



Established as Titonka Savings Bank in 1916
Bank of Friendly Service

173 Main Street North • P.O. Box 309 • Titonka, IA 50480-0309
Phone: 515-928-2142 • 800-920-2085 • Fax: 515-928-2042
www.tsbbank.com

22 October 2012

Jennifer J. Johnson, Secretary
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System
20th St. and Constitution Ave, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20551

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Basel III proposals that were recently approved by the Federal Reserve Board, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I represent the interests of TITONKA SAVINGS BANK, a \$165 million bank headquartered in Titonka, Iowa. I am writing this letter today to express concerns about both the Basel III proposal as well as the "Standardized Approach" proposal.

I understand the overall goal in the Basel III proposals of strengthening capital requirements so banks can weather the storms of downturns economic cycles inevitably bring, but these rules in their entirety are more appropriate for large complex financial institutions competing in a global marketplace than for the business practices of our Titonka Savings Bank, a rural agricultural bank located far North Central Iowa. We respectfully ask that both the Basel III and the Standardized Approach proposals be repealed for the following specific reasons:

Basel III Comments

Requirement that gains and losses on available for sale securities (AFS) must flow through to regulatory capital. This proposed rule requires all unrealized gains and losses on AFS to "flow through" to common equity tier 1 (CET1) capital – which is a new category of tangible capital within the rule. Even daily changes in AFS securities must technically be accounted for in regulatory capital. Because interest rates, particularly on debt securities, can fluctuate frequently, the proposed rules will introduce significant volatility into capital calculations.

This proposed rule ignores the time honored accounting principal of "a going concern" and instead imposes a "liquidation value" when calculating a bank's capital. This is not the way the "real world" works. Had the proposed rule been in effect in the 1980's when we saw a rapid run up in interest rates, the Titonka Savings Bank would most certainly have failed due to a lack of capital even though we maintained a strong asset portfolio during those years.

The timing of this proposed rule is also greatly compounding the problem, since we are now at a period of historically low interest rates. As interest rates begin to rise, capital under this proposal will move rapidly in a negative direction, as while nothing will have changed regarding the bank's tangible equity, regulatory capital ratios could be reduced rapidly. A 300 basis point rise in interest rates for example would reduce the value of our bank's securities portfolios and reduce CET1 significantly, perhaps by as much as 40-50%. At best, this proposal will introduce a significant amount of volatility into the system



Offices in Titonka, Forest City and Thompson, Iowa



which is the opposite of what the goal should be. The goal should be to enhance stability rather than cause volatility. This proposal may necessitate our bank moving to shrink the bank in order to meet the Basel III proposal when interest rates do rise. Shrinking the bank will impair our ability to serve our agricultural and small business customers as well as our consumer lending function, simply because of the upward movement in interest rates.

As for credit risk taken in the investment portfolio, existing rules for other-than-temporarily-impaired (OTTI) investments provide a mechanism for credit losses to be reflected in capital. A natural reaction to this new proposal will be for our bank (and many others) to either hold fewer securities or reclassify existing portfolio assets to hold-to-maturity (HTM). This conversion may reduce the volatility of the proposal, but it comes at the enormous cost of eliminating our ability to manage our investment portfolio through different interest rate and economic cycles – and is a core tool to offset the interest rate risk in our loan and investment portfolios. We would respectfully ask this section of the proposal be eliminated.

Standardized Approach – Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Increased risk weighting for residential loans. Under this proposal, the federal agencies can assign risk weights to residential mortgages based on whether the mortgage is a “traditional” category 1 mortgage or a “riskier” category 2 mortgage. Risk weights under the proposal run from 35% up to 200%. Under current law, most prudently underwritten residential mortgages are risk weighted at 50%.

These proposed residential mortgage rules raise several issues. First, mortgages must be re-assessed after a loan structuring or modification (HAMP loans are exempt). Therefore a “category 1” mortgage could become a “category 2” mortgage if the bank does not modify the loan under HAMP. Many banks, including ours modify loans under non-HAMP methods and have a very successful track record for those borrowers who qualify by keeping them in their homes. Why should we be penalized from a capital standpoint for offering these modifications?

Secondly, similar to the agencies proposal for a “Qualified Residential Mortgage” (QRM) the proposed rules do not recognize private mortgage insurance (PMI) at all to reduce loan to value requirements – so mortgages may be subject to higher risk weights even if PMI reduces the risk on these loans. For example, a bank originating a balloon mortgage (which is now an automatic “category 2” mortgage at any LTV) at 90% LTV would have to risk weight the loan at 150% for capital reservation purposes despite having PMI. This does not reconcile at all with the loan performance we have experienced and may cause us to discontinue balloon mortgages and any loans with PMI. This will have an enormous negative impact on loans to first time homebuyers, as PMI has been used successfully by banks in Iowa for decades with hardly any resulting losses for prudently underwritten loans.

Third, the proposal has no grandfather provision, so all residential mortgage loans on the bank’s books would be subject to the new capital requirements – forcing banks to review all existing files to determine the appropriate category and LTV for each loan file. This “granular” approach is going to put enormous pressure on our bank to implement systems for calculating these new reporting requirements, or whether software vendors could possibly even implement this new requirement in a timely manner. Further complicating the issue, we will not be able to just “assign” a weighting when the loan is booked, but would have to continually re-evaluate the risk weightings based on changes in collateral values, past due status and other risk factors. As our bank’s strong underwriting has led to a very small loss history on

residential real estate loans, this new re-evaluation approach on an asset by asset basis is completely unnecessary and should be eliminated from the proposal.

The bottom line as regards this proposal is that the bank could ultimately need to limit its consumer real estate lending function in order to maintain adequate capital. Such a move would be counterproductive to the economic wellbeing of our rural community.

Credit enhancing representations

The proposed rules would require banks to hold capital for assets with credit enhancing representations and warranties, including for "pipeline" mortgages in the process of being sold. Under the existing capital rules, banks are not required to hold capital against assets with such representations and warranties. This new requirement would affect any mortgage sold with a representation or warranty containing (1) an early default clause, and/or (2) certain premium refund clauses that cover assets guaranteed, in whole or part, by the U.S. government or government sponsored entity.

Early default clauses or premium-refund clauses are very common on third party sales of mortgages. They are largely intended to protect the purchaser by providing some recovery in the event of extremely early or unanticipated pay off or refinancing, and are usually targeted at 120 days or less. They are meant to reimburse the purchaser for the expense of acquiring a loan which subsequently did not perform long enough for any expected return on investment. Instances of enforcing this pay off protection are an extremely small percentage of the overall population of loan transactions, and in any event exist to recoup perceived losses and offer some investor protection. These clauses are tied closer to operational transmission of the loan more than any risk protection as it relates to the underlying collateral.

Requiring off-balance sheet guarantees at 100 percent credit conversion during this initial time period seems onerous in that there is little evidence that these temporary and expiring representations and warranties pose any significant financial exposure. In addition, in many cases the reps and warranties referring to early default and premium refund clauses do not automatically subject the bank to the repurchase of the loan. Often the only liability to the bank would be to refund the servicing premium and any other earned fees on the loan. To require capital reservation for 100% of the loan is not at all commensurate with the amount of risk we are assuming.

Any credit enhancements or representations that exist outside of this initial prepayment protection, whether as part of the contractual agreements between the parties, would amply represent the overwhelming amount of any risk on behalf of the seller. Requiring additional balance sheet guarantees for this transitional period would be a significant increase in capital needs that would be much greater than the actual risk that it is designed to represent. This rule if implemented would literally drive many Iowa community banks out of the secondary market and possibly out of the residential mortgage business altogether. We would respectfully ask that this be eliminated from the proposal.

Change in risk weighting for home equity and second lien loans

This part of the proposal classifies all junior residential liens, such as closed-end home equity loans and HELOC's, as "category 2" exposures with risk weights ranging from 100-200%. More importantly and as is the case most often in our bank, if we hold both the 1st and 2nd mortgages on the same property we would be required to treat both mortgages (even the 1st mortgage) as category 2 exposures (much higher

risk weight). The exception where both mortgages could be placed into a category 1 mortgage – where the combined exposure meets all of the requirements of a category 1 mortgage, is far too narrow and most of our home equity loans and their accompanying 1st mortgage would likely fall into category 2 classifications. This proposal will cause our bank to seriously consider discontinuing our home equity loan programs. We also ask this portion of the proposal be eliminated.

Proposal to increase risk weights on delinquent loans


Like many Iowa banks, we are fortunate with careful underwriting to have a very low delinquency rate currently – but this could change quickly based on economic conditions. This rule, which drastically increases the risk weights for past due loans, is of concern as our bank already sets aside reserves for delinquent loans. By proposing to also increase capital we hold on past due loans, we are basically being required to set aside capital twice. Risk regarding past due loans should continue to be managed through loan loss reserve guidance and not by layering on an additional capital requirement.

If this proposed rule had been in effect during the agricultural crises of the 1980's where we would have been required not only to increase our capital but also to increase our ALLL, our bank would most certainly have failed. During that Ag Crises, we had a significant volume of past due loans. However, were able to work with our financially stressed customers. Had the bank failed, many of these viable farm entities would also have failed as their past due loans would have been collected. This rule if finalized would require us to increase our aggressiveness in moving loans past 90 days delinquent off of our balance sheet, and make us much less likely to pursue loan workout strategies and instead proceed directly to foreclosure sale.

In conclusion, our bank has no way to completely ascertain the full impact of this massive proposal because of the amount of work it will take to understand the rules and how they apply to our balance sheet. We will likely be required to hire a team of consultants to implement the re-assessment of each individual loan in our portfolio with the new risk weights, re-program our core processing software to handle the new coding requirements and then create the necessary reports to analyze the data.

As I stated above, while I support the overall goal of strengthening the financial system by increasing the level and quality of capital that banks hold, these rules are designed much more for large multi-billion dollar global financial institutions that the business practices our small rural bank and of Iowa banks in general. We urge the agency to repeal this proposal so we may continue serving our communities and help strengthen our local economies.

Sincerely yours,



Allan J. Boyken, Pres./CEO

Titonka Savings Bank

173 Main St. N

Titonka, IA 50480

515-928-2142

Allan.Boyken@tsbbank.com