would lead to ''a patchwork system of conflicting regulations,'' which the preemption clause was meant to ''avoid.'' [58] The content of a consumer's credit report could vary depending on the State in which they resided. Thus, instead of the unified national credit market that we have today, lending and underwriting decisions would have to be based in part on where a borrower lives, since the information available to a creditor making a lending decision could be better or worse depending on the borrower's State. The utility of credit reports would be undermined because lenders would no longer be able to accurately compare consumers across the country. Thus, instead of being able to ''transport their credit with them wherever they go,'' consumers could be stuck with the credit options where they live. As a result, the cost of credit would be likely to increase under the 2022 rule's interpretation. For instance, if some State laws were to limit the types of adverse information that could be included in a credit report, lenders may not be able to accurately identify the riskiest borrowers, which in turn could lead to a cross-subsidy by good credit risk borrowers for worse credit risk borrowers. Or for example, if regulation of credit reports is fragmented by State, lenders may charge more for credit in the States where regulation diverges from the national standard in order to account for the reduced accuracy of credit reports in those States.

E. At a Minimum, the 2022 Interpretive Rule Wrongly Concluded That States Can Regulate the Presence of Certain Categories of Information on a Consumer Report

Even if the 2022 interpretive rule were correct that the phrase ''with respect to any subject matter regulated under . . . section 1681c'' in section 1681t(b)(1)(E) means the granular topics addressed by section 1681c (and not the general subject matter of ''information contained in consumer reports''), the interpretive rule was still wrong to conclude that States can validly regulate the presence of certain categories of information—such as medical debt or arrest records—on a consumer report.

Section 1681c provides guidelines for how long information can remain on a credit report, including a general seven-year limitation for any ''adverse item of information.'' [59] The interpretive rule reasoned that ''although *how long* the specific types of information listed in section 1681c may continue to appear on a consumer report is a subject matter regulated under section 1681c, what or when items generally may be *initially* included on a consumer report is not a subject matter regulated under section 1681c.'' [60] Thus, under the interpretive rule, ''State laws relating to what or when items generally may be initially included on a consumer report—or what or when certain types of information may initially be included on a consumer report—would generally not be preempted by section 1681t(b)(1)(E).'' [61] According to the rule, States could thus forbid consumer reporting agencies from reporting entire categories of information, such as medical debt, arrest records, rental arrears, or convictions.[62]

That reasoning is flawed, even on the 2022's interpretive rule's own terms. The presence of information on a credit report is clearly a subject matter regulated under section 1681c. To be sure, section 1681c mainly addresses this subject matter through obsolescence periods, and the 2022 rule recognizes that section 1681t(b)(1)(E) prohibits States from changing the seven-year obsolescence period for negative information on a credit report. But how long information can remain on a credit report and whether the information can be included in the credit report in the first place are two points on the same continuum, and the 2022's artificial distinction between them is arbitrary. To take an extreme example, if a State established a one-day obsolescence period for medical debt information (*i.e.,* such information can remain on a report only for a day), such a law would be preempted under the 2022 rule. But if a State were to prohibit medical debt from appearing on a report in the first place, such a law would not be preempted under the prior rule. It would make no sense to forbid the former but allow the latter.

IV. Regulatory Matters

This is an interpretive rule issued under the Bureau's authority to interpret the FCRA, including under section 1022(b)(1) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, which authorizes guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to enable the Bureau to administer and carry out the purposes and objectives of Federal consumer financial laws, such as the FCRA.[63]

As guidance, this interpretive rule does not have the force or effect of law. It has no legally binding effect, including on persons or entities outside the Federal government.

The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs within the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined that this action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866, as amended.

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act,[64] the Bureau will submit a report containing this interpretive rule and other required information to the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to the interpretive rule taking effect. OMB has designated this interpretive rule as not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

The Bureau has determined that this interpretive rule does not contain any new or substantively revised information collection requirements that would require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act.[65]

Russell Vought,

Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

[FR Doc. 2025–19671 Filed 10–27–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–AM–P

[58] *Ross* v. *FDIC,* 625 F.3d at 813.

[59] 15 U.S.C. 1681c(a).

[60] 87 FR at 41044.

[61] *Id.*

[62] *Id.* at 41044–41046.

[63] 12 U.S.C. 5512(b)(1).

[64] 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*

[65] 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 679

[Docket No. 250312–0037; RTID 0648–XF196]

Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Temporary rule; closure.

SUMMARY: NMFS is prohibiting directed fishing for pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA). This action is necessary to prevent exceeding the annual 2025 total allowable catch of pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the GOA.

DATES: Effective 1200 hours, Alaska local time (A.l.t.), October 25, 2025, through 2400 hours, A.l.t., December 31, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Abby Jahn, 907–586–7228.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NMFS manages the groundfish fishery in the GOA exclusive economic zone according to the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska (FMP) prepared and recommended by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council under authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act). Regulations governing fishing by U.S. vessels in accordance with the FMP appear at subpart H of 50 CFR part 600 and 50 CFR part 679.

The annual 2025 total allowable catch (TAC) of pollock in Statistical Area 620 of the GOA is 82,265 metric tons (mt) as established by the final 2025 and 2026 harvest specifications for groundfish in the GOA (90 FR 12468, March 18, 2025).

The Regional Administrator has determined that the annual 2025 TAC of pollock in Statistical Area 620 of the GOA has been or will be reached. Therefore, in accordance with § 679.20(d)(1)(i) and § 679.20(d)(1)(ii)(B), the Regional Administrator is establishing a directed fishing allowance of 82,165 mt and is setting aside the remaining 200 mt as incidental catch because it is necessary to support other anticipated groundfish fisheries. In accordance with § 679.20(d)(1)(iii), the Regional Administrator finds that this directed fishing allowance has been or will be reached. Consequently, NMFS is prohibiting directed fishing for pollock in Statistical Area 620 of the GOA to prevent exceeding the annual apportionment of pollock TAC for this area.

While this closure is effective, the maximum retainable amounts at § 679.20(e) and (f) apply at any time during a trip.

Classification

NMFS issues this action pursuant to section 305(d) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. This action is required by 50 CFR part 679, which was issued pursuant to section 304(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and is exempt from review under Executive Order 12866.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), there is good cause to waive prior notice and an opportunity for public comment on this action, as notice and comment would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest, as it would prevent NMFS from responding to the most recent fisheries data on pollock harvest in a timely fashion, and would delay the closure of pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the GOA. NMFS was unable to publish a notice providing time for public comment because the most recent, relevant data on pollock harvest in Statistical Area 620 in the GOA only became available as of October 23, 2025.

There is good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3) to waive the 30-day delay in the effective date of this action. This finding is based upon the reasons provided above for waiver of prior notice and opportunity for public comment.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: October 24, 2025.

Samuel D. Rauch, III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2025–19677 Filed 10–24–25; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P