

EXHIBIT 1

PATRICK J SZYMANSKI, PLLC

January 3, 2014

Ms. Beth Holdren
Managing Director Labor Relations, Flight
US Airways, Inc.
4000 E. Sky Harbor Road
Phoenix, AZ 85034

Re: MTA Dispute No. 2

Dear Ms. Holdren:

I am writing in response to your email communications with USAPA Grievance Chair Dave Ciabattoni concerning Merger Transition Agreement Dispute #2 submitted by USAPA. The Union agrees to schedule this dispute for hearing in Washington, D.C., on one of the January 14-16, 2014 dates offered by Arbitrator Bloch. USAPA does not believe the dispute will require more than a one-day hearing but we will of course consider the views of the Company and APA on that question.

USAPA will submit both issues identified under MTA Dispute #2 for hearing. The Company's assertion that it does not agree to submit the first issue stated in MTA #2 to arbitration has no merit since the Company has already agreed under paragraph 20 of the MOU to arbitrate "any dispute" over the interpretation or application of that Agreement. USAPA does not require the Company's further agreement to arbitrate a dispute concerning the MOU. To the extent that the Company asserts that the first issue presented in MTA #2 is subject to the exception language of paragraph 20, that argument must be submitted to arbitration since it presents a dispute over interpretation or application of the MOU.

You further asserted to Capt. Ciabattoni that "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." The apparent consequence of this assertion—that the issue of who may represent the pilots of US Airways in the Section 3 and 13 process established under paragraph 10 of the MOU cannot be resolved under the MOU—is that the seniority integration process should await resolution of that question of representation by the federal district court in Phoenix. This is exactly the claim presented in the first issue of MTA #2, namely that the MOU does not recognize any

1900 L Street, N.W., Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20036
202.369.5889, 202.478.1646 (facsimile)
szymanskip@msn.com

Ms. Beth Holdren
January 3, 2014
Page 2 of 3

party to the seniority integration proceeding other than New American, APA and USAPA and that New American is not free to include any other party in the seniority integration process until there is a ruling by the court. If the Company agrees with this claim, as it now appears the Company does, it would be unnecessary to proceed to arbitration on the first issue of MTA #2 if the Company is willing to agree to act in accord with what now appears to be its position and to deal only with the parties to the MOU (who are clearly identified in the agreement) in the Section 3 and 13 process until directed otherwise by the federal court. Please let us know if you so agree.

Additionally, as part of the MTA Dispute Resolution process, including paragraph 6 of the MOU, USAPA requests that the Company produce the following documents concerning the December 20, 2013 meeting held at the offices of O'Melveny & Meyers in Washington, DC ("the meeting"):

1. any documents exchanged during the meeting and any document that lists documents exchanged by the persons attending the meeting;
2. any minutes, agenda or other document reflecting the issues discussed by the persons attending the meeting;
3. any documents reflecting statements made by the persons attending the meeting;
4. any documents reflecting agreements of any sort made by persons attending the meeting, including any discussion or agreement to future meetings.

Finally, the Company agrees it must arbitrate the second issue identified in MTA Dispute #2 concerning its failure to respond to USAPA's outstanding information requests under MOU paragraph 6. There is obviously no reason why the parties need to incur the expense of submitting that issue to Arbitrator Bloch given that the Company has not asserted that it refuses to produce the documents or has even objected to any of the requests. Failure to produce these documents has delayed and is continuing to delay the work of the USAPA Merger Committee in the Section 3 and 13 process. If the Company will agree to produce the requested

Ms. Beth Holdren
January 3, 2014
Page 3 of 3

information no later than January 8, 2014, then a hearing can be avoided. Please let me know if this resolution is acceptable.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick J. Szymanski". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Patrick J. Szymanski

cc: Paul D. Jones, Esq.
Robert A. Siegel, Esq.
Edgar N. James, Esq.