



Negotiations Session 5, March 2024

 WEBMASTER / APRIL 20, 2024 / MEC



HORIZON AIR MASTER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
STRONGER TOGETHER ✈️ BETTER TOGETHER
AFA-CWA, AFL-CIO
www.afahorizon.org

Getting Closer...But Not Making Much Headway

AFA and management met March 26-28, 2024, to continue negotiations for our new contract. The AFA Committee consists of MECP Lisa Davis Warren, Heather Coleman, Lexie Massey (all current Flight Attendants) and our Staff Attorney and Negotiator, Kimberley Chaput. Management was represented by Shelly Parker, Vice President Station Ops and Inflight; William Casalins Altimar, Manager, Inflight Labor, and Performance; Amber Hopkins, Director, Finance; Latrice Lee, Senior Corporate Counsel, Alaska Legal; and Molly Gabel, Partner, Labor and Employment (outside legal counsel).

As in our February session, Jamie Moore (AIMS, Reserve Chair) and Scheduling Chair Claire Michaels, assisted AFA, and Mick Neiman, Director of Crew Support, worked with management.

It was a busy session! We discussed the following this week:

Article 5 (Hours of Service)

AFA proposed twelve hours of rest at domicile (waivable to 10) and eleven hours (nine at the hotel) on a RON, along with a maximum eleven-hour scheduled duty period. We also proposed limiting our duty period to a maximum of five legs, with no more than four of them working legs. Management rejected this proposal, asserting that they need to

control the schedule and could not afford any loss in productivity.

Claire Michaels researched the effect these improvements would have on our pairings, and there would be some increase in costs versus our current rest and duty rules. We are also aware that Flight Attendants have different needs and preferences. We will continue to consider these as we move forward.

AFA also proposed to cap the maximum rescheduled duty period to twelve hours, with the Flight Attendant having an option to be paid double time if they agree to fly over 12 hours (but no more than 14) if that last leg is a deadhead to a place of rest. We also proposed premium pay for being rescheduled past midnight on the last day of a trip. The flying could not go past 2:00 am, or it would be considered a new calendar day. Management did not agree to any aspect of our proposal on this Article.

AFA also proposed to explicitly spell out the current practice of allowing Flight Attendants to waive contractual duty and contractual domicile rest at any stage down to FAR minimums at any point, whether it be in PBS or in the trip-trading process. (RON rest cannot be waived as it is built into the pairings.) Management said no, but their reasoning was unclear.

We did agree that a Flight Attendant could call crew scheduling to have their release time adjusted to reflect the time deplaning was completed. Management rejected our proposal to adjust duty time following arrival at a hard stand, claiming that that was not within their control.

We also agreed on a change to the use of golden days that will essentially only apply if a Flight Attendant plans, in advance, to leave the Company sometime during an upcoming month. This usually happens when a Flight Attendant starts initial training at Alaska. As an example, currently a Flight Attendant scheduled to leave Horizon on June 7 could use up to four golden days in June. And since a minimum of two golden days must be taken, it becomes very difficult for PBS to build them a line. We have worked out a proration system for using golden days that will ensure the departing Flight Attendant will be awarded a line of pairings/reserve. This will have a positive ripple effect on any Flight Attendants junior to the departing Flight Attendant.

Article 6 (Crew Scheduling)

Management responded to our proposal, and we were quite disappointed. They continue to refuse to allow more flexibility in the pairing build, including the length of pairings.

Again, they claim they need that control, but they did not articulate why or how our proposals would harm them.

Management also rejected our proposal to require a maximum number of lines that contain coverage awards. They also were not interested in our proposal for a minimum number of minimum and maximum credits lines in each domicile. Again, they fear any loss of control.

Management wants to decimate our SAP settlement so that it would only apply if SAP did not open on time and would only be paid to Flight Attendants in the affected domicile(s) if SAP was delayed more than two hours. The pay would be 0.5 credits per hour, with a maximum of six credits. With the two-hour free period, compensation would be capped at 14 hours and six credits. While we realize that the SAP settlement has periodically been costly to the Company, a) they did agree to it; b) SAP is critical to Flight Attendants; and c) SAP's functionality is within their control. This is a huge ask of Flight Attendants, and they are offering nothing in return.

Management also rejected our proposal to trade carryover trips in SAP. They did not have a reason for saying no, even after we explained the history behind the provision (former leadership's security blanket in exchange for getting rid of blackout days during transition). Since the original concerns were unfounded, there really is no basis for excluding carryover trips from SAP.

Management likewise was not interested in our proposals to increase trading flexibility.

We are not clear on management's obsession with control. Obviously, they ultimately need to operate the schedule efficiently. But Flight Attendants also need some control over our own schedules, or at least the option to do so when necessary. We sense that the issue comes down to fear. They fear that the operation will fall apart, and they fear that we do not care. What they are missing is trust and respect. We want our Company to succeed, and we want the operation to function—this means we fly what we bid and get home on time. But our morale falls when we cannot get certain days off when we need. This is critical to our quality of life. Management is unwilling to cede any control to help us achieve a better work-life balance.

Article 7 (Reserve)

Management gave us their opening proposal on reserve, and, well, it is remarkably bad! First off, management wants to be able to change your 14-hour reserve period after the

first day of the block. Under their proposal, you could be AM on Monday but PM for the rest of the block. Currently, if your flying takes you past the end of your reserve period, you will be placed on rest for 10 hours and then back on reserve, but only until the end of your originally scheduled RAP. One of the reasons we agreed to the Alaska reserve policy in the last contract was to end management's right to switch our reserve shifts. Now they want that option back.

Next, management wants the ability to assign Reserves to an initial 14-hour duty period, it's currently 12. The rationale is that they want to be able to assign (for example) a SEA Flight Attendant to deadhead to/from ANC to fly an ANC-FAI turn without having to schedule them to an overnight and then reschedule them to a turn. They should not be doing this in the first place, and it sounds exhausting. We are researching the potential for a grievance on this practice. Equally, management is not proposing any limitations—if they wanted to, this proposal would allow them to schedule ALL reserve for 14 hours of duty. This means a reserve could sit 14 hours on reserve (12 plus call out) and THEN fly for 14 hours. This is insane, as well as severely unhealthy.

Management would also like to increase the number of times a Reserve could be assigned APSB without receiving premium pay from four to seven. They claim that 36% of all premium pay is currently paid for this purpose. We do not know what that 36% represents. We have asked them for more details on this information. They also did not tell us how many times a Reserve had been scheduled to APSB more than seven times, or how many times they had been scheduled to more than four. Without this data, we cannot tell how meaningful this provision would be, so we have asked for more information.

This is not the time for concessions in a contract. AFA will be responding at the next session.

Article 11 Vacation

AFA proposed significant changes to our vacation section. We asked for greater accruals and a higher vacation value. We also proposed a fix to our biggest vacation issue, demanding an assurance that the Company would put enough weeks out for bid to cover all vacation projected to be in Flight Attendant's banks by the end of the year. All other carriers do this. Our pilots do this. When we are unable to use our vacation, the Company is essentially taking away an earned, negotiated benefit. This is not acceptable.

Management will respond at our next session.

Article 14 (Leaves of Absence)

AFA opened on several items in this Article. We asked to extend the period a Flight Attendant may remain insured at employee rates to 12 months for medical/maternity leave and unlimited for worker's compensation leaves. We made some adjustments to comply with state paid sick leave laws. And we proposed that dependents could travel while the Flight Attendant was on leave, and that the Flight Attendant could travel if it was not inconsistent with medical restrictions. Management will respond at the next session.

Next Session

We are getting much closer to what we call a "comprehensive proposal," which is a proposal that covers the entire contract. It would include everything agreed to so far, as well as proposals on all remaining open issues. This allows both sides to see the proposed contract as a whole and to package proposals based on the whole contract, not just the section we're working on. We usually see greater movement by both sides when smaller items begin to drop off or are agreed to, in the interest of focusing on the main issues. We expect to be ready for a comprehensive proposal after just a couple more sessions, but we need to work through the remaining open articles before we do so.

Our next session will be April 15-17, 2024. We are hoping for significant movement from management, but we are not holding our breath. Please wear your white AFA pin and remember that you are not required to discuss negotiations with management. Just politely remind them, "My Negotiating Committee speaks for me!"

Until that time remember that we are **Stronger Together, Better Together!**



