

A New Look at the CRA

By Prabal Chakrabarti, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
John Olson, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco

The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) of 1977 has been a part of the bank regulatory environment for over 30 years. While the statute itself and the regulations that implement it have changed over the intervening decades, a re-examination of the CRA seems particularly relevant in the current environment:

- The banking and broader financial services industries have changed significantly since the CRA was passed, and indeed, have changed significantly since the last major overhaul of the regulations in 1995. The intervening years have been marked by new institutions, new products, and a significantly changed regulatory framework.
- The turmoil in the mortgage, credit, and financial markets has prompted calls for a broad re-examination of how the universe of financial market participants is regulated and supervised.
- The crisis in subprime mortgage lending has prompted questions about the supervisory conditions under which subprime lending can be done responsibly.

These developments have raised questions about what role the CRA should play in financial services regulation, and to whom the CRA ought to apply. In response to the call for a re-examination of the CRA, the Federal Reserve Banks of Boston and San Francisco are jointly preparing a publication that captures the views of some of the leading thinkers on the future of the CRA. The contributors, who include bankers, community-based organizations, and academics, offer a broad range of observations and proposals.

While the publication will be available under separate cover in February, 2009, the authors of this article have identified a set of themes and key questions that emerge from these analyses and commentaries. These themes and questions are not policy proposals, or descriptions of a particular solution. Rather, they are an extended range of questions for policymakers and market participants to grapple with as they consider the future of the CRA.

What IS the CRA?

One key set of questions that arises in this re-examination of the CRA is related to the philosophical underpinnings or justifications for the CRA. What is the underlying intent of the CRA? Is it intended to repair a market failure, perhaps a lack of information about credit quality in low-income areas? Is it intended to encourage banks to look harder for business opportunities that they otherwise would have missed? Is it intended to compel, or encourage, banks to help meet social policy objectives, perhaps as compensation for the privilege

of the bank charter or deposit insurance? If the latter, is the intent of the CRA to encourage banks to do things that are somewhat less profitable to further the social goal? To do things that are unprofitable? Have the philosophical underpinnings of the CRA evolved over time as the regulations and the banking environment have changed?

These questions emerge from the current arrangement, in which the CRA applies only to banks and thrifts. If the CRA were to be expanded to other sorts of financial institutions, what justifications or philosophical underpinnings might apply? If we consider taxpayer subsidy or support to be the “hook” on which we hang the CRA for the banks and thrifts, recent events suggest that other industries that enjoy explicit or implicit taxpayer support would be subject to the same analysis. While the Congress found in the CRA that banks have a “continuing and affirmative obligation” to help meet the credit needs of the communities in which they are chartered, do other types of financial institutions have the same obligation?

People versus Place

Another of the key themes raised by a re-examination of the CRA is the question of whether the CRA ought to be targeted at people or geographies. The current regulations measure how well financial institutions are serving the credit needs of both low- and moderate-income geographies and low- and moderate-income people in their assessment areas.

Several questions emerge from this arrangement. The notion of a financial institution’s “assessment area” based on branch locations merits review, particularly with the evolution of financial services delivery mechanisms that do not rely on a branch network. If the assessment area is not based on branch presence, how should it be defined? If an institution makes loans in a geography, or passes some threshold for market share in a geography, should that geography be included in the bank’s assessment area?

The questions raised under this theme are different for other types of financial institutions. For financial institutions without a consumer product delivery presence, a CRA-like requirement might examine these institutions’ role in supporting community development finance, but a clear regulation would need to define where this support would be required to be provided, to whom, and in what form.

Another question is whether the population segments targeted by the CRA should be based solely on income, or if race should be introduced into the CRA calculus. If a guiding principle of the CRA is that financial institutions should serve the credit needs of “the entire community,”

policymakers might contemplate procedures that take race into consideration when determining which segments of the population are underserved.

Incentives for CRA Performance

Recent trends in CRA ratings show that the vast majority of institutions have a Satisfactory or Outstanding CRA rating. The rewards of having an Outstanding CRA rating can be difficult to quantify, and many institutions seem perfectly happy with a Satisfactory rating. Should a new CRA rule consider some reward for “stretching,” for example by rewarding Outstanding institutions with favorable treatment? Or should the CRA just be a floor, ensuring that institutions are doing a reasonably good job of meeting credit needs?

Disclosure of CRA Performance

One critical aspect of the CRA’s impact on the industry and the communities it serves is the public nature of the CRA performance evaluation. Any member of the public can access an evaluation and form his/her own opinion about the institution’s performance, and interact with the bank to encourage greater community development activity.


In light of the ease with which the public can access this information, what role does disclosure play? Should the law simply require disclosure of information about products and services, terms, geographies served, etc., or should it encourage institutions to adopt new products or practices? How can community organizations play a role in using the information to encourage change?

And Finally... Do We Still Need the CRA?

The question of whether the CRA is needed in the first place is also directly related to the question of the philosophical underpinnings of the CRA. Has the problem that prompted the creation of the CRA, specifically, the practice of redlining, been solved? Is it useful in achieving other social goods, such as poverty alleviation, affordable housing, or neighborhood revitalization?

While we can frame this discussion using the CRA as a starting point, policy makers may also want to think in terms of a blank slate. What 21st century market issues exist? What inequalities are of concern? Can the CRA solve these issues, and if so, does the law need to be expanded or revised? Or, if the CRA is specific to the banks, then should the response to these broader issues be grounded in something other than the CRA?

A Framework for Discussion

Our hope for the forthcoming publication is that it will offer a framework for discussion. A review of the CRA raises many questions, some of which have been explored here in a preliminary way. A more thorough treatment of these questions, as well as others that emerge, will lay the groundwork for a thoughtful examination of the CRA and its role in the regulation of financial services. We invite all concerned parties to contribute to the discussion. 

CRA and the Subprime Crisis

Box 7.1

The CRA has recently come under attack from a number of critics in light of the subprime mortgage crisis. They argue that the law caused banking institutions to engage in high-risk mortgage lending in order to fulfill their CRA obligations to help meet the credit needs of low-income borrowers and areas. However, no empirical evidence has been presented to support these claims. Ben Bernanke, Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, recently stated, “Our own experience with CRA over more than 30 years and recent analysis of available data, including data on subprime loan performance, runs counter to the charge that CRA was at the root of, or otherwise contributed in any substantive way to, the current mortgage difficulties.”¹ A growing body of empirical research refutes the charges against the CRA:

- Over the thirty year track record of the CRA, lending to lower-income individuals and communities has been nearly as profitable and performed similarly to other types of lending done by CRA-covered institutions. The long-term evidence shows that the CRA has not pushed banks into extending loans that perform out of line with their traditional businesses.²
- During the height of the subprime boom, only 6 percent of all the higher-priced loans were extended by CRA-covered lenders to lower-income borrowers or neighborhoods in their CRA assessment areas. The very small share of all higher-priced loan originations that can reasonably be attributed to the CRA is contrary to the charge that the law contributed significantly to the current subprime crisis.³
- Financial institutions seeking CRA credit can also purchase loans from lenders not covered by the CRA. However, less than 2 percent of the higher-priced and CRA-credit-eligible mortgage originations sold by independent mortgage companies were purchased by CRA-covered institutions.
- A recent study based on loans originated in California between January 2004 and December 2006 found that loans originated by lenders regulated under the CRA, in general, were significantly less likely to be in foreclosure than those originated by independent mortgage companies. Further, loans made by CRA lenders within their assessment areas were generally half as likely to go into foreclosure as those made by independent mortgage companies not covered by the CRA.⁴

Strengthening Community Development Infrastructure

1. Malanga, Steven (2005). "America's Worst Urban Program: The Bush Administration is right to put the community development block grant out of its misery." *City Journal*, Spring 2005. Online at www.city-journal.org.
2. Richardson, Todd (2005) "CDBG Formula Targeting to Community Development Need." Office of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, DC. February 2005.
3. Czerwinski, Stanley (2006). "Community Development Block Grant Formula: Options for Improving the Targeting of Funds." United States Government Accountability Office, Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives. June 27, 2006, and Buss, Terry (2008). "Reforming CDBG: An Illusive Quest" *Reengineering Community Development for the 21st Century*, eds. Donna Fabiani and Terry Buss, National Academy of Public Administration, ME Sharpe, Armonk, New York, 2008.
4. Accordino, John, George Galster, and Peter Tatian (2005). "The Impacts of Targeted Public and Nonprofit Investment on Neighborhood Development." LISC and the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, July 2005.
5. Buss, Terry (2008).

Encouraging Entrepreneurship

1. This paper is based in part on a policy paper developed by the Microenterprise Anti-Poverty Consortium (MAP). Comprising the Corporation for Enterprise Development (CFED), the Association for Enterprise Opportunity, The Aspen Institute and the Center for Rural Affairs, the mission of MAP is to advance microenterprise as an anti-poverty and economic development strategy.
2. Association for Enterprise Opportunity (2008) "About Microenterprise" www.microenterpriseworks.org
3. National Community Reinvestment Coalition. "The Community Reinvestment Act" http://www.ncrc.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=100&Itemid=123
4. Joachim, David (2008). "Betting your Retirement on Your Startup," *The New York Times*, published September 30, 2008.
5. "2006 Annual Report to Congress." (2006) National Tax Payer Advocate. <http://www.irs.gov/advocate/>
6. "Report to Congress Assets for Independence Program, Status at the Conclusion of the 8th Year", Office of Community Services, Administration of Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2008). <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/afi/research.html>; "ORR Individual Development Account Program: An Evaluation Report; full report," Office of Refugee Resettlement, Administration of Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, <http://www.ised.us/template/page.cfm?id=223>; and CFED's 2006 IDA program survey.
7. Joyce A. Klein, Ilgar Alisultanov and Amy Kays Blair, *Microenterprise as a Welfare-to-Work Strategy: Two-Year Findings*. (Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute, November 2003), 48; and Peggy Clark and Amy Kays, *Microenterprise and the Poor*. (Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute, 1999), 69.

A New Look at the CRA

1. Press release of Senator Robert Menendez, "Fed Chairman Bernanke Confirms to Sen. Menendez that Community Reinvestment Act is not to Blame for Foreclosure Crisis" December 2, 2008. <http://menendez.senate.gov/pdf/112508ResponsefromBernankeonCRA.pdf>

2. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (1993), Report to the Congress on Community Development Lending by Depository Institutions (Washington: Board of Governors), pp. 1-69; and Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (2000), The Performance and Profitability of CRA-Related Lending (Washington: Board of Governors, July), pp. 1-99.
3. Please see the speech "The Community Reinvestment Act and the Recent Mortgage Crisis" by Federal Reserve Governor Randall Kroszner, delivered December 3, 2008 for more information. www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/kroszner20081203a.htm
4. Laderman, Elizabeth and Carolina Reid (2008). "Lending in Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods in California: The Performance of CRA Lending During the Subprime Meltdown" Working paper presented at the Federal Reserve System Conference on Housing and Mortgage Markets, Washington, DC, December 4, 2008.

A New Safety Net for Low-Income Families

1. This article is adapted from "A New Safety Net for Low Income Families," by Sheila Zedlewski, Ajay Chaudry, and Margaret Simms (2008). The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/publications/411738.html
2. Acs, Gregory and Margery Austin Turner (2008). "Making Work Pay Enough: A Decent Standard of Living for Working Families." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411710_work_pay.pdf
3. U.S. Census Bureau News (2008). "Household Income Rises, Poverty Rate Unchanged, Number of Uninsured Down." Press release, August 26, 2008.
4. Perry, Cynthia and Linda Blumberg (2008). "Making Work Pay II: Comprehensive Health Insurance for Low-Income Working Families." The Urban Institute. http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411714_working_families.pdf
5. Waters Boots, Shelly, Jennifer Macomber, and Anna Danzinger (2008). "Family Security: Supporting Parents' Employment and Children's Development." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411718_parent_employment.pdf
6. Holzer, Harry and Karin Martinson (2008). "Helping Poor Working Parents Get Ahead: Federal Funds for New State Strategies and Systems." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411722_working_parents.pdf
7. Loprest, Pamela and Karin Martinson (2008). "Supporting Work for Low-Income People with Significant Challenges." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411726_supporting_work.pdf
8. Simms, Margaret (2008). "Weathering Job Loss: Unemployment Insurance." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411730_job_loss.pdf
9. McKernan, Signe-Mary and Caroline Ratcliffe (2008). "Enabling Families to Weather Emergencies and Develop." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411734_enabling_families.pdf

Return on Investment

1. Alan Greenspan, "Sustainable Community Development: What Works, What Doesn't, and Why?" remarks delivered at Federal Reserve System conference on Community Affairs Research, March 28, 2003. <http://www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/speeches/2003/20030328/default.htm>.
2. The Urban Institute (2008). *Beyond Ideology, Politics, and Guesswork: The Case for Evidence-Based Policy: Revised 2008* (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute).
3. National Academy of Sciences (2008). *Rebuilding the Research Capacity at HUD* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences).
4. Ibid., p. 2-13.

Supporting Young Children and Families

1. This article is adapted from "Supporting Young Children and Families: An Investment Strategy That Pays," by Julia Isaacs, published by The Brookings Institution Opportunity 08 project and the First Focus publication *Big Ideas for Children: Investing in Our Nation's Future*.
 2. The estimate assumes annual per child costs of \$9,200 per year and participation rates of 75 percent for poor four-year olds, 60 percent for poor three-year olds as well as partially subsidized four-year olds, and 35 percent for partially subsidized three-year olds. For more details, see Isaacs, 2007.
 3. Subtracting out the \$6.5 billion currently provided to three- and four-year olds through Head Start yields the \$18 billion figure for new costs. The long-term goal would be to bring the national Head Start program and the burgeoning state pre-kindergarten programs together into an expanded national pre-kindergarten initiative that provides comprehensive, high-quality services to three- and four-year-olds. Initially, however, the federal government might have to continue separate funding streams for Head Start and the new pre-kindergarten initiative.
 4. Rolnick, Arthur and Rob Grunewald (2007). "The Economics of Early Childhood Development as Seen by Two Fed Economists," *Community Investments* 19(2), Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.
 5. Olds, David L. (2006). "The Nurse-Family Partnership: An Evidence-Based Preventive Intervention." *Infant Mental Health Journal*, vol. 27, no. 1: 5-25.
 6. The \$2 billion estimate follows the methodology outlined in Isaacs, 2007 (Cost Effective Investments in Children, Brookings Institution) except that it assumes that 50 percent of eligible women would participate, as in typical sites operating today, rather than 75 percent, as in the initial three experiments. This change, based on information provided by the Nurse-Family Partnership National Service Office, reduces the cost estimate from \$3 billion to \$2 billion.
 7. Waldfogel, Jane (1999). "Family Leave Coverage in the 1990s." *Monthly Labor Review*. October 1999, 13-21.
 8. See Boots, Macomber, and Danziger (2008) "Family Security: Supporting Parents' Employment and Children's Development," The Urban Institute, for further information on California's Paid Family Leave program and for a similar proposal for employee-financed paid family leave through state pooled funds.
11. Lipman, Barbara. (2005) "Something's Gotta Give: Working Families and the High Cost of Housing," Center for Housing Policy. http://www.nhc.org/pdf/pub_nc_sgg_04_05.pdf
 12. Housing + Transportation Affordability Index <http://htaindex.cnt.org/>
 13. Reconnecting America. "Realizing the Potential: Expanding Housing Opportunities Near Transit." www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/reports
 14. Ibid.
 15. "Research Demonstrates Positive Impact of Family Resident Services on Property Financial Performance" (2007) Enterprise Community Partners, Inc. <http://www.practitionerresources.org/cache/documents/645/64551.pdf>
 16. Proscio, Tony. (2006) "More than Roofs and Walls: Why Resident Services are an Indispensable Part of Affordable Housing" Enterprise Community Partners.
 17. "2008-2010 Research and Policy Agenda" National Resident Services Collaborative. http://www.enterprisecommunity.org/programs/documents/research_policy_agenda.pdf
 18. Waller, Margy. (2005) "High Cost or High Opportunity Cost? Transportation and Family Economic Success," *Brookings Institution Policy Brief*, Center on Children and Families #35, December 2005.
 19. Garfinkel, Perry. "A Hotel's Secret: Treat the Guests Like Guests." *New York Times*, August 23, 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/23/business/23interview.html>
 20. Proscio, Tony. (2008) "Sustainable, Affordable, Doable: Demystifying the Process of Green Affordable Housing" Enterprise Community Partners.
 21. "H.R. 6078: GREEN Act of 2008" Govtrack. www.govtrack.us
 22. Proscio, Tony. (2008) "Sustainable, Affordable, Doable: Demystifying the Process of Green Affordable Housing" Enterprise Community Partners.
 23. Ibid.

Twenty-First Century Ownership

1. Sherraden, Michael (1991). *Assets and the Poor*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
2. Brown, Larry, Robert Kuttner, and Thomas Shapiro (2005). "Building a Real Ownership Society."; Bynner, J. and Will Paxton (2001). "The Asset Effect." London, Institute for Public Policy Research; Schneider, Daniel and Peter Tufano (2004). "New Savings from Old Innovations: Asset-Building for the Less Affluent." Community Development Finance Research Conference; Shapiro, Thomas (2004). *The Hidden Cost of Being African-American*: Oxford University Press; Sodha, Sonia (2006). "Lessons from Across the Atlantic."
3. Woo, Beadsie and Heather McCoullough (2008). "Expanding Asset Building through Shared Ownership." Annie E Casey Foundation.
4. Market Creek Plaza website, www.marketcreek.com
5. Interview with Tracy Bryan, Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation
6. Stuhldreher, Anne (2007). "The People's IPO: Lower-income patrons of Market Creek Plaza can now invest in the shopping center." *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2006.
7. Interview with Tracy Bryan, Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation
8. New Hampshire Community Loan Fund (2008). News release, "Loan Fund sends housing strategy nationwide." May 6, 2008.
9. French, Charlie, Kelly Giraud, and Sallid Ward (2008). "Building Wealth through Ownership: Resident-Owned manufactured housing communities in New Hampshire." *Journal of Extension*, 46.
10. Fireside, Daniel (2008). "Community Land Trust Keeps Prices Affordable - for now and forever." *Yes! Magazine*, Fall 2008.
11. Mission Asset Fund website. "The Mission Asset Fund: Investing in the American Dream." www.missionassetfund.org
12. Ibid.
13. Interview with Steve Meacham, Tenant Organizing Coordinator, Vida Urbana, October 3, 2008
14. Silverman, Ann, Kalima Rose, and Dwayne S. Marsh (2006). "Community Controlled Housing for Massachusetts: Securing Affordability for the Long Term." Action for Regional Equity, Policy Link.