

Regulatory Comments

From: Adam Fiebig <no-reply@cuanswers.com>
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2015 3:28 PM
To: _Regulatory Comments
Subject: Risk-Based Capital Comment

To: Regulatory Comments
From: Adam Fiebig
CU*Answers

02/27/2015

Dear Mr. Poliquin:

History has shown that the cooperative model of credit unions is a successful one. The diverse nature of our charters has meant that despite little capital—except member good will and loyalty—the forefathers and current stakeholders of the industry have built the second largest financial system in America today, serving close to 40 million households with savings of nearly \$1 trillion. The proposed rule will serve to hinder that diversity by placing credit unions into more general categories. Protect the true nature of credit unions by ending this rule so we can celebrate the charters that made this industry possible, from the \$60 billion Navy FCU to any of the \$1-5 million “family” credit unions. From the farming communities of South Dakota serving family farms with loans to the taxi drivers from NYC to San Francisco. From the raw recruit in San Diego to the forward deployed military professional in Diego Garcia, Korea, or Afghanistan. From the auto worker in Detroit or Tennessee to the high tech communities of Silicon Valley.

The NCUA and the credit union industry would both be served better if the formulas and risk weights within RBC were not given the force of law. Do not force my credit union to institute changes both potentially drastic and unwarranted in our balance sheet to meet these arbitrary weights.

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?

When CUs are engaged in a daily, hand-to-hand struggle to help folks improve their lives, to encourage their hopes, to educate their kids, and to find a way to stretch shrinking paychecks to the end of the month: then yes, I get angry and incensed by silly people, sheltered from accountability and the hard realities of this desperate economic struggle who recklessly and insensibly make our tasks unnecessarily more difficult. RBC needs to go.

We must stop the debate about the nuances of the rule and convince the NCUA, after outlining the substantial objections, that the modeling approach needs to be tested and tried in the examination process as a tool and then the results shared with the industry before suggesting that a model be embedded in a law.

Adam
Fiebig

Adam Fiebig
CU*Answers