



August 29, 2014

President

Richard Ellis, UT

Executive Committee

Manju Ganeriwala, VA
Mark Gordon, WY
David H. Lillard Jr., TN
James McIntire, WA
Ken Miller, OK
Beth Pearce, VT
Rich Sattgast, SD

Interim Executive Director

Chris A. Hunter

Headquarters:

2760 Research Park Drive
PO Box 11910
Lexington, KY 40511

P (859) 244-8175

F (859) 244-8001

Office of Federal Relations:

444 N Capitol St, NW, Ste 401
Washington, DC 20001

P (202) 624-8592

F (202) 624-8677

Email: nast@csg.org

www.NAST.org

Secretariat

The Council of
State Governments

Department of the Treasury

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

400 7th Street SW, Suite 3E-218, Mail Stop 9W-11

Washington, DC 20219

Attn: Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division

Docket ID OCC-2013-0016

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

20th Street and Constitution Avenue NW

Washington, DC 20551

Attn: Robert deV. Frierson, Secretary

Docket No. R-1466

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

550 17th Street, NW

Washington, DC 20429

Attn: Comments / Legal ESS

Robert E. Feldman, Executive Secretary

RIN No. 3064-AE04

The National Association of State Treasurers ("NAST") is a bi-partisan association that is comprised of all state treasurers, or state finance officials with comparable responsibilities, from the United States, its commonwealths, territories, and the District of Columbia. The National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers and Treasurers, is an organization for state officials tasked with the financial management of state government. NASACT's membership is comprised of officials who have been elected or appointed to the offices of state auditor, state comptroller or state treasurer in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories.

On September 3, 2014, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board) and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) are scheduled to vote on the liquidity coverage ratio (LCR) final rule. We are very concerned and dismayed about news reports suggesting that the final rule by the Board, FDIC, and Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) (collectively, "the Agencies") may exclude municipal securities from the definition of "High Quality Liquid Assets" (HQLAs). The proposed rule does not include a robust analysis of characteristics of municipal securities, NAST and other organizations representing state and local governments, as well as some individual State Treasurers, have already submitted comments and data demonstrating why municipal securities meet the criteria for inclusion as HQLAs. We hope the news reports of the final rule are not accurate.

It is unreasonable to treat an entire asset class of securities in the same way, as securities of different issuers will have different characteristics. A more reasonable approach would be for the rule to identify quantitative liquidity standards or characteristics that should be met in order for that particular security to be defined as an HQLA.

We continue to believe that excluding municipal securities from HQLAs is not warranted given their liquidity and market-based characteristics. Additionally, the exclusion of municipal securities from HQLAs would increase borrowing costs for municipal issuers, reduce liquidity and increase volatility of municipal securities, and disadvantage U.S. municipal debt relative to foreign sovereign government debt.

Municipal Securities Meet Criteria for Inclusion as HQLAs

Based on our experience in the municipal market and a review of statistical information regarding the characteristics of the municipal market, NAST believes municipal securities meet all of the HQLA criteria as outlined in the proposed rule.

The proposed rule explains that assets classified as HQLAs “exhibit low risk and limited price volatility, are traded in high-volume, deep markets with transparent pricing, and... are eligible to be pledged at a central bank.” In addition, the proposed rule requires that certain categories of HQLA, including Level 2A HQLAs, be “liquid and readily-marketable”, which means they are traded in an active secondary market with (1) more than two committed market makers; (2) a large number of non-market maker participants on both the buying and selling sides of transactions; (3) timely and observable market prices; and (4) a high trading volume.

We address each of the relevant criteria below:

Low Risk and Limited Price Volatility – Municipal securities are among the lowest risk securities across all markets, with the one-year default rate at only 0.012% from 1970 – 2012. (*Source: Moody's Investors Service, “US Municipal Bond Defaults and Recoveries, 1970 – 2012, published May 7, 2013*). Certainly, during the credit crisis and its aftermath, U.S. municipal securities have demonstrated dramatically greater credit stability than numerous European sovereign credits whose government securities may be treated as HQLAs under the proposed LCR rule. The low risk characteristics of municipal securities have already been recognized by the Agencies, leading to a 20% risk weighting under the Agencies’ own regulatory capital rules.

Consistent with their extremely low credit risk, municipal securities have also demonstrated price stability similar to longer-term U.S. Treasury securities and investment grade corporate bonds that are proposed to be classified as HQLAs. For example, since 1925, the five worst month-over-month price movements for long-term AA municipal general obligation bonds and Single-A municipal revenue obligations range between -7.3% and -10.3%, comparable to the ranges for longer-term U.S. Treasury securities (-6.2% to -11.8%) and AAA and BBB corporate bonds (-6.2% to -9.7%). (*Source: Citigroup Global Markets Inc., December 27, 2013*)

High Volume, Deep Markets with Transparent Pricing – Trading volumes in municipal securities are comparable to trading volumes in corporate and GSE bonds that are treated as HQLAs under the proposed LCR rule. Analysis prepared by Citigroup Global Markets Inc. indicate the municipal market trades 0.31% of its total outstanding par every day, comparable to the markets for corporate bonds (0.20%) and GSE debt (0.33%). If non-investment grade and financial debt and certain other securities that are not expected to meet the HQLA criteria are excluded from the trading volumes, the municipal market’s relative liquidity is even stronger. Thus, it is clear that the municipal securities market is a “high volume” market as required for HQLA status.

The municipal securities market is also deep and diverse, both in terms of market makers and non-market making participants. The Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board regulates over 1,600 registered broker-dealers who serve as market makers for municipal securities. Hundreds of thousands of individual retail investors hold about 44% of outstanding municipal bonds. Mutual funds (28%), banks (12%) and property and casualty insurance and life insurance companies (13%) are other large categories of

municipal investors. (Source: *Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association*). Further, municipal securities comprise less than 4% of bank portfolios (Source, *Citigroup Global Markets Inc. December 23, 2013*), providing significant diversification benefits and reducing overall liquidity risk for Covered Financial Institutions if treated as HQLAs.

Municipal bond pricing is highly transparent, with all trades required to be electronically posted within 15 minutes of execution (Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board, Rule G-14). Market participants can easily access all relevant trading information through a variety of broadly available electronic data dissemination platforms, including the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board EMMA on-line platform and private services.

Eligible to Be Pledged at Central Banks – The proposed LCR rule requires that HQLAs be eligible to be pledged at a central bank. The U.S. Federal Reserve Bank accepts all U.S. municipal bonds at a 2% to 5% haircut, the same haircut as U.S. Agency and GSE debt, and a lower haircut than U.S. investment grade corporate bonds.

Liquid and Readily Marketable – As explained in the preceding paragraphs, municipal securities meet the Agencies' definition of "liquid and readily marketable." They are traded in an active secondary market with: (1) about 1,600 municipal market makers nationwide; (2) a large number of non-market making participants on both the buy and the sell side; (3) timely and observable market prices (all trades reported and available to all market participants electronically within 15 minutes of trade execution); and (4) high trading volume (relative trading volumes similar to those for corporate bonds and GSEs).

In addition, the municipal bond performance during the 2008-2009 financial crisis demonstrated the depth and liquidity of such securities, supporting our view that municipal securities should be designated as HQLAs. In the six months from September 2008 when Lehman Brothers failed, through February 2009 when the stock market bottomed out, the primary issuance markets functioned extremely well, with municipal issuers raising over \$135 billion of capital, in almost equal amounts each month. (Source: *The Bond Buyer*). The secondary municipal market also demonstrated strength and depth throughout this period.

Adverse Impact of Proposed LCR Rule on the Municipal Market

Many of the largest and most important participants in the municipal market will be Covered Financial Institutions under the proposed LCR rule. We believe the proposed LCR rule will (1) increase borrowing costs for municipal issuers; (2) reduce market liquidity and increase volatility; and (3) disadvantage U.S. municipalities relative to foreign governments in accessing the U.S. capital markets, which NAST believes is not only unjustifiable but against the broader policy interests of the United States.

Impact to Collateralization of Public Funds

In most states, banks must pledge collateral against any public deposits they hold. Municipal securities may be used as pledged collateral. Under the proposed LCR Rule, financial institutions will need to replace pledged municipal securities with other securities increasing the cost of collateral to the bank. Accounts of municipal entities are usually not highly profitable for financial institutions. Disallowing municipal securities, as a pledged security will reduce profit margins even more, thus incentivizing banks to not hold public depository accounts. State and local governments need access to the cash management and treasury tools offered by Covered Financial Institutions. These services are either not available, or limited in scope from community banks who are not subject to the LCR Rule. The result is more costly banking services, lower yields, or lack of needed cash management products to operate an efficient treasury system.

We also would request that the Agencies reconsider their outflow rate assumptions under the proposed rule for Secured Funding to U.S. banks that are generated from U.S. public sector entities. We believe that history shows these deposits to be very stable and, as such, actually serve to further diversify the sources of stable funding for the regulated companies. We therefore believe that they warrant outflow rates commensurate with other HQLA secured financing and with a maximum outflow of 25%, as recommended in BCBS 238.

Conclusion

NAST and NASACT believe that excluding municipal securities from HQLAs is not warranted given their liquidity and market-based characteristics. Additionally, the exclusion of municipal securities from HQLAs would adversely impact issuers of municipal securities. As explained above, NAST believes a more reasonable approach would be for the rule to identify quantitative liquidity standards or characteristics that should be met in order for a particular security to be defined as an HQLA.

Thank you for considering our comments.


Sincerely,



Hon. Richard K. Ellis
Utah State Treasurer &
NAST President



Hon. David H. Lillard, Jr.
Tennessee State Treasurer &
NAST Senior Vice President



Hon. James L. McIntire
Washington State Treasurer &
NAST Secretary-Treasurer



Hon. Manju Ganeriwala
Treasurer, Commonwealth of Virginia &
NAST Past President



Hon. Young Boozer
Alabama State Treasurer



Hon. Lynn Fitch
Mississippi State Treasurer



Hon. Pamela Leary
Alaska State Treasurer



Hon. Don Stenberg
Nebraska State Treasurer



Hon. Charles Robinson
Arkansas State Treasurer



Hon. Denise L. Nappier
Connecticut State Treasurer



Hon. Steve McCoy
Georgia State Treasurer



Hon. Ron Estes
Kansas State Treasurer



Hon. Todd Hollenbach
Commonwealth of Kentucky State Treasurer



Hon. Michael L. Fitzgerald
Iowa State Treasurer



Hon. Richard Mourdock
Treasurer of State Indiana



Hon. Neria R. Douglass
Maine State Treasurer



Hon. Kate Marshall
Nevada State Treasurer



Hon. Janet Cowell
North Carolina State Treasurer




Hon. Kelly L. Schmidt
North Dakota State Treasurer



Hon. Ken Miller
Oklahoma State Treasurer



Hon. Ted Wheeler
Oregon State Treasurer



Hon. Richard L. Sattgast
South Dakota State Treasurer



Hon. Elizabeth Pearce
Vermont State Treasurer



Hon. John D. Perdue
West Virginia State Treasurer

Nancy K. Kopp

Hon. Nancy K. Kopp
Maryland State Treasurer

Mark Gordon

Hon. Mark Gordon
Wyoming State Treasurer

Steven Grossman

Steven Grossman
Treasurer and Receiver General
Commonwealth of Massachusetts