

# NASFAA's "Off The Cuff" Podcast - Episode 199 Transcript

Justin Draeger:

Hey, everybody. Welcome to another edition of Off the Cuff. I'm Justin Draeger.

Owen Daugherty:

I'm Owen Daugherty with the communications team.

Megan Coval:

I'm Megan Coval with our policy team.

Jill Desjean:

And I'm Jill Desjean, also with our policy team.

Justin Draeger:

Welcome back everybody. It's been a few weeks. We had our national conference and then of course the July 4th holiday. Everybody I trust had a good 4th of July. Did any of you actually go downtown for this year's fourth?

Megan Coval:

No.

Justin Draeger:

No.

Owen Daugherty:

I did for the first time. Yeah.

Justin Draeger:

Yeah. Did you hit the NASFAA rooftop or did you actually go down to the mall?

Owen Daugherty:

No, I enjoyed the fireworks from the NASFAA rooftop. It was a great perk of employment here. It was a beautiful view. Great night. A really cool space to watch it from.

Megan Coval:

Awesome.

Justin Draeger:

Yeah. I've come in for the 4th of July on the NASFAA rooftop. Jill, you have. I remember you were there with us that one year.

Jill Desjean:

Yep.

Justin Draeger:

Megan, have you done it?

Megan Coval:

I've never done it, no.

Justin Draeger:

Yeah, you should come in. And now we're sharing the building, so there's more people up there than I think we've had before. We're sharing it with the wilderness society, I think. And they're taking up two floors. Were they there that night, Owen? Was it shared space now?

Owen Daugherty:

I think it was them, but someone had a black tablecloth full service bar with a bartender paid up there. And then I think they had light finger food and sliders and stuff. And that was-

Justin Draeger:

Well that definitely wasn't NASFAA.

Owen Daugherty:

It wasn't for us. Yeah.

Justin Draeger:

Well that wasn't us, but I hope you went over and grabbed some. Did you?

Owen Daugherty:

I'm very proud of my fiancé. She snuck two sliders at the end of the night, but we tried to be polite and not take it at the beginning. But they were-

Justin Draeger:

Oh, I would've.

Owen Daugherty:

...Clearly about to throw it away. And so that's when we made our move.

Justin Draeger:

Oh, well good for you.

Owen Daugherty:

Yeah, it was great.

Justin Draeger:

Well, I'm glad you enjoyed the fourth. Yeah, we finally with COVID, restrictions all lifted here in Virginia, we had neighbors over and it was a great time. This felt like the, I know we're not totally out of COVID, but sort of like the post COVID coming out party. We had a big group of people, all our friends and neighbors came over, and it just felt really good to be around other people again. So, great weekend.

Justin Draeger:

All right. We've got a lot to talk about today. While we've been off, things have been happening up on Capitol Hill. The president has continued to talk about higher education. Student loans are still an issue that we want to talk about. There's some additional programs for Pell students. Let's jump right in. Megan, why don't you catch us up with appropriations? Where are we at?

Megan Coval:

Yeah, so the process is really going to start kicking off next week on Monday, July 12th, over in the House. And next week they're actually going to be marking up in the Labor H, which is the subcommittee that oversees the education programs, the spending bill for fiscal year 2022. So it's going to be marked up in this subcommittee itself, and then later in the week it'll be marked up in front of the whole appropriation subcommittee. So that's where we'll start to see actual text and get a better understanding of what's going to be proposed in terms of increases to Pell and to SEOG and to Work Study. So we're looking forward to seeing what's in there and getting our hands on that.

Justin Draeger:

Do we have any sort of inclination of what might be included? Are we looking for increases this year, stabilization, level funding?

Megan Coval:

Yeah, I think increases. So one thing that's really exciting and I think leaving everyone sitting on the edge of their seats is that the top line numbers for the appropriation subcommittees were decided a couple of weeks ago. And the Labor Health Human Services and Education committee, sub-committee rather, nice and long title that contains our programs, got a \$40.5 billion increase from last year. So you heard that right, so huge. And that obviously covers labor and health. But I think that we're hopeful with an increase like that, we'll see at least a \$400 increase to the Pell Grant program, which is what President Biden proposed through the discretionary side. So I would also hope with an overall increase of that much we'd see increases to SEOG and Work Study as well, but we'll have a much better sense of that come Monday.

Justin Draeger:

All right. So I don't want to rain on any parades here, but this is the House appropriation side.

Megan Coval:

Yes.

Justin Draeger:

So it is a partisan bill. Do we have any Republicans that are signaling support for the spending increases on the House side?

Megan Coval:

So far, no, and probably not likely to see any getting super excited about that level of increase. But I think as we see the text there may be certain provisions, specific provisions that Republicans get behind or so forth. But I think the overall number is a problem for them at this point.

Justin Draeger:

Okay. So from there, it'll go over to the Senate, and then if things work how they're supposed to be, we're supposed to have final spending numbers for the 22/23 year by October 1st. Are we going to get there?

Megan Coval:

Unlikely. It'll be a much slower process in the Senate, and a much more partisan process. So the House, at least in the past several years, the House has done a pretty good job of doing their part on time and getting that part rolling. But usually the Senate is where things get held up a little bit.

Justin Draeger:

Yeah. And where Republicans have a little bit more control, even though they don't control the Senate. All right. We will keep our eyes in, obviously we'll report out in today's news everything that goes on there. Thanks very much, Megan. All right. So let's turn to President Biden. He's out, almost stumping a little bit this summer. I've seen him in several parts of the country. It seems he was just talking more about his higher education platform. Megan, you want to catch us up?

Megan Coval:

Yeah, so he this week was at McHenry County College, which is a community college in Illinois. And it's been a bit since we've seen the president speak at a college. I was thinking about this because his first lady, Dr. Biden, has been out and about and visited a couple of different colleges, but this is the first time we'd seen him deliver an address. It was about an hour long, and it was focused big picture on his Build Back Better plan, but he was talking about education pretty broadly in the comments. But he did specifically tout his free community college plan, saying things like, does anyone think in the 21st century that only 12 years of education is enough? And we've heard him say this before.

Megan Coval:

And then he also called out the need to increase the Pell Grant, and specifically talked about increasing it to \$8,000, so about a \$1,500 increase, which kind of aligns with what we've seen in his proposals. So pretty standard, but was always nice to hear those specific things get a shout out directly from the president.

Justin Draeger:

Yeah. Is he getting any reaction from Capitol Hill? Does it seem like people are paying attention, or is it mostly the president out there stumping for public support?

Megan Coval:

Yeah, I think it's kind of just been the president getting out there on his plan and talking about it a little bit more, especially now I think that they can get out there more in a safe way. So, no, I didn't at least see any specific reaction to this speech, but again, it aligned pretty closely with what he has put out in

his budget proposal and the American Families plan. So kind of a pretty party line response to those two things.

Justin Draeger:

So when the president shows up at a community college, I would expect him to talk about free community college, so kind of what you talked about here, this extension. But the other sort of big thing we're still waiting on is what's going on with student loan moratorium. So we've been waiting for the secretary to say something. Mr. Cordray could have said something at our conference and didn't say anything. I think he actually said he wasn't going to make news at our conference with any announcements. Did the president say anything about the student loan moratorium? And where's Congress on this?

Megan Coval:

The president did not say anything about it, and nothing about debt forgiveness, nothing about extending the moratorium. I was thinking about this earlier. I'm thinking if I were one of president Biden's advisors, it's probably hard for him to not talk about that. But I think that's the last thing you say before you go out there is, "Don't say anything about any of that," because it's so messy and there's so many different things going on.

Megan Coval:

On Capitol hill though, I think since the last time we've all gathered, we saw some official statements come out, or letters I should say. So back toward the end of June, about 65 democratic lawmakers led by Elizabeth Warren, Senator Elizabeth Warren, excuse me, and majority leader Chuck Schumer sent a letter to the president asking him to extend the payment freeze through the end of March of 2022. All Democrats, both in the House and Senate, not every democratic member, but like I said, about 65 or so. And then just last week, leadership in the House and Senate education committees, Chairman Bobby Scott and Chairwoman Patty Murray sent a letter asking for an extension through just early 2022. So a little bit different than that first letter, which they were not on. So the Dems on the hill are-

Justin Draeger:

We've talked about this before. They're all for it.

Megan Coval:

Yeah, they're banging the drum. Yep.

Justin Draeger:

We've talked about this before. This represents since the beginning of the pandemic, so we're talking March, 2020, the largest student loan borrower benefit program in history. When you forego all the payments, all the interest and all of this is counting towards loan forgiveness, we're talking about, I think I saw an estimate, wasn't it \$60 or \$65 billion through the pandemic-

Megan Coval:

Yeah.

Justin Draeger:

... Worth of benefit going to borrowers? So this does represent sort of the largest borrower benefit program in history. And so Megan, I guess if I was cynical and maybe if I was a conservative member of Congress, I'd look at these requests, particularly from senators Warren and Schumer who have been so laser-focused on loan forgiveness, as a backdoor way to loan forgiveness. did they mention loan forgiveness in this letter that they sent over? And how does that interplay with what they want the president to do, which is just through a flick of the pen, I think is what Senator Schumer says over and over again, write off \$50,000 in loans?

Megan Coval:

Yeah. I mean, this letter was really focused on the repayment freeze and not so much on the request for loan forgiveness, but I think what we're seeing here, at least with that first letter that asked for the extension through the end of March, is that I think a big goal of theirs is to just kind of halt going back into repayment in general, because if you do that, it sort of makes it seem like we won't be getting any forgiveness. I think that's kind of how they're viewing it. If we start back up, then that is sort of throwing up your hands on the chance of getting forgiveness.

Megan Coval:

I don't necessarily view it that way, but I think that is the dynamic that's at play there, just from some things that we've heard and even some things people have said to us when we've been on the record about borrowers going back into repayment.

Owen Daugherty:

I was just going to say, I think that's an important point. And if you kind of parse through the two letters, I think the one from House and Senate education leadership, that's Representative Bobby Scott, and Senator Patty Murray, it's much more framed around the undertaking that it will be for servicers to get these borrowers back to repayment. And they're like, look, end of September is coming. This is just a monumental task. The whole apparatus needs more time to get this figured out and more communication with borrowers. Whereas the Warren/Schumer letter is much more framed as, borrowers still need this relief and the economy and the job market is not to where it needs to be. So it definitely is more so kicking the can down the road and labeling March as opposed to the other letter saying sometime in 2022. So I think that's an important distinction.

Justin Draeger:

Yeah. So there's two things that stick out to me about all of this. One is the president's in a bit of a sticky wicket here, because if he goes out and says that on the one hand, which he's been doing for weeks, get vaccinated, but we're open. We're back. The economy's open, we're roaring back. And on the other hand, in the next breath says, "But we're not back quite yet, so everybody needs additional six to seven months to eight months of loan relief," there's a conflicting message there that somebody is going to have to sort out. The other piece that I keep coming back to is I'm not convinced anymore that we can just start repayment, especially in September now that it's July. Okay, repayments start. It almost seems like we're going to have to have a phased repayment.

Justin Draeger:

And I think step one of that is, you're going to have to stop the benefits of giving people non-payments that count towards forgiveness. There's absolutely no incentive for anybody to make a payment. I would

advise anybody who was asking me, why would you make a payment if a non-payment is going to count, interest-free at that?

Justin Draeger:

So you have to stop that benefit eventually, when the time is right you stop that benefit. And then maybe you let people come back into repayment if they want to keep making payments at that point. But you still extend this grace period for everyone else. So for example, repayments start on October 1. I'm just throwing up the date where this is supposed to happen. You just stop the benefit on October 1, but people aren't required to start payments until, I don't know, February 1.

Justin Draeger:

But for those who want to start remaking payments, because those payments will count towards PSLF, they can opt in just by going to their servicer's website today and start making payments. To me, that's sort of like the on-ramp we should be looking at. I don't know this idea that we're just going to be like, okay, 45 million people, start repayment now. That just seems very unrealistic in terms of logistics.

Megan Coval:

Yeah, and it's-

Justin Draeger:

But I don't know, I'm sure smarter minds are trying to figure this out.

Megan Coval:

But it's a good point, Justin, because I don't really feel like anyone is talking about it in a phased way. It's either, we're going to do it or we're going to delay it. And I don't feel like there's as much conversation, or any conversation really, about the ideas that you just mentioned.

Justin Draeger:

The infrastructure exists. People can go out to their services website and turn on their payments today. So this idea of a phased implementation for people to slowly over four months just start opting in, but they have no incentive until you say, "We're going to stop the benefit piece." I'm not saying charge interest. You can continue that. But the very least, the non-payments counting, why would anybody make a payment in that scenario?

Justin Draeger:

Sticking with loan servicing for just a minute, Jill, it seems like we have some information that's coming out of the CFPB recently about allegations against loan servicers and their ability to accurately give information to borrowers. You want to catch us up here?

Jill Desjean:

Yeah. Yeah. So the CFPB released a report recently that included some findings that federal student loan servicers engaged in a pattern of providing inaccurate information to borrowers, specifically about PSLF. So as you know, to be eligible for PSLF borrowers have to have direct loans. They have to work for an eligible employer and they have to make 120 on time payments. And so the CFPB in this report identified three areas where servicers were misleading borrowers.

Jill Desjean:

The first had to do with FFELP borrowers. Servicers were telling students with FFELP loans that they could submit the employer certification form, which is the form that borrowers can submit once a year. I guess they could submit as much as they want, but they're encouraged to submit it once a year to sort of verify that the payments they've made have been qualifying payments with an eligible employer. And they were telling them that FFELP borrowers could submit the ECF and find out if they had an eligible employer.

Jill Desjean:

But in truth, if you have FFELP loans and you send it to the servicer, they just reject the form because you have FFELP loans.

Justin Draeger:

Right because those aren't eligible loans. So there's no review happening. Yeah.

Jill Desjean:

Right. So you don't get to that employer review process. So these students, these borrowers may have thought that they didn't have eligible loans or that they weren't working for eligible... They didn't have eligible loans, forgive me, but they might've thought they weren't working for eligible employers when they were, and all they would need to do is consolidate into DL and beyond the path to PSLF. So that was bad. The report also found that servicers advised borrowers with FFELP loans that they could not become eligible for PSLF, which, like I just said, is not true. FFELP loans are not eligible, correct, but you can always consolidate into the direct loan program and qualify.

Jill Desjean:

And lastly, servicers told borrowers... Go ahead Justin.

Justin Draeger:

Well, you're using the word servicers, plural, but there is only one PSLF servicer. So is it plural, servicers, or was the issue with one servicer?

Jill Desjean:

This referred broadly to servicers, so not just the PSLF servicers. Because you only end up with the PSLF servicer if you've submitted an ECF, and so in some of these cases, borrowers were just trying to get on that path, but hadn't yet been assigned to the PSLF servicer.

Jill Desjean:

The last thing they found was that servicers are telling borrowers that only employees that worked at employers classified as non-profits would qualify. So anyone who worked for a local state, federal government, tribal government who could be eligible for PSLF may have thought that they weren't if they got that information. So teachers, firefighters, public health employees, people who should be getting PSLF and may have missed that opportunity because of that information.

Justin Draeger:

I imagine this did not go over well with certain members on Capitol Hill who have been taking pretty close examination of loan servicers. Owen, and do we have any reaction from the hill?

Owen Daugherty:

I definitely saw that Warren posted on Twitter an article that had covered this report. I have not thoroughly checked kind of other lawmakers, but Warren definitely seized on it. And it's interesting to see that the CFPB has some teeth again. It seems like they're using their resources and kind of looking into this stuff with more energy than before.

Justin Draeger:

Yeah, well, certainly under the Trump administration they had sort of an across the board objection to the CFPB even looking into the federal student loan programs because they felt like, this is our program, we don't need another federal agency looking into something that is wholly owned by the Department of Education. That is not the tack that this administration is taking, and I don't think it's any coincidence that the current head of Federal Student Aid was the inaugural lead of the CFPB. So besides sharing data with state attorneys general now, they're also sharing it, I presume, with their colleagues over at the CFPB.

Justin Draeger:

So I guess there'll be more to come here. I'll just point out that the federal student loan servicer that's been charged with PSLF is PHEAA FedLoan Servicing. They've taken a bit of heat. There was recently a letter sent to FedLoan about potential false testimony or allegations of false testimony. Megan, do you have the details there?

Megan Coval:

Yeah. That letter was sent from Senator Warren and Senator Kennedy, Senator Kennedy is a Republican from Louisiana, to James Steely. And they basically accused him of delivering false and misleading statements when he testified before the banking committee back in April. So that letter was sent, I believe, toward the end of June. And I haven't heard anything about PHEAA's response to that, but I do think it was just June 23rd that it was sent, so just a couple of weeks ago.

Justin Draeger:

I would say between FedLoan Servicing and Sallie Mae or Navient, there's always sort of this competition between who's the most controversial and who Senator Warren most has in sort of her sites. But just breaking today, actually, PHEAA Fed Loan Servicing said that they will not bid on or accept any extension of its 12 year old federal student loan servicing contract beyond December 14th, 2021, or what's needed to ensure a smooth transition.

Justin Draeger:

So the appointed PSLF servicer appears to be saying, "We're getting out of this business and we're going to focus our attention on consumer lending in the state of Pennsylvania." PHEAA is a quasi-state agency. So I think this is pretty big news. And if Senator Warren had been calling on FSA to sort of evaluate and sometimes fire federal loan servicers, this is a good example of where, from the bully pulpit, you can still potentially get what you want just by sort of, enough. Enough poking and badgering. PHEAA for its part said, "We're done. We're not going to do federal student loan servicing any longer."

Megan Coval:

Yeah. I didn't look before, because I know this just broke this morning, if we had seen her response from Senator Warren yet.

Justin Draeger:

I haven't seen any response yet. This is breaking from Politico. So I guess we'll be on the lookout to see what happens there. But this does sort of... Right now the whole federal student loan servicing picture is changing. We had next gen from the Trump administration, the Biden administration came in based on some legislation that was passed in December, and today they basically said "We're halting and re-evaluating." This will cause them to reevaluate even more and possibly faster because all these PSLF borrowers are going to have to find a new servicer. And that servicer is going to have to be equipped to process PSLF.

Megan Coval:

I've got a tweet.

Owen Daugherty:

Looks like Warren just responded.

Megan Coval:

Yeah.

Owen Daugherty:

Yeah. Two minutes ago.

Justin Draeger:

All right, go ahead Owen. Sure.

Owen Daugherty:

Yeah. She wrote, "Millions of borrowers can breathe a sigh of relief that their loans will no longer be managed by PHEAA, which robbed untold numbers of public servants of debt relief and was caught lying to Congress about its atrocious record of fines and penalties." So as you alluded to Justin, the letter she sent about the PHEAA testimony and yeah, she was quick to highlight that in her tweet.

Justin Draeger:

Someday all of the behind the scenes machinations will probably come out and we'll have some sort of book on this, but for now the federal student loan servicing environment is about to change, and change in a pretty significant way. So. All right. Thank you, Jill, Owen, and Megan. So let's jump into our what was at this last week. I'm sort of curious. I was at a... During the pandemic, everything, all the services, including the sports massage I used to get on a pretty regular basis. I tend to be pretty active. I do a lot of cycling and running and I need somebody to get my muscles into workable shape every once in a while.

Justin Draeger:

That shut down. So when things started opening back up, I had to find a new masseuse. And I went to a new sports massage place. So this isn't sort of the fufu relaxation massage, which is fine. I've done that and do that occasionally too, but this is much more, you're going to be kind of uncomfortable and in pain through a lot of this massage. It's fine. I like it. But the masseuse, I've only been to her a couple of times. she said to me that they also do work for the pro football team here, the Washington team. And I was like, "Oh wow."

Justin Draeger:

And I'm already thinking, I don't know, this is probably my own neurosis, but I'm like, oh man, she works on professional athletes. Their job is to be in shape. I have another job. So being in shape is my less than part-time job. And so I was like, "Oh man, that must be pretty incredible, I imagine from where you're sitting."

Justin Draeger:

And she's like, "No, no, it's not that great because the amount of energy and strength it takes to massage people with big muscles, it's a lot. So I much prefer..." Yeah, right for the rest of the massage, I was like, that has to be one of the most backhanded compliments I have ever received. So if someone like me goes in, nice and doughy, I guess that is, for this masseuse, that's exactly what she's looking for. All right. So that made me think, backhanded compliments that you've all received. Have you gotten any? Megan, what do you got?

Megan Coval:

I feel like this was insulting and a back handed compliment, but I guess that they can be insulting. But I just remember one time I was on this panel. It was me and two other gentlemen, and afterward the moderator came up and spoke to each of us. We were all sitting there in circle. And to this first guy, he was like, "That was great. I love what you said about this." And to the second guy he was like, "That was great. I love what you said about this." And then he said to me, and he's like, "And you," he's like, "That's a great dress." And I know that's laced with more...

Justin Draeger:

Sexism?

Megan Coval:

But what it made me feel was, "You didn't have anything good." I mean, I guess there's that piece of it. But what it made me feel like is, "Wow, your remarks, I have nothing to say about your remarks." There was nothing there.

Justin Draeger:

Yeah. But the moderator was a man.

Megan Coval:

Yeah.

Justin Draeger:

Did you feel like that was... I mean, that seems pretty sexist when I hear it.

Megan Coval:

Yeah, it is. But to me, I think more at the time, I just felt like what I heard was, "You didn't have anything to say that was worth commenting on. So instead I'm going to try to make you feel good by saying that I like the dress you're wearing."

Justin Draeger:

What if he really liked the dress?

Megan Coval:

Maybe. And maybe. I mean, I'm not sure if I would say that. I think I would just not say that.

Jill Desjean:

He could have followed it up with the dress comment, said something nice about what he appreciated.

Megan Coval:

Yeah. But I feel like he was-

Justin Draeger:

And then go to the dress.

Megan Coval:

...Trying.

Jill Desjean:

Because then that would have made the other two feel bad, right?

Megan Coval:

Yeah. I don't know if that was the right example here, but it definitely made me feel like, I think he's trying to say something nice to me, but instead he just made me feel bad.

Justin Draeger:

Well, if it was truly backhanded then, if it wasn't just sexist, if it was truly backhanded, then the message he was trying to tell you was he did not enjoy what you were saying.

Megan Coval:

Yeah. That's what I felt.

Justin Draeger:

That would've been the backhand.

Megan Coval:

That's what I felt. Yeah.

Justin Draeger:

He was trying to send you a message, which was, your comments were totally.

Megan Coval:

Yeah, that's how I felt. Yeah.

Justin Draeger:

All right. How about you, Jill?

Jill Desjean:

Yeah, this is an old one, but the person who delivered it has brought it up multiple times, just to stick the knife and a little further. It was right after we moved here, a month after we moved here, and it was my son's birthday so we had a birthday party. So he was six and my twins were three. And my husband was suddenly unavailable for the day, so I had to lug the cake and the plates and the juice boxes and all this stuff to the party. And I was kind of in a state.

Jill Desjean:

And we get there and I'm meeting all these parents of these little kids who were in his class for the first time. And I'd made the cake and it was not structurally sound, so it collapsed. And so this mom comes up to me and she's just like, "I just love... So many people want to have the perfect birthday party. And I just love that you just don't care. Your toddlers are climbing that rock wall, your cake just fell apart. And you're like, whatever."

Jill Desjean:

And I was like, I do feel like you're trying to be nice, but you're telling me that this party is absolute garbage. And she's brought it up at least... I just saw her recently. This is why it was fresh in my memory. And she brought it up again. And I'm like, I don't know why you think that's what you say to someone.

Justin Draeger:

Because if you know Jill, you know that she does care and the-

Jill Desjean:

That's it, I did care.

Justin Draeger:

...The wheels will just come off the wagon that way. This was a day where there are no... But maybe you should just go with that because the parent who feels, especially, I feel like it may be in this area, this might be true everywhere, but a lot of type A people, a lot of type A parents, if you're getting the reputation of the cool parent, maybe you go with that.

Jill Desjean:

I think that's what she means. I think she just didn't phrase it well. She's like, "You just don't care" and I'm like, wow. But yeah, I also wouldn't want the reputation of the mom who's obsessed with the perfect birthday party. That would actually bother me. I want it to just come off perfectly and see-

Justin Draeger:

Right, that's the key.

Jill Desjean:

That wasn't what I did that day.

Justin Draeger:

It seemed like you didn't put in a lot of it effort and then that showed. That's what it seemed like that day.

Jill Desjean:

Yeah.

Justin Draeger:

All right. That's fair. Okay. How about you, Owen? You got anything?

Owen Daugherty:

Yeah. I mean, I hate to end on a downer. I don't think it's as laughable as the last one, but it's top of mind right now. So I just had my bike stolen from the new building that we just moved into, and I had to make an insurance claim about it. And they're going to make it right and all that stuff. But the whole time the person was just like, "Oh, that sucks. That's a nice bike. Oh man, that's brutal." And then just kept telling me things that I should have done to not allow my bike to have gotten stolen in a locked bike room in my building. And I was like, this isn't that helpful. It's gone. You're supposed to just take my statement. And he just kept-

Justin Draeger:

It was such a nice bike. Why wouldn't you have taken more precaution?

Owen Daugherty:

Yeah, he was giving me tips of how to lock it different and just, "Oh, we're seeing this a lot right now. Thefts are really high. That's really unfortunate." And just not what you want to hear after your bike got stolen. I was like, this is an interesting part of your job.

Justin Draeger:

So first of all I have to ask, what kind of bike was it?

Owen Daugherty:

It was one of those all road, all-terrain gravel bikes.

Justin Draeger:

Okay. So it was a gravel bike.

Owen Daugherty:

Yeah.

Justin Draeger:

And did you lock it in the bike cage or did you just have it in the bike cage?

Owen Daugherty:

I locked it in the bike cage and because of the way-

Justin Draeger:

Oh, and it was still stolen?

Owen Daugherty:

Yeah. And because of the way the bike rack is, I couldn't attach the frame the way I wanted to. And so I just had it locked around the wheel, which was not a quick thing; they undid the bolt. Someone came in with tools and undid wheel. So they left the wheel. They just took my whole bike and not front wheel.

Justin Draeger:

Do they have a camera down there?

Owen Daugherty:

Yeah, it was well-recorded and it's painful to watch.

Megan Coval:

Did the person has their face covered.

Owen Daugherty:

Yeah. Hood up, mask on.

Megan Coval:

Oh, man. That's an operation.

Owen Daugherty:

Came in at 4:00 AM. Yeah, it was really bad.

Justin Draeger:

Maybe they took the bike and they're going to trick it out and return. I mean, if the glass is half full, what do you think?

Owen Daugherty:

Fingers crossed. Yeah.

Justin Draeger:

Anyway. All right. Well, if members want to send us any of their best backhanded comments or give us any backhanded comments, you can send them into our podcast. If they're any good, we'll read them on

the air. Send us your comments, remember to subscribe, tell a friend, and we will see you again next week.