

October 16, 2012

Jennifer J. Johnson, Secretary Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System 20<sup>th</sup> Street and Constitution Avenue N.W. Washington, D.C. 20551 Office of the Comptroller of the Currency 250 E. Street, SW Mail Stop 2-3 Washington, D.C. 20219

Robert E. Feldman
Executive Secretary
Attention: Comments/Legal ESS
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation,
550 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20429

Re:

Basel III Capital Proposals

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Basel III proposals<sup>1</sup> that were recently issued for public comment by the Federal Reserve Board, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

I strongly oppose subjecting community banks (under \$10 billion) including my bank (Liberty National Bank with current total assets of \$215 million) to the proposed Basel III capital standards, which were designed in Basel, Switzerland for large internationally active, banks and not for community banks. Community banks did not engage in the highly leveraged activities that severely depleted capital levels of the largest banks and created panic in the financial markets. Community banks operate on a relationship-based business model that is specifically designed to serve customers in their respective communities on a long-term basis. This model contributes to the success of

The proposals are titled: Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basell III, Minimum Regulatory Capital Ratios, Capital Adequacy, and Transition Provisions, Regulatory Capital Rules: Standardized Approach for Risk-Weighted Assets; Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements; and Regulatory Capital Rules: Advanced Approaches Risk-based Capital Rules: Market Risk Capital Rule.



community banks all over the United States through practical, common sense approaches to managing risk.

The largest banks operate purely on transaction volume and pay little attention to the customer relationship. This difference in banking models demonstrates the need to place tougher capital standards exclusively on the largest banks to better manage the ability to absorb losses.

Inclusion of accumulated other comprehensive income (AOCI) in capital for community banks will result in increased volatility in regulatory capital balances and could rapidly deplete capital levels under certain economic conditions. AOCI for most community banks represents unrealized gains and losses on investment securities held available-for-sale. Because these securities are held at fair value, any gains or losses due to changes in interest rates are captured in the valuation. Recently, both short-term and long-term interest rates have fallen to historic lows generating unprecedented unrealized gains for most investment securities. *Presently, LNB's investment portfolio reflects an unrealized gain of over \$1.5 million.* Additionally, demand for many implicitly and explicitly government guaranteed securities has risen due to a flight to safety and government intervention in the capital markets. This increased demand has caused credit spreads to tighten further increasing bond valuations.

Interest rates have fallen to levels that are unsustainable long-term once an economic recovery accelerates. As interest rate rise, fair values will fall causing the balance of AOCI to decline and become negative. This decline will have a direct, immediate impact on common equity, tier 1, and total capital as the unrealized losses will reduce capital balances. At my bank, for instance, if interest rates increased by 300 basis points, my bank's bond portfolio would show a paper loss of \$1.1 million.

Large financial institutions have the ability to mitigate the risks of capital volatility by entering into qualifying hedge accounting relationships for financial accounting purposes with the use of interest rate derivatives like interest rate swap, option, and future contracts. Community banks do not have the knowledge or expertise to engage in these transactions and manage their associated risks, costs, and barriers to entry. Community banks should continue to exclude AOCI from capital measures as they are currently required to do today.

Implementation of the capital conservation buffers for community banks will be difficult to achieve under the proposal and therefore should not be implemented. Many community banks will need to build additional capital balances to meet the minimum capital requirements with the buffers in place. Community banks do not have ready access to capital that the larger banks have through the capital markets. The only way for community banks to increase capital is through the accumulation of retained earnings over time. Due to the current ultra low interest rate environment, community bank profitability has diminished further hampering their ability to grow capital.

Ada Office • P.O. Box 135 • 118 S. Main • Ada, OH 45810 • (419) 634-5015

Bellefontaine Office • P.O. Box 849 •1120 N. Main • Bellefontaine, OH 43311 • (937) 592-5688

Kenton Office • P.O. Box 234 • 100 E. Franklin • Kenton, OH 43326 • (419) 673-1217

Marysville Office • 160 Coleman's Crossing • Marysville, OH 43040 • (937) 642-0467



The proposed risk weight framework under Basel III is too complicated and will be an onerous regulatory burden that will penalize community banks and jeopardize the housing recovery. Increasing the risk weights for residential balloon loans, interest-only loans, and second liens will penalize community banks who offer these loan products to their customers and deprive customers of many financing options for residential property. Additionally, higher risk weights for balloon loans will further penalize community banks for mitigating interest rate risk in their asset-liability management. Community banks will be forced to originate only 15 or 30 year mortgages with durations that will make their balance sheets more sensitive to changes in long-term interest rates. Many community banks will either exit the residential loan market entirely or only originate those loans that can be sold to a GSE. Second liens will either become more expensive for borrowers or disappear altogether as banks choose not to allocate additional capital to these balance sheet exposures. Community banks should be allowed to stay with the current Basel I risk weight framework for residential loans. Furthermore, community banks will be forced to make significant software upgrades and incur other operational costs to track mortgage loan-to-value ratios in order to determine the proper risk weight categories for mortgages.

In summary, the Basel III proposal is unreasonable and dangerous for the community banks that serve the smaller communities. Liberty National Bank is in its 119<sup>th</sup> year of existence. We are a strong committed community bank which provides more than just financial services to its customers. Imposing the complex capital regulations within Basel III will limit the resources that LNB can use to lend and reinvest in our communities, threatening our recovery.

If we want to prevent another Wall Street fiasco, we should not force community banks out of business and leave their customers in the hands of the megabanks. The adage "big is not always the best" continues to be applicable in the financial services industry today. While the additional capital requirements will improve the safety net for some, it will be the beginning of the end for most community banks. I hope that you will carefully reconsider the Basel III framework and its impact on my community bank.

Sincerely,

Bryan L. Marshall

Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer

ryan X. Marshall

Liberty National Bank

Ada Office • P.O. Box 135 • 118 S. Main • Ada, OH 45810 • (419) 634-5015

Bellefontaine Office • P.O. Box 849 •1120 N. Main • Bellefontaine, OH 43311 • (937) 592-5688

Kenton Office • P.O. Box 234 • 100 E. Franklin • Kenton, OH 43326 • (419) 673-1217

Marysville Office • 160 Coleman's Crossing • Marysville, OH 43040 • (937) 642-0467