

Regulatory Comments

From: Katelyn Larrison <no-reply@cuanswers.com>
Sent: Monday, April 06, 2015 12:56 PM
To: _Regulatory Comments
Subject: Risk-Based Capital Comment

To: Regulatory Comments
From: Katelyn Larrison
Frankenmuth Credit Union

04/06/2015

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.

Congress intended for the NCUA to develop rules around credit union complexity that would take into account the diversity of credit unions. An arbitrary asset cut-off point is contrary to the mission Congress provided to the NCUA, which is to take in account the special nature of my members' relationship with my credit union.

Our credit union believes the RBC2 rule would undermine the cooperative and diverse nature of our charters by creating a one size fits all over-reaching capital formula. This is a massive flaw of the NCUA's structure as regulator and insurer. We believe this is a myopic view of cooperatives and only considers our equity funding mechanism. A cooperative is a like group of individuals banding together to own a business that is guaranteed to meet their similar financial needs. The arguments and logic of the rule misapplies what is done successfully at a local or institutional level, to an entire system. Because of this I would respectfully recommend the rule be thrown out and at best become a matrix the NCUA would use in the exam process only.

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. Thank you,

Katelyn Larrison
Frankenmuth Credit Union



Katelyn Larrison
Frankenmuth Credit Union