

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.* Determinations that set forth minimum monetary wages and fringe benefits determined to be prevailing for various 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); and

(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 (sections 4(c) and 2(a)(1) and (2) of the Act).

§ 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 fringe benefits contained in collective

§4.51

29 CFR Subtitle A (7-1-05 Edition)

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 Classes A, B, and C levels within the

Electronic technician classification family), between classifications of different skill levels (i.e., a maintenance electrician as compared with a maintenance carpenter), or, for example, yields a wage movement inconsistent with the pattern shown by the survey overall or with related and/or similarly skilled job classifications.

(c) *Slotting wage rates.* In some instances, a wage survey for a particular locality may result in insufficient data for one or more job classifications that are required in the performance of a contract. Establishment of a prevailing wage rate for certain such classifications may be accomplished through a "slotting" procedure, such as that used under the Federal pay system. Under this procedure, wage rates are derived for a classification based on a comparison of equivalent or similar job duty and skill characteristics between the classifications studied and those for which no survey data is available. As an example, a wage rate found prevailing for the janitorial classification may be adopted for the classification of mess attendant if the skill and duties attributed to each classification are known to be rated similarly under pay classification schemes. (Both classifications are assigned the same wage grade under the Coordinated Federal Wage System and are paid at the Wage Board grade 2 when hired directly by a Federal agency.)

(d) *Due consideration.* In making wage and fringe benefit determinations, section 2(a)(5) of the Act requires that due consideration be given to the rates that would be paid by the Federal agency to the various classes of service employees if section 5341 or section 5332 of title 5 U.S.C., were applicable to them. Section 5341 refers to the Wage Board or Coordinated Federal Wage System for "blue collar" workers and section 5332 refers to the General Schedule pay system for "white collar" workers. The term *due consideration* implies the exercise of discretion on the basis of the facts and circumstances surrounding each determination, recognizing the legislative objective of narrowing the gap between the wage rates and fringe benefits prevailing for service employees and those established for Federal employees.

Each wage determination is based on a survey or other information on the wage rates and fringe benefits being paid in a particular locality and also takes into account those wage rates and fringe benefits which would be paid under Federal pay systems.

§ 4.52 Fringe benefit determinations.

(a) Wage determinations issued pursuant to the Service Contract Act ordinarily contain provisions for vacation and holiday benefits prevailing in the locality. In addition, wage determinations contain a prescribed minimum rate for all other benefits, such as insurance, pension, etc., which are not required as a matter of law (i.e., excluding Social Security, unemployment insurance, and workers' compensation payments and similar statutory benefits), based upon the sum of the benefits contained in the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment Cost Index (ECI), for all employees in private industry, nationwide (and excluding ECI components for supplemental pay, such as shift differential, which are considered wages rather than fringe benefits under SCA). Pursuant to Section 4(b) of the Act and § 4.123, the Secretary has determined that it is necessary and proper in the public interest, and in accord with remedial purposes of the Act to protect prevailing labor standards, to issue a variation from the Act's requirement that fringe benefits be determined for various classes of service employees in the locality.

(b) The minimum rate for all benefits (other than holidays and vacation) which are not legally required, as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section, shall be phased in over a four-year period beginning June 1, 1997. The first year the rate will be \$.90 per hour plus one-fourth of the difference between \$.90 per hour and the rate prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section; the second year the rate will be increased by one-third of the difference between the rate set the first year and the rate prescribed; the third year the rate will be increased by one-half of the difference between the rate set in the second year and the rate prescribed; and the fourth year and thereafter the rate will be the

rate prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) Where it is determined pursuant to § 4.51(b) that a single fringe benefit rate is paid with respect to a majority of the workers in a class of service employees engaged in similar work in a locality, that rate will be determined to prevail notwithstanding the rate which would otherwise be prescribed pursuant to this section. Ordinarily, it will be found that a majority of workers receive fringe benefits at a single level where those workers are subject to a collective bargaining agreement whose provisions have been found to prevail in the locality.

(d) A significant number of contracts contain a prevailing fringe benefit rate of \$2.56 per hour. Generally, these contracts are large base support contracts, contracts requiring competition from large corporations, contracts requiring highly technical services, and contracts solicited pursuant to A-76 procedures (displacement of Federal employees), as well as successor contracts thereto. The \$2.56 benefit rate shall continue to be issued for all contracts containing the \$2.56 benefit rate, as well as resolicitations and other successor contracts for substantially the same services, until the fringe benefit rate determined in accordance with paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section equals or exceeds \$2.56 per hour.

(e) *Variance procedure.* (1) The Department will consider variations requested by contracting agencies pursuant to Section 4(b) of the Act and § 4.123, from the methodology described in paragraph (a) of this section for determining prevailing fringe benefit rates. This variation procedure will not be utilized to routinely permit separate fringe benefit packages for classes of employees and industries, but rather will be limited to the narrow circumstances set forth herein where special needs of contracting agencies require this procedure. Such variations will be considered where the agency demonstrates that because of the special circumstances of the particular industry, the variation is necessary and proper in the public interest or to avoid the serious impairment of government business. Such a demonstration might be made, for example,