



ASSOCIATION OF FLIGHT ATTENDANTS-CWA, AFL-CIO

HAWAIIAN AIRLINES ■ MASTER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ■

WWW.HAWAIIANAFI.ORG → → →  HAWAIIANAFI

May 15, 2022
Special Meeting – MEC Recall

Dear Flight Attendants –

We ask you to read this important communication in its entirety so you can understand today's MEC Recall of the MEC President and MEC Vice President. The MEC Recall was not an easy decision. However, it was something we felt was necessary in order to serve you, our members, in the way that you deserve.

This communication will explain the basis and our reasons for the recall petition, including providing links and attachments as a reference for you to our [Constitution and ByLaws](#) (C&B), and will also share the voting results and outcome.

The **Ongoing Concerns and Issues** that brought us to this decision are found in the attachment below. The core concern is the inability of the recalled MEC officers to hold management accountable to the contract that we all fought hard for.

The Council 43 Leadership Executive Council (LEC) discussed a recall of the Master Executive Council (MEC) President and MEC Vice President immediately following the mass terminations of our fellow Flight Attendants. It was the disregard and lack of support in these separation hearings that the LEC 43 team determined that they had no choice but to move forward with the recall. While preparing our many grievances for the System Board of Adjustment process, we lost hope that we would have even a minimal amount of support from the MEC to expeditiously process termination cases and other outstanding contractual issues. This is the basis for our MEC Officer recall.

According to our [AFA-CWA structure](#), the MEC works at the direction of the LEC Presidents. Our leadership duty is basic - to serve and protect the rights of all Members.

We initially petitioned the MEC office for the recall in accordance with the C & B. This Special Meeting was to take place on April 15, 2022. On the day of the meeting, there were scheduling concerns for two of the five attendees. It was at the direction of the AFA International Office to petition the scheduling of the Special Meeting during our 49th Annual Board of Directors (BOD) meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada. The rationale for this timing was that all parties would be present so a quorum could take place and the meeting could continue. This also allowed the AFA International officers to be present.

We petitioned AFA International President Sara Nelson for a Special Meeting. The meeting was set for May 15, 2022. In attendance were the three (3) MEC Officers and two (2) LEC Presidents and AFA International Officers. Both LEC Presidents cast their votes based on a set number of votes for each Council, using the 2022 BOD Roll Call numbers. The AFA International President was the chairperson of the meeting that started at 800 am/PST (500 am/H ST).

The MEC Officers and LEC Presidents were the only participants with speaking privileges. Statements and questions were made before the voting took place. The votes were cast by the two (2) LEC Presidents. This is the process outlined by the Constitution and ByLaws.



ASSOCIATION OF FLIGHT ATTENDANTS-CWA, AFL-CIO

HAWAIIAN AIRLINES ■ MASTER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ■

WWW.HAWAIIANAFA.ORG → → →  HAWAIIANAFA

The vote results are as follows:

Agenda Item #1: Recall of the Hawaiian Airlines Master Executive Council Vice President

Council 43/HNL votes for: 1310

Council 43/HNL votes against: 69

Council 47/LAX votes against: 106

Agenda Item #2: Recall of the Hawaiian Airlines Master Executive Council President

Council 43/HNL votes for: 1310

Council 43/HNL votes against: 69

Council 47/LAX votes against: 106

Council 43/HNL's votes reflect the four Flight Attendants who reached out via email speaking against the MEC Recall of the MEC President and MEC Vice President. A 5% buffer was added for those who may not have wanted to support the recall but did not reach out.

The outcome of the vote is that the MEC President and MEC Vice President were recalled and no longer in office as a result of the vote. Per the Constitution and ByLaws, Chastity Theno, MEC Secretary-Treasurer is now Acting MEC President.

Moving forward, the International Office will assist with the transition, adhering to the C & B, Article VII. Airline Master Executive Councils, C. Officers, 3. Vacancies in Office of Master Executive Council, f and g.

Many of you may have questions. And we hope the following information will help you understand what led to this petition and why we believe that it was the only recourse given the many challenges over the almost two years.

For **"Ongoing Concerns and Issues"**, please see below

We plan to host a Membership meeting after our return from the BOD. The purpose is to share the MEC Recall process and what led to this decision and action. We ask that you join us so you can ask questions that pertain to the Council 43 Leadership and work. We will also provide meeting notes for those who are unable to attend the meeting. The date and time will be forthcoming.

Thank you for your patience and understanding through this matter. We have a responsibility to our entire membership. The MEC office directly affects you and we will address your questions and concerns about the MEC Recall.

In Unity,
Jaci-Ann, Kahea, Kerri,

MEC OFFICER RECALL – Ongoing Concerns and Issues

** this is a general list of reasonings for the recall of MECP and MECVP*

Failure to expeditiously/promptly process complaints and grievances.

It is the MEC that is responsible to grieve issues that impact the membership as a whole. Council 43 (C43) has repeatedly asked for the filing of various MEC grievances. The failure to utilize the grievance process to its best and greatest use is a detriment to the membership. The grievance process is what upholds our hard-earned contractual rights. Some of the long-standing issues that we believe warrant an MEC grievance are:

- **Uniforms and Luggage-** Numerous concerns were communicated by the LEC to the MEC regarding issues surrounding uniforms and luggage dating back to 2019. Some of these specific issues include: aprons, ordering, rollerboards, back orders, and minimal complement for new hires.

C43 conducted a membership survey to demonstrate the brevity of the issue. Most importantly an email was sent in October 2021 to the MEC specifically requesting a MEC grievance be filed for this continued issue. This request was ignored.

As it currently stands new hire flight attendants begin their careers in uniforms donated by fellow flight attendants. It is not unheard of for them to have only a single set of uniforms to wear. Despite this they are still required to pay for their uniforms. It is the company's responsibility to ensure employees are provided with uniforms. Exchanging and donating uniform pieces and luggage should not be the necessary or accepted remedy.

These various issues continue to remain without improvement despite the MEC's "discussions" with the Company.

- **Crew Meal Improvement Budget Reconciliation-** AFA participants in crew meal meetings have requested a reconciliation of additional funds allocated to crew meals as a part of the 787 Sideletter. An additional \$550,000 annually beginning in 2018 was allocated for this purpose. At the most basic level, C43 has asked how much the improved meals have cost annually, and what was the difference between the meal costs prior to the improvement allowance. Without even a basic accounting it is impossible to determine if funds are being adequately utilized. This budget request has been made since 2019. The MEC has failed to facilitate this request which ultimately prevents additional improvements from being made.
- **Vacation Accrual-** An inquiry was initiated in October 2020 regarding a shortage in vacation days (as compared to the year prior). An audit was discussed with the Company however it appears that this issue is far more extensive than initially thought and the audit has not been completed. It appears a grievance was filed 3/31/2022 however the status of this grievance and issue have not been communicated.

- **Reserve Issues** such as being asked to call Crew Scheduling when you land, before going to sleep and after you wake up, ARC legality and time out.
- **Contract Hard Copies**- Copies of the 2020 contract have not been made available beyond the initial ordering period.
- **MEC Scheduling Policy Committee has yet to be convened with the Company.**
- **Posting of Recall List**
- **CrewTrac Login Failure**
- **MEC Advanced Notice of Charters**

System Board of Adjustment (SBA) Meetings – despite the tremendous case load and backlog of SBA cases, meetings are not scheduled accordingly (monthly per the MEC Policy & Procedures Manual).

C43 worked along with the MEC to address the decade old backlog of SBA cases. Initially the number of cases totaled more than 100. Many of these cases were settled by the Company with a pay remedy, while this may sound like a successful remedy, it was settled as a “one off” and does not resolve the fundamental issue. This prevents the ability to demonstrate systemic contractual violations.

At other AFA carriers and other flight attendant unions arbitrations are regularly and systematically scheduled on an annual basis. The Hawaiian AFA rarely schedules arbitrations. Our last arbitrated case was several years ago.

When the grievance and arbitration process are not adequately and expeditiously utilized it sends a message that we accept the violations of our hard earned contractual language. Examples- Trips published, Not flown

Inclusion and Collaboration: C43 has made repeated requests to have the appropriate Committee Chairs included as stakeholders and/or subject matter experts in relevant projects etc. For example:

- **Negotiating Committee (NC)**- In years past the NC would be included in any grievance conversations as the Contract Subject Matter Expert as they had the best understanding of the intent of the language and history. Likewise for Company policy if there is a relation to the CBA. Currently this request was generally unfulfilled but for a small handful of instances.
- **Reserve Self-Assignment (RSA) Program** – Repeated requests were made for the Negotiating Chair and Reserve Chair to be included in the implementation of this process and roll out of the program. The MEC Reserve chair was excluded from all conversations with regard to RSA. Once the Company announced the roll out of RSA on May 4th 2022 the Reserve Chair questioned the MEC as to why he was not aware of the roll out. It was not until then that he was included.

MEC Meetings with the Company – meeting notes should be provided to leadership following Company meetings. To date there are monthly meetings with the Vice President of In-Flight that are unaccounted for. These notes would assist your local officers in the day to day operations in support of the membership.

Negotiating Committee, Notes –there have been repeated requests for the NC Committee notes to be provided for the archives; the complete notes from committee member Martin Gusman are unaccounted for. Such material is generally acknowledged as AFA property and not the property of an individual.

Contract Education: Council 43 was looking forward and preparing for Contract education for all Members immediately after the 2020 CBA was ratified. However, there was an extraordinary delay due to the pandemic. On the other hand, once the work of the Voluntary Early Out Program (VEOP) and various Payroll Support Programs (PSPs) were completed by the end of 2020, there was no reason not to continue with Contract education.

The MEC did not prioritize Contract education for a reason that eludes Council 43. Our Mobilizing Team was poised and ready to engage Members yet the plan fell flat because there was no direction and engagement by the MEC. We are two years into our 2020 CBA and there has been little effort for Contract education but for items that come out of the respective Councils independent of the MEC.

FPL Distribution: The MEC received 600 Flight Pay Loss hours per the 2012 Collective Bargaining Agreement. In the 2020 CBA, the Negotiating Committee was able to increase this amount to 900 FPL hours for a 3 way distribution amongst C43, C47 and MEC. However, the MEC decided to disproportionately distribute the FPL hours without conclusive agreement. C43 objected to the distribution as there was no basis for what seemed to be a disproportionate distribution. Hours allocate should be determined by workload.

While it is true that Council 43 has a larger dues stream, it is directly related to the amount of Members that we serve and therefore the amount of work that we do. In addition, the C43 leadership has never begrudged supporting our MEC Committee Chairs. So when they are denied FPL at the MEC level C43 has consistently supported their work by supplementing their FPL.

Background: We all have a fiduciary responsibility to our Members and that includes transparency. Therefore, we determined leading into July 2014:

- 1) For each FPL/UN day of 5 credit hours and First Flight Attendant pay, our officers and volunteers had to work a minimum of 8 hours for that day.
- 2) Exceptions were made for those who had family care needs. They could work 4 hours on the day of FPL/UN and four hours on a different day but the combined total needed to be at least 8 hours.

- 3) Each volunteer worked in our AFA office as a volunteer without FPL until it was mutually agreed that moving forward was in everyone's best interest. [This was usually over a period of one – three months depending on the agreed upon work and hours.]
- 4) If an officer or volunteer worked above and beyond the 8 hours, Council 43 had the option to add FPL after their work was completed on a different day of the month reflected of the unforeseen/planned work the month prior.

The final straw...Transition Period Testing Program (TPTP) – A team of 8-10 AFA C43 representatives were in the office 6 sometimes 7 days a week putting in long hours, doing extremely challenging and emotional work to support our members facing termination. Despite facing a situation that had never been seen in the history of the company, no support and/or assistance from the MECP or MECVP was offered during this grueling 3 month process. There was little intervention and assistance by the MEC before and during this flawed program that saw the termination of 62 HNL-based Flight Attendants.

The TPTP disciplinary hearing process implemented during the testing phase and carried into termination hearings did not comply with the process outlined in the contract's progressive discipline. An MEC grievance was eventually filed, and denied. It appears an appeal was scheduled but not heard and the status of the grievance has not been communicated to C43. During this process we have received numerous accounts of Members whose calls and/or emails to the MECVP went unanswered.

The MECVP continues to misrepresent his participation and attendance in the TPTP hearings. The MECP and MECVP did not attend a single hearing or appeal in Honolulu.

Although this list is not exhaustive it is to illustrate to you that the decision for recall was not taken lightly. It has always been about the work and NOT a personal matter. We, your Council 43 officers, take our responsibilities seriously and will continue to hold each other accountable.