

COMMON TRAITS OF SUCCESSFUL CREDIT UNIONS

WEBINAR 47
hosted by: Bob Schroeder

Welcome!



National Credit Union Income and Expense Ratios (1)

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|----------------|
| Date | Interest Yield on Assets | Div/Int - Assets | Gross = Spread | Other Income | Operating Expense | Net Spread | Loss (2) Prov | Net Income (3) |
| ① Year-End 2016 | 3.40 | - 0.52 | = 287 | + 139 | - 310 | = 116 | - 40 | = 76 |
| Mid-Year 2016 | 3.38 | 0.51 | 287 | 134 | 308 | 113 | 36 | 77 |
| ② Year-End 2015 | 3.36 | 0.52 | 285 | 136 | 311 | 109 | 34 | 75 |
| 2015 | 3.36 | 0.52 | 285 | 136 | 311 | 109 | 34 | 75 |
| 2014 | 3.36 | 0.54 | 283 | 134 | 310 | 107 | 28 | 80 |
| 2013 | 3.36 | 0.59 | 278 | 139 | 314 | 103 | 26 | 83 |
| 2012 | 3.62 | 0.72 | 290 | 145 | 316 | 120 | 35 | 84 |
| 2011 | 4.05 | 0.92 | 312 | 131 | 326 | 117 | 50 | 68 |
| 2010 | 4.46 | 1.21 | 325 | 133 | 319 | 139 | 78 | 50 |
| 2009 | 4.91 | 1.73 | 318 | 161 | 315 | 165 | 111 | 18 |
| 2008 | 5.56 | 2.41 | 314 | 136 | 335 | 116 | 85 | 31 |
| 2007 | 5.89 | 2.78 | 310 | 136 | 338 | 107 | 43 | 64 |
| ③ 2006 | 5.52 | 2.35 | 317 | 129 | 333 | 113 | 31 | 82 |
| 2005 | 4.97 | 1.73 | 324 | 125 | 324 | 125 | 39 | 85 |
| 2004 | 4.72 | 1.41 | 331 | 116 | 320 | 126 | 35 | 92 |
| 2003 | 5.03 | 1.65 | 338 | 114 | 319 | 132 | 34 | 98 |
| 2002 | 5.89 | 2.28 | 361 | 105 | 325 | 141 | 35 | 107 |
| ④ 2001 | 6.93 | 3.35 | 358 | 105 | 335 | 128 | 33 | 95 |
| 2000 | 7.34 | 3.56 | 377 | 95 | 339 | 133 | 31 | 102 |
| Previous year-end totals | 1999 | 7.07 | 371 | 89 | 332 | 127 | 34 | 93 |
| 1998 | 7.38 | 3.57 | 381 | 86 | 331 | 136 | 42 | 95 |
| 1997 | 7.54 | 3.61 | 383 | 81 | 329 | 145 | 43 | 102 |
| 1996 | 7.47 | 3.56 | 391 | 77 | 323 | 145 | 32 | 113 |
| 1995 | 7.39 | 3.54 | 385 | 70 | 317 | 139 | 26 | 113 |
| 1994 | 6.84 | 2.98 | 386 | 64 | 305 | 145 | 24 | 121 |
| 1993 | 7.04 | 3.07 | 397 | 71 | 301 | 167 | 28 | 139 |
| 1992 | 7.95 | 3.87 | 408 | 71 | 306 | 173 | 36 | 136 |
| 1991 | 9.16 | 5.27 | 389 | 65 | 314 | 139 | 45 | 94 |
| 1990 | 9.88 | 5.94 | 394 | 61 | 319 | 137 | 42 | 95 |
| 1989 | 10.00 | 6.02 | 398 | 58 | 319 | 137 | 43 | 94 |
| 1988 | 9.56 | 5.63 | 392 | 52 | 307 | 138 | 39 | 99 |
| 1987 | 9.43 | 5.56 | 387 | 45 | 300 | 131 | 37 | 94 |
| 1986 | 10.26 | 6.32 | 394 | 54 | 311 | 136 | 36 | 100 |
| 1985 | 11.43 | 7.10 | 433 | 48 | 336 | 145 | 29 | 116 |
| 1984 | 11.96 | 7.36 | 460 | 40 | 347 | 153 | | |
| ⑤ 1983 | 11.65 | 7.04 | 461 | 35 | 368 | 128 | | |
| 1982 | 12.82 | 7.53 | 529 | | 418 | | | |
| 1981 | 12.31 | 7.22 | 509 | | 400 | | | |

(1) Interest yield and dividend/interest cost expressed as percent of average total assets, all other figures expressed in basis points (100 bp=1%) of avg assets.

(2) For data through 1991, net loan chargeoffs are reported instead of loan loss provisions.

(3) Net income is after the corporate stabilization expense

Source - CUNA

What Successful Credit Unions Have in Common

“Top Earner” Checklist



Top Earner Checklist

Loan-to-share ratio of 90% or greater

These credit unions put their money to work in loans. Each \$100,000 you take out of 1% investments and put into a 6% loan generates \$5,000 in additional revenue per year.

Top Earner Checklist

Minimum loan growth of 10% annually

Earnings will follow loans. Grow loans and you grow earnings. Declining loans will result in declining earnings.

Top Earner Checklist

Other income to assets of 2.5% or greater

You can't be a top performer without other income above your peers. Credit unions that focus on serving the underserved get a high return from members who like courtesy pay, gap insurances, credit life and disability, etc. This is the second largest revenue stream for credit unions. You cannot expect a high other income ratio if you are focused on serving only 'A+ and A' paper members.

Top Earner Checklist

World-class service

The best credit unions staff themselves with more employees, not less, that are well trained and give incredible service. Plus, the fact we came up with a solution the members feel loved. These members also tell their friends, fellow employees and family.



Top Earner Checklist

Higher ranking in loan yield versus their charge-off ranking

This indicates you are getting compensated for your risk above the peer group. For example, a credit union with a loan yield in the 19th percentile would expect a lower charge off percentile due to attracting higher quality members who receive lower rates. If the charge-off percentile is higher than the loan yield percentile, it indicates the credit union is not being compensated for the risk.

| | CU 1 | Peer | CU 2 |
|------------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Loan Yield Percentile vs. peers | 13 | X | 81 |
| Charge Off Percentile vs. peers | 70 | X | 44 |
| LY-CO Percentile | -57 | X | 37 |

| | CU 1 | Peer | CU 2 |
|---------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| Loan Yield Percentile vs. peers | 13 | X | 81 |
| Charge Off Percentile vs. peers | 70 | X | 44 |
| LY-CO Percentile | -57 | X | 37 |
| Loan Yield | 4.05% | 4.90% | 5.55% |
| Charge Off | 0.54% | 0.46% | 0.31% |
| Net Loan Yield | 3.51% | 4.44% | 5.24% |
| NLY Difference | -0.93% | X | 0.80% |

| | CU 1 | Peer | CU 2 |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|
| Loan Yield Percentile vs. peers | 13 | X | 81 |
| Charge Off Percentile vs. peers | 70 | X | 44 |
| LY-CO Percentile | -57 | X | 37 |
| Loan Yield | 4.05% | 4.90% | 5.55% |
| Charge Off | 0.54% | 0.46% | 0.31% |
| Net Loan Yield | 3.51% | 4.44% | 5.24% |
| NLY Difference | -0.93% | X | 0.80% |
| Loans | \$336,899,476 | X | \$97,315,728 |
| Cost / Benefit | -\$3,133,165 | X | \$778,526 |

What's wrong with Credit Union #1?

1. Underwriting problem, and/or
2. Collection problem, and/or
3. Pricing, and/or
4. Local economy

Top Earner Checklist

Net loan yield goal of 6.5% or higher

(Loan yields less charge offs), some as high as 8.0%. They do this by having well trained employees that serve the underserved that other are denying. They build relationships and the underserved will pay them before paying anyone else.

Top Earner Checklist

Delinquencies and charge offs are usually higher than their peers because they are taking more risk.

Top Earner Checklist

Primary financial institution (PFI)

Credit unions can take more risk if they have a relationship with the member and the member has all their business with the credit union (especially direct deposit).

Top Earner Checklist

Smaller than average loan balances

Mr. and Mrs. "A+" want a \$40,000 loan for their Lexus. You offer 2.9% and they ask you to do the "limbo". How low will you go? You settle at 1.99% for 60 months and your total Finance Charges are \$2,056, assuming the loan is not paid off early. Take the same \$40,000 and lend it for 48 months at 12% to 4 members who live on "D" street and earn \$10,560 in Finance Charges assuming no loan loss or prepayments. That is over 5 times the earnings with one less year. How are smaller loan balances accomplished?

- Less dependence on real estate.
- More dependence on unsecured (we recommend up to 20% of the portfolio).
- More emphasis on serving underserved (smaller car loans with higher yields).

Top Earner Checklist

Favorable FICO mix with a goal of
20% of portfolio C, D & E

However, the C, D & E should have a greater percentage in auto loans versus unsecured loans.

Top Earner Checklist

Incentive plans for all staff

You need a strong sales culture to be a top performing credit union. It will be difficult to establish a sales culture without generous incentive plans for all staff members. We have specific plans that can be implemented at your credit union.



LSCI strategies for Credit Unions to improve earnings:

1. Be aggressive at A & B unsecured lending. (It is OK to offer small signature loans to C, D & E members with Payroll Deduction.)
2. Provide basic transportation (aka auto loans) to C, D & E members who have a good source of income. By definition, C, D & E members don't pay all their bills, but most of them will pay for their car loans to get back and forth to work.
3. Focus on the trend. Many of your C & D members have FICO scores trending up and are far less risk than your high B and low A members with FICO scores trending down.
4. Focus on fee and other income opportunities.

A TALE OF TWO CREDIT UNIONS

Missed Opportunities vs Doing it the LSCI Way



Example #1: \$110M Credit Union

“Missed Opportunities Galore”

| | CU | Target |
|---------------------|---------------|--------|
| Assets \$ | \$110,828,794 | |
| Loans \$ | \$49,476,938 | |
| Shares \$ | \$100,477,000 | |
| Charge Off % | 0.59% | |
| Gross Loan Yield % | 4.73% | |
| Inv Yield % | 1.73% | |
| Fee & Other Inc % | 1.36% | 2.50% |
| Loan to Share (LTS) | 49.24% | 90.00% |
| Net Loan Yield | 4.14% | 6.50% |
| ROA | 0.21% | 1.5%+ |

Example 1...continued

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Income Opportunities: | |
| Additional Loan Income at Target LTS & Yield (90%, 6.5%) | \$4,027,271 |
| Additional Other Income at Target (2.5%) | <u>\$1,263,448</u> |
| Total Additional Earnings if all 3 Targets Achieved | \$5,290,719 |
| Forecasted Additional Expenses (Operations & Salary)* | <u>\$2,900,000</u> |
| Net Additional Earnings | \$2,390,719 |
| Post ROA if all 3 Targets Achieved (Current net earnings plus potential earnings) | 2.16% |

*Forecasted additional expenses were derived from a similar asset-sized peer credit union that is at or near target in all 3 categories.

Example #2: \$100M Credit Union

“Doing It the LSCI Way”

| | CU | Target |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------|
| Assets \$ | \$99,686,650 | |
| Loans \$ | \$70,785,932 | |
| Shares \$ | \$81,974,981 | |
| Charge Off % | 2.00% | |
| Loan Yield %* | 9.49% | |
| Inv Yield % | .78% | |
| Fee & Other Inc % | 4.34% | 2.50% |
| Loan to Share (LTS)** | 86.35% | 90.00% |
| Net Loan Yield | 7.49% | 6.50% |
| ROA | 2.00% | 1.5%+ |

*This CU has 51% of its loan portfolio in C, D & E paper.

**The only target this CU is missing is Loan-to-Share. If Loan-to-Share was met, they would generate additional income of approximately \$360,000.

LENDING LESSON

A Quick Minute on Score Codes, Trends,
and Things to Look For



‘A’ paper loans that fooled us and the dealer was happy

Indirect ‘A’ Paper Repossession Trends

| Name | Age | Sec. D/R | LTV | Score | HYLS | Drop |
|----------------|-----|----------|------|-------------------------|------|------|
| | 20 | 82% | 120% | 724 Invalid score | 530 | 27% |
| | 25 | 64% | 114% | 701 Invalid | 485 | 31% |
| | 27 | 52% | 93% | 729 Invalid | 615 | 16% |
| | 58 | 186% | 121% | 729 | 649 | 11% |
| | 71 | 148% | 121% | 723 | 558 | 23% |
| | 24 | 72% | 121% | 551 | 461 | 16% |
| | 24 | 59% | 123% | 689 | 584 | 18% |
| Average | 25 | 95% | 115% | 715 | 555 | 20% |

The important take a ways:

- Having secured debt ratio guidelines
- Validating scores
- Co-signers

***Secured Debt Ratio
Recommendations***

A+/A/B = up to 75%
C/D/E = up to 50%

Validating a Score:

1. 4 Trade lines
2. Cumulative of \$5,000
3. 2 years of credit history

| Age | Job time | FICO | Valid Score (Y/N) | # of New Accounts in 24 mos. | \$ of New Payments | Residence Status | Secured Debt Ratio | Debt Ratio | Unsecured Debt Ratio | LTV% after Add-ons | First Time Auto Buyer (Y/N) |
|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 32 | 1yr | 489 | Y | 5 | \$479 | Rent | 94% | 48% | 0% | 133.10% | N |
| 34 | 4yrs | 442 | N | 0 | \$182 | Other | 82% | 26% | 0% | 100% | Y |
| 23 | 4 mos | 493 | N | 3 | \$810 | Other | 58% | 33% | 12% | 70.00% | N |
| 42 | 3 mos | 594 | N | 4 | \$469 | Own | 11% | 3.30% | 0% | 96.00% | Y |
| 26 | 2 yrs | N/A | N | 0 | \$240 | Other | 76% | 26.70% | 0% | 101.00% | Y |
| 48 | 1 year | 677 | Y | 6 | \$1,328 | Own | 183% | 71.00% | 1% | 138.00% | N |
| 38 | 16 yrs | 481 | Y | 6 | \$2,051 | Own | 77% | 23.20% | 23% | 75.30% | N |
| 35 | 7yrs | 450 | Y | 12 | \$2,238 | Other | 115% | 46.90% | 31% | 118.00% | N |
| 21 | 5 mos | No score | N | 1 | \$91 | Other | 18% | 7.00% | 0% | 80.00% | Y |
| 27 | 2 mos. | No Score | N | 0 | \$318 | Lives At Home | 57% | 14.00% | 0% | 92.00% | Y |
| 24 | 3 | No score | N | 0 | \$260 | Rent | 60% | 39.80% | 0% | 113.00% | Y |
| 26 | 2 | 487 | Y | 5 | \$732 | Lives At Home | 111% | 36.00% | 29% | 89.00% | N |
| 33 | 6 | 559 | N | 22 | \$1,624 | Own | 117% | 48.60% | 32% | 85.00% | N |
| 26 | 1 | 636 | Y | 2 | \$624 | Lives At Home | 81% | 47.00% | 9% | 96.00% | Y |
| 53 | 4 mos. | 588 | N | 4 | \$515 | Other | 60% | 31.00% | 25% | 95.00% | Y |
| 59 | 4 | 627 | Y | 4 | \$1,157 | Own | 127% | 40.00% | 17% | 88.00% | N |
| 30 | 5 | 618 | Y | 6 | \$3,331 | Lives At Home | 95% | 36.00% | 7% | 83.00% | N |
| 20 | 3 mos | 587 | N | 1 | \$570 | Lives At Home | 102% | 49.00% | 71% | 102.00% | N |
| 61 | 20 | 513 | Y | 2 | \$330 | Other | 29% | 13.00% | 2% | 134.00% | - |
| 51 | 3 mos | 515 | Y | 6 | \$912 | Own | 45% | 20.00% | 0% | 75.00% | N |
| 27 | 5 | 644 | N | 1 | \$437 | Other | 148% | 40.00% | 1% | 115.00% | N |
| 31 | 1 | 604 | Y | 0 | \$622 | Own | 97% | 47.00% | 0% | 103.00% | Y |
| 20 | 1 | 465 | N | 2 | \$236 | Rent | 40% | 16.00% | 0% | 81.00% | Y |
| 24 | 4 | No Score | N | 2 | \$377 | Rent | 39% | 11.00% | 0% | 133.00% | Y |
| 20 | 3 | No score | N | 2 | \$220 | Rent | 60% | 17.00% | 0% | 111.00% | Y |
| 33.24 | 4.58 | 551 | | 3.84 | \$806.13 | | 79% | 32% | 10% | 100% | |

Common Traits of Delinquencies

- Stability: 50% had job times of a year or less and 28% had under 6 months or less
- Mystery borrowers: 50% of the sampling was first time buyers. 6 of the first time borrowers were over 25 years old (3 were over 30). Are they really all first time borrowers?
- Buying too much: Close to 70% had secured debt ratio over our recommendations
- Ratios fit: Debt ratio and unsecured debt ratio “fit into the box” (i.e. very low)
- Living for free: 52% were not paying rent or a mortgage
- Rapid spending: 32% had opened more than our recommend 2 trades per year
- New payment: Average totals in 24 months was \$800 and approximately 30% had over \$1000 in new payments

THE CODES CAN TELL THE STORY

Where is the real risk at?

| Turndowns | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------|----------------------|---|--|
| Paper Grade | FICO Score | Score Codes (First two) | Monthly Income | Annual Income | Debt Ratio | Unsecured Debt Ratio | Number of new accounts in the last 24 months | New Balances being accrued monthly (inflated income calculation) |
| C | 614 | 40,14 | \$2,276 | \$27,000 | 20% | 1% | 1 | \$299 |
| C | 625 | 38,13 | \$1,137 | \$13,644 | 68% | 2% | 2 | \$14 |
| D | 578 | 39,10 | \$5,000 | \$60,000 | 49% | 12% | 0 | 0 |
| A | 690 | 38,14 | \$4,333 | \$52,000 | 38% | 8% | 0 | 0 |
| B | 671 | 38,13 | \$4,333 | \$51,996 | 25% | 34% | 0 | 0 |
| Non-Performing/At Risk | | | | | | | | |
| Paper Grade | FICO Score | Score Codes (First two) | Monthly Income | Annual Income | Debt Ratio | Unsecured Debt Ratio | Number of new uns. accounts in the last 24 months | New Balances being accrued monthly (inflated income calculation) |
| A+ | 740* | 10,30 | \$3,210 | \$38,520 | 30% | 45% | 2 | \$944 |
| A+ | 736 | 10,08 | \$6,666 | \$80,000 | 23% | 34% | 3 | \$344 |
| B | 649 | 10,40 | \$4,698 | \$56,400 | 28% | 39% | 10 | \$1,460 |
| A | 695** | 10,11 | \$14,000 | \$168,000 | 26% | 52% | 3 | \$1,297 |
| B | 677 | 10,30 | \$11,167 | \$134,000 | 30% | 44% | 3 | \$1,535 |
| *CU lost \$16,307 on a \$17,744 debt consolidation loan & **CU lost \$35,000 on a \$55,000 auto loan | | | | | | | Lethal combination: #10 & 11 or #10 & 30 | |

Note the trend

Note the differences in how busy the bottom group has been

- 8 – Too many inquiries in last 12 months
- 10 – Proportion of balance to limits, too high on revolving
- 11 – Amount owed on revolving account is too high
- 13 – Time since delinquency is too recent or unknown
- 14 – Length of time accounts established

- 30 – Time since most recent account opening
- 38 – Serious delinquency, derogatory public record or collection filed
- 39 – Serious delinquency
- 40 – Derogatory or public record or collection filed

LETHAL SCORE COMBINATIONS

- Lethal score combinations for predicting bankruptcy are when these two codes are first and second in the pecking order.
 - Code 10 followed by either codes 30 or 14 (accelerated spending/length of time opened)
- Determining the rate of acceleration and deceleration
 - The higher the score with the first two codes of 38, 39, 40 (relating to late payments) the quicker the score is rebounding
 - The lower the score with the first two codes of 10, 14, 30 the quicker the score is plummeting.

Common Codes

10 – Proportion of balance to limits, too high on revolving

14 – Length of time accounts established

30 – Time since most recent account opening

38 – Serious delinquency, derogatory public record or collection filed

39 – Serious delinquency

40 – Derogatory or public record or collection filed



COMMON TRAITS OF SUCCESSFUL CREDIT UNIONS

WEBINAR 47

hosted by: Bob Schroeder

Questions? Submit using the WebEx toolbar.

*Contact Bob @ 815-761-0135
or bschroeder@rexcuadvice.com.*

