

(General Session - Saturday, September 11, 2004)
(On record 9:00 a.m.)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Ladies and gentlemen, the 10th Biennial Convention of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association will come to order. Please rise and joint me in the presentation of the colors and the singing of our National Anthem.

(Color Guard enters room)

(National Anthem sung by NATCA Member)

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: My dear friends from the great state of Missouri, the great city of St. Louis, the former Regional Vice President of the Central Region, and a man uniquely responsible for bringing us here this morning, Mr. Bill Otto.

(Applause)

MR. BILL OTTO: Welcome, welcome to the 10th Biennial Convention of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association. I would have liked to welcome you to the Central Region, but who knew four years ago in Alaska when this body chose this city that the region would be resolved before the convention convened. Welcome to the state of Missouri, which can best be defined that when, in the year 2000 we elected a dead man rather than send John Ashcroft back to the U.S. Senate.

(Applause)

I would especially like to offer a warm welcome to our beautiful city of St. Louis, home of the best record in baseball, by the way. It's unfortunate that the Cardinals aren't here this weekend, but believe me, you'll have lots of opportunity to see them play through the entire month of October.

This is also the home of Archie Lee, the nation's first air traffic controller, and since American left, the airport looks a lot like it did when Archie stood in his wheelbarrow with his flags. This is also Joe Fruscella's new home. He's been here about a year and is relaxed and is enjoying himself, and we hope to have him checked out of flight data by the holidays.

(Laughter)

We do not have enough time to recognize all the folks who were so instrumental to bringing this convention to St. Louis, but I need to mention a few. From 10 years ago when Mike Putzer and Phil Harmon started the process to Alaska where Manual Sanchez helped make the presentation to the Convention Body to today's steering committee, chaired by our own Tom Warden. And let's not forget the fine efforts

of Don Sapp (ph) from the TRACON. These folks are to be congratulated for bringing to fruition the largest convention in NATCA's history. We want you to enjoy our city and our hospitality and during the day, maybe get some work done. If you imbibe in our famous brewery products, stay out of your cars. If you go to the Eastside, go in groups, coffins are cheaper by the dozen. Enjoy, be safe, be productive. I now have the unique opportunity to officially introduce the Chair of the weekend's events. John has held virtually every position in his various locals, was a member of the phenomenally successful '98 contract and is just entering his second term as our national leader. It is my honor and privilege to introduce our president, John Carr.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, Bill. Thank you all. Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests, facility representatives, delegates, activists, members and friends, welcome to the National Air Traffic Controllers Association's 10th Biennial Convention in the great city of St. Louis, in the battleground state of Missouri. Missouri is the Show-Me state, and John Tune and the outstanding members of the Central Region are committed to showing you a wonderful time and a fantastic convention. As a matter of fact, you got it off to quite a start yesterday evening when you set a new record for the hotel bar, \$9,000 in cocktails were sold after the two hours worth of free ones you had here. I told them you were just getting warmed up, so.....

As you know, the local party is at Grant's Farm, and that's owned by Anheuser Busch. If we run them out of beer, we got a problem.

Before I begin, I would also like to acknowledge, the hard work of the people responsible for bringing us here. Bill Otto, you deserve a great deal of the credit for making this happen, your leadership in bringing the convention here.

I'd also like to publicly thank Buel Warden, Bob Reese, Velvet Kennedy for spearheading the planning, the coordination and the implementation of an event like this. They spent many of their own hours working for the benefit of our members to make sure that this is our best convention ever. And of course, don't forget the facility representatives, as he mentioned, previous facility representatives Rick Schmidt from T75 and John Klunk from the Spirit of St. Louis Tower. And the current facility representatives; Liz Walker from St. Louis Tower, Lonnie Vance from T75, and Stacy King from Spirit of St. Louis Tower. If you would, just give them all a round of

applause. They're right with you.

(Applause)

We have a very full agenda before us in the next several days. But in order to chart this union's course for the next two years, it is important that we pause to reflect on where we've been. In the last two years, one very serious challenge has exceeded all others as a threat to our livelihood and to our profession and to the safety of the aviation system; the threat of air traffic control privatization. And among those who took up our cause and took up the cause of protecting the safest air traffic control system in the world, one man stood taller than the rest. When safety was for sale, he not only said no, he said hell no. Ladies and gentlemen, Congressman Peter DeFazio stood up for you, for your work, for your family, when almost no one else would. He led the charge against extremism and greed. He did so at great personal and professional risk. Congressman DeFazio lashed his own political future to the railroad tracks of air traffic control outsourcing. And I'll be damned if he didn't throw the republican train right off those very same tracks.

(Applause)

We put together a very short video to show you an idea of this man's passion for your cause. And it probably won't win him an oscar but this little number is hotter than Fahrenheit 911. Let's take a look. Please roll the tape.

(Video played of Congressman Peter DeFazio)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Ladies and gentlemen, he wasn't saying that in the breakroom. He was saying that on the floor of the United States Congress. Please welcome a devoted friend, an awesome representative and a hero to every person in this room. From the great state of Oregon, Congressman Peter DeFazio.

(Applause)

MR. PETER DEFAZIO: Well, thanks. After seeing that videotape -- I never watch myself afterwards. The staff always tapes me. I stand on every remark I made there, I tell you. I was really pleased to hear John describe me as standing tall, especially given my stature, so that was -- and I'm really pleased to be here with so many people who have done so much for a great industry and to help keep the flying public safe.

It was three years ago today, just about now, when terrorists turned commercial airliners into weapons of mass destructions and wrought incredible havoc on our country. And the role that you all played that day I think has been little heralded but should be remembered, and it's just one of the many monuments to determination and heroism on the part of Americans in the face of such an

extraordinary catastrophe, and that was when you landed, you know, without precedent 482 planes were in the air without a single operational error.

There is no other air traffic control system in the world that could have done a tiny fraction of what you did. There's no other work force working air traffic control in the world that could have done that, and you may have prevented further tragedies by being able to facilitate that, and you certainly got everyone on the ground safely. So thank you for that. Thank you for what you do every day.

Since I've been to Congress, I go home just about every weekend, it's a long way from Oregon to Washington, thank God. We like our distance. We wish it was a little further, maybe we had an ocean in between or something. But I've logged about three million miles, and logged them safely. And every day more than 600,000 -- well, more than a million Americans on an average day are flying, and you know, they do it safely, they do it without -- they don't get up there and start worrying about what's going to happen in terms of the air traffic control system. It's 10 percent of our economy is aviation; the terrorists knew that part of what they were doing was attacking aviation, the economy, not just killing people, and they knew that. They knew they could strike a body blow, not only at our people, but our economy. And you're the heart and soul of the air traffic control system that makes that 10 percent of our economy function so well. And you'd think that that would get recognition in Washington. And I think it does from the rank and file, because, as you saw on the tape, as I said, both the House and the Senate went aloud in representative democratic form to ban privatization of air traffic control. But then this cabal of video logs downtown at the White House in conjunction with a compliant republican leadership on Capitol Hill, defying all the precedents of the House and the Senate.

You know, I was talking to a former colleague. I gave a speak at the university where he teaches, not long after this -- and actually as it was happening, and I told him what was going on. And he served in Congress 20 years, and he said, well, you can't do that, that's not conference-able, you can't take something that wasn't in either bill and put it into the final product. You just can't do that. It violates all the rules and precedents over 200 years of our government. I said, unless you're not paying attention, I said, we don't follow the rules in Washington anymore. It's not about procedure. It's not about who has the best ideas or the most votes. It's all about ideology. And the ideology here is incredibly destructive, to take the best air traffic control system in the world and place it under

attack. Are we placing it under attack because it's less efficient? I mean, you know, these are tough budgetary times. That might make some sense, but you know, it's interesting. If you look at Euro-control, their own numbers, a mostly privatized system, say that we are -- you are 74 percent more efficient, 79 percent more productive. So I guess it's not an issue of efficiency or saving money.

Then there's safety. A number of us watched with horror a couple years ago as there was a significant mid-air collision over Europe because of understaffing and fragmentation of air traffic control. That hasn't happened here in a very, very, very long time. So I guess it's really not a safety issue. So that really does bring us back to what it was all about.

You're government employees. No one is making -- well, we have an industry that -- well, sometimes they make money. Right now they're not doing too well, but some parts of it are. But we have an industry dependent upon you, but you're not on a daily basis providing profit to somebody. You know, there isn't a margin on top of your salary. And I really can see that as the only reason why they would go down this path, this path that makes no sense, to say that air traffic control is not -- controlled national air space is not an inherently governmental function. I mean that's -- you know, I mean even libertarians I don't think don't go there. (Laughter) But this White House does. I mean, that is just absolutely extraordinary. I mean it could give new meaning to free flight, and then people with stealth planes will really be able to invade the radar and everything else, and we can have sort of competitive landing at some of the airports and see who can get down and get on or off the runway first. But I mean it's just a crazy, crazy idea.

And this is a very real threat. And I'll tell you what I fear. Last summer I was very, very worried, and I saw an unprecedented campaign by your organization, which got their attention. It really got their attention. Boy, did I had some steamed colleagues. And you should ask John about the T-Shirt that he wore to a conference to meet with my Chairman, Mr. Mica, who was one of the many steamed in Hawaii this year. But anyway, we'll leave that aside for now, not appropriate for the speech, but get him tonight and see if he'll tell you that story. But you got their attention, and you rallied the public. You know, my office didn't get a single phone call from somebody saying, no, I really think we ought to privatize that system, Congressman. In fact, we got quite a few phone calls, as did my colleagues all around the country saying, what are guys and women doing up there? What are you thinking or smoking or drinking, or what's going on? So you did a great job and

you helped turn the course. But the threat is still there. And here's how I think they're moving toward it. We know that many of you here, and many of your colleagues are going to be eligible for retirement in the not very distant future; we see that cliff coming. And what are they doing to staff up to deal with that, to give you the time to impart your knowledge, your wisdom, your training, your expertise to the people who will follow you into these jobs. It takes years, as you know, to get a fully qualified air traffic controller trained.

What are they doing about that? Nothing. The president's budget contains zero funding, zero dollars; none, not one to hire additional air traffic controllers. And now we at least managed to get some language in this bill last year to force them to come up with a plan to deal with this. Unfortunately that plan won't come out until December. And I worry what that plan is going to say. I really do. And what I said on the floor, I can see -- you know, I've been through this fight over so many issues, you know, oh, let us take over the postal service; okay, well, I've got this rural route, you know, star route out to Siltcoos Lake. Will you deliver letters to the little old lady who lives down at the end of the road for 37 cents? Oh, God, no. We don't want to do that, we just want the downtown areas. I said, well, then, how are we going to have a national postal system if you just want to cherry-pick off the areas when you can make a bunch of money. And that's what I fear they want to do with our air traffic control system. They've started on the periphery, nibbling away at it, and they're working to the heart. And it makes no sense. It won't sense for the industry, the traveling public, safety, security; none of those things. And I think we can beat them again if we're given a fair chance in that fight and if we're prepared for that fight. But it's not going to be easy. You are going to have to play a key role in it. Your organization is going to have to continue to play a key role in this fight.

And if I'm reelected, I just pledge to you that I will fight with every ounce of strength I have from my grand stature, with my loud voice, speaking on the floor of the House to say this is wrong-headed, we're not going there, we're going to keep the safest, most secure, most efficient air traffic control system in the world intact, and we're going to train a new generation and give them the best equipment money can buy and research can develop. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: That is a hard act to follow. Throughout NATCA's history, our profession has faced many

challenges, and we have weathered those storms with the help of friends like Congressman DeFazio. We have fought off attacks on our pay, on our rights, on our futures. We have had many friends. Our allies have always been there for us in the past and they will be there for us in the future. Not because of who you are, not because of how much money you have, but because of what you do. The work that you do is important. It matters to people who fly. It matters to our nation's economy. And it matters to the public that we serve. Every controller is proud of the job that they do, and proud that our nation can depend on us.

Three years ago this very morning, our nation learned how much they can depend on you. All of us learned how much all of us can depend on each other. More than any other time in our history, this union became a family.

None of us will ever forget that morning, three years ago today, when our nation suffered a horrible attack at the hands of maniacal terrorist. These treacherous, despicable acts of cowardice were designed to destroy our nation's spirit and shatter the hopes and dreams of people everywhere who yearn for our style of freedom and democracy. And yet, at the end of that day, they left a nation stunned but still standing, a people torn by devastation but determined to prevail.

And on this very morning three years ago, the men and women in this room, and the men and women we represent did the impossible. Everyone knows the numbers. But you kept order in the chaos. They delayed their own mourning and grieving until the job was done, and together recorded one of the greatest aviation achievements since the Wright Brothers ran down the sand dunes at Kitty Hawk. And our members and our profession will be forever changed for that day. You see, while the users will express their gratitude and our friends will always be there for us, and our allies will always stand beside us, on that day, we discovered that we can depend on each other. On that day we discovered that when hell is in session, we are capable of our very best work. On that day, we shared our nation's grief and shock and horror only after we had finished the job we were hired to do. We are forever changed by the events of that day and we are forever bound together by them.

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in a moment of silence for all of the victims of September the 11th, 2001.

(Moment of silence)

Thank you very much. Since that fateful morning in our nation's history, much has changed. It has been a challenging time for our union, for our economy, for our industry and for our nation. Actually, much has changed since the last NATCA convention two years ago. We knew then

that a period of unprecedented cooperation between the union and the FAA was probably coming to a close, and we hoped that the gains that we had made in productivity and the expeditious adaptation of new technologies and the mutual goodwill that were the hallmarks of the Garvey administration might guide the new administrator. Sadly, this was not to be. Instead, our employer chose a course of needless and counterproductive confrontation.

So what exactly have we seen in the last two years since we convened in Cleveland? Legislation to privatize towers, a hostile executive order from the White House, a federal labor relations authority packed with anti-union, anti-worker members. New reporting requirements from the Department of Labor that are designed to bankrupt unions and to restrict your political action. Collective bargaining agreements thrown into Congress to avoid bargaining at the negotiating table. Complete and total neglect of a looming and critical staffing crisis. Antagonizing rhetoric from the administrator challenging the motives of you, the members.

Well, I didn't come here this morning to dwell on bad news, nor am I here to tell you what you want to hear. I'm actually here to tell you the truth. And the truth of the matter is this. The state of your union is strong.

(Applause)

Your union is strong because of the commitment and the dedication of her activists. Your union is strong because of the hard work and the perseverance of every person in this room. Your union is strong because you have made her strong with your wits and with your will and with your wallet.

As we plot the course forward, let's remember how far we've come, shall we? Four short years ago, our union was hoping to break the \$1,000,000 mark in PAC contributions. We had a nice newsletter, we began to experiment with a little advertising, and we were strong, very strong inside the FAA. We had major victories to be proud of, and we were then, and are today the most powerful, successful, and effective union at the Federal Aviation Administration.

And then the stakes were raised. It wasn't just about the FAA anymore. Our opponents took their ideology and their agenda beyond the FAA. So we had to go beyond the FAA. It wasn't enough to be effective and influential within the boundaries of 800 Independence Avenue. We had to do more. We had to build more, and we had to reach more. We had to do more lobbying. We had to build more relationships. We had to find new allies. And by the sheer force of your power, NATCA, more than it ever had been before, became something some people thought it never would.

Today your union is a force to be reckoned with. In the last two years alone, we have conducted two major public relations campaigns and they have forced our adversaries into a totally reactive mode. We set their agenda. We forced them to respond to our messages. And we have been on the offense. And we have exceeded everyone's expectation. The little union that could has become a model for political activism in a town where growing indifference to the value and contributions of America's Unions is growing by the day.

Our success is particularly remarkable when you consider the limitations that we face. I mean, after all, we are a small union. Our collective power, the entire size and scope of this union is about the size of one-third of the New York City police department. We've even been called a boutique union. But that's funny; nobody is calling us that anymore. Oh, they're calling us stuff, but it's not that.

As federal employees and guardians of the public safety, we don't have many of the tools that private unions take for granted. So just as in our profession, in Washington, D.C., our most powerful tool is our voice, and your voice is loud and clear. When we speak, the public, the Congress, and our employers take note. We can be proud of what we've done in the last several years. And we can be proud that every time we reach new heights. Every time it seems like we could go no higher, while each and every time we manage to take that bar higher and higher still. You have done this; not me, not Ruth, not the Executive Board. You have done this. Each and every one of you here today, and the people that you represent have made this happen.

How have you done it? Well, you have perfected the art of political activism. You maintain an incredible consistency of message. You tell the truth over and over and over again. And you focus on the big picture. Your focus is laser sharp and anvil strong. Together we have learned how to use politics, policy, activism, and your treasury to shape the course of the debate in this country. We have used the media to leverage our message. We have tripled the size of our PAC, and we are intensely strategic in our giving. We've done advertising and a lot of it. We've strengthened our website. We've mobilized our members. We contact policy makers. We've done leafleting at airports. We've developed an exhibit on the history of air traffic control that sat in the halls of the Russell Senate office building. In short, we have aggressively employed every conceivable technique we can find to reach our goals.

Some of the very best testimony of our success comes from our adversaries. In the heat of that privatization

panel, John Mica, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation said to a reporter, quote, "this is a political game, and they play the \$6,000,000 game, and I don't have \$6,000,000 to spend, so I'm going to trade towers for votes." Well, his estimate later went up to \$7,000,000 and others speculated we spent 10 to 12 million dollars. Leaving aside for a moment the propriety of trading towers for votes, I've got news for my good friend the Chairman. We didn't spend \$12,000,000. We just made it hurt like \$12,000,000.

(Applause)

As native Missourian Harry Truman once said, "I don't give them hell, I just tell them the truth and it feels like hell." Even the Wall Street Journal, which is not a friend of labor, noted our success in an article entitled, "Air Traffic Controllers Are Back". Describing last year's privatization fight, the Journal said, "NATCA has amassed enough influence to peel away many of the administration's republican allies, and to challenge their agenda for change." The story went on to call our campaign savvy and noted, and I quote, "NATCA officials are not shy about taking the offensive."

In the Austin American Statesman, the President's hometown paper, said it best of all in an editorial recap of that privatization fight when they wrote, "As the battle raged throughout the summer, opponents insisted that the FAA wanted to put public safety up for bid, defenders insisting it was a first step towards privatizing the air traffic system. It was a classic eyeball to eyeball confrontation that only ended when the administration blinked."

It is you, the combined leadership of this union, who have authorized and executed this aggressive approach. It is you that have brought us where we are today. You have allowed us to take the offensive. And I'm here today to ask you to authorize us to continue that fight and to keep us on the offense and to enlist more members.

As philosopher Plato said, "The punishment of wise men who suffer from indifference to public affairs is to be ruled by unwise men." Nobody in this room is indifferent to public affairs. You wouldn't be here if you were. But as successful as we have been, we need to increase the ranks among us who are willing to engage in this political process. The stakes are simply too high for anyone represented by this union to sit this one out.

Consider what we've accomplished in this, the 18th summer of our union's existence. Let's look more closely at some of the facts I ticked off earlier. Starting with the PAC. My friends, your PAC is now over \$3,000,000 a cycle and is poised to enter the top 20 nationwide in giving to

federal candidates.

(Applause)

According to the most recent report of the Federal Election Commission, you are the third largest PAC among all transportation unions. And frankly, at the rate we're going, we could finish that cycle Number 1.

If you remember, by the time of the last convention, the Western Pacific Region sparked a competition in PAC fund raising. They took the lead because they made it a goal to take the lead from the Southern Region. And they challenged every other region to catch them. Southern California TRACON was the leader of the PAC, led by Doug Voelpel. (Applause) He's so big, he scared me into increasing mine, and I'm from Great Lakes.

Southern California was the leader of the PAC, and they challenged other facilities to top them. Well, ladies and gentlemen, the Eastern Region took that challenge, and today, the great men and women of the Eastern Region are the new leaders of the PAC.

(Applause)

Not only that, the New York TRACON is now the Number 1 PAC facility in the country contributing an amazing \$4,000 a pay period to our cause.

(Applause)

This is truly the very best kind of competition that there is, because you see, this kind of competition is one where all of us win. Where NATCA wins. As facilities and regions battle for that top position, NATCA members gain political influence. They gain allies, and we gain strength. \$4,000 a pay period. Do you realize that 10 years ago, that was the PAC revenue for the entire country? And now it is the contributions of a single one of our facilities? It is incredible. And it is thanks in no small part to the efforts of a fantastic team at the New York TRACON, led by their facility representative Dean Iacopelli, and their legislative representative, Jimmy Ray Garrett.

(Applause)

Philadelphia, with less than 100 members is the 8th biggest PAC facility in the country. It is incredible what the Eastern Region is doing. To all of our friends in the Eastern Region, my profound thanks for a job well-done, and my sincere gratitude for your dedication to our cause.

But the PAC isn't all we've done. Our communications team is second to none. As a result of their energy, their creativity and their sheer hard work, 49 million Americans have heard your staffing story in the last two months. That's right. 49 million. 36 press conferences, 90 print stories, 231 television stories, dozens of press releases, numerous written opinions to the newspapers, television ads

seen by millions of people in key congressional districts. You'll be hearing more about this in our staffing panel later today. The number of visitors to your website has doubled in a year.

Those of you who attended this year's NATCA in Washington saw the fruits of this labor. Many of the top leaders in Washington came to speak to us. Frank Lautenberg came by. You heard what Congressman DeFazio thinks of you. And of course, who can forget AFL-CIO president John Sweeney's remarks? He said, and I quote, "It is an honor to be with the union that is recruiting new members at a faster pace, raising more PAC money more member, and raising more hell on Capitol Hill than any other union in the AFL-CIO."

(Applause)

In 2003, we almost singlehandedly brought the multi-billion dollar FAA authorizations bill to a standstill for months until our concerns regarding privatization were addressed. And now in 2004, the FAA is totally on their heels over how to deal with the challenge of defending the indefensible position they have taken on controller staffing. They just don't get it. All they have to do to solve their communications problem is to hire more controllers. And until they figure that one out, we're going to keep banging away.

I've got news for our adversaries. We're no longer the little union that could. We're the little union that did, and we're the little union that can, and we're going to keep doing it again and again and again until they get it right.

(Applause)

Because of your leadership and your stewardship, NATCA fights well above its weight class on a whole host of issues ranging from staffing to retirement, privatization and modernization, safety. We may be small but our voice roars when we engage.

We have a whole host of issues in front of us. Our success in growing, our footprint in Washington is something of which we can all be proud. We can pat ourselves on the back; for a moment. And then it's back into the fight.

Former Secretary of State George Shultz said, "Battles aren't won or lost in Washington. They're fought over and over again." And for everyone in this room, I'm sure you know that the privatization battle will be around as long as there is money in the federal treasury worth stealing. We can see forces gathering to seek changes to your pay, your benefits, your working conditions and your retirement. We've already seen an attack on the fundamental right to collective bargaining for many of our members, and we have focused our resources to defend them. These changes are not

for the better; they're for the worse, for all of us, as professionals and as Americans who expect ours to continue to be the safest air traffic control system.

The incredibly reckless fiscal policies of this administration mean that the federal budget deficit will continue to pressure our own FAA budget probably for the rest of our lives and the lives of our children; and I got some young ones.

The changes wrought by this administration have been breathtaking, particularly in light of the productivity and cooperation that was the hallmark of the previous administration. You're all familiar with the two records.

As a consequence of our bitter experiences over the last four years, your National Executive Board made a choice in the upcoming election. And since we do nothing half-way, we are going to do everything we can to elect a new president.

(Applause)

As I'm sure you all know, we have let the Kerry-Edwards campaign borrow one of your best staffers, Jose Ceballos, who as your director of strategic planning and policy, did phenomenal work and who is now working as deputy chief of staff for John Edwards.

I promise you the Kerry-Edwards team is appreciative of your efforts, and I hope you'll hear from them yourself sometime this weekend. If they win, we will be able to get back to the business we are in, of working exclusively to build a better, a safer, a sufficiently staffed air traffic control system that bargains in good faith.

If we have four more years, a prospect that may be harsher than many in this room can imagine. We'll have our work cut out for us because they'll be coming at us again. A Bush administration that doesn't have to face reelection is kind of a scary thought. Still, we'll work with them where we can, and we'll fight them where we must. And we will still have on board the firm of Quinn Gillespie, whose principal, Ed Gillespie, will be returning to our account after his turn as Chairman of the republican National Committee. So we will not be without assets should a second Bush term come to pass. However, we should not kid ourselves. We'll be in for a fight on a whole host of issues.

Frederick Nietzsche once said, "Whatever does not kill me makes me stronger." Well, they haven't killed us yet, and we are stronger than when the Bush Administration came into office. As a matter of fact, I should probably thank him for his help with my PAC. They're a challenge to us on privatization, and our challenge to them on staffing have made us stronger as a union. So while we're shooting for a

knockout in November, we'll be ready for Round 2, should Round 2 come to pass.

You see, NATCA is strong. NATCA is smart. And NATCA is united. We can take whatever they throw at us, turn it around and throw it back at them with the overwhelming power of truth and service in the public's interest. They know.

(Applause)

They know. They know, and the American people know that every single person in this room; every single person we represent; the controllers, the engineers, the automation specialists, the traffic management coordinators, the budget logistics specialists, the staff specialists, every single one of us will do whatever it takes, whatever it takes, to ensure that America's air traffic control system remains the best and the safest in the world. That is our cause, that is our passion, that is our sacred trust. And they're not going to take it away.

(Applause)

Many of our challenges transcend party labels. The fiscal pressures against hiring new controllers are great. The fiscal pressures against new technology will exist no matter who occupies the White House. The threat to collective bargaining will not disappear. The contract tower lawsuit will not magically be decided in our favor. The FAA reorganization will not suddenly make sense. Threats to our retirement will not evaporate. The agency will not bring us contracts on velvety pillows. Over the next three days you will set the path for this union for the next two years. Remember that. This is your convention. Yours.

Just as our dedication to safety is reflected in what we do every day as opposed to what you saw in Congress, our dedication to democracy will be reflected in this meeting. As we previously described to you, we hope to introduce some new things at this convention, and we hope to help inform you in your deliberations. You'll note from the agenda, we have three panels scheduled towards that end. We've provided you with experts on a variety of topics to present facets of the issues. They are not here to propose solutions. They are not here to propose resolutions. These panels are here to provide you with information. Ultimately what you choose to do with that information is up to you.

We, the elected leadership of this union are looking to you, the Convention Body, for guidance. Tell us what you want us to do with you for the next two years. We will, as always, act on that guidance.

My friends, we have come a long way indeed. Our governing documents, our constitution, and our By-Laws have

matured, and the work of our founding fathers has withstood the test of time.

We have come a long way in the last few years. We are armed with new tools and ready for any challenges that may come our way. Both those we can see, and the very many that we can't that are just over the horizon. We have assembled the greatest staff in organized labor, and we are giving them the tools they need to do the job no matter how small or how large. And I challenge anyone to name another union who has had a greater impact pound for pound than ours has in Washington, D.C.

To a greater degree than ever before in our nation's history, we have taken it as our dedication to the safety of America's air travelers from the radar room to the halls of Congress and the corridors of FAA. If not for your efforts, you would already be in a privatized air traffic control system where profit trumps public safety. In fact, when I think of the millions of people who rely on this union every day and the efforts of the people in this room to make sure that this system stays focused on safety, I'm reminded of what Winston Churchill said, "Never have so many owed so much to so few."

Together there is nothing we cannot achieve. Together we will continue to defy the odds. Together we will continue to defy our critics. Together we will continue to defy those breakroom lawyers and those radar room quarterbacks. And together we will continue to fight and to win for the men and the women of this magnificent union.

(Applause)

Thank you. God bless you. God bless America. God bless this great union of ours. Thank you very much. Thank you.

(Applause)

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, the first business in order today is the report of the Credentials Committee. Mike Palumbo is the Chair of this committee and will give his report.

MR. MIKE PALUMBO: Well, I don't have to do a speech luckily, and it's my 15 minutes per se. So the first thing I want to announce, the NATCA Charitable Foundation, their silent auction section, number 1, will close today at the end of the business, 5:00 o'clock, I believe. The NCF door prize, martini basket drawing will be today at 5:00 as well. The official numbers that we present here, it's kind of like a snapshot in time. Some of people that are here that haven't been to convention before, the numbers will grow and they'll change. The official ones that I'll do in a moment, they don't represent everything. Normally we give a report on delegates and alternates.

We've gone from 1,200 to 1,500 people at the last couple conventions, 1,500 here we're expecting. So far, just to rough it up, almost 500 delegates and alternates, and we've had the same and actually a little more, first time ever that guests and NATCA members, individual members, that have attended.

One other note, if you don't mind, I'd like to say thanks, the Credentials Committee's thanks to all the members and the volunteers of the St. Louis locals that spent three or four hours in an un-air conditioned room putting together all these 1,500 packages that you guys are holding. Thanks.

(Applause)

Now, nice and official. Attached is a list of names of the voting members of the 2004 convention and their alternates who have been registered up until 9:08 this morning, Saturday, September 11th, 2004. 330 delegates, 135 alternates, representing a total of 11,249 votes. On behalf of the committee, I move that the role of delegates hereby submitted be the official role of the voting members of the convention at this time.

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It is moved and seconded to adopt the report of the Credentials Committee. Is there any discussion? The question is on the adoption of the report of the Credentials Committee. Those in favor of the report, please say aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, no.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The Credentials Committee report is adopted. Thank you, Mike.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The next item properly before you is the report of the Convention Rules Committee. Bill McGowan is the Chair of this Committee, and he will now give his report. Mr. McGowan. (Pause) Who appears to have over-eaten last night.

(Laughter)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Standing in for Mr. McGowan, Mr. Bill Buvens from D10.

MR. BILL BUVENS: I'd like to thank all the following members of the Rules Committee. And actually, I am the Chair of the Rules Committee, but that's okay. Bill McGowan is the Chair of the Constitution Committee.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: That's right.

MR. BILL BUVENS: That's okay. Anyway, I'd like to thank the following members of the Rules Committee for their dedication and hard work in coming up with the rules that we

have this year. Todd Lamb from the Alaska Region. John Hill from the Central Region. Steve Hylinski from the Eastern Region. Ruth Maestre From the Great Lakes Region. Bill McGowan from the New England Region. Mike Fellows from the Northwest Mountain Region. Charles Cornett, who because of the hurricanes was not able to be here, from the Southern Region. Steve Merlin from the Western Pacific Region. Mike Martin from Region 10, and I'd also like thank Mr. Jim Slaughter, the professional parliamentarian that we have here for his assistance with us.

We, the Committee, propose the following rules. Did everybody get a copy of them? If not, they got them in the back. Number 1, Convention Hours. Unless otherwise directed by the convention, the convention shall be called to order at 9:00 a.m. Recess at 12:30 p.m. Reconvene at 2:00 p.m. And adjourn at the time designated in the convention program.

1(a) Additional meetings or extended meeting hours shall be held when directed by the convention for a period of time determined by the convention in order to facilitate its work.

1(b) No motion to adjourn shall be entertained by the Chair during meeting hours so long as there is any business upon which the convention can act.

Rule 2, Addressing the Convention. Each member who rises to speak shall respectively address the Chair, state their name and the name of their local or other affiliation and shall speak for no more than two minutes, confining themselves to no more than two times on the issue under debate.

All discussion is directed to the Chair.

2 (c) The lines to speak at each microphone shall be cleared between each question.

2 (d) The President shall appoint a timekeeper. A green light indicates when the speaker properly has the floor. A yellow light indicates that the speaker has 30 seconds of time remaining. A red light indicates that the speaker's two minutes have expired. You can see the stop lights up here.

3 Rules on Delegates. (a), all voting members shall register with the Credentials Committee before assuming their status as delegates.

3 (b) Delegates shall wear the identification badges issued to them by the Credentials Committee at all meetings.

3 (c) A member who registers with the Credentials Committee after the submission of the first report of the Credentials Committee assumes their status as a voting delegate upon completion of registration with the Credentials Committee.

3 (d) Delegates shall be seated together in the meeting hall in sections reserved for them under their regional banner.

3 (e) Delegates should be in their seats at least five minutes before the scheduled meeting time.

3 (f) A delegate temporarily leaving the meeting may not relinquish his or her badge to an alternate to vote in his or her stead.

3 (g) If an alternate is to replace a registered delegate, the Credentials Committee must approve proper evidence of that delegates withdrawal from such status, and the alternate properly registered as a voting delegate. Transfer of credentials shall only take place during published registration periods.

3 (h) Exceptions to the published time periods shall be at the discretion of the Credentials Committee Chair. Both delegate and alternate must concurrently present themselves to the Credentials Committee for temporary transfer of position and responsibility. When issued a delegate identification badge, the alternate can sit as a voting delegate of the convention. No alternate or other person can substitute for a delegate who remains registered.

3 (i) A delegate permanently leaving the convention shall report to the Credentials Committee and surrender his or her badge. The alternate taking his or her place shall assume his or her status as a delegate for the remainder of the convention.

Rule 4. Rules on non-delegate members. Any member in good standing may speak on any issue and/or raise a Point of Information.

Rule 5. Rules of Order. The maker of any motion shall be given the opportunity to speak on it first. This privilege also applies to the designee of each national standing committee for any motion put forth by that committee.

Rule 6, Resolutions. (a) To be considered timely, resolutions must be submitted to the Executive Vice President by noon of the day on which they can be heard. All timely resolutions

will be reported out of the Constitution Committed as soon as possible for consideration. Resolutions will be heard in the order that they are received.

6 (b) Untimely resolutions may only be introduced at the conventions by a two-thirds vote.

Rule 7, Voting. Voting at the convention shall be by voice vote. If the Chair or any delegate is in doubt on a voice vote, a division or rising vote may be called. Thereafter, upon a demand by any individual delegate with a second, a roll call vote shall be taken.

7 (a) A roll call vote shall be taken by the Executive Vice President by recording the yea and nay votes of each delegates according to the votes the delegate is entitled to cast.

7 (b) The roll call vote shall be taken in alphabetical order by region, and then facility identifier, beginning with the region that alphabetically follows the region from which the delegate who called for the roll call vote is a member.

7 (c) During a roll call vote, delegates may be allowed to leave and re-enter the Convention floor only under the escort of a Sergeant-at-Arms.

Rule 8, Miscellaneous. The Chair shall determine and may change the order of business of the Convention at any time, subject to the approval of a majority of the delegates present and voting.

8 (b) The Chair shall appoint members in good standing in attendance at the Convention to serve as Sergeants-at-Arms for the General Assembly. The Sergeants-at-Arms shall assist the Chair as requested in maintaining order for the conduct of business.

8 (c) The possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages shall not be allowed in the General Assembly. Smoking shall be prohibited in the Convention Hall.

8 (d) Notices for announcements to the Convention shall be in writing, signed by the person giving the notice, and shall be presented to a Sergeant-at-Arms.

8 (e) Any person who attends the business meetings shall conduct themselves in a manner as to be a credit to the Convention and the Union. Any person not displaying exemplary behavior shall

be subject to removal by order of the Chair.

8 (f) There shall be no unauthorized voice amplification equipment in the Convention hall or adjacent areas.

8 (g) No recordings of the proceedings of the meetings may be made other than those approved by the National Executive Board.

8 (h) Pagers and mobile telephones shall be set on a non-audible position. Mobile telephones will not be used in the Convention Hall.

Rule 9, Suspending the Rules. These rules may be suspended, amended or rescinded by a two-thirds vote.

By direction of the Rules Committee I move the adoption of the Standing Rules for the 10th Biennial Convention as just read.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It is moved and seconded to adopt the Convention Rules. Is there discussion?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The question is on the adoption of the Convention Rules. Those in favor of adopting the Convention Rules, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, no.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The Standing Rules are adopted. One bit of housekeeping before we go forward, just so that you know who the players are. As you probably all know, seated to my far left here is Rita Graf, NATCA's General Counsel. (Applause) To my immediate left, and deserves a much bigger introduction than the one I'm giving her now, your Executive Vice President, Ruth Marlin. To my far right, our honorary parliamentarian Mike Keeper and temporary timekeeper anyway, Mr. Howie Bark (ph). (Applause) And to my immediate right, the most active parliamentary consultant in the country, one of only three attorneys certified with designations as a certified professional parliamentarian and teacher, and professional registered parliamentarian. His clients include the largest trade and industrial associations in the country including the AFL-CIO, the National School Boards and National Air Traffic Controllers Association, and the man, if he's ever not up here, neither will I be, Mr. Jim Slaughter, our parliamentarian.

(Applause)

I'd also like to take one brief moment to introduce -- I'll be introducing people as we roll this out, with your kind concurrence. I'd like to introduce some special guests that we have with us this morning. I hope they're all here.

From the International Federation of Air Traffic Control Association, their president, our president of the International Air Traffic Control Association, Mr. Mark Baumgartner. I don't know if Mark is in the room. We also have Wilfried Hermes from Germany, a retired air traffic controller, Hans Voll, a retired air traffic controller. Greg Miles from CATCA is with us. Ed Wytkind, president of the Transportation Trades Department, and Angus McCormick and Paul Winsley from Prospects, representing controllers from the United Kingdom. If you'd give all our special guests a round of applause, please.

(Applause)

We are very honored that you've chosen to join us, and we welcome you with open arms. Ladies and gentlemen, the next order properly in business is the Report of the Program Chair, Mr. Mark Bohn.

MR. MARK BOHN: Good morning. Mr. President, because of room reassignments, the Program Committee recommends the following modifications in its proposed program, which have been printed and placed in all the registrants' hands for the convention.

From Page 17, for today, the Eastern Regional Breakout would take place in the Jefferson E and F rooms. Also for today, the Southwest Regional Breakout would take place in the Jefferson A room. From Page 18, for tomorrow, Region 10 Breakout will take place in the Atrium C. And by direction of the program committee, I move that these changes printed in the program be adopted.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It is moved and seconded to adopt the report of the Program Committee. Is there any discussion?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The question is on the adoption of the report of the Program Committee. Those in favor of adoption of the program report, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, no.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The ayes have it, and the program is adopted. Thank you, Mark. My former facility representative.

Ladies and gentlemen, we will now hear reports from our standing committees. We will begin with the Chair of NATCA's National Safety Committee, a gentleman whose dedication to this particular cause is extraordinary. He conducted probably one of the most successful NATCA communicating for Safety conferences we've ever had, in recent memory. My good friend, and from the great state of Florida, National Safety Committee Chairman, Mr. Wes Stoops.

(Applause)

MR. WES STOOPS: Good morning, NATCA members, delegates and special guests. I'm a member of the MCO Local, and I proudly serve as your Chairman of the National Safety Committee, and I offer this report on behalf of the entire committee.

NATCA has established itself as a formidable advocate for the issues that affect our membership in both the areas of labor relations and through legislative initiatives spearheaded by a legion of NATCAvists.

Over the past decade in the area of safety and technology, we've seen significant advances in equipment through programs like the Display Systems Replacement, better known as DSR, Arch color display, the integrated terminal weather system and ASDX, just to name a few. The successes of these programs is in large part, a result of NATCA members being directly involved with the development and the implementation process.

One of the challenges before the Safety Committee is to constantly emphasize that the primary focus of NATCA is aviation safety. We must do everything possible to dispel the perception that NATCA is an A-typical labor organization. We must be ever vigilant to convey the message that the services we provide to the citizens of this country are inherently governmental.

Safety Above All must be more than just a catchy slogan. The committee endeavors to deliver the message "Safety Above All" by engaging aviation groups like the Air Safety Foundation, the Air Traffic Procedures Advisory Committee. And we must expand our involvement on an international scale. We must actively engage in a global sense with organizations like IFATCA. We have or will assist in the staffing. The NATCA trade show booth at venues like AOPA Exposition in Long Beach, the Oshkosh EAA Fly-in and Pilot Outreach programs like Operation Raincheck.

The most exciting opportunity NATCA has to demonstrate our commitment to safety is through the communicating for safety conference. I challenge you to tell me who is better qualified to address the concerns of the aviation system than the pilots that fly the airplanes and the controllers that guide them home.

The 2004 Communicating for Safety Conference held in Dallas, Texas, saw the largest attendance ever. And the growth in attendance is expected to continue. The conference had unprecedented media coverage and support from the highest levels of the FAA air traffic division through the involvement of Mr. Russ Chew, the Chief Operating Officer of the ATO. The next conference will be held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin on May 3rd and 4th of 2005.

Each of you was given in your package a card. It's got basic information. However, additional information is available on our website, safety.natca.org. Remember, Communicating for Safety is the only event of its kind that the FAA acknowledges as eligible for up to four days of administrative leave.

At the Cleveland Convention, the Safety Committee conveyed to the delegates the need to get more people involved in safety matters at the local level. The Committee recognizes that simply establishing a position of Facility Safety Representative is not enough to achieve the intended objective. A training program for the position has been developed. The training is conducted at the beginning of each Communicating for Safety Conference or it can also be provided through your regional safety representatives. The committee's goal is to have a trained safety representative at each facility.

You might ask why does a facility need a safety rep? The completion of safety reports is one reason. The UCR program is one avenue to raise attention to operational issues within your facility. Yes, the order is dated. However, the need to report operational issues has never been more important than it is today. I've engaged in a brief dialog with a member of the ATO Terminal Safety Team about revising the UCR process.

The Safety Committee is determined to explore every avenue available to see that the UCR system becomes a viable, functioning and effective tool. The impression that recent technological advances have solved most of our equipment issues is fundamentally wrong. And we are obligated to bring the problems to light. Safety Above All.

The use of the Aviation Safety Reporting forms, ASR forms, is another effective method to bring attention to your facility's operational concerns. In June 2004, there were 3,445 reports received by NASA. Air traffic controllers only filed 63. That figure represents 1.8 percent. In May 2004, there were 37 AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL reports filed. Preliminary research indicates that the drop could be attributed to the fact that the Atlanta safety rep Don Brown may have taken leave in May. (Laughter) I love you, Don.

Folks, just think about it. If every member in attendance at this convention that is eligible to fill out a NASA report, completed one report within the next calendar year, we will more than double the number of reports filed annual. Think about it. Frequency outages. False radar returns. Noncompliance of a published procedure like a SID, or when you catch a readback error by a pilot are just a few examples of the events that happen countless times over the

course of one day.

NATCA members are the best source of data when it comes to identifying the problems that occur on our side of the radio and radar display. We have to fill out the forms, though. Safety Above All. Safety above accessing the internet on a break. Above reading a newspaper. Above ESPN's Sports Center. Safety Above All.

The Committee continues to explore ways to keep the membership informed of the wide variety of systems and programs that impact each of you. Scott Voigt works very closely with the Communications Department at our National Office in this endeavor. The quarterly publication of Safety Net insert found within the NATCA Air Traffic Controller newsletter is the vehicle most of you are familiar with, and the feedback from our members has been favorable. That feedback is critical to the future success of Safety Net. Please contact the committee through our website, Safety.natca.org, or contact Scott directly at svoigt@natca.org to let us know what information you desire.

Speaking of the National Office, the Committee receives a tremendous amount of support from several of the departments, along with the Communications Department, the Committee receives support for Communicating for Safety from the Membership Department, more specifically, Katie Wittig. Our primary interaction, obviously, is through the Safety and Tech Department, and I have to acknowledge the tremendous job that Pauline Hines does to help our committee work through a variety of logistical challenges. Thank you, Pauline.

Do we operate the busiest aviation system in the world? Absolutely. Are system capacity issues eroding the margin of safety? There's no doubt. Just ask the controllers at Newark, Cleveland Center, O'Hare Tower. Are the men and women of NATCA the reason the national airspace system functions as well as it does? You better believe it. Can we improve the margin of safety? We have no other choice.

Remember, Safety above All. Thank you.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Are there any questions on the report from the Safety Committee?

If not, the next order of business in order is a report from the National Legislative Committee. It is my pleasure to welcome our good friend and the Chairman of the National Legislative Committee, and the gentleman whose committee and whose stewardship is responsible for bringing us over the \$3,000,000 in PAC contributions, Mr. Randy Weiland.

(Applause)

MR. RANDY WEILAND: Good morning. Dear brothers and sisters, I'm happy to report that our grassroots legislative

activities are stronger and healthier than ever before. Legislative activism has taken a clear and up-front role in winning successes for NATCA, and continues to be on the edge of new battlegrounds for us, day in and day out.

More than any other time in our past, we face serious legislative threats. The need for NATCA to become political is stronger now than we have ever seen before. Due to the fact that one party controls all branches of our government, we need to reach across both aisles of Congress like we have never done before.

So how are we doing? Well, you can say our presence is not only known in the halls of Congress, it's felt like a bull in a china shop. Slowly, with legislative activism we have been able to forge bipartisan relations in what is the most partisan Congress we've ever seen in our lifetime.

How are we doing this? NATCA members have woken up to the need for grassroots legislative activism. NATCA members are answering the call for political activism almost daily. NATCA members are meeting with members of Congress at home, in their districts on a regular basis, and have been doing so for quite a while.

Additionally, NATCA in Washington continues to be a well attended event by the membership of this union. So what's different now? Lobbying our legislators at home in the districts is happening so fast, we cannot keep track of all the contacts that are occurring. NATCA members are meeting with members of Congress who are not necessarily our friends. Look at the relationship John Carr has built with Congressman Mica, powerful Chairman of the House Aviation Subcommittee. In spite of the obvious political differences, John has forged a new bridge and an important relationship. But who started that relationship? You guessed it. It was a NATCA member from back home in Congressman Mica's district, Donna Fitzgerald, a controller at Orlando.

Clearly, through the collective efforts of our membership, the talented abilities of NATCA employees and the skilled leadership of NATCA national officers, we have demanded the attention of a one-party congress. For this I say thank you to our legislative activists. You get it.

Now, you know I can't come up here and not talk about NATCA PAC. Unfortunately, I think John got my speech away from me before I got a chance to give it, so I'm going to repeat a little bit here; bear with me.

Let's start by looking at what legislative activism has done for NATCA PAC. We begin with a fire on the West Coast. No, not the one that nearly took So-Cal from us, or the one that Bob Marks started in his office roasting a kid-napped pig -- or was that a beaver? I'm not quite sure. We have

facilities out west like So-Cal taking the bull by the horns and putting their monies to work for all of us. From there the fire spread to places like P50, Nor-Cal, Prescott Tower. Most recently the NATCA PAC fire has spread to New York where the leadership of N90 has accepted the challenge started by So-Cal. N90 has sectors in the facility that are surpassing some large facilities in donations to NATCA PAC.

(Applause)

To those distinguished facilities on the West Coast and the East Coast, I say thank you. You obviously get it. NATCA PAC has recently grown to pass a huge milestone. It was through the last push of legislative activism by N90 that raised the bar, putting us over the \$3,000,000 mark. That's right. If you didn't catch it earlier when John said it, NATCA PAC is now taking in over \$3,000,000 per election cycle. So don't feel that you still don't need to stop at the NATCA PAC table when you leave here. This level of contribution is unheard of by an organization of our size. We are often referred to, as John said earlier, as a boutique union. Well, you know what, this little boutique union is packing some serious heat these days. Who specifically should receive credit for this? NATCA member Doug Voelpel. NATCA Member Jimmy Ray Garrett. NATCA Member Noel Kingston. And of course, NATCA members like you who are putting your money where your mouth is.

Once again, I say thank you, NATCA members, you really get it. Let me close this topic with a Top 10 list of things overheard in a National Legislative Committee meeting for NATCA PAC. From the Top 10 list, Number 10. We will stop asking you to contribute when you go over \$50 a pay period. Number 9, National Legislative Committee members will trade in our neckties for PAC forms. Number 8, we accept voluntary donations only unless you don't volunteer. Number 7, have you met my friend Guido?. Number 6, we accept budget busting tax cuts for NATCA PAC. Number 5, I can't remember is PAC is Political Action Committee or Pressure and Coercion. Number 4, Giving to NATCA PAC is easier than trying to figure out the hot and cold water faucets in this hotel. Number 3, Size does matter. Number 2, This will be heard at home: Honey, Doug Voelpel is at the door and says the kids and I have to go with him. Number 1, Give like your job depends on it because it does.

It is because of our healthy PAC we are able to command the attention of Congress on issues like staffing, privatization, budget concerns for the FAA. Most recently, we have lobbied hard for the ability to replace our retiring brothers and sisters. We believe it is vital to our country to keep the skies safe and protected by a well-staffed controller work force. Your Legislative Committee is

working hard to advance that position in the districts, back home while the lobbying staff in DC drives for the green.

You say you want the FAA to hire controllers in your facility? Well, Congress has to give them the funds to do it with. Because we are a union and the battle must be fought by all of us, now you too must stand up and fight with us on this issue. Let your members of Congress know the consequences of inaction. You don't want to be privatized, send a loud and clear message to the White House on election day. Vote for John Kerry.

(Applause)

Brothers and sisters, we need your legislative activism. We need you at NATCA in Washington this coming May. We need you helping to grow NATCA PAC. We need you meeting with your members of Congress at home. And most importantly, we need you in the voting booth in November. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, Randy. Are there any question on the report from the Legislative Committee? If not, ladies and gentlemen, as adopted by you earlier this morning and as called for in the adopted program, we have reached the time for our morning break. I have a couple of housekeeping announcements before we take that. First of all, your continental breakfast this morning was sponsored by Raytheon. We're very grateful for their sponsorship and participation here.

(Applause)

The virtual flight surgeon is in the house. For those of you that do not know, we have contracted with Virtual Flight Surgeons to provide medical advice and expertise on a whole host of issues for our membership. ALPA has used them for many, many years with great success. They're an extraordinary resource that is available to you, the membership, and they are here. They have the Laclede Room for meetings. They're available to meet with you publically or confidentially; your choice. So do take advantage of that if you're interested. The validation team and staffing meeting is being held in the Shaw Room. For anybody that was expecting that; that's where that is at. And the coffee break you're about to enjoy from 10:30 until 11:00 o'clock sharp is sponsored by the Sensis Corporation. Also, the afternoon exhibit hall, it does not open until 1:00 o'clock. The exhibit hall will be open from 1:00 to 5:00, and we encourage you to take a trip through there in the afternoon to take a look at some of our sponsors and some of the gear that they have. We will now take a recess for the morning coffee break, and we will reconvene exactly at 11:00 o'clock. Thank you very much and we'll see you very soon.

(Off record 10:30 a.m.)

(Morning break)

(On record 11:00 a.m.)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Ladies and gentlemen, the convention will come to order. If you could all take your seats, please, close the doors, the convention will come to order. I have a handful of housekeeping announcements that I'll make while those of you that are still standing find your seats. First of all, for those smokers among us, please endeavor to take your smoking outside, up those rear stairs or out by the pool. The real problem is we're going to set off the smoke alarms and then we'll all have to leave. So I mean I like an early shove just like the next guy, but that's not the way to get it. So take the smoking outside to the best of your ability.

Item Number 2 up for bids, there will be cache lunch; hotdogs, sandwiches and things of that nature set up outside in the lobby areas when you leave. If you want to stay in the hotel area for that. So you can be on the lookout for that. Don't forget to tip the people that help you in this hotel. There are many of them. And they count on that. So please remember them as you do that.

Item Number 3, the Miami Beach Giveaway at the Fontainebleau hotel, two nights, double occupancy, will be drawn during the convention bid presentations for the 2008 conventions. So they are having that as a drawing, and it will be done during the presentations.

Next up for bid, NATCA PAC has a table in the back on the outside. Don't forget to go by there and give like your career depends upon it; because it does.

And lastly, don't shy away from registering for the NATCA Charitable Foundation Silent Auction. I see a lot of people walking by kind of looking at those tables full of stuff, wondering what that's all about. It's really very simple. You register your name. You're given a number, like, for instance, Bravo 3, or whatever, and then you bid on things using that number. High bid wins. We'll tell you later when the auction closes, but there is nothing sophisticated about it. They've got some excellent, outstanding things to be bid upon out there, and I'm in competition for many of them, so stay away from Charlie 11 if you see that on any of them. Or I may just run up the price, I don't know.

Having said all of that, the next business properly before us is the report of the Chairman of the Finance Committee. The National Finance Committee report is properly before us and I'd like to introduce to you a great friend, a devoted activist, an amazing individual, someone who gets up as early as I do and stays as late, the National Finance Committee Chairman, Mr. Dale Wright.

(Applause)

MR. DALE WRIGHT: Good morning. The National Finance Committee works for the membership of NATCA to ensure fiscal responsibility of a local, regional and national officers. The National Finance Committee is an internal committee that protects our locals and officers, balloting records, training officers, and research and financial regulations. The Department of Labor has increased their activity in monitoring the financial transactions of all unions, not just NATCA. NATCA has seen an increase in DOL activity, questions and audits being conducted.

The National Finance Committee has also coordinated activity between the Department of Labor and some of our more unfortunate NATCA locals. The National Finance Committee has been very active since our last convention. We've trained over 100 local officers and our new secretary treasurer's class, and another 300 in our basic fac rep class. This training has proved to be well-worth the investment due to increased activity of the Department of Labor.

The Department of Labor hired additional auditors to monitor union spending habits, and the Bush administration was successful in making the filing of LM2 reports much more detailed and labor-intensive. Even though this change did not take effect until July 1st of 2004, NATCA's elected leaders changed our vouchering system on January the 1st, 2004, to ensure we were in compliance so our employees and representatives would have a smooth transition to the new system.

The National Finance Committee's main focus of attention has been on the compliance of our local unions with DOL and NATCA regulations.

In January of 2003, the National Executive Board mandated the use of vouchers and double signatures on checks at the request of the National Finance Committee. There are locals that choose to disregard these mandates by the National Executive Boards. Locals must understand Department of Labor will enforce NATCA's rules and policies as if they were DOL rules and policies when conducting audits. Compliance is not an option. It is mandatory.

The National Finance Committee has audited over 75 NATCA locals since the last convention. The National Finance Committee would like to commend locals who have their financial records in order. We can now say that most NATCA locals are in compliance with all required regulations.

The records of our locals are improving but we still have some problem areas. The first issue is training. Small locals may not have the funds or staffing to travel to

training. The National Finance Committee has a PowerPoint presentation that's available via the Internet or email form the National Finance Committee for locals that are not able to attend training. The training also provides locals with knowledge on DOL regulations, what type of documentation is required, and the methods to track financial transactions.

Many locals have received financial training at the regional fac rep meetings, but with the turnover in smaller locals, we still need to ensure that all locals have the opportunity to train their new officers. Due to staffing issues at most of our facilities, the NFC's duties are being -- and NFC duties being internal union business, most of our audits are now being conducted via mail. Article 9, Section 12 of the NATCA Constitution states the National Finance Committee shall have access to all union financial records. This includes financial records at the local level.

One of our larger locals received a compliance audit by their local DOL office. This local had very good financial records. They received two discrepancy write-ups from the DOL. These were not having an inventory asset list, and the local had one deposit where the deposit slip from the bank had been misplaced. This local had a deposit listed on their bank statement, in their financial report, and a copy of the check stub from the National Office. This ought to provide a look to how detailed the Department of Labor can be in their audits.

There shall be at least two signatures on the signature card at the bank. This became an issue in March of 2004 when the outgoing president of a local would not turn over the funds to the incoming officer, and there were no other names on the bank signature card. After three months of working with the local, the RVP was able to convince the outgoing officer that the funds had to be turned over, or the Department of Labor would be contacted. If there had been two signatures on the signature card at the bank, this issue would not have attracted all the attention.

In July of 2004 we were notified that a local had not filed an LM report in four years. The National Finance Committee assisted the local in filing reports. It was a very difficult task due to no records being on file at the local. The two previous presidents of the local had to visit their banking establishments to receive bank statements for up to four years ago. This demonstrated the need for locals to consider keeping the same bank when officers change. Locals should strive for consistency in financial record keeping even when officers changes.

Local officers need to understand the seriousness of keeping proper financial records. One statement the NFC hears quite often during the audits is our local doesn't

have enough money to matter. The Department of Labor prosecuted one union officer from another union for what they determined as a fraudulent voucher that was for \$58.71. This officer was found guilty and received a suspended two year jail sentence, a \$1,000 fine and a \$25 assessment. Persons who are found guilty of these types of charges may not serve jail time but your employment status could be affected by a guilty verdict.

Smaller locals must understand the ramifications of splitting their dues rebate checks. One NATCA local with three members was splitting their dues rebate check among the membership. Members of this local paid approximately \$100 per quarter to NATCA for their dues. The local president split the \$450 rebate check, and each member received \$50 more dollar than they paid in. NATCA's General counsel, Ms. Rita Graf, advised this was profiting from union funds and could result in charges from the Department of Labor. Ms. Graf sent a letter to the National Finance Committee concerning the legality of locals giving cash to members. Ms. Gaff has advised the National Finance Committee that giving gift cards is the same as cash. Locals shall cease with gifts and gift cards to the membership.

Another area of concern is record keeping, of course. The National Finance Committee has found several locals that have no records or very few records. On two occasions, presidents of locals have been advised -- have advised they left records on file with the local only to have the subsequent officer destroy or discard the records. The National Finance Committee now recommends that officers have their replacements signed from the financial records that are on file. This will provide a sort of insurance policy for the officer after they leave office.

Fiscal responsibility is one of the most important items for a local officer. The President of the local is always responsible for the financial dealings of the local. The President may delegate the day to day financial issues to the treasurer, but remains responsible.

The National Finance Committee continues to work toward improving the financial record keeping of our locals. We've developed several spreadsheets that assist locals in tracking our finances for LM reports and provided a spreadsheet for tracking financial fixed assets.

In November of 2003, the National Finance Committee received a briefing on an internet based financial program that would assist locals in their financial record keeping. This initiative is still on the back burner due to costs, however, due with the increase of Department of Labor activity, the NFC will be discussing it at our November

budget meeting.

Another area of concern for the National Finance Committee is NATCA Members Incorporated. As of August the 1st, 2004, we have two floors of the Krasner building that are empty. A tenant is scheduled to occupy half of the second floor by the end of October. One of our previous tenants left NATCA -- or left NMI owing approximately \$200,500. The NMI board is currently addressing this situation.

The building needs to be upgraded to attract tenants that would make the Krasner Building home for up to five years. The upgrading of the entryway has been approved at a cost of \$39,000. The estimate to replace the windows in the building has ranged from approximately \$800,000 to 1.1 million dollars. Article 9, Section 5 of the NATCA Constitution provides that the National Finance Committee is to review the salaries of the national officers annually and that the voting delegates are to act upon the committees recommendation at the National Convention.

By-Law N1 as amended in 2000 reads as follows. The NATCA National President shall be compensated with an annual base salary of \$165,000. The National Executive Vice President shall be compensated at an annual salary of \$160,000. These salaries will be adjusted and increased at the same rate as air traffic controllers in the Washington, D.C. area. Includes locality and cost of living adjustments.

We have reviewed the salaries of other union officers and industry counterparts of our officers. The National Finance Committee will be forwarding a resolution at the end of this report requesting a change in salaries of our officers. Their proposal will be 220,000 for the President and 210,000 for our Executive Vice President. We understand it's quite an increase over what is listed in By-Law N1. Currently our president's salary is \$195,912.72, and Executive Vice President's salary is \$189,976.08. The difference in salary from the amounts listed in the 2002 NATCA Constitution and the present day salary is from adjustments for locality and cost of living.

We will also forward an amendment to By-Law N4 for consideration for housing allowance, much like union liaisons and technical representatives on temporary duty in Washington, D.C. receive. The amount recommended will be \$90 per day.

On August the 12th, 2004, a meeting was held with NATCA's auditor, Mr. Joe Musher. Also at this meeting were Ms. Rita Graf, our General Counsel, and Ms. Selma Golding-Forrester, NATCA Comptroller and myself. Mr. Musher expressed serious concerns when he was briefed on the local

audits. Mr. Musher would like to speak to you in reference to the seriousness of financial record keeping and compliance with Department of Labor and NATCA regulations.

First off, the Finance Committee would like to thank Mr. Musher for years and years of guidance. He looks out for the locals. And right now I'd like to introduce Mr. Joe Musher to come up and speak to you.

(Applause)

MR. JOE MUSHER: Thank you very much, Dale. And it's an honor and a privilege to be here this morning. I'm an auditor with the firm Buchbinder Tunick & Company. We're a CPA firm. Our specialty are labor unions and employee benefit plans. And I travel all over the country, make presentations, and I also have audits throughout the country. I, for one, want to thank everybody in this room because I travel a lot by air, so I really appreciate all the work you do.

And let me tell you another thing; I'm going to appreciate more what your brothers and sisters do when I fly back this afternoon. Here I'm addressing 1,200 controllers and I'm sitting here thinking who is manning the skies when I'm going back.

But in any event, I'm supposed to be a little bit serious and tell you what the real world is like. NATCA has made a lot of growths. You heard a wonderful speech this morning by your president telling you every place you've been and where you're going. The unfortunate part is you have a lot of vulnerabilities right now. You're leaving yourselves open in a lot of places. And if somebody like the government or Department of Labor wants to come and make life difficult for you, they have that avenue right now. And this is a very serious thing.

The department of justice runs on the premise that everybody is innocent until proven guilty. And I believe you have to be guilty beyond a reasonable -- whatever the attorney is going to tell me I'm supposed to say. Well, that doesn't work in the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor, every single person in this room is guilty until proven innocent. It's reverse. And I'm being real serious. You're guilty; you're on the wrong. And people look at this and say, all right, the IRS comes in, you do an audit for the IRS, you forgot this deduction, you don't have the support, you get your hand spanked. You did an error, you get a fine, you get a penalty; and life goes on. That's not how it works with the Department of Labor. This is a rude awakening. They put you in jail. Dale over here just told you something about a \$58 or \$78 and somebody could go to jail or probation. They put you in jail. So it's not like just I'm sorry and here's my money back.

They're looking to make examples of people. So you need to keep that in mind.

And one of the things to do is they're not a friend of labor for the most part. If DOL comes in, they are not coming in to help you. They're coming in to burn you. And they are going to investigate. And they have unlimited resources. They can stay there as long as they want. There's a rumor circulating in Washington, D.C., right now that DOL is undertaking a project that they want to audit every national union, obviously NATCA being one of those nationals within a 24 month period. That's never been done before. Why do you think they want to do that? The more trouble they make for you, they get the more resources you put into protecting yourself. They have human resources off the streets campaigning, looking to document things in your records and everything else. They're looking to audit these labor unions. Now, where else are they going to go after that? Obviously, they're going to go looking at all the locals.

The first slide, and I just have a few slides up here to show you, is one called the Office of Labor Management Standards. This is the Agency within Department of Labor, they're the ones responsible for conducting civil and criminal investigations. And they're governed by this law, the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. So you can see how far back this dates.

My firm has probably been doing these audits for at least 40 or 50 years. I'm not old enough to be doing them that long. I'm actually I think the third generation partner in our firm that's been involved in this. But you can see really the latest revisions to this law were in 1987. And as your president said this morning, what they did with the LM2 was they made it a lot more cumbersome, adding thousands and thousands of hours, millions of dollars, changing the reporting requirements, making it more difficult for labor.

If you stop to think about it, your reporting package is more stringent than the IRS package which is generating money. It's probably more stringent than any reporting package maybe other than the SCC. And I'm not sure if it's more stringent than the SCC or not; it may be.

The thing that you have to remember, everyone in this room by dealing with the funds; these funds at the locals, they're not your funds. You have a very heavy fiduciary responsibility. That's why the IRS comes in and smacks you on the hand if you do something with your money. But this is other peoples' money. That's why they take this ultra, ultra serious. And that's why they're looking to make examples of people. Your fiduciary responsibility is very

heavy for anybody that handles these funds.

If you look at the next slide. Part of the law. This is the law. Criminal Provisions. Right there, \$10,000 or imprisonment of one year or both. And that was back in '59. I think some of the sentences are becoming more stringent. Right there in the law it tells what the criminal provisions are.

The next slide talks about loans. This is a big thing here. The union, local, national, anybody, cannot loan more than \$2,000. You loan more than \$2,000, guess what, you're subject to a jail sentence, you're subject to a fine. Even if it's in advertently. So you can't even be taking money and loaning it to people. It's against the law. There's something called white, grey, and black. White, you know, is lily white, I can get my two kids to do something like that for you. Black, you go to jail. And grey is how comfortable you feel about something. On these loans, it's black. You go to jail when you start making these loans.

The next item I had here, or that I wanted to talk a little bit about is a real -- there are some real life things that are going on. There was a labor union on the East Coast, a president of a very large union who was indicted on approximately 10 items. And if I had to guess, eight were extremely sophisticated, and most of you in this room wouldn't understand. With no disrespect to anyone. You really need an attorney or a CPA to understand some of these indictments. And the guy was probably guilty of them. There were two indictments that the jury understood. And one they nailed them on and told them about it later. And what was that? That was travel expenses.

What this man did, the President of a union, he would go to a restaurant, and the bill might be \$77.11. And he took the seven and made it into an eight. So it was \$88.11. And in that major city, labor investigators went to every restaurant he submitted documentation on to get their original documentation to prove how he falsified it. So whatever the dollars were, the jury understood. He was stealing from the union. And his comment upon conviction was, I deserved it, I work hard. That didn't go over pretty well. And that just gave Department of Labor more incentive to go after more people.

If you look at this first example, if you look on the web, right now, as of about two weeks ago, there were 98 pages from only two months of indictments or sentencings. And all I did was highlight a few things. Because a lot of times we get lost at Enron and Worldcom and this and that. But you know what? There are many, many, many more things out there of small locals that DOL is going after. And we're talking about different regions all across the

country. We're not talking about any one area.

The first one I had up here, which is probably the largest one I have, it was \$39,000 in union funds that this person took unauthorized paychecks and he made checks to third parties. And the other thing is he used the union's Business credit card for things he wasn't supposed to. A union credit card is something most unions have, and it typically gets a lot of people in trouble.

The next slide, July 26, 2004. This was \$9,801. Oh, they want to put somebody -- somebody was in jail for 180 days for embezzling that from the union. The slide right below it, July 1st, 2004, someone was one count of embezzling \$4,700 and making false entries in the union record books. False entries. And that was the Nashville office. The previous office was Los Angeles.

If we look at the next slide, June '04, someone got hit with seven counts of making false entries in the union books. It doesn't say he took any money, just making false entries in the union books. And that was the San Francisco office.

If you look at the next slide, there's someone there for \$3,672.84. Boy, they get it right down to the penny. Remember, you're dealing with unlimited resources. They can go right down to the penny. This guy got one year probation. San Francisco office.

The next one was \$3,480, embezzling union funds. One count, pled guilty. New Orleans office. The next one after that, embezzling \$2,900. New Orleans office.

The purpose I'm trying to show you, it's throughout the country. The next one, April '04, one count of \$4,125 in union funds. This was the New Orleans office.

And one of my favorites over here. This one is for \$722, a treasurer of the Electrical Workers. One count of theft of \$722, and this was out of the Minneapolis office.

And the last slide I'm showing you up here, someone was embezzling \$6,000 in union funds. He was ordered to make restitution, undergoing alcohol, gambling, and mental health treatment. So what happens is, is they're out there, and they're looking to get you, and they're looking to look at these audits, and they're looking for everything there is. And what happens is, is they do not follow -- and this is a misnomer, they do not follow the IRS regulation. I'm sure everybody in this room knows, I don't need documentation under \$75. That's true for the IRS for travel and entertainment. That is not, I repeat, that is not true for Department of Labor. Department of Labor can require documentation for 10 cents. There is nothing in the law. The Department of Labor and the IRS differ in this. They require the documentation. They do not require a

handwritten note given to Dale saying I lost the documentation, but on my honor, here is all the slips. If that is the best Dale can get, that is the best Dale can get. The DOL does not have to accept that. They need the actual documentation. You need to keep that. You need to pay the exact amount. If some bill is \$126 and 54 cents, you don't write the check for \$127 and round it up because it's easier for reconciliation purposes. You write it out for the penny. You have a fiduciary responsibility.

Personal usage. That's always a big one. You can't use the assets for your own personal usage, whatever they may be. You can't be using the NATCA computer for your personal use, fax machines, anything of that nature. And the other thing which used to be a widespread problem, but I know at national it's more under control, but it's something nationally they've looked at have been travel advances.

So now we're sitting here saying, okay, locals, you have a problem. Dale has made everybody aware of the problem. Dale made me aware of the problem. The committee is out there investigating. You need to get your books and records tightened up. Because if there is exposure, if somebody wants to discredit the union and discredit all the wonderful things you're doing, they're going to say, hey, there's all these people out here that are spending all this money, and they're not submitting documentation, I'm going to turn DOL loose on you. That's a true statement.

Now, the next problem comes into play because the President and the Executive Vice President, they're the ones that sign the LM2's. And typically, around March 31, they always come in to me and say something like, Joe, am I going to jail? True statement. Before you sign, Joe, am I going to jail? Boy, I get grilled by both of them. No, you're not because what I do is I try and we try and do the best job we can. And at headquarters they do a real good job. In fact, when they were audited at headquarters about 10 years ago, one of the things that they really focused hard on was the petty cash. They actually nailed your national office because the petty cash vouchers for \$2 and \$3 weren't put on the person's name on Schedule 9 and 10. And at that time your controller argued we would've had to have another one or two employees just to do it, and you actually want to compromise with them. But that's how ridiculous they were in that respect.

But getting back to national, your president, your Executive Vice President, they're the ones that sign that report. We're the one that prepare it and work with the accounting department. They're the ones that sign it. They're the ones responsible.

So now the next question becomes they're sending

rebates out to the locals. The locals get rebates. If they know of a local that is in violation of DOL regulations or does not have supporting documentation, should they be sending that check out? Are they violating anything? Is there a problem? Are they exercising their fiduciary responsibility with the National funds? It's a question that has to be pondered at National right now. But it's a very serious concern. So the best thing to do right now is to straighten up your own books and records and to have all the documentation there, submit your LM reports in a timely basis, call Dale if you have any questions, go on the website if you have any questions, you can feel free to ask the National controller or Ruth, you can call our office, whatever you want. But you've got to get your questions resolved. You've got to get your ducks in order before you go marching out to war.

So good luck to all of you and thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. DALE WRIGHT: Okay. Luckily, none of our officers have been on a web page yet for the DOL. So anyway, the NFC remains committed to providing the membership with financial training and oversight of NATCA's finances. NATCA's finances at the national level are on solid ground. Local officers shall ensure compliance with DOL regulations and NATCA mandates or this could adversely affect NATCA's future. Your help is not only requested, it is the only way we can ensure all levels of NATCA are fiscally responsible.

And Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the finance committee, first off, I would like to thank you and Ruth and Rita for all your support you give us because without the support we get from you we couldn't do our job.

And also on behalf of the committee, I move to substitute the following language in By-Law N1: "The NATCA National President shall be compensated with an annual base salary of \$220,000. The National Executive Vice President shall be compensated with an annual base salary of \$210,000." Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Ladies and gentlemen, there are two kinds of committee reports -- and thank you, Dale, for yours -- committee reports that serve as information and committee reports that offer motions. Both types of committee report are properly in order. However, I myself typically recuse myself from discussions of salary for executive officers, and Ruth typically does the same. So -- and she would most properly get the gavel according to our constitution, but if she is going to recuse herself as well, I think it's probably most appropriate at this time that we do that.

By way of protocol, if anyone has any resolutions they're in writing that they would like to timely submit to the Executive Vice President before noon today, you can submit them to the office, which is located directly across the hallway. And if they're in by noon today, they'll be considered timely for this session.

However, having said that, it gives me great pleasure to offer this gavel to someone whose held a gavel or two in his life. He is my good friend, your president emeritus, and quite frankly, a hero to this organization, and when you circulate among them, to all of organized labor. I wonder if from the New York TRACON and the Eastern Region if Mr. Barry Krasner would take this gavel from me?

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Wow. Okay. I'd like to thank you. It's getting tougher to get gavel time up here. I guess you need controversial issues. I have noticed as we talk about how old we all are, you go into the bar and every conversation seems to be not about staffing, not about privatization, but about who has got three months left, who has got a year left. The other thing I found noteworthy was that every single person who comes up here these days has to bring up reading glasses.

Okay. So anyway, there was a motion put forth as a result of the report by the Finance Committee. And it's moved and seconded to substitute the language for By-Law N1. Do we have it up on the Board? Is there any way we can put that language up on the Board so people can see it? I know Adell was supposed to have had that. Okay. Anyway, what I'll do is read it. You all have the constitutions in front of you so you can look at By-Law N1. And what this language would do, would substitute that in its entirety. And the language would read, "The NATCA National President shall be compensated with an annual base salary of \$220,000. The National Executive Vice President shall be compensated with an annual base salary of \$210,000." That would be the entire substitution. So the second part of it would no longer exist.

Okay. So it has been moved by the committee so it requires no second. So it is open for discussion. Is there any discussion? Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): Yeah, Mr. Chairman, Hamid Ghaffari, L.A. Center, and a Point of Information. If we could get some more elaboration from the Finance Committee, I think it's going to aid everyone in making this decision. We'd like to find out for sure how they came up with that number, how do we compare with other labor organizations before we make this decision?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Where is Dale?

Dale, at Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Dale Wright): The Finance Committee, when we started discussing it, we wanted to make sure that any member that wanted to run for our national office could do so without having to worry to take a financial hardship on their family. So we looked at salaries throughout the largest facilities. And focusing on Oakland Center, New York Center and TRACON, Chicago, LA, and we looked at Atlanta and Fort Worth Center. And then we took in the highest 12 -- or not highest 12, but above average 12 would be making and we put differentials in it, and some overtime because our officers do, you know, they work more than 40 hours a week. Plus if somebody is working overtime every week, they might have that as part of their income. We don't want to take a financial hit. We came up with approximately \$205,000 out of that. So after we came up with that, we put the vice president at 210 and the President at 220. So that's the basic process we used over -- we worked on this about two to three months.

We started looking at our national officers salaries reference FAA, they're a little bit higher than most of the FAA. And then we started looking at the general public and private, and you take like the second person in command at Triple A, he makes \$800,000 a year. Of course, we're not going to pay that. But we did look at private industries. There's not a lot of unions that fit in where NATCA is at. There's a lot of unions a little bit smaller than us and then there's some a little bit larger than us, but you got to look at what the members make in those unions. And you know, like past pay is there, is like 130, something like that. But their employees don't make what ours make. And then you've got the Teamsters, you know, he makes a lot more. He got over a million members, though, but if you used the price, most of his members are making less than \$80,000 a year.

So we looked at all that, but -- and we realized we weren't going to pay what industry pays for their people, but then we want to make sure that our officers were paid to where any member of this union can run for national office and not take a financial hardship. And those were the figures we came up with.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you, Dale.

MIKE 3 (Dale Wright): Okay.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Mike 1.

MICROPHONE 1 (Scott Conde): Scott Conde, Oakland Center. Motion to amend. I'd like to amend the as stated to add retroactive to January 1st, 2003, to the proposal as stated.

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Let me see if I got this right. You want to amend the motion to add the salary shall be -- or the salary adjustment shall be retroactive to January 1st, 2003?

MICROPHONE 1 (Scott Conde): That's correct.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Let me just get this down. Okay there is a motion to amend by adding this sentence, "This salary adjustment shall be retroactive to January 1st, 2003". Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Moved and seconded to amend the motion. First debate? Mike 1.

MICROPHONE 1 (Scott Conde): Mr. Chairman, as you heard from the Finance Committee, I believe that this body was remiss in not adequately compensating its officers at our last convention. The motion to amend was to make up for the financial hardships that we are not seeking to avoid in the future, but have obviously been realized by our officers in the interim period. And that simply is the reason for it.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Further discussion on the motion to amend. Mike 1.

MICROPHONE 1 (Mark Sherry): Mark Sherry, San Francisco Tower. More particular, I think it's a Point of Information, and maybe Mr. Wright can answer this for me. Has the finance Committee deleted the part about and adjusted with increase as the same rate as air traffic controllers in Washington, D.C. If you amend it back to January 1st, 2003, do they actually make more or less money without those adjustments?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Would they actually be making more or less money without the -- they would be making -- let me see if I got this right, Dale. If you amend it back to 2003, they would have been making more from the beginning than they were making in 2003. Their intent in removing that sentence was that the Body actually deal with the issue of salary every single time, and that there be no automatic adjustments convoluting it, is that correct, Dale?

MICROPHONE 3 (Dale Wright): Our reason for doing it was we had a lot of questions that, you know, well, they're only making 165 and 160. So we want the Constitution to show what the actual salary is. We don't want any of this, you know, if we don't act on it or the delegates don't pass it, and it still says 165 and then it's been increasing, well, here we are, 30,000 difference, and everybody thinks it's 165. That's -- our intent is to have the actual salary in the constitution. Now, what you're saying is if we move it back to 2003, are they going to get the yearly increase for 2004 and all that, is that what you're saying?

MICROPHONE 1 (Mark Sherry): Yeah.

MICROPHONE 3 (Dale Wright): Well, of course, they would be making more if you do it that way. And then this would cut them back down because it would go up January 2004 if the intention of it is give them the yearly increase, which the Finance Committee has taken out. But if you go back to 2003, give them a yearly increase at 2004, then knock it back down now, yeah, it would be less if you do that.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: So wait a minute. Let me see if I understand this for everybody, Dale. With the amendment, if it was retroactive to 2003, then the automatic salary adjustment for the Washington, D.C., area would not have applied from 2003 on, and then the question is where would that fall with the salary now?

MICROPHONE 3 (Dale Wright): Right. If you put it in as it is now and go back to 2003 without the yearly increase, then it's going to be the same. But if your intention is to go back to 2003, give them the 220, of course, they're getting an increase at 2004. I mean I don't know exactly where he wants to go with that, but that needs to be clarified, do they get the 2004 increase? I mean it makes it, you know, when you're talking that much money, five percent can make a lot of difference.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: If I may, before we get back to the author for clarification, the way it's written with the amendment is if this would go back to January 2003, then there would have been no 2004 adjustment. It would be a straight salary of 220 and 210,000. That salary would then have to be adjusted accordingly and see where it fell out, is that correct?

MICROPHONE 3 (Dale Wright): Yeah, that is correct and that was taken from what we believe was the Finance Committee's report that the approximate figure was about \$193,000 as paid out last year. So the adjustment would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$27,000 to the plus.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: So even with the adjustment, then it would fall out. They would be doing better. Okay. Further debate? I got Mike 7.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): Bill Buvens, D10 TRACON. I rise in opposition to this amendment to the resolution. We just elected the executive officers. They knew what the salary was when they ran last year. We didn't make a mistake in Cleveland because there was no presentation or no proposal given to us in Cleveland to act on in the first place. We're doing it now. We're going to give them 220 and 210,000 or whatever the figures were, and so I rise in opposition. Let's just go ahead and let's give them the money now and let's move from there.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you, Mike 7. Any further discussion on the amendment to the motion? Okay. The issue before you is on the adoption of the amendment to the motion, which would add the following sentence: "This salary adjustment shall be retroactive to January 1st, 2003". The vote is solely on the adoption of the amendment. As many as are in favor of adopting the amendment to the motion, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: All opposed, say nay.

AUDIENCE: Nay.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: The nays have it. The amendment is defeated. The issue before you is the original motion, which I will read again: "The NATCA National President shall be compensated with an annual base salary of \$220,000. The National Executive Vice President shall be compensated with an annual base salary of \$210,000." Is there any further discussion?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Are you ready for the question. As many as are in favor of the adoption of the motion to substitute this language for amendment -- or for By-Law N1, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: All those opposed, say nay.

AUDIENCE: Nay.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: The ayes do have it. The motion is adopted.

(Applause)

Okay. The next business in order is the report of the Constitution Committee. Mr. Bill McGowan is the Chair of the Constitution Committee and shall deliver the report. Mr. McGowan. See, they put me up here, I'm not giving it up. You're going to have to pry my dead fingers off this podium.

(Applause)

MICROPHONE 1: Point of Information, Mike 1.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Yes.

MICROPHONE 1: Did Mr. Wright also propose a resolution to change some language in N4 with regard to housing allowance?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: What Mr. Wright did there was he made a recommendation in the body of the report, and it is their intent to submit a resolution, you know, which will fall in place with the other resolutions. Mr. McGowan.

MR. BILL MCGOWAN: Good morning. It's an honor to be subject to your gavel once again, sir. The members of the

National Constitution Committee met on May 13th to 15th of 2004 to consider all the submitted amendments. The committee carefully studied each proposed amendment and identified any conflicts with existing contract provisions, constitutional language, our NATCA By-Laws, federal law, rule or regulation. The blue book before you represents the committees' findings as required by the constitution.

Amendments are listed by article and section, the logical order in which they appear in our constitution. Resolutions appear in the blue book in the order in which they were received.

The committee also met in spring of 2003 to discuss ways to bring our constitution and By-Laws more in compliance with Robert's. We identified eight By-Laws that the committee believes should be moved into the constitution. These eight housekeeping amendments are identified as A-004, 001 through 008 and are presented as the first order of business to the St. Louis delegates.

These eight proposals will not change the way that we do business. We are simply asking the St. Louis delegates to move these items for the sake of form and function into a more appropriate location within our corporate documents. During our meeting in the spring of 2003, the committee in consultation with our parliamentarian discussed the idea of a third section of corporate documents for a policy and position statements.

In the spring of 2004, members of the National Executive Board approached the committee and asked for assistance to draft language to establish a third set of documents to include our position statements. The Constitution Committee and NEB independently arrived at the same conclusion, and now jointly sponsor Amendment A04-009 to better define of our categorization and titling for the different sections of our corporate documents. A04-009 is presented as one of our first orders of convention business. It's important to recognize that A04-009 will not amend or diminish any of the business past at this, or any previous NATCA convention. The committee and the NEB believe that this change will better organize and define our goals and policies, but it will not reduce or restrict the delegates right in obligation to conducting direct business. The committee acknowledges and appreciates the time, effort and energy that individuals have devoted to the union and to their proposals. We recognize that your ideas were submitted with a sincere and earnest desire to improve and promote our association. By direction of the committee, I move to adopt the Constitution Committee's report.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you, Mr.

McGowan. Okay. The motion is to adopt the report of the Constitution Committee. Is there any discussion?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. It is moved and seconded to adopt the report of the Constitution Committee. Are you ready for the question? Oh, I'm sorry, what are you doing? You're moving A4-009 to the beginning, is that what you're doing?

MR. BILL MCGOWAN: No. We're not ready to hear that now.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: So it's just the report?

MR. BILL MCGOWAN: Just the report.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. I'm sorry, then. Then the report is informational only?

MR. BILL MCGOWAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Requires no vote. Thank you very much, Mr. McGowan. See, I should have paid attention. Okay. The next business in order is -- we get into the amendments. Now, what we're asking here, and we'll ask to do it without objection. We normally do the amendments in order as they're printed in the book. A4-009 actually sets the stage for the rest of them. And we ask if, with no objection if we can do that one first, and then move into the rest. Is there any objection?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Cool. Okay. Business in order is on the adoption of 04-009. This is put forth by Constitution and Executive Board. Who is speaking on behalf of the parties? Mike 3, you're speaking on behalf, Bill?

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Yes. We'd like to submit this amendment with the provision that it does not take effect until -- I feel like I'm at a prison break -- after the convention, and that is simply for the sake, so we don't get wrapped around the ax with what's a By-Law, what's a standing rule. When we left Cleveland, the Constitution Committee took our existing By-Laws and we redefined them. Originally we had like eight sections. One section had literally 50 items of business in it. We split things out in to what we thought was a more logical flow into these 17 separate subsections. Everything that was there is still there.

What we passed as By-Law N1 in Cleveland was B10. A50 resolutions to do with reclass and pay is still there, only it's in P2. Rather than come up with a separate section titled S, position and policy statements and having 50 things in there, what we'd like to do is have a third separate section for our policy and position statements. Those are all the NATCA supports, NATCA endorses, NATCA

opposes. We want to put all those together.

They're going to have the same requirement to pass them, amend them, delete them as they do now. Nothing is going to change. If you're going to file an internal grievance, you can file an internal grievance whether it's a policy, a position statement or a By-Law. All we want to do is we were looking to change our organization to put them all together into one section.

The NEB has come forward on their own. And John said this morning he's looking for more information from the delegates. They have committed to, in Boston, reporting back to you, the delegates or the membership what they did in the two years between conventions to deal with all the statements that say, we support, we endorse, we impose. So they would come up in Boston, they'll say, if we support President Kerry, what they did to effect that. But business as it is will continue as it was. Whatever the NEB used to do, they'll continue to do it as they do today. We're just going to put it into a different section with a different title to make it easy to split those things out.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Point of Order.

MICROPHONE (Unidentified): Is this mike working?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: It's Bill. He intentionally killed it for the purpose of speaking beyond the two minutes. Okay. I'll use my watch from now on. I'm sorry, Bill, were you finished.

MR. BILL MCGOWAN: All done.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Thank you. So right off the bat, the amendment is modified to indicate that it does not take effect until the close of the convention. Okay. So that is the issue. It's A4-009 with that modification. Let's initially find out if we have a second. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Moved and seconded to adopt A4-009 as modified. Are you ready for the question? No, you're not. Mike 8.

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): Mike Bates, Griffiss RAPCON. I have a motion to insert some language. I would like to insert after the words National Executive Board shall be.....

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Wait. Let me find it. Where would this be?

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): About halfway down. National Executive Board shall be, right under the underlines there.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Where it says enacted by the National Executive Board shall be presented?

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): Right. In front of

presented, I would like to say, "Published 60 days prior to the National Convention, and" and then it will continue on.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Stand by.

"Published 60 days....."

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): ".....prior to the National Convention, and"

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: "Prior to....."

MICROPHONE 8 (Unidentified): Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Stand by. Okay. So then it would read, ".....shall be presented -- shall be published 60 days prior to the National Convention, and shall be presented to"?

MICROPHONE 8 (Unidentified): No, and presented to the National.....

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: And -- we'll actually we'd be striking it. You'd strike out the other. Okay. Shall -- check, got it. Does everybody understand what he's inserting? Okay. If you look on the one, two, three, four, fifth sentence down where it says "By the National Executive Board shall be....."

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): Point of Information, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Yes.

MICROPHONE 8 (Unidentified): The actual amendments or the change to this is that which is underlined. If my esteemed colleague is trying to insert something in that which -- where the language has not been changed, is that not improper?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: On this one I would rule that it is in order because the overall basis for the amendment or this section of it is dealing with the handling of standing rules, policy, position statements, which didn't necessarily exist in that form before. I'll give it a gray area, but I would rule it's okay. So anyway, let me see if I -- I just want to make sure everyone gets the understanding of it. It would read shall -- insert shall.....

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): It would read, ".....shall be published 60 days....."

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: "Shall be published 60 days prior to the National Convention, and be presented to the National Convention for approval or disapproval."?

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): Yes.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. That is the motion to amend. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. It's moved and seconded to amend the amendment. Mike -- first debate.

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): I just want to make sure

that when this is published, the entire membership sees what it is that the National Executive Board has done with what was recommended. And so it's published and mailed out with the convention package. And that way, we'll all come to convention with an understanding of what's been done.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you, Mike 8.
Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Mike Blake): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mike Blake from Boston Center. I actually have a question for the author. Is the intent to have those published prior to the next convention or have these published for each subsequent convention? Is that clear?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: The intent is that whatever you're proposing, whatever the National Executive Board is bringing before the convention for passage goes out to the membership 60 days in advance. So it would be for each convention, is that correct? Much as the resolutions are now?

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): Point of Privilege. Shouldn't all the mikes be on so that we can respond and do what we're supposed to do, the business of the convention? Shouldn't all the mikes be on at all times?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: You working at TRACON? You're killing me, Mike.

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): No. Several times people have tried to insert Points of Orders, but the mikes are turned off, and they're only turning one mike on at a time, so we can't get the attention of the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: I don't know yet. Because I can hear you, even though the lights are off. But with all these lights up here, it's very difficult to see if all the lights.....

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): I said microphones.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Oh, that's actually a help.

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): I said microphones.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Oh, the mikes. Oh. I thought you said the lights.

(Laughter)

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Let's do it. Let's turn the mikes on.

MICROPHONE 1 (Mike Ryan): Point of Privilege, Mike 1.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Mike 1.

MICROPHONE 1 (Mike Ryan): In the interest of.....

AUDIENCE: Who are you?

MICROPHONE 1 (Mike Ryan) Mike Ryan, So-Cal TRACON. Could we kill the spots and turn up the house lights? These lights going back and forth, they're -- you know, it's

driving everybody crazy.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: I don't know how easy that is to do. I mean we could certainly.....

MICROPHONE 1 (Mike Ryan): Just turn these lights off like they were.....

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Well, I don't have the switches here, so I don't know who we have to coordinate with.

AUDIENCE: We thought you said mikes.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: There we go.

(Applause)

MICROPHONE 1 (Mike Ryan): Point of Privilege, Mike 1.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: There's a lot of people here.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Let's try to get back to the business here.

MICROPHONE 1 (Mike Ryan): Point of Privilege, Mike 1. Is this the only time we're available in the House.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Is this what?

MICROPHONE 1 (Mike Ryan): The only time -- are there other lights or.....

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: I think that's it.

MICROPHONE (Mike Ryan): This side of the room cannot -- unless we can put those lights on the screen or -- we can't see it. This whole side of the room cannot see those lights.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Well, I'll tell you, we'll work on it during lunch so we get it right for the afternoon.

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): Mr. Chairman, Point of Privilege. Mike 2.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): Hamid Ghaffari, L.A. Center. Is it possible as in previous years to try to get some of these amendments and motions and so forth on these screens so everyone could see what we're talking about.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: I think that is the intent. Yeah, okay. We'll check on that.

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): Point of Information.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: We promise things will be better this afternoon.

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): Point of Information.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Speak.

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): Hamid Ghaffari, L.A. Center. Could the Chair ask the author to clarify his position? Is it his intent for this information to be disseminated at the same time as we get the convention booklets? If so, I believe the convention booklets come out

120 days prior.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Mr. Bates?

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): It was my intention to go with the books. But as I understand it, we submit 120 days prior, and they publish 60 days prior. Perhaps I have that wrong.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: That is correct, right?

AUDIENCE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: That is correct. Does that satisfy it?

MICROPHONE 8 (Barry Wilson): Point of Information, Mike 8.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Tread carefully, my friend.

MICROPHONE 8 (Barry Wilson): I intend to. Barry Wilson, Fort Lauderdale Tower. Would this not preclude the NEB from making any decisions 60 days prior to the convention because it wouldn't be able to be published?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: And I told you to tread carefully. That sounds a lot like debate. You're out of order.

(Laughter)

MICROPHONE 1 (Mark Sherry): Mike 1, Mark Sherry, San Francisco Tower. What Barry said.

(Laughter)

MICROPHONE 1 (Mark Sherry) I stand in favor of the -- I'm opposed to the amendment unless you take into account that there has to be some methodology for the 60 days between the cutoff and the convention. I'm sure -- I'm not a delegate so I can't make a motion to amend. But I'm sure you can amend it to make sure that's clear or give the intent to the author.

MICROPHONE 8 (Mike Bates): I believe the intent says because it continues and presented, anything that happens after the 120 or 60 days, whatever the cutoff, would still have to be presented. The way the best of both worlds is covered in my original language.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Mike 9. No Mike 9. Okay. The question is on the adoption of the amendment to the amendment, which would be, ".....shall be published 60 days prior to the National Convention, and", the insertion of those words.

As many as are in favor of its adoption, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: As many as are opposed, say nay.

AUDIENCE: Nay.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: That was pretty weak, guys.

AUDIENCE: Nay. Nay.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. We'll do it by standing. As many as are in favor of the adoption of the amendment, please rise. Orange badges only. There you go.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Please be seated. As many as are opposed, please rise.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Please be seated. Okay. The ayes do have it. The amendment to the amendment is adopted.

The issue before you is the adoption of the amendment as amended. Are you ready for the question? No debate? Mike 9, are you at the mike?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski) Mr. Chairman, Steve Hylinski, Norfolk Tower and member of the Constitution Committee. I have a motion to amend.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Go ahead.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): In the second paragraph that begins with "Standing Rules are those resolutions", following the word "resolutions", I would like to insert the words, "past by Convention Body". And then the rest of the sentence will continue with that applied to the day to day, et cetera. And I also have another one further down when you're ready.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: You have another amendment?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Next paragraph.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: You have to wait till this one is done.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Okay.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Don't confuse me, I'm getting old. Okay, there is a motion to amend the second paragraph which is on the second page, on Page 8, to insert after the word "resolutions", to insert the words "passed by the Convention Body". Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: It is moved and seconded to amend the amended amendment by the insertion of those words.

Are you ready for the question? Mike -- author.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reason that I am inserting this language is to reiterate what my Committee chairman spoke on earlier.

There was a lot of discussion, and I picked up a lot of it the last couple of days, that people were concerned that Standing Rules, being day to day internal operations would require us to bring things into our documents that we don't normally do now, such as employee handbooks, things that are done by the financial committee that don't normally show up on our documents. Which is not the intent. As my Chairman said earlier, Mr. McGowan, what NEB does today, they will continue to do. By putting this language in there is just a clarification that the stuff that goes into the Standing Rules is simply that which is past by the Convention Body; and that is all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you. Mike 7.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): Bill Buvens, D10 TRACON. What Steve said.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you for your well-thought out input, Mr. Buvens. Any further debate?

Okay. The question is on the adoption of the amendment to the amended amendment, which would insert the words, "past by the Convention Body".

As many as are in favor of its adoption, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: All those opposed, say nay.

AUDIENCE: Nay.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. The ayes have it. It is adopted. Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Mr. Chairman, Steve Hylinski, Norfolk Tower and a member of the National Constitution Committee. Motion to amend. The last paragraph where the sentence begins, "the National Executive Board shall report to the" and it is currently worded "next convention". I would like to have that wording state, "shall report to the membership at least 60 days prior to the next convention." Period. The actions taken -- or correction, it will read, "report to the membership at least 60 days prior to the next convention the actions taken by the National Executive Board" and then that sentence continues.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Shall report to the membership.....

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): At least 60 days prior to the next convention.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Stand by. Okay. To the next convention. Okay. Got it.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): After convention -- okay, you got it?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: At least 60 days prior

to the -- okay.

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: So stand by. So it would be the National Executive Board shall report to the, and then you would insert the words, "membership at least 60 days prior to the"?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Correct.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: So it would read, "shall report to the membership at least 60 days prior to the next convention", delegates, et cetera, et cetera?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): No, no. There's a little bit more wording there. Adell has got it right in front of her. It's in red.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Oh, and you'd strike the word delegates?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Correct.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Okay. Does everybody understand that? So basically what he's asking is that the report from the Executive Board does not go to the delegates at the Convention. It goes to the membership 60 days prior to the convention. Is that correct, Steve?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. It is moved and seconded to amend the amended amendment. And Mr. Hylinski.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Yes. The requirement for the -- in this whole article, the intent is for the National Executive Board to provide to -- now what I'm saying, the membership -- a report on what they have actually done with the policy and position statements. Well, providing it to the delegates prior to the next convention would be fine. I think it's more important that we actually get that report to the membership prior to the convention so that the membership can see what has been done by the National Executive Board and then advise their delegates accordingly on how to act on those issues when they come up on the floor. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you, Steve.

MICROPHONE 5 (Jerry Moss): Mike 5, Point of Information.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Mike 5.

MICROPHONE 5 (Jerry Moss): Jerry Moss, Kansas City Center, delegate. Was this not already handled by the prior amendment to the amendment inasmuch as they will publish 60 days prior to and the author's intent was for that information to go out with the convention booklets that do go to the entire membership?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: In actuality, they're

two separate issues. The initial amendment dealt with the resolutions themselves that would be voted on by the delegates going out 60 days in advance. This one talk a report on the actions that the NEB would be responsible for on what they've done with the previous years' policy statements. So it's basically a report to the membership that he's now talking about going out to the full membership.

MICROPHONE 5 (Jerry Moss): Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: I get that right, Steve?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Yes.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Check. Okay. Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Mike Blake): Thank you. Mike Blake from Boston Center. I rise in support of this amendment. I think that the intent by both the NEB and the National Constitution Committee in reality was to increase the communication to the membership. What is important is to gain direction from our membership and gain direction from the convention delegates. We need to come to the conventions prepared with what our membership would like to have done, and I think this clarifies the language, and I rise in strong support of this amendment. Thank you. Further discussion.

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike Bates): Point of Information, Mike 9.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Excuse me, I can see. Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike Bates): Okay. Mike Bates, Griffiss RAPCON. I just want to establish that it was the author's intent that, once again, for material that happens after the booklet has been published, that the NEB's actions would then be reported at convention. Is that the case?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Yeah. Steve gave me the "hi" sign. I think that's what that meant.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Yeah. Hi sign. I know things happen after things are published, and the NEB does bring to us things like resolutions, and the intent is for that stuff to still come to the convention, even after the books are published, like it does today.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you. Mike 5. Further discussion? Okay. Hearing no further discussion, the question is on the adoption of the amendment to the amended amendment, which would insert the following words, after "report to the" will be "membership at least 60 days prior to" -- and scratch the word "delegates".

As many as are in favor of the adoption of the amendment to the amendment, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: All those opposed, say nay.

AUDIENCE: (No audible reply)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: The ayes have it, it is adopted.

The issue before you is on the adoption of the amended amendment as amended and amended. Okay. Do you want me to read the whole thing to you? You guys all got it? Anybody want it read?

AUDIENCE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Yeah, yeah, there's always one. Okay. It would read as follows if adopted:

"Resolutions approved by the National Convention shall form the Standing Rules and Policy/Position Statements of the Association. All Standing Rules and Policy/Position Statements enacted by the National Executive Board shall be published 60 days prior to the National Convention and be presented to the National Convention for approval or disapproval.

Standing Rules and Policy/Position Statements established by the National Executive Board need approval by the National Convention prior to becoming Standing Rules or Policies/Position Statements of the Association.

Standing Rules are those resolutions passed by the Convention Body that apply to the day-to-day internal operations of the Association.

Policies are a means for Convention delegates to provide specific direction to the National Executive Board or National Office that are exclusive of the day-to-day internal operations of the Association. Position Statements are resolutions that do not give specific direction for action.

The National Executive Board shall report to the membership at least 60 days prior to the next Convention. The actions taken by the National Executive Board to comply with the provisions of duly passed Policies/Position Statements and recommend actions to be taken.

This amendment will not take effect until the close of this convention."

Did I get it right?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Yeah.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Is there any further discussion?

Okay. As many as are in favor of the adoption of the amended amendment, please rise. It requires a two-thirds vote, that's why you're rising.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Please be seated. Delegates only, remember. As many as are opposed, please rise.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Wow. Okay. Seeing two-thirds in the affirmative, the amendment is adopted.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Which would take us smartly to the beginning. The next business in order is the adoption of A04.....

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): Point of Privilege, Mike 2.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): Hamid Ghaffari, L.A. Center. If at all possible, Mr. Chairman, if we could get the specific portions of these amendments that are amended to somehow highlight it or underline so everyone knows the specific portions we're talking about.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: How would they put it up on the Board? Are they just coming up bold? Okay. We'll work on it. We'll see if we can make it a little easier and we'll try to step through these so we can make it clear now. The first couple might be easy.

Okay. The issue before us is the adoption of A04-001. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. It is moved and seconded to adopt A04-001. Where's my author? Mr. McGowan.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Bill McGowan from the Constitution Committee. This language exists right now as a By-Law M10. We believe it more appropriately belongs in the Constitution because it directly relates to an issue that's discussed in the Constitution. So what we're doing is we're taking the language, we're moving it into the By-Law. And what is being struck up top looks like what was a "whereas" that was inadvertently left in. But it doesn't change the intent of it. So we're going to take By-Law M10, delete it as a By-Law and move it up into the Constitution.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you, Bill. I just want to make that clear. What they're doing here with the adoption of 04-009, which gives us position papers and policy and other type of documents, these first few are a repositioning of what more properly belongs in one document rather than another. So 04-001 does not seek to change any existing language. It is currently a By-Law. They believe it belongs in the Constitution, and this is what we're voting on. So it is moved and seconded. Is there discussion? Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Move to amend. Steve

Hylinski, Norfolk Tower, member of the Constitution Committee. There's actually a typo in there, and just so no one would get the idea that we're trying to sneak something in; the third line up from the bottom, right before the number 3 that's in parentheses, the word "or" needs to be removed.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Is this an amendment or -- the way it's written in the By-Law, is the word "or" there?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): The way it's in the By-Law, the word "or" is not there. I just wanted to.....

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: The word "or" is not in the By-Law. So if we scratched the word "or" then we're still just doing a transplant?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Correct. It is then exactly what is in the By-Law as it is today. I just want to make sure.....

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. It has been moved and seconded. It really needs to come up for vote. Is anyone opposed to removing that word?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. It's removed. That was Robert's Rules for Dummies.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Is there discussion?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. As many as are in favor of the adoption of 04-001, please rise.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you. Be seated. As many as are opposed to its adoption, please rise.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Seeing two-thirds in the affirmative, it is adopted.

The next business in order is the adoption 04-002. This one appears to be the exact same thing. It appears to be a transplant from a By-Law to the Constitution. Mr. McGowan, as the author.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): 002.....

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Oh, I'm sorry. Hold it one second. It is moved. Is there a second?

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): I think it's supported by the Committee.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Oh, so it is. Okay. Mr. McGowan.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Article IV, Section 6, first full paragraph states, "The National Executive Board makes the determination of which bargaining units are in

Region X." In Article IV, Section 3, we have basically the same language. It says when NATCA union members are employed as determined by the National Executive Board. So we have the same language in two separate sections. We'd like to delete one of them. So we're moving to delete the language as it appears in Article IV, Section 6.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Oh, check. Oh, here you're seeking -- this is not a transplant. Here you're looking to drop that language out of the existing Constitution as being redundant, is that correct?

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Correct.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. It is moved and seconded to adopt 04-002. Is there any discussion?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Seeing none, as many as are in favor of the adoption of 04-002, signify by -- oh, don't say anything, just rise.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you. Be seated. As many as are opposed, please rise.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Seeing two-thirds in the affirmative, it is adopted.

The next business in order is 04-003. Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. McGowan, this again looks like a transplant and a deletion. Transplant to the Constitution and delete from the By-Laws. Is that correct? That is correct, Bill?

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): We're moving a By-Law that exists now, moving it into the Constitution where the information is addressed. It's not changing any of the language of the By-Law, it's just bringing it up into the Constitution.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. So.....

MICROPHONE 2 (Mike Dreger): Point of Information.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: I heard a Point of Information. What mike?

MICROPHONE 2 (Mike Dreger): Mike 2, Mike Dreger, Chicago Midway. Would it be appropriate to consider all these at the same time?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: You could. But by doing it individually you're giving more of an opportunity for people to amend them as they want to, as they go in, should there be any amendment. I mean, you could make a motion to consider them all at the same time. Just let me know which ones you want to consider all together.

MICROPHONE 2 (Mike Dreger): Can we -- it seems like we've had things like this in the past where we put it all up and then you can say -- any individual can remove any one of them that they want to, have further discussion, on it,

we just adopt the rest and then discuss the ones that are left.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: We could do that, but that was always done with the Executive Board resolutions. You would actually have to tell me which ones you want to combine. Because I know I heard people talking about amending some of them. So you have to tell me which ones you want to deal with all together. Well, actually, is anyone.....

MICROPHONE 2 (Mike Dreger): I would say all the rest of them, and let the people that want to amend them take the ones out that they want to deal with.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Let me get a sense of the Body. Does anyone want to do that, or do you just want to go through them one at a time? What, the whole blue book, all of it?

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Mr. Ryan, could you get the bar open? Okay. Stand by then. Give me one second.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Mike 9. Through 8, Number 8. Mr. Chairman, Mike 9.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: What mike?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Mike 9.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Steve Hylinski, Norfolk Tower, member of the Constitution Committee. I would -- I actually oppose considering them all at the same time because there is at least one in there that I would like to amend when we get to it.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Then we'll, that being the case, let's treat it properly. What you're proposing, it appears to me that what we're talking about here, what Mike 2 is talking about, is A-003 through 008. Would you disagree with that?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Correct.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. 003 through 008. So presumably you're putting forth a motion to consider to vote on all of those together?

MICROPHONE 2 (Mike Dreger): Yeah, what you said.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. Is there a second to that motion.

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Moved and seconded to consider 003 through 008 together. Okay. As many as are in favor -- and of course, with the proviso that if anybody wants to throw one out, you could do so. Okay. As many as are in favor of considering them together -- yes?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): I'd like to pull out

number 5.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Number 5 is out. Okay. Any others? Okay. So it is moved and seconded to consider 003, 004, 006, 007.....

MICROPHONE 9 (Unidentified): Point of Information.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER:008 together?

MICROPHONE 9 (Unidentified): Point of Information.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Yes.

MICROPHONE 9 (Unidentified): Number 7 doesn't say delete By-Law I9, but I believe that was the intent of the authors.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Don't know. Don't know. If it becomes an issue, you can go back and delete the By-Law afterwards.

Okay. As many as are in favor of considering them together, say aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Alls opposed, say nay.

AUDIENCE: Nay.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: The ayes have it. We'll do it together. The issue before you is on the adoption of 003, 004, 006, 007, 008. Discussion? Any of them; all of them?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Cool. As many as are in favor of the adoption of 003, 004, 006, 007, 008, please rise.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you. As many as are opposed, please rise.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Seeing two-thirds in the affirmative, they are all adopted.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: The next business in order is the adoption of A04-005. Is there any debate? Let's start with Mike -- this is put forth by Constitution Committee, so let's start with Mr. McGowan. Do you have anything to say, Mr. McGowan?

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): We're taking the section of the By-Law that refers to the Constitution Committee and moving into the Constitution that specifically addresses conventions. No intent to change the language, but to simply move it forward.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you. Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Mr. Chairman, Steve Hylinski, Norfolk Tower, National Constitution Committee. I would like to insert the words "up to six NATCA members to serve from his/her region."

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. So there is a motion to amend by inserting the words "up to" between "appoint" and "six". Does everybody see where that is? Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Moved and seconded to amend the proposed amendment. Discussion? Mr. Hylinski.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reason I would like to insert those words is because so far I have not had the privilege of trying to put together a convention. However, depending on the region, the city, the locals, staffing as it is today, it may be difficult to get six people to serve on a committee. By putting these words in, it will just allow the region that's hosting to gather up as many as they can if they can't reach that number.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Thank you.

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): Point of Order, Mike 2.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): Mr. Chairman, Hamid Ghaffari, L.A. Center. As the amendment is put forth before us, I think there is an error with that particular article that talks about nominations. I think the intent is for it to be Article VIII, Section 6.

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): There was a correction sheet that was put out on that. I don't know if everybody got it. But it should say, Article VIII, Section 6.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: It should be Article VIII, Section 6?

MICROPHONE 9 (Steve Hylinski): Right. I think it came out in everybody's package that they were given when they registered?

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Oh, there was a correction sheet? But it is Article VIII, Section 6, right, Bill? Yeah? Okay. So it is Article VIII, Section 6, not Article VII, Section 6. Okay.

The issue before us on the adoption to the amendment.

MICROPHONE 3 (Troy Swanberg): Point of Information.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Yes.

MICROPHONE 3 (Troy Swanberg): Troy Swanberg, Region X, EGL. Region X here is supporting Miami doing a group support of the convention in 2008. With the writing of this amendment, it says for a singular region. Is there -- would this amendment bypass from having anybody on multiple regions being -- having two different regions having people on that part of six.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Let's save that because the only issue before us now is on the adoption of the words "up to".

MICROPHONE 3 (Troy Swanberg): Okay.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: So let's save that, because that's a good question. We always wonder where you fall in. That's a very good question.

Okay. Any further discussion on the words "up to"? It is moved and seconded to amend the amendment.

As many as are in favor of the amendment to the amendment, say aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: All those opposed, say nay.

AUDIENCE: Nay.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Okay. The ayes have it. The amendment passes.

Now, on yours, I don't know. It doesn't change the language as it exists today, so even if this fails, the question still exists today, so I would have to say at some point in time you have to bow to a constitutional interpretation from the President on how that would work, and that way I escape this whole question.

(Laughter)

I'm sorry I didn't really answer it, but I don't really have an answer. Because your region is not really -- I mean you're a region, but you're not a geographical region. So it's kind of a weird question. Okay. Any further debate on the adoption of the amendment as amended?

As many as are in favor of the adoption of 005 as amended, please rise.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Please be seated. All opposed, please rise.

(Standing count)

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: Seeing two-thirds in the affirmative, it is adopted as amended.

It is now 12:29. I'll take a little bit of latitude, you're not supposed to break till 12:30, but I think if we entertain a motion to recess for lunch, that would be wonderful.

AUDIENCE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: So moved?

AUDIENCE: Second.

CHAIRMAN PRO TEM BARRY KRASNER: So seconded? Opposed? Done. Back here we start again at 2:00 o'clock. Delegates need to be seated according to the rules, five minutes before we start.

(Off record 12:30 p.m.)

(Afternoon Recess)

(On record 2:00 p.m.)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Good afternoon, ladies and

gentlemen. The convention will please come to order. The first order of business properly before us is a report of the Credentials Committee. Mr. Palumbo will make his report.

MR. MIKE PALUMBO: Okay. Unofficially, we'll do that first. 346 delegates, 144 alternates, 391 members, 13 staff and 89 guests. We've never had anything close to this.

Now, officially, attached is a list of the names of the voting members of the 2004 convention and their alternates who have been registered up until 1:48 p.m. today, September 11th, 2004. 346 delegates, 144 alternates representing a total of 12,838 votes. Another record.

On behalf of the committee, I move that the role of delegates hereby submitted be the official role of the voting members of the convention at this time.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It is moved and seconded to adopt the Supplemental Report of the Credentials Committee. Is there discussion? Seeing none, the question is on the adoption of the Credentials Committee Supplemental Report. Those in favor of the report, say aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, no.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The ayes have it. The Credentials Committee Supplemental Report is adopted.

I have a couple of housekeeping announcements before we get started with other business. First and foremost, don't forget the St. Louis locals are in the back of the outer hallway selling their own logo branded merchandise. It's great stuff, and as our hosts, we should support their efforts in every way.

The NATCA Charitable Foundation wants you to know that the Silent Auction Section Number 1 will close at the end of today's business. I don't know which section is Section Number 1, but Section Number 1 will close at the end of today's business. And the door prize martini basket drawing will be today at 5:00.

By way of actual business housekeeping, in my absence today, when I was taking my early shove on the front end, you addressed Amendment Number 5, and at the end of Amendment Number 5, it says to delete By-Law C4. Now, if you look in this green Constitution, By-Law C4 is past presidents attending the convention. And Barry probably did not mean to delete his ride to St. Louis. Lucky for him, the correct Constitution you should be using is the grey Constitution, and By-Law C4 in the grey Constitution is the correct By-Law that should be deleted. So if you have a green Constitution you're going to be confused all week and you should probably just rip it up and discard it. By-Law

C4 in it is not correct. It's actually C3 in the green. So if you don't have a grey one, you probably don't have the correct version. And if there are other -- here you can have this one. So the C4 that was referred to in the green one is not correct. It's the C4 in the grey one that was deleted.

And having said that, let me see if we have any more introductions before we get on with our business. I would like to make note of some notables that are with us in attendance this convention. Shirley Cohen, our court reporter for the last three conventions, is with us. And Bill Black and Dan Hubbard from Fleishman-Hillard are with us and helping us out with the logistics. I'm sure some of you know them, and they're here as well. Joe Kilgallon (ph), NATCA's staffing consultant, is a special guest with us. Kim Lloyd from Fleishman is also with us, she's the one wearing the headphones and helping out everywhere we look. Joe Musher, you heard from this morning, the one that is going to keep us all out of cufflinks is with us in attendance, and we're glad to have him. Bill Osborne will be joining us later on, our general counsel. And for those of you that have seen the member walking with the cane, that is our own Tim Haynes. Tim Haines from the Eastern Region, and the father, by the way, of your reclassification effort.

(Applause)

And we'll be talking more about him later on, I suppose. Now it gives me great pleasure according to the program at this time for a special guest, and it gives me great pleasure to introduce you to the next gentleman that will be joining us. Mr. Ed Wytkind is the President of the Transportation Trades Department at the AFL-CIO. His organization represents several million workers in the private and public sectors of aviation, rail, mass transit, trucking, highways, longshore, maritime, and other related industries.

TTD is actually the transportation and policy arm of the AFL-CIO, which represents more than 13,000,000 workers in the United States. Ed serves as TTD's daily legislative, public policy and regulatory programs and initiatives director. He serves as their chief labor spokesman, and he is their primary spokesman for the 35 transportation unions, of which we are one that are direct affiliates with the AFL-CIO. Additionally, he's an extraordinarily kind gentleman. When I got to Washington in September of 2000, I was somewhat lost. I knew where I wanted to go, I just didn't know how to get there, and Ed took me under his wing and kind of showed me the way. He assisted us in many meetings with the White House in the fall of 2000, culminating in the writing of an executive order, which when we got to the

White House that morning, and Ruth was there as well, the executive order mentioned air traffic control. And we made the point that you ought to go ahead and call it an inherently governmental function. And one of the President's advisors said, well, where would you put that? And we said, well, you could always just say, air traffic control, an inherently governmental function, comma, and Ed said, then you need to do that right there. And that is in fact, what came to pass, until the most recent occupant of the Executive Branch decided to delete those four words. But who knows. Maybe we'll get a chance to reinsert them.

Ed is my personal friend and mentor. He's a champion for working men and women everywhere. He is also extraordinarily gifted as a speaker, and he's been known to bring it on occasion. So without further ado, I would encourage you to ensure that your seatbacks and tray tables are in the upright and locked position, because it's about to get a little bumpy in here.

Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the Transportation Trades Department, my good friend, Mr. Ed Wytkind.

(Applause)

MR. ED WYTKIND: Well, good afternoon. Hope you all had enough lunch, but not too much. I don't want that turbulence in the room to create issues for you.

I'm, of course, thrilled to be here, again with my friends at the Air Traffic Controllers. To John Carr and Ruth Marlin, I just want to thank you for everything that you do to lead this union. Thank you for your support of what we do at TTD to try to make transportation workers a formidable voice in Washington, but more importantly, a group of unions that have the ability to truly improve the lives of workers in the transportation industry. You are fighters. You understand what the right thing is to do at all times. And to John, you are also my friend and you're my mentor as well because you brought a very simple common sense approach to leading a union by coming in and being a very plain speaking but aggressive leader of this union during some very, very difficult times after the 2000 elections. You've been a fighter not only for your union, but for all the unions of transportation labor. And as a member of my Executive Committee, he has been a real leader in getting all transportation unions to mobilize behind the things that you do to represent all of your members, and it is truly an honor to fight next to you in all of our battles.

I also want to thank NATCA members not just because of what you do in your kind of heroic dedication to the country, but I want to thank you for always making me feel

so welcome at your gatherings. I feel at home here, and I'm hoping that when we do our job in less than two months, that American workers will once again feel at home when they visit the nation's capitol.

(Applause)

You know, that's a pretty rude bunch in charge up there. They don't particularly like people like me. They really don't like people like you because the biggest nightmare to this White House are activists who care more than they do about the issues, about the people of this country and about the greatness of the United States. And you know, as union members and activists, we all share a very deep belief in the value of labor and the strong respect for the mission of our nation's air traffic controllers and other FAA professionals.

And on the third anniversary of the 911 attacks, we share a mosaic of emotions that still burn deeply inside all of us three years later; grief and sorrow for the victims and their families, pride and honor for those who serve our country, and a renewed commitment to core values of freedom and community. And yes, we do mourn those who were murdered by brutal terrorists, trying to spread their hatred around the world, but we celebrate the countless acts by ordinary working people that save so many lives. This anniversary is a reminder for all of us beyond our personal identities, as union or non-union workers. As democrats, republicans, independents. As Peter DeFazio said earlier, libertarians. Whatever you are beyond the differences of where we may live, what we might look like, how we might vote, we are above all, Americans. And on that terrible day three years ago when our country needed a handful of men and women to go beyond the call, it was you who stood up and answered that call. You responded with everything that duty, honor, courage and dedication could possibly demand. You help bring order out of chaos in the midst of confusion when nobody could grasp the enormity of what was happening. And indeed, many were succumbing to panic. You stayed focused on one thing, bringing those planes down. Yes, we all know the statistics. But it's not about statistics. It's about a fairly remarkable few hours in our country's history with 5,000 planes, 400,000 passengers, and zero accidents. And yes, it was a feat really that has no parallel in the history of commercial aviation.

In my judgment, when ordinary men and women rise up in the face of great challenges and perform without flaw, without fear, we call them heros. Indeed you are heros, your members are heros, and indeed the American people think you are heros.

(Applause)

But has our government thanked you? Has our government sat down with you in good faith as people who have clearly earned respect and admiration to map out the future of air transportation? No.

Today is a very somber day for many of us, if not all of us. And we need to talk about the lessons of 9/11. We can't stop talking about the lessons of 9/11. The lessons of 9/11 are not what the President wants them to be, which is wrap the flag around me and give me four more years. That's not the lesson I'm talking about. And the elections this fall mean a lot more than you think they mean. We hear it all the time, it's the election of a lifetime. Every four years. It's always an election of a lifetime. If we don't get it right this time, the world as we know it ends.

You know, a lot of you have seen me stand at the podium and yell a lot. Perhaps some of you haven't. I yell a lot about the Bush Administration and its policies. But I wish I didn't have to do that today. I wish I lived in a country where the 9/11 anniversary would be a day of solemn respect and remembrance for the victims and their families, and a day to thank all those who protect our freedom. But too many politicians have taken that away from us. Too many politicians have exploited and coopted for own gain, September 11th. I wish it were not a day for yelling and finger pointing and name calling. But too much has happened these last few weeks. Too much has been done to destroy that which we stand for in this country. And you know what, I'm not going to stand down; sorry. I know it's an anniversary, but I'm not going to stand down. So you're going to get a lot more yelling today. And I got a lot to say, so be patient.

People have been shamelessly hiding behind a phoney veil of God and Country and telling us that there's only one brand of patriotism in this country. And that there's only one way to think, one way to act, and one way to truly love your country. They slander the patriotism and the service of those who want to take this country in a different and I think better direction. They use fear as a political weapon trying to scare people into both a silent submission and a fear of change. There's a one-way street, and I, for one, don't like where it goes. There have been too many attacks and too many lies for us not to return the fire. So let's begin the fire. But when we fire back, let's make sure that we fulfill our duty to fight for what is right. And I do think that what's right on a day like this is reflect on the path of our country, where it has traveled over the past three years. And look ahead and think about where we hope this country will go in the future.

On 9/11 I believe every American made a solemn unspoken

pledge to honor the sacrifice of the victims by renewing our faith in our country, to step out together, step up together to meet the challenge of our enemies. And above all, to never forget the lessons of that day. And what were they?

First, there can be no substitute for vigilance. You know, the Boy Scouts say, "Always be Prepared." That's the standard that NATCA members have always tried to meet. That's why you invest in your training. That's why you demand better technology, and why you demand the investments in modernization that this air traffic system so desperately needs. Because you know that being prepared means more than just having the pieces in place today. It also means looking ahead and taking the necessary steps to ensure that we are ready for whatever may be coming down the road. You know the lesson, you live it every day. Your members live it every day. But has this lesson been learned at the highest level of government? Are our leaders living up to their pledge to do all that's in their power to keep us prepared for any eventuality. I submit to you, the answer is no.

Can you believe that even as the memories of 9/11 were just a few days old, the administration was busy pushing ahead with its risky plans to privatize air traffic control? Can you believe that they devalue your work so much that they're making no plans to replace you when you retired. What the President does not understand is that safety isn't just something that happens; it is the product of years of commitment. Years of commitment. The hard work and dedication that workers in the FAA, air traffic controllers and all the professionals give to this country, it requires training, recruitment of the best and the brightest, and a commitment not just to a job but to a mission. And you and I know that a job and a mission are not the same thing. A job is what you do to put food on the table. A mission is a deep commitment to a set of core values that you carry in your heart. There is a difference. That's why our most critical national services have always been in the hands of workers who aren't thinking about the bottom line. We have always relied on men and women who made a choice, a conscious decision not just to work, but to serve. That's true in military and police and fire and social services, among the nation's teachers who teach our children right and wrong. And it's true for air traffic control, my friend. Because there are certain duties that demand something more. I don't know air traffic control professional who just thinks he or she is doing a job. I know a lot of them who understand in their gut what it means to be serving on a mission, and a privatized air traffic control system will never be able to replicate that dedication.

(Applause)

Because, as I say all the time, you cannot buy commitment and you cannot outsource character.

(Applause)

America has the safest air traffic system in the world because of commitment and character. Because we have men and women who aren't just good at their job; they're committed to their goal. And the only measure of success they're interested in is the successful completion of each day's mission, and the safety of every passenger in our skies. But unfortunately this Administration just doesn't get it. For this crowd, downsizing our government, reducing our reliance on public service, outsourcing, contracting out anything you can is a religion, regardless of the consequences. And that's a real concern; not just for you. Not just for air travelers. It is a concern for the nation's people who travel, who go to work every day, who care about the quality and the fabric of this country and the services that it provides. So this is a fight that's much bigger than you and me. Because you know what, here's what I say. I think mission accomplished, it's not enough just to say mission accomplished. It means a lot more than just putting up a pretty sign and getting a nice crowd out there.

You know, I watched the photo opps of the White House. They're very good at them. But they ring hollow when you really pay attention to what they do. You can't just wear patriotism and not carry it out every day. You can't just walk around and talk to people in these sound-by kind of events, and make it look like you're a patriot and nobody who's not on your side isn't. And it violates everything we're supposed to be learning from what we experience on 9/11.

The second lesson of that day is that America is strongest when we stand united. I know everyone here remembers that day as if it just happened. We knew in our bones that we were witnesses to an extraordinary moment. We all understood on that day what it means to be an American as well. What it takes to defend the values that we hold closest to our hearts, and what the true face of sacrifice looks like. What could Americans not have accomplished on the wake of that day. We were ready to put aside the petty divisions of party, race, and region. We could have changed our country forever. But it never happened. Our leaders didn't do the things it would have taken to keep us united, and inspire this country to achieve great things. They committed a sin that has no parallel in public service. Instead of rallying working men and women, instead of rallying all the people of this country whose heroic deeds

guided our nation in a very dark time, they chose to stick it to the workers of this country and they chose to stick to the same script they've been reading since the first day they took office; privatize, weaken workers and their unions. Strengthen corporate power. Ignore the public interest. Divide the country with phony symbolism. Well, you know what? I don't know about you, but I believe putting air safety in the hands of the same bunch that gave us ENRON, Worldcom and Dick Cheney is a frightening proposition, and you know what, it's just not going to happen in this country.

But if that proposition isn't frightening enough on the 10th of September, you know what, it became unconscionable on September 12th. You know, that doesn't mean the Bush administration has to agree with us all the time. I'm wrong at least half percent of the time. You know, that leaves some room, don't you think, for compromise? But you know what? They have an obligation to treat us with some basic respect and dignity. Why? Because you represent tax payers. You represent people that go to work every day and are law abiding, and raise their kids and pay the mortgage, and they do all the things that this president has never had to do. So you know what? We earn a little more respect, and we certainly earn a lot more dignity than we have.

(Applause)

We're not asking for a lot. At a moment of national unity, you don't go for the jugular. You don't thank the men and women who brought the planes down safely by trying to sell their jobs to the lowest bidder, because in the end, this is not about policy. This has nothing to do with Washington. And it's not about dollars and sense. It's about right and wrong. The right thing to do would have been to sit down with you and understand your views and understand that the workers, the front line workers in the air traffic system know a hell of a lot more than George Bush does about an air transportation system. The right thing to do was to sit down with someone like Pete Zeleski (ph). Pete was probably the first person in America to recognize that planes were being hijacked, and that our nation was under attack. Without flinching, without faltering, he responded to the challenge like thousands and thousands nationwide. And he rose to the occasion. And he maintained the coolness and professionalism that so many of you did to help save the day when it was time to land those planes.

And they didn't talk to Danielle O'Brien (ph), who followed the path of American Flight 77 as they hit the Pentagon. She dealt with a terrible shock, and then she pulled her wits together and then she helped land all those

planes very safely, right? They didn't talk to you. They walked away from you. They didn't talk to air traffic control. They could have talked to any single air traffic controller, from a 25 year veteran to a guy that just started the job that day. And let me say it again, all of them knew a hell of a lot more about air transportation safety than George W. Bush.

(Applause)

Had the administration only taken the time to have those conversations, they may have learned that you can't put a price tag on that kind of confidence, professionalism, good judgment and steady nerves. And they may have understood that you don't undermine the very men and women who have proven themselves on the hardest imaginable challenge. But you didn't talk to Pete Zeleski (ph) or Danielle O'Brien (ph) or any of you. They chose a very different path. They chose to keep their own counsel. You got to fire all those lawyers. And to follow their own roadmap. They chose to treat NATCA as a roadblock on the road to a safer America. Well, you know what, if you took a poll of this country, I assure you that if they had a choice between George W. Bush and NATCA on whether they're going to get from Point A to Point B safely, you will slam-dunk them in that poll every single day.

(Applause)

And you know what, a guy who spent his Vietnam years supposedly patrolling the skies of Central Texas ought to know better, but you know, he doesn't. So three years later, we got to call it like we see it. We got to call it like we see it. And that's what's on the table the next two months.

The way this administration has treated you is just a plain disgrace. A disgrace because it weakens America. A disgrace because it undermines our nation's safety, and above all, a disgrace because it divides this country when the lessons of 9/11 tell us that when we are at our best, we are at our best when we are united as a nation.

And finally, the third important lesson is that moments of great challenge bring the best out of Americans, and that best in each of us comes shining through. You know, we didn't cower away in fear back away. We stepped up as a country, as a nation, as individuals. Entire communities rallied together. Small acts of kindness. Hundreds of millions of dollars donated to help the victims. Waves of new recruits signed up to defend our country. Americans responded in ways large and small. And each act was a very embodiment of patriotism.

We learned during those tough days that the best kind of patriotism isn't announced from a podium. It's not

demonstrated by how many flags you wave or by how much red, white and blue you wear. And in this election too many people are trying to tell us that the only way to be patriotic is to belong to one party and not the other. Too many people are trying to tell us that putting in a hard day's work isn't patriotic enough to deserve a tax break. You also have to be a millionaire.

Too many people are trying to tell us that supporting a department of Homeland Security isn't patriotic enough, you need to agree to make it a union-free zone too. And way, way too many people who have never seen a day of combat in their lives are doing a disservice to those who have by trying to tell us that putting your life on the line in Vietnam isn't enough. You have to come home and think like they do too.

(Applause)

We reject that kind of armchair patriotism. We believe that, at its best, patriotism isn't expressed in words, but in deeds. It's not shown in photo opps but in actions. The best kind of patriotism is on display by NATCA members, and all of America's worker everyday, working men and women who love their families, cherish their freedoms, believe that this is the greatest nation on the planet. It is shown in the work you do with every sunrise, when you oversee the morning push and get thousands of people on their way, because that is an act of patriotism. A photo opp on national TV is not an act of patriotism.

What is an act of patriotism is when you bring a plane down safely during routine circumstances and at more challenging times. Those are acts of patriotism. Patriotism is expressed in the fulfillment of duties great and small by all Americans, by all members of all political parties in our country. And the most patriotic thing that this administration or any other can do is honor those who keep our country strong and secure.

But I don't see much evidence of that. In fact, I see plenty of evidence that this president is indifferent at best, hostile, in actuality, to the value of those who work for a living; trouncing overtime pay, sitting idly by as millions see their pensions destroyed, and refusing to do something about millions of children. We're the richest country in the world. Millions of children who have no healthcare and go to be hungry every night. Anybody heard him talk about a solution to that? There are no solutions to that until we make a change in the oval office.

This Labor Day, George Bush told us where he was. Labor Day, honor our labor. Is there anything more basic than a president should do? Do you know, he became the first president in modern history who did not spend Labor

Day honoring workers. Instead, he went out and -- believe it or not, I know you'll be shocked, attacked the patriotism of those who disagree with him. Of course, you're assuming, well, he sent the VP out to do it, right, Dick Cheney? He'll give the Labor Day speech, right? I mean, hell, Haliburton's Dick Cheney is a guy used to getting other people's work contracted out to him. Makes sense, right? But no, on the very day that Bill Clinton was undergoing eight hours of surgery, Dick Cheney went out and, yes, this is true, blasted the Clinton Administration for not having done enough on the war on terrorism. And just to make sure he could outdo himself, Dick Cheney came out the next day and said that a Kerry victory in November would bring another terrorist attack on U.S. soil. He said, quote, if we make the wrong choice, the danger is that we'll get hit again. You know, scaring people for our own political gain is as low as it gets. It violates everything for which this country stands. And if you hear nothing else today, these folks have got to go.

(Applause)

We are overdue for an administration that recognizes and values the contribution of NATCA members and all union members and all working people in this country. We must have an administration that puts peoples' safety ahead of profits of corporations. We must have an administration that respects the quiet, everyday heroism of men and women who devote themselves to more than just their job, but commit themselves to a mission. And we must have an administration that has the wisdom, the respect, the common sense to sit down with you, America's air traffic controllers, to ensure the strength and the safety of our air traffic system.

But you know what, there is good news. There is a man on the ballot who is right for this country. Indeed, help is on the way. John Kerry has demonstrated throughout his life that a dedication of the same sense of mission and service that embodies the values of you and your members and the very best of our country. He fought to make sure that you and all your brothers and sisters across working America had a voice in our government. He believed from his first days in office, that our government truly is supposed to serve the people, not just the wealthy or the corporate elites. He endorsed the most aggressive labor law reform in the history of presidential politics by saying that if you choose a union, if you get a majority -- excuse me, to choose a union, you will become a union. You won't get delayed for 15, 20 years like we see in this country. No other major party candidate for office facing the people has ever endorsed a more aggressive labor law reform than John

Kerry.

(Applause)

And his record shows he's the kind of man who won't ignore voices, he won't shy away from standing up for us, and he won't undermine our mission. And you know, my friends, this is the presidency of the United States. This isn't for dog catcher. This isn't for some local grand Pooh-bah election. This is the President of the United States, the most powerful nation in the world. That's what's on this table. And you know what? The President's record is on the ballot. And you know what? This is what I say to the President, this is pretty simple stuff. Mr. President, you're not allowed to demean, undermine, and demonize the very workers, government workers who serve you, and then ask them to give you four more years.

(Applause)

Mr. President, you don't get to starve the middle class to push your vision for the country that is bankrupting major industries like the airlines, destroying jobs and pensions, and putting air safety up for sale and then ask the middle class for four more years. So you know what, Mr. President, I have got some bad news for you. You've worn out your welcome, and we're not buying what you're selling. And you know what's even worse, Mr. President? Your interview didn't go real well. So American workers are going to fire you on Judgment Day in November, I promise you that.

(Applause)

But for that to happen, over the next 52 days, we're going to have to fight like hell for John Kerry, for our future. It's going to be a hard campaign and a close election. As we learned in the last one, the winner doesn't always win. We got to be a part of that victory. Our voices must be very loud. We must engage our friends and our neighbors, and we need to challenge them to think about what's at stake. We have the strength to make a difference. And I got news for you guys; you're not going to like it, but whatever you're doing, it's not enough. And then the next day, you wake up and you do more, it's still not enough. I'm asking for 52 days. That's all I need is 52 days to change the direction of this country. So if you think you're doing enough, you're not doing enough. And make sure you wake up tomorrow morning and realize you got to do more, because there's too much at stake. We have to challenge them. We have to be unified. We must be united in our purpose for what's right for this country, united in our concern for air safety, and for the future of this country. United in our hopes for our country. United in our commitment to our shared mission, and united in our

understanding that the road to a stronger and safer America runs through the ballot box.

So I ask you all to get involved. We have the next two months to shape this country's direction. On the third anniversary of 9/11, there can be no better way to honor the thousands who lost their lives, and the heroism of those who saved thousands more than by building a better America. Let us learn those lessons of September 11th. Be prepared, stand united, and let our greatest strength shine through in times of adversity. And don't let them ever question your patriotism because you don't think like them and don't support them. Let us move forward to build a future we all believe in and create the strong America that we all deserve. Thank you. God bless this union and this great country.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: And our grateful thanks to his wife for loaning us to him on his 15th wedding anniversary.

(Applause)

As a point of general knowledge, this may be the only grey constitution in the house. Which is kind of convenient since I need one.

(Laughter)

Actually, I have been noted that most of you have the green copy. But we believe with some degree of certainty that the only real notable difference is the one we've already covered. So we're going to keep a very close eye on that, and if there's another sort of procedural or practical issue dealing with any of the amendments or resolutions that refer to things in the constitution, we'll double-check to make sure that it is as correct in the green as it is in the grey. And hopefully we'll be able to move forward from there. If need be, we'll take this one out and make 1,100 copies. But for now, I'm told that we think that the only major difference was the numbering difference that you'd already seen.

The next order of business properly before you is the one I'm about to describe. I believe it is Number 10, A04-010. Is there a second? I'll give you a moment to find that. Number 10 in the blue book, Page 8, left side. Article III, Section 2, A04-010, authored by Bill McGowan. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved and seconded to adopt A04-010. Is there discussion? And is Bill McGowan present? Bill, Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): If you could give me just a minute, I can explain the difference between the grey and the green.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Yes, we'd love that.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): There's only one big thing. If you look at the green one under Section 3, you see that first?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It's not the part about pay, is it?

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): No.

(Laughter)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: All right. Go ahead, then.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): But it figures that it would hit the only one that makes a difference. Section C, that first one is not numbered. It just runs right into it. It says a compilation of all pertinent resolutions. That should have a number, that should be Number 1. So then it just pushes all the other ones down by one.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: So section C should have a Number 1 next to the word a compilation?

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Correct.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: And Number 2, for constitutional amendment, 3 for.....

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Correct. And that's why they're out of order. We had numerous printing errors. If you look at the top of it, they spelled our name wrong in the header. And they had a bunch of other misprints and misspellings, so that's why we had the grey one reprinted. As far as we're aware, about the only difference was C.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Very well. Is everyone familiar with that? Everybody good with that? Excellent. And you may now address A04-010.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): And the only other difference, there is no Section Q. They numbered R twice.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Very well.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Those are the only two changes of any substance.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Very well. Press on.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Resolution 10 as its written, as the Constitution exists right now, there is a period after the word appeal. What I am adding is by the association to strike out the word NATCA does not exist, that's incorrect, that's a misprint. We've had an instance of at least one, where somebody has been removed from the Agency and supposedly they've been appealing their removal on their own on the outside for years and years, and it's gone on. We just want to clarify that when a member has been removed, and they are appealing it, as long as NATCA is involved in the appeal, whether we're paying for MSPB, whether we're participating in it, whether we're providing some sort of support, that individual is a member in good standing. However, if at some point NATCA decides we are no

longer involved in the appeal, then that individual cannot claim that they are still a member of the Association.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you. Is there discussion? The question is on the adoption of Amendment A04-010. Those in favor of the amendment, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, say no.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Hearing two-thirds in the affirmative, Amendment 04-010 is adopted.

The next question before you is on the adoption Amendment 04-011. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: 04-011, is there a second?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Hearing no second, Amendment 04-011 is not properly before you.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The next question before you is on the adoption of Amendment A04-012. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved and seconded to adopt Amendment A04-012. Is there discussion? And is Carol in the room?

MICROPHONE (Carol Branaman): Here I am.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 9, Carol Branaman.

MICROPHONE 9 (Carol Branaman): This change just clarifies intent. The language that's currently written implies that the National Executive Board is always responsible for the creation of policy, when, in fact, it is the Convention Body that creates policy for the organization at our conventions. And this change simply makes that intent clear.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you. Is there further discussion? Seeing no further discussion, the question is on the adoption of A04-012. Those in favor of the amendment, say aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, say no.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Hearing two-thirds in the affirmative, Amendment 04-012 is adopted.

The next question in your book A04-013 has already been dealt with by previous business. Actually your Proposal Number I think 2 in the book addressed that, and therefore A04-013 is moot and will not be considered.

The next question properly before you is on the adoption of Amendment A04-014. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: I did not hear. I heard something. Was that a second for 014?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved and seconded to adopt A04-014. Is there discussion? Mr. McGowan at Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Bill McGowan, Boston Center. After talking with the parliamentarian, we met in the Spring of '03. He was very diplomatic and polite about it, but most associations don't have their charters have charters and their By-Laws published. This is opening the door for us to be able, if we decide that we want to strike the charters and them maintained at the National Executive Board. Rather than having our charters etched in stone and we can't touch them for two years, this would allow them to be more fluid. Some committees have them; some don't. It's kind of a hodgepodge anyway. But this would allow us to be able to store them offline and not have to have them passed at every convention.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, Mike 3. Further discussion? Where did you all eat, Sleepy's?

Seeing no further discussion, the question before you is on the adoption of Amendment A04-014. All those in favor of its adoption, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, say no.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Hearing two-thirds in the affirmative, A04-014 is adopted.

The next question before you the adoption of A04-015. Is there a second? Say again? Well, in not hearing a second, it fails anyway.

The next item before you is on the adoption of A04-016. And I believe the author requested to drop that. Is that correct? 016 is withdrawn?

AUDIENCE: Yes.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: 016 is withdrawn. Which moves us smartly to the adoption -- we can be done by 3:00, the adoption of Amendment A04-017.

MICROPHONE 9 (George Lloyd): Point of Information, Mike 9.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 9er.

MICROPHONE 9 (George Lloyd): George Lloyd, Anchorage approach, Chairman of the National Election Committee. I'm the author of 017, and I wish to withdraw it.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: In its entirety?

MICROPHONE 9 (George Lloyd): In its entirety. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: A04-017 and all its five pages are withdrawn.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Anybody for an early shove? There will be no debate. Let me just double-check my calendar here to make sure we're not bumping into something else scheduled.

The next item correctly before you the adoption of A04-018, all the way up on Page 16. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved and seconded to adopt A04-018. Is there discussion? And who speaks on behalf of the authors?

MICROPHONE 9 (George Lloyd): George Lloyd, Anchorage Approach, Chairman of the National Election Committee.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (George Lloyd): In Article VII, there is a section in there, and it talks about mail, single word, mail. And then down in the bottom, mailing. And we've changed that to distribution. This will allow the Election Committee to be able to use other forms of balloting other than mail balloting. There is other technology out there today that is being developed that's currently out there that would allow the Election Committee to conduct the election electronically online, telephone, and there are other options out there. But by having the word "mail" and "mailing" in there, it restricts us to a paper ballot for the future, and the costs for paper ballots are pretty high.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Is there further discussion on this amendment? Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Peter Menzel): Yes, Mr. Chairman. Peter Menzel (ph) of Seattle Tower. I have a request, please, a clarification. In reading the new wording, I'm not ensured in my mind that every member would have an opportunity to vote in case there was a meeting held to vote or something like that. I'd want to be assured that every member would have an opportunity to vote.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: George, do you care to address that?

MICROPHONE 9 (George Lloyd): Every member would still have an opportunity to vote. There would still be mailing in the sense of you'd still require by the Department of Labor to be mailed a Notice of Election and an Election Package. What this would eliminate is the mail-back portion when you're able to do it either online or on the telephone or some other avenue to do that. It just allows us to be able to explore those other options and still stay within the Department of Labor guidelines. It doesn't take anything away.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Further discussion? Mike 8.

MICROPHONE 8 (Indiscernible) : (Indiscernible), New

York Center. Point of Information. Just the term of a secret ballot vote; doesn't that specifically imply a mailing vote, not a possible computerized or a phone vote?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: I believe it's the intent of the author that it be a secret ballot between you and whatever methodology they choose. Is that correct, George?

MICROPHONE 9 (George Lloyd): That is correct, John. The balloting would still be secret. Your vote would still be secret. There would be no way for anyone to find out how you voted.

MICROPHONE 8 (Indiscernible): But that clearly change your intent to electronic or otherwise if we actually use secret ballot?

MICROPHONE 9 (George Lloyd): The format in order to vote in the ones that we looked at, it would not take away your ability to have a secret ballot vote because the ballot itself, that is, the block in order to vote in, whether that be an electronic ballot or a paper ballot, they're the same.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Was there someone else at Mike 9? Further discussion? Are you ready for the question? Are you still here?

The question is on the adoption of Amendment A04-018. Those in favor of the amendment, please say aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, say no.

AUDIENCE: No.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Hearing two-thirds in the affirmative, the Amendment 04-018 is adopted.

The next question before you A04-019er.

MICROPHONE 4 (Ruth Marlin): Mr. Chairman?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 4.

MICROPHONE 4 (Ruth Marlin): That proposal has been amended. The.....

AUDIENCE: Who are you?

MICROPHONE 4 (Ruth Marlin): Ruth Marlin, Miami Center.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, ma'am.

MICROPHONE 4 (Ruth Marlin): This wording has been modified slightly and the language is up at the front desk.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The language on A04-019er, the one we're currently discussing?

MICROPHONE 4 (Ruth Marlin): Correct, amended by the author.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Is the language on the sheet describing the National Executive Board's action, is that the sheet you describe, or is there another sheet back there? I don't know.

MICROPHONE 4 (Ruth Marlin): That -- let me read it.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The one that's lined on the left margin there.

MICROPHONE 4 (Ruth Marlin): That is correct.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Does everyone have the amended language?

AUDIENCE: No.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: And we believe it to be on a sheet that it begins at the top with the National Executive Board's Recommendation on Adoption. Let's take a moment and make those available to the delegates. They're on the table where the water is kept in the back of the room. If we could get a couple Sargent-at-Arms to maybe grab a handful and distribute those? If you do not have a sheet that says, "National Executive Board Recommendations", I believe is how it's phrased across the top of it. And it's pretty tight printing. And then on the left margin, about two-thirds of the way down, there's some underlined text. If you do not have one of those, please raise your hand. We'll have a Sargent-At-Arms bring you a copy around, and that will form the corrected language for A04-019er, and we'll proceed when everyone has those. And there's a big group of folks over there in the Northwest Mountain and Alaskan Region that need them. Back in the middle of Great Lakes need them. Western Pacific needs them. Okay, I need one.

(Pause)

We need a couple up here, Ruth. If a Sargent-At-Arms would bring a couple of those up to the podium, that would be appreciated as well. Anybody else who still does not have the sheet I described, raise your hand. Anybody, delegates, that are lacking the sheet? Is there one there on the aisle?

And I will read to you the new language which forms the insert in A04-019er. The author has amended Item 3, second paragraph, first sentence, as follows. And it's the one which in your blue book begins with the words "upon receipt". The new language shall read, as passed out to you, "Upon receipt of an election protest, the National Election Committee shall notify all candidates involved in the protested election and, in the case of a local election, the local Election Committee and the Local President of the protest and the nature of the charges."

And is there anyone in the hall, a delegate, who still does not have that language?

Seeing no one, that language, as I read it, is inserted for the text under 3, second paragraph. And Ms. Marlin, you may proceed.

First of all, was that seconded? I don't think it was seconded, so let's do that again.

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you very much. It has been

moved and seconded. Ms. Marlin, Mike 4.

MICROPHONE 4 (Ruth Marlin): Thank you. At our last convention, we had three proposals for handling of election protests. The delegate asked that we put those together so they had one to work with. We did so, but in merging those three different proposals, we have some redundant language.

This is largely an attempt to clean it up. However, it does also eliminate a requirement for certified mail. We had a protest that came in, and the sole matter of dispute was the determination of whether or not overnight mail was certified mail, and it became somewhat convoluted. The question became, if you have properly delivered an election protest to the Election Committee, should that be heard or should we have artificial barriers. So there was an elimination of that provision. But most of the deletions only refer to provisions that are accompanied elsewhere in the text of the proposal. So it is primarily cleanup with the exception of removing the certified mail requirement.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, Mike 4. Is there further discussion or debate?

Seeing none, the question is on the adoption of A04-019er with the inserted text as previously described. Those in favor of the amendment as described, say aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, say no.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The ayes have it. Amendment 04-019er is adopted.

The next question before you is on the adoption of Amendment A04-020. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved and seconded to adopt A04-020. And prior to giving the author the right of first debate, which is his right, I am going to step out onto the procedural Chair here and rule that if adopted, Amendment A04-020 cannot take effect until the end of this convention, because of Department of Labor laws, because of the way delegates are elected, because of the way delegates are viewed in the eyes of the law and labor, it would be untoward, if not probably illegal to change the methodology in which we account for delegates. Some people may have been ascribed an alternate badge, when in fact, they wanted to be a delegate. Some people may not be here who wanted to be a delegate. And if we're going to change the methodology by which we count delegates, it's only fair that we give notice to the participants, notice to the members that you represent, and allow them an opportunity to then run for those positions or to use whatever local methodology you have. So without objection, the Chair is going to rule that

if adopted, A04-020 will not go into effect until the termination of this convention.

Having said that, Mike 7.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): Bill Buvens, D10 TRACON. The first thing I want to point out is the part that's underlined that says up to a maximum of three total delegates is not there. It was removed prior to being submitted. It somehow got added in there. So this -- what I am about to talk about will not apply there because you will not be any limit to the number of delegates you can bring with that.

With that being said, right now the threshold that we have to go from one delegate to two delegates is 150. So if you have -- any local that has up to 149 people get one delegate. But then you go to 150, you get two delegates, and then the next 50 up to 200, you get a second delegate, and all that. All I'm trying to propose here is that the threshold be lowered to 100. If you have 100 members, you have a delegate. If you have 101 members, or for every 50 members thereof, you get an additional delegate. It's going to increase the number of delegates by approximately 30 that we're going to have. It doesn't mean you have to bring it. It just means that you're entitled to that many delegates. That's pretty much it. It lowers the threshold and provides a more even thing. I know I heard there was a concern from some of the centers that it would dilute the voting strength of the center. Actually it doesn't; it gives you an extra delegate. So that's it.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Barry Krasner): Mr. Chairman, Barry Krasner, New York TRACON. I stand opposed to this amendment. If you look back at the history of where our voting came from, in order to make for a more easy transition into getting things passed, we've decided on a voice vote, then a standing count, and a roll call vote.

In that scenario, as it stands now, in actuality, the small facilities greatly outweigh the large facilities in a voice vote; it's just the way it is, and we've accepted that as our practice because the large facilities always had the roll call vote to fall back on, if it gets right down to it. By changing that, you are going to increase your number of delegates. You can increase them more for the small facilities, which by the way, always complain about not having enough money to get here anyway. And you're going to increase it on the small side. And my fear is by doing this, you're going to drive more and more issues to a roll call vote, and you're going to impede the business of the convention. And therefore, I stand opposed to it. But not being a delegate, I can't amend it.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, sir.

MICROPHONE 1 (Scott Conde): Point of Information.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: From which mike?

MICROPHONE 1 (Scott Conde): Mike 1.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 1.

MICROPHONE 1 (Scott Conde): Scott Conde, Oakland Center. I don't know if we have this information available, but I would like to know the number of facilities per region that have an excess of 100 people in them.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The Chair certainly does not have that information readily available, and I will ask of the author, assuming he does not. He does not. I would say that the information you seek is not readily available, and probably is only available at this hour by a poll of the facilities present, and then you would basically be polling them on reporting out their own membership numbers. I don't have that information.

MICROPHONE 1 (Scott Conde): Okay. Without that, I would ask for the right of discussion, momentarily. I just believe that -- I'm standing against this amendment because I believe it's going to artificially skew even to a greater extent the voting power of certain regions over others simply by the number of facilities you have that will add delegates in the voice vote; to echo Mr. Krasner's thoughts as well.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you. Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Garth Koleszar): Point of Information, Mike 2. Garth Koleszar, L.A. Center. How would the passage of this amendment address the contradiction that now exists in the contract which states that each facility shall get delegates based on the old numbers?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: You said contract, did you mean constitution?

MICROPHONE 2 (Garth Koleszar): No. The contract stipulates how many delegates each local will get for official time off the Boards to attend the convention.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Oh, I see.

MICROPHONE 7 (Unidentified): Point of information, Number 7.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Let me see what we can come up with on this Point of Information first. Your question was how does this affect that?

MICROPHONE 2 (Garth Koleszar): Correct.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: I must assume -- I'll speak for the author, and he can correct me if I'm wrong, but I must assume he considered this point independently of that one. Is that correct?

MICROPHONE 2 (Garth Koleszar): So then the contract language would remain unchanged?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The contract language remains an agreement between us and the employer. This language is an agreement between us and us. So they would be considered separately and it would remain as-is until negotiated by the world's finest contract negotiating team, which we will be Chairing shortly. Mike 7.

MICROPHONE 7 (Jeff Wonser): Jeff Wonser, Cincinnati Tower. Would the Chair be willing to request the delegates who have more than 100 members in their facility to please raise their hands?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: I'd be willing to entertain it as an unofficial and unscientific poll. If you guys would like to see that, let's give it a shot. And delegate only from facilities. All facilities with more than 100 members, please raise your hands.

AUDIENCE: Fac rep or all of them? Centers?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: I think they just wanted over 100. So if you have 400, that's over 100.

(Laughter)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Don't raise all four of your hands. Does that give anyone who wanted to see it what they wanted? And is there any further discussion, since I see no one at the microphones? Any discussion?

The question is on the amendment 04-020, and its adoption. Those in favor of the adoption of Amendment 04-020, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, no.

AUDIENCE: No.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Not hearing two-thirds in the affirmative, A04-020 is defeated.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): Mr. Chairman, Mike 7.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 7.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): Bill Buvens, D10. Before we go to this next one, I want to withdraw two other ones that are in the book.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Okay. Why don't you identify those for the chair?

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): A04-026.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: A04-026. Is there any objection to its withdrawal?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Without objection, 026 is withdrawn.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): And the other one is Resolution R04-027.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: And we don't have to have concurrence. The resolution R04-027 is withdrawn.

And now the question before you is on the adoption of

Amendment A04-021. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: A04-021, is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Oh, just in the nick of time.

Having been moved and seconded, the question is on the adoption of A04-021. Is there discussion? Mike 7.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): Bill Buvens, D10.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Yes, sir.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): All this does is clean up some language in here. It doesn't change anything that we do right now. The wording that I chose -- first off when we also say -- where it says "Policies and By-Laws" in here would be changed to the new language that was passed with A-009, so you know, it will fit with what we have already done this morning. But all this does is just clean up language that's currently in there. I think it makes it easier to read than the way it was before.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: But are you changing what is in the blue book?

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): No. The way that it reads in the blue book is like this. This would become effective immediately if it passes. And then 009 where our "By-Laws and Policies" are stated here would be changed automatically because of the passage of 009.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Very well. Okay. I just wanted to make sure you weren't amending this on the fly. Is there discussion?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: None? The question then is on the adoption of Amendment A04-021. Those in favor signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, no.

AUDIENCE: No.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Let's just stretch our legs anyway. Those in favor, please stand up. Delegates only. (Standing count)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: All right. Please be seated. Those opposed, please stand up. Delegates only. Red badges only. (Standing count)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: And seeing two-thirds in the affirmative, A04-021 is adopted.

The question then is on the adoption of A04-022. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: 04-022, a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved and seconded to adopt A04-022. Is there discussion? And is the author present? I don't know if he is or not.

AUDIENCE: Not present.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Not present?

AUDIENCE: No.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Very well. Is there discussion by anyone who is not the author? I see. I tell you. Whatever we had for lunch, let's have it again. Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Pete Healy): Mike 2.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Pete Healy): Thank you, Pete Healy, ESW Local. I rise in opposition to this amendment. I believe the language in here is so convoluted that elections can be gained, and I oppose that. I support the spirit of the amendment, but as written, I cannot support it.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, Mike 2. Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike Bates): Mike Bates, Griffiss RAPCON. I'm just very glad this was seconded so we have the opportunity to read this over. I think this is fairly ridiculous and should not be passed.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: I'll take that as speaking against.

(Laughter)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Anyone else? Seeing no one else at the microphones, the question before you is on the adoption of Amendment A04-022. Those in favor, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: This could be a record. Those opposed, no.

AUDIENCE: No.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Well, we won't stand up. We'll just say that A04-022 is not adopted and is defeated.

The question before you is on the adoption of A04-023. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved and seconded to adopt A04-023. Is there discussion? Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Bill McGowan, Boston Center. Incorrectly printed is Section 4. That should be completely left out. That's being left as-is. So there are no changes made to this by Section 4.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Section 4 is currently stricken with a single horizontal line. You're telling me that all the language in Section 4 that is so stricken is actually existent and remains?

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): It remains. This amendment contains no.....

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: No changes to Section 4?

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): No changes to Section 4. It's all in 1, 2 and 3.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Did everybody get that? Is anybody unclear at all on what he just said? And as far as the Chair's clarification is concerned, is it your intention that this amendment take effect at the end of this convention?

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): It's my intention -- I would like to pass with the provision that it does not become effective until the end of this convention.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: In other words, you would like it to take effect.....

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill Buvens): Correct.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR:at the end of this convention? Without objection, so moved. Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Bill McGowan, Boston Center. As we so wisely passed this morning with A-009, requesting 60 days notice to the membership, I think it's important to realize that this is not intended to be a brainstorming session for delegates, but rather, delegates that are representative of the Body and the membership. And while I certainly think there needs to be a mechanism there to allow brainstorming and last-minute ideas, I don't think that it necessarily -- somebody's intent to come down here and develop something in a break room or at a restaurant overrides -- it doesn't override the ability of the individual back at the facility at Boston Center or Tower to have input on what we're doing to direct the union for two years. So while I understand that we need to have the mechanism to allow last-minute things to come up, and good ideas are definitely hatched down here, that's in here.

But I think we are better served by getting our business and what we're going to discuss out to the Body 60 days out published in the blue book, so that when you come down here, you've at least had a chance to run these things by your membership before you come into the convention hall.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, sir. Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike Bates): Mike Bates, Griffiss RAPCON. I move we postpone this indefinitely.

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved that we postpone consideration of A04-023 indefinitely. And it has also been duly seconded. Is there discussion?

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike Bates): I think this resolution would unduly restrict the Convention Body from taking care of business on short notice.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Unidentified): I have no debate on that

issue. I was waiting for the others.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: You were on the other question. Very well. Mike 7.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): Bill Buvens, D10. I rise in opposition of postponing indefinitely. If you don't think we need to do it, then vote against it. But don't take the easy way out and postpone something indefinitely just because you don't want to make a hard decision.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Mike Blake): Mike Blake, Boston Center. I don't think this unduly burdens the Convention Body. I believe what we're trying to accomplish here is to be able to come as fully-loaded delegates with the will of the membership back at their locals that know what needs to be passed, and ahead of time, and we can be pre-loaded, as I say. So I believe that this is a good proposal.

MICROPHONE 1 (David Stock): Point of order. Mike 1.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Go ahead.

MICROPHONE 1 (David Stock): He's debating the issue, not debating.....

AUDIENCE: Who are you?

MICROPHONE 1 (David Stock): This is David Stock, Phoenix TRACON. He should be debating whether it was suspended indefinitely, not debating the issue itself.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Actually on a motion to postpone indefinitely, he is allowed to debate the merits of the underlying amendment. So you may continue, Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Mike Blake): I believe that there is still an opportunity for people to propose resolutions and amendments at the convention if they feel it to be that important. It is not taking anything away. They still would have the same ability. We just believe that the communication and the will of the membership back in their home facility should be heard. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you. Mike 1.

MICROPHONE 1 (John Hill): John Hill, Springfield Tower. Mr. Chairman, I also agree that this is the proper time to debate the issue, and am in favor of this amendment. We do have the mechanisms to provide for untimely resolutions here. If someone has a resolution that it needs to be heard, there -- have the methodology to make that happen.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Unidentified): I will speak in opposition to the motion to table this indefinitely. I think we have enough information here to make a good decision. I personally am in opposition to amendment 23. But I do believe we have the ability to make a decision at this time.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Unidentified): Call the question.

MICROPHONE 1 (Mike Ryan): Mike Ryan, So-Cal TRACON. I'm also opposed to postponing indefinitely whether you're for or against. I certainly think this is something that should be heard, and I ask that you call the question.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Is there anyone that remains at the microphones that speaks in favor of postponing indefinitely before we call for the question, just so that we can establish some balance. Is there anyone who wants to speak in favor of postponement. Seeing no one left at the microphones, the question on the motion to postpone indefinitely is before you. Those in favor of postponing indefinitely consideration of A04-023, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed to the motion to postpone it indefinitely, signify by saying no.

AUDIENCE: No.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The matter is not postponed indefinitely and is properly before you on the adoption of A04-023. Is there discussion? Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Garth Koleszar): Garth Koleszar, Los Angeles Center. I speak in opposition to the amendment before us. The way we've done business over the last numerous years has served us well. There is a mechanism to put the resolutions out there. I believe that our members back home make a selection based on their trust and our integrity. I think we the ability to make a decision that is going to best serve our members. I think this adds an additional restriction that's not necessary at this time. And again, I speak in opposition to this amendment.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you. Mike 9er.

MICROPHONE 9 (Barry Krasner): Mr. Chairman, Barry Krasner, New York TRACON. I speak in opposition to this. I do not think it's proper. I think we as a group come together once every two years; that's all we see each other. I think our discussions, whether it be in the bar or in this meeting room, or in panel discussions give rise to issues and give rise to positions that we get an opportunity to discuss here. You have every resolution coming up here from Honorarians to actual position papers based on the discussion; and this would stifle that.

While I understand the desire to plan a convention, this is a convention of the people, and I think it needs to remain a convention of the people. We just passed this morning on the agenda the idea of having three panel discussions to discuss very important issues, and now what we propose is the inability to deal with it, unless three-

quarters of the people vote for it. Robert's rules is about putting forth the will of the majority while protecting the will of the minority. Okay. You're putting forth the will of the majority three-quarters to hear something is just absolutely ridiculous. This is the people's convention. Let them have their convention.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 9er again.

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike Bates): Mike Bates, Griffiss RAPCON. I wholeheartedly endorse Mr. Krasner's opinion there. This should be rejected because a three-quarters vote is way too high a bar to set to take care of necessary business that may occur at the last minute.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Microphone Number 1.

MICROPHONE 1 (Steve Merlin): Steve Merlin, Southern California TRACON. I rise in support, with all due respect, to Mr. Krasner. Robert's Rules also protects the individual members of this organization. And the point of putting out this packet 60 days in advance is because not every member can be here. And every member has a right to know what's going on at this convention, and to provide that input to their representative at this convention. You still have the ability to introduce business to this body. And if the business you bring up is important and worthwhile, three-quarters of this body will see that value and allow it to be heard. By making it easy to sit at the bar and write something out on a napkin and bring it in here and have business conducted, you belittle the right of the member that could not be here. Thanks.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 7.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): Bill Buvens, D10. I'd like to echo some of what Brother Merlin just said. Robert's Rules of Order protects those. And one of the basic tenets in Robert's Rules of Order is advance notice on things that are going to be done at a convention.

Right now with the resolutions we don't have that. So I rise in strong favor of this amendment, and I am not a delegate. If I were, though, I would recommend to somebody that they may want to lower the resolution threshold to maybe two-thirds instead of three-quarters for an untimely resolution. But otherwise.....

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: But since you aren't.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): But since I'm not and I can't, then I rise in strong favor.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, sir.

MICROPHONE (Mike Ryan): Mike Ryan, So-Cal TRACON. I'd just like to echo what Steve said. I've been to a few conventions, not all of them. But I have seen in the last several conventions what Steve was alluding to was several

resolutions get written on cocktail napkins, jammed through for an afternoon session, without the members back home ever getting a chance to see or having any idea of what we're voting on. And I don't think it's too much to ask for those of you that have important issues, instead of the cloak and dagger discussions over the bar, to put them out and let it be discussed among the 15,000 as opposed to the 1,500.

And so I agree with Steve, that if it is that important, you certainly should have three-quarters of the people here be able to see that, and it doesn't preclude you from doing business on the floor.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 6.

MICROPHONE 6 Bernie Reed): Bernie Reed, New York Approach. I call the delegates attention to a few things that we've done here already at this convention by amending some of the amendments that have been opposed. And I say to you that the members in your local didn't take a chance to look at that. And quite possibly, you as a delegate, never envisioned the amendments that came up to the amendments. Or amendments that would come up to the resolution before you got here. But you took it upon yourself to make an informed decision and represent your membership and cast a ballot.

I'm certain that most of you didn't discuss the amount of salary that the President and the vice president would receive at this convention, what a limit would be. But yet, our committee presented to us a salary recommendation. You made a determination. It's the same way here. There have been many great things that have happened with this organization from discussions in a breakout room that have been written on a cocktail napkin, over all the conventions, and I've attended all but the very first. I rise in opposition.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, sir. Mike 1.

(Applause)

MICROPHONE 1 (Alan Bieber): Alan Bieber, Tucson TRACON. I rise opposed to this. If you're not informed, I mean it's every person's responsibility to know what issues are on the table. And I know as a fac rep or a VP you want to be able to go to your membership and say, these are the important issues, and let's discuss them. But how many people in here know all the important issues that their local representative or congressman votes on day to day. You elect somebody to represent you in your best interest, and you have faith in them. If your local doesn't have faith in you, then you have a problem, and this is not going to fix it. You do not restrict genius that comes from a group of people getting together as a bunch of people that can see, I might have an idea that you never thought of; and

what you're doing is you're destroying that independent thought and the process that we have together, that we can, as a group, overcome anything. Thank you.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, sir. Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Mark Sherry): Mark Sherry, San Francisco Tower. I rise in opposition. While you could take Mr. Buven's suggestion, not amendment, and lower that bar to two-thirds. If you were to do that, then 60 percent of the delegates here could think it's a good idea to do whatever issue was proposed, and yet not even be allowed to discuss the issue. I agree, as typical with Bernie Reed. that we have the ability here to bring forth the issues of this association, to do things which maybe we should have thought beforehand, maybe we didn't. And many things are changed by amendment that your membership never knew about in any way, shape or form. I ask for you all to vote opposed.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you. Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): Motion to amend.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Go ahead, Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): Need I say it or do you want to guess it? Ken Martin, Pontiac Tower. Motion to amend the three-quarters to two-thirds, or four-sixth.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved to amend the three-quarters where it appears -- and I know you're about to tell me. Second line, Page 21, to strike the words "three-fourths", and insert the words "two-thirds". Is that correct?

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): What you said.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved and seconded to strike the two words "three-fourths" on Page 21 in the second line, and insert the words "two-thirds" such that it is a two-thirds rather than a three-quarters.

MICROPHONE 2 (Garth Koleszar): Point of Information, Mike 2.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mike 2, go ahead.

MICROPHONE 2 (Garth Koleszar): Garth Koleszar, L.A. Center. Is it the author's intent to reduce the percentage needed for a change to an amendment or an untimely amendment as well?

MICROPHONE (Unidentified): This author or that author?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: You're speaking about the amended portion?

MICROPHONE 2 (Garth Koleszar): Correct.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The plain language would do, in fact, that. Amendments and resolutions, untimely, two-thirds.

MICROPHONE 2 (Garth Koleszar): That is correct, sir.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: And you may proceed, Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): What my.....

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Discussion on your amendment.

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): Yes, sir.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: It has been moved and seconded.
You have the floor.

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): Thank you. What my
esteemed colleague from D10, Bill Buvens, said.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Very well. On the amendment, is
there further discussion? Mike 9er, if you speak on the
amendment.

MICROPHONE 9 (Barry Krasner): Okay. I could do that.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Sure, why not?

MICROPHONE 9 (Barry Krasner): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Barry Krasner, New York TRACON. I speak in opposition to
the amendment. I think it's a good faith approach to try to
reduce the untimeliness on resolutions. But if you reduce
the untimeliness on constitutional amendments too, if it
takes three-quarters to hear it and three-quarters to pass
it, if it was heard as timely, you've effectively done the
exact same thing. Why have it at all?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: I followed that. Did everybody
else? Excellent. Thank you, Mike 9. Mike 7.

MICROPHONE 7 (Bill Buvens): Bill Buvens, D10 TRACON.
I actually rise in opposition to this amendment because
actually what I stated earlier, I meant was something
different.

(Laughter)

By lowering the threshold from three-quarters to two-
thirds on constitutional amendments is exactly what Mr.
Krasner said. Why even have an untimely amendment clause if
you're going to lower the threshold to get it to the floor
and as well as passage. More what I was referring to as a
suggestion for a delegate to make an amendment would be to
have the two-thirds be for resolutions and the three-quarter
left for amendments. But I rise in opposition to the way it
is currently amended.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you, sir. Mike 1.

MICROPHONE 1 (John Hill): John Hill, Springfield Tower.
I also rise in opposition to the amendment as it's worded,
for the same reasons. I don't think we want to lower the
threshold for bringing untimely constitutional amendments.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Thank you. Has been moved and
seconded, and seeing no further debate, the question before
you is on the adoption of the amendment to A04-023, to
strike the words "three-quarters" in the second line on page
21 of your blue book and insert "two-thirds".

All those in favor of the amendment to the amendment
signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: All those opposed, say no.

AUDIENCE: No.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The amendment to the amendment is defeated.

Before you now is Amendment A04-023. Is there discussion? Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike McNally): Mike McNally, New York Center. With all.....

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Allow me to interrupt for just one moment and beg the indulgence of the body to recognize another former president of ours.....

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike McNally): Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR:who is responsible for about two billion dollars in pay for this membership.

(Applause)

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike McNally): Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: You may proceed, Mr. President Emeritus.

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike McNally): Thank you, thank you, thank you. With all due respect to my good good friend, Bill McGowan from Boston Center, I just have a point of information from him. Bill, if you can just give me one example of a resolution we passed that everybody was upset with back home?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: So the Chair asks Mr. McGowan.....

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike McNally): Yes. The Chair does.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR:if you had any examples off the top of your head, which you don't have to have, by the way.

MICROPHONE 3 (Bill McGowan): Off the top of my head, other than dues, I don't.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Oh.

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike McNally): All right. Dues might have been one.

(Laughter)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: So you got your dues and your don'ts.

(Laughter)

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike McNally): But we did fix that one, thank you very much. I rise to speak against the resol -- the.....

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Amendment?

MICROPHONE 9 (Mike McNally):amendment. And again, with all due respect to Bill, I know what he's trying to accomplish. But quite frankly, all you're doing is going to force by proving this or voting for this, all you're

going to do is force every issue to have to be back home before we can get to the convention, which is not a bad thing. But I have a sense that what you're going to do is really limit the business that this union gets done by the way in which we've been doing it for so many years; and it's been working for us. Except for dues; but we did fix that. So, opposed.

MICROPHONE 3 (Unidentified): I call the question.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Mr. McNally, thank you. And not just for your comments.

MICROPHONE 6 (Unidentified): I call the question to vote. Mike 6.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: There is a call for the question.

MICROPHONE 1 (Steve Merlin): Did he have the mikes?

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: What is the next mike? We have a couple more mikes that have yet to speak. Let's address those before we take a call for the question. Unless, of course, it came from one of them. Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Unidentified): I would have called the question.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Well, there you go. Is there a second?

AUDIENCE: Second.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: The question is on ending debate. Those in favor of ending debate, say aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, say no.

AUDIENCE: (No audible response)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Hearing two-thirds in the affirmative, debate is ended.

The question is on the adoption of Amendment A04-023. Those in favor of the adoption of that amendment, signify by saying aye.

AUDIENCE: Aye.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Those opposed, say no.

AUDIENCE: No.

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Hearing two-thirds in the negative, Amendment A04-023 is defeated.

It is now 3:30 in the afternoon. By the program you adopted this morning, it is time for our afternoon break. We will reconvene promptly at 4:00 o'clock. And I have one housekeeping announcement. I said the NCF drawing was at 5:00; it's actually at 5:30. Please be in your seats promptly by 4:00 this afternoon. Thank you.

(Off record 3:30 p.m.)

(Afternoon break)

(On record 4:00 p.m.)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. A couple of housekeeping items before we get

started. First, any facility that's having AT coach issues, please see, or please meet at the breakout, so my note to myself says, or see Allen Bieber from U90. Also, are Barry and Mike in the room? Barry and Mike, are you guys ready over there? Yes? I'd like to ask your indulgence for a moment in welcoming to this microphone a dear friend, President Emeritus, and a gentleman who needs no introduction; but what the heck, he's another giant and I'd like you to welcome him with a warm round of applause; Mr. Mike McNally.

(Applause)

MR. MIKE MCNALLY: Thank you. Thank you my brothers and sisters. Thank you very much. Barry Krasner, come up here. Anyway, I was actually going to write a speech, but I thought long and hard about it and I realized that I didn't have to.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a President's Club.

MR. MIKE MCNALLY: Yes, it is a President's Club. Some good pictures here. Living and dead.

(Laughter)

And you can tell who the dead guys are. At any rate, I'm going to make a plea to the membership this week and I'm going to ask for your help, your assistance. There's another man who also did some great things for this union. He's not here right now, but he will be back this evening. And I'd like to see you shake his hand and thank him for all the work he did. His name is Tim Haines. He was the Chair.....

(Applause)

He served as Vice President, Eastern Region Vice President, but he was the Chair of the Reclash Committee which set us on a course many, many years ago that finally came to fruition in 1998. I mean I think the man worked on it for over eight years to get us to the point where eventually you know the outcome. It is history now. He's not doing well, as you can probably tell. He has about two years to go to get to retirement, and we want to get him to a full retirement, not have to force him into a medical retirement. He has two girls that are living with him that he now has custody of, and they're 13 and 17 and at home taking care of him.

So I'm going to reach out to this group, and certainly when you get back home I'm going to ask you to reach out to our other friends, brothers and sisters out there, to help us get him to the 2000 mark. And I just want to give Barry an opportunity real quick to say a few words.

MR. BARRY KRASNER: Thank you. I want to echo what Mike said. When I came in as President in 1991 and we talked about Reclash, what we were going to do, there was no

FAA reform. We would talk about going through OPM, changing our classification. I asked him to be Chair of the committee. Told him it would be a six month detail; and it has been the rest of his life. The work that we did along the way, that he did along the way, we could not have the pay raise that we had, we could not have been prepared for contract negotiations without Tim.

As Mike said, he's not doing well. He has two years left. I've seen this generous convention body scrape together money for people from Guam and Pango Pango and Leave Share. He has two years left. This body can give enough leave to get him through to retirement. He can't work airplanes again. We're asking for your help so that the FAA does not screw him like they would screw everybody else they had a chance to do.

He is the father of what we have today as far as pay, and I'm asking for your help. We have a thousand people here. If everybody gave one day, we'd have 8,000 hours. We're probably looking for half that amount. So I'm asking for your help. I don't think we have forms here, but I'll let Mike address that. But I am asking for your help. I'm asking you to give generously to Tim like he gave to us.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: I can't say any more than has already been said. The total value, cash and prizes, dock fees, floor mats, full tank of gas is about two billion dollars for what this man did for you and your families. And we will have the forms in the next three days, and we'll fill them out and we will get him to the finish line of his career, like he got us. So I beg your indulgence and your help and your support.

(Applause)

That was fun. We ought to do that more often. Ladies and gentlemen, the afternoon will conclude with a overview of sorts of an issue of very, very grave importance to the union. And as we promised you, we are going to add things to this convention that give you information as delegates on which to act. What you do with the information remains wholly and solely up to you.

The National Traffic Control System is critically understaffed and you already know that. We will not waste your time by telling you things you already know. What you do need to know is what we're doing about it and what can be done about it. And we have assembled a panel of experts that are uniquely qualified to give you perspectives in that regard.

Additionally, this panel will be moderated by someone whose own thesis was a survey of you, the workforce, on your retirement plans and whose body of work is looked at by GAO

as being one of the Litmus Tests and one of the bodies of work and one of the pieces of research that they consider the most credible.

So I beg your deep attention to this panel and I'd like you to give a warm round of applause to someone who needs no introduction and who works probably about 20 hours a day, seven days a week on behalf of every single one of you. My dear friend and extraordinary Executive Vice President, Madam Ms. Ruth Marlin.

(Applause)

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: You know, it's ironic that today's the day that we asked for help for Tim. He's been a good friend of mine for a long time, but it is because of Tim that when we are eligible, we can afford to retire. Keep that in mind when you're filling out those forms.

Good afternoon. I am honored to be able to moderate this first panel and I hope it's an exciting addition to not only this convention, but many conventions to become. We'll be holding three panels in the next two days, addressing some of the major issues confronting our union and, therefore, confronting this Convention Body.

The purpose of these panels is to provide you with information. We've brought experts, as John mentioned, from within the NATCA family and from the outside. Some panels may spark action by the delegates. Others may just be accepted as information. In any case, that choice is yours. But it is our greatest hope that it gives you something to take back to your members. Something that, when you are asked by the first person who sees you on your first day back, "What'd ya'll do up there?", you've got a good answer, and you tell them what we learned and what was important and what we're able to do about it.

Our first panel is on staffing, as John mentioned. An issue with which you are familiar. And the staffing imbalances vary around the country. Some have been feeling the pain for a very long time. Some are just starting to feel it. And others know that it is coming on the horizon, because time marches on.

And the one thing that the down-turn in traffic did not do was slow the aging process for air traffic controllers. The FAA's neglect on this issue is outrageous. Everyone who has either looked at this or noted the research has criticized the Agency's lack of sufficient action. We had a hearing earlier this year where every member of Congress who spoke on the issue talked about the problem and the need to address it. Unfortunately, not one of them was in a position to do anything about it. The GAO and the DOT Inspector General have issued numerous papers, and we have a guest from the Inspector General's office here to talk about

their issues. But to them, with all due respect, it's statistics on paper. They don't feel the pain of a short staff system; you do.

And in that regard, we must stand up for ourselves. And we have brought panelists to talk about what we are doing for ourselves. We've taken an aggressive stand, and NATCA's conducting a vigorous campaign to get Congress to force the FAA to act, and to act now.

In this instance, NATCA is truly leading the effort because NATCA has to. For everyone else it is an academic issue. For us, it our future.

Our effort is starting to show signs of bearing fruit. The House has approved \$9,000,000 in the appropriations mark-up, dedicated to hiring and training air traffic controllers. Just this past week the Senate Committee approved 10,000,000. As we learned in the privatization fight, just having it in the bills doesn't mean you get the money, so we still have a lot of work ahead of us.

Our panel today will start with a broad view and talk about the constraints of the Agency. And we'll start with Stan Collender, one of Washington's leading budget experts.

You each have a packet on your chairs and we have full bios of each person. After Stan, we'll have Alexis Stefani from the Inspector General's office. And I have promised her four times that you will be nice.

(Laughter)

I did. She'll give us the perspective of the Inspector General's Office. In many issues, we have a lot of differences, but when the Inspector General's Office said the FAA has failed to plan for pending controller retirements, I have to tell you, we agree.

We also have Bill Black from our public relations firm Fleishman-Hillard and they'll talk about the various elements of the campaign NATCA's been doing to bring the urgency of the issue to the public view.

And finally, we'll hear from Great Lakes Regional Vice President, Pat Forrey, who is the -- did you draw the short straw, Pat?

MR. PAT FORREY: Evidently.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: He has the job of working with the Agency on the staffing standard and dealing with these issues. So I won't go into all of their bios, but I will tell you some highlights as I introduce each panelist. When they are done, we will have time for questions from the floor, and I hope that you have some interesting and provocative ones.

First we have Stan Collender. Stan Collender is the General Manager of Financial Dynamics Business Communications, the largest business public relations firm

in the world. He's been involved with the Congressional Budget Process since 1974 and he authors an article "Budget Battles", a weekly column in the National Journal. Stan Collender.

(Applause)

MR. STAN COLLENDER: Thank you. Let me start. Tim, could you get in close for a second on just on my face. This is a really good thing, but that's not why I'm doing it. I don't know how many of you can see from where you are. I've got a whole bunch of fuzz on my face. I need to explain. For the last 14 days I've been up in the Grand Tetons in Yellowstone hiking, communing with nature. And I came down from the mountain explicitly to come here. In fact, I left at 4:30 this morning to get here. I did not bring a razor with me. And so please forgive me. This is not normally the way I would appear and, in fact, my wife has insisted that when I get home tonight it is gone. But I just wanted you to. Thank you, Tim. You can pull back just a little bit.

(Laughter)

Just a little bit. Yeah, I can see it from here and I'm going "Oh, my God!". Coming down from the mountain was interesting. I found out -- there were two things. I hadn't actually looked at a paper. I avoided television as much as I possibly could. Didn't look at the news at all. And discovered two things when I came back.

The first two things I saw in the paper this morning was, and I want to thank Bill Black for not pointing this out, the Yankees are only two games, two and a half games, in front of the Red Socks and boy, does that hurt. Needless to say, Bill was from the other side of the family.

The other thing is, there was an interesting article in the New York Times this morning, just a little snippet that said the Bureau of Prisons was laying off a whole bunch of people. They had let their folks know over the last two or three days that they were, because of budget cutbacks and things, there were going to be significant staff reductions in 2005, in spite of the fact that the prison population was growing. That was probably -- those two things brought everything back to reality for me, and let me explain a little bit about what's going on and the magnitude of what you're facing.

Up until 2000 we had had four consecutive years of surpluses. George Bush came in. There were projections of a 5.6 trillion dollar surplus over the next 10 years. As you all know, we're now not only in back in deficit but back in big deficits. The deficit for 2004 will be 420 something, we obviously don't know the final number yet, but it'll be a 70 billion dollar increase over the previous

year, which was itself an all-time record.

I will now give you my numbers, what I think for 2005, 2006 and 2007. It will be easy to see further record deficits every year. And perhaps not even close. And if you take away the impact of the Social Security Trust Fund Surplus, which is growing, and how the candidates can see that they're going to cut the deficit in half over the next five years. If you take out social security, the operating deficit, everything in the "what's left" category produces a deficit of 700, 800, 900 billion dollars.

Now remember, I'm giving you budget projections five years in a row. Federal Budget projections are only good until lunch, so take these things with a grain of salt.

But the situation is pretty difficult, going forward. It's especially difficult because in addition to there being a deficit, overwhelming parts of the budget, parts of the budget that you're not necessarily in, are almost exempt from being looked at. It includes Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Defense, Homeland Security. Put those categories together -- oh, and interest on the debt, excuse me, which is only growing by leaps and bounds. You put all those categories of spending together, you're about 80 percent of the budget is essentially or effectively exempt or rising in an environment where the deficit is going to become an increasing problem.

So the question under those circumstances is, what will change starting next year? And the answer is not much. Unless there's a big increase in the economy, big growth in the economy that we're in that we're not anticipating, or unless there's some dramatic change in the outlook for defense, which no one thinks about. Or unless everyone over 65 suddenly decides they don't want or aren't going to take Social Security and have decided that Medicare is unnecessary, under those circumstances -- oh, and one more, unless interest rates drop to zero. All right. Can I have a show of hands how many -- never mind.

(Laughter)

There were -- I could hear a bunch of wheels turning saying, "What would the mortgage on my house be at zero?" Anyway, I don't mean to make it as dire as it sounds, but it will be a difficult situation. No one is talking about eliminating the deficit in one year or in one decade, necessarily. But there will be pressure regardless of who is elected to do something about this situation. To address something that has essentially gone unaddressed for awhile. Otherwise, this is only going to get worse.

There are several things about this you need to keep in mind. Number 1, your being aware of the situation is critical. Your listening to this message, your getting it,

it sinking in, is very, very important because you're not the only organization, you're not the only group that has an interest in the budget. Many others will be considering what they're going to do in the same situations.

Second, it's a good thing you've got Fleishman-Hillard. I know, Bill, you're surprised. But we used to work together. It's a great thing that you're taking this public relations effort and taking it seriously because your message is getting out that there is a vital role for air traffic control in at least three areas. That is, airline control and safety. By the way, thank you for getting me here, I appreciate that. Number 1, airline control and safety. Number 2, commerce and, therefore, the economy as a whole. And Number 3, obviously, Homeland Security.

You're playing as vital a role as anyone could possibly imagine in what people do every day, even if they don't take an airplane. Under those circumstances, the mission you are trying to fulfill, the needs that you as an organization have and that you, more importantly, as a profession have, have to be taken seriously by those people making decisions in this budget. You cannot simply get together once in awhile and say, "We gotta deal with this." This will be an ongoing effort. It has to be an ongoing effort for Congress to be able to take this seriously while the budget situation is in such turmoil. You will have at least two bites, and maybe three bites of the apple over the next 12 to 18 months.

The process is as follows: First of all, the 2005 appropriation, not yet done. There is the possibility. Now, I literally have been away for 14 days, so I'm assuming that a lame duck session is still a likelihood. The decisions that are made on the budget after the election will be vastly different than those that are made before. Therefore, work on the bills now. Make your voice heard and then assume that if the bill hasn't been approved by election day, you get a chance at a lame duck session afterwards and maybe a very good chance to get the baseline at that point up, when it'll have as little political impact to those who were concerned about spending up in Washington as you could possibly get.

So you've got the 2005 process still in the way. Second, 2006. All federal agencies, all federal departments must submit their budgets for 2006 to the Office of Management and Budget by September 1. My understanding is they're late this year, and they're late this year in large part because they don't want anything to leak out in advance of the election. So the opportunity over the next three months to influence the President's budget, and what he puts in for the concerns that you have will still be present. If

there is a change in administrations, the budget process will obviously extend longer because the President will not submit the budget until March, rather than January or February. But the 2006 process is still there.

Third, obviously the Congressional effort will get underway once the President submits his budget next year. This is a great time to be getting to those people who are running for Congress, either for the first time or for reelection, and making sure they understand the importance of what it is you do and what it is you think needs to be done.

The budget decision that'll be made next spring and next fall will be largely determined by the President's budget coming out and what the new members of Congress coming in think when they first get there. So over the next two or three months, some of the most critical decisions for future funding will be made in an environment that will be among the difficult that Congress and the President will face.

There isn't any group in the world, at least in the United States, that isn't pushing for more dollars. I don't know how many of you saw this, but as part of the Education Appropriation, the biggest one there other than Defense, Congress even cut back a lot of the President's priorities for "No Child Left Behind." So on the one hand, the President's out running around saying, "This is my plan for education". And on the other hand, Congress is cutting it back. The Republican Congress is cutting back, which shows you how difficult the situation is. Get your message out. Do it, both on a grass roots level and at a national level. Understand the environment in which you're operating. And understand that others will be there.....

(Background noise)

(Laughter)

You know, I used to work at comedy clubs. I mean I've had people drop trays right in front of me. That is a record I think, however, either that or somebody wanted to interrupt my -- is somebody over-listening to what we're doing?

Anyway, you will be many opportunities. This is not a done deal. The budget situation is difficult, but everyone we're fighting for a piece of the pie doesn't have the same arguments that you do. Yours are valid. Yours are strong. And the strength of the numbers will help.

Let me end with one quick story. A surgeon, an engineer, and a budget analyst all die and go to heaven. All right. I know it's hard to believe; work with me here, okay?

(Laughter)

A surgeon, an engineer and a budget analyst all die and go to heaven. When they get there, St. Peter meets them at the gates, said, "Look, you all led wonderful lives. You're all worthy of going to heaven. Problem is, we've got a temporary shortage. I've only got room for one of you. The angels and I got together last night. We decided the fairest way to do this was I'm going to ask each of you in turn to explain why the job you were in when you were on earth made you a member of the oldest profession. The one who was a member of the oldest profession will be allowed into heaven. The other two will simply have to wait."

The surgeon goes first, says, "This is easy. The Bible said God created Eve out of Adam's rib. Clearly, that was a surgical act. Therefore, God must have been a surgeon. Surgery must be the oldest profession. Please get out of my way."

St. Peter thinks about it for a second, it makes sense, but he promised the other two he would talk to them. So he turned to the engineer and says, "Can you possibly top that?" The engineer goes, "Sure. Before God made Eve out of Adam's rib, he first built the heavens and the earth out of the chaos. Now clearly, that was an engineering feat. So before God was a surgeon, he was an engineer. Therefore, I should be allowed into heaven."

St. Peter thinks about this, turns to the budget analyst and asks very skeptically, "Can you possibly top that?" The budget analyst smiles, goes "No problem. God may have built the heavens and the earth out of the chaos, but who do you think created that chaos?"

(Laughter)

The question is, how many of you knew where I was going before I got there? So anyway, thank you.

(Applause)

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Thank you, Stan. Next we have Alexis Stefani. Alexis Stefani is the Deputy Assistant Inspector General for -- well actually, currently the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing at the U.S. Department of Transportation; was Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Aviation. Ms. Stefani also testified at the staffing hearing that happened earlier this year, and I believe that her testimony was quite helpful to furthering our cause. Ms. Stefani.

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: Thank you. I appreciate Ruth inviting us here today to participate in the discussion on staffing. We realize how important this issue is to you all. It is basically the underpinning of how you do your jobs efficiently and effectively, and it's paramount to ensuring the safety, the continued safe operations of the national airspace system.

From our perspective, controller staffing has been an important issue, and today it's even more critical as the Agency faces a turnover of half the controller staff by 2012.

I'd like to spend a few minutes putting it in context of this issue and why we think it's so important. As you know, there's really two facets to this. One that we've learned is that it's not just as simple as hiring somebody and putting them on position. There are so many things to consider and so many things that FAA has to consider in the process; whether it's how to place people or how much productivity is being achieved or the technology replacement and what it's going to do to the job. Work rules, training, scheduling, they all affect this process.

But more important, I'd like to build on what Stan was talking about and put this in context. We're in an environment where both industry, the airline industry and FAA are facing tremendous challenges. Without a doubt, it's probably one of the times where there's so many unknowns, whether it's the airline industry and it's undergoing tremendous changes, as Representative DeFazio mentioned. You're looking at major carriers, the network and legacies who are not making any money and haven't made money for a long time. They've had enormous losses. You're looking at low-cost carriers who are become almost the backbone of the industry. You're seeing people, they're de-hubbing, they're changing the types of equipment they're operating, using more regional jets. The potential for more point-to-point operations. It's an industry and major change. And over the next eight years, while the controller staffing retirement bubble occurs, there will be major changes in the industry, and they'll also affect how you all do business.

FAA's facing two major changes themselves. As Stan said, the budget. The Aviation Trust Fund has not met the projections. It's not bringing in the amount of money that they had expected. In fact, in fiscal year '05, the request is for three billion dollars more than the Trust Fund is estimated to bring in during the same time period. And when you match that to the overall deficit in the government, there's not the extra cash to go get from someplace else because there are competing demands for the general fund.

Also, FAA is implementing the ATO, and this is very much like turning a huge ship. This major change in the organization is not something that happens quickly. It's not something that people at all levels readily understand, the roles and their missions and what their functions are, and it's going to take a long time for it to set in.

So when you look at all this, it's a huge challenge. And so far to date, we've only looked at a small portion of

it. We concentrated at looking at the placing and training of air traffic controllers and what FAA has done. When you look at what FAA over the past eight years, they've only replaced 2,000 controllers compared to what, over the next decade, they'll have 7,000, potentially, to replace. It's clear that this staffing -- the retirement bubble and the staffing and hiring bubble that they'll have to do is enormous. And it's an activity they had not experienced since the 1980's.

We wanted to get a handle on how well prepared FAA was for this whole process.

(Laughter)

Yeah, overall, I have to say, they weren't. They were not focused on addressing this issue. They didn't even have the basic, fundamental information that we felt was needed to manage the expected surge in retirement. And I know you're probably thinking, "She's an auditor. She looks at the green-eye shade kind of thing and numbers are important." But the surge is so huge, it's critical that they have good data. They can't go on a gut reaction or a guess. They have to have the information. And they have to adapt as the years go on, and get the information and use it and make the right decision and readjust as time goes on.

But for what we looked at, we had three major findings. First was they needed to develop better attrition estimates at the local level, at the facility level. They have what we felt was a reasonable national estimate. It's based on a three year running average and they just drop the oldest year and add the new. But that just gives you a total at the top for spreading out nationwide. It doesn't tell you what's happening at individual facilities. And if you're dealing with low numbers, that's okay. But when you're dealing with large numbers at a facility, you can't keep doing that as time progresses.

What we saw when we went out there -- we went to 17 facilities, and they did it differently. Some facilities estimated mandatory retirements only. Some said, "Well, we'll take eligibles and that will be our estimate." And others added in other levels of attrition, whether it's people transferring or just quitting, and added it all up and provided it in.

FAA promised that they would look and develop a little better attrition numbers at the local level, and we're hoping this will be in the December plan that Congressman DeFazio mentioned. However, an important point for us is that simply replacing controllers one-for-one at each location will only perpetuate staffing imbalances. But as you know, determining the extent of the staffing imbalances is very problematic.

Once again, when you look at how the staffing standards are developed, they are good at estimating, once again, at the national level and not at the facility level. They were devised for a purpose of a national level and not at the local. I know Pat's on a work group that's working with the FAA on this, and we really think that this is a key effort.

We also believe that as part of that effort, it's important that FAA implement a labor distribution system. Now, I know NATCA's had a lot of concerns about CrewEX (ph). I know the perception is that the IG's office is an advocate of CrewEX. Really, we're an advocate of any labor distribution system that's going to get you good information on what's happening in each of the facilities on a day-by-day basis and marry that with a cost accounting system so that you understand what it's costing to run each of the locations and so that you have better data to make better decisions. But even putting in a labor distribution system tomorrow won't help for about a year or two because you need the data over the long run. So it's really important that this gets put in quickly so that as we're looking over the next decade at the retirements, that we have better data to look at.

The second finding that we dealt with dealt with FAA's placement process. And it was basically, when somebody retired, then they'd place the next controller, the new hire in that position. We really thought there should be a better process. We recommended that they find some means of trying to better match the new employees, the new controller's aptitude and skills with the facility level.

Finally, the last area that we identified was probably the most challenging for FAA, and that was on-the-job training. It is the longest of the training process for a new controller. And FAA really needs to look at it, make it shorter, more cost effective while at the same time maintaining safety. It's Achieving the same results, but trying to do it more cost effective and more timely.

When we looked, it was on the average, at the 17 facilities we looked at, it took 3.1 years for a developmental to become certified. But in some cases, it could take as long as seven years. When we looked at what FAA was doing as far as the process, it was very decentralized. Everybody did their own thing. There weren't nationwide statistics or information coming in on how long did it take controllers to be certified at the various facilities. There wasn't information on where delays or problems might occur in the on-the-job process. There wasn't information on where, when and why training failures occurred. There wasn't information on the cost of the process.

We tried to make comparisons, but we really couldn't. We could look at various factors, but we couldn't make decisions about why things were different. For example, New York Center and Washington Center during the time period we looked at, both had about 70 developmentals. Yet, Washington Center had four training failures and New York had 15. But it couldn't tell whether it was the source of the new hire, was it were they coming out of CTI schools, or what was their source, was that making a difference, was it the difference because of the level of the facility, was it the difference because the way they were actually provided training? FAA couldn't tell us either, and we're hoping that the December plan that they come out will address this and really look into it because it's key.

This was just our first look at this effort. We've identified and we've started a new audit. We talked to Ruth about it. We're going to be out visiting some of the facilities that will be on the staffing standards. To a degree, what we want to look at are some basic questions about how the staffing standards work.

Basic questions we're sure we're going to find a number of different answers would be: What is a work force? Do you add developmentals in? Do you subtract them out? You know, all these kinds of things that we know that for the next couple years we will be busy in this area.

We're looking forward to working with NATCA when we're out at the facilities. We hope to talk to your representatives. We know that it is this will be a front-burner issue for a long time. It represents a significant challenge to FAA. It also represents an opportunity for them to make some changes. And we hope our work will feed into them making some of the right decisions that need to be made. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

VICE PRESIDENT MS. RUTH MARLIN: Thank you. Thank you, Alexis and Stan for pointing out how difficult the problem is that we're facing. And the next speaker we have is Bill Black.

MICROPHONE (Unidentified): Do we get to ask questions, Ms. Marlin?

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: When all four are finished, we'll open the floor to questions, if you don't mind, after the panelists.

Bill Black is with Fleishman-Hillard. He is a Senior Vice President. He is most importantly NATCA's senior account representative and has been working with us on all our campaigns, both in paid media and in the earned media, which is the press conferences. And I will let you read his business in order, but I don't want to cut into his time,

and I'll just let Bill go with your presentation.

MR. BILL BLACK: Thank you, Ruth. I'm here representing a team, the NATCA Communications Team. And I think I'd want to start by identifying the members of that team because we've kind of integrated very closely and have worked well together over the last two years, and everyone of them has contributed hugely to the effort. It starts with the Communications Director of NATCA, Courtney Portner, Doug Church, the NATCA Press Secretary. We also have the other consultant group is the Glover Park Group led by Joe Lockhart, who is on sabbatical from the team right now, saving the world. And I mean that literally, so he hasn't been on the cause lately, but we know he's doing good work. And Larry McQue (ph) in his shop is continuing working with us. And then within Fleishman-Hillard, my partner-in-crime, Dan Hubbard, is also part of the team.

But just as that team is integrated, I think the secret of success, and I do believe we have had a lot of success over the last two years, is the fact that we have integrated a wide variety of elements in how we communicate to the world, and more importantly, to our key audiences about the issues that are important to us and the issues on which we demand action.

Just starting with media relations, we have had an enormous number of press conferences, both the in the privatization fight and in the staffing fight, and many of you here have participated in that. We have a video clip that'll show you some snippets that have been done around the country. And when we do one of those press conferences, it's also -- there are a number of activities that surround those press conferences. We develop opinion editorials, guest editorials to put into newspapers. We try to get Ruth and John before the editorial board so maybe the local newspaper will editorialize on the issue as well. Letters to the editor as well. And at the same time do some paid advertising. And you can see in your booklets that you have, there is a slick of the print ad that is running even as we speak, and we also have a TV ad and some radio ads and again the TV ad will be -- I'll show that shortly.

And lastly, then we move beyond those kind of direct advocacy kinds of programs where, for instance, the web site. We have been in a constant process of enhancing the web site, and that is an very effective internal communications tool so that NATCA members can speak to one another and everybody can kind of be on the same page. But it also offers some external opportunities.

And another one of those kinds of things is the historical exhibit. It's out there in the lobby right now. This again, is not direct advocacy, but it does kind of

paint a picture and tell a story about NATCA. It enhances the reputation of NATCA in Washington and wherever we put that on display. It was on display for a week, as John mentioned this morning, in the Russell Senate Office Building during lobby week. So again, you have that double hit. The members of Congress are getting visited by the lobbyists. Maybe they've had a press conference in their district, maybe they're walking by the historical exhibit. And all of these things combine to create a favorable environment so that when Christine Corcoran or Ken Montoya walk into their office, they are conditioned to be receptive to whatever message they are bringing with them.

This morning John quoted Nietzsche when he said, "Whatever doesn't kill me makes me stronger". And I think my perspective, having been with NATCA now for almost three years, I think have kind of seen that dynamic take place because we came in just a little bit before the privatization battle heated up and we started to build this communication machine then. I mean, obviously NATCA was communicating before that, but I think we kind of got really focused in a way that was new. And the team was built. And we had the same kind of thing that we've had more recently, these press conferences locally.

And I have to say, there were some bumps on the road. We did leafleting, for instance, in December of 2002 to kind of begin the process. And then we began to do press conferences around the country. And there was a kind of a learning curve for all of us, and things took time. But in the end, by the time the August break took place, we were a pretty well-oiled machine and had a huge impact as Congressman DeFazio said today. We actually pissed off a lot of people in Washington. And that was the goal we set and we achieved that goal.

(Laughter)

And as John also mentioned, we sing -- okay, how about applause for pissing people off in Washington, what do you say?

(Applause)

I don't want to stifle that. As John Sweeney said, we've raised more hell than any union in the AFL-CIO, and you can be very proud of that. And we did, and this is -- there is no denying this fact, and this is a huge accomplishment: We blocked passage of the FAA authorization for three months. That is a huge accomplishment by a union of only 15,000 members. So congratulations for you, and I guess this whole team, I think, was very effective in doing that.

Then we come into the staffing fight. As you saw, we had success and we blocked that privatization effort. It's

not gone away but we held it off.

Now we're into staffing. Now this is a more proactive fight. We are not defending, we're on offense and that's a better place to be, and the effectiveness has grown. Again, they didn't kill us, they made us stronger. And I guess the best example I'd like to describe -- well first of all, let me back up. We began to do these local press conferences and they are having the effect. There is a buzz in Washington about this issue that is created by NATCA and only by NATCA, and I think that's something to be very proud of.

So the FAA takes note of this buzz, and they decide, well, they're going to have to do something about this. So they start mimicking us, the sincerest form of flattery. They decide they're going to do these local events, only they're going to do them at facilities where there is, by their estimate, not a staffing shortage so they can claim that there is no staffing problem. So they set up these local events. We hear about this at 6:00 p.m. the day before they were going to do it. They were going to do it the next day at 2:00 o'clock. Now this stronger machine clicks into action, and by the next day many of you already had the talking points in hand. We were alerting the media that we did have a response to this FAA event. John Carr went on a conference call that was very well attended by the media. And sure enough, when the stories came out the next day, the headlines were "Staffing Shortage, FAA on Defense". We had actually trumped them because of this stronger communications effort. So again, I congratulate all of you for that. We have -- we are on offense. They are responding to us. It's our efforts that are making things happen and we can keep that up and we're going to keep it up in the fall. And as Stan pointed out, we're probably going to have to keep it up through next year, and maybe for the rest of our lives. But we do have the ways and means to do that.

So with that, I think I'd like to just go to the video tape. We do have a video tape that describes, sort of, the evolution and the integration of the various components in this staffing fight. And I would just cue the people down back to let it rip.

(Videotape played as follows:)

"Staffing reaches out and touches every single person in this room: engineer, architect, controller, nurse. Clearly, even those who are on the other side of the ideological spectrum will tell you, we face a staffing crisis in this agency."

"We don't have enough bodies to man the positions."

"Philadelphia is the most understaffed air traffic control facility, by percentage, in the entire region."

"You're looking at more airplanes, more things to do, you know, we have to coordinate with different facilities, different sectors, while you're controlling those airplanes. So absolutely, it has a great impact on safety overall."

"Miami's air route traffic control center, which tracks about 6,000 flights a day, is one of the busiest centers in the country. Steve Wallace, Union President of the Miami Chapter of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, says the staffing shortfall may be contributing to more errors."

"And when there is a severe shortage, you only have two choices. And that is to curtail services or to reduce the margin of safety."

"I just don't think that the FAA is prepared. In my opinion, I don't think they're prepared for the massive retirements that they're going to see in the next couple of years."

"The FAA, the GAO and the Inspector General all have predicted that half of all air traffic controllers will retire. So if you know that it's going to take three to five years to train them, and you know that half are leaving, you have to start hiring them at some point. And to date, this year, the FAA has hired a single air traffic controller. That's one air traffic controller to address this coming shortage."

"The FAA insists it has the situation under control."

"We believe we've got a pretty good feel for it and it's hardly a crisis at this point."

"In Washington the Agency's chief, Marian Blakey told us FAA is on top of this. "Believe me, we're going to be ready. We're not going to let that slip."

"Just for the record, we invited the FAA to appear on this program live. It declined, saying that the taped comments you just saw in Kathleen Coat's (ph) report will have to suffice."

(End of videotape)

(Applause)

MR. BILL BLACK: So I think we're well-positioned for the fall. We have the truth and justice behind us, but we also have a very, very strong team and we have you. And so I'm very optimistic for the future, but it's going to be a tough fight, as Stan pointed out. The cacophony among groups demanding money in Washington is almost deafening, and our job is to break through that noise and I think we've had a good effect to date and more to come. Thank you.

(Applause)

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Thanks, Bill. And to show that controllers aren't just good at rapid response when it comes to communications, Stan, the Northern California TRACON has a razor and shaving cream for you.

(Applause)

So finally on the panel, and then we'll open it up to questions, is our own Pat Forrey. I could go on and on and on about Pat Forrey's qualifications, about how wonderful it is to work with him, and how much he has done for this union. But most of you know that already, so I'll just turn it over to Pat Forrey.

(Applause)

MR. PAT FORREY: Thank you, Ruth. I appreciate that. I'll try and keep this brief as I can. It's a very convoluted issue. And I think it really sparked our involvement as a Board back in the fall last year and in the winter during the hearings in Congress when the administrator claimed that we were overstaffed in many, many of our facilities.

Obviously, staffing has been a big issue for us for many years, beginning back in 1998 when we negotiated our first staffing agreement as far as how many bodies we were going to have systemwide. Although it wasn't a very scientific accounting of staffing, it did provide a lot more staffing than we had currently on board at the time and provided us more over the next five years.

NATCA really wanted to get involved in this process because, first of all, we have a looming retirement problem coming up over the next -- really, beginning probably in the next three to four years, we're going to be losing a lot of controllers.

The Agency knows that. Congress knows that. And essentially they delegated, or required, the administrator to come up with some kind of a staffing plan, a work force plan, this December to show how they're going to keep the system staffed with the appropriate number of controllers. We all know, and knew all knew all along, that the staffing standards that the Agency is using, they first of all, aren't applying, and secondly, they're just not very good. They lean more towards the realm of trying to staff toward budget as opposed to staff towards what's required.

We approached Russ Chu (ph) back in the spring about getting involved with the ATO, with the new formation of the ATO, to look at our staffing standards and redo the staffing standards to apply them to a local level, not a national level, because the standards right now are really designed for budgeting purposes, their forecasting models. And the idea is that it gives them a national number that they use

for budgeting, and then they'll leave it up to the management people to decide who should get what staffing where. That would be great if the staffing standard was designed to tell them what they need at each individual facility, but it really doesn't. So that's kind of a chick in the egg scenario.

There are good, actually good formulas in the terminal, the tower cab, the TRACON and the Center staffing standards. Unfortunately, over the last 10 years, there have been changes to the co-efficient levels and the multiplication factors and the type of data they're using to determine what should be counting toward staffing, what shouldn't be counted toward staffing, and the Agency can't really come up with a justification for any of those changes. But if you looked at the original models, staffing models and formulas that they used, they're actually not too bad. And they could be applied locally to each individual facility to give you a grand total of what you need in the system. Obviously it would leave a little bit for flexibility and movement around.

Ross Chu (ph) said, yeah, let's do that. I don't think what we're using right now today is the appropriate staffing model, but let me bounce it off the administrator. Okay. We also sent a letter to the administrator at the same time, requesting that we work on this jointly. We haven't heard back from the administrator yet. We have heard back from Ross Chu (ph), essentially that said, "I'd like to work with you, let's work together. We'll share the information. We'll kind of do parallel tracks. But I can't have my name on anything with you guys stating that this is what we think a staffing standard should be." So his hands are effectively tied by the administrator.

In the meantime, we're working jointly with them to look at the staffing and to see what we can do, really, to justify what's wrong with the staffing standards today in light of the fact that they're going to address their work force hiring plan based on data that says the staffing they have at current facilities is accurate or not accurate. I mean, you can't say what you need to put into a facility when you get retirement projections if you don't know what the requirement is to begin with. And that's what our point has been. And I believe the people we're working with, the Agency and the ATO understand that. The problem is, when that goes up in the final report, I have a feeling that'll get axed out of it. But we'll cross that bridge when we get to it.

In the meantime, one of the things they're doing with the retirement projections is they're looking at the past three years that the controllers have retired, and just the

last three years. And we think there are some flaws to their projections, but we'll go with what they got. What they found is that in each first year of eligibility, 25 percent of those eligible in their first year will retire. They're using an average because in the first year they did this it was 20 percent, the second year was 25 percent, the third year it was 30 percent, so that's been growing every year. Instead of using a progressive projection, they're using an average. So 25 percent of those who are eligible in the first year of retirement will actually retire. The second year, 10 percent, the third year 10 percent, the fourth year I think 15 percent. And after that they consider those people gone from the system.

So they're applying that basic model or formula towards a hiring plan. The problem is, a staffing standard that says a facility is currently overstaffed and they're going to have this many retirement projections in the next four or five years may be completely wrong if the staffing requirement isn't correct. And we think in most terminals, if not all of them, the project is wrong. The administrator and based on the current staffing standards show that the terminal facilities are 1,000 bodies overstaffed and the centers are a 1,000 bodies understaffed. So their first idea was to move everyone from the terminals over to the centers and that should solve their problem.

That's not going to solve their problem. First of all, after they looked at the data and after we showed them some problems with their formulas, they are willing to believe that no, that's not correct. Most of our terminal facilities are right at staffing or just under their staffing, and it's only going to get worse with the retirement projections they got coming.

Anyway, they're putting together a work force planning document, a hiring formula. But it goes much, much further than staffing. They're looking at productivity, they're looking at training, they're looking at waivers for age 56, they're looking at about 20 different things, including budget, as to how they're going to deal with the work force plan issue over the next five to ten years. They want that done by the end of this month, which, good luck to them, that report changes about three times a day. I can't even keep up with it.

In any event, they're looking at it -- and there's some people up there in the Agency that believe that contracting out lower-level facilities, since they don't produce any income for the FAA, that's the way to go with those, we can use all those bodies and move them over. There's people up there at the headquarters that believe that consolidation is going to save them a lot of money. I

don't know if they've realized it yet, but every consolidation they've done to this point's required more staffing, not less. So I don't know where they're coming up with that idea.

As far as the issue of whether we're going to do this together or not do this together, the Board is of this opinion. We will work with the Agency to get as much information as we can and influence as much as we can of that work force planning guide as far as staffing, productivity and things of that nature. We won't be able to put our name on it, and quite frankly, I wouldn't want to put my name on it because I probably won't agree with most of it. But if at some point in time that the Agency decides it would like to work with us and create new staffing standards, we're all game to do that. And I think that the administrator is now starting to lean that direction. So over the next couple of weeks, we'll have a better idea whether that's going to be a reality or not a reality. The only think I did remind the Agency was that back in 1991, 1992, 1993, we asked them to rejoin us and work jointly in reclass. They decided not to, and we all know what happened there.

So that's kind of where we're at with the staffing stuff and what we're working on with the Agency. And I'll leave it open for questions after that.

(Applause)

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: All right. Thanks, Pat. We'll open up to the floor for questions.

(Applause)

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): How are you doing? My question is for Ms. Stefani.

AUDIENCE: Who are you?

MICROPHONE 2 (Hamid Ghaffari): I don't need to tell her who am I. Facility rep, L.A. Center. I believe I'm actually one of the 17 facilities that you folks audited. And it's a question/statement/criticism. You guys are tasked with a certain mission in your job, and I'm not necessarily too certain of that, but I would hope that in trying to determine all the facts that you guys, not just keep yourselves narrow and talk to managers at the facilities, but also keep in mind to talk to the local representatives. Because to this date there has been no audit at my facility that they have even asked to talk to us. I certainly volunteered, but I'm not going to force myself into an office with an auditor to be able to provide them information.

But in the three things that you mentioned, one of them is a certain issue that is near and dear to my heart, and

that's OJT. And I'm sure a lot of these facilities, especially centers, will tell you, that's near and dear to our heart. We could certainly provide you very good input on why we feel there's a problem with the OJT process right now. And actually, one of the underlying problems at a lot of the centers that is tied to what you're trying to find out, is staffing. That really hurts OJT. But again, you're really not going to find that out if your inspectors, your auditors go out to the facilities and skip talking to the folks that are the experts on the system and just talk to the managers. So I would really like it, next time you do that, that you do come out and talk to us.

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: Okay. Point taken.

(Applause)

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: That wasn't that open-ended of a question. Did you want to respond?

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: We try very hard to meet with people that want to meet with us. We do have -- when we go out, we have a plan and to discuss with certain individuals in each of the facilities and we also try to be open. I'm sorry that at your facility that you've had this experience. From what I understand of my team is that we try to involve the union rep in each case. We talk not only to -- we'll go and you're right, sometimes it will be with just the manager, and we'll talk to controllers on the floor and we may not have a session with controllers outside of the manager's presence. But I'll take that back to the team so they understand your point of view.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: One thing I'd like to add to Hamid's comments is that periodically -- not that I would accuse any managers of wanting to keep union reps from talking to people, the managers you talk to may actively interfere with you talking to the rep, and any time you contact us at the National Office, we'll give you the contact information for any facility representative.
Mike 1.

MICROPHONE 1 (Allen Beaver): Allen Beiber, Tucson TRACON. This is for Alexis. My question is that staffing is based on financial numbers. The majority of controllers are going to retire. Your numbers are, I think, fairly skewed. But if you extend the 56 year old age cut-off, a majority of those controllers are already making the top of the band. You can replace controllers two-for-one if you start hiring them now, by the time the people that are at the top of the band start retiring, and the people you're hiring in. I mean it's simple. What's going to happen is you're going to have -- they're going to be scrambling at the end, they're going to give people extensions to work to 60 like they do as far as captains in airlines they can fly

to 60 years old. And they're going to try to shut down facilities, which, to me, is a breach of Homeland Security. And it's a simple problem to fix if you just look at the numbers.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Is there a question in there?

MICROPHONE 1 (Allen Beaver): The question is why haven't they looked to see that, okay, at today's rate if I'm paying a controller X-amount of dollars, I can hire in two controllers for the same price if they're just coming in to the bottom of the band in those facilities. I mean you're going to be able to hire more controllers for less money and that should be taken into consideration and start hiring controllers now.

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: You're right that new controllers' pay is less. The difficulty, as you say, is the budget. And FAA is hard pressed in its operations budget. Labor is the majority, I think it's 70 percent of the budget. Not just controller pay but, you know, other employees in FAA. They don't have the flexibility because they also have pay, you know, rent, they have to do the telecommunication costs and everything else. They've been hiring and replacing on a one-for-one. They have to get the extra money to do the overlap hiring.

MICROPHONE 1 (Allen Beaver): You can't think on a four-year basis though, a political four-year basis. You have got to think long-term, and the FAA and the government in whole has never done that.

MR. STAN COLLENDER: If I can just address that for a second. Remember, I don't work for the government. The problem you're having is you're thinking rationally.

(Laughter)

(Applause)

I didn't mean that to be quite as inflammatory as it sounded, but it came out okay. You're thinking the federal budget is done on a one-year basis. And at this point it's not even one year, it's what can we do before the election and what are we -- so you're right in saying that there's a political aspect to it and a four-year budget. But when you budget on a one year situation, you're asking them to take into account something that is six to eight years down the road. That's difficult for Congress to do. Savings that will materialize in three years don't help them with this year's budget so they tend not to pay attention to it. And that's -- you're right. It's a numbers game, but it's a short-term versus a long-term numbers game as well.

Being rational doesn't necessarily help in that regard. However, and I know because Bill and I used to sit next to each other, I know that part of their strategy is to make

sure that the budget committees on the Hill understand exactly what you're saying. You got to get that message out as strongly as possible.

MICROPHONE 1 (Allen Beaver): Thank you.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Okay. So that everybody knows their sequence, I'm going to go Mike 2, 6, 3 then 8. So Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Bruce Bates): Bruce Bates, Los Angeles Center. A question for Mr. Black. In trying to understand the strategies that NATCA uses to get our message out, I was involved in the leafleting in December that you talked about for the privatization issue. Why was that not used for the staffing issue as well?

MR. BILL BLACK: Well, I don't know if that question is properly directed to me. I mean that's kind of a broader, strategic question for the leadership. I do know that we do keep the leafleting tactic in reserve because it really is a huge burden for people. I mean, the only way to make it effective is to do it around holiday seasons, because that's when a lot of the media is covering travel stories and we can get this story out there. And I guess I would say that at this point we have not reached that critical point where that might have the desired effect.

As Stan talked about, the appropriations process is kind of going through a ka-boogie dance right now as they're pretending to be making decisions and passing bills and doing those sorts of things to make it look like they're legislating. But everybody in Washington knows that the final decisions aren't going to be made until the voters decide on in November, and there is going to be a lame duck session. Under those circumstances when you're in a conference situation, then maybe is the time to pull out all the stops and do a leafleting tactic.

So I guess to answer the question as I've been thinking of it as I'm talking here, it is a tactic that we try to use very sparingly, and I don't think we've had that moment in the staffing process where we would pull that one out.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Mike 6.

MICROPHONE 6 (Ray Gibbons): Ray Gibbons, Chicago TRACON. Ms. Stefani, thanks for coming and I want to direct my question towards you. The most frustrating thing for my facility that's been chronically understaffed for such a long period of time is that the FAA will not admit the problem. And I cannot understand for the life of me why they won't. And the way they get around it is by hiding behind the shell game of authorized staffing versus people who can actually function under general supervision.

My question is when the Inspector General looks at staffing situations, why can we not focus more on people who

can actually come in and do the job rather than looking at an authorized number of 101, having 100 on board of which 75 percent are washing out as they go through training and we have a revolving door of 30 percent that never reaches the usable work force. And I just -- it seems like whoever looks at the issue does not capture that.

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: In our first effort we tried to take a slice and look at OJT because we really felt it was a driver in the process of getting a certified controller there so that you could free up -- you would have fewer scheduling problems, all that, and that it was the longest time frame in the process.

When this December plan comes out, we're hoping that FAA looks, as was mentioned, Pat mentioned, at 20 different factors. There's so many things to weigh. You know, you take Marian Blakey's statement that she was having as a goal, what, 85 percent, 15 percent. I think it was 15 percent developmentals to 85 certified. You've got so many factors going on that what we intend to do next is take the puzzle apart piece by piece. And what you're talking about is one factor. And we will keep it in mind. We will address it at some point in time. But part of the problem is there are just so many facets to this, and FAA has to make the balancing act in this plan, and we're hoping that they do. That they weigh everything and take into effect the staffing standards, current practices and processes, where the person's coming from, how effective that is, the wash-out practices at different facilities.

We just saw so much that was different and nobody had any concept of what was the best practice. And you're looking over the next several years of having a very concentrated effort it FAA to get a handle on this. And we're sure that this December plan will get modified, but we're hoping that it lays a good basis in groundwork because there are just so many facets to this. And it's not going -- it's a huge challenge. It's not going to be easy.

MR. PAT FORREY: I would just like to add one thing, Ray. One of the issues we did raise, and we've been raising, is the whole training issue. The CPC, the developmental ratio and the time it takes to get people checked out, and the fact that they're using developmentals to staff positions. And to incorporate those kinds of things into a staffing standard, that ain't gonna happen in this report because they don't have time to do that. Especially if they're not interested in re-doing a staffing standard. So we'll continue to raise that issue and we'll do it on our own. I mean we've already informed the Agency that we'll either do it jointly with them or we'll do one by ourselves and we'll deliver it to the Kerry administration

when they get into office. So that's kind of where we're at.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Mike 3.

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): Good afternoon, Ms. Stefani. Thank you for coming.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: You're very popular.

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): Are you having fun?

(Laughter)

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): I'm just very concerned that you're having a good time while you're here. I have a 12 part question for you.

(Laughter)

Ken Martin, Pontiac Tower. While you are, you and your cohorts are cavorting around the country and auditing these facilities which I'm sure is very important work to understand the staffing model of what takes place out in the Agency, is anybody from your department auditing regional offices, large facilities where they're hiding thousands if not hundreds of thousands of dollars that are being wasted in salaries for people who can't or couldn't wouldn't or won't do their jobs on the Boards so that they've now put them into these positions and.....

(Applause)

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): Thank you.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: And yes, we do consider that nice.

(Laughter)

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): I haven't dropped the F-bomb yet. And you can just fill in parts 10 through 12. Has somebody really, sincerely looked at the overstaffing of these regional offices and all of these larger facilities that have all these people that are no longer doing -- and I don't want to say they're not being productive, but that's all I can think of to say right now.

And furthermore, part 9 or so, wherever I left off, what about this ATO reorganization? I happen to be in the process of right now going from one facility to another that takes me from a tower to a center. And the amount of coordination in four different cities with five different offices to effect this transfer is mind-boggling. There's got to be a lot of money being wasted out there in that fashion. And if payroll makes up what did you say, 70 percent of the budget, how much money could we save by consolidating some of this? And please, keep your answer short.

(Laughter)

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: All right. We have about fifty-some people that do aviation work, you know, they have a group that looks purely at AVR, and where the, like the

safety inspectors and staffing and training of them and you know, how well they inspect airlines. We have another group that does acquisitions. And as you know, there's a lot of money that goes out to acquisitions and we don't seem to get anything for it, so I have a group that tracks all those and reports on whether it STARS or WAAS (ph) or laws or whatever. At this point in time, we haven't looked at the regional offices in awhile. We are looking at the consolidation of the accounting offices in FAA but we have not looked at what's happening at the regional offices in awhile and I think it's probably a good idea for our next year's plan to consider that as a possibility.

(Applause)

MICROPHONE 3 (Ken Martin): That was a good answer.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Mike 2.

MICROPHONE 2 (Donald Danske): Hi. My name is Donald Danske (ph) from Chicago Midway. It's kind of just an add-on to what he was just saying. Right now, currently, I don't know exactly what year there supposed to get hired, but 120 supervisors supposed to get hired, and where is their productivity level, you know, where's the studies on that?

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: So who would you like to answer that one?

MICROPHONE 2 (Donald Danske): Doesn't matter.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: I have a guess. I believe he's referring to, the FAA was earmarked \$4,000,000 for increasing the number of supervisors to 1,726. And what we're seeing in the field is that they're just draining the controller ranks to fill these positions arbitrarily whether or not that work is needed.

(Applause)

MICROPHONE 2 (Donald Danske): Not even that, you know, it's you know, this labor distribution and CrewEX and all that, I mean, I think it's pretty known how hard we work. You can see that. But where's the production from the supervisors?

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: Well they have to fill out time cards too, right?

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: They don't have time on position.

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: Right. But you'd have them fill out the labor distribution system too, and you would record what they do and you'd have data on what they do. Right?

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: If we had such a thing. So are there any audits going on on productivity outside the controller ranks?

AUDIENCE: No.

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: Uh, no.

(Laughter)

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: That was a very clear answer, don't you think? Mike 9.

(Applause)

MICROPHONE 8 (Veronica Stein): What about Mike 8?

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Oh, you know what, I marked you off accidentally Mike 8. Sorry.

MICROPHONE 8 (Veronica Stein): That's all right. I don't mean to pick on her, but Ms. Stefani this question is for you. Actually I have a comment and a question. Veronica Stein, Memphis Tower. While you're doing your audits and looking into the staffing, if you make a recommendation to the FAA, I hope you keep into mind that if their plan is to contract out the level 2's, move people up and that's gonna fix their staffing, that isn't gonna work. A lot of people are at the lower level facilities because they can't do the job at the higher level facilities. So they go back down where they can be productive. So that would not be a fix. And also when people get to the point where they're burned out, they don't want to work the busy facilities anymore, they're not going to have a place to go back down to where they can keep working a level that is fine for their age or stress level or whatever they could handle. So that's something that needs to be kept in mind if you're gonna make a recommendation.

And my question to you is, is there any -- are you looking into the military controllers who've already proven that they can do the job when you're looking at OJTI? You know, we got CTI students into a level 10 facility in Memphis that took three years to check out. If we could get some of the military people in who are sitting out there trying to get a job with the FAA and can't get hired, end up going DOD or whatever they end up doing, changing career fields, that might be something to look into because they've already worked by the same rules we work by, they have the same CTO that we have. The federal government has already paid for their training. They've already proven they can do the job, that would be a good pool to pull from. I mean they're already out of the military, why not hire them? Has there been anything looked into for that?

(Applause)

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: When we went out and audited, we expected FAA to have data on the who was successful, how long it took, and who flailed, by the source; and they didn't have it. You know, we did look and we had a chart and a report of where people came from at the various facilities and how long it took, on average, to certify. And part of those were ex-military, people who came from the military. The difficulty is that FAA needs to get the data.

They need to know where the military fits best. Again, it comes back to placement. The CTI schools, MAC, you know, off the Street, the OPM cert. Whatever it is, you know, where do these people fit best? And FAA needs to collect the data and, hopefully, they're going to do that with this December plan, so that you're more likely to get a candidate that will be successful at your facility.

MICROPHONE 8 (Veronica Stein): If you can put the word in their ear, whoever might listen, since they don't listen to us half the time, that is something that they definitely need to look at. A lot of the CTI students they go through, they graduate from these schools, they get put in these centers. They're not taught a bloomin' thing about the en route operation. They know nothing about the en route operation. So they go to these en route facilities and either take forever to get checked out, or don't check out at all and end up going into the terminal. So they're not being taught anything in the en route environment at these colleges and they've never worked traffic. The military people have actually worked airplanes. They know what they look like. They've worked them. And I mean this really isn't anything against the CTI, but it is something that the military has already proven. So that would be something if you could recommend to them, maybe they might listen to you guys, that that is something that they need to look at. I've got military people asking me all the time, how do I get hired, and I tell them I have no idea. All they're hiring is out of the colleges and actually right now they're not hiring any of them either. That one controller is probably doing a really good job to replace 450.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Veronica, I see you still don't have to breath in the middle of talking.

(Laughter)

MICROPHONE 8 (Veronica Stein): Nope. I got it down pat. Work in a busy facility, you know. You do that kind of stuff. Thank you.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: All right. We have about 12 or 13 minutes left and I have Mike 9, Mike, 9, Mike 6, Mike 5, Mike 3, Mike 3, Mike 3, Mike 2, Mike 1. So if we could ask our questions as pointedly as possible so everybody has a chance. Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 9 (Allen Fritz): Okay. I've got two. Allen Fritz, Redding Tower. I guess the first one would be for Ms. Stefani. You're actually just -- from your report, you indicated that 3.1 years was your average for people. Do you know, was that for new hires or for transfer in from a lower facility? Did you have a distinction there?

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: It was there's a chart in the report, and it was on average so it would have been

everybody during the time period. But I think training statistics by source for all 17, transfers from other facilities took 1.6 years, defense controllers took three, people from the MAC took 3.3, CTI's took 2.5, and reinstatements took 3.9. So we tried to do it at the 17 facilities, we tried to get that kind of data.

MICROPHONE 9 (Allen Fritz): Okay. The other question I think is for everyone up there. I'll take a couple answers if you got them. As far as the FAA plan, I know you've used the term "hopeful" and I can't say I share that term anyway, in what the FAA's going to come up with. Who, as far as an entity or an individual or a group, is going to be able to look at this thing and tell the FAA that this is garbage? Whose going to be able to really hold the FAA accountable?

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: I know I sat at the witness table with Marian Blakey, and that was, I could see from the way Congress was acting that they're going to follow up on it. They're going to ask for that plan. It was in the authorization bill. It's by law, they have to turn it in. And I would say that like Congressman DeFazio was going to be looking at it. He mentioned it today.

MR. STAN COLLENDER: It's actually not any one person. The process is going back to the founding fathers, but let's move it to today, is multi-layered, is designed to be cumbersome and difficult. But the bottom-line credential is it's going to take someone with testicular fortitude.....

(Laughter)

.....to make this an issue and to make it an issue that is continuously heard because I mean that's the only way, given the budget situation, things will get done. It is frankly something that you can instill in people. But it will be through the communications effort that you do.

MR. BILL BLACK: Yeah, I guess my answer was going to be we are, and I think we do have that characteristic.

(Laughter)

Some metaphorically, some really, you know.

MR. PAT FORREY: As far as, we're trying to influence and shape that report as much as we can to the extent we can. It's not our report, so what we glean from that, what we learn from that we turn over to Bill and his crowd and let them go crazy with the media, our legislative people go crazy with Congress and then we go from there.

MR. STAN COLLENDER: I've just got to add something. This could actually be taken -- this could be done very quickly, if you had a president who just said to his OMB Director, just get this done, all right? This is important. And I don't know about what's going to happen, but the entire process can be short-circuited if the guy at the top

is willing to do that. Sometimes when the guy at the top has got his mind, you know, in other places, it requires members of Congress to make the right call, to you know, press conferences to be held, to put pressure on the OMB Director to bubble it up that way. So it can happen in a lot of different directions. But it's only going to happen, I mean as Bill keeps saying, if you guys get out there and make sure. Because as I started to say earlier, whether it's the veterans or the farmers or you know, anybody else, the ranchers who I just homes I stayed in over the last couple of weeks or the park service, everyone is looking for a little piece of the pie. And just to give you an idea, I just did some quick numbers. The budget next year will be about 2.5 trillion. About three-quarters of that will be what we call uncontrollable. Defense, social security, medicare, interest, that kind of thing. That leaves 625 billion, about 375 of which is defense. Another 30 of which is Homeland Security. So there's about let's say 250 billion left for everything else, the deficit is going to be 500 billion all by itself. So in other words, you could cut every thing else and still have a 250 billion dollar or thereabouts deficit. That should give you an idea of the magnitude of the problem and the demands for a piece of the pie

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Mike 9.

MICROPHONE 5 (Todd Kerekes): Todd Kerekes, Caldwell Tower. My question is for the panel. Given Ms. Stefani's comments on how important training is and how it drives the process, and the data that she quoted saying that people that transfer from one facility to another are really the best developmentals. And notwithstanding my colleague from Memphis' comments, there are people that want to move up. Why not do that? The agency has been strangely resistant to move people from lower level facilities to larger facilities. And it's been told to me that it's budgetary concerns. Well, if you put somebody off the street in New York Center, and they'd take five years to check out, and I can send somebody that will check it in two, why not do that? They make the same amount when they're done.

MR. PAT FORREY: Well, actually, that's probably not necessarily true. I think it varies in some facilities whether the transfer does as well or better than a new hire.

MICROPHONE 5 (Todd Kerekes): That's true. But the data she quoted said.....

MR. PAT FORREY: But as far as it costs us, you're right. That's exactly why they've been reluctant to transfer anybody. It's their budget issues. And it does cost them more to transfer someone in-system and receive a higher pay than if they hired a new person, and even if that

new person checked out in five years.

MICROPHONE 5 (Todd Kerekes): It depends on where they come from.

MR. PAT FORREY: For the most part.

MICROPHONE 5 (Todd Kerekes): Somebody from Caldwell makes the base of the band.

MR. PAT FORREY: But it's the same issue with the whole bubble issue. They can't hire new people even though they save money based on the fact that they're only paying half the salary they're paying someone that's in the system for 30 years. But they can't afford to hire those people. I mean that's where they're at right now.

MICROPHONE 5 (Todd Kerekes): I mean, not to be rationale, but if you have to hire somebody, and you need to get them trained quickly, hire the people that will train quickly.

MR. PAT FORREY: No doubt about that.

MICROPHONE 5 (Todd Kerekes): Thank you.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Mike 6.

MICROPHONE 6 (Bill Clark): I'll try and rant quickly because I know we're running out of time. Bill Clark, Newport News Tower, one of the 69 on the hit list. My reading between the lines of any number of FAA publications and Ms. Blakey's comments and what we hear here, is that they probably want to close our facilities down, move us up, move us out, whatever. And I sat by for several years while the IG's office looked at things like our fam trips and how we use things, and I read about it in the newspapers how bad we were for doing these things. And now I see these things being said, that this is somehow in the administration doing this, I don't see their name mentioned in there.

And Ms. Stefani, you used a couple phrases that I want to make sure I have here, operating on a gut instinct from the administration. I don't know who it is in the administration. I have an idea it's pretty much at the top. And then the other idea of cutting down on our training time by speeding up things is also kind of reminiscent of things like Haliburton's no-bid contracting by cutting costs at the lower levels. I could see that happening. Why isn't the President's name ever invoked in these things? It's just kind of shoved to the side when these are his points that he's pushing?

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: That sounds like a Stan question to me.

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: First we'll let Stan answer what the President is thinking.

MR. STAN COLLENDER: Because he called me just yesterday about this.

(Laughter)

MS. ALEXIS STEFANI: Yeah. I do want to clarify, when I said, you know, gut, it was the idea that you need good data. This is a very significant issue. It's critical, and FAA must have good data. I wasn't saying somebody was making gut decisions. I was saying you can't just rely on your gut on this case; it's too critical. Also, I'm trying to think what -- you made some other point, what was the second one? Oh, on the training. And I want to clarify that on the training, if it's the longest portion for a developmental to become certified, it's important that FAA shortens the time, but it is also very important that safety is not damaged in that process. So I didn't want to ever imply that there was just a need to cut time. You have to do it and maintain safety if you're going to have these large numbers come in to get -- proceed from a developmental to certified.

MICROPHONE 6 (Bill Clark): Dick Cheney and Haliburton.

MR. STAN COLLENDER: This is just quick, and I'm going to be surprisingly fanciful about this. Christine Corcoran's dad is one of my political godfathers. He used to be one of John Kennedy's advance people. He told me a story that I've never forgotten. This is years ago. That Kennedy pulled his staff together and said, anything good that happens I get credit for. Anything bad that's going on, you take the blame. And he was very good at it. Nothing has changed in 40 years of American politics. This is a tough issue. It's not yet settled. And under those circumstances, you wouldn't expect the President to get involved directly. The work that Bill and Fleishman, and you're -- the whole communications team is doing is trying to accomplish what you're saying, which is get the administration to take some responsibility for it by embarrassing them, if nothing else, if they won't get out there and deal with it. It's a difficult thing. Presidents can talk about what they want.

But just one general thing. A lot of the suggestions you all are making are very rational. And I don't mean to use that in a funny way this time. They are in a very solid policy budgeting way, they make sense. That doesn't mean that they won't be considered. They just haven't been considered yet. One of the real problems with American politics, particularly when it comes to budget situations and dollar situations is very often crises produce -- allow members of Congress to move from their existing position. A member who will say I don't want to spend any money on anything for any reason, will suddenly say, oh my god, we've got an air traffic control crisis, and while I don't want to spend money, I have to. Same thing is true with Hurricane Aid, FEMA, those types of things.

Everything you're saying makes a great deal of sense. Going back to the first question. Take it -- you know, why don't we think about this long-term because right now there aren't enough people feeling the pain, and therefore, getting members of Congress to feel the pain and pushing on it.

That's why I congratulated you up-front for getting out in front of this issue as early as you have. But that's also the reason the President is not going to deal with it until that pain bubbles up.

VICE PRESIDENT RUTH MARLIN: Unfortunately it is now 5:30, and by our program, we are supposed to end at 5:30. So while we weren't able to get to all of the questions, and I did have a great fear that we would not have enough questions, I actually had questions on standby in case we needed them, I'm glad to see that we did not, that there was such interest in this top.

But as it is 5:30, I will turn this back to our President, John Carr.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT JOHN CARR: Just a brief note before we recess for the day. And that is, I would like to thank Stan and Alexis and Bill and Pat and Ruth for what I thought was an extraordinarily educational and helpful program. And I'd just like to thank you all for being here and thank you for your participation.

(Applause)

You have your regional breakouts. And of course, you all know your local parties are this evening. And for our guests, we would be honored if you would join us at any one of the many venues. We're all terribly distressed about this, and we plan to drink ourselves silly tonight to wash away the stain of guilt.

(Laughter)

This meeting is in recess until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning sharp. Be careful, be safe, don't drive. Thank you so much.

(Off record 5:30 p.m.)

(Meeting adjourned)