

EXHIBIT A

From: Holdren, Beth [<mailto:beth.holdren@usairways.com>]
Sent: Friday, December 27, 2013 7:27 PM
To: Dave Ciabattoni; Malone, Linda; Mcintosh, Alli; Lyle Hogg
Cc: Brian O'Dwyer; Matthew Bradley; Sue Edwards; Laura Backus; Gary Hummel; Jeff Koontz; ejames@jamhoff.com; apa@mcstephens.net; bboguess@alliedpilots.org; Jones, Paul (Legal Dept); rsiegel@omm.com; 'Hollinger, Chris' (CHollinger@OMM.com)
Subject: RE: MTA Grievance #2

Dave:

In response to USAPA's "MTA Dispute No. 2," submitted December 24, 2013, this is to advise that US Airways, Inc./American Airlines, Inc. (collectively, the "Company") is prepared to select an arbitrator to resolve Question #2 regarding information production in the seniority-integration process. The Company does not, however, agree to submit Question #1 to arbitration. As reflected in MOU Paragraph 10(e), a federal district court, and not an MOU arbitrator, has the jurisdiction to decide whether the West Pilots have the right to separate participation in the seniority-integration process under the McCaskill-Bond statute.

Relatedly, I received your e-mail from earlier today regarding scheduling of the hearing in "MTA Dispute No. 1," in which USAPA declined the Company's suggestion to conduct the hearing on March 11-12 because those dates were not soon enough. Your e-mail states that USAPA would prefer February 3-5 as the dates for the hearing, and that USAPA would be contacting Arbitrator Jaffe today in order to reserve those dates, even though I previously had notified you that the Company's witnesses were not available on those dates. In the future, and in order to avoid possible confusion, I ask that USAPA refrain from contacting arbitrators to reserve dates that the Company has already said are not acceptable. Indeed, in this case, Arbitrator Bloch has previously offered the parties a block of three dates (January 13-15) that is sooner than USAPA's preferred dates of February 3-5 and the earliest available block of three dates.

Given the MOU's guidance that arbitrations should be conducted on an expedited basis, a point that also was noted in your e-mail, the Company suggests that the hearing in "MTA Dispute No. 1," and on Question #2 in "MTA Dispute No. 2," be heard on January 13-15, 2014 before Arbitrator Bloch in Washington, D.C. To avoid any misunderstanding, I wish to make clear that we are suggesting Washington, D.C., because that location is convenient for Arbitrator Bloch and because the O'Melveny facilities are free of cost to all the parties, and not because one side or the other gets to choose an arbitration location in a given case (as suggested in your e-mail). In negotiating the MOU, there was no contemplation that arbitration locations would alternate from one case to the next and, except for instances in which a particular location is preferred by the arbitrator, we expect arbitration hearings to be held in DFW.

Please let me know, as soon as feasible, whether USAPA is available to hold the two hearings on January 13-15 as outlined above. I am copying APA on this message to inquire as to their availability as well.

Thanks. Happy New Year.

Beth Holdren-
Managing Director Labor Relations, Flight
480-693-8612 Office
480-693-1395 Fax