

Regulatory Comments

From: Dana Reif <no-reply@cuanswers.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2015 1:07 PM
To: _Regulatory Comments
Subject: Risk-Based Capital Comment

To: Regulatory Comments
From: Dana Reif
Frankenmuth Credit Union

03/10/2015

Dear Mr. Poliquin:

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?

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dana Reif". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Dana Reif
Frankenmuth Credit Union