CORNERSTONE
CREDIT UNION LEAGUE

RICHARD L. ENSWEILER, CCUE, CAE, CUDE
Chief Executive Officer

May 15, 2014

Mr. Gerard Poliquin
Secretary of the Board
National Credit Union Administration
1775 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-3428

Sent via E-mail to: regcomments@ncua.gov

Re: Cornerstone Credit Union League Comments on Proposed Rule: PCA – Risk-Based Capital

Dear Mr. Poliquin:

This letter represents the views of the Cornerstone Credit Union League ["Cornerstone"] regarding the NCUA's proposal on Risk-Based Capital ["RBC"]. Cornerstone is the official trade association serving 559 federal and state credit unions in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas combined, and more than 8.5 million credit union members. Cornerstone appreciates the opportunity to comment on this very important issue.

Cornerstone understands that the primary mission of the National Credit Union Administration ["NCUA"] is to ensure the safety of soundness of federally insured credit unions. In that effort, NCUA must ensure that credit unions maintain capital ratios and asset levels that provide for a stable insurance fund and healthy financial structure for the system. Although Cornerstone supports a strong credit union system, we must oppose the proposal as drafted because it is flawed in several regards, as detailed below.

Congressional Letter to NCUA
Cornerstone strongly supports the comment letter submitted by Representatives King and Meeks, and signed by more than 320 members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Cornerstone agrees with the concerns raised in that letter including concern regarding potential adverse effects on credit unions and credit union members. Specifically, the letter encourages NCUA to:

1. Take into account the cost and burden of implementing new risk-based capital requirements beyond current ratios;
2. Provide justification and more clarity as to why the risk weights differ from those applied to other community financial institutions; and,
3. Give credit union more time to come into compliance.

Cornerstone urges NCUA to give serious consideration to the issues raised by our members of Congress.

Statement of Congressional Intent and NCUA's Authority
In a comment letter to NCUA, former Senator Alfonse D'Amato clarified congressional intent behind the prompt corrective action ["PCA"] legislation. Specifically, he stated that applying a risk-based capital standard to determine whether a credit union is well capitalized is inconsistent with congressional intent with the PCA statutory language was crafted. Such an action by NCUA would exceed the authority conveyed to it under the Federal Credit Union Act. Senator D'Amato explained that the statute implemented a higher pure net worth requirement for credit unions and instructed NCUA to construct only a risk-based net worth floor, rather than the dual risk-based capital system in place for banks.

Cornerstone feels that NCUA has exceeded its authority by imposing a risk-based capital requirement for well capitalized credit unions higher than the requirement for adequately capitalized credit unions.

Lack of Justification for the Proposed Risk Weights (Sec. 702.104)
Cornerstone opposes the risk weighting categories as proposed. Due to the lack of justification by NCUA in the proposal commentary, the risk weights appear to be unsupported and arbitrary. Many of the risk weights are inappropriate and do not accurately reflect actual risk. The weightings do not account for the individual management strength of credit unions and areas in which credit unions and/or investments have a history of proven success. The risk weights ignore the historical market experience of the industry. The revaluation of certain asset weighting under the proposal could change a credit union's PCA without any reasoned justification.

For some risk categories, the weighting is the same for all loans or investments in that area. The risk weight categories are over generalized. For example, category 4 includes both unsecured and secured loans. Secured loans carry less risk and should be assigned a lower risk weight than unsecured loans.

Several of the risk weightings are alarmingly excessive, especially the proposed weighting of 250% for CUSO investments. In the proposal, all CUSO investments are treated the same regardless of the type of CUSO or its record of performance. While CUSO investments do have a degree of risk, we believe this weighting to be higher than what is warranted. The proposal also fails to consider the nature and past performance of a CUSO, which greatly impacts its level of risk. The proposal penalizes growth in investment value. It is likely that many of our credit unions will look to divest their interests in CUSO's entirely, or severely curtail their ownership if such risk levels are applied. This will reduce opportunities for credit union growth and may reduce member service offerings.

The proposal imposes a high risk weight on residential mortgages, including those guaranteed by the federal government. The risk weight for government backed loans should be lowered to account for the reduced risk related to government guarantees. Additionally, other factors such as real estate loan-to-value should be considered, rather than the approach being solely

concentration focused. The maximum weight assigned to residential mortgages by banks under Basel III is 50%. NCUA has failed to justify why credit unions should warrant as high as 100% for some residential mortgage loans.

The proposal also assigns a large risk weighting to member business loans ["MBLs"] without consideration to the quality of the loans and assets involved. NCUA should take into consideration credit unions providing agricultural MBLs, particularly those credit unions permitted to lend above the MBL cap. These credit union loans are included with all MBLs in the risk weighting, despite the fact of their historical MBL experience and well-managed portfolios. The risk weighting associated with member business loans will restrict all small business loan growth and will have a serious impact on the agricultural community.

The proposed risk weights for long-term investments do not take into account applicable credit or asset liability management considerations; it only captures interest rate risk concerns. A risk weighting focused solely on the average life of an investment does not accomplish the goal of addressing risk in its entirety.

The proposed risk weights also imply that an "apples-to-apples" comparison is possible between different kinds of investments. It is absurd to assume that every investment in a CUSO and mortgage servicing asset would be equivalent, and to assign identical risk weightings to each would in no way be an accurate representation of the actual risk involved.

In many areas, the risk weighting is even more punitive than that for community banks under Basel III. We would ask that this risk-weighting be re-evaluated to more accurately reflect the risk to credit unions.

Consistency with Banks

NCUA states that it intends to make the credit union risk-based capital measure more consistent with the measures used by the banks. If Congress intended credit unions to be subject to the same requirements at the banks, it would have said so. Basel III, the system used for banks, is focused on credit risk. However, the NCUA RBC proposal covers not only credit risk, but also interest-rate risk, concentration risk, liquidity risk, operational risk, and market risk. Furthermore, NCUA's proposal weighs the following areas significantly higher than Basel III: government guaranteed residential mortgages, non-delinquent first mortgage loans, other real estate loans, and MBLs. NCUA has not justified why its RBC proposal is significantly broader and more burdensome than Basel III.

NCUA says it intends the RBC proposal to bring consistency between the bank PCA and credit union PCA, but that approach fails to take into consideration the unique aspects of credit unions, including restraints on how credit unions can raise capital. Unlike the activity of banks which led to the recent economic crisis, credit unions have proven responsible business practices and success over time. As a result, credit unions should be afforded regulatory relief and treatment commensurate with our responsible practices.

Impact on Credit Union and Members
Our member credit unions have expressed that the proposal, as drafted, will drastically affect how they do business in the future, and how they will be limited in serving their members. Based on the proposed risk weights, we anticipate that the proposal will cause many credit unions to limit activities in business lending and residential mortgages. This directly affects the members, many of whom rely on the credit union movement for such loans.

Subjective Determination of Higher Capital Amounts (Sec. 702.105)
Under the proposal, NCUA has the authority on a case-by-case basis to increase the amount of capital a credit union is required to maintain. In other words, even if a credit union is in compliance with the rules, NCUA could require more capital. Despite the proposed "process" we feel that the NCUA board would retain the ability to delegate such power down the chain, perhaps to the examiner level. Cornerstone opposes this provision of the proposal because such power is overly broad and not justified. It is unreasonable to think that a credit union that plays by the rules and is in compliance could be subject to the will of an examiner.

We prefer an objective risk based assessment, so that our credit unions can operate without fear of prompt corrective action.

Definition of "Complex" Credit Union (Sec. 702.103)
The proposal would define a "complex" credit union as ANY credit union with over $50 million in assets. To be considered a complex credit union under the current rule, a credit union needs to be over $50 mill AND have a risk based net worth over 6%.

NCUA has provided no justification for expanding the definition of complex credit union. Size alone does not make a credit union complex. When determining if a credit union is complex, NCUA should also consider a credit union's comprehensive book of assets as well as its operations.

Regulatory Burden
The proposal increases the regulatory burdens of all credit unions, even those under $50 million in assets. Credit unions would experience increased costs associated with updating policies, data collection, and updating reporting systems. This is in addition to the countless other regulatory burdens currently hampering credit unions from serving their members.

According to the proposal, the estimated burden for each credit union (even those under $50 million) to collect risk-based capital ratio data will include:

- One-time recordkeeping, 122 hours
- On-going recordkeeping; 20 hours
- One-time policy review and revision, 20 hours

Additionally, the estimated burden of the risk based capital ratio policy implications on complex credit unions (those over $50 million) includes:

- One time policy review and revision, 40 hours

- Total estimated annual burden:
  - One time recordkeeping and disclosures: 162 hours per complex CU, 122 hours per noncomplex CU
  - On-going record keeping, 20 hours all credit unions

In other words, NCUA estimates the rule will create an additional 162 hours annually for credit union of less than $50 million. That's over four weeks of work for a full-time employee, provided that NCUA has not underestimated the work involved. Keep in mind many of our small credit unions have between 1-5 employees and cannot lose the employee staff time. 160 hours is equivalent to the credit union being short-staffed for over a month! Meanwhile, the members suffer as the credit union is not able to properly serve them. These burdens are above and beyond the countless other regulatory burdens with which credit unions are struggling today.

Extension of Compliance Date

Cornerstone opposes the proposed eighteen months for compliance with a final rule and requests that NCUA provide substantially more time to comply. Eighteen months is unreasonable, especially in light of the fact that Basel III allows banks until 2019 to comply. Under the proposed timeline, credit unions looking to alter their investment portfolio due to the RBC method may be forced to sell investments at less advantageous terms. This is not in the best interest of the credit union or the credit union system.

Additionally, submission of the call report will be a significantly slower process. The call report will be more costly and more complicated due to the amount of new information to be provided. Gathering such information will require changes by data processors, additional staff time, staff training—all of which will takes time and costs money. This decreases the time and resources the credit union can provide back to its members. This proposal is a burden on all credit unions, not just those over $50 million. Cornerstone urges NCUA to provide credit unions until 2019 for compliance.

Summary

In summary, we urge NCUA to remember that its job is to regulate credit unions so that they may thrive and grow; the NCUA should not be managing the credit union balance sheet. We support a risk-based evaluation, just not the particulars of this proposal. We hope that NCUA will give great thought and consideration to the flood of comments on this very important issue and revise the rule as requested.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important issue. Please feel free to contact me at 469-385-6410 with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Ensweiler