Evans, Sandra E

From: Jane Walsh [jane@metropolitanhousing.org]

Sent: Monday, April 05, 2004 12:46 PM
To: regs.comments@ots.treas.gov

Subject: Proposed Changes to CRA

April 5, 2004

Docket No. 04-06 Communications Division Public Information Room, Mailstop 1-5 Office of the Comptroller of the Currency 250 E Street, SW Washington 20219

Docket No. R-1181 Jennifer J. Johnson Secretary Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System 20th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW Washington DC 20551

Robert E. Feldman Executive Secretary Attention: Comments Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation 550 17th Street, NW Washington DC 20429

Regulation Comments, Attention: No. 2004-04 Chief Counsel's Office Office of Thrift Supervision 1700 G Street, NW Washington DC 20552

Dear Officials of Federal Bank and Thrift Agencies:

As a member of the National Community Reinvestment Coalition, the Metropolitan Housing Coalition urges you to withdraw the proposed changes to the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) regulations. CRA has been instrumental in increasing access to homeownership, boosting economic development, and expanding small businesses in the nation's minority, immigrant, and low- and moderate-income communities.

The Metropolitan Housing Coalition is comprised of over 130 member organizations who have been



advocating for fair, decent and affordable housing options for all people in the metropolitan region of Louisville, Kentucky. For 15 years, we have represented the united voice for decent housing, and have recognized the powerful tools offered by CRA to ensure wider opportunities for low- and moderate income people.

- page 2

Your proposed changes are contrary to the CRA statute because they will halt the progress made in community reinvestment. The proposed CRA changes will thwart the Administration's goals of improving the economic status of immigrants and creating 5.5 million new minority homeowners by the end of the decade. Instead, the proposed CRA changes would facilitate predatory lending and reduce the ability of the general public to hold financial institutions accountable for compliance with consumer protection laws.

The proposed changes include three major elements: 1) provide streamlined and cursory exams for banks with assets between \$250 million and \$500 million; 2) establish a weak predatory lending compliance standard under CRA; and 3) expand data collection and reporting for small business and home lending. The beneficial impacts of the third proposal are overwhelmed by the damage imposed by the first two proposals. In addition, the federal banking agencies did not update procedures regarding affiliates and assessment areas in their proposal, and thus missed a vital opportunity to continue CRA's effectiveness.

Under the current CRA regulations, large banks with assets of at least \$250 million are rated by performance evaluations that scrutinize their level of lending, investing, and services to low- and moderate-income communities. The proposed changes will eliminate the investment and service parts of the CRA exam for banks and thrifts with assets between \$250 and \$500 million. The proposed changes would reduce the rigor of CRA exams for 1,111 banks that account for more than \$387 billion in assets. The elimination of the investment and service tests for more than 1,100 banks translates into considerably less access to banking services and capital for underserved communities.

The proposed CRA changes also contain an anti-predatory screen that will actually perpetuate abusive lending. The proposed standard states that loans based on the foreclosure value of the collateral, instead of the ability of the borrower to repay, can result in downgrades in CRA ratings. The asset-based standard falls short because it will not cover many instances of predatory lending. For example, abusive lending would not result in lower CRA ratings when it strips equity without leading to delinquency or foreclosure. In other words, borrowers can have the necessary income to afford monthly payments, but they are still losing wealth as a result of a lender's excessive fees or unnecessary products. CRA exams will allow abusive lending if they contain the proposed anti-predatory standard that does not address the problems of the packing of fees into mortgage loans, high prepayment penalties, loan flipping, mandatory arbitration, and other numerous abuses.

Finally, the federal agencies propose that they will publicly report the specific census tract location of small businesses receiving loans in addition to the current items in the CRA small business data for each depository institution. The positive aspects of the proposed data enhancements do not begin to make up for the significant harm caused by the first two proposals. Furthermore, the federal agencies are not utilizing the data enhancements in order to make CRA exams more rigorous. The agencies must not merely report the new data on CRA exams, but must use the new data to provide less weight on CRA exams to high cost loans than prime loans and assign less weight for purchases than loan originations.

The proposed changes to CRA will directly undercut the Administration's emphasis on minority homeownership and immigrant access to jobs and banking services. The proposals regarding streamlined exams and the anti-predatory lending standard threaten CRA's statutory purpose of the safe and sound provision of credit and deposit services. The proposed data enhancements would become much more meaningful if the agencies update procedures regarding assessment areas, affiliates, and the treatment of high cost loans and purchases on CRA exams. CRA is simply a law that makes capitalism work for all Americans. CRA is too vital to be gutted by harmful regulatory changes and neglect.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Jane M. Walsh Executive Director

encl: MHC Membership List

cc: National Community Reinvestment Coalition