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MESSAGE FROM THE BOARD

Year One of the Taylor Law—September 1, 1967-August 31, 1968—was an historic period in New York State for some 900,000 public employees, their employers and the public. It was a year marked by controversy—most of which was resolved without resort to the strike. It was a time of trial and experiment for the New York State Public Employment Relations Board, the agency created to administer the Law.

History will record the period as one in which all public employees, working within the borders of the Empire State, were, for the first time, granted the right in law to organize and to be represented in collective negotiations by organizations of their own choosing.

In arriving at determinations regarding which competing organizations should represent employees, conflict is inherent in the process. Yet, New York State can take pride in the fact that during Year One not a single strike occurred over representation issues. This fact is recorded in New York despite the experiences in many states where large masses of public employees were given representation rights, and the vigorous response often erupted in strikes.

The Taylor Law, then, appears to be sound in resolving the complex disputes arising among competing organizations for representation rights.

On another front—impasses arising during contract negotiations—the Taylor Law’s success in Year One was not unblemished by strike. New York recorded nine strikes, which are being analyzed by the Public Employment Relations Board to determine the causes, and hopefully, develop routes to take to avoid a repetition in subsequent years. The number of strikes recorded, while of concern to all who have responsibilities in public employment relations, was infinitesimal in comparison to the great number of contracts which were negotiated to satisfactory consummation without disruption of public services.

Thus, the Taylor Law’s experience in its first year was successful—though not perfect. Perfection was not contemplated; indeed, the framers of the statute recognized the necessity for experimentation and the need to build on a solid legal base after some experience.

This report, in its various sections, comments in greater detail on the experiences of PERB under the Law.

Robert D. Helsby, Chairman
George H. Fowler, Member
Joseph R. Crowley, Member
"A Public Employment Relations Board should be created and empowered to establish procedures... The Board should be composed of three public members, appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the members' terms should be for six years, with staggered terms, for the original members."

Taylor Committee Report, 1966

INTRODUCTION

Beginnings under a new law are often difficult and complex, requiring the establishment of an entirely new agency to administer the statute as well as the promulgation of rules and regulations under which the statute is implemented and enforced.

On September 1, 1967, when the Taylor Law went into effect, the New York State Public Employment Relations Board, the agency established to administer the Law, found itself faced immediately with a number of major problems, among which were:

- Defining the nature, role and responsibilities of the Board.
- Adoption of rules and regulations to implement the Law.
- Clarifying the options available to local governments under Section 212 of the Law, including the establishment of their own public employment relations boards.
- Developing an organizational pattern, hiring and training employees, and securing necessary funds for the administration of the agency, and
- Informing public employers, public employees, employee organizations, and the public of a complex new law and a new way of life for those in the public sector.

From the outset, the PERB recognized that for the Taylor Law to be effective, the Board must be neutral and impartial. The Board charted such a course and followed it.

About the Board

The State Public Employment Relations Board was created under Section 205 of the Taylor Law. The Board consists of three members, appointed by the Governor. Not more than two members of the Board may be members of the same political party. Board members are appointed for six-year terms. The Chairman of the Board is the only full-time member. The other two members are paid on a per diem basis. In addition to the Board's statutory responsibility for resolving disputes arising out of contract negotiations, and promulgating rules to implement the intent of the Taylor Law regarding representation questions, the Board serves in a quasi-judicial role in determining whether employee organizations violate the no-strike provision of the statute.

The Board also sits as an appellant, hearing appeals from decisions of the director of representation. The Board is the policy making body for the administration of the Law.

The Chairman of the Board serves as the chief administrative officer, in addition to other responsibilities, for the day-to-day operations.
THE NEW RIGHTS

There are some 900,000 public employees in New York State working for the State, municipalities, counties, towns, villages, school districts and public authorities. In the first year, 1967-68, more than 700,000 public employees were represented by employee organizations in collective negotiations with their employers.

About 340,000 of these public employees gained recognition and engaged in some form of negotiations with their public employers prior to the enactment of the Taylor Law, and most of these were in New York City. An estimated 360,000 obtained and are now exercising such rights for the first time. Thousands more are in various stages of obtaining representation rights.

Recognitions Granted

Most public employers, and public employee organizations seeking to represent employees, have avoided disputes over representation questions. In fact, most representation disputes were resolved either under the auspices of local procedures established to resolve such disputes or voluntarily without resort to such procedures. Preliminary indications show that recognitions have been granted to employee organizations by at least 200 local governments outside of New York City, and not including school districts.

In the school districts, recognition was extended to employee organizations representing professional employees (mostly classroom teachers) in some 600 districts out of a total of more than 800 operating districts.

The great majority of these recognitions were granted since the effective date of the Taylor Law. Employee organizations representing police and firemen have achieved recognition in most of the governments likely to have public safety agencies.

In addition to the large number of voluntary recognitions, the services of the PERB were used to settle 164 representation dis-
putes, and all without resort to strike. In the first year, 309 petitions were received from employee organizations seeking certification as a negotiating agent or decertification of other organizations already recognized. Of this number, 56 were from organizations competing for the right to represent State employees, 107 for school district employees and 146 for employees of local governments or public authorities. Forty-two employee representation elections were conducted by PERB involving nearly 20,000 public workers.

**Significant Decisions**

A number of significant unit determination decisions were issued by the Director of Representation and the Board.

The most far-reaching of these cases in terms of the number of employees involved and the issues raised is the "general unit" designated by the state for all employees except those in the Division of New York State Police, the professional staff of the State University and those defined as management or confidential. The unit determination question for these employees is generally regarded as one of the most complex labor relations matters of its kind, in either public or private employment. Over 3,700 different job titles are held by the 150,000 state employees in the "general unit."

More than 50 petitions were filed with PERB contesting the state's unit decision, and its recognition of the Civil Service Employees' Association as negotiating agent. As a preliminary action in this case, a request was made to the Board to order the state's negotiating team to cease negotiations with the CSEA in the general unit. After hearings on this issue, the Board ordered the state to treat all competing organizations equally in the negotiations until such time as a final determination could be made on the merits of the representation question by PERB. The Court of Appeals, however, in a 5-2 decision, ruled that the Board did not have the authority to issue such an order.

Following nearly eight months of hearings, an intermediate determination was issued by the Director of Representation based on recommendations of the Board's Deputy Chairman who served as hearing officer in the case. That decision established six negotiating units as follows: Operational Services; Inspection and Security Services; Health Services and Support; Administrative Services; Professional, Scientific and Technical Services, and Seasonal Employees of the Long Island State Park Commission. Appeals were filed from this decision with the State PERB by the state and eleven of the employee organizations that had contested the state's original unit determination. The State PERB is responsible for making the final unit determination.

The two other units designated by the state for state employees are: the State Police and the professional staff at the State University. (In each instance, however, the state did not recognize any employee organization.) These unit determinations were contested by various employee organizations.

Representation hearings were held for the members of the Division of New York State Police, and two negotiating units were ultimately established by PERB after challenges were brought to the units established by the Director of Representation. One unit included lieutenants, captains and majors; the second unit was established for all members of the Division below the rank of lieutenant.

**State Police Vote**

Mail ballot elections conducted by PERB in both negotiating units were the first among state employees under the Taylor Law. The Police Benevolent Association, which received a majority of votes, was certified as the negotiating representative for the commissioned officers' unit. A run-off election was required in the other unit when none of the three organizations seeking bargaining rights was able to gain a majority.

The PBA subsequently received the majority of votes in the run-off election over Council 50, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO. Council 50, however, filed objections to the election procedure and these were under investigation as PERB's first year came to a close. The Civil Service Employees' Association competed in the original election, but was eliminated.
City University Case

The first case of its kind in the United States, involving the faculty of the City University of New York, was decided by PERB during Year One. A unit for permanent instructional staff and those temporary instructors with positions leading to tenure and a separate unit for all other temporary instructors were designated by the Director of Representation. The State Board upheld this decision by a 2-1 split vote and elections are scheduled this year to determine the bargaining representatives.

Unusual interest has been generated across the country in another representation matter before PERB involving the professional staff of the State University. Five parties seek certification as negotiating representative and hearings were begun in late summer. A unique question presented in this case is whether representation rights should be granted to employees continuously on individual campuses, or statewide.

Representation Issues

Determinations in all representation disputes before PERB were made on the facts of the case and at times resulted in different determinations from area to area for members of a similar profession. To illustrate, in two early cases classroom teachers were placed in a separate unit from principals and in a later case, both groups were consolidated in one unit.

The question of placement of technical and professional and supervisory employees was one of the principal issues in another major unit determination affecting employees of the New York State Thruway. At issue, also, was the placement of office clericals and bridge painters. Here, the Director of Representation attempted to resolve the dispute by establishing two units, one for all toll collectors, maintenance and clerical employees and the other for all technical, professional and supervisory employees. Three of the four employee organizations competing for representation rights appealed this decision to the PERB.

Each situation at the present state of development of the Law presents new, unusual and distinct problems calling for critical and in-depth analysis of the facts.

In the case of certain workers employed by the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority in Buffalo, the State PERB affirmed its jurisdiction by refusing to dismiss certification petitions by two employee organizations. The question of PERB's jurisdiction arose because the Authority is also an agency of both the New York State and Canadian governments.

In another instance, the Supreme Court of St. Lawrence County upheld PERB's jurisdiction to conduct representation proceedings. A Potsdam school district sought to restrain the State PERB from acting on a petition, alleging that the school board had adopted procedures under Section 206.1 of the Law, thereby divesting PERB of jurisdiction. The Court held that since a petition had been filed with PERB prior to adoption of the school district procedures, jurisdiction remained with the State Board to resolve the representation dispute.

In summary, the representation machinery provided under the Taylor Law appears to be working well. Not only are thousands of employees being represented in negotiations by employee organizations, but most importantly there have been no strikes involving representation issues. The Taylor Law is fulfilling one of its primary objectives: giving employees the right to choose an employee organization, and to negotiate collectively on terms and conditions of employment. Indeed, it was a large order for a new statute.
THE PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF CONTRACT DISPUTES

The Taylor Law is unique in public employment in that, for the first time, it establishes impasse procedures for the resolution of public employer-employee disputes that arise out of contract negotiations.

Section 209 of the Taylor Law provides that public employers and recognized or certified employee organizations may enter into written agreements setting forth procedures to be invoked if disputes arise during the course of collective negotiations. These written agreements may be incorporated in a broader, collectively negotiated contract or may be separate written agreements for the limited purpose of resolving particular disputes. If agreed upon machinery for resolving disputes breaks down, or if the parties fail to agree on such procedures, then the State Public Employment Relations Board is obliged to invoke the Taylor Law’s impasse procedures.

As one of its first tasks, even prior to the implementation of the Law, the State Board actively contacted public employee organizations and public employers to develop a panel of mediators and fact-finders. By the close of the year, 160 experienced labor relations people were named to the panel and were being used effectively throughout the State.

Under the mutually-agreed upon impasse procedures permitted by the statute, the parties to a dispute have unlimited flexibility in establishing machinery that best meets their needs. A problem, however, arises when such machinery fails to resolve a dispute and State PERB is summoned, usually with only a few days, and sometimes only hours, available before a contract expires or budgets are to be submitted. (The PERB is analyzing cases of this type in an effort to devise an approach that retains the flexibility for the parties, while at the same time will permit PERB’s
intervention, if the disputes continues, with sufficient time to be of most help).

The first major round of negotiations under the Law's impasse machinery has been completed. From September 1, 1967 through August 30, 1968, the Conciliation Section of the Board handled in excess of 300 contract disputes in governmental entities ranging from large cities to tiny fire districts, as well as in school districts of all sizes throughout the state. By far, disputes between teacher organizations and local school boards exceeded all others.

Approximately 80 percent of the disputes involved school boards and their employees. Boards of education negotiated with employees in over 1,600 negotiating units. PERB was involved in 226 disputes arising from these negotiations. Two developments were noticeable in school negotiations. The first was the extent of the Board's involvement, clearly greater than that of private sector mediation agencies; secondly, over 50 percent of the disputes which came to the Board were settled through mediation.

Major Disputes

The first major dispute handled by the Board involved the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority and Local 1396, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO. This was the first instance of full application of the impasse procedures. A PERB staff conciliator was appointed; a mediator was appointed, and the first fact-finding panel was appointed by PERB. The recommendations of the panel were accepted by the employer and the employee organizations and settled the dispute. The case clearly demonstrated that competent fact-finding, with equitable recommendations, can be an effective tool in the total impasse machinery.

The effectiveness of the Law's impasse machinery was manifested in numerous other disputes, but perhaps none more so than in the contract dispute between the Plainview-Old Bethpage School district in the Town of Oyster Bay, and the Federation of Teachers. Here, a three-man fact-finding board, assigned following mediation efforts, held marathon hearings over a weekend and resolved 120 issues, thus averting a strike set for the next day.

A landmark in the implementation of the Law's impasse provisions involved a dispute between the City of Schenectady and the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association and Local 28 of the Fire Fighters Union.

The City challenged PERB's authority to enter a contract dispute after the budget submission date and brought the matter to the Supreme Court. In his decision, a Supreme Court Justice upheld the State Board's right to invoke its impasse machinery despite the budget date. The Judge stated in part: "It is apparent ... that the legislature intended PERB to possess powers and duties necessary to give the Taylor Law meaning." He also said: "In order to effectuate the Law the section on impasse machinery must be given a construction which does not render PERB powerless when an impasse does in fact exist."

Other Crises

While PERB's role was paramount in resolving the 300 impasses that came to it directly, the Board also was in close touch with other labor relations crises where negotiations were carried on under procedures established by parties to the dispute.

The State Board was actively involved in negotiations between the New York City Transit Authority and the Transport Workers' Union from initial discussions early in October 1967 up to the settlement two hours beyond the strike deadline. Under Section 209 of the Taylor Law, the TA and the TWU selected to establish their own procedures and named a three-man mediation panel. The Board remained in continuous contact through the marathon bargaining sessions in the event negotiations broke down and the full impasse procedures of the Taylor Law would have to be invoked.

In still another case, also involving New York City's subway system, the State PERB was able to effect a settlement between the Transit Authority and three supervisory unions. Unique in this case was PERB's implementation of the broad statutory authority vested in it to resolve disputes. PERB introduced for the first time under the Taylor Law the "show cause" hearing in which the parties to the dispute were permitted to give evidence on the question of why a fact-finder's recommendations should not be ac-
cepted. The approach resolved the dispute, and as a by-product demonstrated once again the flexibility of the Taylor Law in confronting labor relations disputes.

Despite the success of the impasse procedures, the first year was not without its serious problems. From the inception of the Taylor Law, there have been scores of public employee strikes across the nation, but only nine have occurred in New York State. Only three happened following use of PERB's impasse machinery; four resulted from a breakdown in local impasse procedures, and two involved the Taylor Law indirectly.

Coincident with the effective date of the Law in September 1967, negotiations broke down between the New York City Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers. Some 50,000 teachers did not report to work on opening day and did not return to the schools for 15 days.

In this situation, contract negotiations had been taking place for several months and a distinguished panel of fact-finders was in the process of preparing its report. The full resources of the State PERB were made available to all parties to the dispute, but a critical evaluation of the existing circumstances led the State PERB to the decision that its intervention might raise complications in an already complicated situation. Resolution of the dispute, therefore, continued under the procedures established by the parties before the effective date of the Taylor Law.

The most controversial part of the Taylor Law, the penalty section, was invoked however. Under one set of penalties, a Supreme Court Justice fined the union $150,000 and sentenced the UFT president to 15 days in jail for contempt of court. In addition, the Public Employment Relations Board, after determining that "mass resignations" constituted a strike, for the first time suspended the dues deduction privilege of a union—for 12 months.

Other Strikes

In the New York City sanitation strike, the case was under the jurisdiction of the City's Office of Collective Bargaining which is unique in that its rules and procedures are not subject to approval of PERB.

The relationship between PERB and the OCB was given considerable attention by the Taylor Committee when it was reconvened by the Governor following the sanitationmen's strike. The Taylor Law virtually assures complete autonomy to OCB, except that its procedures may be challenged in the Supreme Court in New York City.

Several other strikes involving fewer than 1,600 employees occurred during the first year. Three occurred in school districts outside New York City: Huntington, Lakeland and the Island Trees school district in Levittown. The State PERB ordered a two-month dues deduction suspension against the employee organization in Lakeland, and a hearing officer recommended a 12-month suspension in the Huntington case; hearings were being held in Island Trees to determine whether in fact the no-strike provision of the Law was violated.

The overall picture for Year One was bright despite the fact that nine strikes occurred. During the first year time did not always permit the full use of the impasse machinery of the Taylor Law. Rather than taking advantage of the mediation step of the impasse procedures, in many instances it was necessary to proceed directly to fact-finding. In the future, however, as experience grows, the State Board anticipates earlier contact with the parties to disputes to insure full use of the Law's dispute-settling machinery.
LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES

In addition to the role usually played by Counsel for a state agency which includes drafting of rules and regulations, preparing legislation, and providing legal opinions, PERB’s Counsel has additional responsibilities relating to local laws to implement the Taylor Law, strikes and reprisals.

Counsel’s office rendered over 250 informal opinions during the year in response to questions raised by attorneys and others involved with the Law. This activity unquestionably smoothed the implementation of the Taylor Law at the early stages when, as in the case with all new laws, there is a great need for explanation and interpretation.

Local Labor Relations Programs

A distinctive feature of the Taylor Law is its strong emphasis on flexibility, particularly with respect to local governments. It permits them to substitute their own labor relations programs for that of the state and provides them with several options. First, a local government may choose to come completely under the jurisdiction of the State PERB; second, it may adopt its own procedures limited to the resolution of representation disputes; or third, it may enact, under Section 212, its own procedures for implementing the Law and may establish its own Public Employment Relations Board.

Local laws under Section 212 must be found by the State Board to be substantially equivalent to the Taylor Law and the PERB’s
Rules of Procedure and the continuing implementation of such local laws is also subject to review. (The only exception is the New York City legislation which is not subject to prior approval by the State Board and can only be challenged in court.)

Local Laws Adopted

A total of 31 units of government had local procedures approved by PERB since September 1967. Two, after approval, repealed their local procedures. Two others did not implement their procedures by appointing a board or adopting rules. The State Board, therefore, rescinded its approval, leaving a total of 27 approved “mini-PERBS” whose jurisdictions collectively involve approximately 70,000 public employees.

Counsel’s office, on request, assisted legal officers of the various jurisdictions with problems encountered in drafting and otherwise preparing local laws for submission to PERB. Counsel’s office, also, has the responsibility to review proposed local laws and to recommend to the PERB approval or disapproval.

Reprisals

Because the Taylor Law guarantees the right of employees to join or refrain from joining an employee organization, the Board’s Rules are equally specific in their protection of employees from any act of reprisal for exercising these rights. In the first year, the State Board has been called on 25 times by employees who claimed their employers had taken retaliatory action against them because of activity on behalf of an employee organization. Counsel’s office served in the prosecutor’s role in these actions and issued six complaints. Fourteen others were dismissed without the issuance of complaints and the remainder were under investigation at the end of August, 1968. In one instance, the reprisal proceeding was settled on the basis of a recommendation of a hearing officer who called for the reappointment of a faculty member at a State University college.

"... experience has been sufficient, however, to point up the questions and issues to which intensive study and discussion should be directed. . . ."

Interim Report of Taylor Committee
June 1968

BREAKING NEW GROUND

In addition to its other powers and functions, the State Public Employment Relations Board has a prime responsibility to make studies and analyses, and act as a clearing house for information relating to conditions of employment of public employees throughout the state.

It carries out this function through its Research Office by making data relating to wages, benefits and employment practices in public and private employment available to employee organizations, mediators, fact-finding boards and joint study committees established by governments and employee organizations. It also conducts studies of problems involved in representation matters and negotiations. These are basically concerned with issues left open or considered experimental by drafters of the Taylor Law.

The State Board serves as a repository for information on wages, fringe benefits, and employment practices applicable to negotiations in the public sector. Much of the data already are
available or are gathered by agencies and organizations in the labor relations field. PERB's research staff will, however, undertake surveys from time to time to fill specific needs.

**Fringe Benefits Study**

During the first year, a survey to determine the pattern of local government fringe benefits was begun by PERB. Although the primary source of data arises from contracts between public employers and their employees, there is a need for comparative data in the private sector. The State Department of Labor is undertaking to provide PERB with expanded data in the private sector through a contract with the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Another survey was initiated by the State Board of the pattern of unit determination and recognition among public sector employers in New York State. When completed, it is anticipated it will be possible to draw at least tentative conclusions on the need for legislative clarification in the representation field.

In keeping with its statutory charges, specific assistance is rendered on request to the parties, to mediators, and to fact-finders. Such requests have varied from examples of contract language to wage rates for comparable jurisdictions. Assistance has been rendered to parties preparing for negotiations as well as during the course of negotiations. Emphasis is placed on the former to introduce a high degree of rationality into the negotiating process so as to reduce to a minimum potential areas of misunderstanding and facilitate the settlement of disputes.

The Board also is charged with responsibility for undertaking studies on certain issues left open by the Law or anticipated by the Taylor Committee to be troublesome. (The Board is required to make recommendations for legislative change from time to time.)

For example, it was unclear at the time the Law was written just how much practice and precedent from the private sector with respect to representation should be transferred to the public sector. Thus, exclusivity was not mandated, and it was made possible for recognition to be granted on a members-only basis—something that has not generally been possible in the private sector for more than 40 years.

In the future, similar studies will be undertaken to provide a basis for policy decisions of the State Board.

The accomplishment of this objective requires an emphasis on data concerning current settlements. Because the budget dates of local public employers—school boards, towns, etc.—tend to come within a very short time span, if not simultaneously, experimentation is required to develop methods of obtaining and disseminating such information with minimum turn-around time. Thus in the public sector the negotiating cycle is proving to be much shorter than in the private sector because of the emphasis upon budget submission dates and the prevalence of short-term—usually one year—contracts.

Thomas E. Joyner, Director of Research (seated), and his assistant, Joseph Phillips, prepare statistics for study on unit determinations.
INFORMED PUBLICS

Probably no other law has caused more concern or engendered more interest than the Taylor Law. The concern and interest are not limited to the principals to a dispute, but encompass large segments of the general public and the news media.

While the Law directly affects some 900,000 New York State residents, it touches nearly every citizen of the state if essential government services are curtailed, or threatened.

The State Public Employment Relations Board, from the outset, was fully aware of the changes the Law would bring about and accepted the challenge of educating its clientele and the public.

The Office of Public Information and Education has the responsibility for developing seminars and other informational meetings geared to help interest clientele in the workings of the Taylor Law and PERB. A number of such sessions were held throughout the first year. In addition, the staff began plans for a national conference on public employment relations sponsored by the Governor and conducted by PERB. The conference is scheduled for October 14-16 and it is expected that 600 persons from across the nation will participate in an exploration of several major problems in the field.

One of the first things undertaken by PERB, after getting organized, was the convening of informal meetings with major public employer and public employee organizations. These meetings served the useful function of getting the thoughts and suggestions of persons and organizations affected by the statute.

Shortly thereafter, the Board initiated a series of eight regional informational meetings which were designed to provide guidance for public employers and employee organizations. The meetings were conducted in the major urban areas of the State, and more than 3,000 individuals participated.

The Board also co-sponsored, together with the Industrial and Labor Relations School at Cornell, a seminar for local government officials who represented communities which contemplated enactment of procedures permitted under Section 212 of the statute.

During the first year of the Law, members of the Public Employment Relations Board and its staff addressed more than 200 meetings sponsored by various groups including colleges and universities, employer organizations and employee groups.

The Office of Public Information and Education coordinated the Board's activity in this area, and also initiated a monthly Newsletter through which it informs its clientele of Board decisions, fact-finding reports, mediation cases, etc. The Newsletter is sent to more than 7,000 individuals throughout the State.


As the year came to a close, another publication was underway outlining the impasse machinery of the Taylor Law.

In addition to these activities, the Office of Public Information and Education announces all decisions of the Board, appointment of mediators and fact-finders and other matters. Staff in the office are in continuing contact, on a daily basis, with various representatives of the news media.
PERB'S STRUCTURE, BUDGET

The task of organizing the administrative operations including the development of the organizational structure, classification of positions and recruiting of personnel, maintenance of financial records and controls and other "housekeeping" functions was accomplished.

Since the early days, the staff has grown to a total of 53 employees in three offices—Albany, New York City and Buffalo.

During the first year, the State Board was funded by an emergency appropriation totaling $526,640. The budget for the 1968-69 fiscal year total $983,598.