

From: Jen - Bullard Children's Dentistry
To: CFPB_consumerreporting_rulemaking
Subject: Consumer Reports - SBREFA
Date: Thursday, October 19, 2023 11:30:50 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from a non-government domain. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact Cybersecurity Incident Response Team (CSIRT) at 202-435-7200 or [report a suspicious email](#).

Dear CFPB,

We sincerely appreciate the opportunity to provide our input on the Consumer Reporting – Small Business Advisory Review Panel.

First and foremost, we wish to express our concerns regarding the language used by the CFPB. We respectfully disagree with the characterization of "inaccuracies" and patients being billed "erroneously." We kindly request that the CFPB share their evidence supporting these claims, or consider refraining from making such statements. It's essential to note that the complaint database offers a limited perspective, often lacking the medical provider's side of the story. We believe that these isolated "complaints" should not be generalized to imply widespread inaccuracies in medical billing. Such generalizations only serve to create unnecessary divisions among patients and the dedicated professionals striving to offer life-saving services.

Secondly, we would like to highlight the predictive nature and overall benefit of medical debt within the credit ecosystem, as demonstrated by the 2014 CFPB study titled "Data point: Medical debt and credit scores." We acknowledge the need for updated research post-implementation of the recent credit bureau industry changes, specifically after the removal of balances less than \$500 after March 31st. We encourage a thorough examination of alternative approaches that would address concerns from all stakeholders effectively.

In addition, we kindly request your understanding of the challenges faced by small physician offices. Timely payments are crucial for our ability to deliver quality healthcare services, and any delays can significantly impact our operations. Many medical providers operate on tight budgets, making it difficult to absorb additional costs. Any disruption in our cash flow may force us to consider options such as raising prices, requiring upfront payments, or even denying care, all of which would affect consumers negatively.

Furthermore, we believe that reporting to credit bureaus fosters fairness among patients who consistently fulfill their financial obligations. It helps distinguish between individuals facing genuine financial hardships and those neglecting their responsibilities. Without this reporting mechanism, responsible payers may bear the burden of higher healthcare costs due to the increased likelihood of bad debt.

We also want to draw attention to the broader accountability created by credit bureaus. This accountability plays a role in encouraging healthy Americans to have health insurance, ensuring timely responses from medical providers, and facilitating necessary communications, such as coordination of benefits and financial assistance paperwork. Removing this accountability could disrupt these essential processes, impacting both patients and healthcare providers negatively.

Lastly, we urge you to consider a comprehensive approach involving all stakeholders, including governmental regulators, payers, medical providers, employers, and patients. Addressing the issue holistically, rather than through fragmented regulations, would reduce complexity and prevent further inaccuracies and erroneous billing. Additionally, we kindly request that the actual proposed regulation, in line with SBREFA requirements, be shared with small businesses before proceeding further.

In conclusion, we respectfully urge you to postpone any considerations of proposed rulemaking until a new study can be conducted, using data gathered after the recent industry changes. It is crucial to weigh the secondary consequences on medical providers and the entire patient population, considering increased costs not only for those with medical debt but for everyone involved. Moreover, we emphasize the importance of accuracy in credit information and its impact on the overall cost of lending in the credit ecosystem.

Thank you for your attention and understanding.

Warm regards,

BULLARD CHILDRENS DENTISTRY

Feedback for Questions

Q1. How, if at all, will the proposal under consideration require your firm to change its operations, products, or services?

Answer - Removing all medical debt from the credit bureau will cause significant operational changes. We will implement that following -

- Require up-front payments based on estimated costs.
- Require credit cards with authorization forms completed before services are provided.
- Refusing service for patient populations with the lowest ability to pay.
- Refusing all non-emergent services if consumer has a past due account.
- Increase our prices to offset the reduction in revenue.
- Ask increase small claims/legal actions to maintain collections.

Q4. What alternative approaches, if any, should the CFPB consider in lieu of the proposal under consideration?

Answer –

1. Require that credit bureau's statistically edit medical debt or other debt classifications predictiveness to be similar in nature. In this alternative approach, it would require credit bureaus to submit a third party audited study of all types of debt in the 15 different "Creditor Classification" from the Metro2 data file received by the credit bureau from data furnishers. The study would determine that debts of similar profile of "like" balances and "creditor classifications" predictiveness be plus or minus 2% accuracy for future repayments and future delinquencies. This report would be required to be provided to the CFPB once every twelve months to ensure "fairness" of all debts predictiveness.
2. Wait to determine the impacts of the March 31, 2023, credit bureau changes before proposing regulations.
3. Do nothing. Penalizing one industry / one type of debt is unfair to medical providers.

Q5. Other than compliance costs, what costs, burdens, or unintended consequences should the CFPB consider with respect to the proposal under consideration? Please quantify if possible. What alternatives, if any, would mitigate such costs, burdens, or unintended consequences?

Answer – We expect our revenue will decrease by 11% or \$900.92. We have already experienced decreases in revenue from March 31st removal of balances \$500.00 and less from the credit bureaus and removing the remaining portion of accounts will be more significant.

As for unintended consequences, CFPB removal of medical debt from the credit bureau eliminates the incentive to carry health insurance, which will raise the costs for those that do. Removing accountability would risk young healthy American's need for health insurance. Individuals will choose to be uninsured, saving thousands of dollars a year.

Q7. What factors disproportionately affecting small entities should the CFPB be aware of when evaluating the proposal under consideration? Would the proposal under consideration provide unique benefits to small entities?

Answer - Many times, we are the medical provider of last resort for many of these patients. The bigger providers with thousands of employees may be able to absorb the cost, but not the small companies. There are zero benefits.

Q32. How might the CFPB define “systemic” issues for purposes of the proposals it is considering? What may be the cause(s) for a furnisher or consumer reporting agency to have erroneous reporting for multiple consumers of the same type (e.g., issues with common processes, policies and procedures, infrastructure limitations, training)? How does your firm become aware of systemic issues that cause consumer reporting errors?

Answer - We dispute the premise of this question and first ask CFPB to showcase holistically with all patient populations the problem of inaccuracies and erroneous reports. The complexities of multiple stakeholders create confusion for patients and pit the provider vs payer, payer vs employer, and provider vs patient. The CFPB is not the regulatory body suited to solve this.

Q33. If furnishers or consumer reporting agencies (or both) investigate and address systemic issues that may be causing consumer reporting errors affecting multiple consumers, based upon a single consumer’s notice of dispute, what kind of notice should go to other potentially similarly situated consumers affected by the systemic issue? At what point(s) of the process? What should that notice(s) say?

Answer – We don’t believe there are systematic issues and as such no notice should be created as it will only increase the cost with no added benefit.

Q38. What are the pros and cons of an alternative approach of mandating a delay in the furnishing and reporting of medical debt for a particular period of time, and not reporting or furnishing medical debt below a particular dollar amount?

Answer – Pros –

1. Accessing the March 31st credit bureau changes could support the CFPB’s position as such this is a pro to at least attempt to access the current self-regulated/free market credit bureau changes first before as CFPB states it “mandating” a change.
2. If the timing of this delay was coordinated with ACA’s IRS 501r requirement of 240 days from the date of the first statement additional accountability could be created to ensure financial assistance applications are received in a timely manner. If 240 days was also used by CMS for insurance requirements of “timely filing” requirements it would take all stakeholders into account.

Cons –

1. Delays could cause less accountability by patients, which will hurt “timely fillings” for insurance eligibility.

2. Mandating versus allowing the “free market” approach to be realized could create future issues as the regulation itself could have unintended consequences in later years that we can’t fully comprehend.
3. Balance thresholds penalize doctors’ offices whose services are the least expensive per procedure. Examples of this include radiology, chiropractic, dentist, pathology, and dermatology to name a few. This creates an imbalance in priority to which even a medical debt is paid. Thereby creating “winners” and “losers” in regulation.

Q39. What are the pros and cons of an alternative approach of requiring consumer reporting agencies and furnishers, upon receiving a dispute, to conduct an independent investigation to certify that a disputed medical debt is accurate and not subject to pending insurance disputes?

Answer – Pros –

1. **Independent Investigation from Insurance Company** - The dispute process should require insurance companies to answer the dispute first and not the data furnisher or the medical provider. This would bring full circle all stakeholders to discuss the dispute. Today insurance companies regularly advise their “clients/patients” to argue medical billing “codes” were inaccurately used and/or the insurance companies deny claims on behalf of patients based upon obtuse requirements put on the providers or patients. Payments are delayed and cause additional administrative costs to the system. Requiring insurance companies to first confirm or reject the dispute of the patient will eliminate the false positives that are occurring in today’s dispute process. This then ensures all disputes are accurate, moving towards the second step of answering from the data furnishers who would then work with their medical providers.
2. The recognition of the CFPB that if medical debt is eliminated altogether from the credit bureau process and thereby the dispute process itself will cease to exist is a positive or pro. The dispute process allows credit bureaus to monitor the approach that collection agencies themselves are taking to collect on accounts instead of an obscure or worse unknown process.

Q43. For each of the proposals under consideration above, do you expect that your firm would restrict or eliminate any product or service offerings to comply with the rule? If so, how would the proposals impact those products or services?

Answer -

- Require up-front payments based on estimated costs.
- Require credit cards with authorization forms completed before services are provided.
- Refusing service for patient populations with the lowest ability to pay.
- Refusing all non-emergent services if consumer has a past due account.
- Increase our prices to offset the reduction in revenue.
- Ask increase small claims/legal actions to maintain collections.

Q44. For each of the proposals under consideration above, please provide information, data, and/or estimates of impacts to your firm’s business operations and revenue, including to both current operations and revenues and to future operations and revenues that could potentially be lost.

Answer –

With the proposed removal of medical debt we expect our revenue to decrease by \$900.92.

-

We calculated this by:

1. Actual revenues returned during the collection process.
2. Revenue decreases as medical debt priority for patient is decreased overall

Q46. What benefits do you expect small entities may experience from any of the proposals under consideration listed above?

Answer –

None. This will create a larger competitive advantage for the large players, pushing many more of the small players out of the business.

Q47. Would the proposals under consideration affect the cost and availability of credit to small entities?

Answer –

We would assume yes. A reduction in cash flow will make small entities a much greater credit risk especially as we look to transfer our business to future ownership generations.

Jen Simons

Business Manager

PH: 920-452-KIDS (5437)

E-mail: Jen@bullardsmiles.com

<http://www.bullardsmiles.com/>

IMPORTANT: This email transmission contains confidential information, some or all of which may be protected health information as defined by the federal Health Insurance Portability & Accountability Act (HIPAA) Privacy Rule. This transmission is intended for the exclusive use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient (or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this facsimile transmission to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this information is strictly prohibited and may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. Please notify the sender by telephone (number listed above) to arrange the return or destruction of the information and all copies.