

## Regulatory Comments

---

**From:** Oscar Melgar <no-reply@cuanswers.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 04, 2015 5:45 PM  
**To:** \_Regulatory Comments  
**Subject:** Risk-Based Capital Comment

To: Regulatory Comments  
From: Oscar Melgar  
South Bay Credit Union

03/04/2015

Dear Mr. Poliquin:

Our credit union's board of directors believes this rule is overreaching as many of the failures this proposed rule is trying to mitigate do not even take into consideration the reasons for the losses during the great recession. As has been depicted during the board meeting and in the proposal, over 40% of failures were the result of fraud; all of us have been following the St. Paul Croatian's fraud loss dilemma, which cost the insurance fund \$170 million dollars to date. Economic policy had nothing to do with many of these losses, regardless of the shape of credit unions' balance sheets. The idea that passing a rule—a seemingly typical government reaction—can stop fraud, eliminate mismanagement and prevent external circumstances from decimating credit union's market environment is wrong. Effective supervision is not rule making, it is intelligent supervision and patient reorganization when problems arise. This is lacking in our cu regulatory community today.

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.

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.

OSCAR M.

Oscar Melgar  
South Bay Credit Union