



The Bank That Listens

August 12, 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:

SIS Bank is headquartered in Sanford, ME. We have \$480 million in assets and 9 branches. We are part of a reciprocal deposit placement network. We have found reciprocal deposits to be an important source of funding.

Thank you for 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 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.

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

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 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.

In its proposal The FDIC does not justify treating reciprocal deposits like traditional brokered deposits. Why lump 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 SIS 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. 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.

Sincerely,



Mark Mickeriz
President & CEO

MTM/ln

cc:

The Honorable Susan Collins
413 Dirksen Senate Office Building
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Angus King
133 Hart Senate Office Building
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Chellie Pingree
2162 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