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I. Introduction

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Sarbanes, and members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the regulatory burden relief initiatives, including efforts pursuant to the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act (EGRPRA), of the Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS).

Removing unnecessary regulatory obstacles that hinder profitability, innovation, and competition in our financial services industry, and that also impede job creation and economic growth in the general economy, is an important and continuing objective of OTS. Although we have accomplished much in recent years to streamline and eliminate some of the burdens faced by the thrift industry, there remain many other areas for improvement. We are fully committed to work with you, Mr. Chairman, and the Members of the Committee to address these issues.

Before proceeding to my testimony, Mr. Chairman, I want to recognize the tireless efforts of Senator Crapo and his staff on pursuing regulatory burden reduction legislation, as well as Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) Vice Chairman John Reich, who has spearheaded the interagency EGRPRA
regulatory burden reduction effort. As you know, Vice Chairman Reich has been nominated to serve as the OTS Director. We look forward to working with him on these and the numerous other issues and challenges facing OTS and the thrift industry.

OTS's highest priority items for regulatory burden relief legislation are:

- Removing the continuing duplicative oversight burden and disparate treatment of savings associations under the federal securities laws by providing savings associations the same exemptions as banks with respect to investment adviser and broker-dealer activities that each conducts on otherwise equal terms and under substantially similar authority.

- Eliminating the existing arbitrary limits on thrift consumer lending activities.

- Updating commercial lending limits for federal savings associations to enhance their ability to diversify and to provide small and medium-sized businesses greater choice and flexibility in meeting their credit needs.

- Establishing statutory succession authority within the Home Owners' Loan Act (HOLA) for the position of the OTS Director.

I will explain each of these items in more detail and describe several other initiatives that we are recommending for enactment. All of these items are included in the Matrix of Financial Services Regulatory Relief Proposals, which
has been included in the record. For your convenience, the items are identified by their Matrix number below.

Before addressing these issues, it is important to note that there are two areas not addressed in this statement that many of our institutions have identified as unduly burdensome—the Bank Secrecy Act requirements and the rules under the Sarbanes Oxley Act. Virtually all institutions raise these two issues as regulatory relief priorities. While we recognize the need for relief in these areas, I do not believe we are at a point right now to be able to make sound recommendations on where to make effective reforms without compromising the underlying purposes of these laws, but we are working with the other federal banking agencies (FBAs) and others to develop recommendations for reform.

II. Revising the Federal Securities Laws to Eliminate Duplicative Regulatory Burdens for Savings Associations [Matrix # 52]

OTS’s most important regulatory burden reduction legislative priority is revising the federal securities laws so that savings associations are relieved of a duplicative burden imposed on them with respect to their investment adviser and broker-dealer activities. This is easily accomplished by revising the federal securities laws so that savings associations and banks are treated equally. As described more fully below, this involves exempting savings associations from the investment adviser and broker-dealer registration requirements to the same extent that banks are exempt under the Investment Advisers Act (IAA) and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (1934 Act).

Although the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) has issued several proposals purportedly to address the duplicative burden imposed on
savings associations, the application of the federal securities laws in these two areas remains a needless additional burden with no additional supervisory benefit for savings associations. Significant disparities remain under the IAA, with savings associations subject to an entirely duplicative SEC oversight regime. Equally significant, it remains uncertain how the SEC will ultimately treat savings associations for purposes of the broker-dealer exemption. In the SEC’s most recent iteration on this issue, it indicated that it would roll back an interim rule that had extended equal treatment to savings associations vis-à-vis banks for purposes of the broker-dealer exemption. While these issues remain in flux, there has been nothing to indicate that we are heading in the direction of reducing needless duplicative oversight for savings associations under the federal securities laws.

Underscoring the case for eliminating these duplicative requirements is the fact that banks and savings associations provide the same investment adviser, trust and custody, third party brokerage, and other related investment and securities services in the same manner and under equivalent statutory authorities. With respect to the oversight and regulation of these activities, OTS examines investment and securities activities of savings associations the same way as the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) and the other federal banking agencies examine the same bank activities—with savings association and bank customers equally well-protected.

To avoid the regulatory burden and substantial costs of this duplicative regulatory structure, some OTS-regulated savings associations have converted to

banks (or to state chartered trust companies) to take advantage of the bank registration exemption. In addition, some institutions have avoided opting for a thrift charter in the first place because of the SEC registration requirements.

The different purposes of the various banking charters make our financial services industry the most flexible and successful in the world. While OTS strongly supports charter choice, that decision should be based solely on the merits of the charter—by choosing a charter that fits a particular business strategy—not on unrelated and extraneous factors such as SEC registration requirements and avoiding duplicative regulation under the federal securities laws.

The existing inequity under the federal securities laws undermines our collective efforts to maintain a strong and competitive banking system. Eliminating the unnecessary costs associated with the IAA and 1934 Act registration requirements would free up significant resources for savings associations in local communities. It would also reduce the regulatory burden and substantial costs associated with a duplicative regulatory structure that has already dictated some institutions' charter choice—an issue recognized by Chairman Donaldson in the context of the discussion on the SEC's IAA proposal.2

A. Investment Adviser Registration

Prior to enactment of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLB Act) in 1999, banks—but not savings associations—enjoyed a blanket exemption under the IAA.

While the GLB Act slightly narrowed the bank exemption, banks may still provide investment management and advisory services to all types of accounts without registering as an investment adviser. The one exception is that a bank (or a department of the bank) must register when it advises a registered investment company, such as a mutual fund.

On May 7, 2004, the SEC issued a proposal providing a narrow exemption from IAA registration to savings associations that limit their investment management and advisory services to a limited range of accounts. Under the proposal, savings association fiduciary accounts are segregated into two categories. Savings associations that provide services to accounts that include only traditional trust, estate, and guardianship accounts would be exempt from registration. Savings associations providing services to accounts that include investment management, agency accounts and other accounts that the SEC has defined as not being for a fiduciary purpose would be required to register as an investment adviser.3

The practical effect of this approach is that it provides an extremely limited exemption that does not provide meaningful regulatory relief for savings associations. This fact was made clear to the SEC Commissioners at a meeting last year when the SEC staff advised the Commissioners that none of the savings associations currently registered under the IAA—there are 42 savings associations currently registered (and 3 registered operating subsidiaries)—would be able to take advantage of the proposed exemption since all provide investment management and advisory services for both account categories.

3. A more detailed description and comparison of bank and savings association activities, and applicability of the IAA to each, is set forth in an attachment to this statement.
While the SEC wants to apply the federal securities laws in two different manners depending on the business operations of a savings association, there is no distinction between these two categories of accounts under the HOLA and OTS regulations applicable to savings associations. The accounts in both categories are fiduciary accounts that receive the same protections under the HOLA and OTS regulations and are subject to similar examination scrutiny. There is no logical basis why savings associations, unlike banks, need duplicative regulatory oversight by the SEC of account activities that OTS already supervises and examines. This is far from functional regulation, but rather over-regulation that accomplishes nothing in the way of a legitimate policy objective.

Savings associations registered as investment advisers have indicated to OTS that registration costs are substantial. IAA costs include registration fees, licensing fees for personnel, and audit requirements, as well as the many hours management must devote to issues raised by duplicative SEC supervision, examinations and oversight. Costs related to legal advice for IAA registration are also a factor. An informal survey of most of our largest IAA-registered savings associations shows aggregate annual costs ranging from $75,000 to $518,200.

Limiting the types of accounts for which a savings association may provide investment management and advisory services to avoid IAA registration, as the SEC has proposed, has the likely effect of negating any meaningful exemption. Generally, institutions will not opt to enter the trust and asset management business line and then decide to forego the most profitable aspects of the business activity. In fact, from a safety and soundness standpoint, we would have to question the rationale behind such an approach. Savings associations providing investment management and advisory services should be encouraged to provide
competitive products and services to the fullest extent practicable and without concern for arbitrary triggers that could significantly increase their compliance cost and supervision. This is particularly important from a regulatory burden reduction perspective when you consider that a bank competitor will incur none of the regulatory costs and burdens as a savings association for engaging in exactly the same activities.

Ironically, many of these same themes were cited as the basis for the SEC's recent rule exempting certain broker-dealers from the IAA registration requirements. Minimizing duplicative regulation, changes reflecting developments and advances in industry practices, acknowledging underlying Congressional intent to carve out certain types of entities from IAA registration because of parallel federal oversight, and ensuring and maintaining consistent consumer protections are all reasons supporting the SEC's exemption for broker-dealers under the IAA. These same reasons support an IAA exemption for savings associations.

Duplicative registration and oversight without any additional supervisory or regulatory benefit is, as we all recognize, regulatory burden in its truest form. For the same reasons that SEC registered broker-dealers should not be subject to registration under the IAA, OTS-licensed savings associations should not be subject to IAA registration.

In addressing this issue, it is important to recall that in July 2000 an amendment was offered by Senator Bayh (on regulatory burden reduction legislation then pending before the Committee) to extend the IAA exemption to savings associations so that savings associations and banks could compete equally in the provision of investment management and advisory services. As the Senator
and others on the Committee at the time may recall, during consideration of the amendment, the SEC represented to the Committee that legislation was not needed to resolve this problem since the SEC would be able to resolve the issue by regulation.\textsuperscript{4} Five years later the issue remains unresolved with virtually no likelihood of changing given that the SEC’s May 2004 proposal offers no relief to existing IAA-registered savings associations. This fact, alone, underscores why nothing short of a legislative solution is adequate to resolve this issue going forward.

While OTS submitted a comment letter to the SEC discussing why the proposed IAA rule is flawed, we are not optimistic that it will change anything given the history of this issue. After much discussion for several years between OTS and the SEC staff, we have not made any headway toward a mutually satisfactory solution. We have no reason to believe that a comment letter outlining all of the discussions that we have already had with the SEC staff will sway the SEC’s position on this issue. This further underscores the need for legislation.

B. Broker-Dealer Registration

A similar duplicative burden exists for savings associations under the broker-dealer provisions of the 1934 Act. Extending the current bank broker-dealer exemption to savings associations would eliminate this duplicative burden. Banks—but not savings associations—enjoyed a blanket exemption from broker-

\textsuperscript{4} During deliberations on the Competitive Markets Supervision Act before the Senate Banking Committee in July 2000, Senator Bayh proposed an amendment to extend the IAA exemption to savings associations. As noted in Senator Bayh’s statement and subsequent letter to the SEC (attached), the amendment was withdrawn pending the SEC’s offer to resolve the issue by regulation.
dealer registration requirements under the 1934 Act before changes were made by the GLB Act. The GLB Act removed the blanket exemption and permitted banks to engage only in specified activities without having to register as a broker-dealer. All other broker-dealer activities must be “pushed out” to a registered broker-dealer. The SEC issued interim broker-dealer rules on May 11, 2001, to implement the new “push-out” requirements. As part of the broker-dealer “push out” rules, the SEC exercised its authority to include savings associations within the bank exemption. This treated savings associations the same as banks for the first time for purposes of broker-dealer registration. In the interim broker-dealer rule, the SEC recognized it would be wrong to continue disparate, anomalous treatment between savings associations and banks.

The SEC postponed the effective date of the interim rule several times. It published proposed amendments to the interim dealer rule on October 20, 2002, and the final dealer rule on February 24, 2003. The final dealer rule gives savings associations the same exemptions as banks. On June 30, 2004, the SEC published in the Federal Register a new proposed rule governing when a bank or savings association must register as a broker.

Unlike the SEC’s final dealer rule and interim broker rule, under the new broker proposal savings associations would no longer be treated the same as banks in all respects. Although savings associations would be treated the same as banks for purposes of the 11 statutory activities they may engage in without registering as a broker with the SEC, as provided by the GLB Act, three non-statutory exemptions provided banks would not be extended to savings associations. The SEC describes the three non-statutory exemptions as targeted exemptions that recognize the existing business practices of some banks. We understand that the SEC staff does not believe savings associations are engaged in the exempted
securities activities and will only extend relief for savings associations to the securities activities they are currently performing. A separate analysis conducted by OTS, however, indicates that savings associations currently engage in all of the securities activities covered by the three additional exemptions. This information was forwarded to the SEC staff pursuant to their request. Moreover, since the exemptions apply to all banks—whether or not they are currently engaged in one of the exempted activities—this approach is not logical. OTS has strongly urged the SEC to remove this new disparity and the additional duplicative burden it imposes on savings associations.

As was the case in the SEC’s investment adviser proposal, in issuing its proposed broker rule, the SEC passed on the opportunity to streamline its overlapping oversight of savings association broker-dealer activities by providing the equivalent treatment to savings associations as banks receive. In both instances, the SEC has proposed to treat savings associations differently than banks in fundamentally important respects. Both of these actions impose duplicative regulatory burdens and demonstrate the continuing, immediate need for legislation to provide relief to savings associations under the federal securities laws.

III. Removing Disparate Standards in Savings Association Consumer Lending Authority [Matrix # 82]

Another important regulatory burden legislative proposal for OTS is eliminating an anomaly that exists under HOLA relating to the consumer lending authority for savings associations. Currently, consumer loans are subject to a 35 percent of assets limitation, while there is no limit on loans a savings association may make through credit card accounts, even though the borrower may use the
loan for the same purposes. Ironically, consumer loans subject to the 35 percent cap are typically secured loans, whereas credit card loans—subject to no savings association investment limit—are not secured. Removing the 35 percent cap on consumer lending will permit savings associations to engage in secured lending activities to the same extent that they may make unsecured credit card loans. Our hope is that this will increase savings association secured lending activities relative to unsecured credit card lending, thereby improving the overall safety and soundness of savings association loan portfolios, as well as providing regulatory burden relief.

A related amendment would address a similar anomaly that exists with how savings associations compute so-called "qualified thrift investments" (QTI) under the qualified thrift lender (QTL) test. Currently, a savings association may count 100 percent of its credit card loans as QTI, but other consumer loans count as QTI only to the extent that these and other categories of loans do not exceed 20 percent of the savings association’s “portfolio assets.” This restriction is arbitrary, unduly complex, and unique to the thrift industry. It bears no relationship to the relative risks presented by the loan and, in our experience, the existing limit is irrelevant to the safe and sound operation of an institution. Removing this artificial limit would enable savings associations to perform more effectively as the retail institutions their customers need and expect, without impairing safety and soundness.

IV. Eliminating Obstacles to Small Business Lending by Federal Savings Associations [Matrix # 53]

Another OTS legislative priority is reducing statutory limitations on the ability of federal savings associations to meet the small business and other
commercial lending needs of their communities by providing businesses greater choice and flexibility for their credit needs. HOE.A now caps the aggregate amount of loans for commercial purposes at 20 percent of a savings association’s assets. Commercial loans in excess of 10 percent of assets must be in small business loans. OTS supports legislative provisions that remove the current limit on small business lending and increase the cap on other commercial lending from 10 percent to 20 percent of assets.

In addition to being good for small business job creation and the economy, there are several reasons why we have concluded that these changes make sense for savings associations from a policy perspective. First, this will give savings associations greater flexibility to promote safety and soundness through diversification. Additional flexibility, particularly in small business lending, will provide opportunities to counter the undulations of a cyclical mortgage market. This will enable savings association managers to continue to meet their ongoing customers’ mortgage and consumer lending needs, while providing additional resources to manage their institutions safely and soundly. In addition, some savings associations are at or near the current statutory limits and must curtail otherwise safe and sound business lending programs. Finally, this proposal will enable savings associations that have a retail lending focus to be able to achieve the economies of scale necessary to engage in this activity safely and profitably.

Small business lending is an integral component of job growth and employment in the United States.5 This proposal would increase competition for,

5. There are currently 23 million small businesses in the United States, representing 99.7 percent of U.S. employers. These firms employ more than half of all private sector employees, accounting for 44 percent of the U.S. private sector payroll. Small businesses generate between 66 to 80 percent of all net new jobs annually, and are responsible for over 50 percent of the U.S.
and the availability of, small business and other commercial loans now and in the future as savings associations develop this line of business. This will be particularly welcome to smaller businesses that have experienced difficulty in obtaining relatively small loans from large commercial banks that set minimum loan amounts as part of their business strategy—a problem that may increase with industry consolidation. Finally, the proposal will also assist businesses that prefer borrowing from entities like savings associations that meet the needs of borrowers with personal service.

V. Agency Continuity – Creating Statutory Succession Authority and Modernizing Appointment Authority for the OTS Director [Matrix #: 59]

OTS urges Congress to authorize the Treasury Secretary to appoint one or more individuals within OTS to serve as OTS Acting Director in order to assure agency continuity. Similarly, it is important to modernize the existing statutory appointment authority for the OTS Director by permitting an appointee a new five-year term.

The first proposal would revise the current procedure of relying on the Vacancies Act to fill any vacancy that occurs during or after the term of an OTS Director or Acting Director. This would eliminate potential concerns and time constraints imposed by the Vacancies Act process under which OTS currently operates. The latter proposal would eliminate reliance on an antiquated

appointment process that currently requires a new OTS Director to fill out the expiring term of a predecessor, rather than receiving a new five-year term.

We believe that both of these revisions are important given our continuing focus on the stability of the financial system and the regulatory oversight agencies in the event of a national emergency. For example, existing uncertainty about succession authority for an OTS Acting Director could impair the ability of OTS to act effectively and decisively in a crisis if an existing OTS Director or an Acting Director, such as me, suddenly was incapacitated as a result of an event arising from a national emergency.

The OCC has long-standing authority for appointing Deputy Comptrollers, and both the FDIC and Federal Reserve Board have succession authority built into their operative authorizing statutes. One approach to ensure OTS continuity would be to amend HOLA to permit the Treasury Secretary to make the OTS appointments so each potential OTS Acting Director would qualify as an “inferior officer” under the Appointments Clause of the Constitution.

The safety and soundness of the banking system depends on regular, uninterrupted oversight by the FBAs. The reality of the appointments process is that there can be a delay of many months before a sub-cabinet level position is filled, and these delays have grown significantly over the last 20 years. An event resulting in numerous vacancies in the Executive Branch would, of course, exacerbate this problem. In light of these growing, and potentially greater, delays, it is important to promote stability and continuity within OTS by encouraging

longevity within the position of the OTS Director, as well as to establish a statutory chain of command within OTS. Implementing these suggested changes will avoid the possibility of gaps in authority to regulate and supervise savings associations, eliminate uncertainty for the savings associations OTS regulates, and avoid potential litigation over whether the acts of OTS staff are valid.

The vacancy issue is of particular concern to OTS because we are the only financial services sector regulator that could be readily exposed to a vacancy problem. During a vacancy, OTS succession now occurs through the process of the Vacancies Act, which has inherent uncertainty regarding immediate succession when the OTS Director departs and limits the period an Acting Director may serve. The organic statutes of the other financial regulators minimize or avoid vacancy problems by providing for automatic and immediate succession or by vesting authority in the remaining members of a board or commission.

VI. Other Regulatory Burden Reduction Proposals

OTS also recommends enactment of other important regulatory burden relief initiatives. We appreciate the opportunity to work with the Committee’s staff on these and other provisions that will benefit the thrift industry.

A. Authorizing Federal Savings Associations to Merge and Consolidate with Nondepository Affiliates [Matrix # 57]

OTS favors giving federal savings associations the authority to merge with one or more of their nondepository institution affiliates, equivalent to authority
enacted for national banks at the end of 2009.\textsuperscript{8} The Bank Merger Act would still apply, and the new authority does not give savings associations the power to engage in new activities.

Under current law, a federal savings association may only merge with another depository institution. This proposal reduces regulatory burden on savings associations by permitting mergers with nondepository affiliates where appropriate for sound business reasons and if otherwise permitted by law. Today, if a savings association wants to acquire the business of an affiliate, it must engage in a series of transactions, such as merging the affiliate into a subsidiary and liquidating the subsidiary into the savings association. Structuring a transaction in this way can be costly and unduly burdensome. We support permitting savings associations to merge with affiliates, along with the existing authority to merge with other depository institutions.

B. Amending the International Lending Supervision Act (ILSA) to Support Consistency and Equal Representation [Matrix # 66 & 67]

Two amendments to ILSA that we previously proposed would promote greater consistency among U.S. regulators in supervising the foreign activities of insured depository institutions.

\textsuperscript{8} Section 6 of the National Bank Consolidation and Merger Act (12 U.S.C. § 215a-3).
1. Applying ILSA to Savings Associations

OTS recommends making federal and state savings associations (and their subsidiaries and affiliates) subject to ILSA on the same basis as other banking institutions. This will eliminate regulatory burden by promoting the uniform supervision of insured depository institutions. OTS is already covered by ILSA along with the other FBAs, but savings associations are not. In enacting ILSA, Congress sought to assure that the economic health and stability of the United States and other nations would not be adversely affected by imprudent lending practices or inadequate supervision. A depository institution subject to ILSA must, among other things:

- Establish special reserves necessary to reflect risks of foreign activities; and

- Submit to the appropriate FBA quarterly reports on its foreign country exposure.

The legislative history of ILSA is silent on the international lending activities of savings associations because these institutions were not active in international finance in 1983. While savings associations maintain a domestic focus—providing credit for housing and other consumer needs within the United States—some savings associations have significant foreign activities. These include investing in foreign currency-denominated CDs, offering foreign currency exchange services, and making loans on the security of foreign real estate or loans to foreign borrowers. In addition, numerous savings and loan holding companies (SLHCs) have international operations (including several foreign-based holding
companies) that provide opportunities for expanded international operations by the subsidiary savings association.

While OTS has broad supervisory powers under HOLA to oversee all activities of savings associations, their subsidiaries, and their affiliates, making savings associations subject to ILSA will enhance OTS's ability to carry out its responsibilities under ILSA and promote consistency among the federal regulators in supervising the foreign activities of insured depository institutions.

2. OTS Representation on the Basel Committee on Bank Supervision

Amending ILSA to support equal representation for OTS on the Basel Committee will enable OTS to share its expertise with respect to consolidated supervision of diverse, internationally active holding companies, one-to-four family and multifamily residential lending, consumer lending, and interest rate risk management. SLHCs operate in more than 130 countries, control over $6 trillion in assets, and their savings association subsidiaries originate almost one in every four residential mortgage loans in the United States. At $2.6 trillion in one-to-four family residential mortgage loan originations in 2004, this market stands as the largest credit market in the world, with over $9 trillion in currently outstanding loans.9

OTS currently participates in numerous Basel Committee working groups and subcommittees. Giving OTS a recognized voice on Basel will help assure that

9. See Mortgage Bankers Association Mortgage Finance Forecast (June 6, 2005).
international bank supervision policies do not inadvertently harm savings associations or the numerous internationally active SLHCs.

C. Clarification of Citizenship of Federal Savings Associations for Federal Diversity Jurisdiction [Matrix # 58]

Pursuant to federal diversity jurisdiction, a federal savings association may sue or be sued in federal court if the claim exceeds $75,000 and the parties are citizens of different states. OTS previously proposed an amendment clarifying that, for purposes of determining diversity jurisdiction, a federal savings association is a citizen only of the state where it has its home office. We would also support a similar proposal, however, that designates that a federal savings association is a citizen for diversity jurisdiction purposes of either its home state or the state in which its principal place of business is located.

Some courts have determined that if a savings association that is organized as a stock corporation conducts a substantial amount of business in more than one state, it is not a citizen of any state and, therefore, it may not sue or be sued in federal court under diversity jurisdiction. Either of the pending diversity jurisdiction proposals would avoid this result. Both would also avoid a potential similar problem with respect to mutual savings associations. The general rule for an unincorporated association is that it is a citizen of every state of which any of its members is a citizen. If a court were to apply this general rule to mutual savings associations, those operating regionally or nationally with depositors across the country would find it difficult or impossible to establish diversity jurisdiction. Both versions of the diversity jurisdiction proposal would establish a uniform rule governing federal jurisdiction, when a savings association is involved and, accordingly, reduce confusion and uncertainty.
D. Enhancing Examination Flexibility [Matrix # 68]

Current law requires the FBAs to conduct a full-scale, on-site examination for the depository institutions under their jurisdiction at least every 12 months. There is an exception for small institutions that have total assets of less than $250 million and are well-capitalized and well-managed and meet other criteria. Examinations of these small institutions are required at least every 18 months.

When originally enacted in 1991, the small institution examination exception was available to institutions with assets less than $100 million (assuming the other statutory criteria were satisfied). This statutory threshold was raised to $250 million in 1994 for institutions in outstanding condition and meeting the other statutory criteria. In 1996, the FBAs were authorized to extend the $250 million threshold to institutions in good condition. Given the fact that the current threshold has been in place for more than eight years, OTS recommends considering whether the $250 million cap should once again be raised. If so, we support the position endorsed by all of the FBAs that consideration of a $500 million cap for well-capitalized, well-managed institutions is appropriate.

This proposal would reduce regulatory burden on low-risk, small institutions and permit the FBAs to more effectively focus their resources on the highest risk institutions.
E. Removal of Qualified Thrift Lender Requirements with Respect to Out-of-State Branches of Federal Savings Associations [Matrix # 54]

OTS also supports removing the requirement that federal savings associations meet the QTL test on a state-by-state basis. This requirement is a superfluous regulatory burden because interstate savings associations may currently structure their activities to assure compliance with the state-by-state requirement. Thus, there is no meaningful purpose for maintaining this requirement. The QTL test should, of course, continue to apply to the institution as a whole.

F. Authority for a Savings and Loan Holding Company to Own a Separate Credit Card Savings Association [Matrix # 99]

Another unnecessary and burdensome statutory provision is a limitation imposed on existing SLHCs that limits their activities (to those permissible for a multiple SLHC) for the acquisition or chartering of a limited purpose credit card savings association, but permits acquiring or chartering (without any activities limitations) of a substantially similar limited purpose credit card bank. This restriction arises out of the fact that a SLHC generally cannot own more than one savings association (unless acquired in a supervisory transaction), without being subject to the activities restrictions imposed on SLHCs owning multiple savings associations. Under the HOLA, a SLHC cannot charter or acquire a limited purpose credit card savings association, but can charter or acquire a limited purpose credit card bank without triggering the multiple SLHC restrictions or being treated as a bank holding company under the Bank Holding Company Act.
From a regulatory burden perspective, it makes no sense to subject a SLHC structure to an additional bank regulator, i.e., supervising a limited purpose credit card bank, simply because of a statutory activities limitation that provides the SLHC cannot own an otherwise permissible limited purpose credit card savings association that it can own if the entity is a bank. This result is illogical and excessive regulatory burden with no additional supervisory or regulatory benefit attached. An amendment providing that a limited purpose credit card savings association is not deemed a savings association, or is excluded from consideration, in applying the activities restrictions imposed on multiple SLHCs under the HOLA would fix this problem.

G. Modernizing the Community Development Investment Authority of Savings Associations [Matrix # 55]

OTS previously proposed and continues to support updating HOLA to give savings associations the same authority as national banks and state member banks to make investments to promote the public welfare. This proposal enhances the ability of savings associations to contribute to the growth and stability of their communities.

Due to changes made to HUD’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program more than 20 years ago, investment opportunities that meet the technical requirements of savings associations’ current statutory community development authority are rare. As a result, OTS has found it cumbersome to promote the spirit and intent of Congress’s determination to allow savings associations to make such community development investments. Currently, using its administrative authority, OTS may issue a “no action” letter when a savings association seeks to make a community development investment that satisfies the
intent of the existing provision, but does not clearly fall within the wording of the statute or the "safe harbor" criteria issued by OTS for these investments. The no-action process, however, takes time, lacks certainty, and is clearly burdensome.

The proposal closely tracks the existing authority for banks. Under the proposal, savings associations may make investments primarily designed to promote the public welfare, directly or indirectly by investing in an entity primarily engaged in making public welfare investments. There is an aggregate limit on investments of 5 percent of a savings association’s capital and surplus, or up to 10 percent on an exception basis.

H. Eliminating Geographic and Ownership Limits on Thrift Service Companies [Matrix # 56 & 94]

OTS supports legislation authorizing federal savings associations to invest in service companies without regard to the current geographic and ownership restrictions. Current law permits a federal savings association to invest in a service company only if (i) the service company is chartered in the savings association’s home state, and (ii) the service company’s stock is available for purchase only by savings associations chartered by that state and other federal savings associations having their home offices in that state.

HOLA imposed these restrictions before interstate branching and before technological advances such as Internet and telephone banking, and they no longer serve a useful purpose. This restriction needlessly complicates the ability of savings associations, which often operate in more than one state, to join with savings associations and banks to obtain services at lower costs due to economies of scale or to engage in other approved activities.
Today, a savings association seeking to make investments through service companies must create an additional corporate layer—known as a second-tier service company—to invest in enterprises located outside the savings association's home state or with a bank. Requiring second-tier service companies serves no rational business purpose, results in unnecessary expense and red tape for federal savings associations and banks, and discourages otherwise worthwhile investments. While this proposal simplifies the ability of banks and savings associations to invest together in service companies, it does not expand the powers of savings associations or banks. The activities of the service company must be permissible investments under the rules applicable to the savings association or bank.

I. Streamlining Agency Action under the Bank Merger Act [Matrix #69]

OTS supports streamlining Bank Merger Act application requirements by eliminating the requirement that each FBA request a competitive factors report from the other three banking agencies and the Attorney General. This means five agencies must consider the competitive effects of every proposed bank or savings association merger. The vast majority of proposed mergers do not raise anti-competitive issues, and these multiple reports, even for those few that do raise issues, are not necessary. The proposal decreases the number to two, with the Attorney General continuing to be required to consider the competitive factors involved in each merger transaction and the FDIC, as the insurer, receiving notice even where it is not the lead banking agency for the particular merger. This will streamline the review of merger applications while assuring appropriate consideration of all anti-competitive issues.
VIII. Conclusion

OTS is committed to reducing regulatory burden wherever it has the ability to do so, consistent with safety and soundness and compliance with law, and without undue impact on existing consumer protections. We support proposed legislation that advances this objective. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the others who have shown leadership on this issue. We look forward to working with the Committee to shape the best possible regulatory burden relief legislation.
# Regulatory Burden of SEC Proposed Exemptive Relief

## Investment Advisor Registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Account or Service Provided</th>
<th>National or State Charter Banks and Trust Companies Exemptive Relief</th>
<th>SEC Proposed Exemptive Relief for Savings Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts without Investment Management or Advice Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trust Accounts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Court Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have exemptive relief - did not previously have to register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Agency/Custodial Accounts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Accounts (with investment management or advice responsibilities)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have exemptive relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employee Benefit Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Charitable Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Accounts (with investment management or advice responsibilities)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Executor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have exemptive relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Guardian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conservator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Accounts (with investment management or advice responsibilities)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have exemptive relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal Trusts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employee Benefit Plans and Trusts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Corporate Entities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mutual Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hedge Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Common Trust Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collective Investment Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Savings associations will not have exemptive relief or burden reduction
August 18, 2000

The Honorable Arthur Levitt
Chairman
Securities and Exchange Commission
450 Fifth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20549

Dear Chairman Levitt:

As you are aware, on July 13, 2000, the Senate Banking Committee held a markup on S. 2107, The Competitive Market Supervision Act, among other legislation. Although I was unable to attend the markup, I submitted a written statement for the record. I thought you might be interested in seeing a copy of the statement, which I attached for you.

In my written statement, as a co-sponsor of S. 2107, I reiterated my belief of the appropriateness of the legislation and its benefits to Americans. Separately, I commented on the Securities and Exchange Committee's rulemaking initiative to exempt savings associations from the Investment Advisors Act. Savings associations should be provided a level playing field with banks, which historically have been exempt from the Act. Because SEC staff determined that this parity issue may be resolved through rulemaking and agreed to move forward with the rulemaking process, I withheld legislative action at the July 13 markup. I look forward to the SEC's timely resolution of this issue.

If I or my staff may be of assistance in this rulemaking effort or other matters, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Evan Bayh
STATEMENT OF SENATOR EVAN BAYH
SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS
COMPETITIVE MARKET SUPERVISION ACT
SAVINGS ASSOCIATION EXEMPTION FROM THE INVESTMENT ADVISORS ACT
July 13, 2006

One of the bills that is before us today is the Competitive Market Supervision Act. This bill, which I have co-sponsored, does two important things for the people of the United States. First, the bill reduces securities fees for a large number of Americans. These fees, while relatively small, put an unnecessary burden on all investors, including those with retirement funds or pension funds. Second, the bill would provide for pay parity for Securities and Exchange Commission professional employees, by permitting the SEC to bring their pay in line with that of employees of other financial regulatory agencies. The SEC is charged with ensuring that investors receive the highest level consumer protections. This bill would help the SEC to attract — and retain — the best minds to fulfill its obligations to the American people.

On a separate issue, I have become aware of disparate treatment between savings associations and banks under the Investment Advisors Act. This Act exempts banks from its scope but does not exempt savings associations. This differing treatment puts savings associations at a competitive disadvantage, without reason. A similar disparity used to exist under a related law, the Investment Company Act of 1940; however, last year the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act corrected the discordant treatment.

In the past few months, my staff has had discussions with the Securities and Exchange Commission and industry representatives. The SEC has determined that it has the statutory authority to exempt individual institutions and groups of institutions — including savings associations — from the scope of the Investment Advisors Act. Since the SEC has concluded that this parity issue may be resolved through rulemaking and has agreed to work with the industry to reach such resolution, I withhold legislative involvement. I appreciate their commitment and look forward to their resolution.