed with relevant topics, professional organization.
- It's always an information-packed meeting. Great networking opportunity and a way to meet new attendees.
- Very good content and guest speakers this year.

2) What factors influenced your decision to attend?

OVERALL MEETING CONTENT:

YES (38 of 56 responding) = 68%

Comments:

- I enjoyed the legionella discussion; also we are in critical times, so it was important to attend.
- Update on standards and regulatory issues.
- I was invited as a presenter.
- Technical information.
- To be informed about new regulations and discussions.
- Drainline carry and low flow research.
- Government Affairs, networking and technical issues.
- Good offering of content and speakers.
- My experience has been that this is always a worthwhile event.
- Great presentations!
- The meetings cover all topics needed for the Plumbing Industry.
- Timing.
- I am a consultant with PMI.
- Important to attend.
- Dr. Marc Edwards / legionella.
- To see future trends in the industry.
- Networking, engagement with industry.
- Important to our corporate direction and strategy.

SPECIFIC CONTENT OF THE MEETING, PLEASE LIST (i.e. committee meeting, special presentation, or topic):

YES (27 of 56 responding) = 48%

Comments:

- Especially the session on alternative media.
- Sustainability Task Group.
- I wanted to be updated on any news regarding US market requirements like the California 1.2 gpm [gallons per minute] issue.
- Technical sessions, social interaction.
- International trade.
- Technical meeting, Board meeting.
- Speakers Dr. Edwards and Dr. Sturman.
- Good science is an imperative as PMI brings support to the market.
- San Antonio Water and Sewer
- Keynote speaker Ross Shaffer was great.
- Committee meeting; Board of Directors meeting.
- Legionella, biofilm, and California legislation.

- Yes, Outreach/Communications Committee and water panel.
- Water conservation and its impact on plumbing systems and public health.
- Outside presentations like Ross Shaffer are always appreciated.
- California content.
- Committee meetings (Outreach/Communications) and the panel discussion topic was of interest.
- Water Conservation topic.
- Biofilm growth and resulting hygiene problems.
- Government Relations.
- Dr. Marc Edwards.
- Dr. Paul Sturman.
- Presentations by Dr. Marc Edwards and Dr. Paul Sturman.
- Water Conservation (California Energy Commission) as well as Prop65 and biofilm topics.
- Current legislation and networking.

CONFERENCE LOCATION:

YES (24 of 56 responding) = 43%

Comments:

- Great location!
- Location was irrelevant to me.
- San Antonio is a great water success story but I'm not a fan of Texas.
- It was nice. I'm fine with all the locales PMI has chosen to date.
- San Antonio was a good choice to keep us in shape (walking).
- Good venue.
- Solid choice.
- Good, positive.
- Texas is good.
- Very nice choice.
- Oh yeah!
- San Antonio is a great town.
- Excellent with good hotel amenities.
- Was a great location and venue with lots of things to see and lots of walking/sightseeing opportunities. Also a safe feeling.
- San Antonio was great!!!
- Fantastic!
- Easy to get to.
- Great choice.
- San Antonio was definitely great, offering the opportunity to just walk around.
- Loved the location.

TRADITION/JOB RESPONSIBILITY, i.e. I ALWAYS ATTEND THE PMI CONFERENCES:

YES (26 of 56 responding) = 46%

NO (1 of 56 responding)

Comments:

- Partially.
- New role with this responsibility.
- So far, yes and I hope my job continues to require me to attend. I'm blessed.
- I generally attend the meetings.
- In my case it is my primary role.
- Long time attendee.
- Board member.
- Always should have attended the PMI Conferences.
- Product manager, always there.
- As a consultant, to assist staff in any way possible.
- Always attend as the company representative.
- New to my company's codes and regulations responsibilities.
- We typically attend.
- Always attend.
- Codes and standards work will have me attending in the future as well.

PMI CONFERENCES ADVERTISEMENT, PLEASE SPECIFY WHERE YOU SAW THE AD:

YES (6 of 54 responding) = 11%

NO (2 of 54 responding)

N/A (2, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- Seen through PMI
- Via email. (2)
- *Reeves Journal Magazine.*
- Saw ads during breaks.
- PMI website and *Mechanical Hub* publication.

OTHER:

YES (9 of 56 responding) = 16%

Comments:

- Invited speaker.
- Build relationship with PMI.
- First time attendee.
- I was a speaker. The program and networking were excellent. Wish I could have stayed longer.
- Rosemont is not the most attractive place unless you have to catch a flight. *[Editor's Note: Rosemont, Illinois is the 2016 Conference location.]*
- It is a great venue to ensure that you and your company is actively engaged in the industry.
- I have not been able to attend the last few conferences and believe it is important to stay abreast of all current issues facing our industry.
- Our company just joined PMI so this was my first time to attend.
- Networking with faucet manufacturers and certification bodies.

3) Special Presentations Ranking

DR. MARC EDWARDS “Achieving Water Conservation without Compromising Public Health”

GREAT (37 out of 52 responding) = 71%
GOOD (13 out of 52 responding) = 25%
AVERAGE (1 out of 52 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 out of 52 responding)
N/A (3, not included in percentage calculations)

DR. PAUL STURMAN “Biofilm Growth and Response to Antimicrobial Treatment”

GREAT (22 out of 53 responding) = 42%
GOOD (21 out of 53 responding) = 40%
AVERAGE (6 out of 53 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (4 out of 53 responding)
N/A (3, not included in percentage calculations)

ROSS SHAFFER Keynote Address

GREAT (40 out of 52 responding) = 77%
GOOD (12 out of 52 responding) = 23%
AVERAGE (0 out of 52 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 52 responding)
N/A (4, not included in percentage calculations)

KAREN GUZ “Insights on San Antonio’s Successes and Challenges in Converting the City to WaterSense Products”

GREAT (23 out of 35 responding) = 66%
GOOD (11 out of 35 responding) = 31%
AVERAGE (1 out of 35 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 35 responding)
N/A (18, not included in percentage calculations)

PANEL DISCUSSION “The Future of Water: Wins, Woes and Worries”

GREAT (12 out of 36 responding) = 33%
GOOD (18 out of 36 responding) = 50%
AVERAGE (6 out of 36 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 36 responding)
N/A (18, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- Dr. Edwards' presentation was excellent and very informative. His could have gone longer with even more information. The biofilm presentation went quite long repeating basically the same thing over and over. Dr. Sturman was certainly passionate about the topic, but we probably did not need so much detail. I fell ill the last morning so I missed the last two topics.
- Dr. Marc Edwards' presentation felt as if there was not a lot of new material and more issues raised than answers proposed.
- Instead of a panel discussion, I believe that questions and answers would have been better.
- All presentations were top notch. Dr. Edwards has the best delivery for his third PMI appearance.
- The presentations of Dr. Edwards and Dr. Sturman had been very interesting and informative for me.
- Karen [Guz] was wonderful, and knows the subject matter. We can use her knowledge again somehow.
- I thought that Dr. Marc Edwards and Dr. Paul Sturman contradicted each other on certain points and when they presented back-to-back. I also thought Dr. Marc Edwards has a very strong engaging presentation. I also wish that Karen Guz and the Future of Water: Wins, Woes and Worries Panel was on Wednesday so more were in attendance. It was a great discussion and just wish more could have been involved.
- I would recommend the presentations by Dr. Edwards and Dr. Sturman be tied to the policy issues facing the industry. The presentations were geared towards an academic audience, not towards an industry audience. While I appreciate the technical nature of the work, I would benefit from the last 15 minutes spent connecting the research to the policy issues facing the industry.
- Would have liked to see the Thursday speaker and panel on Tuesday. Would have made great discussion for the Outreach/Communications meeting.
- All five of these special presentations were totally worth attending the PMI Conference. Very dynamic, informative and thought provoking. The Dr. Edwards and Dr. Sturman presentations/topics were of extreme benefit at this time in light of increasing awareness and necessity to protect our life resource "Potable-Water." These presentations will serve to make us acutely aware of potential health hazards and public safety when researching and applying water conservation methods and principals moving forward.

Comments:

- Dr. Marc Edwards' presentation was informative and educational, but Dr. Sturman's was way too technical. I think that it would have been better to have Karen Guz and the The Future of Water Panel Discussion on Wednesday. People could have even flown out of San Antonio earlier if we ended on Wednesday. Ross Shafer was excellent.
- Topics very relevant for our industry.
- The biofilm presentation was very rich in data, but it was over a lot of people's heads I think. If you didn't have a background in biological research, it was a little challenging to keep up. Also, I think maybe the amount of time spent on it was difficult because most presentations were 30-60 minutes, but if you were in the technical track, you had two hours. I think that the 30-45 minute range is the sweet spot if possible for presentations because even if it isn't the most interesting topic, most can hold their attention that long.
- I feel the presentation on biofilm was not relevant to the audience. It may be of interest to a more "scientific" audience; however, to plumbing manufacturers it may be of little priority.
- Congratulations on the speakers and content this year!
- Excellent job on all fronts!

4) General Membership Meeting (Wednesday) Ranking

GREAT (13 out of 45 responding) = 29%

GOOD (21 out of 45 responding) = 47%

AVERAGE (10 out of 45 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 out of 45 responding)

N/A (11, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- I unexpectedly had to leave so wasn't able to attend.
- The general meeting seems to be very rushed and routine... maybe it is for the staff as you do meet and discuss all the topics, but to the rest of us, the topics are just zoomed over. I expected more update or news or summary of how PMI interacted with California to delay the new legislation to the 1.2 gpm. This was a great achievement but wasn't really discussed.
- Very short recap and not much detail on the budget—make voting on the budget a rather insignificant event.
- The financials should be a handout or leave on the screen long enough for the audience to actually read the information. The Treasurer should walk through the important factors in the budget.
- While it is nice to summarize the past accomplishments of the year, I would have liked to hear more about the upcoming projects for next year.
- Good job in getting the facts, achievements, and goals out to the members along with the stability of PMI.
- Please spend more time on budget details.

5) Issue Committee Meetings: Water Efficiency and Sustainability Ranking

JOHN MESENBRINK “Net-Zero Building”

GREAT (3 out of 52 responding) = 6%
GOOD (20 out of 52 responding) = 38%
AVERAGE (15 out of 52 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (14 out of 52 responding)
N/A (3, not included in percentage calculations)

RALPH SUPPA “Updates on the Canadian Plumbing Industry”

GREAT (9 out of 50 responding) = 18%
GOOD (28 out of 50 responding) = 56%
AVERAGE (13 out of 50 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 50 responding)
N/A (5, not included in percentage calculations)

SUSTAINABILITY TASK GROUP (DANIEL GLEIBERMAN) “Updates on the Product Category Rules (PCR) Guidelines”

GREAT (8 out of 47 responding) = 17%
GOOD (27 out of 47 responding) = 57%
AVERAGE (10 out of 47 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (2 out of 47 responding)
N/A (7, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- PCR: it just was not very clear and I would have benefited from some supporting slides... (unless I was running low on coffee)
- The updates on the PCR have been very helpful for my work.
- Speakers should note a “presentation” doesn’t mean reading the blurbs on your PowerPoint. The audience can read those... bring something to the table.
- There were a total of 12 comments suggesting ways to improve the Net-Zero presentation; including consulting someone from the Living Building Challenge (LBC).

6) Issue Committee Meetings: Fair Trade Ranking

SALIM BHABHRAWALA “Advancing US Exports of Plumbing Products”

GREAT (12 out of 48 responding) = 25%

GOOD (29 out of 48 responding) = 60%

AVERAGE (7 out of 48 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 48 responding)

N/A (8, not included in percentage calculations)

RALPH SUPPA “A Regulatory Alignment Update”

GREAT (9 out of 47 responding) = 19%

GOOD (27 out of 47 responding) = 57%

AVERAGE (11 out of 47 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 47 responding)

N/A (9, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- I rated Ralph [Suppa] as average, but keep in mind, I had seen this information and presentation before—so this might be an unintended bias.
- Both topics were well presented. Good verbal delivery on both, and brief on time presentations.

7) Standing Committee Meetings: Advocacy/Government Affairs Ranking

JERRY DESMOND “California Legislative Update”

GREAT (30 out of 50 responding) = 60%
GOOD (18 out of 50 responding) = 36%
AVERAGE (2 out of 50 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 50 responding)
N/A (4, not included in percentage calculations)

STEPHANIE SALMON “Federal Legislative Update”

GREAT (22 out of 50 responding) = 44%
GOOD (23 out of 50 responding) = 46%
AVERAGE (5 out of 50 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 50 responding)
N/A (4, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- Jerry’s [Desmond] recaps are more detailed.
- Provide guidance on relative importance of pending issues to PMI members.
- They needed more time.
- Both presentations were delivered in a precise manner, covered a wide variety of both current and future oriented projects that PMI is involved in.
- I wasn’t able to attend this meeting.

8) Technical Committee Dual Track

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

GREAT (14 out of 26 responding) = 33%
GOOD (10 out of 26 responding) = 24%
AVERAGE (1 out of 26 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 out of 26 responding)
N/A (14, not included in percentage calculations)

DR. PAUL STURMAN “Biofilms and Pathogen Survival”

GREAT (20 out of 36 responding) = 44%
GOOD (11 out of 36 responding) = 24%
AVERAGE (2 out of 36 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (3 out of 36 responding)
N/A (11, not included in percentage calculations)

PETE DEMARCO “Plumbing Efficiency Research Coalition (PERC) Updates”

GREAT (16 out of 33 responding) = 40%
GOOD (13 out of 33 responding) = 33%
AVERAGE (3 out of 33 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 out of 33 responding)
N/A (16, not included in percentage calculations)

CHRISTIAN TAYLOR-HAMLIN “European Water Label Update”

GREAT (17 out of 33 responding) = 44%
GOOD (13 out of 33 responding) = 33%
AVERAGE (3 out of 33 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 33 responding)
N/A (17, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- We could have used more time for Pete DeMarco and would have appreciated a recap of the latest developments and foreseeable regulatory changes by PMI Technical Staff. I was surprised to barely hear PMI technical staff address the audience... (unless I fell asleep?)
- I felt like Dr. Sturman’s presentation was just a continuation of the previous presentation. It was very redundant.
- Too bad Pete DeMarco did not have a bit more time to bring additional details to his presentation.
- Dr. Paul Sturman: The presentation was good, although it did overlap somewhat with his presentation from earlier on the same day. In speaking with several other more

technical oriented members, they felt it was somewhat repetitive, but still good information and reinforcement. Pete DeMarco: Very good presentation and information on understanding the PERC testing methodology and reasoning behind the research. Great delivery and good slides.

- In-depth insight into research.
- See comment on question 3 for the PERC update—might have been better to spend a little more time discussing this since several members had contributed to this work, good info, well prepared, but seemed rushed. *[Editor’s Note: The comment referred to here from question #3 is, “The biofilm presentation was very rich in data, but it was over a lot of people’s heads I think. If you didn’t have a background in biological research, it was a little challenging to keep up. Also, I think maybe the amount of time spent on it was difficult because most presentations were 30-60 minutes, but if you were in the technical track, you had two hours. I think that the 30-45 minute range is the sweet spot if possible for presentations because even if it isn’t the most interesting topic, most can hold their attention that long.”]*
- Same comment as earlier. *[Editor’s Note: The comment referred to here is, “I feel the presentation on biofilm was not relevant to the audience. It may be of interest to a more ‘scientific’ audience; however, to plumbing manufacturers it may be of little priority.”]*

9) Outreach/Communications Committee Dual Track

OUTREACH/COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

GREAT (6 out of 15 responding) = 40%
GOOD (9 out of 15 responding) = 60%
AVERAGE (0 out of 15 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 15 responding)
N/A (30, not included in percentage calculations)

LAURA MARLOW and DEREK GUFFY “Special Presentation on Market Data”

GREAT (5 out of 18 responding) = 28%
GOOD (11 out of 18 responding) = 61%
AVERAGE (2 out of 18 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 18 responding)
N/A (29, not included in percentage calculations)

PANEL DISCUSSION “Social Media and Digital Communications Strategies”

GREAT (14 out of 18 responding) = 78%
GOOD (4 out of 18 responding) = 22%
AVERAGE (0 out of 18 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 18 responding)
N/A (29, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- Lots of great usable content.
- Tough subject.
- Nice to have marketing tracks at the meeting!
- Really enjoyed the panel discussion. It was a great open-forum for conversations, topics and ideas.
- The CMD Group presentation was a little too much of a “sell” of service and wasn’t as relevant for the committee. The panel discussion was great and informative.

10) Special Dual Track Sessions Ranking

REPORTS FROM THE DUAL TRACK SESSIONS

GREAT (9 out of 44 responding) = 20%

GOOD (26 out of 44 responding) = 59%

AVERAGE (7 out of 44 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (2 out of 44 responding)

N/A (8, not included in percentage calculations)

REPORTS FROM THE ALLIED MEMBER COMMITTEE

GREAT (9 out of 42 responding) = 21%

GOOD (25 out of 42 responding) = 60%

AVERAGE (8 out of 42 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 42 responding)

N/A (9, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- Had to, unexpectedly, leave early.
- Needed better update from the Technical Committee.
- Good, but I paid more attention to the Allied Members Committee section.

11) Did you like the Dual Tracks format? If “No” why not?

Yes (42 of 52 responding) = 81%

No (10 of 52 responding)

Comments:

- It gives the ability for the technical and other (sales/marketing) oriented members the ability to attend session co-related to their responsibilities. Keeps the synergy flowing.
- It was good for those that had multiple members attending to divide and conquer to catch every presentation, allowed for more information to be scheduled into less time.
- Not crazy about it, but understand the reasons to have it.
- Would prefer to be involved in both to hear first-hand the topics. With the dual track, one has to choose.
- I'm troubled here. I do like the dual-track format, it keeps us on time, but I don't like the fact that I can't attend both.
- I think I preferred when we could attend all sessions.
- The expanded presentation in the technical committee has been interesting, but showed some of the topics which had been presented earlier in the morning.
- Often need to attend both sessions.
- I feel I miss too much, but understand the limitations.
- Maybe use this slot for more free time to offer Cracker Barrel sessions [*Editor's Note: networking*] where topics are provided in advance and selected and are discussed in round table formats.
- I would have liked to attend some topics from one and then go to another topic from the other. Dual track is fine but not for multiple discussions.
- Provides options.

12) How could PMI improve the Dual Track format? Please list suggested future topics.

- In the future, it would be nice if these sessions were available to us via a recorded video link on the PMI members-only site. Just a suggestion.
- Maybe some more discussions in the technical committee would be good.
- Start the day early and just expect many participants to attend just one of the session by choice. However, this at least gives the opportunity to attend both if necessary. Most attendees will use the open time productively if they choose to only attend one of the sessions.
- I thought it was great.
- Eliminate the dual tracks and bring both groups together—synergy, not separation.
- Query whether there should be a “technical” track or a “regulatory” track. Most of the people in the technical track are actually dealing with regulatory matters.
- Marketing is hard. Outside speaker would be great if possible.
- I will research this point and offer potential ideas ongoing, directly with staff.
- The dual track format could be expanded to allow the Outreach/Communications team to see more specialized presentations in how similar industry associations handle communications and outreach. The general session continues to be so “technical” in its information that it is difficult to understand how to impact from an outreach and communications angle.
- Not sure if this is the best place for this, or if there will be other places in the survey to answer, but I was hoping for a more interactive session pertaining to regulatory requirements. I’m sure many in that room were very knowledgeable on all the code and law changes pertaining to water flow like CEC [California Energy Commission] and DOE [Department of Energy] and others, but I am new to this industry. I was hoping for some more hands-on training-type seminars to really help educate me on these legal requirements and how they will affect our organization. What would be really nice would be a full day training session or overview to go over all the legal requirements for plumbing products. *[Editor’s Note: PMI does offer this training online [here](#). The Allied Member Committee is currently engaged in updating this content and the new version will be available soon.]*

13) Expanded Sponsorship Program Ranking (Table/Booth Displays)

VALUE ADDED BY HOSTING EXPANDED SPONSORS AT THE CONFERENCE

GREAT (19 out of 50 responding) = 38%
GOOD (22 out of 50 responding) = 44%
AVERAGE (8 out of 50 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 out of 50 responding)
N/A (4, not included in percentage calculations)

PLACEMENT OF THE TABLE/BOOTH DISPLAYS

GREAT (12 out of 49 responding) = 24%
GOOD (27 out of 49 responding) = 55%
AVERAGE (9 out of 49 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 out of 49 responding)
N/A (5, not included in percentage calculations)

NETWORKING TIME ALLOWED FOR INTERACTION WITH SPONSORS

GREAT (20 out of 49 responding) = 41%
GOOD (25 out of 49 responding) = 51%
AVERAGE (4 out of 49 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 49 responding)
N/A (5, not included in percentage calculations)

PMI PASSPORT PROGRAM FOR TRACKING SPONSOR VISITS

GREAT (13 out of 46 responding) = 28%
GOOD (23 out of 46 responding) = 50%
AVERAGE (8 out of 46 responding)
NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (2 out of 46 responding)
N/A (8, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- Networking/booth room was kind of small and a bit noisy.
- Great networking opportunity. The room was small but it kept everyone engaged. There was very little traffic in the early morning and during breaks. Seemed like most people stamped their own Passport card because too few vendors were at their tables. This was due to two things: the vendors were not yet there, or the vendor was networking. Networking is what they should be doing.
- Room was too small for the sponsorship/networking.
- I think the room was too small to accommodate reception and exhibits.
- Sponsors bring added value because it provides some good one-on-one time between members and sponsor companies. Room was a bit crowded due to the location of the

bar. Time for networking was adequate (but hampered somewhat due to room size and bar in the center of the room). PMI Passports: Personal observation only—some members would stamp their own passports during times when sponsors were not manning their tables. Maybe we consider a simple quiz question or information related to sponsors to promote interaction between members and sponsors. This is just a thought to bring more engagement.

- Display room was a little cramped.
- It was great to have support from sponsors but they weren't at their tables so I am unsure as to what they got out of it.
- I think that there is value to having sponsors at the conference, but displays were often unmanned. The Passport is a marketing gimmick to force people to visit all the displays. I would gladly visit displays that have value to me, and not waste time, or the presenter's time, on displays that do not have value to me.
- It has become, in some cases, a collecting-stamps-only visit.

14) Meeting Rooms at the Hotel Contessa in San Antonio, TX

GREAT (21 out of 54 responding) = 39%

GOOD (26 out of 54 responding) = 48%

AVERAGE (3 out of 54 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (4 out of 54 responding)

N/A (2, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- I like the stadium seating that is in Chicago, but this was good.
- Air conditioning—too much! That’s one reason I fell ill.
- They seemed a bit small/tight at times.
- Room was quite small and not well planned for electrical plugs. Shape was not ideal. Too cold, as usual, but overall it still worked out.
- Excellent hotel; excellent location.
- Was a great location and a very nice city.
- Chairs should not be placed so close together.
- Room layout felt very cramped.
- Too tight, had a hard time to sit because all the chairs were too close.
- Room had some AC issues, too cold left side and too warm right side. (It did improve as the conference progressed.) At times it felt like the room was a little cramped—I noticed some members having difficulty exiting or re-entering rows through the meeting. Sponsor/cocktail room was somewhat small especially due to the bar in the center of the already narrow room.
- Pitchers of water, on the tables, works better. It was difficult to get up and get water easily without causing interruption.
- I felt the meeting room was good, however, it felt crowded in the main room.
- Temperature was uncomfortable.
- Meeting rooms were quite cold.
- Temperature control was the only issue. Sound and video worked well. Chairs were great.
- Room was a bit tight.

15) Sleeping Rooms at the Hotel Contessa in San Antonio, TX

GREAT (35 out of 52 responding) = 67%

GOOD (15 out of 52 responding) = 29%

AVERAGE (1 out of 52 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 out of 52 responding)

N/A (4, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- Rooms were large and beautiful. I wish I had more time to spend in the room.
- Rooms were fantastic (suite style) very comfortable and the bed was great. Only negative point I would like to raise is I had an issue with a dripping faucet and running toilet—after the first night I had to shut the bathroom door every night to avoid hearing the dripping. It took four requests made to the front desk to get it fixed. The front desk duty manager offered her apologies for any inconvenience and comped my breakfast on Monday, Oct. 26th.
- Room was too big. Bed too soft.
- Suites were spacious.
- Street side rooms were very noisy due to traffic.

16) How would you rate the Dine Around event?

GREAT (26 out of 52 responding) = 50%

GOOD (18 out of 52 responding) = 35%

AVERAGE (5 out of 52 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (3 out of 52 responding)

N/A (4, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- My dinner at Zinc was not very good at all.
- It was nice to go to a restaurant instead of two evening meals in a conference venue, but the restaurant that I ended up at was not suited for a large group—tables were too close and we were squeezed together. That restaurant (the Texas Bistro) was extremely loud... very hard to carry on a conversation! It was a nice idea to split the group up so you were involved with other participants, instead of people forming their own groups and going out to dinner on their own.
- Acenar: the tables are big, the rooms are small, the noise level is high... it's really hard to communicate with your table guests. Greatly prefer smaller tables in less noisy restaurants. Zinc was better when we went on our own (less noise).
- Another excellent opportunity to network/socialize with individuals that you may not otherwise speak with.
- Due to the noise level of the location, there was very little discussion.
- I did not attend.
- I was at Acenar—my food was cold when I received it ☹️
- Great food, excellent company—fun.
- A lot of confusion with the restaurants and people not pleased with their assigned restaurants (not their choice). Not sure what the issue was since we did the Dine Around Event in the past without any trouble.
- The restaurant was so loud, it was hard to carry on much conversations—at ours anyway.
- PMI staff does a great job as usually selecting venues and organizing the event. Would suggest the Dine Around replace the dinner on the last night and make the night before “on your own.” With the catered lunches, only Monday night was left to try different restaurants.
- Great selection of top-rated restaurants. Maybe adding the first one/two drinks to the PMI rate could avoid the cash-collection at each table.

17) How would you rate Wednesday's conference dinner?

GREAT (16 out of 44 responding) = 36%

GOOD (21 out of 44 responding) = 48%

AVERAGE (6 out of 44 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 out of 44 responding)

N/A (12, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- I unexpectedly had to leave early so missed the dinner.
- It was a very large room—didn't give a cozy group feeling, but we did have a large group.
- Keep it up!
- Needs a program or more formal structure for networking/interacting.
- I understand why, but maybe the reception was too long. Maybe we should have started later, or dinner earlier.
- Well organized and good mix of people at various tables. Great networking opportunities. Some members or attendees were vegetarian on a couple of the tables and they had to wait for their meals to be served. Other than that, great event.
- Dinner was OK but the cocktail portion was too long with not enough food. The entertainment was not that great.
- I'm not one for a long dinner, so unless some other event is scheduled with dinner, such as a guest speaker, suggest this be the Dine Around event.
- I preferred having the dinner with the Keynote Speaker. Food was only okay.
- Entrée needed more substance.
- If feasible, a short keynote speech is beneficial.

18) Time Length of Meetings Ranking

JUST RIGHT (49 out of 54 responding) = 90%

TOO LONG (3 out of 54 responding) = 6%

TOO SHORT (0 out of 54 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (2 out of 54 responding)

N/A (1, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- Some too short, some too long. Topics related to all of us, especially regarding legislation seem too short.
- This issue may be more personal, but I tend to spend breaks on the phone with the office, so I miss the Networking Breaks and sponsored display tables. My only suggestion may be extended breaks, but I'm not sure that works for everyone?
- Perhaps just two full days?
- Thursday's meetings and information could have been moved to Wednesday. Wednesday was a light day and most people left Wednesday night/early Thursday morning.
- There needs to be more breaks. I would prefer to add a day to make it less compact, intense and long.
- The meeting should be two full days—Tuesday and Wednesday worked great. This way people could travel in on Monday. Thursday's meetings could have been worked into the two-day agenda to allow people to leave earlier on Thursday morning.
- For the most part they were good. That 30-45 minute range is just right—enough time to get your point across, but not too long if the speaker is boring, or the topic isn't relevant to you.

19) Informal Networking Opportunities Ranking

GREAT (27 out of 55 responding) = 49%

GOOD (27 out of 55 responding) = 49%

AVERAGE (1 out of 55 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (0 out of 55 responding)

N/A (1, not included in percentage calculations)

There were no written comments.

20) Value of Meeting Materials Ranking

GREAT (20 out of 52 responding) = 38%

GOOD (22 out of 52 responding) = 42%

AVERAGE (9 out of 52 responding)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 out of 52 responding)

N/A (3, not included in percentage calculations)

Comments:

- More needs to be put on the website after the meetings—video?
- Did not receive them.
- I haven't received them yet. It would be nice to have the presentations at the meeting so you could take notes on the actual presentation while the speaker was delivering it. But then again, I'm a note taker by nature, so maybe this would be of little value to others?
- Provide copies of the presentations during registration.

21) Do you feel the 2015 Conference was worth the time and money you invested?

If "No" why not?

Yes (48 of 48 responding) = 100%

No (0)

Comments:

- It was not as beneficial as I'd hoped. I was hoping for more training/guidance concerning all the new legal/regulatory requirements surrounding water efficiency, but I would say it was still worth the trip to start establishing relationships with others in the industry, hear was other challenges others are facing and how they've handled them.
- I was attending as a consultant to assist PMI staff, but did feel all the meetings were of great benefit.

22) Can we count on you to attend the 2016 Conference, October 24-27, at The Westin O'Hare in Rosemont, IL?

Yes (41 of 48 responding) = 85%
No (7 of 48 responding)

Comments:

- As a Board Member [*Editor's Note: "Board" referred to is the board of an individual's company, not the PMI Board of Directors.*] this is something I need to attend only every few years.
- I'm not sure about attendance yet.
- I am hoping to attend, but it depends on what other events need to be covered. My co-workers can be counted on to attend and I will as well if possible.
- Government budget unknown.
- Unsure right now due to work schedule.
- I will be coming, but Rosemont would not have been my first choice of venue.
- I will attend as a consultant to assist PMI staff.
- As long as my travel is approved, I hope to attend.
- Still need to work on membership. [*Editor's Note: Response is from a prospective member.*]
- Every few years works best for me.

23) Do you plan to bring your spouse, companion or other family members?

Yes (2 of 48 responding) = 4%
No (46 of 48 responding)

There were no written comments.

24) Do you wish to be considered for a leadership position (i.e. committee chair)? If “Yes” please provide name.

Yes (3 of 44 responding)

No (41 of 44 responding)

The submitted names come from: CSA Group, Franke and Symmons Industries; individual names are held in confidence.

25) Do you wish to be considered for a position on the PMI Board of Directors? If “Yes” please provide name.

Yes (2 of 44 responding)

No (42 of 44 responding)

The submitted names come from: CSA Group and Symmons Industries; individual names are held in confidence.

26) What kind of keynote speakers/topics would be of interest to you at future PMI meetings?

- This year's was excellent—I think you have done a great job finding keynote speakers.
- Great question—I wish I could give you a great answer.
- Victor Post, GMP Research; Mary-Ann Dickinson, AWE; EPA WaterSense; California IOU [Investor Owned Utility] representatives; NRDC [National Resources Defense Council] representatives
- It would be interesting to have a featured market section and foreign presenters to discuss plumbing challenges in other markets such as China, India, The Middle East, or Japan.
- More discussions about the future of plumbing—what is next?
- I am interested in technical topics like water supply and water treatment.
- Similar to Ross Shafer, or very specific industry related experts.
- Any topics that deal with potential legislative change and flow restriction. Any innovations in the plumbing industry.
- Political commentators such as George Will.
- Michael Hyatt is a great speaker.
- 1. Reclaimed Water—chemistry, how, success stories, road blocks; 2. International drought issues, i.e. Australia—what is their approach in the Plumbing Industry? 3. Have speakers from related manufacturers like pipes, pumps, solenoids.
- Future of technology/communications; new materials/nanotechnology; water desalination
- Prop 65 and its evolution; water conservation; plumbing systems and impact on water quality/health.
- Leaders, any kind of business—developers, inventors, green push, LEED.
- Scott Burrows—I heard him at another conference and he was very motivational and inspiring.
- Motivational with a sense of humor and lighthearted message—work to live, don't live to work.
- Will do some research to see if I can come up with some suggestions.
- Similar to Ross Shafer. Speakers relevant to water, conservation, sustainability. Speakers with impact on marketing expertise for industry associations.
- As I mentioned before, anything focusing on regulatory requirements and changes to regulatory requirements would be helpful to me.
- Really enjoyed Ross Shafer—suggest someone similar.
- I would like to hear more from the regulators—how does their process work, do they read our comments and letters and what they want from us in order to create reasonable regulations? As well as the contractors in the field living with the changing regulations.
- Ross Shafer was very effective and very engaging with the audience. His motivational message-training is very effective.
- Prop 65; conflict minerals.
- Codes and Standards collaboration meeting. Plumbing Technologies Advancements with member product showcases to give members a better understanding of each of our company's products.

27) What can we do to improve the PMI conferences for you?

- Maybe it is because I am too new to it all, but I would be interested in having some training to gain/improve my knowledge on all the plumbing codes and testing and other requirements. Someone mentioned to me that PMI used to offer training—maybe there could be something to offer before, or after, the conference for those interested, as we are traveling anyway. As there are a lot of new members, and maybe some from other industries—a “workshop” or training could be of interest. *[Editor’s Note: PMI does offer this training online [here](#). The Allied Member Committee is currently engaged in updating this content and the new version will be available soon.]*
- Hard to say—you do so much with what you have to work with.
- Increase regulatory content. Ask PMI Technical staff to present a summary of annual regulatory developments with supporting documents and outlook into next year.
- Instead of report-outs from committees (this can be accomplished with a PowerPoint prior to the conference), more Q&A.
- Give more time that isn’t so structured—add a day, make it less intense.
- Please pull my name as a winner for 2017, which will be outside the Chicago area 😊
- Two days is perfect—place was great, Chicago is always good. Summer better though 😊
- As a consultant assisting PMI staff, this point will be an ongoing topic of discussion.
- Provide training on codes and standards—taking the mystery out of compliance.
- Remove the too technical, science/biology focused materials.
- Again, I would suggest some sort of session for “newbies” or folks who would just like a refresher on all the most current regulatory and agency requirements. Maybe even something to explain, in general, all the differences between codes and standards and so forth. Probably would be a good idea to make something like that optional for those who may already know all about it, to keep it from getting boring for them. Maybe have an optional day at the beginning or end for training for the folks who this type of things would be beneficial for? Or maybe have this type of meeting completely separate from the conference, some other time during the year, if it would take up enough time to warrant that, or offer it at multiple times during the year?
- You run a good show. Hotel and location were nice. Missed having a continental breakfast on the last morning—especially since the hotel did not have a snack shop.
- Provide light breakfast each morning.
- Don’t change a thing—well done.

28) Additional Comments:

- Since PMI is only once a year now, pick a place with nice weather, alternating between East and West Coasts.
- It was a great conference at a very nice place. Thank you very much.
- San Antonio was a great location!
- The sponsor/networking area was too small and made it difficult to navigate between groups.
- Thank you to all the PMI team and Board for the opportunity to attend and share updates from Canada. It was a wonderful conference and it is appreciated.
- Thank you.
- I am new, but really enjoyed the thoughtful planning of the event, the professionalism of the attendees, and learning—both from the speakers, as well as, from folks on the side.
- Overall, great job by PMI staff once again!
- I thought you were going to take Ross Shafer's advice and make this survey short 😊