



February 16, 2021

625 Jamaica Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11208-1203

T 718 647 2800
F 718 647 2805
info@cypresshills.org

cypresshills.org

Federal Reserve Board

Via email: regs.comments@federalreserve.gov

Re: Comments on Federal Reserve CRA ANPR: Docket Number R-1723 and
RIN Number 7100-AF94

To Whom It May Concern:

The Cypress Hills Local Development Corporation (CHLDC) and the East Brooklyn Reinvestment Committee write this letter in response to the Federal Reserve Board (“Board”)’s Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) proposal to reform the Community Reinvestment Act (“CRA”) rules. We appreciate the Board’s interest in strengthening the CRA so that banks can better meet the credit needs of low-income communities and communities of color in New York City and throughout the state and country.

CHLDC is a 38 year old, community-governed, not-for-profit community development corporation and settlement house. Our organization builds and manages affordable housing, runs youth and human services programs and provides housing counseling and financial education in East New York, Brooklyn. We have partnered with community residents/activists and small businesses for the past 28 years in the East Brooklyn Reinvestment Committee which has attempted to hold local banks accountable for their obligations under the Community Reinvestment Act. East New York/Cypress Hills is a low- to moderate-income community with a critical need to preserve existing small homes and multifamily housing, an acute shortage of affordable rental units and rising housing costs that impact both owners and tenants. Securing safe, high-quality affordable housing in the community is a major challenge. Brooklyn Community Board 5 identified affordable housing as the leading urgent issue in its Statement of Community District Needs and Community Board Budget Requests for FY2020. 47% of local households are severely rent-burdened, spending more than 50% of income on rent (NYC Community Health Profile for 2018, Brooklyn CD 5). 17.4% of residents live in overcrowded rentals and 30.8% are in housing in fair-to-poor condition (Citizens Committee for Children.) Many housing units have poorly

functioning plumbing and electrical systems, roof leaks, moisture infiltration and old appliances. Mold and rodent infestations are common.

The Committee organizes annual Reinvestment Forums to discuss the banking services and lending needs of residents and small businesses with CRA Officers of local lending institutions/bank representatives and regulators, collaborates with local lenders to craft products tailored to the needs of the community and protests any unfair and predatory actions/products of lenders. At these annual Reinvestment Forums we present an analysis of banks' performance as shown by HMDA data, the results of our own survey of local bank branches and trends in foreclosures and home refinance and repair lending and needs. Over the past 28 years, we are proud to have increased the lending of some banks, attracted the investment of several banks in financial education, housing counseling services and new credit builder products, stopped the automation of a local bank branch and alerted regulators to "on the ground" predators.

We appreciate that the Board refused to join the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency ("OCC") in finalizing their CRA rules. The OCC ignored public comments and rushed through a harmful rule which will lead to less reinvestment, and to reinvestment that is less responsive to community needs, should it survive.

We believe that CRA reform must incorporate the following key principles

1. Quality, Quantity, and Impact are important components of CRA.
 - The CRA should never have been color-blind and must have an affirmative obligation to serve people and communities of color with responsive, impactful activities.
 - Banks must be evaluated on the quantity and quality of CRA activities: retail lending, community development finance, branches, banking products, and services.
 - Downgrade for displacement and harm: There must be downgrades for harmful behavior, including products, practices, and patterns of lending that lead to harassment, displacement, high costs, and harm.
2. Community Input and Community Needs must be at the heart of the CRA.
 - Community input must be woven into the CRA process at all levels, including the performance context and needs assessment; evaluation of bank performance; and additional areas where CRA is taken into account, such as branch closures, mergers and acquisitions, and other applications.
3. Assessment areas must maintain place-based local obligations.

- Maintain assessment areas where banks have branches/ATMs, and expand to other areas where banks also do considerable business, such as lending and taking deposits
- Any assessment area reform must increase the size of the pie: maintain or increase quality reinvestment where it is needed within large cities like New York City, while also directing capital to under-banked regions.

PRIORITY #1: Evaluate banks on the quantity, quality and impact of their activities within the communities they serve to ensure they benefit historically redlined communities: low- and moderate-income people, and Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC). The CRA should incentivize high-quality, responsive, impactful activities and downgrades for displacement and harm.

For the past decade we have criticized our local banks for their lack of home lending in East New York. Our local banks (6 banks – Bank of America, Capital One, Chase, Citibank, HSBC, M & T with 10 branches) have **\$1.1 billion** on deposit at their bank branches but only issued 93 loans totaling in 2019, representing \$38.3 million in home loans (68 home purchase, 25 refinance and no home improvement loans,) with only 14% of these loans issued to LMI borrowers. **This represents only 3% of local banks deposits being reinvested in our neighborhood and is dwarfed by the performance of mortgage companies and all lenders who issued 788 home loans, totaling \$392 million (378 home purchase loans, 404 home refinance loans and 6 home repair loans.) In other words, local banks only have a 10% share of lending in our community and we need to question why the largest lenders in our country cannot match the performance of mortgage companies.** Chase was the only bank amongst the top ten lenders in CB5. The top ten lenders in our neighborhood included: Federal Saving Bank, Freedom Mortgage Company, Quicken Loans, Nationwide Mortgage and United Mortgage to name a few. Many of these mortgage companies specialize in FHA lending which are more flexible but higher cost loans for our borrowers. Furthermore, local bank lending has declined over the past decade. In 2010, the local banks in East New York authorized 201 loans, totaling \$47.9 million loans.

Local banks must improve the volume of their lending. Mortgage companies need additional oversight to ensure they are providing equal access to affordable products to LMI areas and Black and Latino borrowers. Furthermore, several local banks have closed branches (e.g. City National Bank of New Jersey) or just eliminated entire lines of lending that are critical needs in our community (e.g. Capital One stopped providing home purchase and refinance loans) and we believe that is clearly counter to the intent of

CRA and they, and any other bank that does so, should be penalized in their CRA exams for not meeting the clearly articulated needs of the communities from which they take their deposits.

We appreciate the Board's recognition that the CRA and fair lending responsibilities are mutually reinforcing, and for asking how the CRA can better serve people of color. As incorporated in each section below, and throughout all three priorities, we believe that banks must have an affirmative obligation to serve people and communities of color with responsive, impactful activities. Redlining, discrimination, and racial disparities in lending, banking, wealth, and income continue to this day and must be eradicated now!

Quality in lending is important to the East New York community too. All too frequently (e.g. during the sub-prime era), our Black and Latino homebuyers and homebuyers have been targeted for high cost loans when they could have qualified for conventional products. The new rules must ensure everyone has equal access to affordable home and consumer products. New York City is a city of renters; nearly two-thirds of New Yorkers rent their homes. Multifamily lending in New York City is particularly critical for banks and regulators to understand, given the unique housing stock here and its importance to affordable housing and protections for millions of New Yorkers. Access to credit is critical to maintaining this stock of housing in the City, especially in lower-income neighborhoods. Equally important to the volume of lending on these and all sources of housing, if not more so, is that the loans are underwritten responsibly. Multifamily mortgage lending is a business line for many banks, as is the case for 1-4 family lending, small business lending and others. Multifamily lending should be evaluated under the retail test.

First, evaluate all multifamily loans under a set of metrics, such as lending in LMI tracts, different loan purposes, range of building sizes, and how many units are affordable to low- and moderate-income residents. Metrics like these can give an idea as to how equitably the bank is lending to see if they are reaching a range of neighborhoods, rental levels, and building types.

Second, incorporate a robust qualitative assessment to determine if the rating should stay the same, upgrade or downgrade. Give credit for deep and permanent affordability, subsidized affordable housing, and loans to mission-driven developers. Banks should also get credit for committing and adhering to multifamily anti-displacement best practices in all forms of housing, subsidized and unsubsidized. Downgrade banks for lending to landlords who harass or displace tenants, and/or keep buildings in poor conditions.

Best practices for multifamily lending include:

- Responsible underwriting. Underwrite to current in-place rents and realistic maintenance costs. For rent-stabilized buildings, we recommend a DSCR of at least 1.2X¹. In all cases, there should be no provisions that increase rent burden and displace tenants, be it through rent increases or reduced maintenance and services.
- Appropriate vetting of borrowers. Use all available resources to lend to responsible landlords who properly maintain the stock of rent-regulated and affordable housing and respect the rights of tenants. This includes consulting news reports and public lists; monitoring loan conditions, lawsuits, violations, and fines; and consulting with tenants and tenant organizers.
- Responding to issues in buildings: Create a formal process to work with tenants and organizers to respond when problems arise in buildings they finance.

Banks should also get credit for transferring distressed properties to responsible mission driven developers, rather than selling the debt, or supporting the building being sold, to the highest bidder that is only seeking to make a profit. This will be especially important post COVID.

We also believe that when banks underwrite and finance affordable housing developments, they need to do a thorough assessment of the track record of that developer and the depth of the affordability of the homes/units being constructed. In the past, banks have received CRA credit for underwriting “affordable” housing projects when the units are unaffordable for the families residing in that Community Board district/census tract/community. Preference should be given to mission driven nonprofits and MWBE developers and those ensuring permanent affordability in their developments.

Small business lending and support:

We support the board’s proposal to evaluate borrower and distribution metrics and have a separate qualitative analysis, with the possibility of additional credit for responsive products and practices. There must also be downgrades for harm. The exam must evaluate and prioritize small loans to very small businesses, BIPOC-owned businesses, and lending in underserved communities. This can be done by looking at low- and moderate-income communities separately; categories of loan size and business size; lending by race/ethnicity of owner and in communities of color; originations vs

¹ DSCR = Debt Service Coverage Ratio. It refers to the income required to pay the mortgage. DSCR < 1.0 means that the landlord does not have sufficient income to pay debt payments each month. Thus, a DSCR of 1.2 means the landlord has more than enough income to pay the debt, and less incentive to raise rents or reduce costs.

purchases. As data is available, regulators should also evaluate loan types separately (credit cards serve a purpose but aren't as impactful or in high demand as traditional loans and lines of credit).

The qualitative analysis would evaluate the products and practices the bank has implemented to achieve metrics in a meaningful way. Banks that prioritize larger businesses, bypass immigrant communities or borrowers of color, or rely only on credit card loans should be downgraded. Banks that demonstrate responsive products and practices should get positive credit.

Regulators can evaluate how well banks support small businesses in other areas of the CRA as well, such as loans and investments in CDFIs or MDIs identified as meaningfully serving BIPOC, low-income, and immigrant communities; supporting technical assistance; and providing direct grants to small businesses (by the bank or through a nonprofit). Regulators can also evaluate how banks responded to COVID, and who they served, with grants, loans like the Paycheck Protection Program and others, debt relief, and more.

1-4 Family lending to access and preserve homeownership:

For more than a decade the East Brooklyn Reinvestment Committee and CHLDC have been requesting that banks provide home repair financing in our small homes, majority-minority community. East New York has a beautiful two family homes housing stock that was developed mostly before 1920s -- these older homes need systems repairs (e.g. new roofs, boilers, etc.) and using credit cards and home equity loans to replace and upgrade these systems and retrofit homes can be incredibly expensive. Banks need to address this acute need by directly lending to LMI homeowners and partnering with government and nonprofits to issue these smaller loans at subsidized rates. The preservation of these small homes enables Black and Latino LMI homeowners to remain in our increasingly gentrifying City.

We support the board's proposal to evaluate borrower and distribution metrics and a separate qualitative analysis, with credit for responsive products and practices. Also, the metrics here and throughout cannot allow a race to the bottom. For example, a benchmark set to 70% of the market performance in New York City would mean a bank could pass with less than 1% of its loans to low-income borrowers. There must also be downgrades for harm. The exam must evaluate and prioritize lower-income people and BIPOC to achieve and maintain homeownership: low- and moderate-income people and communities separately; lending by race/ethnicity; originations vs purchases (prioritize originations); investor vs owner-occupied (prioritize

owner-occupied); loan types and purposes separately, connected to local needs.

The qualitative analysis would evaluate the products and practices the bank has implemented to achieve metrics in a meaningful way. Banks should be evaluated on their COVID response, such as forbearance with no lump sums, loan modifications, and loan forgiveness. Also, banks should get credit for affordable CRA products that they marketed and originate to LMI borrowers and BIPOC, including products requested by local communities.

Banks should also be downgraded for indications of disparate pricing, harmful products, neglect, or displacement. In existing LMI census tracts in communities such as East New York, banks should not receive CRA credit for lending to middle income borrowers as you as essentially incentivizing gentrification and displacement.

Regulators can evaluate how well banks support homeownership in other areas of the CRA as well, such as financing the construction or preservation of affordable homeownership, including limited equity coops; grants for housing counseling and financial education, staff to provide financial education or homebuyer classes; and foreclosure prevention.

Consumer Lending

Similar metrics for consumer lending makes sense. Quality is more important than volume in this category. Large quantities of high-cost credit cards or other high-cost loans are not helpful, and banks should not be incentivized to increase that volume.

Our Committee worked with a local lender who designed a Credit Builder product based on the community's expressed needs. This product was well-utilized and helped residents establish and repair credit histories and eventually save for homeownership.

Community Development Finance:

We support a comprehensive community development finance test. However, within that test, regulators must evaluate loans and investments separately to maintain the requirement to make investments. The high concentration of banks and a strong CRA obligation through the investment test have ensured banks compete for and make LIHTC investments in New York City and elsewhere. These can be complicated deals and provide a critical source of financing for affordable housing. The CRA must incentivize LIHTC and a broad range of investments, including NMTC, EQ2, CRA-eligible grants, and more. Lastly, we appreciate the attention to long-term patient capital, which can be challenging to obtain given the short-term cycle of CRA

Exams. However, the final rules must also incentivize new activity each year and cycle by evaluating outstanding and new activity.

We support both a quantity and quality metric. For loans and investments, dollars are important, but equally important is the impact of that activity. The Board must be careful not to drive banks to make the largest, simplest deals possible to meet a quantitative metric. The quality score should be broader than a scale of 1 to 3, and should prioritize impactful activities as determined by local communities, with a strong emphasis on mission-driven nonprofit entities. Many of these activities may be small by comparison, but the dollars will have a larger impact.

For example:

- Housing developed by mission driven developers; deep affordable housing for homeless populations, and very low-income people living below 20%, 30%, and 40% AMI; permanent affordability that doesn't expire in 30-40 years; supportive housing; and more.
- Creation and preservation of quality jobs for BIPOC and LMI people, and not simply low-wage jobs with no path upwards
- Grants, loans and investments in mission-driven CDFIs and MDIs that support and lend to very small businesses and BIPOC-owned businesses, as well as others that lend on affordable housing and further economic development. Grants to community-based organizations that provide financial education, housing counseling, tenant supports, small business support.
- Predevelopment financing is especially needed for nonprofit developed housing and community facilities projects.
- Additional activities with mission-driven entities and community-based organizations for community services, such as childcare, healthcare, and financial education
- Support for organizing and policy work that will benefit LMI and BIPOC populations.
- As in all sections, banks should be downgraded for harm or displacement. This includes higher-cost products and practices; loans to problematic developers; business with entities that foster displacement; and more. Strong community engagement can mitigate this.
- Again, banks should look at the area median income of the surrounding community where the project is being developed to ensure the eventual rents or purchase prices are actually affordable to residents of that neighborhood.

Branches / Access to Banking

We support the Board's framework for evaluating branches. The Federal Reserve put forth a comprehensive analysis of bank branch locations, impact of branches opened and closed, products and practices. In addition to factors in the ANPR, regulators should consider branching in communities of color; branches in unbanked and underbanked neighborhoods (at the census tract or neighborhood level); access for immigrants; and efforts to bring people into mainstream banking.

Unbanked and underbanked communities, predominantly LMI and communities of color have been asking for branches and affordable, accessible services for decades to no avail; the need is only exacerbated as branches close and banks direct people to online services. Banks must provide all their service equitably: physical branches, online banking, and the products offered in both spaces. They must also invest in staff, education, and outreach to underserved populations, on their own and in partnership with local organizations.

We are deeply disturbed about the rash of branch closings in New York City especially during the global pandemic and in LMI areas. Bank branches provide a reliable, affordable alternative to the ever-present check cashing shops in East New York. They offer financial education as well as real, knowledgeable and bilingual human beings to discuss savings, credit repair and loan products and easy ways to access services that no ATM or phone line can offer. In a community with a large senior population that is not tech savvy, bank branches are essential to accessing banking services/products as well as alerting trusted community partners to scams and seniors in danger of being bilked.

PRIORITY #2: Community Input and Community Needs must be at the heart of the CRA:

We support the Board's goal for CRA reform to promote community engagement, however there is little detail in the ANPR to achieve that goal. In our experience, banks with community advisory boards and other mechanisms to engage with the community are more responsive in their CRA products and practices. Such processes have led to CRA plans informed by community needs, strengthened relationships with community organizations, and led to the creation of new products and practices. However, overall, few people know about the CRA process, and it is likely not the people most impacted by a bank's activities. Community input must be woven into all aspects of the CRA exam process.

We have been very proactive over the past 28 years in demanding engagement with local banks and have been genuine partners with banking institutions through our annual Reinvestment Forums, through follow-up

meetings with each banks and even through complaining to regulators and elected officials when we feel our voices are not heard. However, we'd also like to see additional engagement with merchants associations, homeowners associations, houses of worship, grassroots nonprofit organizations, small businesses and residents directly through open houses, presentations and outreach initiated by banks, surveys and workshops.

- Performance context and community needs: In addition to gathering demographic and statistical data, regulators must conduct proactive outreach and consult research centered on LMI and BIPOC communities to identify local needs and evaluate how well banks are meeting those needs. This needs to be a representative sample by geography, populations served, and area of focus. Regulators should also collaborate with community organizations to incorporate feedback from residents throughout the assessment areas.
- Bank evaluation: Regulators should have a similar process to gather feedback on individual banks. They should ensure the public knows about bank exams and engage in proactive outreach to solicit feedback. A similar process can be implemented at the time of mergers, branch openings/closings, and other applications that connect to CRA.
- Banks should be evaluated on their community engagement. Banks must also be evaluated on how well they engage community organizations and residents in their CRA plans and implementation.

PRIORITY #3: Assessment areas must maintain place-based, local obligations.

We appreciate the ANPR maintains branch-based assessment areas. ATM-based areas should remain obligatory, not optional. We oppose national assessment areas for internet banks. And for more traditional banks, we oppose any area larger than an MSA; even within just the five boroughs / counties of New York City, the CRA isn't adequately addressing long standing disparities. Related, we appreciate that the proposal seeks to direct capital to underserved areas outside of traditional assessment areas, but as it stands today, low-income, BIPOC neighborhoods are persistently neglected within assessment areas, as is the case in New York City. Too often, when investment comes in, it is for larger scale developments that fuel displacement, rather than for bank branches, affordable bank accounts, small home and small business loans, or other activities that local communities need. The CRA must maintain and strengthen a place-based, local commitment to partnering with and meeting the needs of the populations the CRA was meant to serve: LMI people and communities and people and communities of color.

Additional Points

In addition to the points above, we urge you to advocate for an interagency approach so that all banks are held to the same standards. No CRA should allow 96% of banks to pass their exam in the face of persistent disparities, unmet banking and credit needs, high-cost products, and patterns of lending that foster displacement. Further, regulators must preserve the “low” and “high” satisfactory ratings, and not combine the two in any part of the CRA; this allows a distinction between banks that are barely meeting needs and others that are doing more. Banks should be evaluated at the holding company level and evaluated on the totality of their lending, including by affiliates. They should also be held accountable for problematic practices of entities with which they do business with, such as through formal referrals and partnerships. Additional data will be very useful for communities to evaluate bank performance. CRA Strategic Plan requirements must be strengthened by requiring more transparency regarding planning, groups outreached to, comments submitted, and bank responses, at a minimum.

Conclusion

Low- and moderate-income and BIPOC communities deserve equal access to affordable, accessible banking and credit; safe, affordable housing; quality jobs; and community services. The CRA must be preserved and strengthened with a robust analysis of quality and quantity; incorporating community

input, and keeping a strong local commitment.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely

Harold Green

Harold Green

President of CHLDC Board of Directors and Chair, East Brooklyn Reinvestment Committee