

City v. Soc. Of Urban Renewal Coordinators, 20 OCB 29 (BOC 1977)  
[Decision No. 29-77 (Cert.)]

OFFICE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING  
BOARD OF CERTIFICATION

-----X

In the Matter of

THE CITY OF NEW YORK

DECISION NO. 29-77

Petitioner

DOCKET NO. RE-69-76

-and-

LOCAL-375, CIVIL SERVICE  
TECHNICAL GUILD, DISTRICT  
COUNCIL 37, AFSCME, AFL-CIO

-and-

NEW YORK CITY SOCIETY OF URBAN  
RENEWAL COORDINATORS

Respondents

-----X

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Adam Blumenstein, Esq.  
for City of New York

Morris Weissberg, Esq.  
for NYCSURC

Murray Klein, Esq.  
for Local 375

DECISION AND ORDER

On January 30, 1976, the City of New York filed its petition seeking consolidation of Certification 46J-75 (as amended), held by Local 375, Certifications 50-71 and 51-71, held by NYCSURC, and CWR-23-67 (as amended), held by Local 144, SEIU. That part of the petition seeking consolidation of titles represented by Local 144, SEIU, was withdrawn by the City on March 1, 1976.

Local 375 supports the Petition of the City. The NYCSURC opposes the Petition and requests that the Board leave the existing units undisturbed.

Certification 46J-75 (as amended) is a unit of some 2906 employees in supervisory and non-supervisory titles performing scientific and technical work as engineers, architects, project service specialists, urban designers, planners and the like.

Certification 50-71 includes non-supervisory employees in the titles of Project Development Coordinator, Assistant Project Development Coordinator and Junior Project Development Coordinator, and Certification 51-71 covers the supervisory title of Senior Project Development Coordinator.

Hearings were held on October 13 and December 28, 1976. The final briefs herein were not submitted until April 22, 1977. At the request of the NYCSURC, the Board heard oral argument on August 17, 1977. A transcript was made thereof, and counsel for NYCSURC advised the Board by letter on October 17, 1977, that he did not intend to file any further comments based on the transcript.

#### POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

The City's Petition alleges that the employees in titles represented by Local 375, who perform duties in engineering, architecture, chemistry, planning, urban design and related fields constitute an appropriate unit together with employees represented by NYCSURC who hold titles in the Project Development

Coordinator series. The City alleges that the employees perform related professional and paraprofessional work of an engineering, scientific or technical nature, that the employees share a history of collective bargaining, that the proposed consolidations will further the efficient operation of the public service and that the proposed consolidated unit will be consistent with decisions and policies of the Board of Certification.

The NYCSURC opposes the consolidation. It cites §1178 of the NYC Charter which provides, in substance, that supervisory employees may not be placed in the same units with the employees they supervise.<sup>1</sup>

Further, the Senior Project Development Coordinators assert that they wish to remain in a unit separate from the employees in the other Project Development Coordinator titles whom they supervise, citing NYCCBL §1173-5.0b(1).

The NYCSURC cites the bargaining history of employees in Project Development Coordinator titles in support of its position. It points out that in the past, these employees had been represented by Local 375 pursuant to Certificate CWR-37/67 and CWR-38/67. In Board Decision No. 83-70, many employees represented through separate

---

However, this provision of the Charter was repealed effective January 1, 1977, by the City Council's enactment of Local Law No. 56 of 1977. There is no further need, therefore, to consider arguments based on the City Charter.

bargaining certificates held by Local 375 as well as District Council 37, AFSCME, were consolidated into Certification No. 83-70. However, Project Development Coordinators were not included in that consolidation.

Instead, the NYCSURC, which had filed a petition to represent Project Development Coordinators separately, was permitted to participate in an election in a unit of non-supervisory Project Development Coordinator titles and a supervisory unit of Senior Project Development Coordinators. In Decision No. 37-71, the Board had found that those two units were "units appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining" and that the City and Local 375, D.C. 37, AFSCME, did not object to the continuation of the subject units. The Report Upon Secret Ballot dated June 15, 1971, shows that in the non-supervisory unit, out of 103 eligible voters, 44 valid ballots were cast, of which 43 were for the NYCSURC and 1 was for no union. In the supervisory unit, 7 out of 15 eligible voters participated in the election; all 7 of these cast ballots for the NYCSURC.

The NYCSURC argues that there is no community of interest among the Project Development Coordinators and employees represented by Local 375 because their duties, educational and experience qualifications and career goals are different. Further, the Society alleges that there is a record of hostility between the employees represented by

Local 375 and the Project Development Coordinators which would lead to "injustices" should the small number of Project Development Coordinators be subject to effective control of a larger group of employees during the course of collective-bargaining.

THE EVIDENCE

a. Duties, qualifications, and compensation

The testimony presented at the hearing showed that employees in the Project Development Coordinator series of titles perform work related to securing federal approval and funding of urban renewal projects in the City of New York. The basic task of the Project Development Coordinator, simply stated, is to insure compliance with the several volumes of federal regulations governing urban renewal projects from the planning stage through site acquisition, preparation and construction. Thus, the Project Development Coordinator coordinates the work of the technical specialists engaged in carrying out urban renewal projects in such a manner that the City's application for federal urban renewal funds will be acted on favorably. The President of the Society, a Senior Project Development Coordinator, described the duties of the Project Development Coordinator at the hearing:

"he is knowledgeable in a whole host of specific areas but is a master of none. He is not a planner, not an engineer, not a budget man, he is not an appraiser, he is not a housing specialist, but he

has got to know a little bit about all of these things to run the program. But is a specialist in Federal regulation and law and the City and the State regulations and laws regarding urban renewal."  
(Tr., 59).

Further testimony by this witness established that Project Development Coordinators work with many members of the unit represented by Local 375 in the course of their duties, including employees in the titles of Project Service Specialist Planner, Engineer, Architect, and Urban Designer. However, as pointed out by the Society's witness, the employees represented by Local 375 are not required to be knowledgeable urban renewal matters.

The City presented evidence to show that there been a continuing salary relationship among Project Development Coordinators and certain titles in the unit represented by Local 375. In 1965, before the advent of collective bargaining, Jr. Project Development Coordinators earned \$6,050 per annum. and Jr. Engineers earned \$7,100 per annum. By 1967, when both groups were represented by Local 375, Jr. Engineers earned \$7,450 and the Jr. Project Development Coordinators had been advanced so that they earned \$7,100 per annum. By 1969, the last contract year in which Local represented the Jr. Project Development Coordinators, they had achieved parity with the Jr. Engineers, and both group of employees earned \$9,100 per annum. In subsequence years,

when Jr. Project Development Coordinators were represented by the NYCSURC, both groups of employees continued to earn the same annual salaries. By 1975, the Jr. Project Development Coordinators represented by the NYCSURC and the Jr. Engineers represented by Local 375 earned \$13,300 per annum. "Similar comparisons in salary scales over the years can be made for other titles. For example, before the advent of collective bargaining, the Sr. Project Development Coordinators earned \$11,650 per annum in 1965 and, in the same year, the Sr. Engineers earned \$12,100. By 1967, when both groups were represented by Local 375, Sr. Project Development Coordinators earned \$13,100 per annum., having outstripped the Sr. Engineers who earned \$12,600. in 1969, the last contract year in which both groups were represented by Local 375, the Sr. Project Development Coordinators earned \$15,300 per annum and the Sr. Engineers earned \$14,300. From 1970 onward, the Sr. Project Development Coordinators were represented by the NYCSURC and they were in pay parity with the Sr. Engineers represented by Local 375. Thus, in 1970 both groups carried \$15,300 per annum, and in 1975 both groups earned \$20,650.

The job specifications for the Project Development Coordinator occupational group lists as qualifications for the positions a baccalaureate degree and experience in "construction or design of buildings or in the appraisal, sale, negotiation, management or rental of real property, or the legal aspects thereof." Similarly, the specification for

Project Services Specialist, a title in the certification held by Local 375, lists as a requirement a baccalaureate degree and experience in "real estate management or sales, building construction or design or in legal, accounting, or appraisal activities related thereto...." The specification for Project Coordinator, also represented by Local 375, states that qualified applicants shall have experience in "planning and administering or expediting of engineering design:, and the specification for Urban Designer speaks of experience in "planning, design, research, investigations and studies related to urban design development programs." Finally, the "typical tasks" of a Civil Engineer, a title in the certification held by Local 375, include the "preparation of the basic design plan ... for major projects for the construction, remodeling, operation, maintenance or repair of public works, structures of installation," and the "development of proposals for major engineering projects with regard to the acquisitions, disposition or the public or private use of City property .."

b. History of Conflict

In support of its claim that there exists a history of conflict between Project Development Coordinators and employees represented by Local 375, the NYCSURC presented several nesses. Their testimony related to the circumstances surrounding the negotiations for a contract with a term beginning in



1968, while the Project Development Coordinators were represented by Local 375.

The Society's witnesses testified that two Project Development Coordinators were on the Local 375 bargaining committee which was conducting negotiations with the City on behalf of employees in the many as yet unconsolidated units. The Project Development Coordinators helped formulate demands for bargaining, and the two committee members participated in all negotiating sessions. At the last session however, the then president of Local 375 gave up certain demands that the Project Development Coordinators wished to keep on the table. Although the Society witnesses could not recall all of the specific demands at issue, the record is clear that one such issue involved a \$50 per annum differential for Senior Project Development Coordinators. Other instances of disagreement it were cited, but, understandably, witnesses were unsure concerning events that took place at least seven years ago. It seems clear from the record, however, that at the final negotiation session the then president of Local 375 and the Project Development Coordinators had a disagreement during which either the two Project Development Coordinator representatives walked out or the president of Local 375 walked out. The disagreement was over the question whether to accept an offer from the City to settle the contract at certain level in line with other settlements on related titles, a course favored by the Local 375 leadership, or whether to

continue to press for a higher settlement for the Project Development Coordinators, as desired by the two Project Development Coordinator members. In any event, a contract was later agreed upon by the President of Local 375 and the representative of the City of New York, but the two Project Development Coordinator members were not in the room when the final salary figures were agreed upon.

The proposed contract for Project Development Coordinators was presented to the employees for ratification. Some Project Development Coordinators sought the appointment of an impasse panel in an effort to obtain a better settlement; in the face of opposition from the then president of Local 375, who believed the proposed contract was a good one, the Board of Collective Bargaining refused to commence impasse procedures. Finally, the contract was ratified by the Project Development Coordinators. The NYCSURC witness stated that as a result of this series of events, the NYCSURC was formed to represent the Project Development Coordinators. As we noted above, the Report Upon Secret Ballot shows that of 118 eligible voters, 51 cast ballots favoring representation by the NYCSURC in the election of 1971.

The present President of Local 3115 testified that if the Project Development Coordinators were consolidated into Certification No. 46J-75, the local would represent them fairly. All non-economic benefits would be applied equally to all employees in the unit. Under the Local 375 constitution,

all employees vote on proposed contracts; ratification of a contract is not "title by title" but by a majority of all unit employees. Therefore, discontent over a salary settlement by employees in one title (or in a few titles) would usually not result in rejection of a proposed contract for the entire unit.

Although NYCSURC attempted to introduce testimony and evidence that members of the unit represented by Local 375 were hostile to the interests of Project Development Coordinators, there was no competent evidence that such is the case. The only record testimony relating to the alleged "hostility" was a statement by the President of NYCSURC that in 1969 a Senior Architect told the witness that there was no reason for Project Development Coordinators to earn higher salaries than engineers or architects. NYCSURC also offered an anonymous, undated printed sheet comparing the 1969 salaries of Project Development Coordinators with salaries of engineers and architects: <sup>2</sup> this document was not admitted into evidence by the Trial Examiner, and counsel for the NYCSURC noted his exception to the ruling.

c. Letter of Local 375

In a letter of May 26, 1976, Local 375 expressed its concurrence with the City's request to consolidate Project

Development Coordinators with Certification 46J-75. (as amended)  
As part of its rationale for supporting the proposed consolidation, Local 315 stated:

"The titles presently covered under Certification 46J-75 are qualified and are called upon to perform tasks presently performed by the Project Development Coordinators (all levels) particularly such titles as Urban Designers and Project Coordinators. Other phases of work such as appraisals, acquisitions of land and construction of facilities are definitely within the province of and are performed by engineers, architects and other titles presently included in Certificate 46J-75."

The NYCSURC has cited the above-quoted language as evidence that Local 375 wishes to promote the taking over of Project Development Coordinator functions by employees in its present unit. Local 375 denies any such intention. The testimony of the President of Local 375 is that the Union does not favor the performance of out of title work. The Board notes that the performance of the duties of a certain title by an employee not certified to perform those duties is contrary to the Civil Service Law. [Civil Service Law §61.21]

#### DISCUSSION

It is apparent from the record, that employees in the Project Development Coordinator occupational group perform tasks closely related to those tasks performed by many employees in the unit now represented by Local 375, and to which the City seeks to have the Project Development Coordinators consolidated.

The work of Project Development Coordinators and of the employees represented by Local 375 involves various aspects of planning and construction in the City of New York. Of course, the precise duties performed by employees in each occupational group (including the various occupational groups now included in Certification No. 46J-75), are in some ways distinguishable. However, the conclusion is clear that the duties of the several occupationally related titles are similar in many respects. Further, many of the employees in the unit represented by Local 375 regularly work with and consult with Project Development Coordinators. Finally, there is a similarity in levels of compensation received over the years by Project Development Coordinators and employees represented by Local 375. Although the NYCSURC correctly points out there are differences among the many subject employees, we find that for purposes of unit determination such differences are not controlling. Therefore, we find that the Project Development Coordinators and the employees in the unit represented by Local 375 together constitute an appropriate unit for collective bargaining within the meaning of §1173-5.0b(1) of the NYCCBL and §2.10 of the Board's Rules.

Our determination as to appropriate unit is not vitiated by the bargaining history cited by the NYCSURC. First, the fact that in Decision No. 37-71 the Board, with the consent of all the parties, permitted the Project Development Coordinators to continue as separate units rather than be

consolidated into a unit represented by Local 375 is not controlling here. In the instant case, the parties are litigating the issue of appropriate unit and the City has presented evidence to support its allegations that efficient collective bargaining would be served by a consolidation. In Decision No. 37-71, we found only that the existing separate Project Development Coordinator units were "appropriate" for collective bargaining at that time. However, that does not preclude the Board, when at a later date the question is properly raised and presented, from determining that a different unit is even more appropriate.

We note that in 1971 the Board's policy to foster consolidation of numerous, small collective bargaining units into larger units of occupationally related employees was at the beginning of a lengthy period of implementation. The Board has steadily pursued its consolidation policy and has reduced the number of units with which the City must negotiate to 92 from a figure of 282 in 1971.

Second, the alleged "conflict" cited by the NYCSURC is no more than the friction which occasionally develops between the union leadership and the rank and file, as well as between the employee representative and the employer during protracted and intensive negotiations. It is clear that during the 1969 negotiations, Local 375 permitted extensive participation by Project Development Coordinators during collective bargaining negotiations, that Local 375 vigorously pressed the Project

Development Coordinator demands, and that, finally, a compromise contract was reached by the Union and the City which was ratified by the Project Development Coordinators. The fact that Local 375 did not pursue the matter to impasse was a result of the Union's conviction, entirely reasonable and proper in the circumstances, that the negotiated Project Development Coordinator contract was fair and should be accepted.

In the discharge of its duties as a collective bargaining representative, a union must necessarily harmonize and compromise the varied interests of all of the unit employees. Thus, it is well settled that within the statutory duty of fair representation, a union must be accorded wide latitude in serving as the bargaining representative of its members. [Ford Motor Co. v. Huffman, 345 U.S. 330(1953); Humphrey v. Moore, 375 U.S. 335, 55 LRRM 2031(1964); see generally Vaca v. Sipes, 385 U.S. 895, 64 LRRM 2369(1967).] In so doing, as long as it acts in good faith with the union's best interest in mind, the fact that certain members might object to its actions is no reason to suspect that it has breached its duty of fair representation.

"Inevitably differences arise in the manner and degree to which the terms of any negotiated agreement affect individual employees and classes of employees. The mere existence of such differences does not make them invalid. The complete satisfaction of all who are represented is hardly to be expected. A wide range

of reasonableness must be allowed a statutory bargaining representative in serving the unit it represents, subject always to complete good faith and honesty of purpose in the exercise of its discretion.

Humphrey v. Moore, 375 U.S. 335, 349, 55 LRRM 2031, 2037(1964), quoting Ford Motor Co. v Huffman, 345 U.S. 300, 338(1953).

The New York Court of Appeals has affirmed an Appellate Division decision which dismissed an employee's complaint of breach of fair representation. The employee had been laid off as the result of a new bargaining agreement that exchanged favorable seniority and recall rights for improved pension benefits, [Anderson v. Ambac Industries, Inc., 40 N.Y. 2d 865, 387 N.Y. S. 2d 1006(1976), affirming 48 A.D. 2d 845, 369 N.Y.S. 2d 170(1975)] Noting that in representing all members of the bargaining unit, conflicts will arise, the Court stated, "the mere fact that the union obtained different benefits for each group does no in itself constitute a showing of bad faith" (Id., 40 N.Y. 2d at 865, 387 N.Y.S. 2d at 1007).

Finally, the NYCSURC's contention that the requested consolidation will lead to "injustices" perpetrated by the majority in the large unit on the small number of Project Development Coordinators is not supported by any record evidence. There is no indication from competent evidence that any hostility toward Project Development Coordinators exists on the part of the employees now represented by Local 375. Nor is there any indication that Local 375 will depart from its



statutory duty to represent all members of the unit fairly and vigorously. <sup>3</sup>Similarly, we reject as speculative and unproven the suggestion by the NYCSURC that Local 375 would illegally participate in plan to seek improper lay-offs of Project Development Coordinators in order to replace them with other members of the unit.

In sum, despite its allegations of "hostility" toward Project Development Coordinators on the part of members of the Local 375 unit, the NYCSURC has not shown any history or pattern of hostility nor any concerted course of action which would tend to result in conflict between the two groups of employees. All that was shown at the hearing was an isolated instance of disagreement between a former president of Local 375 and two Project Development Coordinators which occurred over seven years ago. Such a showing is not the basis for a conclusion that the smaller unit cannot be consolidated with the larger one.

The facts in the instant case differ greatly from those in Decision No. 38-74, cited by the NYCSURC. In that case, the Confidential Attendants sought to be removed from one unit and placed in another consolidated unit. The Board permitted the change upon consent of all the parties. Here, the City requests that Project Development Coordinators be placed in a

---

The data relating to salaries of Project Development Coordinators shows that they fared well as to salary increases while represented by Local 375.

consolidated unit while the NYCSURC urges that they remain in a separate, small bargaining unit.

As we said in Decision No. 38-74:

"Consistent with the mandate in §1173-5.0 (b) (1) of the NYCCBL that the Board shall consider the efficient operation of the public service and sound labor relations in determining appropriate units which "shall assure to public employees the fullest freedom of exercising the rights" to bargain collectively, the Board has evolved a policy favoring the consolidation of small fragmented bargaining units into larger, more effective units. In DC 37, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, and the City of New York, Dec. No. 44-68, we set forth our policy of consolidation:

'In our opinion, such a policy, based upon mutuality of interest among occupationally related titles, the history of collective bargaining and other factors is essential to the effectuation of the purposes and policies of the statute and the proper functioning of the collective bargaining process, and should be applied wherever it is possible to do so without severe dislocations or inequities.'

"This policy has proved useful and effective, and we have applied it consistently in numerous cases since 1968. (For example, DC 37 et al, Dec. No. 83-70 and The Doctors Association, Dec. No. 31-73.)"

The NYCSURC has not shown any reason why the Board's consolidation policy should not apply in the instant case. Indeed, the Society's position at the hearing was that the City should offer to Project Development Coordinators the "same salaries and salary conditions at each level that it offers to engineers and it actually gave to engineers," and the same "training stipends and supervisory differentials."

(Tr., pp.42 and 44). There is no clearer indication of the community of interest between PDC's and the employees in unit 46J-75 (as amended), than the fact that PDC's seek from collective bargaining the same salaries and working conditions as the Local 375 employees have attained.

In summary, we find that due to the demonstrated community of interest between PDC's and the employees represented in Certification No. 46J-75 (as amended), the history of collective bargaining which shows similarities in the compensation of all the subject employees, the similarity in the duties performed by PDC's and the other employees, the City's position that a consolidated unit would foster sound labor relations and efficient operation of the public service, and in view of our decisions and policies in similar past cases, it would be proper to grant the City's Petition for Consolidation herein.

Having found that the four certified levels of Project Development Coordinators and the employees in unit 46J-75 (as amended), together constitute the appropriate unit for collective bargaining, we shall devise a method, in accordance with the applicable Law and Rules, for determining the majority representative of the employees in the unit. There are 2906 employees in unit 46J-75 (as amended), of whom 2019 are on voluntarily authorized dues check-off to Local 375. Unit 46J-75 (as amended), is a unit of supervisory and non-supervisory employees. There are 43 Project Development Coordinators

in the four certified titles; 14 of these are in the supervisory unit, and all are voluntarily checked off to the NYCSURC. Of the 29 non-supervisory, employees, 25 are on voluntary dues check-off to the NYCSURC. It is clear that the overwhelming majority of the employees in unit 46J-75 (as amended), including the additional Project Development Coordinators, will be on dues check-off to Local 375. Therefore, in accordance with our procedures, the majority representative of the unit may be determined upon majority dues check-off.<sup>4</sup> An election in this unit would be a needless expenditure of public funds, and would require the excusal of almost 6000 man hours for purposes of voting. The NYCSURC represents approximately 1.5% of the employees in the combined unit, and it would be an empty exercise to conduct an election in the face of such statistics combined with a very large voluntarily authorized dues check-off in favor of Local 375.

Final action concerning the three certificates here at issue must await the outcome of the NYCSURC request for a supervisory election pursuant to §1173-5 0b(1) of the NYCCBL. In Decision No. 38-74, we said:

5

---

See Decisions 51-70, 38-74.

While the NYCCBL §1173-5.0b(2) does not require an election to determine the majority representative of employees in an appropriate unit, §1173-5.0b(1) does require such an election where a proper petition is filed requesting a separate supervisory unit.

"The Board (has held that a 'supervisory unit' must include all related supervisory employees ... a party is required to petition to represent all of the supervisory employees in the unit found to be appropriate separate from non-supervisory employees."

Thus, a proper petition for a supervisory unit in this case would include the 14 Senior Project Development Coordinators and the supervisory employees now in Certification 46J-75 (as amended). Although there has never been a formal Board determination as to the supervisory status of most of the various employees in unit 46J-75, an inspection of the job specifications for the unit employees reveals that at a minimum, 363 of the total 2906 employees are supervisory. Therefore, we shall require that the usual 30% proof of interest be based on that minimum figure plus the 14 Senior Project Development Coordinators - a total of 377 supervisory employees. Should adequate proof of interest be submitted and an election ordered, we shall of course make a determination as to which of the remaining employees in unit 46J-75 are supervisory in order to determine their eligibility to vote in a self-determination election.<sup>6</sup> We shall afford the NYCSURC a period of thirty days from receipt of this decision to present a petition supported by a showing that

---

The appendix to this decision lists those titles with clear supervisory functions. It is from among these titles that a showing of interest may be made.

30% of the employees in the potential supervisory unit desire a separate supervisory unit for purposes of collective bargaining.

We have reviewed the rulings at the hearing and we affirm the Hearing Officer's refusal to admit the anonymous document (Society's Exhibit "I," marked for identification) into evidence because it was neither dated nor identified.

DETERMINATION AND ORDER

Pursuant to the powers vested in the Board of Certification by the New York City Collective Bargaining Law, it is hereby

DETERMINED, that the employees in Certification 46J-75 (as amended) and the employees in Certifications 50-71 and 51-71 together constitute a unit appropriate for purposes of collective bargaining; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Petition of the City of New York is granted to the extent set forth in this Decision; and it is further

DETERMINED, that the NYCSURC may submit to this Board, within thirty days of receipt of this order, a petition for a supervisory unit supported by proof of interest amounting to 30% of the employees in the potential

Decision No. 29-77  
Docket No. RE-69-76

23

supervisory unit as described in the decision above.

DATED: New York, N.Y.  
November 16, 1977

ARVID ANDERSON  
CHAIRMAN

WALTER L. EISENBERG  
MEMBER

ERIC J. SCHMERTZ  
MEMBER

Decision No. 29-77  
Docket No. RE-69-76

APPENDIX

Assistant Coordinator of Highway Transportation Studies  
Assistant Superintendent of Construction (incl. OTB)  
Assistant Surveyor  
Chief Supervisor of Mechanical Installations  
Construction Manager (incl. specialty)  
General Superintendent of Construction (incl. specialty)  
Highway Transportation Specialist  
Principal Air Pollution Inspector  
Principal Chemist (incl. specialties)  
Principal Engineering Technician (incl. OTB)  
Principal Fire Prevention Inspector  
Principal Physicist  
Principal Planner  
Scientist (Water Ecology)  
Senior Air Pollution Inspector  
Senior Chemist (incl. specialties)  
Senior Computer Equipment Design Specialist (OTB)  
Senior Environmental Control Technician  
Senior Highway Transportation Specialist  
Senior Physicist (incl. specialties)  
Senior Planner  
Senior Principal Illustrator (incl. OTB)  
Senior Project Coordinator  
Senior Project Development Coordinator  
Senior Scientist (Radiation Control)  
Senior Steel Construction Inspector  
Senior Supervisor of Mechanical Installations  
Senior Traffic Control Inspector  
Senior Waterfront Construction Inspector  
Superintendent of Construction  
Superintendent of Construction and Repairs  
Supervising Air Pollution Inspector  
Supervising Fire Prevention Inspector  
Supervising Hull and Machinery Inspector  
Supervising Landmarks Preservation Specialist  
Supervisor of Diesel Engine Maintenance  
Supervisor of Electrical Installations  
Supervisor of Mechanical Installations  
Surveyor  
and restored Rule X equivalents