FIRST HOPE BANK

World-class service, close to home

August 7, 2015

Robert E. Feldman
Executive Secretary
Attention: Comments
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
550 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20429

Re: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (RIN 3064–AE37)

Dear Mr. Feldman:

First Hope Bank, A National Banking Association is headquartered in Hope, NJ. We have $459,375,000 in assets and 6 branches. We are part of a reciprocal deposit placement network. We have found reciprocal deposits to be an important source of funding.

We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR) proposing changes to the FDIC's deposit insurance assessment regulation for small banks. In particular, we would like to comment on how this proposal would affect reciprocal deposits.

In short, we strongly urge the FDIC to continue to separate the treatment of reciprocal deposits from that of traditional brokered deposits in setting assessments. Reciprocal deposits are stable sources of core funding that do not present the risks and other characteristics of traditional brokered deposits. The separate treatment of reciprocal deposits from that of traditional brokered deposits in the current assessment system recognizes the differences between the two types of deposits. Reciprocal deposits are not just another form of wholesale funding and should not be treated as such.

Through reciprocal arrangements, we have generated $3.1 million of stable deposits from these atypical customers. They are more concerned with safety and stability, than the interest rate on a certificate of deposit, which is the primary driver of most wholesale funding customers. Additionally, the ability to deal with one bank, instead of dozens, is valued by reciprocal depositors, as they do not have the time or staff to manage the amount of relationships often necessary to maintain FDIC insurance over their entire relationship. It is because of these two critical differences that reciprocal depositors are a more stable form of funding than brokered/wholesale funding.

When it established the current system in 2009, the FDIC recognized that reciprocal deposits "may be a more stable source of funding for healthy banks than other types of brokered

P.O. Box 296 • Hope, NJ 07844 • (908) 459-4121 • Fax (908) 459-5429
Email: info@firsthope.com
EOE/AA M/F/D/V

deposits and that they may not be as readily used to fund rapid asset growth." Nothing has changed since then. Traditional brokered deposits are "hot"; reciprocal deposits are not.

Further, as the FDIC's proposal itself points out, the premium assessment for an institution is supposed to reflect the risks posed by its assets and liabilities. Those risks must be specific and should be measurable.

Reciprocal deposits do not present any of the risks and concerns that traditional brokered deposits do: instability, risk of rapid asset growth, and high cost. On the contrary, our reciprocal deposits come from local customers. We typically have a relationship with our customers that goes far beyond merely accepting their deposits. We set reciprocal deposit interest rates based on local rates. Our experience is that reciprocal deposits "stick" with the bank. For all these reasons, they add to our bank's franchise value.

The FDIC in its proposal gives no justification for treating reciprocal deposits like traditional brokered deposit: no facts, no figures, no analysis. Rather, it arbitrarily lumps the two together. In doing so, it would penalize banks that use them by, in effect, taxing them. Such a tax would be unnecessary and unfair. The FDIC's proposal would punish our bank for using one of the few tools we have to compete against the mega-banks doing business in our area.

Again, we strongly urge you to retain the current system's exclusion of reciprocal deposits from the definition of "brokered" for assessment purposes.

So that we do not have to revisit this issue later, we also strongly urge the FDIC to support legislation to explicitly exempt reciprocal deposits from the definition of brokered deposit in the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

Thank you for your consideration of this vital topic.

Sincerely,

Norman Beatty
President
Chief Executive Officer
Chairman of the Board

cc:

The Honorable Robert Menéndez
528 Hart Senate Office Building
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Cory Booker
359 Dirksen Senate Office Building
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Scott Garrett
2232 Rayburn House Office Building
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Martin J. Gruenberg
Chairman
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
550 17th St., NW
Washington, DC 20429

John E McWeeney, Jr
President and CEO
New Jersey Bankers Association
411 North Avenue East
Cranford, NJ 07016

Wayne Abernathy
Executive Vice President – Financial Institution Policy and Regulatory Affairs
American Bankers Association
1120 Connecticut Ave., NW.
Washington, DC 20036