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MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegates, please take your seats. Silence your phones or give $20 to the Auxiliary. Good morning.

ALL: Good morning.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. I know we had fun on the rooftop last night, but good morning.

ALL: Good morning. [Louder.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All righty. Thank you for yesterday. We got through a lot of business. I truly appreciate it, because that’s what we’re here to do -- the business for NAPS. And, as such, we’re going to continue and move forward. We have the Postmaster General here today, and we have the Chief Operating Officer also here today. So, again, we truly appreciate the Postal Service being here and to listen to our concerns and to answer our questions. However, there are time limits, and I’ll go through those later. But, we must get started today, and the first thing we need to do is make sure that we start the day off right. So, I want to bring Lynn Lacey up, Branch
489, and the former Illini Area VP, and Minister Lynn Lacey, to give our invocation.

    MS. LYNN LACEY: Good morning.

    ALL: Good morning.

    MS. LYNN LACEY: Come on, you can do better than that. Good morning.

    ALL: Good morning. [Louder.]

    MS. LYNN LACEY: Because this is the day that the Lord has made, and we’re going to rejoice and be glad in it.

    [Applause and chorus of Amen.]

    MS. LYNN LACEY: Now, if we can all stand, and even I want you to hold somebody’s hand because somebody may need that touch this morning. Okay. You’re feeling good now, right? Now we’re going to talk to the Master.

    Eternal Father, maker and creator all things, we just want to say thank you this morning. We thank you for the journeys that everyone came from, and you brought us here safe. Thank you for the business that we have at hand, Dear Heavenly Father. I ask you to bless the
resident officers, Dear Heavenly Father, the
Postal Headquarters people there, and each and
every one of your people, Dear Heavenly Father.
We just thank you, Dear Heavenly Father, because
we are able to breathe your fresh air, Dear
Heavenly Father. Dear Heavenly Father, as we
depart and go back to our homes and everything,
Dear Heavenly Father, that you will be with us,
Dear Heavenly Father, that you will keep us, Dear
Heavenly Father. Touch somebody’s mind this
morning, Dear Heavenly Father. Let them know that
they are loved, Father God. We just thank you,
and we bless your name. In Jesus’ name, I ask and
pray. Amen.

ALL: Amen. [Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Lynn. I
appreciate it.

Before I bring up Rosemary Harmon and Roy
Madden to do the Credentials Report, a couple of
quick things. We do have water coolers in the
side. No, no, wait a minute. You thank Sheri
Davies. She had Mohegan Sun modify their policy.
Otherwise, they were going to put tons of water bottles out there. So, Sheri Davies got you -- Bobby Bock, you better get a drink of water from there. Water bottles on the side -- coolers.

I do want to say one other thing. When the Postmaster General speaks and the Chief Operating Officer, Dave Williams -- for respect of them and to move efficiency, we’re going to only use mic 3 right here so you can address the PMG directly. So, in order for -- instead of trying to left and right, I’m going to have everybody stand up here, and if you have a problem standing, you let us know, and we’ll get you in line. But, this is how we’re going to work it. And then, if you can’t get your question answered, just write it down, and we’ll give it to Chuck, and we’ll get them to the Postmaster General and COO.

Of course, I hear some ringing. Does somebody owe me $20? Auxiliary? All right.

So, at this point in time, I do want to give you the flavor of the day. Ben and Jerry’s Cinna-dough-rella. It’s Cinna-dough-rella.
That's what I like is a little cinnamon. But, more importantly, we need our credentials, so I'm bringing up Rosemary Harmon and Roy Madden.

MS. ROSEMARY HARMON: NAPS family, good morning.

ALL: Good morning.

MS. ROSEMARY HARMON: Did you have a great time last night?

ALL: Yes.

MS. ROSEMARY HARMON: Did you have a good time last night?

ALL: Yes. [Louder.]

MS. ROSEMARY HARMON: Thank you. Thanks, Sheri. If you see her, let her know. All right. Just to get us started on the right foot, all veterans, please stand up.

[Applause.]

Thank you.

MR. ROY MADDEN: Good morning, everybody.

ALL: Good morning.

MR. ROY MADDEN: We're going to get this real quick, I hope. No questions, no problems.
So, the Committee has nothing to tell you other than what’s on our seats and our numbers, which we know to be correct so far. First-timers in attendance -- I’m sorry. August 7th, 2018, 8:30 a.m., first-timers in attendance, 118.

[Applause.]

If you’re following along, this is on page 12. Executive Board, number of attending 24. Possible votes, 24. Branches, local and state delegates attending, 909. Number of branches represented, 222. Possible branch votes, 2,482. Total possible votes, branches and Executive Board, 2,506. Total registered in attendance, NAPS delegates, Auxiliary, and guests, 1,056.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

MS. ROSEMARY HARMON: Louis Atkins, where are you?

MR. LOUIS ATKINS: I’m over here, Rosemary.

MS. ROSEMARY HARMON: All right. I’m coming to you.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Rosemary.

Thank you, Roy.

Before I bring up our Postmaster General, I believe there is a video.

[Video plays. Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Excellent video.

Excellent. It is with great honor that I introduce Postmaster General, Megan Brennan. She is the 74th and the first female Postmaster General and Chief Executive Officer of the United States Postal Service.

[Applause.]

Appointed by the Board of Governors, Postmaster General Brennan became -- began her tenure in February 2015. Her core focus is to advance strategies that invest in the future of the Postal Service and to shape the growth opportunities for the organization and the industry it serves. These strategies encompass better use of data and technology, speed the pace of product and service innovations, continue process improvements throughout the organization,
and fully engage and leverage the talents of the organization’s 640,000 employee workforce.

Postmaster General Brennan runs a $70 billion organization -- billion, with a B. That is the cornerstone of a trillion-dollar industry. She has earned a Master’s of Business Administration degree as a Sloan Fellow at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and is alumni of Immaculata College. Please give a warm NAPS welcome to our Postmaster General, Megan Brennan.

[Applause.]

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. My first question, where’s Henry? He has the remote to advance the slides. Is that correct?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I know how to use it. I could punch the buttons for you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: It would be easier if I control it, Brian.

[Laughter.]

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Good morning, everyone.
ALL: Good morning.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Brian also left me the gavel. Now, let me thank Brian and your resident officers, Ivan and Chuck, for the opportunity to be here with you this morning. Also, to thank your Executive Board and the membership at large. I know you had a fun evening last night. Was it on the rooftop, I understand? That’s pretty impressive. And what a beautiful surrounding here in Connecticut.

So, I want to thank you, and I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you today. I want to thank you for your leadership. We’ll have an opportunity to have a conversation this morning. I have a few comments I’d like to make, and then Brian and I discussed the opportunity for Q&A, which will give you an opportunity certainly to share comment with me, and an opportunity for me to provide response and some positioning.

But, I thank you for your leadership and what you do day in and day out for the organization, for our customers, and recognizing
that you have a challenging job. And I was a front-line supervisor, a mid-level manager in my career, and I believe it’s my responsibility and our collective responsibility to provide you with the tools and the training and the resources you need to better serve the American public.

I would like to take a moment and if our veterans in attendance would rise and be recognized.

[Applause.]

Thank you. Thank you for your service. And the Postal Service is proud to be one of the largest civilian employers of veterans, and you make our leadership team stronger. So, thank you for your service.

May I just have a show of hands -- any retirees in the audience? The ones with the big smiles on their faces sitting back all relaxed? They’re not holding a pen in their hand taking copious notes. Let me thank our retirees, and also the fact that you continue to be actively engaged with NAPS and advocating for the NAPS
Association with all stakeholders. Thank you.

You make a difference. We appreciate that very much.

[Applause.]

So, if you think about what’s happening in today’s marketplace and the implications it has for our business, everyone of us, I’m sure, has a smartphone, an iPad, a tablet, some of us carry more than one. That has implications for our business. I was reading an article recently that stated that on average, we look at our smartphones once every 12 minutes. Sound about right? Some of you are looking at yours right now and know that I can see you.

[Laughter.]

So, I’m assuming over the course of the next hour or so, you’re likely -- if that study holds -- to look down at least five times.

Nonetheless, the change in the way we communicate, we conduct business, and we consume information in this what I’ll call the age of the consumer -- and we’re all consumers, and we’re all
demanding consumers -- this immediacy and ability
to go on our smartphone and call up an Uber or
Lyft, to have dinner delivered through GrubHub.
This immediacy, the so-called Amazonization, which
we helped create by delivering timely and accurate
and within two days or less of product.

So, if you think about what’s happening
in the marketplace, think about some of the large
retailers like Kohls, Target, Walmart. They’re
trying to get closer to their consumer. And
because of the consumer expectation for immediacy,
the retailer is looking to shave off cycle time,
meaning get that product into the consumer’s hand
as fast as possible. So, many of these retailers
are now utilizing square footage in their stores
to service fulfillment centers to get that product
to us faster, to meet that demand for immediacy.

So, we’re in this world where we
seamlessly transition between what I’ll call print
and pixel. And what does that do? For us -- and
here’s my caution, please -- I can’t see this in
print anywhere before Thursday. We’ll have our
financial call on Thursday where we’ll report out on our quarter 3 and year-to-date financial performance. But, I wanted to give you a sneak peak here. So, I see some of your taking pictures. Just don’t post that, please, before Thursday.

But, here’s the result in terms of the workload for the organization. The blue bar -- first blue bar -- is same period last year volume. Next, you can see the decline in first-class volume. You can see the single-piece first-class mail decline of more than 6 percent. You can see the commercial or the presort volume decline. You can see the decline in marketing mail. Now, when you look at that decline in marketing mail, what’s concerning, of course, is that year after year, we’ve seen some relatively stable performance from marketing mail, and marketing mail now is roughly 52 percent of our mail mix.

When you look at the growth in package volume, while it’s healthy growth, that rate of growth has slowed considerably. Why is that?
Competition. Competition in the last mile, competition in the end-to-end or network volume, and it’s why we need to continue to deliver the value proposition -- competitive pricing, timely and accurate scanning, and certainly reliable, on-time service.

You can see the decline in international volume as well as in periodicals and other. So, bottom line, you can see that we’re down 3 billion pieces compared to the prior year.

When you look at that over the course of a decade or so, these secular trends continue. That’s a 31 percent decline in overall volume. So, as an organization, it’s why we need to continue to look at every opportunity to adjust the infrastructure, repurpose space, shed latent compacity, pull idle equipment off the workroom floor, and make adjustments to staffing and scheduling. As stewards of this organization, it’s the responsible thing to do.

So, when you look at our financial position in total, and we’ll report out a
controllable loss for the quarter, a net loss for
the quarter and the year-to-date. And some of
these headwinds are outside our control. For
instance, rising fuel costs. That has
implications for our fleet, more than 200,000
vehicles on the street. It has implications for
our facilities with more than 30,000 facilities.

But, the point I’d like to make here is
that our message has been consistent all along --
that while our financial challenges are serious,
they’re solvable. However, we need legislative
reform and regulatory reform to afford us some
business flexibility coupled with our continued
aggressive management of the business. And we’ll
talk about all this. But, when you think about
from a legislative standpoint, the Postal Service,
NAPS, other stakeholders have been advocating for
Postal Reform for more than a decade, since PAEA
was passed, and a credit to your Executive -- your
resident officers, your Executive Board, working
with other stakeholders, postal management, the
industry, and recognizing that they’re advocating
for your interests, and where we were able to align on key provisions of a bill. You know, three years ago, we were able to reach consensus on key provisions of the bill. Yet, the bill languishes. It has bipartisan support in the House. We also have a bill pending in the Senate that has bipartisan support. The challenge, of course, is in this environment, where there are broader public policy issues being debated including how to fund the government before the end of September, in a year where there’s a contentious mid-term election, the likelihood of us being able to advance legislation as the window narrows becomes more and more challenging. Yet, we’re going to continue to advocate for Postal Reform. It’s the responsible thing to do.

We also have a situation where, as you all know, we’ve been operating without independent Governors, and the Senate has not confirmed a Postal Governor since 2010. Again, we’ve been very vocal that this is good governance, that the Postal Service and all of our stakeholders are
best served by having a fully functioning
independent Board of Governors providing guidance
and oversight and direction to the nation’s
second-largest civilian employer and a $68 billion
comp any that matters to the American economy.

Now, the good news is we have two
Governors that were voted out of Committee that
are pending Senate confirmation, and we fully
expect that the Governors will be confirmed this
month when the Senate returns from recess on the
15th of August. So, we will continue to advocate
for the urgency in having Governors on board.

And I think it’s particularly important
when we’re waiting for the results of the
Presidential Taskforce. We expect those
recommendations this month as well. And I think
as you saw when the Presidential Taskforce was --
was announced, the Postal Service was pretty
measured and considered in our comment. I was
vocal to say we welcome this. The Postal Service
voice has been the loudest about the need to look
at our current business model, because the root
cause of our financial instability is a flawed business model that was imposed on us by Congress. We made responsible decisions. We reacted to that decline in volume and that change in mail mix, and we’ll continue to position the organization for success in an increasingly competitive environment. But, we need to have more business flexibility.

So, our expectation is that the taskforce will announce their recommendations in the coming days or weeks, and we expect that stakeholders, specifically Congress, who has a key role to play in any changes that would impact current statute or law, recognizes the role of the Postal Service in an increasingly digitized world that mail still matters, and we’ll talk through that.

So, from a legislative standpoint, there are a number of different -- different initiatives that are being pursued. On the regulatory front, the key issue is, in an environment where we have competition in every product line, some of our detractors will say, well, you have a monopoly.
We have a monopoly in statute only. When you look at first-class mail and marketing mail, susceptible to electronic diversion, the smartphones we carry around, the digital advertising, the exponential growth in digital advertising. Look at your social media platforms, look at Facebook, look at Instagram now. Instagram’s looking more and more like Facebook, right, with the ads? Look at the — the advertisement that comes into your own personal E-mail box. But, look at what’s different about the digital advertising that’s directed at you. Do you notice anything different from a few years back? Is it more personal to you, right? A few years back, marketers used to call it spray and pray, right? Just send out thousands, if not millions of E-mails. Now, advertisers know a lot about us, right? We have our digital footprint, the crumbs that we apparently leave as we’re browsing on social media sites or consuming the news. Programmatic advertising. Programmatic advertising. Take a look at it. It is more
targeted and relevant to you, and that’s a threat to direct mail.

So, it’s why, when we’re in front of the regulator, and we’re arguing that the Postal Service should have pricing flexibility. As you know, we’re in an environment where we have a strict price cap on products that generate roughly 70 percent of our revenue. No other business has that type of constraint. So, the fundamental issue for us is, Congress has imposed significant costs on us and then constrains our ability to generate revenue by utilizing an unrivaled infracture to generate revenue to offset those costs. It’s pretty straightforward, but it doesn’t -- can’t quite capture it in a headline, right?

So, Thursday, Friday, the meeting will just say Postal Service loses X, right? Postal Service loses billions. And, unfortunately, in today’s environment, often we don’t get past the headline. So, the continued challenge for us is to ensure that all stakeholders who will be making
decisions about the future of the Postal Service
and our role in the 21st century marketplace are
educated. So, I thank NAPS leadership and the
NAPS Association at large for your continued
efforts both on the local level, the state, and
the national level to educate our -- our public
officials, and other stakeholders.

Most importantly, what we can control --
both sides of the financial ledger, driving
operating efficiency, reducing costs, generating
profitable revenue. Thank you for your continued
efforts with the engagement programs, because we
are all part of the sales and marketing team. We
all need to understand our products and services.
But, at the end of the day, if we’re not providing
service, which is foundational, all the rest is
for naught.

So, that expression, “Keep the main thing
the main thing, and reinforce purpose,” our
purpose is to provide service to the American
public.

So, we have a plan, and there’s an
expression, “Plan the work and work the plan.”
So, when we look out at the core pillars and strategic objectives for this organization, delivering a world class customer experience, and that’s at every touch point, and I appreciate and applaud your daily efforts here. But, we, as an organization, need to recognize, this goes well beyond transit time. Transit time is important, yes. But, not a day goes by that I don’t get E-mails from customers saying that we did not return the calls, that they waited an inordinate amount of time on hold at the care center. They should not even be calling the care center. The majority of calls that we get at the care center are, “Where’s my package?” And often, when you look at the root cause analysis, it’s less about transit time failures, it’s inaccurate or untimely scans. Hence, all the work you’ve been doing over the years, the investments that we’ve made in ensuring that our employees understand that in the age of the consumer, we’re all demanding consumers, and having that visibility and recognizing where that
package is from when it enters our network until it is delivered at the accurate location -- that’s the perfect package experience, correct? On time, right location, timely and accurate scan, without generating a customer call.

So, we’ve made progress here, but we’re not world class, and we need to continue to earn our customers’ trust, earn their business, and continue to work at every touchpoint to improve that customer experience. We have to get better with ECC cases. And, again, it’s a matter of ownership, acknowledging the issue, and responding to the customer in a timely manner, and resolving it to their satisfaction. It’s not any more complex than that. So, work to do there.

In terms of innovating to deliver value. Dave will likely touch on this more, but if you think about the investments we’ve made -- informed delivery, informed visibility, autonomous-guided vehicles in a number of our plants, experimenting with an ALPS machine in two locations. We’ll continue to look at opportunities to prioritize
investments to keep us competitive.

Investing in our future. And this is everything from infrastructure, facilities, vehicles, people, training, development, the new supervisor training program, management essentials, developing a new POM training program. All that is investments in people, and ultimately -- and how many of you -- maybe a show of hands -- have attended the Analytics University? All right, we need more hands than that, right? But, that’s again, to develop you to help provide the tools that you need to identify gaps in service performance and also ultimately to help us drive operating efficiency. So, we’re committed to these pillars, and we need to continue to demonstrate to our employees at large proof points on our commitment to these core pillars.

So, let’s talk about our strategy in a digital world. What is it? There you go. How many of you are signed up for Informed Delivery? Oh, every hand needs to go up. Retirees, come on. We need to sign every employee up for Informed
Delivery. Our ability, then, to influence consumer adoption is dependent on our understanding of the products and services.

Informed Delivery is our digital strategy. It builds awareness for mail. Right now, we have about 11.4 million consumers signed up. Mailers have generated more than 2,900 content-rich campaigns utilizing Informed Delivery. It’s a chicken and an egg thing for us though, right? Marketers are saying, “Come to me when you have more than 20 millions consumers signed up.” So, we need to demonstrate the value of this, and it’s not just nice to do for those of us who travel and for those of us who have more than one person in the household, because someone is always the CEO of mail, correct? And the CEO of mail may not want you to see everything that comes in the mailbox.

[Laughter.]

Here’s one way to combat that. But, for us, it’s ultimately about demonstrating the value of mail. And think about that and start looking
more closely at your Informed Delivery images. You’re starting to see more and more of our -- of our mailers embed a QR code that enables you then to go immediately to their website. So, for us ultimately to be able to monetize it, if you think about it, one way would be a click-through fee. Another would be if we have multiple mailers and they want to be at the top of your images, right? So, if you’re just scrolling, and the first thing you see is a, you know, a McDonald’s advertisement. So, that’s how we’re working with marketers and some of the use cases that we see for Informed Delivery. So, we need your help here in promoting Informed Delivery.

Also, informed visibility. This is also a game changer for us. This is what the industry and the Postal Service have been working toward, to have that end-to-end visibility, whether it’s on a container, a bundle, a tray, a letter, as it moves through our system, because this creates business intelligence. Business value for the customer as well as value for the organization.
If you think about it from a customer standpoint as well as our own standpoint, an ability to know how to staff their call center based on when they deposited mail, an ability to adjust transportation. So, it’s having this advance information that creates the business and customer value for us. These are investments that we continue to make.

But, if you think back to the graph I showed on the volume and the comparison compared to the same period last year, we need to put in context for stakeholders as well that while we continue to benefit from package growth and that package revenue helps fund the network, an expansive delivery retail processing network that is required to support the universal service obligation. Yet, package volume is roughly 5 percent of our volume, and it is roughly 30 percent of our revenue. Mail is 95 percent of our volume and 70 percent of our revenue. So, we’re making a concerted effort in working with the industry to reinvent mail.
At the recent National Postal Forum with more than 4,000 roughly customers, our emphasis was on how we grow mail, how we position mail as part of an omni-channel or multimedia approach to marketing and getting to the decision-makers who are going to spend on digital because they can, in their minds, reach more at, you know, much lower costs. While that may be true, it’s all about return on investment. So, you’re going to see over the next couple of months more collateral coming out, particularly to support the engagement programs, and us promoting mail -- direct mail -- whether it’s political in election cycle, what’s coming up, right? Mid-term elections. But, between now and the end of September, there are still a number of primary races, special runoffs in multiple states. It’s an opportunity to use mail. What better way to get in front of your constituent or a potential voter?

So, reinventing mail, for us, is a key strategy to grow revenue. So, you’ll be hearing more about that in the coming -- in the coming
weeks and months.

Ultimately, all these initiatives -- we’ve got to run, and run faster, because the competition is not waning. The pace of competition is intensifying, and the Postal Service needs to continue to change and improve. It needs to deliver the value proposition for our customers, and we need to do it together.

So, my ask of you is, I recognize that we have some challenges, and we have forums to identify and work to resolve those issues. My discussion today is to level-set and also sound the siren a bit to say, this is a pivotal time for this organization. It’s a pivotal time for us to demonstrate the value of the Postal Service to the American public -- to demonstrate that mail still matters, that the Postal Service is the platform that the mailing and shipping industry relies on to reach their consumers. It is critically important that the Postal Service have the business flexibility to compete.

So, I want to thank you for what you do
day in and day out. I would encourage you to stay informed. I read your magazines. I would ask you to make sure you’re reading length, make sure you’re watching the videos, please show them to our employees. We have an educated workforce, and if we have 640,000 employees moving in the same direction to serve the American public and to position this organization for long-term success, that’s a formidable team. So, I want to thank you, and I welcome questions. Thank you, everyone.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Megan. I truly appreciate it. We are going -- like I said -- we’re going to start with the questions right in front of you so won’t have to look up to write. Megan has a hard stop at 9:45. I have to get her off this stage. I will not push her, but I will get her off the stage. Now, Megan, you do have -- you do have the gavel. Now, if you feel there is any question that is inappropriate, they’re out of order, and they move on. But, I will give you the
floor. Again, please, global questions, and we’ll move forward, and please make them short, get to your answers, and everybody can be heard. Megan Brennan, it’s all yours.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you, Brian.

Good morning.

MS. PEGGY BEDNAR: Good morning, Ms. Brennan. Peggy Bednar, Branch 20, Pittsburgh, out of Canonsburg.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Just for the record, so everyone is aware, that’s my home -- that’s my zip code, that’s my Postmaster, that’s my supervisor, manager, all wrapped up in one. And, then, Peggy, if I have to gavel you, that’s said.

[Laughter.]

Because if I have to gavel you, I’m going to be there on Saturday.

[Laughter.]

MS. PEGGY BEDNAR: Next.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Just kidding. Go ahead, please.

MS. PEGGY BEDNAR: I just wanted to say
in front of everybody as a group, you have been a
pleasure to be one of my patrons.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Thank you.

MS. PEGGY BEDNAR: All right. Recently,
I attended a MFIL training in Norman, Oklahoma --
that’s Management, Field Essential Leadership if
you are not familiar with that -- and I need to
say this, in 32 years beyond ASP, this was the
most informative training that I have attended
where I have got to meet other level, higher-level
managers, and I just applaud the fact that this
training is going on. I was week 38, and

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: No, absolutely, there
will be. Thank you for your comments, Peggy. I’d
say this, we made a concerted effort and a
commitment when I was appointed to this position
to say we would invest in employee training and
development. And Jeff Williamson and his team
certainly working the NAPS, UPMA, to develop new training to enhance the training, and to develop what we’ll call learning continuum for training at every level of this organization. That will continue. That’s our commitment, and we’ll certainly continue to get input from the management associations on the development of the training. But, thank you for that, and I would encourage others to certainly request the training that is available to you.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: Bobby Bock, Branch 406. We’ve taken over the Headquarters now under fleet -- fleet -- and the vehicles, we don’t have enough vehicles, we’re trying to hold them together. There was talk that they were going to buy some vehicles off the shelf, but we haven’t heard anything yet. Some carriers are waiting for the other vehicles to get back, so they can go out and deliver mail. What’s the status on our fleet?

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yes, thank you for the question, Bobby. So, here’s where we are. In terms of -- annual purchases of vehicles, we
roughly deploy about 9 to 10,000 -- upper bound of about 12,000 a year, primarily in recent years the ProMasters. We’re continuing to test the next generation of delivery vehicles. We’ll likely extend that testing time period because we had multiple suppliers, and a few of the suppliers had to regroup, I’ll say. So, it’s in our best interest before we make a long-term purchase decision, to fully vet multiple vendors. That said, the commercial off-the-shelf vehicles are COTS. We have 20 of them that we’re going to deploy, I think it’s in August -- it’s the end of this month, early September. We’re going to deploy them in, I believe, it’s Michigan, North Carolina, and Virginia to test those. So, that will give us an opportunity in short order to see if these vehicles, which have a larger cargo capacity, can be deployed, and they are commercial off-the-shelf, meaning they’re available, we can purchase them.

The other thing we’re looking at from a delivery vehicle standpoint is when you -- when
you segment the routes by PDs, right, and by type, we have a number of routes that have ten or less box-on-post deliveries. So, this may be the best solution for any number of configurations of vehicles. So, more to follow on that. I recognize the issue. In the near term, though, if we have -- if we have constraints, and we don’t have vehicles available at the VMF, then we’ve got to make the smart business decision and lease some vehicles.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you, Bobby.

MR. MARK VELEZ: Mark Velez, Branch 164, Flushing. First of all, thank you for your service.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you.

MR. MARK VELEZ: It can’t be an easy position. I create a branch pin, and the pin looks like a milk crate, and it says, “Missing NPA raise. If found, contact Branch 164.”

[Laughter.]

Thank you. It kind of wasn’t meant to be
a joke. It’s kind of a serious item with me.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: I’m not laughing.

MR. MARK VELEZ: Okay, no, for everybody else behind me. So, what I would like --

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: I’ll repeat -- oh, Mark, if you could speak into the mic there.

MR. MARK VELEZ: I created a pin that looks like a milk crate, and it says, “NAPS Branch 164 missing NPA Raise as of 2008.”

[Applause.]

Again, it wasn’t meant to be a joke. I need to know, what do I tell my members about the pay package that was presented to us this past couple of months ago? What, from you, should I tell my members? And, if you wish, I do have a copy of the pin. I just want to present it if you want it.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Yeah, no, I don’t need it. Thank you, though.

[Laughter.]  

MR. MARK VELEZ: I figured you’d say that. Again, no disrespect to you or your
position.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Yeah. I’m not taking any disrespect. Here’s my response to you, Mark, and to all of us. We have to deliver better performance results. That’s the reality. We still have a mitigation process that we’ve had since inception. Stop and think for a moment. Are we not responsible for a safe work environment? Are we not responsible as the leaders of this organization to provide training and development to our employees? Are we not responsible to ensure they’re working safely? That’s one of the components of NPA. NPA is a balanced scorecard approach, and while I can appreciate the frustration and obviously we would all prefer if we were in a year where we had consistent increases in our base salary. It’s a pay-for-performance process. So, we have work to do to improve service reliability, safety, operating efficiency. We’re in an environment where we lost 3 billion pieces of mail, and we’re using more hours than same period last year. That
doesn’t compute. We have more tools at our disposal than we’ve ever had. How many of us when we started had more than a clipboard? Now, we have DMS, we have geospatial coordinates to know where every letter carrier is on any given day.

So, I’m sure my response sounds a little harsh, but the reality is, we are in the fight of our lives as an organization, and I recognize that NPA matters, and our base increase matters, but we’re talking about the long-time viability of the Postal Service, and as a leadership team, we have to continue to deliver results. In terms of the consultative process, your Executive Board, your resident officers, determined to go to fact-finding. So, that will be addressed in that forum.

[Applause.]

What I will say is, that what we did commit to do was increase the minimum and maximum salary ranges, we did that. We also agreed to create a workgroup to look at NPA for fiscal year 19. We were responsive to the request to look at
the matrix and put opportunity into cell 3 with
the 1 percent lump sum. So, it’s not as if we’re
not hearing the concerns of the organization and
the membership at large. But, we’ve got to work
through that. I also heard some criticism, “Well,
you should have adjusted NPA mid-cycle, mid-year.”
You know you cannot do that. It smacks of
gamesmanship, and I’m certainly not going to make
any adjustment to a pay-for-performance package in
a year where we’re -- we don’t have independent
Governors. It’s just not good business.

So, I appreciate and thank you for asking
the question, Mark. Someone, and I’m glad you did
it upfront. But, that’s the answer. And short of
that, it’s really not appropriate for me to talk
beyond that given that we’ll be in fact-finding.

MR. MARK VELEZ: Thank you.
MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Okay. Thank you,
Mark.
MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: Good morning.
MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Good morning.
MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: I’m sorry, my
voice isn’t on. My name is Toni Coleman-Scruggs, Branch 493 out of Illinois. Ms. Brennan, I thank you. Several times, the involuntary reassignment letter has been put out, and it seems to be a big issue. I have found in the past few months, I’ve had 10 to 15 cases where employee’s days off are being changed because the manager is saying they don’t like the day off, jobs are being abolished, employee’s days off are just changed at will, and I even found it disturbing recently talking to a Human Resource Manager who said they never heard of the letter. I said, “It’s been out since ’88” and I even forwarded it to them, and I said, “So, are you saying that you’re not listening to the directives that are being put out by Postal Headquarters, and I’m sure Ms. Brennan who personally put out the letter would not appreciate that.” So, that’s one of the issues.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Where is that again? Where’s your location?

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: The Great Lakes Area and specifically --
MS. MEGAN BRENnan: What District?

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: In the District, we’re looking at Chicago --

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Okay.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: -- South Suburban District, and Indiana Area.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Yeah, if I may comment. I think, Brian, was it your recent article where you talked about escalation process? Was it you -- you had a recent article that talked about escalating issues? So, that’s one thing I would ask. If you’re not getting a response at the local level or the area level, elevate it.

Please don’t assume we know. And I know the next response everyone is going shout is it’s happening everywhere, but tell us where it is happening, and then we will summarily work through that, because we -- we have worked over the years with NAPS about ensuring that we have schedules, that if there are changes, that it is not done arbitrarily. So, just ensure you elevate that, and you just did.
MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: And I have been, actually, elevating and still not results. That's what's disturbing.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Hand it right here to Sandy -- right here up front. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: And the last thing, which is very disturbing too, Dave Williams put out a letter about the joint statement on violence and the protocol about due process, and it's still not being followed. There was decision even recently where an employee who was attacked - - and that's happening a lot -- a lot of EAS have been personally attacked and put on emergency placement, and then the joint statement decision by _____ came out, and the person wasn't even at work, telling them that they cannot supervise for six months.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: All right. Let’s not -- we can’t talk about a specific case here.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: Right.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: If you would hand it
off --

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: I handed it off.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Let’s make sure -- it’s in there?

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: It says -- can we ask that, even though the letter has been put out, for some reason, these Human Resources managers in the area have been just talking personally saying they’ve never heard of it, and you’re telling me you’ve been in service 30 years? So --

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: I’ll take that back. There is no -- we’re not going to tolerate that. But, let’s make sure we have the facts and that we address it for the specific case. All right. Thank you.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: Thank you very much. Have a good day. Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you.

MR. KYLE LAURENDINE: Good morning. Kyle
Laurendine, Branch 73, New Orleans. In case nobody has told you this today, I think you’re amazing.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Stay there, you take all the time you’d like. Just stay there.

[Laughter.]

MR. KYLE LAURENDINE: I told you that two years ago when you left our convention, and I’ll open with that.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you.

MR. KYLE LAURENDINE: I’ll keep this global in nature. We understand, and we’ll pick up the baton and do whatever you need us to do as EAS, wherever you want us to direct the organization, we’ll bring it for you, we’ll do that. But, we need you to help us to treat EAS with dignity and respect.

[Applause.]

All we want is a fair chance at compensation. We know we have to repurpose, we have to do different things, we have to restructure, reorganize, and we’ll do whatever you
need us to do. But, every time there’s pay talks with the craft, we see the craft getting pay raises, and they deserve it. They work hard -- the conditions they work under. They are truly deserving, and we are not jealous, man, or anything about that. We would just like to see the EAS get a fair shake at some of the compensation that we work hard for.

[Applause.]

And we just want you to get -- to help push the ball in pay talks to get us to where we need to be to continue to grow, because the people coming behind us -- they don’t want to become EAS, because they don’t see the compensation is there, and we cannot attract a new EAS to take over the mantle so when I retire and like the rest of these ladies and gentleman out here sitting at the NAPS convention retired and enjoying it, there’s nobody to push the organization forward. So, I’m asking you to get into the pay talks and help us to get paid and compensated. Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you.
[Applause.]

MS. MEGAN BRENAN: Let me -- let me --
do you want to add something Kyle?

MR. KYLE LAURENDINE: No.

MS. MEGAN BRENAN: No, go ahead, please.

You look like you wanted to. All right. All
right.

MR. KYLE LAURENDINE: Okay, you’re still
amazing.

[Laughter.]

MS. MEGAN BRENAN: Thank you. Hey,
here’s the reality, as I said. It is a pay-for-
performance system. I recognize, particularly in
what have been some lean years, now there are
still supervisors and managers in this room and
throughout the country, you know, this year, last
year, the prior year that saw base increases,
correct? Now, admittedly, we need to deliver
better results for the organization, for our
customers, and we want everyone to have the
opportunity to see that base increase. In terms
of the pay consultations, my door is always open.
So, we want to move forward on key issues.

As I said, we increased the minimum and the maximum salary ranges. We agreed to revisit, I’ll call it the mechanics of NPA with a work group that has NAPS representation on it.

Absolutely open to do that. And I would ask you, you’re in the position you’re in because you want to make a difference, and you want to contribute. Yes, I mean, obviously pay matters to all of us.

But, you’re in a leadership position because you chose to be in a leadership position, and I’m appreciative and thankful for that every day, because you’re making the decisions that are going to determine the service to our customers, that’s going to determine our financial stability, and I also think that as leaders of this organization, we have a responsibility to continue to look back and identify future leaders and develop them, and I know the first thing you don’t speak to them about is the pay. It’s because they want to be part of a leadership team and have an opportunity to influence this organization. So, point well
taken on pay. Thank you. Yes.

MS. RESHIA BRASWELL: Good morning. My name is Reshia Braswell, Branch 41, Memphis, Tennessee. I’m kind of echoing out there. I want to say I did attend the MFIL program. It is a good program.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Good.

MS. RESHIA BRASWELL: It’s very good. Keep it going. A couple months ago, a statement came out about bullying, and we read it to all our employees, which is good. But, what I would like to know is, isn’t the management staff part of the employment agent with this agency?

[Applause.]

We get bullied every day. I get threatened. I get bullied. I loved -- I used to love my job. I’ve been a manager now for ten years. I love my job -- used to -- now, I don’t. I used to think I wanted it to make a difference. And it’s not just me, it’s everywhere. It’s upper management, being forced, being talked to -- I’ve been told how many times I’m worthless.
MS. MEGAN BRENnan: All right. Yeah, no. That’s unacceptable. Here’s the thing. I don’t bully our leadership team. I don’t expect them to be bullying the Area Vice Presidents. So, here’s again what I would ask. Again, I hear the murmur. Raise it. Raise it repeatedly until it’s addressed. If -- if -- but we also need to understand -- I know that we’re driving for performance results, so you’re saying this is not driving for performance results.

MS. RESHIA BRASWELL: No, ma’am.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: This is unprofessional, disrespectful behavior, and we can’t have it anywhere. So, Memphis, Tennessee, you told me? We will follow up.

MS. RESHIA BRASWELL: Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: All right? Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. CHARLES MAY: Good morning, Ms. Brennan.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Good morning.
MR. CHARLES MAY: My name is Charles May, President of Branch 14, Chicago, Illinois. My question is, could you give us your insights on the new RIF procedure that just came out recently.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: The new RIF procedures?

MR. CHARLES MAY: Yes, the new RIF, how the areas have been divided up differently, and it came out in the Postal Bulletin on the 2nd of August.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: I’m sorry, I don’t know specifically what you’re referring to that the RIF procedures have been changed.

MR. CHARLES MAY: Well, not exactly the RIF procedure. What had happened is is that they have changed how the areas were divided up. It used to be that in the District, if you was -- say if Chicago was broken up, you could transfer to customer service. But, now the new procedures outline that if you are in the plant, you cannot -- and the plant is RIF -- you cannot go to customer service.
MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Oh, I’ll have to -- where’s Bruce? Is Bruce here from Labor? I’ll ask Bruce just to get some clarifying points on that. It might just be based on the installation that you’re referring to?

MR. CHARLES MAY: Yes.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Okay. Yeah, and so typically, obviously, if we need to run a RIF -- and NAPS knows this, and UPMA knows this -- we work very closely with the associations and the individual to find them a landing spot, and I think our track record speaks for itself. But, I understand your concern if we narrow that -- that bid installation --

MR. CHARLES MAY: Right.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN -- that it limits your choices. So, let me have him follow up on that.

MR. CHARLES MAY: All right. Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: I think you just demonstrated that I don’t read the Postal Bulletin regularly.

[Laughter.]
I should have went, [banging of gavel.]

[Laughter.]

Thank you. Good morning.

MR. ROBERT MCMURRAY: Good morning, Ms. Brennan. Robert McMurray, Branch 165, Knoxville. I’ve heard murmurs about what the lady from Branch 41 said from Memphis. So, it sounds like that’s fairly correct. But, my question is, we have an issue where craft replaces OIC positions, bypassing supervisors, and, of course, when the position is actually open, then those supervisors don’t have enough experience to be actually promoted into that OIC or that position. Can we ask you to put some sort of policy so that those supervisors are offered those OIC positions first rather than just placing any local craft into those positions?

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: That’s fair. You know, to me, I’d much rather look at an existing member of our management team who is looking to broaden their knowledge, their depth, and breadth of experience, particularly in a unit where then
we’re going to backfill or use overtime from the craft. So, that said, I’d also want to look at providing opportunities for craft employees, but it makes sense. So, we need to have a process in the District, I would recommend, and engage with NAPS. Pardon me?

MR. ROBERT MCMURRAY: We need your leadership.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: No, understood. I didn’t recognize that to be an issue, that we weren’t providing opportunities to EAS. So, we’ll address that.

MR. ROBERT MCMURRAY: All right. Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Absolutely. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MS. KAY RANDLE: Good morning.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Good morning.

MS. KAY RANDLE: Kay Randle, Branch 269. Thank you for this opportunity. I would like to know -- well, this is really being redundant about
the lack of dignity and respect and the
intimidation. We, as managers, are not allowed to
manage our units.

[Applause.]

We are told that you have to get -- you
have to get your manager -- upper manager has to
give you the okay to curtail mail, to manage your
workload, and yet, you’re being told you have to
get your carriers off the street by a certain
amount of time. We’re also told that in order to
bring in full-day overtime, you’ve got to have
management’s -- upper management’s okay. How can
we, as EAS employees in the field, manage our
units, and at the same time, meet our NPA goals?

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: I appreciate the
comment. My reaction to this would be, you’re in
a management and leadership position. I would
expect that we provide the tools and the training
and the resources to you for you to manage that
unit. Now, there will always be performance
expectations, but, frankly, we don’t have enough
resources or time to micromanage your unit, so we
should be giving you --

[Strong audience reaction.]

MS. KAY RANDLE: Well, this is being done every day. This is being done every day. If I have a situation --

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Excuse me. May I complete my comment?

MS. KAY RANDLE: Oh, okay. I’m sorry.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: All right. No, it’s not you. It’s the crowd -- the response to that. My point being, in an environment where we have to deliver value every day -- that’s non-value add. So, we as a leadership team in an organization -- and I would ask you that you -- Brian and for your resident officers -- when Dave Williams is here, he needs to understand this is still happening, whether it’s Telecons or that type. That’s not helpful for us, right? I expect you -- I’m going to hold you to account to deliver those performance results, correct?

MS. KAY RANDLE: Exactly.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: That’s what I’m going
to hold you to account. What I also would offer, we need to have better relationships with whether it’s your CSOM or your POM or the District, so that we have a more professional and mature relationship in the field. All right. Point well taken. Got it.

MS. KAY RANDLE: Okay, but don’t you think it should start from head down?

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Am I -- am I -- am I calling Telecons? No.

MS. KAY RANDLE: I’m speaking in my District.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yes.

MS. KAY RANDLE: My District.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yes, I heard you.

What District?

MS. KAY RANDLE: Central Illinois.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Okay, thank you.

MS. KAY RANDLE: Central Illinois.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: I hear you. Thank you.

MS. KAY RANDLE: And, one more comment.
Who’s engaging EAS?

MS. MEGAN BRENnan? Me. I’m standing --

I’m standing here right now engaging EAS. This is a form of engagement. It might be -- I may have a different descriptive for how you’re engaging me, but, nonetheless, that’s --

[Strong audience reaction.]

I’m kidding. Come on. Come on.

MS. KAY RANDLE: This is a one-time shot.

I’m speaking on a daily, weekly, monthly, ongoing --

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Yeah. Here’s what should happen, right? Whether you -- whether you’re in a city with a CSOM or your station manager, you know, who do you interact with?

Who’s your accountable manager?

MS. KAY RANDLE: My --

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Not their name, but their title.

MS. KAY RANDLE: POM.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: All right, your POM. So, in our organization, given the size of this
organization, in any survey that we’ve conducted, whether it’s a voice of the employee or an -- an exit survey with employees who resign from our flexible workforce, what do you think the number one complaint is from those employees who resign?

MS. KAY RANDLE: Training.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: No, let me hear what else? The relationship with their supervisor. So, and that could be couched as whether it’s communication or a work schedule, not respecting them. So, my point being that for all of us, it’s who do you interact with on a regular basis. So, in your case, your POM or your District Manager, right?

Another form of engagement is communication that comes out from Headquarters. Communication that comes out from your area. So, ideally, that engagement is like this, correct, in person?

MS. KAY RANDLE: Um-hum.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: But, we also have to recognize your POM has how many other offices that
they’re managing. So, it comes in various forms. But, we all have a responsibility to engage employees at every level of this organization. To me, there’s nothing more fulfilling and you take, I’ll say, some of the criticisms with -- with the engagement but going out and talking with employees.

So, then I would ask you, turn the table, and talk to your employees. Would your employees say you engage them? Good. Very good. That’s what we need. So, we’ve got work to do on engagement with you. Thank you.

MS. KAY RANDLE: Thank you.

[Applause.]

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yes, please.

MS. JAMIE HUFF: Good morning. Jamie Huff, Dayton, Ohio, Branch 2, home of the Wright Brothers and Wright Patterson Air Force Base.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Excellent.

MS. JAMIE HUFF: I just want to commend you as being a woman in your position. It’s something that, you know, us women can look up to.
With that being said, as far as discipline action goes, we tend to see women getting more disciplinary action. With that being said, my employees gave me a plaque that said, “World’s Best Boss” and had my name on it.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Nice.

MS. JAMIE HUFF: Of which, I took a picture of it and posted it on Facebook. I like people to see the positive image with the Postal Service. I was chastised for that by the Postmaster, as it being weak among our employees. I hold my employees accountable, the ones that need to be accountable. I praise and support and provide extra things that I pay for out of my own pocket, and I’m soft-spoken, but yet I can be stern when I need to be, and I don’t appreciate, you know, upper management feeling that they can pick on the women because we are, you know, the mother figures, the, you know, that type of thing.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yeah, that’s not acceptable, no, not acceptable.

MS. JAMIE HUFF: Thank you.
[Applause.]

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: No, and I appreciate that. And I appreciate your comment about, you know, there’s an expression, “It’s like swimming,” and I don’t mean this as literally, right? Kicking and stroking. You want to provide that immediate -- immediate feedback to the employee, positive or if it’s corrective in nature. So, I appreciate that. We can’t have that. Again, I would ask to elevate that, so we know where that is occurring and resolve it.

MS. JAMIE HUFF: One more thing, as a woman, I would appreciate if you would consider having a selfie with me.

[Laughter.]

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Absolutely, once we’re done. Yes.

MS. JAMIE HUFF: Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: In fact, Brian and I were just saying that I have -- well, I’m going to try to stretch it so that we answer all the questions that we have lined up. Please.
MR. GREGORY MORRIS: Good morning.

Gregory Morris, President of Branch 421, Lafayette, Louisiana. A while ago, you was thanking the veterans, and I’m in a position again where I’m a disabled veteran at 30 percent, and my veteran preference rights have been ignored again. Now, I have responded to this issue, and I have carbon copied you the E-mails, so you know what’s going on. What are you going to do to address this issue, please?

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Well, I’m not going to address it in a public forum.

MR. GREGORY MORRIS: I understand, but if you --

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: If you want to, at the end, talk with Sandy or I or Bruce, and we’ll make sure we have the information.

MR. GREGORY MORRIS: That’s what I want to know.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Absolutely.

MR. GREGORY MORRIS: Because it’s the last time it’s happened.
MS. MEGAN BRENAN: Yeah. Let’s talk offline.

MR. GREGORY MORRIS: Now, I’m going to tell you how to fix the Post Office.

MS. MEGAN BRENAN: All right. Yeah, I’m trying to get -- I’m trying to get everyone.

MR. GREGORY MORRIS: It’s real quick.

[Simultaneous speaking.]

MR. GREGORY MORRIS: Get rid of Telecons, and get rid of your PCs.

[Strong audience reaction.]

MS. MEGAN BRENAN: You know, there’s an expression, they is us, right? They is us. So, one thing I would ask everyone, and I think I intimated at the outset of the discussion, we’re going to have disagreements. We don’t have to be disagreeable about it. The other point I would make is, we have enough detractors outside our four walls, and the strength of this organization has always been its employees, and that’s all of us. I am a Postal worker, you’re a Postal worker, every one of the 640,000. Please.
[Applause.]

MR. JASON TAPP: Good morning, Megan.

Jason Tapp, Branch 65, Denver, Colorado. Thank you for talking to us.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Sure.

MR. JASON TAPP: I come before you to offer some solutions to our NPA complaints, kind of. I work on the third team. I’m a supervisor. I know a lot of people that you talk to, they tell you what you want to hear --

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: That’s not true.

MR. JASON TAPP: Really what happens out on the field.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: I’m not hearing what I want to hear for the most part, am I? Come on. No, no, don’t -- that’s -- I have to stop you there. Because, and we all have a responsibility here. Anybody ever remember, years back there used to be this bobblehead, and it was called the Yes Man, and you put it on your dash, right, and it bobbled and said, “How do you do it? You are so smart, sir. You’re the boss.” No. I don’t
have anyone around our table that does that. In fact, sometimes I’m like, please, given me --.
So, no, and you can’t -- you can’t permit that either.

MR. JASON TAPP: Right. What really irks me is we pay out millions and millions of dollars of grievance money -- free money to the craft because we don’t maximize them. It’s like a bonus for them, and I don’t know if we put enough focus on that, you know, I hear one state where like 50,000 hours of admin --

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yeah, let me -- let me interrupt you. All right, point well taken. And the only reason I’m doing that is because I’d like to get to every question, and I’m assuming -- is that gist of your comment? Because I have a response here. We collectively are responsible for that. If we violate the contract and nothing inflames me more -- and I just reviewed the quarter 3 contingent liabilities -- I call it unjust enrichment. But, shame on us, if we’re violating the contract, and shame on us if we’re
not providing that front-line supervisor, mid-level manager with the training. Because if we follow the contract, we’re not going to have these violations.

MR. JASON TAPP: But, some of us aren’t given the opportunity to follow the contract because we’ve got 5:00, 6:00 --

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: That’s another issue. Then, that is on us. That is on Dave Williams and the Operations Team.

MR. JASON TAPP: And that’s the only thing I wanted to address.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: We can’t have these arbitrary -- I hear ya.

MR. JASON TAPP: Make sure that we look at the free money that we pay out instead of hey, we’ve got to make 6, we’ve got to make 7, and then we give out free money. Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yeah. No. And my response was not in frustration to you. It’s to the issue and for us to manage it, because if we put arbitrary windows and then result in payouts,
that’s a poor management decision. So, that’s on us.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Please, in order to get through this, with all due respect, ask your question and move on, not a question with five parts. Please, just your question and we’ll get to everyone. I appreciate that. Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you, Brian.

Thank you. Good morning.

MR. WILLIAM ISAAC: Good morning. My name is William Isaac. I’m Secretary of Branch 33, Columbus.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Columbus, Ohio.

MR. WILLIAM ISAAC: Our President has called our company nothing but a delivery boy for Amazon. Are we really making a decent profit to work our employees on Sunday?

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yes. We are making a profit on our package business, on our NSA with Amazon, on our NSA with Fedex, UPS, DHL. Here’s a reality. Here’s what we -- what we discussed
publicly as well. Not only are our NSAs profitable, not only does the revenue from the package help support the infrastructure that’s required to meet our USO obligation, our regulator annually reviews those NSAs to ensure profitability. Bottom line. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. PAUL NORTON: Good morning.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Good morning.

MR. PAUL NORTON: I’m Paul Norton, Indianapolis, Branch 8. And my question is, with President Trump’s recent comments about the taskforce or whatever he’s putting together. I know he’s a businessman. I know that he’s very high on some things with Amazon and FedEx. What can you tell us in this forum is your feeling -- your opinion -- you and your leadership group -- in terms of giving us some confidence that the Postal Service at your level will be at the table, and anything that you can share that gives us some sense of understanding that maybe Trump might be a little bit wrong on trying to privatize the Postal
Service. Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Let me -- let me say this. You know, clearly, I don’t want to prejudge what the taskforce may recommend. But, if -- if you revisit the objective of the taskforce, you can surmise that they will likely comment on labor costs, pricing and costing, the USO, and the like. And I think credit to NAPS, you had an opportunity to meet with the taskforce, correct? So, our expectation is that the taskforce, ultimately the administration, and ultimately Congress, will consider the views of the various stakeholders and the agency as they look to make any -- any change to our existing -- existing statute or our role. So, aside from that, I really can’t comment. At the appropriate time, we will certainly comment. And this is clearly -- this is a process. But, you can expect that there may be what I’ll call splash recommendations that come out. But, you also need to know -- and your resident officers or Bruce may have already commented to this affect -- there have also already been a number of
stakeholders to include public officials who have been vocal about the role of the Postal Service and what their thoughts are. You can also appreciate, though, that at this juncture, we’re best served as an agency maintaining a position that, you know, we’ll comment at the appropriate time. So, we need to remain measured and considered, because frankly, we want to ensure that we have and maintain a seat at the table, as we work through this process. So, we’ll keep you informed. Thank you.

[Applause.]

Please.

MR. JOE O’DONNELL: Hi. I’m Joe O’Donnell, Branch 20, Pittsburgh. I’m a retiree. I worked 39 years for the Postal Service.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Thank you for your service.

MR. JOE O’DONNELL: Thank you. And my question is, how secure are our -- are the retirees benefits going into the future?

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Um-hum. Thank you
for the question. Good question, because frankly, we all want the opportunity to retire from this organization, and we want to ensure that our pensions are fully funded, and that the Postal Service, a few years down the road, is not like some the states and municipalities that are now, you know, reneging on these pension liabilities. So, it’s why, as an organization, we’ve been very clear about the need (1) for the Medicare integration so that that addresses the gap or the unfunded liability we have with retiree health benefits. So, for HRB, we’re roughly 45 percent funded. For our pensions, how many CSRS in the room? A few CSR, all right. And FERS? Our pensions are roughly 88 percent funded. So, we are in -- we’re very healthy in terms of our funding levels. And, as you well know, I think a change in interest rate has an impact on the funding levels. But, we are in a much better position than the Federal Government and any other entity that we’ve studied, and it’s our goal to ensure that those pensions are protected. So,
thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. JOE O’DONNELL: But, how many years
into the future?

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Decades. Decades.

MR. JOE O’DONNELL: They’re prefunded for
decades.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yes. No, not
prefunding, pensions, decades.

MR. JOE O’DONNELL: It’s already paid
for.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yes. When we look
out -- now, again, where are the accountants in
the room? There are a number of variables that
you look at, right? You look at the interest
rate. You look at actuarial assumptions. But, as
of today point in time, we’re in very good shape.
But, we have to ensure moving forward that we’re
protected, hence on the RHB, the need for Medicare
integration. Absent that, a decade or more from
now, it would be a different discussion. All
things being equal.
MR. JOE O’DONNELL: Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you.

MS. GRACE BALBOA: Hi. My name is Grace Balboa, Branch 122, with the Houston District. I am a Senior Field Sales Representative with an annual target of $10.1 million. Come to find out, actually in a conversation with my sales manager last night, he was pretty upset and perturbed to find out that the EAS from Headquarters are not receiving the raise that NAPS fought so hard for.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: No, nothing has been done yet. Not accurate.

MS. GRACE BALBOA: Okay, because they asked me to bring back information.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you, but not accurate.

MS. GRACE BALBOA: Okay.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: No decisions have been made.

MS. GRACE BALBOA: Okay.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: UPMA is a different story -- the Postmasters Association, but not
Headquarters.

MS. GRACE BALBOA: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MEGAN BRENAR: Thank you.

MS. CINDY MCCracken: Hey, Megan. Cindy McCracken, Northwest Area VP. I appreciate all the efforts we do with engagement, but I have a couple issues with it. You know, I’ve always engaged my employees. I love talking to my people. I like knowing about them, you know, but they know that I drive the line. You know, if there’s -- I just need to know about them, what’s going on. I can tell when an employee walks into my office if they’ve had a bad night or if something’s going on with their family, just because I engage with them so much. I’ve been chastised for my engagement with my employees. When I talked to the other EAS out here, they’re -- they don’t get anything from the upper levels telling them what a good job they’re doing. So, I appreciate every time we meet with you, always say thank you. And that’s just two words, two words. It's so easy to come out of someone’s mouth to say
thank you, you’ve done a great job. But, that’s not happening for us out there, and I always tell my members and my fellowship, don’t expect to hear anything from up above. Make sure that you’re dealing with your people and your staff, and you’re letting them know, thank you. You know, I don’t expect to hear anything from up above. I don’t expect to hear I’ve done a great job. But, I would like to get that changed, so that they are letting us know, hey, you’ve done a great job. I’ve also talked to other members, and because we have a difficult time getting meetings with the District Managers and all that so that we can sit and talk to them, I’d like that to be an easier process. I know that you want them to meet with us, but it’s a hard process to have. I have one gentleman that we cannot get to sit down face-to-face, and I want a face-to-face. I don’t want a Telecon.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: No, and I appreciate that. And just for the audience at large, what we’ve discussed at your Executive Committee
meetings is -- or your Executive Board meetings
when I visit is that I want that relationship. It
should be with that local District Manager. So,
just let us know which District that is, please,
Cindy. If you’d let Sandy know.

MS. CINDY MCCRACKEN: Right. And I don’t
want people to be penalized for being NAPS
members. I’ve talked to people, and they say,
I’ve dropped out of NAPS.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yeah, no.

MS. CINDY MCCRACKEN: So, I don’t want
them penalized for being NAPS. We’re here to
help.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yes.

MS. CINDY MCCRACKEN: That’s my whole
thing is --

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: You’re part of the
leadership team. We are part of the leadership
team.

MS. CINDY MCCRACKEN: And that’s what I
would like, because --

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you.
MS. CINDY MCCracken: -- people here to help.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you. Yes, very good. Thank you.

MS. CINDY MCCracken: Thank you.

[Applause.]

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Well, and look, I know your resident officers are -- are vocal, they're visible, they're out in the field, and we'll continue to work this through them, because I want that level of engagement at the field level. Thank you.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Good morning.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Good morning.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Kathi Clapp, Oregon State President, Branch 940. First, thank you for coming to speak with us, and more importantly, thank you for staying to answer our questions.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Certainly.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: I hear you saying that the EAS need to step up their game and produce more results.
MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Well, we all do -- I do, we as an organization.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Okay. Well, my question then is, recently there has been a decision made to not approve EAS recognition awards, but to approve craft awards. How can that be, if we have been asked to add additional duties, spend more time, and take on more responsibility? How is that recognition?

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Well, first of all, there has been no policy that says we can’t recognize EAS. In fact, we distributed monies for recognition in quarter 1 of this fiscal year.

[Audience sounds of discord.]

MS. KATHI CLAPP: I have just read a directive from --

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: From whom?

MS. KATHI CLAPP: At least my District, the Portland District, which --

MISS MEGAN BRENnan: All right. Thank you.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: -- from Western Area
that denies that.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: All right. Thank you. But, so you know, there’s no global policy that says we have -- we’re not going to recognize EAS. Unless, guys, I need to know if there’s something that I’m not aware of, or, Bruce, I would ask you also to look at that. But, there were monies allocated as it is every year. Please.

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: Hello, Megan. Bonnie Parrish, Vice President of 173, Arkansas, and 904. First of all, I want to thank you for what you did a couple of years ago about cutting down on the Telecons. Right now, they are tripled.

[Laughter.]

And, as it stands now, my -- some of my managers have been given --

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Yeah, I think that might be a little bit of an exaggeration, but I hear ya. Is there anything else you want to add other than that?
MS. BONNIE PARRISH: Yes, ma’am.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Then, please do.

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: As it stands now, some of my managers have been given telephones so that when they’re out on the street delivering Express, they can be on the Telecon.

[Audience sounds of discord.]

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Um-hum.

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: My second --

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Wait, what District is that again?

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: Arkansas.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Okay. Thank you. Look, if that’s -- if you have anything else, fine.

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: Yes, ma’am.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Absent that, I heard you.

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: One important thing.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: And I -- let me finish, please, ma’am. All right? What I would ask is your conversation is with whom, your POM?
Is that your accountable manager?

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: I’m retired.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Oh, you’re retired.

How do you know then Telecons have tripled?

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: Because I -- my branch tells me. My supervisors call me 24/7.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Okay, okay. All right. Very good.

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: One more thing.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: Please.

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: If it’s at all possible, is there any help that we can do, we have so many carriers and clerks, and they were good workers, that they were hurt, but, you know, when you go in and you’re nine routes down, and you got eight IODs that can’t work but an hour, it’s kind of hard to make 6:00 and 5:00 in the evening, and they risk their maximum improvement, and nobody’s trying to rehab them. I’m just saying.

MS. MEGAN BRENnan: I would ask you to make that known, what office you’re talking about
there, because, clearly, if you have employees that are injured and that they’re maximum capability is one hour, then we obviously need to staff that -- that office.

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: It has been made known. I appreciate you for hearing me.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: All right. Thank you. Thank you very much.

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: Have a good day.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: You too. Thank you.

MR. GEORGE BOHRER: My name is George Bohrer, Branch 508, where the flavor of the day is COLA, and we’re not talking about Coca Cola, we’re talking about _______ [unintelligible.]

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: I’m sorry, you’re asking about the status of a COLA increase?

MR. GEORGE BOHRER: No. What my question is really is, is that on the Postal Bank, the Post Office was brought together to pull the country together in the early days, and I think the Postal Banking could also pull this country together in many ways. It would mean more NAPS members and
also more APW members, and in this area of
partisanship and fragilization of the country, I
think it really could pull us together, and once
we get the Postal Banking -- and once we get the
Postal Banking, it’s -- it opens the door for
other things -- wonderful things, say, where we
could be with houses coming along.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Thank you. Let me
comment. I said during my comments that we have
an unrivaled network and infrastructure that we
can leverage. There are some who tout Postal
Banking as -- as an opportunity for us.
Fundamentally, we’re open to discussing any new
product or service that will generate profitable
revenue, right? Profitable revenue, and that we
have the authority to do. We currently don’t have
the authority for Postal Banking.

The other considerations regarding Postal
Banking, (1) safety and security. We have made a
concerted effort over the years to pull cash out
of our facilities for obvious reasons. We still
have over 100 robberies a year. Number 2, the
cost to serve. The salary of, in the example I’ll use, of an APW employee versus a bank teller is significantly different. The other comment I would make is there is significant opposition to the Postal Service competing with private industry, and in this case, payday lenders or community banks.

Now, that said, there may be opportunities for us to partner, to put ATM machines in -- in lobbies. For us, we need to look at innovating closer to the core. Think about some of the state and federal work and agencies that we could partner with. Census is one. The investments we made in visibility in equipment like the MBD and ability to do identify-proof services, either in a retail lobby or on the doorstep. That’s closer to the core, and that’s some of what we’re looking at. But, I appreciate the comment. Thank you.

MR. ARIC SKJELSTAD: Aric Skjelstad, Branch 66, Portland, Oregon. I just want to make a comment and ask you, you made an illustration
earlier about retention of the CCAs, PSEs, and one of the biggest issues for their leaving was the -- their treatment from their supervisors. We have a lot of new, young supervisors coming up, and unfortunately, their mentors or the senior managers above them show them how to treat employees. And that goes to how we’re being treated at EAS, and I hope that you’re using that to reflect what senior management is doing toward the EAS in the field. They’re just reflecting what they’re told to do and how to do it. But, yet, all these people are leaving, and the EAS are staying and putting up with it.

MS. MEGAN BRENNAN: Yeah, well, here’s my point back, right? You and I -- you model the behavior that you expect, correct? Don’t you? In your home or at work? Even if someone treats me poorly, I don’t come back and then displace that on someone else. It’s not -- I’m not discounting your comment. We clearly have work to do. But, nothing says you consider -- you continue that cascade downstream. It stops, right? You’ve got
to stop it here. So again, my comment to you
would be, I’m looking to you for leadership. I’m
looking for you to elevate issues. I’m looking
for you to treat our employees who interact with
you -- they don’t know me. They frankly are less
concerned about what I say. It’s you they
interact with every day. So, if we have a POM or
any other level of management that is not treating
you well, I apologize for that, and we’re going to
continue to work this. But, I would ask you,
don’t then just treat a craft employee or a
colleague or a customer in kind. That’s not how
we operate. We can do better than that. We have
to. We have to do better.

So, let me end again as I started by
thanking you, and I have to tell you, you know,
the back-and-forth prepares me now to go back to
D.C. this afternoon.

[Laughter.]

It’s a joke. Come on.

[Laughter.]

But, here’s what I would say to you, and
please don’t -- any of you who came to the microphone, please know that my frustration, if it was displayed, is not at you -- at the questioner. It’s about the fact that we still have what I would call -- and this is not to minimize it -- but these issues that frankly, at the end of the day, are not going to help us maintain the independent status of this organization. It’s not going to help us better serve our customers. So, that’s what we have to focus on.

[Applause.]

So, a work in progress, and I would ask you, please, continue to treat your employees right, treat our customers right, continue to drive for service, have a positive belief in the future of this organization. It’s a pivotal time, but we’ve got strong leadership, and at the end of the day, we’re responsible for a public institution that just celebrated its 243rd year of existence, right, with a mission unchanged --

[Applause.]

-- a mission unchanged to bind this
nation together, and we’ll continue to do that with your leadership. Thank you, everybody. Enjoy the rest of your week here. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I want to thank Megan Brennan for staying and listening to our concerns. A true leader in the Postal Service and supporting NAPS.

[Applause.]

Al Lum, would you come to the podium. Al Lum.

Our next speaker, Delegates. We’re coming back to order. Again, I want to thank the Postmaster General for speaking to us and listening to our concerns and taking the extra time to be able to come here and get everybody’s question answered. You may not have liked the answer, but like you said, don’t ask the question if you don’t want to hear the answer. But, at least she stayed to answer our questions.

Delegated at mic 3.

MR. CY DUMAS: Point of personal
privilege.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Recognized.

MR. CY DUMAS: Cy Dumas, Providence, Rhode Island. I was disappointed during the presentation by Megan Brennan, who was very informative, that there were five handouts passed while she was speaking, which had to be a distraction to her, especially with people probably looking at those things. When we have any other Postal speakers or other invited guests, don’t have any more handouts, please.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: At this point in time, I want to introduce Al Lum, our NAPS Disciplinary Defense Provider to give us an overview or DDF Program. Mr. Al Lum. And Al, you can bang the gavel too, if anybody gets out of hand.

MR. AL LUM: Good morning, everyone.

ALL: Good morning, Al.

MR. AL LUM: For those who haven’t met me or spoken with me, let me introduce myself. My name is Al Lum, and I am your DDF provider.
Now, I noticed yesterday during the opening ceremony the guest speakers had someone introduce them and give their bio. I wish I would have thought of that. But, I haven’t, so I’m going to go to option B. Option B is go to your January issue of the Postal Supervisor Magazine. There’s an article in there about me. Basically, it’s my bio. All of it’s true, or at least most of it is.

[Laughter.]

But, one thing I would like to add to that. During my tenure as a Postal employee, I was active with NAPS. I was a delegate with Branch 100. I attended many national conventions. So, this is maybe my first convention as your DDF provider, but it’s not my first convention. My first convention was in Louisville, and I’m not talking about the one in 2008. There was one before that. Look at the back of your -- your booklet, and you will see. I think I just gave away my age also. Oh, 2008, sorry. Did I say 1908?
[Laughter.]

Wow. I am pretty old. Let me get to business.

My company’s name is Labor Relations Admin Group. Currently, we have eight advocates, and I’m interviewing three to four more. Currently, there’s three attorneys on board and five advocates, non-attorneys. When I started on January 1st, I had 28 cases that were still pending during various stages of the MSPB process. But, after that, as of July 31st, I picked up 63 adverse action cases. So, when I first meet with the Executive officers, it was indicated that on average, there were 75 cases annually a year. So, it looks like we’re just a little halfway through the year, and we’re going to exceed that easily, because our members come up to me and advise me that they have a lot of cases pending, and they most likely will be sending it to my office.

One of the hot issues that come up is falsification. You know, in the past, what I recall was like time, you know, falsification of
clocking, stuff like that, but now since all the
different business that the Post Office is
receiving from Amazon, Walmart, scanning.
Falsification of scanning. That’s becoming a big
issue.

Decisions that we have received during my
tenure as of to date, 53 decisions came in -- 47
wins and 6 losses. That brings to approximately
89 percent win ratio, and obviously 11 loss.

[Applause.]

And I would just like to end in saying
that in my role as your DDF provider, I am
committed to do my part to assist the Executive
Officers, the Executive Board, and the members to
improve our NAPS organization that will make our
members’ future better.

One last thing, I’d like to thank Charlie
Scialla for his dedication in NAPS as the DDF
provider. For you who would remember, there was a
title given to one of the Executive Officers, Mr.
Naps. Do you know who that is? Don Ledbetter
[phonetic.]
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Ledbetter, Branch 31.

MR. AL LUM: Well, I would propose, and maybe the parliamentarian may tell me I’m out of order, but I propose that Mr. Scialla be given the honorary title of Mr. DDF.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Al. I appreciate it. Al’s going to be in the audience. If any of you have concerns or issues with cases, he’s more than welcome to sit with you, talk with you, go over your cases with you, or anything like that. And I guess Al made a motion from the podium that Charlie Scialla be our Mr. DDF provider. Do I have a second?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Second.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Any discussion? No, of course there would never be. All in favor, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All opposed, shame on you. Motion carried.
[Laughter and applause.]

Thanks, Charlie.

All right. I’m going to bring Chuck Mulidore up, your national Secretary/Treasurer for some announcements. And then, is Lenny Caruso in the house? We want to try to get our golf tourney. Lenny, where are you at? On the golf course? Hole number 7? He stepped out. Well, he had to comb his hair.

Okay. Chuck, you’re up for some announcements.

MR. CHUCK MULIDORE: All right. Good morning, everybody. Charlie, just so you know, there’s no salary with that. Don’t even send anything in on that one.

A couple of brief announcements, and I’ll have some more before lunch. So, real quick, a few things. I thought someone was proposing to me this morning; however, they just lost their ring. So, if -- it’s not my size. There is what looks like it might be a wedding band. I’m not sure. Maybe you don’t want to admit you lost your
wedding band, so you can privately see me, and it will stay between us. Don’t worry about it.

[Laughter.]

But, there is a ring here that needs to be claimed. So, if you don’t want to claim it, it will be in Lost and Found up in the NAPS office.

Diane, I need to give you a check. It’s not from me. A check was found, it was from Branch 20 -- it’s made out to Branch 20. So, I’ll catch you before we -- before we break for lunch or whatever.

New England Area caucus is today immediately after our afternoon session in Penobscot. New England caucus after the afternoon session. I’ll make this announcement again later, but in the Penobscot, New England.

North Central Area, today after pictures, and we’ll do this one again before lunch, in the Oneida Room. North Central.

Pioneer Area will caucus immediately after the morning business session, so before we break for lunch, Pioneer and Abenaki, bring your
banquet exchange coupons. So, Tim is taking the way -- he’s not going to run around the convention hall, he’s going to make you come to him, which is fine. So, good point there, Tim. Again, Pioneer, immediately after the morning session, before lunch, meet in the Abenaki room and bring your banquet coupons.

And that’s all I have for now. If you need the ring, come see me. Lloyd? This is not your ring, right?

Western Region caucus immediately after lunch break for a brief meeting in the caucus room Nehantic-Pequot-Paugussett Room [phonetic]. I’m from Ohio, from Youngstown, we don’t speak these languages. Nehantic-Pequot-Paugussett Room today, Western Region caucus, immediately after the lunch break for a brief meeting, okay? More?

All right. These keys were left in the ladies’ room. I’ll have them up here. If you need keys -- can you see them? It’s got EDS, DS on it. So, if you them -- lost your keys, come see me. That’s it.
[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Is Lenny back in the house? No? Well, we’re moving forward, Lenny. You’re probably still out on the 7th hole or you’re probably in a sand trap. Okay.

It’s my great pleasure, we’re going to move forward, to introduce Dave Williams, your Postal Service Chief Operating Officer. Dave Williams was named Chief Operating Officer and Executive Vice President in February 2015. He leads the continuous improvement of the entire Postal Network Operation as well as allocation of people and resources. He reports to the Postmaster General -- you just missed her -- she was right here. Williams has the responsibility for the day-to-day activities of over 488,000 career employees, working in more than 31,000 facilities supported by a fleet of over 200,000 vehicles. He is responsible for post offices, delivery retail operations, facilities in the mail-processing network. Reporting to Williams are Vice Presidents of delivery operations and
facilities, network operations, retail and
customer service operations, and the seven Vice
Presidents of area operations.

Previously, Mr. Williams served as Vice
President of Network Operations. This role
encompassed responsibility for the national
network of 318 mail-processing and distribution
centers and automation initiatives. Before that,
Mr. Williams served as Vice President of
Engineering and managed all engineering and
development efforts focused on internal processes
including building and equipment maintenance
programs and policies. He directed all
engineering and acquisition support functions
including the design and development of new
automation, material-handling systems, and
vehicles. Please welcome Dave Williams, the
Postal Service Chief Operating Officer.

[Applause.]

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Good morning.

ALL: Good morning.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Good morning. It is
great to be here. Thank you for the invitation, Brian. I appreciate being able to be here today with you and share your day. So, I appreciate that invitation. And let me thank -- let me thank our supervisors, our managers. I am -- I am very honored to be a part of your leadership team, and the leadership that you provide our Postal Service employees is second to none. So, I want to thank you for what you do.

You know, the Postal Service on July 26th celebrated our 243rd anniversary. So, we are 243 years old -- July 26, 1775. You think about how the Postal Service has changed in the last 243 years, and our brand -- our front-facing brand to our customers is second to none. There is no other organization that does what we do, none. No other organization that I can think of that is 243 years old, that is part of the Constitution, that serves every single American six and sometimes seven days a week. There is no other organization like us. And the leadership of this organization, there is no other leadership team like us. So, I
am honored to be a part of the leadership team with all of our managers, supervisors, and Postmasters. We are, in fact, in this together. And there is no doubt in my mind that we have another 243 years ahead of us that are going to be just as great as the last 243 years.

What makes me so proud to be a part of the Postal Service -- what makes me bleed Postal Blue is best described for me, at least, in the inscription that is on the Washington, D.C. Post Office, now the Postal Museum. And it starts off by saying that, “We are messengers of sympathy and love.” And we are, for 243 years, we’ve been sending messages of sympathy and love. We console parted family members. We connect and bond friends and family. We connect and bond individuals, families, businesses, and the government. And that’s something for me that is very, very special, very special, and that’s why I am so proud to be a postal employee, because of our mission and the purpose that we have. It is unlike any other mission or purpose that I know of
in the United States, and in fact, in the world. We deliver 40 percent of the world’s mail. So, we connect people in 190 countries with our citizens. So, that’s why I am so proud to be a Postal employee. And I know that the mission that we have in delivering customer service every day is something that no other organization can touch.

For me, the Postal Service mission from an operations standpoint, particularly in the last five years, has changed pretty dramatically. We can expect it to change pretty dramatically in the next five years. We’ve gone through a lot of change. We’ve gone through a lot of consolidations. We’ve right-sized our organization, the operational footprint that we have, in just about every area to match this new reality that we are working with in terms of volumes and revenues. And when we look at the forecast, the volume and revenue will continue to change, and we must change with it like we have in the last five years, actually in the last 20 years as we’ve seen first-class mail continue to
decrease. And we expect first-class mail to continue to decrease, and the challenge that we have in front of us is twofold and is a challenge that we really haven’t been faced with in our history. And that’s one of chasing the cost curve of volume reductions that we’re seeing with first-class mail and marketing mail, our letter and flat volume, chasing the cost out of the system, and at the same time, chasing the growth curve on packages. We see double-digit increases in package volume, and the two dynamics is something that we haven’t been faced with, and that’s been a challenge and one that our leadership team certainly has risen to the occasion. We are pulling cost out, we are chasing the cost curve on letters and flats, and we are chasing the growth curve on the packages.

We’ve repurposed a lot of our operational footprint for packages as we’ve seen the letter and flat volume decline. We’ve pulled out machines, we’ve consolidated facilities, we’ve consolidated routes, and we’ll continue to do that
because that is -- that is necessary. It’s a business imperative to make sure that our operating footprint matches the volumes and revenues in our system.

As we look at the next couple of years -- as we look at fiscal year 19, we’re expecting another 3 to 3.5 billion pieces of mail gone from the system. So far this year, we’re seeing 3 billion fewer pieces this year than last year, and that’s the challenge that’s ahead of us. At the same time, how do we provide world class service to keep all the rest of our business growing.

Let me thank the leadership team out here for breaking a couple of records in quarter 3 from a service standpoint. In quarter 3, we’ve never had, in the history of the Postal Service, higher service on marketing flats than we’ve ever had in the history of the Postal Service. Thank you very much.

Let me thank you also for periodical service performance for flats. Never in the history have we had higher performance there. So,
you know, that’s a testament to your leadership and what we need to continue doing for FY19 as we close out FY18 strong on the service side, more importantly as we go into FY19, very, very strong on service performance. We know that service performance is the main thing. We know that our customers are the only reason why we’re in business, and we know that every single customer counts. So, it is all about the service that we provide our customers.

We know that our employees deliver the mail, we know that we’ve got to keep our employees safe, and therefore we’ve got to continue to drive hazards out of the workplace. If you think of where we’re at today, we’ve had 38 fatalities so far this year -- 38. Just a couple of weeks ago, it was 35. For every fatality in the industry that we have, the experts say that there are 300,000 hazards in the workplace that ultimately cause a fatality in our workplace. So, 37 members of our postal family did not make it home, a lot of it health-related, a lot of heart attacks, a
lot of strokes. But, there were a number of hazards in our workplace that resulted in fatalities of our family members. So, we know, as leaders of our organization, we’ve got to make sure that our workplaces are very, very safe. And if you think about the numbers of hazards in our workplace for every fatality that we have, we have 300,000 hazards in the workplace -- that’s a lot of hazards that our leadership team needs to address. We need to make sure that we are eliminating hazards and unsafe behaviors in the workplace to make sure that our employees that we’re in charge of do not get hurt.

We also know that customer experience is one of the main things too. Service is no longer defined by just transit time. When you think about some of our competitors and some of the industries that are driving this whole customer experience phenomenon, it is all about the customer experience, because we know that our customers have choices. We know that we are competing in every single product line, and our
customers do have a choice. So, it’s not just
about the transit time when we talk about service,
it’s also how we treat our customers. When we
look at our customer experience, we’ve got work to
do in FY19.

So, those are the three primary
objectives in terms of an operation standpoint, in
terms of our goals for the remainder of this year,
our goals going into FY19. It’s about service.
It’s about making sure that we continue to grow
our revenues by continuing to increase the
customer experience, and we’ve got to make sure
that we’re chasing the cost curve on the letters
and flats and the growth curve on the package
business.

So, that’s where we focused from a
strategic standpoint. Now, how do we get there,
right? How do we get there? We know that Monday
is problematic for operations. Peak volumes on
Monday create an enormous strain on this operating
infrastructure. We know that our carriers leave
our offices late, we know that that they come back
late on Monday. We know that distribution uptime is late. We know that trucks go out to our offices late in a lot of cases on Monday, which puts into a tailspin our whole 24-hour clock execution on Monday night in the plants, and therefore, the rest of the week is out of sync, out of balance. So, one of our main strategies is how do we master Monday. How do we master Monday?

If you look at our package volume on Monday, it’s the fourth highest day of the week for package volume -- fourth highest, think about that. If we were properly load-leveling and had our Monday volume delivered on Saturday and had none of our Tuesday or Wednesday volume in our operations and our delivery units on Monday, it would be one of the very lightest days of the week. So, we’ve got to change from a structural standpoint how we think about Monday. How do we master Monday, mastering it in every sense -- trucks out on time, delivery point sequencing, in the unit before carriers arrive, distribution uptime, up before our carriers arrive, having no -
- no orange or green marketing mail in DPS or FSS or at the case on Monday? How do we get our carriers out ahead of time or on time? How do we get them back on time or earlier, which then allows this whole 24-hour clock for the rest of the week to go smooth?

So, that’s one of our major tactics that we’ve got planned for FY19. We’re calling it Master Monday. How do we master Monday? We’ve got a lot of controls that we have to put in place -- a lot of controls -- and we’ve got to build trust between the operating functions -- trust between transportation and our delivery units, trust between our delivery units and the plant operations, trust between plant operations and maintenance, and so forth, to make sure that our Monday operation is just like any other day of the week. Doing that solves a lot of problems. It solves a lot of the overtime that we’re spending, which drives our total operating expenses, which allows us to start chasing this cost curve that we so desperately need to chase become financially
viable.

So, Monday, and chunking it out by Monday, gives us tremendous focus and tremendous opportunities to establish the rest of the week in great shape. But, it’s going to take our entire leadership team to do that. We’ve got be all on the same page with our expectations, and we’ve got to break a lot of the paradigms that are strangling us today in our solutions around Monday.

In the plant, we’ve got to stop advancing mail on the weekend. Now, I’ve been a plant manager for many years. Most of my operations experience has been in a plant, and I will tell you that for 30 years, we’ve been talking about pushing, pushing to capacity and making sure that we don’t let any machines sit idle. Well, we’ve got to break that, right? We’ve got to do that on Tuesday through Saturday. We’ve got to break that on the weekend. So, that’s a mind-shift change. That’s a paradigm that we’re going to have to adjust to. Pull the brakes on our processing on
the weekend and not advance orange -- Tuesday
orange or Wednesday green into Monday, really
changing the mindset of our plant operations.

Making sure that transportation runs on
time. Trucks have to leave on time. That is a
mind-shift that we’ve to make, because for years,
we’ve been saying, hold that truck for that last
tray, hold that truck for that last tray, and
we’re putting the entire truck at risk for maybe
half a tray of mail. So, we’ve got some
transportation adjustments that we’ve got to make
to ensure that all this volume is in our delivery
units before our carriers even report on Monday.

And then, the whole mindset of package
delivery on Monday as well. See, we’ve started
processing and delivering priority mail packages
on Sunday. We know that’s a competitive
advantage, especially as some of our competitors
are starting their weekend delivery operations,
and we know there are a lot of mailers that want
that transit time reduced. They’re getting closer
to the customer. They’re providing us a lot of
volume on Sunday, and we have an opportunity to break the mindset that we’ve got going on on Monday. So, making sure that all of our priority mail packages delivered on Sunday as well starts to really shrink down this workload on Monday. And the key is to ensure that our carriers leave for their route on time, and more importantly, come back on time. That gets all this collection mail back into our plants on Monday night, and it sets up the entire 24-hour clock and the ability for plant operations to clear Monday night, so that we can induct mail into our networks, whether it’s surface transportation or air transportation on Tuesday morning. And that’s where the big service lift occurs, particularly on three- to five-day, first-class mail service -- that’s where most of the first-class mail volume is -- it’s in three to five days. Most of it’s on surface transportation, and by establishing carriers to come back early and get the mail into our plant early allows us to finish plant operations on Monday night and get that volume cleared and put
into our networks, whether it’s air or surface transportation Tuesday morning, lifts up our first-class mail service performance. And then, it sets up the entire rest of the week.

And so, that’s what we have to do. We have to master Monday. That’s where the biggest pain that we have from a leadership team is, the biggest mindsets that we have to change, the biggest operational adjustments and controls that we have to put in place, but it’s critical. It is critical to chase that cost curve on letters and flats. If you look at the carrier volume, most of our carriers have less than 100 pieces on Monday. The fourth highest package day is on Monday. There is no reason why Monday can’t be like any other day of the week. We have to crack the code on Monday. It drives the expenses out, it will drive service up, and it sets up the rest of the week for success.

So, that’s where we’re focused in terms of the tactical piece for how we address the service performance as measured by transit time,
service performance around first-class mail,
service performance around packages, all the
expense lines around total operating expenses, all
the premium hours that are used on Monday, and
that’s the key for our success.

Mastering Monday also is about safety.
Starting the week off with taking hazards out of
the workplace, and from a customer experience
standpoint, we know that Monday mornings, we’ve
got a lot of customers coming in because we’ve
left notice on all the packages from Friday,
Saturday, Sunday, and we have to master the retail
customer experience on Monday as well.

Vehicles, same thing. We should never,
ever have a vehicle that’s inoperable on Monday
morning. We shouldn’t. I was complaining today.
My plane was late today, and I’m thinking, how can
the very first plane that takes off from the
airport, how can that have a maintenance problem,
right? First thing in the morning, we should
never have that. You think about the adjustments
in the mindset that we have to take place in
Speaking of vehicles, the way that we fuel up our vehicles, we have thousands and thousands and thousands of carriers on penalty overtime fueling up vehicles on Monday -- thousands. Our whole mindset on Monday has to change in every single part of our business. We have allowed Monday to put a stranglehold on our service and our cost, and we’ve got to break that. and I’m asking for your help to do that.

In 2019, we’re going to master Monday. We’ve got to make a lot of changes to set Monday up for the very best day of the week. We’ve got to conquer Monday. We’ve got to master it -- big, big challenge for us. And we’ve got 53 more days before our fiscal year 2019 starts. So, T-53, we’ve got to start now so that day one in 2019, we’re no longer paying all the premium hours on Monday, no longer accepting all of the failed volumes in our plants on Monday, no longer accepting late trips, no longer accepting carriers leaving late and returning late, no longer
accepting vehicles that are not working, no longer accepting fueling of vehicles by our -- by our team on penalty overtime on Monday. We’ve got a big opportunity, and it’s a singular focus -- a singular focus on Monday.

So, that is one of the great tactics that we’ve got planned. We’re also going to be doing a lot of the same things that we’ve done before in the past, as we’re chasing this cost curve. We’re going to be taking out equipment like we’ve done in the past. We’ve taken out almost -- almost 500 pieces of equipment -- 497 pieces of equipment have come out. We’ve got another 115 pieces of equipment that needs to come out in the next 153 days so that we can make sure that our operating footprint is in alignment with the volumes that we have to process and the revenues that fund our operations. So, a lot of equipment will come out, and as we look at the forecast for 2019 and the fact that we’re projected to lose another 3.4 billion pieces, we’re going to be taking out more equipment in 2019.
So, it’s all about making sure that the operating footprint is in alignment with the volume and revenues.

On the package side, this is great news for our business -- great news to grow the kind of package volume and revenues and an opportunity for us to continue to right-size this operating footprint. We’re adding more equipment. We’ve added equipment over the last four or five years, package-processing equipment. We added a lot more last year. We’re planning to add more this coming year. The automated delivery unit orders, more of those. The universal sort systems, more of those. The new enhanced package-processing system that will be starting off in Portland, Oregon in a couple of weeks, another one in Nashville. A machine that processes 25,000 pieces an hour to over 400 sort bins provides a huge amount of capacity and allows us to reposition those APBS machines -- the automated package bundle sorters -- into different locations where we need capacity because of this package growth. So, it’s not all
about taking machines out. We’re making wise investments to continue to stay ahead of the growth curve that we have on packages. So, a lot of work being done to make sure that the capacity that we need to provide great service is there.

Vehicles. We’ve added 8,000 vehicles this year to the fleet, the ProMasters, and we’re looking at repositioning other vehicles so that during peak season, we can continue to flex our muscle on the delivery side -- muscle that no other competitor has with our delivery fleet, with our carriers out on the street six and seven days a week.

So, we’re continuing to build on the strength that we have as an operations team on the package side of the business, expanding stackers, adding feed systems, dealing with non-machinable pieces in an automated way, and looking to the future on the letters and flats too. What do we need to do in the next five years to continue to automate letters and flats and to upgrade some of our plant systems? Testing systems in Richmond,
Virginia, the ALPS machine -- the automated letter processing system. Testing it -- another system in Oklahoma City on automated letter processing system that allows us to create large, large sort programs so we’re no longer constrained by the number of delivery points on a sort program, and automating the feed and the sweep of our delivery bar code sorter so that we can continue to drive innovation in the Postal Service and continue to drive an automated capacity platform that drives value for the Postal Service and for our customers.

So, we’re doing a lot of work, not only for today in making sure that our operating footprint is in alignment with the revenue and volume, but also for the future. How do we set ourselves up over the next 20 or 30 years to keep this automation program in a solid, solid fashion?

So, with that, I would be very, very happy to take questions. I know that we’ve got a lot of questions. I’ll leave it up to Brian to help us sort through how we’re going to navigate
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: First of all, thank you, Dave Williams, for a great presentation.

[Applause.]

Dave, to make things as simple as possible, I’ve asked the delegates to just stay at mic 3. They’ll introduce themselves. They have one question, no 27 followup questions, and just go -- you let me know when you need to go.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. So, delegate at mic 3. Be nice.

MR. TOM ROMA: Hi, Dave.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Hi.

MR. TOM ROMA: My name is Tom Roma.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Yeah, Tom.

MR. TOM ROMA: Northeast Region VP. You remember me?

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: I do.

MR. TOM ROMA: Okay. Three years ago, Dave, I came to you for my people in Puerto Rico and asked about the status of the offshore jobs.
At that time, you told me, “I’ll look into it. I’ll get back.” Almost a year passed, and I haven’t heard from you, and I wrote you a letter. Correct me if I’m wrong.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Nope, you’re on it.

MR. TOM ROMA: Okay. And when you attended that next meeting, you made a point to come to me and said, “Don’t worry, Tom, I’ll get you an answer.” Am I on track so far?

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: You are.

MR. TOM ROMA: Okay. The third time you came after I didn’t get an answer, you and I had a really nice talk, and I said, “Dave, it’s your determination if these jobs are needed or not.” And you said to me, looked me right in the face and said, “Tom, I am going to look into these jobs holistically.” Do you remember that term?

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Yes, I do.

MR. TOM ROMA: And, for the membership, because I didn’t know what it meant at the time, that meant that you were gonna look in areas that already had jobs that weren’t needed, and you
would consider moving them over to jobs where they
might have been needed. Am I right so far?

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Your definition of
holistic might be a little bit different than
mine.

MR. TOM ROMA: Okay. But, that was the
gist of it.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: The gist of it, yeah.

MR. TOM ROMA: Okay. I have still have
not heard from you, Dave.

[Audience reaction.]

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Well, let me give you
an update.

MR. TOM ROMA: Go ahead. I’m happy.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Let me give you an
update. We are looking at them holistically, and
it’s not just the offshore. We don’t have issues
just in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska. We’ve
got to holistically look at all the jobs in all
the Districts to make sure that they make sense,
to make sure that we’ve sized these jobs in all of
our Districts. So, it’s not just Puerto Rico,
Hawaii, or Alaska, and that’s what we were looking at. We’ve got HR that is right now and have been looking at how do we -- what kind of adjustments do we need to make. We’ve got some Districts that have more jobs in certain areas -- in certain area offices that could be problematic. So, we are looking at a whole rebalance. It’s not something that’s going to happen overnight. But, we are looking at it. We’ve got a team that is still working it. It’s not stopped. We haven’t slowed down. And when it comes up, and I expect it to come up in 2019, we’ll be making some adjustments.

MR. TOM ROMA: So, in other words, I have another year to look forward.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Yeah. When are you retiring?

[Laughter.]

MR. TOM ROMA: No, no, I retired four years ago. You’re stuck with me.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: I’m stuck.

MR. TOM ROMA: Okay. No, no. The reason I’m saying this is, I’m close with my people in
Puerto Rico, and I know they’re overworked and undermanned. Okay? I know there is one New York guy down there -- I won’t mention his name -- doing the job of three people, and he suffered a heart attack because of it. He’s now out of work. So, when these people ask me, I got to give them answers. You know? Even if you would have came to me and said, “Tommy, you know what? At this time, we can’t do anything.” Okay?

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: No, that’s not the answer.

MR. TOM ROMA: No, no, but it would have been an answer is what I’m saying. I could have told my people, okay? But, that wasn’t it. So --

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: We are still -- we’re still -- we are on it. People are working it. It hasn’t -- it has not stopped.

MR. TOM ROMA: Okay. There’s 1,300 people now that heard you.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: And let me thank the people in Puerto Rico.

MR. TOM ROMA: Okay.
MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: What an awesome job that the leadership team in Puerto Rico -- I did have an opportunity to go visit Puerto Rico last year, and I gotta tell you, the level of devastation and what that team did to bounce back is nothing short of just amazing and remarkable. They have a great, great team in Puerto Rico, and I’m very proud to be part of that team.

MS. DIANE SMITH: Good morning.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Good morning.

MS. DIANE SMITH: Diane Smith, President of Branch 20 in Pittsburgh. I remember back at National Harbor in 2016 that you -- we were talking about the amount of EAS who were not going to get an NPA payout, and you said at that time that you were responsible, and you took full responsibility for that, and that you would not let that happen again, that you had taken your eye off the ball, and that you said that it would not happen again. Well, here we are in 2018, and I understand that there are up to 19,000 EAS who may not get an NPA payout. I’m just wondering what
happened. Is that keeping your eye on the ball?

[Audience reaction and applause.]

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Well, yes. Yeah.

So, I am responsible for performance in this organization, as we all are, right? This entire leadership team is responsible for performance -- the entire leadership team is responsible for performance. Now, my -- my statement at the time was I did not know how many people were not in the money. That was my statement. When I said that I didn’t know how many people were not in the money, that’s what I said, and I would never let that happen again. Now, I know how many people at this point are not in the money. I do know that. And I’ll say I am responsible for operations, right? So, it’s on me, but we’ve got a leadership team, and everybody is responsible for performance -- everybody. And it is a performance system, and that hasn’t changed -- that has not changed.

MS. DIANE SMITH: One person said to me last week, think of your worst clerk, your worst mail handler, your worst carrier, your worst
custodian, your worst driver, everybody. They are
going to get a pay raise this year, and EAS will
not.

[Applause.]

MR. JAY KILLACKEY: Good morning, Mr. Williams.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Good morning.

MR. JAY KILLACKEY: My name is Jay Killackey. I’m from Branch 43 in Boston. And I’m
along the same lines as the most recent
questioner. You are responsible for everything to
do with operations, and this group and all the
people back home rely on you. So, we have goals
set at the beginning of the year. There need to
be plans established in order to achieve those
goals, operating plans that work, and it’s not
happening. So, probably half the EAS in the
country this year are not going to get a raise,
and that’s not good.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: No, it’s not good.

MR. JAY KILLACKEY: And there’s a report
that the Postal Service puts out every year. It’s
called the 10K Report. You can google it on your phone, USPS 2017 10K Report. On that report, which is a public document, on page 83, it lists the salaries and benefits of the top five executives in the Postal Service, of which you are one. You came in in 2015, and between 2015 and 2017, you received over a 10 percent increase in your base pay.

[Audience reaction.]

In addition, the records show that in bonuses and deferred salary adjustments, that was over $800,000 between 2015 and 2017, and that brings the total compensation and deferred payments to $1.54 million in the past three years. So, that, to me, seems like a measurement of success that the people in this room came here this week because their measurement of success would be a 3 percent raise. A 3 percent raise for line supervisor would be about $2,000, and the current package that’s been proposed, the lowest echelon would be a cash payment, which doesn’t go into your retirement, you only get it once. I
appreciate all the comments that you made at the beginning, all these things that we have to master Monday. It should have been done last Monday.

[Applause.]

We can’t wait until 2019.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: I agree.

MR. JAY KILLACKNEY: And I was a manager of a large office, and if something had to be done, it had to be done today, it was done today. We don’t have any control over a lot of the things that control our lives.

[Applause.]

We need you in the job that you do to help us to get to where we’ve got to be. A lot of people are counting on you. More supervisors work under your leadership than any other Vice President in this organization. I was sort of taken aback when you -- two years ago when you said you didn’t know how bad off we were or words to that effect. You should know that every day, and then when we try to see how we’re doing, the data is two to three months old. We’re supposed
to project on Monday how many hours we’re going to use on Friday. So, we need — we need your help. We want to be somewhere near as successful as you are.

[Applause.]

We’d like to hear your comments.

[Applause.]

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Well, there is no doubt that our customers and our employees need this Postal Service to be successful, no doubt at all. It all starts with service performance. Service performance in terms of transit time, the customer experience, it’s all about financial performance as well. We are not doing very well chasing this cost curve, and it has to do with safety performance, and we’re not where we need to be with safety. So, yes, we owe this — we owe this organization better performance, we do.

MR. TOM HUGHES: I’m Tom Hughes from Branch 100 in New York City, and the two people before me actually covered most of what I was going to ask you. But, I do want to say this,
that in Maryland you did say that your goal was to
get everybody in a box 5 or higher, and I hate to
tell you, but that hasn’t occurred. I wasn’t sure
if you were aware of that.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: I am aware of that.

MR. TOM HUGHES: You weren’t aware back
then, so, I just wanted to make sure. But, since
you brought up the transportation issue, the
transportation issue is a major problem with most
units because of the fact that if we don’t have
the product, you can’t deliver it. So, the
transportation, as Jay just eluded to, it’s
something that’s out of our control but needs to
be fixed.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: When you say
transportation, are you talking about contract
transportation?

MR. TOM HUGHES: No, I’m talking about
the Postal Service vehicles that move our mail.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: The vehicles.

MR. TOM HUGHES: Yeah, out of the plant
and into the stations.
MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: And the vehicles are -- you're talking about vehicle availability that drive on time?

MR. TOM HUGHES: And on time.


MR. TOM HUGHES: It needs to be addressed.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Absolutely, it does.

MR. TOM HUGHES: Thank you.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: Yeah, good morning, Mr. Williams.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Good morning.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: My name is Bobby Bock. The VMF is your friend. Two or three years ago, we changed the formula and fleet management came out of Headquarters -- we're all Headquarters employees. Our fleet manager has retired a couple of years ago -- the national fleet manager -- a year ago, probably. Do you have any idea when that position will be filled permanently, instead
of having somebody acting? Also, in addition, we’re dictated with parts and stuff, and a lot of times we’re putting on junk parts to try to keep vehicles running, and you’re saying, “Hey, we need all these vehicles running on Monday morning,” but that’s our worst morning trying -- chasing the unscheduled maintenance. So, I’m just wondering.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Well, there are a couple things. One is that Kevin McAdams is our Vice President of Delivery Operations. The fleet operations falls under Kevin. We do have an acting manager that is soon to be filled. I don’t have an exact date, but I know I’ve had conversations with Kevin McAdams about his intent to get that job filled, so that is coming.

In terms of the parts, we’ve got to look at our whole weekend operation and VMF, right? We’ve got a number of VMFs that don’t operate on the weekends, and Monday is the most important day to start off the week strong. So, we’ve got to make sure that our vehicles are operable on Monday for sure. So, we’ve got to look at -- and I’ve
talked to Kevin about this a number of times --
we’ve got to look at what we do on the weekends to
make sure that the resources and requirements are
in place for delivery to be very effective.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: And you spoke about the
ProMasters. These ProMasters, you get more damage
on these vehicles that nobody knows what happens.
It’s just ridiculous. You know, they say, well,
the rear camera’s not working, the mirror to look
out for backup, that’s because you hit the top and
the water is falling down on the mirror.

Unreported damage is out of control. Thank you.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KEN BATASTINI: Hi. I’m Ken
Batastini. I’m the President of Branch 478.
Grateful to be retired. Back in 1988 when I
applied to be a supervisor, I wrote in my very
first resume, “The biggest untapped resource of
worker productivity is employee morale. A
contented cow will give you good milk.” So, here
you are, Mr. Williams. You say to us that we are
messengers of sympathy and love. Then, why do our
members and the majority of EAS out in the field - why do they tell us that the morale has never been so low?

[Applause.]

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: You know, morale is, you know -- what do I say to that, right? It’s all of us. It is -- it is all of us. We are all in this together.

[Audience reaction.]

We are, right?

MR. KEN BATASTINI: But, I would tell you that it starts at the top, okay?

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: It does.

MR. KEN BATASTINI: You know the old adage, “It all rolls downhill.”

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: I agree. It does -- it does start at the top. It does start at the top, and we’ve got to model the right behavior at all levels -- at all levels we have to model the right behavior -- all levels, because the craft employees tell us the same thing. So, we all have to model the right behavior to ensure that we are
getting the very best energy and passion from all
of our employees, and the most important person to
an employee’s morale is his or her immediate
supervisor. That’s the most important driver of
morale, and it does start at the top, because
that’s -- that’s how this link occurs. We’ve got
to do a better job. There is no doubt we’ve got
to do a better job, because our customer
experience will be no higher than our employee
experience, and we’ve got to do a better job.

MR. KEN BATASTINI: Thank you.

MR. CY DUMAS: Good morning.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Good morning.

MR. CY DUMAS: Cy Dumas, Providence,
Rhode Island. In New England, there are 17 mail-
processing facilities, and I’ve personally been in
16 of them, most of them frequently, including the
large ones, and this is mirrored around the
country -- inadequate EAS staffing. In ’92,
Carbon Runyon [phonetic from notes] changed the
plants with a 25:1 formula, which eventually went
to 22:1. In the last few years, I’ve heard
nothing coming out of Postal Headquarters regarding relooking in right-sizing the EAS complement for these plants, especially the last several years with the Sunday stuff. So, what is the current status of looking at properly staffing the EAS management in the plants, otherwise the Monday strategy in the field is doomed to fail if we don’t get the proper supervision in the plant when we need it.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Well, we are not looking right now at the 25 or 22:1 ratio. That’s not something that we’re looking at right now. I will tell you we’re looking at the supervisor work credit. Ed Phelan, the VP of Area Operations in the Northeast, is working with Doug Toledo [phonetic], the Area or the Vice President of Labor Relations, working on the supervisor work credit, and we expect that there will be some pilots that will occur that change staffing in 2019.

MR. CY DUMAS: I have a lot of confidence in Mr. Phelan and the NAPS team, Tommy and Jimmy
that work with him, and I’m confident that we’re
going to see something soon. That’s been going on
for a few years. It needed to be going on even
longer than that. We cannot wait for the
planting. You’ve got to start looking at that.
That’s just as critical. The customer service
dies without the plant. You’ve got to look at
that. Thank you.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. MIKE HENDERSON: Good morning. Mike
Henderson from Branch 23 in Detroit. A couple of
concerns and challenges that a lot of offices are
having concerning clerks, concerning how we have
streamlined and just cut so much fat off, it’s
causing a lot of heartache at the stations and the
offices. We’re looking at situations where
supervisors are doing clerk work, we have bids
being reverted, and it’s the opening bid. So,
you’re violating the contract, and we’re talking
about customer service, customer service, customer
service. Are we looking at some measures where
the caps on PSEs can change? Maybe we have
flexibility we used in CCAs and PSEs? We have
branches that are connected with the plans, and
the cap is low, and we’re still talking about
customer service.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Yeah. One of the
biggest challenges we have in making sure that our
operating footprint matches the volume -- the
letter and flat declined, the package increase is
to make sure that we’ve got a great complement
management plan in place. And we’ve got isolated
spots around the country where we’ve got
imbalances. We’ve got to fix those imbalances.
We’ve got a team right now in Dallas looking at
function 1 plants and where those imbalances are.
We’ve got the E1994 reviewed going on. We’ve got
level 2 and level 3 function 4 reviews going on.
We’ve got to make sure that we are properly
evaluating residual bids.

One of the things we can’t do is to
become overstaffed, because we can’t afford it,
especially when we’re going to lose another 3.4
billion pieces of mail going into this year. So, when we say we’ve got to stay ahead of the cost curve and the growth curve on the packages, primarily it is the complement piece that we’ve got to make sure that we’re staying ahead of that, staying ahead of the planning piece in terms of the hiring plan, staying ahead of how we allocate the non-career employees, and with the new HERO system in HR, the timeframe in which that can get accomplished shrinks. So, that is one of our major strategies going into FY19 is to make sure that we’ve got a solid complement plan in every office.

Mr. Mike Henderson: Is that flexibility something you’re looking at, though?

Mr. Dave Williams: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Mike Henderson: Okay.

Mr. Brian Wagner: Okay. We’re down -- we have to cut questions off at 11:20. So, get to your question, and if you can’t get your question answered, write it down, and we’ll get it to Mr. Williams. But, 11:20, Mr. Williams has to go.
MR. JERRY VAN NORMAN: Jerry Van Norman, Vice President of Branch 130 in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Just kind of a side note on your ProMasters. The modification order from you might be in order for a step on the driver’s side in and out of that vehicle all day long, from what I’m hearing. I come from the very little bitty department in the United States Postal Service. I love customer service. You’ve got to deliver the product -- I come from the plant originally -- to get the customer service their product. But, you can’t deliver that product without the vehicle maintenance department. I spent the last five years of my career trying to keep these vehicles together with duct tape and bubble gum. We waited until the 26th year on a 25-year-old -- life expectancy of 25 years -- to finally look for vehicles. That’s nuts.

Another thing -- I’m sorry. I got new staff vehicles this year to replace my Ford Focuses. Why did we buy Korean vehicles? Why did the United States Postal Service buy foreign
vehicles? That’s one. And did we purchase any
four-wheel driver wreckers? I got two brand new
wreckers last year -- two-wheel drive -- Michigan.
It snows.

[Laughter.]

Now, if Tucson and Dallas have got some
four-wheel drive wreckers, contact Michigan, we’d
love to make a swap with you. All right? And as
far as the snow and stuff like this, I would
recommend that when we test our prototypes, test
your prototypes in Wyoming, North and South
Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan --
someplace where the weather is hellacious, because
I can guarantee you that a vehicle that will
operate in those areas will operate perfectly
sufficiently in Florida and Texas. But, just
because it works in Florida and Texas don’t mean
squat in Northern Michigan.

[Applause.]

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: I don’t know how many
questions that was. Let me try to answer them.
Number one, we are -- we are testing our vehicles
in various topographies, various parts of the
country, very extreme cold, very extreme heat, so
we’re doing that.

MR. JERRY VAN HORN: Foreign vehicles.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Foreign vehicles? I
mean, I -- I know that we have purchasing policies
that require a certain very high percentage of
those vehicles being assembled in the United
States. I’m sure that’s what it was. I don’t --
I don’t have the specific answer on that
particular question.

MR. JERRY VAN HORN: well, when I first
noticed that we were purchasing, I think there’s
100+ Hyundai Sonatas, my wife said, “Calm down,
they’re built in Atlanta, Georgia.” Not one of
them came to my office that was built -- that had
anything that said US on it. They were all built
in Osan, Korea.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: So, I don’t, I mean,
I’ll check in on that one. The wreckers -- I
don’t know how many four-wheel drive wreckers
we’ve purchased, but certainly we’ve got the
ability to move them if we don’t need four-wheel drive wreckers in some parts of the country, we can certainly reposition those. That’s not hard to do. So, we’ll -- we’ll take a look at that. Send me an E-mail on the wreckers, and we’ll get people to look at that.

MR. JERRY VAN HORN: Oh, and your fleet maintenance program was a good idea, but come on.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: This will have to be the last question. Please write down your questions for Mr. Williams, and we’ll get them to him for answering. All right? Yes, give the questions to Chuck. Thank you.

MS. VANESSA COBB: Good morning, sir.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: Good morning.

MS. VANESSA COBB: Vanessa Cobb, Branch 354, Tallahassee, Florida. My question is, in Tallahassee, our Postmaster is having carriers bring back mail at 7:00, and our EAS is having to go out and take that mail. Some of those people are out until 9:30, 10:00 at night, and I think that’s just ridiculous, because EAS doesn’t know
the routes, and plus if the carriers would be out there, I think we would get more for our buck. That’s my first question. Very quick.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: That’s wasn’t a question. That was a statement. Okay.

MS. VANESSA COBB: Oh, that was a statement then. So, please look into that.

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: I will.

MS. VANESSA COBB: My next question -- this is a question -- after Jay’s speech with all those nice figures, how much longer do you have so I can get my KSAs ready?

[Audience reaction and laughter.]

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: I didn’t hear that question. What did she say? I didn’t hear it. I didn’t -- oh, she wants my job. Why don’t you come up here and answer the next set of questions.

[Laughter.]

MR. DAVE WILLIAMS: That wasn’t a question either. Hey, let me again thank you -- thank you for your leadership. Thank you for driving this organization. I am very proud to be
part of this leadership team. Thank you for the
time, Brian. I appreciate the invitation.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Mr. Williams. I appreciate you coming and answering
the questions of our members. And those of you
who still have questions, please bring them up to
Chuck. Write them down with your branch number
and name.

For our next order of business, we’re
going to have -- we’re going to recognize the
Dillard Financial Solutions, the NAPS National
Retirement Service Provider to provide a
presentation on financial and retirement. So, if
Theresa Dillard from Dillard Financial Service
Solutions will please come up. There you are.
Now, you have a Power Point presentation?

MS. THERESA DILLARD: Yes, sir.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Here is the
clicker. Again, I’d like to introduce Theresa
Dillard from Dillard Financial Solutions, NAPS
National Retirement Service Provider for a
presentation on Federal and Retirement. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

MR. CHUCK MULIDORE: While we wait for just a second, if you have questions for Megan today or Mr. Williams and you didn’t get those questions answered or you have a followup, just write them down, give them to me, leave me some contact information, an E-mail address preferably on your message, and I’ll get you an answer, okay? So, sometime today, let me have your questions for Dave or Megan or if you have any other questions for anybody you want to have answered. Leave them with me today, and we’ll get you answers, okay? All right. Thank you.

MR. IVAN BUTTS: Good morning.

ALL: Good morning.

MR. IVAN BUTTS: While we set up in transition from Dave’s presentation, I’m going to bring Katie Maddox up. She’s going to give us a SPAC update and tell us a little bit about what’s going on with our SPAC effort outside. So, Katie
Maddox.

[Applause.]

MS. KATIE MADDOX: Good morning, everyone.

ALL: Good morning.

MS. KATIE MADDOX: That was great. Thank you. First of all, I wanted to say thank you to everyone who has donated gifts to our gift raffle. People who have already made contributions, just to let you know, so far with your efforts, we’ve raised over $12,000.

[Applause.]

And that’s just the beginning. And so, if you’re wondering, well, how can I make a contribution to SPAC? We have many raffles going on outside. First of all, we have our SPAC raffle prizes. You get -- for $20, you get six tickets. We have all of these prizes that people have donated from across the country, and we’ll be taking tickets all week, and we are going to announce winners Friday during the closing ceremonies.
We also have -- I want to give a great shout out to Joyce -- oh, I hope I pronounce this right -- Tomaskovic from Branch 508 in Royal Oak, Michigan. She has donated a week in a condo in Orlando right by Disney and all the parks from October 7th through 14th, Columbus Day week, and one ticket for $20 gets you a chance to win.

We also have our Walkathon. Today is the last day to sign up for the Walkathon. So, folks, make sure you go out and get your shirts, go talk to Richard about how you can do it.

And then, we also have our Drive for Five Campaign. If you would like to sign up to contribute to SPAC on a regular basis through payroll deductions or through your OPM annuity, please see me, and we’ll sign you up. For every dollar that you increase to your campaign or for every dollar that you sign up with, you get one ticket for a chance to win an Amazon Echo, provided by Signature Financial.

And then, finally, I want to announce for a $20 donation to the new Jo Jeeter SPAC Fund, you
get a sweet treat from Jo Deeter herself.

So, if you have any questions about how to give to SPAC, what are we doing, how much you’ve given so far, please come see me out in the hallway. I’d be happy to help. Thank you, everyone.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Katie. We have one quick announcement from Roy Madden from the Credentials Committee.

MR. ROY MADDEN: Hi, gang. A quick change on page 12. Executive Board changed from 24 to 25, and then we need to see someone from these four places in our office please. One of them I’m going to name, Jeff Fratto, if you’re in the room, we need to see you again upstairs, please. Is anybody here from Anchorage, Alaska, Arkansas state, and Lansing, Michigan. We’d like to see you upstairs in the Credentials and Registration Office. Thank you.

MR. IVAN BUTTS: Thank you, Roy, Rosemary, and Katie. Katie is a valued part of
our legislative team. She really helps me make sure my schedule and my appointments are right, getting me around through the city and also helping me out -- helping us out when I can’t get around or Bruce is not available to fill in and help our legislative effort. In addition to what she did and what she told us and updated us on, I hope you guys will take the time to go out and give that SPAC donation and get that special treat from Jo Jeeter, and some of you may not know, but if you don’t know, just go get that special treat that we have at the legislative from Jo Jeeter, and you will not be sorry.

A big shout out to Paul Foley. Paul Foley, even before we started the convention, made a $1,000 donation to SPAC in the memory of Andy Socci [phonetic], so Paul, I thank you. Thank you for that.

[Applause.]

We’re going to give out our SPAC Hall of Fame Award, but before we do that, I just want to say a couple words. We heard about the passing of
Ann Konish, who was a long-time, faithful SPAC contributor all through her retirement Stallworth. When I first got up here in 2014, I had the opportunity -- I ended up one year the top SPAC giver for some reason. I don't know how that happened, and Ann came up to me and told me, "One day, I'm going to beat you. I'm going to beat you in SPAC," and I said, "Okay, that's fine. Come on because I might not do this ever again anyway."

So, after this year's LTS -- at this year's LTS, Ann Konish, she made a $5,000 donation to SPAC. That's the most you can give in a year to SPAC, and she made that contribution, and I didn't know at the time that she -- she was sick and that her cancer had came [sic] back. I didn't find that out until after the LTS, and then, unfortunately, a few -- a couple months later, Ann was in the hospital and she was sick, and it was going south. I had the blessing to call Ann that week, and when we had a chance to talk -- because I wanted to thank her -- I wanted to thank her for all her support of me, for her support of SPAC, for her
support of the membership and working the
registration at LTS -- and she told me on that
call, she said, "You know, I really wanted to give
that $5,000 at that moment because I knew I
wouldn’t be here next year." But, it was well
with her soul, and those of us who know, know what
I mean when I say it is well with my soul.

So, I thought that was a beautiful thing,
and what comes to mind is something we hear -- a
statement we hear when we say give me my flowers
while I’m still living so I can see and smell the
beauty of them. So, there’s two things I want to
do. I want to challenge everyone in here to give
$100, if you can, or give whatever you can, and
let Katie know when you give it -- here’s my $100
right here -- that it’s in memory of Ann Konish.
So, if you find it in your heart to give that
contribution to SPAC, that will truly show what --
where we are for a woman who really believed in
what we need to do legislatively.

[Applause.]

So, the other -- the other issue is --
and this goes to the flowers -- on that phone call, I had the chance to tell Ann that this was going to happen. So, from this point forward, the SPAC Hall of Fame Award that we give out to one person from each region every convention, will hereby be named the Ann Konish Hall of Fame Award.

[Applause.]

And I’m going to ask Scott Englerth to come up. He’s the President of the Ann Konish Branch 11, and he will say a few words, and he will present the Ann Konish SPAC Hall of Fame Awards for this year.

[Applause.]

MR. SCOTT ENGLERTH: Thank you, Ivan. Thank you to the members of the Board -- the Executive Board. This is a pretty big honor. Ann was known as the Queen of SPAC. She took that to heart. She wore it with great pride. So, on behalf of her family and Branch 11, I want to thank you for the honor.

The five nominees this year, Paul Foley, Steve Shawn, Michael Boisvert, and two of them who
could not be with us this year, Laurie Wellup [phonetic] from Branch 104, Minnesota, and Patty Lynn from Branch 296, Florida. Join us in congratulating the five this year, please.

[Applause.]

Paul, Steve, and Michael, if you’re in the room, please come up front.

MR. IVAN BUTTS: All right. Not to delay anything, we’ll round the other two up, and we’ll do the photo later. But, here comes Michael Boisvert. Long-time SPAC contributor, long-time ultimate SPAC member.

[Applause.]

MR. IVAN BUTTS: Delegate, mic 3.

MR. JOHN RUSSELL: Ivan, John Russell, Branch 43 in Boston. I just want to thank you for all the work you do, but I gotta tell you, I don’t go to the casino -- retirement -- you know what I mean? Taxes are going up. I do have a $20 bill that I would like to throw that way.

MR. IVAN BUTTS: Thank you.

MR. JOHN RUSSELL: Thank you, Ivan.
MR. IVAN BUTTS: Thank you, John. Appreciate you. John Russell, Branch 43, $20. That’s all right, I’ll take it. In memory of Ann Konish. So, we have one $20. Don’t forget. Don’t forget. If you find it in your heart, please see Katie at the SPAC table, make your donation in memory of Ann Konish so we can publish her total in the magazine when we recap our convention. Thank you. God bless you.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Ivan. And thanks again for the changing the SPAC Hall of Fame to the Ann Konish SPAC Hall of Fame. Very well deserved.

Now, I appreciate Theresa Dillard from Dillard Financial Solutions working with us as we did this, and now I want to bring her up to provide a presentation to the delegation. Theresa Dillard from Dillard Financial Solutions, NAPS National Retirement Service Provider. Theresa.

MS. THERESA DILLARD: Thank you, sir.

[Applause.]
MS. THERESA DILLARD: First of all, I would like to thank the resident officers for letting me be here. I would like to thank the NAPS Board, but most of all I would like to thank you, the membership. We have worked with NAPS for 11 years, and we are here to work for you, because we are here to service you, and we’re here to educate you.

When Steve and I first started working with NAPS, and when we decided that we were going to bid on this vendor position, we took it to the altar, because that’s the first place you need to start things. You need to start things and give it to God, and have God give you direction on what to do.

[Applause.]

In our line of work, we are very decisive and very selective about what groups we work with and where we want to put our time and our energy, and my husband and I have such a passion for NAPS. So, we decided that we would get guidance from the number one man first, and we want to thank you and
thank God for the ability to have us here.

Steve and I, we are -- we’ve been in the business, and we’re the federal benefits providers. What we have done over the years is when Steve retired from the Navy, we wanted to make sure that our business and us stayed into the federal market, in federal realm, and we wanted to help federal employees, because we learned a lot by being a federal employee, and we wanted to help you, and we wanted to help all our postal family.

So, that’s what we have done over the years.

One thing that we do, is we want to make sure that you know that we are fiduciaries. There was a new ruling that came out the first of 2017 where financial planners had to be fiduciaries. Some decided they would be fiduciaries, some decided they would not, and Steve and I took the -- the right path, and we decided that we would get our business as a fiduciary.

One other thing that Steve and I are, is we are a verified vendor on the United States Federal Registry. Now, one thing that we are, we
have a DUNS number from the United States Government. Now, that is the one thing that set Steve and I and our company apart from any other vendor that you had ever had in your NAPS organization, because we have went to OPM, we have went to the United States Government, and we did all our credentials to make sure that Dillard Financial Solutions can be on government contracts. There’s never been a vendor that’s every worked with NAPS that has that credibility that they can be on a government contract. And that is the one thing that really set us aside and set us different when organizations look at vendors bidding on those contracts. That’s the number one thing that they’ve got to make sure that you have, is you’ve got to have that okay on that contractor registry to be able to bid on that job.

Also, we’re a part of the National Ethics Association. The National Ethics Association is an association where we’re always checked out, we’re always looked at, we’re always looked at for
financial, we’re looked at for complaints, we’re looked at for everything. And one thing that I do thank the Lord for, we’ve been working for y’all for 11 years, and we’ve only had two issues that ever arose in the NAPS organization, and we took care of both of those, and both of those have been fully resolved after full investigations. We refunded folks’ money back to them and made them happy. So, we really appreciate that.

Our team of office staff people, we have office staff people that will service all of our NAPS members. We also have a field force of representatives that will be out in the field representing all of the different areas and all the different states, and we look forward to meeting each and every one of you in your branches and educating you.

A little bit about how we are different is number one, we provide education. Education is the key. Knowledge is power. If you know decisions that you have to make along the way, and you have people sitting down with you and guiding
you and talking to you about things that you have to do, whether you’re at the first of your career, the middle of your career, or at the end of your career, it’s going to help you to make more decisions and better choices throughout the way. It doesn’t matter what company people do their business with, but I want to make sure that I educate folks and I teach them, so they will not make bad decisions when it comes time to make a decision about what they have to do with their retirement dollars.

Also, too, there’s one thing that -- there’s different types of advisors. There are risk advisors and there are safe money advisors. Steve and I, when we decided to get our license, we decided to be a safe money advisor. Not one of our clients has ever lost money due to market risk. If you’ve ever lost money in a product, it’s because of early withdrawals, or you cashed it in early, or something like that, because we are not putting people’s money at risk.

We represent insurance carriers that
guarantees your money, commissions are not paid by the members of NAPS. We get paid directly through the insurance carriers that we represent. We have enrollment fees. So, that way, when we sit down and talk to you, it’s not going to be a high-pressure sell, it’s going to be educating. It’s going to be educating you on what you need to do about making decisions when it comes to you and your family.

We have donated in the 11 years that we have been with NAPS over $300,000 to this NAPS organization. I don’t think there’s ever been another vendor ever to donate that type of dollars to a NAPS organization. But, we want to give it back. We want to give you the benefit, so you’ll be able to share in that. We donate money to the states, we donate money to the branches, we donate money to the headquarters, and -- I don’t know if y’all have received it yet -- but, since January 1st, we have just sent our first payment in just a few weeks ago, and here’s some of the branches that’s gonna receive a donation from
Dillard Financial Solutions. It’s Branch 270, Branch 489, Branch 130, Branch 946, Branch 172, Branch 205, and Branch 23. So, those are some branches that we have been working in, and y’all are going to be receiving a donation check from NAPS Headquarters.

We have over 4,000 clients, federal and Postal clients, that is on our books that we service every day and that we want to talk to you. Now, we have developed a hotline just for NAPS in our office, so where if you call into our office on your hotline, we have folks in our office that is just taking care of our NAPS membership.

We have offices in all -- we have representatives in all 50 states. If there’s a star on your state, we have worked in it, we have helped you, and we have provided service to your state.

Some of the things that we have done for NAPS members is we educate you, we do branch workshops, we do state workshops, area workshops, so we can come out and we can workshop for your
folks. We can do a lot of different kinds of presentations. We can do presentations for folks that are beginning employment, in the middle of the road, and at the end of the road toward retirement. We can talk product, non-product, anything that you want us to talk and educate.

I’d like to see a show of hands -- how many people have ever been to one of our workshops? And we definitely hope that you have learned something at our workshops. If you take away just a little something from any workshop that we have ever been to, it’s just a true blessing that you can have knowledge along the way.

Also, too, we would like to hear from you and give us some type of advice on what we can do to better our relationship going forward with NAPS, because you are the members. We want to hear from you. We want to hear what you want us to do, because we are working for you.

One thing we’ve also done is we built a website. We built a website for our NAPS members,
so you can click on this website, and it’s attached to your national website, and you could be educated on different products and different availabilities out there to you as a member. We have spent long hard hours working on this website for you and it’s ever-changing and ongoing all the time.

All the state and branch presidents, we are hosting a President’s Social for you tonight, and the President’s Social is going to be in Earth Ballroom A. Please stop by our booth and pick up your branch packet and your invitation to come visit with us. We would love to see you there. It’s from 7 to 9.

And one thing we want to is, we want to make sure that you are planning. Planning is the key to success. One thing we would like to do is we want to make sure that you have plans. We want to make sure that you have short-term plans, intermediate plans, and long-term plans. If you have plans and you implement those plans, one thing you have to do is you have to make sure you
have a working budget. You have to have a working spending account, because a budget and a spending account is not the same thing. My budget is what I’ve got to have every day to live on, but my spending account is when I want to go to Walmart, or if I want to go to a Hobby Lobby. But, you’ve got to put that spending account in there too. There are so many times when people come up to me, and they say, “Mrs. Dillard, when it gets to almost payday, I’m broke. What am I doing wrong?” I say, “Well, how many times did you use that debit card? Do you ever list it? Do you ever track it?” So, we also do help people plan and budget as well. So, if you make plans and you implement those plans, you will definitely have success.

We’re going to teach you about the three buckets of money. All money falls into three forms. You have non-qualified money that’s been after taxed, you have qualified money that’s pretaxed, and then you have tax-free money, and you’ve got to know when to spend these buckets of
money. Just like you may not want to use your before-tax money to pay off a large purchase. Let’s say, for instance, I’m retiring, and I want to take $150,000 out of my TSP, and I want to pay my house off. Well, number one, you’re paying taxes on that whole lump sum, and then that $150,000 is going to put you in a higher tax bracket, so you’re going to be paying taxes on the whole lump sum in a higher tax bracket. So, you may want to use your money that you’ve already been taxed on, like your Roth IRA money or some of your non-qualified money to make those purchases.

Also, when you go throughout your career, there’s going to be different levels. When you’re young, you want to take a lot of risk. As you go through your career, and as we age up, you want to put more of your money in safety. There’s two times in our life. There’s an accumulation phase, and then there’s a preservation phase. So, you have to ask yourself, what phase of your life are you in to be able to determine how much of your money you want at risk.
Also, too, what is your risk tolerance? How much of your money do you want at risk? Your risk tolerance determines the products that you put your money into. If you want risk, then you’ll use some stocks, mutual funds, some variable products, but if you want safety, you’re gonna use some safe products. You’re gonna use some banking products, some CDs, some bonds, some annuity products. You wanna make sure that you know your risk level.

We have understanding to teach you about your FERS statement. We teach you about your retirement. How do you understand your retirement and all the parts of your retirement? Because your retirement falls in five forms. You’re gonna have your TSP, you’re gonna have your social security, you’re gonna have the supplement or the gap or the bridge, which Congress right now is -- the government is trying to take away from you. If they take that supplement away from you, the younger folks, you’re gonna have to save more for yourself. You’re gonna have to plan for that. If
they raise that high 3 to a high 5, you’re gonna have to up that investment in that TSP. The TSP is the best thing that you have got going when you’re working. It is an awesome product. Make sure you’re taking advantage of that. Also, your pension, and then any other types of investments you have going out there. That’s going to consist of your retirement, so you definitely want to make sure that you have your money there.

Also, too, your TSP falls into different parts. There is a traditional portion of your TSP that’s going to be taxed when you take it out, and then there’s a Roth IRA portion of your TSP that you can put money into your TSP pretax and have tax-free money when you go to take that money out. Now, that’s an awesome benefit for everyone sitting in this room because the government has lifted the wage earning on that Roth IRA. Mostly everybody in this room, you and your spouse, would not qualify for a Roth IRA unless you put it into your TSP plan. But, since they have lifted that wage earning, you’re able to put money into a Roth
IRA. You could put money into your ROTH IRA within your TSP, and you can have an outside Roth IRA. So, that’s an awesome plan as well.

Now, it doesn’t matter what side you put your money into, the government is still going to match that first 5 percent. Now, if you do have it in your Roth IRA portion, they’re going to put that matching in that traditional side. But, take advantage of that Roth IRA, because that is a wonderful benefit later on. If you don’t need the tax deductions now, put your money in that Roth IRA.

Now, when you go to retire, you’re gonna have choices on what to do with your TSP, and the government’s gonna offer you choices. The first choice they’re gonna offer you is if you want to leave your money in your TSP and just leave it alone. You can have monthly withdrawals off your account -- systematic withdrawals. You gotta make sure that you don’t have enough systematic withdrawals coming out versus the interest that it’s making, then you might run out of money. You
can roll your money over into another IRA because that’s what your TSP is -- it’s an individual retirement account. When you first started putting money in there, it was deemed that you were going to use that money as income or some type of tax-deferred program, and these are options that you may have doing your TSP and putting your money in your TSP. Or, you can take money out as a lump sum. But, be careful about taking money as a lump sum to make sure that you’re not being taxed on a lot of that money.

For the younger folks, we’re going to educate you and teach you about the different funds within TSP. The great thing about having a retirement provider is that you’ve got someone legally that can talk to you about your funds. TSP does not have that. OPM does not have that. They can teach you about different things, but they legally cannot tell you what to do with your money, because they don’t have the financial credentials. They’re not licensed.

Now, we want to make sure that you do not
sell your balance of your money to TSP. Everyone
gets a statement in the mail. When you see that
amount of money on that statement and you want an
annuity paid to you from Met Life Insurance
Company, when you go to retire, TSP has to sell
your money to Met Life. You have to give up your
balance. So, you’re selling your money to Met
Life. Met Life is going to give you an annuity
payment. You’ve got one or two choices. Either
get a single life annuity, then if you die, your
spouse gets no money, kids get no money, the
balance is gone. Or you get a joint life annuity.
Now, your spouse can get that money, but it
doesn’t pass any further. So, before you make the
choice to sell your balance of your money to Met
life, definitely sit down and talk to the
retirement provider of your choice and find out
what your options are, because we don’t want to
make sure that you give your money up. [sic] I’ve
talked to folks that have made this decision, and
they had no idea that they were selling their
money to Met Life and not having their balance.
We try to help you increase your money as you go to make sure that you have a built-in COLA into your retirement. If you want to see one of our representatives, or if you want an analysis, or if you want to sit down and talk to someone, please come by our booth, fill out our form. If everyone knows any of us and our representatives, we’re not high-pressure people, we’re not selling people, we’re gonna sit down, and we’re gonna educate you, because it is my duty to educate all the members here.

When I first got in this business, I could pick any world I wanted to go into. I picked, first of all, the risk world. The first time in the risk world, I lost a 60-year-old person’s money due to the stock money, and I had no choice over that, and I had no say-so over that. It did not take me long to know that I wanted to be in the safe money world, because we want to make sure that we are working to help protect your money and to help protect you. God has gave us a calling to educate folks, and we’re
going to do our best whether we stay in NAPS as their retirement provider or not, we’re going to do our best to help you like we always have in the best. God bless y’all, and y’all have a great day.

[Applause.]

MR. CHUCK MULIDORE: Well, I guess this is called stepping in while Brian steps up here. You just have announcements, right? All right. Let me do those. Okay. Let me do some announcements for you. Right now, Branch 14 will caucus immediately following today’s session. They will meet in the corner to the left of where we are now sitting. Branch 14, caucus immediately following today’s session, meeting in the corner to the left of where they are sitting, and Charlie also says Branch 14 will caucus on Thursday, 8/9, this coming Thursday at 6 p.m. in the Oneida Room. So, two caucuses for Branch 14.

I mentioned earlier this morning, New England Area caucus immediately following today’s session -- this afternoon’s session in the
Penobscot Room.

North Central Area caucus this afternoon after pictures in Oneida Room. North Central today.

And we have the Western Region caucus immediately after lunch for a brief meeting.

Okay, well it says after lunch, I don’t know. You changed it? You’ve got it. It’s before lunch. We’re moving on the fly here. So, it’s immediately after the session, but before lunch, in the Western Region caucus room, Nehantic-Pequot-Paugussett conference room. Thank you, Ms. Jones, appreciate you.

Another announcement, okay. All right. So, area photos will be taken today immediately following the recess for lunch at noon. Southeast, Central Gulf, Cotton Belt, and Texas. That’s today right after we’re done, before the lunch session, in the Brothertown Passamaquoddy Room up the steps.

Candidates for office, if you plan to use any kind of video tape, DVD, CD, cassette, 8-
track, whatever you’re going to use, if you have
an 8-track, I want to talk to you afterward. I
really want -- I really think we need to talk,
because I’d love to have it. But, during your
nominating speech on Thursday afternoon, you must
ensure that you have that in the hands of our AV
people as soon as possible today. There over
there on the side of the hall. So, whatever
you’re going to be using for your nominating
speeches on Thursday, please have that equipment
in their hands as soon as possible.

And, Brian, I think that is it right now,
and I’ll turn it back -- oh, I had the phone,
sorry. Not you, I do. This phone was found in
the ladies’ restroom. Bob, ladies’ restroom?
Yeah. This phone -- ladies’ restroom. I don’t
know. I didn’t ask Bob why he found it in the
ladies’ restroom. I have no idea.

[Laughter.]

You know, sometimes you just don’t -- you
just don’t ask. Okay? You just -- there’s no
judgement here, but the phone was in the ladies’
restroom. If you want to call it, or I can call you. Whatever you want to do. So, in the ladies’ restroom.

Okay, Ken. Constitution and Bylaws immediately for a brief meeting before lunch in your caucus room. Constitution and Bylaws for a brief meeting before lunch.

And we did get a quick note here about Northwest Area. I would like to wish the Northwest Area VP, Cindy McCracken, a very happy and blessed birthday today. So, happy birthday, Cindy McCracken.

[Applause.]

My birthday is in October in case you remember. You can always send me a card. Yeah, the 28th. Thank you. I’ll look for something from you, Tommy. You won’t remember, I know that. All right, thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Chuck. I appreciate it. I appreciate Theresa Dillard from Dillard Financial Solutions on her presentation and getting us back on schedule. I truly
appreciate that. We do have one of our vendors, M3 Technologies. They do have to leave, and they won’t be able to stay for the whole convention.

But, we appreciate their sponsorship and support, and they do have a -- they did their drawing, so I want to introduce M3 Technology representatives to come and announce who the winners are of their fabulous prizes from the drawing. Thank you.

M3 TECHNOLOGY -- DENISE: Hello, I’m going to be very quick, because I know you all want to go to lunch. We have three winners. I’m Denise, I’m from M3 Technology. I’m the face of M3 Technology, and this is my colleague, Joe. And now, what everybody is waiting for.

[Drum roll.]

The first prize is a $50 gift card -- Visa gift card, and it goes to Keith LeBlanc.

[Applause.]

Our second prize is a Fire tablet, and that goes to Carolyn Hester.

[Applause.]

And our third and final prize, $100 Visa
gift card goes to David Oliver.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. I appreciate, again, M3 Technology for their support and sponsorship. We’re going to get ready to go to lunch.

MR. CY DUMAS: Point of privilege.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 3.

MR. CY DUMAS: Cy Dumas, Providence, Rhode Island. Ladies and gentlemen, some of you may not realize it, but today is National Purple Heart Day, and I’m confident that we have some veterans in the hall that were wounded in action and received the Purple Heart, and I just want to say thank you to them all.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Cy, much appreciated.

[Applause.]

Okay. We now stand in recess until 1:30 this afternoon, all right? Have a good lunch. See you at 1:30 this afternoon. Thank you.

[Off the record for lunch.]
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, delegates, we’re going to get started. I’d like to call up Lenny Caruso from Branch 5 to report on the NAPS Golf Tournament that took place on Sunday, and those that did participate in the golf tournament, would you please come up to my left, your right, we’re going to get a group picture. Those who participated in the golf tournament, please come up so we can get a group photo, follow up with Dave Scavone and Bob Stevens, our photographs. At this point in time, I would like to recognize Lenny Caruso of Branch 5 and on the Host Branch Committee and Chair of the golf tournament to give a report. Lenny.

MR. LENNY CARUSO: Thank you, Brian. I finally got up here. I don’t have to adjust the mic either. Okay. First of all, everybody has been crediting the veterans. I would like to thank all the veterans too. I’m a disabled veteran, and came right out of the service into the Post Office for 45 years, and I’m happy I’m
retired.

[Applause.]

Okay, myself and Tom Rokosa, my co-chair, would like to thank Brian, Ivan, Chuck, Greg Murphy, Lisa at Branch 5, all the Host Committee, and especially Sheri Davis for helping to get this event organized and finished with a lot of planning and communication amongst all of us. I would also like to thank Chuck’s secretary, Pat French, for keeping me updated on registration and sponsors. I’d like to thank all of the sponsors and vendors that are out in the hallway out there and also Lisa over there at the Mohegan Sun Golf Club who helped me out quite a bit too.

We had 32 golfers, but unfortunately 2 missed the event due to their flight being cancelled late on Saturday. We played at the beautiful and very challenging Mohegan Sun Golf Club in Baltic, Connecticut. It was a very warm and sunny day, but beautiful. Golfers were treated to a Triple T barbeque, which they could eat and drink unlimited on holes 8, 13, and 16,
and a complimentary drink in the clubhouse after they finished. We had six foursomes and two threesomes compete. We also handed out gifts to each golfer and four contests were involved. The three closest to the pins and the par 3s, and the straightest drive closest to the center line at hole 13, and the winning team, I would like to honor right now, posted a very good 8 under par 64, for the top prize. They were one of the threesomes. The team consisted of, and will you please come up, Robert McMurray, William Cook, and Kevin Proctor.

[Applause.]

All from Tennessee.

[Applause.]

Okay. Now, the awards for closest to the pin. Hole 4, Kevin Proctor, 10 feet. Hole 8, Franklin Broadnax, 6 feet, 1 inch. Hole 16, Hector Cordrado, 12 feet, 7 inches. He is not here right now. And now the straightest drive and closest to the center line was Charles May, 1 foot.
Let's give it to Tom Rokosa.

MR. TOM ROKOSA: Hello, everyone. My name is Thomas Rokosa. On behalf of the Host Branch, NAPS Branch 5, Hartford, and the Golf Committee, Lenny and I would like to present a token of our appreciation to Brian Wagner, Ivan Butts, Chuck Mulidore, Greg Murphy, and Sheri Davies -- Davies for giving us the opportunity to host this year's National Convention. And this is the item that we're giving away.

[Off mic speaking.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: We definitely want to thank Lenny and his crew for doing a great job on the golf tournament, and definitely appreciate it. They said I couldn't play because I only play miniature golf, so I understand.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We both had a handicap, too.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thanks for the high chair, I really appreciate it.

[Laughter.]
At this point in time, I would like to --

let me get to my notes here -- would like to bring

up Chuck Mulidore, our national Secretary/Treasurer to do a few remarks on

announcements, and then I need Roe Herzog and Toni Regozzi to come up here for the balloting, as we

announce the Balloting Committee. And then I need

-- okay, how are you doing? Okay, so Chuck, any

announcements, and then Toni and Roe, please come

up.

MR. CHUCK MULIDORE: All right. Good

afternoon, everybody, again. Nothing new in terms

of announcements other than the fact that the

following area photos will be taken immediately

upon adjournment today in the Brothertown

Passamaquoddy Room. So, after we adjourn,

Michiana, Illini, North Central, and the MINK.

So, after recess this afternoon, Michiana, Illini,

North Central, and MINK in the Brothertown

Passamaquoddy Room. That’s all I have.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thanks, Chuck. Is Roe

coming up and Toni? Chair and co-chair of the
Balloting Committee. Oh, I see you. All righty. Okay. And at approximately 2 p.m. on my schedule, the Postmaster’s Committee should be getting ready for their report approximately 2 p.m., just give or take a few minutes, all right? So, as Roe and Toni come up -- again, thank you very much for this morning. Very good questions. I appreciate the fact that everyone was very patient with the Postmaster General and Dave Williams. I’m glad I was taking those questions. Okay. I’m bringing up Rosemary Herzog, Roe Herzog, the Chair of the Balloting Election Committee and Toni Regozzi, also the Co-Chair. Roe is from West Palm Beach, Florida, Branch 154, and Toni Regozzi is from Milwaukee, Branch 72. So, at this point in time, I’m going to read the Balloting Committee and then turn it over to Roe for more instructions. So, please listen up, because this was top secret for -- until this morning.

So, we’re going to start with the first area, New England Area, Virginia Herbert, Westfield, Mass, Branch 102, Jim Misserville,
Hampton, New Hampshire, Branch 498. New York Area, Frank Lido, Branch 459, St. Clair Maynard, “Butch” Branch 51. Mideast Area, Sue Barco, Branch 20, Constance Scales, Branch 53. Capitol Atlantic Area, Charles Jacob, Branch 132, Melinda Pennix, Branch 157. Pioneer Area, Debra Moore, Branch 55, Trent Clark, Branch 33. Michiana Area, Sharon Wright, Branch 23, Dave Hommerson, Branch 925. Illini area, Branch 17, Brenda Jackson, Dawn Hagen, Branch 255. North Central Area, Bruce Kuiper, Branch 16, Bob Tolman, Branch 946, South Dakota. MINK Area, Virginia Price Booker, Branch 131, Laurie McCann, Branch 52. Southeast Area, Kim Hatton-Mullins, Branch 81, Josephine Wooley, Branch 82. Central Gulf Area, Larry Hamilton, Branch 209, Albert Feazell, Branch 73. Cotton Belt Area, Thomas Lavalais, Mid-City, Oklahoma, Branch 80, Michelle Ikes, Branch 41. Texas Area, Mae Tutt, Branch 86, Jessie Austin, Branch 122. Northwest Area, Pamela Kennedy, Branch 66, Christina Moore, Branch 60. Rocky Mountain Area, Richard Price, Branch 65, Jackie Clayton, Branch
1 463. Pacific Area, Dianne Ayon, Branch 88, and
2 Patricia Cobb, Branch 39.
3 That is our Ballot and Election Committee
4 assigned. I will turn it now over to Roe Herzog
5 for any comments about the Balloting Committee.
6 Roe.
7 MS. ROE HERZOG: Thank you, Brian. Good
8 afternoon. Those members whose names Brian just
9 called off, we’re going to meet this afternoon at
10 5:30. It will be a brief meeting. I just want to
11 make sure that everybody is here and accounted
12 for, and we will hand out the rules, so you’ll be
13 familiar with what you’re going to be expected to
14 do. Thank you and see you at 5:30. We’ll meet in
15 the back of the room, my right, your left.
16 MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Roe. Our
17 next guest speaker, Tony Leonardi, the co-
18 President of the United Postmasters and Managers
19 of America, UPMA. Tony’s postal career began in
20 June of 1994. He started as a letter carrier,
21 then moved up to supervisor, working in those
22 positions for four years each. In 2002, he earned
the title of Postmaster, a position he has never vacated. Since then, he has served in numerous OIC positions and is currently Postmaster of Mims, Florida. Prior to the merger of NAPUS and the League, Tony served in the following positions in NAPUS. He was the National Membership Chair in 2007 to 2008, National Postmaster Rep in 2009, and National Vice President for Area 2 in 2010 to 2011, before assuming his responsibilities as National President for the terms of 2014 to 2017.

In November of 2016, Tony began serving as National co-President of UPMA, representing over 25 active and retired members. He is committed to bringing these two organizations together to improve the quality of life for all Postmasters and Managers across this country to insure this -- we must face the future united and confident with a common vision. Tony currently lives in Alexandria, Virginia, with his wife, Karen, and his daughter, Isabella. Please give a warm NAPS welcome to Tony Leonardi, co-President of UPMA.

[Applause.]
MR. TONY LEONARDI: Good afternoon, everybody.

ALL: Good afternoon.

MR. TONY LEONARDI: I want to first thank Brian, Ivan, and Chuck for allowing me to speak for a few minutes to you. Coming back here to Connecticut, this has been my home for over 50 years. I just recently relocated to Florida last year, and it’s always nice to come home and visit some of my money out there. So, maybe you guys can win some of it back, please. I would appreciate that.

I also want to take this moment to just thank Louis Atkins, your past National President. He’s a personal friend of mine, and I understand after 28 years, he is actually coming off the Board, is that correct? I want to wish him and his wife, Benita, the best down in Louisiana as they go to the next chapter of life. So, to you, Louis, thank you for all you’ve done, all your friendship, and support. I appreciate you.

[Applause.]
You know, we’ll talk about a few things briefly, a lot of it has already been gone over by different speakers. But, you know, we have the Postal Commission that’s going to rule very shortly. It’s going to be important that as an organization that we are prepared to respond to that. We don’t know what the Commission is going to find or what their direction is, but we have to make sure that we come together with the other organizations and the unions and make sure that we have a quick response.

You know, Postal Reform, we all know that’s overdue. It’s been talked about, well, since 2006, right? That’s when we started walking the hill to try to get it changed. The prefunding is an unnecessary burden on us, and, you know, the Postal Service, the longer we go without that Postal Reform, the more concern I have is that they’re going to wind up making short-term decisions that may not be in our best interest long-term. So, we need to stay vigilant on that. Make sure you give to SPAC and you support your
legislative front, because it is the life we chose, all right? We are at the will of the Congress and Senate, and we need to make sure that they hear our voice on that, because it’s very important to our future.

You heard your Area Vice President, Mr. Ed Phelan talk about the SWCs. I want to thank Tommy and Jim for working on that committee to get that -- it’s something that, you know, it’s been talked about for, like I said, the last couple of years, and I understand you guys are close to revamping it. We appreciate that. But, you know, that’s only one part of the equation is staffing it correctly. Another part of it is, do we have the replacements when we take time off. Are we on call 24 hours a day? When we leave on Friday afternoon, does your phone ring three times at 6:00 before you get up, right? We need to have a system -- a backup system -- or enough staffing so people can leave their job on their day off, not worry about getting five phone calls, or, God forbid, missing one, all right, and not
responding. So, we need to look at that too, as our organizations have many common goals in this. We have to find a way that we can get -- feel like we can leave our job and disconnect on our day off, and many of us don’t feel that way. So, I hope that will help.

Another good example of how the organizations work together is a lot of you have seen the rollouts of the level 20, 21, and 22s. The Postmaster and supervisor work hours are being rolled out for this year. They’re going to the same across the country, all right? If you’re a Postmaster in California or you’re in Connecticut or you’re in Florida, you’re going to get the same hours by your level, you’re going to get the same hours for your supervisor by your level. If we’re all under the same NPA system, isn’t it only fair that we have the same budget to work from? Something we should have done years ago, but it took forever for them to agree to bring that together and make it consistent throughout the areas. So, that’s another good thing that we’ve
done.

NPA. Well, can talk about that for next six hours. But, look, we’re all on the same page with you guys with this. We understand the system has to be redone, all right? Currently, the way we have it, it’s -- it’s not representative of the work that you guys do. We’re aware of that too. You know, we think that there needs to be some form of base in the NPA system, something. You know, if it’s something around cost of living needs to be the bottom, and then there needs to be a component of that that gives you more money if the performance is there. But, we can’t have people go years in a row without receiving any raise. It’s not fair, and it’s not what the NPA system was designed to do. So, we’re going to work with your organization to try to revamp that also.

I am sure that our newly elected President, Dan Hines, will also work closely with your organization to make sure that we are on the same page with many of the things that we have in
common, especially, I think the NPA system. That is the biggest challenge facing all of our organizations, because if people don’t feel like they’re valued, then they don’t want to do a good job, they don’t want to get promoted, they don’t want to step up. So, those are just some of the topics.

I would say this in closing, that I want to again thank your leadership Brian, Ivan, and Chuck, for their friendship and their support over the last two years. We will continue to work with them until our term -- my term ends on October 31st, and I’m sure that we’ll still have -- our organizations will always have a good relationship. So, Brian, I thank you for allowing me to speak. Thank you very much, appreciate it. Have a great convention. Thanks.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Tony, thank you very much, and on behalf of NAPS -- the entire NAPS organization -- I wish you and Shawn and your families all the best as you transition back to
the Post Office from your positions of representing your members from UPMA and formerly the League in NAPUS. All the best to you, and thank you for coming and joining with us and sharing your thoughts.

We have one member on the Balloting and Election Committee who is not here, Brenda Jackson from Branch 17. She has been replaced by Ricky Hilliard of Branch 489. So, Ricky Hilliard, Branch 489 is for the Illini Area replacing Brenda Jackson.

So, with that, do we have the Postmasters Committee ready to present their report? Joe Bodary. Okay, Postmasters Committee, you’re up.

[Music.]

MR. JOE BODARY: Good afternoon, delegates.

ALL: Good afternoon.

MR. JOE BODARY: My name is Joe Bodary. I’m the Michigan State President, and I’m also the Chairman of the Postmasters Committee.

[Applause.]
Oh, man, woo. Is that better? Okay.

Let me start over. My name is Joe Bodary. I’m the State President from Michigan, and I’m the Chairman of the Postmasters Committee. I’d like to see how many Postmasters we have in attendance.

If you could please stand if you’re a Postmaster.

[Applause.]

We grow bigger and bigger every year. I grow bigger this way, but the crowd’s grown bigger, and we’re pleased to see that. We had a very good committee this year, a lot of issues, especially with the pay talks and UPMA doing the same thing as us or trying to. I want to thank Shawn Accord for addressing our committee this morning. I don’t know if he’s still here, but is he here? Thanks, Shawn. You gave us a different light on what we were talking about, and we appreciate that. I also want to thank Kevin on my committee for being our Secretary and doing all the hard work for us. Kevin, thank you for that.

[Applause.]

I’d like to go over our old business.
Recommendations we made at the last convention, I’m going to report on that, where we are, where we went with it. We had a couple things. We asked the Executive Board to get a seat at the Consultative with the Postal Service and some of our issues, and, of course, if you read in the Postal Supervisor Magazine, they were told no. We asked that they publish the results of our recommendations, and it was done in the Postal Supervisor through various issues. We also asked that they publish the finance numbers with all Postmasters, but they were not able to get a breakdown on that. We also asked that the Postal Service Headquarters send all the Area Managers, District Managers, and Postmasters a copy of the magazine. It does go out to District Managers, and for those of you who don’t know, Megan said she reads the magazine, and that’s true, because she sent me comments on some of my articles. So, I know she reads it.

[Laughter.]

Unfortunately, it proved to be not cost
effective to send it out to everyone there, but we may be bringing that up again.

So, now we’ve got some new business we’d like to go over. Okay, that will be me.

[Laughter.]

Let’s go over new business, okay. Issues for Headquarters, we’re bringing to them. We believe that they could afford one or two mailings of that magazine to non-member Postmasters each year, and then also, there was an Executive Committee for Postmasters that was created, and we asked that they -- that we or part of us be included on that committee. I believe we did some investigation further, and that committee may not longer exist. But, if it’s still there, we want to be a part of it.

We found out we have 3,752 Postmasters in the NAPS organization.

[Applause.]

According to NAPS math -- not Postal math, or not regular math -- but NAPS math, that’s like about 28 percent membership. In the past few
years, we were trying to get to 20 percent, and we’ve exceeded that.

And then we want the Executive Postmaster Committee should be at the Postmaster Committee, selected for the National Convention to discuss issues and goals. Okay.

MR. STEVE SHAWVER: Hi. Steve Shawver, Branch 122, Houston. On the Postmaster only issues, we were talking about Telecons and staffing issues being understaffed. If I lean forward in the mic, oh, I can hear my echo. Maybe it’s just my ringing in my ears. But, the Telecons were on Saturday, after hours, and just like anything else, the Postmaster is the one that’s responsible, and it turns out that where we have typically a 50- to 60-hour week, it keeps on going. The Postmasters have no relief in many of the smaller offices. The PMRs aren’t hired in some cases, or they have to travel 50 or 60 miles just to cover an office, and it’s not their PMR, they’re borrowing a PMR. I think we’ve all had to borrow people. And the Christmas pay for the
Postmasters just simply isn’t allowed because they’re a different EAS-type of employee. And the 1260 [sic] issues.

The issue is that in smaller post offices where you can’t work anymore than 15 hours a week -- well, if you work over 15, then you start paying the clerks -- were not working.

MR. JIMMY SALMON: My name is Jimmy Salmon, Postmaster, Branch 246, Phoenix. I have issues that apply to all Postmasters and Managers. Postmasters and Managers are delivering mail due to a shortage of RCAs and CCAs. It’s getting increasingly worse in all areas.

Customer surveys, we used to suggest that a small incentive like a book of stamps or something, etcetera, be attached to filling out a survey to increase participation from our customers.

Postmasters and Managers are being made responsible for everything including areas where little to zero knowledge is known. Examples would be electrical work plan, human resources and
labor. We need to reenergize building and
equipment that we need to update our offices to
reflect a positive image to our customers, and
House of Representatives resolutions on
privatizing the Postal Service, President Trump’s
taskforce, and Postal Reform -- Postal Reform
example would be insurance.

MR. JOE BODARY: Okay, that’s our report.
Are there any questions, comments, concerns? We
have time. Brian said we have until 2:30.

[Laughter.]

No hurry. Okay, one thing we did put in
here is a Title 39 subsection 1004.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate at mic 7.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: John Harris, Branch
567. I’m trying to determine or trying to figure
out the purpose of your committee is to do what?

[Audience reaction.]

What is the purpose of the Postmasters
Committee?

MR. JOE BODARY: Okay. Well, we do -- as
you know, we’ve been trying to get enough members
in our organization that we can represent
Postmasters at pay talks. But, our committee, we
make recommendations to the Executive Board of
things that we see to help improve working
conditions of Postmasters, and then we also -- a
lot of those issues also affect Managers and
Supervisors. So, we kind of broke down our
recommendations for things that are just for
Postmasters, and last year, when they met with
Headquarters, Headquarters said they won’t discuss
Postmaster issues with them. Our thought was,
should the Postal Service recognize us as a --
part of that negotiating for the Postmasters that
they’ll take us at the Consultative table for
those.

So, we separated those issues for
recommendations, and then our other
recommendations, we feel that the Executive Board
can take the consultative, because they affect
everybody -- Supervisors, Managers, and
Postmasters.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: All right. Well,
should you not be submitted resolutions for
discussion by this body?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: They’ve had
resolutions come through. I mean, you’ve asked
what they’ve -- what their function is, and they
answered. So, now you -- if they want to submit
resolutions, they can submit resolutions like any
other member or branch or committee. But, the
question whether or not they are submitting them,
it’s their choice as the committee.

Now, I would like to have Joe finish his
report before we take any further questions.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: Well, he did ask.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Well, I know, but he
came back -- finishing up some.

MR. JOE BODARY: Yeah, I’ve just got to
read two more sentences.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: He’s got to read two
more sentences. Please, I ask that we let him
finish his report, and we’ll come back to your
question and anybody else at the microphone.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: 10-4.
MR. JOE BODARY: Okay. The last few things we’ve got to say, I just want to read the citation out of the Title 39, Section 104, which states that, “A Postmaster organization means an organization recognized by the Postal Service under subsection B as representing at least 20 percent of Postmasters.” This committee believes that we should be represented by NAPS in pay consultations with 13,400 Postmasters in the Postal Service and 3,752 Postmasters that belong to NAPS as of June 2018 DCO, and that’s where we got our 28 percent from.

Now, back to the resolutions, we can submit resolutions, or we can submit recommendations. We have submitted resolutions. Last convention, we submitted two. Basically, a resolution, the body votes on, the Executive Board has to take it to consultative, which they did, and they were turned down on it.

We can make recommendations, recommending to the Executive Board to take it to consultative, but it doesn’t mean that they’re mandated to,
because the body didn’t vote on it to happen. So, that’s why we do recommendations or resolutions. And this year, we didn’t, seeing we know how the Postal Service stands with the Postmasters, we didn’t want to submit resolutions, because they’d be wasting their time when they won’t listen to them.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: Hmm. Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 1.

MR. STEVE GERBER: Steve Gerber, Branch 139, Salt Lake City, Utah, past Board member, and retired Postmaster. The question I’m going ask now is that we’ve reached that 20 percent threshold, what are we going to do to get a role at the consultative with the Postal Service for Postmasters?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: So, you’re asking me?

MR. STEVE GERBER: Yeah.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: NAPS is going to look at that -- our options with regard to Title 39, and see -- and look at our options to seek that representation, because we have over 20 percent.
MR. STEVE GERBER: When did we cross that threshold?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: When did we cross that threshold?

MR. STEVE GERBER: Yeah.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I’m not -- I’m not sure when we crossed the threshold, but now that we know that we have approximately 3,700 Postmasters, trying to figure out how many Postmasters there were in the country, we are looking at that we have over 20 percent to start preparing a case that we within Title 39 have a right to represent Postmasters.

MR. STEVE GERBER: Now, see it done. Thank you.


MS. CYNTHIA SHEFFTON: Yeah, hi. Good afternoon. This is Cynthia Sheffton, Branch 237. I’d like to ask the Postmasters Committee, I am a Postmaster, Level 22, we have Postmasters delivering mail, and we are also being asked to
cover the shifts of the Supervisors. So, to
address that gentleman, what happens is, if we
don’t work together, the Supervisors lose. So,
what I would ask them to do is also to look at
these things that are happening that impact
Supervisors, where we’re actually taking away the
work that they should be -- that they should do,
because we don’t have enough Supervisors.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. one of the
things I’d like to address is the fact that we’re
working on the Supervisor workload service credits
to address this issue that the Supervisors have
workloads that they should be doing, and the
Postmasters have their workload to be done, and if
we do the SWCs with the workload out there, we
should be able to cover those -- those duties so
the Postmaster doesn’t have to do the Supervisor’s
job, and the Supervisor doesn’t have to cover for
all the Postmasters. I think the SWCs will help
alleviate that. But, we understand that people
are working without a relief, and the Postmaster
is working the day off of their Supervisors.
Delegate, I think that’s mic 4.

MS. BEVERLY MARRIOTT: 9.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, that’s close enough for math.

[Laughter.]

That’s Postal math, 9, 4, whatever.

MS. BEVERLY MARRIOTT: Beverly Marriott, Branch 177, and I am a Level 18 Postmaster.

[Applause.]

I wanted to say first that during peak as a Level 18, we were tasked with delivering mail and working seven days a week. There are two occupational codes, one where the Level 18 gets paid, and then the other one is where the Level 18 does not get paid during peak. So, I’m asking that since we’ve reached the percentage that the Postmaster and NAPS work to make sure that we are paid properly. I know it’s not gonna happen to me, because January 10th is retirement day.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Congratulations in advance.

MS. BEVERLY MARRIOTT: But, I just think
that with all the hard work and the Amazon and the
18-hour days, that some representation needs to be
done. And also, I was told from a fellow
colleague that went to the UPMA, that UPMA is
making a play on regular Supervisors to move them
from NAPS to UPMA, because the representation for
Postmasters and Supervisors is lacking. So, we’ve
got some work to do.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Well, I believe we
have the best representation in our Disciplinary
Defense Fund, and that’s shown by how we have won
cases and worked to represent our members in the
best possible way with Charlie Scialla, with over
31 years as a DDF provider, and known as Mr. DDF
right now, and then with Al Lum on board. I think
our members should be very proud of the
representation they get regarding our DDF. Thank
you.

MS. BEVERLY MARRIOTT: And I agree, and I
thank Scialla and Associates. It’s just that we
need to be aware of the impending changes that are
occurring with UPMA.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you very much.

Delegate, mic 2.

MR. STEVE KOBILSKA: Brian, Steve Kobliska, Branch 244, California. I’ve been listening to a lot of people saying that they’re working 48, 60 hours a week. That’s been happening in our District also. We’ve been told that there is no compensatory time. How do these people get paid for their work?

[Audience reaction.]

What is -- what is the recommendation? I mean, it’s getting to the point where this is absolutely asinine. I mean, you’re killing people out in the field. So, how do these people get compensated for working 60, 70 hours? And I’m going to give you a for-instance. We had the Thompson fires or Thomas fires -- we had people working from 4 to 7 every day, 18 days in a row, and I’m sure there’s a lot of things, like in Puerto Rico, and everything else, this is happening. How do you compensate these people for time? What do we do? What is the recommendation?
Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, when we’re talking now, we’re on the Postmasters Committee, and we’re talking about Supervisors and the Postmasters. The Post Office says we have the special-exempt for Supervisors. You work, you get paid the straight time.

MR. STEVE KOBLISKA: I’m talking -- I’m just talking Supervisors.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: But, we’re on the Postmasters Committee right now.

MR. STEVE KOBLISKA: They’re EAS.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I understand that. But, Steve, we’re doing the Postmasters --

MR. STEVE KOBLISKA: This happens with all -- all factions of this. It can be involved with Postmasters, it can be managers of any area. It’s happening throughout the United States, and, like I said, what recourse do we have to get these people paid for the work that they really do?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: On the standpoint of Supervisors, even though we’re on the Postmasters
Committee report, Supervisors that are special-exempt should be putting in for all their time and not working off the clock. We’ve written about that, “T’d off about T-time” if you read my article and read the other articles we’ve written. If you’re exempt, you’re exempt by Department of Labor standards, you’re exempt. The Post Office will not pay you. That’s the Department of Labor standards. If you need to have time off or need to be off, you need to bring somebody up so that you can have your relief. And like Megan Brennan said, if you’ve got it locally, you need to start pushing it up. There’s a letter out there about excessive use of exempt employees for being worked. We have to push back at the local level, and you’re supposed to look for people to bring up to help cover you. That’s where we’re at right now, and the SWCs was going to possibly get us more Supervisors once we get the SWCs online. So, that will be a help to the membership.

But, your designation, by Department of
Labor standards, if you’re exempt, you’re exempt. That’s in any company. They can work you as much as they want. They, the Postal Service, are the company you work for. That’s the Department of Labor standards. We’re lucky that Vince Paladino and the officers back in 1995 or in the mid ’90s got us special-exempt when Morgan Runyon, one of the Supervisors to be exempt, and worked 60 hours a week with no pay.

So, with that, I’m going to continue. Is there anything else regarding the Postmasters Committee related to the Postmasters? Delegate at mic 2.

MS. MARY BURKHARD: Yeah, Mary Burkhard, Branch 244. I just wanted to bring to your attention that all the other federal agencies, they do have comp time -- compensation time, and what they do is when you go over there, for every hour you work extra, you put it in a log. At the end of the week, your manager signs that log, and during the year, you can use that for either sick leave or annual leave. And so, that’s how other
federal agencies do it. We’re the only one that
doesn’t have comp time, and I think we should be
following up on that, because it’s really illegal
what we do when someone says you can work forever.
I’ve been asking this of Doug Tolino [phonetic]
many, many times, some of you have been there, and
he’s always saying, “Mary, you’re not an
indentured servant. Exempt only means 40 hours a
week.” And what he said when we were in Puerto
Rico last time, and I think he even said it in New
York at that meeting, he said, “Forty hours,
that’s what I would work. If they don’t
appreciate it, and there’s no real reason for
working extra, I wouldn’t work.” That’s what Doug
Tolino said. So, I think we should be following
what our leadership says, and enforcing this and
pushing it up, because when you shine a light on
this abuse, it’s going to start going away. It’s
just got to be wrong. Who wants to be exempt?
I’m exempt. It’s crazy when we have a theory like
that that you can work forever. That doesn’t make
any sense. We need a solution. But, I appreciate
your answers. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Mary, it’s not a theory, it’s a law. We have the Postal Reorganization Act in 1970. We’re under Title 39. We are under that part of the federal government and not the other part of the federal government quasi. So, but, I will tell this, that NAPS is looking at Title 39 and how it relates to how we – how our managers are paid, and what the pay package and the fact-finding coming up. We will look at how Title 39, within the law, what we can do, whether we have to get the law changed or within the law, we can make sure our members are compensated for the work they do.

MS. MARY BURKHARD: Thank you, because I think you should be putting together examples of this to show them areas where this is factual, not just theory, because there’s many, many people here, I’m sure, that would like to stand up and say this is my particular case, this is how many hours I work. So, thank you.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Mary.

Anyone else on the Postmasters Committee report?
Delegate, mic 7.

MS. CHERYL HUTCHINS: Oh, it just has to do with the hour subject. Cheryl Hutchins, Branch 23, Detroit. This issue about Supervisors or EAS working, it’s a violation of the National Labor -- I know we’re exempt, I understand that -- but, the only way -- because I’ve talked to the National Labor Relations Board about this -- when it’s being abused, unless people stand up, put these cases together, there’s nothing you can do about it. But, if there is a specific area in the EAS, a woman speak up, if NAPS can’t escalate it, you can take it to the NLR. Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Any other -- number 5.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Kathi Clapp, Oregon State, Branch 940. Is there a National Postmasters Committee that meets on the recommendations based upon this Committee’s recommendations?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: When we had -- when I
appointed the Postmasters Committee on the Executive Board, we placed Postmasters in the field on this Committee. We gave them the recommendations of the Postmasters from this Committee. This Committee can change every two years. So, we did a Postmasters Executive Board Committee to see what our Executive Board could do to help through the process of Postmasters and help move things forward at the national level.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: And how many times has that Committee met in the last two years?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I would have to pull is that -- Craig Johnson is the Chair of that. We had meetings prior to the Board meetings, and they would call their meetings by Telecon. And then we report in the NAPS minutes of the Executive Board meeting. So, they would report, and it would be in the Executive Board minutes.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Okay. And have those Committee meeting minutes been shared with the Postmasters Committee at this convention?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I don’t believe
they’ve been shared, but they’ve been published in our Postal Supervisor Magazine and our Executive Board minutes for everyone to read.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Okay. I also just want to share with you that my husband was the very first Postmaster ever to serve on the National Board. He was the Northwest Area Vice President and the Postmasters Committee is the result of that. So, thank you very much.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Kathi. I can see you, Cy. Delegate, mic 3.

MR. CY DUMAS: Point of personal privilege.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yes.

MR. CY DUMAS: I want to thank the Postmasters who are members of NAPS and serving on this Committee. I want to ask all the delegates back home in your branches to help our Postmaster members to get more into dealing with their issues. But, I take offense and umbrage with the two UPMA people being at our meeting --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: [Banging of gavel.]
Cy, you’re out of order.

MR. BY DUMAS: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Wow.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Is there anybody else who has a -- delegate, mic 5.

MS. JACKIE HENDRICKS: Jackie Hendricks, Branch 172, Little Rock, Arkansas. What I found that -- when I was mandated to work, I would tell my boss if I have to work, I need off a day through the week. That works for me. So, if I have to work on Saturday, then I want Friday off. It’s never been a problem. That’s all.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Just as information, there is an ELM reference that says if you’re directed to work, you may get another day off. You need to complete a 3971 and submit it. You may get that off. So, please look at the ELM reference on that, that if you’re directed to work on your day off, and you’re exempt, you may get another day off. There is no such thing as comp time in the Postal Service. There is personal time, personal leave. I saw on 7.
Microphone 7.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: Point of information.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I’ve got microphone 7.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: Mic 7. John Harris, Branch 567. You just ruled that Mr. Dumas was out of order.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yes, I did.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: Why?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I felt that he was being disrespectful to our guests in this convention, and it wasn’t appropriate.

[Applause.]

MR. JOHN HARRIS: I’d like to --

disrespectful for expressing of the fact that he didn’t like the guest here because of whatever reason that he didn’t get to expound?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Well, I ruled him out of order. It was still disrespectful, and I continue with my out of order ruling.

[Applause.]

MR. JOHN HARRIS: I’d like to challenge the Chair on that.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Is there a second?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Yes.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, okay. It’s been moved and seconded to appeal the decision of the Chair. All those in favor in supporting the chair, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All opposed.

[Chorus of nays.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The Chair has been -- the Chair is right. Ayes have it. The Chair is right.

[Applause.]

Put that in the records for my wife.

[Laughter.]

Okay, delegate --

MR. KEVIN TRAYER: Over here.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Mic 9.

MR. KEVIN TRAYER: Oh my God, you can’t even see him either. It’s 10, Brian. Close enough.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: When you’re -- it was just one short.

MR. KEVIN TRAYER: We’re only 9 miles away.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. What may I do for you, Mr. Trayer? You’ve been recognized.

MR. KEVIN TRAYER: Kevin Trayer, Branch 142, and a member of the Executive Board, also a member of the Postmaster Committee for the Executive Board along with several other members of the Central Region, Bart Green, and Craig Johnson is our Chair. I just want you all to know we do have some challenges and frustrations, but we do work hard, and we are going to continue to be your voice, as the Committee up there is. We met this week. A lot of things transitioned over two years of time here, and in the recent past, we have now come to the conclusion, we’re getting close to taking next action. We need to.

So, folks, with that said, that will be done as we move forward, but also somebody else made mention, when we go into the new Postmasters
Essentials Training, it’s my perfect opportunity as a NAPS rep to get up with the UPMA rep. I don’t besmirch anybody in the room, I just ask who’s a NAPS member. They raise their hand, and I ask them, what are the benefits of NAPS, and that’s all I have to do, and the DDF is our biggest catch right there when somebody says why do I want to join someplace that I have to spend $8000 to represent me, and you guys do it as part of our membership. It’s been self-selling.

But, I do not besmirch my UPMA members that are in the room. I work with them closely, and we do have common ground, and we need to stay working on that. But, with that said, we are working with you on the Executive Board, we’re working with the National Committee, and we will continue to work, and we all need to get out there and get other members signed up. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 3.

MS. PEGGY BEDNAR: Peggy Bednar, Branch 20, Pittsburgh, PA. As a higher-level Postmaster,
I was highly offended by Cy. I am a member of both organizations, as both organizations have
great input on our ability to do our jobs, and you
protect us. So, when you say that, hey, my
Supervisor or my Postmaster didn’t give me a day
off, hello, I’m in the room. I give people off.
I hear you. So, when you say they, it’s not all
of us. We’re here to support NAPS.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you. As I see
nobody else at the mics --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Mic 1.
MR. GIL BARBA: Over here.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Sorry.
MR. GIL BARBA: Gil Barba, Branch 373. I
want to say this, I hear a lot of device in this
hearing. We’re on the same team. We’re on the
same team -- the Postmasters have our back, or
they’re supposed to have our back, we’re supposed
to have their back. Unfortunately, it’s become an
environment where they’re pitting us against each
other. We gotta work through this. These guys
here have got your back.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 7.

MR. BOB BRADFORD: Bob Bradford, Texas state. I’m in Branch -- I keep moving -- Heart of Texas Branch. Y’all call it Waco, but it’s really the Heart of Texas Branch. A few conventions ago, I got up -- I’ll get into the Postmaster -- I got up and said Texans had the worst President that ever existed. I’ve been now in error. We now have the worst President, but he ain’t from Texas.

[Laughter.]

Now --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I thought he was talking about me.

[Laughter.]

MR. BOB BRADFORD: My branch has 23 members, 12 of them are Postmasters. Whatever you do, do something for them, because I’d sure hate to lose half of my branch. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I just want to make --
is Ken Bunch and Rich Caruso close by for when we
go into resolutions after this report? I want to
make sure they’re in the -- in the house -- in the
room. Thank you. I’m looking. Okay, I see you,
Rich. That’s fine. You don’t need a Postmaster
question, do you? No, okay. All right.

So, seeing nobody else at the mics
regarding the Postmasters Committee report, I will
turn it over to Joe Bodary for final remarks.

MR. JOE BODARY: Wow.

[Laughter.]

I’m speechless. I appreciate the
comments and the concerns. We -- a lot of what
you brought up here, we discussed in our Committee
meeting. You know, as for UPMA, I also am a
member of UPMA, and half the members on this
Committee are also members of UPMA. So, we do
work together. As a Postmaster, I’m a Level 21.
I has EAS Supervisors that work for me, and I know
my Committee doesn’t want to hear it, but I have
the perfect office, because we work together. And
they don’t believe me, but it’s true. You know, I
tell them the edge of the case is wearing off from my feet being up on it. But, we work together.

My Supervisors, they get paid for every hour they work. I don’t let them work over 40, but if they did, they’d get paid for it, and we work together. And I know it happens all over.

So, one of the comments made we gotta move it up. Yeah, if it’s not happening, that’s what your NAPS reps are there for. You move it up. Our District Manager is new, she’s from Texas. Hopefully, I’m not too sure, we don’t know her that well yet, but she put her foot down and said, no, it’s a safety hazard for people to be working 7, 14 days in a row, whether it be a CCA, a PSC, an EAS -- it’s not healthy, and it’s not gonna happen. So, we gotta move issues up.

Whether you’re a Supervisor, Manager, or Postmaster, if you’re being abused, and you’re being abused by working that many hours, move it up. That’s all I can advise you.

I’d like to thank my Committee. I’m going to read their names so you can recognize
them: Marsha Danzy is my co-Chairman.

[Applause.]

She’s from Branch 905. Laura Hires from Branch 130.

[Sing­le clap.]

Stan Johnson, Branch 60.

[Sing­le clap.]

Sammy Jones, Branch 405.

[Sing­le clap.]

Rick Kindsvatter, Branch 929.

[Sing­le clap.]

Kevin Moore, Branch 281.

[Sing­le clap.]

Joe O’Donnell, Branch 20.

[Sing­le clap.]

James Salmon, Branch 246.

[Sing­le clap.]

Stephen Shawver (or Steven or Stephan, whichever we want to call him), Branch 122.

[Sing­le clap.]

Aric Skjelstad, Branch 66.

[Sing­le clap.]
Beverly Torain, Branch 177.

[Singel clap.]

April Trevino, Branch 94.

[Singel clap.]

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Joe, and thank you Postmasters Committee. You are dismissed. Thank you very much for your excellent report.

[Applause.]

We’re going to go off-script for a minute. I think it’s very important that we recognize the people who have served us so well for years, and even though this person has been with us for years and has stepped down and has retired, he will always be with us in spirit and in knowledge. And we’d like to bring Charlie Scialla up, our former Disciplinary Defense Provider, now known as Mr. DDF, and his wife, Marie, for a special recognition.

[Applause.]

Charlie.
MR. CHARLIE SCIALLA: Mr. DDF.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Mr. DDF. It’s not on the certificate, but we’ll make an amendment. But, this is a Certificate of Appreciation, and I’m going to read it, if you’ll please give me the indulgence.

"National Association of Postal Supervisors. The National Association of Postal Supervisors, NAPS, hereby acknowledges and recognizes Charlie Scialla as an outstanding NAPS Disciplinary Defense Provider, DDF, for the past 31 years. On behalf of the NAPS organization and its entire membership, NAPS thanks you for your commitment to represent members in adverse action and debt collection cases, your tireless and endless counsel, and years of dedicated service is not only greatly appreciated but has been a priceless service to NAPS and its members. In testimony whereof, the signatures of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, National President, Executive Vice President, and National Secretary/Treasurer are here to affix this 2018
Congratulations, Charlie, and congratulations, Marie.

[Applause and chanting, “Charlie, Charlie.”]

On behalf of NAPS, go ahead. We have for Charlie so he always has -- even though he’s retired, to keep track of time -- a NAPS logo watch.

MR. CHARLIE SCIALLA: Oh, yeah.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Just so he knows when to show up for the next National Convention, and please, invite him to meetings, because he has so much value and knowledge that he can present to you and give to your members, not only to our veterans, but the new, first-timers coming in.

Charlie, I ask you to say a few remarks on behalf of you and your lovely wife, Marie.
MR. CHARLIE SCIALLA: Thank you, Brian.

Well, this is a big surprise, I mean, after I got that title this morning. But, seriously, it was 28-1/2 years DDF provider. It was enjoyable, and I think, and I hope that everybody thought we did a good job. I know we did a good job. We were probably the best in the country on wins and losses and settlements. And I’m gonna make one commercial.

[Laughter.]

We have never, ever in my 28-1/2 years of being the head of the DDF, have ever charged a member any money for any case that we ever had.

[Applause.]

And my commercial is, support the DDF. It’s very important the way things are going, and I have to say one thing, the group of people that I put together and now Al has, has over 390 years of Postal Service, working in the Post Office and as retirees, and I put my 64 years in as a Postal Executive and with NAPS. And again, I thank Brian, I thank NAPS, I thank all of you. It was a
real surprise, and I appreciate it. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you very much for indulging on this, and again, Charlie Scialla and Marie Scialla for all they’ve done for NAPS.

[Applause.]

I want to bring up Ken Bunch and Rich Caruso so that we can continue with the unfinished business of the -- unfinished report of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

MR. MAC LITTLES: Mr. Chairman.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 3.

MR. MAC LITTLES: Mac Littles, Branch 35, home of the Superbowl Champions, Philadelphia Eagles.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Chuck told me to rule you out of order. He’s Dallas, I don’t know. But, go ahead.

MR. MAC LITTLES: While we’re on the subject of service and on service as far as longevity, I’m standing here because for the past
three days, I’ve heard five words, “Thank you for your service,” by Dave Mastroianni, Ed Phelan, Shawn Accord, Megan Brennan. They’ve all thanked the service men for their service. I’m standing because I think it would be a good gesture for our next convention if we had a pin for the first-timers and for anyone who’s a veteran that said thank you for your service. I mean, there’s been numerous wars -- Korean, Desert Storm, Viet Nam, you name it -- the ultimate sacrifice has been given, and I think it would be a good gesture. I even have a Brian Wagner pin that says reelect you. It would have been nice if it said thank you for your service. That’s all I have to say.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Well, thank you for those comments.

[Applause.]

Are we ready, Rich?

MR. MARCEL WEBB: Mic 7.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 7.

MR. MARCEL WEBB: Good afternoon,

President, Mr. Brian. Marcel Webb, Branch 917,
State President. Point of personal privilege. I just want to say, Trina Webb, thank you for 25 great years of marriage. Thank you.

[Audience reaction and applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Let me -- I know there’s a lot -- we talked about this earlier. We’ll be more than happy to do maybe the good of the association and recognitions. I will give you time at the end of the day if somebody wants to get up. I appreciate that. I know we want to get business done. I do want to bring up the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, but congratulations on 25 years, and again, we’ll be more than happy to listen to your accolades of friends and family and recognitions at the end of the day.

So, at this point in time, I’d like to bring up Rich Caruso and Ken --

MR. BOBBY BOCK: Mic 7.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 7.

Bobby, I didn’t see you.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: I was trying before you
transition. I was looking at the UPMA website, and -- I’m Bobby Bock, Branch 406 -- and I was very intrigued -- first of all, thank you for the water -- very intrigued. What they -- their rate when they come here next year, it’s $139 a night. We’re paying $179. It just seems like it’s -- that’s $40 a night times 7, you’re looking at $280 extra that we’re paying for a week than they’re getting -- for the same hotel. It just seems like we didn’t negotiate very well.

[Audience reaction.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: You know, Bobby, I don’t know their contract, but I know what our contract has given us with the breakfasts, the complimentary transportation. There is so much in a contract that you just can’t look at one thing. But, I hear you. But, the thing is we voted four years ago for this. But, you have to look at the whole package of a convention. You just can’t look at -- and I got some nodding heads out there on the Host Committee who understands -- you just can’t look at one item. I don’t know their
contract. I know our contract, and I believe we’ve been getting the best value for our -- our fees, our registration fees, and we’re going to continue to do that. Compliments out to Sheri Davies, our Conference Director, who has done an outstanding job of helping, because one of the things is, if there’s an issue, we address it as quickly as we can. Thank you very much. Now, I’m going to bring up Ken Bunch and Rich Caruso.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: I understand they’re addressing the issues, and I appreciate it, but I just want the Convention aware --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. It has been noted.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: $40 more a night.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I know the math. Thank you.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: Okay.

Here we go.

MR. KEN BUNCH:  Good afternoon, NAPS.  
ALL:  Good afternoon, Ken.  
MR. KEN BUNCH:  Thank you.  We have two resolutions that was given to us after we concluded our presentation yesterday, and I’m going to presume that we numbered these resolutions 17 and 18.  Yes.  Does everybody have a copy of the resolution that begin in the top that says, “Term Limits for Resident Officers?” Does everybody have that?

ALL:  Yes.

MR. KEN BUNCH:  Okay.  Let’s label that Number 17.  Show of hands of who does not have it. Could the Sargent at Arms please assist with ensuring that those delegates get a copy of this resolution.  Mic 7.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER:  Mic 7.

MR. JOHN HARRIS:  John Harris, Branch 567.  Now, we’ve been handed five resolutions here.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER:  Okay.
MR. JOHN HARRIS: Now, he said there were only two that were submitted to his Committee.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Well, this is Constitution and Bylaws. I don’t know -- the other resolutions may be for the Resolutions Committee.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: Okay.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: We’re doing Constitution and Bylaws right now.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: All right.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay?

MR. JOHN HARRIS: 10-4.

MR. KEN BUNCH: It’s from Branch Number 244. It begins with “Term Limits for Resident Officers” submitted by Branch 244. Does everybody have a copy now? Okay. Here we go. We’re only going to read the resolves as yesterday.

“Therefore, let it be resolved that our Constitution and Bylaws be revised to restrict resident officers to two terms of two years each for the positions of National President, Vice President -- National Vice President, and National
Secretary/Treasurer.”

The Committee’s recommendation was for nonconcurrence. The reason for our nonconcurrence is this body has addressed this resolution before, and there are two reasons, really. One, for those of you who are submitted resolutions perhaps for the first time or considering submitting resolutions for the first time, when you want to change the Constitution and Bylaws, it’s important that you tell the Committee exactly which language in the Constitution you want to change, where that language exists, what language you wish to strike, what language you wish to add. Because when you give us a generic proposal, if you will, such as this, that means that the Committee now would have to scour the entire Constitution and Bylaws to see what other positions or places in the Constitution that this would impact, if it was so implemented. That’s not the Committee’s role.

As the submitter of the resolution, it’s yours to identify exactly which language you want us to change, which language you want to take out,
which language you wish to add. This resolution does not do that, okay? And just on the substance of it, we do not believe that she should restrict our members’ right to choose who they want to elect to represent them by term-limiting anyone in this organization. Thank you.

[Applause.]

So, the Committee’s recommendation, again, was for nonconcurrence.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Resolution 17, the Committee’s recommendation is for nonconcurrence. Are there any objections?

Delegate, mic 2.

MR. RICHARD SIGMAN: Richard Sigman, Branch 244. I object.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Resolution will be held over for second reading.

MR. KEN BUNCH: Resolution Number 18. Resolution Number 18 was submitted. I know they gave you all at least four or five resolutions. This one is from Branch 255, Heart of Illinois Branch. Number 255. If you do not have it,
please let’s see a show of hands of those who do not have the one submitted from Branch 255. Okay. Sargent at Arms, could you please assist.

MR. ARNIE ROSARIO: Question, please, mic 3.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 3.

MR. ARNIE ROSARIO: Arnie Rosario, Branch 96, Maine. We received other proposed resolutions during the morning. There’s one from Branch 244 and one from Carolina’s bi-state Branch 936. They both seem to address Constitution and Bylaws. I don’t know if they haven’t received them yet or what’s going on here.

MR. KEN BUNCH: We have those, and if you read them carefully, and we’ve read them. Solely because a person mentions the Constitution and Bylaws and to implement what the resolution is saying may require a change to the Constitution and Bylaws; however, the process or the formation of it would not allow it to be before the Constitution and Bylaws at this time. Again, if you look at it, it -- it’s really a proposal or a
proposition, and the Constitution and Bylaws Committee does not deal with proposals or propositions.

MR. ARNIE ROSARIO: Thank you for the clarification.

MR. KEN BUNCH: No problem.

[Speaking off mic.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Does everybody have -- who still does not have 18? Okay. We’re working on it. I do want to let Bernie McCarthy and Junemarie Brandt know that we will be going into resolutions after the Constitution and Bylaws, so just, I guess, be on deck, I guess, if that’s the word. So, sometime in a while.

Okay. Again, hands raised if you do not have Resolution 18 for Constitution and Bylaws.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: What branch? Can you say what branch?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Branch 255. I think it’s a good time for a stretch. Just keep raising them up. That’s good, that’s good. All right. Are we -- smiling? All right. Okay. Are we
ready? Okay.

MR. KEN BUNCH: Okay. Please label that resolution Number 18.

Resolved, that Article 3, Section V, paragraphs 1 and 2 be changed to reflect how local and state branch affiliation is determined, and be it further resolved that Article 3, Section V, paragraphs 1 and 2 be amended to read, “Any employees eligible for active membership who are employed in an installation with a USPS Finance number affiliated with a local branch shall be eligible for NAPS membership only by affiliation with said branch. Any employees eligible for active membership who are employed in an installation that is not affiliated with the local branch within a state shall become a member of that respective state branch. Where there is no state branch, the applicant will become members affiliated with a local branch within the state based on the employee’s USPS Finance number.”

The Committee’s recommendation was for nonconcurrence. The reason for that is really the
last sentence there, where it says, “Where there is no state branch, the applicants will become members affiliated with the local branch within the state based on the employee’s USPS Finance number.”

Within the Postal Service’s structure, every office is supposed to have its own Finance number. Often times, an office can get a Finance number and who determines which branch that Finance number falls on? Is it based on that branches location or that particular office’s location? Who determines whether, let’s say it’s the boundaries of a District, if you will, or a NAPS branch? Who determines whether it goes to the, let’s say left or to the right? If it’s not clear -- if that -- if that particular building has never been identified as a member of a branch, who determines which branch it goes to?

So, because that language is ambiguous, this still leaves it ambiguous. We do not wish to add that to the Constitution and Bylaws.

The Committee’s recommendation again is
for nonconcurrence.

    MS. LINDA WILSON: Mic 7.

    MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The Committee’s recommendation for Resolution 18 is for nonconcurrence. Are there any objections?

    Delegate at mic 7.

    MS. LINDA WILSON: Linda Wilson, Branch 255. I object.

    MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. The resolution will be held over for a second reading.

    [Speaking off mic.]

    Delegate, mic 3.

    MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Constitution Committee, okay. Luther Manuel, Branch 548. You know, you’re doing a pretty good job, Brian.

    MR. BRIAN WAGNER: You make me feel 6 feet tall, thank you.

    [Laughter.]

    MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Why couldn’t the Committee amend this as you’ve done with others? In other words, if the only problem was the last sentence, why couldn’t you just amend it, removing
the last sentence, and then concur as amended?

MR. KEN BUNCH: Because everything else in the resolution, Luther, is already in the Constitution and Bylaws, other than that last sentence.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: I didn’t look -- all right.

[Audience reaction.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thanks, Luther. You have three more times at the mic, don’t worry.

[Laughter.]

[Speaking off mic.]

MR. KEN BUNCH: Committee members, we will meet -- or objectors, we will meet with you as soon as we dispense with the first readings from yesterday. We’ll complete the second reading of those that we began with yesterday. All right?

Okay. Let’s go back to those that were objected to yesterday. Okay.

Resolution Number 1. The Committee’s original recommendation was for concurrence as amended, page 72. We met with the objector. The
objector withdrew their objection. So, the Committee’s recommendation was for concurrence as amended.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. Any discussion? Delegate, mic 2.

MR. JJ WONG: JJ Wong, Branch 497. Point of clarification. Ken, the amended for finally on that first -- first resolve. You have to change from further to finally.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: You’re making -- are you making an amendment to this motion?

MR. JJ WONG: Point of clarification. We did it in the Committee.

MR. KEN BUNCH: I’m sorry. My Committee member is correct. We did change the word in the first resolve from -- on line 22, the last word on line 22, which presently is “further.” We changed that to “finally.” It’s minor, but it’s accurate. So, yes, that’s the other amendment that we did. So, concurrence as amended, amended.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Resolution
1. Again, the Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. Any discussion? Any objection? Mic 7.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: Could you please read — well, John Harris, Branch 567. Could you please tell us what the resolution resolves are?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: That was read yesterday.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: Yeah, I know.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: We’ve read it yesterday. We’ve had the discussion. You have it in front of you. We will move forward.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: Do we? Are we in agreement?

[Applause.]

MR. JOHN HARRIS: All right, that’s fine. If that’s what you all want to do.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Again, the Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. Are there any objections? The Committee’s recommendation for concurrence as amended, hearing no objection, is concurred with and passes.
MR. KEN BUNCH: The next resolution that was objected to was Resolution Number 3.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 1.

Sorry, Cathy.

MS. CATHY SUTTON: Cathy Sutton, Branch 373. Since this is Constitution and Bylaws, don’t they still have to take a vote for the two-thirds?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I’ll defer to the parliamentarian. Dr. Bishop.

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: Thank you for that question. That’s a question. Ordinarily, because you require a super majority, in this case, two-thirds to pass your Constitutional amendments, you’re absolutely correct. But, any vote that can be taken by a voice vote or a ballot vote or a counted vote can also be taken without objection. If you get without objection, it’s obviously a minimum of a two-thirds vote, because it would only take one objection to force any other kind of vote. So, without objection is a general consensus. Some people call it unanimous, which isn’t the correct way of doing it. But, without
objection vote, certainly constitutes the minimum of two-thirds.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you, Dr. Bishop.

MR. KEN BUNCH: We’re on Resolution Number 3. The Committee’s original recommendation was for concurrence. We met with the objector, and the Committee’s recommendation stands as originally concurred with.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The Committee’s recommendation for Resolution 3 was for concurrence. Are there any objections? Delegate, mic 7.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: Bobby Bock, Branch 406. My main concern was not that a person could associate with any branch that they wanted, but the branch should be able to take them in as a -- as a member. Some people are -- they try to bully different branches and jump from one branch to another branch as an associate member. So, we should follow like the same rules that we have as regular members. You can belong to the branch where you’re at. If you’re in Orlando, Florida,
you need to belong to an Orlando, Florida branch. If you’re in St. Petersburg, you should belong to a St. Petersburg branch, unless you desire to work and go to another branch, and that branch should be allowed to accept you, and it shouldn’t be arbitrarily where you just jump from branch to branch because you’re not happy where you’re at, and then we get stuck -- taking -- holding -- taking somebody. It’s, you know, come on. You know, I just hope that the body would reconsider this, that they should be -- the branch should be able to accept them as a member. Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Any other discussion?

MR. STEVE MOREAU: Mic 4.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 4.

MR. STEVE MOREAU: Steve Moreau, Branch 102. People in retirement don’t always have brick-and-mortar homes. Some of them travel, some of them move into recreational vehicles. They should be allowed to join any branch they want if they’re -- don’t have a home.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Any other discussion?
Okay. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mic 7, mic 7.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate at mic 7.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: Toni Coleman-Scruggs, Branch 493. I sat in yesterday also on this issue, and I think the concern was again, not so much that members could be part of any branches or retirees. The issue was as far as the rules, we seem to have two sets of rules. I know less than two years ago when I changed and wanted to go to a new branch, the other branch had to accept me. It wasn’t automatic. A letter was sent to that branch, and they stated -- they had to give approval to accept me, even though I’m a retiree. You’ll have to excuse me -- my voice.

Mr. Bock, I guess he was explaining that the issue was someone wanted to join his as a retiree, it didn’t apply. So, it seems that we have two different rules. So, what is -- as far as clarification -- is it required as such in my case that the gaining branch has to say they’re
going to accept me? So, that’s what I’m asking for clarification. Is that the policy, because that’s what’s been happening.

[Speaking off mic.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. From the National standpoint, we have to notify the gaining office that you’re going to become an associate member so that they can charge you for your associate dues, otherwise you come on their rolls, and you have to pay them because it’s a direct pay. They have to know. They will not -- they don’t have the right to refuse you if you qualify for membership, but we have to notify them that you’re coming in so they can charge you for your associate dues.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: Okay, so -- so that is the rule now. I know it in the case again, they were asked, and they had to say yes. And, that was sent out from NAPS Headquarters. It was sent to the President of the branch and asked, was it okay to accept me.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: We sent out to the
gaining office or the gaining branch to let them know that if you did not pay, they did not accept you. You had to pay. If you refused to pay, they didn’t have to accept you because you didn’t pay their dues. That’s why we send the letter to the gaining branch to say you want to from Branch 1 to Branch 2. Branch 2 needs to know that you’ve paid. Otherwise, if you haven’t paid, you can’t be an associate member of that branch. We were just conferring -- confirming with that branch that you paid the dues.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: Okay. Not to be argumentative, I agree with what you’re stating, but that’s not what happened. So --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 3.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Luther Manuel, Branch 548. I think we’ve made a mistake here. Let me just take a look at something with Dr. Bishop here. On the first reading, you can only object and then it goes to the second reading. On the second reading, I don’t believe it can be carried without a vote, and the reason why is because on
the second reading, you asked the question. The Committee has stated so and so and so and so, are there any conversations, because the objection part is gone. Now, it’s a matter of conversation. If hearing none, or seeing none, the Committee’s recommendation was for nonconcurrence. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrence. Boom. That should have come. There should have been a vote. If it’s on the first reading, there is no challenge, then you don’t have to take a vote. But, on the second reading, people are not required to come to the mic and speak. They can keep it to themselves and wait for the vote and express it that way. So, I do believe we may have erred. I think we have to take the vote on the second reading. Now, I can be corrected on this.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I will bring Dr. Bishop up to possibly correct you.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: And I see he’s right there.

[Laughter.]
DR. BRUCE BISHOP: The member again raises an interesting point. If there is any member who wants further discussion on an issue that is before you -- a resolution or a motion that is before you -- if any member wishes to engage in discussion, or if any member wants to actually do a voice or any other kind of vote on an issue, when the Chair says, “Are there any objections?” you don’t have to state what your objection is, you just have to object. Yell out, “I object.” The Chair won’t ask you to state your objection beyond “I object.” As soon as you say, “I object,” then the Chair will further the discussion, first by saying, “Is there any discussion on the motion before you?” That invites people to come to the microphone and either speak in favor or opposed to the motion. If no one comes to the microphone, then the Chair will say, “I assume you’re ready to vote. All those in favor, say yes. All those opposed, say no.” But, if no one objects when the Chair asks if there are any objections, he’s asking does
anybody now object to the Committee’s recommendation, which still stands, does anybody object. If you don’t, which is what happened with the previous resolution, then the motion carries by general consent, and the minutes will reflect that the motion carried without objection.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: But, there was an objection.

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: It’s the most efficient and the most effective way of taking a vote in this case.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: It was objected to, that’s why it was held to a second reading.

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: But, it was objected in the first reading.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Exactly.

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: The Committee came up, indicates that it met with the objector, heard the objector’s concerns, and stands by its recommendation of concurrence. Now, since the objector has already been given an opportunity to object, and they did publicly, and then they had
the opportunity to go and meet with the Committee, if the objector wants to continue to promote their objection, then this is their opportunity to do it on the second reading. But, the thinking is that perhaps that person was satisfied by the Committee’s explanation, and therefore no longer holds that same objection. Anybody else who wants to can now object. But, without objection, there’s no reason to have a discussion, and there’s no reason to have a vote. The issue carries without objection.

But, the delegate at mic 3 is absolutely correct in that that is another way of doing it. It would just take longer, be less efficient, less efficient, and so the manner in which I suggest that we continue is to first have the Chair ask if there’s any objection, and if anybody objects, yell it out. You don’t even have to go to a microphone, just say, “I object.” Then, the chair will say, “Hearing an objection, we’re going to entertain discussion for and against.” Following discussion, then we’ll vote. All those in favor.
All those opposed. And assuring that we get the two-thirds majority required.

MR. VICTOR LOPEZ: Mic 10. 10.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yes. Delegate, mic 10, let’s go with.

MR. VICTOR LOPEZ: Victor Lopez, Miami Branch 146. I call for the question.

[Applause.]

[Speaking off mic.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: We had a pro and we had a con. The question is called for. All those in favor of calling for the question, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Opposed, nay.

[Single nay.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The ayes have it to call for the question. Now, with a vote on the motion or the resolution.

Number 3. The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All opposed say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The ayes have it. The resolution is concurred with and passes.

MR. KEN BUNCH: Resolution Number 4, page 74. The Committee’s original recommendation was for concurrence. After meeting with the objector, the objector withdrew their objection. Therefore, the Committee maintains its recommendation of concurrence.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Resolution 4. The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence. Are there any objections? You only have two more times, you know.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: That’s okay. That’s fine.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, yes. Delegate at mic 3.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: I object.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: And what is your objection?

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Well, I --
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Who are you?

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Luther Manuel, Branch 548. I’ve -- I feel --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Who are you? I didn’t hear you.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Luther Manuel, Branch 548, from the Great State of New Jersey, also known as the Garden State, with -- with the new next Superbowl Champion being -- now, I can’t say the New York Giants -- the New Jersey Giants.

[Audience reaction.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Delegate, you’re recognized.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Okay. I’m not playing a game here.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Please.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: I’m not -- I wouldn’t do that. I just feel now at this point, parliamentary inquiry. What are we going to do at this point? There was no concurrence. I mean, the Committee’s recommendation was accepted. Now what? Now what?
DR. BRUCE BISHOP: May I?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yes.

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: As I explained, I’ll do it again. If there’s an objection, then the Chair will say, “Hearing an objection, we’re now going to open this resolution for discussion.” Would somebody like to speak in favor of the resolution, followed by would somebody like to speak opposed to the resolution, back and forth, alternating pro and con until there’s no one else at the microphone or perhaps no one will even go to the microphone, in which case the Chair will call for the vote. All those in favor, say aye. All those opposed, say no.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: You -- you’re putting a slight twist, and I think these gentlemen know that, to what we are normally accustomed to doing.

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: Perhaps I am.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: It’s legal what you’re doing, but it’s kind of like a twist from what we normally did for all these years. But, I’ll accept that explanation. And somebody said
go sit down, so I’m going to go sit down.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No. That’s -- no, don’t do that.

[Laughter.]

Okay. Delegate, mic 3.

MR. BOB TOLMAN: Bob Tolman, South Dakota Branch 946. In precedence of past conventions, we’ve voted on these and not -- the President did not ask if anybody objects. It was -- the President asked all those in favor, say aye, with the Committee, whatever their preference was, and those say no. So, we voted, and let’s forego this objection deal of the second reading and just plain vote. Thank you.

MR. JASON TAPP: Mic 5.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 5.

MR. JASON TAPP: Jason Tapp, Branch 65, Denver, Colorado. This is a parliamentary question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: He’s earning his keep.

MR. JASON TAPP: So, after the first -- at the first reading, there is a recommendation
for concurrence, the body doesn’t really have an
opportunity to discuss the issue. Now, I might
not object to it, but I might have clarifying
questions that I want to ask. Why do we have to
object before the President opens it up for
discussion? Shouldn’t he just open it up for
discussion whether we object or not? Should he
just not say is there any discussion on this
issue, if not, can we vote on it?

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: Sure, absolutely.

Understand, let’s go back to what I told you --
the folks on Sunday at my first meeting, and let’s
go back to what I -- revisit what I said
yesterday. I don’t care.

[Laughter.]

I want to make sure you guys do -- I want
to make sure you guys get to make the decisions
that you want to make. I’ve told you before, I
don’t care if you vote yes, or I don’t care if you
vote no. I don’t care if you pass a resolution or
kill the resolution. I have -- I don’t care. My
role is to assure an efficient and effective use
of your time and to help you make decisions thereby as effectively and efficiently. If you want to do it that way, that’s perfectly okay with me. The previously speaker is absolutely right. This is a twist on the way, perhaps, that you’ve done it in the past. If you want to keep doing it the way you’ve done it, I don’t have a problem with that even a little bit, and I’ll leave it up to the discretion of the Chair. When the resolution is reintroduced for the second reading, the Chair can say, “First, is there any discussion? The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence, is there any discussion?” and wait to see if anybody goes to the mic.

But then, understand if no one goes to the microphone, then you’re indicating that you don’t care to discuss this, in which case the Chair can then ask for the vote without discussion. So, open it up for discussion. You go to the microphone if you want to. Don’t go to the microphone if you don’t want to, and we’ll do it that way, if that’s what the Chair wants to do.
Either way is perfectly okay. But, the previous speaker is correct. It’s a twist, and I’ve heard the other folks say it, you’re not comfortable doing it this way. I don’t care. It’s okay with me. I’m not offended.

[Laughter and applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: And as Dr. Bishop has told me, I’m not supposed to care, and I don’t care, so if you either want to say yae or nay, I’m good with it. All right? And we’ll just vote.

MR. TRENT CLARK: Mic 4.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate at mic 4.

MR. TRENT CLARK: Trent Clark from the Great State of Ohio, Buckeyes. OH.

[Audience reaction.]

Am I missing something here? On the first day, if there’s no objector, we don’t vote, right?

ALL: Right.

MR. TRENT CLARK: The second day, the objector withdrew their objection. Why don’t we just adopt it? There’s no objector. It’s the
same as the first day. Am I missing something? I mean, goodness.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No, you’re not. Okay. Any more? Anybody else at the mic? Okay. Yes. Delegate, mic 1. Is it 1?

MS. SHARON GISHI: Yes, 1. Sharon Gishi, Branch 94. Sorry, I actually kind of agree with Luther.

[Audience reaction.]

It’s not that I never agree with Luther, but I believe he has a point there. First reading, we don’t discuss it, you just object if you have an objection because otherwise we’d never get through it.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Sharon. It has been asked and answered. We have discussed it.

MS. SHARON GISHI: Well, I just want to say -- but, on the second -- the second reading, even if the objector withdraws, maybe there was somebody else who objected --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Sharon, we’re going to
vote. We’re gonna vote. I’m going to bang the
gavel more often. I’ve got a backup gavel. Not a
problem. Delegate 5.

MS. BARBARA MILLER: Barbara Miller, Branch 61, Seattle, Washington. Point of
clarification.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

MS. BARBARA MILLER: On the last resolve, did Luther not object to that resolution?

[Audience reaction.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yeah.

MS. BARBARA MILLER: So, if he did not object to that resolution, shouldn’t it just be
passed, and we move to the next one?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Luther objected. So, now we have to vote. Now, we have discussion on
Resolution 3. That was 3, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: 4.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: 4? Okay. Well, see. Would anybody like to speak in favor of this
resolution? Mic 2.

MR. RAJA MOSTAFA: Raja Mostafa, Branch
249. Why don’t we vote on that we want to go with the old system or the new system that we’re going to vote or not? So, what the majority wants. Just vote on that, what the majority wants. 

[Audience reaction.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: It’s the Chair’s discretion. We will vote.

MR. RAJA MOSTAFA: Okay. Thank you.


MR. ERNESTO ROSALES: Ernesto Rosales, Branch 406. I call for the question.

[Audience reaction.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: You can’t, there is no question.

[Speaking off mic.] We’ve had an objection on 4, no discussion, because Luther got up and objected to 4, so I have an objection. Any other discussion — anybody for or against? If not, we’ll vote.

MR. GREG MURPHY: Against.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 4.

MR. GREG MURPHY: I apologize. Greg
Murphy, New England Area Vice President and member of the Executive Board. And I apologize to this body first of all that I didn’t get up here a while ago and object to this. And I object on behalf of the folks that are in -- that were in my branch, and because the District was moved -- one area of a District branch, and that branch only meets on Saturday, then the residents that were in our former branch are forced to travel to go to a meeting on their non-scheduled day every time this branch holds a meeting, because they only hold their meeting on Saturdays. And I think that’s extremely unfair to them. They believe it’s unfair. They’ve requested of me that I put in a transfer, and I’ve told them that under the Constitution and Bylaws, I can’t do that.

So, what I would object to is first -- is the first resolution. There has to be instances in which we allow the place of residence to be the determining factor. If we’re not -- if we’re causing our employee -- we want members to come to the meetings. But, if we’re going to schedule the
meetings only on their non-scheduled day and they have an opportunity to belong to a branch that’s close to their home and that they can go to the meetings and be active and participative, I think we should afford them that opportunity be an active member.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Any more discussion?

MR. VICTOR LOPEZ: Point of personal privilege, Mic 10.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Mic 10.

MR. VICTOR LOPEZ: Victor Lopez, Miami Branch 146. I believe the question was called for, so I don’t understand why we still have a discussion.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: There was no discussion. The question was objected. We didn’t have discussion. We didn’t have a pro and a con or any other further discussion.

MR. VICTOR LOPEZ: Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The call for question was out of order. Anyone that would like to speak
in favor of this resolution? Okay. Hearing none, we’re going to vote. We’re going to vote.

On Resolution 4, the Committee’s recommendation was for concurrence. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it, it’s concurred with.

The resolution passes.

We’re on number 5?

MR. KEN BUNCH: Resolution Number 5. The Committee’s original recommendation was for concurrence as amended. We met with the objector, and we maintain our recommendation of concurrence as amended.

But, I want to speak to this prior to turning it over to you all for discussion, if you allow me. The objector was under the impression that this resolution would impact the way local branches are already formed. In other words, if a
branch was formed and it fell under one Executive, if you will, or let’s say an office has a branch with two Executives in it, that everybody in that office now would fall under that one Executive. In other words, if you have a District Manager, and in that District, you have three or four different branches, the objector was under the impression that this resolution would require all of those branches to move under that one District Manager into one branch. That’s not what this resolution does.

This resolution deals with the forming of branches, not what happens to them after they’re formed, okay? So that’s -- that’s the clarification piece on this.

So, the Committee’s recommendation was for concurrence as amended.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Resolution 5. The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. Is there any discussion?

MR. ARIC SKJELSTAD: Mic 5.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate at mic 5.
MR. ARIC SKJELSTAD: Aric Skjelstad, Branch 66, Portland. I object to their recommendation. The reason being is even though you say that it’s for future branch -- that’s what you said, it’s not for forming now, that it wouldn’t change how things are now, but you said the future. You said the forming of branches. There’s a possibility that an area can get changed or something can happen where a branch needs to cover two different states. This doesn’t allow that. Right now, our branch does cover two states. We have Oregon and Washington, right across the river. So, what about the future? What happens if there has to be a change in other branches? You couldn’t do that. So, I object to that, and I would like nonconcurrence on this.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. As for clarification, when you look at the Constitution, it talks about offices within a state, and if they don’t belong, and offices within a state that belong to the state branch. By Constitution, what has happened was when people signed up for
branches, they crossed into other states, which should have not happened by Constitution, but it was done because of the way our old system was, and your Finance number followed you. If you weren’t in -- if you were in Oregon and you got a job in Washington, and the office you went into, there was no NAPS member in the Washington office you went to, you’re in the old membership system, and it followed you by default. The Constitution says if there is a local branch, you would affiliate with the local branch. If there’s no local branch, it’s within the state. It does not have cross unless it’s within our Constitution, which is, again, Branch 55, which is in the Pioneer Area, but it’s in Indiana.

What has happened in the past should not have happened by Constitution, but our system did not catch it, and we have not changed it -- basically grandfathered in, unless we go and do an audit and move everybody. So, at this point in time, this is to fix any of the future.

Any other discussion?
MR. EDMOND SMITH: Microphone number 5.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Microphone number 5.

MR. EDMOND SMITH: Edmond Smith, Branch 928. So, with this resolution, you would effectively remove all crossing of state lines and make sure that branches that now represent more than one state would be eliminated?

MR. KEN BUNCH: No, no. The issue is when you form a branch -- what this resolution says is when you form a branch -- when the branch is being formed, that it has to fall under one single District. It has to fall under one Executive, if you will. It can’t -- a single branch cannot be covered by multiple Districts. When a branch is formed -- in other words, if ten people get together or ten little small offices, and they come up with 20 members, they can’t say, well, half of us are going to be in this District, and half of us are going to be in that District. No. When a branch forms, it has to be under a single District. It has to be under a single installation head. It can’t be under multiple
ones. That’s basically what this resolution says.

MR. EDMOND SMITH: Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Again, any more discussion? Anybody? Delegate at mic 5.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Yes, I just want some clarification. Kathi Clapp, Oregon State, Branch 940. So, the way the state of Oregon, or Branch 66 in the state of Oregon has been formed is, it encompasses all of the state of Oregon and Southwest Washington under one PCS. And so, therefore, the branch covers two states under one PCS. As I read this, if a new branch was formed, they would not be allowed to cover both states, and yet, they still have to cover the area under one PCS. How would that work?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Are the PCS District?

MR. KATHI CLAPP: Yes.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: You’re in a District office?

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Yes.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Wherever the District is domiciled, that’s the branch.
MS. KATHI CLAPP: So, what happens to the people in Southwest Oregon, I mean, Washington, that report to the PCS in Portland, but they’re a different state?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Here’s what happens. You’re in a — let’s just call it the District. It’s in Portland, Oregon, correct?

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Yes.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: And they have people domiciled out in the field, correct?

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Yes.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: In Washington state?

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Yes.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: They, by default, are under the PCS District in Oregon. They would stay there, even though they’re working in an office, because their affiliation is by the Finance number. They can request an exception because they’re domiciled outside their employing office, and they could be a member of a branch in Washington state.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Okay, but this -- the
way this is worded, it says, “A local branch may
not accept for membership current or eligible
active members who are in employing offices
outside the local branch’s respective state.”

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Right. That’s when
they’re formed. This is the forming of --

MS. KATHI CLAPP: I understand.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: So, if we had not
formed Branch 66, and we were attempting to do so,
we would not be allowed to represent the people
who work in Southwest Washington, although they
are under the direct leadership of one PCS.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Portland District is
the District.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Yes.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: They domicile people
in Washington. Their domicile is outside the
employing office. At any time, the District could
call them back to that District office.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: So, what about the part
that says they may not have people from two
states?

[Speaking off mic.]

MS. KATHI CLAPP: It says outside of the respective state, not outside of the respective District.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The District -- we have Districts that cross state lines all the time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mic 2.

MR. ARNIE ROSARIO: Mic 3. Isn’t it saying employing office, which is the District?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The same employing office is the District.

MR. ARNIE ROSARIO: Right, which is in --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Oregon.

MR. ARNIE ROSARIO: Oregon.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Who are you? I’m sorry.

MR. ARNIE ROSARIO: Oh, sorry. Arnie Rosario, Branch 96, Maine.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yeah, I’m sorry. Go ahead, Kathi.
MS. KATHI CLAPP: I just don’t understand how this would work, for example, if you were trying to create a branch such as we have.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Creating a new branch, if you’re in the state of Oregon, you could not get members in the state of Washington because the Constitution says if you’re in an employing office -- a local office within a state -- if there is no local office within a state, then you become a member of the state branch. If there’s no state branch, you become a member of the local branch within the state. So, technically, all of our territory is state-based, unless we have it like bi-state and we already have something in the Constitution that’s been done that way.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: So, I’m sorry if I’m trying to be -- I just don’t understand. So, if I have someone in Southwest Washington, and there are local branches in Washington, and a state branch in Washington, how would they be part of our branch based on this language?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mic 2.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, wait a minute.
I’m still on here. The question -- you have a
District office -- one Finance number employing
office. I’m trying to go back to Oregon.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Okay.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: They’re District
employees domiciled out all over.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: No, they’re not
District employees.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: What are they? You
said they’re under the PCS.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: They’re Postmasters,
they’re Supervisors, they’re Managers.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The office is a PCS
office. They have one main Finance number
assigned to them.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: To the District. They
work in an office that has a different Finance
number.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: In the District?

MS. KATHI CLAPP: In the District.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: And where is the
District?

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Portland.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. So, they’re in Portland, Oregon. That’s their Finance number, that’s their employing office. That’s where --

MS. KATHI CLAPP: It is not their Finance number.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, okay.

MR. KEN BUNCH: If you look at the resolution in its entirety, it does allow for the situation that you are describing. If you notice where it says outside of the state but in accordance with Article 3, Section VI, which offers the exception, which means that you can formulate the branch, but some of those people would come in under the exception, even though they’re on the other side of the state line. They just have to get the exception, that’s all.

MS. KATHI CLAPP: Okay.

MR. KEN BUNCH: Read the Article -- read the resolve in its entirety. It says unless in accordance with Article 3, Section VI.
MS. KATHI CLAPP: All right. I still believe the language is incorrect.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Any more discussion?

MR. JJ WONG: Mic 2.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Mic 2.

MR. JJ WONG: JJ Wong, Branch 497. I stand up here in agreement with the Committee’s recommendation mainly because basically all this resolution does is define the local branch as according to the whereas in this resolution. As to Kathi’s objection, you know, we heard it, we understand where she’s coming from. The language in the Constitution and Bylaws hasn’t changed except for the definition of a local branch, and with her concern, if you have people that are outside of your state, then just use the Section Number 3. Create a state or bi-state branch with those members. That’s all you have to do.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Thank you.

Delegate, mic 7.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: Bobby -- Bobby Bock, Branch 406. I call for the question.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Question has been called for. All those in favor of calling for the question, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The ayes have it. The question has been called for. Now, we’re going to vote on Resolution 5. The Committee’s recommendation was for concurrence as amended. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence as amended, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it. It’s passed.

MR. KEN BUNCH: The next resolution that was objected to was Resolution Number 9. Number 9. The Committee met with the objector, and the objector withdrew their objection.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. All right.
Resolution Number 9. The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence as amended, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[No response.]

Resolution passes. The ayes have it.

MR. KEN BUNCH: The next resolution --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 3.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Luther Manuel, New Jersey, Great State. Two things. Number one, the -- one of the previous speakers mentioned someone from the floor’s name. Generally, that’s not acceptable in Robert’s Rules of Orders.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I apologize.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Not you.

[Laughter.]

I’m just saying something in general.

Yeah, it’s okay. The other thing is this, when
you have a voice vote on Constitution and Bylaws, that vote wasn't -- it was loud -- both were loud -- one was louder. But, the difference with Constitution and Bylaws, it requires a two-thirds vote.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I heard two-thirds.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: You heard two-thirds?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I heard two-thirds.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Well, if you say you heard two-thirds --

[Laughter.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: You're more than willing to challenge the chair. I heard two-thirds.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: No. We're gonna save those Sargent at Arms today.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

[Laughter.]

One more time, Luther, at the mic, and you're done. We did pass something, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Got get 'em, Luther.
MR. RICH CARUSO: Okay. The next resolution was Resolution Number 10. The Committee originally voted nonconcurrence. It was objected to. We met with the two objectors. One of them agreed with us, and the other one disagreed. We took -- the Committee took another vote on it, and we again nonconcurred on Resolution Number 10.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Resolution Number 10. The Committee’s recommendation is nonconcurrence. Any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the Committee’s recommendation is for nonconcurrence. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[Single nay.]

Committee’s recommendation is concurred with, and the motion -- the resolution fails.

MR. RICH CARUSO: Okay, the next resolution that was objected to at the first
reading is Resolution Number 11. We met with the
objector, we heard their concerns, and the
Committee again voted nonconcurrence.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Resolution 11. The
Committee’s recommendation is for nonconcurrence.
Any discussion?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I object.
Okay. Delegate at mic -- it looks like 10.

MR. JERRY VAN NORMAN: My understanding,
it was -- Jerry Van Norman, Branch 130, Grand
Rapids, Michigan. My understanding was where you
told us originally, we just have to object first,
and then it’s open for discussion. But, if this
is the discussion phase, please me know.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yeah, discussion.

MR. JERRY VAN NORMAN: Okay, fine. I
object to the nonconcurrence. Knowledge in Postal
Regulations --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Jerry, could you speak
into the microphone, please. I’m having a hard
time hearing you.

MR. JERRY VAN NORMAN: Certainly.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. JERRY VAN NORMAN: Knowledge in Postal Rules and Regulations is necessary and commendable. It can be acquired in a week. Juris doctorate takes two years plus. Meaning no disrespect to our past or present providers, but when my life is on the line, I don’t want a physician’s assistant performing my triple bypass. I want a surgeon. I think we need an attorney in retainer.


MR. BOBBY BOCK: I support the Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrency. There are attorney’s that commit malpractice every day. We have the best DDF ever, and I -- nonconcurrency, I support the Committee. Bobby Bock, Branch 46, the water boy.

[Laughter.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Delegate, mic 10, I saw first.

MR. TOM HORNER: I’m for, so if there’s
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Who are you?

MR. TOM HORNER: I’m Tom Horner. I’m for the -- Branch 420. Tom Horner.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yeah.

MR. TOM HORNER: I’m for the nonconcurrence because he’s got a good success rate.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yeah. Anybody against the resolution? Against nonconcurrence. Anybody against nonconcurrence?

MR. CY DUMAS: I have a question. Is it too early to call for the question?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 3.

MR. CY DUMAS: Cy Dumas, Providence, Rhode Island. Call for the question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Question called for. We’ve had a pro and a con. Question has been called for. All those in favor of calling for the question, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.
[No response.]

Question has been called for. Now, we’re going to vote on Resolution 11. The Committee’s recommendation is for nonconcurrence. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrence, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it. The Committee’s recommendation is for nonconcurrence. It fails.

MR. RICH CARUSO: Okay. The next resolution that was objected to was Resolution Number 74, page 80. I’m sorry. Resolution Number 14 on page 80. That’s close.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: That’s the Postal math.

MR. RICH CARUSO: That’s the Postal math. I was close. Anyhow, Resolution 14. The Committee’s original decision was for nonconcurrence. We met with the objector, and the Committee again voted for nonconcurrence.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Resolution 14. The Committee’s recommendation is for nonconcurrence. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the Committee’s recommendation is for nonconcurrence. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrence, say aye. 

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[No response.]

The ayes have it. The Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrence is concurred with. It fails.

MR. KEN BUNCH: The final resolution that was objected to yesterday was Resolution Number 16. The Committee’s recommendation was for nonconcurrence. The Committee maintains its position of nonconcurrence after meeting with the objectors.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Resolution 16. The Committee’s recommendation is for nonconcurrence. Any discussion? I see a hand.
Delegate at mic 7 -- on their way.

MR. RAY ELLIOTT: Ray Elliott, Branch 289. My objection to this is this is not a Constitution and Bylaw change. We have nothing in our Constitution and Bylaws, and dealing with reading this 16, to me is a sexual harassment subject that should be added onto our Constitution. But, as this resolution is written, it should go to the Resolutions Committee, then submitted to the National Board to come up --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, Ray, excuse me. Would you like to make a motion to refer that to the Resolutions Committee?

MR. RAY ELLIOTT: Okay, thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: That was easy. We should have done it two minutes ago.

Bernie McCarthy and Junemarie Brandt, are you -- are you close by?

MR. RAY ELLIOTT: Brian, excuse me.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yeah?

MR. RAY ELLIOTT: Did you say the Committee was going to make that recommendation?
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No, you would make that recommendation --

MR. RAY ELLIOTT: Yes, I would make that recommendation, I’m sorry.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: -- to send it over to the Resolutions Committee.

MR. RAY ELLIOTT: Right.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Do we have a second on that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Second.


MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: Toni Coleman-Scruggs -- I’m sorry -- Branch 493. I object, only because he stated that this should be referred. This resolution has to do with ethics, and which we already have an ethics policy. And actually, in our -- we passed several resolutions regarding ethics going back, I think, to Kentucky, and even at the last convention we passed Resolution 104, dealing with ethics, and this is actually dealing with ethics that we’ve already
passed. The body passed it already twice. So, it should not go to the different Committee. We’ve already passed it.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. All right.

Thank you. Any other discussion on the motion to move this resolution --

MR. JOHN FARRELL: Mic 2.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Mic 2.

MR. JOHN FARRELL: John Farrell, Branch 53, Newark, New Jersey. This resolution calls for changes in the Constitution, and I believe that it’s properly situated with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

MR. JOHN FARRELL: I don’t think that it’s a resolution that should be decided by the Resolutions Committee -- it’s an amendment to the Constitution, and that’s what we’re supposed to be handling.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Thank you.

Anyone in favor of sending this to the Resolution -- any other discussion in favor of sending this
motion to the Resolution Committee? Hearing none, we have a pro and a con. Are we ready to vote?

MR. KEVIN TRAYER: Kevin Trayer, mic 10. I call for the question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Delegate at mic 10, Kevin Trayer. Thank you. Question has been called for. All those in favor of the motion to send -- all those in favor of calling for the question, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

Question called for, close debate.

Now, on the motion to send Resolution 16 to the Resolutions Committee, all those in favor of sending Resolution 16 to the Resolutions Committee, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

Nays have it. The resolution stays with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. So, now --
MR. KEN BUNCH: All right. Since the Committee’s recommendation was originally for nonconcurrence, and we maintain our recommendation of nonconcurrence, we will speak briefly to why.

This resolution deals with establishing basically a table of penalties for officers who are accused or proven to be derelict in their duties. This body has dealt with this issue before. This type of resolution has come before us before, and as you know, our Constitution and Bylaws does not have a table of penalties for addressing officers that are accused of not performing their duties effectively.

Well, this resolution attempts to do that; however, there may be those who believe we should have such a table of penalties. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee does not feel that this resolution addresses that appropriately.

MR. RON COLE: Ron Cole, Branch 183.

Just a point of clarification. When we discussed moving that over to the other Committee, doesn’t it have to be seconded first?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yep, it was.

MR. RON COLE: Okay. We didn’t hear the second on this side.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Delegate, mic 3.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Luther Manuel, Branch 548. There’s a system already in place for dealing with officers or members or anything that’s out of order. If you go to Robert’s Rules of Order, 11th Edition, you can look it up. It will explain to you -- actually, you can look in 10th or 11th Edition. It will actually -- it will explain to you what to do when you have a member or an officer who have done something wrong. You have to remember, Robert’s Rules of Order were designed to protect the rights of the minority. That person you’re challenging, he has rights, and enhance the rights or give the best rights to the
majority.

So, if you have a person, there are no monetary, we’re going to take so much money from him or we’re going to stop him, or we’re going to cut him off. That’s why you have elections. But, in the meantime, if they do something so egregious that it troubles your branch, you can call for a special meeting. You can ask them to have an officer to be there if you like or your Area Officer, or your Regional VP. But, there is a solution for dealing with that. If you’re in an office or you’re in any area where you feel that your NAPS officers are not doing the right thing and you want to get rid of them, there is a process. And, if you need to, you can call the National President or the National Parliamentarian who, by the way -- I want you all to understand something about this parliamentarian. Let me throw this in. The parliamentarian works for the body, not for the President. Please remember that. Because if you have questions, he -- he is here for us. Don’t get lost in this thing that
because he’s sitting next to Brian and got an
extra Ben and Jerry coupon --

[Laughter and applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Out of order. Time’s
up. [Banging of the gavel.] Gimme another gavel.

[Laughter.]

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: If you have
questions, you can pull him on the side or come
here and ask him. He’s not going to deny
answering you, because he works for all of us, not
just the Board. So, be sure that if you got
things, well, I don’t know, ask him. Or remember
your right to do this, parliamentarian inquiry.
You can always come to the mic at any time and
make a parliamentary inquiry. You have to wait
for your chance, but you can make it. Point of
order is different, you can cut right in then.
But, you can make a parliamentarian inquiry.

I just wanted to be clear on that. We do
have a method of getting rid of -- let’s say we
want to get rid of Brian, you know.

[Laughter.]
What we’ll do, we’ll vote in Jay Killackey.

[Laughter and applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Out of order.

[Banging of the gavel.]

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: I want to know how he knew that I have two Ben & Jerry coupons.

[Laughter.]

I have a stalker.

[Laughter.]

A couple of points of clarification since I -- since I was called out here. The delegate is correct. The Robert’s Rules of Order does provide an entire section on discipline of officers and discipline of members, and since I have the floor for a moment, I just want to speak to this particular issue when I tell you I don’t care if you pass or you don’t. I will advise you, this is very dangerous language to put in a Constitution. It’s just so horribly ambiguous and vague, because it makes a simple reference to the word complaint without any operational or any other kind of
definition of what a complaint is, and it directs the Board to do something with any complaint whatsoever. And, as the previous delegate said, Robert’s provides some language for member discipline for the word he used “egregious behavior,” not just a complaint.

And so, I caution you about the specific language within this proposal, and I do work for you, and I’m very happy to do so.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: And, as the Chair, I don’t care.

[Laughter.]

Now, is there any more discussion on Resolution 16? Delegate at mic 7.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: Toni Coleman-Scruggs, Branch 493. Point of clarification, and I just do want to point this out. From my understanding, we have an Ethics Committee, is that correct?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yes.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: We have an
Ethics Committee. We established an Ethics Committee back in Kentucky. We also, on our taxes, for this 501C5, we state to the IRS that we have an Ethics Committee, and that they meet and address ethics issues. We have passed ethics resolutions that, for some reason, at the last convention -- Resolution 104 was a NAPS Ethics Committee -- was an -- excuse me, I’m sorry. It was an ethics resolution that passed overwhelmingly by the body. So, we’ve already passed it.

The issue is the body is being overridden by the Board and not following what we’re saying that we’ve already established. We told the IRS we have a Committee, they meet, and they address it. So, you can’t say -- you’re saying it’s dangerous territory, and even the Board, from what I understand, for the past few years put out or amended their ethics policy. Am I correct on that also?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: That we’ve amended the ethics policy?
MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: On you -- for the duties of the officers -- you have a policy, and I think, as I recall, it even states if the officer violates this ethics policy, that they can be removed from the Board. That’s written in those duties. If you take --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No, it’s not.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: I can pull it.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: In the duties?

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: In your duties, it says -- in your ethics policy that you have -- that you all put out every year or two, you have several, I have several copies. It states that in there.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I don’t have it in front of me, so --

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: I can get you a copy. I have it.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Well, continue with your comments.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: Right. So, we do have an ethics apology, I mean ethics policy,
we agree.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yes.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: We also agree that we tell the IRS that we have an Ethics Committee, and that they meet and deal with ethics issues, conflicts of interest, issues like that.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: We report to the IRS in our 990N or our 990 that we have an Ethics Committee, or we have ethics, correct.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: We have ethics -- right.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: And whistleblower, correct.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: Whistleblower policy, Ethics Committee, and that we address it, they meet and discuss ethics issues, correct?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Correct.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS: So, I’m not understanding when they say it’s dangerous territory when we’ve already established it. And also, as far as the time table, excuse me, I have spoken to the Ethics Committee, a couple of
people, and they did even bring --

MS BRIDGET EVANS:  Mic 1.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER:  Delegate, mic 1. Have you got a point of order? Microphone 1.

MS. BRIDGET EVANS:  Bridget Evans, Branch 159. I call for the question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER:  No, we can’t. We have a discussion going on. Continue.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:  That was so rude.

MS. TONI COLEMAN-SCRUGGS:  Thank you.

One of the Ethics Board members even stated to me that the problem that we had in addressing ethics issues was we did not have anything concrete to state what action that we would take, and that was brought up. So, even in the Post Office, it states if you violate this, we do that. If you violate that, we do this. When there’s nothing there, then, of course, you can’t do anything, it’s just open-ended. We’re just saying, if you violate the ethics policy, but that’s it. Thank you very much.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Any more discussion? Delegate at mic 3.

MR. RON WARD: Ron Ward, Branch 74, South Jersey. I’m just wondering, are we gonna follow the procedure of for and against? It sounds like we’re getting people for the resolution or against the Committee. We are not having back and forth, so it seems like the last two spoke for the recommendation of nonconcurrence.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Right, we’ve had two.

MR. RON WARD: Okay.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: She spoke against the -- right? She spoke --

MR. RON WARD: Against the nonconcurrence or for the nonconcurrence?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Against the nonconcurrence. She’s for this resolution.

MR. RON WARD: So, we had for and against now, so --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Right. We’ve had for and against.

MR. RON WARD: So, can we call for the
question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I hope so.

[Laughter.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate at mic 7.

MR. KENT BUCKLEY: I call for the question.


MR. KENT BUCKLEY: Kent Buckley, Branch 39. I had a question about ethics, and when the question is brought up about overstepping boundaries. We had a situation in Los Angeles where we had --

[Banging of the gavel.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Ken, we’re discussing the resolution, and that’s --

MR. KENT BUCKLEY: They were talking about ethics, weren’t they?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No. We’re talking about the Resolution 16. Are you for or against the resolution?
MR. KENT BUCKLEY: I thought they talked about ethics.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No. It’s Resolution 16.

[Chorus of nos.]

We’re having discussion on it. Thank you.

Delegate at mic 6.

MR. TOM O’CONNOR: Tom O’Connor, Chattanooga, Branch 97. I’d like to call for the question, please.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. The question has been called for.

[Applause.]

All those in favor of calling for the question, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

That was close. Ayes have it.

[Laughter.]

Now, we’re going to vote on the
Committee’s recommendation of Resolution 16 for nonconcurrence. If you -- if you vote yes, you’re voting against the resolution. If you vote yes, you’re voting against the resolution. You’re voting for the Committee’s recommendation. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrence, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it. The Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrence is concurred with and fails. Okay.

MR. KEN BUNCH: The Constitution and Bylaws Committee will meet immediately with the objectors in Schaghticoke 2. Let’s do this immediately. The objectors from Resolutions 17 and 18.

MR. BERNIE MCCARTHY: I believe by now you have been -- there have been three -- at least three resolutions distributed amongst you. You got ‘em, right? You should have one that’s from
Maryland/Washington D.C. Branch 923. You should have another submitted by Branch 244. And you should have a third from Central Florida Branch 406.

[Audience reaction.]

[ Speaking off mic. ]

MR. BERNIE MCCARTHY: Okay. We’re going to start out.

[Audience reaction.]

MR. BERNIE MCCARTHY: Hold on, hold on. We’ll start out with the one that’s from Maryland/Washington D.C. That will be Resolution Number 63.

[Audience reaction.]

[ Speaking off mic. ]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Those who don’t -- those who don’t have Resolution 63 put in by the Maryland/Washington, D.C. Branch 923, raise your hand. Okay. Sargent of Arms, please get these resolutions to the people raising their hands. We’re doing Number 63 right now by Maryland/Washington, D.C. Branch 923. Raise your
hands if you want a resolution or raise your hands
if you want to stretch. All right. Make sure,
keep your hands up to get this resolution so we
can move forward. Sargent of Arms over to -- yep.

[Speaking of mic.]

We also have Resolution 64 from Branch
244. Who needs -- from Branch 244, raise your
hand who needs Resolution, it’s Number 64. Keep
your hands up. Please get one to the
parliamentarian, Dr. -- who’s ordering pizza?

Okay. Again, we’re -- keep your hands up
if you have not gotten 63 or 64. The resolution
from Maryland/Washington, D.C. Branch 923 is
Number 63, and Resolution 64 is from Branch 244.

[Speaking off mic.]

Keep your hands up if you have not yet
received Resolution 63 and 64.

MR. BRIAN CROWE: Mr. Chairman. Mic
number 6.

Mic 6.

MR. BRIAN CROWE: Wait a minute, I’m
corrected by the gentleman back here. The submitted by Branch 244 is different. There are two. The one I was referring to was the one in Constitution. I’m Brian Crowe, and I’m from Branch 14 in Chicago, home of the Chicago Cubs and --

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: What are you asking, Brian?

MR. BRIAN CROWE: Are we looking -- what are we looking at for title on that page?

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: The one we’re looking for is Resolution 64 from Branch 244, is entitled, “One Member, One Vote, for Resident Officers.”

MR. BRIAN CROWE: Great, thank you.


MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Give us -- I understand. But, until you’re recognized, I will get to you. Okay? All right.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Mic 6.

MS. LANEDA PITTS: Thank you. Good afternoon.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Good afternoon.

MS. LANEDA PITTS: My name is LaNeda Pitts. I’m a member of Branch 14, Chicago, and I wanted to make a point of personal privilege. I’ve noticed in the past at other conventions we had some concerns, like a gentleman just said a few minutes ago, whether a person is for or against a resolution. In the past, we used to put little signs on the mics showing pro and con, and then that way, the people could line up, and you would know for sure who’s for a resolution and who’s against it. I would like for us to recommend that we do this again for this convention.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: LaNeda, thank you. We tried that, and people who were pro went to con, and people who were con went to pro. They didn’t follow. I’m sorry, they didn’t follow it. You just let us know you’re pro or con. Otherwise, you’re running back to microphones. But, I do understand. Thank you.

Okay. So, let’s see what you’ve got
MR. BERNIE MCCARTHY: Does everyone have a copy of Resolution Number 63 from Maryland/Washington, D.C.?

[Audience reaction.]

Can I begin?

[Chorus of yeses.]

Okay. Resolution Number 63. Resolved, that for any -- for any detail assignments and/or special projects that total more than 90 days in the calendar year, the USPS will create a career-funded position to accommodate the vacancy, and be it further resolved that the new position be created and posted 60 days from the date the USPS is informed of a violation of the agreement, and be it finally resolved that the new EAS position is at a comparable level as other EAS employees doing the same duties and functions.

The Committee amended this resolution as follows. In the second resolved, on the very first line, they inserted, “no more than” between the words “posted” and “60.” So, that resolve
will now read, “That the new position be created and posted no more than 60 days from the date the USPS is informed of a violation of the agreement.”

The Committee’s recommendation was for concurrence as amended.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Resolution 63. The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. Do we have any objections? Do we have any objections? Okay. Delegate, mic 3.

MR. ARNIE ROSARIO: Arnie Rosario, Branch 96, Portland, Maine. I object.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Resolution will be held over for a second reading.

MR. BERNIE MCCARTHY: Okay. We’re on Resolution Number 64. It’s the one that has the title on the top, “One Member, One Vote, for Resident Officers.” Do we have that one? Can I begin? Okay.

Therefore, be it resolved that a Committee be put together by our Executive Officers to review our current --

MS. ROE HERZOG: Excuse me, Bernie.
Excuse me --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, delegate, mic 6.

MS. ROE HERZOG: Roe Herzog, Florida State President.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

MS. ROE HERZOG: There’s still some members back here that don’t have this, and we need an opportunity to read it, because some of us just got it.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. How many still do not have this? We’ve had our hands raised. Where’s the Sargent of Arms? Let’s please get these resolutions to these members, please.

MS. ROE HERZOG: They had to go get more copies made.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you for notifying us.

MS. ROE HERZOG: Okay.

[Speaking off mic.]

MR. AL BONENBERGER: Mic 7.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 7.

MR. AL BONENBERGER: Al Bonenberger,
Branch 103, San Antonio.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yes.

MR. AL BONENBERGER: While they get copies, just a question. There’s another one on our table here. It says Carolina Bi-State Branch 936.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: They’ll get to it. Thank you.

MR. AL BONENBERGER: Okay. That’s another one that’s going to come up?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yes.

MR. AL BONENBERGER: Okay. Thank you.

[Speaking off mic.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. We’re going to move to Resolution 5 [sic] while we’re waiting for these copies to come in for you to read Resolution 64. So, if you’ll turn your books to Resolution 25 on page 84, we’re going to move forward after the second reading of the resolution.

MR. BERNIE MCCARTHY: This constitutes the second reading of Resolution Number 25. It can be found on page 84.
Resolution 25 was objected to in the first reading, and the Committee met with the objector, and after considering the discussion with the objector, the Committee reaffirmed its original recommendation of concurrence as amended.

Do I need to read the amendment?

[Chorus of nos.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Resolution 25. The Committee’s recommendation was for concurrence as amended. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Okay. Then, all those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence as amended, please signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it. The Committee’s recommendation for concurrence as amended is concurred with and passes.

MR. BERNIE MCCARTHY: We are now on Resolution Number 27. The Committee met with the objector for Resolution Number 27, and after
hearing her concerns, the Committee amended the resolution -- yeah, they did -- oh, no, I’m sorry, I’m sorry, you’re right. After hearing the objection, the Committee deliberated, and after discussing it again, the Committee has changed its recommendation from concurrence as amended to one of nonconcurrence.


MS. DIANE SMITH: Diane Smith, President, Branch 20, Pittsburgh. I submitted this resolution for a number of reasons. I’ve had several members who have brought this to my attention that when they were promoted, they were not given any information concerning the NAPS organization or the other management organizations. One member in specific, he had to pay Union dues to the Carrier Union for almost a full year, because they would not permit him to get out of the Union within 30 days, which it
states that they can let you out if they want to.

The other reasons that I did this is that people get into problems and situations. I have a member right now, or not even a member, he just joined. He just got promoted in June. They’ve already presented him with discipline. He did not know what to do, who to contact, or anything. He went to the Union and asked the Union if they would represent him and who could represent him.

All I’m asking for is they give them the information, the USPS, at the time that they are promoted, to give them a Form 1187 and 1188 to at least let them get out of the Union, you know, their respective Unions, and have some information about the management organizations. We still go and talk to them at NSP. Now, my next NSP class isn’t until September the 10th, whereas some of these people who have been promoted for months and months.

The other thing is they’re not -- well, there’s other things about the DDF Fund that they have requirements that they have to make. But, I
just cannot see why we would not, as an organization, want to give the newly promoted supervisor any information about this management organization, and I believe it should be at the time that they are promoted.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Delegate, mic 5.

MR. ROBERT MCMURRAY: Yes. Robert McMurray, Branch 165. Point of clarification. Why did you decide to nonconcur?

MR. BERNIE MCCARTHY: Our Committee went over this resolution two or three different times, and it isn’t -- the Committee did not feel that we did not want the information about NAPS being distributed when an individual is promoted. The Committee was not comfortable with the fact that it was being asked that the US Postal Service be tasked or charged with doing it. Who’s to say when they’re going to give it to them? Who’s to say what they’re going to give to them? When you say information, you’re not restricting yourself just to an 1187 or an 1188, and that’s how the
Committee looked at it. They’re not objecting to the idea, they’re objecting to the execution of it.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Delegate, mic 7.

MR. BOB BRADFORD: Oh, this is hot. It’s been used a lot. Bob Bradford, Branch 203, the Heart of Texas. I’m speaking supporting the original occurrence as admitted. I’m against what they changed it to, same thing. I signed over 200 members, and when I did it, I gave them both of these forms, and it made it a lot easier. When I got promoted, I was a mail handler Union for a year and a half after I got promoted. I could never remember my anniversary date. So, if you give it to them right there, they’ve got that period they can get out at that time when they get promoted. I think the original concurrence was right.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: That’s two against.

Okay. Delegate, mic 2.

MS. ANGELA GARLAND: Angela Garland,
State of Delaware, Branch 909. I’m not sure if Bob was for or against. I think he’s against.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Bob, you’re against the resolution, correct? You were against? Yes, the Committee’s recommendation, yes.

MS. ANGELA GARLAND: For the record, I think that NAPS needs to control its own narrative and its own brand, and we must get to these people. That’s what we’re supposed to do. We’re supposed to go these meetings, have these conversations with the Learning and Diversity Manager, the District Manager, if need be, and find out when the classes are, and when they’re going to promote, or if the class is too far away, when do they promote, and who are they promoting, so that we can get in touch with those people. I get in touch with them, I know their names, I send them E-mails. I do all those things and then offer them the 1187 and the 1188. It is upon us to control our narrative. I don’t trust the Post Office. If they won’t give me a raise that I’m due, do I trust them to coach and bring forth new
leadership? No.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: So, you’re for the Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrence. Okay. I’m trying to -- okay. Delegate, mic 3.

Oh, I’m sorry. I apologize to Sargent of Arms back there. Delegate at mic 5.

MR. JEFF CRISAFULI: Jeff Crisafuli, Branch 36, Kansas City, Missouri, home of the last-place Royals.

[Laughter.]

Call for the question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The question has been called for. All those in favor of calling for the question, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Ayes have it. Question has been called for.

[Speaking off mic.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: We were following
through with the Sargent of Arms, they were keeping track. We had the question called for.
The debate is over.

[Speaking off mic.]
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I understand you were standing there, but I also had the Sargent of Arms up here letting me know that they were standing over there too.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: But, there’s no Sargent of Arms here.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I understand that. But, I’m following -- people were standing up there and watching, and I got waved to. I apologize.

And more importantly, it’s the pro and the con. We’ve had a pro and a con on this discussion until who gets to the microphone first. It’s a pro and a con. The question -- we will -- as the Chair, I will continue to do my due diligence to recognize in order as best we can. Again, Sargent of Arms, I would appreciate maybe somebody up here too to help so I know when you’re
waving.

So, the question has been called for.

Now, we’re going to vote on Resolution 27. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrence, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it. The Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrence is concurred with and it fails.

MR. CY DUMAS: Mic 3. Point of information.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 3.

MR. CY DUMAS: Cy Dumas, Providence, Rhode Island. In terms of 1188 process, Brian, I was under the impression that anytime a craft goes to management, if you fill out the 1188 and you put in the remarks promoted to management effective such and such a date, that the year -- the anniversary date didn’t have to complied with.

[Audience reaction.]
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. The process that we see, it’s a Postal Service HR issue. It’s the responsibility of the employee to complete their 1188 and submit it to HR. We will get at NAPS Headquarters 1188s and Jovan Duncan, our membership manager, as a courtesy will forward it on within 30 days of a promotion from craft to EAS, you write at the top, promoted to EAS, 30 days. We send to Shared Services. It is not the responsibility of NAPS to make that change. It’s Shared Services.

MR. CY DUMAS: I agree.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: And then, depending on what Union you’re in, depends on when you can submit an 1188 and get out of their Union. And then some, my understanding, and I could be corrected by a thousand people in here, that some people need to be in a Union to get their health benefits so if they get out, they can’t get the health benefits.

MR. CY DUMAS: That’s true.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.
MR. CY DUMAS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right.

[Speaking off mic.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Does everybody have Resolution 64, and have you had time to read it? One member, One vote. Who does not have that? Okay. I see one hand. They’re probably on the table somewhere. Please look. We’re going to move to Resolution 64. The first reading.

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: Resolved.

Therefore, let it be resolved that a Committee be put together by our Executive Officers to review our current Constitution and make the appropriate changes so that beginning in the year 2020, NAPS will allow each individual member the dignity and respect to cast individual votes for National President, National Vice President, and National Secretary/Treasurer.

The Committee’s recommendation was for nonconcurrence.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Resolution 64. The Committee’s recommendation is for nonconcurrence.
Do I have any objections? Delegate, mic 2.

MS. CLARISSA BOGNOT: Clarissa Bognot, Branch 244. I object.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Resolution will be held over for a second reading.

Okay. The Committee is going to start on Resolution 28, page 86. Resolution 28, page 86. Does everybody have that one?

MR. JASON TAPP: Mic 5.

[Speaking off mic.]

MR. JASON TAPP: Mic 5.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. I’m sorry.

Delegate, mic 5.

MR. JASON TAPP: Jason Tapp, Branch 65, Denver, Colorado. Don’t you want to go to 65? Resolution 65?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Not everyone has that. We’re waiting for that. So, we were going to continue with these current resolutions we addressed yesterday, and we’ll forward until we get Resolution 65.

MR. JASON TAPP: Okay.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: Resolution 28. The Committee, after meeting with the objector, made an amendment. The amendment was -- the amendment was in line 56 to strike the words “customer service” and replace them with “all EAS” and also in line 68, strike the words “customer service” and replace with “all EAS.”

So, the resolve will now read: “That each time a new program or task is assigned to all EAS operations, the USPS will provide NAPS with an outline of how much time is required to effectively perform each new program or task added, and be it further resolved that each time a new program or task is assigned to all EAS operations, the USPS will provide NAPS with an outline of how each new program or task is to be integrated into the existing workload and prioritized with current duties.”

The Committee’s recommendation is now concurrence as amended.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Resolution 28. The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. Any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended --

[Audience reaction.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Well, okay. Just -- wait a minute.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mic 9.


MR. GREG MURPHY: Greg Murphy, New England Area Vice President. I would offer an amendment that we change the word from “all” to “any,” because my concern here is that if you say all EAS operations, then basically the USPS could say, well we didn’t change all the operations, we just changed this one. So, I would suggest the word to “any EAS operation” so that we can make sure the Postal Service doesn’t come back and say we didn’t change them all, we just changed these two or this one, so we don’t need to take those actions. I offer that.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: You offer a motion.

MR. GREG MURPHY: Yes, I offer a motion to amend.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: You offer a motion that changes “all” to “any.”

MR. GREG MURPHY: That’s correct.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: So, I need a second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. So, do we have any discussion on changing “all” to “any”. It’s still three letters.

[Laughter.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, just the amendment changing “all” to “any.” Any discussion? Yell out if you’re not -- okay. All those in favor of changing -- on the motion to change “all” to “any,” signify by saying aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[No response.]

The ayes have it. Changing “all” to “any” now. And would you now read that section.
Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mic 9.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 9.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay, I’m for nonconcurrency. I can see where this can be used against --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Wait a minute. Right now -- are you against -- were you against -- we’ve already voted on the amendment. So, now we’re going to read the amendment -- the second amendment, and then we’ll have further discussion, okay? Just be patient. We want to read the amendment we just made so everybody is clear. Okay.

[Speaking off mic.]

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: After the amendment, the resolved now reads: “Each time a new program or task is assigned to any EAS operations, the USPS will provide NAPS with an outline of how much time is required to effectively perform each new program or task added, and be it further resolved that each time a
new program or task is assigned to any EAS operations, the USPS will provide NAPS with an outline of how each new program or task is to be integrated into the existing workload and prioritized with current duties.”

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right.

Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. Any discussion? Delegate, mic 9.

MS. TRUEVA RICHARDSON: I’m for nonconcurrence. This is Trueva Richardson from -- Trueva Richardson, Branch 26, Mobile. In terms of nonconcurrence, I can see where this could be used against us, where the time to pull the report varies according to the duties, because it’s more than just pulling reports, you have to analyze and act on it, and I can just see how they would minimize the time it takes to -- for that particular duty, when it varies so much. And I would just be afraid that they would use that against us, minimizing the task.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Delegate, mic 5.
MS. BONNIE PARRISH: Bonnie Parrish, Branch 904, 173, Home of the Hogs.

[Laughter.]

I disagree too, also, Brian. This is going to cause some hurt and discontent for the Post Office. You’re saying to give a time limit. How are you going to give a time limit if you have an NDC new program and supervisors got to go out there and rerouting, and you go across the river, and you’re running a ______ [not clear] and they putting in a new Amazon program that’s gonna take an additional 15 minutes for 2 days. So, how you gonna do all this information? Hello?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No, I don’t answer. That’s your discussion.

MS. BONNIE PARRISH: I’m just saying.


MR. JOE RUGGERIO: Joe Ruggerio, Branch 932. I’m for the resolution as written. I asked
for the -- I asked for the original, and thank
you, Greg, for changing it to any. The reason
being, we all have new programs. Everything is on
the computers. It takes time, and anytime it
takes to run a new -- anytime -- the F1 schedule,
we’ll use that for an example. It takes me an
additional hour a week, an hour to do the schedule
and an hour to do the F1 schedule. That’s two
hours out of my 50, 60 hours a week that I put in.
All right? So, add on any new programs, and now
we’re talking 10 to 12 hours a day of new
programs, and that’s what we want to do with that.
If we change it -- the resolution -- if we ask for
that resolution, at least we have an idea how much
additional more time we have of work we’re going
to have, and it will also close the gap -- we can
actually figure out how much time a day we’re
actually spending on new programs.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you. Any other
discussion? Delegate, mic 10. Thank you, Marty.

MR. MARK SCHULTZ: Mark Schultz, Branch
577 in Florida. The District in the Area is going
to assign a time whether we ask for a head’s up or not. So, they’re going to assign a time. We’re simply it sounds like this resolution asking to be told what that time is in advance, and the more we can document how much time we’re being asked to take to do these tasks, the easier it’s going to be in the future to document what time we’ll need in the SWCs, and we’ll be able to look ahead and say look how much time you’ve said all these different tasks take, now we’re going to look at the SWCs and see if that makes sense. I mean, I’m not the writer of this resolution, but it seems to make sense. They’re going to assign a time whether you ask for it or not.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Delegate, mic 5.

MR. ROBERT MCMURRAY: Yes, Robert McMurray, Branch 165, Knoxville, again. I’m actually for the resolution but would vote against it, and the reason being that it’s too limited. There are so many things that can be added to a task such as a new program on a computer. Then,
you have to repair or amend the information on the
computer, and then you have to answer to a manager
for the information on the computer, etcetera.
So, you’re really -- I agree that you do want that
information, but they’re going to minimize as one
person said earlier. Typically, something
monitored as 10 minutes a day ends up being 30 to
an hour. Just information. Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Thank you. All right.
Delegate at mic 6. We’ve had three against and
two for so far on my count.

MR. TIM FORD: My name is Tim Ford,
Southern Region Vice President. I’m speaking in
favor of the motion. I’ve got to give you some
insight about how the Postal Service looks at the
time for a task. Remember when they took away
data technicians, and they said they saved 793
jobs -- they eliminated? As a member of the
Board, I asked the Postal Service -- because that
equates to about 1.6 million work hours -- I asked
them where they assigned those work hours. They
went crazy. They went crazy and said, “We’ve
taken away all kinds of stuff, and it doesn’t take that much time.” I said, “Really? Where did you put it? Did you add 1.6 million hours to EAS? No? Well, somebody’s doing the work.”

We would like to have at least an idea of what amount of time that you think it’s going to take to do a task. How many of you have been given a new task, and it says it will only take 5 minutes? Anybody?

[Audience reaction.]

How many of those did you get, one? Two? Three? We at least need a head’s up on how much time it’s going to take. We can argue about it with the Postal Service, but at least give us a starting point so we can discuss how much time it takes to do your job. Thank you.


MR. VICTOR LOPEZ: Victor Lopez, Miami, Branch 146. I call for the question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. The question has been called for. All those in favor of
calling for the question, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it. The question has been called for. We’re going to vote on Resolution 28.

The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence as amended, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it. The Committee’s recommendation is concurred with and passes.

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: Resolution 29.

The Committee met with the objector, and we made a new amendment to it. Resolution 29, we are striking the entire resolve, which is lines 114 to 124. It’s totally gone. We are replacing it with the following resolve.

“Resolved, all EAS positions posted must
not have a lunch period that exceeds one hour.”

That’s it. I’ll read it again. “Resolved, all EAS positions posted not have a lunch period that exceeds one hour.”

The Committee’s recommendation is concurrence as amended.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Resolution 29. The Committee’s recommendation is concurrence as amended. Any discussion? Any discussion?

Okay. Thank you. Delegate at mic 9.

MS. CYNTHIA IRVINE: Cynthia Irvine, Branch 421, Lafayette, Louisiana, home of the Spice, not for the tender stomachs. I’m in agreement with the amendment because I was a victim of a two-lunch spread, and OSHA stepped in and said that 8 hours is 8 hours.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Any other discussion?

MR. TRENT CLARK: Mic 4.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate at mic 4.

MR. TRENT CLARK: Trent Clark from Branch 33 in Columbus, Ohio. Okay. About the amendment, it says no more than an hour. What’s to stop them
from saying, okay a half hour at 11:00 in the
morning and a half hour at 7 in the evening? So,
I think it should be stipulated in there also
about what you really mean. One lunch period.
Because they can do that.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. It looks like
delegate at mic 7.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: Bobby Bock, Branch 406.

I call for the question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. The question
has been called for on Resolution 29. All those
in favor of calling for the question, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say no.

[Chorus of nos.]

The ayes have it. The question has been
called for. Now, we’re going to vote on
Resolution 29, and the Committee’s recommendation
for concurrence as amended. All those in favor of
the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence as
amended, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]
All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it. The Committee’s recommendation is concurred with. It passes.

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: Resolution 31.

The Committee originally --

MR. JOHN HARRIS: Mic 7.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 7.

MR. JOHN HARRIS: John Harris, Branch 567. The gentleman over here, he acted like that he wanted to amend the previous resolution, but he did not state so. Ladies and gentlemen, if you want to amend a resolution, make it plain. Make it plain. Say that you want to amend the resolution, so that we can consider it, and go ahead and amend it, because he sounded like he wanted to amend it, but he did not state so. He didn’t state so. So, when in the future in order for us to consider this, in order for us to make your amendment, please state that. Let us know.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: Resolution 31.
The Committee had recommended concurrence. We met with the objector and made an amendment. The amendment is on line 124 to strike the word “issued” and replace it with “considered.”

The resolve now reads: “Resolved, that the investigation not be punitive in nature and include assurance that all EAS employees will be given due process before disciplinary action is considered.”

The Committee’s recommendation is now concurrence as amended.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. Resolution 31. Any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. All those in favor in of the Committee’s recommendation, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[No response.]

The ayes have it. The Committee’s recommendation for concurrence is concurred with
and passes.

[Speaking off mic.]

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: Resolution 51.

The objector withdrew their objection.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. The Committee’s recommendation on Resolution 51 was for concurrence. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The Committee’s recommendation for concurrence is concurred with, and it’s passed.

MR. AL BONENBERGER: Mic 7.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 7.

MR. AL BONENBERGER: Al Bonenberger, Branch 103. I know we have a lot of first-timers. I think there were about 30. Anyway, do they know what’s going to happen to these resolutions we pass here? Not everybody in this hall, I think,
know that the Postal Service will be presented
these resolutions by Headquarters, and if
Headquarters -- Postal Headquarters doesn’t want
to accept them, they just say no. So, just
information to the first-timers. What we’re
trying to pass here doesn’t mean it’s going to
happen. Keep that in mind.

[Speaking off mic.]

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: Resolution 54.

After meeting with the objector, the Committee
reaffirmed its decision of nonconcurrence.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Resolution 54. The
Committee’s recommendation was for nonconcurrence.

Any discussion? Delegate, mic 2.

MS. KARYN RAHMING: Karyn Rahming, Branch
77. In regards to that resolution, I did meet
with the objectors, and basically in a Level 18
Postmaster Office, we have several RMPOs that we
do have required -- audits, inventories, we have
observations that we have to do, and we are
required to use our own vehicles, or we’re not in
compliance with what it is that we’re required to
do. So, that’s why it was suggested that the 
District or Post Office be able to provide us with 
vehicles so that we can do our job.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: So, are you for or 
against?

MS. KARYN RAHMING: I’m against their 
nonconcurrence.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Thank you. Any 
other discussion? Hearing none, the Committee’s 
recommendation for Resolution 54 is 
nonconcurrence. All those in favor of the 
Committee’s recommendation, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The nays have it. The Committee’s 
recommendation is not concurred with and it fails 
-- it passes. The resolution passes. The 
resolution passes.

[Speaking off mic.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yes, the resolution 
passes. The resolution -- you voted -- right, you
voted for nonconcurrence. You voted no against the Committee’s recommendation for nonconcurrence, which means you’re voting for the resolution. That’s why I said the resolution passes.

Stenographer, NaCorey, am I good?

[Speaking off mic.]

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: Resolution 55, 55. We are -- the Committee, after meeting with the objector struck the entire resolve, which is lines 89 to 95 and substituted the new resolve.

Resolved, that the CSAW program in Level 18 offices be changed to not automatically deduct the 15 hours the Postmaster could work as allotted by the contract, but only deduct the actual hours worked by the Postmaster.

I’ll read it again. The new resolve is:

Resolved, that the CSAW program in Level 18 offices be changed to not automatically deduct the 15 hours the Postmaster could work as allotted by the contract, but only deduct the actual hours worked by the Postmaster.

The Committee’s recommendation is
concurrence as amended.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Resolution 55. The Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. Any discussion?

MR. RICH CARUSO: Mic 7.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 7 and mic 5. Okay.

MR. RICH CARUSO: Point of clarification.

Rich Caruso, Branch 930, Nebraska. Regarding Number 54, what -- if the body nonconcurs with the Committee nonconcurs, does that mean that 54 is passed?

[Audience reaction.]

I thought Brian or the -- Brian said it did not pass.

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: He said it passed, and the stenographer and the minutes will reflect that it passed. That’s -- that is one of the issues. Some of you might remember that I tried to change that at your last convention so that you actually voted on the resolution as opposed to the Committee’s recommendation, and you guys weren’t
comfortable with that little twist either. And so, as a result of that, we have this double negative kind of stuff that can be confusing. I appreciate the clarification, but let’s try to make the points of clarification immediately as opposed to once we’ve moved on. Thank you.

MR. RICH CARUSO: All right. Thank you.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. We’re on Resolution 55. The Committee’s recommendation for concurrence as amended. Is there any discussion? Delegate, mic 10. I see you. Go ahead, delegate.

MR. JAVIER FALCON: Good afternoon. This is Javier Falcon. I’m with Branch 265 out of Lubbock. This has kind of been one of my pet peeves. I shouldn’t think that the Postal Service should be using language to manipulate craft hours and assign them arbitrarily to EAS. You will eventually wind up losing those hours out of your budget. So, I think that there should be something else that should address this issue in order to get the fix that we actually need and not hurt ourselves when the next budget comes out.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Any other discussion? Hearing none, the Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it. The Committee’s recommendation for concurrence is concurred with and passes.

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: Resolution Number 56. The Committee’s initial recommendation was for concurrence as amended. After meeting with the objectors, we have reaffirmed our concurrence as amended. So, the Committee’s continued decision is concurrence as amended.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Resolution 56. The Committee’s recommendation is concurrence as amended. Any discussion? Delegate, mic 3.

MR. PRESCOTT BUTLER: Prescott Butler, Branch 327. I object.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. You object.
You can discuss. It’s open for discussion.

MR. PRESCOTT BUTLER: Great. The reason why I am objecting to this particular resolution is, what we’re trying to do is take the points that are earned by our leaders when they take trips. Now, all -- all we’ve been saying, we’re family. I just have to use this as an example. If I paid for a ticket for my mother to come to the family reunion, after she earns the points, I’m not gonna ask her to give the points back to me. That’s what we’re doing to our leaders. Now, we always say how much we respect and we love our leaders. I always say, you show me. That’s how I understand. We talked about this Sunday.
Unfortunately, the room only held 100 people.
But, we talked about the divisiveness within this organization. And when the enemy comes to attack, they always attack our leaders. Do you understand how many trips you would have to fly in order to earn a free flight? Why are we nickeling and diming the leaders? Are we the ones sitting at
the airport when flights are being cancelled? Are we the ones sitting on the plane taking 6-hour flights? Why are we doing this to our leaders? I ask that this body will reject that resolution from this Committee.

[Applause.]


MS. JOYCE TOMASKOVIC: Joyce Tomaskovic, Branch 508. I want to agree with the gentleman that just spoke, and also, I want to caution everyone. The Postal Service has been trying to take your points. Pass this resolution, and you lose your points too. I’m sure they’re going to use that as an excuse.


MS. CYNTHIA SHEFTON: Cynthia Shefton, Branch 237. While I appreciate what he just said, but the bottom line is, you know, it says in business. It has nothing to do with the
leadership, but this is membership’s money that is used to purchase whatever they need. There’s all kinds of perks, and I agree that we shouldn’t take it from them, but if they get it, because it was membership money, this is not personal, this is business, it’s not divisive, it’s business, and that’s what’s wrong with this organization. When it comes to accountability and responsibility, we say it’s personal. It’s not, it’s business. If they use membership money to do whatever they need to do with the flights, then there -- I think this is great. It’s simply saying don’t take it from them, but use it for what it was for, business. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 7.

Well, okay. I saw here on 7. I didn’t -- all right. I’ll go to delegate, mic 9.

MR. NEIL BAKER: Neil Baker, Branch 104.

I’m opposed to this resolution. Maybe some of your branches ought to think about the 30 to 35 weekends that your National Officers spend on the
road, not because they find it pleasurable, not because they think they’re racking miles, because you invite them to come to your Christmas parties, to your membership meetings, and they do so at your request, not because they think they’re going to rack up enough miles to get a free trip. And somebody else said it right. You go to a trip to Mexico, you pay 75,000 miles for one way. How many trips do you think they earn in a year? Maybe two? Maybe you forgot about who’s going to do all the accounting to keep track of all these miles. Oh, you want to hire another office person to sit down every weekend at NAPS Headquarters to sort this out? Come on, folks. Get real.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Delegate, mic -- no? Delegate, mic 5. Where am I at? I’m not -- oh, there’s somebody waving. Delegate, mic 5. Thank you.

MR. JOHN VALUET: John Valuet, Idaho State, 915. Hey, just clarification. From what I’m understanding with the Executive Board
members, that they use their own personal credit cards and such for getting this and then are reimbursed later on. So, there would be no way of them being able to differentiate on their accounts of what is theirs that they used on their own personal time or things that they used for the business, and there would be no way to account of handing that back over to NAPS National. I mean, if there was a system where it was separated, it would be a totally different issue. But, when they’re using their own credit cards and getting reimbursed for their expenses later on, which is my understanding -- if I’m wrong correct it -- there’s no way of differentiating between what they used for their own personal use and what they used for NAPS business.

So, at this point, it seems like the resolution wouldn’t make any sense.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Is there anybody for this Committee’s recommendation? I know. I’ve had -- I’ve had four against. I’m looking for a pro. Delegate at mic 7.
MS. JUNEBUG WARDELL: Junebug Wardell from Detroit, Michigan, Branch 23. Call for the question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. The question has been called for. Can I have a second?

[Chorus of seconds.]

All those in favor of calling for the question, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The ayes have it. Question has been called for. Now, if you vote -- the Committee’s recommendation is for concurrence as amended. If you vote for it, then we have the changing of the airline tickets. If you vote no, then the resolution fails.

So, all those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence as amended -- if you vote for the Committee’s recommendation as amended, you are supporting this resolution for the airline tickets and everything to be tracked
and be turned back. If you vote no, then you’re voting to cancel this resolution -- this resolution fails, and nothing changes. Okay.

So, all those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence as amended, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The nays have it. The Committee’s recommendation is not concurred with. The resolution fails.

We want to take a moment. I know we’ve got some resolutions, but we want to get the 50/50 done with the Auxiliary right now, if you will indulge the Chair as we come up and -- Skip and Rick, come up. Are we good? We’re going to do the 50/50. Let’s take a break real quick, all right? So, I’m going to turn it over to you, Mr. Skip.

MR. SKIP CORLEY: Okay. Once again, you did real good today. We raised a total of $9,310.
So, you can give yourself a hand.

[Applause.]

Okay. That means -- that means that the -- one winner is going to get $4,655. And if they want, they can take me out, you know, for doing this for them, okay? And, you know, we’re doing this again -- we’re doing this again Thursday morning, starting Thursday morning at about 7:00. So, come down, you know, the early bird gets the worm. I’ll be there at 7:00, and I’m telling you, get your tickets now.

So, we’re gonna -- can I get another first-timer to pull these? Over here. Come on up.

[Drum roll.]

And again, as always, if the winner is not here, we gonna keep the ticket and post it and we’ll let you know who wins Thursday.

[Drum roll.]

All right, all right. Everybody’s ready. We got 9-7-2-9-8-9-5. Once again, 9-7-2-9-8-9-5.

[Applause.]
We got a winner. Do we have a winner?

[Music playing.]

Come on up. Come on down. Come on down.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Louis, you can’t pick her pocket yet, she doesn’t have the money. You want to go verify the ticket? Okay.

[Applause.]

It pays to support the Auxiliary. All right. Thank you, Auxiliary. Look, we’re going to finish up some resolutions from yesterday’s first reading, and then we’ve got another one we have to read, and then the Resolutions Committee got one they haven’t looked at, so they’re going to have to come back on Thursday, because you have it there, but they have not looked at it for review.

So, we’re going to Resolution 59. We’re trying to get everybody out of here.

MR. BERNIE MCCARTHY: Okay. Now that everybody’s in a good mood, I’m back.

We’re on Resolution Number 59. The Committee met with the objector for Resolution
Number 59, and after hearing their concerns, the Committee has reaffirmed the original recommendation for concurrence.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. The Committee’s recommendation for Resolution 59 is for concurrence. Is there any discussion? Delegate at mic 9.

MR. MIKE FIELDS: Good afternoon. Mike Fields, Branch 936, Carolina Bi-States. I rise to oppose this resolution selection. First of all, let me say I want to be straight up. I work for Dillard Financial Solutions. Not only do I work for them, I am the National Director of Agent Services for the NAPS Division. And I -- I make this clear because when I objected yesterday to this resolution, I had to meet with the Resolutions Committee, and if anyone has ever met with the Resolutions Committee after objecting, it gets very intimidating. I walk into a closet-like room, 15 to 20 Committee members, and the Chairperson says to you, “You have five minutes to defend your position, start now.” I went crazy.
I mean, I felt like I just got pulled over by the cops, and I didn’t know where to put my hands, you know, or I might get locked up or something. But, I got tongue-tied.

But, one of the things that really stuck out to me in that Committee meeting was that one of the Committee members asked a question to my colleague that was with me, and he said, “Do you have a financial connection to Dillard Financial Solutions?” And that stunned me because in my mind, the question should not have been do you have a financial connection. The question should be how does NAPS have a financial connection to Dillard Financial Solutions, because the resolution says because of this partnership, that NAPS is losing money.

Well, I looked. I did some research and found that at our last convention for vendors, NAPS made $20,000 in vendor fees. This convention, one vendor is paying half that for exclusivity. Now, how can you tell me that NAPS is losing money when they are getting that kind of
money from this exclusivity agreement?

Also, it doesn’t stop there. If a person purchases a product from Dillard Financial Solutions, the NAPS Officer receives a royalty from everyone they make.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The NAPS National Office, NAPS organization.


[Laughter.]

But it doesn’t stop there. Oh no. It doesn’t stop there.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, okay.

MR. MIKE FIELDS: If the state offices agree to the exclusivity for their conventions, Dillard Financial Solutions will offset some costs to help them with their convention, and if a member purchases a product from Dillard Financial Solutions through that state convention, that state branch will receive a royalty for each application that’s been approved.

But, it doesn’t stop there. Dillard
Financial Solutions will be meeting with local branches to do what we call an expo, an educational seminar where we’re educating our members and their families about their benefits, and if a member signs a contract with Dillard Financial Solutions, the local branch will receive a royalty for each contract signed.

So, how can you tell me that we are losing money with this contract? Yes, I work for Dillard Financial Solutions, and whether we pass this resolution or not, I’m still going to make money because the products are for the best of our members. The people that are gonna hurt if this resolution is passed are the members who -- who do not -- I’m sorry -- the members that do pass this resolution. That’s all I have. Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Delegate, mic 7.

MR. BOB TOLMAN: Bob Tolman, South Dakota, Branch 946. We wrote this resolution, and the reason why we wrote it was that --

[Banging of gavel.]
-- we believe it’s a conflict of interest for NAPS members to be paid --

[Applause]

-- by an exclusive consultant for their services to influence NAPS members to go to a financial institution. Earlier today -- and I have no problems with the Dillard program -- but, Mrs. Dillard said that they gave out -- if I remember my numbers correct -- approximately $100,000 in the past 13 years. That was all given before an exclusive contract. There are other vendors that would be most interested to also come and vie for our business. But, this exclusivity that has now come about -- and I would like to know how that came about -- allowing NAPS members --

[Applause.]

-- to, if the right words are “feather their back pocket” on the backs of other NAPS members for influencing them to go to a particular financial or any other -- I don’t know what the organization, it does not have to be financial --
but, this has all the writings on the wall, in my opinion, of ethics, ethics, ethics.

[Applause.]

Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Delegate, mic 8. 10. I didn’t see your thumb. I didn’t see it was 10. Okay.

MR. LOUIS ATKINS: Hey, I’m not wallpaper, now.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

MR. LOUIS ATKINS: Hey, my name is Louis Atkins. I’m the immediate past President of NAPS.

[Applause.]

And first thing I would like to say, I want to -- I’m in favor of the amendment. But, what the previous delegate said, I’m in certain agreement. But, previous to him, the man from Dillard was all talking about money. I’m going to talk about membership and my members here. I’m here to say that we can’t be bought. I’m here to say that we’re not going to lose money because we will have other vendors here. It’s our job as
NAPS leaders to educate our members, not make decisions for. Dillard and all the vendors are great people. I’m not against them, but I am for our members making their own choices. No vendor out there has the product for 1,200 people out here. Let our own members make their choices and not be determined by the amount of money they give. Because we are losing money, because other vendors are out there, particularly at the other small states that’s agreeing to this. There are at least five other vendors with financial that have contacted me wishing they could have been here. Thank you, my delegates. Please vote against -- well, please vote for the resolution. And I sat in as South Dakota to help write it. Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Delegate, mic 3.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mic 9.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, wait a minute. Okay, 3 and then we’ll go to 9. I’m watching, and
he’s taller than I am. Go ahead, Cy. Delegate, mic 3. Turn the mic on, please. Mic 3. Mic 3.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: 9 is working.

9 is working.

[Speaking off mic.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I’ll bring you mic 4. Battery is probably dead.


MR. CY DUMAS: Thanks. I just have a question, Brian. How much money.

[Audience reaction.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: He did say it, but the mic wasn’t on.

MR. CY DUMAS: Cy Dumas, Providence, Rhode Island. I apologize. How much money has NAPS Headquarters received from Dillard in recent years? That would help me to consider what I’m going to do.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: $10,000.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Are you saying since
the contract was signed?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: $10,000.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Chuck, do you have that information? I’ll turn it over to the Secretary/Treasurer who is handling, of course, the treasury to answer that question.

MR. CHUCK MULIDORE: Just don’t shoot the messenger. The contract with Dillard provides that they give us -- they’ve given us $20,000 so far. That’s broken down into royalty money, as well as the way they do funding for Regional Vice President’s training, something they never had before. So, each region now has training money that they can use to contribute to their local areas or states or whatever. So, so far, we’ve received about $20,000, and I say about because we got some checks last week as I was leaving. We deposited them, but we didn’t send the money back to the branches, about $1300 in money that I have to return to branches as part of the contract through an ACH deposit. So, it’s over $20,000 so far. That’s contractual, and they’ve met all of
their contractual requirements on royalties to this point.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Now, delegate, mic 9.

MR. WILLIAM HEMPHILL: Brian, William Hemphill, Branch 248, Wilmington, North Carolina, known for whatever.

[Laughter.]

Yeah, the home of Michael Jordan, the place we ate yesterday. Anyway, my thing is, I’m not against Dillard. I’m against the Executive Board and you three people up there who are in charge, letting them slide in the back door.

[Applause.]

That’s what I’m against. And what I mean by against, people from around the country -- branches from around the country had no idea what was going on. Some of them just found out since they got here because this was done through the back door. And what I mean through the back door, through the back door.

[Laughter and audience reaction.]

People in California, places like that,
they didn’t know nothing about Dillard. They
didn’t know nothing about the deal, and that’s
wrong. Let me tell you when the first time this
deal ever came up. This group right over here,
Capital Atlantic, we heard about it three years
ago, and guess what happened? We turned it down,
because we was not gonna let one group dominate.
We wanted whoever wanted to do this and finance.
Look, what was the problem? If it was 10 people,
let ‘em all come. But, what this group right here
did, what I am still p’d off about, is because
y’all let them come in the back door.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Is there
any delegate that is against the Committee’s
recommendation? Delegate at mic 3.

MR. LES COHEN: Les Cohen, Branch 287,
Central Jersey. First of all, I disagree entirely
with that concept of the back door. We elected
these people as our officials, as our leaders,
which means we entrusted them to make decisions
for us. So, all they did was their job. If you
don’t agree with their job, you’re entitled to have an opinion and say I don’t agree with the way you did your job, next time you run for office, I’m not going to vote for you. That’s how you handle it. That’s how civilized people handle it. You can’t make accusations against these people who work very hard for us.

Let me tell you something. I know nothing about Dillard at all. I don’t know anybody at Dillard. I don’t really care about Dillard, to be perfectly honest with you. But, the point is, if they decided that pursuing a contract with Dillard was good for NAPS, okay, that’s your decision to make. I respect it. I may not agree with it, and, like I said, maybe I’ll vote you out next time, but I’m not going to criticize you. You did your job, I’ll do my job.

I think that we should not make any kind of accusations, ever, against our leaders because all that does is put cracks in the dike and weakens our organization. Number one, if you’re family, you don’t talk like that about your
family.

[Applause.]

And number two is this, Brian Wagner is a very decent man. He wouldn’t do anything unethical, either would Ivan Butts or Chuck Mulidore. They’re not that kind of people. They don’t make special deals where you give me money – that’s not the kind of people they are. If you don’t know that by now, you’re kidding yourself. Pay attention to what’s going on, okay? Thanks.

[Applause.]


MR. BOB BRADFORD: Bob Bradford, Heart of Texas Branch, the home of Chip and Joanne.

[Laughter.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Magnolia.

MR. BOB BRADFORD: Magnolia. Anyway, I would like to call for the question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

[Applause.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. The
question has been called for. Do I have a second?

[Chorus of seconds.]

All those in favor of calling for the question, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

The question has been called for.

MR. BOB TOLMAN: Point of personal privilege.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate at mic 7.

MR. BOB TOLMAN: As the writer, if there’s any other notice or whatever, I have the opportunity, according to the rules, to have the last word or second word. My name is Bob Tolman.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

MR. BOB TOLMAN: My name is Bob Tolman, I’m with Branch 946 of South Dakota. Forgive me, mea culpa. So, I would like to have a last word as the -- before the question is called.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yep. Bob, you’re out of order. You already had a chance to speak.
MR. BOB TOLMAN: I understand, but according to the rules, the person has a second opportunity.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Please designate in the rules -- you’re -- what section that you’re claiming that you’re requesting this opportunity to speak as the maker to make a final say? If it’s in Section 1 or 2.

MR. BOB TOLMAN: I think it’s in 2. Number 5. A delegate shall not speak more than twice on the same question until all who wish to speak have had an opportunity to do so.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Yes, and you had an opportunity to do so.

MR. BOB TOLMAN: I would like to speak twice.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No. The question’s been called. It would be out of order. Bob, the question has been called for, it’s been voted on. It’s out of order. Okay.

MR. BOB TOLMAN: Thank you to the Committee for their work. I just want to make one
more note.

[Banging of gavel.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Bob, you’re out of order.

MR. BOB TOLMAN: I know I’m out of order.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: You’re out of order.

MR. BOB TOLMAN: The other group had 4 minutes and 50 seconds, and I had 10.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, we’re going to vote on Resolution 59. The Committee’s recommendation was for concurrence. All those in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those against, say nay.

[Chorus of nays.]

We’re doing a standing vote. Okay. Everybody stay seated. Those who are in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence, please stand. As Dr. Bishop says, you can’t stand louder than you can yell.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Mr. Chairman.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: We’re doing a vote right now.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, point of order.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate at mic 3.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Luther Manuel. What we need -- you’re saying that -- but, we need on this type of vote, you need clarification. If you vote this, this is what this means. If you vote that, this is what that means. That way you won’t have the big to-do later on. So, clarify the vote.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Thank you for that, but Luther, throughout, I -- on some I did, and some I didn’t, and no one questioned on all the ones I didn’t do it on. I did not do it on every one. So, we’re voting. Now, we’re just standing up vote. So, those who are in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence, please stand.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Who’s blocking mic 6?

Yeah, mic 6.

MR. JOHN SZPYHULSKY: John Szpyhulsky, Branch 327. Should the doors be closed for this so the people don’t come in and out, so that the Sargent of Arms can make an actual count?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No. We’re not counting. We’re visualizing right now, okay?

Those again, who are in favor of the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence --

MR. JEFF CRISAFULLI: Point of order.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 5.

MR. JEFF CRISAFULLI: Jeff Crisafulli, Kansas City, Missouri, Branch 36. I have to agree with Luther. You were the one that decided to, oh, well I’ll talk and tell you how to vote for this one or vote for that one. You were -- you explained it when you thought it was important, so you should explain this one too, since it’s been asked.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Okay. Okay. As the Chair, I don’t care. One of the things you
said was that I heard it, it seemed to be explained, now I’m gonna -- on some of them it was -- when you’re doing concurrence and nonconcurrence, if you vote against, you’re voting not for the resolution. This has been straightforward. Concurrence, you vote for it, or you don’t vote for it. We didn’t have a nonconcurrence and was a double negative. It didn’t seem straightforward. That’s why, with all due respect, I figured you understood what we were voting for. Dillard or -- the resolution or not the resolution to continue with Dillard. Concurrence is for this resolution.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Mr. Chairman. Point of order. Listen, I don’t care if you all don’t want to hear it. Point of order. Before a vote --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Luther --

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Before a vote --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Who are you?

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Oh. Luther Manuel, Branch 548. Before a vote, a delegate --
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Excuse me, you’ll get your point of order. Please sit down, everyone. We’re going to make sure we do this so when it comes time, I don’t want anybody just standing and getting tired. Okay. Please sit down. We’ll get through this point of order and then move forward.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: A member may ask for clarification before a vote. If I’m standing here and I don’t --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No one asked for clarification.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: You can ask for clarification. You cannot deny that.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I didn’t.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Yes, you did. Yes, you did.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I’m going to defer to the parliamentarian.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: You said I’m not going to do it. Yes, you did. Oh no, I get a Ben & Jerry for that.

[Laughter.]
[Banging of gavel.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER:  Please.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL:  All right. No, some of the resolutions are kind of clear. It’s, you know, and they’re moving right along. But, when you have this much debate over something, there’s a lot of personal opinion came into this. When the people stand to vote, a delegate does have the right -- remember Robert’s Rules of Order -- to enforce the will of the majority, yet -- yet protect the rights of the minority.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER:  Okay.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL:  Let us not forget that.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER:  I’m not forgetting.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL:  It’s written in the book.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER:  I understand.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL:  He’ll tell you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER:  I know. He’s been telling me.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL:  All right.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: We will explain it.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: I am making this request. I’m using it as a point of order. I should use it as a new point of personal privilege, but I’ll just keep with the point of order.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: I’m saying, clarify what the vote is about.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: That’s all, instead of having people stand up, what was they talking about. No. I can feel it. That’s why I’m bringing it up, okay? So, your clarification will save all the argument later.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I will do that.

MR. LUTHER MANUEL: Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. For clarification -- okay.

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: It’s obviously getting late.

[Audience reaction.]
So, typically, the Chair has explained the motion to make sure everybody understands when it’s a nonconcurrence issue. Because we want to make sure that everybody understands the double negative. When it concurrence that you’re voting on, then it appears historically and certainly over the last day everybody has understood the concurrence, so the lack of explanation -- therefore, the lack of explanation.

I can assure you the Chair -- I can assure you the parliamentarian has no objection whatsoever to increasing clarity. Anytime anybody asks for an explanation, we’re going to bend over backwards to make sure everybody understands what you’re voting on. That’s -- that certainly is my job, certainly the job of the Chair, to make sure everybody understands what you’re voting on.

So, it wasn’t clear to me and probably wasn’t clear to the Chair that the original point of order was a request for that explanation, but rather just a why didn’t you.

So, I’ve got no problem explaining, and I
know your President has no problem whatsoever explaining what the intent of the vote is.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: So, let’s get -- mic 7.

MR. BOBBY BOCK: Bobby Bock, Branch 406. Point of personal privilege. When we’re having the standing count, are you standing visual? Should we have our credentials out for that, or no?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No. Right now, no. That’s not -- we would be doing a division on that part.

6, can we -- yes, delegate at mic 6.

MS. MAE FLETCHER: Mae Fletcher, Branch 9, Austin, Texas. Clarification. When we vote for this concurrence, we are voting that we no longer do business with Dillard Financial. Am I correct?

[Audience reaction.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No, no. Okay. Let me -- if you give the Chair an opportunity to explain what we just had this five-minute discussion on.
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Here’s what’s going to happen. The Committee has recommended concurrence on this resolution that NAPS opposes this exclusive contract and that NAPS members ask the contract be terminated as soon as legally possible. Exclusive. The members oppose this exclusive contract and that the NAPS members ask the contract to be terminated as soon as legally possible. So, that’s what the Committee recommended that NAPS does, that we -- that NAPS opposed this, with your vote, and that when reasonably possible, we will terminate the contract that’s legally possible -- with regard to Dillard that we have. A piece of paper that says here’s what the contract is.

If you vote in favor of the Committee’s concurrence recommendation, then NAPS will look at this and NAPS members ask that we terminate it as soon as legally possible.

If you vote against that, that means that we continue with the current contract that we have
with Dillard.

So, you vote yes not to have an exclusive contract with Dillard. You vote not, we continue with the Dillard organization as it currently is.

MS. MAE FLETCHER: Thank you so much.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Thank you, and I appreciate the dedication and commitment of the convention floor.

So now -- where are we at?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mic 10.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Mic 10.

MR. RICKEY FRAZIER: Rickey Frazier, Branch 399, Huntsville, Alabama, home of the Alabama Crimson Tide National Champs. This -- this is the problem. We're going through the process of counting now, so how am I going to validate what they put these tics on a piece of paper are accurate? That's one thing. But, transparency is the issue. This whole insane thing we keep going over and over things that are so simple. We need some validation of the counts, going by all these little tic marks, that's not
going to get it. Thank you.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Are we ready?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: No, mic 1.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. Okay, wait a minute. I got -- I’m going with mic 1, and then we’ll go to mic 7.

MS. MARILYN JONES: Marilyn Jones, Branch 39 and Branch 905. Point of information, I guess it would be, I’m really not sure. But, I think the key words in this resolution is “as soon as legally possible.” Do we know -- can I ask that? The length of the contract with Dillard. I think that --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Legally possible. There are provisions in the contract to -- Dillard has until a certain date or somewhere in that contract a certain time could be notified to the company -- to Dillard -- that we would terminate the contract.

MS. MARILYN JONES: Okay. What is the length -- what is the date. That’s what we’re -- that’s what I’m asking. What’s the length of the
contract or the date of the contract?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The length of the contract -- I don’t have it front of me -- I’m going to -- I believe it’s three years, and we have to give them 120 days’ notice.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hello, didn’t I call for the question?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: This is clarification of the contract.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: How many clarifications do you need? Everybody’s been talking. I called for the question.

[Banging of the gavel.]

[Applause.]

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: Wow, you can’t have it goth ways. You can’t have it both ways. You can’t -- you can’t say we want to make sure everybody understands everything before we vote and then say but we don’t want any more discussion.

[Applause.]

If you want to make sure every single
person knows what they’re voting on, then we have to allow for these points of clarification prior to voting. I know we all want to get out of here, but you also want to make sure everybody votes clearly so they make the best decision that they can make individually.

And so, we’ve already tried a voice vote, and that didn’t work. The Chair couldn’t tell if there were more yeses or nos. So, Robert’s tells us that we have to use a more certain method, and the next most certain method is a standing look and see how many people are standing up vote. So, what you’re going to be asked to do, is if you’re in favor of the resolution, stand up. We’re not going to count, we’re going to look. And then you’re going to sit down, and we’re going to ask people who are opposed to the motion to stand up, and we’re going to look again. As I said yesterday, what we have found is that no one can stand up louder than anybody else, but you can yell yes or no louder. So, we’re going to try a standing vote now.
MS. TAYLORIA MCPHEE-JOHNSON: Mic 7.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate, mic 7.

MS. TAYLORIA MCPHEE-JOHNSON: Tayloria McPhee-Johnson, Branch 156 -- 146, Miami, Florida.

Question. Do we have a financial fee if we terminate the contract?

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: The question has been called for, and discussion has already been done.

MS. TAYLORIA MCPHEE-JOHNSON: No, I’m asking the question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: You can’t. The question has been called for, discussion has already been done. We’re voting. The only question we can entertain is about the vote. We’ve already discussed -- the question has been called for. There’s no more discussion on this -- on this contract.

MS. TAYLORIA MCPHEE-JOHNSON: But, I’m asking for clarification, because what I’m trying to do is understand if there is something associated with this.

[Audience reaction.]
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay, okay.

MR. BRUCE BISHOP: Again, it’s your rule. You have a rule that says once the question is called for, there can be no more discussion on the issue. If a member wants to continue discussion, then she can make a motion to suspend the rule. So, what you would have to say is, “I would request that by unanimous consent a suspension of the rule to close debate so that I can ask one more question.” And then, without objection, you would be allowed to do that. But, there is no other way to allow for further discussion on the issue.

Discussion on the vote is allowed, because we want to make sure everybody understands clearly what the vote is and how we’re going to do it. But, no more discussion on the issue of the resolution without a suspension of the rules.

MS. TAYLORIA MCPHEE-JOHNSON: Okay.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Delegate at mic 6.

MS. CAROLYN SIMMS: Carolyn Simms, Branch 173, Arkansas. I put a motion in to actually
suspend the rule because I feel as a delegation, we don’t understand what we’re voting on.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: What rule are you suspending?

MS. CAROLYN SIMMS: The rule to call for the question and not have further clarification.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: He brought it up.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

MR. BRUCE BISHOP: So, let me try this again. She had a specific question she wanted to ask, and the only way she could ask that question, given that the question has already been called for, would be to ask for suspension so that she, individually, could ask a question. Now, you’ve made it a little bit more complicated, I’m sorry to say, because what I think you’re asking for is a reconsideration of the motion to close debate.

MS. CAROLYN SIMMS: Yes.

DR. BRUCE BISHOP: You’re asking the group to reconsider that motion, and to vote not
to close debate. So, why don’t you make the
motion to reconsider the vote to close debate.
Somebody can second that, and we can vote on that,
and it requires a majority vote to pass.

MS. CAROLYN SIMMS: I make the motion to
reconsider the vote.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I second
it.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. All right. So,
all those in favor of opening up discussion again
on this resolution, signify by saying aye.


MR. BRIAN WAGNER: I’m in a vote right
now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, point
of -- well, question.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: No, I’m in a vote
right now. All those in favor of extending
discussion on this resolution, say aye.

[Chorus of ayes.]

All those opposed, say nay.
[Chorus of nays.]

We’re not discussing any more. Now, we’re on the vote.

[Applause.]

Now, I’m going to still do the standing vote, and Louis counts as one, not a half.

[Laughter.]

All those in favor -- remember, if you’re voting for the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence, you’re voting for that NAPS oppose the exclusive contract and that it be further resolved that the contract be terminated as soon as legally possible. Those in favor of that resolution -- the Committee’s concurrence with that -- please stand. You’re voting for the resolution of concurrence of the Committee.

All right. I’ve got some eyes. Ivan, you stand up too. Are you good? All right, sit down, please. Now, everybody sit down. This is the only exercise we’re getting today.

Now, those who are against the Committee’s recommendation for concurrence, who’s
in favor of continuing with the contract with
Dillard, please stand.
The Committee’s recommendation for
concurrence is concurred with. The resolution
passes.

[Applause.]
Okay. The motion passes. Please indulge
us, we’re close. Right, Bernie? We’re close.

[Speaking off mic.]
We have two more resolutions from
yesterday.

[Audience reaction.]
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mic number 6,
please.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Mic 6.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I’d like to
make a motion to adjourn.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Second.

[Audience reaction.]
MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay. The motion -- I
think I heard a few seconds. Okay. Before we --
we want to make sure before we take that
recommendation, the Committee needs to at least
get clarification on what they’re going to do with
the objectors before we -- everybody heads out of
this room, okay? So, give me the privilege of
getting Bernie and June up here to make
clarification.

[Speaking off mic.]

[Banging of the gavel.]

MR. BERNIE MCCARTHY: Before I say
another word, I want to clarify something. I
don’t want anybody in this room to think that when
you come before the Resolutions Committee to
object that you’re before a Tribunal, because that
is not the case. We are going to do everything
possible to make you comfortable and give you
enough time to have your voice heard, just as we
did with all of the objectors yesterday. I just
wanted to clarify that.

Will the Resolutions Committee please
report to the Schaghicoke Room 1, and the
objectors, if you’ll wait five or ten minutes and
come to the Schaghicoke 1, we’ll deal with your
objections. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mic 1.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Before we adjourn, we do have announcements.

MR. TOM O’CONNOR: Mr. Chairman, I need to clarify my motion. It’s Tom O’Connor, Branch 97. I move it’s a motion to recess only until Thursday, not to adjourn.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Thank you. That was understood. So -- well, we’re not going to get out of here. Mic 4.

MS. DOLORES MAHONEY: We have --

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Who are you?

MS. DOLORES MAHONEY: Oh, Dolores Mahoney from Lehigh Valley, President.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Okay.

MS. DOLORES MAHONEY: We have one resolution that we didn’t even go over. We should go over that one.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: That’s why --

MS. JUNEMARIE BRANDT: We actually -- there’s one resolution that we had that we have
not dealt with yet, and I believe there is one that was passed out, but the Committee has not met on it yet. The one that the Committee has not met and made a decision on is the one from the Carolinas Bi-State Branch 936. So, we can’t read that for the first time because of the fact that the Committee has not reviewed it and made a decision.

Yeah, and please, all the resolutions that were passed out today, take the copies with you, please, so we don’t have to re-pass them out.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: All right. Okay. Now, before we recess, I will bring up National Secretary/Treasurer Chuck Mulidore for some final announcements, and then I’ll have whatever. Okay. Chuck, are you ready?

MR. CHUCK MULIDORE: Indeed. Okay. Good afternoon. All right. A couple announcements. From this morning, anybody still looking for this ring? I have it. It’s going to go to Lost and Found at the NAPS office. The ring will go to the NAPS office Lost and Found. An earring was found
today. You can see it. It’s a silver earring, it’s not mine. I don’t wear silver. So, it’s -- it’ll be in the NAPS office Lost and Found.

The New England caucus will be immediately after the afternoon session, Penobscot. New England caucus, Penobscot, as soon as we’re done here today.

New York Area caucus at the close of today’s session, they will meet here in front of the convention floor. New York caucus.

And you’re invited to the reception tonight from -- hosted by -- what have you got? Okay. Hosted by the Dillard Financial Solutions.

[Laughter and audience reaction.]

[Banging of the gavel.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: We’re professional. Come on.

It is hosted by Dillard Financial Solutions, food and fellowship, tonight from 7 to 9 in the Earth Ballroom, other side of the Mohegan Sun Earth Ballroom.

Reminder that Detroit Branch 23 --
[Banging of gavel.]

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Come on, delegates.

MR. CHUCK MULIDORE: Detroit Branch 23 is having a Tuesday night party tonight at the VFW Hall. Here’s the address: 91 Raymond Hill Road. It’s in Uncasville. It’s 3-1/2 miles from here. 91 Raymond Hill Road. 9 p.m. until 12:30 tonight.

And finally, oh, two more. Immediately upon adjournment, pictures in Brothertown Passamaquoddy, Michiani, Illini, North Center, and MINK. Pictures right now, Brothertown Passamaquoddy.

And finally, if you are running for office and you have music, DVD, CD, 8-track, marching band -- whatever you’re going to have, it needs to be with the AV people as soon as possible, like right now. So, if you have music or something like a video to give them, give it to them now. That’s it. Thank you very much.

MR. BRIAN WAGNER: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Now, just a reminder about Thursday morning. The walkers for the SPAC
Walkathon are to meet at, I believe, it’s 6:15 a.m. at the entrance of the Mohegan Sun. Is that correct, SPAC Walkathon? Don’t forget to wear your SPAC Walkathon shirts.

Okay. I guess we’ll end the day here, right? Thank you for your hard work, really, attention and efficiency. Remember, enjoy Wednesday, sleep late, have fun, enjoy the night. We stand in recess until 8:30 a.m. on Thursday -- in recess until 8:30 a.m. Thursday. Enjoy your day off.

[Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned in recess.]

[Off the record.]
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