

In determining whether a proposed settlement is in the public interest, a district court "must accord deference to the government's predictions about the efficacy of its remedies, and may not require that the remedies perfectly match the alleged violations." *SBC Commc'ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 17; see also *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (noting the need for courts to be "deferential to the government's predictions as to the effect of the proposed remedies"); *United States v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 272 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2003) (noting that the court should grant due respect to the United States' prediction as to the effect of proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its views of the nature of the case).

Courts have greater flexibility in approving proposed consent decrees than in crafting their own decrees following a finding of liability in a litigated matter. "[A] proposed decree must be approved even if it falls short of the remedy the court would impose on its own, as long as it falls within the range of acceptability or is 'within the reaches of public interest.'" *United States v. Am. Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 552 F. Supp. 131, 151 (D.D.C. 1982) (citations omitted) (quoting *United States v. Gillette Co.*, 406 F. Supp. 713, 716 (D. Mass. 1975)), *aff'd sub nom. Maryland v. United States*, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983); see also *United States v. Alcan Aluminum Ltd.*, 605 F. Supp. 619, 622 (W.D. Ky. 1985) (approving the consent decree even though the court would have imposed a greater remedy). To meet this standard, the United States "need only provide a factual basis for concluding that the settlements are reasonably adequate remedies for the alleged harms." *SBC Commc'ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 17.

Moreover, the court's role under the APPA is limited to reviewing the remedy in relationship to the violations that the United States has alleged in its Complaint, and does not authorize the court to "construct [its] own hypothetical case and then evaluate the decree against that case." *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459. Because the "court's authority to review the decree depends entirely on the government's exercising its prosecutorial discretion by bringing a case in the first place," it follows that "the court is only authorized to review the decree itself," and not to "effectively redraft the complaint" to inquire into other matters that the United States did not pursue. *Id.* at 1459–60. As this Court recently confirmed in *SBC*

*Communications*, courts "cannot look beyond the complaint in making the public interest determination unless the complaint is drafted so narrowly as to make a mockery of judicial power." *SBC Commc'ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 15.

In its 2004 amendments, Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of utilizing consent decrees in antitrust enforcement, adding the unambiguous instruction that "[n]othing in this section shall be construed to require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing or to require the court to permit anyone to intervene." 15 U.S.C. 16(e)(2). The language wrote into the statute what Congress intended when it enacted the Tunney Act in 1974, as Senator Tunney explained: "[t]he court is nowhere compelled to go to trial or to engage in extended proceedings which might have the effect of vitiating the benefits of prompt and less costly settlement through the consent decree process." 119 Cong. Rec. 24,598 (1973) (statement of Senator Tunney). Rather, the procedure for the public interest determination is left to the discretion of the court, with the recognition that the court's "scope of review remains sharply proscribed by precedent and the nature of Tunney Act proceedings." *SBC Commc'ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 11.4

#### VIII. Determinative Documents

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment.

Dated: November 14, 2008.

**Mitchell H. Glende, Esq.**

*U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Litigation I Section, 1401 H Street, NW., Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 353–3106.*

#### Appendix A

##### Definition of Herfindahl-Hirschman Index ("HHI")

"HHI" means the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index, a commonly accepted

<sup>4</sup> See *United States v. Enova Corp.*, 107 F. Supp. 2d 10, 17 (D.D.C. 2000) (noting that the "Tunney Act expressly allows the court to make its public interest determination on the basis of the competitive impact statement and response to comments alone"); *United States v. Mid-Am. Dairyman, Inc.*, 1977–1 Trade Cas. (CCH) '61,508, at 71,980 (W.D. Mo. 1977) ("Absent a showing of corrupt failure of the government to discharge its duty, the Court, in making its public interest finding, should \* \* \* carefully consider the explanations of the government in the competitive impact statement and its responses to comments in order to determine whether those explanations are reasonable under the circumstances."); S. Rep. No. 93–298, 93d Cong., 1st Sess., at 6 (1973) ("Where the public interest can be meaningfully evaluated simply on the basis of briefs and oral arguments, that is the approach that should be utilized.").

measure of market concentration. It is calculated by squaring the market share of each firm competing in the market and then summing the resulting numbers. For example, for a market consisting of four firms with shares of 30 percent, 30 percent, 20 percent, and 20 percent, the HHI is 2600 (30<sup>2</sup> + 30<sup>2</sup> + 20<sup>2</sup> + 20<sup>2</sup> = 2600). The HHI takes into account the relative size distribution of the firms in a market and approaches zero when a market consists of a large number of small firms. The HHI increases both as the number of firms in the market decreases and as the disparity in size between those firms increases.

Markets in which the HHI is between 1000 and 1800 points are considered to be moderately concentrated, and those in which the HHI is in excess of 1800 points are considered to be highly concentrated. See *Horizontal Merger Guidelines* 1.51 (revised Apr. 8, 1997). Transactions that increase the HHI by more than 100 points in concentrated markets presumptively raise antitrust concerns under the guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission. See *id.*

[FR Doc. E8–27970 Filed 11–24–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Office of the Secretary

##### Submission for OMB Review: Comment Request

November 21, 2008.

The Department of Labor (DOL) hereby announces the submission of the following public information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. chapter 35). A copy of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation; including among other things a description of the likely respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden may be obtained from the RegInfo.gov Web site at <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain> or by contacting Darrin King on 202–693–4129 (this is not a toll-free number)/e-mail: [DOL\\_PRA\\_PUBLIC@dol.gov](mailto:DOL_PRA_PUBLIC@dol.gov).

Interested parties are encouraged to send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, Telephone:

inconsonant with the allegations charged as to fall outside of the "reaches of the public interest").

202-395-7316/Fax: 202-395-6974 (these are not toll-free numbers), E-mail: [OIRA\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov) within 30 days from the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**. In order to ensure the appropriate consideration, comments should reference the OMB Control Number (see below).

The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

*Agency:* Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

*Type of Review:* Extension without change of a previously approved collection.

*Title of Collection:* Inorganic Arsenic (29 CFR 1910.1018).

*OMB Control Number:* 1218-0104.

*Affected Public:* Business or other for-profits.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 3.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden*

*Hours:* 385.

*Estimated Total Annual Costs Burden:* \$31,165.

*Description:* The purpose of the Department's Inorganic Arsenic Standard at 29 CFR 1910.1018 and the information collection requirements contained therein is to provide protection for employees from the adverse health effects associated with occupational exposure to inorganic arsenic. For additional information, see the related 60-day preclearance notice published in the **Federal Register** at 73 FR 55871 on September 26, 2008. PRA documentation prepared in association with the preclearance notice is available on <http://www.regulations.gov> under docket number OSHA 2008-0036.

**Darrin A. King,**

*Departmental Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. E8-27936 Filed 11-24-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-26-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-63,924; TA-W-63,924A]

#### Boise Cascade, LLC, Wood Products Division, La Grande Lumber Mill, La Grande, OR; Boise Cascade, LLC, Wood Products Division, La Grande Particleboard, La Grande, OR; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application postmarked October 24, 2008, the Oregon AFL-CIO Labor Liaison and the Carpenter's Industrial Council requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The determination was issued on October 1, 2008. The Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on October 20, 2008 (73 FR 62323).

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the finding that imports of softwood lumber and particleboard did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift of production to a foreign source occurred.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner provided additional information pertaining to imports of softwood lumber and particleboard and requested further investigation concerning the import impact on production at the subject firm.

The Department has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and the existing record and has determined that the Department will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974.

### Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the U.S. Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 14th day of November 2008.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8-27933 Filed 11-24-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-64,088]

#### Rexam Closure Systems, Inc., Bowling Green, OH; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated October 22, 2008, the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Region 2-B, requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers' eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The determination was issued on October 3, 2008. The Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on October 20, 2008 (73 FR 62323).

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the finding that imports of plastic closures for plastic food industry packaging did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject firm and no shift of production to a foreign source occurred.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner provided additional information pertaining to a shift in subject plant production of plastic closures for plastic food industry packaging to China and requested further investigation of import impact as it relates to declining subject plant production of plastic closures for plastic food industry packaging.

The Department has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and the existing record and has determined that the Department will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974.

### Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the U.S. Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of November 2008.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E8-27935 Filed 11-24-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P