

**7535-01-U**

**NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION**

**12 CFR Part 701**

**RIN 3133-AD75**

**The Low-Income Definition**

**AGENCY:** National Credit Union Administration (NCUA).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** NCUA is amending the definition of “low-income members” to clarify that, in determining if a credit union qualifies for a low-income designation, the comparison of credit union data, whether individual or family income data, must be with statistical data for the same category. The amendment will clarify the intention of the original regulatory text so it is consistent with the geo-coding software the agency uses to make the low-income credit union (LICU) designation.

**DATES:** The rule was previously issued as an interim final rule, which became effective on publication on August 5, 2010, 75 FR 47171 (Aug. 5, 2010) and is being published as a final rule without change.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Regina Metz, Staff Attorney, Office of General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314-3428, or telephone: (703) 518-6540.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Background

The Federal Credit Union Act (Act) authorizes the NCUA Board (Board) to define “low-income members” so that credit unions with a membership consisting of predominantly low-income members can benefit from certain statutory relief and receive assistance from the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund. 12 U.S.C. 1752(5), 1757a(b)(2)(A), 1757a(c)(2)(B), 1772c-1. This authority has been implemented in §701.34 of NCUA regulations, known as the low-income rule. 12 CFR 701.34. In April 2008, the Board proposed substantial changes to the rule, which had previously been based on measuring median household income, with geographic differentials for certain areas with higher costs of living. 73 FR 22836 (April 28, 2008). In brief, the Board proposed to, and as adopted in the final rule, did replace median household income with median family income or median earnings for individuals as better measures, more flexible, and in line with standards used by other federal agencies. 73 FR 71909 (Nov. 26, 2008).

As discussed in the preamble to the final rule, NCUA also undertook as part of the regulatory changes to facilitate the low-income designation process by eliminating the requirement for credit unions to apply for the designation. NCUA is in the process of implementing geo-coding software to make the calculation automatically for credit unions during the examination process.

NCUA will make the determination of whether a majority of an FCU's members are low-income based on data it obtains during the examination process. This will involve linking member address information to publicly available information from the U.S. Census Bureau to estimate member earnings. Using automated, geo-coding software, NCUA will use member street addresses collected during FCU examinations to determine the geographic area and metropolitan area for each member account. NCUA will then use income information for the geographic area from the Census Bureau and assign estimated earnings to each member.

73 FR at 71910-11. NCUA's software ensures that the same categories of data available for member income at a particular credit union are compared with like categories of statistical data on income from the Census Bureau. In particular, individual member earnings information is compared to median individual earnings data and family income information is compared to median family income data.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> NCUA's geo-coding software, known within the agency as the "Low-Income Designation Assessment Tool," is currently a stand-alone software program developed by NCUA's Office of the Chief Information Officer with guidance from regional staff experienced in low-income designation. Regional staff as well as Economic Development Specialists currently use the tool as needed based on requests from credit unions. Eventually, the same software rules will be embedded into the NCUA AIREX examination software. The current version performs 30 different ratio calculations for each member based on a variety of factors and data to determine whether the member meets the low-income definition. The variety of ratios is expansive in order to provide all of the possible options for members to meet the definition. Factors recognize the following: (1) data sources include both decennial income data as well as American Community Survey income data; (2) different data is incorporated for metro vs. non-

The final rule in November 2008 also provided credit unions, as an alternative to relying on NCUA's geo-coding software, the option of providing actual income information about their members as a basis for qualifying as a LICU. Confusion has arisen regarding the appropriate comparison of actual member information and statistical data from the Census Bureau, prompting the need for this clarifying amendment. The confusion arises from a discussion in the preamble to the final rule, where the Board stated:

The rule also provides an alternative basis for an FCU to qualify for a LICU designation. An FCU may be able to demonstrate the actual income of its members based on data it has, for example, from loan applications or surveys of its members. An FCU may qualify as a LICU if it can establish a majority of its members meet the low-income formula. For example, an FCU with 1,000 members may be able to show the actual income of 501 or more of its members is equal to or less than 80% of the MFI for the metropolitan area(s) where they live. As a practical matter, the Board thinks few FCUs will need this option because NCUA's approach of matching member residential information with Census Bureau income information will provide an estimate very close to members' actual income.

73 FR at 71911. The rule provides median family income or median individual earnings as alternatives and, as noted above, NCUA's geo-coding software compares like categories of data. Unfortunately, the above-quoted statement in the preamble indicated that, as an alternative to relying on the NCUA's geo-coding, a credit union could apply for a low-income designation relying on a comparison of actual income data for individual members to statistical data on median family income as the basis for the designation. This would not be a valid or meaningful comparison. The Board believes

---

metro geographic areas; and (3) ratio options include comparisons of census tract and block group income data, to zip code, county, MSA, state, and national data, plus comparisons of county income data to CBSA, state, and national income data.

that, as a matter of logic and statistical reasoning, only like categories of data may be compared in making the determination that a credit union's membership meets the low-income definition. Actual individual member income information should not be measured against median family income, but rather, against individual median earnings.

#### Interim Final Rule and Comments

In July 2010, the Board issued an interim final rule amending §701.34(a)(1) by clarifying that median family income and median earnings for individuals are alternative bases on which credit union members may qualify as low income. 75 FR 47171 (Aug. 5, 2010).

In addition, the interim final rule amended the subsection of the rule regarding the option for credit unions to submit their own information for purposes of qualifying for the designation to clarify that actual member data must be compared with a like category of statistical data.

NCUA received three comment letters: one from a federal credit union and two from credit union trade associations. All three commenters supported the clarification in the interim final rule. The two trade associations, commenting on an issue outside the scope of the interim final rule, urged the NCUA to consider further amendment of the low-income rule to permit credit unions that do not qualify under NCUA's geo-coding software to use a statistically valid, random sample of member income data to support a designation as a low-income credit union. Concurrent with issuing this final rule, the Board is separately issuing a proposed rule addressing the use of a statistically valid, random sample to support the low-income designation.

## **Regulatory Procedures**

### Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires NCUA to prepare an analysis to describe any significant economic impact any regulation may have on a substantial number of small entities. 5 U.S.C. 603(a). For purposes of this analysis, NCUA considers credit unions having under \$10 million in assets small entities. Interpretive Ruling and Policy Statement 03-2, 68 FR 31949 (May 29, 2003). As of December 31, 2007, out of approximately 8,410 federally insured credit unions, 3,599 had less than \$10 million in assets. This interim final rule merely clarifies the existing low-income rule and, therefore, an analysis is not required. NCUA, however, provided an analysis when it issued the final rule in November 2008, concluding that the economic impact on entities affected by the rule would not be significant. 73 F.R. 71911-12.

### Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA) of 1996, Pub. L. 104-121, provides generally for congressional review of agency rules. A reporting requirement is triggered in instances where NCUA issues a final rule as defined by Section 551 of the Administrative Procedures Act. 5 U.S.C. 551. The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has determined that this final rule is not a major rule for purposes of SBREFA.

### Paperwork Reduction Act

This clarifying amendment does not change the collection requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.

### Executive Order 13132

Executive Order 13132 encourages independent regulatory agencies to consider the impact of their actions on state and local interests. In adherence to fundamental federalism principles, NCUA, an independent regulatory agency as defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(5), voluntarily complies with the executive order. The final rule will not have substantial direct effect on the states, on the connection between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. NCUA has determined this final rule does not constitute a policy that has federalism implications for purposes of the executive order.

### The Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1999 – Assessment of Federal Regulations and Policies on Families

NCUA has determined that this final rule will not affect family well-being within the meaning of section 654 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1999, Pub. L. 105-277, 112 Stat. 2681 (1998).

### **List of Subjects**

#### **12 CFR Part 701**

Credit unions, Federal credit unions, Low income, Nonmember deposits, Secondary capital, Shares

By the National Credit Union Administration Board, on December 16, 2010.

---

Mary F. Rupp

Secretary of the Board

For the reasons stated above, NCUA amends 12 CFR part 701 as follows:

## **PART 701 — ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS**

1. The authority for part 701 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 12 U.S.C. 1752(5), 1757, 1765, 1766, 1781, 1782, 1787, 1789; Title V, Pub. L. 109-351, 120 Stat. 1966.

2. In §701.34, amend paragraph (a) by:

a. Removing the first two sentences in paragraph (a)(2) and adding a new first sentence; and

b. Adding a new sentence to the end of paragraph (a)(3).

The additions read as follows:

### **§701.34 [Amended]**

(a) Designation of low-income status. \* \* \*

(2) Low-income members are those members whose family income is 80% or less than the median family income for the metropolitan area where they live or national metropolitan area, whichever is greater, or those members who earn 80% or less than the total median earnings for individuals for the metropolitan area where they live or national metropolitan area, whichever is greater. \* \* \*

(3) \* \* \* Actual member income data must be compared to a like category of statistical data, for example, actual individual member income may only be compared to total median earnings for individuals for the metropolitan area where they live or national metropolitan area, whichever is greater.

\* \* \* \* \*