

September 27, 2012

VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY

Ms. Jennifer J. Johnson, Secretary
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System
20th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20551
regs.comments@federalreserve.gov
Docket No. R-1442 and RIN No. 7100-AD87

RE: Regulatory Capital Rules: (1) Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Minimum Regulatory Capital Ratios, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, and Prompt Correction Act; and (2) Standardized Approach for Risk-Weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements: Docket No. R-1442 and RIN No. 7100-AD87

Dear Ms. Johnson:

Spring Bank is a \$160 million asset size community institution in Brookfield, Wisconsin. As President and CEO of Spring Bank, I am gravely concerned over the broad approach taken by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (FRB), together with Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), (collectively, the Agencies) to impose a "one-size-fits-all" regulatory capital scheme despite the fact that the industry believed the Basel III proposals were intended for the very large, complex international institutions.

After careful consideration, I believe this approach excessively tightens regulatory capital requirements on community banks which is unwarranted, beyond Congressional intent in many respects, and will likely cause a disruption in available credit in our marketplace.

I wish to remind the Agencies that, in addition to the proposed Basel III rules, there are currently at least ten major mortgage related rulemakings in various stages of development (HOEPA, MLO compensation, TILA/RESPA integration, two appraisal rules, ability-to-repay, risk retention, escrow requirements, and mortgage servicing rules under both TILA and RESPA). This, in turn, builds upon at least seven major final rulemakings in the previous 36 months (RESPA reform, HPML requirements, two MDIA implementation rules, appraisal reforms, appraisal guidelines, and MLO compensation).

I am very much concerned about the cumulative burden these rules will have on my institution. It is vitally important that the proposed regulatory capital rules be analyzed together in the context of other rulemakings and regulatory reforms—and be prospective in approach. The Agencies must not create capital requirements that are based upon occurrences in the past, under a different regulatory environment, and without consideration of other rulemakings and reforms.

For these reasons and for the concerns outlined below, the Agencies must withdraw the proposed regulatory capital rules, conduct additional study and analysis, and only propose capital rules which take into consideration the impact other regulatory proposals and reforms

will have on risk. The Agencies must recognize that there are many differences between community banks and large, complex international institutions—and must, therefore, not force a community bank into the same capital calculation “peg-hole” as a sophisticated international institution.

If the Agencies do not withdraw the proposals to further study the drastic impact they will have on community banks and on the U.S. financial industry as a whole, I urge the Agencies to take into consideration the specific concerns and recommended changes noted below.

Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income (AOCI)

As proposed, all unrealized gains and losses on available for sale securities (AFS) must “flow through” to common equity tier 1 capital. Therefore, if there is a change in the value of an AFS security (which can occur daily in some circumstances), that change must immediately be accounted for in regulatory capital. I wish to remind the Agencies that unrealized gains and losses occur in AFS portfolios primarily as a result of movements in interest rates—and *not* as a result of credit risk.

If the rules are finalized as proposed, with the inclusion of unrealized losses of AFS securities in common equity tier 1 capital, rising interest rates would put downward pressure on banking organizations’ capital levels. This will potentially cause my bank to reduce our growth or shrink our securities portfolios considerably in order to maintain capital ratios at the desired or required levels.

Additionally, as a community bank, we have been an investor in our local government entities. However, as proposed, the rules would discourage my bank from holding municipal securities, including holding U.S. Treasuries, because of the interest rate impact on such long-duration assets. This, in turn, could lead to a lower return on assets for my bank and less funding for the housing market and national and local governments, collectively.

This provision is likely to cause fluctuations in capital that would result in restricting our ability to meet the credit needs of privately held businesses and individuals in our community.

For these reasons, I greatly oppose this proposed treatment. The Agencies must remove this treatment from the proposals.

Capital Risk-Weights for Residential Mortgages and Related Matters, High Volatility Commercial Real Estate (HVCRE), and Home-Equity Lines of Credit (HELOCs)

The Agencies’ proposals place new significantly higher capital risk weights in several categories of real property-secured loans despite having neither empirical evidence to substantiate the need for such heightened capital levels, nor a mandate under law. The proposals raise several significant concerns, including the following.

Residential Mortgage Exposures Risk Weights

The proposals assign risk weights to residential mortgage exposures based on whether the loan is a “traditional” mortgage (Category 1) or a “riskier” mortgage (Category 2) *and* the loan-to-value (LTV) ratio of the mortgage. The current risk weight for a real estate mortgage is generally 50%; however, depending upon the Category and LTV ratio of a particular residential mortgage, the capital risk could rise to 200%. These higher risk weights appear to be arbitrarily set as there is no empirical data presented by the Agencies to support this extraordinary increase in risk weights for certain types of mortgages.

Respectfully, I challenge the Agencies' assumption that a residential mortgage has a higher degree of risk based exclusively upon the loan having a balloon payment, an adjustable rate, or an interest-only payment, to warrant the substantial increases in capital risk weights that are proposed. In fact, our portfolio of balloon loans has experienced minimum losses with a default rate of less than 1/10 of 1.0%. The Agencies' proposed capital treatment far outweighs the reality of risk that we have experienced for these types of loans.

In addition, the substantial increase in risk weights will discourage my bank from making these types of loans even though we have experienced minimal losses. Spring Bank's portfolio of loans that include 3 to 5 year balloon mortgages on 1 to 4 family residences comprise over 20% of our outstanding loans. We provide such loan products in order to offer loans to good borrowers and to protect against interest-rate risk. However, the new risk weights will discourage us from making such loans. For example, if we make a 5-year balloon loan with a LTV of 81-90%, the capital risk weight skyrockets from the current rule of 50% to 150% under the proposals. This type of treatment will detrimentally impact just how many loans I can offer my community and customers, will reduce or eliminate a traditional credit product that customers seek, and will also reduce our ability to protect against interest rate risk.

This provision alone reduces our Total Capital Ratio from over 16% to less than 14%. Our ability to support this type of client in the future would be severely curtailed and those we would serve would see an increase in the cost of their credit.

The Agencies must not finalize the proposed rules with such severe and unwarranted risk weighted treatment of residential mortgage exposures.

High Volatility Commercial Real Estate (HVCRE)

As proposed, high volatility commercial real estate (HVCRE) is defined as acquisition, development and construction (ADC) commercial real estate loans except: (1) One- to four-family residential ADC loans; or (2) commercial real estate ADC loans in which: (a) applicable regulatory LTV requirements are met; (b) the borrower has contributed cash to the project of at least 15% of the real estate's "appraised as completed" value prior to the advancement of funds by the bank; and (c) the borrower-contributed capital is contractually required to remain in the project until the credit facility is converted to permanent financing, sold or paid in full. Under the proposed standardized approach, each HVCRE loan in a bank's portfolio will be assigned a 150 percent risk weight.

While I recognize the fact that certain types of commercial real estate (CRE) lending may pose a higher risk given today's economic environment, the Agencies' proposals impose a higher risk weight without considering any of the following mitigating factors in connection with a particular transaction: LTV ratio; dollar amount of the loan; other commercial real estate assets of the borrower; any guaranty; or other general risk-mitigating factors of a particular CRE loan request. Just as these risk-mitigating factors are analyzed when we decide whether to approve or deny a particular CRE loan request, the Agencies must also take these mitigating factors into consideration when assigning a capital risk weight to a particular CRE.

If mitigating factors are not taken into consideration, the proposals would restrict our ability to provide credit to credit worthy borrowers and negatively impact the ability of borrowers to develop projects that lead to job growth.

Therefore, the Agencies must revise their proposed HVCRE risk weight to take into consideration risk-mitigating factors.

Home-equity Lines of Credit (HELOCs)

The proposal classifies all junior liens, such as home-equity lines of credit (HELOCs), as Category 2 exposures with risk weights ranging from 100 to 200%. In addition, a bank that holds two or more mortgages on the same property would be required to treat *all* the mortgages on the property—even the first lien mortgage—as Category 2 exposures. Thus, if a bank that made the first lien also makes the junior lien, the junior lien may “taint” the first lien thereby causing the first lien to be placed in Category 2, and resulting in a higher risk weight for the first lien. By contrast, if one bank makes the first lien and a different bank makes the junior lien, then the junior lien does not change the risk weight of the first lien. There is one exception to this general treatment; however, that exception is very narrow and thus, most junior lien mortgages will likely be deemed Category 2 mortgages.

Again, this is another area within the proposals for which the Agencies have provided no data to support their assertion that all HELOCs are risky and warrant such severe treatment. In reality, HELOCs are carefully underwritten—based not only on the value of the home, but upon the borrower’s creditworthiness and with some of the strongest LTV ratios.

Spring Bank prudently makes HELOC loans as demonstrated by the fact we have never experienced a loan loss on any HELOC. Our ability and capacity to provide credit to credit worthy individuals will be impaired.

The Agencies must remove the treatment that all HELOCs are an automatic Category 2 classification.

Conclusion

For the concerns outlined above, the Agencies must withdraw the proposed regulatory capital rules, conduct additional study and analysis, and only propose capital rules which take into consideration the impact other regulatory proposals and reforms have on risk.

The Agencies must recognize that there are many differences between community banks and large, complex international institutions—and must, therefore, not force a community bank into the same capital calculation “peg-hole” as a complex international institution.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Agencies’ proposals.

Sincerely,

David L. Schuelke
President and CEO
Spring Bank
Brookfield, Wisconsin