NEW YORK CITY

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND WORKER PROTECTION

DCWP RULES HEARING

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF RULES RELATING TO DEBT COLLECTORS

December 12, 2024

INDEX

Name/Title	<u>Page</u>
Elora	5
Danielle Arlowe, Senior Vice President, American Financial Services Association	6
Jason Forbes	8
Todd Hauslanger, Attorney Patrick Mott, Director, Assistant General Counsel Capital One	l 18

1 [00:06:59] [OFF TOPIC CONVERSTION]

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

HO KARLINE JUNG: Hi everyone. We are going to be getting started in a couple minutes. I'm just going to let some more people trickle in. Thanks. In the meantime, please make sure that your lines are muted. Thank you.

[00:07:34] [OFF TOPIC CONVERSATION]

HO JUNG: Good morning, everyone. I am going to get started. Good morning. My name is Karline Jung. I have been designated at the -- as the hearing officer for the public hearing of the Department of Consumer and Worker Protection on the proposed rules to amend rules relating to debt collectors. This hearing is being held by teleconference call. It is now 11:03 a.m. on Thursday, December 12, 2024 and I am hereby convening the public hearing on this proposed rule. The proposed rule was published in the city record on November 12, 2024. The published notice and rules are available online on the NYC rules website and the department's website. The department has proposed these rules pursuant to the authority vested in the Commissioner of the Department of Consumer and Worker Protection by Sections 1043 and 220f -- 2203f of the New York City Charter and Sections 20-104b, 20-493a

25

and 20-702 of the New York City Administrative Code. This hearing affords the public the opportunity to comment on all aspects of the rules the department has proposed. The department will carefully review all testimony and written comments received at this hearing and will give due weight and consideration to proposals and recommendations that are submitted for the record at this hearing. To ensure that everyone seeking to testify will have an opportunity to do so, I ask that we all follow these ground rules. During the hearing, all participants should give due respect and consideration to the folks offering their testimony. Please mute your lines if you are not speaking. Each witness will have a maximum of three minutes to provide oral testimony. If your comments take longer than three minutes, please synthesize your oral testimony and leave a written copy for the record. Unlike the limit on the time for oral testimony, there is no limit on the number of pages you can submit as written testimony or as documents for the record. The written submission will be made part of the public record. Now, if you are looking to testify today and you have not yet let me know, please do so right now in the chat. Okay. Now, before we begin, I'll remind everyone to please mute your lines

1 until you're call to provide testimony. I will now 2 call the first witness. You will have three minutes 3 for testimony and you may begin whenever you're ready. I have Danielle Arlowe. Danielle? Danielle, are you 4 able to hear me? 5 MS. ELORA: Hi. I work with Danielle. I 6 think she's having some audio issues. 7 HO JUNG: Got it. Okay. 8 9 MS. ELORA: She is there online. I see her 10 video is on. 11 HO JUNG: Yes. 12 MS. ELORA: She's getting that sorted right 13 out. 14 HO JUNG: Okay. 15 MS. ELORA: Thanks so much. Sorry about 16 that. 17 HO JUNG: Okay. No worries. Whenever she's 18 ready. 19 MS. ELORA: Perfect. Thank you. 20 HO JUNG: Thank you. Okay. If anyone else 21 is looking to testify, please let me know in the chat. 22 Okay. Seeing no one present to offer testimony as of 23 now, I will wait until Danielle is ready and then we 24 can hear her testimony and see if anyone else would

like to provide testimony as well.

25

MR. [NAME]: Alright There it goes. Go ahead.

HO JUNG: Alright. Hi, Danielle. Are you ready? Okay. You may begin whenever you're ready.

MS. DANIELLE FAGRE ARLOWE: Thank you so much. Can you hear me okay?

HO JUNG: Yes.

2.3

MS. ARLOWE: Okay, good. Sorry. I had a little technical issue earlier.

HO JUNG: No worries at all.

MS. ARLOWE: Alright. Thank you so much for the opportunity to highlight our concerns with the proposed amended debt collector rules. We filed a much more extensive comment for the record. I'm Danielle Fagre Arlowe. I'm Senior Vice President at the American Financial Services Association. We represent creditors in across a wide array of credit providers including the traditional installment lending industry, the vehicle finance industry, the payments industry, mortgage. We have everyone from small regional businesses to some of the, the largest banks in the world as members. But one thing that all of our members who operate in New York have in common is that we have grave concerns and we're alarmed about the conflation here between collectors whose business

25

model is collection. I hear a little feedback on the line. Can you hear that? Whose business model is collection and creditors who are collecting their own accounts that they originated or acquired shortly after or well before any default was on the account. Creditors collecting their own debts and collectors collecting charge off debt is beyond apples and oranges. And it's a false equivalence to say that, that, that one could comply with the other. There are different roles and different duties to the customer that we have. Let me give you an example. Creditors have to communicate with their, with their consumers, their customers under an array of state and federal The same requirements that might arguably benefit consumers when applied to third party debt collectors are likely to harm consumers if applied to creditors. Debt validation is a perfect example of this. Well, validation by a collector who has no previous interaction with a consumer might help that consumer identify the debt to make sure there's no error in who, in, in who's who, et cetera. Validation on an account -- if everyone can mute their lines, actually would be great because I'm getting some feedback on the line. Could you mute if you're not muted? Thank you. Validation by a collector who has

no previous interaction. 1 2 HO JUNG: No. Danielle, I think we lost you 3 for a second. Do you -- do you check. 4 MS. ARLOWE: Okav. HO JUNG: Yes, we can hear you now. 5 MS. ARLOWE: I'm back. I was hearing, I was 6 7 hearing interference on the line still. Could everyone mute -- do you mind if they aren't talking --8 9 I'm sorry that mine looks like it's muted. Alright. 10 HO JUNG: No. 11 MS. JASON FORBES: Karline, Danielle, it's 12 Jason. Before you continue, just, Karline [inaudible] [00:16:50] for your information, I've got multiple 13 people who are trying to call in, including myself. 14 15 HO JUNG: Mm-hmm. 16 MR. FORBES: And the phone line is not open. 17 So, the Zoom meeting is open for like, there are like 18 eight of us that are in here but the phone line 19 apparently is not working. 20 HO JUNG: Okay. Noted. 21 MR. FORBES: It's not working for me either. 22 MS. ARLOWE: Okay. 2.3 HO JUNG: I'll try to get that sorted. 24 Thank you for letting me know. 25 MR. FORBES: Sure.

> Geneva Worldwide, Inc. 228 Park Ave S - PMB 27669, New York, NY 10003

MS. ARLOWE: Thanks, you got it. Thanks for your patience.

HO JUNG: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MS. ARLOWE: Alright. And I'm -- I'll be well under my three minutes. So, basically, the point about debt, debt validation is it might sense in the case of the third party dept collector. But it doesn't make sense where everybody knows that it's the right person that you're talking to. And it would be very confusing for a consumer, who is receiving statements from the same entity at the same time. Especially if the consumer's account is current to suddenly be treated like they might not be them. It's not just confusing, it inevitably leads to fear of, of fraud et cetera. So, just -- if there's one thing to take away from this let me be clear. This is not about who wears the white hat. We're not saying we're better than third party debt collectors. about the nature of the communication itself and the inadvertent consumer harm enforcing creditors to behave like third party debt collectors in the same way. This amendment rule would be inconsistent with an array of Federal Law and New York Law. conflicts with the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act. It directly conflicts with the Fair Credit

25

Reporting Act where we have to, we have to report things completely inaccurately. It is different than Article 29H of the New York General Business Law that distinctly defines principal cre-, creditor and debt collector differently and the New York State Department of Financial Services regulations that treat original creditors and debt collectors di-, differently. A couple very quick examples, it's unclear within this amended rule when certain communications are triggered because we're already communicating with these same customers through statements and regular account servicing. The rule treats accounts in good standing or very early stage delinquency as the same -- as if they were accounts that are deemed so in arrears that they may never be required including requiring written consent if they've already requested in a regularly receiving digital communication from creditors. The Fair Credit Reporting Act as I mentioned requires information to be reported to credit bureaus accurately and completely and there are elements in here that would prevent us from doing so. It puts us in a, in an impossible position of choosing which law to violate or accelerating the debt. Neither of those are good for consumers. The final point I want to make is on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

timing. Yes, we first commented on this issue in 2022. We acknowledge that this has been a long process. But it was not until the November 7th webinar that we've realized that the definition of debt collector wasn't -- was intended to include creditors with these new provisions. In fact, it was clear to us based on previous language that it was drafted only with third party debt collectors in mind. The very definition of debt belies that intent. debt applies to accounts in good standing, then we have to treat accounts in good standing as if they're in arrears under this rule. We simply must be afforded the due process of reopening the entire rulemaking process to allow careful consideration of the unique and far reaching implications for consumers over a realistic period of time if this amended rule is to apply to cre-, creditors. Thank you so much. Sorry for the technical difficulties, open for questions and eagerly looking forward to the other commentary. Thank you.

HO JUNG: Thank you. With regard to the issues people are having calling in, I do see a number of people who are calling in externally. So, it may be an issue on their end. But we just pasted the call-in number once again in the chat. If anyone

would like to testify in the meantime, please let me know. Okay. Seeing no one present to offer testimony, I will go off camera and adjourn the hearing until an individual appears to offer testimony or until 12:00 p.m. Whichever comes first. Thank you.

MR. TODD HOUSLANGER: Hello, this is Todd Houslanger.

HO JUNG: Hi. Are you looking to testify or provide comments today?

MR. HOUSLANGER: Yes. I'm calling in because my -- the chat isn't working to -- for me to leave comments for you. I don't know if other people are having problem and doing items in the chat but I can't seem to type anything. But I'm --

HO JUNG: Alright. Okay.

MR. HOUSLANGER: -- happy to, to provide a, a statement. Actually, I do have questions, which I would like the answers but I'm ready to testify.

Sure.

HO JUNG: Okay. Just for your awareness, I won't be able to answer any questions on the proposed rules because the hearing is solely to provide comments or testimony. But you'll have three minutes and you can begin whenever you're ready.

Geneva Worldwide, Inc. 228 Park Ave S - PMB 27669, New York, NY 10003

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. HOUSLANGER: Thank you. My name is Todd I am an attorney at the Firm Houslanger & Houslanger. I have several positions in several Associates. organizations both locally, statewide and nationally in regard to creditors rights. My concern that I've addressed in a letter dated November 7th is in regard to attorneys and the regulations that are proposed as they apply to attorneys. It's always been our position and I believe there's been litigation that set forth that a local administrative agency such as yours is unable to regulate attorneys who, who are governed by the courts and the supervision and the licensing therein. What remains very unclear to me and my colleague-, colleagues is how these rules would apply to lawyers performing what lawyers perform. other words, legal action includes a judgment, enforcement and execution, wage garnishment, issuance of information and other subpoenas, restraining notices in the like [inaudible] [00:24:58]. The rules that's drafted would appear to apply and regulate attorney conduct especially in regards to judgments that are entered. What is especially a concern are judgments that have been entered previously to these rules. The New York CPLR Section 221 provides that judgments are effective for 20 years. That's because

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

it's especially difficult to execute upon a judgment amongst other reasons. Many judgments may have been entered by default. These regulations would appear to require verification of the debt by means other and a copy of the judgment. This is practically impossible because the retention period for records might be seven years. And judgments are good for 20 years. So, in other words, if you're requiring attorneys to provide verification of the debt by means other and a copy of the judgment. Even if it's a default judgment would basically make that judgment ineffective to enforce. That would be detrimental to all the creditors. And creditors don't just include corporate creditors. They include individuals. Individuals that might be bringing an action against another individual, so this would be totally detrimental to public policy. I believe that you indicated that this would be responded to in the FAQs although we haven't seen any FAQs yet. So, if you can let us know and that's going to come out, I would appreciate it. Thank you.

HO JUNG: Alright. Thank you for your comments. If there is anyone else who would like to provide testimony, you can let me know either in a chat or by going off mute. Alright. Seeing no one

else present to offer testimony, I will adjourn the hearing once again until someone appears to offer testimony or until 12:00 p.m. And just for everyone's awareness --

MR. FORBES: Here --

HO JUNG: Yes.

MR. FORBES: This is Jason Forbes again, just for fairness, the number that was originally pushed the pass code I should say to get into the meeting.

HO JUNG: Mm-hmm.

MR. FORBES: That was originally pushed from the DCWP [inaudible] [00:27:28] getting people in the one you put in the group chat and the Teams meeting now does get a person in but I think you might have a group of people. I, I strongly suspect I know multiple people who are not able to get in from the pass code that was originally provided for the meeting. So, I think that for, for the hearing today, we might be missing a couple of groups that intend to testify.

HO JUNG: Got it. Okay. Are they able to come into the meeting with the pass-, -- new pass code that was provided in the chat?

MR. FORBES: I'm, I'm not sure. I'm trying

to distribute it to anyone --

2.3

HO JUNG: Got it.

MR. FORBES: -- I know but I, I can't speak for the entirety of the public.

HO JUNG: Okay. Well, the hearing is until 12:00 p.m. So, if at any point they are able to make it in, they will be able to provide testimony. If they are unable to provide testimony during this hearing, the transcript of the hearing will be available and posted to our website and everyone will still be able to submit written comments to us before the end of the day at the website that was provided in the chat on NYC rules or by e-mail through rulecomments@nyc.dcwp.gov. I'm sorry, I meant rulecomments@dcwp.nyc.gov and I'll put that into chat right now as well. In the meantime, I will adjourn the hearing until someone appears to offer a testimony. Thank you.

MS. FORBES: It's Jason. I have just a suggestion because of the concern of people who still aren't in the meeting who had the, the incorrect pass code. Would it be possible to have someone from the DCWP call in to the other pass code that was provided for the meeting and just announce in that call for the people who are sitting on a quiet line to have the

1 correct pass code, so they can dial into this meeting? 2 HO JUNG: Could you give me a couple of 3 minutes and we'll see what we can do? Thanks. 4 MR. FORBES: Okay. Thank you. Do you want 5 the pass code that was provided --HO JUNG: Yes. 6 MR. FORBES: -- for the DCWP that others are 7 on? 8 9 HO JUNG: Yes. 10 MR. FORBES: One moment. I'll, I'll 11 [inaudible] [00:35:08] it here. I have it if you're 12 ready. 13 HO JUNG: Yes, I'm ready. 14 MR. FORBES: The phone number that was 15 provided was 646-893-7101 and the pass code which is 16 the same one that you put in the chat. The pass code 17 that was provided, the phone conference idea -- ID was 18 555-494-77#. And I think that we have other people in 19 that, in that conference line. 20 HO JUNG: Okay, got it. Thank you. MR. FORBES: Thanks. 21 22 HO JUNG: Hi, Jason. So, I just had a 23 colleague call in to the number that you provided me. 24 I'm not sure if there are still people in there 25 because we haven't gotten a response. But we did let

them know or let anyone who might be in the room know of the phone conference ID that is currently working for people, so just wanted to let you know.

MR. FORBES: Thank you.

2.3

MR. PATRICK MOTT: O-, okay. This is, this is Pat Mott from, from Capital One. We were just on that line. And we didn't hear any announcement being made and then we saw the line close. So, I'm not sure if --

HO JUNG: Okay. I apologize for the technical difficulties --

MR. MOTT: Yeah. So, we --

HO JUNG: -- on our end. Sorry about that.

MR. MOTT: -- we found this, we found this line through a different website but the original dial in information was from the, the notice. So, that's why people, I believe, were going to that other line. I think we missed any discussion that happened. Is it possible to give a replay of what has happened so far for those who are on the other line or what, what has happened so far in this?

HO JUNG: So, we had one person provide testimony so far. We're not sure if we can have them testify again. I'll have to check, if you could give me one minute. I'll find out for you --

1 MR. MOTT: Okay.

2.3

HO JUNG: -- if we can do that. So, unfortunately, we cannot have a repeated testimony but there will be a transcript available online of the rules hearing. So, you will be able to check what the comments that were provided beforehand said when it's posted on our website.

MR. MOTT: Thank you.

Apologies for the technical difficulties and for the inconvenience. We will be expen-, -- extending the hearing by 30 minutes until 12:30 p.m. due to the issues that everyone is having. If you do know anyone who is struggling to get into the hearing, if you could let them know to please enter through either video conference or if they're using the external call to use the number and the conference ID that's provided in the chat, that would be much appreciated. Thank you.

MR. MOTT: Would you be able to put that ID number in the chat again for, for those who joined after --

MS. SARAH: Thank you.

HO JUNG: Yes, I will do that right now.

MR. MOTT: It's, it's not in there, so.

228 Park Ave S - PMB 27669, New York, NY 10003

Geneva Worldwide, Inc.

HO JUNG: Okay. Got it. Thanks for letting me know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MS. [NAME]: That's the first anyways.

HO JUNG: Hi, for those who have just joined, apologies for the technical difficulties. are trying to figure that out right now but if you are just joining and would like to offer testimony or comments on the proposed rules, please let me know. Hi, everyone, once again, apologies for the technical difficulties for those who have just joined. to let you know that we will be extending the hearing until 12:30 p.m. And so, if you would like to provide any comments or provide testimony, please let me know And we'd also like to let you know that a transcript of the hearing will be posted online to our website if you would like to look back on testimony that has been provided so far. We are working on sending the correct meeting information to everyone that's registered right now. So, in the meantime, if you do have comments you'd like to provide, please just let me know. Thank you. Hi, everyone. For those who have just joined, we will be extending the hearing until 12:30 p.m. If you would like to provide any testimony or comments, please let me know. Thank you.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

HO JUNG: Hi, everyone, seeing that it is now 12:30 p.m., I will adjourn the hearing. Thank you everyone for participating and for your patience and apologies once again for any of the technical difficulties that you might have faced. Thank you.

25

CERTIFICATE OF ACCURACY

I, Ryan Manaloto, certify that the foregoing transcript of DCWP Rules Hearing; Proposed Amendment of Rules Relating to Debt Collectors on December 12, 2024 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Certified By

Philot

Date: February 7, 2025

GENEVAWORLDWIDE, INC

228 Park Ave S - PMB 27669

New York, NY 10003