August 5, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

*The Alabama State Conference (ASC) Economic Empowerment Programs* appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR) regarding updating the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA). This NPR represents the most significant changes to the CRA regulation and exams in 27 years.

CRA has successfully leveraged loans, investments, and services. Between 2009 and 2020, banks made more than $2.58 trillion in home loans to low- and moderate-income (LMI) borrowers or in LMI census tracts. From 2009-2020 they made $1,036,726.00 mortgages in Rural Alabama and $309,601.00 to businesses in LMI. We need to build on this progress and address remaining disparities in lending through CRA reform.

CRA will be more effective in bolstering bank reinvestment activity in underserved communities, the more rigorous CRA exams and ratings. The agencies proposed important improvements in the CRA regulation, including increasing the rigor of the subtests on the CRA exams, expanding geographical areas on CRA exams, and collecting more data to scrutinize bank performance. However, they did not sufficiently address racial inequities.

**CRA must explicitly consider bank activity by race and ethnicity in order to fairly address the racial disparities.** Although the CRA statute does not mention race, it required banks to serve all communities, which provides room for the federal bank agencies to incorporate race in CRA exams. Persistent racial disparities in lending should compel the agencies to incorporate race and ethnicity in CRA exams. A recent annual analysis showed continuing disparities in loan denials by race and when people of color receive home loans, their equity accumulation was less. By including race and ethnicity, CRA can identify and address persistent racial disparities that have direct impacts on quality of life and health outcomes.

I believe and it has been proven that posting comments on agency websites will establish accountability on the part of examiners to consider them. In addition, these comments can be referenced during future merger applications to determine if the banks addressed significant concerns of the public. Also, the agencies should establish a public registry that community organizations can use to sign up if they want to be contacted about community needs and bank CRA performance. Furthermore, the ASC Economic Empowerment Programs request that the agencies start to publish which organizations they consult with to understand local community needs, commit to collecting input from a diverse range of organizations that includes organizations led by people of color and women, follow up on needs identified and detail how community input was factored into the results of CRA performance evaluations.
Currently, about 98% of banks pass their CRA exams on an annual basis with just less than 10% receiving an Outstanding rating and almost 90% of them receiving a rating of Satisfactory. CRA has successfully leveraged more loans, investments, and services for LMI communities, but it would be more effective in doing so if the ratings system more accurately revealed distinctions in performance. More banks would be identified as significantly lagging their peers, which would motivate them to improve their ratings and increase their reinvestment activity. As a result of this proposed reform, several banks would likely respond by boosting their retail lending to underserved communities.

The agencies proposed improvements to the other subtests of the large bank exam but did not establish as many guidelines for the performance measures, which could contribute to inflation on the subtests. The community development finance test, for example, will consist of a quantitative measure of a bank’s ratio of community development finance divided by deposits. The bank’s ratio will be compared to a local and national ratio. The agencies, however, did not provide enough guidelines to examiners for comparing the bank’s ratio to either the local or national ratio, making it possible for an examiner to inflate a rating by choosing the lowest comparator ratio.

We believe that it is possible for the agencies to further develop guidelines for how to use the performance measures on the community development and services subtests of the large bank exam in order to produce a uniformly rigorous CRA exam and guard against ratings inflation.

The agencies proposed refinements to the definitions of affordable housing, economic development, climate resiliency and remediation, community facilities and infrastructure that we believe will more effectively target revitalization activities to communities such as persistent poverty counties and Native American communities.

We would like accountability for discrimination, assessment areas to be expanded to include online lending and for performances in smaller areas to be considered as well.

We ask the agencies to expand upon their proposal to include partnerships with banks and non-banks for retail lending. When a bank partners with more than one non-bank, the lending of all the non-banks needs to be totaled together for calculating if the threshold is exceeded for purposes of creating assessment areas.

To ensure that banks serve smaller metropolitan areas and rural counties, the agencies proposed requiring that banks with 10 or more assessment areas must receive at least a Low Satisfactory rating in 60% of the assessment areas to pass overall. This still may not be an adequate solution since the smaller areas could represent a minority of areas, allowing a bank to pass.
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