1	BY AUTHORITY				
2	ORDINANCE NO COUNCIL BILL NO. CB10-0345				
3	SERIES OF 2010 COMMITTEE OF REFERENCE:				
4	FINANCE				
5	<u>A</u> <u>BILL</u>				
6	For an Ordinance creating Section 20-76(e) of Division 3 of Article IV of Chapter				
7	20, Treatment of Employees Associated with City Contracts, concerning				
8	prevailing wage penalties.				
9					
10	WHEREAS, Division 3 of Article IV of Chapter 20 provides requirements for the				
11	payment of prevailing wages to employees associated with City contracts; and,				
12	WHEREAS, the City Council finds that Section 20-76(e) should be created to authorize				
13	the Auditor to assess penalties against contractors paying workers less than prevailing wages.				
14	NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF				
15	DENVER:				
16	Section 1. Section 20-76(e) of the Denver Revised Municipal Code shall be created				
17	and be read as follows:				
18	"Sec. 20-76(e) Penalties. Any contractor or subcontractor subject to the requirements of this				
19	section shall as a penalty pay to the City and County of Denver an amount as set forth below for				
20	each week, or portion thereof, for each worker paid less than the applicable prevailing wage				
21	rates.				
22	(1) The amount of the penalty shall be determined by the auditor based on consideration of				
23	both of the following:				
24	(i) Whether the failure of the contractor or subcontractor to pay the correct wage rate was				
25	a good faith mistake and, if so, the error was corrected within thirty (30) days of the				
26	date brought to the attention of the contractor or subcontractor.				
27	(ii) Whether the contractor or subcontractor has a prior record of failing to meet its				
28	prevailing wage obligations.				
29	(2) The penalty shall be twenty dollars (\$20) for each week, or portion thereof, for each				
30	worker paid less than the prevailing wage rate, unless the failure of the contractor or				
31	subcontractor to pay the correct rate of prevailing wages was a good faith mistake and, if so,				
32	the error was corrected within thirty (30) days of the date brought to the attention of the				
33	contractor or subcontractor.				

(3) The penalty shall be thirty-five dollars (\$35) for each week, or portion thereof, for each
 worker paid less than the prevailing wage rate, if the contractor or subcontractor has been
 assessed a penalty, but not more than two other penalties, within the previous three years for
 failing to meet its prevailing wage obligations on a separate contract, unless those penalties
 were subsequently withdrawn or overturned.

6 (4) The penalty shall be fifty dollars (\$50) for each week, or portion thereof, for each worker
7 paid less than the prevailing wage rate, if the contractor or subcontractor has been assessed
8 three or more other penalties within the previous three years for failing to meet its prevailing
9 wage obligations on separate contracts, unless those penalties were subsequently withdrawn
10 or overturned.

(5) The determination of the auditor as to the imposition and amount of the penalty shall bereviewable as follows:

- (i) Any person who disputes any determination made by or on behalf of the city pursuant
   to the authority of the auditor, which determination adversely affects such person, may
   petition the auditor for a hearing concerning such determination no later than thirty (30)
   days after having been notified of any such determination. Compliance with the
   provisions of this subsection shall be a jurisdictional prerequisite to any action brought
   under the provisions of this section, and failure of compliance shall forever bar any
   such action.
- 20 (ii) The auditor shall designate as a hearing officer a person retained by the city for that
  21 purpose.
- (iii) The petition for a hearing shall be in writing, and the facts and figures submitted shall
  be submitted under oath or affirmation either in writing or orally at a hearing scheduled
  by the hearing officer. The hearing, if any, shall take place in the city, and notice
  thereof and the proceedings shall otherwise be in accordance with rules and
  regulations issued by the auditor. The petitioner shall bear the burden of proof, and the
  standard of proof shall conform with that in civil, nonjury cases in state district court.
- (iv) Thereupon, the hearing officer shall make a final determination. Such final
  determination shall be considered a final order and may be reviewed under Rule
  106(a)(4) of the state rules of civil procedure by the petitioner or by the city. A request
  for reconsideration of the determination may be made if filed with the hearing officer
  within fifteen (15) days of the date of determination, in which case the hearing officer
  shall review the record of the proceedings, and the determination shall be considered a

1		final order upon the date the hearing officer rules on the request for reconsideration.				
2		The non-prevailing party shall be responsible for and shall pay the costs of the hearing,				
3		including the costs of the hearing officer and the hearing reporter.				
4	(v)	The district court of the second judicial district of the State of Colorado shall have				
5		original jurisdiction in proceedings to review all questions of law and fact determined by				
6		the hearing officer by order or writ under F	Rule 106(a)(4) of the state rules of civil			
7		procedure.				
8	(vi)	Failure to pay outstanding penalties that are not pending appeal and are owed to the				
9		city pursuant to this section shall be groun	ds for suspension or revocation of any			
10		license issued by the city until fully paid."				
11						
12						
13	COMMIT	/ITTEE APPROVAL DATE: May 5, 2010				
14	MAYOR	MAYOR-COUNCIL DATE: May 11, 2010				
15	PASSED	BY THE COUNCIL		2010		
16			PRESIDENT			
17	APPROVED:		MAYOR	2010		
18	ATTEST		- CLERK AND RECORDER,			
19			EX-OFFICIO CLERK OF THE			
20			CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER			
21						
22	NOTICE	PUBLISHED IN THE DAILY JOURNAL	2010;	2010		
23	PREPARED BY: Daniel B. Slattery- Assistant City Attorney DATE:					
24	Pursuant to section 13-12, D.R.M.C., this proposed ordinance has been reviewed by the office of the					
25	City Attorney. We find no irregularity as to form, and have no legal objection to the proposed					
26	ordinance. The proposed ordinance is not submitted to the City Council for approval pursuant to §					
27	3.2.6 of 1	he Charter.				
28						
29	David R. Fine, City Attorney for the City and County of Denver					
30	BY:,City Attorney					
31	DATE: _					