

Presentation to  
Committee on Economic Development & Business  
March 19, 2013 at 9:00 am  
State Capitol Conference Room 312

**Testimony in SUPPORT of S. B. 470, SD1**

TO: The Honorable Clift Tsuji, Chair  
The Honorable Gene Ward, Vice Chair  
Members of the Committee

My name is Edward Pei and I am the Executive Director of the Hawaii Bankers Association (HBA). HBA is the trade association representing all FDIC insured depository institutions operating in the State of Hawaii.

Since its inception, MasterCard and Visa has prohibited the surcharging of credit card transactions to assure that credit card users were not penalized by the merchant for using a credit card to make their purchase. Effective January 28, 2013, this ban was lifted, allowing merchants now to add a "Checkout Fee" to the transaction, should their customer opt to use a credit card as their payment device. While the ban has been lifted by the bank card associations, 10 states have instituted a ban on surcharging and many other states have bills pending to implement the ban. We believe Hawaii should also implement this ban against surcharging.

Customers have choices today at the point of sale but one of the most convenient is the credit card. It is also easier and safer to use than other payment devices. Implementing a surcharge, or "checkout fee", will discourage and prevent some customers from using their credit cards. Customers should continue to have the freedom and the option to choose whatever payment device works best for them, without any financial penalties influencing their decision. Some merchants, like hotels, rental cars and many online merchants, virtually require a credit card for their purchases and giving them the ability to assess an additional fee for the transaction would simply provide unjust enrichment for the merchant.

In summary, we support SB 470, SD1 and the right of our consumers to use their payment device of choice to complete transactions at the point of sale. Please let us know if you would like any further information on this matter.

Edward Y. W. Pei  
(808) 524-5161

Representative Clift Tsuji, Chair  
Representative Gene Ward, Vice Chair  
Committee on Economic Development & Business



HEARING      Tuesday, March 19, 2013  
                  9:00 am  
                  Conference Room 312  
                  State Capitol, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RE:      **SB470, SD2, Relating to Credit Cards**

Chair Tsuji, Vice Chair Ward, and Members of the Committee:

Retail Merchants of Hawaii (RMH) is a not-for-profit trade organization representing 200 members and over 2,000 storefronts, and is committed to support the retail industry and business in general in Hawaii. The retail industry is one of the largest employers in the state, employing 25% of the labor force.

RMH understands and shares the Legislature's concerns about the surcharging issue and the desire to protect Hawaii's consumers. **We believe this measure is unnecessary and offer the following comments on SB470, SD1**, which prohibits retailers from imposing credit card surcharges in certain instances.

The Credit Card Fees lawsuit was filed by merchants in an attempt to lower credit card swipe fees, and in turn, operational costs that contribute to higher consumer prices. The much-touted settlement is still in dispute, and in reality does nothing to control swipe fees.

Ten states have similar prohibition statutes in place and at least fourteen others have bills under consideration. In conversations with our members, RMH has determined that while there may be exceptions, retailers in general have no intention of imposing surcharges on our customers. Doing so will put any retailer at a serious disadvantage in this highly competitive arena.

- Existing merchant agreements with VISA/MasterCard require retailers to handle credit cards the **same in every store**, regardless of location. This provision automatically bars any retailer that has even one location in a state with a surcharge ban.
- The settlement states that if a merchant is going to surcharge VISA/MasterCard they must also surcharge any other card with an equal or higher swipe fee, i.e., American Express. However, American Express operating rules require that any surcharge must be applied to all cards, even debit cards. And surcharging debit cards is prohibited by the settlement.
- Stores that are not included in the previously noted points and that are inclined to impose surcharges must comply with the settlement's requirements: 1) notify VISA/MasterCard of their intent to do so at least 30 days prior to surcharging; 2) limit surcharging to credit cards only (not allowed for debit or prepaid cards); 3) limit the amount to the merchant's particular discount rate (interchange rate) for each applicable credit card surcharged; 4) disclose the surcharge as a merchant fee and clearly alert consumers to the practice at the point of sale and on every receipt. The process is costly, cumbersome, time-consuming, and will most likely alienate customers.

Thank you for your consideration and for the opportunity to comment on this measure.

Carol Pregill, President

RETAIL MERCHANTS OF HAWAII  
1240 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 330  
Honolulu, HI 96814  
ph: 808-592-4200 / fax: 808-592-4202



## HAWAII FOOD INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION (HFIA)

1050 Bishop St. PMB 235  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
Fax : 808-791-0702  
Telephone : 808-533-1292

**TO:**

### **COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & BUSINESS**

**Rep. Clift Tsuji, Chair**

**Rep. Gene Ward, Vice Chair**

### **COMMITTEE ON WATER & LAND**

**Rep. Cindy Evans, Chair**

**Rep. Nicole E. Lowen, Vice Chair**

**FROM: HAWAII FOOD INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION**

**Lauren Zirbel, Executive Director**

**DATE: Tuesday, March 19, 2013**

**TIME: 9:00 a.m.**

**PLACE: Conference Room 312**

**RE: SB 470**

### **Position: Comments**

The Hawaii Food Industry Association is comprised of two hundred member companies representing retailers, suppliers, producers and distributors of food and beverage related products in the State of Hawaii.

**As part of a proposed settlement agreement reached in antitrust litigation against Visa and MasterCard, and a number of large U.S. banks, both card brands agreed to relax their network rules regarding merchant prohibitions on surcharging on credit cards (debit is not included).** The proposed settlement agreement was reached in July 2012, and granted preliminary approval by the Court in November. The card brands agreed to relax the surcharging prohibitions as of January 27, 2013. View the Visa rule changes [here](#) and the MasterCard rule changes [here](#).

**Surcharging is not the answer to centrally price-fixed swipe fees that inflate prices for all merchants and all consumers. Merchants do not want to be the collection agents for over-inflated bank fees. Merchants want a competitive market. If we had that, then the fees would fall**

**dramatically.**

The proposed settlement agreement is severely flawed and does very little, if anything, to fix a broken marketplace that's been negatively impacting the merchant community for well over a decade as we've seen per transaction costs triple over the last several years alone. Card acceptance fees are on average the second-highest operating cost for merchants across the country, and one of the fastest growing year over year

**Our members have emphatically said they're not interested in surcharging. Even if they wanted to, Visa and MasterCard have put barriers in place so it can't happen for most merchants.**

Merchants still don't know what the fees are on specific cards they get in their stores. Without knowing that, implementing the surcharging provisions is virtually impossible. In a 2009 report, GAO found that Visa had over 60 credit card interchange rates, and MasterCard has over 240. If anything, this system has become even more complicated since then.

Currently, ten states – California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, New York, Oklahoma, and Texas – prohibit surcharging. These states represent over 40% of total card sales across all industries. Merchants that operate in those ten states (virtually all national and many regional chains) will not be able to surcharge anywhere because Visa and MasterCard require merchants to surcharge all of their sales – or none at all.

Any merchant who accepts American Express will not be able to surcharge due to AmEx operating rules (which would require even debit cards to be surcharged in order for any cards to be surcharged)<sup>1</sup> that are currently the subject of litigation by the Department of Justice. That case is not expected to go to trial until 2014. If AmEx wins, the surcharging provisions negotiated in the antitrust litigation will remain completely unworkable.

Visa and MasterCard are requiring that merchants give them 30 days notice prior to surcharging. Surcharging is not going to happen overnight. Also, this will intimidate small merchants so that they won't want to surcharge.

The surcharging provisions of the proposed settlement are also intended to hurt new potential competitors to Visa and MasterCard. Merchants that want to surcharge, for example, will be prohibited from accepting (or will have to stop accepting) Paypal - or any other emerging payments options that prohibit surcharging - in their stores.

The surcharging provisions are just another example of Visa and MasterCard tricks and traps. In making these changes to their network rules, they also sneakily changed the definitions of their covered products applicable not just to surcharging, but to all facets of their merchant operating rules, including mobile payments. This creates a danger that Visa and MasterCard will require merchants to accept their preferred mobile payment solution and stifle innovation in an area that has the promise to bring some new ideas to market.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mandelbaum, Robb. [Visa and MasterCard Settle Lawsuit, but Merchants Aren't Celebrating](#). *New York Times*. August 8, 2012.

The last thing we want to see happen is a for the Visa/MasterCard duopoly to stifle the innovation we're seeing from new players in the mobile payments space, and cement their stranglehold and broken business model in this new, emerging marketplace. The types of tricks and traps we see here are all the more reason lawmakers and federal agencies need to more closely scrutinize the actions of these major companies now and in the future as they could be given significant immunity from private legal action if the proposed antitrust settlement were to be approved by the court.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.



1654 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826-2097  
Telephone: (808) 941.0556  
Fax: (808) 945.0019  
Web site: [www.hcul.org](http://www.hcul.org)  
Email: [info@hcul.org](mailto:info@hcul.org)



Testimony to the House Committee on Economic Development and Business  
March 19, 2013

Testimony in support of SB 470 SD1, Relating to Credit Cards

To: The Honorable Clift Tsuji, Chair  
The Honorable Gene Ward, Vice-Chair  
Members of the Committee

My name is Stefanie Sakamoto, and I am testifying on behalf of the Hawaii Credit Union League, the local trade association for 78 Hawaii credit unions, representing approximately 804,000 credit union members across the state.

We are in support of SB 470 SD1, which would prohibit retailers from imposing credit card surcharges. In today's environment of e-commerce, credit cards have become among the most convenient methods of payment. Credit cards are an easy, efficient, and safe way to pay. Consumers should not be penalized for using credit cards, and should have ample freedom to use any method of payment that they choose. Allowing retailers to charge a fee to use credit cards would only discourage consumers from using credit cards.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**edbtestimony**

---

**From:** mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 17, 2013 3:46 PM  
**To:** edbtestimony  
**Cc:** tabraham08@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Submitted testimony for SB470 on Mar 19, 2013 09:00AM

**SB470**

Submitted on: 3/17/2013

Testimony for EDB on Mar 19, 2013 09:00AM in Conference Room 312

<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Testifier Position</b>	<b>Present at Hearing</b>
Troy Abraham	Individual	Support	No

Comments: I support Urgent passage of this bill

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email [webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov](mailto:webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov)