

**ALLEGANY COUNTY**  
 **TEACHERS**  
**Federal Credit Union**

14316 National Highway, SW  
LaVale, Maryland 21502  
Telephone: 301-729-8015  
Fax: 301-729-2147

May 12, 2014

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

Via e-mail: [regcomments@ncua.gov](mailto:regcomments@ncua.gov)

**RE: Comments on Proposed Rule: Prompt Corrective Action – Risk-Based Capital.**

Dear Mr. Poliquin:

Allegany County Teachers Federal Credit Union serves Allegany County, its residents, employees and many family members in surrounding areas. We currently have 9,068 Members and \$97.0 million in assets. We appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on the National Credit Union Administration's (NCUA) proposed rule Prompt Corrective Action – Risk-Based Capital (RBC). We are committed to our members and the communities we serve through the strong leadership of the credit union movement in Maryland and Washington, DC by creating a collaborative environment that adds value through shared services, consumer awareness, and innovative market development.

Allegany County Teachers Federal Credit Union feels strongly that given credit unions managed to remain strong through the worst financial crisis in the past 80 years, this proposed rule is without merit. Furthermore, if the proposed rule is adopted as written, it will place an undue burden upon credit unions to comply. In fact, most affected credit unions would need to increase the amount of capital held in order to be well capitalized, and would likely face burdensome risk weightings that would serve as a disincentive to continue or enter into member business and mortgage lending programs, and long-term investments, inevitably pushing members to credit unions' competitors.

We continue to review all aspects of the RBC proposal, its proposed effects on our individual credit union and our industry throughout Maryland and Washington, DC. We are also working with our trade association, the Credit Union National Association (CUNA) on their own analyses of the agency's proposed rule, its affects, and how it will affect our services and members.

CUNA has estimated that if all affected credit unions acted to adjust their capital levels to maintain current margins above the "well capitalized" thresholds according to the RBC proposed rule requirements; credit unions would have to raise up to \$7.3 billion in additional capital.

### **Proposed RBC effects on credit unions**

NCUA estimates that over 90% of the credit unions with assets over \$50 million, under the proposed rule applied today, would meet the minimum risk-based capital requirements. NCUA also estimates that only 200 credit unions would experience a decline in their PCA classification from well capitalized to adequately capitalized if the proposal were in effect now and 10 well capitalized credit unions would be downgraded to under-capitalized. However, CUNA estimates that a greater number of credit unions would fall from being comfortably well capitalized under the current system to being merely well capitalized under the proposed system. This is of great significance, as many credit unions may not be aware of the punitive nature of this rule when basing their analysis simply on the information provided by NCUA.

### **Proposed risk-weights**

A number of the risk weights, especially for member business loan and mortgage concentrations as well as for CUSO investments, do not appear to be properly calibrated for credit unions. They are even higher than what is being imposed on banks by the BASEL III changes. Using higher risk weights on long-term assets to deal with interest-rate risk is misleading without considering liability maturities and other mitigating factors.

### **CUSO Investments**

Additionally, we encourage NCUA to implement regulations that encourage the use of CUSOs to generate net income and remove all regulatory impediments to CUSOs and collaboration. We recommend the removal of risk ratings for CUSO investments and loans as immaterial, inapplicable to CUSO investments and to encourage CUSO investment for policy reasons.

### **NCUSIF 1% Deposit to be ignored**

NCUA's requirement that the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund 1% deposit be ignored in the risk-based capital calculation should be reconsidered. The justification for removing the deposit is unclear, yet quite significant.

### **Examiner discretion to change risk ratings**

Proposed section 702.105(c) is troubling in that NCUA would assume additional authority to impose higher capital requirements on individual credit unions that could exceed even well capitalized level requirements. Unlike under the existing statutory net worth rules known as Prompt Corrective Action (PCA) regulations, credit unions would no longer have clear rules to avoid prompt corrective action imposed by NCUA if the agency establishes its authority to use "judgment" on a credit union-by-credit union basis to make changes to risk ratings. This section of the proposed rule opens the door to inconsistent and potentially arbitrary application of the intended rules. In addition, would significantly diminish the responsibility of boards and management to make critical financial judgments, determine the strategic direction of the credit union, and oversee policy. Our recommendation is to remove section 702.105(c) from the proposed rule entirely.

### **Mortgage Loan Servicing Risk Rating**

In our opinion, the mortgage servicing risk rating of 250% appears excessive. The high-risk rating will likely discourage many credit unions from loan participations. In light of a

recovering, currently active mortgage market, we recommend that the agency consider significantly reducing this risk rating. Without loan participations, many credit unions may not have sufficient interest income to survive.

### **Implementation Date**

We are also recommending that the proposed implementation date of eighteen months after becoming final be extended. This proposed time-frame does not give credit unions sufficient lead time to plan for the new risk based capital ratio requirements and other proposed changes to part 702 and implement them properly. This is particularly important as many credit unions may wish to alter their balance sheet composition in response to the rule. We are urging the agency to provide a much longer implementation period, particularly in light of the multi-year development and implementation of Basel III for banks.

### **Conclusion**

Allegany County Teachers Federal Credit Union appreciates the value of a financial institution's capital as a durable source of funding that can be readily deployed to shore up a balance sheet under duress and the need for regulatory oversight. In that spirit, we are asking NCUA to carefully weigh the comments received and consider withdrawing this flawed proposal in favor of opening a new productive dialogue with the credit union community regarding warranted and balanced risk-based capital reform. Short of that, at the very least, we urge NCUA to pursue the appropriate amendments to this rule that will ensure a viable, well-balanced risk-based capital system is implemented.

Allegany County Teachers Federal Credit Union fully understands the importance of monitoring and mitigating interest rate risk as it relates to long-term assets; however, assigning a higher risk weighting based on this factor alone is misleading. We are expected to develop, calculate, and evaluate a Net Economic Value to ensure that our balance sheet is well-positioned to cope with a variety of rate scenarios. If we are developing that analysis and applying it accurately and efficiently, and having it reviewed by a third party, why is it necessary to establish another level of risk? There are so many variables to consider when analyzing interest rate risk including but not limited to non-maturity deposits and the credit union's actual prepayment of loans. Furthermore, if consideration is being given to the net long-term assets to assets ratio, NCUA must consider the volatility of this ratio based on the specific credit union's fluctuation in assets. As a "Teachers" credit union, it is customary for our assets to drop \$1.0 to \$2.0 in the summer while the teachers are not receiving a pay causing a significant change in our net long-term assets to assets ratio. The net long-term assets to assets ratio is too remedial to adequately assess interest rate risk.

Allowing examiners to change risk ratings opens up the door to inconsistent and potentially arbitrary application of the intended rules because we all interpret the rules differently and each examiner has their very own area of expertise. In my experience with NCUA Examiners, it is apparent that not all of them are on the same page nor can they provide concrete evidence or advice when approached with probing questions about rules and regulations and why a credit union is being issued a Document of Resolution (DOR) or how they can fix an identified compliance violation. They also tend to require certain practices at some credit unions, but not all despite the regulatory requirements. This proposed section of the regulation provides for additional confusion and subjective examinations resulting in an unreliable method of FAIRLY examining all credit unions. Furthermore, a NCUA Examiner has limited knowledge of the credit union's operations, strategic direction, and financial stability making it extremely difficult to

systematically assess the Credit Risk, Interest Rate Risk, Liquidity Risk, Strategic Risk, Compliance Risk, Reputation Risk, and Transaction Risk.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed rule Prompt Corrective Action – Risk-Based Capital. If you should have any questions, please contact me at [christie28@alcoteachersfcu.org](mailto:christie28@alcoteachersfcu.org) and 301-729-8015.

Sincerely,

*Christie L. Clark*

Christie L. Clark  
Vice President

Cc: Rep. John Delaney  
Sen. Barbara Mikulski  
Sen. Benjamin Cardin