

# Office of the Comptroller of the Currency December 2002 

Comptroller
John D. Hawke, Jr.

## Executive Committee

| First Senior Deputy Comptroller and Chief Counsel | Julie L. Williams |
| :---: | :---: |
| Chief of Staff. | Mark A. Nishan |
| Senior Deputy Comptroller and Chief National Bank Examiner | Emory Wayne Rushton |
| Senior Deputy Comptroller for Large Bank Supervision | Douglas W. Roeder |
| Senior Deputy Comptroller for Mid-Size/Community Bank Supervision. | Timothy W. Long |
| Chief Information Officer | Jackquelyn E. Fletcher |
| Senior Deputy Comptroller for International and Economic Affairs | Jonathan L. Fiechter |
| Senior Deputy Comptroller for Management and Chief Financial Officer | Edward J. Hanley |
| Ombudsman | Samuel P. Golden |
| Senior Deputy Comptroller for Public Affairs (Acting) | Mark A. Nishan |

## Background

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) was established in 1863 as a bureau of the Department of the Treasury. The OCC is headed by the Comptroller, who is appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a five-year term.

The OCC regulates national banks by its power to:

- Examine the banks;
- Approve or deny applications for new charters, branches, capital, or other changes in corporate or banking structure;
- Take supervisory actions against banks that do not conform to laws and regulations or that otherwise engage in unsound banking practices, including removal of officers, negotiation of agreements to change existing banking practices, and issuance of cease and desist orders; and
- Issue rules and regulations concerning banking practices and governing bank lending and investment practices and corporate structure.

The OCC divides the United States into six geographical districts, with each headed by a deputy comptroller.

The OCC is funded through assessments on the assets of national banks, and federal branches and agencies. Under the International Banking Act of 1978, the OCC regulates federal branches and agencies of foreign banks in the United States.

## The Comptroller

Comptroller John D. Hawke, Jr., has held office as the 28th Comptroller of the Currency since December 8, 1998, after being appointed by President Clinton during a congressional recess. He was confirmed subsequently by the U.S. Senate for a five-year term starting
on October 13, 1999. Prior to his appointment Mr. Hawke served for $3^{1 / 2}$ years as Under Secretary of the Treasury for Domestic Finance. He oversaw development of policy and legislation on financial institutions, debt management, and capital markets; served as chairman of the Advanced Counterfeit Deterrence Steering Committee; and was a member of the board of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation. Before joining Treasury, he was a senior partner at the Washington, D.C., law firm of Arnold \& Porter, which he joined as an associate in 1962. In 1975 he left to serve as general counsel to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, returning in 1978. At Arnold \& Porter he headed the financial institutions practice. From 1987 to 1995 he was chairman of the firm.

Mr. Hawke has written extensively on the regulation of financial institutions, including Commentaries on Banking Regulation, published in 1985. From 1970 to 1987 he taught courses on federal regulation of banking at Georgetown University Law Center. He has also taught courses on bank acquisitions and serves as chairman of the Board of Advisors of the Morin Center for Banking Law Studies. In 1987 Mr. Hawke served on a committee of inquiry appointed by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange to study the role of futures markets in the October 1987 stock market crash. He was a founding member of the Shadow Financial Regulatory Committee and served on it until joining Treasury.

Mr. Hawke was graduated from Yale University in 1954 with a B.A. in English. From 1955 to 1957 he served on active duty with the U.S. Air Force. After graduating in 1960 from Columbia University School of Law, where he was editor-in-chief of the Columbia Law Review, Mr. Hawke clerked for Judge E. Barrett Prettyman on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. From 1961 to 1962 he was counsel to the Select Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives.

The Quarterly Journal is the journal of record for the most significant actions and policies of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. It is published four times a year. The Quarterly Journal includes policy statements, decisions on banking structure, selected speeches and congressional testimony, material released in the interpretive letters series, statistical data, and other information of interest to the administration of national banks. Send suggestions or questions to Rebecca Miller, Senior Writer-Editor, Communications Division, Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, DC 20219. Subscriptions are available for $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 0}$ a year by writing to Publications-QJ, Comptroller of the Currency, Attn: Accounts Receivable, 250 E St., SW, MS 4-8, Washington, DC, 20219. The Quarterly Journal is on the Web at http://www.occ.treas.gov/qj/qj.htm.

# Quarterly Journal 



# Office of the Comptroller of the Currency 

John D. Hawke, Jr.<br>Comptroller of the Currency

## Contents

Page
Condition and Performance of Commercial Banks ..... 1
Recent Corporate Decisions ..... 19
Appeals Process ..... 21
Speeches and Congressional Testimony. ..... 23
Interpretations-July 1 to September 30, 2002 ..... 29
Mergers—July 1 to September 30, 2002 ..... 53
Tables on the Financial Performance of National Banks ..... 61
Index ..... 77

## Condition and Performance of Commercial Banks

## Summary

Earnings at national banks set another record in the third quarter, as both net interest income and noninterest income showed double-digit gains over the same quarter a year ago. Return on assets set another record, and return on equity rose above 17 percent in the quarter for the first time. Larger banks especially benefited from strong growth in core deposits and an extension of record-low interest rates. Continued strength in the housing market raised both lending and fee income.

On the minus side, asset quality continued to erode, with most of the deterioration concentrated in commercial and industrial (C\&I) loans at the larger banks. Overcapacity throughout the manufacturing sector continues to exert downward pressure on corporate profits and thus C\&I credit quality. Although the real estate sector has remained strong, real estate markets in a number of cities appears vulnerable to price corrections, with possible consequences for banks.

## Key Trends

During the third quarter, net income at national banks grew by 9 percent over the previous quarter and 57 percent over the same quarter of 2001. Until this year, net income had never reached $\$ 12.5$ billion in any quarter, and return on assets had never reached 1.5 percent. But net income has topped $\$ 12.5$ billion, and return on assets has topped 1.5 percent, in each of the first three quarters of 2002.

## Table 1-Major revenue components all rise; drop in provisioning holds down costs

| National banks | Major income components <br> (\$ millions change 2001-2002) |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Q2 yr-to-yr | \% Change | Q3 yr-to-yr | \% Change |
| Revenues |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Net interest income | 4,190 | $13.7 \%$ | 3,963 | $12.6 \%$ |
| Real gains/losses securities | 51 | $10.7 \%$ | 616 | $105.5 \%$ |
| $\quad$ Noninterest income | 2,049 | $8.3 \%$ | 3,683 | $15.1 \%$ |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Provisioning | 1,475 | $23.6 \%$ | -321 | $-3.9 \%$ |
| $\quad$ Noninterest expense | 881 | $2.7 \%$ | 737 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Net income | 3,160 | $28.7 \%$ | 5,604 | $57.2 \%$ |

Source: Integrated Banking Information System (OCC)

All major categories of revenues and expenses show this trend. Net interest income rose 2 percent on the quarter and 13 percent on the year, as low short-term interest rates and wide spreads between short- and long-term rates continued to be favorable. Noninterest income rose 6 percent on the quarter and 15 percent on the year. Return on equity rose above 17 percent for the first time this quarter and now stands at 16.2 percent for the year to date, just shy of the all-time high recorded in 1993. Provisions rose from the previous quarter, but fell year-over-year, despite persistent problems in credit quality. Realized gains and losses on security sales rose substantially both on the quarter and on the year, as banks appeared to be taking the opportunity to sell securities that had appreciated in the low-interest-rate environment.

Large banks have been the primary beneficiaries of these favorable trends. Net income rose 23 percent on the year for nonspecialty small banks ${ }^{1}$ (assets under $\$ 1$ billion), but 64 percent for large banks (assets over $\$ 1$ billion). Particularly notable are the differences in realized gains and losses on the sale of securities, and changes in provisioning. While small banks were increasing their provisions by 16 percent year-over-year, their larger counterparts were decreasing their provisions by 13 percent.

[^0]Figure 1-Expense control at large banks key to better performance

National nonspecialty banks


Source: Integrated Banking Information System (OCC) *Banks held constant over the five-year period 2002 data as of September 30, 2002. All other data as of year-end.

Much of the earnings advantage enjoyed by large banks over the last several years has come from better control of expenses. Figure 1 shows trends in net operating revenue and noninterest expense for the four size categories of national banks. For the smallest banks (under $\$ 100$ million in assets) noninterest expense grew faster than net operating revenues between 1997 and 2002. For the largest banks on the other hand (over $\$ 10$ billion in assets), revenues rose much faster than noninterest expenses, leading to a sharp improvement in the operating efficiency ratio. As a result, for banks under $\$ 1$ billion in assets, return on equity (ROE) hit a post-1991 low in 2001, and has risen only modestly so far in 2002. At the same time, banks over $\$ 1$ billion have seen a near record in ROE so far this year.

Figure 2—Overcapacity in many sectors raises risk to lenders


Note: Bank exposure data as of 2002Q2.
Source: Federal Reserve Board/Haver Analytics; Credit Analytics (OCC), Credit Suisse First Boston

Banks across the board have benefited from the rise in core deposits over the last year and a half. Core deposits grew at a 7.2 percent annual rate between the first quarter of 2000 and the second quarter of 2001 , and at a 9.7
percent annual rate over the next five quarters. Year-todate growth in core deposits, adjusted for inflation, now stands at a 15 -year high.

In the third quarter, credit quality continued to deteriorate in the C\&I sector, particularly at large banks. For many sectors, a worldwide overhang of excess capacity continues to depress profits and discourage business investment. Figure 2 shows the drop in capacity utilization for many manufacturing industries since the peak of the business cycle three years ago. Nearly all of these industries show a sharp drop, which has put downward pressure on prices and thus corporate profits.

The column at the right in Figure 2 indicates that many of the same industries also face pressure to increase funding for their defined-benefit pension programs. With U.S. equity markets due for a third consecutive year of negative returns, most defined-benefit pension plans have been losing money; for the Standard \& Poor's 500 companies, these plans are now about 20 percent underfunded. The need to make up the shortfall will put pressure on already stressed companies.

The U.S. corporate sector continues to suffer as a result of weakness in the economies of our major trading partners. Weak demand abroad contributes to the stuttering recovery at home. Moreover, weak corporate earnings in Europe and Japan have meant an increase in nonperforming loans made by U.S. banks to foreign borrowers. Over the last six quarters, for example, U.S. national banks have seen their ratio of C\&I loans noncurrent rise by 96 basis points for domestic borrowers, but by 205 basis points for foreign borrowers.

The real estate sector remains crucial to continued income gains in the banking system. The commercial real estate market has shown increasing signs of weakness, although it remains much stronger than it was during the recession of 1990-91. For example, the noncurrent ratio for business real estate loans (defined as commercial real estate, construction, and multifamily lending) stands at 1.02 percent so far in 2002 , up from a low of 0.76 percent in 1999 and 2000, but down from nearly 10 percent in 1991.

Figure 3-Potential housing bubbles
MSAs identified by multiple studies as vulnerable to residential real estate correction


Note: Metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) marked have been identified as vulnerable to correction and have national banks.

[^1]But the big question mark remains residential real estate. House prices have continued to increase in all regions, raising the question of whether home prices are due for a fall. While analysts are not labeling the current situation a national housing bubble, several reports have identified possible regional bubbles. Figure 3 shows the 16 metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) identified as vulnerable to a home price correction by at least two of six recent studies. Not surprisingly, the high-tech centers of San Francisco, San Jose, Tacoma, Boston, and New Jersey appear on many lists. Other fast-growth areas in California, the Northeast, and Florida are also on the list for a possible correction.

# Key indicators, FDIC-insured national banks <br> Annual 1998-2001, year-to-date through September 30, 2002, third quarter 2001, and third quarter 2002 

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# Loan performance, FDIC-insured national banks <br> Annual 1998-2001, year-to-date through September 30, 2002, third quarter 2001, and third quarter 2002 

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^2]
## Key indicators, FDIC-insured national banks by asset size Third quarter 2001 and third quarter 2002

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  | Less than \$100M |  | \$100M to \$1B |  | \$1B to \$10B |  | Greater than \$10B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 |
| Number of institutions reporting. | 1,026 | 966 | 971 | 954 | 131 | 128 | 41 | 44 |
| Total employees (FTEs) | 24,314 | 22,514 | 95,953 | 93,083 | 110,579 | 104,119 | 716,666 | 763,617 |
| Selected income data (\$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net income | \$131 | \$152 | \$790 | \$833 | \$1,527 | \$2,093 | \$7,347 | \$12,322 |
| Net interest income | 518 | 512 | 2,540 | 2,507 | 4,199 | 3,626 | 24,153 | 28,729 |
| Provision for loan losses . | 42 | 36 | 246 | 190 | 821 | 600 | 7,114 | 7,077 |
| Noninterest income. | 228 | 220 | 1,410 | 1,157 | 2,790 | 3,827 | 19,997 | 22,904 |
| Noninterest expense | 528 | 497 | 2,566 | 2,348 | 3,916 | 3,683 | 25,993 | 27,212 |
| Net operating income | 130 | 146 | 772 | 809 | 1,476 | 2,021 | 7,037 | 11,642 |
| Cash dividends declared | 61 | 68 | 422 | 369 | 1,040 | 1,098 | 5,558 | 7,818 |
| Net charge-offs to loan and lease reserve | 34 | 24 | 175 | 125 | 699 | 800 | 5,677 | 6,749 |
| Selected condition data (\$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total assets | 53,297 | 51,373 | 255,948 | 255,234 | 411,486 | 395,872 | 2,823,087 | 3,143,632 |
| Total loans and leases | 31,929 | 30,525 | 160,584 | 159,668 | 261,168 | 237,876 | 1,781,386 | 1,964,247 |
| Reserve for losses | 431 | 428 | 2,268 | 2,267 | 5,439 | 4,119 | 35,027 | 40,847 |
| Securities. | 12,724 | 12,690 | 60,625 | 63,199 | 84,949 | 90,064 | 368,038 | 475,122 |
| Other real estate owned. | 70 | 76 | 254 | 262 | 175 | 226 | 1,307 | 1,396 |
| Noncurrent loans and leases | 345 | 367 | 1,582 | 1,604 | 2,829 | 2,312 | 27,875 | 34,069 |
| Total deposits | 44,747 | 42,996 | 206,204 | 206,833 | 264,481 | 262,409 | 1,780,575 | 1,977,805 |
| Domestic deposits | 44,747 | 42,996 | 205,842 | 206,410 | 261,760 | 260,050 | 1,395,891 | 1,604,566 |
| Equity capital | 6,173 | 6,068 | 26,206 | 26,074 | 40,300 | 42,610 | 256,440 | 292,088 |
| Off-balance-sheet derivatives | 56 | 21 | 2,889 | 1,668 | 38,821 | 30,055 | 19,446,459 | 25,414,182 |
| Performance ratios (annualized \%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Return on equity | 8.65 | 10.16 | 12.27 | 13.02 | 15.46 | 19.81 | 11.86 | 17.14 |
| Return on assets | 1.00 | 1.20 | 1.25 | 1.33 | 1.50 | 2.15 | 1.06 | 1.59 |
| Net interest income to assets. | 3.94 | 4.03 | 4.01 | 3.99 | 4.13 | 3.73 | 3.47 | 3.70 |
| Loss provision to assets | 0.32 | 0.29 | 0.39 | 0.30 | 0.81 | 0.62 | 1.02 | 0.91 |
| Net operating income to assets | 0.99 | 1.15 | 1.22 | 1.29 | 1.45 | 2.08 | 1.01 | 1.50 |
| Noninterest income to assets. | 1.73 | 1.74 | 2.23 | 1.84 | 2.75 | 3.93 | 2.87 | 2.95 |
| Noninterest expense to assets | 4.02 | 3.92 | 4.06 | 3.73 | 3.85 | 3.79 | 3.73 | 3.51 |
| Loss provision to loans and leases | 0.54 | 0.48 | 0.62 | 0.48 | 1.27 | 1.01 | 1.58 | 1.46 |
| Net charge-offs to loans and leases. | 0.43 | 0.32 | 0.44 | 0.32 | 1.08 | 1.34 | 1.26 | 1.40 |
| Loss provision to net charge-offs | 124.75 | 152.31 | 140.80 | 151.63 | 117.56 | 74.97 | 125.33 | 104.87 |
| Performance ratios (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent of institutions unprofitable. | 12.18 | 10.56 | 4.53 | 3.25 | 4.58 | 2.34 | 4.88 | 2.27 |
| Percent of institutions with earnings gains. | 47.27 | 63.66 | 59.94 | 76.62 | 62.60 | 79.69 | 60.98 | 70.45 |
| Nonint. income to net operating revenue | 30.59 | 30.11 | 35.69 | 31.58 | 39.92 | 51.34 | 45.29 | 44.36 |
| Nonint. expense to net operating revenue. | 70.81 | 67.92 | 64.97 | 64.08 | 56.02 | 49.42 | 58.87 | 52.70 |
| Condition ratios (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nonperforming assets to assets. | 0.78 | 0.89 | 0.72 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.65 | 1.05 | 1.16 |
| Noncurrent loans to loans | 1.08 | 1.20 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 0.97 | 1.56 | 1.73 |
| Loss reserve to noncurrent loans. | 124.88 | 116.53 | 143.41 | 141.33 | 192.29 | 178.18 | 125.66 | 119.90 |
| Loss reserve to loans. | 1.35 | 1.40 | 1.41 | 1.42 | 2.08 | 1.73 | 1.97 | 2.08 |
| Equity capital to assets | 11.58 | 11.81 | 10.24 | 10.22 | 9.79 | 10.76 | 9.08 | 9.29 |
| Leverage ratio . | 11.20 | 11.34 | 9.54 | 9.45 | 8.45 | 9.56 | 7.40 | 7.60 |
| Risk-based capital ratio. | 18.17 | 18.58 | 14.69 | 14.95 | 13.85 | 15.94 | 11.88 | 12.34 |
| Net loans and leases to assets | 59.10 | 58.59 | 61.85 | 61.67 | 62.15 | 59.05 | 61.86 | 61.18 |
| Securities to assets | 23.87 | 24.70 | 23.69 | 24.76 | 20.64 | 22.75 | 13.04 | 15.11 |
| Appreciation in securities (\% of par) | 2.27 | 2.62 | 2.37 | 2.82 | 2.16 | 2.46 | 1.67 | 2.06 |
| Residential mortgage assets to assets | 21.77 | 22.22 | 24.61 | 24.73 | 26.95 | 25.40 | 20.32 | 23.91 |
| Total deposits to assets | 83.96 | 83.69 | 80.56 | 81.04 | 64.27 | 66.29 | 63.07 | 62.91 |
| Core deposits to assets | 70.49 | 70.62 | 67.05 | 68.05 | 54.09 | 56.59 | 42.91 | 44.95 |
| Volatile liabilities to assets | 15.23 | 14.86 | 17.95 | 17.18 | 25.78 | 23.72 | 35.08 | 32.38 |

## Loan performance, FDIC-insured national banks by asset size <br> Third quarter 2001 and third quarter 2002

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  | Less than \$100M |  | \$100M to \$1B |  | \$1B to \$10B |  | Greater than \$10B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 |
| Percent of loans past due 30-89 days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases | 1.42 | 1.37 | 1.28 | 1.07 | 1.36 | 1.18 | 1.38 | 1.14 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 1.21 | 1.21 | 1.06 | 0.89 | 0.97 | 0.92 | 1.37 | 1.11 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 1.51 | 1.55 | 1.28 | 1.16 | 0.94 | 1.31 | 1.71 | 1.41 |
| Home equity loans | 0.81 | 0.61 | 0.76 | 0.53 | 0.89 | 0.59 | 0.94 | 0.66 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 0.97 | 0.49 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 0.94 | 0.45 | 0.71 | 0.32 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 0.95 | 1.03 | 0.87 | 0.70 | 0.81 | 0.51 | 0.79 | 0.63 |
| Construction RE loans | 1.24 | 0.96 | 1.35 | 0.93 | 1.48 | 1.06 | 1.33 | 1.19 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 1.84 | 1.63 | 1.36 | 1.23 | 1.54 | 1.37 | 0.87 | 0.76 |
| Loans to individuals | 2.35 | 2.31 | 2.46 | 2.02 | 2.31 | 1.91 | 2.32 | 2.16 |
| Credit cards. | 2.72 | 2.36 | 5.48 | 3.71 | 2.77 | 2.04 | 2.56 | 2.59 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 2.38 | 2.34 | 1.96 | 1.78 | 2.09 | 2.00 | 2.40 | 2.08 |
| All other loans and leases. | 0.75 | 0.82 | 0.76 | 0.64 | 1.07 | 0.72 | 1.40 | 0.55 |
| Percent of loans noncurrent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases . . | 1.08 | 1.20 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 0.97 | 1.56 | 1.73 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 0.93 | 1.07 | 0.82 | 0.85 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 1.08 | 1.07 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.71 | 0.76 | 0.69 | 0.94 | 1.09 | 1.14 |
| Home equity loans | 0.39 | 0.34 | 0.37 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.33 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 0.64 | 1.20 | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.41 | 0.49 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 1.04 | 1.13 | 0.91 | 0.99 | 0.93 | 0.87 | 1.08 | 1.10 |
| Construction RE loans | 0.71 | 1.28 | 0.94 | 0.85 | 1.22 | 0.87 | 1.26 | 1.26 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 1.81 | 1.91 | 1.48 | 1.62 | 1.69 | 1.41 | 2.33 | 3.30 |
| Loans to individuals | 0.77 | 0.79 | 1.07 | 0.97 | 1.43 | 1.06 | 1.52 | 1.61 |
| Credit cards. | 1.74 | 1.79 | 4.16 | 3.59 | 2.41 | 1.54 | 1.98 | 2.05 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 0.75 | 0.76 | 0.53 | 0.55 | 0.76 | 0.83 | 1.30 | 1.40 |
| All other loans and leases | 1.10 | 1.34 | 1.07 | 0.99 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 1.32 | 1.19 |
| Percent of loans charged-off, net |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases | 0.43 | 0.32 | 0.44 | 0.32 | 1.08 | 1.34 | 1.26 | 1.40 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.60 | 0.19 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.33 | 0.95 | 0.17 |
| Home equity loans . . . . . | 0.04 | 0.02 | -0.06 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.12 | 0.39 | 0.21 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 0.64 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.42 | 0.06 | 0.08 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.21 | 0.16 |
| Construction RE loans | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.30 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 0.93 | 0.70 | 0.71 | 0.67 | 0.96 | 1.07 | 1.44 | 2.00 |
| Loans to individuals | 0.98 | 1.06 | 1.87 | 1.10 | 3.65 | 5.05 | 3.16 | 3.87 |
| Credit cards. | 3.22 | 5.03 | 6.87 | 2.23 | 6.89 | 11.08 | 4.82 | 5.62 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 0.91 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 1.23 | 0.87 | 1.80 | 2.23 |
| All other loans and leases. | 0.88 | 0.29 | 0.36 | 0.56 | 0.68 | 0.33 | 0.53 | 0.61 |
| Loans outstanding (\$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases | \$31,929 | \$30,525 | \$160,584 | \$159,668 | \$261,168 | \$237,876 | \$1,781,386 | \$1,964,247 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 18,573 | 18,091 | 101,682 | 104,415 | 138,161 | 123,887 | 680,173 | 830,781 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 8,282 | 7,852 | 41,264 | 39,648 | 63,563 | 51,160 | 337,531 | 427,960 |
| Home equity loans . . . . . . . . . . | 475 | 490 | 4,365 | 5,061 | 9,280 | 9,712 | 81,511 | 117,577 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 404 | 442 | 3,683 | 3,930 | 4,933 | 4,181 | 21,233 | 23,663 |
| Commercial RE loans . . . . . . . | 5,442 | 5,481 | 37,333 | 40,026 | 41,873 | 41,214 | 147,026 | 161,919 |
| Construction RE loans | 1,830 | 1,658 | 10,717 | 11,047 | 16,566 | 15,401 | 60,871 | 67,697 |
| Farmland loans | 2,141 | 2,168 | 4,318 | 4,703 | 1,799 | 1,713 | 4,408 | 4,624 |
| RE loans from foreign offices. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 146 | 506 | 27,592 | 27,342 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 5,415 | 4,953 | 28,845 | 27,269 | 49,347 | 46,480 | 534,421 | 479,039 |
| Loans to individuals | 4,275 | 3,853 | 20,347 | 18,215 | 53,750 | 45,318 | 294,460 | 373,172 |
| Credit cards*. | 127 | 167 | 3,107 | 2,601 | 22,754 | 17,261 | 130,193 | 183,467 |
| Other revolving credit plans | 69 | 61 | 419 | 356 | 1,779 | 2,413 | 18,752 | 30,576 |
| Installment loans . . . . . . . | 4,079 | 3,624 | 16,821 | 15,257 | 29,217 | 25,644 | 145,516 | 159,130 |
| All other loans and leases | 3,723 | 3,671 | 9,916 | 9,963 | 20,005 | 22,278 | 273,416 | 283,558 |
| Less: Unearned income. | 57 | 42 | 205 | 194 | 95 | 88 | 1,084 | 2,304 |

## Key indicators, FDIC-insured national banks by region <br> Third quarter 2002

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# Key indicators, FDIC-insured commercial banks <br> Annual 1998-2001, year-to-date through September 30, 2002, third quarter 2001, and third quarter 2002 

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# Loan performance, FDIC-insured commercial banks <br> Annual 1998-2001, year-to-date through September 30, 2002, third quarter 2001, and third quarter 2002 

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | Preliminary 2002YTD | 2001Q3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Preliminary } \\ \text { 2002Q3 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent of loans past due 30-89 days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases | 1.26 | 1.14 | 1.26 | 1.37 | 1.14 | 1.36 | 1.14 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 1.26 | 1.09 | 1.26 | 1.31 | 1.03 | 1.23 | 1.03 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 1.44 | 1.43 | 1.72 | 1.67 | 1.35 | 1.47 | 1.35 |
| Home equity loans | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.98 | 0.91 | 0.61 | 0.88 | 0.61 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 0.86 | 0.57 | 0.55 | 0.69 | 0.40 | 0.73 | 0.40 |
| Commercial RE loans . | 0.99 | 0.69 | 0.74 | 0.90 | 0.70 | 0.90 | 0.70 |
| Construction RE loans | 1.50 | 0.98 | 1.06 | 1.21 | 1.03 | 1.27 | 1.03 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 0.88 | 0.79 | 0.83 | 1.01 | 0.91 | 1.10 | 0.91 |
| Loans to individuals | 2.43 | 2.33 | 2.47 | 2.46 | 2.19 | 2.37 | 2.19 |
| Credit cards. | 2.58 | 2.59 | 2.66 | 2.69 | 2.76 | 2.76 | 2.76 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 2.33 | 2.18 | 2.34 | 2.55 | 2.02 | 2.30 | 2.02 |
| All other loans and leases | 0.51 | 0.54 | 0.65 | 0.84 | 0.56 | 1.13 | 0.56 |
| Percent of loans noncurrent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases. | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.12 | 1.41 | 1.50 | 1.34 | 1.50 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 0.91 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.96 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.93 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 0.88 | 0.82 | 0.90 | 0.96 | 0.97 | 0.91 | 0.97 |
| Home equity loans | 0.42 | 0.33 | 0.37 | 0.39 | 0.30 | 0.41 | 0.30 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 0.83 | 0.41 | 0.44 | 0.43 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.39 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 0.95 | 0.77 | 0.72 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.94 | 0.96 |
| Construction RE loans | 0.81 | 0.67 | 0.76 | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.07 | 1.09 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 0.99 | 1.18 | 1.66 | 2.41 | 3.01 | 2.18 | 3.01 |
| Loans to individuals | 1.52 | 1.42 | 1.41 | 1.48 | 1.45 | 1.42 | 1.45 |
| Credit cards. | 2.22 | 2.05 | 2.01 | 2.12 | 2.14 | 2.18 | 2.14 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 1.06 | 1.04 | 0.98 | 1.21 | 1.11 | 1.06 | 1.11 |
| All other loans and leases | 0.34 | 0.39 | 0.69 | 0.96 | 1.03 | 0.99 | 1.03 |
| Percent of loans charged-off, net |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases . . . . . . . . . | 0.67 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.95 | 1.12 | 0.96 | 1.15 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.30 | 0.15 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.14 | 0.47 | 0.15 |
| Home equity loans | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 0.27 | 0.19 | 0.26 | 0.16 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.07 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.11 |
| Construction RE loans | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.22 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 0.42 | 0.58 | 0.81 | 1.43 | 1.75 | 1.30 | 2.04 |
| Loans to individuals . | 2.69 | 2.32 | 2.43 | 2.73 | 3.40 | 2.71 | 3.23 |
| Credit cards. | 5.19 | 4.45 | 4.39 | 5.14 | 6.68 | 5.20 | 6.04 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.18 | 1.29 | 1.40 | 1.27 | 1.48 |
| All other loans and leases. | 0.52 | 0.34 | 0.31 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.45 | 0.52 |
| Loans outstanding (\$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases | \$3,238,286 | \$3,491,659 | \$3,819,516 | \$3,889,473 | \$4,069,196 | \$3,860,780 | \$4,069,196 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 1,345,589 | 1,510,342 | 1,673,325 | 1,800,226 | 1,970,709 | 1,747,875 | 1,970,709 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 668,706 | 737,110 | 790,030 | 810,844 | 881,535 | 785,660 | 881,535 |
| Home equity loans . | 96,647 | 102,339 | 127,694 | 154,157 | 201,250 | 145,755 | 201,250 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 43,242 | 53,168 | 60,406 | 64,127 | 68,805 | 63,500 | 68,805 |
| Commercial RE loans . | 370,544 | 417,633 | 466,453 | 505,827 | 541,665 | 492,459 | 541,665 |
| Construction RE loans | 106,719 | 135,632 | 162,613 | 193,047 | 205,853 | 190,512 | 205,853 |
| Farmland loans | 29,096 | 31,902 | 34,096 | 35,531 | 37,787 | 35,410 | 37,787 |
| RE loans from foreign offices. . | 30,635 | 32,558 | 32,033 | 36,695 | 33,815 | 34,580 | 33,815 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 898,555 | 969,257 | 1,051,992 | 981,394 | 921,365 | 1,011,433 | 921,365 |
| Loans to individuals | 570,863 | 558,424 | 606,663 | 629,896 | 688,201 | 607,562 | 688,201 |
| Credit cards*. | 228,781 | 212,051 | 249,372 | 232,899 | 267,659 | 218,398 | 267,659 |
| Other revolving credit plans | na | na | na | 34,203 | 38,376 | 25,517 | 38,376 |
| Installment loans. . . | 342,081 | 346,373 | 357,291 | 362,794 | 382,166 | 363,647 | 382,166 |
| All other loans and leases | 427,397 | 457,309 | 490,448 | 481,068 | 492,554 | 496,574 | 492,554 |
| Less: Unearned income. | 4,117 | 3,673 | 2,912 | 3,110 | 3,634 | 2,665 | 3,634 |

[^3]
## Key indicators, FDIC-insured commercial banks by asset size Third quarter 2001 and third quarter 2002

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Loan performance, FDIC-insured commercial banks by asset size Third quarter 2001 and third quarter 2002

|  | Less than \$100M |  | \$100M to \$1B |  | \$1B to \$10B |  | Greater than \$10B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 | 2001Q3 | 2002Q3 |
| Percent of loans past due 30-89 days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases | 1.56 | 1.47 | 1.31 | 1.13 | 1.35 | 1.17 | 1.36 | 1.13 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 1.39 | 1.31 | 1.11 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 0.89 | 1.33 | 1.08 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 1.77 | 1.70 | 1.39 | 1.29 | 1.08 | 1.13 | 1.56 | 1.39 |
| Home equity loans | 0.83 | 0.67 | 0.78 | 0.52 | 0.88 | 0.54 | 0.90 | 0.62 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 0.76 | 0.65 | 0.51 | 0.56 | 0.65 | 0.40 | 0.83 | 0.34 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 1.18 | 1.03 | 0.88 | 0.72 | 0.85 | 0.74 | 0.91 | 0.64 |
| Construction RE loans | 1.38 | 1.31 | 1.33 | 0.96 | 1.21 | 1.00 | 1.25 | 1.06 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 1.90 | 1.77 | 1.53 | 1.32 | 1.54 | 1.39 | 0.96 | 0.75 |
| Loans to individuals | 2.59 | 2.46 | 2.40 | 2.30 | 2.43 | 2.02 | 2.35 | 2.20 |
| Credit cards. | 2.34 | 2.54 | 5.46 | 4.87 | 3.01 | 2.73 | 2.60 | 2.70 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 2.64 | 2.50 | 2.05 | 2.01 | 2.18 | 1.79 | 2.36 | 2.04 |
| All other loans and leases | 0.79 | 0.83 | 0.72 | 0.75 | 0.96 | 0.76 | 1.19 | 0.51 |
| Percent of loans noncurrent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases . . . | 1.12 | 1.17 | 0.96 | 1.02 | 1.12 | 1.10 | 1.47 | 1.70 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 0.98 | 1.03 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.97 | 0.96 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 0.86 | 0.90 | 0.73 | 0.78 | 0.83 | 0.90 | 0.98 | 1.03 |
| Home equity loans | 0.40 | 0.31 | 0.37 | 0.26 | 0.45 | 0.31 | 0.41 | 0.31 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 0.53 | 0.76 | 0.53 | 0.45 | 0.39 | 0.25 | 0.35 | 0.40 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 1.13 | 1.14 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Construction RE loans | 0.94 | 1.08 | 0.94 | 1.10 | 1.18 | 1.13 | 1.08 | 1.07 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 1.72 | 1.73 | 1.43 | 1.54 | 1.77 | 1.90 | 2.35 | 3.43 |
| Loans to individuals | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 1.31 | 1.01 | 1.52 | 1.59 |
| Credit cards. | 1.73 | 1.36 | 3.70 | 3.56 | 2.42 | 1.84 | 2.07 | 2.14 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 0.97 | 0.99 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.68 | 0.65 | 1.26 | 1.30 |
| All other loans and leases | 1.07 | 1.27 | 1.05 | 1.19 | 0.67 | 0.81 | 1.01 | 1.03 |
| Percent of loans charged-off, net |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.97 | 1.05 | 1.10 | 1.36 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.44 | 0.16 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.20 | 0.68 | 0.15 |
| Home equity loans | -0.05 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.32 | 0.18 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 0.19 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.03 | 0.05 |
| Commercial RE loans . | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.13 |
| Construction RE loans | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.29 | 0.31 | 0.11 | 0.22 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 0.70 | 0.74 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 1.16 | 1.33 | 1.40 | 2.35 |
| Loans to individuals | 0.95 | 0.99 | 1.61 | 1.48 | 3.39 | 3.93 | 2.78 | 3.37 |
| Credit cards . . . . | 3.01 | 4.05 | 6.83 | 5.78 | 7.12 | 9.48 | 4.73 | 5.56 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 0.89 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.91 | 1.12 | 1.03 | 1.42 | 1.70 |
| All other loans and leases. | 0.55 | 0.32 | 0.60 | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.43 | 0.41 | 0.53 |
| Loans outstanding (\$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total loans and leases | \$139,619 | \$134,048 | \$524,200 | \$557,861 | \$566,495 | \$554,757 | \$2,630,466 | \$2,822,529 |
| Loans secured by real estate (RE). | 81,050 | 79,687 | 343,533 | 378,163 | 313,570 | 315,137 | 1,009,723 | 1,197,721 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 35,789 | 33,936 | 130,137 | 132,332 | 127,243 | 114,807 | 492,490 | 600,460 |
| Home equity loans . | 2,186 | 2,334 | 14,818 | 18,504 | 19,219 | 22,700 | 109,532 | 157,711 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 1,804 | 1,811 | 11,421 | 13,222 | 13,379 | 13,597 | 36,896 | 40,175 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 23,260 | 23,905 | 130,656 | 149,990 | 108,152 | 116,684 | 230,392 | 251,085 |
| Construction RE loans | 7,773 | 7,420 | 42,121 | 47,877 | 41,368 | 42,427 | 99,250 | 108,129 |
| Farmland loans | 10,239 | 10,281 | 14,342 | 16,205 | 3,865 | 4,018 | 6,965 | 7,284 |
| RE loans from foreign offices. | 0 | 0 | 38 | 33 | 344 | 905 | 34,198 | 32,877 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 24,083 | 22,433 | 93,259 | 94,890 | 117,541 | 110,402 | 776,550 | 693,641 |
| Loans to individuals | 17,865 | 15,850 | 59,912 | 55,838 | 99,377 | 91,070 | 430,409 | 525,443 |
| Credit cards*. | 483 | 421 | 7,027 | 6,789 | 37,283 | 29,818 | 173,604 | 230,631 |
| Other revolving credit plans | 298 | 264 | 1,660 | 1,604 | 2,884 | 3,802 | 20,675 | 32,706 |
| Installment loans. | 17,083 | 15,165 | 51,225 | 47,446 | 59,209 | 57,450 | 236,130 | 262,105 |
| All other loans and leases | 16,788 | 16,201 | 28,115 | 29,551 | 36,597 | 38,649 | 415,073 | 408,153 |
| Less: Unearned income. . | 167 | 123 | 618 | 582 | 589 | 501 | 1,290 | 2,427 |

## Key indicators, FDIC-insured commercial banks by region <br> Third quarter 2002

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Glossary

## Data Sources

Data are from the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) Reports of Condition and Income (call reports) submitted by all Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)-insured, national-chartered and state-chartered commercial banks and trust companies in the United States and its territories. Uninsured banks, savings banks, savings associations, and U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks are excluded from these tables. All data are collected and presented based on the location of each reporting institution's main office. Reported data may include assets and liabilities located outside of the reporting institution's home state.

The data are stored on and retrieved from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's (OCC's) Integrated Banking Information System (IBIS), which is obtained from the FDIC's Research Information System (RIS) database.

## Computation Methodology

For performance ratios constructed by dividing an income statement (flow) item by a balance sheet (stock) item, the income item for the period was annualized (multiplied by the number of periods in a year) and divided by the average balance sheet item for the period (beginning-of-period amount plus end-of-period amount plus any interim periods, divided by the total number of periods). For "pooling-of-interest" mergers, prior period(s) balance sheet items of "acquired" institution(s) are included in balance sheet averages because the year-to-date income reported by the "acquirer" includes the year-to-date results of "acquired" institutions. No adjustments are made for "purchase accounting" mergers because the year-to-date income reported by the "acquirer" does not include the prior-to-merger results of "acquired" institutions.

## Definitions

Commercial real estate loans-loans secured by nonfarm nonresidential properties.

Construction real estate loans-includes loans for all property types under construction, as well as loans for land acquisition and development.

Core deposits-the sum of transaction deposits plus savings deposits plus small time deposits (under $\$ 100,000)$.

IBIS—OCC's Integrated Banking Information System
Leverage ratio-Tier 1 capital divided by adjusted tangible total assets.

Loans to individuals-includes outstanding credit card balances and other secured and unsecured installment loans.

Net charge-offs to loan and lease reserve-total loans and leases charged off (removed from balance sheet because of uncollectibility), less amounts recovered on loans and leases previously charged off.

Net loans and leases to assets-total loans and leases net of the reserve for losses.

Net operating income-income excluding discretionary transactions such as gains (or losses) on the sale of investment securities and extraordinary items. Income taxes subtracted from operating income have been adjusted to exclude the portion applicable to securities gains (or losses).

Net operating revenue-the sum of net interest income plus noninterest income.

Noncurrent loans and leases-the sum of loans and leases 90 days or more past due plus loans and leases in nonaccrual status.

Nonperforming assets-the sum of noncurrent loans and leases plus noncurrent debt securities and other assets plus other real estate owned.

Number of institutions reporting-the number of institutions that actually filed a financial report.

Off-balance-sheet derivatives-the notional value of futures and forwards, swaps, and options contracts; beginning March 31, 1995, new reporting detail permits the exclusion of spot foreign exchange contracts. For March 31, 1984 through December 31, 1985, only foreign exchange futures and forwards contracts were reported; beginning March 31, 1986, interest rate swaps contracts were reported; beginning March 31, 1990, banks began to report interest rate and other futures and forwards contracts, foreign exchange and other swaps contracts, and all types of option contracts.

Other real estate owned-primarily foreclosed property. Direct and indirect investments in real estate ventures are excluded. The amount is reflected net of valuation allowances.

Percent of institutions unprofitable-the percent of institutions with negative net income for the respective period.

Percent of institutions with earnings gains-the percent of institutions that increased their net income (or decreased their losses) compared to the same period a year earlier.

Reserve for losses-the sum of the allowance for loan and lease losses plus the allocated transfer risk reserve.

Residential mortgage assets-the sum of mortgages for 1-to-4-family residences plus mortgage-backed securities.

Return on assets (ROA)—net income (including gains or losses on securities and extraordinary items) as a percentage of average total assets.

Return on equity (ROE)—net income (including gains or losses on securities and extraordinary items) as a percentage of average total equity capital.

Risk-based capital ratio-total capital divided by riskweighted assets.

Risk-weighted assets—assets adjusted for risk-based capital definitions, which include on-balance-sheet as well as off-balance-sheet items multiplied by risk weights that range from zero to 100 percent.

Securities-excludes securities held in trading accounts. Effective March 31, 1994 with the full implementation of Financial Accounting Standard (FAS) 115, securities classified by banks as "held-to-maturity" are reported at their amortized cost, and securities classified as "available-for-sale" are reported at their current fair (market) values.

Securities gains (losses)—net pre-tax realized gains (losses) on held-to-maturity and available-for-sale securities.

Total capital-the sum of Tier 1 and Tier 2 capital. Tier 1 capital consists of common equity capital plus noncumulative perpetual preferred stock plus minority interest in consolidated subsidiaries less goodwill and other ineligible intangible assets. Tier 2 capital consists of subordinated debt plus intermediate-term preferred stock plus cumulative long-term preferred stock plus a portion of a bank's allowance for loan and lease losses. The amount of eligible intangibles (including mortgage servicing rights) included in Tier 1 capital and the amount of the allowance included in Tier 2 capital are limited in accordance with supervisory capital regulations.

Volatile liabilities-the sum of large-denomination time deposits plus foreign-office deposits plus federal funds purchased plus securities sold under agreements to repurchase plus other borrowings. Beginning March 31, 1994, new reporting detail permits the exclusion of other borrowed money with original maturity of more than one year; previously, all other borrowed money was included. Also beginning March 31, 1994, the newly reported "trading liabilities less revaluation losses on assets held in trading accounts" is included.

## Recent Corporate Decisions

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) publishes monthly, in its publication Interpretations and Actions, corporate decisions that represent a new or changed policy, or present issues of general interest to the public or the banking industry. In addition, summaries of selected corporate decisions appear in each issue of the Quarterly Journal. In the third quarter of 2002, the following corporate decisions were of particular importance because they were precedent setting or otherwise represented issues of importance. The OCC's decision documents for these decisions may be found in Interpretations and Actions using the decision number at the end of each summary.

## Conversions

On August 30, 2002, the OCC granted conditional approval for the Bank of Lockesburg, Arkansas, to convert to a national bank titled First National Bank of Stuttgart and to conduct fiduciary powers. Prior to converting, the bank relocated to Stuttgart, Arkansas. The bank's parent holding company, DeWitt First Bancshares, desired a banking presence in Stuttgart and chose this approach since Arkansas law does not permit bank holding companies to charter new banks in the state. In addition to standard conditions imposed on all banks converting to a national charter, the approval imposed conditions addressing capital.
[Conditional Approval Letter No. 545]

On September 4, 2002, the OCC granted conditional approval for First Citizens Bank, Roanoke, Virginia, to convert to a national credit card bank titled First Citizens Bank, National Association. In addition to the standard conditions imposed on all banks converting to national charter, the approval imposed an ongoing condition to address significant changes from the bank's business plan or operations. [Conditional Approval Letter No. 548]

## Operating Subsidiaries

On July 31, 2002, the OCC granted approval for MB Financial Bank, National Association, Chicago, Illinois, to acquire as operating subsidiaries several companies that collectively engage in equipment leasing and provide various ancillary services. The principal activity of the companies is computer and telecommunications equipment leasing. [Corporate Decision No. 2002-13]

On August 27, 2002, the OCC acknowledged receipt of the after-the-fact notice by Metropolitan National Bank, New York, New York, regarding the bank's acquisition of G\&R Check Cashing Corp (G\&R). G\&R engages in general check-cashing services and other activities permissible under 12 CFR 5.34(e)(5)(v). The OCC's letter advises that the bank and G\&R are not authorized to engage in "payday lending" activities or enter into arrangements with third parties to provide "payday" type loans through offices or facilities operated by a third party. [Corporate Decision No. 2002-14]

## Appeal 1 - Appeal of Accounting Decision

A bank appealed two Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) decisions regarding the accounting treatment for income earned and expenses incurred from two separate affinity card relationships. The issues involved the bank's contractual agreements with an affinity group (contract no. 1) and an affiliate (contract no. 2), respectively, and are individually discussed below.

## Contract No. 1

## Background

The bank purchased an existing affinity portfolio from another institution at a premium. The contract with the affinity association required an advance at signing and minimum annual payments (royalty expense). The bank computed the expenses associated with the contract based on a formula that allocated most of the expense to the latter years of the contract because of the belief that the economics of the program would improve over time. The bank recorded the difference between the minimum payments and the formula expense as a prepaid asset.

## Discussion

The OCC and the bank agreed that the guiding standards fell under generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), and the Financial Accounting Standards Board Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts (No. 5), which requires that expenses be allocated in a systematic and rational manner during the period in which the related assets are expected to provide benefits.

In determining the criteria of systematic and rational, the bank considered the totality of the agreement with the recognition of royalty expenses, which include the amortization of the purchase premium. The premium for the portfolio reflected the benefit in prior years of the affinity group's endorsements compared to the benefits enjoyed from royalty payments in later years. The bank believed that the combination of royalty expense and
premium amortization resulted in a reasonably consistent charge against receivables. Escalation of royalty fees paid to the affinity group mirrored the improving economics of the program over time. The bank's external auditors agreed that the bank's approach was systematic and rational.

The OCC concluded that a systematic and rational approach was one that recognized periodic expense in relationship to the average revolving receivable balances in the corresponding period. Based on the bank's projections, the OCC determined that an amortization rate of between 1.1 and 1.3 percent of average revolving balances would provide this level relationship. The OCC estimated that such a method would reduce the prepaid balance by almost 75 percent and directed the bank to charge off this amount.

## Conclusion

The accounting standards and principles relevant to this transaction are not specific. Therefore, when considering the bank's and the OCC's methods, it was believed that there existed a legitimate difference of opinion regarding a systematic and rational approach to accounting for this complex transaction. The ombudsman clearly acknowledged that there could be different judgments made, and different conclusions reached, on the asset valuations. Therefore, the ombudsman opined that the most appropriate resolution of this difference of opinion rested with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) accounting division. The bank was directed to contact the SEC to discuss the accounting treatment for this transaction.

## Contract No. 2

## Background

In a separate agreement the affinity group's affiliate agreed to pay the bank a percentage of the shortfall if a specified rate of return was not met. This gross profit adjustment was recorded as a prepaid asset. This receivable was recorded during the early years of the contract but was not payable by the affiliate until the expiration of the 16 -year contract.

## Discussion

The bank believed that the prepaid asset was fully bankable, based on the unconditional contractual obligation of the affiliate, and therefore carried it at full value. The OCC concluded that the bank's accounting treatment for this asset was inappropriate. The OCC considered this prepaid asset to be a gain contingency, and as such, under GAAP it should not be recognized until payment is realized. The bank was of the opinion that the asset had economic value, and therefore, the OCC should not impose an accounting treatment that assigns no value.

## Conclusion

In considering all of the dimensions of the prepaid asset, the ombudsman opined that it was appropriate to recognize the revenue. However, in light of the extended time period required to receive payment, it would have been more appropriate to record the prepaid asset at a discounted value. Therefore, the bank was directed to adjust its books to reflect the discounted value of the asset for each of the periods in question and amend the call reports as appropriate.

## Speeches and Congressional Testimony

Of the Comptroller of the Currency
Remarks by John D. Hawke, Jr., Comptroller of the Currency, before the Independent Bankers Association of Texas, on the OCC's relationship to community banks, San Antonio, Texas, September 23, 200225

# Remarks by John D. Hawke, Jr., Comptroller of the Currency, before the Independent Bankers Association of Texas, on the OCC's relationship to community banks, San Antonio, Texas, September 23, 2002 

I'm sure that Independent Bankers Association of Texas (IBAT) was as relieved as any group in America when we heard the announcement that the players' union and the major league baseball owners had reached a settlement in their labor dispute. After all the work that had gone into developing this year's conference theme, it would have been a real pity had it come to stand as nothing more than a reminder that the national pastime had shut down for the season, disappointing millions of fans and putting thousands of people out of work. Thankfully, the games continue, the playoffs and the World Series loom, and I'm pleased to be joining IBAT once again, at its own annual fall classic.

As we contemplated the possibility of a baseball strike, I heard plenty of speculation that another strike might spell the demise of baseball as we know it-that this time, the fans might cast the final vote with their feet. Frankly, I never thought there was much chance of that happening. Despite the economic challenges that the game faces, it's always been part of our national identity.

Of course, people once said the same thing about cock fighting, corn husking, and minstrel shows-once popular pursuits that no one pursues any more. It reminds us tastes and habits change-that nothing is forever.

The question that has been much discussed of late is whether community banking will share in the fate of other venerable institutions overtaken by time and eventsor whether it can marshal the endurance, adaptability, and political support necessary to avoid such a fate.

Certainly there's no shortage of pessimists about the future of community banking-and little dispute about some of the particulars of their basic argument. Community banks are disappearing at an alarming ratenearly one a day, on average. Some have fallen to merger and acquisition, while others have succumbed to weak fundamentals, such as shrinking loan margins, a consumer mentality that focuses on small differences in price to the exclusion of all other considerations, and, above all, the absence of the economies of scale that might otherwise make the numbers work.

Let me give you an example I can speak to with some authority. In terms of your overall expenses, the cost of
regulatory compliance ranks pretty far down the list. At least I hope it does. But it's a conspicuous cost because-to be frank about it-it's a cost whose benefits aren't always obvious.

Year after year, our friends in Congress add new mandates for consumer protection, community service, and more, and expect the regulators to enforce them. But the costs all come back to you, in the form of the people you have to pay to do the extra legwork and paperwork the law requires, and in the form of the supervisory assessments you have to pay $u s$ so that our examiners can certify that you're in compliance with the law.

Big banks don't like this any better than small ones do. They just don't seem to feel it as much.

Community banks are feeling these pressures more than ever before, partly because they are more exposed to big bank competition than ever before. There are no sheltered markets anymore-only places your competitors have chosen not to go. The advent of true nationwide branching is one manifestation of that; improvements in technology, which bring remote delivery of financial services within reach of millions, is another; and the removal of statutory prohibitions on the types of products and services that integrated financial institutions can offer is a third. Together, these market and regulatory changes add up to what is probably the most challenging competitive environment for community banking in decades.

A cursory look at the numbers here in Texas-one of the nation's traditional strongholds of community banking-seems to support what the analysts say about the unstoppable momentum of financial services consolidation and community bank evaporation. In 1998, there were 798 commercial banks in operation statewide. As of the middle of this year, the number was down to 675-a drop of nearly 15 percent. Roughly 13,000 fewer people work in Texas banking today than four years ago. Some of those same people might have once worked for you.

But to me the remarkable thing is not that there's been some contraction in the banking industry. Given the number of banks with which we began, contraction was a foregone conclusion, especially in a softening economy.

And the Texas economy, while no softer than most, has been affected by a variety of circumstances unique to it. I'm speaking now of the state's heavy reliance on agriculture, which has been buffeted by drought and low commodity prices; weakness in the Mexican economy, to which the state's fortunes are so closely linked; and fallout from the collapse of Enron and related businesses.

In light of these bumps and bruises, I think we should be focusing on a different set of numbers-the actual performance and condition ratios of Texas banks. They tell a story of resilience and underlying strengthnotwithstanding the dire pronouncements of the industry analysts.

Consider these 2001 numbers, using 1998-a strong growth year-as a comparative benchmark. Return on equity, up. Return on assets, up. Net charge-offs, down. Capital, up. Noncurrent loans, down.

And the outlook for the near term is equally positive. Many of you have reported a recent surge in retail deposits, as individual investors seek sanctuary from the turbulence on Wall Street in banks on Main Street. Coupled with rising loan demand, which seems likely as the national recovery gains speed, community banks in Texas and throughout the country may be poised to realize major gains to the bottom line.

Some would have you believe that community bankers have done nothing more than to prove the importance of good timing, suggesting that you've been accidental beneficiaries of trends you've had no hand in shaping. I don't share that view. I believe, rather (and the numbers confirm this), that the community bank business model, with its emphasis on personal service, is fundamentally sound. I believe that the skill that bankers like you have brought to the business has been instrumental in proving the so-called experts wrong-at least so far. Most of all, I believe that the role you play in the markets you serve is crucial to the health of our communities and to the national economy. Your ability to react quickly and rationally to local credit needs, to price fairly, and to provide customers with a wide range of banking and related financial products, is indispensable-and irreplaceable.

I should hasten to add that while all of these factors have played a role in your past success, none of it guarantees that this success will continue. As I've said, people's habits do change-whether it's the games they watch and play or the way they save and invest.

In my view, the value you contribute is too important to be left to chance or to the sometimes-merciless whims of the marketplace. So I believe that the regulatory and legislative policies of our government must explicitly embrace the interests of community banks-much as we have embraced the interests of family farms or small business generally-as a matter of fundamental national importance. Without taking anything away from your great skills as bank managers, I am convinced that such an embrace is crucial to the continued success-and longterm survival—of our nation's community banking sector.

I am not in any way implying that the interests of community banks should prevail at the expense of large banks. Big banks make their own outsized contribution to America's international competitiveness and economic health. Supporting one sector of an industry is not equivalent to oppressing another. The goal of economic regulation, after all, is to achieve the appropriate parity between efficiency and equity-a goal that's consistent with recognition of the fact that our supervisory and regulatory policies have disproportionate impact on the well-being of community banks.

Some may accuse the OCC of being a latecomer to this view. There seems to be a notion out there-and it's nothing new-that we're "the big bank regulator," and that we're less attuned to the needs and concerns of community banks than, say, our colleagues at the state banking departments and at the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC). But let me ask you this: can we be accurately referred to as the "big bank regulator" when nearly 2,000 of the 2,300 national banks that we're responsible for are community banks with assets under \$1 billion? And half of that number- 1,000 national banksholds less than $\$ 100$ million in assets.

And is it fair to characterize the OCC as indifferent to the needs of community banks when more than 1,300 of our examiners-nearly 80 percent of the OCC's total examination force-is dedicated to community bank supervision? I'm referring to 1,300 highly trained professionals, men and women who are widely acknowledged to be the very best in the business at what they do. Most of them have deep roots in the communities whose banks they serve.

I should add that we restructured our procedures several years ago so that those same local examiners and front-line supervisors-we call them assistant deputy comptrollers (ADCs)—make 90 percent of the decisions that affect your institutions. That move was designed to
take advantage of the depth of experience-averaging more than 20 years-possessed by our ADCs.

I don't think we can fairly be accused of being unresponsive to the banks we supervise when, in 2001 alone, the OCC sponsored nearly 200 outreach events around the country-a number that doesn't include the many events sponsored by others that we attend or the dozens of meetings that we hold with state banking associations delegations when they come to Washington. I was pleased to welcome a large IBAT delegation to our offices just a few months ago and look forward to welcoming you back. Let me assure you that there will always be an open door-and a warm spot in our heartsfor IBAT at the OCC.

In our case, numbers alone-the number of smaller banks that we supervise and the number of examiners assigned to them-tell only part of the story of our commitment to the health of community banking. It's reflected in our whole approach to supervision, which draws on procedures formulated especially for community banks. These procedures take a risk-focused approach that allows for streamlined, efficient examinations. We focus on practices and outcomes-an approach designed to get examiners in and out of your bank as quickly as possible with the information that they need to provide effective supervision.

Our commitment to community banks is also reflected in our sensitivity to regulatory burden-and an appreciation of how profoundly community banks can be affected by it. Today we don't issue a regulation without first conducting a community bank impact analysis. When we find that the costs of a given regulation to community banks are out of proportion to the benefits that regulation is likely to bring to the industry and the public, we'll step back and reconsider it.

Technology offers tremendous potential for reducing regulatory burden, and we're aggressively exploring possible ways to automate supervisory communications and the examination process itself. I believe that the day is not far off when most of the exchanges between bankers and regulators will take place through systems like the OCC's National BankNet. Before much longer you'll be able to comment on proposed regulations, pay your regulatory assessment, and file corporate applicationsall on line.

And we're working to give examiners the ability to perform even more of their routine supervisory duties
remotely. That will mean fewer burdens on you-less staff time preparing for exams, less time producing paperwork, and a less intrusive examiner presence on site.

Burden reduction was an important consideration behind the adoption of our "Canary" early warning system-a system that, as many of you have heard, is designed to enhance our ability to identify and respond to emerging risks. Canary enables us to zero in on those banks that have the greatest amount of financial risk and the greatest possibility of problems. By the same token, it also enables us to avoid imposing undue burden on well-managed institutions. If your bank is one of those-and the vast majority of community banks fall squarely into the wellmanaged category-Canary can result in real reductions in regulatory burden.

But I can assure you that whether yours is a troubled institution, a problem-free institution, or something in between, your examiner will be there for you. No matter how much technology enables us to conduct supervision remotely, an on-site presence will always be a central component of the supervisory relationship.

Many bankers prize that relationship. They tell me that they use our examiners like all-purpose consultants-and for good reason, because in the ranks of OCC examiners are men and women whose expertise on a whole range of banking subjects is recognized throughout the nation and around the world. I know that some banks opt for a national charter precisely because the organizers know they can count on expertise furnished by our examiners to help them make it through the always-challenging start-up period.

But community banks that are also national banks pay for the privilege-and pay more than they should have to, in my judgment. The unfair financial burden that you bear is the result of what I believe is a serious flaw in our whole system of bank supervision. Although the OCC assessment schedule is progressive-that is, large national banks pay more than their pro rata share of the costs of their supervision-the assessments you pay as national banks are still considerably higher than you'd be paying under a state charter. You know this, and so do we.

This fee disparity is the result of a system under which the Federal Reserve and the FDIC provide the federal supervision of state-chartered banks-indeed, they perform for state banks virtually every function we perform for national banks-but they don't charge those banks for their services. Instead, the resources used by the FDIC for this purpose are provided in large part by
national banks, which account for more than half of the balance in the Bank Insurance Fund. In other words, national banks are effectively subsidizing the supervision of your state bank competitors.

And because the states themselves actually provide only a small part of the total supervision their banks require, the states can afford to charge less-much less-than a comparable national bank pays to the OCC, which provides all of its supervision.

We believe that this arrangement is patently unfair to national banks and harmful to the dual banking system, and I have repeatedly urged Congress to address this issue in the context of deposit insurance reform. Everyone agrees that banks should contribute to the insurance funds based on the risks they present, and that healthy banks should not be required to bear the costs and risks of providing deposit insurance to poorly managed institutions. We strongly believe that the same principle of equity should apply to supervisory assessments as well and that the fee disparity between national and state banks should be eliminated.

Let me emphasize that the OCC is not proposing-and never has, as long as I've been Comptroller-that the fee disparity problem be resolved by charging additional fees to state banks. Our proposed solution, which would draw on FDIC revenues to fund all supervision, would benefit state banks every bit as much as national banks.

Our commitment to community banks is also reflected in OCC policies designed to assist national banks in keeping up with the demands of a highly competitive financial marketplace. For example, we launched a pilot program that allows national banks with the highest supervisory ratings to exceed the customary 15 percent limit on loans to a single borrower where the limit is higher for statechartered institutions. It was designed exclusively for community banks, which may now be in a position to compete favorably for larger borrowers who previously had to go elsewhere to meet their financing needs.

It's just another way that the OCC has "stepped up to the plate" to support the interests of community banks.

I opened my remarks by suggesting that the coming years would be decisive ones for community banks-and for the organizations, like IBAT, that speak for them. In that vein, let me offer one final thought. While regulatory sensitivity to community banking's unique needs is important, the future of community banking in America will not be determined by government action-or inaction. All the government support in the world won't be enough if your customers feel ill served or inadequately served banking with you. They will regret it if they have to go elsewhere to have their financial needs well and comprehensively met, but most of them will go nonetheless. The challenge for community bankers is to help your customers make the decision that's right for them-and right for you.
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## Interpretive Letters

## 938-January 18, 2001

## 12 USC 84(d)(2)(b)

Dear [ ];
This is in response to your letter of December 11, 2000. You have requested the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's (OCC's) opinion as to whether certain loans made by [ ] ("bank") to two separate borrowing entities that are related through common ownership would be combined for lending limit purposes. Based on the information you provided in your letter and subsequent e-mails, it is my opinion that the two bank loans may be combinable for purposes of the legal lending limit during the year 2001 for the reasons set forth below.

## I. Facts

The bank has two outstanding credit facilities totaling $\$ 14,620,000$ to two limited liability companies managed by [ ] ("Inc."). [ Inc.] is wholly owned by [A], [B], and [C].

The first credit is a \$9,620,000 line of credit to [ ] ("West") for the purposes of land acquisition and site development. The acquired property is 67 acres located on the west side of Rt. [\#] in [City, State]. West will develop the site for shopping center lots for sale to retailers. Repayment of the loan is expected from sale of the developed lots to various retailers, including [\#1] and [\#2]. The owners of West are:


The loan is guaranteed by [Inc.], [A], [B], and [C]. West may use [ ] ("Inc. 2"), a wholly owned subsidiary of [Inc.], to perform the site development work.

The second credit is a $\$ 5$ million line to [ ] ("East"). The purpose of this loan is to finance the land acquisition and site development phase of a two-phase shopping center development project. The second phase, involving the construction of retail stores on the site, will be financed through a conventional commercial construction loan.

The phase two financing will not be underwritten until a majority of the leases with the major tenants are executed. [Inc.] currently has secured letters of intent from 100 percent of the major tenants (i.e., [\#3], [\#4], [\#5], [\#6], and [\#7]). The expected source of repayment of the loan will be a take out by the phase two financing. East is owned by:

| [A] | 24.83 percent |
| :--- | ---: |
| [B] | 24.83 percent |
| [C] | 24.83 percent |
| [D] | 22 percent |
| [E] | 2.5 percent |
| [Inc.] | 1.01 percent |

The loan is guaranteed by [Inc.], [A], [B], and [C]. East may also use [Inc. 2] to perform the site development work.

The projected cash expenditures for East and West for the development period are as follows (in thousands):

| Table 1—Projected cash expenditures <br> for East, 2000-2001 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Projected cash expenditures | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | TOTAL |
| Land Acquisition | 4,709 | 0 | 4,709 |
| Site development | 1,500 | 8,700 | 10,200 |
| Other | 876 | 1,526 | 2,402 |
| Total | 7,085 | 10,226 | 17,311 |


| Table 2—Projected cash expenditures <br> for West, 2000-2002 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Projected cash expenditures | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | TOTAL |
| Land Acquisition | 9,302 | 0 | 130 | 9,432 |
| Site development | 1,230 | 1,075 | 0 | 2,305 |
| Other | 468 | 419 | 60 | 947 |
| Total | 11,000 | 1,494 | 190 | 12,684 |

## II. Legal Analysis

Generally, a national bank's total outstanding loans to one borrower may not exceed 15 percent of the bank's capital and surplus, plus an additional 10 percent of capital and surplus if the amount over the 15 percent general limit is fully secured by readily marketable securities. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}$ "borrower" includes a person who is named a borrower or debtor in a loan or extension of credit. ${ }^{2}$ Also, loans

[^4]to one borrower will be attributed to another person and both will be considered a borrower (1) when the proceeds are used for the direct benefit of the other person, or (2) when a common enterprise is deemed to exist between the persons. ${ }^{3}$

The proceeds of a loan to borrower will be deemed to be used for the direct benefit of another person and will be attributed to that other person when the proceeds, or assets purchased with such proceeds, are transferred to that other person, other than in a bona fide arm's-length transaction where the proceeds are used to acquire property, goods, or services. ${ }^{4}$

A common enterprise is deemed to exist when
(1) the expected source of repayment for each loan is the same and neither borrower has another source of income from which the loan and the borrower's other obligations can be repaid,
(2) the borrowers are related through common control and there is substantial financial interdependence between or among the borrowers,
(3) the borrowers use the loan proceeds to acquire more than 50 percent of a business enterprise, or
(4) the OCC determines that a common enterprise exists based on the facts and circumstances of particular transactions. ${ }^{5}$

Thus, in determining whether a loan to one borrower should be attributed to another borrower for lending limit purposes, one must apply each of the five loan combination/attribution tests set forth above-the one direct benefit test and the four common enterprise teststo the specific facts of each loan relationship. ${ }^{6}$

[^5]
## A. Direct Benefit Test

According to your letter, loan proceeds for both the West and East loans will be used to acquire land and pay for site development costs. Some of those proceeds may be paid to [Inc. 2] for site development work. As long as payments to [Inc. 2] result from bona fide arm's-length transactions, the proceeds of the West and East loans paid to [Inc. 2] will not be attributed to [Inc. 2] under the direct benefit test at 12 CFR 32.5(b).

## B. Common Enterprise Test \# 1Common Expected Source of Repayment

The expected source of repayment on the West loan is the sale of the developed lots to various retailers. The expected source of repayment on the East loan will be the proceeds of the phase two construction loan. Since the expected sources of repayment of the two loans are different, the loans will not be combined for purposes of the lending limit under the common enterprise test at 12 CFR 32.5(c)(1).

## C. Common Enterprise Test \# 2Common Control and Significant Financial Interdependence

As stated above on page three, one way in which a common enterprise is deemed to exist is when:
(1) the borrowers are related through common control, and
(2) there is substantial financial interdependence between or among the borrowers. ${ }^{7}$

Borrowers are related through common control when one person or entity controls another, or two or more entities are each controlled by the same person or entity. For the purposes of this combination rule, control is deemed to exist if a person directly or indirectly, or acting through or together with one or more persons either (1) owns or controls 25 percent or more of the voting securities of another person, (2) controls in any manner the election of a majority of the directors or trustees of another person, or (3) has the power to exercise a controlling influence over the management or policies of another person. ${ }^{8}$

[^6]Based on the information in your letter, West, East, [Inc. 2] and [Inc.] are related through the common control of [A], [B], and [C]. The next question, then, is to determine whether substantial financial interdependence exists between or among the control group members. Substantial financial interdependence is deemed to exist when 50 percent or more of one person's annual gross receipts or gross expenditures are derived from transactions with the other person. 12 CFR 32.5 (c)(2)(ii). In determining whether substantial financial interdependence exists, we look at the borrower's gross receipts or gross expenditures "on an annual basis." When calculating a borrower's gross receipts or gross expenditures on "an annual basis," the relevant annual period will generally be the fiscal year used by the borrower. ${ }^{9}$ Both West and East have a calendar year fiscal period.

Accordingly, if 50 percent or more of West's annual gross receipts or gross expenditures were received from or paid to East, [Inc.2], or [Inc.], then substantial financial interdependence would exist between West and such entity or entities, and loans to West would be attributed to, or combined with loans to, such entity or entities. Similarly, if 50 percent or more of East's annual gross receipts or gross expenditures were received from or paid to West, [Inc. 2], or [Inc.], then substantial financial interdependence would exist between East and such entity or entities, and loans to East would be attributed to, or combined with loans to, such entity or entities. The same analysis would apply to each member of the common control group.

Assuming that all of the site development costs incurred by West and East will be paid to [Inc. 2], those payments to [Inc.2] will represent 85 percent and 72 percent, respectively, of West's and East's gross annual expenditures for the fiscal year 2001. ${ }^{10}$ Thus, for the year 2001, there will be substantial financial interdependence between West and [Inc.2] and between East and [Inc.2]. ${ }^{11}$

Consequently, for the year 2001 loans to West will be attributed to [Inc. 2] because (1) the two entities are related through common control, and (2) substantial financial interdependence exists between the two entities

[^7]for the year 2001. Likewise, for the year 2001, loans to East will be attributed to [Inc. 2] because (1) the two entities are related through common control, and (2) substantial financial interdependence exists between the two entities for the year 2001. Thus, the loans to West and East will be attributed to [Inc 2] during 2001, and therefore are combined for the purpose of the lending limit under 12 CFR 32.5(c)(2).

## D. Common Enterprise Test \# 3Borrowing to Acquire Control

This test is not applicable to the West and East loans.

## E. Common Enterprise Test \# 4Facts and Circumstances

OCC rulings and interpretations reveal that a very strong evidentiary record based upon a number of factors must exist before a common enterprise will be found to exist solely on the basis of the facts and circumstances test. ${ }^{12}$ In administrative opinions and interpretive letters, the OCC has considered the following facts and circumstances to be relevant to a common enterprise determination: engaging in supporting lines of business, interchange of goods and services, common ownership of assets, common management, use of common facilities, commingling of assets and liabilities, closely related business activities, similarity in structure, financing and holding, use of same business address, centralized cash management program, likelihood that a financially troubled member of the group would receive financial aid from other members of the group, family relationships among the borrowers, and pledging of assets to support another person's loans. ${ }^{13}$

Based on the information provided in your letter, I am unable to determine with any certainty whether the loans to West and East should be combined for lending limit purposes under the facts and circumstances test.

## III. Conclusion

Based on the information provided and the assumption that all of the site development costs will be paid to [Inc. 2], the loans to West and East will be attributed to [Inc. 2] for the year 2001 under the common enterprise test at 12 CFR 32.5 (c)(2) and thus combined for purposes

[^8]of the legal lending limit. If all of the site development costs will not be paid to [Inc. 2], but where payments by West and East to [Inc. 2] during a fiscal period will still represent 50 percent or more of each company's gross expenditures for that period, the same attribution and combination results.

I trust this is responsive to your request. If you have any further questions, please contact me at (312) 360-8805.

Christopher G. Sablich
Senior Attorney
Central District Office

## 939—October 15, 2001

## 12 USC 24(7)

Dear [ ]:
This responds to your letter of June 28, 2001, on behalf of [ ] ("the bank"). In your letter, you request confirmation by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) of your view that federal law preempts the laws of Massachusetts and Florida that purport to restrict or prohibit a national bank from establishing deposit-taking automated teller machines (ATMs). ${ }^{1}$ For the reasons discussed below, we conclude that federal law would preempt those state laws.

## Background

The bank is considering establishing deposit-taking ATMs in a number of states, including Massachusetts and Florida. The bank has no branches or offices in either state, but contemplates installing unmanned, deposittaking ATMs in publicly accessible areas of buildings at which certain of its affiliates have operations. The bank's customers will be able to access their accounts through the bank's ATMs or ATMs owned and operated by other financial institutions in the networks, and customers of these other financial institutions will be able to access their accounts through the bank's ATMs.

[^9]
## The Massachusetts Statute

Under Massachusetts law, an out-of-state bank may establish an ATM only if the laws of the state in which it has its main office would permit a bank with its main office in Massachusetts to establish an ATM in that state:

> No [non-Massachusetts] financial institution . . . shall purchase, establish, install, operate, lease or use individually or with any financial institution or organization or share with any financial institution or organization any such electronic branch in the commonwealth unless the financial institution . . . has its main office in one of the states of the United States, and the laws of such state expressly authorize, under conditions no more restrictive than those imposed by this chapter as determined by the commissioner, financial institutions or organizations organized under the laws of the commonwealth to purchase, establish, install, operate, lease, use or share electronic branches in such other state; provided, however, that any such financial institution . . shall have applied to and obtained approval of the commissioner prior to engaging in any activity pursuant to this section.

Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. Ch. 167B, §§ 1 and 3 (West 2001) (emphasis added). The Massachusetts Division of Banks enforces this reciprocity statute by requiring an out-ofstate bank to "submit a completed application, along with a copy of the relevant statute from the state in which it has its main office, and an affidavit signed by such bank's counsel affirming that such statute would authorize a bank which has its main office in Massachusetts to establish an electronic branch within that state." Massachusetts Division of Banks Opinion 96-161.

According to your letter, you have been advised by staff at the Massachusetts Division of Banks that the division would enforce the application and reciprocity requirements against a national bank that has its home office outside Massachusetts. The bank's home state of New Jersey prohibits out-of-state financial institutions from establishing ATMs in New Jersey. It has no reciprocity exception to this prohibition. Thus, if the Massachusetts statute applied to the bank, the bank would be prohibited from establishing an ATM in Massachusetts.

## The Florida Statute

Florida's "remote financial service units" statute prohibits an out-of-state bank from establishing and operating a deposit-taking ATM in Florida:

Any bank which is not authorized to do business in [Florida] or does not have its principal office and place of business in [Florida] is prohibited from using in [Florida] any remote financial service unit or any associated system by which a remote financial service unit is operated. However, any bank which is not authorized to do business in [Florida] or does not have its principal office and place of business in [Florida] may use in [Florida] any remote financial service unit or any associated system within [Florida] by which such a remote service unit is operated if . . such bank does not take deposits, either directly or indirectly, from any source whatsoever by use of the remote financial service unit or associated system.

Fla. Stat. Ann. § 658.65 (West 2000) (emphasis added). Although the term "remote financial service unit" is not defined in the Florida statutes or regulations, staff at the Florida Banking Department have opined that the term includes an ATM. According to your letter, department staff also interpret the phrase "authorized to do business" to mean, in the context of an out-of-state bank, a bank that has established a branch in Florida pursuant to Florida's branching laws. ${ }^{2}$ Thus, if applied to the bank, the Florida law would prohibit the bank from establishing deposittaking ATMs in Florida unless the bank first establishes a branch there.

## Analysis

## Permissibility of the activity

The threshold question in any preemption analysis is whether the activities in question are permissible for a national bank under federal law. If they are not, then there is no preemption issue.

National banks are authorized to establish and operate ATMs. ${ }^{3}$ The banking services provided through ATMs represent long-established banking activities: receiving deposits, disbursing cash from bank accounts, and extending credit in the form of cash advances. Each of these activities lies at the heart of national bank authority under 12 USC 24(Seventh), whether as part of the

[^10]enumerated national bank power to receive deposits, as part of the authority to engage in the "business of banking," or as an activity incidental to permissible banking activity. ${ }^{4}$ As the OCC has expressly reaffirmed in a recently adopted regulation, 12 CFR 7.4003, ${ }^{5}$ the power to deploy and operate ATMs is implicit in the National Bank Act's authorization of national banks to receive deposits, make loans and carry on the "business of banking." ATMs and other electronic media simply represent a different means of exercising established banking powers. 12 CFR 7.1019.

Moreover, a national bank's authority to establish and operate ATMs is unaffected by the federal branching law. Congress has specifically directed that state law will apply, in certain respects, to a national bank's authority to branch interstate. The McFadden Act, as amended, provides that national banks may establish "branches" only to the extent that state law authorizes state banks to establish branches. ${ }^{6}$ However, the McFadden Act, as revised, expressly excludes ATMs from the definition of "branch," thereby removing national bank ATMs from the reach of state-law-based restrictions. ${ }^{7}$ Accordingly, section 7.4003 of the OCC's rules provides that an ATM is not a branch "and is not subject to state geographic or operational restrictions or licensing laws."

Based on this analysis, it is clear that the bank's proposed activities through ATMs in Massachusetts and Florida are permissible under well-settled federal authority.

## Preemptive effect of federal law

In our opinion, federal law preempts the Massachusetts and Florida statutes that purport to restrict or prohibit a national bank's authority to establish ATMs in those states, because the statutes conflict with federal law authorizing the bank to engage in the activities in question and with the OCC's exclusive visitorial powers over

[^11]national banks. These points are addressed in more detail below, following a brief summary of the law governing preemption and the OCC's visitorial powers.

Preemption and visitorial powers. When the federal government acts within the sphere of authority conferred upon it by the Constitution, federal law is paramount over, and may preempt, state law. ${ }^{8}$ Federal authority over national banks stems from several constitutional sources, including the Necessary and Proper Clause and the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution. ${ }^{9}$

The U. S. Supreme Court has identified several bases for federal preemption of state law. First, Congress may expressly state that it intends to preempt state law. ${ }^{10}$ Second, a federal statute may create a scheme of federal regulation "so pervasive as to make reasonable the inference that Congress left no room for the States to supplement it." ${ }^{11}$ Third, the state law may conflict with a federal law. ${ }^{12}$ In Barnett Bank v. Nelson, ${ }^{13}$ the Supreme Court elaborated on this third test:

Federal law may be in "irreconcilable conflict" with state law. Rice v. Norman Williams Co., 458 U. S. 654, 659 (1982). Compliance with both statutes, for example, may be a "physical impossibility," Florida Lime \& Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Paul, 373 U. S. 132, 142-143 (1963); or, the state law may "stan[d] as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress." Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U. S. 52, 67 (1941).

The Court in Barnett went on to state that
In defining the pre-emptive scope of statutes and regulations granting a power to national banks, these cases [i.e., national bank preemption cases] take the view that normally Congress would not want States to forbid, or to impair significantly, the exercise of a power that Congress explicitly granted. To say this is not to deprive States of the power to regulate national banks, where ... doing so does not prevent or significantly interfere with the national bank's exercise of its powers. ${ }^{14}$

[^12]A conflict between a state law and federal law need not be complete in order for federal law to have preemptive effect. Where a federal grant of authority is unrestricted, for example, state law that attempts to place limits on the scope and exercise of that authority will be preempted. ${ }^{15}$ Thus, federal law preempts not only state laws that purport to prohibit a national bank from engaging in an activity permissible under federal law but also state laws that condition or confine the exercise by a national bank of its express or incidental powers. As the Court stated in Barnett,
... where Congress has not expressly conditioned the grant of "power" upon a grant of state permission, the Court has ordinarily found that no such condition applies. In Franklin Nat. Bank, the Court made this point explicit. It held that Congress did not intend to subject national banks' power to local restrictions, because the Federal power-granting statute there in question contained "no indication that Congress [so] intended . . . as it has done by express language in several other instances." ${ }^{16}$

Moreover, the preemption may arise because of a conflict between a state law and a federal regulation. As stated by the Supreme Court in Fidelity Federal Savings and Loan Ass'n v. de la Cuesta ${ }^{17}$ :

Federal regulations have no less pre-emptive effect than federal statutes. Where Congress has directed an administrator to exercise his discretion, his judgments are subject to judicial review only to determine whether he has exceeded his statutory authority or acted arbitrarily. *** A pre-emptive regulation's force does not depend on express congressional authorization to displace state law; moreover, whether the administrator failed to exercise an option to promulgate regulations which did not disturb state law is not dispositive.

458 U.S. at 153-154 (citations omitted).
Congress vested the OCC with the authority to determine whether a national bank is engaging in permissible activities. Under 12 USC 484 and other federal statutes, ${ }^{18}$ the OCC has exclusive visitorial powers over national

[^13]banks except as otherwise expressly provided by federal law. ${ }^{19}$ These powers include the right to examine a bank, inspect a bank's books and records, regulate and supervise activities authorized or permitted pursuant to federal banking law, and enforce compliance with any applicable federal or state laws concerning those activities. ${ }^{20}$

Application of federal law to state statutes. If applied to the bank, the state laws at issue would prohibit the bank from establishing ATMs in Massachusetts and Florida, respectively. Given that the bank's home state has no provision in its banking laws that would satisfy the Massachusetts reciprocity requirement, the laws of Massachusetts would, if applied to the bank, preclude it from establishing ATMs in that state. Similarly, the bank does not have its principal place of business in Florida and is not "authorized to do business" as the Florida Banking Department interprets that term. Thus, the Florida law would prohibit the bank from establishing deposit-taking ATMs in that state.

In Guttau, the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit considered similar state restrictions imposed in Iowa on a national bank's authority to deploy and operate ATMs. In that case, a national bank operated several ATMs in Iowa but maintained no branches in that state and sought to enjoin the enforcement of Iowa's ATM restrictions. Iowa prohibited the operation of an ATM by any bank without an office in Iowa, required ATM operators to apply for state approval, and prohibited the display of financial institution advertising upon ATM terminals. The Court of Appeals held that the Iowa restrictions were preempted by the National Bank Act:

Congress has made clear in the NBA its intent that ATMs are not to be subject to state regulation, and thus the provisions of the Iowa [law] that would prevent or significantly interfere with Bank One's placement and operation of its ATMs must be held to be preempted. ${ }^{21}$

Like the state laws at issue in Guttau, the Massachusetts and Florida laws in question here would prohibit the bank's exercise of its permissible federal powers.

[^14]For this reason, it is our opinion that the state laws are preempted by federal law. ${ }^{22}$

Nor would the Massachusetts or Florida statutes at issue be immune from preemption under the Electronic Funds Transfer Act ${ }^{23}$ ("EFTA"). The EFTA allows states to retain control over electronic transfers:

This subchapter does not annul, alter, or affect the laws of any State relating to electronic funds transfers, except to the extent that those laws are inconsistent with the provisions of this subchapter, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency. A state law is not inconsistent with this subchapter if the protection such law affords any consumer is greater than the protection afforded by this subchapter. ${ }^{24}$

However, as explained by the court in Guttau,
this anti-preemption provision is specifically limited to the provisions of the federal EFTA, and nothing therein grants the states any additional authority to regulate national banks. State regulation of national banks is proper where "doing so does not prevent or significantly interfere with the national bank's exercise of its powers." Barnett Bank, 116 S . Ct. at 1109. Congress has made clear in the [National Bank Act] its intent that ATMs are not to be subject to state regulation, and thus the provisions of the Iowa EFTA that would prevent or significantly interfere with Bank One's placement and operation of its ATMs must be held to be preempted. ${ }^{25}$

[^15]Thus, the preemption analysis articulated above is unaffected by a state's EFTA.

## Conclusion

Because ATMs are not branches under 12 USC 36(j), state law geographic restrictions are inapplicable to ATMs. Congress has placed no other restrictions upon ATMs in the National Bank Act, and, therefore, a state may not prevent, restrict, or condition a national bank's authority to establish ATMs. Accordingly, we conclude that the Massachusetts reciprocity statute and the Florida prohibition on the establishment of deposit-taking ATMs by out-of-state banks are preempted by federal law.

Julie. L. Williams<br>First Senior Deputy Comptroller and Chief Counsel<br>cc: Richard T. Donelan, Jr.<br>Chief Banking Counsel<br>Office of Comptroller<br>Florida Department of Banking and Finance<br>Thomas J. Curry<br>Commissioner of Banks<br>Commonwealth of Massachusetts<br>Jennifer Davis Carey, Director<br>Office of Consumer Affairs and Business Regulation<br>Commonwealth of Massachusetts

## 940—May 24, 2002

## 12 USC 24(7)

Re: [ ] Investment Management Activities
Dear [ ]:
This is in response to your letter requesting confirmation that [ ] (the "bank") may hold for limited periods of time, limited interests in certain private investment funds for which it serves as investment manager. The bank contends that holding such limited interests is convenient and useful for the bank in order to conduct its investment management business. For the reasons set forth below, we conclude that the bank may hold the interests in the funds in the manner and as described herein.

## A. Background

The bank, which is a subsidiary of [A], is a national bank with powers limited to trust powers. As a national bank,
the bank is exempt from registration as an investment advisor under the Investment Advisers Act of $1940 .{ }^{1}$ The bank serves as investment manager for a number of private investment funds organized in the United States (the "funds"). ${ }^{2}$ The funds invest in a variety of financial instruments, including stocks and bonds, currencies, and commodities. The funds use cash instruments as well as over-the-counter and exchange-traded derivatives. The funds also take both short and long positions in securities. The funds may invest in securities and other financial assets in which a national bank ordinarily is not permitted directly to invest. ${ }^{3}$

The funds are structured as multi-advisor funds. As investment manager, the bank chooses the advisors for each fund, allocates fund assets to each advisor, and sets up stop-loss provisions and other limits for the advisors. The bank also monitors the advisors' performance and processes, re-allocates assets among advisors, and, if necessary, terminates advisors that no longer meet performance or other standards. Certain of the funds are organized as Delaware limited partnerships and others are organized as Delaware limited liability companies. All of the funds are taxed as partnerships. Consistent with this tax treatment, all the losses, gains, fees, and expenses are passed through from the funds to their respective investors.

The funds' investors are primarily high-net-worth individuals who meet the definitions of both accredited investors under the Securities Act of $1933^{4}$ and qualified purchasers under the Investment Company Act of 1940. ${ }^{5}$ The funds are marketed primarily by broker-dealers that are affiliates of the bank. These affiliated brokerdealers are registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. ${ }^{6}$ As investment manager, the bank receives both a management fee and a fee for performance for each of the funds. The management fee is a percentage of the assets of each fund. The fee for performance is a percentage of the profits of each fund above a certain hurdle rate.

[^16]The bank represents that it would be to the advantage of U.S. investors in the funds if the bank's compensation for performance were paid as a share of profits, rather than as a fee. To receive a share of the profits, the bank would need to hold an interest in the funds. In the case of funds organized as limited partnerships, the bank would become a special limited partner. As a special limited partner, the bank would not participate in all of the gains and losses of the partnership, but only in the gains equal to the performance fee to which the bank is entitled as investment manager. In the case of funds organized as limited liability companies, the bank would be a special member of those companies, with the same types of rights it would have in the limited partnerships. We refer to the bank's special limited partner and special member interests in the funds as "special interests."

Performance compensation can be a substantial percentage of the funds' respective returns. The bank represents that individual investors, trusts, and investors taxed as partnerships that in turn have individual or trust investors, prefer that investment funds structure performance compensation as an allocation to the investment manager's equity account rather than as a fee. Under U.S. tax law, individual investors must report as income their proportionate share of the gross amount of an investment fund's income and gains before deducting investment-related fees and expenses paid by the investment fund. The limit placed by the U.S. tax laws on the deductibility of these fees and expenses may preclude high-income individuals from deducting their full proportionate share of the fees and expenses of the investment funds. If, however, the investment manager is paid in the form of a profit allocation, rather than through a performance fee, the amount so paid is not treated as income to investors who are not recipients of the allocation.

For these reasons, the bank represents that it is an industry practice for investment advisors and managers of certain types of investment funds to receive performance-related compensation as a profit allocation. The bank has provided examples of other, similar private investment funds that its affiliated broker-dealer markets to investors. The similar funds marketed by the broker-dealer are structured to provide payments for advisory services as fund allocations rather than as fees to maximize tax efficiency for investors. Because several nonbank investment managers follow industry practice in structuring performance compensation as an equity interest, the bank believes that the limitation on deductibility on the funds' performance fees as currently
structured (rather than the proposed performance-based equity allocation to the bank as investment manager) is having a significant adverse effect on the bank's ability to compete for this type of advisory business. The bank represents that if it is not able to structure its performance-based compensation using an allocation of income and gains to its equity account, the funds would be significantly disadvantaged in competing for investors' money.

The bank's ownership interest in the funds would be limited. The bank does not propose to make any out-ofpocket investments in the funds, although it will hold a special interest in each fund to enable it to receive its performance-based compensation in the form of a profit allocation as described above. The bank has represented that under the terms of the instruments governing the funds and creating the special interests, the bank will not participate in any losses suffered by the funds. The bank will account for its special interest in the funds under the equity method of accounting. The bank's loss exposure from an accounting perspective will be limited to the amount of profit allocation it expects to receive as compensation. The special interest would not entitle the bank to voting rights. The bank represents that it will receive a special interest in a fund only while the bank provides investment management services to the fund. The bank will withdraw all profit allocations immediately. ${ }^{7}$

The bank proposes to receive a special interest in a fund for which it serves as investment manager only to the extent it is necessary to attract investors into the fund. The bank will hold special interests only in investment funds that hold securities and financial instruments, and will not invest in any fund that includes real estate or tangible personal property. The bank will hold a special interest in a fund containing bank-ineligible investments only while the bank serves as an investment manager to the fund, and only if the terms of the instruments governing the fund allow the bank to sell, redeem, or otherwise dispose of its equity allocation if it no longer services the fund.

[^17]
## B. Analysis

## 1. The bank's holding an interest in funds in order to engage in the investment advisory business is incidental to the business of banking.

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) has long held that a national bank may provide investment management services as part of the business of banking authorized under 12 USC 24(Seventh) and pursuant to their fiduciary powers under 12 USC 92a. ${ }^{8}$ Section 24(Seventh) also gives national banks incidental powers to engage in activities that are incidental to enumerated bank powers as well as the broader "business of banking." ${ }^{" 9}$ Prior to VALIC, the standard that was often considered in determining whether an activity was incidental to banking was the one advanced by the First Circuit Court of Appeals in Arnold Tours. ${ }^{10}$ The Arnold Tours standard defined an incidental power as one that is "convenient or useful in connection with the performance of one of the bank's established activities pursuant to its express powers under the National Bank Act." ${ }^{11}$ Even prior to VALIC, the Arnold Tours formula represented the narrow interpretation of the "incidental powers" provision of the National Bank Act. The VALIC decision, however, has established that the Arnold Tours formula should be read to provide that an incidental power includes one that is "convenient" or "useful" to the "business of banking," as well as a power incidental to the express powers specifically enumerated in 12 USC 24 (Seventh). Thus, it would be considered incidental to a permissible bank activity for a national bank to hold interests in an investment fund to which it provides investment management services if, under the circumstances presented, holding the interests is convenient or useful to the clearly bank-permissible investment management activities conducted by the bank. ${ }^{12}$

[^18]The OCC recently confirmed that it was legally permissible for an investment advisor that was partly owned by a national bank to hold limited equity interests in certain investment funds to which the investment advisor provided services. ${ }^{13}$ In Interpretive Letter No. 897, the OCC noted several reasons in support of limited equity investments in funds by an investment advisor in which a national bank proposed to hold a noncontrolling interest, to: (1) assure that the advisor's interests were aligned with those of the other investors in the funds; (2) provide a tax-efficient means for the advisor to receive performance-based compensation; and (3) efficiently fund the advisor's obligations to its staff for performancebased bonuses. These three reasons each constituted reasons why the advisor's investments in the funds were convenient or useful to the national bank in carrying out its business, and not mere passive investments unrelated to the bank's business.

In the instant proposal, the bank's ownership for limited periods of small interests in investment funds it manages is directly related to, and an integral part of, the bank's activity of providing bank-permissible investment management and administrative services to certain investment funds. The purpose of holding the special interests is to enable the bank to act as an investment manager to the types of investment funds in which this form of ownership by the investment manager is convenient and useful-indeed, necessary. The level of such investments by the bank in any single fund and in the aggregate will be limited. The proposed special interests in the investment funds are not passive or speculative investments on the bank's part. The investments are made solely to enable the bank to provide investment management services as conducted by its competitors in the investment management industry. As a practical matter, in order to offer the funds it manages, the bank must structure its compensation to hold these investments in this limited manner. They will be held only when, and for so long as, the bank is providing such investment management services.

[^19]Investing in the funds it manages enables the bank to receive its compensation in a manner that provides tax treatment to investors in a fund comparable to that of investors in similar funds. As described above, because performance-based compensation frequently can be a substantial percentage of a private investment fund's returns, the use of a performance-based allocation can have a significant effect on individual investors. As a result, private investment funds traditionally have structured performance compensation as an equity allocation in order to prevent individuals from being disadvantaged by limits on the deductibility of performance-based compensation in the form of fees. Permitting the bank to receive the special interests in the funds enables it to compete more effectively with entities that can offer this tax result to their individual investors.

Accordingly, in the instant case, because the bank's ownership of limited equity interests in the funds it advises is restricted to a context where the holding is integral to facilitating a recognized bank-permissible activity, such holdings are permissible as an incident to the bank-permissible investment management activities.

## 2. Holding an interest in funds in order to engage in the investment advisory business is not prohibited by 12 USC 24(Seventh).

Section 24(Seventh) addresses the ability of a national bank to underwrite and deal in securities. Specifically, section 24(Seventh) provides that " $[t]$ he business of dealing in securities and stock by the association shall be limited to purchasing and selling such securities and stock without recourse, solely upon the order, and for the account of, customers, and in no case for its own account, and the association shall not underwrite any issue of securities or stock: Provided, That the association may purchase for its own account investment securities under such limitations and restrictions as the Comptroller of the Currency may by regulation prescribe."

Here, the bank would not be "dealing" in or "underwriting" securities prohibited for national banks by section 24(Seventh). Although "dealing" and "underwriting" are not defined in section 24(Seventh), ${ }^{14}$ "dealing" in securities is generally understood to encompass the purchase of securities as principal for resale to others. ${ }^{15}$ "Dealing" is buying and selling as part of a regular business. A dealer typically maintains an inventory of securities and holds itself out to the public as willing to purchase and sell and continuously quote prices. ${ }^{16}$ "Underwriting" is generally understood as encompassing the purchase of securities from an issuer for distribution and sale to investors. ${ }^{17}$

Case law confirms that one cannot be an underwriter in the absence of a public offering. ${ }^{18}$

Under the above definitions, the bank receiving the special interests would not constitute "dealing" or "underwriting." The bank has represented that it will receive the special interests solely for purposes of engaging in the investment management business. The bank will not hold the special interests in order to engage in a regular business of buying and selling them in the secondary market ${ }^{19}$ and will not participate in a public offering of the securities to investors.

The ownership by the bank of the special interests would be a type of equity investment, and therefore is not the type of security subject to the limitations placed upon national banks' purchase of investment securities in 12 USC 24(Seventh) or in 12 CFR Part 1. The statutory definition of investment securities includes "marketable obligations evidencing the indebtedness of any person, copartnership, association or corporation in the form of bonds, notes, and/or debentures, commonly known as 'investment securities'" and gives the Comptroller the authority to define further that term. Accordingly, the OCC issued implementing regulations defining "investment securities" at 12 CFR Part 1. Under part 1, an investment security is defined as "a 'marketable' debt obligation that is not predominantly speculative in nature. ${ }^{22}$ Equity securities do not represent debt obligations.

[^20]The language in the fifth sentence of section 24(Seventh)-"nothing herein contained shall authorize the purchase by the association for its own account of any shares of stock of any corporation"-is not a blanket bar on national bank acquisitions of stock. Rather, as discussed below, that language was intended to make clear that the express authorization contained in the statute permitting banks to invest in "investment securities" does not include an authorization for investments in stock. This proviso does not affect national banks' authority to hold equities, if the holding can qualify as permissible because it is part of or incidental to permissible banking activities. ${ }^{21}$

In the present situation, the bank's receiving the special interests enables it to engage in permissible banking activities and act as investment manager for investment funds that, in practice, require the manager to take an equity stake. Institutional and sophisticated individual investors in these funds require the manager to structure the payment of performance fees in this fashion. In this connection, these investments permit the bank to offer funds that provide investors with a tax treatment comparable to that of investors in other, similar funds. The bank would be unable to offer these funds on a competitive basis unless it makes these investments. Based on these circumstances, the proposed investments are an integral component of investment management services provided by the bank to the investment funds.

## C. Conclusion

Based upon a review of the information you provided, including the representations and commitments made in your letter, and for the reasons discussed above, we conclude that the bank may receive the special interests in the funds, subject to the following conditions:
(1) The funds shall constitute "affiliates" of the bank and Citibank, N.A., for purposes of sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act.
(2) Prior to receiving the special interest in the funds, the bank shall adopt and implement an appropriate risk management process, acceptable to the OCC examiner-in-charge, to monitor these interests. The bank's risk management process shall be comprehensive and shall include:
(i) Adoption and implementation of a conflict of interest policy addressing all inherent conflicts associated with the bank's holding of the special interests in the funds; and

[^21](ii) Adoption and implementation of risk management policies and procedures for monitoring the special interests in the funds and the risks associated with those interests, taking into account relevant factors noted in OCC guidance (e.g., OCC Banking Circular 277 (BC 277-October 1993), Supplemental Guidance 1 to BC 277 (January 1999) and the Handbook for National Bank Examiners, "Risk Management of Financial Derivatives" (January 1997)).

The bank shall provide the OCC with copies of the policies and procedures described in (i) and (ii) prior to receiving a special interest in the funds it manages.
(3) The bank shall not receive special interests in the funds other than funds that invest in securities and financial instruments, and the bank shall not invest in any fund that holds real estate or tangible personal property.
(4) The bank shall make reports and other information in the bank's possession readily available to OCC supervisory staff as necessary for the OCC to determine compliance with these conditions.
(5) The bank will account for its special interests in the funds under the equity method of accounting.
(6) The bank will hold special interests in a fund only when, and only for so long as, it is providing investment management services to the fund.

These conditions are conditions imposed in writing by the OCC in connection with its action on the bank's request for a legal opinion confirming that its interest in the funds is permissible under 12 USC 24 (Seventh) and, as such, may be enforced in proceedings under applicable law.

Julie L. Williams
First Senior Deputy Comptroller and Chief Counsel

## 941—June 11, 2002

## 12 USC 24(7)

Dear [ ]:
This responds to your request for confirmation that [ ] ("bank") had authority to acquire preferred stock of [ ] ("company"), a subsidiary of [ ], pursuant to its authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt. The bank acquired the preferred stock ("preferred stock")
as partial consideration for the disposition of a loan portfolio to the company. Based on the information and representations you provided, we conclude that the bank had authority to acquire and may continue to hold the preferred stock pursuant to its authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt. The bank's existing holdings represent less than 5 percent of the bank's capital and surplus and are within applicable limits.

## Background

The bank recently disposed of a portfolio of loans to the company in exchange for cash and preferred stock. The bank had negotiated to dispose of the loan portfolio for cash, but had accepted the company's offer of 90 percent cash and 10 percent preferred stock because the cash portion of the company's offer was significantly higher than other offers the bank received.

The preferred stock was issued in a private placement and is rated above investment grade by two nationally recognized statistical rating organizations. It has a limited life of 20 years and is not otherwise redeemable at the option of the issuer. Dividend payments are cumulative with a fixed dividend of 6.2 percent. Preferred shareholders have a priority over common stockholders upon dissolution of the corporation and have no voting rights other than those required under state law (generally relating to the preferred shareholders' liquidation preference rights). There is a one-year restriction on the sale or transfer of the preferred stock except to the bank's affiliates. After one year, the bank may transfer the preferred stock to a commercial bank, finance company, insurance company, or other financial institution or fund, that is regularly engaged in making, purchasing or investing in loans, and has a tangible net worth in excess of $\$ 100,000,000$. You have asked whether the bank had authority to acquire and hold the preferred stock under its authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt. ${ }^{1}$

[^22]
## Discussion

## A. Legal Authority to Acquire and Hold the Preferred Stock

National banks may acquire and hold preferred stock under the authority in 12 USC 24(Seventh) to discount and negotiate evidences of debt if the preferred stock is, in substance, a debt obligation of the issuer.

Section 24(Seventh) expressly authorizes national banks to conduct the business of banking, including "by discounting and negotiating promissory notes, drafts, bills of exchange and other evidences of debt." ${ }^{2} 12$ USC 24(Seventh). This authority has long included the power to acquire and hold a variety of debt and debt-like instruments, including certain instruments denominated as securities. ${ }^{3}$

For example, the OCC concluded that a national bank could acquire privately placed assets-backed securities under its authority to negotiate evidences of debt. ${ }^{4}$ In that case, the bank had asked whether the assetbacked securities qualified as investment securities under 12 CFR Part 1. The OCC determined that the securities did not meet the marketability requirements for investment securities, but could be purchased under

[^23]the authority to negotiate evidences of debt. The OCC stated that the ability of a national bank to acquire asset-backed securities is not limited by the fact that such investments may not be eligible as investment securities. ${ }^{5}$

The OCC reached the same conclusion in a recent matter involving trust preferred securities. ${ }^{6}$ Trust preferred securities are debt-like instruments that are issued by trusts organized by banks or bank holding companies. In a typical structure, the trust sells common securities to the organizing bank or bank holding company and sells preferred securities to third-party investors. The proceeds of the preferred securities issuance are then used to purchase a junior subordinated debenture from the bank or bank holding company. The bank or bank holding company guarantees that the trust will pay its obligations with the cash it has collected from the interest payments on the junior subordinated debt it owns.

The OCC had previously determined that, although trust preferred securities were denominated as securities, they were, in substance, debt obligations. ${ }^{7}$ As debt obligations, the trust preferred securities would qualify as investment securities as long as they met the applicable rating and marketability requirements of 12 CFR Part 1. The OCC later concluded that national banks could purchase trust preferred securities under the authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt even if they did not qualify as investment securities, because the trust preferred securities were debt obligations. ${ }^{8}$

The OCC has considered several factors to determine whether securities with characteristics of both debt and equity have sufficient indicia of debt to qualify as debt obligations. ${ }^{9}$ These factors include whether the returns on the investment are fixed or based on the success of the enterprise, the voting rights of the stockholder, the obligation to pay dividends, rights of stockholders in the

[^24]event of the failure of the issuer, whether the security has a limited life, and whether it is rated. ${ }^{10}$

These factors distinguish equity securities (or common stock) from debt securities. For example, common stock provides an ownership interest and appreciation of the market value of the issuer and dividends. In contrast, debt securities offer investors periodic interest payments, often in the form of fixed dividend payments, and a principal payment at maturity. In addition, common stock typically is perpetual and has broad voting rights, while debt securities can be perpetual or limited in term and have limited voting rights. In the event of the failure of an issuer, the claims of the common stockholders are subordinate to the holders of debt securities. Finally, rating agencies typically do not rate equity instruments but will assign credit ratings to debt securities.

Relying on these factors, the OCC has determined that national banks may purchase preferred stock as an investment security where the preferred stock can be properly characterized, in substance, as a debt obligation. For example, the OCC concluded that money market preferred stock had sufficient indicia of debt to qualify as an investment security under 12 CFR Part $1 .{ }^{11}$ Like debt holders, money market preferred holders did not share in the appreciation or the profits of the issuer, but instead were entitled to dividends determined by a formula established in the prospectus and principal at redemption. Money market preferred holders also had limited voting rights typical of debt holders. Although the money market preferred stock did not have a set maturity date, the OCC viewed it as similar to a series of fixed maturity instruments because dividend rates on the stock were reset every 49 days. Finally, like other debt instruments, the money market preferred stock was given a credit rating by the rating agencies.

In addition, as noted above, the OCC has concluded that trust preferred securities are debt-like instruments that may be purchased as investment securities or under the authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt. ${ }^{12}$

[^25]Trust preferred securities have many characteristics typically associated with debt obligations including fixed and cumulative dividends, limited voting rights, and limited life.

The preferred stock is analogous in virtually all relevant respects to the preferred stock the OCC has previously concluded are debt obligations and not equity. ${ }^{13}$ The preferred stock has characteristics typically associated with debt obligations, such as corporate bonds and municipal revenue bonds. For example, like debt holders, the preferred stockholders do not share in the profits of the issuer, but rather receive fixed dividend payments during the term of the preferred stock and principal at redemption. Also, like holders of debt, the preferred stockholders do not have authority to vote on ownership matters other than in limited situations. And claims of the common stockholders are subordinate to the holders of the preferred stock upon dissolution of the company. In addition, like most debt, the preferred stock is not perpetual. It has a limited life of 20 years. It is also given a credit rating by rating agencies, just as with debt. Thus, because the preferred stock closely resembles and can be properly characterized, in substance, as debt, the bank may acquire and hold it under the authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt.

Because the preferred stock is, in substance, a debt obligation, the bank's acquisition of the preferred stock does not violate the Glass-Steagall Act's limitation on stock ownership. That provision limits the ownership of the "stock of any corporation" unless "otherwise permitted by law." ${ }^{14}$ Here the preferred stock, despite its label, is not, in substance, "stock of any corporation." ${ }^{15}$ Functionally, it is a debt obligation. As a debt obligation, its acquisition is "otherwise permitted by law." ${ }^{16}$ Specifically, national banks may acquire the preferred stock pursuant to the authority to "discount and negotiate . . . evidences of debt." ${ }^{17}$

## B. Prudential Standards and Regulatory Limits on Preferred Stock

Banks that hold debt obligations, such as the preferred stock, are subject to limits on the amount of debt the bank

[^26]may hold. Most debt obligations are subject to limits of 10 to 15 percent of the bank's capital and surplus. ${ }^{18}$ Some debt obligations, such as subordinated, unsecured long-term debt may be subject to stricter limits for safety and soundness reasons. In this case, the preferred stock represents less than 5 percent of the bank's capital and surplus. ${ }^{19}$ This amount is within the prudential limits that the OCC would apply to such subordinated unsecured long-term debt.

The bank also must adhere to the prudential requirements in Banking Circular 181 (Rev.). ${ }^{20}$ In that regard, the bank should conduct an independent analysis to determine that the acquisition of the preferred stock meets the bank's own internal underwriting standards. The nature and extent of the bank's independent analysis is a function of the type of transaction at issue and the bank's lending policies and procedures. The bank's acceptance of a favorable analysis of the preferred stock by the issuer, a credit rating institution, or another entity does not satisfy the need to conduct an independent credit analysis. The bank may, however, consider analysis by other sources as factors when independently assessing the preferred stock. The bank must maintain its analysis on an ongoing basis and must have continued access to appropriate credit and portfolio performance data as long as it holds the preferred stock.

## Conclusion

The bank had authority to acquire and may hold the preferred stock under its authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt. The bank's existing holdings represent less than 5 percent of the bank's capital and surplus and are within applicable limits. If you have any questions, please contact Beth Kirby, special counsel, at (202) 874-5210.

Ellen Broadman
Director
Securities and Corporate Practices Division

[^27]
## 942-June 11, 2002

## 12 CFR 32.7

Subject: Pilot program for residential real estate loans and small business loans, 12 CFR 32.7

Dear [ ]:
This letter responds to your letters of April 12, 2002, and May 8, 2002, regarding the applicability of the two special limits in the lending limit pilot program (pilot program or program), 12 CFR 32.7, to loans made to finance land development or property construction.

The pilot program provides new special lending limits for residential real estate loans and small business loans under certain conditions. ${ }^{1}$ A residential real estate loan is defined as a loan or extension of credit that is secured by 1-4-family residential real estate. 12 CFR 32.2(p). Such loan must be secured by a perfected first-lien security interest in 1 -4-family real estate in an amount that does not exceed 80 percent of the appraised value of the collateral at the time the loan is made. ${ }^{2}$ A small business loan is defined as a loan or extension of credit "'secured by nonfarm nonresidential properties'3 or 'a commercial or industrial loan' as defined in the instructions for preparation of the Consolidated Report of Condition and Income" (call report instructions). ${ }^{4} 12$ CFR 32.2(r). A bank must apply for approval to use the special limits in the program and must meet certain requirements for eligibility. As you note, ["bank"] has been approved to participate in the pilot program.

A loan secured by real estate made to finance land development or property construction cannot qualify for the special limit for small business loans because the loan is excluded from the category of loans "secured by nonfarm nonresidential properties" and from the category of "commercial and industrial loans." Instead, the call report instructions provide that such construction and land development loans are reported as a separate category of loan, namely, "Construction, land development, and other land loans." ${ }^{5}$ For these reasons, the special limit for small business loans does not extend to a loan secured

[^28]by real estate to finance land development or property construction. ${ }^{6}$

A bank cannot avoid this result by making a construction or land development loan without taking a security interest in the real estate. It is true that not taking a security interest in the real estate would remove the loan from the "Construction, land development, and other land loans" category in the call report instructions, and potentially put it into the "commercial or industrial loan" category, depending upon its other characteristics. However, as you correctly point out in both your letters, making such a construction or land development loan on an unsecured basis would "not appear to be consistent with prudent banking practices." The basic purpose of the lending limit regulation is to "protect the safety and soundness of national banks" by preventing excessive loans to one borrower and promoting diversification of loans. ${ }^{7}$ The pilot program itself stresses that the higher limits being made available in specified circumstances must be used in a manner that is "consistent with safety and soundness." ${ }^{8}$

Finally, a loan made to finance land development or property construction will also not generally qualify for the special limit for residential real estate loans. This is because a residential real estate loan must be secured by an existing, completed $1-4$-family residence. A loan to finance land development or property construction will not generally meet this requirement. ${ }^{9}$

I trust this letter is responsive to your inquiry.

Ray Natter<br>Deputy Chief Counsel

[^29]
## 943-July 24, 2002

## 12 USC 24(7)

Dear [ ]:
This responds to your letter of April 12, 2002, as supplemented by your letter of May 7, 2002, requesting confirmation that [ ] ("bank"), may lawfully acquire and hold a one-third non-controlling equity interest in [ ] ("company"), a [State] limited liability company that will own and operate a single small airplane. For the reasons set forth below, the bank may acquire and hold the interest in the company, in the manner and as described herein.

## A. Background

The bank proposes to make a non-controlling investment in the company, which will own and operate a plane that the bank will use in its conduct of business. The two other owners also plan to utilize the aircraft for their own respective business and personal purposes. The plane will not be used for chartering purposes or to generate income unrelated to the usage of the owners themselves. The bank has almost 50 offices spread across [State1, State2] and [State3], and will use the plane to facilitate bank management's air travel to these various offices. The bank represents that since its offices are located in geographic areas served by small airports offering infrequent commercial flights, reliance upon commercial air-carriers has not been practical or convenient. Thus, this investment will provide the bank with access to an airplane that will permit management to better serve the bank's numerous offices spread across three states.

## B. Analysis

A national bank may engage in activities that are part of or incidental to the business of banking. In a variety of circumstances, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) has permitted national banks to own, either directly, or indirectly through an operating subsidiary, a non-controlling interest in an enterprise. ${ }^{1}$ The OCC has concluded that national banks are legally permitted to make a non-controlling investment in a company provided four criteria or standards are met. ${ }^{2}$ These standards, which have been distilled from our

[^30]previous decisions in the area of permissible noncontrolling investments for national banks and their subsidiaries, are:
(1) The activities of the enterprise in which the investment is made must be limited to activities that are part of, or incidental to, the business of banking (or otherwise authorized for a national bank).
(2) The bank must be able to prevent the enterprise from engaging in activities that do not meet the foregoing standard, or be able to withdraw its investment.
(3) The bank's loss exposure must be limited, as a legal and accounting matter, and the bank must not have open-ended liability for the obligations of the enterprise.
(4) The investment must be convenient or useful to the bank in carrying out its business and not a mere passive investment unrelated to that bank's banking business.

We conclude, as discussed below, that the bank's investment in the company will satisfy these four criteria.

> 1. The activities of the enterprise in which the investment is made must be limited to activities that are part of, or incidental to, the business of banking (or otherwise authorized for a national bank).

The National Bank Act, in relevant part, provides that national banks shall have the power:
[t]o exercise . . . all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry on the business of banking; by discounting and negotiating promissory notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and other evidences of debt; by receiving deposits; by buying and selling exchange, coin, and bullion; by loaning money on personal security; and by obtaining, issuing, and circulating notes....

The Supreme Court has held that this powers clause of 12 USC 24(Seventh) is a broad grant of power to engage in the business of banking, which is not limited to the five enumerated powers. Further, national banks are authorized to engage in an activity if it is incidental to the performance of the enumerated powers in section 24(Seventh) or if it is incidental to the performance of an activity that is part of the business of banking. ${ }^{3}$

[^31]The company will own and operate a single airplane, the use of which will permit bank management to better serve the bank's numerous offices spread across three states. The bank's ownership interest in and operation of an airplane for use in its business is legally permissible under 12 USC 24(Seventh) as part of or incidental to the business of banking.

Its decision to be a one-third owner of the plane (through the company) is based upon projected need and usage by the bank. It requires access to an airplane, but not so much as to justify purchasing one outright. The other two owners will use the airplane for their proportionate share, to the mutual benefit of all three owners. The first standard is satisfied.

## 2. The bank must be able to prevent the enterprise from engaging in activities that do not meet the foregoing standard, or be able to withdraw its investment.

This is an obvious corollary to the first standard. It is not sufficient that the entity's activities are permissible at the time a bank initially acquires its interest; they must also remain permissible for as long as the bank retains an ownership interest.

The bank has the ability and the intention to divest itself of its investment in the company should the company engage in any activities that are impermissible for a national bank. Article XIV of the proposed LLC Operating Agreement that you have submitted for our review stipulates that the company shall be dissolved upon the direction of any LLC member. This ability to divest and the stated intention to do so, if necessary, appear adequate to permit the bank to withdraw its investment in the company should the company undertake impermissible activities. The second standard is thus satisfied.
3. The bank's loss exposure must be limited, as a legal and accounting matter, and the bank must not have open-ended liability for the obligations of the enterprise.

## a. Loss exposure from a legal standpoint.

A primary concern of the OCC is that national banks should not be subjected to undue risk. Where an investing bank will not control the operations of the entity in which the bank holds an interest, it is important that the national bank's investment not expose it to unlimited liability.

The company is a [State] limited liability company. As a legal matter, investors in a [State] limited liability
company do not incur liability with respect to the liabilities or obligations of the limited liability company solely by reason of being a member or manager of the company. ${ }^{4}$ Furthermore, the proposed LLC Operating Agreement includes a provision stating that the members of the company shall have no liability or obligation for any debts, liabilities, or obligations of the company beyond the members' respective capital contributions or obligations to make a capital contribution, except as expressly required by the agreement or applicable law. See Agreement at Article XIX.

Thus, the bank's loss exposure for the liabilities of the company will be limited.

## b. Loss exposure from an accounting standpoint.

In assessing a bank's loss exposure as an accounting matter, the OCC has previously noted that the appropriate accounting treatment for a bank's minority investment in a corporate entity is to report it as an unconsolidated entity under the equity or cost method of accounting. You have represented that the bank will account for its ownership interest in the company according to the equity method of accounting. Under the equity method of accounting, unless the bank has guaranteed any of the liabilities of the entity or has other financial obligations to the entity, losses are generally limited to the amount of the investment, including loans and other advances shown on the investor's books.

Therefore, for both legal and accounting purposes, the bank's potential loss exposure arising from its investment in the company should be limited to the amount of its investment. Since that exposure will be quantifiable and controllable, the third standard is satisfied.

## 4. The investment must be convenient or useful to the bank in carrying out its business and not a mere passive investment unrelated to that bank's banking business.

A national bank's investment in an enterprise or entity must also satisfy the requirement that the investment have a beneficial connection to the bank's business, i.e., be convenient or useful to the investing bank's business activities, and not constitute a mere passive investment unrelated to that bank's banking business. Twelve USC 24(Seventh) gives national banks incidental powers that are "necessary" to carry on the business of banking.

[^32]"Necessary" has been judicially construed to mean "convenient or useful." ${ }^{5}$ Our precedents on bank noncontrolling investments have indicated that the investment must be convenient or useful to the bank in conducting that bank's business. The investment must benefit or facilitate that business and cannot be a mere passive or speculative investment. ${ }^{6}$

In this instance, the bank's ownership interest in the company is neither passive nor speculative, and this ownership interest will be convenient and useful for the bank. The bank has almost 50 offices spread across [State1, State2] and [State3]. As a result of its investment in the company, the bank will have access to an airplane to facilitate bank management's air travel to these various offices. The bank represents that since its offices are located in geographic areas served by small airports offering infrequent commercial flights, reliance upon commercial air-carriers is neither practical nor convenient. Access to the aircraft owned and operated by the company will permit the bank's management to better serve the bank's numerous offices spread across three states. Thus, the investment is not a mere passive investment unrelated to the bank's banking business.

Accordingly, the fourth standard is satisfied.

## C. Conclusion

Based upon a thorough review of the information you provided, including the representations and commitments made in your letters, and for the reasons discussed above, it is my opinion that the bank may acquire a noncontrolling equity investment in the company, subject to the following conditions:
(1) The company will engage only in activities that are permissible for a national bank;
(2) In the event that the company engages in an activity that is inconsistent with condition number one, the bank will divest its interest in the company in accord with the bank's letter of May 7, 2002;
(3) The bank will account for its investment in the company under the equity method of accounting; and

[^33](4) The company will be subject to OCC supervision and examination, subject to the limitations and requirements of 12 USC 1820a and 1831v.

These conditions are conditions imposed in writing by the OCC in connection with this opinion letter stating that the bank's investment in the company is permissible under 12 USC 24(Seventh). As such, these conditions may be enforced in proceedings under applicable law.

If you have any questions, please contact Counsel June Hinson Allen at (404) 588-4520.

Brenda Curry
District Counsel
Southeastern District

## 944—August 12, 2002

## 12 USC 24(7)

Subject: Proposed Loss Notification and Credit Monitoring Services

Dear [ ]:
This is in response to your letter, transmitted via e-mail on June 27, 2002 to Richard Erb, licensing manager, Large Bank Supervision, regarding the proposal of [ ], [City, State] ("bank") to engage in certain loss notification and credit monitoring services. In particular, you seek the OCC's concurrence with your view that the proposed activities are incidental to the business of banking under 12 USC 24(Seventh) and therefore permissible for a national bank.

## Facts

The bank, which specializes in the issuance of retail and business credit cards, proposes to add loss notification and credit monitoring services to its product offerings. Initially these services would be offered solely to the bank's cardholders. At some later time, the bank may also offer these services to cardholders of other issuers and to the general public. Customers would pay a monthly charge for each service. In the case of the bank's own cardholders, such charges would appear on the regular monthly billing statement.

Customers who purchase the bank's loss notification services would be able to register all their credit, debit, ATM, and telephone calling cards with the bank.

Participating customers whose cards were lost or stolen would then be able to notify the bank of the loss or theft and the bank would then (a) notify the issuers of all the lost or stolen cards and (b) request that the cards be canceled or reissued. Through this process, the customers would receive full protection from their respective card issuers for fraudulent charges. They would also be eligible for emergency cash advances.

Customers who purchase the bank's credit monitoring services would also be able to obtain, at any time, the following products or services:
(a) A merged triple credit bureau report (i.e., from the three major credit bureaus);
(b) A current credit score;
(c) Monthly monitoring of their credit record for new accounts, inquiries, and derogatory or adverse information;
(d) Access to their Social Security account to confirm accurate Social Security deductions by past and present employers;
(e) Access to medical information about them on file at the Medical Information Bureau, including health information used by insurance companies; ${ }^{1}$
(f) Access to records of their motor vehicle violations, including points and dates by which points should be removed from their drivers license records; and
(g) Access to credit advisory consultants.

The bank currently offers these services, provided by nonaffiliates, to its own cardholders pursuant to its authority to act as a finder under 12 CFR 7.1002. However, the bank would like to bring these services in-house.

## Analysis

The OCC has traditionally recognized the authority of national banks to organize and perform any of their lawful activities in a reasonable and convenient manner

[^34]not prohibited by law. A national bank may engage in all activities that are part of or incidental to the business of banking. 12 USC 24(Seventh). In NationsBank of North Carolina, N.A., v. Variable Life Annuity Co., 513 U.S. 251 (1995), the Supreme Court held that the "business of banking" is not limited to the enumerated powers in 12 USC 24(Seventh), but rather encompasses activities that are part of the business of banking. Id. at 258. The Court further established that banks may engage in activities that are incidental to the enumerated powers as well as the broader "business of banking."

The OCC determined a number of years ago that loss notification services such as those proposed by the bank are incidental to banking. ${ }^{2}$ Since the issuance of credit cards has long been determined to be a proper activity for national banks, ancillary activities such as loss notification and providing emergency loans are a logical outgrowth of those services.

The OCC has also consistently stated for many years that the operation of a credit bureau is incidental to banking and thus permissible for national banks. ${ }^{3}$ In addition, it has determined that providing credit verification incidental to the issuance of credit cards is permissible. ${ }^{4}$ If it is permissible for a national bank to operate a credit bureau, then it is clearly also permissible for the bank to provide directly to its customers those services that are performed by a credit bureau or are a logical outgrowth of credit bureau activities, i.e., credit reports, credit scores, and monitoring of credit records. Providing access to credit advisory consultants is well within a national bank's longstanding authority to offer financial counseling. 12 CFR 5.34(e)(5)(v)(I); OCC Interpretive Letter No. 137, reprinted in [1981-1982 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) If 85,218 (December 27, 1979).

While the other services proposed to be offered by the bank (providing customers with access to their Social Security, medical, and motor vehicle records) are not viewed as strictly banking, financial, or related economic information, the inclusion of these services along with the other credit monitoring services is permissible. The OCC has long held that, under their incidental powers, national

[^35]banks may sell non-banking products and services when reasonably necessary to provide banking products on a competitive basis by creating a package of related services needed to satisfy consumer demand, meet market competition, and enable the national bank successfully to market its services. See, e.g., OCC Interpretive Letter No. 928, reprinted in [Current Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) II 81-453 (December 24, 2001). ${ }^{5}$ In this case, the inclusion of these other records as part of the credit monitoring services to be offered by the bank will make the overall package more attractive and useful to
${ }^{5}$ See also OCC Interpretive Letter No. 653, reprinted in [1994-1995 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) If 83,601 (Dec. 22, 1994)
customers by providing them with a single convenient source through which to gain access to a wide variety of personal, financial, and other files.

## Conclusion

The loss notification and credit monitoring activities described in your letter are permissible under 12 USC 24(Seventh) because they are part of or incidental to the business of banking.

Sue E. Auerbach
Counsel
Bank Activities and Structure Division
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## Mergers-July 1 to September 30, 2002

Most transactions in this section do not have accompanying decisions. In those cases, the OCC reviewed the competitive effects of the proposals by using its standard procedures for determining whether the transaction has minimal or no adverse competitive effects. The OCC found the proposals
satisfied its criteria for transactions that clearly had no or minimal adverse competitive effects. In addition, the Attorney General either filed no report on the proposed transaction or found that the proposal would not have a significantly adverse effect on competition.

## Nonaffiliated mergers (mergers consummated involving two or more nonaffiliated operating banks), from July 1 to September 30, 2002

Title and location (charter number)
Total assets

| California |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Pacific Western National Bank, Santa Monica (017423) | 781,762,000 |
| and Upland Bank, Upland, California. | 103,887,000 |
| merged on August 22, 2002 under the title of Pacific Western National Bank, Santa Monica (017423) | 871,497,000 |
| Rancho Santa Fe National Bank, Rancho Santa Fe (017212) | 404,164,000 |
| and First National Bank, San Diego, California (017129) | 649,131,000 |
| merged on September 10, 2002 under the title of First National Bank, Rancho Santa Fe (017212) | 1,132,133,000 |
| Pacific Western National Bank, Santa Monica (017423) | 781,727,000 |
| and Marathon National Bank, Los Angeles, California (017915) | 109,300,000 |
| merged on August 23, 2002 under the title of Pacific Western National Bank, Santa Monica (017423) | 891,027,000 |
| Connecticut |  |
| Westport National Bank, Westport (023664) | 80,225,000 |
| and Middlesex Bank \& Trust Company, Newton, Massachusetts | 40,395,000 |
| merged on July 1, 2002 under the title of Westport National Bank, Westport (023664) | 119,945,000 |
| Kansas |  |
| Sunflower Bank, National Association, Salina (004742) | 879,124,000 |
| and Bank of Monte Vista, Monte Vista, Colorado | 68,923,000 |
| merged on September 9, 2002 under the title of Sunflower Bank, National Association, Salina (004742) | 939,690,000 |

Nonaffiliated mergers-thrift (mergers consummated involving nonaffiliated national banks and savings and loan associations), from July 1 to September 30, 2002
Title and location (charter number)
Total assets

## Maine

Banknorth, National Association, Portland (024096) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 21,094,132,000
and Ipswich Savings Bank, Ipswich, Massachusetts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $320,971,000$
merged on July 26, 2002 under the title of Banknorth, National Association, Portland (024096) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 21, 448,031,000

Texas
The First National Bank of Bastrop, Bastrop (004093) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $208,082,000$
and Community Bank of Central Texas, SSB, Smithville, Texas . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
merged on July 29, 2002 under the title of The First National Bank of Bastrop, Bastrop (004093) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 208,082,000

# Affiliated mergers (mergers consummated involving two or more affiliated operating banks), from July 1 through September 30, 2002 

| Title and location (charter number) | Total assets |
| :---: | :---: |
| Illinois |  |
| The First National Bank in Toledo, Toledo (013682) | 150,308,000 |
| and First State Bank of Newman, Newman, Illinois. | 23,300,000 |
| merged on July 15, 2002 under the title of The First National Bank in Toledo, Toledo (013682) . | 173,608,000 |
| Wells Fargo Bank Illinois, National Association, Galesburg (022636) | 351,364,000 |
| and Marquette Bank Monmouth, Monmouth, Illinois | 84,726,000 |
| and Marquette Bank Morrison, Morrison, Illinois | 99,646,000 |
| merged on July 13, 2002 under the title of Wells Fargo Bank Illinois, National Association, Galesburg (022636). | 535,736,000 |
| Bank One, National Association, Chicago (000008) | 178,035,024,000 |
| and Bank One, Colorado, National Association, Denver, Colorado (015184) | 3,589,066,000 |
| and Bank One, Indiana, National Association, Indianapolis, Indiana (013759) | 12,386,042,000 |
| and Bank One, Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. | 6,836,419,000 |
| merged on August 22, 2002 under the title of Bank One, National Association, Chicago (000008) | 192,007,104,000 |
| The First National Bank in Staunton, Staunton (014310). | 239,706,000 |
| and Hamel State Bank, Hamel, Illinois. | 54,873,000 |
| merged on September 21, 2002 under the title of The First National Bank in Staunton, Staunton (014310) | 294,579,000 |
| Minnesota |  |
| Wells Fargo Bank Minnesota, National Association, Minneapolis (002006). | 52,428,420,000 |
| and Marquette Bank, National Association, Rogers, Minnesota (022831). | 2,003,711,000 |
| and Marquette Capital Bank, National Association, Wayzata, Minnesota (023153) | 272,664,000 |
| merged on July 13, 2002 under the title of Wells Fargo Bank Minnesota, National Association, Minneapolis (002006) | 54,477,822,000 |
| F\&M Community Bank, National Association, Preston (024356). | 47,349,000 |
| and F\&M Community Bank, National Association, Chatfield, Minnesota (024089) | 8,217,000 |
| merged on July 1, 2002 under the title of F\&M Community Bank, National Association, Preston (024356) | 55,566,000 |
| TCF National Bank, Minneapolis (023253) | 11,057,665,000 |
| and TCF National Bank Colorado, Englewood, Colorado (023269) | 123,378,000 |
| merged on July 26, 2002 under the title of TCF National Bank, Minneapolis (023253) | 11,157,641,000 |
| Northwestern Bank, National Association, Dilworth (024372) | 75,423,000 |
| and Viking Bank, Hendrum, Minnesota | 26,690,000 |
| merged on August 16, 2002 under the title of Northwestern Bank, National Association, Dilworth (024372) | 102,113,000 |
| Nevada |  |
| Household Bank (SB), National Association, Las Vegas (022675) | 3,200,000,000 |
| and Household Bank (Nevada), National Association, Las Vegas, Nevada (018818) | 1,591,330,000 |
| merged on July 1, 2002 under the title of Household Bank (SB), National Association, Las Vegas (022675) | 4,728,668,000 |
| Household Bank (SB), National Association, Las Vegas (022675) | 4,034,081,000 |
| and Beneficial National Bank USA, New Castle, Delaware (022474). | 78,248,000 |
| merged on July 1, 2002 under the title of Household Bank (SB), National Association, Las Vegas (022675) | 4,112,329,000 |
| New York |  |
| The National Bank of Geneva, Geneva (012450) | 572,175,000 |
| and The Pavilion State Bank, Pavilion, New York | 97,494,000 |
| merged on September 20, 2002 under the title of The National Bank of Geneva, Geneva (012450). | 669,669,000 |

## Affiliated mergers (continued)

| Ohio |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Charter One Bank, National Association, Cleveland (024340) | 38,165,417,000 |
| and Charter Bank, Wyandotte, Michigan | 266,839,000 |
| merged on August 9, 2002 under the title of Charter One Bank, National Association, Cleveland (024340) | 38,492,702,000 |
| First National Bank of Southwestern Ohio, Hamilton (000056) | 1,343,438,000 |
| and Hebron Deposit Bank, Hebron, Kentucky | 102,794,000 |
| merged on July 19, 2002 under the title of First Financial Bank, National Association, Hamilton (000056) | 1,446,232,000 |
| Oklahoma |  |
| Shamrock Bank, National Association, Coalgate (012529) | 43,707,000 |
| and First Bank of Apache, Apache, Oklahoma on September 6, 2002 | 21,463,000 |
| and Clayton State Bank, Clayton, Oklahoma on September 6, 2002 | 19,887,000 |
| and Bryan County National Bank, Caddo, Oklahoma (015106) on August 9, 2002 | 32,778,000 |
| merged on those respective dates under the title of Shamrock Bank, National Association, Coalgate (012529) | 117,835,000 |
| Texas |  |
| Wells Fargo Bank Texas, National Association, San Antonio (014208) | 23,648,435,000 |
| and The First National Bank of Amarillo, Amarillo, Texas (023451) | 347,127,000 |
| merged on August 24, 2002 under the title of Wells Fargo Bank Texas, National Association, San Antonio (014208) | 24,011,753,000 |
| Wisconsin |  |
| Wells Fargo Bank Wisconsin National Association, Milwaukee (015057) | 2,381,193,000 |
| and The First National Bank and Trust Company of Baraboo, Baraboo, Wisconsin (014060) | 100,948,000 |
| and Meridian Capital Bank, National Association, Milwaukee, Wisconsin (023787) | 96,014,000 |
| merged on July 13, 2002 under the title of Wells Fargo Bank Wisconsin National Association, Milwaukee (015057) | 2,578,155,000 |

# Affiliated mergers-thrift (mergers consummated involving affiliated national banks and savings and loan associations), from July 1 through September 30, 2002 

| Title and location (charter number) | Total assets |
| :---: | :---: |
| Maine |  |
| Banknorth, National Association, Portland (024096). | 21,129,898,000 |
| and Southington Savings Bank, Southington, Connecticut | 675,994,000 |
| merged on August 31, 2002 under the title of Banknorth, National Association, Portland (024096) | 21,916,175,000 |
| Tennessee |  |
| EFS National Bank, Memphis (022404). . | 885,297,000 |
| and EFS Federal Savings Bank, Cordova, Tennessee. | 385,000,000 |
| merged on August 26, 2002 under the title of EFS National Bank, Memphis (022404) | 1,270,000,000 |
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## Assets, liabilities, and capital accounts of national banks

September 30, 2001 and September 30, 2002
(Dollar figures in millions)

|  | September 30, 2001 | September 30, 2002 | Change <br> September 30, 2001September 30, 2002 fully consolidated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Consolidated foreign and domestic | Consolidated foreign and domestic | Amount | Percent |
| Number of institutions | 2,169 | 2,092 | (77) | (3.55) |
| Total assets. | \$3,543,818 | \$3,846,111 | \$302,293 | 8.53 |
| Cash and balances due from depositories. | 196,884 | 211,285 | 14,401 | 7.31 |
| Noninterest-bearing balances, currency and coin | 146,048 | 157,617 | 11,569 | 7.92 |
| Interest bearing balances. . | 50,836 | 53,668 | 2,832 | 5.57 |
| Securities | 526,337 | 641,075 | 114,738 | 21.80 |
| Held-to-maturity securities, amortized cost | 25,785 | 25,548 | (237) | (0.92) |
| Available-for-sale securities, fair value. | 500,552 | 615,527 | 114,975 | 22.97 |
| Federal funds sold and securities purchased | 153,896 | 141,591 | $(12,305)$ | (8.00) |
| Net loans and leases . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 2,191,901 | 2,344,654 | 152,753 | 6.97 |
| Total loans and leases | 2,235,067 | 2,392,315 | 157,248 | 7.04 |
| Loans and leases, gross. | 2,236,509 | 2,394,943 | 158,434 | 7.08 |
| Less: Unearned income. | 1,441 | 2,628 | 1,186 | 82.30 |
| Less: Reserve for losses | 43,166 | 47,661 | 4,495 | 10.41 |
| Assets held in trading account | 130,552 | 161,125 | 30,573 | 23.42 |
| Other real estate owned | 1,806 | 1,961 | 155 | 8.59 |
| Intangible assets | 81,541 | 86,762 | 5,221 | 6.40 |
| All other assets | 260,901 | 257,657 | $(3,244)$ | (1.24) |
| Total liabilities and equity capital . . . . . . . . . . . | 3,543,818 | 3,846,111 | 302,293 | 8.53 |
| Deposits in domestic offices | 1,908,241 | 2,114,022 | 205,781 | 10.78 |
| Deposits in foreign offices | 387,767 | 376,022 | $(11,745)$ | (3.03) |
| Total deposits | 2,296,007 | 2,490,044 | 194,036 | 8.45 |
| Noninterest-bearing deposits | 450,957 | 544,018 | 93,061 | 20.64 |
| Interest-bearing deposits. . | 1,845,051 | 1,946,026 | 100,975 | 5.47 |
| Federal funds purchased and securities sold | 272,493 | 258,878 | $(13,615)$ | (5.00) |
| Other borrowed money | 336,192 | 390,546 | 54,353 | 16.17 |
| Trading liabilities less revaluation losses | 26,940 | 26,509 | (431) | (1.60) |
| Subordinated notes and debentures | 64,897 | 67,581 | 2,684 | 4.14 |
| All other liabilities | 218,169 | 245,714 | 27,545 | 12.63 |
| Trading liabilities revaluation losses. | 60,647 | 84,774 | 24,126 | 39.78 |
| Other . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 157,521 | 160,940 | 3,418 | 2.17 |
| Total equity capital | 329,119 | 366,841 | 37,721 | 11.46 |
| Perpetual preferred stock | 805 | 2,703 | 1,899 | 236.00 |
| Common stock | 13,181 | 12,704 | (477) | (3.62) |
| Surplus | 177,354 | 196,733 | 19,379 | 10.93 |
| Retained earnings and other comprehensive income | $144,873$ | $162,318$ | $17,445$ | 12.04 |
| Other equity capital components . . . . . . . . . . . . . | (34) | (34) | 0 | NM |

[^36]
## Quarterly income and expenses of national banks Third quarter 2001 and third quarter 2002


*Includes mortgage indebtedness
NM indicates calculated percent change is not meaningful

# Year-to-date income and expenses of national banks Through September 30, 2001 and through September 30, 2002 

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  | September 30, 2001 | September 30, 2002 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Consolidated foreign and domestic | Consolidated foreign and domestic | Amount | Percent |
| Number of institutions | 2,169 | 2,092 | (77) | (3.55) |
| Net income . | \$31,624 | \$43,213 | \$11,588 | 36.64 |
| Net interest income | 90,283 | 105,605 | 15,322 | 16.97 |
| Total interest income. | 172,193 | 155,771 | $(16,421)$ | (9.54) |
| On loans | 132,917 | 119,530 | $(13,387)$ | (10.07) |
| From lease financing receivables | 5,780 | 5,459 | (321) | (5.55) |
| On balances due from depositories. | 2,108 | 1,384 | (724) | (34.33) |
| On securities. | 23,043 | 23,605 | 562 | 2.44 |
| From assets held in trading account | 2,885 | 2,620 | (264) | (9.17) |
| On federal funds sold and securities repurchased. | 4,698 | 2,149 | $(2,549)$ | (54.26) |
| Less: Interest expense . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 81,910 | 50,166 | $(31,744)$ | (38.75) |
| On deposits. | 55,103 | 33,671 | $(21,433)$ | (38.90) |
| Of federal funds purchased and securities sold. | 8,233 | 3,890 | $(4,344)$ | (52.76) |
| On demand notes and other borrowed money* | 15,648 | 10,190 | $(5,458)$ | (34.88) |
| On subordinated notes and debentures. | 2,925 | 2,416 | (509) | (17.41) |
| Less: Provision for losses | 19,465 | 24,013 | 4,549 | 23.37 |
| Noninterest income | 73,068 | 81,370 | 8,301 | 11.36 |
| From fiduciary activities | 6,463 | 6,590 | 127 | 1.97 |
| Service charges on deposits | 12,473 | 14,420 | 1,947 | 15.61 |
| Trading revenue. | 5,503 | 5,654 | 152 | 2.76 |
| From interest rate exposures | 2,567 | 2,425 | (142) | (5.53) |
| From foreign exchange exposures | 2,466 | 2,368 | (98) | (3.98) |
| From equity security and index exposures | 329 | 513 | 183 | 55.70 |
| From commodity and other exposures | 170 | 351 | 182 | 107.25 |
| Investment banking brokerage fees. | 3,578 | 3,474 | (104) | (2.91) |
| Venture capital revenue. | (574) | (166) | 408 | (71.09) |
| Net servicing fees . . . . | 7,858 | 7,311 | (547) | (6.96) |
| Net securitization income | 8,578 | 11,528 | 2,949 | 34.38 |
| Insurance commissions and fees. | 1,155 | 1,635 | 480 | 41.58 |
| Net gains on asset sales. | 3,579 | 3,965 | 386 | 10.79 |
| Sales of loans and leases. | 1,994 | 3,596 | 1,601 | 80.29 |
| Sales of other real estate owned | (17) | (27) | (10) | 54.77 |
| Sales of other assets(excluding securities) | 1,602 | 397 | $(1,206)$ | (75.24) |
| Other noninterest income | 24,457 | 26,959 | 2,502 | 10.23 |
| Gains/losses on securities | 1,437 | 2,091 | 654 | 45.53 |
| Less: Noninterest expense | 96,034 | 100,058 | 4,024 | 4.19 |
| Salaries and employee benefits. | 37,701 | 41,241 | 3,540 | 9.39 |
| Of premises and fixed assets. | 11,456 | 11,800 | 344 | 3.00 |
| Other noninterest expense. | 42,985 | 44,037 | 1,052 | 2.45 |
| Less: Taxes on income before extraordinary items | 17,297 | 21,821 | 4,524 | 26.16 |
| Income/loss from extraordinary items, net of income taxes | (368) | 39 | 407 | NM |
| Memoranda: |  |  |  |  |
| Net operating income | 31,034 | 41,765 | 10,731 | 34.58 |
| Income before taxes and extraordinary items. | 49,290 | 64,995 | 15,706 | 31.86 |
| Income net of taxes before extraordinary items | 31,992 | 43,174 | 11,181 | 34.95 |
| Cash dividends declared. | 20,863 | 30,943 | 10,080 | 48.31 |
| Net charge-offs to loan and lease reserve | 16,646 | 23,693 | 7,048 | 42.34 |
| Charge-offs to loan and lease reserve. | 19,715 | 27,510 | 7,795 | 39.54 |
| Less: Recoveries credited to loan and lease reserve . | 3,069 | 3,816 | 747 | 24.33 |

*Includes mortgage indebtedness
NM indicates calculated percent change is not meaningful.

# Assets of national banks by asset size <br> September 30, 2002 

|  | All national banks | National banks |  |  |  | Memoranda: <br> All <br> commercial banks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less than } \\ \$ 100 \\ \text { million } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \quad \$ 100 \\ & \text { million to } \\ & \$ 1 \text { billion } \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 1$ billion to $\$ 10$ billion | Greater <br> than $\$ 10$ billion |  |
| Number of institutions reporting. | 2,092 | 966 | 954 | 128 | 44 | 7,933 |
| Total assets. | \$3,846,111 | \$51,373 | \$255,234 | \$395,872 | \$3,143,632 | \$6,932,604 |
| Cash and balances due from | 211,285 | 3,185 | 12,220 | 22,989 | 172,890 | 377,851 |
| Securities | 641,075 | 12,690 | 63,199 | 90,064 | 475,122 | 1,292,320 |
| Federal funds sold and securities purchased | 141,591 | 2,929 | 9,552 | 22,755 | 106,355 | 326,634 |
| Net loans and leases | 2,344,654 | 30,097 | 157,400 | 233,757 | 1,923,399 | 3,993,694 |
| Total loans and leases | 2,392,315 | 30,525 | 159,668 | 237,876 | 1,964,247 | 4,069,196 |
| Loans and leases, gross. | 2,394,943 | 30,567 | 159,861 | 237,964 | 1,966,550 | 4,072,829 |
| Less: Unearned income. | 2,628 | 42 | 194 | 88 | 2,304 | 3,634 |
| Less: Reserve for losses | 47,661 | 428 | 2,267 | 4,119 | 40,847 | 75,502 |
| Assets held in trading account | 161,125 | 0 | 70 | 474 | 160,581 | 385,105 |
| Other real estate owned | 1,961 | 76 | 262 | 226 | 1,396 | 3,954 |
| Intangible assets | 86,762 | 154 | 1,673 | 6,073 | 78,863 | 122,115 |
| All other assets | 257,657 | 2,240 | 10,858 | 19,534 | 225,025 | 430,931 |
| Gross loans and leases by type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans secured by real estate | 1,077,175 | 18,091 | 104,415 | 123,887 | 830,781 | 1,970,709 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 526,620 | 7,852 | 39,648 | 51,160 | 427,960 | 881,535 |
| Home equity loans | 132,839 | 490 | 5,061 | 9,712 | 117,577 | 201,250 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 32,216 | 442 | 3,930 | 4,181 | 23,663 | 68,805 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 248,640 | 5,481 | 40,026 | 41,214 | 161,919 | 541,665 |
| Construction RE loans | 95,803 | 1,658 | 11,047 | 15,401 | 67,697 | 205,853 |
| Farmland loans | 13,208 | 2,168 | 4,703 | 1,713 | 4,624 | 37,787 |
| RE loans from foreign offices | 27,848 | 0 | 1 | 506 | 27,342 | 33,815 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 557,741 | 4,953 | 27,269 | 46,480 | 479,039 | 921,365 |
| Loans to individuals | 440,558 | 3,853 | 18,215 | 45,318 | 373,172 | 688,201 |
| Credit cards* | 203,497 | 167 | 2,601 | 17,261 | 183,467 | 267,659 |
| Other revolving credit plans | 33,406 | 61 | 356 | 2,413 | 30,576 | 38,376 |
| Installment loans. . . . . . | 203,655 | 3,624 | 15,257 | 25,644 | 159,130 | 382,166 |
| All other loans and leases | 319,469 | 3,671 | 9,963 | 22,278 | 283,558 | 492,554 |
| Securities by type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U.S. Treasury securities | 16,040 | 616 | 2,464 | 3,785 | 9,177 | 54,813 |
| Mortgage-backed securities | 400,110 | 3,563 | 23,467 | 49,407 | 323,673 | 695,045 |
| Pass-through securities | 293,992 | 2,564 | 14,564 | 28,144 | 248,721 | 456,782 |
| Collateralized mortgage obligations. | 106,118 | 1,000 | 8,904 | 21,262 | 74,952 | 238,262 |
| Other securities . | 174,887 | 8,488 | 36,953 | 34,376 | $\mathbf{9 5 , 0 7 0}$ | 439,917 |
| Other U.S. government securities . | 61,354 | 5,857 | 21,264 | 16,528 | 17,705 | 220,454 |
| State and local government securities. | 46,065 | 2,077 | 11,212 | 8,376 | 24,401 | 101,298 |
| Other debt securities | 59,076 | 406 | 3,233 | 7,634 | 47,804 | 99,892 |
| Equity securities | 8,391 | 148 | 1,244 | 1,839 | 5,159 | 18,273 |
| Memoranda: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agricultural production loans. | 19,326 | 3,097 | 5,575 | 2,727 | 7,926 | 47,669 |
| Pledged securities . | 305,877 | 4,843 | 28,552 | 38,733 | 233,749 | 643,915 |
| Book value of securities | 628,028 | 12,427 | 61,768 | 88,136 | 465,697 | 1,264,480 |
| Available-for-sale securities | 602,480 | 10,325 | 52,599 | 79,702 | 459,854 | 1,166,436 |
| Held-to-maturity securities. | 25,548 | 2,102 | 9,169 | 8,434 | 5,843 | 98,044 |
| Market value of securities. | 641,835 | 12,753 | 63,509 | 90,301 | 475,273 | 1,295,204 |
| Available-for-sale securities | 615,527 | 10,588 | 54,029 | 81,630 | 469,279 | 1,194,276 |
| Held-to-maturity securities . . . . . | 26,308 | 2,164 | 9,479 | 8,670 | 5,994 | 100,928 |

*Prior to March 2001, also included "Other revolving credit plans."

## Past-due and nonaccrual loans and leases of national banks by asset size September 30, 2002

(Dollar figures in millions)


## Liabilities of national banks by asset size

September 30, 2002
(Dollar figures in millions)


# Off-balance-sheet items of national banks by asset size September 30, 2002 


## Quarterly income and expenses of national banks by asset size Third quarter 2002

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  | All national banks | National banks |  |  |  | Memoranda: <br> All commercial banks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less than } \\ \$ 100 \\ \text { million } \end{gathered}$ | \$100 million to \$1 billion | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1 \text { billion } \\ \text { to } \$ 10 \\ \text { billion } \end{gathered}$ | Greater than $\$ 10$ billion |  |
| Number of institutions reporting. | 2,092 | 966 | 954 | 128 | 44 | 7,933 |
| Net income | \$15,399 | \$152 | \$833 | \$2,093 | \$12,322 | \$23,344 |
| Net interest income | 35,374 | 512 | 2,507 | 3,626 | 28,729 | 59,636 |
| Total interest income. | 52,171 | 765 | 3,768 | 5,315 | 42,323 | 90,710 |
| On loans | 39,941 | 589 | 2,907 | 4,043 | 32,402 | 67,193 |
| From lease financing receivables | 1,762 | 3 | 21 | 61 | 1,677 | 2,561 |
| On balances due from depositories | 436 | 7 | 15 | 27 | 387 | 881 |
| On securities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 8,079 | 149 | 764 | 1,061 | 6,105 | 15,427 |
| From assets held in trading account | 949 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 944 | 2,442 |
| On fed. funds sold \& securities repurchased | 666 | 13 | 45 | 89 | 519 | 1,532 |
| Less: Interest expense . | 16,798 | 253 | 1,262 | 1,689 | 13,593 | 31,074 |
| On deposits | 11,258 | 236 | 1,094 | 1,149 | 8,779 | 21,087 |
| Of federal funds purchased \& securities sold | 1,253 | 2 | 29 | 164 | 1,058 | 2,657 |
| On demand notes \& other borrowed money* | 3,507 | 15 | 136 | 335 | 3,021 | 6,211 |
| On subordinated notes and debentures . . . . . | 780 | 0 | 3 | 42 | 736 | 1,118 |
| Less: Provision for losses | 7,904 | 36 | 190 | 600 | 7,077 | 12,699 |
| Noninterest income | 28,108 | 220 | 1,157 | 3,827 | 22,904 | 43,624 |
| From fiduciary activities | 2,130 | 9 | 149 | 347 | 1,625 | 5,121 |
| Service charges on deposits | 4,935 | 63 | 306 | 433 | 4,133 | 7,601 |
| Trading revenue | 1,833 | 0 | (0) | 16 | 1,817 | 2,389 |
| From interest rate exposures | 1,083 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 1,073 | 1,231 |
| From foreign exchange exposures | 631 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 630 | 1,031 |
| From equity security and index exposures | (9) | 0 | 0 | 5 | (14) | (172) |
| From commodity and other exposures | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 277 |
| Investment banking brokerage fees. . . . | 1,040 | 1 | 17 | 51 | 970 | 2,071 |
| Venture capital revenue. | (359) | (0) | (1) | (1) | (357) | (462) |
| Net servicing fees | 1,771 | 42 | 76 | 237 | 1,415 | 2,345 |
| Net securitization income | 4,350 | 2 | 95 | 483 | 3,770 | 5,653 |
| Insurance commissions and fees. | 523 | 8 | 23 | 47 | 445 | 840 |
| Net gains on asset sales. | 1,947 | 10 | 101 | 825 | 1,011 | 2,851 |
| Sales of loans and leases. | 1,525 | 10 | 98 | 803 | 614 | 2,347 |
| Sales of other real estate owned | (42) | 0 | 2 | 2 | (47) | (35) |
| Sales of other assets(excluding securities) | 464 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 443 | 540 |
| Other noninterest income | 9,938 | 86 | 390 | 1,388 | 8,074 | 15,215 |
| Gains/losses on securities | 1,201 | 8 | 31 | 132 | 1,030 | 2,465 |
| Less: Noninterest expense | 33,740 | 497 | 2,348 | 3,683 | 27,212 | 58,120 |
| Salaries and employee benefits. | 13,848 | 242 | 1,096 | 1,354 | 11,156 | 24,922 |
| Of premises and fixed assets. . | 4,013 | 61 | 293 | 394 | 3,265 | 7,515 |
| Other noninterest expense. | 14,818 | 191 | 940 | 1,835 | 11,850 | 24,209 |
| Less: Taxes on income before extraord. items | 7,602 | 54 | 324 | 1,190 | 6,034 | 11,522 |
| Income/loss from extraord. items, net of taxes. | 39 | (0) | (4) | (19) | 62 | (3) |
| Memoranda: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net operating income | 14,618 | 146 | 809 | 2,021 | 11,642 | 21,713 |
| Income before taxes and extraordinary items. | 23,039 | 206 | 1,157 | 3,301 | 18,375 | 34,906 |
| Income net of taxes before extraordinary items | 15,437 | 152 | 833 | 2,111 | 12,341 | 23,384 |
| Cash dividends declared. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 9,352 | 68 | 369 | 1,098 | 7,818 | 15,388 |
| Net loan and lease losses. | 7,698 | 24 | 125 | 800 | 6,749 | 11,524 |
| Charge-offs to loan and lease reserve. | 8,924 | 32 | 162 | 919 | 7,811 | 13,188 |
| Less: Recoveries credited to loan \& lease resv. | 1,226 | 8 | 37 | 119 | 1,062 | 1,663 |

*Includes mortgage indebtedness

## Year-to-date income and expenses of national banks by asset size Through September 30, 2002

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  | All national banks | National banks |  |  |  | Memoranda: <br> All <br> commercial banks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less than } \\ \$ 100 \\ \text { million } \end{gathered}$ | $\$ 100$ <br> million to \$1 billion | \$1 billion to $\$ 10$ billion | Greater <br> than $\$ 10$ billion |  |
| Number of institutions reporting. . | 2,092 | 966 | 954 | 128 | 44 | 7,933 |
| Net income . | \$43,213 | \$429 | \$2,303 | \$5,198 | \$35,282 | \$68,512 |
| Net interest income | 105,605 | 1,489 | 7,362 | 11,244 | 85,510 | 176,779 |
| Total interest income. | 155,771 | 2,273 | 11,233 | 16,416 | 125,850 | 269,777 |
| On loans | 119,530 | 1,731 | 8,622 | 12,620 | 96,557 | 200,136 |
| From lease financing receivables | 5,459 | 9 | 66 | 184 | 5,199 | 7,845 |
| On balances due from depositories. | 1,384 | 21 | 47 | 66 | 1,251 | 2,736 |
| On securities | 23,605 | 462 | 2,319 | 3,157 | 17,666 | 45,744 |
| From assets held in trading account | 2,620 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 2,603 | 6,698 |
| On fed. funds sold \& securities repurchased | 2,149 | 38 | 128 | 255 | 1,727 | 4,706 |
| Less: Interest expense . | 50,166 | 784 | 3,870 | 5,172 | 40,339 | 92,998 |
| On deposits . | 33,671 | 734 | 3,382 | 3,532 | 26,023 | 63,582 |
| Of federal funds purchased \& securities sold. | 3,890 | 7 | 89 | 500 | 3,293 | 7,916 |
| On demand notes \& other borrowed money*. | 10,190 | 43 | 391 | 1,034 | 8,722 | 18,169 |
| On subordinated notes and debentures . . | 2,416 | 0 | 8 | 107 | 2,301 | 3,332 |
| Less: Provision for losses | 24,013 | 98 | 612 | 1,720 | 21,584 | 35,192 |
| Noninterest income . | 81,370 | 628 | 3,279 | 9,803 | 67,659 | 127,642 |
| From fiduciary activities | 6,590 | 27 | 467 | 1,088 | 5,008 | 15,702 |
| Service charges on deposits | 14,420 | 177 | 860 | 1,231 | 12,152 | 22,021 |
| Trading revenue . | 5,654 | 0 | (1) | 43 | 5,612 | 8,908 |
| From interest rate exposures | 2,425 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 2,401 | 4,290 |
| From foreign exchange exposures | 2,368 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2,365 | 3,591 |
| From equity security and index exposures | 513 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 495 | 724 |
| From commodity and other exposures . | 351 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 351 | 275 |
| Investment banking brokerage fees. . . | 3,474 | 3 | 51 | 152 | 3,267 | 6,754 |
| Venture capital revenue. | (166) | (0) | (1) | (1) | (164) | (508) |
| Net servicing fees | 7,311 | 143 | 223 | 906 | 6,039 | 9,437 |
| Net securitization income. | 11,528 | 6 | 257 | 1,035 | 10,230 | 14,865 |
| Insurance commissions and fees. | 1,635 | 20 | 59 | 123 | 1,432 | 2,558 |
| Net gains on asset sales. | 3,965 | 20 | 238 | 1,239 | 2,469 | 6,064 |
| Sales of loans and leases. | 3,596 | 20 | 229 | 1,205 | 2,142 | 5,551 |
| Sales of other real estate owned | (27) | (1) | 5 | 3 | (34) | (18) |
| Sales of other assets(excluding securities) | 397 | 1 | 4 | 31 | 362 | 531 |
| Other noninterest income | 26,959 | 233 | 1,126 | 3,987 | 21,614 | 41,841 |
| Gains/losses on securities | 2,091 | 14 | 57 | 192 | 1,828 | 4,173 |
| Less: Noninterest expense | 100,058 | 1,454 | 6,882 | 11,548 | 80,174 | 170,995 |
| Salaries and employee benefits. | 41,241 | 708 | 3,222 | 4,055 | 33,257 | 74,306 |
| Of premises and fixed assets. | 11,800 | 176 | 856 | 1,160 | 9,608 | 21,743 |
| Other noninterest expense. | 44,037 | 562 | 2,748 | 6,032 | 34,696 | 71,166 |
| Less: Taxes on income before extraord. items | 21,821 | 151 | 898 | 2,754 | 18,018 | 33,892 |
| Income/loss from extraord. items, net of taxes. | 39 | (0) | (4) | (19) | 62 | (3) |
| Memoranda: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net operating income | 41,765 | 417 | 2,263 | 5,085 | 33,999 | 65,688 |
| Income before taxes and extraordinary items. | 64,995 | 580 | 3,205 | 7,971 | 53,239 | 102,407 |
| Income net of taxes before extraordinary items | 43,174 | 429 | 2,307 | 5,217 | 35,220 | 68,515 |
| Cash dividends declared | 30,943 | 220 | 1,113 | 2,313 | 27,297 | 49,295 |
| Net loan and lease losses. | 23,693 | 62 | 431 | 1,841 | 21,359 | 33,189 |
| Charge-offs to loan and lease reserve. | 27,510 | 88 | 554 | 2,195 | 24,673 | 38,580 |
| Less: Recoveries credited to loan \& lease resv. | 3,816 | 25 | 123 | 354 | 3,314 | 5,391 |

[^37]
# Quarterly net loan and lease losses of national banks by asset size Third quarter 2002 

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  | All national banks | National banks |  |  |  | Memoranda: <br> All <br> commercial <br> banks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Less than \$100 million | \$100 <br> million to <br> \$1 billion | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1 \text { billion } \\ & \text { to } \$ 10 \\ & \text { billion } \end{aligned}$ | Greater <br> than \$10 billion |  |
| Number of institutions reporting. | 2,092 | 966 | 954 | 128 | 44 | 7,933 |
| Net charge-offs to loan and lease reserve . . . | \$7,698 | \$24 | \$125 | \$800 | \$6,749 | \$11,524 |
| Loans secured by real estate | 469 | 2 | 16 | 62 | 388 | 705 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 223 | 1 | 8 | 42 | 173 | 310 |
| Home equity loans | 64 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 80 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 10 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 13 |
| Commercial RE loans . | 78 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 64 | 151 |
| Construction RE loans | 56 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 50 | 112 |
| Farmland loans | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| RE loans from foreign offices. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 2,601 | 9 | 45 | 124 | 2,423 | 4,741 |
| Loans to individuals | 4,167 | 10 | 50 | 596 | 3,511 | 5,446 |
| Credit cards. | 3,016 | 2 | 14 | 535 | 2,465 | 3,914 |
| Installment loans and other plans | $1,151$ | 8 | 36 | 61 | $1,046$ | $1,532$ |
| All other loans and leases . . . . . . . | 461 | 3 | 14 | 18 | 427 | 632 |
| Charge-offs to loan and lease reserve . | 8,924 | 32 | 162 | 919 | 7,811 | 13,188 |
| Loans secured by real estate | 566 | 4 | 21 | 88 | 453 | 855 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 257 | 2 | 9 | 48 | 198 | 361 |
| Home equity loans | 74 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 69 | 93 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 10 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 14 |
| Commercial RE loans . . . . . . . . . . | 103 | 1 | 9 | 17 | 77 | 197 |
| Construction RE loans | 72 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 58 | 133 |
| Farmland loans | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| RE loans from foreign offices. | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 47 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 2,997 | 11 | 54 | 151 | 2,781 | 5,289 |
| Loans to individuals | 4,817 | 13 | 71 | 657 | 4,075 | 6,289 |
| Credit cards. | $3,371$ | 2 | 21 | 570 | 2,778 | 4,332 |
| Installment loans and other plans | $1,446$ | 11 | 50 | $88$ | $1,297$ | 1,956 |
| All other loans and leases | 545 | 3 | 16 | 23 | 502 | 755 |
| Recoveries credited to loan and lease reserve. | 1,226 | 8 | 37 | 119 | 1,062 | 1,663 |
| Loans secured by real estate | 97 | 1 | 5 | 25 | 65 | 150 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 34 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 26 | 52 |
| Home equity loans | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 14 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Commercial RE loans . . . . . . . . | 25 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 13 | 45 |
| Construction RE loans | 16 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 21 |
| Farmland loans | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| RE loans from foreign offices. | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 396 | 2 | 8 | 27 | 358 | 548 |
| Loans to individuals | 650 | 3 | 21 | 62 | 564 | 842 |
| Credit cards. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 355 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 313 | 419 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 295 | 3 | 14 | 27 | 251 | 424 |
| All other loans and leases . . . . . . | 84 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 75 | 123 |

## Year-to-date net loan and lease losses of national banks by asset size Through September 30, 2002

(Dollar figures in millions)

|  | All national banks | National banks |  |  |  | Memoranda: <br> All <br> commercial banks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less than } \\ \$ 100 \\ \text { million } \end{gathered}$ | \$100 million to \$1 billion | \$1 billion to $\$ 10$ billion | Greater than $\$ 10$ billion |  |
| Number of institutions reporting. | 2,092 | 966 | 954 | 128 | 44 | 7,933 |
| Net charge-offs to loan and lease reserve . . | 23,693 | 62 | 431 | 1,841 | 21,359 | 33,189 |
| Loans secured by real estate | 1,408 | 10 | 55 | 147 | 1,197 | 2,046 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 647 | 4 | 23 | 69 | 552 | 891 |
| Home equity loans | 209 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 196 | 252 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 21 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 31 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 292 | 5 | 24 | 35 | 229 | 518 |
| Construction RE loans | 131 | 1 | 4 | 23 | 104 | 233 |
| Farmland loans | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 19 |
| RE loans from foreign offices. | 96 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 95 | 102 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 7,841 | 21 | 118 | 355 | 7,347 | 12,490 |
| Loans to individuals | 13,077 | 27 | 229 | 1,297 | 11,524 | 16,773 |
| Credit cards. | 9,857 | 5 | 130 | 1,076 | 8,645 | 12,472 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 3,220 | 21 | 99 | 221 | 2,879 | 4,302 |
| All other loans and leases. | 1,368 | 5 | 29 | 43 | 1,291 | 1,880 |
| Charge-offs to loan and lease reserve | 27,510 | 88 | 554 | 2,195 | 24,673 | 38,580 |
| Loans secured by real estate | 1,665 | 13 | 69 | 192 | 1,392 | 2,475 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 748 | 5 | 29 | 81 | 633 | 1,050 |
| Home equity loans | 237 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 220 | 292 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 24 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 17 | 39 |
| Commercial RE loans . . . . . . . | 358 | 6 | 30 | 50 | 273 | 656 |
| Construction RE loans | 165 | 1 | 5 | 35 | 124 | 282 |
| Farmland loans | 15 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 30 |
| RE loans from foreign offices. | 117 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 116 | 127 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 9,082 | 28 | 150 | 437 | 8,467 | 14,181 |
| Loans to individuals | 15,130 | 38 | 298 | 1,509 | 13,285 | 19,649 |
| Credit cards. | 10,963 | 6 | 154 | 1,193 | 9,610 | 13,981 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 4,166 | 31 | 144 | 316 | 3,675 | 5,668 |
| All other loans and leases . . . . | 1,633 | 9 | 38 | 57 | 1,530 | 2,275 |
| Recoveries credited to loan and lease reserve | 3,816 | 25 | 123 | 354 | 3,314 | 5,391 |
| Loans secured by real estate | 257 | 3 | 14 | 45 | 195 | 429 |
| 1-4 family residential mortgages | 101 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 81 | 159 |
| Home equity loans . . . . . . | 28 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 24 | 40 |
| Multifamily residential mortgages | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Commercial RE loans. | 66 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 45 | 137 |
| Construction RE loans | 34 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 20 | 50 |
| Farmland loans | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| RE loans from foreign offices. | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 25 |
| Commercial and industrial loans | 1,241 | 7 | 31 | 83 | 1,120 | 1,691 |
| Loans to individuals | 2,052 | 11 | 70 | 212 | 1,760 | 2,876 |
| Credit cards. | 1,107 | 1 | 24 | 117 | 964 | 1,509 |
| Installment loans and other plans | 946 | 10 | 45 | 95 | 796 | 1,367 |
| All other loans and leases . . . . . . | 266 | 4 | 9 | 14 | 239 | 394 |

## Number of national banks by state and asset size

September 30, 2002

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |

# Total assets of national banks by state and asset size <br> September 30, 2002 



## Affiliated mergers:

For quarter, 57
Affiliated mergers-thrift:
For quarter, $\mathbf{5 9}$
Appeals process, 21
Assets, liabilities, and capital accounts of national banks (financial table), 63
Assets of national banks by asset size (financial table), 66
Assets, total, of national banks by state and asset size (financial table), 75

Commercial banks:
Condition and performance of, $\mathbf{1}$
Number of commercial banks by state, 74
Off-balance-sheet items, 69
Past-due and nonaccrual loans and leases, 67
Quarterly income and expenses, 64
Quarterly net loan and lease losses, 72
Total assets, 66
Total assets by state, 75
Total liabilities, 68
Year-to-date income and expenses, 65
Year-to-date net loan and lease losses, 73
Condition and performance of commercial banks, $\mathbf{1}$
Congressional testimony, speeches and, 23
Corporate decisions, recent, 19

Decisions, recent corporate, 19

Financial performance of national banks, tables on the, $\mathbf{6 1}$
Hawke, John D., Jr., Comptroller of the Currency:
Biography, inside front cover
Speech, 25
Interpretations, 29
Interpretive letters:
Interpretive Letter No. 938, Permissibility of combining bank loans to meet legal lending limit, 31
Interpretive Letter No. 939, Federal preemption of state law on automated teller machines, $\mathbf{3 4}$
Interpretive Letter No. 940, Permissibility of bank holdings in private investment funds, $\mathbf{3 8}$
Interpretive Letter No. 941, Permissibility of bank acquiring preferred stock, 42
Interpretive Letter No. 942, Applicability of special lending limits in financing land development, 46

Interpretive Letter No. 943, Permissibility of acquiring interest in limited liability company, 47
Interpretive Letter No. 944, Permissibility of loss
notification and credit monitoring services, 49

Key indicators, FDIC-insured commercial banks (condition tables):

Annual 1998-2001, year-to-date through quarter, 10
By asset size, 12
By region, 14
Key indicators, FDIC-insured national banks
(condition tables):
Annual 1998-2001, year-to-date through quarter, 4
By asset size, 6
By region, 8

Liabilities of national banks by asset size
(financial table), 68
Loan performance, FDIC-insured commercial banks (condition tables):

Annual 1998-2001, year-to-date through quarter, 11
By asset size, 13
By region, 15
Loan performance, FDIC-insured national banks
(condition tables):
Annual 1998-2001, year-to-date through quarter, 5
By asset size, 7
By region, 9

Mergers:
Affiliated, (involving affiliated operating banks), for quarter, 57
Affiliated, -thrift (involving affiliated national banks and savings and loan associations), for quarter, 59
Nonaffiliated, (involving two or more nonaffiliated operating banks), for quarter, 55
Nonaffiliated, -thrift (involving nonaffiliated national banks and savings and loan associations), for quarter, 56

Nonaffiliated mergers:
For quarter, 55
Nonaffiliated mergers-thrift:
For quarter, 56
Number of national banks by state and asset size (financial table), 74

Off-balance-sheet items of national banks by asset size (financial table), 69
Office of the Comptroller of the Currency:
Interpretations, 29
Speeches and congressional testimony, 23

Past-due and nonaccrual loans and leases of national banks by asset size (financial table), 67

Quarterly income and expenses of national banks by asset size (financial table), 70
Quarterly income and expenses of national banks (financial table), 64
Quarterly net loan and lease losses of national banks by asset size (financial table), 72

Recent corporate decisions, 19

Speeches and congressional testimony:
Of John D. Hawke, Jr., Comptroller of the Currency:
On the OCC's relationship to community banks, 25

Tables on the financial performance of national banks, 61 Testimony, congressional, speeches and, 23
Total assets of national banks by state and asset size (financial table), 75

Year-to-date income and expenses of national banks by asset size (financial table), 71
Year-to-date income and expenses of national banks (financial table), 65
Year-to-date net loan and lease losses of national banks by asset size (financial table), 73

12 CFR 32.7 (interpretive letter), 46
12 USC 24(7) (interpretive letter), 34, 38, 42, 47, 49
12 USC 84(d)(2)(b) (interpretive letter), 31


Northeastern District
New York District Office 1114 Avenue of the Americas Suite 3900
New York, NY 10036-7780
(212) 819-9860

Midwestern District
Kansas City District Office 2345 Grand Boulevard Suite 700
Kansas City, MO 64108-2683
(816) 556-1800

S outhwestern District
Dallas District Office
1600 Lincoln Plaza, Suite 1600
500 North Akard Street
Dallas, TX 75201-3394
(214) 720-0656

Southeastern District
Atlanta District Office
Marquis One Tower, Suite 600
245 Peachtree Center Ave., NE
Atlanta, GA 30303-1223
(404) 659-8855

## Headquarters

Washington Office
250 E Street, SW
Washington Office
250 E Street, SW
Washington, DC 20219-0001
(202) 874-5000

## Central District

Chicago District Office
One Financial Place, Suite 2700 440 South LaSalle Street Chicago, IL 60605-1073
(312) 360-8800

## Western District

San Francisco District Office 50 Fremont Street
Suite 3900
San Francisco, CA 94105-2292
(415) 545-5900

For more information on the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, contact:
OCC Public Information Room, Communications Division, Washington, DC 20219 fax (202) 874-4448****e-mail FOIA-PA@occ.treas.gov


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Nonspecialty category excludes credit card and trust banks.

[^1]:    Source: OCC GBFA review of six housing studies

[^2]:    *Prior to March 2001, credit cards included "Other revolving credit plans."

[^3]:    *Prior to March 2001, credit cards included "Other revolving credit plans."

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ See 12 USC 84(a); 12 CFR 32.2(a).
    ${ }^{2} 12$ CFR 32.2(a).

[^5]:    ${ }^{3}$ See 12 CFR 32.5(a). A guarantor is considered a "borrower" only if that guarantor is deemed to be a borrower under the direct benefit or common enterprise tests set forth at 12 CFR 32.5. See 12 CFR 32.2(a).
    ${ }^{4} 12$ CFR 32.5(b).
    ${ }^{5}$ See 12 CFR 32.5(c).
    ${ }^{6}$ In addition to the general limit on loans to one borrower, there is an additional limit which applies to loans to a corporate group. See 12 CFR $32.5(\mathrm{~d})$. Loans to a corporate group may not exceed 50 percent of a national bank's capital and surplus. 12 CFR $32.5(\mathrm{~d})(1)$. A corporate group is defined as a person and all of its subsidiaries. Id. For the purpose of this rule, a corporation or limited liability company is a subsidiary of a person if that person owns more than 50 percent of the voting interests of the corporation or company. Id. This limit is independent of the general 15 percent limit on loans to one borrower set forth at 12 USC 84 and 12 CFR 32.3. This special limit applies to a corporate group regardless of whether loans to different members of the corporate group are combined for the general 15 percent limit.

[^6]:    ${ }^{7}$ See 12 CFR 32.5(c)(2).
    ${ }^{8}$ See 12 CFR 32.2(g). The term "person" as used section 32.2(g) means, among other things, a corporation, limited liability company, partnership or a trust. See 12 CFR 32.2(k).

[^7]:    ${ }^{9}$ See OCC Interpretive Letter from Jonathan Rushdooney, attorney (December 24, 1986) (unpublished).
    ${ }^{10}$ West's projected site development costs for 2001 of $\$ 8,700 \mathrm{M}$ divided by its total projected expenditures for 2001 of $\$ 10,226 \mathrm{M}$ equal 85 percent; East's projected site development costs for 2001 of $\$ 1,075 \mathrm{M}$ divided by its total projected expenditures for 2001 of $\$ 1,494 \mathrm{M}$ equals 72 percent.
    ${ }^{11}$ Note that the critical issue here is the percentage of West's and East's gross expenditure paid to [Inc. 2], not whether 100 percent of the site development cost will be paid to [Inc. 2].

[^8]:    ${ }^{12}$ Interpretive Letter No. 563, reprinted in [1991-1992 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. $\mathbb{T} 83,314$, at 71,439 (September 6, 1991).
    ${ }^{13}$ Id.; see also Kenneth C. Rojc, National Bank Lending Limits-A New Framework, 40 Bus. Law. 903, 923-24 (1985)(citing various OCC interpretive letters).

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ As explained below, the issue presented by the bank's request is essentially identical to the issue addressed in Bank One v. Guttau, 190 F.3d 844 (8th Cir. 1999). For that reason, the publication and comment requirements of 12 USC 43 are not applicable to the bank's request. See 12 USC 43(c)(1). The OCC provided an opportunity for regulators in the affected states to comment, however, and this letter therefore takes into account comments on the bank's request the OCC received from the Florida Division of Banking and Finance and the Massachusetts Office of Consumer Affairs.

[^10]:    ${ }^{2}$ In his letter responding to the OCC's request for Florida's comments on the bank's preemption request, Richard T. Donelan, Jr., the chief counsel of the Florida Division of Banking and Finance, did not address this staff interpretation of the Florida statute. Mr. Donelan did, however, confirm that Florida "provides criminal penalties for the taking of deposits by financial institutions that are not authorized to do business in Florida. . . ."
    ${ }^{3} 12$ CFR 7.4003.

[^11]:    ${ }^{4}$ The powers clause of section 24 (Seventh) provides that a national bank may "exercise by its board of directors or duly authorized officers or agents, subject to law, all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry on the business of banking . . . ." 12 USC 24(Seventh). See NationsBank v. Variable Annuity Life Ins. Corp., 513 U.S. 251 (1995) (the "business of banking" is not limited to the list of powers enumerated in section 24(Seventh)).
    ${ }^{5} 64$ Fed. Reg. 60092 (Nov. 4, 1999).
    ${ }^{6}$ See 12 USC 36(c)-(g).
    ${ }^{7}$ See Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act, Pub. L. No. 104-208, § 2205(a), 110 Stat. 3009-405 (Sept. 30, 1996); see also Bank One, Utah v. Guttau, 190 F.3d 844 (8th Cir. 1999), cert. denied sub nom., Foster v. Bank One, Utah, 120 S. Ct. 1718 (2000) (Iowa location, registration, and advertising restrictions on national bank ATMs preempted).

[^12]:    ${ }^{8}$ U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2 (the Supremacy Clause); Cohen v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat.) 264, 414 (1821) (Marshall, C.J.).
    ${ }^{9}$ U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl.3, cl. 18; McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316, 409 (1819).
    ${ }^{10}$ E.g., Jones v. Rath Packing Co., 430 U.S. 519 (1977).
    ${ }^{11}$ Rice v. Norman Williams Co., 458 U.S. 654, 659 (1982).
    ${ }^{12}$ See, e.g., Franklin National Bank, 347 U.S. 373 (1954); Davis v Elmira Savings Bank, 161 U.S. 275 (1896).
    ${ }^{13} 517$ U.S. 25, 31 (1996).

[^13]:    ${ }^{14}$ Barnett, 517 U.S. at 33.
    ${ }^{15}$ See, e.g., New York Bankers Association, Inc. v. Levin, 999 F. Supp. 716 (W.D.N.Y. 1998).
    ${ }^{16}$ Barnett, 517 U.S. at 34 (citations omitted; emphasis in original).
    ${ }^{17} 458$ U.S. 141 (1982).
    ${ }^{18}$ See, e.g., 12 USC 93, 481, and 1818.

[^14]:    ${ }^{19}$ Guthrie v. Harkness, 199 U.S. 148 (1905); Bank One Texas, N.A. v. Patterson, No. 3:93-CV-1081-G (N.D. Tex. Sept. 9, 1994), aff'd 68 F.3d 469 (5th Cir. 1995).
    ${ }^{20} 12$ CFR 7.4000(a)(2). See also First National Bank of Youngstown v. Hughes, 6 F. 737, 740-41 (1881).
    ${ }^{21}$ Id. at 850; see also Metrobank, N.A., et al. v. Foster, No. 4-01-CV-10226, order at 12, n. 7 (S.D. Iowa Aug. 21, 2001) (Guttau persuasive in determining that it is appropriate for the district court to address similar question of whether Iowa prohibition on ATM fees is preempted).

[^15]:    ${ }^{22}$ See Barnett, 517 U.S. at 34; 12 CFR 7.4003. Even if the bank were able to satisfy the requirements imposed by Massachusetts and Florida, the barriers to entry presented by these states' laws would constitute an impermissible exercise of visitorial powers over the bank. As explained above, Congress intended to permit national banks to receive deposits and to have "all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry on the business of banking." 12 USC 24(Seventh). Federal regulations expressly interpret this grant to include the authority to use ATMs. 12 CFR 7.4003. Massachusetts provides that an out-of-state bank, including a national bank, must "have applied to and obtained approval of the commissioner prior to" establishing an ATM. Similarly, the Florida statute requires an out-of-state bank, including a national bank, to become "authorized" by the Banking Department before establishing a deposit-taking ATM in Florida. A state requirement that a national bank obtain state approval or license to exercise a power authorized under federal law is an assertion by the state that it has supervisory or regulatory authority over national banks. This is in direct conflict with the federal law providing that the OCC has exclusive visitorial powers over national banks except as otherwise provided by federal law. 12 USC 484; 12 CFR 7.4000. A state law that purports to vest this authority in a state is preempted.
    ${ }^{23} 15$ USC 1693-1693r.
    ${ }^{24} 15$ USC 1693q.
    ${ }^{25}$ Guttau, 190 F. 3d at 850 .

[^16]:    ${ }^{1} 15$ USC 80b-1 to 80b-21.
    ${ }^{2}$ In addition to the funds, the bank also serves as investment manager for a number of private investment funds organized outside the United States. This letter does not address the permissibility of the bank's activities with respect to the foreign funds.
    ${ }^{3}$ The bank plans to invest only in funds that invest primarily in securities. Any non-securities investments will be limited to financial investments, and will not include real estate or tangible personal property.
    ${ }^{4} 15$ USC 77a to 77aa.
    ${ }^{5} 15$ USC 80a-1 to 80a-64.
    ${ }^{6} 15$ USC 77b et seq.

[^17]:    ${ }^{7}$ The bank has indicated that it will have a standing request for redemption of all equity allocations from each fund. The bank will receive the redemption proceeds on the same business day that a fund determines the final amount of each allocation. Because the bank will in effect withdraw all profit allocations immediately, the amount of the bank's interest in any fund as a practical matter would, consistent with Interpretive Letter No. 897, supra, never exceed 24.99 percent of the total equity of any fund.

[^18]:    ${ }^{8}$ See, e.g., Interpretive Letter No. 897 (October 23, 2000) reprinted in [20002001 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking Law. Rep. (CCH) II 81-416; Interpretive Letter No. 851 (December 8, 1999) reprinted in [1998-1999 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) $\llbracket$ 81,308; Interpretive Letter No. 871 (October 14, 1999) reprinted in [1999-2000 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) II 81,365; Conditional Approval Letter No. 164 (December 9, 1994); Interpretive Letter No. 648 (May 4, 1994) reprinted in [1994 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) $[83,557$; Interpretive Letter No. 647 (April 15, 1994), reprinted in $[1994$ Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) $I[83,558$; Interpretive Letter No. 622 (April 9, 1993) reprinted in [1993-1994 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) $[$ 83,557; Interpretive Letter No. 403 (December 9, 1987), reprinted in [1988-1989 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) If 85,627.
    ${ }^{9}$ VALIC, supra, at 258 n. 2.
    ${ }^{10}$ Arnold Tours v. Camp, 472 F.2d 427 (1st Cir. 1972)("Arnold Tours").
    ${ }^{11}$ Id. at 432.

[^19]:    ${ }^{12}$ See Interpretive Letter No. 897 (October 23, 2000), reprinted in [20002001 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking Law. Rep. (CCH) If 81-416. See also Interpretive Letter No. 742 (August 19, 1996), reprinted in [1997-1998 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) If 81-106; Interpretive Letter No. 737 (August 19, 1996), reprinted in [1997-1998 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) If 81-101; Interpretive Letter No. 494 (December 20, 1989), reprinted in [1989-90 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) qif 83,083.
    ${ }^{13}$ Interpretive Letter No. 897 (October 23, 2000), reprinted in [2000-2001 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking Law. Rep. (CCH) If 81-416.

[^20]:    ${ }^{14}$ Although the securities laws definitions are not dispositive in determining whether a particular type of securities activity is permitted for banks, these definitions provide a useful starting point for characterizing a bank's securities activities. Under section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, a "dealer" is defined as "any person engaged in the business of buying and selling securities for his own account, through a broker or otherwise, but does not include any person insofar as he buys or sells securities for his own account, either individually or in some fiduciary capacity, but not part of a regular business." 15 USC 78c(a)(5). Under the Securities Act of 1933, an "underwriter" includes "any person who has purchased from an issuer with a view to, or offers or sells for an issuer in connection with, the distribution of any security." 15 USC 77(b)(a)(11).
    ${ }^{15}$ Interpretive Letter No. 393 (July 5, 1987), reprinted in [1988-1989 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH)_ If 85,617 (national bank with limited market presence not considered a dealer). See also Louis Loss, Securities Regulation 2983-84 (3d ed. 1990).
    ${ }^{16}$ Citicorp, J.P. Morgan \& Co. Inc., Banker Trust New York Corporation, 73 Fed. Res. Bull. 473 n. 4 (1987); OCC Interpretive Letter No. 684, supra.
    ${ }^{17}$ Interpretive Letter No. 388 (June 16, 1987), reprinted in [1998-1989 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) II 85,612; Interpretive Letter No. 329 (March 4, 1985), reprinted in [1985-1987 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) II 85,499.
    ${ }^{18}$ SIA v. Board of Governors, 807 F.2d 1052 (D.C. Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 483 U.S. 1005 (1987).
    ${ }^{19}$ The bank will not act as market maker in the securities by quoting prices continuously on both sides of the market.
    ${ }^{20} 12$ CFR 1.2(e).

[^21]:    ${ }^{21}$ The legislative history of the language in the fifth sentence of section 24 (Seventh) is discussed in detail in Interpretive Letter No. 892 (September 13, 2000).

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) has permitted national banks to purchase and hold preferred stock as Type III investment securities if the securities meet the applicable rating and marketability requirements of 12 CFR 1.2. See Interpretive Letter No. 777 (April 8, 1997), reprinted in [1997 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) II 81-204. The OCC does not express any view on whether the preferred stock, in this case, meets the marketability requirements of 12 CFR 1.2 or qualifies as a Type III investment security. Regardless of whether it qualifies as a Type III investment security, however, the preferred stock should be reported as a security under Financial Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 115: Accounting for Certain Investments in Debt and Equity Securities. In addition, the preferred stock should be categorized as a security and listed in Schedule B (Securities) in the call report.

[^23]:    ${ }^{2}$ The courts have long held that the term "discount" includes purchases of notes and other evidences of debt. See, e.g., National Bank v. Johnson, 104 U.S. 271 (1881); Steward v. Atlantic National Bank, 27 F.2d 224, 228 (9th Cir. 1928); Morris v. Third National Bank, 142 F. 25 (8th Cir. 1905); Danforth v. National State Bank of Elizabeth, 48 F. 271 (3d Cir. 1891). See also 12A Words and Phrases 285-95 (West 1954 and Supp. 1986). And negotiation is a form of transfer, disposition or sale. Black's Law Dictionary 934 (5th ed. 1979); 28 Words and Phrases 758-766 (West 1955 \& Supp. 1986). Thus, the OCC has concluded that the authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt includes the authority to purchase and sell debt and debt-like instruments. See, e.g., OCC Conditional Approval No. 262, Interpretations and Actions, Dec. 1997, Vol. 10, No. 12 ("the power to discount and negotiate is the power to purchase and sell, and purchasing and selling as principal defines underwriting and dealing").
    ${ }^{3}$ See Interpretive Letter No. 833 (July 8, 1998), reprinted in [1998 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) If 81-287; Interpretive Letter No. 834, (July 8, 1998), reprinted in [1998 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) II 81-288; Interpretive Letter No. 600 (July 31, 1992), reprinted in [1992-1993 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) If 83,427; Interpretive Letter No. 182 (March 10, 1981), reprinted in [1981-1982 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) II 85,263. The OCC has sometimes referred, more broadly, to a national bank's "general lending authority" to purchase debt securities rather than the authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt. For example, the OCC approved a bank's purchase of participation certificates that represented interests in pools of FHA-insured Title I property improvement loans under its general lending powers. See, e.g., Interpretive Letter No. 579 (March 24, 1992), reprinted in [1991-1992 Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) If 83,349 . This reference to a bank's general lending authority includes the authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt.
    ${ }^{4}$ Interpretive Letter No. 600, supra.

[^24]:    ${ }^{5} I d$.
    ${ }^{6}$ Interpretive Letter No. 908, reprinted in [Current Transfer Binder] Fed. Banking L. Rep. (CCH) If 81-433 (April 23, 2001).
    ${ }^{7}$ Interpretive Letter No. 777, supra.
    ${ }^{8}$ Interpretive Letter No. 908, supra.
    ${ }^{9}$ Some of these decisions addressed whether the securities would qualify as investment securities and did not discuss the authority to discount and negotiate evidences of debt. Nonetheless, these decisions are instructive because the OCC first had to determine whether the securities were debt obligations in order to determine whether they qualified as investment securities. An investment security is, by definition, "a marketable debt obligation that is not predominately speculative in nature." 12 CFR 1.2(e).

[^25]:    ${ }^{10}$ See, e.g., Interpretive Letter No. 777 and Interpretive Letter No. 781, both supra.
    ${ }^{11}$ See Interpretive Letter No. 781, supra (money market preferred stock closely resembles and can be properly characterized in substance as debt).
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