

From: Pete Dugstad
To: Officers; Negotiating Advisory Committee
Sent: 1/23/2013 11:54:10 AM
Subject: Fwd: [phillypilot] Re: A Letter from Capt. Jamie Juvurek - A USAPA Founder

FYI

More new features from the Looney Toons:

Subject: Fwd: [phillypilot] Re: A Letter from Capt. Jamie Juvurek - A

-----Original Message-----

From: B767pilot <B767pilot@aol.com>
To: b767pilot <b767pilot@aol.com>
Sent: Wed, Jan 23, 2013 9:46 am
Subject: Fwd: [phillypilot] Re: A Letter from Capt. Jamie Juvurek - A USAPA Founder

From: b767pilot@aol.com
To: Phillypilot@yahoogroups.com
Sent: 1/23/2013 9:45:44 A.M. Eastern Standard Time
Subj: [phillypilot] Re: A Letter from Capt. Jamie Juvurek - A USAPA Founder

From: jamiejav@carolina.rr.com
To: B767pilot@aol.com
Sent: 1/23/2013 7:28:03 A.M. Eastern Standard Time
Subj: Re: [phillypilot] Re: NAC Road Show

To all. This is the reason I quit USAPA. Pat Szymanski along with our leadership has sold you all out on the seniority issue. The very issue Steve Bradford convinced all of you to for for USAPA in the first place.

The web boards have gone silent from west posters and the West reps are smiling from ear to ear. THEY HAVE BEEN PROMISED SOMETHING and I know from talking to my connections that a sellout is on its way.

The purpose of the CLT recall is for one reason and one reason only: to remove the remaining barriers of Gary Hummel to cram down a seniority presentation that pays your dues money to fund the West pilots legal team to have a seat at the seniority arbitration.

Pat said that USAPA represents all the pilots and to prove it he is arguing that DOH really means nothing.

If that's the case we might as well be management.

Sent from Jamie's iPad.

On Jan 22, 2013, at 23:23, B767pilot@aol.com wrote:

From: b767pilot@aol.com
To: Phillypilot@yahoogroups.com
Sent: 1/22/2013 11:01:23 P.M. Eastern Standard Time

Subj: [phillypilot] Re: NAC Road Show

I went to the NAC Road show last night in CLT and I thought I would pass on my observations and thoughts.

The meeting began with a short speech by USAPA attorney Syzmanski to explain the process of the MOU negotiations. Essentially, he explained that the Unsecured Creditors were driving the ship. They were taking an unusual active roll in seeing American through this bankruptcy.

They believed that the best outcome of this bankruptcy for their investments was that American merge with another airline before coming out of bankruptcy. The AMR management however, prefers to stand alone and come out of bankruptcy and then decide if it wants to merge with someone else thereby giving them more control over the process.

US Airways management has been working in concert with the Unsecured Creditors to force the merger before they exit bankruptcy. Also by offering the American employees a better deal than AMR offered them, they have gained the advantage of union support. To counter, the AMR management came back to the employee unions with a better deal than they first offered but still not as good as US Airways did.

Then Dean Colello, the NAC Chairman explained how the negotiations between USAPA and the Unsecured Creditors and our management came about and showed slides with lots of numbers explaining the offers. First how much AMR needed to save to be financially viable and how much our management offered and then how much AMR counter offered. Somehow we were not being considered in any of this.

Collello did a credible job for much of a power point presentation on the MOU explaining each section and how it will affect us. There seemed to be some aspects he was unsure like reserve and vacation bidding and could not give details in a few cases because the language seemed too vague. I suggest you look at the video that was made and follow along with your copy of the MOU for more details if you can't make a meeting. It would take too long for me to go through it item by item and I would get it wrong anyway.

Then began a question and answer period that helped clarify some of the missing pieces. I was able to ask about whether a change of unions would affect the Pension Investigation and I was told it would have no effect.

Several pilots offered passionate views that we were not getting anything for our years of sacrifice and wanted answers as to why we were giving up contractual items like Scope, Change of Control and minimum fleet.

Not sure that Dean answered to the satisfaction everyone or even anyone. Essentially he said we are getting more with the higher pay rates that would be retroactive plus the 14% and later 16% pension contributions plus the \$40 million split among the pilots. In other words, instead of a large payout for the Change of Control, we would be getting more salary and retirement. I wondered why it had to be either/or. It should have been both! We should get the higher wages, better retirement and some more money for Change of Control. Dean said they tried.

Capt. Grey Seymour was handed the mic and he was livid about the lack of monies for giving up those contractual items and was adamant that this may help the junior pilots but would not be as good a deal for the senior pilots, especially ones like him that only have a few years to make enough to retire on. One remark that stood out was when Dean said the junior pilots will have the career the rest of us should have had with this merger.

Colello suggested that the numbers show that with the higher pay and more money into Grey's retirement account, it will more than make up or the Change of Control money that we may have gotten. I could not give you an honest answer as to whether Grey is correct or the NAC's numbers are. Dean sure did not convince Grey.

Scope and Minimum fleet and block hours were covered again, it was all numbers and I have no idea who is correct. Steve Crimi wrote a very good letter on this subject and I sent it out earlier today. Another mine field with the company.

There were also other pilots that had similar demands as to why we gave up Change of Control and again, it was bandied about with numbers flying back and fourth. Watch the video.

Seniority. The 2000 lb Guerrilla in the room. As soon as the first question was asked about seniority, Syzmanski jumped to his feet and told Dean he would answer this question and then told the crowd he would not answer the question. Typical attorney.

There are many things in this MOU that are good and some that are bad but here is where the rubber meets the road and where this may be problematic.

There is a definite uneasiness whenever our leaders speak about seniority now. In fact, they are running like crazy from that subject, so first let me remind them that the USAPA Constitution says that any seniority will be based on Date of Hire with protections and restrictions. We didn't sacrifice so much these last 7 years just to give up now.

My BS meter pegged when I heard Syzmanski and watched the two PHX Reps standing in front of me at the meeting. My sincere hope is that a deal has not been made behind our backs. Syzmanski said at one point and I think he may have let it slip because he never said it again and then rushed over it, that the BPR must decide on what lists to give for seniority negotiations and eventual arbitration. I thought, "really?" What lists is he talking about?

Last night in the P4P phone conference, when asked that very question Syzmanski riled about the Date of Hire provision and even made the remark that didn't Date of Hire already cause you guys enough problems (this is not verbatim)? He did apologize later when he realized he created a firestorm during that conference with those remarks. But now you understand my concern.

There is only one list that we will accept. That is the combined list of the former America West pilots and the East pilots. Not two lists. Here is what I think could be happening. A deal might have been made with our officers that promises that if the west pilots will support the MOU, then the BPR will vote to send two separate lists to the APA. This could give for example, a 2003 date of hire on the west the possibility of being ahead of a 1985 hire East pilot. If there are three lists that go to arbitration, under the McCaskill/ Bond all three lists may be considered equal and could well be merged based on relative position. In effect, this gives the west the Nic without calling it the Nic.

How do you ensure a vote like that? We already have a 6 to 5 voting block with the 2 DCA Reps and Jamie Weidner in PHL voting with the PHX reps. Then get rid of the opposition in CLT through a recall and you have what you need. It may also be possible that some or all of the BPR is not being told the truth about this until after the recall, the PHL election and when we get closer to the seniority issue being included. If the 3 CLT Reps are recalled, even if the 3 new PHL reps are elected and vote for one list, we will lose that vote and two lists are sent for consideration.

Why are the west pilots being told to shut up about seniority and to support this MOU? **Watching the two PHX reps standing in front of me nod enthusiastically when Syzmanski said the Nic was dead made me wonder why they were so happy about it. It just shows how I feel about the untrustworthiness of our leadership and why we need an independent BPR.**

This is all the more reason for voting against the CLT recall of the 3 CLT Reps. We need to make sure those guys are not recalled and ensure that Paul Music, Paul DiOrio and Brian Pflanger in Philly are elected to ensure we have enough votes to carry the BPR.

All negotiations have a rhythm of their own that goes back and forth. Each side has a number that they will not go beyond. Each side measures the other side to see what leverage they have, what wiggle room they may have, how passionate they feel about what they are negotiating and how much support they have for their positions and the two sides go back and forth until someone blinks and a deal both sides can live with is made or both sides walk away.

We had a President that came into office telling the other side not to worry, he will get a contract. Kind of like a guy that goes into a car dealer and says he's not leaving until he buys a car. He is a car dealer's dream by advertising his intentions ahead of time. We also have a split pilot group east and west and factions within both sides, so we have a weakened position there.

Dean says they did their best and I have no reason to doubt him. But we also shot ourselves in the foot as I explained above and it put them at a disadvantage to begin with. He also said we left little money on the table but that is a subjective view since he could never know just how far the other side would have been willing to go if we had presented a tougher facade and a unified union. In the end, I feel we did not didn't set ourselves up correctly to begin with.

So, the question now becomes what happens if we vote the MOU down. Will the Unsecured Creditors come back or walk away and do this deal without us? Colello and Syzmanski say they believe they would do the deal without us. I have no information to the contrary so I have to believe them. They say without an MOU, the APA will decide our fate in a year or two. In the mean time, we stay at the status quo on pay, retirement and benefits. That would be an unacceptable scenario considering the retroactive pay.

I think the MOU stinks because there are too many variables, the language is too vague with a management group that is so untrustworthy and we should have received a better buyout for the change of control along with the pay rates and retirement. But it is what it is and nothing is going to change that now. That train really has left the station because as far as the Unsecured Creditors are concerned, the negotiating is over.

But I have to believe that we would be better served if we have a chair at the contract negotiating table where many things that are vague now will be negotiated and since we have a great deal of experience with this management group and how it places language in a contract that gives them loop holes when they want it, I think we need to be there.

The bottom line is this, do we take what we negotiated or wait for them to negotiate for us someday down the road and still no guarantee that we would win a substantial lawsuit for Change of Control or Min Fleet, etc. Look how successful we have been so far?

I am not going to vote yet so that I can continue to study this. I suggest everyone look at all of the information and decide for yourself what is in your best interest and the best interest for your profession.

For you junior pilots, what is negotiated now will impact you for the rest of your career, so stay informed.

Bill Glynn



[Reply via web post](#) [Reply to sender](#) [Reply to group](#) [Start a New Topic](#) [Messages in this topic \(\)](#)

RECENT ACTIVITY:

[Visit Your Group](#)

<http://groups.yahoo.com>

[Switch to: Text-Only, Daily Digest](#) • [Unsubscribe](#) • [Terms of Use](#) • [Send us Feedback](#)