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Dear Sir or Madam:

Although it appears the Basel III proposals were intended for large, sophisticated financial institutions, community banks are being thrown into the mix. These new capital proposals are unnecessary as our balance sheets are so simple. These proposals will just add to the costly regulatory burden that is being pushed down to the community banks as “best practices”.

As a community banker, I recognize the importance of appropriate levels of capital as a key component of a safe and sound bank. Required maintenance of adequate levels of capital is good for all banks and the regulatory agencies already have minimum and well capitalized standards for community banks. When reviewing the size, complexity, and scope of community banks, it should be very clear to the regulators that community banks do not need a new series of regulatory burdens in addition to what already exists today. My concern is the burdensome process and consequences of instituting complex new rules on community banks. It is not necessary to redefine capital adequacy for all banks, regardless of size or risk profile, to accomplish the goal of adequate capital. Community banks should be exempt from these proposals and allowed to continue to measure capital according to present methodology.

Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income (AOCI). This is an issue that will potentially have significant adverse impact as proposed. While we have sizeable unrealized gains in our securities portfolio today, our risk analysis shows this will quickly turn into a very large unrealized loss in a rapid rate increase environment. In both situations, these are paper gains and losses, and we have never used our portfolio for trading or unusual activity to see these kinds of gains or losses. We clearly monitor these gains and losses, and they are in all of our risk models. This could easily create a scenario in which our well-capitalized bank could face severe sanctions due solely to market rate movements. Further, the “mark to market” requirement will require us to hold more capital to compensate for inevitable swings in interest rates, thus hindering growth and lending opportunities.

The logical thing to do is to exempt all but those complex international banking institutions considered “systemically important” from these burdensome, elaborate, and counterproductive capital rules. Community banks should be allowed to continue using the current Basel I risk weightings as they have and will continue to serve banks, customers, and regulators very well.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposals.

Sincerely,

Shon B. Myers
President and Chief Executive Officer