

THE SNAG SHEET

MONTHLY NEWSLETTER OF CANADIAN
AIRWAYS LODGE 764

Apr 2009



International Association
of Machinists and
Aerospace Workers
Representing Air Transport
Workers in
British Columbia and the
Yukon



President's Message

This past month has certainly contained a lot of mixed messages for the members of our Local. We had bad news for our members at MTU where a sharp drop in the number of engines slated for work at their facility resulted in a reduction of more than 20 of our members there. The remaining members also entered into a Section 54 (BC Labour Code) mitigation agreement that will see them reduced to a 4 day week for the next 6 months.

On a far more positive note, Aveos is finally actioning their long awaited permanent recalls into Heavy Maintenance here in YVR. So far the announced numbers are 107 people spread over all categories. They are still contacting the last few people in a couple of categories but most of those returning have been contacted and have been given return to work dates.

Our members in the Airports group received news that could yet go either way. They were told that the company will be recalling and adding to the number of permanent positions for the summer schedule, but they are dragging their feet and as of this moment have not actually actioned any recalls. This indecision is currently holding up shift bidding because of the recall of members to lead positions. That needs to be accomplished prior to shift bidding.

And in what truly be the most puzzling news to confront most of us this past month is the announcement that our members at Air Canada have a new boss. Well, at least a new old boss. It appears that Monty was too Union friendly and was not the man the Board of Directors felt was capable of doing the heavy lifting with all of us in negotiations this year. For anyone who doesn't know or chooses not to remember, Calin Rovinescu, he is a corporate lawyer and restructuring

Inside this issue:

President's Message	1-2
Turbofan Aircraft Engines	2-5
UAL Report	6
Airports/Cargo Report	6-7
MTU-C Report	7-8
Educator's Report	8-9
Pension Report	9-10
Tech-Ops Report	10-11
Day of Mourning	11

specialist who has ties with Air Canada going all the way back to 1987 when Air Canada used him to help with Brain Mulroney's privatization of Air Canada.

Robert Milton made him part of the Executive Circle of Trust after he helped stymie the Onyx bid for Air Canada in 1999. Most of us certainly remember him as the person who was responsible for gutting our collective agreements and trying to wind up our pension plan during CCAA in 2003-2004. Well, he's back for a second kick at the cat.

So far Calin is making the right noises about not wanting to go into CCAA and growing the company to profitability instead of parking airplanes and shrinking its profitability as some pundits suggest. We know his track record all too well but for now, to be fair, we will give him the benefit of the doubt and believe what he is telling the world.

But to Mr. Rovinescu I have this to say; quoting the 43rd President of the United States, the noted orator, George W. Bush "Fool me once, shame on me. Fool me twice...umm... ahhh... won't get fooled again."

To make sure you get correct, timely and pertinent information, check the Union Bulletin boards, our website or even better, sign up for our email list and we will send it directly to you as soon as we get it. To sign up, simply go to the LL764 website www.iam764.ca home page. At the bottom of the right hand column there is a link "**Join IAM 764 mailing list**". Simply click on the link and input your personal email address that you wish to use. Do not use your Air Canada, MTU or United Airlines email address. We will not send any information or communications to Company email accounts and risk members being disciplined for misuse of company email.

Christopher Hiscock
President
Canadian Airways Lodge 764

Turbofan Aircraft Engines

When Leonardo Da Vinci first contemplated of humans flying like the birds in the 15th century, the problems were clear. Humans were far too heavy for flight, they lacked feathers and wings, they were not streamlined enough, and they tired out rather quickly after a lot of fruitless flapping.

Thus, the human mind searched for a work-around. Clearly, from what was observed with kites and balloons, the solution was a light frame that would travel through an ocean of air and support a greater weight, with movement powered by an engine.

Today's history of flight is constantly being revised by aircraft engine technology. In its early beginnings, powered flight began with a heavy and clumsy mechanical arrangement of piston engines, propellers, and chain drives.



But soon, the overpowering aroma of profit engendered research for lighter and more efficient engines, mechanical systems with less weight and greater simplicity enabling greater distance from a given quantity of fuel, and more reliability from all of the components. Thus was commercial aircraft manufacturing born, starting with William Edward Boeing¹ working from a small factory in Washington State in the early 1900's.

Commercial aircraft engine technology can be divided into three major development stages historically – radial design gasoline engines driving propellers, like those powering the venerable Douglas DC3, turbine powered engines with propellers, like those on the Bristol Britanias, and fanjet engines, developed for military and commercial applications, including the Comet, the DC8, the B707, and all of their successors. This article is a quick summary on the history of fanjet technology, and where it is at within commercial air transport today.

Fanjet technology research began with the military urgencies of the 1930's. The first patent on a jet turbine engine design was obtained by the British Air Force mechanic (Sir) Frank Whittle in January 1930. That patented engine was later built and installed in the first military jet aircraft called the Gloster Meteor. The Meteor became part of the British air defense system after 1940, but was restricted the British airspace account its high fuel consumption and short range.

The first jet turbine engine to power an aircraft was designed by the German researcher Dr. Hans von Ohain in August 1938, and was designated the Heinkel He118. The Heinkel design lead to the later Messerschmitt ME262, which was extremely fast in the air, but fuel hungry, limited in range, and often caught on the ground during Allied attacks. Both Whittle and von Ohain are credited with the invention of the jet engine after WWII, but neither knew what the other had developed because of secrecy during the war years.

At the end of World War II, the Americans took most of the German research documents, and their scientists working on jet engines, back to the United States. Corporations like Pratt & Whitney and General Electric immediately hired these researchers to begin work on jet engine design. The British and Americans shared their findings on turbofan technology until about 1950. Then corporate competition for commercial applications began.

The British advanced their turbofan engine research through Rolls Royce Aviation. The first British attempt at a commercial turbofan engine aircraft was the Dehavilland Comet. The Comet was clearly the leader in the "jet engine aircraft race", until it had to be withdrawn from service after several catastrophic accidents (one with CPA in Karachi, India – pilot error), and several caused by the then unknown phenomena of metal fatigue. The British were never successful in the large jet aircraft market in later years, scoring only limited success with the Vickers VC10. The Royal Air Force bought up most of these aircraft after they were retired commercially, and converted nine VC10's to aerial tankers. The remainder were either scrapped account corrosion problems, or used for parts. There was the same limited success with the supersonic Concorde. Today, some now sit outside airport entrances (LHR, BGI) on a plinth. However, all was not lost for the British.

The first major production of jet engines for aviation use began with Rolls Royce of Britain in 1950 designing the

Conway 12 turbofan engine. In 1953, the American company Pratt & Whitney (P&W) responded with the J57 turbofan design, which still powers the American Air Force B52 bomber today. That design was improved with the P&W JT3D engine, which enjoyed strong acceptance by commercial carriers, who were now ordering Boeing 707s and McDonnell-Douglas DC8's with P&W engines as fast as the manufacturers could build them.

By 1960, aircraft manufacturers Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas were bringing larger and heavier aircraft into production for continental and inter-continental travel, and reliable, more powerful engines were needed to get these aircraft into the air. Turbofan research technology was advanced by commercial aviation demands, and both Roll Royce and Pratt & Whitney (and later General Electric) brought larger, more powerful, and more efficient turbofans to the market to meet engineering demands for larger and heavier aircraft.

The next breakthrough in turbofan technology was the realization that a larger fan in front of the engine, with a higher bypass ratio design, sending most of the air around the engine core, instead of through it, delivered quieter operation and more thrust, than the current low bypass ratio engine design in use. More thrust meant designers could create bigger airplanes and carry heavier payloads. Again more powerful turbofans were encouraged by military need.

The American Air Force needed a huge transport aircraft to carry heavy tactical weapons and supplies (tanks, trucks and armored personnel carriers) over long distances on short notice, and the Lockheed Corporation submitted the C5 Galaxy design.

General Electric developed a large turbofan engine with an 8:1 high bypass ratio (eight times as much air is ducted around the engine as passed through it) which produced massive thrust, and the two designs fathered the USAF C5A Galaxy, and provided the technological base for the turbofan engine to make the B747 a reality.

The oil crisis of the 1970's prompted turbofan engine research scientists to make design improvements in fuel economy, reduce overall engine weight, extend the life of engine components, lengthen the hours before major engine overhaul, and multiply thrust/horsepower without additional cost.

Four engined DC8 and Boeing aircraft would have been on their way to the desert by 1970, had there not been a GE/SNECMA retrofit for the old P&W turbofans for a CFM56 turbofan engine which boosted horsepower, increased range, met new noise regulations, and had better fuel economy. Almost a third of the stretched DC8's (61/63) produced were modified with new engines and many are still labouring away today as cargo aircraft ("freight dogs"). The USAF has also made the same retrofit on many of its older B707 tankers and transports.

The tri-jets (DC10, L1011) took over many of the medium and long haul routes from the retired DC8's and B707's when more capacity was needed.

It was during this development stage that the British engine manufacturer Rolls Royce experienced its first stumble. The RB211 turbofan for the L1011 aircraft experienced hub failures on the fan during design testing. The failure was caused by a new composite blade material breaking away from the fan hub during operation. A British Government bailout saved Rolls Royce Aerospace from bankruptcy while the fan blades and hub were hastily re-designed with metal.

The twin jets (B757, B737 long range models, and Airbus models) awaited an improvement and certification on engine reliability to allow for their extended operation over water. The technological improvement in turbofan reliability and subsequent change to air regulations was not long in coming, and those changes sent the thirsty tri-jets to air cargo duties or to an early grave in the desert.

Turbofan technology also had to keep up with the demands from the commercial carriers imposed upon the aircraft manufacturers for more capacity. Manufacturers responded by taking existing designs and "stretching" them to give added seating and cargo volume. Of course this meant new engines with more horsepower and thrust. The best example of this is the Boeing 737, of which there are now eight variants, with seating from 100-200 passengers, and range covering everything from short to long haul, with engines to match.

When Boeing announced the B777 in several models, GE was first to supply the huge engines that would be required to get this aircraft off the ground. The GE90's develop up to 113,500 pounds thrust each, and one early model engine mounted on a B747 test bed was able to keep the aircraft

aloft and climbing, while the remaining three P&W engines were left on idle.

But as turbofan engines have gotten bigger, the problems for repair at off-line points have grown larger and more costly for the airlines.

Early McDonnell-Douglas and Boeing aircraft used to be able to transport a spare engine (called a "fifth pod") under the wing, attached to a special inboard pylon, to an off-line point to rescue an aircraft with engine problems. Later, cargo aircraft were able to carry engine cores to disabled aircraft. Air Canada used its B747 Combi several times in rescue missions for L1011 aircraft with engine failures in Honolulu. In all these examples, the aircraft downtime was lengthy and expensive. Engine changes at off-line points are labour intensive and logistically challenging. Another example follows.

The B777 engine is huge, and there are only two aircraft in the world that can handle its massive size – one is the USAF C5A Galaxy (which is not available for rent), and the other is the Antonov AN225, which is heavily booked, expensive to charter, and at present, consists of only one aircraft in operation.

The AN225 was originally designed to provide support to the Russian space program and transport rocket stages inside its fuselage, as well as carrying a reusable space shuttle on a top mount over the wing root, back to its launching site. A second aircraft was partially built but mothballed when the Soviet Union collapsed. The second aircraft has been taken out of storage and is being refurbished for the charter market, but will not be available until 2010.

Both Boeing and Airbus have built large capacity aircraft for the carriage of oversized cargo (Airbus with the "Beluga" and Boeing with the "Very Large Cargo Carrier – VLCC"), but these aircraft are committed to the Airbus and B787 assembly programs respectively, and have not been offered to the charter market.

Thus, engine failures on B777 aircraft in remote areas have become a major supply nightmare for the airlines, and Air Canada has had two failures in the last six months.

Both engine failures happened over the North Pacific, en-route from Japan. In both cases, the aircraft was able to

land without incident, one in Fairbanks Alaska, and the other in Anchorage. In one case, the failure was a gearbox assembly on the engine, a known design problem for the higher rated, more powerful GE turbofan on the Boeing 777-300. The other failure was with the sixth stage compressor fan blades which come loose at the higher continuous cruise power setting for the B777-300. All Air Canada B777-300 aircraft have been restricted to 120 minutes ETOPS (maximum time for one engine operation away from a landing point) until all these engines are modified. An ETOPS restriction means longer routes over land, more fuel, increased flight time, and of course, higher operating expenses per flight, which means reduced profit.

In the case of the two diverted flights, once the passengers had been accommodated on other carriers, our own mechanics had to fly to Alaska, and undertake an engine change in the bitter cold, outside, using a large USAF parachute draped over the wing, as a cover over the afflicted engine. The parachute-draped space was heated with Herman-Nelson portable heaters during the repair, as hangar space is simply not available on short notice in Alaska.

The new engine had to come from the GE factory in Dayton, Ohio, and had to be trucked to Alaska. Air Canada was appalled to learn that oversize loads on trucks (which this engine was) are not permitted on Alaskan highways on Sundays. Thus, in one occurrence, the engine sat at the Yukon/Alaska border crossing for twenty-four hours. In both cases, the downtime and repair on the aircraft was about two weeks. In each case, the cost of B777 downtime, lost revenue, and aircraft scheduling headaches for Air Canada was not funny.

Happily for the airline, the engine gearbox and sixth stage blade problems are under engine warranty, so some of these expenses will be shared by the General Electric Corporation. In addition, the GE90 can be stripped down to its engine core, with the fan assembly and shroud disassembled, allowing accommodation on a B747 freighter. However, time saved with a quick delivery of a new engine to an offline point by freighter becomes time lost while the new engine is reassembled by mechanics before mounting on the aircraft pylon.

So, as turbofan technology continues to improve under the impetus of decreasing oil reserves, and engines and aircraft grow larger, off-line point engine repair has now become a major headache for the world's airlines.

The Russians seem well poised to capture a very lucrative portion of the large turbofan engine off-line point rescue market, unless the American Government decides that the USAF C5A Galaxy can be made available for this task. With the Americans reducing their military commitments worldwide, and hard economic times certainly upon us, everyone is looking for ways to make a buck. The USAF may find itself in the GE90 engine rescue business if the price is right.

1 The Boeings were part of the wealthy Alsatian Calvinist Schlumberger dynasty of manufacturers from Alsace-Lorraine, who amassed a huge fortune from mechanical wizardry with mass produced textiles, and re-invested their profits in oil exploration during the early 20th century. William Boeing drew on the family fortunes around this time to pursue his aeronautics business in America. For an excellent book on how family dynasties have controlled emerging technologies and advanced their considerable wealth, see Landes, David, *Dynasties: Fortunes and Misfortunes of the World's Great Family Businesses*, Viking Press, New York 2006, hardcover pp.380



David Varnes, ST LL764 and Chair, History Committee

United Airlines Report

There is one disciplinary grievance under consideration by the District for pursuit past Step 3.

The Company has advised that they have their expectations for Dependability ready for posting, and have agreed that all previously issued letters regarding Innocent Absenteeism would be removed from employee records. However, they recently began issuing the letters again. The last batch included errors such as a second letter being given when there was no first one, and a letter to a member whose record had actually improved. All members are strongly encouraged to verify the Company's findings from their own records to insure they are not being unnecessarily harassed for their use of sick time.

The Company has advised they will begin hiring for summer temporary positions shortly.

The Company has advised that they do not have firm manpower counts to give to the scheduling committee for a new bid, and the next bid would likely coincide with the change in flight schedule in early June.

A Committee has been formed to work with the Company to facilitate the various issues expected to arise for the 2010 Olympics. Members interested in helping can contact Bro. Al Webb.

The Company sent five members for Level I First Aid training at St. John's Ambulance. Sisters Kate Chacko, Caroline McClintock, Janet Andrews, Sharon So and Bro. Dragan Milosevic completed the day long course and are now qualified for a period of two years. The Company is looking at setting up another class.

The Company has launched a renewed effort to ensure employees are up to date in training. Supervisor Brian Bird has returned to work from medical leave and is spearheading this effort for the Company. This has meant some disruption to the operation and frustration as members have been pulled off shift to complete recur-

rent computer modules.

Manager Nigel Newsome has advised that he will be meeting with each employee regarding safety. It is expected these meetings will be a reiteration of the contentious 'Always, Always, Never, Never' letters of last year. He has given assurances this is an information session only and employees will NOT be required to sign anything. Members should know he has advised employees they do not require a shop steward for these meetings. Any members with concerns about this or anything else are strongly encouraged to contact a shop steward.

In Solidarity,

Janet Andrews
Senior Steward

Airports/Cargo Report

Baggage Agents

Andrew Chan presented a Summer Shift Schedule to the Company that has been accepted in principle by the Shop Committee. This shift requires an additional 5 CSA positions and we are awaiting the Recall letters to be issued prior to proceeding with the bid.

Cabins

The Cabins Shift Committee will reconvene next week to see if they can come to an agreement on a summer shift. The Company has yet to issue the recall letters for 5 LCSCA, 11 CSCA and 1 additional P/T CSCA.

Overtime for the month of March was 175 hours.

Cargo

The Shop Committee has asked the Company to start discussions on the summer shift bid.

The summer shift bid is forecast to take effect May 24, 2009.

Promos

The Promotional Bulletin for the Gate Planner positions has closed and we are waiting for the Company to conclude the testing and interview process.

There is a Promotional Bulletin out for Airport/Cargo Trainer Level 2 which closes on April 27, 2009.

Ramp

The Ramp Shift Committee made their first presentation to the Company last week. The Company voiced their concerns over certain areas that the Committee took away to address. This shift requires an additional 51 SA positions and again we are awaiting the recall letters.

Overtime for the month of March was **4505** hours which equates to **28** full time jobs.

Retirements May 01, 2009

Chris Mantel, Lead Station Attendant – Cargo 33 years.

Seniority

The 2009 Seniority list was issued on April 01, 2009. Members are advised to make sure that the information listed is correct. The appeal deadline is April 30; 2009. The lists are available for viewing at the Union office located at Gate 5, as well as the Tool Crib and Cargo Manpower.

Shop Stewards

Shop Stewards are reminded to take accurate notes so the Shop Committee can proceed with any type of appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Cox, Chair

Craig Chard, Member

MTU-C Report**GRIEVANCE STATUS****Policy Complaints Grievances**

Article 5 – Mandatory O/T (resolved)

Established minimum wages (step two)

Conflict of interest (step 3)

Denial of recall (step three)

Rescinded recall (step three)

Failure to recall (step three)

Personal/Group

Discipline Stores

On March 27, 2009 the Membership voted on a package that included:

The entire Bargaining Unit will participate in a HRDC Work Share Program

The application of LOA 4 dealing with benefits will be suspended for one year.

Double time will be suspended

Scheduled shut down for three days (Dec 29, 30, 31, 2009)

All non-bargaining unit personnel will participate in a 5% salary reduction as well as an option to participate in the Work Share Program

Employees who have retired under the recent VSIP program will be eligible to enroll in the Retiree Benefits Program

Grievance #W06074 Article 2- The Company will apply the settlement request.

Grievance #W03290 Article 2 & 6- The Company will suspend its interpretation and application of Clause 6.03

while any provision of this Memorandum of Agreement is in effect.

The Vote was accepted by a margin of 75% and the application for Work Share was submitted to the Government on March 31, 2009. We are expecting an answer towards the end of April whether it has been accepted.

We are still waiting on the decision regarding the KC 10 contract. The decision is due at the end of June 2009.

To date 28 individuals have either taken a VSIP or have been laid off. One bright spot, we were able to mitigate three layoffs by transferring these individuals through the Article 9 process into the Accessory shop.

In Solidarity,
Neil Carter Senior Steward

Please update your address/email
information
with the Lodge 764 offices as
Negotiations will be starting up in
2009.

Educator's Report

This month's Education Committee Report has input from our facilitator of the New Steward Training, Brother Ken Hagen. The Education Committee arranged the training, so it would not be appropriate for the "outside contractor" to file the report.

Eighteen stewards from Lodge 764 and five from Local Lodge 16 (Swissport, etc) attended training on March 24 and 27. They learned the Structure of the IAM, Roles of a Steward, Complaint Investigation, how to properly file a grievance, and most importantly, interacted with other stewards in different work areas (Airports, Tech Ops, Logistics and Supply and smaller contractors)

My thanks to Bros. Cooper and Girard from the Tech Ops Shop Committee Office for their assistance, particularly on the Friday session.

BROTHER KEN HAGEN

Ken has taken on the task of Steward Training from great instructors in the past, like Brother Dave Mayes and others. Ken's dedication and commitment to this Lodge has been greatly appreciated and he will be stepping aside for others to take on the role of facilitator. Ken, you have done an amazing job of keeping the Lodge in order and helping out other Brothers and Sisters. On behalf of the Education Committee and myself as Educator, we wish you all the best in your leisure life of retirement.

Brothers Glenn Girard and Glenn Cooper will be taking on the task in the future, and this could evolve into some collective agreement training, as soon as we find out what collective agreement we are working under. Some big shoes to fill, but great guys for the tough job ahead.

We also have Health and Safety Representatives training near completion and in the next few months should see the role out of the pilot program.

This Lodge has done its best at delivering in-house training to its IAM members – through CLC Harrison Winter School and in Placid Harbour at the Winpisinger Centre.

I know that most members are not happy about paying dues, but there is power in Education...Without funds to continually educate our members, front-line Negotiators, Shop Committee Chairs, Health and Safety Reps, etc. we are dead in the water. Over the next few days, months and years, we all will see very crucial attacks to our well-deserved Defined Benefit Pension Plan, Health and Safety Regulations, Travel Benefits and Medical/Dental Plans.

I hope those who attended the steward training received a good working knowledge of what it means to be a Steward. Thank you for your attendance and now go out and get a coworker to come out to the next Union Meeting and get him/her involved too.

Regards,
Wes Sim, LL764 Educator, Trustee , Chair of the Education Committee

LL764 Pension Report

A defined benefit pension plan entitles members to a minimum benefit payable but no maximum. Once you retire the plan will continue to pay your monthly benefit until the first day of the month in which you die regardless of your age. If you are married at the time of your death, your spouse will continue to receive their monthly survivors benefit until the first day of the month in which they die regardless of their age. Only at that time is your benefit from the pension plan completed.

The minimum amount payable to every member is your contributions with interest. You will see that amount on your annual pension statements as well as on your detailed reports generated on the Aeronet. The interest rate credited is the 5 year Canadian Bank rate. It does not reflect the actual in-

come generated on your behalf through the investments in the pension trust fund. That amount is significantly higher. If you and your spouse both die prior to receiving an amount equal to or greater than your contributions with interest, any remaining amount is payable to your estate.

When you terminate or retire from the Company, you can elect to receive an immediate monthly pension, a deferred monthly pension or a lump sum transfer of something called a commuted value. Which of these options is available to you is dependant upon your age and years of pensionable service on the date of retirement/termination. Most people understand the immediate or deferred monthly pension options but are confused by the commuted value transfer option.

In general terms (for every rule there are exceptions) it is available until the month of your 50th birthday. Commencing with the month after your 50th birthday it is replaced with the ability to take an immediate reduced monthly pension. The commuted value is a lump sum dollar amount that represents the amount of money that would have to be invested at the discount (interest) rate specified by the rules established by the Canadian Institute of Actuaries to generate an equivalent monthly benefit to the one owed you under the rules of the pension plan. The larger the monthly pension you would be entitled to, the larger your commuted value will be.

This amount may be transferred into a locked-in RRSP or similar pension investment. If the amount is large enough, the Income Tax Act comes into play and limits the amount you can transfer and requires the Company to pay any excess money to you as cash - taxable income. The detailed report will tell you exactly how much you can transfer and how much you will receive as taxable income.

If the pension fund is deemed to be underfunded on a solvency deficit basis, as ours currently is, this will affect your commuted value transfer. You will be paid a percentage of your commuted value equal to the funding ratio of the plan at the date of your retirement / termination. That rate is currently

88% for the CAIL plan and 90% for the AC plan. The Pension Benefit Standards Act requires that the remaining % equal to the underfunded amount (12% and 10% respectively) is held in trust in the pension plan for 5 years. That "holdback" amount will be paid to you at the end of the 5 year period. It is designed that way so that members leaving an underfunded pension plan continue to share an equal amount of risk, for 5 years, with those members still in the plan. This is to prevent a "run" on the pension plan by members seeking to leave at the expense of members who choose to stay.

Email is the most effective way to reach me. I may be contacted at pres764@telus.net with any questions or concerns that you may have.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher Hiscock
Chairman, LL764 Pension Committee

Bargaining Survey Online

2009 Bargaining Survey/Suggestion Form for IAM Members Working at Air Canada.

The link for this form is online at:
<http://iam764.ca/Default.aspx>

Please take the time to complete this Survey for the upcoming contract negotiations. The input from the Surveys will enable your Negotiating Committee to better understand and address the membership's issues and priorities. We appreciate your participation. The Survey will remain active until April 26, 2009.

Tech-Ops Report

Arbitration Hearings: The next scheduled date with Chief Arbitrator Martin Teplitsky is May 21, 2009 in Toronto.

UMCM Meeting: The next UMCM Meeting is scheduled for May 5th – 8th, 2009 in Montreal.

Gantt Chart Meetings: District 140 General Chairpersons and Shop Committee Representatives from Vancouver and Winnipeg met on March 24, 2009 in Montreal to review the constant changes that are occurring regarding the planning/scheduling of aircraft maintenance throughout the system.

YVR Base Permanent Recalls: The Shop Committee has been informed that the Company has commenced recalling an additional 106 individuals to support the two (2) additional heavy maintenance production lines in the YVR North Hangar. Any Member receiving recall paperwork from Air Canada/Aveos is reminded to ensure that the Tech Ops Shop Committee receives a faxed copy of their selection to accept/decline recall. The Tech Ops Shop Committee Office fax number is (604) 273-0896.

2009 Seniority Lists: Seniority Lists for all Categories and Classifications were issued on March 31, 2009. It is the responsibility of each Member to examine the Seniority Lists for errors. In the event that there are errors, appeals must be submitted (faxed) per Article 16.18.01 utilizing the proper Appeal Form no later than April 30th, 2009. The fax numbers are: Labour Relations YUL (514) 856-7416, District Lodge 140 (604) 448-0710 and Tech Ops Shop Committee (604) 273-0896.

Collective Bargaining 2009: TMOS, Finance and Clerical Negotiation Committee Representatives are currently attending Collective Bargaining Training at the William W. Winpisinger Education Technology Center from April 5th – 10th, 2009.

LOU #4 Above Basic Interview Training: The Shop Committee would like to thank the Shop Stewards that volunteered to participate in the LOU #4 Above Basic Interview Training Process.

Basic Shop Stewards Training: The Education Committee provided all new Tech Ops Shop Stewards with a one (1) day Basic Shop Steward Training Course. The Shop Committee would like to thank the Education Committee for providing this much needed training.

Air Canada/Aveos Transition - District Lodge 140 has issued Bulletin #27 pertaining to the ongoing discussions to address the transitional issues as a result of the Aveos and Air Canada transition. The Union and the Company are scheduling additional meetings to discuss the outstanding issues affecting the Membership. Shop Stewards are reminded to check both websites; District Lodge <http://www.iam140.ca/> and Local Lodge <http://iam764.ca/> on a regular basis to ensure the Membership in your work location are kept up to date as this process progresses.

Line Maintenance Category 33 Shifts: The Shop Committee and Local Line Maintenance Management have reached a Local Shift Agreement for the Category 33s currently working within this formation. Local Management is currently scheduling these individuals to their new shift.

In Solidarity,

Joe Toth, L/L 764, Tech Ops Chair

Glenn Cooper, L/L 764, Tech Ops Member

Glenn Girard, L/L 764, Tech Ops Member

25 Years—Day of Mourning

Day of Mourning, April 28, 2009

"Twenty-fifth Anniversary"

This year marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the National Day of Mourning as proclaimed by the Canadian Labour Congress in 1984. That date coincided with the seventieth anniversary of the first Ontario Worker's Compensation Act approved by the government.

On February 1, 1991, April 28th was subsequently enshrined by Royal Statute as, a 'Day of Mourning for Person's Killed or Injured in the Workplace'.

Although recognized workplace time-loss injuries recorded by all Provincial/Territorial Workers Compensation Boards across the country in the year 2007 stood reduced, down by 11,853 from 2006 to 317,524. Clearly more tragic was the "Total Number of Fatalities Accepted" for the same year nationwide. The Association of Workers Compensation Boards of Canada (AWCBC) reports an increase over 2006 of 79 deaths for a national total of 1055 fatalities at work or on account of industrial causes. That is how many Canadian mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters and friends never made it home alive from work or died from workplace causes in the year 2007. Twenty years of fighting workplace accident injury and fatality; and the sad fact remains that each year brings new statistics representing the on-going travesty, heartache and hardship of personal loss from the workplace.

Major gains have been made with the adoption of legislation that corporations, and those in positions responsible for the direction of workers, be subject to criminal liability for workplace accountability. In addition to legislative gains, improvements are also reflected in collective bargaining. However, in light of the foregoing statistics, much more needs to be done.

'Mourn the Dead, Fight for the Living!'

(courtesy of <http://www.iamaw.ca>)

Next General Meeting

May 13, 2009

5 PM

7980 River Road
Richmond, B.C.



WE'RE ON THE WEB!
WWW.IAM764.CA

IN MEMORIAM

SISTER ANNE CHAN

BROTHER MARCEL LECOURS

(JAN 2009)

Local 764 Executive Board

Chris Hiscock – President

Mike Sanghera – Vice-President

David Varnes – Secretary Treasurer

Laura Sharpe -Recording Secretary

Steve Daechsel -Trustee

Wes Sim – Trustee, Educator

Cam McDonald -Trustee

Dan Cooke – Conductor/Sentinel

Gordon Taylor – Communicator

Joe Toth - Tech-Ops Shop Chair

Kevin Cox - Airports/Cargo Shop Chair

Neil Carter – Senior Steward MTU

Janet Andrews – Senior Steward UAL

Ron McKelvie – Clerical Chief Shop Steward

The Snag Sheet is published 10 times per year :

CANADIAN AIRWAYS LODGE 764
7980 RIVER ROAD,
RICHMOND, B.C. V6X 1X7
< CHARTERED 1941 >

EDITOR: Gord Taylor
WEBMASTER: Gord Taylor

Office: (604) 273-9668

Fax: (604) 273-9670

E-mail:
webmaster@iam764.ca

All monthly issues are available
online by visiting the Lodge website: