

From: Peter McDonald [pete@usa2net.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 01, 2006 8:00 PM
To: Comments, Regs
Subject: Proposed Guidance for Commercial Real Estate Lending

Peter McDonald
39144 Harbor Hills Blvd.
Lady Lake, FL 32159-5931

March 1, 2006

William Magrini

Dear William Magrini:

As a director of a very profitable community bank which in it's entire history has had negibable write-offs for bad loans I am concerned when a govenment agency attempts to fix something that isn't broken. I am old enough to remember when changes of the same magnatude were made several years ago leading to problems only resolved by the RTC at the cost of failure for many previously well run institutions. In addition many individuals and businesses were hurt when the rules were changed mid-stream. Please remember history and realize that your actions prior to the RTC debacle were the cause of the problem!

I also endorse the material below.

I write because I think it important to comment on the Guidance being proposed with respect to commercial real estate lending. Commercial real estate lending is an extremely important part of the economy in Florida and like wise it is extremely important part of bank lending.

I understand the need for sound lending and sound loan portfolios. I have concerns, however, that the Guidance as announced will have a negative overall effect on my institution and the economy as a whole.

My concerns are not so much with the individual practices set out in the Guidance, but rather with the way the Guidance is imposed. We have had experience in which examiners impose even existing regulations differently than they previously had done. The proposed Guidance contains certain thresholds and a laundry list of practices and requirements. I am concerned that the rules of the game have suddenly changed.

Specifically there are several points we would like for the Guidance to make clear. First, that in looking at concentrations there will not be a one size fits all response. Each of our institutions has a different history, different controls, different portfolios, and different markets. When those in the field determine there is a concentration any response needs to be tailored for the specific circumstances.

Second, we hope the Guidance will make it very clear that if the concentration thresholds are exceeded it does not automatically require a capital increase. Any increase should be in the context of the circumstances of the particular institution.

Third, the Guidance should expressly indicate that its purpose is not to discourage commercial real estate lending.

If the Guidance is imposed in a mechanical or arbitrary manner or if it is intended to effect a policy shift discouraging commercial real estate lending then I fear grave consequences. Secured real estate lending has been the bread and butter of banks in Florida. If such loans are not available then will we have to look to other types of credits which historically have been more risky?

Perhaps most important, if the message is perceived to be that commercial real estate lending has great regulatory risk, then such loans will significantly diminish. This will lead to a downturn in our economy that will create systemic problems for banks far beyond the risk of commercial real estate loans.

I thank you for your consideration of these concerns and comments and hope that the final Guidance will address them in a meaningful way

Sincerely,

Peter McDonald
352 753-7539