Federal Reserve Bank
Office of the Comptroller
Federal Deposit of Insurance

Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) Proposed Rulemaking: Request for Feedback

<u>Partial Consideration</u>

Question 1. Should the agencies consider partial consideration for any other community development activities (for example, financing broadband infrastructure, health care facilities, other essential infrastructure and community facilities), or should partial consideration be limited to only affordable housing?

Question 2. If partial consideration is extended to other types of community development activities with a primary purpose of community development, should there be a minimum percentage of the activity that serves low- or moderate-income individuals or geographies or whether such consideration is appropriate for this rulemaking in other specific cases.

<u>Affordable Housing</u>

Question 3. Is the proposed standard of government programs having a "stated purpose or bona fide intent" of providing affordable housing for low- or moderate-income (or, under the alternative discussed above, for low-, moderate- or middle-income) individuals appropriate, or is a different standard more appropriate for considering government programs that provide affordable housing? Should these activities be required to meet a specific affordability standard, -53- such as rents not exceeding 30 percent of 80 percent of median income? Should these activities be required to include verification that at least a majority of occupants of affordable units are low- or moderate-income individuals?

Question 4. In qualifying affordable rental housing activities in conjunction with a government program, should the agencies consider activities that provide affordable housing to middle-income individuals in high opportunity areas, in nonmetropolitan counties, or in other geographies?

Question 5. Are there alternative ways to ensure that naturally occurring affordable housing activities are targeted to properties where rents remain affordable for low- and moderate-income individuals, including properties where a renovation is occurring?

Question 6. What approach would appropriately consider activities that support naturally occurring affordable housing that is most beneficial for low- or moderate-income individuals and communities? Should the proposed geographic criterion be expanded to include census tracts in which the median renter is low- or moderate-income, or in distressed and underserved census tracts, in order to encourage affordable housing in a wider range of communities, or would this expanded option risk crediting activities that do not benefit low- or moderate-income renters?

Question 7. Should the proposed approach to considering naturally occurring affordable housing be broadened to include single-family rental housing that meets the eligibility criteria proposed for multifamily rental housing? If so, should consideration of single-family rental housing be limited to rural geographies, or eligible in all geographies, provided the eligibility criteria to ensure affordability are met?

Question 8. How should the agencies consider activities that support affordable low- or moderate-income homeownership in order to ensure that qualifying activities are affordable, sustainable, and beneficial for low- or moderate-income individuals and communities?

Question 9. Should the proposed approach to considering mortgage-backed securities that finance affordable housing be modified to ensure that the activity is aligned with CRA's purpose of strengthening credit access for low- or moderate-income individuals? For example, should the agencies consider only the value of affordable loans in a qualifying mortgage-backed security, rather than the full value of the security? Should only the initial purchase of a mortgage-backed security be considered for affordable housing?

Question 10. What changes, if any, should the agencies consider to ensure that the proposed affordable housing definition is clearly and appropriately inclusive of activities that support affordable housing for low- or moderate-income individuals, including activities that involve complex or novel solutions such as community land trusts, shared equity models, and manufactured housing?

<u>Small Businesses and Small Farms, Climate Resilience, Energy Efficiency</u>

Question 11. Would lending to small businesses and small farms that may also support job creation, retention, and improvement for low- or moderate-income individuals and communities be sufficiently recognized through the analysis of small business and small farm loans and the qualitative review in the Retail Lending Test?

Question 12. During a transition period, should the agencies continue to evaluate bank loans to small businesses and small farms as community development activities until these loans are assessed as reported loans under the proposed Retail Lending Test?

Question 13. Should the agencies retain a separate component for job creation, retention, and improvement for low- and moderate-income individuals under the economic development definition? If so, should activities conducted with businesses or farms of any size and that create or retain jobs for low- or moderate-income individuals be considered? Are there criteria that can be included to demonstrate that the primary purpose of an activity is job creation, retention, or improvement for low- or moderate-income individuals and that ensure activities are not qualified simply because they offer low wage jobs?

Question 14. Should any or all place-based definition activities be required to be conducted in conjunction with a government plan, program, or initiative and include an explicit focus of benefitting the targeted census tract(s)? If so, are there appropriate standards for plans, programs, or initiatives? Are there alternative options for determining whether place-based definition activities meet identified community needs?

Question 15. How should the proposals for place-based definitions focus on benefitting residents in targeted census tracts and also ensure that the activities benefit low- or moderate income residents? How should considerations about whether an activity would displace or exclude low- or moderate-income residents be reflected in the proposed definitions?

Question 16. Should the agencies include certain housing activities as eligible revitalization activities? If so, should housing activities be considered in all, or only certain, targeted geographies, and should there be additional eligibility requirements for these activities?

Question 17. Should the agencies consider additional requirements for essential community infrastructure projects and essential community facilities to ensure that activities include a benefit to low- or moderate-income residents in the communities served by these projects?

Question 18. Should the agencies consider any additional criteria to ensure that recovery of disaster areas benefits low- or moderate-income individuals and communities?

Question 19. Does the disaster preparedness and climate resiliency definition appropriately define qualifying activities as those that assist individuals and communities to prepare for, adapt to, and withstand natural disasters, weather-related disasters, or climate-related risks? How should these activities be tailored to directly benefit low- or moderate-income communities and distressed or underserved nonmetropolitan middle-income areas? Are other criteria needed to ensure these activities benefit low- or moderate-income individuals and communities?

Question 20. Should the agencies include activities that promote energy efficiency as a component of the disaster preparedness and climate resiliency definition? Or should these activities be considered under other definitions, such as affordable housing and community facilities?

Question 21. Should the agencies include other energy-related activities that are distinct from energy-efficiency improvements in the disaster preparedness and climate resiliency definition? If so, what would this category of activities include and what criteria is needed to ensure a direct benefit to the targeted geographies?

Question 22. Should the agencies consider utility-scale projects, such as certain solar projects, that would benefit residents in targeted census tracts as part of a disaster preparedness and climate resiliency definition?

Question 23. Should the agencies include a prong of the disaster preparedness and climate resiliency definition for activities that benefit low- or moderate-income individuals, regardless of whether they reside in one of the targeted geographies? If so, what types of activities should be included under this prong?

Question 24. Should the agencies qualify activities related to disaster preparedness and climate resiliency in designated disaster areas? If so, are there additional criteria needed to ensure that these activities benefit communities with the fewest resources to address the impacts of future disasters and climate-related risks?

Minority Depository Institutions (MDIs)

Question 25. Should the agencies also include in the MDI definition insured credit unions considered to be MDIs by the National Credit Union Administration?

Question 26. Should the agencies consider activities undertaken by an MDI or WDI to promote its own sustainability and profitability? If so, should additional eligibility criteria be considered to ensure investments will more directly benefit low- and moderate-income and other underserved communities?

Financial Literacy

Question 27. Should consideration of financial literacy activities expand to include activities that benefit individuals and families of all income levels, including low- and moderate-income, or should consideration be limited to activities that have a primary purpose of benefiting low- or moderate-income individuals or families?

Native Land Areas

Question 28. To what extent is the proposed definition of Native Land Areas inclusive of geographic areas with Native and tribal community development needs?

Question 29. In addition to the proposed criteria, should the agencies consider additional eligibility requirements for activities in Native Land Areas to ensure a community development activity benefits low- or moderate-income residents who reside in Native Land Areas?

Question 30. Should the agencies also consider activities in Native Land Areas undertaken in conjunction with tribal association or tribal designee plans, programs, or initiatives, in addition to the proposed criteria to consider activities in conjunction with Federal, state, local, or tribal government plans, programs, or initiatives?

Non-exhaustive List of Qualifying Activities

Question 31. Should the agencies also maintain a non-exhaustive list of activities that do not qualify for CRA consideration as a community development activity?

Question 32. What procedures should the agencies develop for accepting submissions and establishing a timeline for review?

Question 33. Various processes and actions under the proposed rule, such as the process for confirming qualifying community development activities in § __.14, the designation of census tracts in § __.12, and, with respect to recovery activities in designated disaster areas, the determination of temporary exception or an extension of the period of eligibility of activities under § __.13(h)(1), would involve joint action by the agencies. The agencies invite comment on these proposed joint processes and actions, as well as alternative processes and actions, such as consultation among the agencies, that would be consistent with the purposes of the Community Reinvestment Act

Question 34. For the proposed impact review factors for activities serving geographic areas with high community development needs, should the agencies include persistent poverty counties, high poverty census tracts, or areas with low levels of community development financing? Should all geographic designations be included or some combination? What considerations should the agencies take in defining these categories and updating a list of geographies for these categories?

Question 35. For the proposed factor focused on activities supporting MDIs, WDIs, LICUs, and Treasury Department-certified CDFIs, should the factor exclude placements of short-term deposits, and should any other activities be excluded? Should the criterion specifically emphasize equity investments, long-term debt financing, donations, and services, and should other activities be emphasized?

Question 36. Which of the thresholds discussed would be appropriate to classify smaller businesses and farms for the impact review factor relating to community development activities that support smaller businesses and farms: the proposed standard of gross annual revenue of $250,000 or less, or an alternative gross annual revenue threshold of $100,000 or less, or $500,000 or less?

Question 37. For the proposed factor of activities that support affordable housing in high opportunity areas, is the proposed approach to use the FHFA definition of high opportunity areas appropriate? Are there other options for defining high opportunity areas?

Question 38. For the proposed factor to designate activities benefitting or serving Native communities, should the factor be defined to include activities benefitting Native and tribal communities that are not located in Native Land Areas? If so, how should the agencies consider defining activities that benefit Native and tribal communities outside of Native Land Areas?

Assessment Areas

Question 39. Should both small and intermediate banks continue to have the option of delineating partial counties, or should they be required to delineate whole counties as facility based assessment areas to increase consistency across banks?

Question 40. Do the proposed definitions of "remote service facility" and "branch" include sufficient specificity for the types of facilities and circumstances under which banks would be required to delineate facility-based assessment areas, or are other changes to the CRA regulations necessary to better clarify when the delineation of facility-based assessment areas would be required?

Question 41. How should the agencies treat bank business models where staff assist customers to make deposits on their phone or mobile device while the customer is onsite?

Question 42. Should the proposed "accepts deposits" language be included in the definition of a branch?

Question 43. If a bank's retail lending assessment area is located in the same MSA (or state non-MSA area) where a smaller facility-based assessment area is located, should the bank be required to expand its facility-based assessment area to the whole MSA (or non-MSA area) or should it have the option to designate the portion of the MSA that excludes the facility-based assessment area as a new retail lending assessment area?

Question 44. Should a bank be evaluated for all of its major product lines in each retail lending assessment area? In the alternative, should the agencies evaluate home mortgage product lines only when the number of home mortgage loans exceeds the proposed threshold of 100 loans, and evaluate small business loans only when the number of small business loans exceeds the proposed threshold of 250 loans?

Question 45. The agencies' proposals for delineating retail lending assessment areas and evaluating remaining outside lending at the institution level for large banks are intended to meet the objectives of reflecting changes in banking over time while retaining a local focus to CRA evaluations. What alternative methods should the agencies consider for evaluating outside lending that would preserve a bank's obligation to meet the needs of its local communities?

Question 46. The proposed approach for delineating retail lending assessment areas would apply to all large banks with the goal of providing an equitable framework for banks with different business models.

Should a large bank with a significant majority of its retail loans inside of its facility-based assessment areas be exempted from delineating retail lending assessment areas? If so, how should an exemption be defined for a large bank that lends primarily inside its facility-based assessment area?

Question 47. The agencies propose to give CRA consideration for community development financing activities that are outside of facility-based assessment areas. What alternative approaches would encourage banks that choose to do so to conduct effective community development activities outside of their facility-based assessment areas? For example, should banks be required to delineate specific geographies where they will focus their outside facility-based assessment area community development financing activity?

Question 48. Should all banks have the option to have community development activities outside of facility-based assessment areas considered, including all intermediate banks, small banks, and banks that elect to be evaluated under a strategic plan?

Question 49. The agencies' proposed approach to tailoring the performance tests that pertain to each bank category aims to appropriately balance the objectives of maintaining strong CRA obligations and recognizing differences in bank capacity. What adjustments to the proposed evaluation framework should be considered to better achieve this balance?

Asset Thresholds

Question 50. The proposed asset thresholds consider the associated burden related to new regulatory changes and their larger impact on smaller banks, and it balances this with their obligations to meet community credit needs. Are there other asset thresholds that should be considered that strike the appropriate balance of these objectives?

Question 51. Should the agencies adopt an asset threshold for small banks that differs from the SBA's size standards of $750 million for purposes of CRA regulations? Is the proposed asset threshold of $600 million appropriate?

Performance Standards

Question 52. The agencies propose to require that the activities of a bank's operations and operating subsidiaries be included as part of its CRA evaluation, as banks exercise a high level of ownership, control, and management of their subsidiaries, such that the activities of these subsidiaries could reasonably be attributable directly to the bank. What, if any, other factors should be taken into account with regard to this requirement?

Question 53. As discussed above, what factors and criteria should the agencies consider in adopting definitions of "operating subsidiary" for state non-member banks and state savings associations, and "operations subsidiary" for state member banks, for purposes of this proposed requirement?

Question 54. When a bank chooses to have the agencies consider retail loans within a retail loan category that are made or purchased by one or more of the bank's affiliates in a particular assessment area, should the agencies consider all of the retail loans within that retail loan category made by all of the bank's affiliates only in that particular assessment area, or should the agencies then consider all of the retail loans made by all of the bank's affiliates within that retail loan category in all of the bank's assessment areas?

Question 55. The agencies request feedback on the proposed performance context factors in § __.21(e). Are there other ways to bring greater clarity to the use of performance context factors as applied to different performance tests?

Question 56. Should the agencies aggregate closed-end home mortgage loans of all purposes? Or should the agencies evaluate loans with different purposes separately given that the factors driving demand for home purchase, home refinance, and other purpose home mortgage loans vary over time and meet different credit needs?

Question 57. Should the agencies exclude home improvement and other purpose closed-end home mortgage loans from the closed-end home mortgage loan product category to emphasize home purchase and refinance lending? If so, should home improvement and other purpose closed-end home mortgage loans be evaluated under the Retail Lending Test as a distinct product category or qualitatively under the Retail Services and Products Test?

Question 58. Should the agencies include closed-end non-owner-occupied housing lending in the closed-end home mortgage loan product category?

Question 59. Should open-end home mortgage loans be evaluated qualitatively under the Retail Services and Products Test rather than with metrics under the Retail Lending Test?

Question 60. Should multifamily lending be evaluated under the Retail Lending Test and the Community Development Financing Test (or the Community Development Test for Wholesale or Limited Purpose Banks)? Or should multifamily lending be instead evaluated only under the Community Development Financing Test?

Question 61. Should banks that are primarily multifamily lenders be designated as limited purpose banks and have their multifamily lending evaluated only under the Community Development Financing Test?

Question 62. Should the agencies adopt a size standard for small business loans and small farm loans that differs from the SBA's size standards for purposes of the CRA? Is the proposed size standard of gross annual revenues of $5 million or less, which is consistent with the size standard proposed by the CFPB in its Section 1071 Rulemaking, appropriate? Should the CRA compliance date for updated "small business," "small business loan," "small farm," and "small farm loan" definitions be directly aligned with a future compliance date in the CFPB's Section 1071 Rulemaking, or should the agencies provide an additional year after the proposed updated CRA definitions become effective?

Question 63. Should the agencies' current small business loan and small farm loan definitions sunset on the compliance date of the definitions proposed by the agencies?

Question 64. Should retail loan purchases be treated as equivalent to loan originations? If so, should consideration be limited to certain purchases – such as from a CDFI or directly from the originator? What, if any, other restrictions should be placed on the consideration of purchased loans?

Question 65. Would it be appropriate to consider information indicating that retail loan purchases were made for the sole or primary purpose of inappropriately influencing the bank's retail lending performance evaluation as an additional factor in considering the bank's performance under the metrics or should such purchased loans be removed from the bank's metrics?

Question 66. Do the benefits of evaluating automobile lending under the metrics-based Retail Lending Test outweigh the potential downsides, particularly related to data collection and reporting burden? In the alternative, should the agencies adopt a qualitative approach to evaluate automobile lending for all banks under the proposed Retail Lending Test?

Question 67. Should credit cards be included in CRA evaluations? If so, when credit card loans constitute a major project line, should they be evaluated quantitatively under the proposed Retail Lending Test or qualitatively under the proposed Retail Services and Products Test?

Question 68. What data collection and reporting challenges, if any, for credit card loans could adversely affect the accuracy of metrics?

Question 69. Should the agencies adopt a qualitative approach to evaluate consumer loans? Should qualitative evaluation be limited to certain consumer loan categories or types?

Question 70. Should the agencies use a different standard for determining when to evaluate closed-end home mortgage, open-end home mortgage, multifamily, small business, and small farm lending? If so, what methodology should the agencies use and why? Should the agencies use a different standard for determining when to evaluate automobile loans?

Question 71. Should the agencies use a different standard for determining when to evaluate multifamily loans under the Retail Lending Test? If so, should the standard be dependent on whether the lender is a monoline multifamily lender or is predominantly a multifamily lender within the geographic area? Relatedly, what should a “predominantly” standard be for determining whether multifamily loans constitute a major product line entail?

Question 72. For calculating the bank volume metric, what alternatives should the agencies consider to the proposed approach of using collected deposits data for large banks with assets of over $10 billion and for other banks that elect to collect this data, and using the FDIC’s Summary of Deposits data for other banks that do not collect this data? For calculating the market volume benchmark, what alternatives should the agencies consider to the proposed approach of using reported deposits data for large banks with assets of over $10 billion, and using the FDIC’s Summary of Deposits data for large banks with assets of $10 billion or less?

Question 73. Should large banks receive a recommended Retail Lending Test conclusion of “Substantial Noncompliance” for performance below a threshold lower than 30 percent (e.g., 15 percent of the market volume benchmark) on the retail lending volume screen?

Question 74. Should the geographic distribution evaluations of banks with few or no low and moderate-income census tracts in their assessment areas include the distribution of lending to distressed and underserved census tracts? Alternatively, should the distribution of lending in distressed and underserved census tracts be considered qualitatively?

Question 75. Is the choice of $250,000 gross annual revenue an appropriate threshold to distinguish whether a business or farm may be particularly likely to have unmet credit needs, or should the threshold be lower (e.g., $100,000) or higher (e.g., $500,000)?

Question 76. Should the community benchmarks be set using the most recent data available at the time of the examination? Would an alternative method that establishes benchmarks earlier be preferable?

Question 77. Should the bank volume metric and distribution bank metrics use all data from the bank's evaluation period, while the market volume benchmark and distribution market benchmarks use only reported data available at the time of the exam? Would an alternative in which the bank volume metrics and distribution bank metrics were calculated from bank data covering only the same years for which that reported data was available be preferable?

Question 78. Are the proposed community benchmarks appropriate, including the use of low-income and moderate-income family counts for the borrower distribution of home mortgage lending? Would alternative benchmarks be preferable? If so, which ones?

Question 79. Should automobile lending for all banks be evaluated using benchmarks developed only from the lending of banks with assets of over $10 billion?

Question 80. Are the proposed market and community multipliers for each conclusion category set at appropriate levels? If not, what other set of multipliers would be preferable? In general, are the resulting thresholds set at an appropriate level for each conclusion category?

Question 81. How should the agencies use the calibrated market benchmark and calibrated community benchmark to set performance thresholds? Should the agencies set thresholds based on the lower of the calibrated market benchmark or calibrated community benchmark?

Question 82. How should the agencies address the potential concern that the proposed approach may set performance expectations too low in places where all lenders, or a significant share of lenders, are underserving the market and failing to meet community credit needs? Should the agencies consider an alternative approach to setting the performance thresholds that would use a weighted average of the calibrated market benchmark and calibrated community benchmark?

Question 83. Should the agencies weight the two distribution results equally? Should the borrower distribution conclusion be weighted more heavily than the geographic distribution conclusion to provide an additional incentive for lending to low- and moderate-income borrowers in certain areas? Are there circumstances under which the geographic distribution conclusion should be weighed less heavily, such as in rural areas with few low- and moderateincome census tracts or where the number of investor loans is increasing rapidly?

Question 84. Should the agencies use loan count in conjunction with, or in place of, dollar volume in weighting product line conclusions to determine the overall Retail Lending Test conclusion in an assessment area?

Question 85. Would identifying underperforming markets appropriately counter the possibility that the market benchmarks might be set too low in some assessment areas? If so, what data points should be used to set expectations for the market benchmark? How far below this expectation should an observed market benchmark be allowed to fall before the market is designated as underperforming?

Question 86. Should the agencies consider other factors, such as oral or written comments about a bank's retail lending performance, as well as the bank's responses to those comments, in developing Retail Lending Test conclusions?

Question 87. Should all large banks have their retail lending in their outside retail lending areas evaluated? Should the agencies exempt banks that make more than a certain percentage, such as 80 percent, of their retail loans within facility-based assessment areas and retail lending assessment areas? At what percentage should this exemption threshold be set?

Question 88. Does the tailored benchmark method proposed above for setting performance ranges for outside retail lending areas achieve a balance between matching expectations to a bank's lending opportunities, limiting complexity, and setting appropriate performance standards? Should the agencies instead use less tailored benchmarks by setting a uniform outside retail lending areas benchmarks for every bank? Or should the agencies use a more tailored benchmarks by setting weights on geographies by individual product line?

Question 89. Should assessment area and outside retail lending area conclusions be weighted by the average of a bank's percentage of loans and deposits there? Is the proposed approach for using FDIC's Summary of Deposits data for banks that do not collect and maintain deposits data appropriate? Should the agencies use another method for choosing weights?

Question 90. Should the agencies use the percentage of families and total population in an assessment area by census tract income level in addition to the other comparators listed (i.e., census tracts, households, and businesses) for the assessment of branches and remote service facilities?

Question 91. Are there other alternative approaches or definitions the agencies should consider in designating places with limited branch access for communities, such as branch distance thresholds determined by census tract population densities, commuting patterns or some other metric? For example, should the agencies not divide geographies and use the more flexible, second alternative approach?

Question 92. How should geographies be divided to appropriately identify different distance thresholds? Should they be divided according to those in the proposed approach of urban, suburban, and rural areas; those in the alternative approach of central counties, outlying counties, and nonmetropolitan counties; or some other delineation?

Question 93. How narrowly should designations of low branch access and very low branch access be tailored so that banks may target additional retail services appropriately?

Question 94. Is a fixed distance standard that allows the concentration of low and very low branch access areas to vary across regions, such as that in the proposed approach, or a locally determined distance threshold that identifies a similar concentration of low and very low branch access areas within each local area, such as that in the alternative approach, most appropriate when identifying areas with limited branch access?

Question 95. Should the agencies take into consideration credit union locations in any of the proposed approaches, or should the analysis be based solely on the distribution of bank branches? For example, in the proposed or local approach, having a credit union within the relevant distance of a census tract population center would mean that the census tract would not be a very low branch access census tract (if there were no bank branch present).

Question 96. If the local approach were adopted, how frequently should the local distances be updated?

Question 97. What other branch-based services could be considered as responsive to low and moderate-income needs?

Question 98. Should branches in distressed or underserved middle-income nonmetropolitan census tracts receive qualitative consideration, without documenting that the branch provides services to low- or moderate-income individuals?

Question 99. Should the agencies provide favorable qualitative consideration for retail branching in middle-income and upper-income census tracts if a bank can demonstrate that branch locations in these geographies deliver services to low- or moderate-income individuals? What information should banks provide to demonstrate such service to low- or moderate-income individuals?

Digital Delivery Systems

Question 100. How could the agencies further define ways to evaluate the digital activity by individuals in low-, moderate-, middle-, and upper-income census tracts, as part of a bank's digital and other delivery systems evaluation?

Question 101. Should affordability be one of the factors in evaluating digital and other delivery systems? If so, what data should the agencies consider?

Question 102. Are there comparators that the agencies should consider to assess the degree to which a bank is reaching individuals in low- or moderate-income census tracts through digital and other delivery systems?

Question 103. Should the evaluation of digital and other delivery systems be optional for banks with assets of $10 billion or less as proposed, or should this component be required for these banks? Alternatively, should the agencies maintain current evaluation standards for alternative delivery systems for banks within this tier?

Question 104. Are there additional categories of responsive credit products and programs that should be included in the regulation for qualitative consideration?

Question 105. Should the agencies provide more specific guidance regarding what credit products and programs may be considered especially responsive, or is it preferable to provide general criteria so as not to discourage a bank from pursuing impactful and responsive activities that may deviate from the specific examples?

Question 106. Should special purpose credit programs meeting the credit needs of a bank's assessment areas be included in the regulation as an example of loan product or program that facilitates home mortgage and consumer lending for low- and moderate-income individuals?

Question 107. Are the features of cost, functionality, and inclusion of access appropriate for establishing whether a deposit product is responsive to the needs of low- and moderate-income individuals? What other features or characteristics should be considered? Should a minimum number of features be met in order to be considered 'responsive'?

Question 108. The agencies wish to encourage retail banking activities that may increase access to credit. Aside from deposit accounts, are there other products or services that may increase credit access?

Question 109. Are the proposed usage factors appropriate for an evaluation of responsive deposit products? Should the agencies consider the total number of active responsive deposit products relative to all active consumer deposit accounts offered by the bank?

Question 110. Should the agencies take other information into consideration when evaluating the responsiveness of a bank's deposit products, such as the location where the responsive deposit products are made available?

Question 111. Should large banks with assets of $10 billion or less have the option of a responsive deposit products evaluation, as proposed, or should this component be required, as it is for large banks with assets of over $10 billion?

Question 113. The agencies propose weighting the digital and other delivery systems component relative to the physical delivery systems according to the bank's business model, as demonstrated by the share of consumer accounts opened digitally. Is this an appropriate approach, or is there an alternative that could be implemented consistently? Or, should the weighting be determined based on performance context?

Question 114. How should the agencies weight the two subcomponents of the credit and deposit products evaluation? Should the two subcomponents receive equal weighting, or should examiner judgment and performance context determine the relative weighting?

Question 115. Should the credit and deposit products evaluation receive its own conclusion that is combined with the delivery systems evaluation for an overall institution conclusion? Or should favorable performance on the credit and deposit products evaluation be used solely to upgrade the delivery systems conclusion? For large banks with assets of $10 billion or less that elect to be evaluated on their digital delivery systems and deposit products, how should their performance in these areas be considered when determining the bank's overall Retail Services and Products Test conclusion?

Question 116. Should each part of the Retail Services and Products Test receive equal weighting to derive the institution conclusion, or should the weighting vary by a bank's business model and other performance context?

Question 117. Should activities that cannot be allocated to a specific county or state be considered at the highest level (at the state or institution level, as appropriate) instead of allocated to multiple counties or states based upon the distribution of all low- and moderateincome families across the counties or states?

Question 118. What methodology should be used to allocate the dollar value of activities to specific counties for activities that serve multiple counties? For example, should the agencies use the distribution of all low- and moderate-income families across the applicable counties? Or, should the agencies use an alternative approach, such as the distribution of the total population across the applicable counties? Should the agencies consider other measures that would reflect economic development activities that benefit small businesses and small farms or use a standardized approach to allocate activities?

Question 119. The agencies are seeking feedback on alternatives to determining the denominator of the bank assessment area community development financing metric. What are the benefits and drawbacks, including data challenges, of implementing an alternative approach that bases the denominator of the metric on the share of bank depositors residing in the assessment area (described above) in contrast to the proposed approach of relying on dollar amounts of deposits?

Question 120. For large banks with assets of $10 billion or less, under the proposed Community Development Financing Test, is it appropriate to use the FDIC's Summary of Deposits data instead of deposits data that is required to be collected and maintained by the bank to tailor new data requirements, or would it be preferable to require collected deposits data for all large banks?

Question 121. What is the appropriate method to using the local and nationwide benchmarks to assess performance? Should the agencies rely on examiner judgment on how to weigh the comparison of the two benchmarks, or should there be additional structure, such as calculating an average of the two benchmarks, or taking the minimum, or the maximum, of the two benchmarks?

Question 122. What other considerations should the agencies take to ensure greater clarity and consistency regarding the calculation of benchmarks? Should the benchmarks be calculated from data that is available prior to the end of the evaluation period, or is it preferable to align the benchmark data with the beginning and end of the evaluation period?

Question 123. When calculating the weighted average of facility-based assessment area conclusions and assessment area community development financing benchmarks, is it appropriate to weight assessment area metrics and benchmarks by the average share of loans and deposits, as proposed?

Question 124. Is the proposed use of the FDIC's Summary of Deposits data for banks that do not collect and maintain deposits data appropriate, or should all large banks be required to collect and maintain deposits data, which would enable the metrics and benchmarks to be based on collected deposits data for all large banks?

Question 125. Considering current data limitations, what approaches would further enhance the clarity and consistency of the proposed approach for assigning community development financing conclusions, such as assigning separate conclusions for the metric and benchmarks component and the impact review component? To calculate an average of the conclusions on the two components, what would be the appropriate weighting for the metric and benchmarks component, and for the impact review component? For instance, should both components be weighted equally, or should the metric and benchmarks be weighted more than impact review component?

Question 126. How can the agencies encourage greater consistency and clarity for the impact review of bank activities? Should the agencies consider publishing standard metrics in performance evaluations, such as the percentage of a bank's activities that meet one or more impact criteria?

Question 127. Should volunteer activities unrelated to the provision of financial services be considered in all areas or just in nonmetropolitan areas?

Question 128. For large banks with average assets of over $10 billion, does the benefit of using a metric of community development service hours per full time employee outweigh the burden of collecting and reporting additional data points? Should the agencies consider other quantitative measures? Should the agencies consider using this metric for all large banks, including those with average assets of $10 billion or less, which would require that all large banks collect and report these data?

Question 129. How should the agencies define a full-time equivalent employee? Should this include bank executives and staff? For banks with average assets of over $10 billion, should the agencies consider an additional metric of community development service hours per executive to provide greater clarity in the evaluation of community development services?

Question 130. Once community development services data is available, should benchmarks and thresholds for the bank assessment area community development services hours metric be developed? Under such an approach, how should the metric and qualitative components be combined to derive Community Development Services Test conclusions?

Question 131. How could the agencies provide more certainty in the evaluation of community development financing at the facility-based assessment area level? Should a bank assessment area community development financing metric be used to measure the amount of community development financing activities relative to a bank's capacity? If so, what is the appropriate denominator?

Question 132. Should a benchmark be established to evaluate community development financing performance for wholesale and limited purpose banks at the institution level? If so, should the nationwide community development financing benchmark for all large banks be used, or should the benchmark be tailored specifically to wholesale and limited purpose banks?

Question 133. For wholesale and limited purpose banks that wish to receive consideration for community development services, should these banks be required to opt into the proposed Community Development Services Test, or should they have the option to submit services to be reviewed on a qualitative basis at the institution level, without having to opt into the Community Development Services Test?

Strategic Plan

Question 134. Should the strategic plan option continue to be available to all banks, or do changes in the proposed regulation's assessment area provisions and the metrics approach reduce the need for the strategic plan option for banks with specialized business strategies?

Question 135. Large banks electing to be evaluated under a strategic plan would have activities outside of facility-based assessment areas considered through retail lending assessment areas and then outside retail lending assessment areas. Should small and intermediate banks electing to be evaluated under a strategic plan be allowed to delineate the same types of assessment areas? What criteria should there be for choosing additional assessment areas? Could such banks have the ability to incorporate goals for facility-based assessment areas and goals for outside of assessment areas?

Question 136. In assessing performance under a strategic plan, the agencies determine whether a bank has "substantially met" its plan goals. Should the agencies continue to maintain the substantially met criteria? If so, should it be defined and how? For example, as a percentage (e.g., 95 percent) of each measurable goal included in the plan, the percentage of goals met, or a combination of how many goals were not met and by how much?

Question 137. The agencies are considering announcing pending strategic plans using the same means used to announce upcoming examination schedules or completed CRA examinations and CRA ratings.

What are the potential advantages or disadvantages to making the draft plans available on the regulators' websites?

Question 138. In addition to posting draft plans on a bank's website and the appropriate Federal banking agency's website, should approved strategic plans also be posted on a bank's website and the appropriate Federal banking agency's website?

Question 139. The agencies request feedback on whether it would be more appropriate to weight retail lending activity 60 percent and community development activity 40 percent in deriving the overall rating at the state, multistate MSA or institution level for an intermediate bank in order to maintain the CRA's focus on meeting community credit needs through small business loans, small farm loans, and home mortgage loans.

Question 140. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal to limit the state, multistate MSA, and institution-level ratings to at most a "Needs to Improve" for large banks with ten or more assessment areas unless 60 percent or more of the bank's assessment areas at that level have an overall performance of at least "Low Satisfactory"? Should this limitation apply to all assessment areas, or only facility-based assessment areas? Is ten assessment areas the right threshold number to prompt this limitation, and is 60 percent the right threshold number to pass it? If not, what should that number be? Importantly, what impact would this proposal have on branch closures?

Question 141. The agencies propose to continue to evaluate small banks under the current framework in order to tailor the evaluation approach according to a bank's size and business model. What are other ways of tailoring the performance evaluation for small banks?

Question 142. Should additional consideration be provided to small banks that conduct activities that would be considered under the Retail Services and Products Test, Community Development Financing Test, or Community Development Services Test when determining the bank's overall institution rating?

Question 143. The agencies' proposal to require intermediate banks to be evaluated under the proposed Retail Lending Test is intended to provide intermediate banks with increased clarity and transparency of supervisory expectations and standards for evaluating their retail lending products. The agencies propose tailoring the application of this test by limiting data reporting requirements for intermediate banks. Are there other ways of tailoring the Retail Lending Test for intermediate banks that should be considered?

Community Development Financing Test

Question 144. The agencies propose to provide continued flexibility for the consideration of community development activities conducted by intermediate banks both under the status-quo community development test and the proposed Community Development Financing Test. Specifically, intermediate banks' retail loans such as small business, small farm, and home mortgage loans may be considered as community development loans, provided those loans have a primary purpose of community development and the bank is not required to report those loans. Should the agencies provide consideration for those loans under the Community Development Financing Test?

Question 145. Should intermediate banks be able to choose whether a small business or small farm loan is considered under the Retail Lending Test or, if it has a primary purpose of community development, under the applicable community development evaluation, regardless of the reporting status of these loans? Should the same approach be applied for the intermediate bank community development performance standards in § __.29(b) and for intermediate banks that decide to opt into the Community Development Financing Test in § __.24?

Question 146. Are the agencies' current policies for considering CRA performance on applications sufficient? If not, what changes would make the process more effective?

Deposits Data

Question 147. What are the potential benefits and downsides of the proposed approach to require deposits data collection, maintenance, and reporting only for large banks with assets of over $10 billion? Does the proposed approach create an appropriate balance between tailoring data requirements and ensuring accuracy of the proposed metrics? Should the agencies consider an alternative approach of requiring, rather than allowing the option for, large banks with assets of $10 billion or less to collect and maintain deposits data? If so, would a longer transition period for large banks with assets of $10 billion or less to begin to collect and maintain deposits data (such as an additional 12 or 24 months beyond the transition period for large banks with assets of over $10 billion) make this alternative more feasible?

Question 148. Should large banks with assets of $10 billion or less that elect to collect and maintain deposits data also be required to report deposits data? Under an alternative approach in which all large banks with assets of $10 billion or less are required to collect and maintain deposits data, should these banks also be required to report the data, or would it be appropriate to limit new data burden for these banks by not requiring them to report the data?

Question 149. What are alternative approaches to deposits data collection and maintenance that would achieve a balance between supporting the proposed metrics and minimizing additional data burden? Would it be preferable to require deposits data collected as a year- or quarterly-end total, rather than an average annual deposit balance calculated based on average daily balances from monthly or quarterly statements?

Question 150. Should deposits sourced from commercial banks or other depository institutions be excluded from the deposits data that is reported or optionally maintained by banks? Should other categories of deposits be included in this deposits data?

Question 151. For what types of deposit accounts, such as pre-paid debit card accounts, and Health Savings Accounts, might depositor location be unavailable to the bank? For these account types, is it appropriate to require the data to be reported at the institution level? Should brokered deposits be reported at the institution level as well?

Question 152. What is the appropriate treatment of non-brokered reciprocal deposits? Should a non-brokered reciprocal deposit be considered as a deposit for the bank sending the non-brokered reciprocal deposit, but not be considered as a deposit for the bank receiving the reciprocal deposit?

Question 153. Do bank operational systems permit the collection of deposit information at the county-level, based on a depositor's address, or would systems need to be modified to capture this information? If systems need to be modified or upgraded, what would the associated costs be?

Question 154. In order to reduce burden associated with the reporting of deposits data, what other steps can the agencies take or what guidance or reporting tools can the agencies develop to reduce burden while still ensuring adequate data to inform the metrics approach?

Question 155. Should the agencies consider an alternative approach of publishing a data set containing county-level deposits data in order to provide greater insight into bank performance?

Question 156. Should banks collect and report an indicator for whether the loan was made to a business or farm with gross annual revenues of $250,000 or less or another gross annual revenue threshold that better represents lending to the smallest businesses or farms during the interim period before the CFPB Section 1071 Rulemaking is in effect?

Question 157. Would the benefits of requiring home mortgage data collection by non HMDA reporter large banks that engage in a minimum volume of mortgage lending outweigh the burden associated with such data collection? Does the further benefit of requiring this data to be reported outweigh the additional burden of reporting?

Question 158. Should large banks with assets of $10 billion or less be required to collect, maintain, and report automobile lending data? If so, would a longer transition period for large banks with assets of $10 billion or less to begin to collect, maintain, and report automobile lending data (such as an additional 12 or 24 months beyond the transition period for large banks with assets of over $10 billion) make this alternative more feasible? Does the added value from being able to use these data in the construction of metrics and benchmarks outweigh the burden involved in requiring data collection and reporting by these banks?

Question 159. Should the agencies streamline any of the proposed data fields for collecting and reporting automobile data? If so, would it still allow for constructing comprehensive automobile lending metrics?

Question 160. Should the agencies consider publishing county-level automobile lending data in the form of a data set?

Question 161. How might the format and level of data required to be reported affect the burden on those banks required to report community development financing activity data, as well as the usefulness of the data? For example, would it be appropriate to require reporting community development financing data aggregated at the county-level as opposed to the individual activity-level?

Question 162. What other steps can the agencies take, or what procedures can the agencies develop, to reduce the burden of the collection of additional community development financing data fields while still ensuring adequate data to inform the evaluation of performance? How could a data template be designed to promote consistency and reduce burden?

Question 163. Should the agencies require the collection and maintenance of branch and remote service availability data as proposed, or alternatively, should the agencies continue with the current practice of reviewing this data from the bank's public file?

Question 164. Should the agencies determine which data points a bank should collect and maintain to demonstrate responsiveness to low- and moderate-income individuals via the bank's digital and other delivery systems such as usage? Alternatively, should the agencies grant banks the flexibility to determine which data points to collect and maintain for evaluation?

Question 165. Are the proposed data collection elements for responsive deposit products appropriate, or are there alternatives to the proposed approach that more efficiently facilitate the evaluation of responsive deposit products? Should the agencies require collection and maintenance of specific data elements for the evaluation of responsive deposit products? Alternatively, should the agencies grant banks the flexibility to determine which data points to collect and maintain for evaluation?

Question 166. Does the proposed retail services data exist in a format that is feasibly transferrable to data collection, or would a required template provided by the agencies be sufficient in the collection of retail services and products information?

Question 167. What steps can the agencies take to reduce burden of the proposed information collection requirements while still ensuring adequate information to inform the evaluation of services?

Question 168. Should large banks with assets of $10 billion or less be required to collect and maintain data on deposit product responsiveness and/or digital and other delivery systems? If so, would a longer transition period to begin to collect and report such data (such as an additional 12 or 24 months beyond the transition period for large banks with assets of over $10 billion) make this alternative more feasible? Does the added value from being able to use this data outweigh the burden involved in requiring data collection by these banks?

Question 169. Should large banks with assets of $10 billion or less be required to collect community development services data in a machine readable form, as prescribed by the agencies, equivalent to the data required to be collected and maintained by large banks with assets of over $10 billion? Under this alternative, should large banks with assets of $10 billion or less have the option of using a standardized template or collecting and maintaining the data in their own format? If large banks with assets of $10 billion or less are required to collect and maintain community development services data, would a longer transition period for these banks to begin to collect and maintain deposits data (such as an additional 12 or 24 months beyond the transition period for large banks with assets of over $10 billion) make this alternative more feasible? Does the added value from being able to use this data in the construction of a metric outweigh the burden involved in requiring data collection by these banks?

Question 170. Should large banks with assets of over $10 billion be required to collect, maintain, and report data on the number of full-time equivalent employees at the assessment area, state, multistate MSA and institution level in order to develop a standardized metric to evaluate community development service performance for these banks?

Question 171. Should small banks that opt to be evaluated under the metrics-based Retail Lending Test be required to collect, maintain, and report related data or is it appropriate to use data that a small bank maintains in its own format or by sampling the bank's loan files?

Question 172. Would a tool to identify retail lending assessment areas based on reported data be useful?

Question 173. Should the agencies disclose HMDA data by race and ethnicity in large bank CRA performance evaluations?

Public Data, Comment Period, 1071 Rulemaking

Question 174. Are there other ways the agencies could encourage public comments related to CRA examinations, including any suggested changes to proposed § __.46?

Question 175. Is there additional data the agencies should provide the public and what would that be?

Question 176. Should the agencies publish bank-related data, such as retail lending and community development financing metrics, in advance of an examination to provide additional information to the public?

Question 177. Should the agencies ask for public comment about community credit needs and opportunities in specific geographies?

Question 178. The agencies ask for comment on the proposed effective date and the applicability dates for the various provisions of the proposed rule, including on the proposed start date for CRA examinations under the new tests.

Question 179. Would it be better to tie the timing of a change to the proposed small business and small farm definitions to when the CFPB finalizes its Section 1071 Rulemaking or to provide an additional 12 months after the CFPB finalizes its proposed rule? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each option?

Question 180. When should the agencies sunset the agencies' small business loan and small farm loan definitions?