

Dear flight attendant,

Direct, open and honest communication is an important part of United's Working Together culture.

While we believe that labor contract negotiations are best left to direct discussions at the bargaining table, given the widespread misrepresentations about the current negotiations, we want to make sure you have the facts.

United Labor Relations



For the latest on negotiations go to unitednegotiations.com

We are fully committed to negotiations, and we're not satisfied with the progress so far.

- Despite having met for one week every month from January through April, the United and AFA negotiating teams have reached agreement on only two very minor contract provisions, “Missing, Interned and Prisoner of War” and “Jury and Witness Duty.”
 - Everyone should expect better progress, especially considering that many of the subjects addressed so far concern less-critical aspects of a collective agreement, such as jumpseating, cabin tidying, crew meals, crew lounges and duty free sales.
 - It's reasonable to expect that all these provisions could have been finalized in a matter of days, and we are as frustrated with the lack of progress as you are.
 - We've brought these concerns to AFA's attention, and they responded by suggesting we spend more time negotiating. But time spent in negotiations is not the problem. In fact, AFA has not even responded to proposals on seven different topics that United put on the table in February, March and April. More time in negotiations is not the answer.
-

We want to negotiate in a spirit of positive, open discussion and collaboration.

- As one might expect, AFA claims United is solely responsible for the slow progress in negotiations. But the fundamental problem is this: United and AFA have very different philosophies when it comes to bargaining.
- We believe negotiation requires positive, open communication, discussion and collaboration.
- We believe that we can find mutually agreeable solutions to real issues that benefit flight attendants and United.
- We're committed to the hard work of establishing relationships and building trust required for successful bargaining.
- We believe in making a genuine attempt to compromise and finding win-win solutions for co-workers.
- We believe our track record proves our commitment to reaching fair agreements.

We believe that for United to be successful, it is critical that agreements be fair to flight attendants and fair to United.

- ① We're committed to providing competitive and sustainable improvements in pay, benefits and working conditions.
- ② We're committed to investing in our people and our product, and ensuring that we're a consistently profitable airline that can provide good careers and retirements.
- ③ We're committed to working together with the AFA to reach a collective bargaining agreement that benefits all flight attendants.
- ④ We don't suggest that the rights and obligations traditionally outlined in collective agreements simply be left to company policy.

What's all this about "language" vs. policies"?

AFA's latest claim concerns, as they put it: "management's intransigence in their commitment to aggressively pursue an agenda to replace the language in our current contracts with their company policy." This is simply not true. Let's look at the facts and what actually occurred during negotiations.

This issue arose during discussions of contract language covering "jumpseating." In February, United presented a jumpseat proposal that stated, in part: "Use of the cabin (Flight Attendant) jumpseat shall be subject to company regulations, policies and procedures." Was this an attempt to replace existing contract language with company policy? Absolutely not. It merely restated the current S-UA AFA collective agreement provision on jumpseating:

"Flight Attendants shall be granted authority to use the cabin jumpseat in accordance with the company regulations and procedures..."

Responding to United's proposal, AFA proposed new contract language for jumpseating that incorporated processes currently in company policies—processes (or "rules," if you prefer) which today don't appear in any existing contract. In discussions about the Union proposal, company representatives at one point suggested that setting current processes in stone in a collective agreement may not be good for flight attendants in the long run, since future improvements in technology might support even better processes.

The union is entitled to disagree with that viewpoint and seek to put current policies into the collective agreement. That doesn't mean United will necessarily agree; there's nothing wrong with

What's all this about "language" vs. "policies"? continued

the Union proposing it. But it is wrong—and completely disingenuous—for AFA to accuse United of trying to “replace” current contract language with company policy, when the opposite is what actually happened.

United has never proposed or even implied that pay, scheduling, assignment of work, rest

requirements, safety or other important working conditions be left simply to company policy.

AFA's attempt to suggest this in their postings is false. It's misleading, and it's a disservice to flight attendants.

We have a proven track record of successful negotiations with co-workers and their union representatives.

- The claim that United's “tools in negotiation are to divide us, blame us and delay us” isn't supported by the record—the fact is that since the merger United has reached 15 tentative collective bargaining agreements with various work groups—including separate ratified agreements for each of the three flight attendant groups. That wouldn't have happened if we weren't interested in, or capable of, reaching agreements.
- While not all these agreements were ratified on the first attempt, we stuck with it and made progress.
 1. With S-CO IBT Technicians, Sept. 10, 2010, after 21 months of negotiations RATIFIED
 2. With S-CO IAM Flight Attendants, Sept. 30, 2010, after 10 months NOT RATIFIED
 3. With S-CO IBT Fleet Service, Nov. 19, 2010, after 6 months RATIFIED
 4. With S-CO IAM Flight Attendants, Dec. 17, 2010 RATIFIED
 5. With S-UA IBT Technicians, March 25, 2011, after 24 months NOT RATIFIED
 6. With S-UA IBT Technicians, November 11, 2011 RATIFIED
 7. With S-UA AFA Flight Attendants, January 9, 2012, after 33 months RATIFIED
 8. With S-CMI IBT Technicians, April 5, 2012, after 5 months RATIFIED
 9. With S-CO IAM Ground Instructors, May 21, 2012, after 15 months RATIFIED
 10. With S-CO AFA Flight Attendants, June 8, 2012, after 4 months RATIFIED
 11. With S-CMI AFA Flight Attendants, July 17, 2012, after 2 months RATIFIED
 12. With United ALPA Pilots, August 3, 2012, after 23 months RATIFIED
 13. With United IAM Fleet Service, February 13, 2013, after 15 months NOT RATIFIED
 14. With United IAM Passenger Service, February 13, 2013, after 9 months NOT RATIFIED
 15. With United Storekeepers, February 13, 2013, after 9 months NOT RATIFIED