

From: [Eric Leatham](#)
To: [Regulatory Comments](#)
Subject: Comments on Notice of Credit Union Changes
Date: Friday, January 15, 2016 11:22:58 AM

Gerard Poliquin
National Credit Union Administration
Alexandria DC 22314

Comments on Notice of Credit Union Changes

Dear Gerard Poliquin:

It appears that credit unions and banks are regulated differently. Credit unions already enjoy a huge advantage by not paying income taxes and we should not be making it easier for them to compete with banks.

Dear Mr. Poliquin:

As a banker, I am concerned about the impact of further expanding the credit union industry's potential field of membership through the proposed rule on Chartering and Field of Membership. The provisions of this proposal, when implemented all together, would provide federal credit unions with the opportunity to increase membership drastically, resulting in a broad expansion of the credit union industry's tax subsidy.

- My bank serves customers and the surrounding community, and unfair competition from the credit union industry impacts my business. For example, we make few automobile loans now as we cannot compete with the very low rates that credit unions offer. Banks are not tax exempt, but are for-profit businesses attempting to balance offering products and services to best serve customers while growing the business to offer more lines of credit and other economic capital to communities.
- Congress has kept in place advantages for the credit union industry, but those advantages come with limitations, including the size of the institutions and scope of activities. Congress understood that if community credit unions were to fulfill their public mission, there needed to be a legitimate shared bond among members, even amending the FCU Act in 1998, to include the term "local." Combined with the terms "well-defined," it is clear Congress intended to impose finite and narrow limits on the area that a community credit union may serve. This proposal goes beyond any reasonable definition of local and well-defined. The proposed rule intends to treat a Combined Statistical Area and a Congressional District as a well-defined local community. In addition, the proposal expands the rural district population limit by four times the current threshold to one million. We have several credit unions in Oregon that dwarf the size of most of our community banks. I feel that large credit unions should be subject to the income tax just like we are if they want to expand that much and compete directly.
- Congress deliberately instructed NCUA through the FCU Act to keep credit unions small and focused on providing services to specific groups that lack other access to financial

services. The proposal would disregard this Congressional directive by modifying NCUA's process for assessing stand-alone feasibility of groups that seek to be added to the field of membership of an existing multiple common bond credit union by allowing a streamlined determination for groups with between 3,000 and 4,999 potential new members.

This letter demonstrates that such a broad expansion of authorities as proposed greatly undercuts Congressional-mandated limits on field of membership and will lead to a broad expansion of the credit union industry's tax subsidy—already valued at \$26.75 billion over the next 10 years. This abuse of regulatory authority has vast implications for both marketplace dynamics and the potential increase of tax subsidies at a time when governments are working with large budget deficits. It is clear that the NCUA Board has blatantly disregarded Congressional intent and is overstepping its regulatory reach.

Please act like a regulatory agency and properly monitor the actions of credit unions.

Sincerely,
Eric Leatham
13105 SW 64th Ave
Portland, OR 97219