



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,

William E. Moschella  
Assistant Attorney General

*Saunders*

**FROM THE OFFICE OF U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD**

**FAX COVER SHEET**

DATE 2/20/04

SENDER'S INITIALS KNH

TIME 3:05 pm

PAGES (INCLUDING COVER SHEET) 7

**PLEASE DELIVER TO:**

ORGANIZATION: DOJ

ATTENTION: William Moschella, Esq.

TELEPHONE NUMBER: (202) 514-2141

FAX NUMBER: (202) 514-5821

COMMENTS: Thank you for taking my call.

Referred to the Governor's office, which Senator Byrd also sent to you by mail on February 17, 2004.

U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD  
311 HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

FROM: Kathleen Neff, Esq.

TELEPHONE NUMBER: (202) 224-3360



STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA  
**OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR**  
CHARLESTON 25305

BOB WISE  
GOVERNOR

February 13, 2004

VIA FAX AND OVERNIGHT COURIER

Maribeth Petrizzi  
Chief, Litigation II Section  
Antitrust Division  
United States Department of Justice  
1401 H Street, NW  
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:

As Governor of the State of West Virginia, I object to the proposed Final Judgment in *United States v. Alcan Aluminum Corp.* and ask the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to reject the Final Judgment as currently written and to enter a final judgment that will protect the citizens of West Virginia by allowing Alcan to own the plant of Pechiney Rolled Products. The Final Judgment is flawed and the divestiture it requires is unnecessary and contrary to the public interest.

The planned merger of Alcan and Pechiney is global in scope and involves the integration of facilities and operations all over the world. It is ironic and incredible that the Justice Department somehow sees Jackson County, West Virginia, as the only area of certain danger as a result of this merger. It is wholly unacceptable that West Virginia's economy and hundreds of its citizens may suffer because the Justice Department has chosen to bargain away their rights in exchange for an agreed order to hastily and recklessly resolve a theoretical concern. It is disappointing that the Justice Department apparently has opted for the expedience of an agreed order imposing an artificial remedy and has made West Virginia's jobs and economy a bargaining chip in the process.



West Virginia does not oppose the acquisition of Pechiney, S. A. by Alcan Aluminum Corporation. However, West Virginia is vitally concerned with that part of the proposed Final Judgment that requires Alcan to divest the plant of Pechiney Rolled Products, located at Ravenswood, West Virginia. If new owners of the plant lack the qualifications necessary for success, the plant will fail and close. That would be a disaster for many people and communities in West Virginia. The economic impact of closure of this facility would be devastating for hundreds of employees and retirees of the Ravenswood facility and the economies of Jackson County and the State as a whole.

This letter of opposition is submitted to the Court and the Justice Department under the terms of the Turney Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16. Under that Act, the Court must determine whether the proposed Final Judgment is in the public interest, and may consider "effects of alternative remedies actually considered" and "the impact of such judgment upon the public generally."

The Final Judgment puts the public interest in serious jeopardy. If it is not implemented in the public interest, many persons are certain to suffer.

*The Ravenswood Plant*

The Pechiney Rolled Products plant at Ravenswood employs approximately 960 workers, 700 of whom are hourly workers. It currently has approximately 900 retirees.

The Ravenswood plant is an integrated facility that produces aluminum sheet, aluminum slab, various aluminum specialty products, and brazing sheet. The brazing sheet market is the only one that apparently concerns the Justice Department, but it makes up only a relatively small part of the plant's total output. Pechiney Rolled Products sells about 35 million pounds of brazing sheet per year. Only 28% of the plant's output is brazing sheet. Brazing sheet is a small market, and a small portion of the rolled products sales. Though the plant's larger volume products (principally aluminum plate and sheet) are not the subject of any antitrust concern, the proposed Final Judgment would affect all of the plant's products because the entire plant is to be sold pursuant to its terms.

The plant's dominant product is aluminum plate which is sold as general engineering plate and plate for the aerospace industry. Some aluminum product is produced for transportation manufacturers for railcars, tanker trailers, and wide roofs for freight trailers. The Ravenswood plant also sells rolled aluminum for building products - siding and downspouts. Aerospace customers require product that meets exacting safety standards and they rely on their suppliers for technical support. Pechiney is able to give technical customer support. It has research facilities near Grenoble, France. It has machinery for running trials. It has intellectual property rights, which it will retain after the merger. A buyer of the Ravenswood plant would have to be equally capable of meeting the demands of buyers of these products.

Brazing sheet is not a commodity product. Its production and sale are heavily dependent on technology - for product development and for customer service. There are actually forty different brazing sheet products, some of it "header stock" - the top of the radiator - and "tube stock" - the water carrying tubes that are air-cooled. Competition in the brazing sheet market

is not on price alone, but also on performance, quality, alloy development, product development, service, and long-term relationships.

#### *Defects in the Final Judgment*

The Final Judgment is defective because it compels the divestiture of the Ravenswood plant. For reasons discussed in the next section of this comment and objection, Alcan's ownership of the plant would not endanger competition in any market. The fundamental premise of the Final Judgment is erroneous.

The Final Judgment fails to account for the range of products manufactured at Ravenswood. It ignores the products other than brazing sheet. If the search for a successor fails to take the other products into account, there is substantial danger that an ostensible "new owner" found by Alcan under the Final Judgment would lack the necessary experience and technical capability of producing and selling the full range of these products.

The Final Judgment lacks adequate standards for the search for new owners of the Ravenswood plant. It provides no guidance in the event that a qualified buyer with the adequate capital capability is not found by Alcan or the trustee.

Moreover, even if a purchaser is found, it does not have to agree to be bound by the proposed Final Judgment. Consent Final Judgment, §§ II.E and IV.A.

The purchaser must demonstrate only that the acquired assets will be used "as part of a viable, ongoing business, engaged in developing, manufacturing, and selling brazing sheet in North America." Consent Final Judgment, § IV.J. This requirement ignores the important fact that brazing sheet is only one of the products (28% of the total production) manufactured at Ravenswood. In fact, the proposed Final Judgment ignores 72% of the products made by this plant that is to be sold. The plant will not survive unless the purchaser makes a commitment to make and sell *all* of the Ravenswood products.

The Final Judgment does not require the purchaser to make its commitments for any length of time. How long the purchaser must operate the plant is not specified. The purchaser need not give assurance for sustained operation.

If the divestiture process were allowed to proceed and if Alcan is unable to find a purchaser acceptable to the Justice Department within the time allowed (120-180 days after the end of the tender offer), a trustee will be appointed to make the sale. Consent Final Judgment, §§ IV.A and V. Any potential purchaser truly capable of operating the plant effectively will surely be located during the time allowed to Alcan. If the sale falls to the hands of a trustee, the likelihood of finding an effective owner of the plant is virtually nil.

The recent owners of the plant have not been able to operate it profitably. Unprofitable plants are often bought by purchasers who intend to sell off assets and go out of business. New owners might also attempt to avoid pension obligations undertaken by Pechiney, its

predecessor owners, or successors. The Final Judgment does not sufficiently guard against these disastrous possibilities.

Final judgments like the one proposed in this case often fail to result in successful operations after the divestiture. A 1999 FTC Divestiture Study<sup>1</sup> found that buyers of divested assets often lack the information necessary to carry on the business successfully. They often do not fully know what assets they need to succeed in the business, or whether the assets offered by the sellers are up to the task.<sup>2</sup> Attempts by Alcan to find purchasers experienced in brazing sheet would identify potential buyers that might not be capable of making and selling Ravenswood's other products.

Under these circumstances, particularly in light of the inadequacy of the Final Judgment, the State of West Virginia fears that the urgency in finding a buyer for Ravenswood will lead to a sale to owners who will not keep the plant open. These real dangers make it necessary for the State of West Virginia to register these objections.<sup>3</sup>

#### *The Effect of the Acquisition on Competition*

Divestiture of the Ravenswood plant, part of which includes Pechiney's Brazing Sheet Business, is totally unnecessary. Competition in the brazing sheet market is active now and will remain active after the purchase of Pechiney by Alcan. There is sound reason to believe that intense competition would continue in the brazing sheet market if Alcan retained ownership of Pechiney Rolled Products. The Final Judgment and the Justice Department's Competitive Impact Statement ("CIS") fail to analyze the effect of the acquisition on the markets for the products of Pechiney Rolled Products other than brazing sheet.

Competitors in the brazing sheet market are, in order of market share, Alcoa, Pechiney Rolled Products, Alcan and Corus. Alcoa obtained its position as the market leader when it acquired Alumax, which had brazing sheet production facilities at Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Alcoa has been, until now, the world's largest aluminum producer. The combination of Alcan and Pechiney takes that title away from Alcoa. The competition between Alcoa and Alcan around the world has been intense, and the rivalry would continue after this combination is formed,

<sup>1</sup> FTC, "A Study of the Commission's Divestiture Process" (1999), available at [www.ftc.gov/os/1999/9908/index.htm#6](http://www.ftc.gov/os/1999/9908/index.htm#6).

<sup>2</sup> See Richard Parker and David Balto, "The Evolving Approach to Merger Remedies," ANTI-TRUST REPORT, May 2000 (Matthew Bender), 2, 9.

<sup>3</sup> "One particular complication in selling Ravenswood could be the plant's capacity to produce hard alloy plate for the aerospace industry. Operating a plate mill required the support of a research and development team, according to Lloyd O'Carroll of BB&T Capital Markets, and few companies had that capability. In North America, the only company in the market besides Alcoa and Alcan-Pechiney was Houston-based Kaiser Aluminum Corp.. O'Carroll said, but Kaiser was struggling to emerge from Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection and was unlikely to have the cash to finance an acquisition unless it succeeded in selling off some of its alumina assets. Anglo-Dutch steel and aluminum producer Corus Group Plc also produces plate but has said it intends to exit the aluminum business." Online American Metal Market, October 1, 2003, [http://www.findarticles.com/cf\\_dls/m3MKT/39-3\\_111/108450462/p1/article.html](http://www.findarticles.com/cf_dls/m3MKT/39-3_111/108450462/p1/article.html).

especially since Alcoa surely will attempt to regain its standing as the world leader in brazing sheet production.

Purchasers of brazing sheet from the Ravenswood plant and other similar facilities are Tier 1 suppliers to the automotive industry. These are large, sophisticated buyers that are capable of negotiating favorable prices. Furthermore, they must qualify to supply the automobile manufacturers, and they in turn require qualification by those who supply them with materials like brazing sheet. Each Tier 1 supplier chooses suppliers of brazing sheet from whom it will demand qualification. This means that each brazing sheet producer does not compete with all other brazing sheet sellers in seeking the business of a Tier 1 supplier, but at the most one or two of the other sellers. Purchasers want to maintain at least two reliable sources. These circumstances significantly reduce the impact of market share as a factor for analysis of the anti-competitive effects of the proposed merger.

The Justice Department asserts in its CIS that Alcan is a new "maverick" that is using low prices to gain market share in the brazing sheet market. If Alcan owned the Pechiney Rolling Products plant, the Justice Department believes it would gain that market share without price concessions. This would lead it to abandon its low-price strategy, hurting purchasers who now enjoy the benefits of Alcan's low prices. That analysis by the Justice Department is highly questionable. First, as a practical matter, Alcan is unlikely to use a low price strategy any longer than necessary to gain the market share it wants. Once it gains the market share it seeks, the low price strategy will end and purchasers will not have any price benefit. Second, Alcan shares the brazing sheet market with its arch-rival Alcoa, the major seller in the market. Alcan could not raise prices above Alcoa's price, and vice versa. There is price discipline in the market with these two sellers vying with one another. Alcan's low prices are a short-term strategy. It is not worth the risks posed by the consent decree to require divestiture just to get this short term advantage. Indeed, allowing Alcan to retain the Ravenswood facility may very well create a pro-competitive effect in that Alcoa will have to find ways to regain its "world leader" title. Third, the buyers of brazing sheet are large, sophisticated purchasers who are capable of negotiating prices.

In spite of the Justice Department's concerns, Alcan would be the best owner of the Ravenswood plant. Among the reasons for this conclusion are these:

1. The divestiture is not necessary because competition in the brazing sheet market without the divestiture would continue to be intense.
2. Alcan, being aggressive in its competition with Alcoa, would maximize the potential of the Ravenswood plant better than any other owner. Contrary to the Justice Department's view that Alcan would not compete aggressively as owner of the Ravenswood plant, industry commentators believe that Alcan "could speed up the 'fixing' of Pechiney's Ravenswood facility now under way."<sup>4</sup>
3. Finding a buyer capable of maximizing the potential of the Ravenswood plant would be very difficult, if not impossible, especially in light of the previous lack of profitability of that plant and its legacy costs.

<sup>4</sup> Online Metal Center News, August 2003.


<http://metalcennews.com/2003/august/mcn0803Merger.htm> (viewed 10/6/03)

- 4. Alcan has the experience and facilities to make and sell all of the products of the Ravenswood plant, not just the brazing sheet upon which the Final Judgment focuses.

*Conclusion*

West Virginia proposes that the Final Judgment be modified to permit Alcan to retain ownership of the Pechiney Brazing Sheet Business and the other operations of Pechiney Rolled Products at Ravenswood. In the alternative, West Virginia proposes that no buyer be accepted for the Ravenswood plant that has fewer capabilities than those of Alcan, and that if the buyer fails to keep the plant in operation, the plant should revert to Alcan.

The current economic climate demands that the State of West Virginia expend every effort to ensure that no jobs are lost as the result of the Alcan/Pechiney transaction. The proposed Final Order, however, severely threatens our economy and places at severe risk the jobs of hundreds of Ravenswood plant employees and the future welfare of hundreds of its retirees. The State of West Virginia cannot stand idly by and allow its economy and citizens to be jeopardized. The public interest requires that Alcan retain ownership of the plant, or, in the alternative, that the highest priority in this divestiture be given to finding a buyer that is at least as capable as Alcan to operate the plant. If such a buyer cannot be found, Alcan should be permitted to own and operate the plant.

Very truly yours,  
  
Governor Bob Wise