

March 13, 2006

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

Regarding: Concentrations in Commercial Real Estate Lending, Sound
Risk Management Practices

Dear Mr. Feldman:

I am writing you regarding the proposed guidance and request for comment regarding the above referenced matter.

I have attached a copy of the comment letter which the Community Bankers Association of Illinois (CBAI) submitted to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on March 8th. This letter requests the reconsideration of the need for the proposed CRE Guidance and accurately states the position of the 500+ member banks of the CBAI. I am pleased to be the Chairman of CBAI for 2005/2006.

I would like to highlight several facts as they relate specifically to our 10 year old bank located in the northwestern Chicago suburb of Buffalo Grove. Our Bank is active in commercial real estate/construction lender. An average of 57% of our loans during

600 North Buffalo Grove Road • Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089 • phone: (847)465-9700 fax: (847)465-9701

Member FDIC



Page 2.


the past five years are in our commercial real estate/construction loan portfolios. We feel that we carefully underwrite and monitor these loans. In reviewing our loan losses (since inception) we have found that we experienced ZERO loan losses in our commercial real estate/construction loan portfolios. Our Board of Directors is well informed and supportive our commercial real estate/construction lending activities. In summary, we are not new to this area of lending, we are experienced real estate lenders, we have not suffered losses in this area of lending, and we are not in a geographic area that has experienced dramatic valuation cycles.

To quote the last paragraph of the attached CBAI comment letter -

“... well-intentioned regulatory burden that is overly broad and not properly focused can be detrimental to community banks, to their borrowers and to their local economies. It is the opinion of CBAI, the proposed CRE Guidance is flawed because it would unnecessarily limit commercial lending opportunities for banks that are not in high risk markets, it would impose new procedures and require the use of personnel resources to administer certain commercial lending activities without a demonstrated need at the particular bank in question, or it would require the bank to raise additional capital to support lending practices the bank has historically managed in a safe and sound manner at existing capital levels. Any one of these unattractive consequences, or any combination of them, will exact a price on community banks by diverting resources, by causing the banks to forego otherwise attractive lending opportunities, or by making future capital initiatives more difficult due to the capital initiatives that might be unnecessary under the proposed CRE Guidance.”

Thank you for this opportunity to request that you reconsider the need for this added regulatory burden.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David G. Schroeder". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

David G. Schroeder
President and CEO



Representing Illinois' Real Community Banks

March 8, 2006

Jennifer J. Johnson, Secretary
 Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System
 20th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W.
 Washington, D.C. 20551

Also sent by fax to: (202) 452-3819

Re: Docket No. OP-1248; Proposed Guidance on Concentrations in Commercial Real Estate Lending, Sound Risk Management Practices

Dear Ms. Johnson:

The Community Bankers Association of Illinois ("CBAI") appreciates this opportunity to comment on the federal regulatory agencies' proposed interagency guidance regarding concentrations in commercial real estate lending ("the proposed CRE Guidance"). For the reasons addressed below, CBAI urges the agencies to reconsider the need for the proposed CRE Guidance, with particular focus on whether the proposed CRE Guidance is an overly broad "one size fits all" imposition that will unnecessarily impact financial institutions that do not share the same commercial real estate lending risk factors as other financial institutions.

We first note that the proposed CRE Guidance is apparently based on evidence that "some" financial institutions have vulnerabilities related to commercial real estate lending concentrations:

"The Agencies have observed that *some* institutions have high and increasing concentrations of commercial real estate loans....As provided in the proposed Guidance, *such* institutions should have in place risk management practices and capital levels appropriate to the risk associated with these concentrations."
 [emphasis added] January 13, 2006 Federal Register at Page 2303.

* * * * *

"The Agencies have observed that *some* institutions have high and increasing concentrations of commercial real estate loans on their balance sheets and are concerned that these concentrations may make the institutions more vulnerable

Page Two
 Jennifer J. Johnson, Secretary
 March 8, 2006

to cyclical commercial real estate markets.” [emphasis added] January 13, 2006 Federal Register at Page 2304.

* * * * *

“While underwriting standards are generally stronger than those during previous CRE cycles, the Agencies have observed high concentrations in CRE loans at *some* institutions.” [emphasis added] January 13, 2006 Federal Register at Page 2304.

* * * * *

“Recent examinations have indicated that the risk management practices and capital levels of *some* institutions are not keeping pace with their increasing CRE concentrations. In *some* cases, the Agencies have observed that institutions have rapidly expanded their CRE lending operations into new markets without establishing adequate control and reporting processes, including the preparation of market analyses.” [emphasis added] January 13, 2006 Federal Register at Page 2304.

If specific financial institutions have engaged, or are engaging, in lending practices that the agencies believe is inconsistent with safe and sound banking practices, the agencies have the ability to address such practices or deficiencies through regulatory tools that are already available. It concerns CBAI that the agencies might react to a problem that “some” financial institutions are experiencing by imposing new standards or new regulatory burdens on *all* financial institutions. Not all banks, not all communities, and not all geographic sectors of the United States experience the same level of risk and “cyclical” peril with respect to commercial real estate loan portfolios. Imposing new standards, with the corresponding costs and diversion of resources, on financial institutions that have historically managed their commercial real estate lending practices in a safe and sound manner with insignificant levels of loan losses is neither necessary nor in the interests of the banks and their communities.

CBAI does not object to the concept, addressed in the proposed CRE Guidance, that the bank’s board of directors should be informed of relevant commercial real estate trends and lending factors and should exercise oversight with respect to the commercial real estate lending strategy and policies of the bank. Furthermore, the proposed CRE Guidance makes references to guidelines or regulations that are already in effect (e.g., the reference to compliance with existing real estate appraisal regulations) and CBAI certainly expects that financial institutions would abide by existing laws, regulations and prudent

Page Three
Jennifer J. Johnson, Secretary
March 8, 2006

banking guidelines affecting commercial real estate lending.

However, the detail with respect to strategic planning, loan underwriting, monitoring of commercial real estate loans, usage of management information system technology, and stress testing to assess and monitor either individual loans or risks to broader loan portfolios introduces new and unnecessary burdens for banks that are not experiencing, and have not experienced, significant problems in their commercial real estate lending activities. If a community bank has a history of strong management and control regarding its commercial real estate loan portfolio, if that bank is in a market not visited by negative commercial real estate trends or cycles that have surfaced in other areas of the country, and if that bank is in all other respects being managed in a safe and sound manner, should a regulatory agency assume that changing the practices that have worked at that bank for decades will make the bank more efficient or less vulnerable to problems?

CBAI also has a concern with language in the proposed CRE Guidance suggesting that additional capital may be necessary to support commercial real estate loan concentrations. Again, the assumption that existing capital levels are insufficient to protect that bank against risk exposure in commercial real estate loan portfolios elevates unrealized potential peril over historical reality. Not all banks, despite common percentages or ratios involving their commercial real estate loan portfolios, have or will experience the same level of risk or loss. Making universal assumptions, rather than looking at banks on a bank-by-bank or at least market-by-market basis, does an injustice to specific banks that are well managed and that have always operated in a safe and sound manner at existing capital levels. Requiring such a bank to needlessly raise additional capital may impair the bank's ability to go back to its shareholders or its community in the future when it has a real need to raise capital for a given purpose.

Finally, the result of the proposed CRE Guidance may be to make commercial real estate loans less available to businesses or to prospective businesses in some markets that are not over-banked. If a bank begins to restrict its commercial real estate lending activities out of fear that it may incur additional costs or diversion of resources due to the concentration levels contemplated by the proposed CRE Guidance, then the bank may make such credit less available in its community. That, in turn, benefits neither the bank, the commercial loan applicant, or the community.

One week ago, in her testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, First Senior Deputy Comptroller of the Currency Julie Williams said the following:


“Unnecessary (regulatory) burden exacts a heavy price on banks, bank customers, and our economy. For our nation's community banks, unnecessary burden can actually imperil their competitive viability.”

Page Four
Jennifer J. Johnson, Secretary
March 8, 2006

We completely agree with that statement, but we suggest that it can be extended to suggest that a well-intended regulatory burden that is *overly broad and not properly focused* can also be detrimental to community banks, to their borrowers and to their local economies. In the opinion of CBAI, the proposed CRE Guidance is flawed because it would unnecessarily limit commercial lending opportunities for banks that are not in high risk markets, it would impose new procedures and require the use of personnel resources to administer certain commercial lending activities without a demonstrated need at the particular bank in question, or it would require the bank to raise additional capital to support lending practices that the bank has historically managed in a safe and sound manner at existing capital levels. Any one of these unattractive consequences, or any combination of them, will exact a price on community banks by diverting resources, by causing the banks to forego otherwise attractive lending opportunities, or by making future capital initiatives more difficult due to the capital initiatives that might be necessary under the proposed CRE Guidance.

Thank you for your attention and for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,



Jerry D. Cavanaugh
General Counsel
Community Bankers Association of Illinois