

Large and Highly Complex Bank Requests for Adjustments to Total Score in Large Bank Pricing Scorecards January 1, 2018 – September 30, 2021

Date of Request	Basis of Request	Decision
May 10, 2018	<p>The Bank argued that the large bank scorecard assessment methodology does not adequately consider certain qualitative and quantitative risk factors that mitigate the Bank's risk profile. Specifically, the Bank contends that its portfolio of interest-only (IO) mortgage loans, which are treated as higher-risk assets in the scorecard, are conservatively underwritten with full documentation and strong collateral protection. The Bank notes that its IO borrowers typically have strong net worth, substantial liquidity, high credit scores, and low debt-to-income (DTI) ratios. The Bank believes these factors, coupled with its low level of historical losses, warrant what amounts to a 10-point reduction in its total score.</p>	<p>Based on a comprehensive analysis of all relevant information, DIR has determined that the Bank's request for a downward adjustment to total score is not warranted. This decision reflects the consideration given to the Bank's portfolio of low-LTV nontraditional mortgage loans in the calculation of the Higher-Risk Assets ratio, and lower loss rates for the 1-4 family first lien portfolio. DIR recalculated the Bank's total score to account for these factors and the changes failed to reach the 5-point materiality threshold.</p>
December 10, 2019	<p>The Bank argued that the 5-point total score upward adjustment implemented by DIR effective the second quarter 2019 assessment period is not warranted because the scorecard fails to adequately consider certain qualitative and quantitative risk factors that mitigate the Bank's risk profile. Specifically, the Bank contends that its portfolio of collateralized loan obligations (CLOs) which are treated as higher-risk assets in the scorecard, are supported by credit enhancement mechanisms (enhanced to AAA and AA credit rating levels) which reduce the portfolio's risk of loss to a negligible level. The Bank believes that the higher-risk assets classification is inappropriate based on the CLO portfolio's actual risk of loss.</p>	<p>After carefully considering the information provided by the Bank, DIR denied the Bank's request to withdraw the 5-point upward adjustment. Prior to application of the 5-point upward adjustment, the Bank's total score did not fully reflect its concentration of higher-risk assets relative to other large banks, and thus did not accurately reflect the Bank's risk to the Deposit Insurance Fund. Moreover, DIR continues to believe that the higher-risk assets classification of the Bank's CLO portfolio is appropriate.</p>

<p>September 10, 2020</p>	<p>The Bank contends that the large bank scorecard loss severity measure overstates the Bank’s risk of loss, specifically the high loss rates applied to the Bank’s government-backed FHA and VA loans. The Bank argues that because it maintains foreclosure reserves to cover any residual risk of loss on FHA and VA loans that go into foreclosure, these loans pose no incremental risk of loss to the DIF.</p>	<p>Based on a comprehensive analysis of all relevant information, DIR has determined that a 5-point downward adjustment to the Bank’s total score is warranted. The Bank’s concentration of government guaranteed loans is unique among large institutions, and the standardized loss-rate assumptions applied to such loans materially distort the Bank’s total score and overall risk profile. The downward adjustment is retroactive to the second quarter of 2020.</p>
<p>November 4, 2020</p>	<p>The Bank argued that the 5-point total score upward adjustment implemented by DIR effective the second quarter 2014 assessment period is no longer warranted based on a reduction in the Bank's higher-risk assets concentration, specifically its portfolio of higher-risk C&I loans. Additionally, the Bank believes that certain qualitative and quantitative risk factors that mitigate the Bank's risk profile are not adequately captured by the scorecard.</p>	<p>After carefully considering the information provided by the Bank, DIR has determined that a 5-point upward adjustment to the Bank’s total score is no longer warranted. DIR acknowledges the improvement in the Bank’s risk profile and scorecard metrics, most notably a reduction in the Bank’s portfolio of higher-risk C&I loans. Moreover, weaknesses previously cited in the Bank’s leverage lending policy have been fully addressed and the Bank’s annual growth rate has stabilized to a more moderate level. The upward adjustment was removed effective the third quarter of 2020.</p>
<p>December 11, 2020</p>	<p>The Bank argued that the 5-point total score downward adjustment first implemented by DIR effective the second quarter 2017 assessment period should not have been removed by DIR effective the second quarter 2020 assessment period. The Bank believes that its total score continues to warrant special consideration given the Bank’s risk-based assessment rate is not commensurate with the risk it poses to the DIF. Specifically, the Bank’s relatively large portions of loans categorized as “other loans” and assets categorized as “other assets” make the bank particularly sensitive to the standardized loss-rate assumptions used in the scorecard loss severity model.</p>	<p>On June 11, 2020, DIR gave the Bank advance notice of removal of the five-point downward adjustment to its total score starting in the second quarter of 2020. Subsequently DIR carefully considered the information provided by the Bank on August 6, 2020 and December 11, 2020, as well as the Bank’s second quarter 2020 scorecard results and all subsequent changes to the relevant risk factors. Based on a comprehensive analysis of all relevant information, DIR has maintained its decision to remove the five-point downward adjustment to the Bank’s total score. In support of its determination, DIR reiterated that the sharp decline in the Bank’s asset quality no longer supports continued recognition of lower loss rate assumptions in the loss severity measure.</p>

<p>March 12, 2021</p>	<p>The bank is requesting an adjustment to its core earnings measure to add back a provision expense for non-purchase credit deteriorated loans which were marked to fair value at the time of a recent acquisition. The bank argues that the provision expense double counts the potential for loss with no additional risk to the FDIC.</p>	<p>Based on a comprehensive analysis of all relevant information, DIR has determined that the assessment regulations were correctly applied, and as a result, the Bank's request is denied. Additionally, the requested adjustments to core earnings and allowances would reduce the Bank's total score by less than one point, short of the five-point materiality threshold. Thus, if DIR were to accept the Bank's argument that the "double counting" overstates the Bank's risk to the DIF, the Bank would not be eligible for an adjustment to its total score.</p>
-----------------------	---	---