

Office of Collective Bargaining

-----x  
In the Matter of the Impasse

between

REPORT and RECOMMENDATIONS

THE CITY OF NEW YORK

of

and

IMPASSE PANEL

LOCAL 237, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD  
OF TEAMSTERS

Case No. 1-88-72  
Re: X-RAY TECHNICIAN  
OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

On May 10, 1972, the Office of Collective Bargaining determined that an impasse existed in the Collective bargaining between Local 237, International Brotherhood of Teamsters thereafter referred to as the Union, and the City of New York, hereinafter referred to as the City, and appointed the undersigned as an impasse panel to hear and report and make recommendations for the resolution of the dispute.

A hearing was hold on June 6, 1972, at which the parties were given full opportunity to present evidence, testimony and argument in support of their respective positions. The Union was represented by Bert Rose, its Director of Organization, and the City was represented by Robert H. Pick, Esq., Assistant Director of Labor Relations. Also present at the hearing were the following:

Pauline Dyer, Recording Secretary, Local 237  
Arthur Illery, Business Agent  
Roger Umhey, Health Department  
Joseph Hutchinson, Bellevue Hospital  
Ruth Lane, Queens General Hospital  
Joseph Lawson, Rikers Island Hospital  
Robert Cattano, Department of Health  
Learmond Puckering, Department of Health  
Mabel E. Hobbs, Elmhurst Hospital  
Mary Milne, Research Analyst, City

The dispute is concerned with the unresolved issue of salaries in the negotiation of an agreement to succeed one which expired June 30, 1971. The parties have agreed that the successor contract should be for a three year period ending June 30, 1974. The bargaining unit consists of approximately 170 x-ray technicians, six radiation technicians, thirteen junior technicians and eleven supervisors of x-ray technicians, most of whom are employed by the evidence and the arguments of the parties and my recommendations thereon:

Under the expired contract, the annual salary range for x-ray technicians and radiation technicians was \$8,250 - \$8,790. The Union asks that it be raised to \$15,000. It makes the following arguments: The x-ray technicians were the first medical technicians to be licensed by the State of New York and as far as the Union knows they are the only such medical technicians so licensed. It claims this as official recognition of the skill and expertise required of this group. The City recognized that expertise when it negotiated that now expired contract and increased the minimum of the x-ray technicians from \$6,500 in two years to \$8,250. However, this salary level is woefully inadequate in the Union's opinion because these technicians work side by side with similar technicians employed by the private hospitals under the City affiliation program.

The record indicates that x-ray technicians are employed in the private sector and the affiliated hospitals at much higher salaries. Below are representative examples:

New York University	-	\$10,283
Montefiore Hospital	-	\$10,205 - 11,830
Roosevelt Hospital	-	\$ 9,500 - 11,801
Mt. Sinai Hospital	-	\$10,244 - 11,875
Lenox Hill Hospital	-	\$10,360 - 11,980
New York Hospital	-	\$ 9,396 - 11,849
Booth Memorial Hospital	-	\$10,179 - 12,162
St. Lukes Hospital	-	\$ 8,770 - 12,267
Maimonides Hospital	-	\$10,375
St. Vincent's Hospital	-	\$ 9,882 - 10,647

The record also indicated that senior x-ray technicians and supervisors x-ray technicians are proportionately higher.

The Union contends that the low level of City salaries has made it difficult to recruit new technicians. It has been eight years since the Civil Service Commission has given an examination for X-ray Technicians. The hiring has been done by what might be called "open door hearings", in which technicians are hired by simply filling out a form listing their qualifications and training.

The Union states that the X-ray Technicians have substantially increased their productivity. Although it did not submit data to support its contention, the Union argues that the increase in the use of municipal hospitals, which has been substantial in the last few years, contrasted with the small increase in the number of technicians, supports its assertion that their productivity must have increased substantially.

The City does not deny that the X-ray Technicians are entitled to substantial increases. It argues, however, that any comparison between City salaries and those paid in the private sector is not valid unless fringe benefits are also included. When all fringes are costed out, the hourly salary for x-ray technicians, according to the City's computations, would range from \$6.58 to \$7.11 per hour. This compares favorably with the private sector where the computation for those X-ray Technicians who work 37 ½ hours is \$6.80 per hour and for those who work 35 hours is \$7.28. It should be pointed out, however, that the private sector hospitals are moving very rapidly to a 35-hour week.

The City argues that its financial condition must also be taken into account in making my recommendation. With no additional revenue in the offing, the City is faced with increasing demands from both its employees and its consumers of service. It argues that the granting of an unusually large wage increase to any group will have a most deleterious effect on the City's relations With its other employees. The City submitted Statistics showing the kind of settlements it has reached with other groups in the medical service field and urged a recommendation similar to them.

Finally, the City argued that any recommendation must take into account the fact that guidelines have been established by the Federal Pay Board and that any increase would have to obtain its approval.

I have considered the arguments of both sides. I recognize that the basic obligation of the City is to pay its employees a fair wage comparable to that of other government bodies and of the private sector. I agree that the City's financial condition is a relevant factor although it cannot be the sole criterion in this proceeding. I also recognize that if a comparison is to be made with the private sector the value of fringes must be taken into account.

In fashioning my recommendation I have taken all these factors into Account. My recommendation is intended to balance the employees' right to comparable salaries, the City's need to be competitive and the restraints imposed by the City's financial condition and the Federal Wage Guidelines.

I hereby recommend the following increases in salaries:

For X-ray Technicians and Radiation Technicians who now have a rate range of \$8,250-8,790: an across-the-board increase on July 1, 1971, of \$750, making the rate range \$9,000-9,540; on July 1, 1972, an across-the-board increase of \$750, making the rate range \$9,750-10,290; on January 1, 1973, an increase in the hiring rate of \$500, making the minimum salary \$10,250; on July 1, 1973, an across-the-board increase of \$750, making the minimum salary \$11,000. I also recommend establishing a rate range of \$11,000-11,600.

For Senior X-ray Technicians and Senior Radiation Technicians who are now at \$8,750-9,740: on July 1, 1971, an across-the-board increase of \$850, making the salary range \$9,600-10,590; on July 1, 1972, an across-the-board increase of \$850, making the salary range \$10,450-11,440; on January 1, 1973, an increase in the minimum hiring rate of \$500, making the salary range \$10,950-11,440; on July 1, 1973, an across-the-board increase of \$850. I recommend that the rate range be \$11,800-12,400.

For Supervisor of X-ray Technicians who are now receiving \$9,750-11,425: on July 1, 1971, an across-the-board increase of \$950, making the salary range \$10,700-12,375; on July 1, 1972, an across-the-board increase of \$950, making the salary range \$11,650-13,325; on January 1, 1973, an increase in the minimum hiring rate of \$400, making the rate range \$12,050-13,325; on July 1, 1973, an

across-the-board increase of \$950. I recommend the rate range be \$13,000-14,273.

Respectfully submitted,

---

BENJAMIN H. WOLF  
Impasse Panel

Dated: New York, December 19, 1972.