

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

One Ashburton Place: Room 503
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 979-1900

BRIAN MCGOLDRICK,
Appellant

v.

MassDOT,
Respondent

C-20-035

Appearance for Appellant:

Pro Se
Brian McGoldrick

Appearance for Respondent:

Matthias P. Kriegel, Esq.¹
MassDOT
10 Park Plaza
Boston, MA 02116

Commissioner:

Christopher C. Bowman²

Summary of Decision

The Civil Service Commission denied the Appellant’s appeal to be reclassified from Engineering Aide II to General Construction Inspector I as he failed to show that he performed the level distinguishing duties of the higher classification a majority of the time. Rather, he is a properly classified EA-II who has historically performed his job well and is sometimes trusted with greater responsibility to act temporarily “out-of-grade” as a result.

DECISION

On October 7, 2019, the Appellant, Brian McGoldrick (Appellant), pursuant to G.L. c. 30, § 49, filed an appeal with the Civil Service Commission (Commission), contesting the decision of the state’s Human Resources Division (HRD), in which HRD affirmed MassDOT’s denial of his request to be reclassified from Engineering Aide II (EA-II) to General Construction

¹ The Commission is informed that Attorney Kriegel has left the employ of MassDOT and thus a copy of this decision is being forwarded to MassDOT labor relations specialist Eric F. Pike.

² The Commission acknowledges the assistance of Legal Intern Daniel Taylor in the drafting of this decision.

Inspector I (GCI-I). On March 24, 2020, Commissioner Paul M. Stein held a remote pre-hearing conference. Commissioner Cynthia A. Ittleman then held a remote full hearing, on May 5, 2020.³ The hearing was recorded via Webex, and both parties were provided with a link to the recording of the hearing.⁴ The Commission also retained a copy of the hearing recording and caused the hearing to be transcribed. Commissioner Ittleman retired in March 2022, and the appeal was assigned to me for decision. I have carefully reviewed the transcript and the parties' exhibits and submissions. For the reasons stated herein, the appeal is denied.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Nineteen (19) exhibits were entered into evidence at the hearing. The record was left open to allow the Appellant and the Respondent to submit additional documentation, and both parties did so. Based on these exhibits and the testimony of the following witnesses:

For the Appellant:

- Brian McGoldrick, Appellant

For MassDOT:

- James Marine, Acting District Administration Manager, District 3, MassDOT
- Steven Chumsae, General Construction Inspector I, Highway Division, District 3, MassDOT

and taking administrative notice of all pleadings filed in the case, pertinent rules, statutes, regulations, case law and policies, and drawing reasonable inferences from the credible evidence, I make the following findings of fact:

³ The Standard Adjudicatory Rules of Practice and Procedure, 801 CMR § 1.01 (formal rules), apply to adjudications before the Commission with Chapter 31 or any Commission rules taking precedence.

⁴ If there is a judicial appeal of this decision, the plaintiff in the judicial appeal would be obligated to supply the court with a transcript of this hearing to the extent that he/she wishes to challenge the decision as unsupported by the substantial evidence, arbitrary and capricious, or an abuse of discretion. If such an appeal is filed, the recording provided to the parties should be used to transcribe the hearing.

1. The Appellant is employed with MassDOT in its Highway Division, Construction Department, District 3, and is classified as an Engineering Aide II. (Testimony of Appellant; Exhibits 1, 2).
2. The Appellant received a bachelor's degree in Criminal Justice from Westfield State College in 1998, and a master's degree in Criminal Justice from Anna Maria College in 2000. He has previously held an NETTCP HMA Paving Inspector Certification, and currently holds an ACI Concrete Field-Testing Technician Grade 1 Certification. (Testimony of Appellant; Exhibit 19)
3. The Appellant began work at MassDOT as an Engineering Aide II on April 12, 2009. He was assigned to the Highway Division, District 3, in Worcester, MA. (Testimony of Appellant; Exhibits 1, 2)
4. Since 2009, the Appellant has worked on projects of varying size and complexity as an Assistant to the Resident Engineer and as a Resident Engineer. His duties have included measurement and calculation of contract quantities for payment, collection of material slips from the contractor for payment, inspection of the contractor's work progress to ensure compliance with contract documents, obtaining materials samples from projects for submission to the Materials Lab, and assisting the Resident Engineer in performing concrete testing. (Testimony of Appellant; Exhibits 3, 4, 19)
5. From May 2014 to October 2015, the Appellant worked as an Assistant to the Resident Engineer on a contract for districtwide ADA improvements and upgrades. His duties included paving inspection, sampling of construction materials, and maintenance of records and daily reports. (Exhibits 4, 19)

6. From June 2015 to November 2016, the Appellant worked as an Assistant to the Resident Engineer on road reconstruction and related work in Dudley, MA. His duties included inspecting sewer line drainage and paved surfaces, collecting samples for lab testing, and verifying compliance of wheelchair ramps with new ADA requirements. (Testimony of Appellant; Exhibits 4, 19)
7. Beginning in June 2016, the Appellant worked as an Assistant to the Resident Engineer on a bridge rehabilitation project in Southbridge, MA. His duties included conducting field inspections of drilling, anchoring, and grouting, collecting materials samples for testing, monitoring load testing, and reporting daily activities. (Testimony of Appellant; Exhibits 4, 19)
8. In October 2016, the Appellant worked as a Resident Engineer for a water main construction project in Charlton, MA. He successfully completed the project on time and on budget. His responsibilities included inspecting construction to ensure conformity to the contract, facilitating payment of police bills, drafting extra work orders, collecting materials samples for lab testing, and maintenance of construction records, including daily reports, the material control ledger, the quantity control ledger, the police logbook, and the legal ledger. (Testimony of Appellant; Exhibits 4, 19)
9. While the Appellant was acting as a Resident Engineer, he exercised functional supervision over between one (1) and five (5) construction workers. He was responsible for submitting payroll, but did not conduct any employee performance reviews or complete any Employee Performance Review System (EPRS) reports. (Testimony of Appellant)
10. The Appellant's Form 30, dated March 8, 2011, was in effect at the time he filed his reclassification request, and described his duties as including measurement and calculation of

contract quantities for payment, collection of material slips from contractors for payment, inspection of contractor work progress to ensure compliance with contract documents, obtaining of materials samples to submit to the materials lab, and assistance to the Resident Engineer in performing concrete testing. (Exhibit 3)

11. The Appellant's Employee Performance Review System (EPRS) reports from fiscal years 2012, 2016, and 2017 are all positive, frequently exceeding expectations. He is described as "dependable," "meticulous," and "conscientious." (Exhibit 6)

12. The position of Resident Engineer may be filled by individuals of several different classifications: typically, Civil Engineer II's and Civil Engineer III's, but also General Construction Inspector I's and General Construction Inspector II's. Engineering Aide II's are typically appointed Resident Engineers for smaller projects with shorter durations. (Testimony of Marine)

13. On February 22, 2016, the Appellant filed a reclassification request, alleging that he was wrongly classified as an Engineering Aide II and should be reclassified as a General Construction Inspector I. In support of his request, the Appellant filed his Interview Guide on May 10, 2017. (Exhibit 2)

14. In his reclassification interview guide, the Appellant noted that he spends 25% of his time maintaining construction records, 5% of his time taking material samples to the lab, 20% of his time checking safety setups, and 50% of his time inspecting contractor work and calculating the work that has been completed. (Exhibit 2)

15. The Appellant, in his testimony, agreed that the duties he lists in the Interview Guide are not those performed by a GCI-I. (Testimony of Appellant)

16. The Appellant's supervisor, Peter Kurt, Civil Engineer III, filed a Classification Appeal Request on July 6, 2017. (Post-Hearing Exhibit 1)
17. An audit was conducted by MassDOT Personnel Analyst Evelyn Smith, including an interview and review of supporting documentation. (Exhibit 11)
18. On March 14, 2019, Dennis Giglio, Manager of Total Rewards and Compensation for MassDOT Human Resources, wrote to the Appellant that a preliminary recommendation had been made to deny his appeal. The letter provided the Appellant with the right to submit a written rebuttal. (Exhibit 11)
19. On July 10, 2019, John Lindholm, Manager of Compensation for MassDOT Human Resources, wrote to the Appellant to notify him that MassDOT had denied his appeal to be reclassified from EA-II to GCI-I. He informed the Appellant of his right to appeal to Commonwealth's Human Resources Division (HRD). (Exhibit 12)
20. On October 7, 2019, the Appellant filed his appeal with HRD. (Exhibit 15)
21. On February 26, 2020, Alexandra McInnis, Senior Personnel Analyst in HRD's Classification and Compensation Unit, wrote to the Appellant to notify him that his appeal had been denied by HRD because his duties did not warrant reallocation of his position. Ms. McInnis provided the Appellant with appeal rights and instructions. (Exhibit 14)
22. On February 29, 2020, the Appellant appealed HRD's decision to the Civil Service Commission. (Exhibit 15)
23. The duties of an Engineering Aide II are set out in the Classification Specification for the Engineering Aide Series. The Classification Specification states that the EA-II position is the second-level technical job in the series. (Exhibit 8)

24. The EA Classification Specification “Summary of Series” describes the function of an Engineering Aide as follows:

Incumbents of positions in this series read and interpret maps and charts and draw sketches and plans; operate surveying instruments; accumulate data for traffic surveys; calculate costs for estimates and payments; clear vegetation along survey lines; maintain records; deliver reports and supplies; write letters, reports, and memoranda; and perform related work as required.

The basic purpose of this work is to perform technical duties in support of engineering activities such as land acquisition, and surveying, and assisting in the design, construction, and maintenance of highways, bridges, buildings, waterways, and recreational facilities.

(Exhibit 8)

25. The EA Classification Specification lists the following under “Examples of Duties Common to All Levels in Series”:

1. Reads and interprets maps, and charts; takes field notes; draws sketches and plans.
2. Assists in surveys by acting as rodman and running the transit or level to give simple lines and grades; participates in plane surveys.
3. Accumulates data for analysis in traffic surveys using such equipment as traffic counters and scales.
4. Prepares maps and charts of wetland areas, work progress, urban boundaries, rainfall yields, road and/or highway systems, and proposed or existing land acquisitions.
5. Calculates item or unit quantity for pay estimates, contract changes, final payments, and future projects.
6. Inspects minor details of construction work.
7. Collects samples of construction materials for laboratory analysis and analyzes test results for conformance with specifications, standards, and codes.
8. Participates in the clearing and grubbing of vegetation to facilitate the setting of survey or construction lines.
9. Maintains engineering records including survey files, correspondence, plans, and maps in order to document unit assignments.
10. Writes routine letters and reports and memoranda regarding such matters as investigations or inspections in order to recommend corrective action, detail findings, or justify contract proposals.

11. Performs related duties such as revising and updating state owned property descriptions on geographical, survey, topographical, or other maps; conducting research in order to adapt or draft technical formulation of ownership plans; and interpreting state laws to evaluate plans or specifications, inspect buildings, or answer inquiries from the public.

Based on assignment, incumbents of positions at this level also:

1. Assist in investigating oil spills and violations of rules and regulations dealing with water supplies, wastewater, and hazardous waste treatment by collecting samples for analysis in the field or laboratory.
2. Inspect watershed areas to ensure that public and private sanitary systems do not adversely affect the water supply.

(Exhibit 8)

26. Under “Differences Between Levels in Series” the EA Classification Specification states that those in level EA-II:

1. Inspect construction work to assure compliance with contract plans and specifications on construction projects such as highways, buildings, sewers, bridges, dams, and waterways.
2. Compute curves, baselines, property lines, and elevations.
3. Draft plans for engineering projects and assist in the simple phases of design work.
4. Operate survey instruments on plane surveys.
5. Inspect completed construction; calculate quantities; and assist in the preparation of reports for interim and final payments.
6. Perform related duties such as testing, isolating, and replacing defective parts on mechanical, electrical, or electronic devices, using proper safety equipment in performing duties requiring the use of these devices.

(Exhibit 8)

27. The duties of a General Construction Inspector I are set out in the Classification Specification for the General Construction Inspector Series. The Classification Specification states that the GCI-I position is the entry-level technical job in the series. (Exhibit 9)
28. The GCI Classification Specification “Summary of Series” describes the function of General Construction Inspector as follows:

Incumbents of positions in this series inspect the construction of highways, buildings, bridges, dams, water or sewage systems, tunnels, and waterways for conformance with plans and specifications; conduct tests on construction materials; survey construction sites; maintain records of construction operations; and perform related work as required.

The basic purpose of this work is to oversee the construction practices used on various sites, and to enforce compliance with plans, specifications and all applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

(Exhibit 9)

29. The GCI Classification Specification lists the following under “Examples of Duties Common to All Levels in Series”:

1. Inspects materials and construction operations for conformance to rules and regulations and contract plans and specifications.
2. Conducts field and/or laboratory tests on materials used in the construction of highways, buildings, bridges, dams, water/sewage systems, tunnels, and waterways for conformance with specifications, standards, and code compliance to ensure construction safety.
3. Performs minor survey work on construction sites by placing grade stakes and operating survey instruments such as transits, compasses, levels, and rods to determine lines and grades in construction work and boundary lines for conformance with construction specifications.
4. Maintains records at construction operations by taking field notes and drawing sketches to chronicle the progress of construction.
5. Inspects contractors' safety procedures for conformance with state and federal regulations including the number and location of construction safety signs at work sites to ensure the safety of construction personnel and the completed project.
6. Performs related duties such as attending safety meetings and construction seminars to keep abreast of changes and new developments in the field of construction; calculating quantities for pay estimates and payments and writing routine letters and memoranda.

(Exhibit 9)

30. Under “Minimum Entrance Requirements,” the GCI Classification Specification provides at the GCI-I level:

Applicants must have at least (A) four years of full-time, or equivalent part-time, technical experience in the construction, inspection, and/or alteration of construction projects such as highways, buildings, bridges, tunnels, sewers,

waterways, dams, and parks, or (B) any equivalent combination of the required experience and the substitutions below.

Substitutions:

- I. An associate's degree, with a major in civil engineering, civil engineering technology, or construction technology may be substituted for a maximum of two years of the required experience.
- II. A bachelor's or higher degree with a major in civil engineering, civil engineering technology, architecture, or structural, architectural, or sanitary engineering may be substituted for the required experience.

(Exhibit 9)

Legal Standard

Section 49 of G.L. c. 30 states, in relevant part:

Any manager or employee of the commonwealth objecting to any provision of the classification of his office or position may appeal in writing to the personnel administrator and shall be entitled to a hearing upon such appeal... Any manager or employee or group of employees further aggrieved after appeal to the personnel administrator may appeal to the civil service commission. Said commission shall hear all appeals as if said appeals were originally entered before it.

The Appellant has the burden of proving that he is improperly classified. To do so, he must show that he performs the duties of the General Construction Inspector I title more than 50% of the time, on a regular basis. Gaffey v. Dep't of Revenue, 24 MCSR 380, 381 (2011); Bhandari v. Exec. Office of Admin. and Finance, 28 MCSR 9 (2015) (finding that "in order to justify a reclassification, an employee must establish that he is performing the duties encompassed within the higher-level position a majority of the time..."). Further, "[w]here duties are equally applicable to both the lower and higher titles, although they may be described slightly differently for each title, those types of overlapping duties are not distinguishing duties of the higher title." Sanders v. Dep't. of Labor Standards, 32 MSCR 413, 415 (2019).

MassDOT's Argument

MassDOT argues that the Appellant has failed to prove he spends the majority of his working time performing the duties of a GCI-I, and is therefore not entitled to be reclassified as a GCI-I.

First, the Appellant's day-to-day duties primarily involve inspecting contractor work to ensure conformity with the specifications outlined for the project. Consequently, he works mostly with hired contractors, in communication with his supervisor, to ensure projects are completed in a successful and timely fashion. This falls well within the job duties of an EA-II.

Second, when asked which duties he performs that entitle him to be classified as a GCI-I, the Appellant recited a number of EA-II duties listed in his Form 30 and in his performance reviews. He also noted that he performed some additional duties while working as a Resident Engineer, including writing extra work orders, drawing sketches, reviewing safety setups, and providing for payment of contractors and police via the Site Application Module ("SAM"). It was the Appellant's understanding that completing the duties of a Resident Engineer for a period of time would make him eligible for reclassification as a GCI-I. The Appellant later clarified that this was his personal perception, and he had not explicitly been told that performing the duties of a Resident Engineer would be sufficient for reclassification as a GCI-I.

James Marine, Acting District Administration Manager for District 3, also testified that the position of Resident Engineer can be filled by EA-II, GCI-I, or GCI-II positions, and that performing the duties of a Resident Engineer is not necessarily indicative of performing the duties of a GCI-I. As such, performance as a Resident Engineer, absent other considerations, is an insufficient basis for reclassification to GCI-I.

Further, the Appellant was appointed Resident Engineer temporarily, for only a single project, a water main construction in Charlton, MA. The project began in October 2016, about seven (7) months after the Appellant initially applied for a reclassification. Reclassification

requires that an individual be regularly performing the duties of a higher-level position a majority of the time at the time reclassification is sought. As Appellant was not performing the duties of the Resident Engineer at the time of his application for reclassification, those duties have no direct bearing on this appeal. And additionally, as the Appellant's appointment as a Resident Engineer was only temporary, he cannot be said to "regularly" be performing the duties of a Resident Engineer.

Lastly, while some of the duties performed by the Appellant are similar in nature to those performed by a GCI-I—namely, maintaining records and inspecting the work of contractors—the duties of a GCI-I come with more responsibility, and are aimed at different purposes (e.g., inspecting to ensure conformance to the contract vs. conformance to broader MassDOT specifications). Further, the Appellant bears the burden of proving that this similar work conforms more to the responsibilities of a GCI-I than an EA-II, and he has failed to do so.

In short, the Appellant's Forms 30 and performance reviews, and Appellant's own testimony, describe duties consistent with those of an EA-II, and as such, his appeal should be denied.

Appellant's argument

The Appellant argues that the record supports his claim that he regularly spends a majority of his working time performing the level-distinguishing duties of a GCI-I.

The Appellant, in his testimony and in his initial request for reclassification, outlines the percentage of his work week that he devotes to his various responsibilities. He spends about 10-25% of his working time maintaining construction records, about 5-10% collecting and transporting materials samples, about 20% reviewing safety setups and traffic flow issues, and about 50% inspecting contractor work and calculating the work that has been completed.

The Appellant also points to a number of duties listed in the GCI Classification Specification that he performed as a Resident Engineer, and which he believes merit his reclassification to GCI-I. First, he inspected materials and construction operations for conformance to rules and regulations, contract plans and specifications. Second, he maintained records of construction operations by taking field notes and drawing at least one sketch. Third, he inspected the safety procedures of contractors, particularly procedures related to traffic and signage. Lastly, he performed related duties such as attending safety meetings and construction seminars and calculating quantities for pay estimates and payments. The Appellant also exercised functional supervision over a small number of employees while serving as a Resident Engineer, a level of responsibility exercised by both GCI-I and EA-II incumbents.

The Appellant also satisfies both the minimum entrance requirements and the requirements for hire enumerated in the GCI Classification Specification. For the former, the Appellant has more than the requisite four years of full-time technical experience in the construction and inspection of construction projects, given that he began work as an EA-II in 2009, and his initial request for reclassification was filed in 2016. As to the latter, most of the qualifications required for a GCI-I are also required for an EA-II, and the Appellant has particular knowledge of and experience with, for example, report writing and inspection techniques.

Analysis

It is evident from the record that the Appellant is a thorough, attentive, and highly competent employee. However, he has not shown that he regularly spends the majority of his working time performing the level-distinguishing duties of a General Construction Inspector I.

The Appellant contends that by serving as a Resident Engineer he took on duties which qualified him to be reclassified as a GCI-I. The Commission has consistently held that

reclassification requires proof that an Appellant’s duties comprise the majority of his or her current, permanently assigned work. In this respect, a reclassification is different from a promotion, which implies a prospective change in duties, rather than proof that the duties are already being performed at the higher level a majority of the time. See, e.g., Shine v. Department of Correction, 34 MCSR 60 (2021); Brunelle v. Massachusetts Dep’t of Transp., 33 MCSR 370 (2020); Hartnett v. Department of Revenue, 30 MCSR 398 (2017); Baran v. Department of Conservation & Recreation, 18 MCSR 355 (2005).

Given that the Appellant’s appointment as a Resident Engineer was only temporary, his responsibilities during that period cannot rightfully be considered a part of his regular, permanently assigned work. This is particularly true given the infrequency with which employees classified as EA-II are appointed Resident Engineer, suggesting that in the future, the Appellant is unlikely to perform the duties of a Resident Engineer with any regularity. Accordingly, those duties which the Appellant performed as a Resident Engineer are relevant only inasmuch as they are indicative of the Appellant’s skills and qualifications.

As such, whether the Appellant’s appeal is granted depends on the remainder of his duties—described in his testimony and in his initial reclassification request—most of which fall within the duties enumerated by the EA Classification Specification.

For example, the Appellant estimates that 5-10% of his working time is devoted to “materials work,” taking samples onsite and transporting them to the Materials Lab. This is a duty explicitly listed in the EA Classification Specification: “Collects samples of construction materials for laboratory analysis...” This is meaningfully distinct from the duty articulated in the GCI Classification Specification, which requires General Construction Inspectors to conduct field and/or laboratory tests on used materials, rather than simply taking samples.

Moreover, both Classification Specifications describe as a duty the inspection of materials used and work completed by contractors, to ensure compliance with contract plans and specifications. The GCI Classification Specification additionally requires inspection for conformance to rules and regulations. Overlapping duties such as these, which are equally applicable to both the higher and lower titles, though they may be described slightly differently, are not distinguishing duties of the higher title. Sanders, 32 MSCR at 415. Moreover, the inspections conducted by the Appellant are primarily concerned with conformance to contract specifications, not to state or federal rules and regulations. As such, the inspections on which Appellant spends approximately 50% of his working time amount to either a non-level-distinguishing duty, or a duty within his current classification.

The Appellant devotes a further 25% of his working time to the maintenance of records, especially daily reports and police logbooks. The EA Classification Specification requires maintenance of engineering records and the writing of routine reports and memoranda, while similar provisions in the GCI Classification Specification require maintenance of records of construction operations and chronicling of the progress of construction. As above, these duties are broad in scope, and overlap a great deal. For example, both encompass the drafting of daily reports, which are routine memoranda as contemplated by the former, and a chronicle of the progress of construction as contemplated by the latter. Accordingly, the Appellant's maintenance of such records cannot properly be considered to be a level-distinguishing duty.

The only duty which the Appellant regularly undertakes that is unequivocally a duty of GCI-I's is the monitoring of contractors to ensure they are adhering to safety requirements, particularly as related to traffic safety and lane closures. Inspecting contractor's safety procedures for conformance with state and federal regulations is a duty clearly enumerated in the

GCI Classification Specification. However, this accounts for only 20% of the Appellant's working time and alone is insufficient to support a reclassification.

Despite his time as a Resident Engineer, and despite his evident qualifications, the Appellant has not demonstrated that he regularly spends a majority of his working time performing the duties of a GCI-I. Rather, he is a properly classified EA-II who has historically performed his job well and is sometimes trusted with greater responsibility as a result.

It is worth noting that when an employee agrees to temporarily work "out-of-grade," he may have some other claim (such as under a collective bargaining agreement) to receive a pay-differential for the time spent working in that capacity, but temporary, voluntary, or overtime assignments are not, as a general rule, meant to be transformed into permanent promotions through the reclassification statute. It behooves the Appellant to explore through his union what relief he may be entitled to receive to compensate him for "out-of-grade" work that he honorably and effectively performed for the Commonwealth.

For all of the above reasons, the Appellant's appeal for a reclassification under Docket No. C-20-035 is hereby *denied*.

Civil Service Commission

/s/ Christopher Bowman
Christopher C. Bowman
Chair

By a vote of the Civil Service Commission (Bowman, Chair; Stein and Tivnan, Commissioners) on June 15, 2022.

Either party may file a motion for reconsideration within ten days of the receipt of this Commission order or decision. Under the pertinent provisions of the Code of Mass. Regulations, 801 CMR 1.01(7)(l), the motion must identify a clerical or mechanical error in the decision or a significant factor the Agency or the Presiding Officer may have overlooked in deciding the case. A motion for reconsideration does not toll the statutorily prescribed thirty-day time limit for seeking judicial review of this commission order or decision.

Under the provisions of G.L. c. 31, § 44, any party aggrieved by this Commission order or decision may initiate proceedings for judicial review under G.L. c. 30A, § 14 in the superior court within thirty (30) days after receipt of

this order or decision. Commencement of such proceeding shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of this Commission order or decision. After initiating proceedings for judicial review in Superior Court, the plaintiff, or his/her attorney, is required to serve a copy of the summons and complaint upon the Boston office of the attorney General of the Commonwealth, with a copy to the Civil Service Commission, in the time and in the manner prescribed by Mass. R. Civ. P. 4(d).

Notice to:

Brian McGoldrick (Appellant)

Eric Pike (for Respondent)