



Cleanlink News September 28 2010

Survey: Matting Confusion

A survey of facility managers and cleaning professionals reveals that many misconceptions persist regarding the use and benefits of matting systems. Perhaps the most notable area of confusion is whether purchasing mats costs more, less, or about the same amount as renting them.

Fully 75 percent of survey respondents said they believed purchasing mats is more expensive than renting them while the rest thought it was less expensive, indicated that they did not know, or believed that the costs were about the same.

"This is an issue the [entire] matting industry has been dealing with for years," says Christopher Tricozzi, vice president of marketing for Crown Mats and Matting, which commissioned the survey. "The truth of the matter is that ten weeks of renting a mat usually equals the entire cost of the mat, making it far less expensive to own than to rent."

Some of the other survey findings included:

- Only 17 percent of respondents knew that sustainable mats are made from 100 percent recycled plastics. The rest believed sustainable mats were made from recycled mats or from a variety of recycled materials.
- More than half of the respondents knew that scrapper mats remove soils more aggressively than other types of matting.
- Eighty percent of the respondents were aware that high-performance matting systems are designed to capture and trap soils
- About 80 percent also knew that high-performance matting systems can help facilities qualify for LEED credits and that they usually have longer warranties than rental mats.

The survey also questioned respondents about slip-and-fall accidents — which matting systems are specifically designed to help prevent.

Most respondents believed that slip-and-fall accidents can cost building owners or employers more than \$50,000, while only 26 percent were aware that the actual average cost of a slip-and-fall injury is \$28,000 (including medical bills, physical therapy costs, and missed wages).

