ANONYMOUS

Proposal and Comment Information

Title: Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital and Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, R-1888

Comment ID: FR-2026-0008-01-C127

Submitter Information

Name: Anonymous

Submitted Date: 05/08/2026

Subject: Comment on Proposed Bitcoin Capital Treatment

To the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:

I am a U.S. consumer and investor who cares about having access to Bitcoin services through regulated American banks instead of being pushed toward offshore platforms or lightly supervised companies.

I care about this issue because clear and reasonable banking rules affect consumer protection, financial stability, and America's ability to remain competitive in financial innovation. If regulated banks are discouraged from participating in Bitcoin-related services, customers like me will still seek those services elsewhere, but with fewer protections and less oversight.

I do not believe Basel's blanket 1,250% risk weight is the right approach for Bitcoin. Bitcoin carries real risks, including volatility, cybersecurity, custody, and operational risks, and banks should absolutely be required to manage those risks carefully. But treating Bitcoin exposure as if it requires capital equal to the full value of the asset effectively prevents regulated banks from participating at all.

That outcome does not reduce demand for Bitcoin. It simply pushes activity outside the regulated banking system and into less transparent markets where regulators have less visibility and consumers have fewer safeguards.

Bitcoin is different from many other cryptoassets because it does not depend on an issuer, reserve manager, or centralized company promising repayment. Its risks should be evaluated directly and addressed through appropriate supervision, operational standards, custody controls, liquidity management, and reasonable concentration limits.

I respectfully urge the agencies not to adopt a blanket 1,250% treatment for Bitcoin. Instead, I ask that you develop a more risk-sensitive framework that distinguishes Bitcoin from other digital assets and allows regulated U.S. banks to provide custody, payments, settlement, and related financial services under strong supervision.

Keeping Bitcoin activity within regulated American financial institutions is safer for consumers, better for oversight, and more supportive of long-term U.S. competitiveness.