

April 20, 2026

Update from the FFT 165 STR

LEC 165 Pilots,

I am following through on my campaign promise to provide integrity and transparency. I will be blunt: Our LEC 165 capt. and F/O representatives' actions raise serious concerns regarding policy compliance, transparency, integrity, and member representation, including presently and actively circumventing your right to exercise your vote in the democratic recall process. Though this letter is lengthy, I believe the detailed content is necessary to be completely transparent and counter further twisting or manipulation. I ask that you review the following carefully and determine the appropriate course of action.

When Capt. Howell and F/O Weihing ran for their seats, they asked for your trust. They told you they would represent your interests and bring transparency to the MEC. I am writing to you today because their conduct in office has been the opposite of what they promised. What follows is a factual account of a pattern of behavior that I believe demonstrates that they are **unfit for the positions they hold**.

The evidence falls into five categories: pushing strategies that risk your careers on a strategy that ALPA's own lawyers reject; refusal to show up for the represented pilots; misrepresenting the legal risks you face and misrepresenting you; violating MEC policy and silencing disagreement; and canceling the meeting when I placed their recall on the agenda. Ten days later, that meeting is still to be rescheduled.

Pushing a Strategy ALPA's Own Lawyers Reject That Risks Your Career

During the March 24 LEC meeting, F/O Weihing suggested that negotiations could be approached in a way that anticipates failure to force a future outcome. Specifically, he posed the option to "show up" to display "good faith," have a large ask the company will likely turn down, and then leave when negotiations fail and say, "We tried."

He then said that when the company implements AQP unilaterally, "the system will fail." Meaning, too many pilots will fail their checkrides, be without protective language, and the company will have to come back to us and "negotiate again." He is comfortable placing pilots in harm's way because he believes your careers can be used to "create chaos" with the company and manufacture a point of leverage. Let me be specific about what this means for you: This plan risks your checkride, your PRIA/PRD, your resume, and your ability to get hired at another carrier, all in the name of a leverage strategy that **ALPA's own lawyers told him will not work**. Capt. Howell expressed support for this strategy during the discussion at the LEC meeting as well.

Your representatives should be stewards of your career and place your protection as the highest priority. A representative who is willing to use your career as a bargaining chip against legal advice is not fit for leadership.

Refusal to Show Up

F/O Weihing did not attend the CVG airport sit, despite being a part of its planning, plenty of available options to do so, including FPL and bidding, and my insistence that he attend. So, I called him out on it.

He said he wasn't willing to take the pay cut on that day from his 8-hour turn to accept 5.5 hours for FPL, despite being #10 on the DEN F/O seniority list and on the 12-year pay scale. He avoided one-third of the bases and almost one-third of the total pilots who attended LEC 165 airport sits over 2.5 hours of top-scale pay. This is your F/O representative. He voluntarily took this position, including its obligations. He chose 2.5 hours of top-scale pay (a conflict he could have avoided altogether with a different bid and/or better use of FPL) over showing up for the pilots in CVG. To every F/O in DEN, DFW, and CVG: This is how much your F/O representative values your time and your voice. He couldn't be bothered to show up for an entire domicile and scoffed when I held him accountable, but he expects you to keep him in the seat and says he'll show up another time. He also claims to have a pulse on the same pilots for whom he refused to appear.

Effective representation requires showing up every time, not just when it's convenient. A representative who won't do that is not fit for the role.

Misrepresenting Your Legal Exposure and Misrepresenting You

ALPA National provided clear legal guidance to the MEC and LEC leadership on the AQP LOA:

- The company can implement AQP unilaterally due to management rights.
- Any challenge to Frontier's imposition of AQP would likely be adjudicated as a "minor dispute," with the court directing ALPA to resolve the issue through the grievance process.
- Arbitration outcomes would likely be unfavorable without good-faith negotiation that results in a passed AQP LOA.
- Focus should be on pilot protections; riding the passing of an AQP LOA on financial gain is not within the scope of an AQP LOA in good faith negotiations.

Despite this, Capt. Howell and F/O Weihing avoided, minimized, and disputed these points during pilot discussions at airport sits. Put plainly, your capt. and F/O representatives told you the opposite of what ALPA's own lawyers told them, claiming a difference of interpretation on clearly presented information.

I attended and engaged at all three airport sits. In those same airport discussions, questions about "what pilots want" focused on desired gains without clearly identifying the minimum terms pilots would be willing to accept. Your capt. and F/O representatives then used this reasoning to characterize the majority as opposed to an AQP LOA in the absence of financial gain.

I believe that your capt. and F/O representatives' characterization of the majority of LEC 165 pilots is deliberately false and skewed to support their own agenda. It does not reflect the nuance of pilot responses, particularly given the legal constraints outlined above. Most of our pilots would, of course, love a pay increase, but not at the cost of protections or the long-term negative impact on negotiations.

This is not simply a difference of opinion and is damaging to our pilot group because it leaves pilots confused about the actual risks we face. A leader who lies to the people they represent, especially about the legal consequences of their decisions, is not fit to hold that position.

Violating MEC Policy and Silencing Disagreement

Following an MEC discussion on a unified path forward, Capt. Howell contacted senior management to express a personal position that differed from the MEC discussion. This is inconsistent with Frontier MEC Policy Manual §1.H.3.f.i, which requires coordination through proper channels and prohibits escalation beyond the chief pilot without the MEC chair's approval. This conduct displays division to management when we must maintain a unified front.

In full transparency: I made a similar error when I emailed upper management about a stroller-related issue. I disclosed it immediately to the MEC chair once my capt. representative brought it to my attention, committed to not repeating it, and moved on. The MEC chair indicated that he would have supported the communication anyway, given its scope. The difference is simple: What I did was not harmful to the MEC. I also disclosed my error, accepted the correction, and it never happened again. Capt. Howell did it deliberately and has never acknowledged wrongdoing. On the contrary, he introduced a resolution at our last LEC meeting to amend Frontier MEC Policy Manual §1.H.3.f.i to bypass MEC approval prior to contacting upper management. I cannot think of one valid reason for this proposal other than to permit similar action in the future, which is unacceptable.

That pattern extends to how Capt. Howell handles disagreement within the LEC. I told him which specific paragraphs I disagreed with in the March 30 LEC communication and said, "If you intend to send the message as is, then I want my name removed from it." He said, "I understand your position on the comm," and removed my name. However, I was not informed or engaged about the April 16 communication. When an LEC member reached out on the subject, Capt. Howell said that it "was partly an oversight, but also consistent with his previously stated preference not to be included."

I asked to be removed from one communication (March 30) in which I disagreed with specific portions as written. Capt. Howell then used that request as a blanket excuse to cut me out of future communications without notice. That is not an "oversight." That is a deliberate misrepresentation of my position—a lie—to exclude an officer who disagrees with him.

Every quote above is documented in text messages or e-mails, and I challenge their dispute.

Capt. Howell made clear in the April 16 communication that “CJ and I will be conducting two-day airport sits... in both CVG and DFW over the next few months.” This is news to me, as is my removal from attendance to silence me while they pitch their agenda in my absence.

Capt. Howell accuses me of fueling division. The division already existed and needs to stop, which is one of the two main reasons I ran for this office. The other reason was the utter lack of transparency in significant matters. I made this clear to him during my campaign, and I am now forced out of necessity to use extraordinary measures to communicate transparently to the LEC. Capt. Howell asked not to have our last phone call recorded and now refuses to respond to me via e-mail, instead attempting to communicate by phone. This communicates to me a fear of transparency, exposure, and accountability.

A leader who goes around the MEC to upper-level management against policy and silences fellow officers who challenge him is not serving the pilot group. He is serving himself and is dangerous to the best interests of the pilot group.

Cancelled Your LEC Meeting and Robbed You of Your Democratic Rights

Due to their conduct, I informed the capt. and F/O representatives in writing on the proposed agenda that their recall would be considered at the May 5 LEC meeting in accordance with ALPA By-Laws. Here is the timeline:

The May 5 meeting was scheduled for months via ALPA email distribution.

April 1: All three LEC 165 officers agreed to host the LEC meeting in CVG and proctor in DEN and DFW. That was the last discussion of the scheduled meeting. We agreed to send a “save the date” so that pilots in all three domiciles could bid. An important note: Despite an attending member’s seconded motion and agreement at the March LEC meeting that we would host the next LEC meetings in DFW or CVG (proctored in all domiciles), Capt. Howell said on April 1 that we would host in Denver and potentially proctor in the other domiciles. I spoke with him for over two hours, during which I aggressively questioned his motives and integrity. This is the phone call he said he did not want recorded. Only after bringing F/O Weihing into the conversation did he finally agree to proceed as discussed with the March LEC meeting and **how you all deserve**.

April 3: I submitted the proposed agenda, including capt. and F/O representative recall items, and requested any additions. No reply.

April 9, morning: I sent a last reminder for additions to the agenda and informed them that if there were no additions, I would submit to meet ALPA timelines.

April 9, evening: Capt. Howell wrote me: “As previously stated, the May 5 meeting is being postponed to a later date due to scheduling conflicts.”

Nothing was “previously stated.” There was no prior discussion about postponing. There was no scheduling conflict. To this day, Capt. Howell and F/O Weihing refuse to respond to my multiple e-mails demanding the specific “scheduling conflict”

reason. The only thing that changed between April 1 and April 9 was the recall appearing on the agenda. I believe that is when and why the meeting was canceled.

Capt. Howell also said that “pursuit of this action [maintaining their recall items on the agenda] will likely initiate a recall process on your position.” Read that again. Your LEC chair threatened to recall his own secretary-treasurer for the act of placing a recall item on the agenda—a right explicitly provided under the ALPA Constitution and By-Laws. That is not leadership. That is retaliation. He then “relieved” me of responsibility for the agenda to remove me from the process. I pressed Capt. Howell and F/O Weihing for a reason for the “scheduling conflict” and exercised my LEC officer rights per the By-Laws to require Capt. Howell to hold an LEC meeting. At the time I am sending this letter out for distribution, neither has responded to my multiple e-mails requesting the reason for the “scheduling conflict” or my demand to immediately reschedule, provide adequate time for all pilots to bid, and ensure the agenda is posted far enough in advance to ensure recall items meet timelines per the ALPA Constitution and By-Laws. The silence speaks for itself. Was there a scheduling conflict, or is this a clear attempt to avoid recall as long as desired? Will a coincidentally timed personal matter be later disclosed in an attempt to gain sympathy and legitimize their decision for damage control?

The base visits communicated in the April 16 communication will still incur the same cost of venue, meals, FPL, and hotel accommodations, and they **will not give you an opportunity to vote or be on record**. In my opinion, it is a weak and expensive attempt to get you to think you’re heard since the LEC meeting, where you can act, was canceled and is still not rescheduled.

Any representative who abuses their position in order to manipulate or cancel meetings to avoid recall and suppress the will of their pilots deserves immediate recall and should immediately resign, as well as be subject to an Article 8 hearing per the ALPA Constitution and By-Laws. I don’t see any reasonable conclusion other than by action or inaction; both Capt. Howell and F/O Weihing deliberately engaged in this behavior.

What to Do Next

The recall of LEC representatives is your right under the ALPA Constitution and By-Laws. I ask: Why are your capt. and F/O representatives so intent on avoiding their recall vote? Why are they delaying the process where you can exercise your democratic rights?

If, in your judgment, the conduct documented above warrants the recall of Capt. Howell, F/O Weihing, or me:

- Discuss these facts with fellow LEC 165 pilots.
- Initiate or sign a recall petition. You do not need approval from the officers whose conduct is at issue.
- Contact me with any questions.

The cancellation of the May 5 meeting kept you from exercising this right. Don't let it.

I submit all of this to you, LEC 165. I am not afraid of the same process that I am asking you to apply to Capt. Howell and F/O Weihing. I readily present myself to you for recall at any time you desire, and I will push for it to happen quickly. Your capt. and F/O representatives should do the same.

If you choose to vote me out, I will gladly step down because your voice is what matters in this bottom-up organization.

LEC 165 has pilots of integrity who are ready to take up the torch. I am asking them to step up. We need transparent, truthful, servant leaders at the MEC table. You deserve representatives who tell the whole truth with transparency, are accountable, and never restrict you from exercising your rights. Right now, you don't have that. This is your LEC. Act accordingly.

Fighting for You,

Capt. Timothy Brown
Secretary - Treasurer
Timothy.Brown@alpa.org

[Air Line Pilots Association, International](http://www.alpa.org)
www.alpa.org

7950 Jones Branch Drive, Suite 400 S
McLean, VA 22102

Please [click here](#) if you would like to unsubscribe from this mailing.