



---

1501 Highwoods Blvd Suite 400, Greensboro, North Carolina 27410, 336-369-0900, Fax 336-369-0937

September 8, 2015

Mr. 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:

NewBridge Bank is a community bank headquartered in Greensboro, NC. We have \$2.8 billion in assets and 41 branches located throughout the state.

Over the years, we have found it harder and harder as a community bank to compete with large, national and regional financial institutions. As a group, they have attracted a growing percentage of the industry's deposits every year. In our effort to stabilize our deposit base against these larger financial institutions, we have found reciprocal deposits to be one of the few tools available to community banks to enable us to compete effectively with them. Reciprocal deposits have accounted for nearly 2% percent of our total deposits.

We welcome this opportunity to comment on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR) RIN 3064-AE37, which proposes changes to the FDIC's deposit insurance assessment regulation for small banks, that is to say banks with assets of less than \$10 billion. In short, the proposal would penalize smaller and midsized community banks such as NewBridge that use reciprocal deposits by, in effect, taxing them. Why does the FDIC propose this harsh treatment, treatment that is a complete reversal of current practice?

When the FDIC established the current small bank assessment formula system in 2009, it explicitly 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."

How?

It excluded reciprocal deposits from the “adjusted brokered deposit ratio” that increases assessments on banks that rely on traditional brokered deposits for funding. It recognized that reciprocal deposits differed from traditional brokered deposits in a number of ways. NewBridge has always considered traditional brokered deposits are “hot money” that flow from bank to bank in search of the highest interest rates in a national market. As result, we have made a strategic decision to minimize the use of such funds. In contrast, reciprocal deposits typically come from a bank’s local customers at local interest rates. We have found that once deposited these funds tend to stay with the Bank as they are more relationship oriented deposit with fellow institutions where their depositor is looking for additional safety when their deposits exceed the \$250,000 FDIC insurance threshold not rate.

The proposed assessment system would no longer exclude reciprocal deposits from the definition of brokered deposits. It would fold reciprocal deposits in with traditional brokered deposits and other wholesale funding. The proposal gives no reason for doing so. It does not argue that reciprocal deposits are as risky as traditional brokered deposits, nor does it show data that reciprocal deposits increase the risk of loss to the Deposit Insurance Fund (DIF).

Several post-crisis studies have, in fact, shown the opposite: reciprocal deposits did not increase risk of failure. Nor did they increase losses in the event of failure, as can collateralized funds.

It is easy to see why we as a community bank value reciprocal deposits. They enable us to retain our large-dollar depositors in the face of competition from the country’s largest banks. Why would the FDIC want to penalize us for using them without even giving a reason? Hundreds of community banks would feel the burden of the unjustified tax on a stable, nonvolatile source of funding.

Wholesale funds can adjust to the new assessments by simply shifting prices downward. Reciprocal deposits, with rates based on local markets, cannot. Faced with the new tax the proposal would impose, community banks will lose their safe, stable, large-dollar deposits to the largest banks that can attract the funds without providing deposit insurance.

We urge you to retain the current system’s exclusion of reciprocal deposits from the definition of “brokered” for assessment purposes.

Further, we strongly encourage the FDIC to support legislation to explicitly exempt reciprocal deposits from the statutory definition of brokered deposit as well.

Sincerely,



Kenneth W. Banner  
Executive Vice President  
Treasurer and Chief Investment Officer

cc:

The Honorable Richard Burr  
217 Russell Senate Office Building  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Thom Tillis  
185 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Mark Walker  
312 Cannon 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