

\*\*\*\*\*

In the Matter of the Collective  
Bargaining Impasse

between

LOCAL 306, AUDIO-VISUAL AID TECHNICIANS,  
and SENIOR AUDIO-VISUAL AID TECHNICIANS,  
I.A.T.S.E.

Case No.

- and -

I-40-69

THE CITY OF NEW YORK, OFFICE OF  
LABOR RELATIONS

\*\*\*\*\*

REPORT

&

RECOMMENDATIONS

of the

IMPASSE PANEL

THOMAS A. KNOWLTON

On July 16, 1969, I was designated as a "One-Man Impasse Panel" to aid the parties hereto in resolving their contract dispute for the period commencing July 1 1968. Following my appointment, a hearing was hold on August 28 at which both parties were represented. Also present were representatives of the Board of Higher Education. At the hearing, the parties agreed that the only issue which was to be submitted to the Panel was one of wage or salary rates and adjustments.

\* \* \*

There are two categories of employees who are included within the bargaining unit. The two classification titles are: Audio-Visual-Aid Technician, approximately 28 in number, and Senior Visual-Aid Technician, approximately 4 in number. (The absence of "Audio" in the latter title has no significance. The incumbents clearly do audio-visual work.)

The rates of pay in effect as of June 30, 1968, i.e., the day on which the previous agreement expired, ranged from a minimum salary of \$5,750 to a maximum of \$6,950 for the Technicians and from a minimum of \$7,100 to a maximum of \$8,600 for the Seniors.

During negotiations, various salary increase proposals were made by the parties. At the time of the hearing, it was the Union's view that the Technicians, who were included at the time within the career and salary plan in Salary Increment Scale 14 with a range of \$5,750 to \$7,190, should be raised to Salary Increment Scale 24 with a range of \$9,400 to \$11,500. Similarly, the Seniors, who were included in Scale 18 (\$7,100 to \$8,900), should, in the Union's view, be raised to Scale 28 (\$11,200 to \$13,600).

The Union's request was based primarily upon its analysis of the wages paid in private industry to persons with similar, or no greater, qualifications than are required of the Technicians. Indeed, the Union represents a considerable number of such persons in private industry and is therefore completely familiar with their compensation.

It is reasonable to conclude from the evidence that the salary scale for similar work in private industry in the City is somewhat higher than the level which the Union requests here. However, a comparison of public and private employment, their advantages or disadvantages, is not entirely feasible. There has probably never been any period when public employees' salaries were at the level reached in some areas of private employment.

The City in its final offer to the Union has recognized an obligation to increase the salary scale by an amount greater than that which it would normally propose in dealing with its employees. It proposed for the Technicians an increase totaling 01,950 over a three-year period commencing July 1, 1968 and extending through June 30, 1971. This amount would result in a minimum rate of \$7,700 and a maximum of \$8,700 per year commencing July 1, 1970. It would result in increases of nearly 10.9% in 1968; 10.1% in 1969; and 8.2% in 1970. For the Senior classification, the total increase contained in the offer amounted to nearly \$2,300 over a three-year period, or a all increase of 28.1%.

I conclude that, while the City's final offer as set forth in the testimony which was offered at the hearing, re resents a special acknowledgment off the consideration to which the employees here are entitled, it is nonetheless insufficient to satisfy the requirements of the situation.

Precise computations of wage data are somewhat misleading. In general, it is impossible to establish a level of wage or salary increases which accurately reflects all facets of the problem. This is particularly true when we are dealing with three-year period -- nearly half of which has been completed -- a period moreover in which there has been a very considerable

change in living costs which would quite possibly not have been foreseen had negotiations been concluded prior to July 1, 1968.

In part, therefore the recommendation which follows is derived from hindsight, though I hasten to add that I do not suggest that delayed and retroactive wage increases are necessarily more accurate than those which are negotiated in the normal fashion. I believe that the appropriate increase and resulting salary scale for the Technicians should be as follows:

For the year beginning July 1, 1968, an increase of \$700, i.e., a minimum of \$6,450 and a maximum of \$7,890.

For the year beginning July 1, 1969, an increase of \$800, a minimum of \$7,250 and a maximum of \$8,690.

For the year beginning July 1, 1970, an increase of \$800, i.e., a minimum of \$8,050 and a maximum of \$9,490.

For the Senior classification, I recommend:

For the year beginning July 1, 1968, an increase of \$750, i.e., a minimum of \$7,850 and a maximum of \$9,650.

For the year beginning July 1, 1969, an increase of \$850, i.e., a minimum of \$8,700 and a maximum of \$10,500.

For the year beginning July 1, 1970, an increase of \$850, i.e., a minimum of \$9,550 and a maximum of \$11,350.

It will be observed that the increase for the Senior classification acknowledges to some extent the principle of percentage increase and recognizes the desirability of maintaining a promotional differential.

The increases which are set forth herein are, of course, considered as total increases. Increments, if any, which have been paid commencing on July 1, 1968, should be deducted from the amount shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Thomas A. Knowlton

October 30, 1969