



Welcome to yet another issue of *Ala Mai*, our continuing feature from ALPA's Communications Committee, now going public. You may know that in Hawaiian *Ala Mai* means "Wake Up," and we hope you'll read these messages and wake up to the reality of what's going on at our airline instead of relying on rumors, hearsay, or management spin.

Like a good cup of Kona, we prefer to take our information strong and hot, so let's discuss the ongoing propaganda coming out of Koapaka.

Enjoy this issue of *Ala Mai*.



Mahalo - Pūpukahi I Holomua! 

Ladies and Gentlemen - Spam Filters On

It's worth remembering that we are currently renegotiating the contract that was agreed to in 2005 to enable the company to emerge from bankruptcy. When we started this negotiation three years ago, we had a clear set of objectives based on your input. These were to: (1) complete our efforts to provide adequate retirement benefits for all pilots equivalent to those frozen by management during bankruptcy; (2) provide compensation for HAL pilots that recognized our substantial contribution to the company's survival and success and was consistent with Hawaiian's industry leading financial and operational performance; and (3) update our contract, as appropriate, to provide the company with the ability to continue its competitive position in the marketplace.

And as you know, throughout this process we've acted in accordance with these goals. We agreed to fly more hours when Aloha and ATA ceased service, get the Airbus online, allow maintenance of 767s in New Zealand and more. Some of these agreements were not without controversy among the membership. However, they were all done to forward our objective of supporting Hawaiian's competitive position when it makes sense for our membership. And each of them has helped us improve our current negotiating position.

So it surprises us to get yet another letter from Mark Dunkerley which misstates the pilot objectives we have voiced repeatedly to management, and which seems to forget or ignore the work rules and job flexibility that he has either already received or has been tentatively agreed to in negotiations. So we would like to respond briefly to Mr. Dunkerley's post-Thanksgiving letter to each Hawaiian pilot.

First of all, the company has not met our pay "agenda" as Dunkerley says in his letter. The company is asking for a longer contract, has not met our compensation goals until later in the contract term than we indicated was necessary, and fails to recognize the substantial and unnecessary delay in the bargaining process that they have caused.

Secondly, we believe that the individual projected pay assumption that Dunkerley provides for each of you in his letter probably includes three factors that may significantly over-state the added value above and beyond our

current contract that the company's proposal represents (the company has not shared their calculations with us, but based on their previous rhetoric and a quick analysis of several projections we believe this to be the case).

Dunkerley touched on one of these items: the fact that the numbers quoted apply to the highest-paid seat that you can hold. So, if you are a 717 Captain but you have the seniority to hold the left seat of the 767, the numbers you see in your letter reflect the 767, not the pay you could expect if you stayed in your current position. Similarly, if you are a 767 First Officer who can hold 717 Captain (perhaps you are holding out for 767 Captain – skipping the intermediate 717 step, and saving the Company training costs), the numbers quoted would reflect you as a 717 Captain.

Another concern applies to senior First Officers. Be aware that if, based on the company's assumptions, you are projected to upgrade within the term of their proposed contract, the approximate 30% jump in pay due to upgrade would be reflected in those numbers. This increase, of course, would exist under the company's proposal or ALPA's proposal, or even our current contract for that matter.

Similarly, for more junior First Officers, keep in mind that the contract already contains relatively large longevity increases between years 1 through 7. If the company is projecting you to be in that longevity range during the term of their proposed contract, then a significant portion of the pay numbers Dunkerley provided to you would be due to those increases.

As for the rest of the letter, we trust that your BS detector is switched on and tuned up. But in case you need any calibration, consider just one "work rule and management flexibility item" that Dunkerley outlines in his letter: "Required Company Meeting." Asking us to come to work to *for no pay* to hear a lecture has nothing to do with "narrowing the gap between us and our competitors." It is not necessary for the company's success, and isn't found in other pilot contracts. Despite our clear statements that we won't agree to it, this company proposal inexplicably remains on the table. The company is always free to require us to come in as long as we are paid. This proposal by itself puts their entire proposal, and their professed desire to complete negotiations, into perspective, doesn't it?

We will continue to negotiate. We will make changes, perhaps even those that would increase productivity or management flexibility, but only if they make sense and are appropriate for us given the circumstances. We expect management will continue to spend large sums of money on consultants hired to sway the negotiations by attempting to manipulate you, the membership. If they shared this money at the table instead, we might be done by now. We are looking forward to our next opportunity to close out this contract, and will keep you up to date. We look forward to seeing you at the meetings December 4.

The MEC,

Eric

Kim

Mark

Sam

