

Date: Tuesday, March 3, 2020
Subject: Taskforce Check-in

INVITEES:

Todd Zywicki; Matt Cameron; Howard Beales; Jean Noonan; Bill MacLeod; Tom Durkin; Nat Weber; Greg Elliehausen; David Hixson

AGENDA:

- I. March Meeting Schedule:
 - a. Review
 - b. Topics missing
 - c. Additional prep
 - i. Walk through initial year-long schedule
 - ii. Scoping overlapping regulatory jurisdiction
 - II. Quick hits:
 - a. Monthly Status Check-in
 - b. March 10 Listening Session Invitees
 - c. RFI Draft—Please provide comments by end of day
 - d. Updates on hiring
 - e. Report template guidance, citation formatting
-

General Notes

- 1. March Meetings
 - a) Discussed March 10-13 agenda
 - b) Covered invitees to March 10 Listening Session
 - c) Discussed topics to add to March 10-13 meetings
 - d) Add topic to agenda to narrow regulatory overlap research
- 2. Quick hits
 - a) Monthly Check-in
 - i) Overall a great check-in, the Director was impressed with the speed that the team was ramping up
 - ii) Matt and Todd shared the year-long schedule the team developed during orientation as well as the initial report outline
 - (1) Request to share schedule

- (a) Please note, that we will set aside time (timeboxed time!) to review the schedule in order to decompose some of the activities into smaller more manageable chunks of work
 - (2) Regarding scope outline
 - (a) Current thinking is to address Mortgages as a part of disclosures, but there may be topics that will require the group to rethink this approach as the report is being developed
-

Actions Items

1. Nat will attempt to add 30 minutes reviews with offices during our March Meetings
 - Supervision & Enforcement: General overview of Division and how to determine when to use these regulatory tools
 - Consumer Education: Overview of projects in literacy and education; insights into effectiveness of education; best practices
 - Fair Lending: Overview of office and programs; how does this group inform Bureau policy
2. Nat will attempt to add 60-90 conversation to March Meetings
 - Review proposed symposium on disparate impact
 - Bureau's approach and guidance on discrimination suites
 - How do you think about relationship between innovation as a public benefit versus innovations that may have real or perceived disparate impact
3. David will obtain a clearer picture of MOUs between Federal Regulators
 - Does the Director have priorities on which MOUs to improve or directional guidance for improvements
 - Are there missing MOUs
4. Nat will share project timeline with Taskforce (attached to email)
5. Nat to look into getting an editor for the report
 - Suggestion options could be to contract, hire additional staff, or edit by committee
 - Consider contacting Federal Reserve economic editing team—POC is Economic Editing at Federal Reserve Bank, Mary Bean