

(c)(1) A request for a determination under this section may be made by any interested party, including contractors or prospective contractors, and associations of contractors, representatives of employees, and interested Government agencies. Such a request shall be submitted in writing to the Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC 20210.

(2) The request shall include a statement setting forth in detail why the petitioner believes that a person or firm whose name appears on the debarred bidders list has a substantial interest in any firm, corporation, partnership, or association which is seeking or has been awarded a contract of the United States or the District of Columbia. No particular form is prescribed for the submission of a request under this section.

(d)(1) The Administrator, on his/her own motion or after receipt of a request for a determination, may make a finding on the issue of substantial interest.

(2) If the Administrator determines that there may be a substantial interest, but finds that there is insufficient evidence to render a final ruling thereon, the Administrator may refer the issue to the Chief Administrative Law Judge in accordance with paragraph (e) of this section.

(3) If the Administrator finds that no substantial interest exists, or that there is not sufficient information to warrant the initiation of an investigation, the requesting party, if any, will be so notified and no further action taken.

(4)(i) If the Administrator finds that a substantial interest exists, the person or firm affected will be notified of the Administrator's finding, which shall include the reasons therefor, and such person or firm shall be afforded an opportunity to request that a hearing be held to render a decision on the issue of substantial interest.

(ii) Such person or firm shall have 20 days from the date of the Administrator's ruling to request a hearing. A detailed statement of the reasons why the Administrator's ruling is in error, including facts alleged to be in dispute,

if any, shall be submitted with the request for a hearing.

(iii) If no hearing is requested within the time mentioned in paragraph (d)(4)(ii) of this section, the Administrator's finding shall be final and the Administrator shall so notify the Comptroller General. If a hearing is requested, the decision of the Administrator shall be inoperative unless and until the Administrative Law Judge or the Administrative Review Board issues an order that there is a substantial interest.

(e) *Referral to the Chief Administrative Law Judge.* The Administrator on his/her own motion, or upon a request for a hearing where the Administrator determines that relevant facts are in dispute, shall by order refer the issue to the Chief Administrative Law Judge, for designation of an Administrative Law Judge who shall conduct such hearings as may be necessary to render a decision solely on the issue of substantial interest. As provided in section 4(a) of the Act, the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (41 U.S.C. 38, 39) shall be applicable to such proceedings, which shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth at 29 CFR part 6.

(f) *Referral to the Administrative Review Board.* When the person or firm requests a hearing and the Administrator determines that relevant facts are not in dispute, the Administrator will refer the issue and the record compiled thereon to the Administrative Review Board to render a decision solely on the issue of substantial interest. Such proceeding shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth at 29 CFR part 8.

### Subpart B—Wage Determination Procedures

#### § 4.50 Types of wage and fringe benefit determinations.

The Administrator specifies the minimum monetary wages and fringe benefits to be paid as required under the Act in two types of determinations:

(a) *Prevailing in the locality.* (1) Determinations that set forth minimum monetary wages and fringe benefits determined to be prevailing for various

#### § 4.51

classes of service employees in the locality (sections 2(a)(1) and 2(a)(2) of the Act) after giving “due consideration” to the rates applicable to such service employees if directly hired by the Federal Government (section 2(a)(5) of the Act).

(2) The prevailing wage determinations applicable to most contracts covered by the Act are based upon cross-industry survey data. However, in some cases the Department of Labor may issue industry specific wage determinations for application to specific types of service contracts. In addition, the geographic scope of contracts is often different and the geographic scope of the underlying survey data for the wage determinations applicable to those contracts may be different. Therefore, a variety of different prevailing wage determinations may be applicable in a particular locality. The application of these different prevailing wage determinations will depend upon the nature of the contracts to which they are applied.

(b) *Collective Bargaining Agreement—(Successorship)*. Determinations that set forth the wage rates and fringe benefits, including accrued and prospective increases, contained in a collective bargaining agreement applicable to the service employees who performed on a predecessor contract in the same locality. (See sections 2(a)(1) and (2) as well as 4(c) of the Act.)

[70 FR 50898, Aug. 26, 2005]

#### **§ 4.51 Prevailing in the locality determinations.**

(a) *Information considered*. The minimum monetary wages and fringe benefits set forth in determinations of the Secretary are based on all available pertinent information as to wage rates and fringe benefits being paid at the time the determination is made. Such information is most frequently derived from area surveys made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, or other Labor Department personnel. Information may also be obtained from Government contracting officers and from other available sources, including employees and their representatives and employers and their associations. The determinations may be based on the wage rates and

#### 29 CFR Subtitle A (7–1–09 Edition)

fringe benefits contained in collective bargaining agreements where they have been determined to prevail in a locality for specified occupational class(es) of employees.

(b) *Determination of prevailing rates*. Where a single rate is paid to a majority (50 percent or more) of the workers in a class of service employees engaged in similar work in a particular locality, that rate is determined to prevail. The wage rates and fringe benefits in a collective bargaining agreement covering 2,001 janitors in a locality, for example, prevail if it is determined that no more than 4,000 workers are engaged in such janitorial work in that locality. In the case of information developed from surveys, statistical measurements of central tendency such as a median (a point in a distribution of wage rates where 50 percent of the surveyed workers receive that or a higher rate and an equal number receive a lesser rate) or the mean (average) are considered reliable indicators of the prevailing rate. Which of these statistical measurements will be applied in a given case will be determined after a careful analysis of the overall survey, separate classification data, patterns existing between survey periods, and the way the separate classification data interrelate. Use of the median is the general rule. However, the mean (average) rate may be used in situations where, after analysis, it is determined that the median is not a reliable indicator. Examples where the mean may be used include situations where:

(1) The number of workers studied for the job classification constitutes a relatively small sample and the computed median results in an actual rate that is paid to few of the studied workers in the class;

(2) Statistical deviation such as a skewed (bimodal or multimodal) frequency distribution biases the median rate due to large concentrations of workers toward either end of the distribution curve and the computed median results in an actual rate that is paid to few of the studied workers in the class; or

(3) The computed median rate distorts historic wage relationships between job levels within a classification family (i.e., Electronic Technician