OFFICE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CITY OF NEW YORK

In the Matter of Impasse Between

THE CITY OF NEW YORK

and

IMPASSE PANEL

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

I-34-69

and

DISTRICT COUNCIL 37 and LOCAL 1070 with respect to the position of COURT INTERPRETER

### REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<u>of the</u>

IMPASSE PANEL

The undersigned was designated as a one-member Impasse Panel to Assist the parties hereto to resolve their dispute over the terms of the renewal of their Collective Bargaining Agreement, effective January 1, 1969, pursuant to Paragraph 1173-7.0c of Chapter 54 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York. A formal hearing was held on May 8, 1969, at which time the parties were given an opportunity to adduce testimony, introduce evidence and argue their viewpoints with respect to the issues remaining to be resolved. The parties at the hearing were represented by the following:

For the Administrative Board:

George J. Levine, Planning Officer

For the City of New York:

Robert H. Pick, Assistant Director of Labor Relations

For the Union:

Alan R. Viani, Assistant Director of Research and Negotiations Mrs. Alice Adams, President, Official Court Interpreters Association Miss Victoria Affronti, Delegate

The present impasse arises from the inability of the representatives of the Administrative Board of the City of New York to arrive at a mutually satisfactory settlement with the Union in collective bargaining negotiations with respect to the position of Court Interpreters in the Unified Court System., to be effective from the expiration date of their prior agreement on December 31 1968.

On the basis of the record and the evidence adduced at the hearing, the Impasse Panelist makes-the following recommendations as the basis for resolving the open issues between the parties:

### 1. <u>Wage Increase</u>

The evidence indicates that the average increase for City employees in 1969 amounts to approximately 8%. This formula should be applied in the present circumstances, except in the case of the highest rated employees, who, under certain circumstances will not receive the service increment for reasons explained below.

I, therefore, recommend that this city-wide precedent be spelled out as an across-the-board increase of \$400.00 per annum, and, as an increment for one year of service acquired prior to January 1, 1969 of \$350.00 a year, for a total of \$750.00, effective January 1, 1969; and that similar increases totaling \$750.00, be made effective January 1,1970.

# 2. <u>Minimum Rates</u>

The record reflects a grave hiring problem for-interpreters, and, that this problem stems directly from an unrealistic and inadequate starting salary. As a matter of fact, even when interpreters are induced to accept jobs with the City, they tend to drift away to higher paying City jobs, such as, assistant court clerk, before permanent status is achieved. Hence., an increase in the starting rate is deemed essential, not only to give appropriate recognition to this category, but also to make it possible for the City to attract interpreters who seek a career in this classification. Accordingly, I recommend that the minimum wage rate be increased from the present \$7,750.00 per annum. to \$9,000.00 per annum., effective January 1, 1969, and, that an additional increase of \$500.00 be instituted, effective January 1, 1970, making the minimum hiring rate., at that time. \$9,5000.00

#### 3. <u>Maximum Rates</u>

I recommend that the maximum rate be set at \$11,000.00, effective January 1, 1969, and that it be increased to \$11,850.00 on January 1, 1970. These figures are based on the following facts and computations:

Beginning with January 1, 1967 the then maximum rate of \$9,550.00 per annum. became \$10,150.00 with the addition of a service increment of \$600.00 for employees who had more than five years of service. With the addition of a service increment in the amount of \$200.00 for five years or more of service, irrespective of the maximum rate then pertaining, the too rate, at that time, went to \$10,350.00. This figure would rise to \$11,100.00 as of January 1, 1969 with the implementation of the general and full service increase of \$750.00 recommended herein, and, finally, the maximum rate would rise to \$11,850.00 as of January 1, 1970, when the second general and full service increase of \$750.00 per annum would go into effect.

# 4. <u>Bar To Service Increases</u>

The stated maximum salaries shall not be a bar to the wage increases herein but shall be a bar to service increases. The employees in this classification generally perform the same type of work, merely, interpreting and translating court proceedings. However, their wage ranges are disproportionate to their duties insofar as the employees working in the Supreme Court have been accorded greater recognition for no reason other than the fact that this court is a higher tribunal. It would appear, therefore, that the employees in the lower courts should be given greater wage recognition since their responsibility and performance do not justify the existing adverse wage differential. Under the above proposal, the lower court interpreters will achieve a higher wage plateau in relationship to those working in the higher courts, while the latter continue to receive reasonable wage recognition.

### 5. <u>Welfare Contributions</u>

In view of the argument that most, if not all, welfare contributions begin at \$60.00 per annum, and, one year later, are increased to \$85.00 per employee per annum, and, further, in view of the Union's contention that the \$60.00 contribution is, for all practical purposes, a thing of the past, I deem the most equitable solution. to be a contribution of \$85.00 per employee per annum, effective July 11 1969.

# 6. <u>Duration Of New Agreement</u>

By consent of the parties, the new agreement shall take effect on January 1, 1969 and shall be for a term of two (2) years, to December 31, 1970.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE MARLIN Impasse Panelist

Dated: June 23, 1969