

and the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. The 272,000-acre National Monument encompasses 86,400 acres of BLM lands and 64,400 acres of Forest Service lands in the Coachella Valley and surrounding mountains. Additional land managing entities within the National Monument include the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the California Department of Fish and Game, Riverside County, local jurisdictions, and private landowners. The management plan provides direction for coordination between the BLM, Forest Service, and various partners and outlines proposed strategies for protecting the values that the National Monument was established to protect.

DATES: The Approved Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument Management Plan became effective on approval of the ROD.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Copies of the Approved Management Plan and Record of Decision are available for public inspection at the BLM Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office, P.O. Box 581260, 690 W. Garnet Avenue, North Palm Springs, CA 92258. Interested persons may also review the Approved Management Plan and Record of Decision on the Internet at <http://www.ca.blm.gov/palmsprings>. Copies may be requested by contacting Greg Hill at the above address, or at Phone Number: 760-251-4800.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument was established by Pub. L. 106-351 and will be cooperatively managed by the BLM and the Forest Service. The Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument Act of 2000 affects only Federal lands and Federal interests located within the established boundaries. The BLM and the Forest Service will jointly manage Federal lands in the National Monument in coordination with the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, other Federal agencies, State agencies, and local governments.

Dated: February 4, 2004.

Danella George,

Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains, National Monument Manager.

Dated: February 5, 2004.

Gene Zimmerman,

San Bernardino National Forest, Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 04-7826 Filed 4-8-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-40-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-04-009]

Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: April 16, 2004 at 11 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agenda for future meetings: none.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Inv. Nos. 731-TA-1073-1075 (Preliminary) (Certain Circular Welded Carbon Quality Line Pipe from China, Korea, and Mexico)—briefing and vote. (The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination to the Secretary of Commerce on or before April 19, 2004; Commissioners' opinions are currently scheduled to be transmitted to the Secretary of Commerce on or before April 26, 2004.)
5. Outstanding action jackets: None.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 6, 2004.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 04-8198 Filed 4-7-04; 10:46 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Responses to Public Comments on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Inc., et al.

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h), the United States hereby publishes the public comments received on the proposed final Judgment in *United States v. Alcan Inc., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, No. 1:030 CV 02012-GK*, filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, together with the government's responses to the comments.

On September 29, 2003, the United States filed a Complaint that alleged that Alcan Inc.'s proposed acquisition of Pechiney, S.A., would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18, by

substantially lessening competition in the sale of brazing sheet in North America. The proposed final Judgment, also filed on September 29th, requires the defendants to divest Pechiney's brazing sheet business to a purchaser acceptable to the United States.

Public comment was invited within the statutory 60-day comment period. The public comments and the United States' responses thereto are included within the United States's Certificate of Compliance with the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, which appears immediately below. After publication of this Certificate of Compliance in the **Federal Register**, the United States may file a motion with the Court, urging it to conclude that the proposed Judgment is in the public interest and to enter the proposed Judgment. Copies of the Complaint, Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, proposed Final Judgment, the Competitive Impact Statement, and the United States's Certificate of Compliance with the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act are currently available for inspection in Room 200 of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 325 7th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: (202) 514-2481) and at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 333 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20001. Copies of any of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

United States of America, Plaintiff, v. Alcan Inc., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Defendants.

[Case No. 1:030 CV 02012-GK]

Judge Gladys Kessler
Deck Type: Antitrust

Notice of Filing of the United States's Certificate of Compliance With the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h)

Please take notice that the United States has filed its Certificate of Compliance with the antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h) ("Tunney Act"). Following publication in the **Federal Register** of the public comments and the government's responses, the United States will move the Court for entry of the pending Final Judgment. Dated: March 15, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,
Anthony E. Harris,

(IL Bar #1133713), U.S. Department of Justice, antitrust Division, 1401 H Street, NW., Suite 3000. Washington, DC 20530, Telephone No.: (202) 307-6583.

Attorney for the United States

United States's Certificate of Compliance with the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties act

The United States of America hereby certifies that it has complied with the provisions of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h) (“APPA”), and states:

1. The Complaint, proposed Final Judgment (“Judgment”), and Hold Separate Stipulation and Order (“Hold Separate Order”), by which the parties have agreed to the Court’s entry of the Final Judgment following compliance with the APPA, were filed on September 29, 2003. The United States filed its Competitive Impact Statement on November 14, 2003.

2. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 16(b), the proposed Judgment, Hold Separate Order, and Competitive Impact Statement were published in the **Federal Register** on December 17, 2003 (68 FR 70287). A copy of the **Federal Register** notice is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

3. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 16(b), the United States furnished copies of the Complaint, Hold Separate Order, proposed Judgment, and Competitive impact Statement to anyone requesting them.

4. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 16(c), a summary of the terms of the proposed Judgment, Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, and Competitive Impact Statement was published in The Washington Post, a newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia, during a seven-day period in December 2003 (December 13th–December 19th). A copy of the Proof of Publication from The Washington Post is attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

5. On March 15, 2004, defendants served on the United States, and attempted to file with this Court, declarations that describe their communications with employees of the United States concerning the proposed Judgment, as required by 15 U.S.C. 16(g). See Exhibit 16.

6. The sixty-day public comment period specified in 15 U.S.C. 16(b) began on December 17, 2003, and ended on February 17, 2004. During that period, the United States received a total of eleven comments on the proposed settlement. The United States evaluated and responded to each comment, and has arranged to publish the comments and its responses in the

Federal Register, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 16(b) and (d). Copies of the comments and the United States’s response are attached hereto as Exhibits 3 through 15; they are summarized below.

A. Comments From State and Local Government Officials and Labor Leaders¹

The United States received four comments from state and local government officials, viz., the governor of West Virginia (Exhibits 3 and 15), the mayors of Ripley and Ravenswood, West Virginia (Exhibits 4 and 6), and the president of the Jackson County (WV) Development Authority (Exhibit 5). The officials represent the interests of constituents who are current or retired employees of the Ravenswood facility, which comprises the bulk of Pechiney’s “brazing sheet business” subject to divestiture under the terms of proposed Judgment (§§ II (E) and IV(A)). The United States also received comments from labor leaders, who represent the interests of current and retired hourly wage workers (Exhibit 7) and retired salaried employees at the Ravenswood facility (Exhibits 8 and 13).²

These comments raise three broad concerns about the proposed Judgment and the scope of the ordered divestiture. First, these commenters assert that the proposed Judgment is unnecessary because, in their view, Alcan’s acquisition of Pechiney would not substantially diminish competition. Second, they contend that even if the acquisition was unlawful, requiring the parties to sell the Ravenswood facility is excessive because brazing sheet accounts for only a fraction of the facility’s production. And finally, they contended that, by requiring defendants to divest the Ravenswood facility, the proposed Judgment would jeopardize jobs and retirement benefits of the facility’s current and retired workers. The commenters reasoned that a purchaser of the Ravenswood facility would not be a vigorous and viable competitor—and thus, would be

¹ The United States received Tunney Act comments from two members of the public (Exhibits 12 and 14), whose concerns generally echoed those voiced by state and local officials and labor leaders.

² Two individuals sent comments not only to the Department of Justice, but also to their Congressional representatives. The United States promptly responded to those comments (Exhibits 15 and 13), and submitted more expansive replies (Exhibits 3 and 7) after it had received and reviewed all other public comments received during the sixty-day comment period. The United States also considered and responded to another public comment that had been sent to Congressional representatives (Exhibit 14), but which was never submitted directly to the Department of Justice.

significantly more likely to fail—if it does not have the technical expertise to develop, produce, and sell brazing sheet and other rolled aluminum products and begins its operations saddled with the “legacy costs” (i.e., retiree pension, life, health care insurance benefits) of its former owners, Alcan and Pechiney.

In its responses, the United States generally explained that the appropriate legal standard for assessing the proposed Judgment is whether its entry would be in the “public interest.” To make that determination the Court, *inter alia*, must carefully review the relationship between the relief in the proposed Judgment and the allegations of the government’s Complaint. A Tunney Act proceeding is not an open forum for commenters—or a court—to second-guess the United States’s exercise of its broad discretion to file a civil complaint to enforce the nation’s antitrust laws. “The Tunney Act cannot be interpreted as an authorization for a district court to assume the role of Attorney General,” *United States v. Microsoft Inc.*, 56 F.3d 1448, 1462 (D.C. Cir. 1995). “[T]he court is only authorized to review the decree itself” and has no authority to “effectively redraft the complaint” to inquire into matters that the government might have but did not pursue, *Microsoft Corp.*, 56 F.3d at 1459–60. In the context of a Tunney Act proceeding, a court cannot, as several commenters urged, reject the proposed settlement simply because it provides relief that is “not necessary” or “to which the government might not be strictly entitled,” *United States v. Bechtel Corp.*, 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir. 1981). See *United States v. Alex Brown & Sons, Inc.*, 169 F.R.D. 532, 541 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (purpose of Tunney Act is to ascertain whether proposed relief is in public interest, “not to evaluate the strength of the [g]overnment’s case”). Thus, the United States is not required to prove the allegations of its antitrust complaint before the Court can evaluate the appropriateness of the parties’ agreed-upon relief. Imposing such a requirement on the United States would effectively turn every government antitrust case into a full-blown trial on the merits of the parties’ claims, and seriously undermine the effectiveness of antitrust enforcement by use of consent decrees. *Microsoft Inc.*, 56 F.3d at 1459; *Alex Brown & Sons, Inc.*, 169 F.R.D. at 541.

Applying those legal principles to this case, the Court’s entry of the proposed Judgment surely would be “within the reaches” of the public interest (*United States v. Bechtel Corp., Inc.*, 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 454 U.S. 1083 (1981)). The proposed

Judgment would alleviate the serious competitive concerns regarding defendants' proposals to combine two of North America's three major producers of brazing sheet by requiring defendants promptly to divest Pechiney's Ravenswood rolling mill, which produces all of the brazing sheet made and sold by Pechiney in North America. The sale of the Ravenswood facility to a viable purchaser would create a new competitor in brazing sheet, and thus leave competition in the North American brazing sheet market no worse off after Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney than before it.

Responding to the argument that the divestiture relief in the proposed Judgment is too broad, the United States noted that the competitive problems created by Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney could not be cured simply by requiring a piecemeal sale or "partial divestiture" of only those portions of the Ravenswood facility devoted to developing, producing, and selling brazing sheets. The commenters acknowledged that brazing sheets is produced on the same production lines that make many other important rolled aluminum alloy products (*e.g.*, common alloy coil, aerospace sheet) at Ravenswood. The United States is unaware of any evidence that would warrant a conclusion that dismantling the Ravenswood facility to sell off a few parts exclusively committed to the production of brazing sheet would produce a viable new firm capable of replacing the competition lost by Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney. In these circumstances, the proposed Judgment's mandated complete divestiture of the Ravenswood facility as an ongoing business enterprise is an appropriate means of ensuring the new purchaser's long-term competitive in the brazing sheet business. See Federal Trade Commission, *A Study of the Commission's Divestiture Process* 12 (1999) ("[D]ivestiture of an ongoing business is more likely to result in a viable operation than divestiture of a more narrowly defined package of assets and provides support for the common sense conclusion that [antitrust enforcement agencies] should prefer the divestiture of an ongoing business.")

Finally, the United States shares the commenters' keen interest in ensuring that the purchaser of the Ravenswood facility is a viable competitor capable of long-term survival. Indeed, a lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that Pechiney's brazing sheet business (including the Ravenswood facility) be divested to a person who, in the United States' judgment, is able to successfully operate

it as an ongoing business enterprise in competition with Alcan and others. (See Judgment § IV(J).) But it is far too early to assume that defendants' legacy costs will automatically doom or scare off any potential purchaser of the Ravenswood facility, especially since defendants' are still negotiating with prospective buyers.³ Even if defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser through their own efforts, the proposed Judgment permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee to conduct an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and sell Pechiney's brazing sheet business "at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort" (Judgment §§ V(A) and (B)). In short, there is no reason for the Court to conclude, as some commenters have urged, that Alcan must retain Pechiney's brazing sheet business (and the Ravenswood facility) because defendants'—and if necessary, the trustee's—efforts to sell Pechiney's brazing sheet business will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.⁴

B. Comments From Customers and Suppliers of the Ravenswood Facility

The United States also received comments from customers and suppliers of the Ravenswood facility (Exhibits 9 through 11). The comments emphasized that the Ravenswood facility must be sold to a purchaser with the financial, technical, and marketing resources to continue operating Pechiney's brazing sheet business (and the Ravenswood facility) as part of a competitively vigorous, viable, ongoing enterprise. Like the state and government officials, these commenters doubted whether a new purchaser could manage that responsibility if it is burdened with the legacy costs of the Ravenswood facility's former owners, Alcan and Pechiney.

In response, the United States noted that the ordered divestiture should provide the new purchaser with the means to continue successfully competing against Alcan and others in

³ In fact, defendants recently notified the United States that they soon will request, pursuant to the terms of the Judgment (§ IV(A)), an extension of the ordered deadline for their efforts to find an acceptable purchaser.

⁴ Obviously, an "acceptable purchaser" of Pechiney's brazing sheet business would not be a firm so burdened by its former owners' legacy costs that it is unviable. See Judgment, § IV(J): divestiture terms must not give defendants "the ability unreasonably to raise the [new firm's] costs, to lower [its] * * * efficiency, or otherwise to interfere in * * * [its] ability * * * to compete effectively."

the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet and other rolled aluminum products. For instance, the proposed Judgment requires defendants to sell any tangible and intangible assets used in the production and sale of brazing sheet, including the entire Ravenswood facility and any research, development, or engineering facilities, wherever located, used to develop and produce any product—not just brazing sheet—currently rolled at the Ravenswood facility, including R&D for aluminum plate used in military and aerospace applications. (See Judgment §§ II(E), IV(J).) As to their contention that there may not be an acceptable purchaser, the United States reiterated its view that it would be premature to rule out the existence of such a purchaser, since neither defendants—nor for that matter, the trustee—have exhausted all efforts to find one.

7. The public comments did not persuade the United States to withdraw its consent to entry of the proposed Judgment. At this state, with the United States having published its proposed settlement and its responses to public comments, and defendants having certified their pre-settlement contacts with government officials, the parties have fulfilled their obligations under the APPA. Pursuant to the Hold Separate Stipulation and Order the Court entered on September 30, 2003, and 15 U.S.C. 16(e), this Court may now enter the Final Judgment, if it determines that the entry of the Final Judgment is in the public interest.

8. For the reasons set forth in the Competitive Impact Statement and its Motion for Entry of Final Judgment, the United States strongly believes that the Final Judgment is in the public interest and urges the Court to enter the Final Judgment without further proceeding.

Dated: March 15, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony E. Harris (IL Bar #1133713),
Joseph M. Miler (DC Bar #439965),
*U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust
Division, Litigation II Section, 1401 H
Street, NW., Suite 3000, Washington, DC
20530, (202) 305-8462.*

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Certificate of Service

I, Anthony E. Harris, hereby certify that on March 15, 2004, I caused copies of the foregoing Notice of Filing and United States' Certificate of Compliance with the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act to be served by mail by sending them first-class, postage prepaid, to duly authorized legal representatives of those parties, as follows:

Counsel for Defendants Alcan Inc. and Alcan Aluminum Corp.

D. Stuart Meiklejohn, Esquire, Michael B. Miller, Esquire, Sullivan & Cromwell, 125 Broad Street, New York, NY 10004-2498

Peter B. Gronvall, Esquire, Sullivan & Cromwell, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Suite 800, Washington, DC 20006

Counsel for Defendants Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC

W. Dale Collins, Esquire, Shearman & Sterling LLP, 599 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10022-6069.

Anthony E. Harris, Esquire, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 1401 H Street, NW., Suite 3000, Washington, DC 20530, Telephone No.: (202) 307-6583.

Note: Exhibits 1 and 2 are available for inspection in Room 200 of the Antitrust

Division, Department of Justice, 325 7th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202-514-2481) and at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 333 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20001. Copies of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee. Exhibit 1 is also available in the December 17, 2003, issue of the **Federal Register**, 68 FR 70287 (2003).

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

March 15, 2004

The Honorable Bob Wise
Governor
State of West Virginia
Office of the Governor
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Re: *Public Comment on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Ltd., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Civil No. 1:030 CV 02012 (D.D.C., filed Sept. 29, 2003)*

Dear Governor Wise:

This letter responds to your letter of February 13, 2004, which comments on the terms of the proposed Final Judgment ("Judgment") submitted for entry in this case. The United States's Complaint in this case charged that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would substantially lessen North American competition in the sale of brazing sheet, a rolled aluminum alloy widely used in fabricating certain critical components of heat exchange systems (e.g., heaters, air conditioners, and radiators) for all types of motor vehicles. The proposed Judgment would resolve those competitive concerns by requiring the defendants to divest Pechiney's "brazing sheet business," a term defined in the Judgment, § II(E), to include, *inter alia*, Pechiney's aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia, which produces all of the brazing sheet sold by Pechiney in North America.

Your letter raises three major issues related to the proposed divestiture of Pechiney's brazing sheet assets. First, you suggest that the Court should not require the defendants to divest the Ravenswood facility because Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would not substantially diminish competition in the sale of brazing sheet. Second, you contend that even if the proposed acquisition was anticompetitive, the proposed divestiture is excessive because only a small portion of the Ravenswood facility's production is brazing sheet, the relevant product that precipitated our concerns about the transaction. Third – and what we sense is your primary concern – you point out that the Ravenswood facility has been historically unprofitable, a situation largely attributable to the high costs of pension and retiree health care benefit plans (i.e., "legacy" costs). You note that these legacy costs may not only limit the number of potential purchasers of Ravenswood, but also increase the likelihood that, without a major adjustment in these expenses, any new owner may soon find that the Ravenswood facility is not competitively viable and close it, a development that would adversely affect competition for brazing sheet and the income and livelihoods of Ravenswood's current and retired workers.

The procedures for entering a proposed final judgment in a government antitrust civil case are set forth in the Tunney Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 16(b)-(h). Before entering a proposed decree, the court must conclude that the relief would be in the “public interest.” 15 U.S.C. § 16(e). The public interest determination requires a court to carefully examine the relationship between the relief in the proposed Judgment and the allegations of the government’s Complaint. The court must enter the Judgment if it concludes that the relief is “within the *reaches* of the public interest,” *United States v. Am. Telephone & Telegraph Co.*, 552 F. Supp. 131, 151 (D.D.C. 1982) (emphasis original; citations omitted), *aff’d sub nom. Maryland v. United States*, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983), even if the remedy is not what the court itself would have fashioned had it stood in the prosecutor’s shoes. *United States v. Microsoft*, 56 F.3d 1448, 1460 (D.C. Cir. 1995). *See also United States v. Alcan Aluminum Ltd.*, 605 F. Supp. 619, 622 (W.D. Ky. 1985) (approving consent decree even though the court would have imposed more restrictive terms).

Although public comments on a proposed decree may inform a court’s analysis of the proposed relief and its public interest determination, the Tunney Act proceeding is not an open forum for commenters – or the Court – to second-guess the United States’s exercise of its broad discretion to file a civil complaint to enforce the nation’s antitrust laws. “[T]he Tunney Act cannot be interpreted as an authorization for a district court to assume the role of Attorney General.” *United States v. Microsoft Inc.*, 56 F.3d 1448, 1462 (D.C. Cir. 1995). Indeed, 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,” “the court is only authorized to review the decree itself,” and it has no authority to “effectively redraft the complaint” to inquire into matters that the government might have but did not pursue, *Microsoft Corp.*, 56 F.3d at 1459-60. Nor, for that matter, does the Tunney Act confer upon a court authority to reject a proposed settlement because it provides relief that is “not necessary” or “to which the government might not be strictly entitled,” *United States v. Bechtel Corp.*, 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir. 1981).

Thus, your contention that the divestiture relief in the proposed Judgment is unnecessary because Alcan’s acquisition of Pechiney was not anticompetitive is not a basis under the law to reject a proposed Judgment. *See United States v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 2003-3 Trade Cas. (CCH) ¶ 74,097 at 96,872 (D.D.C. 2003) (“[C]ourt must accord due respect to the government’s prediction as to the effect of the proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its view as to the nature of the case. . . . [T]he court is not to review allegations and issues that were not contained in the government’s complaint, . . . nor should it ‘base its public interest determination on antitrust concerns in markets other than those alleged in the government’s complaint. . . .’”) (citations omitted); *United States v. Alex Brown & Sons, Inc.*, 169 F.R.D. 532, 541 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (purpose of Tunney Act is to ascertain whether proposed relief is in public interest, “not to evaluate the strength of the Government’s case”). Also, your suggestion that the Court should require the United States to prove the allegations of its antitrust complaint before the Court can assess the appropriateness of the parties’ agreed-upon relief is inconsistent with established law. Imposing such a requirement in a Tunney Act proceeding would turn every government antitrust case into a full-blown trial on the merits of the parties’

claims, and seriously undermine the effectiveness of antitrust enforcement by use of consent decrees. *Microsoft Inc.*, 56 F.3d at 1459; *Alex Brown & Sons, Inc.*, 169 F.R.D. at 541.

As to the proposed Judgment submitted in this case, its entry surely would be “within the reaches” of the public interest (*United States v. Bechtel Corp., Inc.*, 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 454 U.S. 1083 (1981)). The Judgment would alleviate the United States’s serious competitive concerns regarding the defendants’ proposal to combine two of North America’s three major producers of brazing sheet by requiring defendants promptly to divest Pechiney’s Ravenswood rolling mill, which accounts for all of the brazing sheet developed, produced, and sold by Pechiney in North America. The sale of the Ravenswood facility to a viable purchaser would create a new competitor in brazing sheet, and thus leave competition in the North American brazing sheet market no worse off after Alcan’s acquisition of Pechiney than before it. In short, “[g]iving due respect to the Justice Department’s perception of the market structure and its view of the nature of its case” (*Microsoft Inc.*, 56 F.3d at 1461), the proposed Judgment “responds fully to the anticompetitive concerns raised by the merger because it would maintain the status quo.” *Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 2003-2 Trade Cas. (CCH) at 96,874. As such, “it seems reasonable that entering the proposed Final Judgment will eliminate the threats of easier anticompetitive coordination and diminished competition,” which would put the proposed relief “well ‘within the reaches of the public interest.’” *Id.* (citations omitted).

The competitive problems created by Alcan’s acquisition of Pechiney could not be cured simply by requiring a “partial divestiture” of only those portions of the Ravenswood facility devoted to developing, producing, and selling brazing sheet. As you point out in your comment, at Ravenswood brazing sheet is produced on the same production lines that make many other important rolled aluminum alloy products (*e.g.*, common alloy coil, aerospace sheet). The United States is unaware of any evidence that would support a conclusion that dismantling the Ravenswood facility to sell off a few parts exclusively committed to the production of brazing sheet would produce a viable new firm capable of replacing the competition lost by Alcan’s acquisition of Pechiney. The Federal Trade Commission, based on a recent empirical study of its own divestiture efforts, observed: “[D]ivestiture of an ongoing business is more likely to result in a viable operation than divestiture of a more narrowly defined package of assets and provides support for the common sense conclusion that [antitrust enforcement agencies] should prefer the divestiture of an ongoing business.” Federal Trade Commission, *A Study of the Commission’s Divestiture Process* 12 (1999).¹ Thus, to ensure that the ordered divestiture produces a viable and effective competitor, it makes good economic and business sense for the Judgment to require a sale of the entire Ravenswood facility, even though defendants’ combination would have created serious competitive problems in only one major product produced by that plant.


Finally, the proposed Judgment addresses your concern that the legacy costs associated with the Ravenswood facility may prevent a potential purchaser from profitably operating the facility. A lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that the Ravenswood facility be

¹The FTC study is available online at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/1999/08/divestiture.pdf>.

divested to a person who, in the United States's judgment, is able to successfully operate it and provide competition for Alcan (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)). Although the defendants have solicited offers for Pechiney's brazing sheet assets, they have not selected a proposed purchaser. In the event the defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser on their own, the proposed decree permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee responsible for conducting an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and selling Pechiney's brazing sheet assets "at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort" (Judgment, § V(B)). At this point in the divestiture process, however, it would be inappropriate to conclude that the defendants' – or if necessary, the trustee's – efforts to sell Pechiney's brazing sheet assets will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.²

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention; we hope this information will help alleviate them. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), a copy of your comment and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely yours,



Maribeth Petrizzi

Chief

Litigation II Section

²Obviously, an "acceptable purchaser" of Pechiney's brazing sheet business would not be a firm so burdened by its former owners' legacy costs that it is unviable. *See* Judgment, § IV(J): Divestiture terms must not give the defendants "the ability unreasonably to raise the [new firm's] costs, to lower [its] . . . efficiency, or otherwise to interfere in . . . [its] ability . . . to compete effectively."

www.usdo.gov/atr/cases/f202800/202847.htm.



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

March 15, 2004

The Honorable Clair Roseberry
Mayor
City of Ravenswood
212 Walnut Street
Ravenswood, West Virginia 26164

Re: *Public Comment on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Ltd., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Civil No. 1:030 CV 02012 (D.D.C., filed Sept. 29, 2003)*

Dear Mayor Roseberry:

This letter responds to your letter of February 4, 2004, which comments on the proposed Final Judgment ("Judgment") submitted for entry in this case. The United States's Complaint in this case charged that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would substantially lessen North American competition in the sale of brazing sheet, a rolled aluminum alloy widely used in fabricating certain critical components of heat exchange systems (e.g., heaters, air conditioners, and radiators) for all types of motor vehicles. The proposed Judgment would resolve those competitive concerns by requiring the defendants to divest Pechiney's "brazing sheet business," a term defined in the Judgment, § II(E), to include Pechiney's entire aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia, which, *inter alia*, produces all of the brazing sheet sold by Pechiney in North America.

In your letter, you expressed a belief, elaborated upon in the accompanying city council resolution, that in order to safeguard competition and preserve local employment, the Ravenswood facility must be divested to a firm that is, above everything else, competitively viable. The United States, of course, shares this concern, for a lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that the Ravenswood facility be divested to a person who, in the United States's judgment, is able to operate it successfully in competition with Alcan and others (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)). To that end, the proposed Judgment requires defendants to divest any tangible and intangible assets used in the production and sale of brazing sheet, including the entire Ravenswood facility, and any research, development, or engineering facilities, *wherever located*, used to develop and produce any product — not just brazing sheet — currently rolled at the Ravenswood facility. *See* Judgment, §§ II(E)(1)-(3).

Concern that there may not be an acceptable purchaser of these assets may be premature. Although the defendants have solicited offers for Pechiney's brazing sheet assets, they have not selected a proposed purchaser. In the event the defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser

on their own, the proposed decree permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee responsible for conducting an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and selling Pechiney's brazing sheet assets "at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort" (Judgment, § V(B)). At this point in the divestiture process, however, it would be inappropriate to conclude that the defendants' – or if necessary, the trustee's – efforts to sell Pechiney's brazing sheet assets will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.¹

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention; we hope this information will help alleviate them. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), a copy of your comment and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely yours,



Maribeth Petrizzi

Chief

Litigation II Section

¹An "acceptable purchaser" of Pechiney's brazing sheet business would not be a firm so burdened by its former owners' legacy costs that it is unviable. *See* Judgment, § IV(J): Divestiture terms must not give the defendants "the ability unreasonably to raise the [new firm's] costs, to lower [its] . . . efficiency, or otherwise to interfere in . . . [its] ability . . . to compete effectively."

January 4, 2004

Maribeth Petrizzi
Chief, Litigation II Section
Antitrust Division
United States Department of Justice
1401 H Street, NW
Suite 3000
Washington, DC 20530


Re: Pechiney Rolled Products Plant, Ravenswood, West Virginia

Dear Ms. Petrizzi:

Attached is a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Ravenswood expressing the concerns of council of the possible sale of the Pechiney Rolled Products Plant under the terms of a consent decree now pending before the United States District Court in Washington.

We request that the concerns highlighted in the attached resolution be considered and trust that it will assist you in your deliberations.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Clair Roseberry".

Clair Roseberry
Mayor

Attachment:

Pechiney Rolled Products Plant, Ravenswood, WV Resolution

**PECHINEY ROLLED PRODUCTS PLANT
RAVENWOOD, WEST VIRGINIA
RESOLUTION**

Whereas, the City of Ravenswood is a City of approximately 4100 people with the Pechiney Rolled Products Plant located 6 miles south of the City.


Whereas, the purpose of this resolution is to express the Common Council of the City of Ravenswood's concern over the sale of the Pechiney Rolled Products plant at Ravenswood under the terms of a consent decree now pending before the United States District Court House in Washington.

Whereas, many of the employees of the plant live in the city and the surrounding area thus the well-being of the city is linked to the successful operation of the plant because many of its citizens work there and also because about one-third of the families in the city are retirees, many being former workers at the Pechiney plant. The average age in the city's population is 42. If the plant were to close, many families and retirees in the area as well as the City's revenues would be directly affected.


Whereas, it is vital that any purchaser of the Pechiney plant have the capability and commitment necessary to operate the plant into the future. We are concerned that a buyer will be found to satisfy the requirement of divestiture, but the buyer will lack the resources to keep the plant in operation in the long term.

Therefore, the Common Council of the City of Ravenswood urge those in control of this process-the Court, the parties to the consent decree, and any trustee who might be appointed in the future-to accept as potential buyers only those companies that will clearly be successful. If such a clearly successful buyer cannot be found, we urge that Alcan be allowed to keep the plant. Alcan is clearly capable of keeping the plant going into the future. Its continued ownership of the plant would be in the public interest of our community.

Let it be resolved that on the 3rd day of February 2004, the Common Council of the City of Ravenswood by a majority vote of the body in attendance adopted and authorized the Honorable Clair Roseberry, the Mayor of the City of Ravenswood, to sign the foregoing resolution.


Clair Roseberry
Mayor

Attest:


Lucy J. Harbert
Recorder



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

March 15, 2004

Ms. Marci D. Weyer
President
Jackson County Development Authority
104 Miller Drive
Ripley, West Virginia 25271

Re: *Public Comment on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Ltd., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Civil No. 1:030 CV 02012 (D.D.C., filed Sept. 29, 2003)*

Dear Ms. Weyer:

This letter responds to your February 2004 letter, which comments on the proposed Final Judgment ("Judgment") submitted for entry in this case. The United States's Complaint in this case charged that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would substantially lessen North American competition in the sale of brazing sheet, a rolled aluminum alloy widely used in fabricating certain critical components of heat exchange systems (e.g., heaters, air conditioners, and radiators) for all types of motor vehicles. The proposed Judgment would resolve those competitive concerns by requiring the defendants to divest Pechiney's "brazing sheet business," a term defined in the Judgment, § II(E), to include, *inter alia*, Pechiney's aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia, which produces all of the brazing sheet sold by Pechiney in North America.


In your letter, you express a general concern, reflected in a resolution adopted by the Jackson County Development Authority, that a new owner of the Ravenswood facility may not be able to operate the plant profitably and may close it, a development that would adversely affect competition for brazing sheet and the income and livelihoods of Ravenswood's current and former employees. You have urged the Court to permit Alcan to retain and operate the plant if "no reliable buyer is found."

Your concern that there will not be an acceptable purchaser for the Ravenswood facility may be premature. A lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that the Ravenswood facility be divested to a person who, in the United States's judgment, is able to operate it successfully in competition with Alcan and others (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)). Although the defendants have solicited offers for Pechiney's brazing sheet business, they have not selected a proposed purchaser. In the event the defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser on their own, the proposed decree permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee responsible for conducting an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and selling Pechiney's brazing sheet

assets “at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort” (Judgment, §V(B)). At this point in the divestiture process, however, it would be inappropriate to conclude that the defendants’ – or if necessary, the trustee’s – efforts to sell Pechiney’s brazing sheet assets will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.¹

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention; we hope this information will help alleviate them. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), a copy of your comment and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely yours,



Maribeth Petrizzi
Chief
Litigation II Section

¹An “acceptable purchaser” of Pechiney’s brazing sheet business would not be a firm so burdened by its former owners’ legacy costs that it is unviable. *See* Judgment, § IV(J): Divestiture terms must not give the defendants “the ability unreasonably to raise the [new firm’s] costs, to lower [its] . . . efficiency, or otherwise to interfere in . . . [its] ability . . . to compete effectively.”

Maribeth Petrizzi
Chief, Litigation II Section
Antitrust Division
United States Department of Justice
1401 H Street, NW
Suite 3000
Washington, DC 20530

Re: Alcan Acquisition of Pechiney

Dear Ms. Petrizzi:

It is with great concern that I write to you concerning the acquisition of Pechiney by Alcan. I am president of the Development Authority of Jackson County, West Virginia, where Pechiney has a major plant, Pechiney Rolled products. Under the pending consent decree Alcan is required to divest that plant.

The Jackson County Development Authority adopted the following resolution of February 3, 2004 to express its concern about the long term continuation of the Pechiney Rolled Products plant as an employer and taxpayer in the county:

WHEREAS, the Jackson County Development Authority is a body politic created by act of the Jackson County Commission; and

WHEREAS, Pechiney Rolled Products is a major employer and taxpaying business in Jackson County, West Virginia; and

WHEREAS, under a consent decree permitting the acquisition of Pechiney by Alcan, the purchaser is required to divest that plant by selling it to an owner who would continue to produce brazing sheet at the plant; and

WHEREAS, this Authority is concerned that a new owner would lack the capability to operate the plant successfully in light of the plant's lack of profitability and the necessity of integrating it into allied operations of the owner; and


WHEREAS, a shutdown at the plant would be devastating to the people of Jackson County; and

WHEREAS, continued operation of the plant by Alcan, a qualified owner, would avert the danger of a shutdown of the plant; therefore

IT IS RESOLVED, that the foregoing concerns of the Jackson County Development Authority should be made known to the Court considering the consent decree, so that the public interest may be served and the Court might, if no reliable buyer is found for the plant, reconsider the advisability of terminating the requirement of divestiture and permit Alcan to own and operate the plant.

I understand that comments made to you will be conveyed to the parties to the consent decree and to the court.

Very truly yours,



Marci D. Weyer
President

Jackson County Development Authority

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Jackson County Development Authority is a body politic created by act of the Jackson County Commission; and

WHEREAS, Pechiney Rolled Products is a major employer and taxpaying business in Jackson County, West Virginia; and

WHEREAS, under a consent decree permitting the acquisition of Pechiney by Alcan, the purchaser is required to divest that plant by selling it to an owner who would continue to produce brazing sheet at the plant; and

WHEREAS, this Authority is concerned that a new owner would lack the capability to operate the plant successfully in light of the plant's lack of profitability and the necessity of integrating it into allied operations of the owner; and

WHEREAS, a shutdown at the plant would be devastating to the people of Jackson County; and

WHEREAS, continued operation of the plant by Alcan, a qualified owner, would avert the danger of a shutdown of the plant; therefore

IT IS RESOLVED, that the foregoing concerns of the Jackson County Development Authority should be made known to the Court considering the consent decree, so that the public interest may be served and the Court might, if no reliable buyer is found for the plant, reconsider the advisability of terminating the requirement of divestiture and permit Alcan to own and operate the plant.



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

March 15, 2004

The Honorable Ollie M. Harvey
Mayor
City of Ripley
113 South Church Street
Ripley, West Virginia 25271

Re: *Public Comment on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Ltd., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Civil No. 1:030 CV 02012 (D.D.C., filed Sept. 29, 2003)*

Dear Mayor Harvey:

This letter responds to your letter of February 9, 2004, which comments on the proposed Final Judgment ("Judgment") submitted for entry in this case. The United States's Complaint in this case charged that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would substantially lessen North American competition in the sale of brazing sheet, a rolled aluminum alloy widely used in fabricating certain critical components of heat exchange systems (e.g., heaters, air conditioners, and radiators) for all types of motor vehicles. The proposed Judgment would resolve those competitive concerns by requiring the defendants to divest Pechiney's "brazing sheet business," a term defined in the Judgment, § II(E), to include Pechiney's entire aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia, which, *inter alia*, produces all of the brazing sheet sold by Pechiney in North America.


In your letter, submitted on behalf of Ripley's Common Council, you noted that, in order to preserve local employment opportunities and retiree benefits, the Ravenswood facility must be divested to a firm that is, above everything else, competitively viable. The United States, of course, shares this concern, for a lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that the Ravenswood facility be divested to a person who, in the United States's judgment, is able to operate it successfully in competition with Alcan and others (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)). To that end, the proposed Judgment requires defendants to sell any tangible and intangible assets used in the production and sale of brazing sheet, including the entire Ravenswood facility, and any research, development, or engineering facilities, wherever located, used to develop and produce any product – not just brazing sheet – currently rolled at the Ravenswood facility. *See* Judgment, § II(E)(1)-(3).

Concern that there may not be an acceptable purchaser of these assets may be premature. Although the defendants have solicited offers for Pechiney's brazing sheet assets, they have not selected a proposed purchaser. In the event the defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser

on their own, the proposed decree permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee responsible for conducting an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and selling Pechiney's brazing sheet assets "at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort" (Judgment, § V(B)). At this point in the divestiture process, however, it would be inappropriate to conclude that the defendants' – or if necessary, the trustee's – efforts to sell Pechiney's brazing sheet assets will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention; we hope this information will help alleviate them. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), a copy of your comment and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Maribeth Petrizzi", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Maribeth Petrizzi

Chief

Litigation II Section

City of Ripley

113 SOUTH CHURCH STREET
RIPLEY, WV 25271
Phone: (304) 372-3482
Fax: (304) 372-6693

Mayor

Ollie M. Harvey

Recorder

William E. Casto

February 9, 2004

Maribeth Petrizzi
Chief, Litigation II Section
Antitrust Division
United States Department of Justice
1401 H Street, NW
Suite 3000
Washington, DC 20530

Re: Pechiney Rolled Products/288322-00004

Dear Ms. Petrizzi:

On behalf of the Common Council we are concerned about the proposed divestiture of Pechiney Rolled Products under a consent decree provision in the settlement of Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney. This divestiture is causing concern among retirees who depend upon the continued operation of the Pechiney Rolled Products plant for payment of medical benefits.

I am Mayor of Ripley, West Virginia, a town near the plant, where many retirees live. The town has a \$3 million operating budget with a tax base that includes many citizens in the retiree group. The concern of the retirees is that a new owner of the plant will fail to operate the plant successfully, so that retirement benefits will be in jeopardy. Three of our council members are plant retirees, and, one is employed by Pechiney.

My husband, Don, is a retired employee of the Ravenswood Works with forty-two (42) years of service as a metallurgical engineer. Are we worried about the sale of the facility to a qualified owner who can successfully keep the plant operating - - very definitely.

For the protection of the current employees and the retirement group, the plant must be owned and operated by a company like Pechiney or Alcan that has the capacity to absorb costs of operation when the plant is unprofitable. The retirees observe similar situations where new owners take over plants and shut them down or renounce benefit obligations because the new owners can't afford to do otherwise.

Common Council

Curtis Anderson

David Brubaker

Don Kenthorne

Russ Vannoy

Victor Yoak

February 9, 2004

It is imperative for the life of this community that the Pechiney plant be owned and operated by a company committed to long-term production and employment. The plant must not be sold to a company that might have financing and good intentions in the short term but lacks the experience and facilities necessary to maintain operations into the future.

Very truly yours,

Ollie M. Harvey
MAYOR

OMH:isb

Cc: Governor Bob Wise
Senator Robert Byrd
Senator Jay Rockefeller



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

March 15, 2004

Mr. L. D. Whitman
Chairman
Ravenswood Aluminum Retired Salary
Association Committee
809 Cypress Street
Ravenswood, West Virginia 26164

Re: *Public Comment on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Ltd., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Civil No. 1:030 CV 02012 (D.D.C., filed Sept. 29, 2003)*

Dear Mr. Whitman:

This letter responds to your letter of October 29, 2003, commenting on the proposed Final Judgment ("Judgment") submitted for entry in this case. The United States's Complaint in this case charged that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would substantially lessen North American competition in the sale of brazing sheet, a rolled aluminum alloy widely used in fabricating certain critical components of heat exchange systems (e.g., heaters, air conditioners, and radiators) for all types of motor vehicles. The proposed Judgment would resolve those competitive concerns by requiring the defendants to divest Pechiney's "brazing sheet business," a term defined in the Judgment, § II(E), to include Pechiney's entire aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia, which, *inter alia*, produces all of the brazing sheet sold by Pechiney in North America.

In your letter, you expressed a concern that to safeguard competition and preserve local employment opportunities, the Ravenswood facility must be divested to a new owner that is capable of operating the plant as part of a viable ongoing business enterprise. The United States, of course, shares this concern, for a lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that the Ravenswood facility be divested to a person who, in the United States's judgment, is able to operate it successfully in competition with Alcan and others (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)). To that end, the proposed Judgment requires defendants to sell any tangible and intangible assets used in the production and sale of brazing sheet, including the entire Ravenswood facility, and any research, development, or engineering facilities, wherever located, used to develop and produce any product – not just brazing sheet – currently rolled at the Ravenswood facility, including R&D for aluminum plate used in military and aerospace applications. *See* Judgment, §§ II(E)(1)-(3).


You have noted that the Ravenswood facility is currently unprofitable, and you suggested that the defendants, Alcan and Pechiney, must retain responsibility for the costs of current retiree

pension, health care, and life insurance benefit plans of retirees in order to ensure the competitive viability of any new owner of the Ravenswood facility.

Because the defendants are still soliciting and evaluating offers for Pechiney's brazing sheet assets, it is too early for us to comment on particular terms of any potential divestiture agreement. Even if the defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser on their own, the proposed decree permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee responsible for conducting an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and selling Pechiney's brazing sheet assets "at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort" (*see* Judgment, § V(B)). What we can say, however, is that it is certainly inappropriate to conclude at this time that the defendants' – or if necessary, the trustee's – efforts to sell Pechiney's brazing sheet assets will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.¹

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention; we hope this information will help alleviate them. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), a copy of your comment and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely yours,


Maribeth Petrizzi
Chief
Litigation II Section

¹An "acceptable purchaser" of Pechiney's brazing sheet business would not be a firm so burdened by its former owners' legacy costs that it is unviable. *See* Judgment, § IV(J): Divestiture terms must not give the defendants "the ability unreasonably to raise the [new firm's] costs, to lower [its] . . . efficiency, or otherwise to interfere in . . . [its] ability . . . to compete effectively."

October, 29, 2003

809 Cypress Street
Ravenswood, WV 26164

John Ashcroft
U.S. Dept. of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Regarding: Sale of Ravenswood, West Virginia Rolling Mill

Dear Mr. Ashcroft

The Ravenswood Aluminum Plants' Salaried Retiree Organization is writing this letter to express our concern about the current events as they relate to the Alcan purchase of Pechiney Aluminum.

We understand that the U.S. Justice Department has approved the purchase but Alcan must divest themselves of the Ravenswood Rolling Mill.

It is our understanding that Pechiney purchased the Plant in September 1999 to better compete with Aloc in the critical Aerospace Market. Pechiney has spent in excess of \$125 million to improve the Plant's capacity and capability for this Market. The forced sale of Ravenswood will certainly enhance Alcoa's plate position in the world market with a smaller producer's ownership of Ravenswood.

According to the previous and current management, this Plant has not been profitable since it was sold by Kaiser Aluminum in 1989. It is therefore, our desire that Alcan/Pechiney retain the legacy cost, i.e. Pensions, Medical, and Life Insurance for the existing Retirees.

This legacy cost must be addressed to allow this Plant to be profitable. If not, it will in all probability go the way of the Steel Mills and severely impact our State and Community.

As an organization we are willing to have one or more of our Retirees assist the Trustees of the Plant during its transition.

Your immediate attention to this matter is requested!

Sincerely,



L.D. Whitman
Retired Plant Manager
Chairman Ravenswood Aluminum Retired Salary Association Committee.



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

March 15, 2004

Mr. David R. Jury
Assistant General Counsel
United Steelworkers of America
Five Gateway Venter
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Re: *Public Comment on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Ltd., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Civil No. 1:030 CV 02012 (D.D.C., filed Sept. 29, 2003)*

Dear Mr. Jury:

This letter responds to your letter of February 13, 2004, commenting on the proposed Final Judgment ("Judgment") submitted for entry in this case. The United States's Complaint in this case charged that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would substantially lessen North American competition in the sale of brazing sheet, a rolled aluminum alloy widely used in fabricating certain critical components of heat exchange systems (e.g., heaters, air conditioners, and radiators) for all types of motor vehicles. The proposed Judgment would resolve those competitive concerns by requiring the defendants to divest Pechiney's "brazing sheet business," a term defined in the Judgment, § II(E), to include Pechiney's entire aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia, which, *inter alia*, produces all of the brazing sheet sold by Pechiney in North America.

Your union, United Steelworkers of America, represents hourly employees and retirees of the Ravenswood facility. In your letter, you expressed support for Governor Bob Wise's previous comment in which he urged modifying the proposed Judgment either to permit Alcan to retain Ravenswood facility (irrespective of the competitive harm the acquisition would cause in the brazing sheet market), or to allow the Ravenswood facility to "revert" to Alcan in the event a new buyer is unable "to keep the plant open." You also expressed a willingness to work constructively with any purchaser willing "to build a relationship" with your union and negotiate "an appropriate labor agreement that protects active members and retirees."


The United States believes that, in order to be an effective competitor, the new owner of Pechiney's brazing sheet business must be capable of operating the assets successfully (*see* Judgment, § IV (J)). Indeed, a lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that the Ravenswood facility be divested to a person who, in the United States's judgment, is able to operate it successfully in competition with Alcan and others (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)). To that end, the proposed Judgment requires the defendants to divest any tangible and intangible assets used in the

production and sale of brazing sheet, including the entire Ravenswood facility, and any research, development, or engineering facilities, wherever located, used to develop and produce any product – not just brazing sheet – currently rolled at the Ravenswood facility. *See* Judgment, §§ II(E)(1)-(3).

Any concern that there may not be an acceptable purchaser of these assets may well be premature. Although the defendants have solicited offers for Pechiney's brazing sheet assets, they have not selected a proposed purchaser. In the event the defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser on their own, the proposed decree permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee responsible for conducting an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and selling Pechiney's brazing sheet assets "at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort" (Judgment, § V(B)). At this point in the divestiture process, however, it would be inappropriate to conclude that the defendants' – or if necessary, the trustee's – efforts to sell Pechiney's brazing sheet assets will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.¹

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention; we hope this information will help alleviate them. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), a copy of your comment and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely yours,



Maribeth Petrizzi

Chief

Litigation II Section

¹An "acceptable purchaser" of Pechiney's brazing sheet business would not be a firm so burdened by its former owners' legacy costs that it is unviable. *See* Judgment, § IV(J): Divestiture terms must not give the defendants "the ability unreasonably to raise the [new firm's] costs, to lower [its] . . . efficiency, or otherwise to interfere in . . . [its] ability . . . to compete effectively."



United Steelworkers of America

AFL-CIO-CLC

Five Gateway Center
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

412-562-2400 • 412-562-2484 (Fax)

Writer's Direct Dial (412) 562-1164

Writer's Facsimile (412) 562-2429

February 13, 2004

VIA UPS NEXT DAY DELIVERY**1Z 263 055 22 1022 944 4**

Ms. Maribeth Petrizzi
Chief, Litigation II Section
Antitrust Division
United States Department of Justice
1401 H Street, N.W.
Suite 3000
Washington, DC 20530

Re: United States v. Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney,
S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC

United States District Court for the District of
Columbia, Case No. 1:03CV02012

Dear Ms. Petrizzi:

I write on behalf of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO-CLC ("USWA"), the exclusive bargaining representative of the hourly production and maintenance employees employed by Pechiney Rolled Products ("Pechiney") at its Ravenswood, West Virginia facility. This letter is submitted under the terms of the Tunney Act, 15 U.S.C. §16, and relates to the Final Judgment that has been proposed in this matter.

It is our understanding that West Virginia Governor Bob Wise has submitted to you a letter in which he proposes that the Final Judgment be modified either to permit Alcan Aluminum Corporation ("Alcan") to retain the brazing sheet business and other operations at the Ravenswood facility (thus obviating the need for the marketing and sale of the plant) or provide that the facility "revert" to Alcan in the event that the buyer of the plant is unable to keep the plant in operation. Governor Wise clearly has acted out of his concern about the future of aluminum making at Ravenswood, a future that is now uncertain as no purchaser for the plant has been identified.


As the representative of the hourly employees and retirees of the Ravenswood plant, it goes without saying that the USWA shares that concern. The USWA is prepared

Ms. Maribeth Petrizzi
February 13, 2004

Page 2

to work constructively with all parties-in-interest relating to the sale of the facility and to engage with any prospective purchaser that wishes to build a relationship with the USWA and negotiate an appropriate labor agreement that protects both our active members and retirees. Nevertheless, because the results of any sale process cannot be predicted today, the USWA would support modifying the Final Judgment generally in the manner that Governor Wise has suggested, provided, of course, that Alcan consents to such treatment.

Respectfully submitted,



David R. Jury
Assistant General Counsel

DRJ/dd

cc: Leo Gerard, International President
Andrew Palm, International Vice President
Lawrence McBrearty, Canadian National Director
Ernest R. Thompson, Director
Tim Dean, Sub-District Director



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

March 15, 2004

Ms. Renee Martin-Nagle
Vice President and General Counsel
Airbus North America Holdings, Inc.
198 Van Buren Street
Suite 300
Herndon, Virginia 20170-5335

Re: *Public Comment on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Ltd., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Civil No. 1:030 CV 02012 (D.D.C., filed Sept. 29, 2003)*

Dear Ms. Martin-Nagle:

This letter responds to your letter of November 21, 2003, which comments on the proposed Final Judgment ("Judgment") submitted for entry in this case. The United States's Complaint in this case charged that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would substantially lessen North American competition in the sale of brazing sheet, a rolled aluminum alloy widely used in fabricating certain critical components of heat exchange systems (e.g., heaters, air conditioners, and radiators) for all types of motor vehicles. The proposed Judgment would resolve those competitive concerns by requiring the defendants to divest Pechiney's "brazing sheet business," a term defined in the Judgment, § II(E), to include Pechiney's entire aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia, which, *inter alia*, produces all of the brazing sheet sold by Pechiney in North America.

Your company, Airbus North America Holdings, Inc., purchases various rolled aluminum products from the Ravenswood facility that would be divested pursuant to the terms of the proposed Judgment. Airbus is concerned that any new owner of Pechiney's brazing sheet assets must have "the technical, financial, and managerial qualifications necessary to operate the plant effectively in extremely competitive global markets." You have requested an opportunity to comment on the qualifications of a prospective buyer before the United States exercises its "sole discretion" and concludes that that firm is an acceptable purchaser of the assets pursuant to the terms of the Judgment, § IV(J).

The United States shares your concern that, to be an effective competitor, the new owner of Pechiney's brazing sheet business must be capable of operating the assets successfully. For that reason, a lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that the Ravenswood facility be divested to a person who, in the United States's sole discretion, is able to operate it successfully in competition with Alcan and others (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)). To that end, the proposed Judgment


requires defendants to sell any tangible and intangible assets used in the production and sale of brazing sheet, including the entire Ravenswood facility, and any research, development, or engineering facilities, *wherever located*, used to develop and produce any product – not just brazing sheet – currently rolled at the Ravenswood facility (*see* Judgment, §§ II (E)(1)-(3)).

Although the United States reserves “sole discretion” as to whether a prospective buyer of Pechiney’s brazing sheet business may be a viable and effective competitor (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)), it will consider your company’s view before making a final decision on that question.

In any event, the divestiture process is continuing and has yet to produce any proposed purchaser. Although the defendants have solicited offers for Pechiney’s brazing sheet assets, they have not proposed a purchaser for the divested assets. If the defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser on their own, the proposed Judgment permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee responsible for conducting an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and selling Pechiney’s brazing sheet assets “at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort” (Judgment, §V(B)). In short, at this point, we cannot conclude that the defendants’ – or if necessary, the trustee’s – efforts to sell Pechiney’s brazing sheet assets will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention; we hope this information will help alleviate them. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), a copy of your comment and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely yours,



Maribeth Petrizzi

Chief

Litigation II Section

cc: Richard Liebeskind, Esquire



November 21, 2003

Anthony Harris, Esq.
U.S. Department of Justice
Litigation II Section, Suite 3000
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Re: U.S. v. Alcan, Inc.


Dear Mr. Harris:

On behalf of Airbus SAS and Airbus North America Holdings, Inc., I hereby request that Airbus be advised about each potential purchaser of the Ravenswood, West Virginia facility that is considered by the Department of Justice pursuant to the consent decree in the above-captioned case. Specifically, Airbus asks that you provide it with the opportunity to comment in a timely and effective way on the qualifications of any such purchaser. You may send all information to Airbus by addressing it to me at the address below. In addition, I ask that you also send a copy Martyn Brown at Airbus UK, Ltd., B3 New Tech Center, Golf Course Lane, Filton, Bristol, UK BS99 7AR.

As you know, Airbus purchases significant amounts of highly specialized aluminum products from the Ravenswood plant and is very concerned that Ravenswood be owned by a company with the technical, financial, and managerial qualifications necessary to operate the plant effectively in extremely competitive global markets. Further, the sale of the Ravenswood facility has the potential to cause damage to our commercial competitiveness by raising prices for specialized aluminum.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Please feel free to call me at (703) 834-3545 should you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Renée Martin-Nagle
Vice-President & General Counsel

cc Martyn Brown
Richard Liebeskid



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

March 15, 2004

Mr. Mark Dempsey
West Virginia President
American Electric Power
707 Virginia Street
Suite 1100
P.O. Box 1986
Charleston, West Virginia 25327-1986

Re: *Public Comment on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Ltd., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Civil No. 1:030 CV 02012 (D.D.C., filed Sept. 29, 2003)*

Dear Mr. Dempsey:

This letter responds to your letter of February 13, 2004, which comments on the proposed Final Judgment ("Judgment") submitted for entry in this case. The United States's Complaint in this case charged that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would substantially lessen North American competition in the sale of brazing sheet, a rolled aluminum alloy widely used in fabricating certain critical components of heat exchange systems (*e.g.*, heaters, air conditioners, and radiators) for all types of motor vehicles. The proposed Judgment would resolve those competitive concerns by requiring the defendants to divest Pechiney's "brazing sheet business," a term defined in the Judgment, § II(E), to include Pechiney's entire aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia, which, *inter alia*, produces all of the brazing sheet sold by Pechiney in North America.

Your company, American Electric Power, supplies electricity to the Ravenswood facility that would be divested pursuant to the terms of the proposed Judgment. In your letter, you express a concern that the government may have overreached by proposing that the defendants divest the entire Ravenswood facility, when the only competitive problem was in brazing sheet. You also assert that the new owner of Pechiney's brazing sheet assets may not have "the capacity, technology, and experience" to operate the entire Ravenswood plant, and that the new firm will be significantly more likely to fail without these capabilities.

The competitive problems created by Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney could not be cured simply by requiring a "partial divestiture" of only those portions of the Ravenswood facility devoted to developing, producing, and selling brazing sheet. As you point out in your comment, brazing sheet is produced on the same production lines that make many other important rolled aluminum

alloy products (*e.g.*, common alloy coil, aerospace sheet) at Ravenswood. The United States is unaware of any evidence that would support a conclusion that dismantling the Ravenswood facility to sell off a few parts exclusively committed to the production of brazing sheet would produce a viable new firm capable of replacing the competition lost by Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney. An observation by the Federal Trade Commission, based on a recent empirical study of its own divestiture efforts, is particularly apt here: "[D]ivestiture of an ongoing business is more likely to result in a viable operation than divestiture of a more narrowly defined package of assets and provides support for the common sense conclusion that [antitrust enforcement agencies] should prefer the divestiture of an ongoing business." Federal Trade Commission, *A Study of the Commission's Divestiture Process* 10-12, esp. 12 (1999).¹

The United States, of course, shares your concern that in order to be an effective competitor, the new owner of Pechiney's brazing sheet assets must be capable of operating the assets successfully. Indeed, a lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that the Ravenswood facility be divested to a person who, in the United States's judgment, is able to operate it successfully in competition with Alcan and others (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)). To that end, the proposed Judgment requires defendants to sell any tangible and intangible assets used in the production and sale of brazing sheet, including the entire Ravenswood facility, and any research, development, or engineering facilities, wherever located, used to develop and produce any product – not just brazing sheet – currently rolled at the Ravenswood facility. *See* Judgment, §§ II(E)(1)-(3).


Your fear that there may not be an acceptable purchaser of these assets may be premature. Although the defendants have solicited offers for Pechiney's brazing sheet assets, they have not selected a proposed purchaser. In the event the defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser on their own, the proposed Judgment permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee responsible for conducting an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and selling Pechiney's brazing sheet assets "at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort" (Judgment, § V(B)). At this point in the divestiture process, however, it would be inappropriate to conclude that the defendants' – or if necessary, the trustee's – efforts to sell Pechiney's brazing sheet assets will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.²

¹The FTC study is available online at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/1999/08/divestiture.pdf>.

²An "acceptable purchaser" of Pechiney's brazing sheet business would not be a firm so burdened by its former owners' legacy costs that it is unviable. *See* Judgment, § IV(J): Divestiture terms must not give the defendants "the ability unreasonably to raise the [new firm's] costs, to lower [its] . . . efficiency, or otherwise to interfere in . . . [its] ability . . . to compete effectively."

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention; we hope this information will help alleviate them. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), a copy of your comment and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Maribeth Petrizzi", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Maribeth Petrizzi

Chief

Litigation II Section

American Electric Power
707 Virginia Street, E., Suite 1100
P O Box 1986
Charleston, WV 25327-1986
www.aep.com

Mark E. Dempsey
West Virginia President

304-348-4120
mrdempsey@aep.com

Maribeth Petrizzi
Chief, Litigation II Section
Antitrust Division
United States Department of Justice
1401 H Street, NW
Suite 3000
Washington, DC 20530

Re: Pechiney Rolled Products, Ravenswood, West Virginia

Dear Ms. Petrizzi:

This letter is submitted as a comment on the Final Judgment now before the Federal District Court in Washington concerning the purchase of Pechiney by Alcan. Under that Final Judgment, Alcan must divest the Pechiney Rolled Products plant at Ravenswood, West Virginia. The divestiture is of great concern to American Electric Power (AEP).

The Pechiney Rolled Products plant and the Century Aluminum plant adjacent to it use very large amounts of electricity in their manufacturing processes. In addition to providing electric power to the plants, AEP also supplies power to the communities around the plants, including the plants' employees and their families and the businesses that provide additional products and services to them.

AEP's concern about the pending Final Judgment and the divestiture of the Pechiney Rolled Products plant is that such action might lead to a shut down of the plant. The Final Judgment focuses on the brazing sheet business conducted at the plant, and expresses an intent to keep brazing sheet as a product of the plant, but is silent about the major product of the plant, aluminum sheet. The Final Judgment says nothing about keeping that important business going. If the divestiture should lead to the purchase by an owner who lacks the capacity, technology, and experience to produce all of the plant's products, there is substantial danger that the plant would not survive. Failure of the fabricating plant could itself have an adverse impact on competition in the brazing sheet market and would jeopardize the neighboring aluminum plant and the communities that rely on and support the plants and their employees.

Survival of these plants is essential for the economic health of this region. AEP submits this comment to draw attention to the fact that more issues than competition in the brazing sheet market are at stake. Our customers in the area would suffer substantial hardship, and AEP itself would lose industrial, commercial, and residential business.

It appears to AEP that the best solution would be to allow Alcan to continue to operate the Pechiney Rolled Products plant. Alcan has the needed capacity and experience to operate the plant successfully.

We suggest this solution on the basis of our knowledge of the plants and our concern about their future. The suggestion is in no way prompted by any contact with Alcan.

We ask that the Court be informed of these concerns and our suggested solution.

Very truly yours,


Mark Dempsey
West Virginia President

Cc: John Smolak – Economic Development Manager, AEP



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

March 15, 2004

Mr. Ron Thompson
Vice President of Operations
Century Aluminum of West Virginia, Inc.
Ravenswood Operations
Post Office Box 98
Ravenswood, West Virginia 26164

Re: *Public Comment on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Ltd., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Civil No. 1:030 CV 02012 (D.D.C., filed Sept. 29, 2003)*

Dear Mr. Thompson:

This letter responds to your February 12, 2004 letter commenting on the proposed Final Judgment ("Judgment") submitted for entry in this case. The United States's Complaint in this case charged that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would substantially lessen North American competition in the sale of brazing sheet, a rolled aluminum alloy widely used in fabricating certain critical components of heat exchange systems (e.g., heaters, air conditioners, and radiators) for all types of motor vehicles. The proposed Judgment would resolve those competitive concerns by requiring the defendants to divest Pechiney's "brazing sheet business," a term defined in the Judgment, § II(E), to include Pechiney's entire aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia, which, *inter alia*, produces all of the brazing sheet sold by Pechiney in North America.


Your company, Century Aluminum, is a major customer of the Ravenswood facility that would be divested pursuant to the terms of the proposed Judgment, selling the facility between 275 and 325 million pounds of primary aluminum annually. In your letter, you expressed a concern that in order to meet your company's credit standards, the Ravenswood facility must be sold to a firm with the necessary financial, technical, and marketing resources that would enable it to operate the Ravenswood facility as part of a viable, ongoing business enterprise. The United States, of course, shares this concern, for a lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that the Ravenswood facility be divested to a person who, in the United States's judgment, is able to operate it successfully in competition with Alcan and others (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)). To that end, the proposed Judgment requires defendants to sell any tangible and intangible assets used in the production and sale of brazing sheet, including the entire Ravenswood facility, and any research, development, or engineering facilities, *wherever located*, used to develop and produce any product – not just brazing

sheet – currently rolled at the Ravenswood facility, including R&D for aluminum plate used in military and aerospace applications. *See* Judgment, §§ II(E)(1)-(3).

However, at this stage of the divestiture process, it is premature to speculate as to whether such a purchaser currently exists. Although the defendants have solicited offers for Pechiney's brazing sheet assets, they have not selected a proposed purchaser. In the event the defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser on their own, the proposed decree permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee responsible for conducting an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and selling Pechiney's brazing sheet assets "at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort" (Judgment, § V(B)). At this point, it would be speculative to conclude that the defendants' – or if necessary, the trustee's – efforts to sell Pechiney's brazing sheet assets will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.¹

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention; we hope this information will help alleviate them. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), a copy of your comment and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely yours,



Maribeth Petrizzi

Chief

Litigation II Section

¹An "acceptable purchaser" of Pechiney's brazing sheet business would not be a firm so burdened by its former owners' legacy costs that it is unviable. *See* Judgment, § IV(J): Divestiture terms must not give the defendants "the ability unreasonably to raise the [new firm's] costs, to lower [its] . . . efficiency, or otherwise to interfere in . . . [its] ability . . . to compete effectively."

Century ALUMINUM
**Ravenswood
Operations**

February 12, 2004

Ms. Maribeth Petrizzi
Chief, Litigation II Section
Antitrust Division
United States Department of Justice
1401 H Street, NW Suite 3000
Washington, DC 20530

Re: Pechiney Rolled Products Plant, Ravenswood, West Virginia

Dear Ms. Petrizzi:

I am the manager of the Century Aluminum primary aluminum plant at Ravenswood, West Virginia. The plant is located adjacent to the Pechiney Rolled Products plant which is to be divested by Alcan under a pending consent decree. The two plants operated as an integrated entity from the late 1950s, when they were constructed by Kaiser Aluminum, until 1999 when Century sold the rolling mill portion to Pechiney. Our plant has 700 employees and has pension and health benefits obligations to 300 retirees.

The rolling mill is the major customer for our plant. It contractually purchases between 275 million and 325 million pounds of primary aluminum a year out of our total yearly production of about 375 million pounds. The metal is delivered in molten or liquid form as it comes out of Century's electrolytic cells. This eliminates the need for the metal to be cast by Century and then re-melted by the mill for casting into shapes suitable for rolling. This arrangement and the close proximity of the plants produce savings that are shared by the parties.

Century Aluminum's principal concern with the divestiture process is that prospective new owners may not meet our company's credit standards. Century typically holds as much as \$30.0 million in accounts receivable each month under the existing contract – a significant liability for a company our size. Consequently we would require that a new owner possess a credit rating approximating that of Pechiney/Alcan.

Century Aluminum of West Virginia, Inc.
Post Office Box 98
Ravenswood, WV 26164
(304) 273-6000 Phone

A Century Aluminum Company


Ms. Maribeth Petrizzi
February 12, 2004
Page -2-

The anti-trust implications of Alcan's ownership and operation of the mill – specifically with respect to the rolling of brazing sheet – are not for our company to judge. From first-hand experience in operating the mill, we are able to say with authority, however, that operation of the mill requires substantial financial, technical and marketing resources. Under new ownership, the Ravenswood mill would compete directly against large producers of premium rolled products, including Alcan and Alcoa, the world's two largest aluminum manufacturers.

I hope we have provided you with a fuller understanding of the inter-related manufacturing processes between our reduction plant and the rolling mill. We hope that the mill will continue to operate under the management of an owner with all of the resources required to assure its economic success.

We are available to provide any additional information you may require.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Thompson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ron" being more prominent than the last name "Thompson".

Ron Thompson
Vice President of Operations
Century Aluminum of West Virginia, Inc.



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

March 15, 2004

Mr. L. D. Whitman
Route 1
Box 79A
Ravenswood, West Virginia 26164

Re: *Public Comment on Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Alcan Ltd., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, Civil No. 1:030 CV 02012 (D.D.C., filed Sept. 29, 2003)*

Dear Mr. Whitman:

This letter responds to your letter commenting on the proposed Final Judgment ("Judgment") submitted for entry in this case. The United States's Complaint in this case charged that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would substantially lessen North American competition in the sale of brazing sheet, a rolled aluminum alloy widely used in fabricating certain critical components of heat exchange systems (e.g., heaters, air conditioners, and radiators) for all types of motor vehicles. The proposed Judgment would resolve those competitive concerns by requiring the defendants to divest Pechiney's "brazing sheet business," a term defined in the Judgment, § II(E), to include Pechiney's entire aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia, which, *inter alia*, produces all of the brazing sheet sold by Pechiney in North America.


In your letter, you expressed a concern that to safeguard competition and preserve local employment opportunities, the Ravenswood facility must be divested to a new owner that is capable of operating the plant as part of a viable ongoing business enterprise. The United States, of course, shares this concern, for a lynchpin of the proposed decree is its requirement that the Ravenswood facility be divested to a person who, in the United States's judgment, is able to operate it successfully in competition with Alcan and others (*see* Judgment, § IV(J)). To that end, the proposed Judgment requires defendants to sell any tangible and intangible assets used in the production and sale of brazing sheet, including the entire Ravenswood facility, and any research, development, or engineering facilities, *wherever located*, used to develop and produce any product – not just brazing sheet – currently rolled at the Ravenswood facility, including R&D for aluminum plate used in military and aerospace applications. *See* Judgment, §§ II(E)(1)-(3).

Your concern that there will not be an acceptable purchaser of these assets may be premature. Although the defendants have solicited offers for Pechiney's brazing sheet assets, they have not selected a proposed purchaser. In the event the defendants are unable to find an acceptable purchaser

on their own, the proposed decree permits the Department of Justice to nominate, and the Court to appoint, a trustee responsible for conducting an independent search for an acceptable purchaser and selling Pechiney's brazing sheet assets "at such price and on such terms as are then obtainable upon reasonable effort" (Judgment, § V(B)). At this point in the divestiture process, however, it would be inappropriate to conclude that the defendants' – or if necessary, the trustee's – efforts to sell Pechiney's brazing sheet assets will not produce an acceptable, viable purchaser capable of vigorously competing in the development, production, and sale of brazing sheet in North America.¹

Thank you for bringing your concerns to our attention; we hope this information will help alleviate them. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), a copy of your comment and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely yours,


Maribeth Petrizzi
Chief
Litigation II Section

¹An "acceptable purchaser" of Pechiney's brazing sheet business would not be a firm so burdened by its former owners' legacy costs that it is unviable. *See* Judgment, § IV(J): Divestiture terms must not give the defendants "the ability unreasonably to raise the [new firm's] costs, to lower [its] . . . efficiency, or otherwise to interfere in . . . [its] ability . . . to compete effectively."

Route 1
Box 79A
Ravenswood, WV 26164

Maribeth Petrizzi
Chief, Litigation II Section
Antitrust Division
United States Department of Justice
1401 H Street, NW
Suite 3000
Washington , DC 20530

Re: US v. Alcan et al., Case No. 1:03CV02012
in the United States District Court for the District of
Columbia

Dear Ms. Petrizzi:

I am writing to comment on the potential effects of the consent decree now before the Court in connection with the purchase of Pechiney by Alcan. My concern is particularly about the divestiture of Pechiney Rolled Products which is required by that consent decree.

The plant of Pechiney Rolled Products is located at Ravenswood, West Virginia. I was at one time plant manager there, and I am now chairman of the retiree group of former employees of the plant. I live not far from the plant.

My chief concern is that the divestiture of the plant might result in its being sold to new owners who will not operate the plant successfully and will cause its shutdown. A shutdown of that plant would be devastating to the entire community, and particularly to the thousands of employees and retirees who would be left without work or the means to live decent lives.

I know that efforts are being made to locate a buyer who would commit itself to operating the plant into the future. However, my knowledge of the plant and its history leads me to worry about the ability of a new owner to fulfill that commitment. It would not be enough for a buyer simply to have the capital to acquire the plant and take on the legacy costs associated with it. The new owner must have a high level of technical capability. It must be able to do the testing necessary to satisfy the safety requirements and to test new alloys for the plant's products, aluminum plate and brazing sheet. Because aluminum plate is used for military purposes and by the

aerospace industry, intense safety testing is needed on the products. The present owner, Pechiney, has facilities in France where technological work can be done. Alcan also has the technological capability required to operate the plant. A new owner would have to possess the same high level of technological capability. Very few potential buyers would qualify.

If the plant should close because a new owner lacks the necessary experience or technological backup, the retirees whom I represent would be in life threatening circumstances. I regularly receive calls from retired people or their families who tell me how little they have to live on, particularly in light of the medical bills they must pay to maintain themselves. If the medical benefits they now receive were to be shut off because of plant closing or the owner's bankruptcy or the inability of the owner to meet pension obligations, these people would have nothing to show for lives of hard work and they would be left in desperate circumstances.

If no buyer can be found as capable as Alcan to operate the Ravenswood plant, I suggest that Alcan be allowed to retain the plant.

Very truly yours,



L. D. Whitman



U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Legislative Affairs

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

March 10, 2004

The Honorable Robert C. Byrd
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Byrd:

This responds to your fax to the Department of Justice forwarding concerns of Governor Wise regarding the proposed final judgment in *United States v. Alcan Inc.* The proposed final judgment requires that, to resolve the Department's concern that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would harm competition in the production and sale of brazing sheet in North America, the parties divest Pechiney's aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia.

Governor Wise recommends that Alcan be allowed to keep Pechiney's Ravenswood plant, or that a purchaser for the plant be chosen who possesses the same operational capabilities as Alcan. The Department appreciates having the benefit of Governor Wise's perspective.

The proposed consent decree requires that the Ravenswood plant be sold to someone able to successfully operate it and provide competition for Alcan. This ability to compete effectively is a cornerstone of the decree. Closing the plant or selling the plant to an entity that is not able to compete would not address the competitive problem. Alcan and Pechiney have hired an investment banking firm to identify prospective purchasers and help arrange the purchase, and the Department has no reason to believe that these efforts will not be successful. Furthermore, even if the parties do not find a purchaser acceptable to the Department on their own, the Department would appoint a trustee to conduct an independent search for an appropriate purchaser.

Please be assured that the Antitrust Division will take Governor Wise's comments and all other public comments into consideration before asking the court in this case to consider whether entry of the consent decree is in the public interest. If we can be of further assistance on this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "William E. Moschella". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "W" and "M".

William E. Moschella
Assistant Attorney General



DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Antitrust Division

R. HEWITT PATE
Assistant Attorney General

Main Justice Building
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530-0001
(202) 514-2401 / (202) 616-2645 (Fax)
E-mail: antitrust@usdoj.gov
Web site: <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr>

FEB 25 2004

The Honorable Robert C. Byrd
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Byrd:

This responds to your letter to the Department of Justice, which forwarded concerns of your constituent, L.D. Whitman, Chairman of the Ravenswood Aluminum Retired Salary Association Committee, regarding the proposed consent decree in *United States v. Alcan Inc.* The proposed decree requires that to resolve the Department's concern that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would harm competition in the production and sale of brazing sheet in North America, the parties must divest Pechiney's aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia. Mr. Whitman, a former manager of the Ravenswood rolling mill, expresses his concern that in order for Ravenswood's new owner to compete effectively, Alcan and Pechiney must agree to retain this facility's substantial legacy costs (*i.e.*, pension, medical, and life insurance benefits for current retirees) – expenses, which, in Mr. Whitman's view, have been a major impediment to the continued profitability and viability of Ravenswood.

The requirement in the proposed consent decree is that the Ravenswood rolling mill be sold to someone who will be able to successfully operate the facility and provide competition for Alcan, Alcoa, and others; this is a cornerstone of the decree. Alcan and Pechiney have recently retained an investment banking firm to identify prospective purchasers and help arrange the purchase, and the Antitrust Division has no reason to believe that these efforts will not be successful. Please be assured that the Antitrust Division will take Mr. Whitman's comments and all other public comments into consideration before asking the court in this case to consider whether entry of the consent decree is in the public interest.

If we can be of further assistance on this or any other matter, please contact this office.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Hewitt Pate", is written over a horizontal line.

R. Hewitt Pate

TED STEVENS, ALASKA, CHAIRMAN

THAD COCHRAN, MISSISSIPPI
ARLEN SPECTER, PENNSYLVANIA
PETE V. DOMENICI, NEW MEXICO
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, MISSOURI
SLADE GORTON, WASHINGTON
MITCH MCCONNELL, KENTUCKY
CONRAD BURNS, MONTANA
RICHARD C. SHELBY, ALABAMA
JUD GRASSLEY, NEW HAMPSHIRE
ROBERT F. BENNETT, UTAH
BEN NINH THORSE CAMPBELL, COLORADO
TERRY CRAIG, IDAHO
LAUCH FAIRCLOTH, NORTH CAROLINA
KAY BAKER HUTCHISON, TEXAS

ROBERT C. BYRD, WEST VIRGINIA
DANIEL K. INOUE, HAWAII
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, SOUTH CAROLINA
PATRICK J. LEAHY, VERMONT
DALE BUMPERS, ARKANSAS
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, NEW JERSEY
TOM HARKIN, IOWA
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, MARYLAND
HARRY REID, NEVADA
HERB KOHL, WISCONSIN
PATTY MURRAY, WASHINGTON
BYRON DORGAN, NORTH DAKOTA
BARBARA BOXER, CALIFORNIA

STEVEN J. CORTESE, STAFF DIRECTOR
JAMES H. ENGLISH, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6025

December 30, 2003

Mr. William Moschella
Assistant Attorney General for Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Room 1145
Washington, D.C. 20530


Dear Mr. Moschella:

The enclosed communication is respectfully referred for your consideration, since it concerns a matter within the jurisdiction of your office.

I would appreciate your looking into the matter referenced in the accompanying letter, and providing me with your views on the concerns raised by my constituent.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,



Robert C. Byrd

RCB: kh
Enclosures

October, 29, 2003

809 Cypress Street
Ravenswood, WV 26164

Senator Robert C. Byrd
311 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington D.C., 20510

Regarding: Sale of Ravenswood, West Virginia Rolling Mill

Dear Senator Byrd,

The Ravenswood Aluminum Plants' Salaried Retiree Organization is writing this letter to express our concern about the current events as they relate to the Alcan purchase of Pechiney Aluminum.

We understand that the U.S. Justice Department has approved the purchase but Alcan must divest themselves of the Ravenswood Rolling Mill.

It is our understanding that Pechiney purchased the Plant in September 1999 to better compete with Aloca in the critical Aerospace Market. Pechiney has spent in excess of \$125 million to improve the Plant's capacity and capability for this Market. The forced sale of Ravenswood will certainly enhance Alcoa's plate position in the world market with a smaller producer's ownership of Ravenswood.

According to the previous and current management, this Plant has not been profitable since it was sold by Kaiser Aluminum in 1989. It is therefore, our desire that Alcan/Pechiney retain the legacy cost, i.e. Pensions, Medical, and Life Insurance for the existing Retirees.

This legacy cost must be addressed to allow this Plant to be profitable. If not, it will in all probability go the way of the Steel Mills and severely impact our State and Community.

As an organization we are willing to have one or more of our Retirees assist the Trustees of the Plant during its transition

Your immediate attention to this matter is requested!

Sincerely,



L.D. Whitman
Retired Plant Manager
Chairman Ravenswood Aluminum Retired Salary Association Committee.



DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Antitrust Division

R. HEWITT PATE
Assistant Attorney General

Main Justice Building
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530-0001
(202) 514-2401 / (202) 616-2645 (Fax)
E-mail: antitrust@usdoj.gov
Web site: <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr>

FEB 25 2004

The Honorable Robert C. Byrd
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Byrd:

This responds to your letter to the Department of Justice forwarding concerns of your constituent Toni Burks regarding the proposed consent decree in *United States v. Alcan Inc.* The proposed decree requires that, to resolve the Department's concern that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would harm competition in the production and sale of brazing sheet in North America, the parties divest Pechiney's aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia. Ms. Burks is concerned that if there is no attractive buyer for the facility, Alcan might decide to close it.

The decree requires that the Ravenswood plant be sold to someone able to successfully operate it and provide competition for Alcan; this is a cornerstone of the decree. Simply closing the plant would not address the competitive problem. Alcan and Pechiney have hired an investment banking firm to identify prospective purchasers and help arrange the purchase, and the Department has no reason to believe that these efforts will not be successful. Furthermore, even if the parties do not find a purchaser acceptable to the Department on their own, the Department would appoint a trustee to conduct an independent search for a purchaser.

Please be assured that the Antitrust Division will take Ms. Burks's comments and all other public comments into consideration before asking the court in this case to consider whether entry of the consent decree is in the public interest. If we can be of further assistance on this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Hewitt Pate", is written over a horizontal line.

R. Hewitt Pate



DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Antitrust Division

R. HEWITT PATE
Assistant Attorney General

Main Justice Building
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530-0001
(202) 514-2401 / (202) 616-2645 (Fax)
E-mail: antitrust@usdoj.gov
Web site: <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr>

NOV 20 2003

The Honorable Shelley Moore Capito
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congresswoman Capito:

This responds to the e-mail you forwarded from your constituent Toni Burks regarding the proposed consent decree in *United States v. Alcan Inc.* The proposed decree requires that, to resolve the Department of Justice's concern that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would harm competition in the production and sale of brazing sheet in North America, the parties divest Pechiney's aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia. Ms. Burks expresses concern that if there is no buyer for this facility, Alcan might retain it and later decide to close it.

The requirement that the Ravenswood plant be sold to someone who will be able to successfully operate the facility and provide competition for Alcan is a cornerstone of the proposed consent decree. Alcan and Pechiney have recently retained an investment banking firm to identify prospective purchasers and help arrange the purchase, and the Antitrust Division has no reason to believe that these efforts will not be successful. Please be assured that the Antitrust Division will take Ms. Burks's and all other public comments into consideration before asking the court in this case to consider whether entry of the consent decree is in the public interest.

If we can be of further assistance on this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Hewitt Pate", is written over a horizontal line.

R. Hewitt Pate
Assistant Attorney General

cc: Toni Burks

TED STEVENS, ALASKA, CHAIRMAN

THAD COCHRAN, MISSISSIPPI
WILLIAM SPECTER, PENNSYLVANIA
PETER V. DOMENICI, NEW MEXICO
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, MISSOURI
BLAKE GORTON, WASHINGTON
MITCH MCCONNELL, KENTUCKY
CONRAD BURNS, MONTANA
RICHARD C. SHELBY, ALABAMA
LUDD GREGG, NEW HAMPSHIRE
ROBERT F. BENNETT, UTAH
KEN NICHOLSON, COLORADO
ARRY CRAIG, IDAHO
ALUCH FAIRCLOTH, NORTH CAROLINA
LAW BAILEY HUTCHISON, TEXAS

ROBERT C. BYRD, WEST VIRGINIA
DANIEL K. INOUE, HAWAII
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, SOUTH CAROLINA
PATRICK J. LEAHY, VERMONT
DALE BUMPERS, ARKANSAS
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, NEW JERSEY
TOM HARKIN, IOWA
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, MARYLAND
HARRY REID, NEVADA
HERB KOHL, WISCONSIN
PATTY MURRAY, WASHINGTON
BYRON DORGAN, NORTH DAKOTA
BARBARA BOXER, CALIFORNIA

STEVEN J. CORTESE, STAFF DIRECTOR
JAMES H. ENGLISH, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6025

December 30, 2003

Mr. William Moschella
Assistant Attorney General for Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Room 1145
Washington, D.C. 20530


Dear Mr. Moschella:

The enclosed communication is respectfully referred for your consideration, since it concerns a matter within the jurisdiction of your office.

I would appreciate your looking into the matter referenced in the accompanying e-mail, and providing me with your views on the concerns raised by my constituent.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,


Robert C. Byrd

RCB: kh
Enclosures

Snapshot Report: Incoming Constituent Message

Imported through WebresponD Daemon

Report Date: 9/30/2003

Assign Staff: email

Address To: General

Name: Mrs. Toni

Burks

Address: 705 Chambers Drive

Ravenswood WV 26164

USA

Email Addr: burkst@charter.net

URL:

Home Phone: (304) 273-9680

Cell Phone:

Work Phone:

Fax:

Salutation: Dear Mrs. Burks:

In Type:

Reply Ltr:

Interest Code: W-BUSINESS

Org Name:

Assign Ltr:

Classification:

P. Code:

Category 1:

Ref. Number:

Grp Id: W030930

Category 2:

Title:

Category 3:

Message Body:

Subject Desc: Business

Date Received: 9/29/2003 10:01:27 PM

Dear Senator Byrd,

We have just heard the Justice Department has approved the Alcan purchase of Pechiney subject to the divestiture of the Ravenswood Aluminum operations.

Those of us in Ravenswood have also heard there is very likely no buyer and that Pechiney will be shutting the plant down "if that's what it takes to seal the deal." The closure may be rumor, but sounds plausible.

Jobs in West Virginia are so precious and few, is there anything you can do?

Thank you,

Toni Burks
Ravenswood, WV

HELLEY MOORE CAPITO
2ND DISTRICT, WEST VIRGINIA

COMMITTEES:
TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE
FINANCIAL SERVICES
SMALL BUSINESS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-4802

October 3, 2003

1431 LONGWORTH H.O.B.
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-4802
202-225-2711

4815 MACCORKLE AVE.
CHARLESTON, W.V. 25304
304-925-5964

300 FOXCROFT AVE.
SUITE 102
MARTINSBURG, W.V. 25401
304-264-8810

WWW.HOUSE.GOV/CAPITO

Christopher Rizzuto
Director of Congressional and Public Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, N.W. 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20531

Dear Director:

Recently a constituent of mine, Toni Burks, contacted my office with concerns about a recent Justice Department ruling. After reviewing the request, I have forwarded the letter to you so that the matter can be more directly handled.

Thank you for your time and effort. Please send any response directly to the constituent.

Sincerely,



Shelley Moore Capito, M.C.

View e:\emailobj\200309\2\929220203.txt

From: Write your representative <writerep@www6.house.gov>
Date: 9/29/2003 10:01:56 PM
To: wv02wyr@housemail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

We have just heard the justice department has approved the Alcan purchase of Pechiney subject to the divestiture of the Ravenswood Aluminum operations. Those of us in Ravenswood have also heard there is very likely no buyer and that Pechiney will be shutting the plant down "if that's what it takes to seal the deal." The closure may be rumor, but sounds plausible.

Jobs in West Virginia are so precious and few, is there anything you can do?

Thank you,

Toni Burks
Ravenswood, WV

==== Original Formatted Message Starts Here =====

DATE: September 29, 2003 8:19 PM
NAME: Toni Burks
ADDR1: 705 Chambers Drive
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Ravenswood
STATE: West Virginia
ZIP: 26164-1305
PHONE: 304-273-9680
EMAIL: burkst@charter.net
msg:

We have just heard the justice department has approved the Alcan purchase of Pechiney subject to the divestiture of the Ravenswood Aluminum operations. Those of us in Ravenswood have also heard there is very likely no buyer and that Pechiney will be shutting the plant down "if that's what it takes to seal the deal." The closure may be rumor, but sounds plausible.

Jobs in West Virginia are so precious and few, is there anything you can do?

Thank you,

Toni Burks
Ravenswood, WV

View e:\emailobj\200309\2\929220203.txt - BCUMMINGS

Version 2.6.C.0723 (ABC) on wv02 using the QNG configuration on the qpowers/qng/OLEdb database with WORD 97 under 1024x768 resolution - 10/3/03
Set up Application Preferences for this workstation



U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Legislative Affairs

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

March 10, 2004

The Honorable Robert C. Byrd
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Byrd:

This responds to your fax to the Department of Justice forwarding concerns of Governor Wise regarding the proposed final judgment in *United States v. Alcan Inc.* The proposed final judgment requires that, to resolve the Department's concern that Alcan's acquisition of Pechiney would harm competition in the production and sale of brazing sheet in North America, the parties divest Pechiney's aluminum rolling mill in Ravenswood, West Virginia.

Governor Wise recommends that Alcan be allowed to keep Pechiney's Ravenswood plant, or that a purchaser for the plant be chosen who possesses the same operational capabilities as Alcan. The Department appreciates having the benefit of Governor Wise's perspective.

The proposed consent decree requires that the Ravenswood plant be sold to someone able to successfully operate it and provide competition for Alcan. This ability to compete effectively is a cornerstone of the decree. Closing the plant or selling the plant to an entity that is not able to compete would not address the competitive problem. Alcan and Pechiney have hired an investment banking firm to identify prospective purchasers and help arrange the purchase, and the Department has no reason to believe that these efforts will not be successful. Furthermore, even if the parties do not find a purchaser acceptable to the Department on their own, the Department would appoint a trustee to conduct an independent search for an appropriate purchaser.

Please be assured that the Antitrust Division will take Governor Wise's comments and all other public comments into consideration before asking the court in this case to consider whether entry of the consent decree is in the public interest. If we can be of further assistance on this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "William E. Moschella", is positioned above the typed name.

William E. Moschella
Assistant Attorney General

Note: Exhibit 15 is available for inspection in Room 200 of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 325 7th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202-514-2481) and at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 333 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20001. Copies of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee. Exhibit 15 is also available on the Antitrust Division's website at <<http://www.usdoj.gov/atr.cases/f202800/202847.htm>>.

Defendants' Description and Certification of Written or Oral Communications Concerning the Proposed Final Judgment in This Action

Pursuant to Section 2(g) of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(g), defendants Alcan, Inc., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC, ("Defendants") by their attorneys, submit the following description and certification of all written or oral communications by or on behalf of any of the Defendants with any officer or employee of the United States concerning or relevant to the proposed Final Judgment filed in this action on September 29, 2003. In accordance with Section 2(g), the description excludes any communications "made by counsel of record alone with the Attorney General or the employees of the Department of Justice alone."

Description

From September 2, 2003 to October 1, 2003, Defendants had numerous meetings and telephone conferences with employees of the United States concerning a possible settlement; from October 1, 2003 to the present date, Defendants have had additional conversations relating to the settlement. All of those contacts related to negotiation of a settlement in the general form contained in the proposed Final Judgment. Listed below are the individuals who participated in one or more of the meetings or telephone conferences.

Defendants

David McAusland, Alcan Inc.
Mac Tracy, Alcan Inc.
Martha Brooks, Alcan Inc.
D. Stuart Meiklejohn, Sullivan & Cromwell LLP
Steven Holley, Sullivan & Cromwell LLP
Michael Miller, Sullivan & Cromwell LLP

United States Department of Justice

Deborah Majoras, Antitrust Division
J. Robert Kramer II, Antitrust Division
Maribeth Petrizzi, Antitrust Division
Anthony Harris, Antitrust Division
Joseph Miller, Antitrust Division

Ronald Drennan, Antitrust Division

II. Certification

Defendants certify that they have complied with the requirements of Section 2(g) and that the description above of communications by or on behalf of Defendants, known to Defendants, of which Defendants reasonably should have known, or otherwise required to be reported under Section 2(g), is true and complete.

Dated: March 15, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,
Sullivan & Cromwell LLP
Peter Gronvall (Bar #475630)
Counsel for Alcan, Inc., Alcan Aluminum Corp., Pechiney, S.A., and Pechiney Rolled Products, LLC.

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on this 15 day of March, 2004, I caused a true copy of the foregoing Defendants' Description and Certification of Written or Oral Communications Concerning the Proposed Final Judgment in this Action to be served via messenger to: Anthony E. Harris, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Litigation II Section, 1401 H Street, NW., Suite 3000, Washington, DC 20530. (202) 307-6583.

Attorney for Plaintiff United States of America

Dated: March 15, 2004.

Peter B. Gronvall (Bar No. 475630),
Sullivan & Cromwell, LLP,
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.,
Washington, DC 20006-5805, Tel:
(202) 956-7500.

[FR Doc. 04-7264 Filed 4-8-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment Standards Administration, Wage and Hour Division

Minimum Wages for Federal and Federally Assisted Construction; General Wage Determination Decisions

General wage determination decisions of the Secretary of Labor are issued in accordance with applicable law and are based on the information obtained by the Department of Labor from its study of local wage conditions and data made available from other sources. They specify the basic hourly wage rates and fringe benefits which are determined to be prevailing for the described classes of laborers and mechanics employed on construction projects of a similar character and in the localities specified therein.

The determinations in these decisions of prevailing rates and fringe benefits have been made in accordance with 29 CFR Part 1, by authority of the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494, as amended, 40 U.S.C. 276a) and of other Federal statutes referred to in 29 CFR Part 1, Appendix, as well as such additional statutes as may from time to time be enacted containing provisions for the payment of wages determined to be prevailing by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. The prevailing rates and fringe benefits determined in these decisions shall, in accordance with the provisions of the foregoing statutes, constitute the minimum wages payable on Federal and federally assisted construction projects to laborers and mechanics of the specified classes engaged on contract work of the character and in the localities described therein.

Good cause is hereby found for not utilizing notice and public comment procedure thereon prior to the issuance of these determinations as prescribed in 5 U.S.C. 553 and not providing for delay in the effective date as prescribed in that section, because the necessity to issue current construction industry wage determinations frequently and in large volume causes procedures to be impractical and contrary to the public interest.

General wage determination decisions, and modifications and supersedes decisions thereto, contain no expiration dates and are effective from their date of notice in the **Federal Register**, or on the date written notice is received by the agency, whichever is earlier. These decisions are to be used in accordance with the provisions of 29 CFR Parts 1 and 5. Accordingly, the applicable decision, together with any modifications issued, must be made a part of every contract for performance of the described work within the geographic area indicated as required by an applicable Federal prevailing wage law and 29 CFR Part 5. The wage rates and fringe benefits, notice of which is published herein, and which are contained in the Government Printing Office (GPO) document entitled "General Wage Determinations Issued Under The Davis-Bacon And Related Acts," shall be the minimum paid by contractors and subcontractors to laborers and mechanics.

Any person, organization, or governmental agency having an interest in the rates determined as prevailing is encouraged to submit wage rate and fringe benefit information for consideration by the Department.