

From: Wes Condron [wcondron@amcommbank.com]
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2006 5:46 PM
To: Comments, Regs
Subject: CRE Guidance, Docket Numbers: 06-01, OP-1248, 2006-1

Wes Condron
1100 W. Main St.
Blue Springs, MO 64015-3612

April 7, 2006

Comments to OTS

Dear Comments to OTS:

As a community banker, I would like to share with you my thoughts on the proposed guidance, Concentrations in Commercial Real Estate Lending, Sound Risk Management Practices.

Most community banks are underwriting their CRE loans conservatively. They carefully inspect collateral and monitor loan performance and the borrower's financial condition. We as a small community bank lend in our community and we believe we are generally close to our customers. We think we know the condition of our local economy and our borrowers.

Community banks have generally increased staff and risk management practices and capital levels since previous downturns in commercial real estate lending and are now better equipped to handle future downturns.

There already exists a body of real estate lending standards, regulations and guidelines. Examiners have the necessary tools to enforce them and address unsafe and unsound practices; we strongly believe that the proposed guidance is unnecessary. Regulators should address CRE management problems bank by bank, not by broad brush across the banking industry.

The proposed threshold limits of CRE loans to capital are too restrictive and do not take into account the lending and risk management practices of individual institutions. They also do not recognize that different segments of the CRE markets have different levels of risk. Thus, the thresholds may not give an accurate picture of the risk in an institution.

Community banks already hold capital at levels above minimum standards and should not need to raise additional capital because their CRE loans exceed the proposed thresholds. Regulators should consider the bank's allowance for loan losses and current capital levels along with risk management practices.

The proposed guidance is unfairly burdensome for community banks that do not have opportunities to raise capital or diversify their portfolio to the extent that larger regional banks can. The CRE portfolios of many community banks have grown in response to the needs of their community. If our bank is pressured to lower its CRE exposure, our ability to generate income and more capital will be constrained and we will lose good loans to larger competitors.

The proposal's recommendations regarding management information system reports will be particularly costly and burdensome to our Bank; the increase in payroll and information systems costs would far out weigh the benefit to our Bank. From the perspective of our small community Bank, I am frankly much more concerned about death by over-regulation and the cost of complying with the over-regulation than I am about death by loan losses.

For these reasons, I urge you not go forward with the guidance as it has been proposed. Instead, regulators should use the regulatory tools already in place to identify and address CRE lending risks where they truly exist and abandon the proposed thresholds that are too restrictive and misleading.

Sincerely,

Wes Condron
816-228-2300