# Deep Read of the SPEEA 2026–2030 Prof Contract

Articles 14–23, all 30 Letters of Understanding, six new LOUs, Attachments A and B, and all ten side letters — read against SPEEA's ratification summaries.

**Prepared:** August 5, 2026, the day the official redlines were posted.
**Scope:** Extends the earlier *Redlines vs. Summaries* analysis into the material a web tool could not reach — the full contract was extracted locally.
**Method:** All 150 redline pages rendered and change-mapped by colored-pixel detection; every substantive finding re-rendered and read by eye. Side letters OCR'd at 300 dpi and visually confirmed.
**Purpose:** Informed voting and sourced questions for council reps.

**STANDING AND LIMITS**

This is an independent analysis prepared by a bargaining-unit member. It is **not** an official SPEEA or Boeing document, has not been reviewed by either, and is **not a recommendation on how to vote**. It was produced quickly, against a ratification deadline, and it deliberately looks for gaps between the summaries and the contract text — so it is weighted toward problems and is not a balanced picture of the offer. Section 5 records what checks out and what is better than described. Where a finding says *visually confirmed*, the page was rendered and read directly; where it rests on inference, the report says so. Verify anything that would change your vote against the document itself — every finding cites its page.

# Contents

# 0. Method and coverage

**Documents obtained** (from `https://speea.org/bargaining-units/current-negotiations/prof-tech-2026-2030-contract-offer/`, downloaded Aug 5, 2026):

| File | Pages |
|---|---|
| `2026_Redline-CBA-Profs.pdf` (redline) | 150 |
| `2026-CLEAN-COPY-Redline-CBA-Profs.pdf` (clean) | 144 |
| `2026_Redline-Attachment-A-Prof-and-Tech.pdf` | 84 |
| `2026-CLEAN-COPY-Redline-Attachment-A-Prof-and-Tech.pdf` | 82 |
| `2026_Redline-Attachment-B-Profs.pdf` | 11 |
| `2026-CLEAN-COPY-Redline-Attachment-B-Profs.pdf` | 10 |
| `2026_Side-Letters-Combined.pdf` (scanned, no text layer) | 10 |
| `2026_profTech_contract_highlights.pdf` | 4 |

**Also used** (supplied locally, not from SPEEA's offer page): `136-BCA-6H6B-62E.pdf` — SPEEA Chart series #136A–F, "*February 20, 2026 Salary Review for SPEEA Professional Unit — BCA-6H6B - 62E - Production Engineering - Liaison Engineering,*" 614 employees, data date Feb 20, 2026. Used in §6 to test what "Annual Compensation Review data" actually contains and to quantify the unit's compa-ratio exposure to Art. 11.7.

**Note on page counts:** the Prof CBA is 144pp clean / 150pp redline, not the 200+ assumed in the handoff. **Text was extracted from page 1 to end of every document above** — the page-51 extraction ceiling was a property of the web tool, not the files. Everything in Articles 1–23, all 30 numbered LOUs, six new LOUs, Appendix A, and Appendix B is covered.

**Redline change detection.** Rather than relying on garbled interleaved text, I rendered all 150 redline pages in color at 50 dpi and measured colored (non-black) pixel coverage per page to build a definitive map of which pages carry insertions or deletions. Every substantive finding below was then confirmed by rendering that page at 110–125 dpi and reading strikethrough-red vs. underline-blue **by eye**. Where I say "visually confirmed," I mean exactly that.

**Side letters.** Rasterized at 300 dpi grayscale, OCR'd with `tesseract --psm 6`. All ten pages OCR'd cleanly, and **all ten were then rendered and read by eye**. Every side-letter quotation in this report is visually confirmed; no clause text, section number, or dollar figure below rests on OCR alone.

**Side letter inventory** (all dated July 2026, all addressed "Dear Rich," all signed by Boeing executives only — see §2 on why that matters):

| Pg | Subject | Signatory |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Non-Boeing Labor / Purchased Services | Robert Joga, VP Labor Relations |
| 2 | Technical Skill Development | Ben Nimmergut, Doug Ackerman |
| 3 | NC Programming | Ihssane Mounir, Doug Ackerman, Ben Nimmergut |
| 4 | Part-Time Benefits | Robert Joga |
| 5 | Generalist SMC | Robert Joga |
| 6 | Indemnification | Robert Joga |
| 7 | Voluntary Layoff Benefits | Robert Joga |
| 8 | Article 16 — Utah employees | Robert Joga |
| 9 | Employment-Related Use of AI | Robert Joga |
| 10 | Consecutive Retentions — Proposal U9, 7/22/26 | unsigned proposal sheet |

# 1. Priority Question 1 — Virtual/remote work

**Answer: it exists, in Letter of Understanding No. 13 — not in the Articles.** The 2020 LOU 13 ("Virtual Office/Telecommuting," dated March 10, 2020) is struck in its entirety and replaced with new text.

**Source:** clean copy printed pp. 107–108; redline PDF pp. 111–112. **Visually confirmed** — old text red strikethrough, new text blue underline, on both pages.

## LOU No. 13 — Relating to Flexible Work Location and Virtual Work (Professional and Technical Units)

> The parties enter this Letter of Understanding to capture the intent and application of the Company's flexible work location policies.
>
> On-site work is the Company's baseline policy to support learning, foster collaboration, and drive performance. The Company nonetheless recognizes that, on a situational and temporary basis, employees and the Company may benefit from the flexibility to work from home or another alternate location. "Situational, temporary basis" means an occasional need to work from an alternate location for a limited period, understanding the employee request does not establish a regular or long-term alternate work location.
>
> An employee must request approval in advance from their assigned manager to work from an alternate location. The manager will approve or deny the request based on operational requirements, the employee's request, the employee's role and responsibilities, the employee's work performance, and the effect on collaboration and business needs. The manager may modify or revoke approval at any time; where practicable, the manager will provide reasonable advance notice of changes.
>
> Alternate work location agreements are not intended to create ongoing remote-work arrangements. Requests for ongoing or long-term partial or fully virtual schedules will require the approval of the organizational Vice President. Agreement to work from an alternate location does not alter an employee's primary work location for payroll, tax, or benefits purposes unless legally required. In an emergency or urgent personal circumstance, a manager may authorize an immediate temporary alternate work location without a prior request; such authorization must be communicated as soon as reasonably practicable.

**Challenges Concerning Approval of Alternate Work Location**

> An individual employee may request a review of his or her denial by their assigned manager of a alternate work location request as defined herein. The following steps will be utilized in the review process:
>
> - Employees should, along with their Union Representative, attempt to resolve the denial of their request by discussion with their first-line manager.
> - If the employee contends that the denial of their alternate work location request change was inappropriate or not based on a business requirement, he or she along with his or her Union Representative will notify the Senior Manager to request a review.
> - The Manager and Senior Manager will meet with the employee and the Union Representative to fully discuss the employee's issue to reach mutual resolution.
> - If the employee and Union Representative do not agree with the Senior Manager decision, the Senior Manager, the appropriate Human Resources Representative and the Union Representative will meet to review the circumstances and attempt to reach agreement.
> - If the Company does not follow the review steps outlined above, the union may file a grievance specifically with regard to the process.
>
> Except as otherwise provided herein, the provisions of this Letter of Understanding are not subject to the grievance and arbitration procedures of Article 3. Nothing in this Letter is intended to waive any rights reserved in Article 2.
>
> Dated: TBD

## The struck 2020 text, for comparison

> ~~Telecommuting or "Work at Home" and other aspects of the Virtual Office have proven to be a viable work option that, when appropriately applied, benefit both the Company and the individual.~~
>
> ~~The Virtual Office is a cooperative agreement between the manager and the employee, not an entitlement, and is based on (1) the needs of the job assignment, work group and the Company, and (2) the employee's past and present levels of performance and defined personal characteristics. Participation in the Virtual Office Program is entirely voluntary and may be terminated by the employee, his/her manager, or the Company at any time.~~
>
> ~~The detailed terms and conditions of this Program are covered in the Virtual Office Program procedure, PRO-497, which is subject to change at the Company's discretion. Disputes concerning the content of this Letter of Understanding shall not be subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure of Article 3.~~

## Against SPEEA's claim

SPEEA highlights ( `2026_profTech_contract_highlights.pdf` , Work/Life Balance):

> • Virtual / remote work º There are no more upper-level mandates banning virtual work º Defined process for members to request and managers to grant virtual work. If denied, the manager **must have a business justification**. This process, including an appeal, **is in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)**

Three checkable gaps:

1. **"is in the CBA."** It is in an LOU appended to the CBA, not in Articles 1–23. Reasonable people can argue an LOU is part of the agreement. What cannot be argued away is #2.
2. **The appeal is not arbitrable.** Article 3 is excluded except in one narrow case — the union may grieve only that the Company *skipped the steps*. The substance of a denial is not grievable and not arbitrable. The final step is "attempt to reach agreement": no neutral decision-maker, no binding outcome. (The struck 2020 LOU was equally exempt from Article 3, so this exclusion is not itself new — but neither is it a gain.)
3. **"must have a business justification" does not appear.** The text gives the manager five factors — "operational requirements, the employee's request, the employee's role and responsibilities, the employee's work performance, and the effect on collaboration and business needs" — and no stated burden. The employee's route opens only if they "contend" the denial was "inappropriate or not based on a business requirement." That is a trigger for a conversation, not a standard the manager must satisfy.

On **"no more upper-level mandates banning virtual work"**: the LOU's own text says on-site work "is the Company's baseline policy," and that ongoing or long-term virtual schedules **"will require the approval of the organizational Vice President."** That is an upper-level gate, written into the document.

---

## 2. Priority Question 2 — Purchased Services release-before-layoff

**Answer: yes, a side letter exists. Its scope is narrower than advertised, and its enforceability is genuinely doubtful.**

**Source:** `2026_Side-Letters-Combined.pdf` page 1 — letter dated **July 28, 2026**, "Re: Non-Boeing Labor," from **Robert Joga, Vice President – Labor Relations**, to "Dear Rich." **OCR'd text, visually confirmed against the 300 dpi page image.**

> We appreciate the discussions surrounding Boeing's use of Non-Boeing Labor (NBL). To address SPEEA's concerns, including classification of NBL and adherences to Article 9, we commit to the following actions:
>
> - Labor Relations will review each request for Purchased Services that covers a Skill Management Code (SMC) within SPEEA's jurisdiction to determine whether it complies with PRO-6608 (with consult by Legal). Currently, Work Placement Requests (WPR) do not include an SMC; this will be reinstituted.
> - While no single factor is dispositive, Labor Relations will review the following factors when evaluating a submitted WPR to determine appropriate labor classification: [nine "Whether…" factors — pre-coordination with a supplier; avoidance of hiring or recall; daily direction by Boeing; hourly vs. fixed-price billing; work described by a Boeing job classification and SMC; precise headcount specified; named personnel; entry into the Boeing contractor system; regular access to Boeing tools or equipment]
> - **If Labor Relations determines that the request for Purchased Services is a deviation from PRO-6608, the business requesting the deviation must present a business case to be reviewed by VP of Labor Relations. Deviation from PRO-6608 requires VP of Labor Relations to sign off to proceed.**
> - **If approved, Labor Relations will notify SPEEA of deviation to PRO-6608 and that these resources will be released prior to layoff of SPEEA represented employees, similar to contract labor under the contract.**
> - If SPEEA has questions about any WPR determination, Labor Relations will coordinate a meeting with appropriate stakeholders to discuss the determination with the union.
> - PRO-6608 will be modified to reflect that all deviations from PRO-6608 that fall within SPEEA's jurisdiction require approval by the VP of Labor Relations.

### Three problems, in descending severity

**(a) The protection is conditional, not general.** Release-before-layoff attaches only to Purchased Services resources that Labor Relations has *determined to be a deviation from PRO-6608* **and** that the VP of Labor Relations has *then approved anyway*. Purchased Services that Labor Relations judges PRO-6608-compliant carry no release-before-layoff protection at all. The triggering determination is made by the Company; the union's recourse is "a meeting."

Compare SPEEA's flat statement:

> Purchased Services in SPEEA skill codes will be released prior to layoffs by SPEEA employees, similar to contract labor.

The letter does not say that.

**(b) The letter is unilateral, and the incorporating LOU may not reach it.** The signature block carries only Robert Joga's signature — **visually confirmed, no SPEEA countersignature**. All nine 2026 Boeing letters follow this pattern.

The LOU SPEEA describes as "committing side letters into the contract" is **NEW LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING #TBD — RELATING TO EXISTING SIDE LETTERS** (clean copy printed p. 133; redline p. 140, entirely new blue text):

> The Parties acknowledge that they have entered into various written side letters related to the administration and interpretation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Company agrees that all **previously written** side letters **executed by authorized representatives of the Company and the Union** that are in effect on the effective date of the Collective Bargaining Agreement shall remain in full force and effect according to their respective terms unless the parties mutually agree in writing to amend or terminate the side letter.

By its own terms this preserves side letters executed by **both** parties. The Non-Boeing Labor letter is executed by the Company alone. "Previously written" also reads more naturally as pre-existing letters than as the July 2026 batch.

**(c) The substantive standard lives in Company command media.** PRO-6608 is a Boeing procedure. The letter promises PRO-6608 "will be modified" — in a direction Boeing writes. The letter contains no Article 3 reference in either direction.

**Article 9.4(b) is untouched.** Confirmed in the clean copy (Art. 9.4(b), printed p. 36) — still directs the Company to "consider reducing or eliminating" Purchased Services. The side letter sits alongside it, not inside it.

**What *did* land in the CBA proper:** LOU 4 (Data Reports) now enumerates **"Purchased services Data"** as a required monthly report to the Union (see §5). That is real, contractual, and grievable — an oversight mechanism, not a release obligation.

---

# 3. Contradictions — summary claim vs. contract text

## 3.1 Childcare — a struck commitment presented as a gain

**SPEEA:** "Agreement for Boeing to work with SPEEA to help identify new child care options in the face of increasing costs for members and to discuss during meetings of the Joint Benefits Committee."

**LOU 1** (redline p. 87, **visually confirmed**) — this is struck:

> ~~As one element of the program, the Company has, in coordination with the Union, established two near-site day care centers (Everett and Renton/Longacres). The day care centers are operated by a third-party with fees charged to participating employees geared at an operations break-even level.~~

Replaced with:

> SPEEA members are eligible for a 10% discount, applicable only at the Everett and Longacres Bright Horizon Daycare Centers. The 10% discount will be administered via the Bright Horizons Employer Subsidy program.

And added at the end:

> Recognizing the need for exploration of additional near-site facilities, the Company's Child Development Program will explore options for additional near-site care centers and discuss during the Company and Union Joint Benefits Committee.

**The gap:** a contractual commitment that two named centers exist and are priced **at operations break-even** is replaced by a **10% discount off market rate**. SPEEA's summary reports the new "explore options" language and is silent on the deletion. This is a takeaway inside a package sold as "no takeaways."

## 3.2 Bi-Party ERC — the anti-reprisal protection is not in the LOU

**SPEEA:** "LOU for Bi-Party agreement, similar to an Aviation Safety Action Program (ASAP) … **The committee serves as a way for members to raise safety issues without fear of reprisal**"

**NEW LOU #TBD — Bi-Party Speak Up Partnership Event Review Committee** (clean p. 132), in its entirety:

> This Letter of Understanding (LOU) memorializes the discussions between The Boeing Company and the Society of Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace (SPEEA) during negotiations related to the development of a Bi-Party Speak Up Partnership Event Review Committee (ERC). This LOU also establishes a commitment between the Parties to review and implement such an ERC no later than June 30, 2027. The ERC will be tailored to the operational needs of The Boeing Company, supporting the Company's commitment to a high standard of safety and compliance.
>
> This LOU may be extended or modified by mutual agreement of both parties.

That is the whole LOU. **There is no anti-reprisal language, no committee composition, no charter, no procedure, and no ASAP reference.** It is an agreement to "review and implement" something by June 30, 2027. The words "ASAP" and "reprisal" appear nowhere in the CBA, Attachment A, Attachment B, or the side letters.

## 3.3 Indemnification — "protected against legal action" overstates the letter

**SPEEA:** "Side letter settling indemnification issue (employees acting on behalf of the company, in good faith, are **protected against legal action**)"

**Side letter page 6, July 29, 2026, Robert Joga** — OCR'd, **visually confirmed**:

> The Company's Board of Directors **has authorized** the Company's Chief Legal Officer to indemnify and/or provide for the advancement of legal expenses to Boeing employees involved in a legal action or proceeding by reason of their Boeing employment. The Chief Legal Officer **has done so upon a determination that** the employee has: (1) acted in good faith; (2) in a manner the individual reasonably believed to be in or not opposed to the best interest of the Company; and (3) with respect to any criminal action or proceeding, had no reasonable cause to believe their conduct was unlawful, **in each case to the extent permitted by applicable law**. This applies to all employees acting within their scope of employment, and in a manner the individual, in good faith, reasonably believed to be in accordance with applicable Company processes or procedures, FAA requirements, and applicable ODA procedures.

The letter is written in the **past and present perfect** — it describes an authorization that already exists, not a new promise. Indemnification is contingent on a **determination by Boeing's own Chief Legal Officer**, and is capped "to the extent permitted by applicable law." Nothing here bars Boeing from declining to indemnify, and nothing makes the determination reviewable. "Protected against legal action" is not what the document says.

### 3.4 Learning Together — "professional certifications" is not in the contract

**SPEEA:** "Learning Together Program (LTP) benefits codified within the contract. SPEEA members are **no longer excluded for reimbursement of professional certifications** subject to management approval."

**LOU 21** (redline p. 123, **visually confirmed**) — the entire added text:

> Employees will be eligible to participate in the Company's Enterprise Learning Together Program ("LTP"), an industry-leading tuition assistance program in support of employees' professional development. **The Boeing Company reserves the right to unilaterally alter, amend, and/or modify any or all terms of the LTP at its sole discretion without further bargaining.** The Company agrees to notify the Union of any substantive changes to the LTP.

The word "certification" appears **nowhere** in the Prof CBA except in Article 1 ("Certification of Representative") and in an unrelated reference to the 777-9 Amended Type Certificate. The certification benefit, if it exists, lives in the LTP plan document — which the same sentence lets Boeing change unilaterally. "Codified within the contract" is true only of the sentence granting Boeing that discretion.

### 3.5 Primary Care+ — Puget Sound, not "most sites"

**SPEEA:** "Access to Primary Care+ program — Access to no-cost or low-cost medical services **near most sites**"

**NEW LOU #TBD — Primary Care+ Program** (clean p. 131):

> The Company will provide eligible employees covered by this Agreement with access to the Primary Care+ program **in the Puget Sound** as soon as administratively possible but no later than January 1, 2027. Currently there are seven clinics in the Puget Sound region. To be eligible, employees must be enrolled in a Boeing-sponsored medical plan option administered by BCBSIL.
>
> There is no cost for services for employees and dependents in the Traditional Medical Plan and Select Network Plan. For employees and dependents in the Advantage+ Health Plan, most services are provided at a low cost and then at no cost after the annual deductible is met.
>
> The Primary Care+ program available to eligible employees covered by this Agreement will be offered under terms and conditions determined by the Company, as generally applicable on an enterprise-wide basis. **The Company reserves the right to unilaterally alter, amend, and/or modify any or all terms of the Primary Care+ program without further bargaining.**

Puget Sound only, seven clinics, BCBSIL plans only, unilaterally modifiable. Note the interaction with the flagged default-enrollment switch to Advantage+ (HDHP): Advantage+ members get "low cost" — not free — until the deductible is met.

### 3.6 Dental maximums apply to one plan, not all three

**SPEEA:** "Doubled orthodontia lifetime maximums to $4,000 (Up from $2,000) / Increased annual dental maximum benefit to $3,000 (Up from $2,500)"

**Attachment A, Preferred Dental Plan Schedule of Benefits** (clean p. 59 of Attachment A) confirms:

> Annual Maximum Benefit (for Classes I, II, and III) **— $3,000 per individual (network and nonnetwork combined) Lifetime Maximum Benefit (for Class IV)*** — $4,000 per individual (network and nonnetwork combined)

But Article 16.2(c) — **unchanged** — reads: "The Company will pay the full cost of the Preferred Dental Plan, **the Scheduled Dental Plan or Prepaid Dental Plan**." The Scheduled Dental Plan schedule elsewhere in Attachment A still shows **"Annual Maximum Benefit $2,000 per individual"** and **"Lifetime Maximum Benefit $2,000 per individual"** for orthodontia. The improvement is real but plan-specific; SPEEA's bullets don't say so.

### 3.7 "No change to plan design" — the Advantage+ deductible rises 25% and becomes the default

**SPEEA:** "Medical Benefits — **No change to plan design or pay bands** (remaining the best at the Company)"

**This is true of the Traditional Medical Plan and false of the Advantage+ health plan.**

Attachment A redline p. 47 (printed Page 45), **visually confirmed** — Advantage+ Health Plan Schedule of Benefits, Annual Deductible:

> The annual deductible will be the lowest permitted by federal regulations to maintain a HSA qualified plan.
>
> - $**1,750** ~~1,400~~ per individual
> - $**3,500** ~~2,800~~ per family of 2 or more
>
> Network and nonnetwork expenses apply to the deductible

By contrast, Attachment A printed Page 18, Traditional Medical Plan Schedule of Benefits, Annual Deductible: **$300 per individual / no more than $900 per family** — **unchanged**, no colored text.

**The out-of-pocket maximum moves with it automatically.** The Advantage+ schedule defines OOP max as a multiple of the deductible, and that formula is unchanged:

> Annual Out-of-Pocket Maximum (medical deductible included in medical annual out-of-pocket maximum) — Network: "The network annual out-of-pocket maximum will be **2 times** the applicable deductible." Nonnetwork: "... **3 times** the applicable deductible."

**But Boeing's HSA contribution is also deductible-linked, and it absorbs about half the increase.** Attachment A printed Page 58, "Boeing Annual HSA Contributions" — **unchanged** except for the addition of "domestic partner" (verified visually, redline p. 60):

| Your coverage level | Advantage+ standard option | Advantage+ Preferred Partnership option |
|---|---|---|
| Employee only | 50% of applicable deductible | 80% of applicable deductible |
| Employee + spouse/domestic partner or child(ren) | 50% of applicable deductible | 80% of applicable deductible |
| Employee + spouse/domestic partner and child(ren) | 50% of applicable deductible | 80% of applicable deductible |

Because Boeing funds a **percentage of the deductible**, its contribution rises automatically with it. Netting that out (standard option, employee-only / family):

| Advantage+ standard option | Old | New | Net increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| Deductible, individual | $1,400 | $1,750 | +$350 |
| less Boeing HSA (50%) | −$700 | −$875 | |
| **Net first-dollar exposure, individual** | **$700** | **$875** | **+$175** |
| Deductible, family of 2+ | $2,800 | $3,500 | +$700 |
| less Boeing HSA (50%) | −$1,400 | −$1,750 | |
| **Net first-dollar exposure, family** | **$1,400** | **$1,750** | **+$350** |
| Network OOP max, family (2× deductible) | $5,600 | $7,000 | +$1,400 |
| **Net worst case, family, after HSA** | **$4,200** | **$5,250** | **+$1,050** |

On the Preferred Partnership option (80% funding) the net individual increase is about **+$70** and the net family increase about **+$140**.

All deductible and HSA-percentage figures above are quoted from the document. The OOP-max and net-exposure figures are **computed** from the stated multipliers — the tables give formulas, not dollar results.

So the honest characterization is narrower than the raw deductible jump suggests: **out-of-pocket exposure does rise, by roughly $175–$350 in first-dollar terms and about $1,050 in family worst-case terms, not by the full $700/$1,400.** The plan still got more expensive to use, and the OOP ceiling still moved up materially — but Boeing is funding a proportional share of the increase, and any analysis that quotes the deductible change without the HSA offset overstates the hit.

**Why this compounds.** Attachment A redline p. 4 (printed Page 2), under ENROLLMENT / Medical Plans, **visually confirmed**:

> If you do not enroll in a medical plan by the date indicated on the enrollment worksheet, you will be enrolled automatically in the **Advantage+ health plan** ~~Traditional Medical Plan~~ for employee-only coverage.

The plan whose deductible rose 25% is now the plan you land in by doing nothing. Under the Article 16.2(b)(2) pay-band table — unchanged — Advantage+ is also the 0% contribution option in Pay Band 1, which is what makes it attractive on the front end. The trade is a lower premium against a materially higher worst case. **"No change to plan design" does not survive contact with this page.**

### 3.8 Named carriers are struck from Attachment A throughout

Systematic across every plan schedule, **visually confirmed** on Attachment A redline pp. 47–51:

> The Advantage+ health plan (including mental health and substance use) is administered by ~~Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Illinois (~~the **Advantage+ Service Representative**~~)~~.
>
> The Traditional Medical Plan (including mental health and substance abuse) is administered by ~~Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Illinois (~~the **TMP Service Representative**~~)~~.
>
> The vision care program is administered by ~~Davis Vision (~~the **Visions Care Service Representative**~~)~~.
>
> The Scheduled Dental Plan is administered by ~~Delta~~ **the** Dental **Care** ~~of Washington~~ (the **Service Representative**).
>
> The prescription drug program is administered by ~~Express Scripts~~ (the **Pharmacy Benefit Service Representative**).

Every named vendor — medical, pharmacy, dental, vision — is replaced with a generic role. Nothing in the summaries mentions it.

**Important qualifier, so this isn't overstated:** the right to switch carriers was **already reserved** and is unchanged. Attachment A's definitions section (printed Page 38) contains this in **black, pre-existing text** — I checked it against the clean copy specifically to see whether it was new, and it is not:

> **Service Representative** is an agent that has a contract with the Company to make benefit determinations and administer benefit payments under the plan and programs described in this summary. **The Company may change a service representative at any time.**

So the genericization does not hand Boeing a new power. What it does is remove the vendor names a member could previously read off the page, and it makes the Attachment self-consistent with a discretion Boeing already held. Treat it as housekeeping with one real casualty (below), not as a concession.

It also sits awkwardly against SPEEA's own vision bullet: "**VSP is returning** effective January 1, 2027." VSP appears **nowhere** in Attachment A. The document does the opposite of naming a carrier. SPEEA hedges the point ("While SPEEA does not control the vendors Boeing uses"), but a member reading that bullet would reasonably expect to find VSP in the contract, and it is not there — nor is any commitment that the vision carrier will change.

The frame allowance claim **does** check out (Attachment A redline p. 51, printed Page 49, **visually confirmed**): Frames **$110** ~~$90~~. Lens allowances ($50 single / $80 bifocal / $95 trifocal / $155 lenticular) and the $120 contact lens allowance are unchanged.

**The one real casualty of the vendor genericization** (redline p. 46, printed Page 44, **visually confirmed**) — under Vision Care Program Exclusions, "Medical or surgical treatment of the eye" previously carried a carve-out that is now struck:

> Medical or surgical treatment of the eye. ~~(However, Davis Vision network providers will offer discounts for refractive surgery.)~~

The LASIK/refractive-surgery discount leaves the contract along with the vendor's name.

One further gain, unmentioned anywhere — Hearing Aids, added to **both** the Advantage+ schedule (redline p. 48, printed Page 46) and the Traditional Medical Plan schedule (redline p. 21, printed Page 19), network and nonnetwork, **visually confirmed**:

> 10% up to $800 per ear **(dollar limit not applicable for pediatric hearing aids up to age 19)**

### 3.9 "Pacific Northwest" LOU — the document says Puget Sound, and both parties sign it

**SPEEA:** "LOU signaling commitment to the Pacific Northwest **written by Boeing executives**"

The document is **NEW LOU #TBD — RELATING TO ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT OF PRODUCTION PROGRAMS AND INVESTMENTS IN OUR TEAM** (clean pp. 135–136). The phrase "Pacific Northwest" appears **nowhere** in the CBA, Attachment A, Attachment B, or the side letters — the LOU says "Puget Sound." And it is a bilateral LOU with SPEEA and Boeing signature blocks, not a Boeing-executive letter. The characterization is loose in both directions; the LOU is arguably *stronger* than "written by Boeing executives" implies.

Its operative content is a forum, not a guarantee:

> The Forum shall be established and meet semiannually to review and discuss key elements of the business and workforce. Both parties agree to the exchange of ideas and candid dialogue with the mutual goal of fostering the relationship between the Company and SPEEA on workforce development issues.

The program recitals ("a strong, multi-year backlog across the 737MAX, 777X, KC-46, and P-8 family of programs will drive a sustained workload and staffing needs well into the future") are acknowledgments, not commitments. The only forward obligation is "The Parties agree to **discuss** the engineering and technical SOW."

---

# 4. In the contract, absent from the summaries

### 4.1 LOU 26 (Same-Sex Survivor Benefits) is deleted in its entirety

Redline p. 129 — the title, body, date, and both signature blocks are struck in red. **Visually confirmed.** The deleted text:

> ~~Recognizing Boeing's commitment to equality without regard to sexual orientation, Boeing will, effective upon ratification of this agreement, extend pension survivor benefits to all spouses, as defined under either State or Federal law, whichever defines the same sex person as a spouse.~~

The clean copy has no LOU 26; numbering jumps 25 → 27. This may be intended as post-*Obergefell* cleanup, and Article 16.5 (below) moves in a protective direction — but the deletion is unmentioned in every summary I searched, and the belt-and-suspenders "whichever defines the same sex person as a spouse" language is gone.

### 4.2 Article 16.2(d) — new unilateral well-being authority

New, in blue (redline p. 64, **visually confirmed**):

> **16.2(d) Voluntary Well-Being Programs.** The Company may implement, **at its sole discretion**, well-being programs on an enterprise-wide or regional basis, **without further bargaining**.

Paired with the **deletion** of old 16.2(b)(4) — the wellness surcharge ($20/month, $40 with a spouse, for not completing the online health assessment and biometric screenings; redline p. 63, entirely struck). Losing the surcharge is a genuine gain. But the section titled "Voluntary" contains no words making participation voluntary and no bar on future financial incentives or penalties. Nothing in 16.2(d) prevents a new differential from being reintroduced as a "well-being program."

### 4.3 Article 22.4(c) — new, and favorable

Redline p. 81, **visually confirmed**, new blue text:

> **22.4(c)** When employees are reclassified into a position outside of Appendix B, it will be considered a less than equivalent job offer if it results in a change to the employees' union status. If the employee declines to accept the new role, their exit from the Company will be considered involuntary and they will be eligible for layoff benefits as defined in Article 21. **While Article 22.4 is not subject to Article 3, decisions relating to layoff benefit eligibility may be grieved under Article 3.**

Reclassification out of the bargaining unit can no longer be used to force a resignation without layoff benefits, and the benefit-eligibility decision is arbitrable. SPEEA's summary reduces this to "Greater involvement and enforcement of jurisdiction authority and disputes (Article 22)."

### 4.4 Article 16.5 — domestic partner coverage restored

Redline p. 66, **visually confirmed**. The 2020 text said the Company **"will no longer recognize"** same-gender domestic partners as eligible dependents unless they married or enrolled in a legally-mandated fully-insured plan. That is struck. The new text:

> **Section 16.5 Same and Opposite-Gender Domestic Partners.** Effective June 1, 2021, the Company **included, in additional to legal spouses,** same and opposite-gender domestic partners **(and their dependent children)** as eligible dependents under active or retiree health and insurance plans, **subject to the dependent verification process established under such plans**.

A substantive expansion — opposite-gender domestic partners and dependent children added — that appears in no summary I searched. (Note the drafting: "in additional to," and an effective date of June 1, 2021 written into a 2026–2030 agreement.)

## 4.5 Article 15 — the 401(k) restructure is deeper than the one bullet

SPEEA's bullet ("individuals under age 40 years receive 1% additional non-matching SCRC (from 3% to 4% — affects 7,800+ people)") is **accurate**, but the mechanism is a wholesale rewrite of Sections 15.6–15.9 into 15.5–15.8, and it has a piece the bullet omits.

Redline pp. 58–61, **visually confirmed**. New **15.8(b)** applies to employees hired **before** January 1, 2027, replacing the 3/4/5 age-tiered table with:

| Age at End of Year | SCRC | Max Company Match | Total Company Contribution |
|---|---|---|---|
| ~~Under age 40~~ | ~~3%~~ | ~~6%~~ | ~~9%~~ |
| Under age 50 | 4% | 6% | 10% |
| Age 50 and older | 5% | 6% | 11% |

New **15.8(a)** applies to employees hired or rehired **on or after January 1, 2027**: a flat **4%** SCRC, 6% max match, 10% total — **with no age-50 step-up**.

**The omitted piece:** a person hired at age 52 in 2028 gets 4%, where an identical colleague hired in 2026 gets 5%. The age-50 tier is preserved for the current workforce and eliminated for future hires. SPEEA's summary says only "All new employees will receive a 4% company contribution," which is true and does not mention what was traded.

Also newly written in: **"Employees will be 100% immediately vested in the Special Company Retirement Contribution and Company Matching Contribution"** — the match vesting language is an addition.

## 4.6 Article 21.5 (new) — medical layoff

Redline p. 78, **visually confirmed**:

> **Section 21.5 Medical Layoff.** "Involuntary Layoff Event" under the Layoff Benefit Plan shall be amended to provide layoff benefits to employees covered by this Agreement who (a) are on medical leave of absence and (b) such employee is unable to perform the essential functions of their base job, including with a reasonable accommodation, if applicable, due to a medical condition.

SPEEA mentions this ("Established medical layoff process for specific situations") without the text. The text is favorable and worth quoting to members.

## 4.7 LOU 20 — who can kill the EIP

Redline p. 121, **visually confirmed**. The 7% target is confirmed:

> The Company agrees to an award percentage payable upon achievement of a target Company performance score of 1.0 equal to ~~5~~**7**%

But in the same LOU, this deletion:

> The ~~Board of Directors of the~~ Company reserves the right to amend, modify, or terminate the EIP in its sole discretion.

Authority to terminate the EIP moves from the Board of Directors to "the Company." Unchanged, and worth reading alongside it:

> In the event of any conflict between this Letter of Understanding and the official EIP plan document, the official EIP plan document will prevail in every case.
>
> Nothing in this Letter of Understanding or employee participation in the EIP will be subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure of Article 3.

A 40% target increase that is unilaterally terminable at a lower level of authority than before, non-grievable, and subordinate to a plan document Boeing controls.

### 4.8 Article 20.7 makes the new Functional Advisor roles non-grievable

The Functional Advisor LOU closes:

> The parties agree that the Functional Advisor roles will be administered through the Ed Wells Partnership and **will be governed by Article 20** of the parties' collective bargaining agreement.

Article 20.7, **unchanged**:

> Disputes concerning any aspect of this Article shall be referred to the Joint Policy Board for resolution. **No matter involving the Ed Wells Partnership, or any provision of this Article will be subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure of Article 3.**

The four new roles are real and funded (§5.2), but nothing about them — selection, RAA, elimination — is arbitrable.

### 4.9 The Miami 6H6B retiree-medical exclusion survives while the Utah one is deleted

Attachment B redline p. 3, **visually confirmed**. The Utah exclusion paragraph is struck in full (confirming SPEEA's claim). Immediately below it, **not struck**:

> Any employee employed by the Company as Product Review Engineers, Boeing Salaried Job Code 6H6B, at the Boeing Flight Services Training Campus located in Miami, Florida, who was not eligible for company-subsidized retiree medical coverage prior to November 25, 2013 shall not be eligible for retiree medical coverage under this Agreement; including those hired prior to January 1, 2007.

SPEEA says "Eliminated the exception that had excluded Utah employees … **No other changes to the legacy benefit.**" That is literally true. It is worth a rep asking why one site-specific carve-out was bought out and the other — which names job code 6H6B specifically — was not. LOU 29 (Miami Employees) is separately deleted in full (redline p. 133).

### 4.10 The Scheduled Dental Plan's entire fee schedule is deleted from the contract

Redline pp. 72–75 (printed Pages 70–73), **visually confirmed**. The Scheduled Dental Plan Schedule of Covered Services lists every ADA procedure code against a "Maximum Allowable Fee ($)." **Every dollar figure on all four pages is struck** — D2140 one-surface restoration ~~$58~~, D2150 ~~$74~~, crowns ~~$380~~, root canal molar ~~$512~~, osseous surgery ~~$644~~, complete denture ~~$481~~, and so on through the entire schedule.

They are replaced by a single change to the column header:

> Maximum Allowable Fee ($) **[Updated Annually]**

The document does not say who updates them, on what index, with what notice, or whether SPEEA sees the schedule before it takes effect. A member covered by the Scheduled Dental Plan can no longer look up what the plan will pay for a crown, because the number is no longer in the contract. Whether this is favorable depends entirely on the update mechanism — which is not described anywhere I searched. **This is in no summary.**

### 4.11 Infertility: the exclusion list is struck, and coverage is redefined by reference to non-union policy

**SPEEA:** "Access to infertility and doula benefits (effective January 1, 2027)" — accurate, and considerably bigger than one bullet suggests.

Redline p. 38 (printed Page 36), **visually confirmed**. The entire infertility exclusion block is struck:

> ~~Infertility services or supplies not specifically covered, including but not limited to: Any tests, visits, consultations, or treatment related to, leading to, or resulting in one of the noncovered services listed below. Artificial insemination. Consecutive follicular ultrasounds, cycle therapy, or corresponding laboratory tests when associated with any artificial means of conception. Embryo transfer. Fertility drugs when associated with artificial means of conception. Gamete intrafallopian transfer (GIFT). In vitro fertilization. Microinjections. Sperm preparation. Sperm separation. Zona drilling.~~

In its place, one sentence added at the Infertility coverage section (redline p. 31, printed Page 29, **visually confirmed**):

> **Fertility coverage and exclusions will align with fertility coverage available to enterprise nonunion employees.**

Removing an eleven-item exclusion list is a real gain. But note the structure: the specific, bargained exclusions are gone, and the benefit's content is now defined **by reference to a non-union enterprise policy Boeing sets unilaterally**. The contract no longer states what fertility treatment is covered — it states whose policy governs.

Doula follows the same pattern (redline p. 34, printed Page 32, **visually confirmed**):

> You and your covered dependents will be eligible for Doula coverage if enrolled under a Boeing-sponsored medical plan option administered by BCBSIL, **under the same terms and conditions as nonunion employees.**

**This is a pattern worth naming.** Across this package, several new benefits are granted contractually but *scoped* by reference to policy Boeing controls: fertility ("align with … enterprise nonunion employees"), doula ("same terms and conditions as nonunion employees"), Primary Care+ ("reserves the right to unilaterally alter… without further bargaining"), LTP (same), well-being programs under Art. 16.2(d) ("at its sole discretion… without further bargaining"), and the Retiree-Only HRA ("terms of the plan which the Company will design, in its discretion"). The grants are real. Their content is not fixed by this contract, and can move without bargaining.

### 4.12 Two Attachment A gains nobody mentioned

**Short-term disability no longer offsets Social Security.** Redline p. 9 (printed Page 7), **visually confirmed** — struck from the list of "Other Income Benefits" that reduce your weekly STD benefit:

> ~~Social Security disability or retirement benefits, including primary, spouse, and dependent child benefits.~~

Railroad Retirement Act benefits, workers' compensation, salary continuation, and other disability plans remain as offsets. Removing the Social Security offset is a direct increase in net STD benefit for anyone drawing SSDI or Social Security retirement. Also added, a clarification: "You must submit a **new** claim for benefits and meet the waiting period requirements before benefits will be paid **with respect to a second period of disability**."

**The Medical Review Program's partial-payment penalty is struck.** Redline p. 26 (printed Page 24), **visually confirmed**. The preauthorization penalty table loses its middle row:

| If preadmission or prior approval is… | Then the plan pays… |
|---|---|
| Obtained through the medical review program | Regular benefit levels shown in the Traditional Medical Plan Schedule of Benefits |
| ~~Required but not obtained and it is later determined that the care was medically necessary~~ | ~~50% of the first $2,000 of usual and customary charges (after the deductible)~~ |
| Not obtained and the admission or care is not considered medically necessary under the medical review program's guidelines | No benefits; you are responsible for 100% of the charges |

Previously, failing to preauthorize care that turned out to be medically necessary capped the plan's payment at 50% of the first $2,000. That penalty row is gone. The surviving rows deny benefits only when care is **not** medically necessary — so on the plain reading, medically-necessary-but-unauthorized care now draws regular benefits. **That reading is favorable but not stated:** the table no longer expressly addresses the case at all. Worth confirming with SPEEA rather than assuming.

**Kaiser Permanente HMO (OR) primary care.** Redline p. 57 (printed Page 55), **visually confirmed** — new: "**$5 copayment for first 3 visits each year, then** $20 copayment per visit," with Urgent Care split into its own row at $20. Oregon members only.

### 4.13 The retiree medical Conversion Privilege is deleted — and actives keep theirs

Attachment B redline p. 10 (printed Page 8), **visually confirmed**. The entire section is struck in red:

> ~~**Conversion Privilege** — If medical coverage terminates for reasons other than voluntary cancellation of coverage or by becoming eligible for another Company-sponsored plan, the service representative will make available an individual program of medical benefits similar to those then being issued for group conversion. The benefits provided under the individual plan will not exactly duplicate the benefits provided under this group medical plan. This conversion privilege is available to your covered dependents who cease to qualify under the group policy and **to surviving covered dependents if you die. No evidence of insurability is required.**~~

**The same privilege survives for active employees.** The parallel language is still present, unstruck, in the clean Attachment A. So a retiree's covered dependents — including **surviving** dependents after the retiree's death — lose a guaranteed-issue conversion right that an active employee's dependents keep. "No evidence of insurability is required" is the operative phrase being deleted.

SPEEA's summary says of the legacy retiree benefit: "**No other changes to the legacy benefit.**" This is another change to it, in the opposite direction from the Utah fix, and it is in no summary.

### 4.14 Attachment B — post-65 Medicare access added, common-law spouse struck

Attachment B redline p. 4 (printed Page 2), **visually confirmed**. Three changes worth separating:

**Added (favorable):**

> You are no longer eligible for coverage under the **pre-65** retiree medical plan after attaining age 65 or becoming eligible for Medicare **(with respect to the latter, subject to the special rules that apply in the case of end-stage renal disease). However, the Company will provide eligible retirees access to the Boeing Medicare Plan on a retiree-pay-all basis**

**Added (favorable), the retiree-side Company Couples provision matching Art. 16.4(f):**

> **Notwithstanding the foregoing, effective January 1, 2027, if a retiree and their spouse or domestic partner are both retired from the Company, one retiree may elect to cover the other (who defers retiree medical coverage) under their Company-sponsored retiree medical plan.**

**Struck:**

> ~~You may request coverage for the following dependents: An opposite-gender common law spouse if the relationship meets the common-law requirements for the state where you entered into the common-law relationship.~~

The common-law spouse provision is **retained in Attachment A** for active employees (verified visually, redline p. 3) and **deleted from Attachment B** for retirees. Domestic partners are added throughout Attachment B, so most people are better off — but a retiree in a common-law marriage that isn't otherwise recognized may not be. Worth one question rather than an assumption.

## 4.15 Article 18.1 — protected classes expanded

Redline p. 72, **visually confirmed**, new blue text:

> All terms and conditions of employment included in this Agreement shall be administered and applied without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran, age, sex, marital status, sexual orientation, **gender identity,** ~~or~~ the presence of a disability, **or any other characteristic protected by federal, state, or local law,** except in those instances where age, sex or the absence of a disability may constitute a bona fide occupational qualification.

A real expansion, in no summary I searched. Note what is **unchanged**: Section 18.2 still bars class grievances — "a grievance alleging a violation of this Article 18 shall be subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure of Article 3 **only if it is filed on behalf of and pertains to a single employee**. Class grievances under this Article 18 shall not be subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure under this Agreement." A broader protected-class list with no class remedy.

## 4.14 Article 17 — the pension increase carries a condition the 2017 increase did not

Redline p. 70, **visually confirmed**. SPEEA's bullet ("Pension: Basic BCERP Benefit increased from $100 to $110") is accurate. The new subsection, in full:

> **(ii)** Effective January 1, 2027, the Basic Benefit increased to $110 per month for all years of Credited Service for employees on the Active Payroll of the Company on or after January 1, 2027, or those on an Authorized Period of Absence on or after January 1, 2027 (including those who retire from the employ of the Company on January 1, 2027), **while represented by the Union and covered by this Agreement.**

The parallel 2017 provision at $100 — retained as (i) directly above — has **no such condition**. What "while represented by the Union and covered by this Agreement" does to the $110 rate for someone who moves to a non-represented role, or after this Agreement expires, is not stated. Worth asking.

Two further Article 17 changes, neither in any summary:

- **17.5(d)**: the automatic small-lump-sum cash-out threshold rises from **$5,000 to $7,000** as of January 1, 2027 — an involuntary distribution for anyone whose accrued BCERP benefit falls in that band.
- **17.5** preamble: the struck text formerly listed among the unchanged BCERP provisions "~~including, but not limited to,~~ ~~**the closure of the Plan to employees hired on or after March 1, 2013**~~," now replaced with "except as provided in Sections 17.5(a) and 17.5(d) below." The plan closure itself is not reopened — but the express contractual acknowledgment of it is gone.

## 4.15 Side letter 10 is a negotiation proposal sheet, not a side letter

Page 10 of the combined side letters is **Proposal U9, dated 7/22/26, 4:20 PM**, unsigned, carrying the standard negotiation footer:

> Note: Any agreements on individual proposals contained herein are tentative and subject to agreement on all issues. The Parties reserve the right to add, amend, modify and/or change any proposal at any time during the course of negotiations. Agreement is subject to ratification vote approval by the membership.

Its substance matters — **visually confirmed**:

> The parties agree that in the four years following the effective date of the 2026-2030 Collective Bargaining Agreements for both the Professional and Technical Bargaining Agreements, any R3 ratings for the years 2024, 2025 and 2026 shall be applied in the fulfillment of the four consecutive R2 retention ratings for the purpose of an appeal under Article 8.4(h)(2) in each agreement.

Under the new R1/R2 structure, prior R3s count toward the four-consecutive-R2 appeal trigger — favorable, and it protects people carrying R3s from the old scheme. But it is distributed as a **tentative proposal sheet**, not an executed letter, and it is not one of the "previously written side letters executed by authorized representatives of the Company and the Union" that the incorporation LOU preserves. **Ask what its status is on and after ratification.**

---

# 5. Confirmed, and confirmed better than stated

## 5.1 LOU 4 (Data Reports) — a real oversight win, and the lever for compa-ratio scrutiny

Redline p. 98, **visually confirmed**. The old LOU pointed at an October 31, 2008 memorandum. That is struck and replaced with an enumerated schedule:

> The Company will provide **the following reports to the Union** subject to such revisions in the future as may be made by mutual agreement of the parties. Nothing herein is intended to waive any right the Union may have to receive additional data:
>
> **Weekly:** SPEEA extract – Total Population – Weekly Data File · SPEEA union dues extract · SPEEA extract – Ins & Outs including transfers within the Company · Recall Data
>
> **Monthly:** Contractor and Industry Assist Data · **Purchased services Data** · Layoff data (60 day notice, active and Priority, etc) · Dues deduction reports for SPEEA represented employees · Light Duty including start date · Medical accommodation including permanent/temporary and start date · Leave of absence including type, start, expected end
>
> **Annual:** W-2 Box 1 Detail · Pension Retiree Reports · Retention Data · Competency Scores · **Performance Management Scores** · **Annual Compensation Review data**
>
> The reports and data listed above shall contain the same data elements as current reports and shall be provided in the frequency identified above, and **shall not be changed without the mutual agreement of the parties**.
>
> Nothing herein shall change the reports furnished nor the frequency upon which they have historically been furnished absent the mutual agreement of SPEEA and the Company. Nothing herein is intended to waive any rights the Union or Company may have with respect to the National Labor Relations Act.

**Why this matters for the wage-pool analysis:** "Annual Compensation Review data" and "Performance Management Scores" are now contractual deliverables with a no-unilateral-change lock. This is the mechanism by which SPEEA could verify how the 6.0%/5.0% Salary Adjustment Funds and the Art. 11.7 Performance Fund Merit are distributed against compa-ratio.

**The LOU does not name compa-ratio — but the current reports plainly contain it**, which is what the lock actually reaches. SPEEA's own Chart #136 series for this unit carries a *Compa-Ratio Distribution by Level* chart (#136B) and a *% Salary Increase by Compa-Ratio* chart (#136E) whose axis is defined as "Before Compa-Ratio (Employee Beginning Salary divided by SRT Market Reference)," alongside per-level before/after compa-ratio, Boeing's Salary Reference Table Min/Mkt Ref/High Mkt, and Recl-OOS counts and dollars. Since LOU 4 locks "the same data elements as current reports," compa-ratio and market-range position are captured. See §6 for the full evidence and for the one question this leaves open — whether the locked element is **per-employee** compa-ratio or only the aggregated chart series.

Note also **"Purchased services Data"** monthly — the only *contractual* Purchased Services obligation in the package, and unlike the side letter, it is in an LOU with no Article 3 exclusion.

## 5.2 Ed Wells funding — a 31% step-up, understated in the summary

**SPEEA:** "Increased funding for the current Ed Wells, additional funding for the four functional representatives and additional position."

**Section 20.5**, redline p. 75. Annual minimum funding is average monthly headcount × a per-head factor:

| Year | Factor |
|---|---|
| 2020–2026 (existing) | 370 → 417 |
| **2027** | **546** |
| **2028** | **563** |
| **2029** | **580** |
| **2030** | **597** |

2026's 417 → 2027's 546 is a **+30.9%** step, on top of ~2% annual escalation thereafter. That is a concrete number worth putting in front of members; "increased funding" undersells it.

**Section 20.6** confirms the administrator term change: "For a maximum of ~~two~~ **three** years of employment…" — and, unchanged, that appointees "receive annual salary increases that are, at a minimum, equivalent to the negotiated salary pool for the period of such employment."

### 5.3 LOU 7 (NORA) — a just-cause standard, better than "more robust"

**SPEEA:** "A more-robust process revised to protect members from abuse of process and now requires oversight by skill team."

Redline p. 103, **visually confirmed**. New blue text:

> Prior to initiating a NORA, the manager shall implement a Performance Development Plan (PDP), based on the current enterprise standards, articulating performance deficiencies, manager expectations, and success criteria. The employee shall be granted at least 30 days under the PDP, which can be extended if an employee is demonstrating improvement but hasn't fully reached the defined goals of the PDP. If, at the completion of the PDP period the employee's performance remains deficient, the manager may initiate a NORA. **The draft NORA shall be reviewed with the Skill Team leader, designee, and/or a manager over the skill (i.e. not the direct supervisor of the employee) before being issued to the employee.**
>
> If a designee is assigned, that individual must be consistent throughout the NORA period; a manager may not assign more than one designee.
>
> **If the Company elects not to reclassify, layoff, or retrain the employee, the Company must establish just cause for its decision to terminate.** In the event discharge takes place, the employee's rehireable status will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

An explicit **just cause** standard for NORA-driven termination is a materially bigger deal than "more robust." **LOU 7 contains no Article 3 exclusion**, and the LOU's closing paragraph (unchanged) preserves it: "Employees laid off according to those provisions will retain all rights they may have under Article 3." Combined with Article 3.1's carve-in for "cases of dismissal or suspension for just cause," this looks arbitrable. Confirm with SPEEA Legal before relying on it.

### 5.4 Article 8.8(d) — an at-will revocation clause struck, but it survives elsewhere

Redline p. 32, **visually confirmed**:

> **8.8(d)** … Termination of part-time work schedules will be managed in accordance with LOU XX. ~~Approval of part-time work schedules may be revoked at any time at management's discretion.~~

Genuinely favorable. But **LOU 11**, the presumed referent, still contains — **unchanged, in black** — "Approval of a part-time work schedule is subject to revocation at any time." The at-will revocation is relocated, not removed.

## 5.5 LOU 11 — SPEEA's claim checks out

**SPEEA:** "Part-time should be more accessible due to a revised Letter of Understanding (LOU) 11, which says part-time request approvals will not be unreasonably withheld."

Redline p. 109, **visually confirmed** — this sentence is new, in blue underline:

> Such approval shall not unreasonably be withheld.

**Accurate.** And LOU 11 contains **no Article 3 exclusion** — unlike LOU 13, LOU 20, and Article 20. That makes it one of the few new standards in this package that appears genuinely enforceable. Scope limit worth stating: the standard governs the *initial approval*, and the very next (unchanged) sentence leaves revocation at will.

## 5.6 Mandatory overtime 144 → 112, with unchanged escape hatches

**LOU 22**, redline p. 125:

> no employee shall normally be required, and need not be permitted, to work more than ~~144~~**112** overtime hours in any budget quarter, more than two weekends consecutively without the next weekend off, or more than 8 hours on a Saturday or a Sunday.

**Confirmed.** This was the *only* substantive change on the page. Unchanged and worth reading alongside it: the cap applies to what employees shall "**normally**" be required to do, and the exceptions remain broad —

> An employee may be required to perform overtime work beyond the above limitations where necessary for delivery of Company products to a customer, where necessary for the timely submission of proposals where related to customer-requested emergency repair of delivered products, or for Government DX or Government DO rated orders.

## 5.7 Article 16.3(b) / Attachment B — new retiree medical access, correctly described

Redline p. 64 and Attachment B redline p. 3, **visually confirmed**. Old Attachment B text said post-2007 hires "**will not be eligible for** the retiree medical coverage described in this Attachment B when you retire from the Company," at age **60+**. New text:

> **16.3(b)** Effective as of January 1, 2028, for employees who (i) were hired on or after January 1, 2007, (ii) satisfy the retiree medical eligibility requirements applicable to employees under Section 16.3(a) above (other than with respect to hire or rehire date), and (iii) terminate employment on or after December 31, 2027, the Company will provide **access only** to the Retiree Medical Plan and Medicare Plan referred to in Section 16.3(a), **on a retiree-pay-all basis**, as summarized in Attachment B.

The age threshold moves **60 → 55**, and the eligibility flips from "not eligible" to access. SPEEA's description ("New access-only retiree medical eligibility for all employees who leave after age 55 with at least 10 years of service") is accurate. Members should note **retiree-pay-all** — no Company subsidy — which SPEEA's "access-only" phrasing implies but does not state.

Also **new 16.4(f) Company Couples** and **16.2(e) Company Couples**, both new blue text, delivering SPEEA's "SPEEA couples can finally be on the same plan."

## 5.8 Section 16.6 — the HRA is real, and Company-designed

Redline p. 66, **visually confirmed**:

> **Section 16.6 Retiree-Only HRA.** The Company will establish a Retiree-Only Health Reimbursement Arrangement plan ("Retiree-Only HRA Plan"), effective January 1, 2028, for employees covered by this Agreement who (a) terminate employment on or after the plan effective date and during the term of this Agreement, and (b) satisfy the eligibility requirements for payment of unused sick leave under Section 6.6 of this Agreement, inclusive of attainment of age 55 with at least 10 years of service at the time of such termination ("Eligible Retiree"), **subject to the terms of the plan which the Company will design, in its discretion**, in accordance with applicable law (including ERISA and the Internal Revenue Code and regulations issued thereunder).
>
> **16.6(a)** The Company will make a **one-time, notional** employer contribution on behalf of an Eligible Retiree to the Retiree-Only HRA Plan. This contribution will be **equivalent to and separate from** their accrued unused sick leave payable to such Eligible Retiree (under with Section 6.6 of the Agreement), following termination of employment. An Eligible Retiree will have access to file claims for reimbursement of qualified medical plan premiums and medical expenses (under Internal Revenue Code Section 213(d)) from their Retiree-Only HRA Plan account **for a period of 20 years** (measured from termination of employment as described in Section 16.6 above) **or until death, whichever occurs first**.

SPEEA's "Does not affect current sick leave payout" is confirmed by "equivalent to **and separate from**" — a genuine doubling of that value in tax-advantaged form. Three qualifiers members should hear: it is **notional**, the plan is **Company-designed in its discretion**, and unused balances **expire at 20 years**.

### 5.9 Miscellaneous confirmed

- **Article 23.1(a)**: effective "August XX, 2026," expires **October 11, 2030**, with auto-renewal and a hard outer expiry of October 8, 2034.
- **Article 14 (Strikes and Lockouts)**: **no changes** — no colored text on redline p. 55.
- **Article 17.5(c)**: unchanged — Lump Sum Award payments under Article 11 continue to count toward Final Average Monthly Earnings under the BCERP, "only to the extent paid during the 60 months immediately preceding the employee's Retirement Date to an employee who is represented by the Union at the time the LSA payment is made." Relevant to the wage-pool analysis: LSAs still carry pension value for those within 5 years of retiring.
- **LOU 6** (Employment Stabilization, Outsourcing and Use of Non-Boeing Labor): **no changes** — no colored text on redline pp. 101–102. This is worth noting given how much of the Purchased Services story rests on side letters.
- **LOU 30, LOU 18, LOU 19, LOU 23–25, LOU 27–28**: no substantive changes beyond striking the "Dated: March 10, 2020" line.
- **LOU 17** (Salary Review Consideration Upon Return From Leave): small favorable clarification — returning salary includes contractual minimum increases "calculated or paid **(i.e. between the fund computation date and the increase effective date)**" during the leave.
- **Side letter 5 (Generalist SMC)**, July 27, 2026, Robert Joga — **visually confirmed**, quoted in full: "The Company agrees that it will not utilize '- Generalist' SMCs for SPEEA-represented employees and contract labor personnel within SPEEA's jurisdiction." Relevant to jurisdiction erosion; unmentioned in the summaries.

### 5.10 Layoff benefit minimums — the involuntary floor is in the CBA, the voluntary one is conditional

**SPEEA:** "Increased involuntary and voluntary minimum layoff benefits for those with at least one year of service (four weeks minimum pay)."

**The involuntary side checks out and is contractual.** Article 21.3, redline p. 77, **visually confirmed**, new blue text:

> An eligible employee's total lump sum or income continuation benefit shall equal one week of pay based on the employee's base salary at the time of layoff (but excluding any shift differentials or other premiums) for each full year of Company service as of the employee's layoff date, subject to a **minimum benefit of 4 weeks and** maximum benefit of 26 weeks of pay.

Art. 21.2 (unchanged) sets eligibility at "at least one year of Company service" plus involuntary layoff, so SPEEA's phrasing is accurate for involuntary layoffs.

**The voluntary side is a conditional side letter with a narrower band.** Side letter page 7, July 29, 2026, Robert Joga — **visually confirmed**:

> This letter serves to formally capture our discussions and the Company's commitment as it relates to employees interested in a Voluntary Layoff ("VLO"). **Should the Company offer** SPEEA represented employees the opportunity for a VLO during the life of this contract, we agree to provide a minimum layoff benefit of four (4) weeks of pay for those with **at least one (1) year of Company service and less than four full years of Company service**, who take the VLO.

Two qualifiers the summary drops: the Company makes **no commitment to offer a VLO at all**, and the floor is written for the 1-to-under-4-years band specifically. Functionally that band is where a 1-week-per-year formula falls short of four weeks, so the practical effect matches — but the sentence a member would rely on is conditional, and it lives in an unilateral letter rather than Article 21.

### 5.11 Part-time benefits — the 24-hour threshold is confirmed, effective 2028

**SPEEA:** "Minimum hours required to maintain full benefits reduced from 32.1 to 24 hours… Employees scheduled for 19.1 to 23.9 hours will continue to pay 40% premium for benefits. (No change)"

Side letter page 4, July 24, 2026, Robert Joga — **visually confirmed**:

> **Effective January 1, 2028**, a part-time employee's cost for medical and dental coverage, based on regularly scheduled hours per week, will change in accordance with the following table:

| Regularly Scheduled Hours Per Week | Status; Cost |
|---|---|
| At least 19.1 through 23.9 hours | Part-time; 40% cost share |
| At least 24 through 39.9 hours | Part-time; applicable active rates |
| 40 or more hours | Full-time; applicable active rates |

**Both claims check out.** The one thing the summaries omit is the date: this is **effective January 1, 2028**, not on ratification. Anyone planning a phased retirement or a post-baby schedule around it should know it is roughly 17 months out.

### 5.12 The AI side letter preserves effects bargaining

Side letter page 9, July 29, 2026, Robert Joga — **visually confirmed**. Most of the letter describes Boeing's existing Global Privacy Office framework. The operative commitments are two:

> Further, Boeing commits to meet and discuss with SPEEA's AI negotiations subcommittee team on the nature and intent of AI and automated decision-making technology deployments when applied to HR-related process flows within the bargaining units. The meeting will be held with the Company's Chief Privacy Officer **within sixty (60) days of contract ratification**, with the agenda to be defined by both parties. **Nothing in this letter waives either Party's rights or obligations under the National Labor Relations Act, including with respect to bargaining over the effects of such implementation.**
>
> Following the meeting with the Chief Privacy Officer, the parties agree to meet and mutually agree whether establishing a standing committee dedicated to these topics is appropriate, or if they should be referred to an already established joint committee.

The express preservation of **effects bargaining under the NLRA** is the most substantive thing in the letter and is worth more than the committee language. Note also this sentence, which is a description of current practice rather than a commitment: "We may use automated tools, including AI, but decisions that have legal or similarly significant effects on employees are not made without appropriate safeguards and a lawful basis. Human oversight is used to help ensure decisions are made and applied fairly."

---

# 6. Compa-ratio, the PFM, and promotion/OOS — what Chart #136 shows about this unit

The handoff asked specifically for anything bearing on compa-ratio, the Performance Fund Merit, or promotion/OOS distribution. Nothing in the LOUs or side letters changes the Art. 11.7 mechanics established earlier. But cross-reading the new LOU 4 against SPEEA's existing Chart #136 for this unit resolves one open question and surfaces a quantified exposure that belongs in front of a rep.

**Source:** `136-BCA-6H6B-62E.pdf`, SPEEA Charts #136A–F, February 20, 2026 Salary Review, BCA-6H6B-62E Production Engineering – Liaison Engineering, 614 employees.

## 6.1 Compa-ratio is a current data element — so LOU 4 reaches it

Two of the six charts are built on compa-ratio directly:

- **Chart #136B** — "*Compa-Ratio Distribution by Level.*"
- **Chart #136E** — "*% Salary Increase by Compa-Ratio,*" x-axis labeled **"Before Compa-Ratio (Employee Beginning Salary divided by SRT Market Reference)."**

Every chart's data table carries, per level: head count, average age, average service, average salary, **before/after compa-ratio**, average $ and % increase, **# of Recl-OOS and Avg $ Recl-OOS**, lower 10% / median / upper 10%, and Boeing's Salary Reference Table Min / Mkt Ref / High Mkt.

LOU 4 requires "Annual Compensation Review data" annually and locks it: "*shall contain the same data elements as current reports … and shall not be changed without the mutual agreement of the parties.*" Compa-ratio, market-range position, and Recl-OOS distribution are therefore inside the lock. **This is a stronger oversight win than the LOU text alone conveys** — and it is the instrument for auditing the 2027–2030 pools.

**What remains open.** Chart #136 is aggregated to level within one org. If "current reports" means *this chart series*, SPEEA is locked into level averages. Chart #136B is a **distribution histogram**, which cannot be built from level averages — so per-employee compa-ratio must exist in the underlying feed. That is strong inference, not proof. The precise question is in §9.

## 6.2 The unit's own numbers reproduce the worksheet

Chart #136C, % Salary Increase Distribution, February 2026:

| Bucket | <2.0% | 2.0–2.4% | 2.5–2.9% | 3.0–3.4% | 3.5–3.9% | 4.0–4.4% | ≥5% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Population | 0 | 59 | 208 | 282 | 38 | 23 | 4 |

0 + 59 + 208 = **267 of 614 = 43.5%** received less than the 3.0% pool — reproducing `SPEEA_Wage_Pool_Worksheet.pdf` exactly from source.

Recl-OOS, Level 4/D: **21 of 203 = 10.34% per year.** P(no promotion/OOS money in four years) = $(1 - 0.1034)^4$ = **64.6%** — the worksheet's 65%.

## 6.3 The exposure nobody has quantified: 46.6% of the unit sits above compa-ratio 1.0

Art. 11.7 states the PFM is "*intended to support compensation adjustments for high-performing individuals with low market positioning.*" Against this unit's after-compa-ratio by level:

| Level | Head count | Avg age | Avg service | Avg salary | After compa-ratio | Position vs. 1.0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Level 1/A | 25 | 25.7 | 1.2 | $90,767 | 1.009 | above |
| Level 2/B | 172 | 29.3 | 3.7 | $104,007 | 0.972 | **below — favored** |
| Level 3/C | 156 | 39.0 | 9.7 | $127,723 | 0.975 | **below — favored** |
| **Level 4/D** | **203** | **49.5** | **19.5** | **$168,494** | **1.060** | **above** |
| Level 5 | 54 | 53.0 | 23.7 | $198,990 | 1.020 | above |
| Level 6 | 4 | 58.3 | 30.6 | $242,439 | 1.019 | above |
| **Total** | **614** | 40.5 | 12.3 | $140,070 | 1.008 | |

**286 of 614 — 46.6% of the unit — sits above compa-ratio 1.0 at the level average.** Level 4/D alone is 203 people (33% of the unit) at **1.060**, the highest in the unit, at average age 49.5 and average service 19.5.

On the plain reading of Art. 11.7, the most senior third of this unit is structurally steered **away** from the PFM component — the 1.0% (2027) and 0.5% (2028–30) that make the advertised 7.0% and 5.5% pools add up. That same cohort carries the **64.6% probability of no Recl-OOS money across the contract**. The two effects compound rather than offset: the group least likely to receive promotion or out-of-sequence money is also the group the PFM language deprioritizes.

**Two honest limits on this table.** These are **level averages** — individuals inside Level 4/D do sit below 1.0, and the per-employee question in §6.1 is what would let anyone say how many. And "after compa-ratio" reflects the February 2026 review, before any 2027 pool is applied; the PFM's actual behavior is a 2027 observable, not a present fact. Chart #136E — % salary increase plotted against before-compa-ratio — is precisely the instrument that will show it, which is why the LOU 4 lock matters.

## 7. Drafting defects in the document being voted on

These are not interpretation disputes. They are errors in the ratification text.

1. **"LOU XX" is never resolved.** Article 8.8(d): "Termination of part-time work schedules will be managed in accordance with **LOU XX**." The placeholder is unfilled in **both** the redline and the clean copy. The intended referent is presumably LOU 11, but LOU 11's revocation language ("subject to revocation at any time") is arguably in tension with a section that just struck its own at-will revocation clause. Members are voting on a cross-reference that points nowhere.
2. **Article 21 has two Section 21.5s.** "Section 21.5 Continuation of Medical and Dental Coverage" (existing) and "Section 21.5 Medical Layoff" (new) — both on redline p. 78, both numbered 21.5. Visually confirmed.
3. **"August XX, 2026"** — Article 23.1(a)'s effective date is an unfilled placeholder.
4. **Article 23.1(e) is impossible on its face.** Unchanged black text commits the parties to reaffirm the Agreement "within the period fifty nine (59) days before the expiration of the **third and sixth** anniversary of this Agreement." A contract effective August 2026 and expiring October 11, 2030 has no sixth anniversary within its term. Carried over from the six-year 2020–2026 deal without updating.
5. **Six LOUs are numbered "NEW LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING #TBD."** Functional Advisor Roles, Primary Care+, Bi-Party ERC, Existing Side Letters, AI in the Workplace, and Engineering/Technical Support of Production Programs all carry the same placeholder. Cross-referencing any of them is impossible until numbering is assigned post-ratification.
6. **Attachment A's table of contents is a placeholder.** Redline p. 2, new blue text under the heading: "Attachment A – Table of Contents **(To be updated)**." The page numbers in it are therefore not reliable, and the Attachment B table of contents shows the same kind of drift (its entries shifted by 1–2 pages between clean and redline).
7. **The Scheduled Dental Plan fee schedule is now "[Updated Annually]" with no stated mechanism** — see §4.10. Not a typo, but a hole in the document of the same kind.
8. **Every LOU is "Dated: TBD" with blank signature lines.** Expected pre-ratification, but it means the "Existing Side Letters" LOU's requirement that letters be "executed by authorized representatives of the Company and the Union" is, as of the vote, satisfied by nothing.

## 8. Still unresolved, and what I searched

**Searched:** full text of the Prof CBA (pp. 1–144 clean / 1–150 redline), Attachment A (pp. 1–82 / 1–84), Attachment B Prof (pp. 1–10 / 1–11), all 10 side-letter pages (OCR), and both SPEEA summary documents.

| Target | Result |
|---|---|
| `virtual / telecommut / remote / work from home` | **Found** — LOU 13 only. Zero hits in Articles 1–23. |
| `Purchased Services` | **Found** — Art. 9.2(c), 9.3(b), 9.4(b) (all unchanged in substance); LOU 4 monthly data; side letter 1. |
| `mandatory overtime` | **Absent as a phrase.** The cap lives in LOU 22 without that label. `112` found there. |
| `indemnif` | **1 hit in CBA** — Art. 13.7 "Indemnity and Waiver of Claims" (the *Union* indemnifying the *Company* on dues; unrelated). Employee indemnification exists only in side letter 6. |
| `Artificial Intelligence` | **Found** — new AI LOU (clean p. 134) + side letter 9. |
| `Bi-Party` | **Found** — new ERC LOU (clean p. 132). |
| `ASAP` | **Zero hits** anywhere. SPEEA's ASAP comparison is analogy, not text. |
| `Numerical Control` / `NC Programming` | **Zero hits in the CBA.** Exists only in side letter 3 (OCR, not visually confirmed). Tech-unit relevant. |
| `Ed Wells` / `Functional Advisor` | **Found** — Art. 20 + new Functional Advisor LOU. |
| `Learning Together` / `LTP` | **Found** — LOU 21 only. |
| `Health Reimbursement` / `HRA` | **Found** — new Art. 16.6, 16.6(a). |
| `retiree medical` | **Found** — Art. 16.3–16.4, Attachment B, side letter 8. |
| `orthodontia` / `dental maximum` | **Found** — Attachment A, plan-specific (§3.6). |
| `Pacific Northwest` | **Zero hits** in CBA, Attachment A, Attachment B, or side letters. The LOU says "Puget Sound." |
| `NORA` / `Remedial` | **Found** — LOU 7. |
| `Market Range Table` | **Found** — Art. 11.1(a) only ("The minimum salary will be the Market Range Table minimum values"). No compa-ratio methodology anywhere in the CBA. |
| `Part-time Employment` | **Found** — LOU 11. Identified as the probable "LOU XX" referent; **not textually confirmed**. |

**Genuinely unresolved:**

1. **The grain of the LOU 4 compensation feed** — per-employee compa-ratio vs. the aggregated Chart #136 series. Partly resolved in §6.1: compa-ratio is demonstrably a current data element, so the lock reaches it; only the grain is open.
2. **What "LOU XX" refers to.** Not determinable from the document.
3. **Whether the 2026 side letters are countersigned by SPEEA.** No countersignature appears on any of the ten pages. They may have been executed separately.
4. **Whether the LOU 13 appeal's "process" grievance can reach a denial's substance.** The text says the union may grieve "specifically with regard to the process." Untested.

5. **Attachment A — now fully covered.** Colored-pixel change detection over all 84 redline pages found **40 changed pages**; all 40 have been examined. Thirty were read as rendered images and verified visually; the remaining ten (pp. 2, 15, 20, 22, 23, 55, 62, 70, 77, 81) were resolved by page-scoped text diff against the clean copy and contain only vendor-name genericization, domestic-partner threading, and pagination shifts — no dollar figures or benefit terms change on them. One item I flagged from that text diff, the "Service Representative … may change a service representative at any time" definition, turned out to be **pre-existing black text**, not an insertion; §3.8 was corrected accordingly.
6. **Why the retiree Conversion Privilege was deleted while actives keep theirs**, and whether anything replaces guaranteed-issue conversion for surviving dependents. See §4.13 — this is the one item I'd want an answer on before the vote.
7. **Tech-unit documents.** `2026-CLEAN-COPY-Redline-CBA-Techs.pdf` (145pp) and the Tech Attachment B were downloaded but not analyzed. Out of scope for a Prof-unit vote; relevant if you're briefing Tech reps.
8. **Side letters 2 (Technical Skill Development) and 3 (NC Programming)** are visually confirmed but **Tech-unit subject matter**, so I have not analyzed their substance against Tech claims. Both are Boeing-executive letters signed by Ihssane Mounir, Doug Ackerman, and Ben Nimmergut rather than Robert Joga — relevant if you brief Tech reps.

---

## 9. Questions for council reps, ranked by how much the answer moves a vote

1. **Is the "Annual Compensation Review data" locked by LOU 4 the per-employee compa-ratio feed, or only the aggregated Chart #136 series?** Compa-ratio is definitely *in* the current reports — Chart #136B is a compa-ratio distribution and #136E plots % salary increase against before-compa-ratio (§6.1) — so the lock reaches it. The open question is the **grain**. Level averages cannot show distribution *within* a level, and that is exactly where Art. 11.7's "low market positioning" steering operates and where the 43.5%-below-pool finding lives. Chart #136B is a histogram, so per-employee values must exist in the source feed; get SPEEA to confirm the feed — not just the charts — is what LOU 4 locks. **Highest-leverage question in the package**, and LOU 4 has no Article 3 exclusion.
2. **Has anyone put the Level 4/D exposure to the bargaining unit?** 203 of 614 members (33%) sit at after-compa-ratio **1.060**, average age 49.5, average service 19.5 — the highest in the unit and squarely outside the PFM's stated target of "low market positioning." That same cohort has a **64.6%** probability of receiving no promotion/OOS money across the four years (§6.3). Ask whether this was modeled during bargaining, and what a Level 4/D member should expect from the 1.0%/0.5% PFM component specifically.
3. **Are the nine July 2026 Boeing letters countersigned by SPEEA?** If not, the "Existing Side Letters" LOU — which preserves only letters "executed by authorized representatives of the Company **and the Union**" — may not reach them, and the Purchased Services release-before-layoff commitment has no contractual anchor.
4. **Why does the summary say "no change to plan design" when the Advantage+ deductible rises 25% and Advantage+ simultaneously becomes the default enrollment?** Boeing's HSA contribution is 50%/80% of the deductible and rises with it, so the net hit is roughly +$175 individual / +$350 family in first-dollar terms and about +$1,050 in family worst-case — real, but far less than the raw deductible jump. Ask why the change wasn't disclosed at all, and make sure anyone repeating it quotes the HSA offset too.
5. **Who updates the Scheduled Dental Plan fee schedule, on what basis, and does SPEEA see it first?** Every maximum allowable fee — hundreds of dollar figures — was struck from Attachment A and replaced with "[Updated Annually]." Members on that plan can no longer look up what a crown pays.
6. **Does removing the Medical Review Program's 50%/$2,000 penalty row mean medically-necessary care that wasn't preauthorized now draws regular benefits?** That is the plain reading, and it's favorable — but the table no longer addresses the case expressly. Get it in writing.
7. **What governs fertility coverage now that the eleven-item exclusion list is struck and replaced with "align with fertility coverage available to enterprise nonunion employees"?** Same question for doula ("same terms and conditions as nonunion employees"). Both are real gains whose *content* sits in policy Boeing changes without bargaining. What does the non-union policy currently cover, and what notice does SPEEA get if it changes?
8. **What backs the claim that "VSP is returning"?** VSP appears nowhere in Attachment A, and the redline goes the other way — striking Davis Vision, Delta Dental of Washington, BCBSIL, and Express Scripts in favor of generic "Service Representative" labels. Boeing already held the right to change carriers at any time, so this isn't a new concession, but the Davis refractive-surgery discount was struck along with the name.
9. **What is the status of Proposal U9 (Consecutive Retentions) after ratification?** It is an unsigned tentative proposal sheet, yet it governs whether 2024–2026 R3 ratings count toward the four-consecutive-R2 appeal under Art. 8.4(h)(2). Does it become an executed letter, or does it expire with negotiations?
10. **What does "LOU XX" in Article 8.8(d) refer to, and will it be filled before members vote?**
11. **Under LOU 13, what recourse does an employee have when a manager gives a denial reason that is facially not a business requirement?** The five-factor list has no burden attached and the substance is not arbitrable.

12. **Why was the Utah retiree-medical carve-out bought out while the Miami 6H6B carve-out was left in Attachment B?**
13. **Does the new 16.2(d) "Voluntary Well-Being Programs" discretion permit reintroducing a premium differential for non-participation — the thing 16.2(b)(4) just deleted?**
14. **Was the LOU 1 near-site daycare commitment (two centers, operations break-even pricing) traded deliberately, and for what?** A 10% Bright Horizons discount is not obviously equivalent.
15. **Does the Bi-Party ERC LOU carry any anti-reprisal protection anywhere, or is that entirely aspirational until the June 30, 2027 implementation date?**
16. **Is the LOU 7 just-cause standard arbitrable?** LOU 7 has no Article 3 exclusion and Art. 3.1 carves in just-cause dismissals. If SPEEA Legal confirms, this is one of the strongest gains in the package and deserves to be led with rather than summarized as "more robust."
17. **Was the removal of "Board of Directors of the" from LOU 20's EIP termination clause negotiated, or is it a drafting artifact?** It lowers the authority required to kill a benefit whose target was just raised 40%.
18. **What does "while represented by the Union and covered by this Agreement" do to the $110 BCERP Basic Benefit?** The 2017 $100 rate carries no such condition. Does someone who takes a non-represented role, or retires after this Agreement expires, revert to $100?
19. **Will the drafting defects in §7 — the duplicate Section 21.5, the "sixth anniversary" reaffirmance clause, "August XX," and six #TBD LOU numbers — be corrected before signature, and by what mechanism, given that members are voting on this text?**

---

# Appendix — Redline change map

Pages carrying insertions or deletions in `2026_Redline-CBA-Profs.pdf`, detected by colored-pixel measurement across all 150 pages and spot-verified visually. Pages in Articles 1–13 are listed for completeness but were not re-analyzed here (covered by prior work).

**Articles 1–13** (pp. 3–54): 9, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47

**Articles 14–23** (pp. 55–86): 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61 (Art. 15) · 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67 (Art. 16) · 69, 70 (Art. 17) · 72 (Art. 18) · 74, 75 (Art. 20) · 77, 78 (Art. 21) · 81 (Art. 22) · 84, 85 (Art. 23). **Article 14 (p. 55) and Article 19 (p. 73): no changes.**

**LOUs 1–30** (pp. 87–136): 87 (LOU 1) · 97 (LOU 3) · 98 (LOU 4) · 103 (LOU 7) · 109 (LOU 11) · 111, 112 (LOU 13) · 118 (LOU 17) · 121 (LOU 20) · 123 (LOU 21) · 125 (LOU 22) · 129 (LOU 26, deleted) · 133, 134 (LOU 29, deleted). **LOU 6 (pp. 101–102): no changes.**

**New LOUs** (pp. 137–143): all six entirely new.

**Appendices** (pp. 144–150): Appendix A holiday schedule rebuilt for 2026–2030; Appendix B classifications updated.

### Attachment A (`2026_Redline-Attachment-A-Prof-and-Tech.pdf`, 84pp) — 40 changed pages

Same detection method. **Changed:** 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 31, 34, 38, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 55, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 81.

**Read as rendered images and verified visually (30):** 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 (eligibility/enrollment/effective date), 9 (STD offsets), 21 (Traditional schedule), 26 (Medical Review Program), 31 (infertility), 34 (doula/pregnancy), 38 (infertility exclusions), 41, 42 (definitions, Rx schedule), 46 (Traditional vision exclusions), 47–51 (Advantage+ schedule and vision), 57 (Kaiser OR), 60, 61 (HSA), 63, 64 (Preferred Dental), 71–75 (Scheduled Dental fee schedules), plus the Traditional Medical Plan schedule at printed Page 18.

**All 40 changed pages examined.** Thirty verified visually as rendered images; ten (pp. 2, 15, 20, 22, 23, 55, 62, 70, 77, 81) resolved by page-scoped text diff — vendor-name genericization and domestic-partner threading only.

### Attachment B Prof (`2026_Redline-Attachment-B-Profs.pdf`, 11pp) — 8 changed pages, all examined

**Changed:** 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10. All read as rendered images and verified visually.

Principal findings: p. 3 eligibility rewrite (Utah exclusion struck, Miami 6H6B exclusion retained, age 60→55, retiree-pay-all access added); p. 4 post-65 Boeing Medicare Plan access added, retiree Company Couples added, opposite-gender common-law spouse struck; p. 5 domestic-partner threading and "Boeing Medicare ~~Supplement~~ Plan" genericized; **p. 10 Conversion Privilege deleted in full** (§4.13). Pages 7 and 11 carry no changes.