

Per Nader's point 1: "No need for retroactive pay, if we had accepted Company's offer back in July 2014": Mr. Nader forgets that we've gone without any pay raises since October 2013 (2 years). So if we are discussing retroactive pay, then it should go back to October 2013, and not just to 2015.

Per Nader's point 2: I'm not sure where he gets "18 open items" vs now "28" on his comments about the Survey: The Survey and Open Items were general in terms, covering key sections. Many of the sections had multiple items that are being negotiated. In an effort to keep the Survey process simpler, the Survey was condensed to get an overall feel for how the crews felt about key ideas covered by these sections. It is obvious that Mr. Daily does not care for the added protections and benefits that the Union and the Negotiating Committee is trying to negotiate on behalf of all the crewmembers.

Per Nader's point 3: "the Union refused to share with us the result of the survey": The purpose of the Survey was to guide the future Negotiations. As a Negotiator, you don't show all of your cards/tactics to the opposing side. Specially, knowing that Mr. Nader and maybe a few others are quick to report back to the Company what the Union is saying and doing.

Per Nader's point 4: He will present to the Company the "Top 10 Pilot Issues" and "Continue the Torch": First, the fact that Mr. Daily is suggesting to go to the Company to continue to negotiate for these Top Pilot Issues, clearly shows that he understands that the current proposal being voted on, does not offer the group industry standard protections/benefits that this group so much deserves. So why then vote YES, for something that is substandard and attempts to set the crewmembers protections/benefits back. The Union and Negotiating Committee has already presented to the Company the Top Issues that must be resolved in order to ratify the proposal. If Amerijet really cares about its crewmembers, is willing to work with the Union (as stated in their emails) and is willing to negotiate in "Good Faith", then the way to "make good on your word" is to return to the Negotiating table and address what the majority of the crewmembers consider to be important issues.

Per Nader's points on "Captain Briggs": We all appreciate the hard work and efforts that Paul has put forward. However, the gains that Paul has made by talking to management outside of the Negotiating table, MUST be in writing in the proposal (and ultimately what becomes our CBA) in order for it to have any real and binding meaning.

Per Nader's "NO vote" language: First, is good to know that Nader is now a self-proclaimed clairvoyant, and knows how long the process of negotiating a CBA will take (specially since he's not involved with this process). Second, a "NO vote" will totally invalidate the previously held Company vagues vote, and most likely cause for the Lawsuits to be DISMISSED immediately, forcing the Company to return back to Mediation. Third, with the amount of OPEN items that we have left on the table, it should not take too long for the Mediation Board to get through this process.

Per Nader's "after the strike we ended up with less than they offered us before the strike": Nader has absolutely no clue what he's talking about. Nader was never involved with the Negotiations process, to know what was being offered. Nader has already forgotten that the main reason why the Union was asked to come in and represent the crewmembers of Amerijet, is exactly due to everything that the crewmembers had lost approximately 5 years prior to you having a CBA. Most of these items were regained in the 2009 CBA. The 2009 strike, and the support that the crewmembers received from the entire industry, actually led to your first CBA.

Per Nader's "there is no guarantee what the pay rate will be in a different contract": The Company has already agreed to give you the pay that is on the proposal. If anything, they pay may be higher for some categories. In either case, what is GUARANTEE is that whatever pay/benefits you end up with in a Union ratified contract, WILL BE LEGAL, BINDING and ENFORCABLE. That is absolutely not the case with the Company's proposal without Teamster representation.

Per Nader's "we can always do amendments to the contract after ratification". This is an admission that the current Company's proposal does not give the crewmembers the best Job Protections/Benefits that you all deserve. Besides, the Company refuses to sign the "Letter of Agreement" sent on your behalf, regarding making the proposed pay immediate. Keep asking yourself, why is Amerijet refusing to give you that money now, and insists on keeping very damaging language in their proposal.