

enforcement efforts and/or efforts to preserve national security. Disclosure of the accounting would also permit the individual who is the subject of a record to impede the investigation, to tamper with witnesses or evidence, and to avoid detection or apprehension, which would undermine the entire investigative process.

(b) From subsection (d) (Access to Records) because access to the records contained in this system of records could inform the subject of an investigation of an actual or potential criminal, civil, or regulatory violation, to the existence of the investigation, and reveal investigative interest on the part of DHS or another agency. Access to the records could permit the individual who is the subject of a record to impede the investigation, to tamper with witnesses or evidence, and to avoid detection or apprehension. Amendment of the records could interfere with ongoing investigations and law enforcement activities and would impose an impossible administrative burden by requiring investigations to be continuously reinvestigated. In addition, permitting access and amendment to such information could disclose security-sensitive information that could be detrimental to homeland security.

(c) From subsection (e)(1) (Relevancy and Necessity of Information) because in the course of investigations into potential violations of Federal law, the accuracy of information obtained or introduced occasionally may be unclear or the information may not be strictly relevant or necessary to a specific investigation. In the interests of effective law enforcement, it is appropriate to retain all information that may aid in establishing patterns of unlawful activity.

(d) From subsections (e)(4)(G), (e)(4)(H), and (e)(4)(I) (Agency Requirements), and (f) (Agency Rules) because portions of this system are exempt from the individual access provisions of subsection (d) for the reasons noted above, and therefore DHS is not required to establish requirements, rules, or procedures with respect to such access. Providing notice to individuals with respect to existence of records pertaining to them in the system of records or otherwise setting up procedures pursuant to which individuals may access and view records pertaining to themselves in the system would undermine investigative efforts and reveal the identities of witnesses, and potential witnesses, and confidential informants.

Dated: August 12, 2009.

**Mary Ellen Callahan,**  
Chief Privacy Officer, Department of  
Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. E9–20155 Filed 8–21–09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Office of the Secretary

#### 6 CFR Part 5

[Docket No. DHS–2009–0063]

#### Privacy Act of 1974: Implementation of Exemptions; Department of Homeland Security/ALL—013 Claims Records System of Records

**AGENCY:** Privacy Office, DHS.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Homeland Security is issuing a final rule to amend its regulations to exempt portions of a Department-wide system of records entitled the “Department of Homeland Security/ALL—013 Claims Records System of Records” from certain provisions of the Privacy Act. Specifically, the Department exempts portions of the Department of Homeland Security/ALL—013 Claims Records system from one or more provisions of the Privacy Act because of criminal, civil, and administrative enforcement requirements.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* This final rule is effective August 24, 2009.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For general questions and privacy issues please contact: Mary Ellen Callahan (703–235–0780), Chief Privacy Officer, Privacy Office, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC 20528.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) published a notice of proposed rulemaking in the **Federal Register**, 73 FR 63908, October 28, 2008, proposing to exempt portions of the system of records from one or more provisions of the Privacy Act because of criminal, civil, and administrative enforcement requirements. The system of records is the DHS/ALL—013 Claims Records system. The DHS/ALL—013 Claims Records system of records notice was published concurrently in the **Federal Register**, 73 FR 63987, October 28, 2008, and comments were invited on both the notice of proposed rulemaking and system of records notice. No comments were received.

##### Public Comments

DHS received no comments on the notice of proposed rulemaking or system of records notice. DHS will implement the rulemaking as proposed.

#### List of Subjects in 6 CFR Part 5

Freedom of information; Privacy.

■ For the reasons stated in the preamble, DHS amends Chapter I of Title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

#### PART 5—DISCLOSURE OF RECORDS AND INFORMATION

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 5 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** Public Law 107–296, 116 Stat. 2135, 6 U.S.C. 101 *et seq.*; 5 U.S.C. 301. Subpart A also issued under 5 U.S.C. 552. Subpart B also issued under 5 U.S.C. 552a.

■ 2. Add at the end of Appendix C to Part 5, Exemption of Record Systems under the Privacy Act, the following new paragraph 15:

#### Appendix C to Part 5—DHS Systems of Records Exempt From the Privacy Act

\* \* \* \* \*

15. The DHS/ALL—013 Claims Records system of records consists of electronic and paper records and will be used by DHS and its components. The DHS/ALL—013 Claims Records system is a repository of information held by DHS in connection with its several and varied missions and functions, including, but not limited to: the enforcement of civil and criminal laws; investigations, inquiries, and proceedings there under; and national security, intelligence activities; and protection of the President of the United States or other individuals pursuant to Section 3056 and 3056A of Title 18. The DHS/ALL—013 Claims Records system contains information that is collected by, on behalf of, in support of, or in cooperation with DHS and its components and may contain personally identifiable information collected by other Federal, State, local, Tribal, foreign, or international government agencies. The Secretary of Homeland Security has exempted this system from the following provisions of the Privacy Act, subject to limitations set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3) and (4); (d); (e)(1), (e)(2), (e)(3), (e)(4)(G), (e)(4)(H), (e)(4)(I), (e)(5) and (e)(8); (f), and (g) pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(j)(2). Additionally, the Secretary of Homeland Security has exempted this system from the following provisions of the Privacy Act, subject to limitations set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552a(c)(3), (d), (e)(1), (e)(4)(G), (e)(4)(H), (I), and (f) pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(1), (k)(2), and (k)(3). Exemptions from these particular subsections are justified, on a case-by-case basis to be determined at the time a request is made, for the following reasons:

(a) From subsection (c)(3) and (4) (Accounting for Disclosures) because release of the accounting of disclosures could alert the subject of an investigation of an actual or potential criminal, civil, or regulatory violation to the existence of the investigation, and reveal investigative interest on the part of DHS as well as the recipient agency. Disclosure of the accounting would therefore present a serious impediment to law enforcement efforts and/or efforts to preserve

national security. Disclosure of the accounting would also permit the individual who is the subject of a record to impede the investigation, to tamper with witnesses or evidence, and to avoid detection or apprehension, which would undermine the entire investigative process.

(b) From subsection (d) (Access to Records) because access to the records contained in this system of records could inform the subject of an investigation of an actual or potential criminal, civil, or regulatory violation, to the existence of the investigation, and reveal investigative interest on the part of DHS or another agency. Access to the records could permit the individual who is the subject of a record to impede the investigation, to tamper with witnesses or evidence, and to avoid detection or apprehension. Amendment of the records could interfere with ongoing investigations and law enforcement activities and would impose an impossible administrative burden by requiring investigations to be continuously reinvestigated. In addition, permitting access and amendment to such information could disclose security-sensitive information that could be detrimental to homeland security.

(c) From subsection (e)(1) (Relevancy and Necessity of Information) because in the course of investigations into potential violations of Federal law, the accuracy of information obtained or introduced occasionally may be unclear or the information may not be strictly relevant or necessary to a specific investigation. In the interests of effective law enforcement, it is appropriate to retain all information that may aid in establishing patterns of unlawful activity.

(d) From subsection (e)(2) (Collection of Information from Individuals) because requiring that information be collected from the subject of an investigation would alert the subject to the nature or existence of an investigation, thereby interfering with the related investigation and law enforcement activities.

(e) From subsection (e)(3) (Notice to Subjects) because providing such detailed information would impede law enforcement in that it could compromise investigations by: revealing the existence of an otherwise confidential investigation and thereby provide an opportunity for the subject of an investigation to conceal evidence, alter patterns of behavior, or take other actions that could thwart investigative efforts; reveal the identity of witnesses in investigations, thereby providing an opportunity for the subjects of the investigations or others to harass, intimidate, or otherwise interfere with the collection of evidence or other information from such witnesses; or reveal the identity of confidential informants, which would negatively affect the informant's usefulness in any ongoing or future investigations and discourage members of the public from cooperating as confidential informants in any future investigations.

(f) From subsections (e)(4)(G), (H), and (I) (Agency Requirements), and (f) (Agency Rules) because portions of this system are exempt from the individual access provisions

of subsection (d) for the reasons noted above, and therefore DHS is not required to establish requirements, rules, or procedures with respect to such access. Providing notice to individuals with respect to existence of records pertaining to them in the system of records or otherwise setting up procedures pursuant to which individuals may access and view records pertaining to themselves in the system would undermine investigative efforts and reveal the identities of witnesses, and potential witnesses, and confidential informants.

(g) From subsection (e)(5) (Collection of Information) because in the collection of information for law enforcement purposes it is impossible to determine in advance what information is accurate, relevant, timely, and complete. Compliance with (e)(5) would preclude DHS agents from using their investigative training and exercise of good judgment to both conduct and report on investigations.

(h) From subsection (e)(8) (Notice on Individuals) because compliance would interfere with DHS' ability to obtain, serve, and issue subpoenas, warrants, and other law enforcement mechanisms that may be filed under seal, and could result in disclosure of investigative techniques, procedures, and evidence.

(i) From subsection (g) to the extent that the system is exempt from other specific subsections of the Privacy Act relating to individuals' rights to access and amend their records contained in the system. Therefore DHS is not required to establish rules or procedures pursuant to which individuals may seek a civil remedy for the agency's: refusal to amend a record; refusal to comply with a request for access to records; failure to maintain accurate, relevant timely and complete records; or failure to otherwise comply with an individual's right to access or amend records.

Dated: August 12, 2009.

**Mary Ellen Callahan**,  
Chief Privacy Officer, Department of  
Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. E9-20154 Filed 8-21-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-9B-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 15 CFR Part 902

#### 50 CFR Part 648

[Docket No. 071220873-91153-02]

RIN 0648-AS25

### Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish; Amendment 1

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and

Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS is implementing approved measures contained in Amendment 1 to the Tilefish Fishery Management Plan (FMP), developed by the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council). The approved measures address issues and problems that have been identified since the FMP was first implemented. These measures are intended to achieve the management objectives of the FMP, and implement an Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) program.

**DATES:** Effective November 1, 2009, except for the amendments to 15 CFR 902.1(b), and 50 CFR 648.290 and 648.291, which are effective August 24, 2009.

**ADDRESSES:** A Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was prepared for Amendment 1 that describes the action and other alternatives considered and provides a thorough analysis of the impacts of the approved measures and alternatives. Copies of supporting documents, including the Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) and Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) are available from Daniel Furlong, Executive Director, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, Room 2115, Federal Building, 300 South New Street, Dover, DE 19904-6790. A copy of the RIR/IRFA is accessible via the Internet at <http://www.nero.noaa.gov/>.

Written comments regarding the burden-hour estimate or other aspects of the collection-of-information requirement contained in this proposed rule should be submitted to the Regional Administrator at 55 Great Republic Drive, Gloucester, MA 01930, and by e-mail to [David.Rostker@omb.eop.gov](mailto:David.Rostker@omb.eop.gov), or fax to 202-395-7285.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Timothy A. Cardiasmenos, Fishery Policy Analyst, 978-281-9204.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

In March 2004, the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) began development of Amendment 1 to the FMP to evaluate alternatives for a limited access privilege program (LAPP) and other measures for limited access tilefish vessels. The Council held 17 public meetings on Amendment 1 between March 2004 and April 2008. After considering a wide range of issues, alternatives, and public input, the Council submitted a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Amendment 1 to NMFS. The Notice