



# LEGENDS

---

## BANK

---

September 8, 2006

Mr. Robert E. Feldman  
Executive Secretary  
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation  
550 Seventeenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20429

Re: Deposit Insurance Assessments and Federal Home Loan Bank Advances

Dear Mr. Feldman:

I write with regard to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation notice of proposed rulemaking and request for comment on deposit insurance assessments. Specifically, I write to address the FDIC's request for comment on whether Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLBank) advances should be included in the definition of volatile liabilities or, alternatively, whether higher assessment rates should be charged to institutions that have significant amounts of secured liabilities. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important matter.

I am the president of Legends Bank, a \$206 million community bank serving eight rural communities in central Missouri. Over the last ten years, the nature of our business has changed as a result of increased competition from regional and national banks as well as from a number of non-bank sources such as Edward Jones. Virtually all of the deposits which have left us in this process have exited our communities, leaving us to look to other sources of funding in order to serve the credit needs of our customers. Fortunately, the FHLBank has been there for us, and we have about \$13 million in advances outstanding from them.

Advances are not volatile liabilities for FHLBank members. FHLBank advances have pre-defined, understood, and predictable terms. Unlike deposits, advances do not evaporate due to circumstances outside of the control of an FHLBank member. Experience has shown that retail deposits may be lost due to disintermediation arising from a variety of factors: special, short-term promotions in a particular market or the existence of higher returns to depositors on alternative assets. While some institutions can look to Wall Street for replacement liabilities, the money and capital markets have not functioned well as long-term, stable providers of wholesale funds to community banks like us that comprise the bulk of the membership of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

As set by Congress, the primary purpose of the FHLBank System is to provide a source of long-term liquidity for FHLBank members. Throughout their 75-year history, the FHLBanks have performed this mission successfully. The FHLBanks are a stable, reliable source of funds for member institutions, and the availability of such credit has a predictable, beneficial effect on members' business plans. Given the value of such a stable source of funding, it is not surprising that more than 8,200 financial institutions are members of the FHLBank System. It would be illogical to include FHLBank advances in the definition of volatile liabilities given the stability of the FHLBanks, the reliable availability of advances as a source of wholesale funding, and the beneficial and predictable effect of such funding on members' business

200 EAST MAIN STREET • P.O. BOX 888 • LINN, MISSOURI 65051  
573-897-2204 • FAX 573-897-4202 • [www.legendsbk.com](http://www.legendsbk.com)



Linn ♦ Belle ♦ Bland ♦ East Linn ♦ Loose Creek ♦ Owensville ♦ Taos ♦ Union ♦ Westphalia




plans. I urge the FDIC not to include Federal Home Loan Bank advances in the definition of volatile liabilities.

Discouraging borrowing from the FHLBanks would be counterproductive to reducing the risk of failure of FDIC-insured institutions. In fact, discouraging the use of FHLBank advances could lead to the perverse effect of increasing risks to FHLBank members. Borrowers frequently use FHLBank advances for liquidity purposes and to manage interest-rate risk, as well as to fund loan growth. In many markets such as ours, the supply of deposit funds is inadequate to meet loan demand and prudent financial management needs. Curtailing the use of FHLBank advances would force institutions to look to alternative, often more costly wholesale funding sources that are demonstrably more volatile, thereby reducing profitability and increasing liquidity risk.

Penalizing the use of advances through the imposition of insurance premiums also would conflict with the intent of Congress in establishing the FHLBanks, in opening membership in FHLBanks to commercial banks in FIRREA, and, more recently, in adopting the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, which expanded small banks' access to advances. The FHLBanks' mission is to provide financial institutions with access to low-cost funding so they may adequately meet communities' credit needs to support homeownership and community development. Charging higher assessments to those banks utilizing advances would, in effect, use the regulatory process to vitiate the FHLBanks' mission as established and repeatedly reaffirmed by the Congress.

The cooperative relationship between the FHLBanks and member financial institutions has worked remarkably well for 75 years. FHLBank advances serve as a critical source of credit for housing and community development purposes, support sound financial management practices, and allow member banks throughout the nation to remain competitive. FHLBank membership has long been viewed as protection for deposit insurance funds because FHLBank members have access to guaranteed liquidity. Penalizing financial institutions for their cooperative relationship with the FHLBanks would result in their being less competitive, limit credit availability in the communities they serve, and limit their use of a valuable liquidity source, all for no justifiable economic or public policy reason. I urge the FDIC not to include Federal Home Loan Bank advances in the definition of volatile liabilities.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John A. Klebba", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

John A. Klebba