

In the Matter of LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION and ENGINEERS AND ARCHITECTS ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, BURBANK CHAPTER

In the Matter of LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION and ASSOCIATED ENGINEERS AND TECHNICIANS, INC.

*Cases Nos. 21-R-2213 and 21-R-2355, respectively.—Decided
October 20, 1944*

Mr. Charles M. Ryan and George R. O'Brien, for the Board.

Messrs. O'Melveny & Myers, by Mr. Homer I. Mitchell, of Los Angeles, Calif., for the Company.

Messrs. Katz, Gallagher & Margolis, by Mr. Ben Margolis, of Los Angeles, Calif., for Burbank Chapter.

Mr. Edward L. Blincoe, of Los Angeles, Calif., for Associated Engineers.

Mr. E. R. White, of Los Angeles, Calif., and Mr. Leland H. Hewitt, of Burbank, Calif., for Lodge No. 727 and Lodge No. 1712.

Mr. A. Sumner Lawrence, of counsel to the Board.

DECISION

AND

DIRECTION OF ELECTIONS

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Upon separate petitions filed by Engineers and Architects Association of Southern California, Burbank Chapter, herein called Burbank Chapter, and by Associated Engineers and Technicians, Inc., herein called the Associated Engineers, alleging that questions affecting commerce had arisen concerning the representation of employees of Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, Burbank, California, herein called the Company,¹ the National Labor Relations Board, herein called the Board, provided for an appropriate consolidated hearing upon due notice before W. P. Webb, Trial Examiner. Said hearing was held at various times between July 24 and August 2, 1944, at Los Angeles, California. The Company, Burbank Chapter, the Associated Engi-

¹ The name of the Company which is incorrectly set forth in certain of the formal papers as "Lockheed Aircraft Company," is hereby corrected in accordance with the facts stipulated by the parties at the hearing.

neers, International Association of Machinists, Aeronautical Industrial District Lodge No. 727, herein called Lodge No. 727, and International Association of Machinists, Local Lodge No. 1712, herein called Lodge No. 1712, appeared, participated and were afforded full opportunity to be heard, to examine, and cross-examine witnesses and to introduce evidence bearing on the issues. The Trial Examiner's rulings made at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed. The motions of the Company and Lodge No. 727 to dismiss the present proceedings in whole or in part are hereby denied for reasons hereinafter stated. All parties were afforded an opportunity to file briefs with the Board.

Upon the entire record in the case, the Board makes the following :

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. THE BUSINESS OF THE COMPANY

Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, a California corporation, has its principal office and place of business at Burbank, California, where it is engaged in the manufacture and sale of airplanes and airplane parts. The Company owns and operates nine plants within the State of California and a modification plant at Dallas, Texas. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, the Company purchased raw materials exceeding \$50,000,000 in value, of which approximately 85 percent was shipped to the California plants of the Company from points outside the State of California. During the same period, the Company's total sales of finished products exceeded \$85,000,000 in value, of which sales more than 90 percent represented products sold and shipped from the Company's California plants to points outside the State of California. The value of business has greatly increased since 1941, both with respect to incoming materials and outgoing products.

The Company admits that it is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act.

II. THE ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED

Engineers and Architects Association of Southern California, Burbank Chapter, and Associated Engineers and Technicians, Inc., are unaffiliated labor organizations, admitting to membership employees of the Company.

International Association of Machinists, Aeronautical Industrial District Lodge No. 727, and International Association of Machinists, Local Lodge No. 1712, are labor organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, admitting to membership employees of the Company.

III. THE QUESTIONS CONCERNING REPRESENTATION

The Company has refused to recognize the petitioning labor organizations as the exclusive bargaining representatives of its employees in the units claimed by such organizations unless and until they are certified by the Board.

At the hearing Lodge No. 727 moved to dismiss the petition filed by the Associated Engineers insofar as the unit claimed therein conflicts with a unit established by a series of collective bargaining agreements between the Company and Lodge No. 727, particularly an outstanding agreement in existence since September 15, 1941.² Since it appears that the agreement has been in effect for a period of more than 1 year and is of indefinite duration, subject to termination upon notice by either of the parties thereto, we find that it is not a bar to the proceeding brought by the Associated Engineers.³

A statement prepared by an attorney for the Board and included among the exhibits introduced in evidence at the hearing, indicates that Burbank Chapter and the Associated Engineers, each represents a substantial number of employees of the Company in the unit which it claims to be appropriate.⁴

We find that questions affecting commerce have arisen concerning the representation of employees of the Company, within the meaning of Section 9 (c) and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act.

IV. THE APPROPRIATE UNITS

Burbank Chapter contends that the monthly salaried engineering employees of the Company, excluding supervisory employees, in plants located within the municipal limits of the city of Burbank, California, constitute an appropriate unit. The Associated Engineers requests a unit of both salaried and hourly paid engineering employees in plants located within 10 counties of Southern California,

² The agreement provides that "it shall remain in force until July 1, 1943, or for the period of the Unlimited National Emergency proclaimed by the President of the United States, whichever is longer and thereafter until thirty (30) days after either party hereto shall give to the other written notice of desire for change of termination."

³ See *Matter of The Matheson Alkali Works*, 55 N. L. R. B. 1100; *Matter of Basic Refractories, Inc*, 55 N. L. R. B. 391.

⁴ The attorney for the Board reported that Burbank Chapter had submitted 747 designations, dated between April 1943 and August 1944, including 5 undated, of which 747 checked with a list of employees read from the company records and containing 1,566 names within the unit claimed appropriate by Burbank Chapter and that the Associated Engineers had submitted 730 designations dated between February 1943 and July 1944, of which 577 checked with the said list of employees containing 3,055 names within the unit claimed appropriate by the Associated Engineers.

The statement of the attorney for the Board further indicates that Lodge No 1712 submitted 119 designations dated between 1941 and December 1943, of which 44 checked with the said list containing at least 1,566 names within the unit claimed appropriate by Lodge No 1712.

Lodge No. 727 submitted no evidence of representation but relied upon its contract with the Company to establish its interest in the proceeding.

including the city of Burbank and the area adjacent thereto.⁵ Lodge No. 1712, claims as appropriate a unit consisting of monthly salaried engineering employees throughout the plants of the Company wherever located.⁶ Lodge No. 727 does not seek an election in any unit but opposes the unit claimed by the Associated Engineers upon the ground that the hourly paid engineering employees are presently represented by Lodge No. 727 under a contract with the Company covering both hourly paid production and hourly paid engineering employees. The Company takes the position that all the proposed units are inappropriate. In addition to the dispute as to the geographical scope and character of the appropriate unit, there is also in issue between the Company and one or more unions the inclusion or exclusion of specific categories of engineering and technical employees.

The geographical scope of the appropriate unit

The request of Burbank Chapter that the unit be limited from a geographical point of view to the municipal limits of Burbank, California, is apparently based on the fact that Burbank Chapter has as yet not organized to any substantial degree the Company's employees in plants located outside the city of Burbank. In thus limiting its present request, Burbank Chapter contends that it is motivated by a consideration of the difficulties of traveling in wartime and a regard for the convenience of the employees with respect to attendance at union meetings and other matters relating to collective bargaining. On the other hand, it appears that engineering employees who work at certain of the plants in Burbank perform the same duties as similar employees in plants located in the area outside Burbank and are at times the subject of transfer between the Burbank and the outlying plants. Moreover, the record discloses that engineering employees in outside plants have been organized in substantial numbers by other labor organizations and that the entire history of collective bargaining, insofar as it affects the engineering employees, has been conducted upon a broad geographical basis coextensive with the plants of the Company. Under the circumstances, we are of the opinion that the scope of collective bargaining as shown by the history of bargaining relations and confirmed by the extent of organization among the Company's employees, should govern with respect to the geographical limits of the appropriate unit or units in the present proceeding. Accordingly, we shall adopt a company-wide limit as the basis for such unit or units as may be hereinafter found appropriate.

⁵ The area claimed by the Associated Engineers extends to a maximum of approximately 100 miles from the Company's main plants at Burbank. Most of the plants herein concerned are, however, concentrated within a considerably smaller territory embracing the neighboring suburban sections of Burbank and Los Angeles.

⁶ The Company has in addition to plants in the area claimed by the Associated Engineers, other plants in more distant sections of California and also outside the boundaries thereof.

The character of the appropriate unit

The issues with respect to the character of the appropriate unit are whether the unit should be limited to monthly salaried engineering employees as advocated by both Burbank Chapter and Lodge No. 1712, or whether such unit should include both monthly salaried and hourly paid engineering employees, which latter alternative is supported by the Associated Engineers and is opposed by Lodge No. 727. The issues presented require an evaluation of the position of the monthly salaried engineering employees as an identifiable homogeneous group, together with a consideration of the status of the hourly paid engineering employees in relation to the hourly paid production employees.

With respect to the monthly salaried employees who as a group perform work of a professional character, the record indicates that while such employees share to a large extent with the hourly paid engineering employees, the same background of technical education and experience,⁷ the former are distinguishable from the latter in that the professional employees not only are paid in a manner different from that of the non-professional employees, but also as a general rule receive higher remuneration and have duties of a more responsible nature involving the use of judgment and discretion.

With respect to the status of the hourly paid engineering employees in relation to the production group, it appears that the hourly paid engineering employees have interests and duties which are clearly distinguishable from those of the hourly paid production employees. Despite this fact, it is the contention of Lodge No. 727 that the hourly paid engineering employees should not be separated from the production group upon the ground that such engineering employees have, since 1937, been included under a series of collective bargaining agreements between the Company and Lodge No. 727, covering all hourly paid employees generally. In support of this contention it appears that the hourly paid engineering employees thus covered have been and still are actively represented by Lodge No. 727 in collective bargaining with the Company. On the other hand, the record discloses that, notwithstanding the fact that the Company has recognized Lodge No. 727 as the exclusive bargaining representative for all hourly paid employees including hourly paid engineering employees, the latter have never been effectively organized by Lodge No. 727 and have on several occasions in the last few years, indicated a desire to withdraw from their association with the hourly paid production employees.⁸

⁷ The record discloses that the employees in the non-professional categories are generally in the position of trainees and advance normally by promotion to the professional level.

⁸ The attempts of the hourly paid engineering employees to escape inclusion within the larger group of production employees led to the formation of the Associated Engineers, one of the petitioners in the present proceeding.

While the history of collective bargaining is entitled to weight in the determination of the appropriate unit, we do not agree that countervailing factors may not determine that a unit different from the one so established will better effectuate the purposes and policies of the Act.⁹ In recognition of such factors here present, we shall, for the purposes of collective bargaining, separate the hourly paid engineering employees from the similarly paid production employees with whom they have been associated. Moreover, since it appears that the hourly paid and the monthly salaried engineering employees are identifiable homogeneous groups, we are of the opinion that such groups may properly function as separate bargaining units, or might appropriately constitute a single appropriate unit.¹⁰ Accordingly, we find that the considerations are sufficiently balanced to make the desires of the employees themselves a factor in our determination of the type of unit or units through which they shall bargain. We shall, therefore, make no present determination of the appropriate unit or units as affecting the engineering employees hereinabove referred to, but shall reserve such finding pending the result of the separate elections which we shall hereinafter direct. Upon the result of these elections will depend, in part, the scope of the bargaining unit or units sought herein. If at such elections the employees of both engineering groups select the Associated Engineers as their bargaining representative, they will be merged into a single appropriate unit; otherwise they will constitute separate units.

The inclusion or exclusion of specific categories of employees

The categories requested by both Burbank Chapter¹¹ and the Associated Engineers, listed in Appendix A, are largely uncontested by the Company and appear from the record to be generally proper for inclusion within a unit of engineering employees. On the other hand, a few classifications, namely, Industrial Engineer and Contract Specifications Writer, although unopposed by the Company, would appear from the evidence to raise considerable doubt as to the propriety of their inclusion within either of the two groups. The evidence reveals that the duties of the industrial engineer concern primarily efficiency recommendations in the handling of personnel requirements, including the duty to determine whether some employees should be discharged

⁹ See *Matter of Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co.*, 57 N. L. R. B. 1540.

¹⁰ The separate interests of professional employees have been frequently recognized as entitling such employees to collective bargaining apart from non-professional employees. See *Matter of General Electric Company*, 57 N. L. R. B. 81; *Matter of Radio Corporation of America, R. C. A. Division*, 57 N. L. R. B. 1729.

¹¹ The categories requested by Burbank Chapter are substantially the same as those desired by Lodge No. 1712 which also seeks a unit of salaried engineering employees without, however, any geographical limitations thereto.

or transferred; that the work of contract specifications writer requires no engineering training and is of an administrative clerical nature within the jurisdiction of the operations control office. We find that the employees in the aforesaid classifications have managerial duties which require their exclusion from the two groups of engineering employees.

There remains for consideration the question of including or excluding the following classifications as to which a controversy exists among the parties:

Aircraft Equipment Stylist: The work of an employee in this position, a monthly salaried classification, is essentially that of an interior decorator and is concerned with the interior style and design of airplanes as distinguished from their construction from an engineering point of view. While such an employee would, in the course of his work, normally come in contact with numerous engineering employees and generally has a knowledge of blueprints and information of a technical nature, the record indicates that his work is of an artistic rather than of an engineering character. In view of the dissimilarity between the duties of the aircraft equipment stylist and those of employees engaged in actual engineering work, we shall exclude all employees in the classification of aircraft equipment stylist from the group of monthly salaried engineering employees hereinafter referred to.

Engineering Planner: The duties of an employee in this position, a monthly salaried position in the A grade and an hourly one in the B grade,¹² are to assist in the selection of personnel, to assign job numbers, and to prepare the information for the design group which establishes work schedules. Such an employee should know the nomenclature and the components of an airplane. He is not, however, required to know any of the technical details and in practice has generally a financial and accounting rather than a technical and engineering background. The record discloses that engineering planners in general perform a business function under the supervision of the chief research engineer, which involves duties having no direct relation to the work of actual engineering employees. We shall, therefore, exclude employees in this category from the two groups of engineering employees hereinafter referred to.

Estimator: Employees in this category, a monthly salaried position, perform duties of an administrative nature. Such employees estimate costs of tooling, labor, and shipping requirements, including the total cost of an airplane scheduled for production. The work requires knowledge on the part of the estimator of the various machines

¹² Employees in the "A" grade perform work on the professional level as compared with employees in the "B" grade whose work is of a more routine character than that of employees in the "A" classification.

and tool operations from a shop standpoint, together with the cost of any tool needed to produce the airplane in question. Since it appears that employees in the classification of estimator perform administrative business functions not directly concerned with engineering activities, we shall exclude such employees from the group of monthly salaried engineering employees.

Flight Test Pilot: Employees in this category, a monthly salaried classification, are special pilots with wide experience in stunt flying and all types of flying maneuvers. The duties of flight test pilots are to test and report on the flying qualities of any of the aircraft manufactured by the Company. In the performance of this work, flight test pilots should have a working knowledge of aeronautics from a performance point of view. Although flight test pilots do work which is related to problems of engineering, they are not required to be familiar with design elements and merely report on the practical results that develop from testing. We find, in view of the difference in work performed by flight test pilots as compared with that of the engineering employees, that flight test pilots have insufficient interests in common with the monthly salaried engineering employees to warrant their inclusion within the group of monthly salaried engineering employees; we shall exclude them.

Laboratory Technician: An employee in the position of laboratory technician, an hourly paid classification, makes laboratory tests in connection with the medical examinations of new employees of the Company. The evidence reveals that he has nothing to do with the design or development of aircraft. In the absence of a direct relation between the work of the laboratory technician and that of the hourly paid engineering employees, we shall exclude employees in the classification of laboratory technician from the group of hourly paid engineering employees.

Manufacturing Analyst: The duties of a manufacturing analyst, a monthly salaried employee, consist primarily of analyzing the flow of parts to production control departments, investigating labor turnover and recommending changes in the number of personnel. In connection with these duties, manufacturing analysts recommend the number and type of persons to be employed in any operation and also recommend the use of labor saving machinery. Manufacturing analysts are not found in the engineering branch but are found in the department of management control. The position of manufacturing analyst is one of staff assistant to the director of manufacturing development, an executive on the second level of management. The record discloses that while manufacturing analysts prepare reports on such items as planning and tool design, they are trained in statistics rather than engineering, are concerned with high production methods, and have nothing to do with engineering formulae or the interpreta-

tion of blueprints. Since it appears that manufacturing analysts are essentially administrative employees, we shall exclude them from the group of monthly salaried engineering employees.

Materials Engineer: Employees in this classification, a monthly salaried position, are primarily concerned with the procurement of materials required by their respective departments and to this end make contact with and are contacted by vendors with respect to the products which the latter have to offer. As a part of such duties, an employee in this category would relay information obtained to the various technical people in his department and might also assist in expediting the paper work required to procure materials for one of the projects under development by the Company. While an employee of this type is required to know something about the materials he seeks, he is required to have not a technical but rather a commercial knowledge of the product involved. We find that the duties of materials engineer are concerned primarily with business functions not directly related to those of the engineering employees. Accordingly, we shall exclude employees in the classification of materials engineer from the group of monthly salaried engineering employees.

Methods Analyst: The duties of methods analysts comprise the investigation of office procedure in the various departments and the working out of better systems for performing the administrative paper work connected with each operation. Methods analysts do not in practice require engineering training,¹³ and are found in numerous departments in addition to the engineering branch where their work is mainly an investigating function with respect to the efficient routing of papers between offices. The position of methods analyst, which is salaried in the A, and hourly paid in the B and C classifications, is one of staff assistant to the various department heads. In view of the managerial functions performed by methods analysts, we shall exclude them from the two groups of engineering employees.¹⁴

Outside Liaison Man: An employee in this position, a monthly salaried classification, inspects tools, fabricated parts, and assemblies which are being manufactured at Company vendors. He makes commitments to vendors in regard to conformance with company standards and policies. He also relays information back in regard to the progress of the assemblies at a particular plant. The work is primarily an inspection function and includes the making of recommendations as to the modification of facilities in outside plants. The qualifications for the position require more of a mechanical shop knowledge than the

¹³ The reference to engineering training in the job description of employees in this position is not indicative of the actual requirements thereof.

¹⁴ See *Matter of Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corporation*, 54 N. L. R. B. 103.

engineering approach. The only department in which this classification is found is the customer service technical department.¹⁵ We find that employees in this category have few interests in common with the engineering employees as a group. Accordingly, we shall exclude employees in the classification of outside liaison man from the group of monthly salaried engineering employees.

Production Change Analyst: Employees in this category, a monthly salaried position, have the duty of ascertaining when production changes should become effective in aircraft which are being produced in quantity. Production change analysts investigate requests for changes in engineering drawings. As the result of their investigations, they make recommendations to the tool planners, or production processor, who predetermines the type of tool and method for fabricating a part. While engineering training is desirable for employees in this position, such training is not required, since knowledge sufficient for the performance of duties of production change analyst may be gained from shop experience. Since the work of employees in this classification is primarily concerned with management functions for the performance of which engineering training is not required, we shall exclude production change analysts from the group of monthly salaried engineering employees.

Project Liaison Man: This employee works from the works coordinator's office in coordinating the various segments of manufacturing toward the ultimate completion of aircraft. The same type of employee is also found in the manufacturing development control division. The work of the project liaison man is to perform the dispatching function, the follow-up function, and any and all service functions that are instrumental in making parts and effectively meeting due dates and schedules. The position, while in the monthly salaried group, is considered by the Company to be of an administrative character and does not require a professional engineering training. In view of the managerial functions of the project liaison man as manifested by his duties with respect to the coordination of manufacturing units, we shall exclude employees in this category from the group of monthly salaried engineering employees.¹⁶

Works Simplification Analyst: The duties of the works simplification analysts consist of devising new operating procedures for a department with respect to the flow of parts and paper work. In furtherance of their proposals for improvements in procedures, works simplification analysts hold supervisory meetings at which they explain to

¹⁵ The similar category of customers' service representative in this division was stricken from both petitions by amendments at the hearing.

¹⁶ See *Matter of Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corporation*, 54 N. L. R. B. 103.

the line and staff supervisors their programs with regard to the institution of works simplification proposals. Other duties include the analyzing of works simplification proposals made by production employees and the submission of these proposals in proper form to the foreman of the department concerned for his opinion as to the practical character of such proposals. The position of works simplification analyst, a monthly salaried classification, does not require college engineering training and is considered by the Company as purely administrative in character, requiring mainly the qualifications of an industrial relations man. We find that the duties of works simplification analysts are of an administrative character without intimate relation to those of the monthly salaried engineering employees. Accordingly, we shall exclude employees in the classification of works simplification analyst from the group of monthly salaried engineering employees.

Field Service Man: This is a temporary classification assigned to employees of any type who are transferred from the main plants to service in the field. The record reveals that there is no group of employees who are regularly employed as field service men. It is contended, however, that field service men should be included insofar as they are engineering employees on temporary assignments to field duty. It would appear that it is possible, by checking the individual field service men, to ascertain which are and which are not engineering employees. Accordingly, we shall include within the two groups hereinafter referred to such field service men who upon investigation are shown to be engineering employees within the definition of the groups hereinafter referred to and who are temporarily assigned to field duty.

As previously indicated, we shall, at this time make no final determination with respect to the appropriate unit or units pending the outcome of elections among employees of the Company in each of the voting groups set forth below:

1. All monthly salaried engineering employees of the Company in the classifications listed in Appendix A, including employees in the classification of field service men who upon investigation, are shown to be such monthly salaried engineering employees temporarily assigned to field duty, but excluding employees in the classifications listed in Appendix B, and all administrative, executive, and supervisory employees with authority to hire, promote, discharge, discipline, or otherwise effect changes in the status of employees, or effectively recommend such action;

2. All hourly paid engineering employees of the Company in the classifications listed in Appendix C, including employees in the classi-

fication of field service men who upon investigation, are shown to be such hourly paid engineering employees temporarily assigned to field duty, but excluding employees in the classifications listed in Appendix D, and all supervisory employees with authority to hire, promote, discharge, discipline, or otherwise effect changes in the status of employees, or effectively recommend such action.

V. THE DETERMINATION OF REPRESENTATIVES

We shall direct that the questions concerning representation which have arisen be resolved by elections by secret ballot among the employees in the two groups who were employed during the pay-roll period immediately preceding the date of the Direction of Elections herein, subject to the limitations and additions set forth in the Direction.¹⁷

DIRECTION OF ELECTIONS

By virtue of and pursuant to the power vested in the National Labor Relations Board by Section 9 (c) of the National Labor Relations Act, and pursuant to Article III, Section 9, of National Labor Relations Board Rules and Regulations—Series 3, as amended, it is hereby

DIRECTED that, as part of the investigation to ascertain representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining with Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, Burbank, California, elections by secret ballot shall be conducted as early as possible but not later than thirty (30) days from the date of this Direction under the direction and supervision of the Regional Director for the Twenty-first Region, acting in this matter as agent for the National Labor Relations Board and subject to Article III, Sections 10 and 11, of said Rules and Regulations among the following groups of employees of the Company who were employed during the pay-roll period immediately preceding the date of this Direction, including employees who did not work during said pay-roll period because they were ill or on vacation or temporarily laid off, and including employees in the armed forces of the United States who present themselves in person at the polls, but excluding any who have since quit or been discharged for cause and have not been rehired or reinstated prior to the date of the elections:

1. All monthly salaried engineering employees of the Company in the group described in Section IV, above, to determine whether they desire to be represented by International Association of Machinists,

¹⁷ Although Lodge No 1712 did not make a substantial showing of representation, we shall, nevertheless, accord it a place on the ballot in view of the fact that it appears as an intervenor and that an election is being directed in the group claimed by Lodge No 1712 as constituting an appropriate unit.

Local Lodge No. 1712, or by Engineers and Architects Association of Southern California, Burbank Chapter, or by Associated Engineers and Technicians, Inc., for the purposes of collective bargaining, or by none of these organizations;

2. All hourly paid engineering employees of the Company in the group described in Section IV, above, to determine whether they desire to be represented by International Association of Machinists, Aeronautical Industrial District Lodge No. 727, or by Associated Engineers and Technicians, Inc., for the purposes of collective bargaining, or by neither.

CHAIRMAN MILLIS took no part in the consideration of the above Decision and Direction of Elections.

APPENDIX A

Aerodynamist	Process Engineer
Aerodynamics Engineer	Production Engineer Design
Construction Engineer A and B	Research Engineer
Contract Specifications Engineer	Research Laboratory Analyst A
Design Specialist	Salvage Engineer
Development Liaison Engineer*	Service Engineer
Electrical Engineer	Staff Engineer
Engineering Designer	Standards Analyst A
Engineering Drawings Checker A	Standards Engineer
Engineering Liaison Man A	Stress Analyst
Flight Test Analyst A	Structures Engineer
Flight Test Engineer	Tool Engineer
Manufacturing Engineer	Tool Research Analyst
Mechanical Design Engineer	Weight Control Engineer
Procurement Engineer	Wind Tunnel Test Engineer
Process Analyst A	

APPENDIX B

Aircraft Equipment Stylist	Materials Engineer
Engineering Planner Grade A	Methods Analyst A
Estimator	Outside Liaison Man
Flight Test Pilot	Project Liaison Man
Industrial Engineer	Production Change Analyst
Manufacturing Analyst	Works Simplification Analyst

*While the Company has no employees at present in the category of Development Liaison Engineer, the classification is included since the possibility exists that the Company may in the future have employees within such classification.

APPENDIX C

Construction Engineer C	Material Analyst
Draftsman	Mathematician
Engineering Assistant	Process Analyst B and C
Engineering Draftsman	Research Laboratory Analyst B
Engineering Drawings Checker B	and C
Engineering Liaison Man B	Standards Analyst B and C
and C	Technical Computer
Engineering Technician	Technical Writer
Flight Test Analyst B	Time-Study Man
Loftsman	Weight Analyst

APPENDIX D

Contract Specifications Writer	Engineering Planner B
Laboratory Technician	Methods Analyst B and C