



# 2010 INGAA Foundation Spring Meeting Survey

51 Total Responses

## 1. Did you attend this meeting?

Responses	
Yes	42
No	0

## 2. Please evaluate the 2010 Spring Foundation meeting [rating scale 1 to 10; 10 is excellent]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Facility	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	3.9% 2	15.7% 8	47.1% 24	33.3% 17
Program/ Speakers	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	4.0% 2	0.0% 0	4.0% 2	42.0% 21	28.0% 14	22.0% 11
Networking Opportunities	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	3.9% 2	3.9% 2	33.3% 17	25.5% 13	35.3% 18
Safety Moment/Trucking Accidents	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	2.3% 1	7.0% 3	7.0% 3	14.0% 6	34.9% 15	25.6% 11	9.3% 4

### Notes:

1. I thought the facilities were excellent and the presentations very informative. I especially enjoyed the panel on Pipeline Construction Safety. The insights regarding our industry's political challenges presented by Governor Ridge were great as well.
2. I left after Gov Ridge spoke.
3. I don't recall the safety moment. Perhaps I was out of the room at that time.
4. The Safety presentation was very informative and helpful. Safety is always a good topic.
5. I was only able to attend the opening evening reception due to a schedule conflict.
6. The meeting was hugely successful with great speakers, a great program and a great facility.
7. Breakfast set up was awkward and food marginal. Did not attend Thursday dinner - no comments.
8. Good mixers!
9. The helpfulness and hospitality of the staff at La Cantera was excellent.

**3. What could be done to improve this meeting?**

	Response Percent	Response Count
Speakers with a broader focus	17.6%	9
Speakers with a more topic specific focus (specify below)	7.8%	4
More detailed presentations about study results	11.7%	6
Dinner speaker	11.7%	6
Other (specify below)	7.8%	4

Other:

1. I would like to see presentations on more global issues such as macro economic trends affecting our industry and overall industry outlook.
2. Striving for Excellence in Project Execution - The speech did not really cover project execution. Prioritizing Safety - The individual presentations were a little weak.
3. More time for Q&A with some of the speakers.
4. Mix was good as presented
5. No weaknesses
6. Arrange golf so that Friday night stay is not required for people from out of town who want to play
7. I think the programs have been very good.
8. Liked as it was
9. Since a dinner speaker is one of the possible improvement suggestions, I will weigh in on that topic. I would not have a dinner speaker. It will cut into the networking time too much.
10. I thought the meeting was planned and executed well.
11. No suggestions. Really enjoyed Tom Ridge, and Don Santa's Washington report. Safety pane was good too.
12. supply/demand/price outlook for gas
13. Dinner (casual) the first evening would be good. Other regulatory topics such as integrity management, repair technologies (old pipelines).
14. Spring meeting Presentations should remain "big picture" / executive level oriented. Detailed presentations should be scheduled for work shop type meetings.
15. Good speakers, in particular the safety focus.

**4. Please evaluate the process used for the Planning and Studies meeting. [rating scale 1 to 10; 10 is excellent] Please note any suggested improvements below.**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	9.3%	27.9%	25.6%	25.6%	9.3%
0	0	0	0	2	4	12	11	11	4

Notes:

1. More of a "champion" presentation for the need of some study would progress the issue
2. I really prefer the approach to look at ideas and brainstorm off of an established list of ideas.

3. Very good meeting, with only suggestion to allow adequate Q&A time for all speakers.
4. Did not care about many of the suggested topics. Not pertinent to my business
5. Did not attend
6. No specific thoughts at this time there are electronic systems that could capture everyone's vote after a brief discussion at the table on the content of each study. This may give a better representation of the individual's casting votes.
7. did not attend
8. It seemed like everyone was reading the study ideas for the first time and then rushing to decisions without always fully understanding the studies. I recommend some emphasis on preparation so all attendees understand the studies and the selection process in advance. Once the planning session was concluded, only one person from each company (the board) could participate in the session Friday morning where the results of the selection process were discussed. Having been part of the selection process but not part of the board, I would have liked to have heard the results of the selection process.
9. Was unable to attend Planning & Studies
10. Rating of high, medium and low did not work as well as a scale from 1 to 5. Write-ups were not clear enough for me to be confident in the voting.
11. Wow, was much different and easier this year.
12. Well done. The process allowed for ranking of proposed studies and opportunities to add additional recommendations if required.

**5. In your view, what was the highlight of the meeting? (check all that apply)**

	Response Percent	Response Count
Striving for Excellence in Project Execution, Allan Bradley, Questar Pipeline Company	27.5%	14
Prioritizing Safety: Making Safety Change Stick Panel	31.4%	16
Risk Management & Competitive Issues in the Natural Gas Industry, Governor Thomas J. Ridge	58.8%	30
Planning and Studies Meeting	5.9%	3
The Washington Report, Don Santa	51.0%	26
Pipeline Executives Forum	23.5%	12
New EPA Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rules Panel	15.7%	8

**6. Are there other activities or opportunities you would like the Foundation to organize at the spring meeting?**

1. No
2. I like the current format. I don't believe there is enough time to include anything else.
3. No comments
4. Maybe have 1 afternoon with multiple topics at the same time so you can "pick" which is more pertinent or interesting to what you want or need to know?

**7. Do you have any other suggestions or comments that would help us improve the quality of the Spring program in 2011?**

1. Continue to have meetings at locations with great flight options for all members.
2. No
3. Meetings have gotten too large for meaningful networking at social events. Perhaps limit the number of people per company that can attend -- at least for no fee
4. I thought the meeting was well organized and the execution appeared flawless. Great job John and Rich!
5. See above.
6. I did not like the change in program schedule where P&S was integrated into the overall program and golf was done at the end.
7. More topics - Industry/legislative/maintenance. Everyone wants to talk construction and new things. We need to do a better job of talking about what we have in the ground already too! Some since 1929!!!
8. Maybe let some old people win at least one game in shuffle board

**8. Please note any topics/issues you might like addressed at the Annual Meeting in November 2010.**

1. perhaps guest speaker from ANGA
2. Pipeline efficiency study. Compare different types of drivers and what is available today.
3. All Ex-Officio Chairmen to attend - twist some arms
4. threat of FERC section 5 impacts to returns and impacts that will have on project development from the companies' standpoint
5. A safety topic is always valuable and relevant to everyone in attendance.
6. Nat Gas Infrastructure: Degree of Completion; Big Inch, Shale Build-Out, Other
7. A presentation around information that has been assembled and shared with legislators regarding what role natural gas and the pipeline industry can play in helping the environment would be of great interest to the Foundation members. A specific focus on comparing emissions from natural gas generation versus coal generation would be of interest.
8. I like the way you have incorporated outside speakers.
9. No comments at this time.
10. Above.