

commercial information to indicate that this feature is essential to the conservation of leatherback sea turtles. In other words, there is not substantial information to indicate that the successful conservation of leatherback sea turtles requires including this open space feature in a designation of critical habitat. The petitioner's discussions of the status of leatherback sea turtles rely primarily on Pacific population assessments to illustrate the precarious situation for leatherback sea turtles. More recent, readily available sources of information specific to Atlantic populations were not cited. The Turtle Expert Working Group published An Assessment of the Leatherback Turtle Population in the Atlantic Ocean in 2007 (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-555) that characterizes the Atlantic population as stable or increasing overall. That assessment characterizes the nesting trend for the North Caribbean stock, which includes Puerto Rico, as increasing. Further, this assessment concludes that inter-nesting threats throughout the North Caribbean for those rookeries are generally "low" in a range including "low," "medium," and "high." No new or substantial information is presented to support the petitioner's assertions that leatherback populations in the Atlantic, or in the North Caribbean, have seriously declined in the years since the original critical habitat designation in St. Croix, or that the Atlantic populations are likely to follow the Pacific population trajectory if critical habitat is not revised to include open marine space off the Northeast Ecological corridor.

As discussed above, the petitioner provided no information, nor is any available in the literature and other material readily available in our files, to prescribe some parameters of an open space feature off the Northeast Ecological Corridor that is essential to the leatherback sea turtle's conservation, thus there is not substantial scientific information indicating that habitat features may exist that meet the first two criteria of the definition of critical habitat. Without such parameters there is no basis on which to conclude that such a feature may require special management considerations or protections, to address potential threats or impacts to the feature, or management needs of the feature, to provide for the conservation of leatherback sea turtles. Thus, there is not substantial scientific information indicating the third aspect of the definition of critical habitat may be met that special management considerations may be required to protect essential

physical or biological features to provide for the conservation of the species.

#### Petition Finding

After considering the petition, the information cited by the petitioner, and relevant information readily available in our files, we conclude that, with respect to areas under NMFS' jurisdiction, the petition does not present substantial scientific information indicating that the petitioned revision of designated critical habitat for leatherback sea turtles may be warranted.

#### Authority

The authority for this action is the ESA, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1533 *et seq.*).

Dated: July 14, 2010.

**Eric C. Schwaab,**

*Assistant Administrator for Fisheries,  
National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2010-17531 Filed 7-15-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-533-810]

#### Stainless Steel Bar from India: Extension of Time Limit for the Final Results of the 2008-2009 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

**AGENCY:** Import Administration,  
International Trade Administration,  
Department of Commerce.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 16, 2010.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Austin Redington or Brandon Farlander,  
AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import  
Administration, International Trade  
Administration, U.S. Department of  
Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution  
Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230;  
telephone (202) 482-1664 and (202)  
482-0182, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On February 21, 1995, the Department of Commerce ("Department") published the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar ("SSB") from India. See *Antidumping Duty Orders: Stainless Steel Bar from Brazil, India and Japan*, 60 FR 9661 (February 21, 1995). On March 24, 2009, in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), the Department initiated an administrative review of the order for two companies. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, Request*

*for Revocation in Part, and Deferral of Administrative Review*, 74 FR 12310 (March 24, 2009). On March 15, 2010, the Department published its preliminary results of the 2008-2009 antidumping duty administrative review. See *Stainless Steel Bar from India: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 75 FR 12199 (March 15, 2010). The final results for this review are currently due no later than July 13, 2010.

#### Extension of Time Limit of Final Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act requires the Department to issue final results within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within this time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time period to a maximum of 180 days.

Completion of the final results of the administrative review within the 120-day period in this case is not practicable because, following the preliminary results, the Department received additional cost information from Venus, as requested by the Department, which required the Department to produce a post-preliminary analysis involving a comprehensive cost analysis, significantly delaying the briefing schedule. See Memorandum from Susan Kuhbach, Senior Office Director to Ronald K Lorentzen, Assistant Secretary, entitled "Post-Preliminary Analysis Calculation Memorandum for Venus Wire Industries Pvt. Ltd.," dated May 19, 2010. Further, the Department requires additional time to review and address the detail and complexity of the cost accounting issues and arguments brought forward in the case and rebuttal briefs from both Venus Wire Industries Pvt. Ltd. and the domestic interested parties. Thus, we have determined it is not practicable to complete this review within the time specified under the Act, we are extending the time period for issuing the final reand sults of the administrative review by 45 days in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. Therefore, the final results are now due no later than August 27, 2010.

This notice is published pursuant to sections 751(a) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: July 12, 2010.

**Edward C. Yang,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for  
Antidumping and Countervailing Duty  
Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2010-17423 Filed 7-15-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**