

**From:** [Cleo Segovia](#)  
**To:** [Regulatory Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Cleo Segovia - Risk-Based Capital (RBC2)  
**Date:** Friday, April 24, 2015 11:32:05 AM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Dear Mr. Poliquin,

As an employee of Resource One, I would like to take the time to address my personal concerns regarding the revised Risk-Based Capital proposal. While I support the requirements for credit unions to be financially healthy, the updated proposal would instead have an adverse effect on the movement. I would like to express my concerns on RBC2 and its flaws to express my disapproval even in its updated context.

The current system works, credit unions came through the last Recession, the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression, just fine. Resource One has long demonstrated consistent growth since it was originally chartered, serving over 50,000 members. Although I believe NCUA has taken steps in the right direction to improve the original capital risk proposal, its revised format still seems to be flawed in its current state.

A substantial change in RBC2 was to eliminate higher risk weights for longer-term investments, which is appreciated. We encourage NCUA to refrain from issuing a proposal on interest rate risk that would apply a minimum quantitative measure of interest rate risk to all covered credit unions using some common measurement framework. Interest rate risk should not be incorporated into the risk-based capital system. NCUA already has an interest rate risk rule in place that provides adequate protection. If NCUA feels that additional interest rate risk steps are needed, they should be addressed in the regulatory, examination, and supervision process.

RBC2 proposal increased this threshold from \$50 million to \$100 million. There are still concerns with the approach of defining credit unions as complex simply based on asset size. NCUA should define complex with factors such as deposit account types, member services, loan and investment types, and portfolio composition. We feel this approach is more consistent with the Federal Credit Union Act which requires NCUA to consider "the portfolio of assets and liabilities" of credit unions when determining whether they are "complex."

I appreciate your willingness to allow me to express my comments on this revised impactful regulatory proposal. I respectfully encourage you to consider additional improvements to the proposed revised Risk-Based Capital (RBC2) Rule in accordance with my views included in this letter. Thank you again for the opportunity to voice my opinions and comments on the proposal.

Respectfully,

**Mr. Cleo Segovia, MBA, SCMS**  
Financial Analyst | Finance  
Political Advocacy Coordinator | Governance



Member/Owner since 2004

p: 214.565.5304 | c: 214.679.7959 | f: 214.292.0779

[www.r1cu.org](http://www.r1cu.org) | [cleo.segovia@r1cu.org](mailto:cleo.segovia@r1cu.org)  



**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE** The information in this e-mail may be confidential and/or privileged. This e-mail is intended to be reviewed by only the individual or organization named above. If you are not the intended recipient or an authorized representative of the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination or copying of this email and its attachments, if any, or the information contained herein is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail and delete this e-mail from your system.

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, delete this e-mail and destroy any copies. Any dissemination or use of this information by a person other than the intended recipient is unauthorized and may be illegal. Resource One Credit Union reserves the right to monitor all e-mail communications through its networks for quality control purposes.