

period will become part of the public record. After 30 days, the Commission will again review the Consent Agreement and the comments received, and will decide whether it should withdraw from the Consent Agreement, modify it, or make final the Decision and Order (“Order”).

II. The Parties

A. AMGH

AMGH is wholly owned by KKR North America Fund XI (AMG) LLC. It is likely the largest provider of air ambulance services in the United States with 270 operating locations in 38 states. AMGH operates as Hawaii Life Flight in Hawaii.

B. AMR

AMR is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Envision Healthcare and is the largest national ground ambulance provider in the United States, but also provides air ambulance services in several locations. In Hawaii, it provides both ground ambulance services and inter-facility air ambulance transport services. To provide inter-facility air ambulance transport services, AMR partners with LifeTeam, an air ambulance provider located in the Midwest, which has the necessary FAA licenses and certifications, and provides the pilots and maintenance for the fixed-wing aircraft. AMR handles the marketing, medical personnel, and billing for the services provided.

III. The Proposed Acquisition

Under an agreement executed on August 7, 2017, AMGH will acquire 100 percent of the voting stock of AMR in a deal valued at approximately \$2.4 billion.

The Commission’s Complaint alleges that the Acquisition, if consummated would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 18, and Section 5 of the FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 45, by substantially lessening competition for the provision of inter-facility air ambulance transport services in Hawaii.

IV. The Relevant Market and Structure of the Markets

The Commission’s Complaint alleges that the relevant product market in which to analyze the Acquisition is the provision of inter-facility air ambulance transport services. These services consist of air ambulance services that transfer patients between medical facilities on different islands, including from medical facilities with low acuity or limited patient treatment capabilities to those that can provide the appropriate medical and surgical care.

The Commission’s Complaint alleges that the relevant geographic market in which to analyze the effects of the Acquisition is the State of Hawaii.

The Commission’s Complaint alleges that the Acquisition will increase concentration in an already highly concentrated market. AMGH and AMR are the only two providers of inter-facility air ambulance transport services in Hawaii.

V. Effects of the Transaction

According to the Commission, the effect of the Acquisition, if consummated, may be substantially to lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly in inter-facility air ambulance transport services, and increase the likelihood of the unilateral exercise of market power. The Acquisition would increase the likelihood that consumers, third-party payers, or government health care providers would be forced to pay higher prices or experience degradation in service or quality.

VI. Entry Conditions

The Commission’s Complaint alleges that entry into the relevant market would not be timely, likely, or sufficient to deter or counteract the anticompetitive effects of the Acquisition. The primary barrier to entry is the lack of sufficient volume of referrals and payments from third party payers to justify the economic risk of new entry, even if the parties imposed a small but significant non-transitory increase in price (SSNIP).

VII. The Proposed Consent Agreement

The proposed Consent Agreement remedies the anticompetitive concerns raised by the Acquisition by requiring AMR to sell its inter-facility air ambulance transport services business, including the assets that support that business, to AIRMD, LLC, dba LifeTeam. LifeTeam is a large, established company with experience in the industry. It is also the current operator of the FAA certified aircraft used by AMR for inter-facility air ambulance transport services in Hawaii, and thus very familiar with AMR’s assets and operations in Hawaii. Under the proposed Consent Agreement, AMR will divest to LifeTeam the four-fixed wing aircraft it uses to fly patients inter-island, support LifeTeam’s application for a Certificate of Need with the State of Hawaii to operate ground ambulances, and offer LifeTeam the option to purchase up to four ground ambulances from AMR. LifeTeam would use the ground ambulances to support its air ambulance transport service to

transfer patients to and from medical facilities and the aircraft it operates.

The proposed Consent Agreement also contains an Order to Maintain Assets that will issue at the time the proposed Consent Agreement is accepted for public comment. The Order to Maintain Assets requires Respondents to operate and maintain the divestiture assets in the normal course of business through the date that the Respondents complete divestiture of the assets, thereby maintaining the economic viability, marketability, and competitiveness of the assets. The Order to Maintain Assets also authorizes the Commission to appoint an independent third party as a monitor to oversee the Respondents’ compliance with the requirements of the proposed Consent Agreement.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the proposed Consent agreement, and the Commission does not intend this analysis to constitute an official interpretation of the proposed Consent Agreement or to modify its terms in any way.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2018–05251 Filed 3–14–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–P

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[File No. 161 0230]

Oregon Lithoprint, Inc.; Analysis To Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed consent agreement.

SUMMARY: The consent agreement in this matter settles alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair methods of competition. The attached Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes both the allegations in the complaint and the terms of the consent order—embodied in the consent agreement—that would settle these allegations.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 8, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties may file a comment online or on paper, by following the instructions in the Request for Comment part of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below. Write: “In the Matter of Oregon Lithoprint, Inc., File No. 161 0230” on your comment, and file your comment online at <https://ftcpublic.commentworks.com/ftc/oregonlithoprintconsent> by following the instructions on the web-based form. If

you prefer to file your comment on paper, write “In the Matter of Oregon Lithoprint, Inc., File No. 161 0230” on your comment and on the envelope, and mail your comment to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite CC–5610 (Annex D), Washington, DC 20580, or deliver your comment to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Constitution Center, 400 7th Street SW, 5th Floor, Suite 5610 (Annex D), Washington, DC 20024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Turner (202–326–3619), Bureau of Competition, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20580.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 46(f), and FTC Rule 2.34, 16 CFR 2.34, notice is hereby given that the above-captioned consent agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days. The following Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes the terms of the consent agreement, and the allegations in the complaint. An electronic copy of the full text of the consent agreement package can be obtained from the FTC Home Page (for March 9, 2018), on the World Wide Web, at <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/commission-actions>.

You can file a comment online or on paper. For the Commission to consider your comment, we must receive it on or before April 8, 2018. Write “In the Matter of Oregon Lithoprint, Inc., File No. 161 0230” on your comment. Your comment—including your name and your state—will be placed on the public record of this proceeding, including, to the extent practicable, on the public Commission website, at <https://www.ftc.gov/policy/public-comments>.

Postal mail addressed to the Commission is subject to delay due to heightened security screening. As a result, we encourage you to submit your comments online. To make sure that the Commission considers your online comment, you must file it at <https://ftcpublishcommentworks.com/ftc/oregonlithoprintconsent> by following the instructions on the web-based form. If this Notice appears at <http://www.regulations.gov/#!home>, you also may file a comment through that website.

If you prefer to file your comment on paper, write “In the Matter of Oregon

Lithoprint, Inc., File No. 161 0230” on your comment and on the envelope, and mail your comment to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite CC–5610 (Annex D), Washington, DC 20580, or deliver your comment to the following address: Federal Trade Commission, Office of the Secretary, Constitution Center, 400 7th Street SW, 5th Floor, Suite 5610 (Annex D), Washington, DC 20024. If possible, submit your paper comment to the Commission by courier or overnight service.

Because your comment will be placed on the publicly accessible FTC website at <https://www.ftc.gov>, you are solely responsible for making sure that your comment does not include any sensitive or confidential information. In particular, your comment should not include any sensitive personal information, such as your or anyone else’s Social Security number; date of birth; driver’s license number or other state identification number, or foreign country equivalent; passport number; financial account number; or credit or debit card number. You are also solely responsible for making sure that your comment does not include any sensitive health information, such as medical records or other individually identifiable health information. In addition, your comment should not include any “trade secret or any commercial or financial information which . . . is privileged or confidential”—as provided by Section 6(f) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. 46(f), and FTC Rule 4.10(a)(2), 16 CFR 4.10(a)(2)—including in particular competitively sensitive information such as costs, sales statistics, inventories, formulas, patterns, devices, manufacturing processes, or customer names.

Comments containing material for which confidential treatment is requested must be filed in paper form, must be clearly labeled “Confidential,” and must comply with FTC Rule 4.9(c). In particular, the written request for confidential treatment that accompanies the comment must include the factual and legal basis for the request, and must identify the specific portions of the comment to be withheld from the public record. See FTC Rule 4.9(c). Your comment will be kept confidential only if the General Counsel grants your request in accordance with the law and the public interest. Once your comment has been posted on the public FTC website—as legally required by FTC Rule 4.9(b)—we cannot redact or remove your comment from the FTC website, unless you submit a

confidentiality request that meets the requirements for such treatment under FTC Rule 4.9(c), and the General Counsel grants that request.

Visit the FTC website at <http://www.ftc.gov> to read this Notice and the news release describing it. The FTC Act and other laws that the Commission administers permit the collection of public comments to consider and use in this proceeding, as appropriate. The Commission will consider all timely and responsive public comments that it receives on or before April 8, 2018. For information on the Commission’s privacy policy, including routine uses permitted by the Privacy Act, see <https://www.ftc.gov/site-information/privacy-policy>.

Analysis of Agreement Containing Consent Orders To Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission (“Commission”) has accepted, subject to final approval, an agreement containing consent order (“Consent Agreement”) from Oregon Lithoprint Inc. (“OLI”). The Commission’s Complaint alleges that OLI violated Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 45, by inviting a competitor in the publication of foreclosure notices to divide clients by geographic market.

Under the terms of the proposed Consent Agreement, OLI is required to cease and desist from communicating with its competitors about the placement of foreclosure notices. It is also barred from entering into, participating in, inviting, or soliciting an agreement with any competitor to divide markets or to allocate customers.

The Consent Agreement has been placed on the public record for 30 days for receipt of comments from interested members of the public. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After 30 days, the Commission will review the Consent Agreement again and the comments received, and will decide whether it should withdraw from the Consent Agreement or make final the accompanying Decision and Order (“Proposed Order”).

The purpose of this Analysis to Aid Public Comment is to invite and facilitate public comment. It is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the proposed Consent Agreement and the accompanying Proposed Order or in any way to modify their terms.

I. The Complaint

The allegations of the Complaint are summarized below:

OLI owns the News-Register, a twice-weekly community newspaper based in Yamhill, Oregon. Among other things, the News-Register charges clients to publish a type of legal notice known as a foreclosure notice. Under Oregon law, parties foreclosing on real property must place a notice of foreclosure in a qualifying newspaper in the county within which the property is located.

The News-Register's only competitor in Yamhill County is The Newberg Graphic, a weekly community newspaper. The Newberg Graphic also publishes foreclosure notices, and it charges considerably less than the News-Register for the service. The News-Register has more subscribers and a wider circulation within Yamhill County than The Newberg Graphic.

In August 2016, the publisher of the News-Register learned that a client intended to place foreclosure notices only in The Newberg Graphic from that point on because The Newberg Graphic was less expensive than the News-Register. In response, on August 29, 2016, the publisher emailed a manager at the parent company of The Newberg Graphic and explained the publisher's view that, under state law, foreclosure notices should be placed in the newspaper with the largest circulation in the area that the property is located. The publisher concluded his email by inviting the competitor to join the News-Register in instructing mutual clients that they should place foreclosure notices in the newspaper dominant in the area of the foreclosed property. The parent company of the The Newberg Graphic rejected the invitation and reported it to the Federal Trade Commission.

Several months later, in October 2016, the publisher of the News-Register emailed the competitor again to state that the News-Register had told a client to use The Newberg Graphic because the property in question was located in its area, and that the client was in fact going to use The Newberg Graphic to publish the notice. He ended the email stating "[i]t is probably too much to expect that others would do likewise."

The parent company of the The Newberg Graphic interpreted this second email as another invitation to collude, rejected the invitation, and reported it to the Federal Trade Commission.

II. Analysis

OLI's August 29, 2016, email to its competitor is an explicit attempt to arrange an agreement between the two companies to divide foreclosure notices by geography. It is an invitation to collude. The October 2016 email is also

an invitation to collude: OLI proposed a market allocation scheme and expressed a hope that its competitor would join that conduct. The Commission has long held that invitations to collude violate Section 5 of the FTC Act.

In a 2015 statement, the Commission explained that unfair methods of competition under Section 5 "must cause, or be likely to cause, harm to competition or the competitive process, taking into account any associated cognizable efficiencies and business justifications."¹ Potential violations are evaluated under a "framework similar to the rule of reason."² Competitive effects analysis under the rule of reason depends upon the nature of the conduct that is under review.³

An invitation to collude is "potentially harmful and . . . serves no legitimate business purpose."⁴ For this reason, the Commission treats such conduct as "inherently suspect" (that is, presumptively anticompetitive).⁵ Accordingly, an invitation to collude can be condemned under Section 5 without a showing that the respondent possesses market power.⁶

The Commission has long held that an invitation to collude violates Section 5 of the FTC Act even where there is no proof that the competitor accepted the

¹ Fed. Trade Comm'n, Statement of Enforcement Principles Regarding "Unfair Methods of Competition" Under Section 5 of the FTC Act (Aug. 13, 2015) (Section 5 Unfair Methods of Competition Policy Statement), available at https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_statements/735201/150813section5enforcement.pdf. Acting Chairman Ohlhausen dissented from the issuance of the Section 5 Unfair Methods of Competition Policy Statement. See <https://www.ftc.gov/public-statements/2015/08/dissenting-statement-commissioner-ohlhausen-ftc-act-section-5-policy>.

² Section 5 Unfair Methods of Competition Policy Statement.

³ See, e.g., *California Dental Ass'n v. FTC*, 526 U.S. 756, 781 (1999) ("What is required . . . is an inquiry meet for the case, looking to the circumstances, details, and logic of a restraint").

⁴ *In re Valassis Commc'ns., Inc.*, 141 F.T.C. 247, 283 (2006) (Analysis of Agreement Containing Consent Order to Aid Public Comment); see also Address by FTC Chairwoman Edith Ramirez, Section 5 Enforcement Principles, George Washington University Law School at 5 (Aug. 13, 2015), available at https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_statements/735411/150813section5speech.pdf.

⁵ See, e.g., *In re North Carolina Bd. of Dental Examiners*, 152 F.T.C. 640, 668 (2011) (noting that conduct is inherently suspect if it can be "reasonably characterized as 'giv[ing] rise to an intuitively obviously inference of anticompetitive effect.'" (citation omitted)).

⁶ See, e.g., *In re Realcomp II, Ltd.*, 148 F.T.C. ___, No. 9320, 2009 FTC LEXIS 250 at *51 (Oct. 30, 2009) (Comm'n Op.) (explaining that if conduct is "inherently suspect" in nature, and there are no cognizable procompetitive justifications, the Commission can condemn it "without proof of market power or actual effects").

invitation.⁷ This is for several reasons. First, unaccepted solicitations may facilitate coordination between competitors because they reveal information about the solicitor's intentions or preferences. Second, it can be difficult to discern whether a competitor has accepted a solicitation. Third, finding a violation may deter conduct that has no legitimate business purpose.⁸

III. The Proposed Consent Order

The Proposed Order contains the following substantive provisions:

Section II, Paragraph A of the Proposed Order enjoins OLI from entering or attempting to enter any agreement to refuse to publish legal notices or allocate customers for the publication of legal notices.

Section II, Paragraph B prohibits OLI from publically or privately communicating with a competitor that the competitor should advise customers to place foreclosure notices in the newspaper with the widest circulation in the area in which the property is located, or refuse to publish notices for properties located in a competitor's primary distribution area.

Section II, Paragraph C, contains three provisos. The first allows OLI to communicate with any governmental body regarding the proper interpretation of state law related to legal notices. The second allows OLI to participate with any effort of the Oregon newspaper association to lobby any governmental body regarding legal notices. The third allows OLI to disseminate information regarding legal notices to the public.

Sections III–VI of the Proposed Order impose certain standard reporting and compliance requirements on OLI.

The Proposed Order will expire in 10 years.

⁷ See, e.g., *In re Valassis Commc'ns, Inc.*, 141 F.T.C. 247 (2006); *In re Stone Container*, 125 F.T.C. 853 (1998); *In re Precision Moulding*, 122 F.T.C. 104 (1996). See also *In re McWane, Inc.*, Docket No. 9351, *Opinion of the Commission on Motions for Summary Decision* at 20–21 (F.T.C. Aug. 9, 2012) ("an invitation to collude is 'the quintessential example of the kind of conduct that should be . . . challenged as a violation of Section 5'" (citing the Statement of Chairman Liebowitz and Commissioners Kovacic and Rosch, *In re U-Haul Int'l, Inc.*, 150 F.T.C. 1, 53 (2010)). This conclusion has been endorsed by leading antitrust scholars. See P. Areeda & H. Hovenkamp, VI ANTITRUST LAW ¶ 1419 (2003); Stephen Calkins, *Counterpoint: The Legal Foundation of the Commission's Use of Section 5 to Challenge Invitations to Collude is Secure*, ANTITRUST Spring 2000, at 69. In a case brought under a state's version of Section 5, the First Circuit expressed support for the Commission's application of Section 5 to invitations to collude. *Liu v. Amerco*, 677 F.3d 489 (1st Cir. 2012).

⁸ *In re Valassis Commc'c, Inc.*, 141 F.T.C. 247, 283 (2006) (Analysis of Agreement Containing Consent Order to Aid Public Comment).

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the proposed Consent agreement, and the Commission does not intend this analysis to constitute an official interpretation of the proposed Consent Agreement or to modify its terms in any way.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2018-05252 Filed 3-14-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[Docket No. CDC-2016-0094]

Final Revised Vaccine Information Materials for MMR (Measles, Mumps, and Rubella) and MMRV (Measles, Mumps, Rubella, and Varicella) Vaccines

AGENCY: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act (NCVIA), CDC must develop vaccine information materials that all health care providers are required to give to patients/parents prior to administration of specific vaccines. On October 18, 2016, CDC published a notice in the **Federal Register** seeking public comments on proposed updated vaccine information materials for MMR vaccine and MMRV vaccine. Following review of comments submitted and consultation as required under the law, CDC has finalized the materials. Copies of the final vaccine information materials for MMR and MMRV vaccine are available to download from <http://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/hcp/vis/index.html> or <http://www.regulations.gov> (see Docket Number CDC-2016-0094).

DATES: Beginning no later than June 1, 2018, each health care provider who administers MMR or MMRV vaccine to any child or adult in the United States shall provide copies of the relevant vaccine information materials referenced in this notice, dated February 12, 2018, in conformance with the February 23, 2018 CDC Instructions for the Use of Vaccine Information Statements prior to providing such vaccinations.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Suzanne Johnson-DeLeon (msj1@

cdc.gov), National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Mailstop A-19, 1600 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30329.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-660), as amended by section 708 of Public Law 103-183, added section 2126 to the Public Health Service Act. Section 2126, codified at 42 U.S.C. 300aa-26, requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop and disseminate vaccine information materials for distribution by all health care providers in the United States to any patient (or to the parent or legal representative in the case of a child) receiving vaccines covered under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (VICP).

Development and revision of the vaccine information materials, also known as Vaccine Information Statements (VIS), have been delegated by the Secretary to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Section 2126 requires that the materials be developed, or revised, after notice to the public, with a 60-day comment period, and in consultation with the Advisory Commission on Childhood Vaccines, appropriate health care provider and parent organizations, and the Food and Drug Administration. The law also requires that the information contained in the materials be based on available data and information, be presented in understandable terms, and include:

- (1) A concise description of the benefits of the vaccine,
- (2) A concise description of the risks associated with the vaccine,
- (3) A statement of the availability of the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, and
- (4) Such other relevant information as may be determined by the Secretary.

The vaccines initially covered under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program were diphtheria, tetanus, pertussis, measles, mumps, rubella, and poliomyelitis vaccines. Since April 15, 1992, any health care provider in the United States who intends to administer one of these covered vaccines is required to provide copies of the relevant vaccine information materials prior to administration of any of these vaccines. Since then, the following vaccines have been added to the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, requiring use of vaccine information materials for them as well: Hepatitis B, *Haemophilus influenzae* type b (Hib), varicella (chickenpox), pneumococcal conjugate,

rotavirus, hepatitis A, meningococcal, human papillomavirus (HPV), and seasonal influenza vaccines.

Instructions for use of the vaccine information materials are found on the CDC website at: <http://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/hcp/vis/index.html>.

Revised Vaccine Information Materials

The vaccine information materials referenced in this notice were developed in consultation with the Advisory Commission on Childhood Vaccines, the Food and Drug Administration, and parent and healthcare provider organizations. Following consultation and review of comments submitted, the vaccine information materials covering MMR and MMRV vaccines have been finalized and are available to download from <http://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/hcp/vis/index.html> or <http://www.regulations.gov> (see Docket Number CDC-2016-0094). The Vaccine Information Statements (VISs) are “MMR Vaccine (Measles, Mumps, and Rubella): What You Need to Know” and “MMRV Vaccine (Measles, Mumps, Rubella, and Varicella): What You Need to Know,” publication date February 12, 2018.

With publication of this notice, by June 1, 2018, all health care providers must discontinue use of the previous editions and provide copies of these updated vaccine information materials prior to immunization in conformance with CDC’s February 23, 2018 Instructions for the Use of Vaccine Information Statements.

Dated: March 12, 2018.

Sandra Cashman,

Executive Secretary, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[FR Doc. 2018-05299 Filed 3-14-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163-18-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[60Day-FY-1072; Docket No. CDC-2018-0020]

Proposed Data Collection Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations

AGENCY: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Notice with comment period.

SUMMARY: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), as part of its continuing effort to reduce public