collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format.

We are soliciting comments on the proposed ICR that is described below. We are especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is the collection necessary to the proper functions of the OST; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the OST enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the OST minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. We will include or summarize each comment in our request to OMB to approve this ICR. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Abstract: This notice is for renewal of information collection under OMB regulations at 5 CFR part 1320 that implement the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq. These regulations require interested members of the public and affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping activities (see 5 CFR 1320.8 (d)). This notice identifies an information collection activity that the OST is submitting to OMB for renewal. Public Law 103–412, The American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994, allows Indian tribes on a voluntary basis to take their funds out of trust status within the Department of the Interior (and the Federal Government) in order to manage such funds on their own. 25 CFR part 1200, subpart B, Sec. 1200.13, “How does a tribe apply to withdraw funds?” describes the requirements for application for withdrawal. The Act covers all tribal trust funds including judgment funds as well as some settlements funds, but excludes funds held in Individual Indian Money accounts. Both the Act and the regulations state that upon withdrawal of the funds, the Department of the Interior (and the Federal Government) have no further liability for such funds. Accompanying their application for withdrawal of trust funds, tribes are required to submit a Management Plan for managing the funds being withdrawn, to protect the funds once they are out of trust status.

This information collection allows the OST to collect the tribes’ applications for withdrawal of funds held in trust by the Department of the Interior. If OST did not collect this information, the OST would not be able to comply with the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994, and tribes would not be able to withdraw funds held for them in trust by the Department of the Interior.

Title of Collection: Application to Withdraw Tribal Funds from Trust Status, 25 CFR 1200.
OMB Control Number: 1035–0003.
Form Number: None.
Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.
Respondents/Affected Public: Tribal governments.
Total Estimated Number of Annual Respondents: One respondent, on average, every three years.
Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 1.
Estimated Completion Time per Response: 750 hours.
Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours: 750.
Respondent’s Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit.
Frequency of Collection: Once per tribe per trust fund withdrawal application.
Total Estimated Annual Non-hour Burden Cost: None.
An agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The authority for this action is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

Jerald Gidner,
Principal Deputy Special Trustee, Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians.
[FR Doc. 2018–25726 Filed 11–23–18; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4334–63–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–589 and 731–TA–1394–1395 (Final)]
Forged Steel Fittings From China and Italy

Determinations
On the basis of the record developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of forged steel fittings from China and Italy that have been found by the U.S. Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (“LTFV”), and to be subsidized by the government of China.

Background
The Commission instituted these investigations effective October 5, 2017, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and Commerce by Bonney Forge Corporation, Mount Union, Pennsylvania, and the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Effective May 17, 2018, the Commission established a general schedule for the conduct of the final phase of its investigations on forged steel fittings, following notification of preliminary determinations by Commerce that imports of forged steel fittings from China, Italy, and Taiwan were being sold at LTFV within the meaning of 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the final phase of the Commission’s investigations and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission.

1 The record is defined in sec. 207.2(t) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(t)).
Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the Federal Register on June 4, 2018 (83 FR 25715). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on August 2, 2018, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel. The Commission subsequently issued its final affirmative determination regarding dumped imports of forged steel fittings from Taiwan on September 14, 2018 (83 FR 47640, September 20, 2018). Following notification of final determinations by Commerce that imports of forged steel fittings from Italy and China were being sold at LTFV within the meaning of section 735(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1677d(a)),3 and subsidized by the government of China within meaning of section 703(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671d(a)),4 notice of the supplemental schedule of the final phase of the Commission’s antidumping and countervailing duty investigations with respect to China and Italy was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the Federal Register of October 22, 2018 (83 FR 53295).

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to sections 705(b) and 735(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b) and 19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on November 19, 2018. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4850 (November 2018), entitled Forged Steel Fittings from China and Italy: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–589 and 731–TA–1394–1395 (Final). By order of the Commission. Issued: November 19, 2018.

Katherine Hiner,
Supervisory Attorney.

[FR Doc. 2018–25612 Filed 11–23–18; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Antitrust Division
United States v. CRH plc, et al.; Response to Public Comment

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(b)–(h), that one comment was received concerning the proposed Final Judgment in this case, and that comment together with the Response of the United States to Public Comment have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in United States of America v. CRH plc, et al., Civil Action No. 1:18–cv–1473. Copies of the comment and the United States’ Response are available for inspection on the Antitrust Division’s website at http://www.justice.gov/atr and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Patricia A. Brink,
Director of Civil Enforcement.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia

Judge: Dabney L. Friedrich

RESPONSE OF PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES TO PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT

Pursuant to the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act (the “APPA” or “Tunney Act”), 15 U.S.C. §§ 16(b)–(h), the United States hereby responds to the public comment received regarding the proposed Final Judgment in this case. After careful consideration of the submitted comment, the United States continues to believe that the divestiture required by the proposed Final Judgment provides an effective and appropriate remedy for the antitrust violation alleged in the Complaint. In addition, the divestiture has the effect of increasing competitive choices for some customers. As a result of the divestiture, two quarries that previously did not compete—because they were under common ownership—now do. The United States will move the Court for entry of the proposed Final Judgment after the public comment and this response have been published pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 16(d).

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendants CRH plc and CRH Americas Materials, Inc. (collectively, “CRH”) agreed to acquire the assets of Defendant Pounding Mill Quarry Corporation (“Pounding Mill”), which primarily consisted of four aggregate quarries located in West Virginia and Virginia. The United States filed a civil antitrust Complaint on June 22, 2018, seeking to enjoin the proposed acquisition. The Complaint alleged that the likely effect of this acquisition would be to lessen competition substantially in the markets for aggregate and asphalt concrete that are used in West Virginia Department of Transportation (“WVDOT”) road projects in southern West Virginia. This loss of competition likely would result in increased prices and decreased service in these markets. Therefore, the Complaint alleged that the proposed acquisition violates Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and should be enjoined.

Simultaneously with the filing of the Complaint, the United States filed a proposed Final Judgment, a Stipulation signed by Plaintiff and Defendants consenting to entry of the proposed Final Judgment after compliance with the requirements of the Tunney Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16, and a Competitive Impact Statement (“CIS”) describing the transaction and the proposed Final Judgment. The United States published the proposed Final Judgment and the CIS in the Federal Register on July 2, 2018, see 83 Fed. Reg. 30956 (July 2, 2018), and caused summaries of the proposed Final Judgment and CIS, together with directions for the submission of written comments relating to the proposed Final Judgment, to be published in the Washington Post and Bluefield Daily Telegraph from July 2, 2018, through July 10, 2018. The 60-day public comment period ended on September 10, 2018. The United States received one public comment. See Tunney Act Comments of the State of West Virginia on the Proposed Final Judgment (“WV Comment”), attached hereto as Exhibit A.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW UNDER THE APPA FOR THE PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT

The Clayton Act, as amended by the APPA, requires that proposed consent judgments in antitrust cases brought by the United States be subject to a 60-day comment period, after which the court shall determine whether entry of the proposed Final Judgment “is in the public interest.” 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1). In making that determination, the court, in accordance with the statute as amended in 2004, is required to consider:
(A) the competitive impact of such judgment, including termination of alleged violations, provisions for enforcement and modification, duration of relief sought, and anticipated effects of alternative remedies actually considered, whether its terms are...