

consumers, lesser quality products that do not have the longevity consumers have come to expect and ultimately harm the industry. Fortune’s business model relies less and less on small business relationships, rather they are actively moving away from these smaller companies in favor of larger distributors, big box stores, online retailers, etc. Since it is not clear if Yale Mechanical hardware (different from Smart locks) will be included in the divestiture, please note that the Masterlock Brand along with Yale’s padlocks could make for one sided market position. Also of note, Schaub’s product offering is not considered Mechanical door hardware.

Furthermore, the combination of Assa Abloy’s acquisition of Spectrum Brands’ HHI division and Fortune Brands’ acquisition of Emtek could give these companies a dominant market position in the residential lock and hardware industry. This could lead to higher prices, reduced innovation, and further reliance on overseas manufacturing where quality is often sacrificed and corporate profits are favored. The harm small and medium-sized businesses could experience is not conducive to sustaining healthy business practices that rely on these companies for their lock and hardware needs. Specifically, regarding the acquisition of Spectrum Brands’ HHI division by Assa Abloy, consideration must be given to the reduced intensity of competition that could take place should the following door hardware brands share common ownership: Yale, Kwikset, Baldwin, Weiser, National Hardware, EZset.

I urge the Department of Justice to carefully consider the implications of both the proposed acquisition of Spectrum Brands’ HHI division by Assa Abloy and the divestiture of Emtek and Schaub to Fortune Brands. The value of small businesses to our economy, especially in the Residential housing market is not to be taken lightly.

The antitrust laws are in place to protect the American people, and I trust that the Department of Justice will take the necessary steps to ensure fair competition in the market.

I wish to thank Attorney General Merrick Garland and Deputy Attorney General Lisa Monaco for their high level of service to the American People.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
Joseph Storrs

[FR Doc. 2023–19530 Filed 9–8–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Toxic Substances Control Act

On September 5, 2023, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree (the “Consent Decree”) with the District Court of the Southern District of New York in a lawsuit entitled *United States of America v.*

Apex Building Company, Inc., Civil Action No. 23–cv–007838.

In this action, the United States seeks, as provided under Toxic Substances Control Act (“TSCA”), injunctive relief from Apex Building Company, Inc., among others, in connection with the defendant’s unlawful work practices during renovations governed by an implementing regulation of the TSCA—the Renovation, Repair, and Painting Rule, 40 CFR part 745. The proposed consent decree resolves the United States’ claims, requires Apex Building Company, Inc. to pay \$606,706, and imposes injunctive relief.

The publication of this notice opens the public comment on the proposed settlement. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States of America v. Apex Building Company, Inc.*, DJ #90–5–2–1–12388. All comments must be submitted no later than 30 days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

<i>To submit comments:</i>	<i>Send them to:</i>
By email	<i>pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov.</i>
By mail	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, D.C. 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the settlement may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: https://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. We will provide a paper copy of the settlement upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please email your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for \$13.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

Henry S. Friedman,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2023–19532 Filed 9–8–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1117–0009]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection Activities; Extension of a Previously Approved Collection; Controlled Substances Import/Export Declaration

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 60-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Department of Justice (DOJ), will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until November 13, 2023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have additional comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Scott A. Brinks, Regulatory Drafting and Policy Support Section, Drug Enforcement Administration; Mailing Address: 8701 Morrisette Drive, Springfield, Virginia 22152; Telephone: (571) 362–3261, Email: *scott.a.brinks@dea.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological