1	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
2	
3	* * * * * * * *
4	House Bill 2114
-	* * * * * * * *
5	
6	
7	House Judiciary Subcommittee On Courts
8	
9	
10	Community College of Allegheny Campus Byers Hall, Room 107
11	808 Ridge Avenue
	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
12	
13	Wednesday, April 8, 1998 - 9:34 a.m.
14	
15	
16	000
17	
18	BEFORE:
19	Honorable Daniel Clark, Majority Chairperson
20	Frank Dermody, Minority Chairperson
21	IN ATTENDANCE:
22	Honorable Russell Robinson Honorable Mark Cohen
23	
24	
25	

KEY REPORTERS

1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404
(717) 764-7801 Fax (717) 764-6367

1998-088

CONTENTS

_		
2	·	
3	WITNESSES	PAGE
4	Honorable William Russell Robinson Prime Sponsor of House Bill 2114	
5		4
6		
7	Harold G. Dix, Esquire Chair, Legal Affairs Advisory Committee Pennsylvania Bankers Association	9
8		
9		
10	Richard Boyd, Consumer	22
11		
12	Dean Sheaffer, Vice Chairman Pennsylvania Retailers Association	42
13		
14	Associated Credit Bureaus` Steve Burik, Vice President Jerry Bunton	
15		69
16		77
17	Nathana Garaldi Garan Wina Bassidant	0.3
18	Anthony Capaldi, Group Vice President Trans Union	83
19		
20	Barry E. Creany Senior Deputy Attorney General	96
21	Bureau of Consumer Protection Office of the Attorney General	
22	one more and an	
23	Thomas Padles	121
24	Thomas Bailey President, Brentwood Savings Bank	121
^ -		

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Good morning. I'd like to welcome everybody to the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Courts hearing on House Bill 2114.

As everyone knows, this is a bill that was introduced by Representative William Russell Robinson and provides for certain regulations of consumer credit reporting and providing for obligations of credit card reporting agencies, et cetera.

I think at this time, why, we'll call on Representative Robinson to give us an opening statement and an overview of the report. And then, Mr. Robinson, you're certainly welcome to come up here and join me -- it's not that crowded -- and we can go on and hear testimony from the other people that are assembled. Representative Robinson.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Chairman

Clark, Members of the Judiciary Subcommittee on

Courts, staff, witnesses and observers, welcome

to Pittsburgh and welcome to the 19th Legislative

District.

As a trustee of Community College of Allegheny County, I would like to thank the Board

of Trustees of Community College of Allegheny
County, the President and Vice President, David
Griffin, of this campus and his staff for
accommodating this public hearing.

One of the most prominent and increasingly troublesome issues facing the people of Pennsylvania is that of identity theft:

Someone or some organization actually acquired your personal background information or Social Security number or credit card number or uses the Internet to engage in activities, illegal activities that have devastated many folks in our Commonwealth by destroying their credit status, limiting their borrowing power, and raising many questions about how such things could happen.

Across America, the problems associated with identity theft are mounting. And estimates are that billions of dollars are being siphoned off into the possession of unscrupulous folks who prey upon banking institutions, credit card issuers, senior citizens, and just plain hard working people.

House Bill 2114 is an attempt to make credit issuers more accountable when they issue credit, allow the State Attorney General and

local district attorneys to work cooperatively in assisting Commonwealth citizens victimized by identity theft, ensure that those areas in existing law not covered by the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act are addressed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to provide more penalties for those who would engage in fraud and the possession and use of someone's personal and private records without authorization.

This issue cannot be resolved without the cooperation of many parties who are directly or indirectly affected. The United States Senate is now considering a bill, Senate Bill 2 sponsored by Senator John Cow (phonetic) of Arizona.

Both House Bill 2114 and Senate Bill 2 attempt to address similar issues. My own identity theft story has been reported and well documented.

I was victimized over a five-year period. I was fortunate to identify the person who stole my identity and engaged in fraudulent activities.

The person who stole my identity was found guilty in a court law of and penalized.

Even after the court proceedings which included signed letters admitting guilt by the person who stole my identity and various attempts to secure the cooperation and assistance of credit granting agencies and credit reporting agencies, I was still unable to reestablish the good credit status I had prior to my identity being stolen.

I finally filed suit against several creditors who had provided inaccurate information to credit reporting agencies. I was still unable to obtain additional credit or reestablish my good credit status.

Can you believe I lost my case against the creditors? Good customers who have established a good credit history and status should be protected against identity theft and against the sometimes indifferent approach creditors and credit reporting agencies take towards assisting those who have been victimized by credit fraud.

Good customers are being treated badly.

High school students and first-time college

students are being issued credit in record

numbers while many of their parents are being

saddled with debt and bad credit not of their own

making.

Consumer organizations, government, and the business community can and must solve the problem. Again, I thank this Subcommittee for its timely attention to this issue.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: We thank you very much, Representative Robinson. You certainly may come up here and join us for the rest of the testimony and ask questions of the witnesses and individuals who testify.

Everyone I think has an agenda or an itinerary of what we're going to do this morning and into this afternoon. One change on that is the 10:25 gentleman from the Attorney General's office, Barry Creany.

He is in Somerset County this morning in court. He may be coming late. So I think what we're going to do is we're going to be ahead of schedule and move along; but as long as individuals are here to testify, I think we'll move and try to accommodate that.

The next individual to provide testimony to the Committee is Harold G. Dix, Esquire. He is the Chairperson, the Legal Affairs Advisory Committee of the Pennsylvania Bankers

1 Association.

1 1

MR. DIX: Good morning. I am Harold
Dix, Associate Counsel for Mellon Bank and Chair
of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association Legal
Affairs Advisory Committee.

PBA appreciates the opportunity to offer its initial reaction to House Bill 2114. The Pennsylvania Bankers Association is the Financial Services Trade Association representing approximately 226 national and state banks, bank and trust companies, savings bank, and savings associations in the Commonwealth.

Its membership constitutes over 99 percent of the banking assets in the Commonwealth. In addition, over 80 percent of PBA's membership is comprised of financial institutions with assets of less than 500 million.

I emphasize initial reaction as PBA has not had time to thoroughly review and consider the Bill. Rather, we have come to listen and learn the points of view of others and share our first impressions.

Upon completion of our review, our findings will be presented to the PBA Legal

Affairs Advisory Committee and ultimately the PBA State Government Relations Policy Committee.

PBA supports the concepts of fair credit reporting. Banks need accurate and reliable credit data on which to base their credit decisions. They also want their customers to have reasonable protections of their credit records.

It has been our experience that important issues are sometimes best addressed by uncomplicated laws unencumbered by extensive regulation.

We believe this is appropriately demonstrated by the way Fair Credit Reporting has been addressed since 1972 by the federal act named for that subject.

This law, illucidated by the Federal Trade Commission commentary, has provided consumer protection through requirements with which lenders and credit reporters have been able to comply.

The Pennsylvania Attorney General has access to this time-tested consumer protection law. PBA questions the complexities and potential inconsistencies that could arise from

House Bill 2114 creating a second path to the same desired result.

To begin with, the federal law and its

FTC commentary would be joined by a state law
which authorizes regulations yet to be written.

The federal law and House Bill 2114 have apparent
inconsistencies.

It is uncertain whether the state regulations and the FTC commentary would initially, later, or ever be essentially the same or even complimentary. These potential contradictions threaten simplicity in knowing and comply with the law.

Also, loss of simplicity frequently leads to increased expense. The increased complexity and cost of lender and credit reporter compliance could ultimately be reflected in increased pricing to be borne by the customer.

The lenders and credit reporters forced to comply with unlike federal and state requirements will likely be impacted by additional legal, compliance, operational, and auditing expense.

Legal compliance and regulatory experts could profit individually from debating the

inconsistencies of state and federal fair credit reporting requirements. PBA questions whether the increased complexity and the attendant cost would result in commensurate benefit to the consumer.

Again, PBA appreciates the opportunity to participate in this hearing and share our first impressions with the Committee. We will incorporate what we learned today in our expanded review of House Bill 2114.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: We thank you very much. And I think you are correct, that we're all here to gain some input, ideas, when we consider this Bill and listen to other points of view.

And this is a very preliminary process to get individuals here, get their first impression or first reactions to the Bill, and then we can work from there.

On page 2 when you talked about the authorized regulations yet to be written, are those federal regulations that haven't been written to the federal law or are those regulations that will ultimately be drafted from this state law?

MR. DIX: The latter, Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: The latter, okay.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Dix, for your attention to this matter. As I said in my testimony, it's going to take the cooperation and assistance of all affected parties. And certainly our banking institutions are affected.

Let me ask you some questions in light of your statement that at least you and your Committee have not thoroughly reviewed House Bill 2114.

So if I ask you any questions which you don't have the answer to, I hope you will take them as advisory and as your Committee does peruse this Bill more completely that you may be able to develop an answer.

My first question relates to the relationship that, let's say, in this instance Mellon Bank or other states have to out-of-state banks. How do you work with these out-of-state banks and are there any state and federal regulations that govern what you can or cannot do in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?

MR. DIX: I want to make sure that I

understand your question, Representative. The Fair Credit Reporting Act -- the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act would cover the operations of banks in all states. And that is the law to which I think the industry is now looking as I indicated earlier as elucidated by the Federal Trade Commission commentary.

That would be the one law. I'm not aware -- there may be state laws in individual jurisdictions; but I couldn't speak to that now.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: The basis of my question is that this proposed bill would regulate banking in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Some banks that operate in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are not headquartered here. They're headquartered elsewhere. They are governed by some federal regulations.

One of the questions that's been raised with me is how can we regulate banks outside the Commonwealth that issue credit cards; for example, a Chase Manhattan Bank or a City Corp that are not headquartered here in Pennsylvania but do banking business here?

Some of that business they may do with a Mellon Bank or other banks for convenience or business reasons. So I'm looking at that kind of arrangement and what laws generally govern that.

MR. DIX: I think I'd better understand your question -- I apologize for not being quicker to the issue. It seems to me that the basic law would still be the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act.

Now how the Attorney General's Office here would access that and how they would work in perhaps in combination with the attorney generals of other states I think would be a question that perhaps would be best addressed to the Attorney General's office when they are here.

But I think clearly that there would be a body of law to which the Attorney General could address the concerns for transactions that would take place in Pennsylvania by banks doing business in Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: I want to ask just two other questions if I might. And let me presume -- and this is not a reflection on your expertise. Let me presume that you might not be the person who can answer these questions.

There may be others here who can or there may be someone who's actually involved in banking day to day who may be able to answer these two questions, but I need to put these two to you in light of your testimony.

One is, Are there established standards that banks in Pennsylvania use when issuing credit, either credit cards or credit opportunity? And if there are standards, are these standards used by all banks and are they used by them in the same fashion? Are they applied in the same fashion?

MR. DIX: I will attempt as best I can to respond to the question, Representative. I cannot speak for all banks. I will presume that all banks will have approximately the same desire and effort, which will be to comply with the laws which impact the transaction that they govern.

These laws are generally reflected by documentation and by policies and procedures which each financial institution promulgates to reasonably ensure that compliance with the applicable law follows.

Beyond that, you have quality control operations and auditors which are generally

making sure that the operational aspects or the procedures are followed. I think that the procedures are the key in most cases to effective compliance with these laws and regulations.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. Let me ask you my final question, and I appreciate your patience.

When banks in Pennsylvania assume or acquire bad debt -- people simply don't pay their bills -- and the banking institution has this on their books and their auditors say you've got some folks here who didn't pay you, what are you planning on doing about this, how do these banking institutions address this issue of a bad debt that's on their books? What do they do with the bad debt?

MR. DIX: When you say assume the debt, Representative, do you mean debt that they have produced themselves?

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: No --

MR. DIX: -- credits that they have produced themselves or buy from someone else?

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: -- that is produced by way of customers who they are doing business with who don't pay.

MR. DIX: Then you don't mean obligations that have been originated by other creditors that have been purchased?

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: No.

MR. DIX: Because I don't think that very many institutions are going to buy debt that's already bad.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Unless they get it at a big discount.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: A big discount. No. But debt that's generated by someone who's doing business with them, for example, a bank issues a credit card and for whatever reason a person does not pay that credit card debt to the bank. They simply don't pay.

The auditors come in at the end of the year or whenever they audit and say you have a debt here that has not been collected, that's not being paid -- and maybe you even have document they won't pay -- how does the bank address that debt?

MR. DIX: Depending on the size and the type of the obligation, whether it is secured, unsecured -- if it's a credit card, I think in most cases it's going to be unsecured debt,

Representative.

I think the major consideration is going to be whether after the first collection call or first series of calls and letters have either been effective or not effective, at some point, the account is going to the move to the status which is known as charge-off.

And depending on the likelihood of collecting the account -- again, regarding the size, it might be placed with a collection agency -- it is possible that it might actually at some point go to a representative law firm for a collection action.

But again, each one of these would involve a separate credit evaluation that the collection area of the bank would have to make.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: One quick follow-up to that. Is there a point at which the bank would have to make a decision as to whether or not to write off this debt and have it subtracted from any taxes that are due?

MR. DIX: I'll have to disqualify myself from making a comment regarding the taxation because I just would not know, Representative.

But I would say that at some point you are going

to have to determine whether this debt is effectively collectible or uncollectible for the safety and soundness considerations of your portfolio.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Thank you. I'd like to acknowledge that Representative Frank Dermody has joined the panel. Let me follow-up with two questions that came to my mind.

When we have a bank that deals in all 50 states that might be headquartered in New York or Maryland, when they enter a state, do they need to know the laws of all 50 states as far as credit and credit reporting?

Or I think what Representative Robinson was getting at is there some kind of Interstate Commerce Clause that could preempt state laws or do you know how they mesh or work together?

Or once you enter a state, then you become responsible for their laws once you're doing business in that state?

MR. DIX: Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't want to oversimplify a very important and one of the most complex areas; but I think you

have a bit of both.

There are some considerations which may preempt state laws. For instance, there are certain issues of interest exportation which a national bank can export from its own state. But there are certain police power regulations which you generally presume that a state keeps to itself. And so I think you have a bit of both there.

And any state that deals in extraterritorial credit considerations I think would absolutely have to consider the many laws and regulations which could affect it in the other jurisdictions in which it is going to be lending.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: And No. 2, is there a -- is debt for a bank that Representative Robinson was talking about, are those limits regulated that you can only have -- do auditors come in and say that you have 5 percent on debt of assets or is there a limit that you can run a follow-up?

MR. DIX: Again, I'm going to have to speak with, unfortunately, some lack of definition. But at some point, I would think

that whether your regulator is a state or a federal regulator the amount of aggregate bad debt that you have is going to be a consideration in their assessment of the safety and soundness of the institution and also potentially the effectiveness of the operations of the lending, the credit assessment that led to the loans, and also the effectiveness of the collection.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: So when those debts get too high, I'm sure there's internal measures that they take; but I assume also that they need to satisfy the examiners that they have a process and policy to liquidate that.

MR. DIX: I think that's a reasonable statement, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Representative Dermody?

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Thank you very much. As I indicated, the next individual to provide us testimony is the Senior Deputy to the Attorney General's office; and he has not arrived yet. So I think we'll jump down to Mr. Richard Boyd if he's here. Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,

distinguished Representatives. Before I begin, I'd like to thank all of you for providing this forum that this story can be told and for your continuing work on this issue.

The injured party is actually my wife,

Joanne Boyd, who had surgery on Monday and is not

able to be here. So I'll be delivering her

testimony. And when you see the first person

used, its her and not I.

Until about ten years ago, the department store, oil company, and bank credit cards that I used were opened in joint names with my husband using his Social Security number.

In the late 1980's, I responded to one of the many and frequent mail offers for a credit card in my own name and Social Security number. During the next few years, I applied for and received several additional credit cards in my own name.

Since I was not employed and had limited income from baby-sitting, holiday gifts, and occasional garage sale income, my purchases were modest and it was my practice to pay the entire balance when the monthly bill was received.

I felt a small sense of independence.

Little did I know the perils that lay ahead. On my personal note, if there were major purchases that were required, they were put on our joint credit cards.

About a year ago, which would have been on or about April 1st, 1987, I wrote to one of my credit card accounts to have the credit limit increased from \$300 to \$800 for the purpose of buying a much needed kitchen range.

I expected prompt approval since I had always paid the full balance on time over the five to six years that I held the card. About ten days later, I received a letter from the card issuer advising me that they were sorry that they could not grant my request because of unfavorable information in my consumer credit file.

In the same letter, I was notified that I was entitled to receive a statement containing the principle reasons for the unfavorable decision by contacting the Credit Bureau, one of the credit agencies.

As directed, I contacted the Credit
Bureau and requested a copy of my Consumer Credit
Report. Approximately three weeks later, I
received the Consumer Credit Report.

Incredibly, expecting a one-page document since I only held three or four cards under my name and Social Security number, I was astounded to find a 14-page report containing more than 60 total accounts.

After identifying my own valid accounts which were all current, I was left with more than 50 bogus accounts, many of which were seriously delinquent. These accounts included real estate mortgages, bank cards, department store, and utility accounts.

Additionally, the report contained a listing of eight aliases and several employers that I had no knowledge of. The next day, I went to Credit Bureau office in Carnegie, Pennsylvania, with credit report in hand.

I provided the Credit Bureau with a copy of my credit report that had the bogus accounts noted. The Bureau representative advised me that this was not uncommon and promised a full audit and corrective action within six weeks.

They also provided me with a form to complete that would require future creditors to call me at my home phone if credit was being applied for with my Social Security number. It's

called a block. They also put a note in the file that there was suspected fraudulent activity.

Additionally, they advised me that there were two additional consumer credit agencies,

Equifax and Trans Union, that I needed to contact.

I wrote both those agencies.

And in about two weeks, I received their credit history reports. These reports contained another 12 to 15 bogus accounts and aliases similar to those previously identified.

I again noted the accounts that were not mine and returned the reports to the respective agency with a letter requesting corrective action and a fraud block.

Several weeks later, I received an undated report from the original contact, the Credit Bureau. All original bogus accounts were removed; but alas, three additional bogus accounts appeared.

It was determined later that these were actually in process between the time the original report was generated and my placing the block on the account.

Disturbingly, my account still displayed the original aliases. Once again, a letter was

prepared and a second credit report was returned to the Credit Bureau for audit and corrections.

Shortly thereafter, corrected reports were received from Trans Union and Equifax. They too contained several new bogus accounts that required additional correspondence and returned mailings.

Several weeks later, I received the second corrected credit history report back from the Credit Bureau. All the bogus accounts noted in my previous correspondence had been removed as were the aliases and the incorrect employers.

Alarming, however, the new report now included a new account from Allegheny County Civil Court on a civil claim judgement in the amount of \$4,300. This item was added to my record despite the fraudulent activity block that had been put on the account months before.

The next day I traveled to the Allegheny County Courthouse to find the source of this judgment. I was advised by the clerk of courts that the party whose name matched one of the aliases associated with my account removed her mother from a nursing home and did not pay the final bill.

3 |

The county clerk had no idea how the judgment got into my name except for the use of my Social Security number. They said they do not check Social Security numbers on judgments of this type. And I was told that it was again my responsibility to clear the record with the Credit Bureau.

An additional letter was written and forward to the Credit Bureau for correction. I'm happy to say that as of this day of my testimony my credit history with each of the three agencies is free of fraudulently-opened accounts.

Initially but not for long, we tried to imagine this situation was happening as a result of human error in transcribing numbers when accounts were opened. Soon it was obvious that this was a carefully calculated and executed over and over again.

It took nearly a year, considerable time and expense to pursue just the clearing of my credit history. We have gained a lot of experience and are definitely more aware of the devious ways members of society use to enhance their lives at others' expense.

This identity fraud action needs to be

stopped. I wrote to the Social Security

Administration to advise them of the events and
to solicit their help.

None was forthcoming, and all they did was send me a pamphlet that gave me guidelines on how to protect myself by securing my wallet and the tissues from credit card purchases.

In summary, I'd like to see the following minimum features of your legislation: Ability to bring punitive action to the perpetrators; education to the consumers and the need to receive regular issuance of credit history reports; notification of the consumer if aliases are received by the credit agency; and more responsible research by the credit issuers.

Thank you again, Representative, for your efforts in developing effective legislation so others do not have to experience what we did.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Thank you very much, Mr. Boyd. Did this occur because someone was using your wife's name or someone was using your wife's Social Security number or a combination of?

MR. BOYD: We believe it's the Social Security number exclusively because of all the

aliases that were used. Nothing ever showed up with my wife's name on it. It was her Social Security number.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: However, the judgment in Allegheny Courthouse, there wouldn't have been a Social Security number attached to that.

MR. BOYD: Well, if there wasn't, we don't know how it got in our name. And we were not able to get any -- they would not show us the document that was the result of the judgment that put it into the Credit Bureau's hands.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: It seemed to me that maybe they were doing it both ways. Everything that came in under your wife's Social Security number was listed by the computer and then everything that came in under the alias name --

MR. BOYD: We know from the judgment number that was shown on our credit report -- and my wife's name did not appear anywhere in that judgment. They told us that. They told us the name of the person whose name was on that judgment, and it was one of the aliases that we had previously seen on our credit report.

But we've not been able to find that

person. There's no address in this Pittsburgh area for that individual. And if you look --

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Do you know how they initially, from the Credit Bureau, how they initially matched your wife's name with this alias or --

MR. BOYD: Social Security number.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Okay. I thank you very much.

MR. BOYD: You're welcome.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Mr. Boyd, I appreciate you bringing to us one of those horror stories. As you know, there are many out there; maybe not enough for some people to feel that there's a serious problem that has to be addressed.

But I suspect there are a lot of persons like yourself and your wife who have had to try to go it alone. In your testimony, I didn't notice -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- any indication that you received any substantive help from the issuers of credit, credit reporting agencies, or any agencies representing persons who were doing business with as you tried to resolve this issue?

MR. BOYD: We received none. Actually in most cases in the few instances that we tried, we received nothing but a brick wall. One of the accounts, and if I may use an account name, was Duquesne Light.

And this particular individual had opened four accounts that were in arrears with Duquesne Light. And we visited Duquesne Light offices and we wanted to see the document that showed either a signature -- and they said they wouldn't give it to us; they couldn't provide that.

And it just up -- we had to write a letter to them and the Credit Bureau requesting that that be taken from our credit history. And after several letters, it was finally removed.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: You mentioned that your wife had opened up some accounts in her own name and that you also had some joint accounts.

Can you remember what standard you had to meet, what requirements you had to meet to open those accounts and whether or not you had to meet the same standard each time you opened an account?

MR. BOYD: In terms of the joint accounts?

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Joint account or the one that your wife opened.

MR. BOYD: On the joint accounts that I was directly involved with, I obviously had to state my employer's name, I had to state my income, income for the family in order to get the card.

That was typically the case with whether it was a utility or whether it was a gasoline credit card or even a bank card. In the case of my wife -- and we questioned this. We were kind of wary when she applied. She had no job. She put "no income, housewife," and received the card.

Now granted, the credit limit was low.
\$300 I believe was the highest one. But I would
say the standards weren't the same if you look at
it that way.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Were you ever contacted by anyone you used as a credit reference when you were establishing your credit that indicated to you or your wife that they had been contacted by a potential issuer of credit and that you were being contacted to verify the

information that you had provided to Duquesne Light or whomever else you might have gotten credit from? MR. BOYD: No, I can't remember receiving. REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: There was a -- Mr. Dix mentioned that the Federal Trade Commission and its procedures were available to consumers, certainly those dealing with banks, to resolve issues that are identified in House Bill 2114.

In your attempt to reestablish your credit and your wife's attempt, were you ever informed of any procedures that were available to you through the Federal Trade Commission?

MR. BOYD: No, I was not.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Are you aware of the Fair Credit Reporting Act and its relationship to the Federal Trade Commission?

MR. BOYD: I am now.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: There also was a suggestion that Pennsylvanians could access through the Attorney General the processes that were put in place by the Federal Trade Commission pursuant to the Federal Fair Credit Reporting

Act.

Are you aware of any authorization that the present Attorney General in Pennsylvania has to do that on behalf of citizens?

MR. BOYD: No, we're not.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Did you have any contact, you or your wife, with the Attorney General's office?

MR. BOYD: We were not.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Were you aware that there is within the Attorney General's office an advocate that addresses consumer problems such as yours?

MR. BOYD: No, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Were you aware that you could have gone to your local District Attorney and asked your District Attorney to take action against whomever had perpetrated this fraud against you and your wife?

MR. BOYD: No, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: One last question. This relates to something that a lot of Pennsylvanians are unaware of. Are you aware that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is authorized to sell your Social Security number?

MR. BOYD: No, sir.

· 12

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: You need to check on that. Many Pennsylvanians are unaware that their Social Security numbers are being sold by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Contact the Department of Transportation and ask them have they sold your Social Security number lately. I think you'll be surprised.

That's why I said in my testimony the issue we're trying to address in 2114 will require the cooperation of a lot of people. This is not an attempt to pick on any one segment of the society.

Part of what happened to you is that you and your wife and everybody in this room is vulnerable to the same thing going on. I wouldn't doubt there's somebody in this room today whose Social Security number is being used by someone without authorization.

Probably the only reason you're not out of this room worrying about it is you don't know about it. It's like termites in your house. You will find out when you apply for credit.

Or if you don't have the savvy to find out how you correct bad credit that might be in

your name -- some people as I understand are savvy enough to get their situation corrected.

I'd like to find those people, get that savvy, and put it in a bottle and use it for some of the poor souls out here who are being victimized.

MR. BOYD: Let me know when you do.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: I will do
that. One last quick question if I might. Do
you have any suggestions as to what issuers of
credit can do when they are issuing credit that
may help them to establish the validity and
credibility of people that they're issuing credit
to that perhaps they're not doing now?

MR. BOYD: The one thing that I've had experience in are the department stores that basically we will just sign you up and give you a credit card and let you make purchases on the spot with no background check at all.

I would think that they would want to do a little more detailed research up front and find out exactly who they're dealing with and what their ability to pay and if they are, in fact, that person.

What would be wrong with calling the number given or the name or -- I mean, are there

ways of associating a Social Security number on a data base to a name?

I mean, if those agencies that this person, this fraudulent person contacted and established credit, if they would have just taken the time to see, does this Social Security number match this person whose name I have on my application.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: I thank you for your testimony. Let me give you and everybody just one practical experience I had with this. And I use my situation because I know it best.

Again, as Chairman Clark said, we're just beginning this process; and so I think it is appropriate for us to get accurate information also real life situations: What is actually happening to people, not what we think, not what the law says; but what actually happens to people.

I went into a Lord and Taylor store in Philadelphia at their grand opening last summer. They were issuing credit cards on the spot. You signed up, they gave you a little travel bag, and they told you to go upstairs on the second floor

and they would verify whether or not you could immediately start purchasing.

So there was some process in place. I didn't know what that was. But I went upstairs to the second floor and there was a line of people. Some people were rejected; some were accepted.

Those that were rejected were told, We're unable to provide you with credit at this point. You won't be able to shop today. In my case, I wasn't but others were told, You're approved.

Now, there were two clerks behind the desk. They seemed to be working at some kind of computer. When I applied, they told me that I would be unable to secure credit at that point and that what I needed to do was wait until their central office contacted me.

Well, I found out I'd say may be two
weeks later, Central Office in Cleveland, they
sent me a letter indicating that the reason my
credit with Lord and Taylor could not be approved
on the spot or at any time was because -- and I
believe it was TRW that they used as a reference
point -- indicated that there was something in my

credit file that indicated that I was not a worthy applicant.

Now, it should be noted that during this period of time that I applied I was still in the process of trying to resolve the issue of my credit status. And so I wasn't surprised when I was turned down in the store.

I then became more concerned about what process they actually were using because there were some people with me, one of whom I know for a fact used information that was not accurate. They don't even live in this state.

They called me one day and said, Guess what? I got a credit card from Lord and Taylor. And I said, okay. Good. You're a good credit risk. I says, You know I didn't get mine. I told him why. I said, okay, I understand that.

But he said, What you don't understand is I didn't give them accurate information. And then I said to them, What did you do with the credit card? They said, I returned it, which is what they should have done. They returned it.

What they were actually trying to get, ladies and gentlemen, was the travel bag. And that's why they gave the false information. In

that instance, they were not attempting to engage in fraudulent activity. They were simply trying to get the free travel bag.

But Lord and Taylor may have left itself open to being victimized by somebody who may have gone ahead, run up a lot of credit debt, walked away from it, and guess who's going to pay? The people who go into Lord and Taylor and buy shoes and dresses. Because I guarantee you Lord and Taylor probably upped the price.

And that's not a criticism of them. I suspect that they have to do that. We all know about insurance fraud and we're told that insurance fraud costs those of us who are not engaged in it.

How is it costing us who are not engaged in it? The insurance companies tell you, We upped your prices. Help us stop insurance fraud. I'm saying to the retail industry and the banking industry, help stop the fraud. Help us treat good customers the way they should be treated. Good customers are being treated badly.

And I thank you, Mr. Boyd, and your wife for your testimony.

MR. BOYD: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Boyd. The next individual who we'll accept testimony from is Dean Sheaffer. He is the Vice Chair of the Pennsylvania Retailers Association. How are you today?

MR. SHEAFFER: Good. Thank you.

Chairman Clark, Subcommittee Members present,
good morning. My name is Dean Sheaffer. I'm the
Vice Chairman of the Pennsylvania Retailers
Association and Vice President and Director of
Credit of Boscov's Department Stores in Reading,
Pennsylvania.

Boscov's is the largest independently-owned department store chain in the U.S. By December, '98, Boscov's will have 32 stores doing business in the states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, and Delaware. Of the 32 stores, 23 of them are located in Pennsylvania employing approximately 7,000 Pennsylvanians.

The PRA is the largest retail trade association in the Commonwealth representing retailers throughout the Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania on legislative issues that impact our industry.

Before I get into the rest of my formal testimony, I'd really like the opportunity to address some of the concerns that have already been raised here today.

Perhaps I can lend a little bit of a firsthand perspective as to what at least Boscov's in their instant credit environment does to help protect ourselves and Pennsylvanians from credit card fraud.

Typically when we go into a new store opening or in an existing store, we will take what we call an express application. It lists things like name, address, social, date of birth. There's a place for the co-applicant. That data is entered into a front-end processing system where we do some very basic validity checks.

We then ship that information out typically to either Trans Union or Equifax where a substantial number of validity checks are performed to determine whether or not the address that has been entered, specifically the house number and the zip code, matches one of the addresses or former addresses contained in the

Bureau; whether or not the Social Security number is substantially the same as that for the individual attempting to obtain credit.

In addition to that, we actually purchased three different scores: One that determines the probability of an account going to either write-off or bankruptcy; one that ranks net worth; and one that determines the propensity to use retail credit cards.

three-dimensional matrix and the decision is made to either approve or decline the application. In addition to all of that process, the address entered, the Social Security entered, the name entered are run through a number of Bureau-based checks like Safe Scan that looks at the address to determine if it's a mail drop or has been used fraudulently, that looks at the telephone number if that's been entered and transmitted to see if that's been used fraudulently, to see if the address is perhaps a prison or a mental institution.

There are an entire series of checks.

In addition to that, the Credit Bureau itself
maintains a fraud victim indicator flag on the

file. If that is set, the instant credit will not be approved.

There are, in fact, eight separate flags that cause us to go through additional processing even if that Credit Bureau meets our normal credit criteria. There are indicators that there is something unusual between the information that was entered and the information that the Bureau contains. And we will not approve instant credit in that case.

Assume that all of those criteria have been satisfied, our response is sent back to either the clerk or our credit central personnel. And in the case of an instant application, we verify picture ID.

I think in some cases in New Jersey there are not always picture IDs because in Jersey some of the older New Jersey driver's licenses I don't believe have pictures, so we verify the physical description of the individual.

But we accept state-issued driver's licenses, nondriver's licenses, passports, military ID, and that's about it. And that ID must match the physical description of the person

and the information that is on the application before we will complete the transaction and offer that credit card.

So at least from Boscov's standpoint -- and I believe that I can speak for the huge majority of the retailers -- there are substantial safeguards in place to protect not only ourselves but Pennsylvanians from identity fraud.

One of our biggest nightmares is when there is identity fraud. It is an administrative nightmare for us to try to pull the application and try to help sort out exactly what it is that has happened. It's very, very costly for us to try to help our customer that has been legitimately the victim of identity fraud sort it out.

And we do, by the way, help our customers in sorting this out. If a customer contacts us and indicates that they've never opened the account that they've received a bill for or that's appeared on their Credit Bureau report, we'll pull the application, make a copy of it, send it to them so that they can verify the signature on it.

If they don't respond to us and say, no, this is not my signature -- because in about 80 percent of the cases we actually find that yes they did sign up for that tote bag or whatever it is and have simply forgotten that they did.

It may have been two years ago that they signed up and never used the card, simply cut it up and threw it away. In the cases that they said, no, this is not my signature, we will then send a Fraud Affidavit out to them.

They respond with it to us, we notify them of the appropriate procedure to contact the credit bureaus and attempt to straighten out their Credit Bureau report.

We will also then forward that to our security division who will intercede on the customer's behalf with a local law enforcement agency or the appropriate law enforcement agency to try to help our customer.

They are after all our customers. And if we're involved in a situation, we certainly want to help them straighten that out.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Excuse me. All those checks while that person's waiting to take their tote bag --

MR. SHEAFFER: It takes under 30 seconds, yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: If I might, since you deviated from your testimony, let me ask a couple quick questions. First let me say I have a Boscov's credit card and I use it frequently.

MR. SHEAFFER: Excellent.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: But I was a bit anxious when I started having credit problems that Boscov's and other creditors, because I still do have some credit cards, would in fact deny me credit.

I had that happen in one instance with a local department store where they denied me additional, continued credit after I had been a good customer for more than 35 years, never missed a payment, didn't owe them any money.

In my case, they summarily discontinued servicing me; never informed me; and when I went in to get that friendly service, was told by one of the executives, We'll take care of it. And to this day, to this day they haven't contacted me; and they're a constituent of mine. We have a problem. They evidently aren't like Boscov's.

That's another issue. Let me ask about this procedure that you put in place. You suggested that the vast majority of retailers similar to Boscov's have the same procedure.

Are you prepared to tell this Committee that, in fact, the procedure that Boscov's has which appears to be substantive and substantial is the procedure that is used by the majority of retailers in Pennsylvania who are in the same type of business as you?

MR. SHEAFFER: Every retailer has their own set of procedures, their own set of criteria, their own set of underwriting standards.

Retailers use their credit for portfolios in fact in a couple of different business fashions.

One example that I can think of, Kohls, who's recently come into our area, is using their credit portfolio not so much as a profit center but rather to drive sales, strictly to drive sales. And they base theirs on a break-even profit. Boscov's tries to make a little bit of money on their credit portfolios.

Our interest rates are different than Kohls might be and Bon Ton's interest rates are different than what Boscov's are; and therefore,

underwriting standards, our credit approval criteria is different.

Not to say that one is better or worse than the other. But I think it is fair to say that all of us are very interested in preventing credit card fraud. It is, as I said, an administrative nightmare; it's extremely costly from our perspective.

So although the underwriting standards may be different and in fact the fraud prevention standards may be different, we all have the same focus, to prevent credit card fraud.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Let me ask another couple quick questions as a follow-up. Would you be opposed in your organization if we took the procedure that you outlined that Boscov's uses to prevent credit card fraud as best you can and carved it in stone and put it in law and said you have to do this?

MR. SHEAFFER: Yes, I would.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. I'll get back to it later on. Also, Mr. Boyd suggested in his attempt to straighten out his situation -- he did not necessarily mention Boscov's or a store like you. I want to clarify

that -- the information which you just gave to me which you said this procedure is used by at least ... Boscov's and similar retailers, is this information available to the public?

For example, would Mr. Boyd or Mr. Robinson or Mr. Dermody or Mr. Clark have known this? Does Boscov's tell me when I go in, I'm protecting you the customer; and here's what I'm doing?

Because when I look over that instant credit line, from what I understand, folks want the tote bag. But also the first thing that's running through my head is somebody in that line may have my credit card number and you may issue them credit.

MR. SHEAFFER: We do not make a general public statement of our credit policies and procedures. We're a privately-owned company and, in fact, our procedures change. The reason that I'm opposed to carving the procedure into stone is that our procedures change on maybe a monthly basis.

We try to structure ourselves and be responsive to changes in what people trying to commit fraud are doing and to changes that the

Credit Bureaus are making, as you've said, Representative.

There are many, many, different entities involved from the DMV to the Credit Bureaus, and we try to be as responsive as we possibly can to those changes and we constantly update our policies and procedures in an attempt to do a better job in underwriting and a better job of protecting ourselves and customers against fraud.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Two other real quick questions: One, What is the source of the information that you utilize and the Credit Bureau utilizes and your computer utilizes to determine if anyone is credit worthy?

Where do you get that information?

MR. SHEAFFER: The information is derived primarily from the Credit Bureaus; and the Credit Bureaus derive their information primarily from credit grantors and public records, things like bankruptcy courts and the other various court systems throughout the Commonwealth or in other states their court systems.

Those are the two primary sources of information. Perhaps the Credit Bureaus -- I

1 believe that they're going to testify at some point. Perhaps they can better describe other 3 elements that they incorporate in their Credit Bureau. 5 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: One last 6 If I use Mr. Clark's -- Representative question: 7 Clark's Social Security number, is it possible I could get credit in his name? 8 9 MR. SHEAFFER: Not in our instant credit 10 process. 11 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: At Boscov's? MR. SHEAFFER: At Boscov's. 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Is it possible 14 somewhere else that I might be able to do that? I can't exclude that MR. SHEAFFER: 15 possibility. Somewhere else is pretty broad. 16 17 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Thank you. MR. SHEAFFER: If I can continue with 18 the testimony, I'd like to thank the Committee 19 20 for the opportunity to express the PRA's deep concern with House Bill 2114. 21 The PRA believes the Bill is duplicative 22 23 of the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act, The FCRA, in many areas and is entirely unnecessary 24 in light of the current legislative and business 25

environment.

In order to understand our opposition to this Bill, a brief overview of the FCRA is required. The FCRA has been in place for decades. This law was effectively amended as recently as October 1, 1997.

The Federal Trade Commission acknowledges that under the statute millions of credit reports are issued every year. Federal investigators report that the complaint rate for credit reporting issues is less than 1/10th of 1 percent of all issued credit reports.

To put these same numbers in terms of my personal experience, in February of this year, Boscov's reported our experience with over 900,000 customers to the three major credit reporting agencies.

In the same month, we received only 41 disputes through the Automated Consumer Dispute Verification System. And this system is set up to ensure that if a creditor makes a change in a consumer's credit record all threes agencies are updated immediately.

Of the 41 disputes, changes were made to 26 consumer credit records. Assuming that all of

the changes were actually errors in reporting, this equates to an error rate very similar to what the FTC reported.

Boscov's handled 93 percent of these disputes within ten days of receiving them and 100 percent within 30 days. Even given the extraordinarily low number of credit reporting errors and complaints, the FCRA provides significant consumer protections in the event that an error goes unresolved.

Both the consumer and the FTC may bring action against a consumer reporting agency and a furnisher of incorrect information. Is should also be noted that as of October 1, 1997, the States' Attorney General may enforce the FDCR.

This provision already gives

Pennsylvania the right to directly enforce a

statute that is nearly identical to the proposed

legislation. In addition to these legislative

issues, there are common sense business reasons

why HB 2114 is unnecessary.

Consumer reporting agencies are in business to provide creditors, insurers, and others with individual consumer information on

which decisions to lend money, extend credit, or issue insurance are based.

A creditor or insurer pays the reporting agency for this information. There seems to be an underlying assumption that consumer reporting agencies and credit grantors are at best unconcerned if erroneous data that adversely affects our customers is contained in their credit reports.

Nothing could be further from the truth. We are in the big business of selling goods and services. In order to sell our goods, we are also in the business of extending credit.

As credit grantors, we could not and would not tolerate the reporting agencies providing erroneous information that prevented us from lending our customers the money they need to make purchases in our stores. If we were to do so, we would quickly be out of business.

Consumer reports are the raw material of the credit industry. Our end products are the loans that we make. As in the steel industry where the quality of the final forging is dependent upon the quality of the raw ore, the quality of our loan portfolios are dependent upon

the quality of the Consumer Reports that we purchase.

To survive, we must and do demand the best information that we can obtain. With the low margins in the retail industry, we need every sale we can make. We could not continue to do business with a reporting agency that kept us from making sales because they provided us with incorrect consumer information.

In addition to the requirements of the FCRA, there already exists a simple, common sense business mechanism that makes HB 2114 unnecessary.

In conclusion, the concept of providing Pennsylvanians the protection and recourse for correcting erroneous personal information maintained by consumer reporting agencies is good; however, HB 2114 is duplicative of the FCRA and unnecessary.

The FCRA and underlying business realities ensure that consumers are protected from and have significant legal rights to address errors in their credit reports.

The Pennsylvania Retailers Association urges the Committee to oppose HB 2114. I thank

you, Chairman Clark and Members present, for your time and the opportunity to present testimony in opposition to HB 2114. At this time, I would like to answer any questions the Committee may have.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Thank you very much. You indicated that you had experiences with over 900,000 customers and that there were 41 disputes.

Can you go through that process of how you received or become aware of a dispute and then you indicated some changes were made in those records or in your records? Could you go through that with us?

MR. SHEAFFER: Absolutely. We actually made changes in the month of February to 26 individual consumer's records. The primary way that we are notified that a consumer's disputing a particular trade line that Boscov's is reporting -- trade line is basically our report of how the consumer has paid Boscov's -- is actually through one of the Credit Bureaus.

The consumer has either been denied credit or has requested a copy of their credit bureau and says this is not my credit record, but

the credit record is incorrect in some fashion.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: So you use these
Credit Bureaus in two ways: No. 1, to get
information from them; and No. 2, you provide
information to them on accounts that are dubious?

MR. SCHAFFER: Precisely -- no. No. We actually provide them records on all accounts.

Whether they pay on time or pay late, we simply report our experience with those accounts.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: So in these instances, you made a report and a customer got their credit report and question why is Boscov's on this?

MR. SHEAFFER: Or why is Boscov's reporting this particular information; I disagree with what they are reporting.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Okay.

MR. SHEAFFER: And the major reason that Boscov's changes our credit report is when we determine that there is something that was beyond the consumer's control, particularly in processing -- we process a little bit over on average of a million dollars' worth of payments every day of the year.

And there are times when either the mail

is delayed or a payment may be applied to an incorrect account or the payment may be processed in an incorrect amount.

If we are able to determine that -- and we are through the microfilming process at Core States, who is our processing bank -- if we determine that it is something that was beyond the consumer's control and that we have reported the consumer as being past due, we will change the report to reflect that they were not because it was clearly beyond their control.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Now, you also indicated that this House Bill duplicates the federal statutes. And my question is, Well, why can't we just adopt this as a state law? It's very similar to the federal law. Why can't the state just adopt that as is?

MR. SHEAFFER: Well, the Bill is in part duplicative; but there's also a number of provisions in HB 2114 that are inconsistent with the federal bill and which are unworkable.

For example, in section 103, the definition of Item of Information is unworkable because an information entry maybe be used by different creditors in different ways.

One creditor may decide to deny credit on an entry and another may choose to extend the credit. Again, every creditor has their own underwriting criteria.

In section 201 (c) 2 2, it's also unworkable. How can a nonunique identifier be used to verify the identity of the consumer? That seems to be internally illogical.

The ability to give consumers the right to block their Credit Bureau file due to possible fraudulent use of the Credit Bureau report is fine in theory. However, as a practical matter, the consumer reporting agencies already alert creditors to known fraudulent use of credit files.

PRA believes that these provisions which create an administrative nightmare for consumers and the reporting agencies. Could consumers intentionally block legitimate negative data? How is a creditor to decide if a consumer should have known that he obtained goods, services, or monies as a result of a blocked transaction?

What would happen if a consumer had requested that their report be blocked but then needed access to credit in an emergency

situation?

Creditors regularly obtain Credit Bureau data for account management purposes -- we call them credit scores -- as often as every three to six months.

And in that periodic review, we try to determine whether there is a need for an additional extension of credit for our customers and, if so, grant it without their having to ask for that.

Would the consumers be aware that if they blocked their Credit Bureau report that they would no longer be eligible for this kind of process? While section 204 deals with in-person and mail-in application, no provision is made for telephone or electronic applications.

It is also unclear how a creditor might contact the person to whom an extension of credit would be mailed to verify an address change.

In section 207, consumer reporting agencies are prohibited from furnishing consumer reports within 30 days of an address change unless the consumer has been contacted and has verified the address change.

Nationally about 20 percent of all

consumers move every year. Often additional credit for household needs is required after a move.

Will the reporting agencies be able to mail a verification form, have the consumer mail a response to the form, and update their records with address information prior to the consumer needing this additional credit?

Can you imagine the consumer confusion in being denied credit because their credit data could not be accessed in a timely fashion? Those are just some of what the PRA sees as unworkable provisions in HB 2114.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: I guess from a technical standpoint, why, we'll need to look at those sections and see if we can't address some concerns with regard to those.

Also my understanding is -- and we're going to hear from the Attorney General's Office hopefully in a few minutes. But my understanding and I believe your understanding is that the Attorney General's Office does have the power to intercede in these matters.

And if you could describe that or any experience you may have had with their office in

this area --

MR. SHEAFFER: We actually do deal with the Attorney General's office on a -- I wouldn't call it a regular basis. But we probably receive maybe six pieces of correspondence a year, maybe slightly more than that, dealing with everything from our collection practices to potential FCRA issues.

And we work -- when there is a consumer that has a question, has gone to the Attorney General, we certainly want to resolve, to fix whatever may be wrong. Again, they are our customers.

And even if for whatever reason they can't be our credit customers, we want them to continue to be our cash customers and our check writing customers. It just makes common, good business sense to try to handle these customers in the best way that we possibly can and the most sensitive way that we possibly can.

To directly answer your question, I actually have copies of section 621 (c) 1 of the Federal FCRA that I'd be more than happy to give to you. It is my belief that that clearly empowers the chief law enforcement officer of the

state to enforce the provisions of the FCRA.

And while I'm not an attorney, I think it is very, very clear-cut. I'd be happy to give that to you. And perhaps it is -- as Representative Robinson I think alluded to, perhaps it's a matter of educating the Pennsylvanians that they have access to the Attorney General.

Certainly some of them know this; some of them understand this because we do get correspondence. And perhaps it's an educational issue more than a legislative issue.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Just one, maybe a comment. It just seems that if you listen to the Boyd case if somebody has a problem that they didn't cause, they had absolutely nothing to do with it, they wake up one day and their credit's ruined, they've got reports out there and aliases they've never had, it seems the complete burden is now on them to correct this whole situation.

So their lives are disrupted for months. They don't have credit and they've got significant problems that bears on them and yet it's all on them.

I don't know if this Bill is an answer,

but there's got to be something done to relieve somebody who has done nothing wrong. And those that have done everything wrong are out using their numbers, getting credit, and everything else.

To me -- and I don't know. If I don't have an answer; I don't know if you do. But it's frustrating for me to hear that. And I understand your problems.

But the process of correcting to me is one that needs to be changed, fixed, or something because the process of correcting as far as I can tell and the people that have come to my office is not that easy.

MR. SHEAFFER: Again, I'm not sure that I have a clear answer either; but I think that most businesses understand how valuable their customers are.

We have a very, very clear process place to try -- even though the crime of credit card fraud has been committed against the consumer, our customer, not Boscov's, we feel that because we are involved at least tangentially in this process that it's our obligation to try to assist our customer in any way that we can.

And that's why we send them the Fraud Affidavit, that's why we forward it to our security division to try to work with the customer and the appropriate law enforcement agent to try to resolve this.

And sometimes, probably many times it doesn't perhaps get resolved as quickly as possible. I guess particularly when you get into the larger cities the law enforcement agencies have I guess what they consider to be more important things to do than that.

I'm not sure how to solve that problem.

All that I can say is that we as businesses

understand and try to help our consumers in any
way that we can.

And not to speak for the Credit Bureaus, but my experience with the Credit Bureaus is that when consumers go to them they also do their very, very best to try to sort the matter out with the creditors and to -- and Mr. Boyd has even said I believe that although it took him some time and there were a number of entities involved -- the court system, the credit bureaus, and the creditors -- that finally his Credit Bureau report was rectified.

Probably not in as timely a fashion as he or anybody would like to see. But I'm not sure exactly how to solve that problem either. I don't think that this Bill perhaps quite addresses the underlying problem.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: I think what keeps going through my mind is that I'm sitting here and I don't know if my credit rating is any good or not until I go to your store and try to get that free tote bag.

So I might be blissfully walking through life here thinking that I'm in good shape and maybe I'll have to go in and have you run that 30-second check on me.

MR. SHEAFFER: Happy to do it.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Thank you very much, Mr. Sheaffer. We're going to take a break now for our stenographer.

(At which time, a brief break was taken.)

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Okay. Our break is over. I'd like to welcome Representative Mark

Cohen to the panel. Mark has just gotten here, and we're certainly glad that he was able to make the trip to Pittsburgh to be with us today.

And if Steve Burik is here, he is from

the Associated Credit Bureaus and we'd like him to offer his testimony. Good morning.

MR. BURIK: Good morning, Chairman

Clark. I have a copy of my testimony in the blue

packet. My actual testimony as on the left-hand

side and some of our responses in writing on the

right-hand side.

Thank you, Chairman Clark and
Representative Robinson and other Committee
Members. My name is Steve Burik. I'm the Vice
President of area sales for Trans Union in the
Pittsburgh office.

Trans Union is a primary repository of consumer data offering a range of information services including nationwide credit information.

We have two credit reporting divisions in Pennsylvania. In addition to my office in Pittsburgh, we have a facility in Springfield, which is outside of Philadelphia, that houses another sales division along with our national Consumer Relations Department and our eastern regional offices.

Trans Union and its affiliates employ approximately 800 people in the State of

Pennsylvania. I appreciate the opportunity to provide Trans Union's views on House Bill 2114. My comments now are intended to supplement the written statement that has been provided to the Committee.

Concerns about privacy and the problems of consumers who have been victims of identity theft have led to drafting of legislation like House Bill 2114. These proposals are well intentioned but impractical.

They will only serve to choke off the availability of consumer credit without providing prudent solutions to privacy and security concerns.

Trans Union recognizes that there is a balance between the availability of credit information and the improper access to such information that can infringe on consumers' expectations of privacy.

Perhaps Trans Union has adopted stringent privacy protocols and established the Fraud Victim's Assistance Department which we spent over a million dollars per year in assisting consumers on an annual basis to address concerns over privacy and identity theft.

confidentiality of personal credit information contained in our data base. Access to this information is limited to companies that have legal permissible purpose to receive it.

These protocols protect the

When information from the data base is supplied, we limit the type of information we disclose to our customers based on the balance between their needs, permissible purpose, and the likely consumer benefit.

We believe that consumers should have the right to make informed decisions about the use of their personal data, including the right to be removed from direct marketing lists.

Consumers have the right to choose, if they want, the opportunity to shop at home, evaluate competing consumer credit offers, or receive other types of promotions in the mail.

At every consumer contact, we notify consumers of their right to have their names removed from Trans Union's lists. We also encourage our customers to do the same. We provide an address and a toll-free number that consumers can use to opt out.

Trans Union's Fraud Victim's Assistance

Department has a program designed to prevent further fraud and to restore the credit file to its accurate state.

To accomplish this, we add a consumer fraud statement to the credit file; secondly, we remove the victim's name from mailing lists; and third, we highlight recent inquiries and/or accounts suspected of fraud.

After verifying the identity of the consumer, we will mail the credit file to the consumer along with educational materials on how to prevent future fraud. Additionally, we notify joint victim credit grantors.

We also maintain a data base of fraud information which contains fraud addresses, fraud telephone numbers, and fraud Social Security numbers. And we investigate any disputed credit information to restore the credit file to its accurate state.

House Bill 2114 is a duplication of existing federal law and industry practice. Its goals are laudable, but the implementation of House Bill 2114's provisions would hinder consumers' ability to get credit without a corresponding benefit to consumers.

House Bill 2114 lacks sensitivity to the balance between security, privacy, and the availability of fast, accurate consumer credit history information.

Trans Union is committed to working with legislators, customers, competitors, and consumers to ensure that the privacy and security of consumer credit information is continually balanced with the demand for instant access to credit.

I thank you for this opportunity to present testimony in opposition to House Bill 2114 and I will answer any questions that the Committee Members have to the best of my abilities. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: We thank you. Do you have any numbers on the number of individuals your Fraud Victim's Assistance Program would help in any one year?

MR. BURIK: Yes. We average approximately 40,000 inquiries per month where consumers are either notifying us of they lost their wallets or they want to put a consumer statement on their file notifying other credit grantors of potential fraud.

1 But of those 40,000 monthly inquiries, 2 actual victims of identity fraud averages around 3 10 percent of those 40,000. CHAIRPERSON CLARK: So that's about 4,000 a month? 5 6 MR. BURIK: 4,000 inquiries a month. 7 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: And I don't know if you can answer this, but do other companies such 8 9 as your own have similar Fraud Victim's 10 Assistance Programs? 11 MR. BURIK: I can't speak for my 12 competitors, but Trans Union was the first bureau 13 to develop our Fraud Victim Assistance 14 Department, which has been in place for about 15 five years now. CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Who are your other 16 17 competitors? MR. BURIK: Equifax and Experian. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: And are you the 20 basic top three or whatever? MR. BURIK: Yes. This is the three 21 national credit bureaus. 22 23 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: And this program's 24 been in place for five years? 25 MR. BURIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Representative Robinson.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Mr. Burik, thank you very much for
your testimony. Let me ask you some specific
questions. Let me preface my comments by saying
we've had some explanation today of the way
things should be by those of you who represent
the industry.

Probably if things were that way we probably wouldn't be sitting here. I can say that with accuracy not only from my own personal experience but from the experience of others.

It sounds good, gentlemen; but it don't work that way and you know it doesn't work that way. Let me ask a couple questions if I might that are very specific to how the system actually works.

The Fraud Victim's Assistance

Department, how would a consumer find out that
you have such an entity?

MR. BURIK: Well, when the consumer has potential claims of fraud or requests a copy of their credit report, Trans Union will inform them that the Fraud Victim Assistance Department

1 exists. And it's based out of California. 2 So and we have 800 numbers available for 3 the -- to assist the consumer. 4 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Pardon me. 5 Would the consumer be able to actually talk to a 6 person? 7 MR. BURIK: Yes. REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: If they called 8 9 the 800 number, they could talk to a person? 10 MR. BURIK: Yes, in our Fraud Victim's 11 Assistance Department. 12 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Another question: Who does Trans Union represent? 13 14 MR. BURIK: Trans Union 15 represents -- we're the national -- I'm national 16 Trans Union Credit Bureau. REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Who pays your 17 18 bills? 19 MR. BURIK: I'm not sure I understand 20 your question. REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: How do you 21 22 function day-to-day financially? How does your 23 organization function? How do you hire the people who work in the Fraud Victim Assistance 24 25 Department?

1 MR. BURIK: Trans Union is a national 2 Credit Bureau. We're based out of Chicago. And 3 for instance, Pittsburgh is one of 30 offices 4 nationally. 5 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: But who pays the Bill? 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Who hires you? 8 MR. BURIK: Well, we have a eastern 9 regional office out of Springfield, Pennsylvania, 10 who I report to and then that division reports 11 nationally to our Chicago headquarters. 12 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Who pays your 13 bills? 14 VOICE: Mr. Chairman, for clarification, I think he --15 16 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Hang on. I quess 17 they want to know how your company generates 18 revenues. Would a Boscov's retain you or would 19 a -- I think maybe is that where we're going? 20 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: That's where 21 we're headed. 22 MR. BUNTON: If I could just get on the record I'm Jerry Bunton with Trans Union, and I'm 23 24 here to help Steve out. 25 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: All right.

1 MR. BUNTON: Not that he needs help. 2 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: He just needs 3 an answer. CHAIRPERSON CLARK: A little problem with the question, but we're on track now. 5 6 MR. BUNTON: Yes. The people that grant 7 credit, the stores, the Boscov's of the world, 8 they are the people that are our primary 9 customers. 10 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Are there any 11 other people who are your primary customers? 12 MR. BUNTON: Anybody that grants 13 credit -- banks -- anyone that needs a credit 14 file to look at to make a credit decision, 15 they're Trans Union's primary customer. REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Would it be 16 17 fair to say that Trans Union does not represent 18 the customers who utilize the services of your 19 primary sponsors? 20 The consumer, the ultimate MR. BUNTON: 21 person looking for the credit decision --22 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: MR. BUNTON: -- they have no direct 23 24 relationship with Trans Union, that's true. 25 if we're not giving quality information to the

1 credit grantors as was testified to earlier, 2 they're not going to buy the credit reports from 3 us. REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: The Fraud 5 Victim Assistance Department -- correct me if I'm Б wrong -- the money that pays for its operation, 7 its staff, et cetera, is provided by potential 8 grantors of credit who pay you a fee to conduct 9 this service? 10 MR. BUNTON: To the extent that -- it's 11 an expense. It's a part of our business. We 12 don't have a special fund or a special assessment 13 for the credit grantors; but it comes out of 14 our -- you know, it's an operating expense. REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Would I be 15 16 able to contribute money to Trans Union for your 17 operation? Could I write you a check? 18 MR. BUNTON: No. 19 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: In other 20 words, you would not service me? 21 MR. BUNTON: We would service you. 22 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: But I couldn't 23 write you a check? 24 MR. BUNTON: You couldn't write us a

check. It's already part of the package --

25

1 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: You're doing 2 this for the consumer but you represent the 3 creditors? 4 MR. BUNTON: Correct. 5 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. Let me follow-up on this. Credit counseling, does Trans 6 7 Union do credit counseling? MR. BUNTON: No. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: You don't do 10 any credit counseling? 11 MR. BUNTON: No. 12 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Do any of 13 your clients, people who sponsor you, do they do 14 credit counseling? That I don't know. MR. BUNTON: 15 MR. BURIK: There's a local organization 16 17 called a Consumer Credit Counseling Service, and 18 they are spread out throughout the United States. Here in Pittsburgh there's an organization. 19 20 That's what it's called, CCCS. 21 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Who pays them? 22 It's free. It's provided to the VOICE: 23 consumer, Representative Robinson --24 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Nothing is free in America. It's actually --25

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Okay. Hang on. stenographer only has four arms. VOICE: What Dean Sheaffer said, it's provided at no charge by a lot of the local bureaus; but it's ultimately financed by creditors as a service to customers. MR. SCHAFFER: Actually what happens is that the customer through Consumer Credit Counseling Services makes a hundred-dollar payment to us, CCCS in turn bills us for a percentage of that payment in order to support their services and their counseling of the customers.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Is it correct -- and I realize no one here represents this organization, at least I don't think there is, this Credit Counseling Service. Is it correct and accurate to say that the services they provide are designed to get consumers to pay their bills on time?

MR. SCHAFFER: I don't --

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: I would assume that that's true.

MR. SCHAFFER: I think without speaking for them it's my perception that their purpose is

1 to help Pennsylvanians, in our case, that are 2 unable to appropriately structure their finances to help them negotiate with creditors an 3 agreement that they can work within a budget that they can work within and still satisfy the 5 creditors. 6 And, again, it's the creditors that are 7 It's not to make sure that we paying for that. 8 9 get paid. It's to help those customers that are 10 in trouble budget their way and work their way 11 out because they feel the obligation to do that. REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Back to 12 Mr. Burik, is Trans Union a nonprofit corporation 13 14 in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania? MR. BURIK: No. 15 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Is Trans Union 16 17 a nonprofit corporation? MR. BURIK: No. 18 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Is Trans Union 19 a S-2 corporation? 20 MR. BUNTON: I would say no. 21 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Do either one 22 of you know the actual legal status of Trans 23 Union to do business in Pennsylvania? 24 MR. BUNTON: I'm not sure how it's 25

1 registered to do business in Pennsylvania. 2 headquartered in Chicago, Illinois. I'm not 3 sure, but it's probably a privately-held corporation. 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. But the point I'm getting at is House Bill 2114 and its 6 amendments speaks to the issue of credit reporting agencies allowing the consumers of 8 9 Pennsylvania to see your financial statements. 10 So I need to know what your legal status is to 11 determine if that would be appropriate. I personally think it's appropriate, but 12 I need to know what your legal status is. 13 may preclude --14 MR. BUNTON: For consumers to see the 15 financial statements of Trans Union? 16 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Who pays you? 17 Who pays your bills? What's your bottom line? 18 19 MR. BUNTON: I'm not sure. VOICE: -- VP for a company called Trans 20 21 Union --THE COURT REPORTER: Sir, could I have 22 23 your name, please? MR. CAPALDI: Yes. My name is Anthony 24 Capaldi, C-A-P-A-L-D-I. I'm group VP for the 25

1 company. We are a Delaware Corporation licensed 2 to do business in the State of Pennsylvania. 3 We're a privately-held corporation. We would not 4 release our financial figures to you. 5 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: You say you do not or will not? 6 7 MR. CAPALDI: We do not release them to 8 anyone. We're a privately-held corporation. 9 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Do you pay 10 taxes in Pennsylvania? MR. CAPALDI: I'm sure we do. I don't 11 12 I'd be glad to find out for you. know. 13 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: I'd appreciate 14 Just a couple other quick questions if I might, and I'm being aggressive because I think 15 16 we need to put it on the table who represents who so that we can determine who's helping who. 17 I think consumers believe that credit 18 reporting agencies and credit counseling services 19 20 are there to assist them. That's probably not completely accurate. You're probably there more 21 22 to assist the people who are paying your bills. 23 That's probably more accurate. And I base that on the nature of the 24

business that your sponsors are engaged in:

25

business of selling services and making a profit.

That's why I said there's nothing free in

America. So I don't believe you're doing this

free. Somebody is paying for it. Someone has to

pay for it. They have to.

· 19

And I'm simply trying to find out who's paying the bills and whose bidding are you actually doing? And I believe that part of the problem is because you work for the credit granting agencies, because you work for the retailers, you don't have an incentive to really work for the customer.

And I think if you did have an incentive to work for the customer the customer wouldn't have so much trouble finding out about this Fraud Victim Assistance and all these other very good programs you have which are not designed to help the consumer. They're designed to help the retailer.

Only the retailer has access to this information. Because the retailer has a vested interest, as you stated, in making sure that people are not engaged in fraudulent activities. But what about the people who have been victimized by fraudulent activities?

I haven't heard anybody who talked about them except Mr. Boyd, who was victimized. I'm being very serious about that. Yes, there are laws in place. But if the laws are not obeyed and not enforced, then what do we have?

Why should Pennsylvania citizens have to travel to the Federal Trade Commission to resolve problems in Pennsylvania and why should we have Delaware corporations operating in Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania citizens not be protected?

There's something wrong with the picture.

And 2114 is an attempt to get at what I believe is wrong. And one way to get at it is to find out who represents, who's paying who, and who is protecting the consumer, the actual people who are buying the products for which they are granted credit to purchase.

Let me just ask a couple other quick questions; and I appreciate your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and both of you gentlemen. You mentioned about this Fraud Victim Assistance Program.

If a person, consumer informs you they've been victimized by fraud, what action is taken by the Fraud Victim Assistance Department

at Trans Union?

MR. BURIK: What we'll do is go through the verification process of the fraud. We'll get in writing their complaints, their concerns as well as talk to them over the phone and verify back to the credit grantor to get the facts and data to back up, you know, to see if we have a matching story here.

And if that's the case, the consumer would be assisted at that point. They also have the ability to add a consumer statement to their file up to a hundred words on the file which will notify any other credit grantors that actually pull the credit file of the consumer so they can be prewarned that there has some potential fraud.

We also have listened to the previous testimony, this fraud data base of information, which is called our hot data base which contains fraud addresses, Social Security numbers, and current addresses.

So our credit granting community can be prewarned that potential fraud exists out there on a certain consumer and they can match that back to their application process.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Just two other

quick questions. I said I'm being very aggressive because I'm trying to get to what actually happens, not what you say happens, what actually happens to people.

And I will call that 800 number. I'm going to see if I can talk to a live person because to this date, I've never been able to talk to a live person when I've called concerning my own personal credit problem either calling the retailer or calling the credit reporting agency. Never. Never.

I've written and got a response, but never have been able to talk to a live person. So this will be a new experience for me, and I appreciate Trans Union being diligent in that regard.

MR. BURIK: Excuse me, Representative Robinson. It's important to know from Trans Union's point of view there is two separate -- I'm talking about two separate entities here.

Our Fraud Victim Assistance Department is separate from our Consumer Relations

Department. They both have 800 numbers for the consumer to talk to, but the Consumer Relations

number is actually a recording that you'll get when they call requesting a copy of their credit report or if they have a dispute.

Trans Union within 48 hours, we will send out a copy of the credit report. That's all an automated system, an automated phone system. But the Fraud Victim Assistance Department is a totally separate division or department.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Do you have that 800 number with you?

MR. BURIK: Yes, I do.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Because I'm still a victim.

MR. BURIK: Sure. It's 800-680-7289. That's the Fraud Victim Assistance Department.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: I'll get back to you and let you know if they gave me any assistance as a victim of fraud. Let me go to my last question. And I do not presume that either one of you gentlemen have all the answers, so don't take this personally.

The legal issue: In some instances, people have gone to court -- and I won't use my own particular case as a reference -- have gone to court to try to determine that they indeed did

not open up accounts, that they indeed were not engaged any in any activity that was not within the purviews of any arrangement they had with a creditor, that they were not in any way attempting to defraud a creditor.

Many of these people find that once they get into court they lose not because they don't have a good case, because, evidently, there is not in place any standard of evidence that is acceptable in a court of law at least in Pennsylvania that a person can meet so that they can say, I'm not the one.

Does your Fraud Victim Assistance

Program at all address or research any legal
actions that consumers have taken to clear their
name and use that information in any fashion that
might help the consumer reestablish the good
credit status that they previously had?

MR. BUNTON: I would say basically, no. We don't get into the legal research or into the individual case. Basically, we're like the public library. Whatever result comes from that we'll put in our data base and report, but we don't get involved in the particular case that you might have with your creditor.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: So would it be fair to say that a person who lost their case would have that document in their file and that would simply be further evidence that they're not credit worthy?

MR. BUNTON: That they lost the case?

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Yeah, because
no one's ever won a case. No one that I know of
has ever sued a creditor relative to the issues
that we're talking about here and won a case. If
there is, I'd like to know where it is. Never.

MR. BUNTON: Although we do follow public records, what we're going to talk about is the integrity of your credit file. And if for some reason the dispute did not work out between you and the creditor, if that had worked out, you wouldn't even need to go to court.

If it didn't work out, then we're going to still report the information that the creditor gives us. If you win a judgment against a creditor and straighten that out, then we'll report whatever information the Credit Bureau reports to us.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. So if the creditor is successful, then you simply

1 verify their success? In other words, you verify 2 what's already in the court document if they're 3 successful? If they're not successful, you 4 verify they're not successful? 5 MR. BUNTON: We'll verify the status of 6 your credit whether you've paid your debt or not. 7 We wouldn't really get so much into reporting, you 8 know, John Smith versus Sears. We wouldn't have 9 that decision. But we probably have the credit record that the debt has been paid or forgiven or 10 11 what have you. 12 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Let me ask you 13 one more question because I don't want to 14 dominate the time. And I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your indulgence. 15 16 Does Trans Union have any authorization to remove from a credit file information placed 17 there by a grantor of credit? That's the first 18 19 question. Okay. 20 Can you on your own remove information 21

that a creditor has put in that file, anybody's file?

22

23

24

25

MR. BUNTON: I would say on our own, no. REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay --MR. BURIK: One exception:

Delinquencies are removed from the file as well as public record information from the file between either seven years or a ten-year basis. By law, by the Fair Credit Reporting Act, we have to remove that.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. Once that seven- or ten-year period passes, whichever it is -- and I'm not arguing with you about that -- at that time, is the consumer eligible then to apply for credit from the same grantor of credit they had this bad debt with?

And if they are, what's the likelihood that that creditor would give them credit after seven or ten years?

MR. BURIK: They don't have to wait seven or ten years. They could apply for credit after a year. There really is no time limit for them to go back to the credit grantor and apply for more credit.

MR. BUNTON: And I would still say that's the decision of the credit grantor, you know, whether or not they're going to extend credit or not.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Correct me if

I'm wrong, that credit grantor's going to come

1 back to Trans Union and say, What's in your file, What's in your file, if the person owes 3 them money. And they're going to turn the person 4 down practically. 5 MR. BUNTON: We'll report what's in the 6 file; but, you know, we can't really speak for the credit grantors what decision they would 8 make. 9 REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Good customers 10 are being treated badly. Thank you, 11 Mr. Chairman. 12 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Representative 13 Dermody? REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: 14 15 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Representative 16 Cohen. 17 REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: No. CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Let me ask you one 18 19 question, or maybe I'll give you a scenario and you tell me if I'm right or wrong. You come into 20 21 contact with John Q. Public, a citizen on the 22 street, by the fact that they have been denied 23 credit by a department store. That person inquires into the department 24

store as to why they were denied credit; and they

25

1 said, well, because of a credit report, and here 2 is how you get a credit report. 3 They call you, you send them a credit report, and then the process begins as to whether 4 5 that credit report is accurate or inaccurate and that is your contact with someone on the street. 6 MR. BUNTON: Right. 8 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: When you send that 9 credit report out, is there a statement or an 800 10 number on that indicating your victim fraud union 11 on that credit report? 12 MR. BUNTON: I would say, yes, that's where we would put that, our Fraud Victim 13 Assistance number. 14 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Okay. If you feel 15 you're a victim or whatever of a fraud and that 16 that information appears on a credit report, call 17 this number --18 19 MR. BUNTON: Correct. Yes. 20 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: All right. I thank 21 you gentlemen for your testimony today, and we will certainly also consider your comments as we 22

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON:

Thank you.

Thank you.

work through the process.

MR. BUNTON:

23

. 24

25

I believe now we'll

1 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: 2 back up and pick up Barry E. Creany. Maybe you 3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

can help us with the pronouncement of your name. And he is the Senior Deputy Attorney General, Bureau of Consumer Protection, the Office of the

6 State Attorney General. You may proceed.

> Thank you, Mr. Chairman, MR. CREANY: distinguished Members of the Subcommittee. appreciate the opportunity to be able to testify on behalf of the House Bill 2114 Consumer Credit Reporting Act.

Before I make my formal remarks, I extend to you the greetings of Attorney General Mike Fisher. Attorney General Fisher commends Representative Robinson and the entire -- all the cosponsors and the entire Subcommittee for its efforts in reviewing this Bill which if enacted would augment protections afforded consumers to quard against the misuse of confidential identifying information and to preserve their credit worthiness.

Consumers have come to rely upon the strength of their credit histories in order to afford themselves and their families the basic needs of houses, transportation, and education. When inaccurate information is reported or when confidential information is misused, consumers often suffer immediate losses economically, they miss certain opportunities, and are sometimes faced with the difficult burden of correcting their credit profiles.

We live in an instant credit society, a society that is far more reliant upon credit than we were a generation ago. Consumers save less than ever before and allocate more of their net income to pay mortgages, car loans, student loans, and credit card debt.

Car sales are traditionally the No. 1 source of complaints filed with the Bureau of Consumer Protection. Car dealers tell us that most buyers don't care what the price of the car is.

They tell us that consumers only want to know what the payment will be. Auto dealers love these payment buyers. And in order to maintain this way of life, consumers must maintain a good credit rating.

We often hear from consumers about debt problems they experience when they were unable to meet their payments as a result of the loss of

employment, health-related expenses, divorce, and other catastrophic events which leave them with ruined credit.

It is not uncommon for us to hear from consumers who are shocked to learn that their credit reports contain inaccurate information because somehow their credit information has been mixed with that of another party.

But far more disturbing are the periodic complaints we receive from people who have worked hard and always paid their way but nevertheless are being harassed by creditors or their credit has been destroyed by con artists who have tapped into their confidential financial information and used that information to perpetrate telemarketing and identity fraud scams.

Credit identity fraud is a serious crime we are beginning to hear about more often. When consumers discover that a credit reporting agency is carrying inaccurate information and complain to the Bureau of Consumer Protection, we attempt to mediate the problem by contacting the Credit Bureaus and guiding them through the dispute process.

This process can be a very daunting task even where the Credit Bureaus recognize that fraud is involved and cooperate in removing the false information.

I understand that this Subcommittee has or will be hearing firsthand from a number of consumers who have lived through the nightmare of having to unravel problems that result from being victimized by credit identity fraud; therefore, we would defer to their testimony as to how difficult that process can be.

Another serious problem we see resulting from the unauthorized use and possession of personal identifying information is the harm that results from buying and selling information regarding victims of telemarketing fraud.

Associated with such fraud are list brokers who peddle information such as a consumer's name, address, phone numbers, bank account information, and other information regarding past victimization.

Those who purchase these lists then revictimize the consumers, often using the confidential information to fashion their new scams.

The Consumer Credit Reporting Act will enhance the protections provided by the Fair Credit Reporting Act in its 1996 amendments in a number of significant ways.

First, all of the rights under federal law and enforceable in federal courts will be incorporated into state law. As a result, consumers will have much greater access to the remedies by virtue of being able to bring actions in state courts located within their counties of residence.

This bill would likewise provide the Attorney General's Office with a choice of forum in which to seek injunctive relief. In addition to these practical enforcement considerations, the Consumer Credit Reporting Act provides for additional substantive protections which will place tighter controls on the issuance of instant credit and will provide criminal penalties for those who are involved in the unauthorized disclosure, possession, or use of personal identifying information.

These additional protections should provide a strong deterrent in addressing the problem of credit identity fraud and the

brokering of financial information which is often associated with telemarketing fraud schemes.

Section 204 (a) subsections 1, 2, and 3 are compliance procedures with added protections on top of the Fair Credit Reporting Act. These procedures are aimed at curtailing credit identity fraud which is often something that starts at a retail level.

These compliance procedures merely require that before providing consumers with instant credit, retailers first obtain sufficient identifying information and certify that employees are instructed to check photo identification.

If the offer is being made by mail, the party accessing credit reports must verify any address changes that may be involved in the course of an extension of credit.

These compliance procedures are not just good for consumers, they're good credit extension practices and will serve the interests of retailers and creditors as well. Section 506 makes it a criminal act to engage in four specific types of the intentional misuse of personal identifying information.

~ -

Rather than having to fit a practice into an existing theory of liability for theft, the subsections to section 506 are well tailored to fit both credit identity fraud and persons who market the names of past telemarketing victims.

The Consumer Credit Reporting Act will serve Pennsylvania consumers well by adopting rights and remedies formerly only provided by federal law.

Further, it will add the necessary criminal sanctions to help deter the unauthorized access and misuse of a consumer's personal identifying information. For these reasons, the Office of Attorney General supports House Bill 2114. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Thank you,
Mr. Creany. Let me ask a couple questions, some
of which are based on testimony that was
previously given before you arrived. And I'm not
attempting to put you on the spot or anyone else
who has testified.

All the testimony is available for your perusal and I appreciate you doing that. Also, I'm not trying to ask you questions to

substantiate my position that 2114 is necessary.

So I need you to answer the question,
What role did the Attorney General's Office have
in formulating House Bill 2114 as it is before
us? And we have copies here to my right.

MR. CREANY: We did go on record on January 14th to support amendments that were to a prior piece of legislation, and that's to the extent I'm aware of our role in this proceeding.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: In other words, the Attorney General's Office has not helped to fashion 2114?

MR. CREANY: No, we didn't. There was two amendments to a bill on privacy that we supported which are in fact the provisions that are incorporated in section 204 and section 506, the provisions that will limit access and use of personal identifying information.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Correct me if I'm wrong, the Attorney General's Office was contacted by my office and your assistance was requested in improving 2114 and soliciting your recommendations?

MR. CREANY: I believe so. It was more through the legislative office than the section

I'm with.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. So there has been contact with the Attorney General's Office relative to strengthening 2114, but the Attorney General's Office was not involved in drafting 2114?

MR. CREANY: That's my understanding.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. The issue of identity theft, I've used that term and I think some others have today. Correct me if I'm wrong, presently in Pennsylvania today and tomorrow, there is not something called identity theft? There's nothing in law which identifies a crime of identity theft?

MR. CREANY: I don't believe there's anything that fits. It would be more of a theft by deception or one of the other theft offenses that that type of act would fit under.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Would the definition of identity theft in 2114 more specifically identify the types of issues that 2114 is trying to address?

MR. CREANY: I believe that it does.

And that's how we've supported it because it not

(sic) just the completed act that somebody's used

it, but when people are obtaining this information and possessing it, and then go to use it, all those types of specific acts are violations under section 506.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. There was some testimony earlier that the Attorney General's Office can utilize the Fair Credit Reporting Act and federal procedures to address the problems identified in 2114.

First of all, is that true? And second of all, if it true, what has been the relationship of the Attorney General's Office to the federal process?

MR. CREANY: That is true. There is jurisdiction and actions are permitted by the states. I've been with the Attorney General's Office ten years, and the only action I'm aware of was a multi-state action that was taken several years ago against the major credit reporting agencies where there was several states joined together and entered into an agreement.

That is one of the only ones I've ever known our office going into federal court on. It was a multi-state settlement. As far as those situations where there's federal

jurisdiction and we still have state laws, we have a lot of these types of laws.

that the Federal Trade Commission allows us to go into federal court on a telemarketing violation. We also have our state law. But sometimes tied to the federal laws are requirements that we act with notice first to the federal authorities. So this one has a separate basis for us to go in under state law. And sometimes that's the better forum.

Bringing consumers from Juniata County to Pittsburgh or to a federal court in Johnstown might be more difficult than bringing it in Juniata or Huntingdon or one of those outer-lying counties. And therefore, we've got to consider all these when we're bringing actions.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Would it be fair to say that the Attorney General himself through you does not believe that 2114 is in conflict with the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act?

MR. CREANY: It doesn't appear. And the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act specifically

allows for state laws that enhance protections to consumers with one section that outlines areas where we may be preempted.

But as I reviewed 2114, it was my impression that we pretty much have a mirror image except for these few sections, section 204 and section 506 which augment the protections that aren't in place on a federal level.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Would the passage of 2114 assist the Attorney General's Office in protecting the consumers in Pennsylvania?

MR. CREANY: I think it would make it much more easy for us to go in and not just to choose in state court but also in situations where there's a mishandling of the information that -- those instances, especially the criminal ones, could be dealt with a lot more easily in a criminal setting now that we've given that there would be passage of that law.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: 2114 very specifically attempts to deal with front-end solutions to the credit identity issue. Are there any additional recommendations that the Attorney General's Office would be fashioning to

strengthen 2114 in terms of how we can prevent identity theft as opposed to simply prosecute people who are found guilty of it?

MR. CREANY: I'm not aware of any at this moment. I'd have to check with the Legislative Office on any considerations they might want to add.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: One last question relates to staffing. We're four legislators here. And from time to time, we have to make decisions about staffing for the various departments, at least what amount of money would be made available.

Two questions: How many staff people do you have that deal with these issues of consumer fraud, consumer advocacy, and what do you think would be a sufficient compliment if 2114 were to pass?

MR. CREANY: I have a small part of the state. The Evansburg regional office covers nine counties and I have three agents that cover those. We generally take in about 3,000 complaints a year.

I think at this point it's difficult -- and that's probably a common ratio

throughout the state that each agent's handling about a thousand cases a year. I think it's difficult to handle some of these things as well as you would want to because of the pressure.

There is an effort in our office to bring in a mediation process with interns, and we're hoping to develop that further in the next year.

But one thing that I noticed in preparing for today's hearing, I tried to gather some of the cases that we've seen since January and tried to find out what's happened since the first letters went out to the creditors.

And it's something that I find that because the agents aren't able to do a, you know, consistent work one case through to the end, some of these things they really do take a lot more time to the extent that I had a case that involved someone who was dunning a consumer for what looked like credit identity fraud to me.

She gets a bill. She's got to call this number. She's first talking to the representative on the other side who is a creditor. He says, What's your last -- what's the last four digits of your Social Security

number?

Consumers are told never to give out anything over the phone. And this lady's mother taught her well and she said I was told never to give these things out. And I said that's the advise we pass on to consumers.

This fellow wanted that as some form of verification. When she wouldn't give it to him, he hung up the phone. I picked up that case and called him and I explained I want your information. What do you have on this account?

We found out four out of four pieces of information they had identifying this consumer were inaccurate, yet they were continuing to dun it. But these are the kind of cases that might get passed along and take months and months to unravel.

We've tried to work on them, but I think additional help in the mediation unit or staffing would benefit that situation.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Creany.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Representative Cohen.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you.

Representative Robinson said that in his personal experiences he was unaware of any successful prosecutions under the Federal Act. Do you have knowledge about how the Federal Act works?

MR. CREANY: I have knowledge that there may be instances, but none that I'm aware of in Pennsylvania where there are firms that do bring actions in situations of credit identity fraud.

But it's sort of an emerging civil action. We don't see much of it around the country. There are some national firms that are doing these, but I think there's none that we're aware of in Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: So there's no litigation in Pennsylvania --

MR. CREANY: It does seem like even with just where there might not be credit identity fraud but there's some sort mishandling of information, consumers are so relieved to try to correct it, it doesn't seem like it's one case that they take into court because of, you know, the costs involved there.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: So to your knowledge, do consumers take it to the federal agencies, the FTCs?

1 MR. CREANY: They may make complaints to 2 the FTC, but our experience has been that we're 3 generally more keyed to addressing a consumer problem of a Pennsylvania consumer than the 5 Federal Trade Commission would be in Washington, DC. 6 7 A lot of the situations that we see even resolved don't involved restitution for consumers 8 9 because we're much more accountable to the 10 Pennsylvania consumers than the Federal Trade 11 Commission attorneys would be. 12 REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Do you have any 13 idea as to what percentage of complaints were 14 formally resolved? 15 MR. CREANY: No, I don't have that 16 information. 17 REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Is it a substantial number of complaints that are 18 19 formally resolved? 20 MR. CREANY: I think for the most part 21 we're able to work through a lot of the 22 complaints about misinformation. Credit identity

fraud's one that seems to be a longer road to

It's just a really difficult time

unravel, but it does seem like it works out.

23

24

25

process because not maybe the agencies -- credit reporting agencies or their management; but on the lower level, there's a reticent to change any sort of credit report without something very significant.

I think the basis is they want to see you proving the information before making any changes.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Are most of your actions with -- well, on behalf of an individual, are they with the creditor providing bad information to the credit union?

Because I think we've heard today from the credit union's that they basically pass along and compile and verify information that's provided to them. So is your contact with a creditor that has provided that information or with a credit union who has reported it?

MR. CREANY: I'd say it's pretty much both. We see both very commonly. It's odd.

Some of the ones more common that come in our office, Representative George just referred one recently that a fellow finds from his credit

report that he has thirty accounts on it totalling \$72,000.

He had focused his complaint against the Credit Bureau, and we therefore filed or forwarded the complaint to them for handling. When we're talking to them, in a matter of a month there was no activity on, you know, changing the situation that he was faced with.

But talking to them yesterday, now they're aware that somehow -- and they're not clear. They're trying to identify it. But somehow information was mixed into his account.

So somebody furnishing information to them blended in or somehow it got mixed in the process and it was on his report. At this point, they're certainly going to be removing it.

But until I talked to the supervisor at the Credit Bureau yesterday, it didn't seem like they were sufficiently satisfied that it should be done immediately. But this fellow is, you know, clearly not the debtor in that situation.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Whenever you find out that there's actual fraud as opposed to a mistake, does your Bureau follow through on a prosecution or is that referred to another

bureau?

MR. CREANY: They've been very rare, but there would definitely be referral over to the Criminal Division or else the local district attorney.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: And why are they rare?

MR. CREANY: They're rare because I think in those situations -- we've had one or two in the time that I've been with the Attorney General's Office.

But there are situations where the consumer doesn't come to us because it's perceived to be more of a criminal situation, so we maybe aren't the first, you know, contact that they have.

Sometimes it does happen that they're reporting it to us as an initial and we refer it to criminal. But a lot of these might first go to the police department or local district attorneys.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Because I would have thought that someone would not be aware that there is identity fraud until you've checked, you know, the credit union and back with the creditor

and then that you would be the people to say, well, it wasn't a mistake in reporting or it wasn't an input type thing, you know, there is someone out there that's using your --

MR. CREANY: Well, one recent example that we have of this is this lady who was divorced and steals her ex-husband's identification. The husband remarries. Somewhere down the line they are applying for credit and find out there's problems.

That case immediately went to the District Attorney up in Cambria County who prosecuted the ex-wife for all of these frauds. She had taken his identification and established accounts that she was using. So it had been one that we didn't have any dealings in.

It was just a report after the fact from the District Attorney's office. It is fairly common if they find that there is some sort of forgery or clearly somebody's stolen someone's identity, I think it's more common that people perceive it as a criminal act and go to the local criminal authorities rather than the State Consumer Protection Office.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Well, in a situation

like that, you can eliminate the suspects pretty quickly and pinpoint who probably has done that.

But I'm thinking in a situation where someone has picked up someone else's Social Security card or address or telephone number from the phone book, how would you get a handle on that and eventually prosecute that? Or is that just something that's too large a problem to get a handle on?

MR. CREANY: I haven't really seen in my region any of those large-scale, you know, real large-scale types of credit identity fraud that I've read about.

But in our area, we do have the more common ones where someone's used a credit card, some clerk has taken that identification and used it in making other charges, those types of situations.

And like you say, those are sometimes easy to identify the suspects when you start getting the information on where it was billed from and such.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Thank you. Representative Robinson.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Just a comment

and then one question. I represent two of the largest retail districts in the state, so my concern is not simply from the standpoint of consumers but also for the retailers.

Also you mentioned a submerging civil action. Some people that I've talked to across the country liken what's happening to this area of identity fraud in terms of resolution to what has been happening in terms of the government having to take on the tobacco industry.

And so it may be a long time before the industry is willing to do more to protect consumers. And it probably will take the enthusiasm of the government again to over-regulate the industry to deal with what is an obvious problem.

My question relates to standards of evidence. As a lawyer, you're probably more familiar with what I'm talking about than I am. Is there a standard or are there standards of evidence that can be utilized in a court of law where a consumer can indeed present evidence that that was accepted by the court and be proof that that particular consumer was not the person who established credit accounts or loans that have

not been paid?

MR. CREANY: I don't believe there's any special standard of evidence. We have federal rules in the Federal and State Evidence Rules governing actions within Pennsylvania.

But it gets into a situation with some of those types of situations that you're trying to prove the forgery or you're trying to prove that you weren't at such a place.

If somebody's done a good job of obtaining birth certifies and information and really does construct an identity, that is a very difficult thing. You're proving a negative. I wasn't there. I didn't buy this. I don't have those products.

That's why it's probably needing no special rules of evidence. It's just that the burden to carry is so much heavier in those situations.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: We thank you, and give our best to the Attorney General.

MR. CREANY: Thank you very much, sir. CHAIRPERSON CLARK: The next individual

/

1 to provide testimony to the Committee is Donald 2 He is the President of Fourth Wave. 3 Fry? 4 (No audible response.) 5 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Okay. I see 6 Mr. DeFrancesco is here. He is with the 7 Pennsylvania Association of Community Bankers, if you'd like to join us and provide us with your 8 9 testimony. 10 You're not Mr. Bailey? 11 MR. DEFRANCESCO: I'm not Mr. Bailey, 12 but I can present Mr. Bailey's remarks. 13 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: I'll tell you what 14 we'll do. You're waiting for -- all right. Why don't we take a ten-minute break here. We'll 15 16 scour around and see if we can find Mr. Fry and 17 find out who the Fourth Wave is. MR. DEFRANCESCO: I appreciate that. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: And we'll come back 20 in about ten minutes. (At which time, a brief break was taken.) 21 22 CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Okay. And the last 23 person to testify before our Committee this 24 morning or this afternoon is Thomas Bailey. is the President of the Brentwood Savings Bank. 25

And I assume that he is not representative to George Bailey.

MR. BAILEY: No. Lot of comparisons.

Good morning. As was stated, I'm Thomas Bailey, President of Brentwood Savings Bank.

Brentwood Savings Bank is 170 million, 35 person institution operating in the South Hills of Pittsburgh.

We are a member of the Pennsylvania

Association of Community Bankers, and I come to
you today as a member of the PACB's legislative
committee. And I would like to preface my
remarks by saying this is our preliminary view on
the House Bill 2114.

To its benefit, Pennsylvania has an extensive network of community banks. Community banks are unique and they maintain a hometown commitment. Our decisions are made locally so we can respond to individual needs on a local economy.

We offer a full line of quality
financial services and boast the same high-tech
amenities offered in our nation's largest
financial conglomerates. Yet we offer these
services with a personal touch that can only be

found in your hometown bank.

As community banks, we are proud of our reputation. We also look to a bright future with neighbors and can continue to benefit from community banking option.

I am here to talk about the marketplace in general, House Bill 214 specifically. As a smaller institution, my bank and most community banks face a very real challenge.

Because of our limited size in terms of manpower, each new regulation presents an increased demand for additional employees and consequently increased costs to consumers.

As you move forward on your deliberations of House Bill 2114 or any legislation for that matter,, I urge you to take a keen look at the cost and benefit of the proposal.

House Bill 2114 would indeed increase my operation's cost and would provide very little in terms of new necessary consumer protection.

House Bill 2114 mirrors very closely the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act.

It institutes much of the same consumer protection already outlined in the federal

legislation, yet it does not rely on the same federal disclosure to satisfy the reporting provisions of the law.

Also, it establishes a duplicate system of recourse which a consumer can choose to exercise their rights under the law -- two separate and distinct mechanisms serving identical purposes.

The system we would create through the passage of House Bill 2114 would produce greater jurisdictional confusion and arguably complicate what should be a straightforward procedure.

The additional disclosure requirements as outlined in section 207 (c) would also serve to confuse the consumer who already faces a barrage of paperwork and disclosures as they proceed through what has become a very complicated loan process.

Another perspective that concerns our industry in this and in any proposal is the inherent flaws or issues that require attentions, alterations over time. What House Bill 2114 mirrors the Federal Credit Reporting Act as both exist today, there will certainly be changes made to both over time.

As much as we are concerned with the duplication and increased regulatory burden House Bill 2114 would present to our industry, we are much more concerned about the future and where the two laws diverge leaving us to comply with two separate and distinct sets of rules authorizing two separate and distinct systems carrying out preliminarily the same mission.

We strongly suggest that if the legislation does move forward an amendment be offered that would automatically yield state law to federal standards.

In closing, let me say that we rely on the credit reporting industry to provide accurate data which we use to make daily business decisions. Erroneous data may cost us a customer or introduce increased risk to our loan portfolio.

Our industry has a vested interest and is an advocate for accuracy in credit reporting. However, House Bill 2114 will not provide additional protection to consumers, nor will it necessarily increase the accuracy of consumer credit data.

It will indeed increase the cost to

Pennsylvania businesses and will increase the demand on our judicial system. While House Bill 2114 is founded on good intent, we question whether its results will truly offer public benefit.

PACB urges the Committee to take a diligent look at this policy initiative. Evaluate it carefully. We believe you will find the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide adequate protection to consumers and therefore eliminate the need for this Bill.

Thank you for your time and the opportunity to present my opinion to this Committee. I would be glad to answer any questions at this time.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: We thank you very much for your testimony and your insight.

Representative Robinson.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you Mr. Bailey.
Unfortunately, you didn't benefit from the some of the previous testimony. I don't say that as a criticism but just as an encouragement to you to at your leisure your committee also has to review the other testimony that was presented,

particularly the testimony of the Attorney

General Michael Fisher, who is supportive of this

legislation.

Let me ask you somewhat of a rhetorical question. Again, I'm not trying to embarrass you. If you had an opportunity to conduct your business in Brentwood as opposed to Washington, D.C., which place would you conduct your business?

MR. BAILEY: I think we've elected to do that -- as we stand now, we're a state charter bank. But we have the -- the problem where we have to comply with both federal laws and state laws --

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: The point I'm trying to make is that 2114 gives Pennsylvanians an opportunity to resolve problems with their credit in Pennsylvania. They can also go to Washington DC; but I believe and the cosponsors of the Bill believe that we should allow our Attorney General, our courts in Pennsylvania assist the consumers and creditors in resolving dispute.

And so 2114 recognizes the Federal Credit Reporting Act is mirrored after that Act,

but it is intended to allow Pennsylvanians to

stay here in our Commonwealth and not have to go

down the turnpike to Washington, D.C.

Also, the issue of whether or not federal law would take precedent, when this Bill was drafted, that was one of the first concerns that I raised that we not be in conflict with federal law.

It is certainly not my intent as a prime sponsor to create more complications for our retailers or for consumers. I represent two of the largest retail districts in the state. Just about every bank -- major bank in this region is headquartered and does business in my legislative district.

So I'm not trying to create problems for constituents, believe me. I am concerned, however, that we be able to fill in the gap, so to speak, were the federal law does allow us to operate that we do that and we do that to protect Pennsylvania citizens.

I do not presume that when the federal bill was being debated and its amendments that all issues were resolved or that everybody agreed. I presumed that some compromise was

struck and no one went away feeling completely satisfied.

I anticipate that here in Pennsylvania we'll probably have a similar process. If I had my way, 2114 would become the law. I'm not going to have my way, and so 2114 as it's drafted t probably will not be the law.

But there was every intent and I think we fulfilled the intent to make sure that 2114 is in not in conflict with the federal law and is subservient to Federal law. There's no attempt at all to supersede that.

And I'm sure before the process is finished that will be answered definitively. And I have no problem with answering that definitively. I don't think it'll serve any purpose for us to try to usurp federal authority in this regard.

One question if I might, and I do appreciate your time and effort. I noticed your testimony did not speak to protections for consumers. Your testimony spoke to the interest of the banking and credit lending industry.

And that's a part of my problem is that it would appear that the banks and credit lending

industry are only concerned about themselves and have left it to me and my colleagues to be concerned about the consumers.

What do you do? What does your association do to address consumer concerns about identity theft, about fraud, about credit counseling, and about protecting the good credit status of good customers who are being treated badly?

MR. BAILEY: I think that's the advantage of a small community bank is we don't want to lose those customers so we work with them. And that's the advantage of a small community bank. So when somebody says, hey, that's not my credit problem -- at least I can speak for Brentwood -- is we try to resolve that issue.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Have you read House Bill 2114?

MR. BAILEY: Yes, I have.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBINSON: Okay. One more question if I might, Mr. Chairman. And I do thank you and the indulgence of the Members that are here and who attended.

I would just like to encourage everyone

to not only read 2114, but read the proposed amendments. There will be some other amendments that I'm shaping and I'm sure other Members of the Committee will shape amendments once they read the testimony from the two hearings that we've had.

I'm not trying to blindside anybody.

This is an issue that I feel is a growing problem in Pennsylvania. I'd rather deal with it now than later.

And I think there are enough people who have suffered that we all who have a direct or indirect interest in this probably need to make one, two, or three attempts at trying to more clearly define the problem and see if there are areas in which we can work cooperatively.

Two things I believe we can do -- and they are addressed in this Bill: One, I think we can identify what identity theft is. I think that would be to all of our mutual benefit to clarify that.

And second of all, I think we can do something to address the issue of instant credit of how we can better serve each other by reviewing that whole process where instant credit

is given where you walk in a store and you get your tote bag or your bottle of perfume and then you start shopping based upon some instant credit check.

And I think that extends to this instant credit that's being extended to our college students where college students literally are inundated with credit cards and marketers and others telling them, Take these credit cards, do your thing; and then when those students invariably in most instances get into credit problems, those same marketers and sales people are knocking on their door harassing them, because they want their money and they're entitled to their money. I think we need to do something about that.

The last thing is I think we can do something about people who have and use someone else's credit identity, someone else's personal identity without authorization. That should be illegal. No one should be engaged in that activity, including the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which now is engaged in that activity.

Those are three things that I think we

probably can agree need to be worked on. We might not agree on the solution, but I think we can agree that those are problems. And I certainly stand ready to work with any of you.

And I will be contacting you because I plan to be relentless in this regard.

б

.7

And I thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I thank everyone who's here. I thank our stenographer. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: Thank you, Representative Robinson.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: I have no comment.

CHAIRPERSON CLARK: I think we could sort of, you know, wrap things up, you know. We understand the small institutions. I don't think anyone understands them any better than me.

But I think what we need to do is you get a credit report and there's a problem on that report and you review that with your customer and you need to make a decision of whether to make a loan or not make a loan, and then I think rightfully so you're out of the process from there.

And then that individual says, well, you

know, they gave me this loan despite this; but I want to get it cleaned up. And the question is and the problems are, you know, where do you go, how do you do it and do it effectively and within some kind of time frame that the person can get it resolved with some peace of mind that, gee, you know, I paid that off and it's still on the report and I'd like to get that cleaned up so that the next time I go to borrow something it just won't be there plus the peace of mind of knowing that you have a clean credit report.

So hopefully our intent isn't and hopefully as this evolves it won't be to put any additional obligations on you once you see that report, bring it to a customer's attention, and then, you know, make your decision based on your discussions with your customers.

So I think with that, why, we'll adjourn this meeting and once again thank everyone for coming out today and offering the testimony. And we'll certainly be working with each and every one of you as we work this Bill and run all the legislation through the legislative process. Thank you very much.

(At or about 12:56 p.m., the hearing was

adjourned.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Deirdre J. Meyer, Reporter, Notary

Public, duly commissioned and qualified in and

for the County of Lancaster, Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania, hereby certify that the foregoing

is a true and accurate transcript of my stenotype

notes taken by me and subsequently reduced to

computer printout under my supervision, and that

This certification does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under my direct control and/or supervision.

this copy is a correct record of the same.

Deirdre J. Meyer, Reporter, Notary Public. My commission expires August 10, 1998.