_Regulatory Comments

From: Jessica Hillborg <no-reply@cuanswers.com>
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2015 4:58 PM
To: _Regulatory Comments
Subject: Risk-Based Capital Comment

To: Regulatory Comments
From: Jessica Hillborg
Frankenmuth Credit Union

04/10/2015

Dear Mr. Poliquin:

I am an employee and member of a credit union and I am opposed to the revised Risk-Based Capital regulation. If your goal is to protect the NCUSIF, why implement a rule that will make it harder for credit unions to provide high quality services and rates to their owners? In the last ten years, fraud has caused 41% of failures. Turn your attentions to what matters, don't harm the vast majority of credit unions that have been operating the right way for years.

I believe the revised RBC rule penalizes credit unions for specific activities such as real estate lending, member business lending, and credit unions chartered to assist the un-bankable by placing a capital tax on the resulting assets of low income or poor credit lending. We believe the end result will be thousands of homogenous balance sheets in 2025 that you can easily understand from a supervisory perspective. However, this current risk posture of the NCUA cannot fail but to lead credit unions to shy away from diversity or cooperative reason for the charter and field of membership. The end result of this rule will ultimately force credit unions into potential areas of investment and lending that the credit union lacks experience with or create industry wide concentrations that could be impacted by similar economic variables. In and of itself, this rule creates more risk than it proposes to control.

As pointed out in the Hon. J. Mark McWatters' dissent, the NCUA has pivoted away from its own long-standing interpretation of Section 216(d) of the Federal Credit Union Act. In 2007, the NCUA asked Congress to amend the regulation because you said the NCUA needed additional authority to create a two-tiered Risk Based Capital test. Can you explain why you suddenly believe the NCUA has the authority to do so, when your past practice has been the exact opposite?

Our credit union board and management team are making numerous decisions about the composition of our balance sheet and capital adequacy based on the needs of our unique membership and local community. These factors do not just take into consideration the asset type, but include the reasons for our charter to begin with, corresponding funding from liabilities, and unique economic needs of the communities they serve. These thousands of local decisions are driven by diverse business priorities, pricing and growth objectives as well as responses to unique local needs. We believe our decisions have resulted in varied portfolio strategies which enhance the balance sheet's overall soundness rather than a single approach nationwide to risk management. RBC2 puts that at risk.

Thank you for your consideration. I want to see positive growth in the credit union movement and I do not feel that this proposal will help to achieve that.

Jessica Hillborg
Frankenmuth Credit Union