

The Convention reconvened at 2:00 p.m., President Kinsey Robinson presiding.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Let's call the session to order. To begin with this afternoon, I'm going to call our International Secretary-Treasurer to the dais to introduce our next guest, a young fellow that has a very compelling story to tell. And I'll tell you, I hope you give him a very warm welcome.

SECRETARY-TREASURER DANLEY: Well, before I introduce our next speaker, as I mentioned yesterday, we had two of our own involved in some serious job site accidents and you heard from Billy Wiggins yesterday. The next individual you are going to hear from is an apprentice from Local 75 like I mentioned by the name of John Casey. Before I introduce him, I just want to thank the delegates for that vote of confidence that you just bestowed upon me a little while ago, so thank you very much. I appreciate it. (Applause.)

John is a 26-year-old highly motivated and highly regarded third-year apprentice with Roofers Local 75 out of Dayton, Ohio. He grew up in a small town in Ohio and graduated from a Construction Tech class at Green County Career Center after which he joined Roofers Local 75. John is a single dad of a 5-year-old son, Austin, who means the world to him.

John was badly burned when in the process of grabbing a 4 foot by 8 feet sheet of DensDeck he stepped back and fell over a mop cart full of hot. And to make matters worse, he landed in an area that had just been mopped. Dealing with second and third degree burns on his waist, chest, arms and back, John has made an amazing progress and is adamant about getting back to roofing. He maintains an unbelievable, positive attitude which will be evident in a few moments. John is a roofer. He would say that roofing is in his blood, literally.

Delegates and guests, please extend a warm welcome to John Casey. (Standing ovation.)

JOHN CASEY (Local 75): You have to forgive me guys, I'm shaking worse than the dice at the craps table out there. (Laughter.)

SECRETARY-TREASURER DANLEY: They're Roofers, they're with you.

DELEGATE JOHN CASEY: Basically he covered what happened. We were doing a tearoff; we tore off about 15 squares that day. And we had the ISO and everything on, putting the DensDeck back up and just -- accidents happen, man. Everybody just got complacent I think. We were just comfortable. We had a little pace going and we were in tight quarters. We were about 6 feet away from the edge and it just kind of happened. The first couple of slides I'm going to show you is the removal process. This was pretty much a couple hours after I got off a Care Flight. My dad took this picture. I had to be Care Flighted from Wright-Patterson Airport Base to Miami Valley Hospital Burn Unit, where the first three days I was wrapped in these garments right here. And they had tubes running through everything to soak me with mineral oil. After that didn't work as well as they thought it

was going to, they decided to get some adhesive removal from the janitor's closet and dilute it and put me to sleep to scrub it off.

This is another picture of me wrapped up. I was pretty lucky -- pretty fortunate. They didn't think any of the tar that had hit me in the face and top of my head -- they did think I was going to have to have grafts on my face and stuff, but fortunately it healed up. I can grow a full beard and everything is fine. My hair grows in just fine. That's my face, covered my goatee pretty much perfectly all the way down my throat.

This is my left arm. This is the arm that I had put -- when I felt the tub hit the back of my leg, I spun and tried to get out of it. I was pretty much committed to the fall at that point. And I spun, and when I had spun, I put my left arm down on the roof. And that's exactly where he had just come out with the mop.

This is after they got the tar off of my back. They had to wait -- after the -- they put the adhesive remover or whatever you want to call it on there, the mineral oil and all that stuff. They had to wait a few days, keep washing me, keep it clean to make sure all of that stuff had got out and until it had become what they call full thickness burns. Where -- if you can see in this slide a little bit, the yellowish stuff, that is what they call full thickness where I couldn't feel anything right there on my ribs. You could spoke it, scratch it, flick it, I couldn't feel it. And that's what they call a full thickness burn. And that's pretty much when they get ready for your skin graft.

That's -- that's where the tub flipped over on me when I was trying to get out of the area that had been mopped. I, in a panic, put my arm -- put my right arm down on top of the tub, and it had come over and flipped over on top of me.

That's my right arm that I set on the tub trying to get my balance. You get in it man, it's just like sliding on ice. You just can't get no grip, balance, nothing. It's -- you're in it.

This is more the removal stage. I can't really tell if that's my left or right arm. This is where -- yeah, right there, that's -- the white was what I was talking about where it comes in to play, the full thickness burns.

That's just before my skin grafts. I was getting ready to go into surgery there. Everything had -- I had been in the hospital probably six days at this point. It took them about three days -- maybe two, three days to completely remove all the tar and let the wounds get ready for grafting.

You can tell they had me pretty comfortable in there because obviously in this slide, I literally was on Facebook while they were taking pictures. So I was, you know, pretty comfortable. I didn't really feel much after I had got there. I mean, once I did, they took care of me.

So this is bolsters for -- this is how they keep the grafts on. After your surgery, what they do is they take these -- I can't really describe them, it's like a really thick pad of gauze and they stitch it into -- around the area, around where they graft. And it puts pressure on -- well, it was this side right here, but it puts pressure on and holds the grafts in place so they don't come off and get rejected. And actually, I had to go through this part twice on my rib cage because the first set -- this is the first time -- they rejected. And I think it was because they put them -- they put those bolsters on really extremely tight the first time and it ended up ripping the cartilage

in my chest, my pectorals. So at that point, like, I could barely move. So this is the back part of the bolsters on the backside. They, like I said, they just go and just stitch it all the way around the graft. This is after I've been released from the hospital. This was my first visit to the burn clinic. I go to the burn clinic -- I spent two and a half -- two and a half weeks in the hospital, total. I was released once I could do a full bandage change without any IV medication. They made me do three or four of those. I was just tired of being in the hospital, to be honest with you. It was driving me crazy, I couldn't smoke cigarettes. I had to lay in bed all day. So I toughed it out and, you know, I just did the bandage changes without any IV medication three times and the doctor said, all right, you can go home.

At that point, I went and stayed at my mom's house and she did the bandage changes and everything there. She's a -- she just passed her state R.N., so she was kind of familiar with that -- with what needed to be done and kept me from getting infections and everything until it all closed up. This is my left armpit. That was probably the most agonizing and aggravating burn and skin graft that there was. Just due to the fact that I have to -- I have to hang. I went to -- I don't think you guys got them around here, but where I'm from we got like Meijers, and they have like a \$20 pullup bar that hangs in your doorway. And I just went and got it. And I hang from it. And it stretched that graft to keep it from contracting. It stretches all my ribs and everything from just hanging there. I hang on the monkey bars when I take my boy to the park and stuff. But it keeps ripping -- well, not at this point, it's closed up now. It kept ripping. It would just close up and I would have to do my physical therapy and stretch it and it would rip again. And that's another picture of it from another angle. You can see right here where they took the donor site on my leg. It's a pretty decent shot right there. They took all the skin from my hip to my ankle on my right side and used that to graft onto the rest of my body. And that's pretty much like a wood planer.

When you get burned, your nerve endings sever. So, like I was saying, you know, you can flick it, whatever, like it didn't hurt at that point. When they take the skin off of whatever, they have like literally what -- it looks just like a wood planer and it just shaves the skin right off. And then they run it through a -- like a perforator machine to give the fresh skin -- like it almost looks like a waffle, kind of. If you guys want to ever see it or anything, just find me around here and I'll show you.

It's healed up now it don't look nearly this bad. That's part of the donor site.

And let's see. Is that the last slide? Yep, I think that was the last one. So that's what I went through, basically, and, you know, it's just recovering and trying to get back to work, really. I'm probably going to be on light duty working at the shop for a few weeks and they got some things planned on me. I probably won't be on -- won't be on a roof until next year some time, which is kind of a bummer but, you know, I don't like sitting around very much.

I'm real grateful for you guys bringing me out here and stuff. This, it is awesome. Like I didn't -- I don't think I deserve it. You know, it's just -- this has been an amazing experience. And I want to thank everybody for

hearing me speak.

And, you know, if anything -- if anybody gets anything man, like, I know a lot of you guys teach the apprenticeship schools. A lot of you guys are foremen or whatever. You know, just, man, watch the -- just the complacency. And, you know, getting comfortable -- getting too comfortable, man. People get hurt. That's all I got. Thank you.

(Standing ovation.)

SECRETARY-TREASURER DANLEY: Well, as I said yesterday, both accidents were tragic and they certainly were, you know. This organization and all the locals strive for zero injuries. Unfortunately, accidents do happen and John had a terrible accident. Billy Wiggins will never return to our trade. Fortunately, John will. His injuries will heal and they were quite graphic, so give him another nice round of applause. Thank you.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: You know, yesterday, I said the right to a safe job is a fundamental right of every worker. And that we all must commit to zero injuries on the work site. And I tell you, if John's story isn't one that we can take that seriously and commit ourselves to do what we've got to do to keep our industry safe, I don't know what is. And we have a gentleman at Mic No. 4.

DELEGATE BARNES: Yeah, I'm Steve Barnes with Roofers Local 106 out of Evansville, Indiana. Is there any way we can get them slides for our Apprenticeship Program?

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: I suppose that we could make those available. I'll have the Secretary-Treasurer speak with John. I think it's up to John whether he wants to have them available, of course. And if that can be done, we'll make sure we do it.

DELEGATE BARNES: I mean, that would show our apprentices what could happen.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Absolutely, Steve. I'm sure Bob will be happy to work that out with John.

DELEGATE BARNES: All right. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you for your comment.

With that, I'm going to call on Chairman Tom Pedrick of the Resolutions Committee to report on Resolutions 36 and 20.

Excuse me. I have another gentleman at Mic No. 4.

DELEGATE LUSSOW: Yes, President Robinson. Jeff Lussow, Business Manager with Roofers Local 26. It was a really compelling story that young man just told us. I'd like to see if we could pass the hat around for him, do a little collection up. I'm sure he's got a lot of medical bills and we should help the Brother out.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: That is a very good idea. Thank you, Jeff.
(Applause.)
Brother at Mic No. 4.

DELEGATE IRWIN: Yeah, my name is Glen Irwin, I'm from Local 119 out of Indianapolis, Indiana. And I just wanted to say I feel his pain. I've done that myself. I was 10 days in the hospital. I fell and got burned real bad and had to -- they used Go-Jo out of the maintenance room to get it off of me and it took two days to get it off.
It burnt my whole arm, a few places in my back. They took two skin grafts off my leg to repair my arm and my hand. And I was just real lucky to be able to play guitar again. It messed up some tendons in my hand, but I just -- I really wanted to say that, Man, you look good for -- I mean, I don't know where you was at -- what hospital you was at, but they really did a good job. And I feel your pain. And good luck in the future, and you'll be back at it. That's what I've got to say.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you, Brother, for your kind comments.
(Applause.)

As soon as we pass these resolutions, I'm going to ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to send the hat around and see if we can't help John out a little bit.
With that, I'm going to call on Chairman Pedrick.

SECOND INTERNATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT TOM PEDRICK (Chair Resolutions Committee): Okay. We'll first report on Resolution No. 36. The Resolutions Committee has met and heard testimony on Resolution No. 36 and its companion, Resolution 62. Secretary Dan O'Donnell will now read Resolution 36.

SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT DAN O'DONNELL (Secretary Resolutions Committee): Thank you, Tom.

WHEREAS, job-related injuries or illnesses can have significant impact on members, their families and employers; and

WHEREAS, roofers have one of the highest lifetime risks of fatal work injuries in all of construction; and

WHEREAS, roofers have a right to return home safe and healthy at the end their workday; and

WHEREAS, there always exists some combination of tools, work practices and personal protective equipment that enables workers to perform their jobs safely; and

WHEREAS, safety on the job site starts at the top and requires a top-down company commitment, making safety a core value so that everyone understands that they have a vested interest in creating a safe work environment; and

WHEREAS, everyone needs to be responsible for safety, from individual workers to foremen, project supervisors and company management; and

WHEREAS, striving for zero injuries makes sense and is a practical and achievable goal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Roofers and Waterproofers Research and Education Joint Trust Fund will team with signatory contractors and associations to work toward an injury-free worksite, where injuries are not acceptable and where both labor and management do everything possible to prevent them.

The Committee heard testimony and voted unanimously in favor of it.
Mr. Chairman, I move for adoption of Resolution No. 36 as read.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE CHAIR PEDRICK: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: You have heard the motion and the second. On the question? All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

The ayes have it.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN PEDRICK: The Resolution Committee has met and heard testimony on Resolution No. 20. Secretary Dan O'Donnell will now read Resolution No. 20.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE SECRETARY O'DONNELL: WHEREAS, a growing number of owners are requiring our contractors to have good safety records and employ workers with specific types of training before they can bid or be awarded a job; and WHEREAS, we have an obligation to our members, our employers and the end user to provide the highest quality training programs and materials available and affordable; and

WHEREAS, in order to be ready for future demands, we must set the bar high in all our training programs if we intend to compete and increase our work opportunities; and

WHEREAS, the challenges and demands of today's fast paced economy require aggressive steps to prepare the members and the unionized segment of our industry for the future; and

WHEREAS, the emergence of new roofing and waterproofing technologies demands that we do whatever it takes to maintain our involvement in the application and maintenance of these systems - whether they are vegetative or garden roofs, rack-mounted PVC systems, PVC shingles, air and vapor barriers, cool or reflective paints and coatings, or single-ply membranes laminated with solar collectors.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Roofers and Waterproofers Research and Education Joint Trust Fund will aggressively build and expand our Apprenticeship and Training curriculum so that we are well-positioned to provide the highly trained and uniquely skilled Roofers and Waterproofers necessary to protect our work jurisdiction, expand our work opportunities and install the more sophisticated roofing and waterproofing products that are emerging in both the residential and commercial roofing and waterproofing industry.

The Committee heard testimony and voted unanimously in favor of it.

Mr. Chairman, I move for adoption of Resolution No. 20 as read.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE CHAIR PEDRICK: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: You've heard the resolution and second. On the question? All those in favor signify by say "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

The ayes have it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Secretary.

Next, I'd like to call on the Finance Chairman, Doug Ziegler to give a report on Resolution No. 9.

FINANCE COMMITTEE CHAIR ZIEGLER: The Finance Committee has met and heard testimony on Resolution 9 and its companion Resolutions 30, 39, 44 and 56. Secretary Paul Bickford will now read Resolution 9.

FINANCE COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: WHEREAS, the importance of developing and promoting quality training programs, establishing and maintaining our ability to protect work jurisdiction, identifying and expanding work opportunities for roofers and waterproofers and their employers, improving the safety and health of roofers and waterproofers and their families, and improving communications between the Union and the employers have never been greater; and

WHEREAS, the cost of these initiatives continues to increase and current contributions will be insufficient to support these in the future; and

WHEREAS, the availability of grant funding from Federal, State and non-government sources is not guaranteed or reliable; and

WHEREAS, the development and delivery of quality and effective programs depends on a reliable, steady stream of funding; and

WHEREAS, the International Union and the signatory employers have an established joint labor-management cooperation trust, entitled the Roofers and Waterproofers Research and Education Joint Trust Fund, within the meaning of Section 302(c)(9), of the Labor Management Relations Act to develop and implement these programs;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Article II, Section 5 of the International By-Laws be amended to read as follows:

Section 5. Effective January 1st, 2014, Local Unions shall bargain for a contribution of no less than three cents per hour in all new agreements or renegotiated collective bargaining agreements with signatory employers to the Roofers and Waterproofers Research and Education Joint Trust Fund for each hour worked by all covered bargaining union employees.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee heard the testimony, voted unanimously in favor, and I move that we adopt Resolution No. 9 as read.

FINANCE COMMITTEE CHAIR ZIEGLER: I second the nomination.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: We have a motion and second. On the question? All those in favor signify by saying "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

The ayes have it.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Our next speaker is a gentleman named Randy DeFrehn. Randy is the executive director of the National Coordinating Committee for Multiemployer Plans. And

I know many of you probably have attended their sessions over the years. In his 35 years of experience working with multiemployer plans, he has served this community as administrator of national pension and health benefit plans, an employee benefits consultant, a registered investment advisor, and for the last 10 years, as their lead advocate and chief spokesman on matters of public policy affecting plans, participants and their sponsoring organizations. Randy has organized and coordinates the activities for the Multiemployer Pension Plans Coalition, a diverse group comprised of more than 60 employer associations, unions and large employers, plans and trades associations concerned with the ongoing viability of multiemployer plans and their sponsoring organizations. The coalition was largely responsible for the enactment of the multiemployer provisions of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 and the subsequent funding relief contained in the recently enacted Preservation of Access to Medicare and Pension Relief Act of 2010. On the health care front, he is instrumental in the coordination of the multiemployer community's response to proposed regulations implementing the Affordable Care Act. Randy is a member of the board of the Employee Benefit Research Institute, a member of the Government Liaison Committee of the International Foundation of Employee Benefit Plans, a member of the Health Sector Assembly, and a co-founder of the International Consortium of Advocates for Worker Benefit Security. A graduate of the University of Pittsburgh, he also holds a Master's degree in Industrial Relations from St. Francis University. Randy is arguably the most knowledgeable person on health and welfare plans and pension plans in the country today. The NCCMP does more for Taft-Hartley Plans than any other employee benefit organization. If your fund does not belong to the NCCMP, you should seriously consider becoming a member of this worthwhile organization. Delegates and guests, please give a warm welcome to Randy DeFrehn. (Standing ovation.)

RANDY DeFREHN (Executive Director National Coordinating Committee for Multiemployer Plans): Thank you, Kinsey. Hi guys.

... Delegates respond with Hello ...

This is that sweet spot in the agenda right after lunch, things are starting to settle a little bit, the eyes are starting to droop a little bit, but I have to tell you after just watching that session with John Casey, it's a sobering, sobering time. And certainly that's the kind of thing that gets all of our attention.

I don't know if that was an intentional set up for the rest of this -- my comments because they tend to be a little sobering, too; but we're going to talk a little bit about the two things that multiemployer pension and health plans are dealing with these days. And that's integration of the Affordable Care Act and pension reform in order to preserve our plans. So with that, I'd just like to kind of launch into a couple of comments about the Affordable Care Act. And, first of all, you know, coming here and talking to you today is absolutely -- to me, it's an honor. You guys are our members. But in order for me to represent our plans and our members and our participants, I need to hear from you what's important. And coming to Conventions and coming to meetings and listening to what you're dealing with

at the local level and, you know, the kinds of issues that you're facing in bargaining really helps me to be able to communicate that information back to the policymakers in Washington. And it's critical to hear that. So as Kinsey said, those of you who are members, I thank you for your support of the years and certainly for those who haven't joined, please consider doing so.

You know, the Affordable Care Act is a -- it's an interesting creature. If you step back and say from a social policy standpoint, is this a good thing or a bad thing? It's kind of like Medicare, you know, whenever that was enacted, everybody was fighting over it and the Republicans didn't want it, the Democrats wanted it under the great society, but over the years, it's come to be a really critical part of our social fabric. Medicaid is another piece of it. You know, Medicare was supposed to be for old people, Medicaid for the younger people and the disabled. But the bottom line on it is, if you look at Medicaid, it is probably the single most important social program for the middle class. Why is that? Because those of us who live long enough to have our assets depleted and end up in a nursing home end up on Medicaid as a way to fund that care.

You think about it. Before the Johnson administration, before the great society, those people had nowhere to go. And in those days, there was a much greater social fabric. The family held together more. You lived with your kids. You lived with your grandchildren. That doesn't happen now. Half the marriages end in divorce, and we have a lot of old people out there who live by themselves. Without those programs, those people would be under the bridge.

So, if we step back again and think about the Affordable Care Act, was it a good thing? It will take a generation or two to figure out whether it was a good thing. But the intent was good, to make sure that people were covered, that everybody has health coverage and that it's affordable.

What was our position before we started? What was your position? What were our employer's position on health reform? Well, we were facing years and years of double digit inflation and we all recognized that that was not something that could be sustainable in the long term. So what did we say? Well, we said, This makes sense. Finally, we're going to have all those guys who have taken the low road who don't provide benefits coverage to their employees and we're going to have a level playing field and they're going to have to pay something. Well, we all know that unfortunately as much as there was promise of that, that didn't happen in this act.

And the threshold for where employers have to worry about whether they're going to be penalized for not providing coverage is set so high that it excludes virtually the entire construction industry and many other industries where multiemployer plans are engaged.

How did this bill get enacted? Well, it's a study in sausage making. Remember they tell you, you never want to see how two things are made, sausages and laws, this is a combination of the two. Remember, in 2008, we had majorities in the House and the Senate and we had the White House, and as I recall, the story was permanent majorities. That was what they were talking about. We had 60 votes in the Senate, a filibuster proof Senate, and what did the Democrats do with that as far as crafting this social legislation?

Nothing. They fought among themselves for two years trying to put together some kind of a bill and they had to horse trade within their own caucus.

Senator Baucus jumped in and took the reins as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

And for those who call this ObamaCare, they're missing the boat. This is really OBaucusCare. And to have Max Baucus stand up and say that this is a train wreck, there is no engineer who is more responsible for what this thing looks like than Max Baucus. And that's not a good thing in case you hadn't noticed.

I get a little excited when I talk about this stuff, and I know you do too because, in fact, what happened here is not good for our plans. We had a law that essentially was the Senate side of a bill. And those of you whose familiarity with how a law gets enacted is based on what you learned in high school, forget all that crap. The bottom line on it is, the Senate passes a version; the House passes a version and then they get together in conference to sort out what's actually going to get enacted. In this case, though, when we got to the end of 2010 -- excuse me, 2009, we ended up with a major problem. The Senate had enacted their version and then Teddy Kennedy died. So that supermajority, that 60 votes, that filibuster proof Senate that we had failed to exist. And the Republicans said, "We're never going to pass another bill. If you want this law, pass what we pass."

How many of you remember when Nancy Pelosi was quoted as saying, "If you want to know what's in this bill, vote for it and then go read it?" Remember that? Everybody criticized Nancy for that; but the bottom line on it was, it didn't matter. If the House had not passed that version, there would not be an Affordable Care Act. I'll leave to you the decision as to whether that's a good thing or a bad thing.

But, again, from a social policy standpoint, the Democrats wanted healthcare reform, they got it. But we got a bill that's only half a bill. A lot of the things that were in there, that we were told as this was going through don't worry about it we'll deal with it in conference. And for us, the multiemployer plans, they really didn't even think about us. So we're kind of left out in the cold. And, unfortunately, what that means to us is all too clear: that rather than having a level playing field and having our employers and our participants be able to participate in either the exchanges or to preserve our own plans as we've been promised by a politician who continues to say this, that if you like what you have, you can keep it. How many of you actually believe that?

(No response.)

That's what I thought. Because the bottom line on it is, for our members, things have changed. And I want you to all recognize the leadership from your International, from Kinsey, in making sure that the politicians heard that message loud and clear. He was the first. And I'll tell you, he's not the only one that feels that way; but he certainly was the one that stood up and said it first. And he deserves a lot of recognition for doing that. Thank you.

(Standing ovation.)

After Kinsey's statement appeared in the press, we've seen others like that. There was a joint letter sent out by Jim Hoffa, Joe Hanson and D. Taylor that's the Teamsters, the UFCW and UNITE-HERE and they all criticize the law, but didn't go as far as calling for its repeal. Terry O'Sullivan at the Laborer's sent a letter. Ed Hill put an ad in Roll Call and The Hill

magazines on the Hill which said, "Mr. President, live up to your promise. Let us keep our plans."

Well, I can tell you that we've been engaged in kind of behind the scenes negotiations with the administration at the highest levels since this thing was passed. We were good soldiers. We agreed that we would keep the conversations among ourselves so that we could work through what our issues were.

What were our primary issues? Well, not only do our plans have to make the contributions to pay for our members. But the guy across the street who our employees are competing with, they're going to be able to go into these exchanges and get subsidized coverage. We didn't think that was fair. And we gave the administration a roadmap for how to allow our plans to have the same treatment as commercial insurance carriers and the exchanges. We explained to them that under the law, any time there's something called a statutory gap -- they didn't really think about us so there was a gap -- that the agencies who administer those rules could pass -- they have broad discretion in formulating the rules consistent with Congressional intent.

For 10 months, they told us, you know, we haven't quite addressed that fundamental question you are asking us; but why don't we talk about some other alternatives that might work? They finally came back and said, Sorry, we can't get there. So some of the other alternatives that we've talked with them about, unfortunately they can't get there either.

There are a couple of things that we've gotten. We've gotten the transition rule which we hope will remain permanent that says that an employer who makes a contribution pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement to a plan that's affordable and meets minimum essential coverage would not be subject to the penalties if somebody doesn't become eligible and ends up on the exchange. That's the transition rule. We're not sure that that's going to remain in there. If that weren't there, that would mean that that employer who's paying his monthly checks on time the way he's supposed to could then get whacked by the exchange. If one person who should have received coverage didn't get coverage, he could be subject for having to pay penalties for everybody that was employed, that's not right. We're continuing to push back against that. But the simple fact of the matter is that these exchanges are going to be up and running by January 1st. We've seen what a great job they've done with the systems to get people enrolled. That was something they were aware of for a long time; but the people who were at the top who were in charge said, We've got it covered, not a problem. So we'll see when the exchanges are actually up and running whether they've got it covered or not.

Our concern is that we have other things like a temporary reinsurance fee. That's that bellybutton tax people talk about, \$5.25 per person, not per member, per person. Every dependent per month, \$63 a year.

Local 1199 in New York, SEIU that's a \$20 million a year fee. For what? Nothing. This only goes into a temporary reinsurance pool for the commercial insurance carriers. They're the ones who get to tap that if they have one of their offerings on this exchange that has a bad experience, these dollars will help them absorb that adverse selection and that bad experience.

Can our plans tap into that as well if we have a bad experience? No. Do we think that's appropriate? Not only is it inappropriate, it's an incorrect interpretation of what the law says who should pay into that. The law is very

specific. It covers insurance carriers and it covers TPAs acting on behalf of the insurers. It says nothing about self-funded plans.

And other places where they wanted self-funded plans to pay in this patient research and effectiveness studies, the dollar and the \$2.00 fee, it says that everybody pays. The Administration tried to spread this out though so that the insurance carriers had less of a burden. That's not fair, and it's not right.

And we've heard some discussions about whether or not there was going to be a push back. Some reporters were asking some questions this morning. Even in the deal to reopen the Government and extend the debt limit, they were talking about maybe they would push that off for an extra year. Well, you know what, it doesn't matter if they push it off, it doesn't look like they're going to now. But even if they push it off for a year, if they're going to come back and tell us we have to pay it, we're going to tell them, we'll see you in court. All right.

(Applause.)

Okay. Now that I got excited about that stuff and my blood pressure is up let's talk about pensions.

You know guys, our multiemployer plan system has been around since World War II. They started -- proliferated at that point and grew and most of our -- as did most of our benefit plans. And, you know, that we've gone through a lot of changes over those years.

Our plans started out being pay as you go, just like Social Security is. Then we had the Studebaker situation back in the '60s where Studebaker had a lot of people that they promised benefits to, closed up shop and moved to Canada and left everybody holding the bag. And that formed some of the basis for the passage of the Employer Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA as we know it. ERISA requires pre-funding of pension plans. ERISA set up the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation, but the multiemployer plan guarantee that was set up there wasn't effective in 1974 or '76 when ERISA became effective. They set up the single employer guarantee but they didn't implement the multiemployer guarantee until five years later when they passed something called the Multiemployer Pension Plan Amendments Act or MEPPA.

And what did they do to get that off the ground? Well, they were worried. They had one big plan they were worried about, that's a plan we're still worried about, that's the Mineworker's plan. And the reason I know that's so was because I was working there then. I had the privilege of starting with the Mineworker's plan the day ERISA became effective in January of 1976. And I've been doing this for a hell of a long time.

The reason they were able to set up that guaranteed fund was they passed something called a withdrawal liability. And, you know, when that came out, I remember talking to the guy who drafted it. And, you know, this was going to be the end of multiemployer plans. How many times have we heard that? It wasn't. Our plans all had very modest benefits. We kept the lid on those benefits. We had very conservatively invested investments and then we had some pretty good times; right? We got back to work. We had double digit returns in the investment markets.

And what happened in the '80s and early '90s? Were we worried about withdrawal liability? What were we doing? We were passing amendments to increase pensioners benefits and give raises on the accruals so that the

employer could continue to deduct the contributions they were required to make pursuant to the bargaining agreements. We didn't care about withdrawal liability, it wasn't a big deal. Yeah, there was still a cottage industry of lawyers out there telling employers, you can't get into these plans as you've got this withdrawal liability thing. But it wasn't until 2000, 2002 where we had that tech bubble come along and kind of whacked our plans 10 to 15 percent, we were really worried.

It was the first time we saw three negative years in the stock market since the middle of World War II, but it was a once in a lifetime event. That's what everybody told us. The economists said, Once in a lifetime; right? Yeah, once in a lifetime. Well, seven years later, we had the second once in a lifetime event. I've asked my actuary friends if that means our life expectancy is now down seven years. But, all kidding aside, we had some very serious issues we had to do deal with. And that tech bubble, that first once in a lifetime event, precipitated the passage of the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

Now, we needed that because there were a number of plans that were going to have funding deficiencies and that meant the employer was going to have to kick in their proportionate share of those deficiencies, it could be maybe 400 percent of what they paid that year. And then they get the privilege of paying an excise tax running from between 5 and 100 percent of what that additional shortfall would be. We had to get that fixed and we did in the Pension Protection Act. They came up with some pretty bizarre changes for our funding rules, but that was the price of getting that done.

So, 2006-2007, we looked at these rules. A lot of plans said, You know, we don't want to have to deal with these zones, so we're going to continue to increase our contributions. We're going to lower our accrual rates. And by 2008, the first time there had to be a zone status determination done, our plans were about 90 percent funded. Seventy-six percent were in the green zone. And you guys that are the trustees, you know what I'm talking about. We only had 24 percent in the other two zones all together.

Fast forward one year. The markets drop 22 and a half percent as a medium rate of return for our plans. We thought we were going to get 7 and a half percent; that means we were down 30 percent by the end of 2008. And that just flipped everything. Now only 20 percent of our plans were green and 80 percent were either red or yellow.

And since then, we've been struggling. Why have we been struggling? For the same reasons we were having in the '70s, because there was no work. There's no work now. It's starting to pick up a little bit, but we have some opportunities that are coming at us down the road and we're going to be able to take advantage of those if we're able to get the kind of changes that we need now to the law.

We have a provision in the Pension Protection Act that is about to sunset at the end of next year; that's in the zone provisions. What that means is if you're already in a zone, you've got to keep doing what your plan says you are going to do; but if the first time you go from green to yellow is 2015, the old rules apply. If you have a funding deficiency, you have to make up those contribution deficiencies and the excise tax. Nobody believes that's going to happen. Congress is either going to re-authorize it or they're going to make some changes.

We think that because of that, we have an opportunity to fix the problems. We know that we have employers that are running for the door now because of withdrawal liability. Because some of those funding improvement and rehab plans we had to adopt under the current Pension Protection Act that have contribution rate increases that are 7, 8, 9, percent, 10 percent compounded every year for as far as you can see. And they're doing the math. It's not too hard to figure out that if those go into effect raising the 20-year cap on your withdrawal liability, and it's cheaper to get out now.

So those two factors and a third, which is that the financial services industry decided they were going to lay on new rules on employers to report possible liabilities. Possible liabilities, not real ones on their financials now are constraining our employers' ability to access credit. We had no choice but to go ahead and create something called a Retirement Security Review Commission. And we did that, now it's a little over two years ago. And we spent 18 months -- as Kinsey mentioned, we had over 40 groups in here. And it was basically all the labor unions that use multiemployer plans, their employer counterparts. We had some of the big employers at the table because they were going to be there anyhow like Bechtel and UPS. We had a couple of the big plans there, Central States, which everybody knows is in trouble, and Western Conference Teamsters, which everybody knows is not, the Mineworkers were there, the BCOA were there. That plan is also on the same trajectory as Central States, 12 years to insolvency.

So we knew we had our work cut out for us. We had two objectives: to make sure at the end of the day that any change we implemented would have regular retirement income, not change into a 401(k), not having a savings account, and the ability to save their own money. Boy what a gift that is, to set up your own savings account and go down and get a passbook. 401(k)s are okay for people who have more money than need the pensions. The average guy can't put enough money away to live off of for the rest of their retirement. So it was important that we did that. And on the other side we said, You know, we recognize that the employers are going to want to get out of the system. So any change we make has to reduce that exposure, that outside exposure for withdrawal liability. And so we created this commission.

I'm not going to go into their recommendations, they fall into three categories: Technical corrections to the PPA, fixing those plans like Central States and the Mineworkers that are headed for insolvency. Now, you'll hear some stuff out there from people like the Machinists. They all want to talk about the facts, and they just want to layout their own push. Because, quite frankly, they're more interested in their relationships with Boeing than their big national plan or their small multiemployer plans around the country. So they're saying bad things about this proposal. Well, guess what, most of our meetings were held in the Machinists' building with them at the table. Now, it may end up costing their administrator his job because he was there and he said, Yeah, I agree with this and he has supported us.

But we need to have the ability to act before our plans are completely bankrupt, and before they're completely insolvent. Because we have some plans out there that can be salvaged. Why can't we do that? Because the current law says we can't.

Those same people who will be driven off a cliff when their plan hits insolvency could have their benefits preserved at a much higher level if the

trustees and the bargaining parties were given the authority to act and intervene earlier. So that's one of the things that's in here. It's only those plans that are insolvent or heading for insolvency that would be affected. And our job was to try to preserve those plans and preserve benefits at a level higher than what they would get under the existing law. The last piece is something we call innovation. It would provide new plan designs that look just like today's plan designs but have a little bit higher funding requirements because they do away with withdrawal liability. We want to keep our employers in the system, and we have to keep our employers in the system. If all we have is a continually shrinking pool of employers, our plans can't be sustained long term.

These models work that we've proposed. It's very much similar to what the Canadian model looks like, and it's similar to what the Dutch system looks like. The Dutch system is one of the most revered systems in the world. They provide good benefits and they do it by protecting the participant and not making the employer the insurer of the performance of the investment markets. So with that, I just want to say one last thing and that's that you can see all of these recommendations at a Web site called solutionsnotbailouts.com. It's not a hard read, but it's a good summary of the activities that these groups engaged in for 18 months to come up with these recommendations.

Now, we expect there to be a Bill to be introduced before the end of the year in the House, and then we'll move that over to the Senate. We've got good bipartisan support from leadership on both sides of the aisle because this is the right thing to do. And as you heard Steve Lindauer talk about earlier today because both labor and management are going arm in arm to the Hill and saying, We need this. It's how we got the last pension rules adopted. And it's how we're going to be successful this time.

But it's not going to be easy. And we're going to have to be asking you and your employers locally to talk to your Representatives and your Senators and tell them that you support these proposals. Because we need to provide benefits for the generations that come after us and so the next 60 years people continue to receive benefits.

So with that, I'd just like to say that this is imperative. You'll hear Sean McGarvey talk about the opportunities we're going to have going forward if we can get this law enacted and these changes to the pension laws. Because I can tell you right now, having discussed this with many of the largest employers in construction in the country, they're scared to death of withdrawal liability, and if we can't find a way to get rid of it, they're going to do their work nonunion.

If we want to participate, if the union sector is going to grow, we need to take that next step in the evolution of our plans. Remember, pay as you go, pre-funded withdrawal liability and now we need to do something new and different and innovative: what we tried to do all along, and that's make sure that that guy who has worked his whole career thinking he's going to get a pension, does have a pension.

And so with that, I just want to thank you all again for the invitation to be here and for your support as we go forward.

Thanks, guys.

(Standing ovation.)

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you, Randy. We appreciate your remarks. As I've said, Randy is probably, arguably, the top guy in the country today on health and welfare and pension plans. And I'll tell you, you know, there's a lot of answers out there we're looking for, but he's doing the job by carrying the banner for all of us.
Delegate at Mic No. 4.

DELEGATE LUSSOW: Yeah, Kinsey, Delegates, I'd like to thank you all for donating to John Casey. I'd like to amend my motion, though, we had a brother, Billy Higgins yesterday that fell, maybe we can split the money between the two gentleman. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you very much, Jeff. And I believe that the Secretary-Treasurer has already amended that for you.
(Applause.)

Our next speaker is a gentleman that I've known for quite some time. And he is totally committed to the unionized industry and especially to apprenticeship training. He will be our closing speaker for today and his name is Rod Petrick.

Rod is President of Ridgeworth Roofing Co., Inc. in Bridgeview, Illinois, and he's a Local 11 contractor. Ridgeworth Roofing is a full service commercial, industrial and institutional contractor founded in 1974 by his father, Robert Petrick.

Rod has been involved in the family business since 1975 starting as a Roofer Local No. 11 apprentice and working his way up from the roof to his current position as President.

Rod is a Past President of the Chicago Roofing Contractors Association. He worked with the Roofing Industry Alliance to negotiate with the City of Chicago an amendment to the roof reflectivity required in new building codes. Rod is the Past President of the Midwest Roofing Contractors Association. And he has been involved with the MRCA as the director since 1998 through 2000 working on various different committees, and a Technical and Research Committee member since 2001. Currently, he is the MRCA foundation cochairman. He is also involved in the National Roofing Contractors Association and as past CERTA Task Force Chairman and committee member. This task force works directly with CNA Insurance on roofing installation procedures as it relates to torch usage on the roof. He has also previously served on the Labor Management Committee for the NRCA.

Most recently, Rod has been involved with negotiations with the City of Chicago as they prepare to update the current Energy Code Requirements. He currently is Chairman of the State of Illinois's Department of Finance and Professional Regulation Roofers Advisory Council, NRCA Technical Committee Member and NRCA Labor Management Committee, CRC and A&R Committee and serves on the Joint Roofing Industry National Labor Management Committee. As a member of the National Labor Management Committee, Rod works with us to develop and produce new training materials, like the Green Roofing Manual, and promotes Apprenticeship and Foremen Training around the country. I appreciate all of the personal time that Rod gives to make the unionized roofing industry a safer and better place to work.
Please welcome a true friend of the Roofers Union, Rod Petrick.

(Standing ovation.)

ROD PETRICK (President Ridgeworth Roofing Co.): Good afternoon.

... Delegates respond "Good Afternoon"...

You know, I guess I have to start. I was sitting in the back and watched John Casey and I had an opportunity to talk to him before he came out. And I can tell you, as a roofing contractor, you have a lot of, you know, balls in the court every day, you know, trying to get work, making sure that the guys are on the projects and they're coming in on time and on budget. But as a contractor that suffered through the most catastrophic fatality back over 20 years ago, I can tell you that that will wake you up. And the most important thing that I want to see every day is the guys that work for our company go home safe and that they are able to go home to their family and play with their kids and do what they have to do. That's most important for all of us. (Applause.)

You know I was looking at the agenda and right on the front cover -- and it's on the wall behind me: Proud, Professional, Committed to Excellence. I can tell you that when I have to go in and negotiate a project, we're always against the private work non-signatory contractors. When a building owner asks why he should use a signatory contractor, my comments to him are, that I bring a professional, trained work force that is trained to the current OSHA requirements, job safety and are updated by the manufacturers technical information so that we can put the roof on, and it will be a successful project. Most importantly, my men were roofers yesterday, today and tomorrow. I'm not --

(Applause.)

-- going to Menards to pick up labor.

Kinsey had called me back in August, And you know, he had asked for members of the contractors side of the committee to come speak. And I figured I was off the hook because there's a chairman that's right out of California. But Kinsey made the call, and I kind of figured I was on the hook. And he asked, you know, to talk about labor management. I can tell you that 25 to about 38 years ago when I first started, you'd hear the word "labor management" and you knew it must have been time for negotiations. Well, I can tell you now labor management is not just for negotiations, there's a lot going on. And I can tell you, you know, I guess that we're spoiled in Chicago because we have an excellent group in labor management to get together on a pretty much regular basis. Gary, we're still waiting for that phone call.

When we're out working together, you know, I look at it with the union and with the contractors, we have to work together. Some of the examples I can give you from being in Chicago, we've recently got started with a random drug testing program. It was a long and sometimes difficult task to get it gone through, agreed on, figure how we were going to fund it. And there's a lot of concern on how it was going to be taken, what was going to be the catch rate. I can tell you I'm proud to be a member of Local 11 because our catch rate in Chicago is less than half the national average. But the biggest bang for that is we now have architects, consultants, general contractors and high-end roof buyers in these Petrochemical plants that have now recognized that program. And they bring our contractors in because they know that we are committed to making our work force drug free and safe.

(Applause.)

You know without the union, there are no contractors and without the contractors, there are no professional applicators. We have to work together, and I think we do very well. You know in the old days, I can tell you when I was an apprentice, it seemed like there was a lot of animosity between contractors in the workforce. Probably 20 years ago that had started to change, and you see a lot more open dialogue working together.

I can tell you in Chicago that when we meet we talk about marketing, business development, and how we can better go after this. You know, and the challenge is for everyone to be sitting with their contractors. Because we are one, whether it's the smallest local in the smallest town in the middle of nowhere to the biggest local, which I believe is Chicago right now, we're all looked at as one. And we all have to put on that professional face and show everybody that we are trained. If you get a roofer that comes from out of town, he is trained to the same methods and applications as the guys that are in the area. And a trained workforce is important.

The Labor Management Committee and Kinsey had mentioned a little bit earlier. I got on the group and felt, you know, what are we going to do, have dinner and talk about a few things and that will be the end of the meeting? But it's a lot more than that. I can tell you recently Tom was sitting with a few of us contractors after a dinner meeting and we started through a couple filtered water and bottled beverages. We took and said that we need to get this labor management group on the road so that other contractors and labor unions in these areas can see what is being done.

Our first meeting was in Vegas back in March. I think we had four or five contractors along with the union officials and it was an opportunity for them to see what was going on. And it was a chance for us to be able to showcase that we are out here and we are trying to work for the betterment of the entire trade.

Part of the main thing, as I sit here and I went through the union's Web site, was the Labor Management Committee. We have to figure out how to recruit and retain qualified roofers. At our last labor management meeting which was recently held in Chicago, they rolled out a new type of training program which was all computer-based. And the gentleman that was there -- and I don't know if he's been here to show you guys -- but he had shown some stuff that he's doing for the electrical trades, which was phenomenal. And he did show some small pieces on the roofing.

And I know you guys have to vote on funding this. But I can tell you that when the apprentice coordinators go to these job fairs, instead of just having a hatchet and a trowelling knife on their table, if they have this computer set up with these programs on there, you know, instead of that young hopeful new apprentice looking at it and saying, I'm going to be an electrician, look at the cool stuff they do. They're able to look at the roofer and say, Hey, you know, these guys, they're pretty cool, look at what they're doing.

As the trade continues to evolve, we are going to be charged with having to get these gentlemen -- these young guys into the trade. Because if you look around -- I know when I look in the mirror, I'm trying to figure out who the old guy is looking back at me every morning.

(Laughter.)

We have the old members train the Trainers and this is something that is dear

to me. We're fortunate in Chicago, we got Marty Headtke who is one of the top trainers that does the foremen training. But there's a small group of trainers. We need the rank and file guys, the guys that are in the trenches every day. You know who the guys are in your local that could possibly be a good trainer. We need to expand on these trainers. They've got a Train the Trainer Program because it's not easy, especially when you're talking in front of your peers. I would have to say most of you guys that are involved in your local groups know most of the guys that are signatory in your area. And sometimes it's hard to teach because they're going to be razzing you and that. There's always some room for that, but we need to have more trainers. It's very important because as we continue to build modules. I was listening in the back that they want to expand modules on PV and cool roofing, that's stuff we got to have people go out and train. We can't just count on the three or four or five guys that are doing it. Because they also have responsibilities back where they're from, you know, in their individual home locals. So that is very important.

The National Apprentice Standard along with the Apprentice Curriculum, being an Apprentice Trustee in Chicago, I can tell you that within the next week or so, we start months of pretty intense training that I go on every Saturday. Those of you who have been to our training center will see that it is used and it is utilized. And, you know, we keep bringing these kids on, we have to show them, and that's part of bringing the professional roofer to the job. Foreman training, I guess I can tell you, and I think Kinsey would agree, we were doing a presentation last year in San Antonio at the IRE and a contractor from one of the northern states raised his hand and said, I didn't know anything about foreman training. And I actually think Marty and his group are going out to do some training up in the state of Minnesota.

For you guys in these areas, get it out to your contractors. Let them know what type of training is available. I know as a contractor we just got a letter from Local 11 and they list all the programs, the advanced training, upgrades, upgrade classes. And then I just write a letter, include that and every mechanic knows where he's a little bit weak. And as a contractor I can look and say, you know, I see these different projects that are going to be out in the next year. If you're a little weak or you don't have the expertise, go spend some time at the training center. I ask our guys to upgrade OSHA 10s and 30s because we're seeing the OSHA 10 now is kind of the standard. Most of these high-end users are requesting or requiring OSHA 30s. So make sure that you are getting back to your guys; let them know what's available at your training center. And if not, I'm sure if you call and let John know, he can get you the information that has to get out.

We got health and safety training. The hard part, you know, is looking at promotion and marketing. We do it in Chicago kind of on and off. And Rich and Gary can tell you, you can spend a lot of cubic dollars really fast doing marketing. And it's hard to measure the gain, but that's part of the, as we call it, the alphabet soup in Chicago. We have the CRCA and then the CRC. The CRC are the signatory contractors. It's interesting when those ads run. If the weather is nice, we don't get many calls; but you start having a catastrophic weather event or high wind, heavy snow and ice, we're not getting calls from the consumer: we're getting calls from the building officials and the newspapers because they go back and they say, "These are the

professionals, these are the guys we need to talk to." And if they're talking to us that means the union employees, whether they're from Chicago or anywhere else in the country are going to be up on the roof working. And like I say, that's hard to measure the value of those dollars, but when it starts to come in you'll see it and it does work.

And we have to foster cooperation. It's no longer us against them. You know, for us to succeed in today's marketplace, we all have to work together, and sometimes go hand in hand to a big customer to show that there is a relationship between both of us and that we are working together.

One thing, when we have our labor management meetings I sit there and I'm kind of in shock. Jim Hadel gets up there. I'm sure when years ago in Kansas City, when he was up on a pitch tear off and pitch back on, none of the guys working with him, himself included, probably thought he could walk into Congress and shake hands with some Congressmen and Senators and be able to talk about things that are important to our industry. Whether it's project labor agreements or Department of Labor on different OSHA regulations, there is a constant onslaught from the regulators trying to get into our business. We have a limited amount of tools in our toolbox that we go out every day that we can install: Asphalt built up roofing, modified single ply, whether it's garden and PV. And I can tell you now that it's just coming out that they're trying to take asphalt away from us. I would say everyone in here has probably worked with some hot asphalt at one time or another. It's a viable system that's been around for over 150 years and they want to take it away. We have to be smart and the way we do that is we can go back together as labor and management and show them that we have the trained mechanics that can install these safely without risk.

You know, a lot of this you guys keep hearing. I'm talking about professional roofers and professional contractors. We have to go back and you have to push that forward. It's the most important thing we can do. As I look at it, we're constantly in a fight for our life from non-signatory contractors in our area or states now that are doing right-to-work and through government legislation. So it's a challenge to everyone, whether you are the small local or the big locals. Work together. Get to know your state officials. Get to know the guys that are sitting up here because they all work together. And we're all doing one thing: to promote the professional roofing contractor and the professional mechanics that work for them every day.

Thank you.

(Standing ovation.)

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you, Rod. Rod works with us so closely that he knows every gentleman at this dais. And he works with most of us, not just once in a while, I mean on an ongoing basis on everything we are involved in. And I appreciate again his making the trip out here from Chicago and everything he's done for us.
Gentleman at Mic No. 1.

DELEGATE MENZEL: President Robinson, Gary Menzel, Roofers 11, Chicago, Illinois. I thank you guys for having Rod out. Rod is the epitome of labor management. He's done a great job with us. He works with us. He cares about his men. He cares about his industry. He

cares about his union. He's a card carrying member.
Rod, thanks for doing what you do for the industry. We don't always get along, it's labor and management. Sometimes he thinks I'm an asshole, and I feel the same. But we had dinner last night, we worked that out. And we're going to be fine together and we're going to work for the future.
If everyone in this room had more Ridgeworth Roofing companies, we'd all be in better shape. I'd like to thank him and his father and his family for their years of service and their dedication to our industry.
Thanks, Rod.
(Applause.)

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you, Gary. And make sure to put in that call to Rod, will you?
Maybe if we can run a little film piece.
... Trunk Monkey Sales video played ...
I'll now call on Jim Hadel, Chairman of the Law Committee for a report on Resolution 11 and 14.

LAW COMMITTEE CHAIR HADEL: The Law Committee has met and heard testimony on Resolution 11 and its companion Resolutions 31, 40 and 45. The Secretary will now read Resolution No. 11.

LAW COMMITTEE SECRETARY PETERSON: No. 11:
WHEREAS, significant changes in the method of payment have affected the ability of some employers to forward authorized dues obligation to each local union; and
WHEREAS, lack of uniformity mandates that local unions be authorized to require appropriate and lawful check-off provisions; and
WHEREAS, the payment of dues varies based upon days or hours worked or other methods.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Article V, Section 3 of the International By-Laws be amended to read as follows:
Section 3. It shall be the obligation of each Local Union to negotiate an appropriate and lawful check-off provision in each collective bargaining agreement to effect payment of dues based on days or hours worked or on a percentage of earnings.
Mr. Chairman the committee has heard testimony and voted unanimously in favor of it and I move for adoption of Resolution No. 11 as read.

LAW COMMITTEE CHAIR HADEL: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: You have heard the motion and the second. On the question? Gentleman at Mic No. 1.

DELEGATE MENZEL: Gary Menzel, Local 11 Chicago, Illinois. We've been trying to get a dues structure similar to what you guys are passing here at Local 11 for years. It goes back to John Martini's time. Our membership has voted it down every time we've tried to get it done.
We believe in this system. Our Executive Board has asked our membership over and over to accept this uniform system. We believe it will enhance the

economic development of the membership, the local. We've been to the guys and we've said, Hey, this is what we need to be on. We would like to see this resolution, but our membership is not in favor of it at this time. So Local 11 is against this resolution and will be voting no on this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you, Brother.

Anyone else on the question?

(No response.)

All those in favor please signify by saying "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(Chorus of noes.)

The ayes have it. Thank you, gentlemen.

(Applause.)

LAW COMMITTEE CHAIR HADEL: The Law Committee also met and heard testimony on Resolution 14 and its companion Resolutions 33, 41 and 47. The Secretary will now read Resolution No. 14.

LAW COMMITTEE SECRETARY PETERSON: No. 14:

WHEREAS, the obligation of each local or otherwise affiliated subordinate body of this International is essential to the continued operation and economic well-being of the membership and local unions and the International Union.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Article V, Section 12(c) of the International By-Laws be amended to read as follows:

Section 12(c). It shall be the obligation of each affiliated subordinate body of the International to negotiate an appropriate and lawful check-off provision in each collective bargaining agreement to effect payment of the International Work Dues; provided that the obligation to make such payment shall be the member's obligation and shall not be affected by the failure to obtain or arrange check-off.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee heard testimony and voted unanimously in favor of it and I move for adoption of Resolution 14 as read.

LAW COMMITTEE CHAIR HADEL: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: You've heard the motion and the second. On the question?

On the question? All those in favor signify by saying "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

The ayes have it.

I'll now call on Tom Pedrick, Chairman of the Resolution Committee to read one more resolution today.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE CHAIR PEDRICK: Okay. The Resolutions Committee has met and heard testimony on Resolution No. 16. Secretary Dan O'Donnell will now read Resolution No. 16.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE SECRETARY O'DONNELL: Resolution 16:

WHEREAS, the International Slate and Tile Roofers Union of America was chartered by the American Federation of Labor in 1903; and

WHEREAS, through an amalgamation in 1919 and Convention action in 1978 to

rename the organization the United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers and Allied Workers, this Union has stood 110 years as a beacon of collective action for workers; and

WHEREAS, our forefathers struggled and fought for our Union to receive a "fair days pay for a fair days work;" and

WHEREAS, through collective bargaining and the creation of pension and health and welfare plans, the standard of living for all roofers, waterproofers and allied workers and their families has been raised; and

WHEREAS, justice for roofers, waterproofers and allied workers is and will remain the commitment of the Union; and

WHEREAS, we want to express our deep gratitude and appreciation for all those men and women who strove over the years to protect our trade and craft jurisdiction;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that all members of the United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers and Allied Workers join in celebration of this "110-Year Anniversary" with a renewed spirit of commitment to stand strong as an independent trade union and to speak with one voice representing all men and women working in the roofing and waterproofing crafts.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee heard testimony and voted unanimously in favor of it, and I move for adoption of Resolution No. 16 as read.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE CHAIR PEDRICK: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: This is a good way to end a long day. You've heard the motion and the second. On the question? All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

The ayes have it.

Happy birthday, Brothers.

(Standing ovation.)

I'd like to call Dan O'Donnell, Chairman of the Trials and Grievances Committee to give a short report.

SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT DAN O'DONNELL (Chair Trials and Grievances Committee): I'd like to recognize the members of the Trials and Grievances Committee: Secretary Mike Vasey, Cleveland, Ohio, Local Union No. 44; Modesto Gaxiola, Las Vegas, Nevada, Local Union 162; Daniel Garcia, San Jose, California, Local Union 95; Enrique Subiono, Honolulu, Hawaii, Local Union No. 221; Gene Harris, Minneapolis, Minnesota, Local Union 96; Morgan Nolde, Oakland, California, Local Union 81; Ron Haney, Syracuse, New York, Local Union 195; Marvin Cochran, Columbus, Ohio, Local Union 86; Michael Kujawa, Toledo, Ohio, Local Union 134; Clyde Dale Rose, Charleston, West Virginia, Local Union 185.

President Robinson, the Trials and Grievances Committee has met and the case was dismissed. I ask that the Committee be discharged.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: All those in favor of discharging the committee, with a thanks from the entire Convention for a job well done, all those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Thank you, gentlemen.

I will now call on Robert Peterson, Chairman of the Officer's Report Committee.

We have a gentleman at Mic No. 1.

DELEGATE MENZEL: Gary Menzel, Local 11, Chicago. I would like to thank the Trials and Grievances Committee for a matter that was one of our issues. And I'd like to thank them for their time, their patience and understanding. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you, Gary. They worked hard and I know they deserve a big thanks.

Bob.

EIGHTH VICE PRESIDENT ROBERT PETERSON (Chair Officer's Report Committee): Delegates and guests, the Officers Report Committee consists of myself as the Chairman, Bob Peterson, I'm from Detroit, 149; Rich Mathis is the Secretary out of Chicago, Illinois, Local 11; Robert Stanton from St. Louis, Missouri, Local 2; William Wilmer, New York City, Local 8; Ed Rolfe from Boston, Mass, Local 33; Brian Greg from Detroit, Michigan, 149; Cliff Smith from LA, Local 36; Bruce Lau, San Francisco, Local 40; Robert Pearson from Des Moines, Iowa, Local 142; Fredrick Pollazon from Pittsburgh, Local 37; Darrell Hopkins, Sr. from Portland Oregon, Local 149.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has reviewed the following reports: The fiscal year audits from June of '09 through June of 2013. The cases heard by the International E-Board from October of '08 through August 2013, the minutes of the International E-Board from October 2008 through September 2013.

As it had been in the past practice of this Convention and the previous Conventions, I would make a motion to accept these reports as presented to the committee.

They are available in print form. I'm not going to read them all. So I'd like to make a motion at this time to accept as presented to our committee.

SIXTH VICE PRESIDENT RICH MATHIS (Secretary Officer's Report Committee): I'll second that motion.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

You've heard the motion and the second. On the question? All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed?

(No response.)

The ayes have it. Thank you.

At this time, I'll call on Secretary-Treasurer Danley to wind up his business and whatever he has to do to instruct you as far as meetings and so forth and times. And we'll move on and shut this thing down so you can go spend some time in Las Vegas.

SECRETARY-TREASURER DANLEY: Well, first the good news, following Brother Jeff

Lussow's recommendation in passing the hat for the two individuals, we collected \$3,270 in cash.

(Applause.)

And a \$100 gift card.

(Standing ovation.)

Nice job. I've just got a couple of announcements. Steve Barnes asked me to announce that he has tickets available for the gun raffle. Steve is in back, he's from Local 106.

And then I think the only committee meeting I've got on my chart is for Revisions, which I believe is Don O'Blenis. You want to move that up or leave it. Okay, so you're going to still meet in Chablis, and that's the Revisions Committee right after the session.

The Finance Committee in Bordeaux at 5:30 -- at 4:30.

All right. And then we completed a lot of the pictures this morning, but I know that some of the locals still want their pictures and stuff that didn't get taken. So if you want your group photos of your locals, hang tough here. Is my photographer still in the room or available? There he is, okay. So we'll get that set up.

Other than that, Mr. Chairman, that's all the announcements.

PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. This meeting is adjourned until 8:30 tomorrow morning.

(Applause.)

... Whereupon, the Convention session adjourned at 3:45 p.m. to reconvene on Wednesday, October 16, 2013 at 8:30 a.m. ...