APR10'09 PM 2:24 BOARD

Bay Federal
CREDIT UNION
Making a real difference

April 6, 2009

Ms. Mary Rupp
Secretary of the Board
National Credit Union Administration
1775 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-3428

RE: Comments on the Corporate Credit Union System Strategy

Dear Ms. Rupp:

On behalf of Bay Federal Credit Union, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the NCUA Board's recent actions designed to stabilize the corporate credit union system. The program, as initially outlined in *NCUA Letter to Credit Unions No. 09-CU-02,* and as further reflected in *NCUA Letter to Credit Unions No. 09-CU-06,* included three primary objectives regarding the corporate system: 1) maintaining liquidity; 2) strengthening capital; and 3) evaluating the existing structure of the corporate system via an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR). Our comments will address the actions the Board has taken towards accomplishing these objectives.

Maintaining Liquidity and Strengthening Capital

We have significant concerns that the Board's strategy, as crafted and implemented to date, does not fully take into account the serious repercussions to the natural person credit union system and, as a result, to consumers and credit union members. This concern has been further sharpened by NCUA's unexpected actions on March 20, 2009, involving U.S. Central FCU and Western Corporate FCU (WesCorp), which will have an especially pronounced effect on credit unions, especially in California. Further, we believe that the strategy is too narrowly-focused and inflexible in its approach in that it fails to take advantage of several other options and tools available to the Agency that could reduce the costs and impact of the program to credit unions. However, we are encouraged and cautiously optimistic that the Board's action on March 26, 2009, to ask Congress to form a Corporate Credit Union Stabilization Fund takes an important step towards addressing this concern. By spreading the cost of the stabilization action over as much as seven years, federally-insured credit unions are given the breathing room and flexibility they desperately need.

Immediate Actions NCUA Should Take

We believe that the NCUA should utilize its regulatory authority to redefine the definition of "total assets" under §702.2(g) of the Prompt Corrective Action rule to exclude guaranteed or low/no-risk assets from net worth ratio calculations. This action would provide immediate relief in the following ways:

- It would allow credit unions to invest in no-risk assets and/or take certain assistance (e.g., loans from the CLF, asset purchase, guarantees, etc.), if necessary, without harming or diluting their net worth ratio.
- It would give many credit unions time to manage the multitude of challenging issues they currently face due to this once-in-a-lifetime economic crisis—which now includes the costs of the stabilization plan—without running afoul of PCA requirements.
- It would encourage additional credit union participation in the CU SIP program, therefore generating additional liquidity for the corporate system.

We applaud the NCUA for issuing guidance to examiners which includes instructions to recognize and allow for temporary reductions in ROA and net worth that result from credit union participation in the CU SIP program, and for recently taking action to amend its rule on the assessment of the federal credit union operating fee to exclude investments made under the CU SIP and CU HARP programs from the calculation of total assets. However, we believe it would provide more uniformity and reliability to formally make this redefinition via an amendment to the PCA regulation. If NCUA does take this reasonable and much needed step, the Leagues recommend that the following assets be excluded from "total assets" for the calculation of net worth:

- Cash
- Overnight investments in corporate credit unions
- CU SIP deposits in corporate
- Corporate CU CDs
- Insured institutional certificates of deposit
- Guaranteed student loans
- Share secured loans
- Guaranteed portion of SBA loans
- Shares and loans guaranteed by the government
- Other government/recourse loans
- Accrued interest of non-risk investments
- Loans purchased from liquidating credit unions
- Assets held with options to sell to government
- Loans under Corporate CU Loan Guarantee Program
- GNMA/FNMA/FHLMC (GSE) securities/bonds
- U.S. Treasuries
- Furniture, fixtures, and equipment
- Land and buildings

The California Credit Union League performed a sample analysis of 9 credit unions as of December 31, 2008, which includes the impact of excluding these assets. This analysis also includes the impact of NCUA's corporate stabilization actions, including the 100% write-down of credit unions' PIC and MCA investments in WesCorp.

Credit Union	PCA Net Worth Ratio: 12/31/2008 as reported	12/31/08 with Risk-Adjusted Assets	Effect	12/31/08 Pro-Forma with Corp Stabilization and Risk-Adjusted Assets	12/31/08 Pro-Forma with Corp Stabilization and Reported Assets	Effect
[redacted]						
CU 2	11.19%	13.60%	[redacted]	11.74%	9.66%	[redacted]
[redacted]						
CU 4	8.04%	9.12%	[redacted]	7.61%	6.71%	[redacted]
[redacted]						
CU 6	7.65%	7.97%	[redacted]	6.89%	6.62%	[redacted]
[redacted]						
CU 8	9.84%	14.42%	[redacted]	11.86%	8.09%	[redacted]
[redacted]						

Their calculations indicate that such a redefinition of "total assets" can positively impact credit unions' net worth ratios in the range of 27 to 458 basis points. In the case of the stabilization effect, this change would have a dramatic and much-needed effect on some credit unions' net worth classification. In our opinion, no/low-risk assets represent less risk to a credit union and should not require the same level of reserves as riskier assets. In the absence of a risk-weighted system for calculating credit union net worth (proposed and supported by NCUA in 2005) credit unions are unfairly and misleadingly penalized for holding assets that are of lower risk. Consumers, in short, are not being provided with an apples-to-apples comparison when a credit union's net worth is calculated under NCUA's PCA framework and current definition of "total assets". Indeed, to ignore this option is to invite unnecessary instability into the credit union system when NCUA's top priority should be to take steps towards system stabilization.

Tools Available to NCUA Through Congress

In addition to the immediate steps described above, we are supporting the work of the California Credit Union League and CUNA to ask Congress to obtain the following tools to help NCUA address current liquidity and capital issues:

- TARP or other government funds as a backstop to NCUSIF - Credit unions have been working with members of Congress to urge the Treasury to set aside at least $20 billion of TARP funds to be accessed should corporate or natural person credit union losses covered by the NCUSIF exceed $500 million. By allowing NCUA to reduce the current cost to credit unions of the corporate stabilization plan, this action would greatly mitigate the negative impact on credit unions' ROA and net worth and would bolster both credit union system confidence and public confidence.

- Corporate access to the Central Liquidity Facility (CLF) - As recommended in the January 2009 report from PricewaterhouseCoopers LLC to the NCUA Board, the CLF should be used to infuse liquidity and capital into the corporates. A change to the Federal Credit Union Act would expand authority of the CLF beyond its current authority to make liquidity loans only to natural person credit unions to permit direct investment in corporates.
- Replenishment of the NCUSIF over multiple years - FDIC is currently permitted five years to replenish their insurance fund. Section 2 of H.R. 786 (which makes permanent the $250,000 deposit insurance coverage for federally-insured financial institutions) would extend this period of time to eight years. In the interest of greater regulatory coordination within the financial services sector, we believe the replenishment period for credit unions should mirror that of banks, and are pursuing an amendment to this legislation to provide a similar restoration period for the NCUSIF.
- Risk-based net worth standards – Efforts to modernize the PCA system may also include urging Congress to consider the removal of all of the PCA stipulations from the statute and leave it to regulatory determination, similar to the system under which the banking industry operates. This would provide for greater flexibility and responsiveness, especially during times of crisis. Credit unions, which have proven to be less risky financial intermediaries than banks and thrifts, should be subject to a PCA framework that provides, at minimum, as much flexibility as the FDIC, the OTS, and the OCC utilize for bank PCA standards.
    - We also encourage the NCUA Board to support changes to the definition of net worth that would allow government assistance in the form of loans to credit unions to be included in a credit unions net worth ratio. Such loans, in the form of "Section 208" assistance, were use effectively in the 1980's to help a number of credit unions through a severe economic crisis. These credit unions are now healthy, and are providing valuable services to hundreds of thousands of members. The loans that were used to help these credit unions were repaid, with interest.
- Credit union access to alternative capital – In order to effectively compete, to have a sufficient financial base to effectively serve their members, and to adjust to fluctuating economic conditions, credit unions must have the ability to build additional capital. Structured properly, giving credit unions this ability will provide an additional buffer to the NCUSIF, and make the fund stronger

We urge the Board to actively support the ongoing efforts to secure these tools for NCUA, and further recommend that the Agency assertively pursue the recently announced Treasury initiative designed to deal with troubled assets (i.e, the 'Public-Private Investment Program').

Evaluating the Structure of the Corporate Credit Union System

NCUA's ANPR seeks input from all stakeholders in the credit union industry regarding reforms to the regulatory and functional structure of the corporate system. It is a sweeping reconsideration of the current role corporate credit unions play in the credit union system, including their charters, powers, investment authority, capital requirements, fields of membership, risk management and governance. In our view, the ANPR takes an unnecessarily broad approach in that it assumes the current corporate system is flawed in virtually every respect, and therefore requires a complete retooling. While we fully acknowledge the serious stress that has been placed on the corporate system, we do not agree that the current situation warrants what would amount to a wholesale remaking of corporates as they are known and used today. Therefore, rather than addressing the multitude of detailed questions in the ANPR, we would prefer to provide our views on the role of corporates in the credit union system, including our opinion of some of the key issues presented in the proposal.

The Role of Corporates

We believe the corporates serve a vital role for credit unions. By serving as a central point for credit union investment and payment system services and aggregation, they provide many services that typically would be economically available only to the largest financial institutions (e.g., share draft processing, wire transfers, ACH services, cash orders, etc.). By managing liquidity within the credit union industry, corporates are able to effectively and efficiently move excess liquidity to the areas of greatest need. In addition, they provide the wherewithal to help credit unions manage risk, and are uniquely positioned to facilitate participation lending. Operational efficiencies and cost considerations prohibit many credit unions from obtaining these services directly from the Federal Reserve.

Areas Where Improvements are Needed

We believe that there is room for greater efficiencies, more effective risk management in the system, and governance enhancements.

Greater Efficiencies. We believe that corporate consolidation would be beneficial to the system, and that NCUA should be more open, responsive, and supportive of such consolidation by removing unreasonable impediments and/or resistance to corporate credit union mergers. We realize that each tier of the corporate network takes its own share of income, adds another layer of cost, each has its own capital requirements, all of which reduces efficiency and effectiveness.

More Effective Risk Management. Recent events indicate that corporates require a larger capital cushion, a greater diversification of investment to include more restrictions on concentration risk, and more—or at least better—risk management tools. In addition, to provide an even more robust "firewall" between corporate credit union risk and natural person credit union safety, NCUA might consider the creation of a separate insurance fund or separate insurance "system"

Bay Federal
CREDIT UNION
Making a real difference

for corporate credit unions in the future. As the Federal Reserve and Treasury contemplate measures for reducing systemic risk, it will be important to recognize the *systemically important* role the corporate system plays in the nation's "financial plumbing." Ultimately, 90 million credit union members rely on the corporate system to provide trading, payments, clearing, and settlement services for their local credit unions. NCUA's aim should be to assure that the credit union system as a whole is better able to withstand future shocks.

Enhanced Governance. Finally, we believe that term limits for directors would be reasonable, as would minimum standards for experience, knowledge, and training.

To summarize: we believe that while the corporate system is in need of some key adjustments, it is not broken. Going forward, we would like to be reassured that NCUA will maintain an ongoing evaluation as to the possible need to continue the corporate deposit guarantee past 2010, and that the Agency is prepared to address the concurrent maturities of CU SIP investments.

In closing, we appreciate the opportunity to provide our views, concerns, and recommendations regarding the Agency's unprecedented action. We urge the Board to strike an effective and fair balance between the current needs of the corporate system and the very real, long-term, substantial needs of the entire credit union movement, and to strive for cooperation and transparency with credit unions in the process. We believe that to not do so will ultimately hurt public confidence in credit unions and the NCUA, and will be financially detrimental to American consumers.

Sincerely,

Carrie Birkhofer
President and CEO
Bay Federal Credit Union