

Pace University

DigitalCommons@Pace

Faculty Working Papers

Lubin School of Business

8-1-2003

Credit union industry consolidation in the 1990s.

James S. Gould

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/lubinfaculty_workingpapers

Recommended Citation

Gould, James S., "Credit union industry consolidation in the 1990s." (2003). *Faculty Working Papers*. 160.
https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/lubinfaculty_workingpapers/160

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Lubin School of Business at DigitalCommons@Pace. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Working Papers by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Pace. For more information, please contact nmcguire@pace.edu.

**CENTER
FOR
APPLIED
RESEARCH**

**WORKING
PAPERS**

No. 212 August 2003

**Credit Union Industry Consolidation
In the 1990s**

by

**James S. Gould, Ph.D.
Professor of Marketing
Lubin School of Business
Pace University**

**Surendra K. Kaushik, Ph.D.
Professor of Finance
Lubin School of Business
Pace University**

and

**Raymond H. Lopez, Ph.D.
Professor of Finance
Lubin School of Business
Pace University**

Lubin School of Business

PACE
UNIVERSITY

**CREDIT UNION INDUSTRY
CONSOLIDATION
IN THE 1990s**

by

**James S. Gould, Ph.D.,
Surendra K. Kaushik, Ph.D.,
and
Raymond H. Lopez, Ph.D.**

Dr. James S. Gould is Professor of Marketing at the Lubin School of Business, Pace University.

Dr. Surendra K. Kaushik is Professor of Finance at the Lubin School of Business, Pace University.

Dr. Raymond H. Lopez is Professor of Finance at the Lubin School of Business, Pace University, and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Academic Federal Credit Union.

INTRODUCTION

Dramatic changes have taken place in the financial services industry in the United States over the last quarter century. This has been the era of deregulation in financial services and it has dramatically affected every institution operating within the industry. The objective of this study is to examine forces influencing the changing structure of the credit union industry as it competes with larger financial services entities.

In the years before deregulation, there were clear lines of distinction between depository institutions operating in the financial services marketplace. The largest participants, measured by assets or operating income, were the commercial banks whose primary characteristics were the offering of checkable deposits and the making of commercial loans. Mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations offered passbook savings accounts and made residential mortgage loans. Credit unions offered share savings accounts on which they paid dividends and made consumer installment loans to their members.

In the last three decades, the unique characteristics and distinctions of these institutions have blurred. Each group has expanded and diversified its product and service offerings to both lenders and borrowers. As new opportunities for providing financial services have developed, there has been increased competition from other market segments. Full service brokerage houses, money market mutual funds and mutual fund families have created new savings and investment instruments, advertising and marketing them nationwide. With the repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act in 1999, the "one-stop" financial services institution became a reality.

In terms of total assets, as well as average assets per institution, credit unions are the smallest "players" in the financial services industry. Therefore it would be easy to conclude that in this increasingly competitive marketplace, their position would be the most likely to deteriorate, vis-à-vis larger more diversified firms. Yet the operating performance of the industry has been extraordinary. Operating data analyzed in this study show clearly how the industry has grown and evolved to meet the financial services needs and desires of its growing membership base while experiencing significant consolidation.

COMPETITIVE PERSPECTIVE IN FINANCIAL SERVICES

The structure of the credit union industry has evolved over the last quarter century influenced by both internal and external forces. Inside the industry, data will show enhanced efficiencies due to asset size, providing members with expanded services at competitive prices. External forces have also been contributing to the structure and shape of the industry. The competitive landscape of financial services has created challenges and opportunities that must be addressed by credit union managers, boards of directors, and government regulators.

Since the commercial banking segment of the financial services industry is the largest in terms of assets, branches, products, etc., it has had an impact on shaping every institution in the marketplace. In the 1990s, two key pieces of legislation have had a direct impact on commercial bank structure and an indirect impact on other players in financial services.

In September of 1994, Congress passed the Riegle-Neal Interstate Banking and Branching Efficiency Act allowing banks and bank-holding companies to establish branches across state lines. This proved to be the final stage of a decades long process of bank branching deregulation in the United States whose restrictions date from the Banking Act of 1933. Along with the relaxation of state restrictions on statewide and interstate branching in the 1970s and 1980s, higher asset concentrations in the banking industry have been observed for decades.⁽¹⁾

In addition to first reducing and ultimately eliminating branching restrictions, important technological innovations have contributed to concentration throughout the financial services industry. The computer revolution for data gathering, analysis, and storage and the growth of ATM utilization by the public have had an impact on industry structure. The efficiency gains are greatest in large high-tech financial institutions with bank customers and members of credit unions deriving the benefits of lower product costs and enhanced speed of transaction execution.

In November of 1999, Congress passed the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Financial Services Modernization Act, allowing affiliations among banks, securities firms, and insurance companies. This act effectively created a new type of institution, the financial holding company, which could now offer banking, securities, and insurance products under one roof. By July of 2001, 558 financial holding companies had been formed, with 19 of the 20 largest banks in the U.S. belonging to a financial holding company.⁽²⁾

Other provisions of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act are intended to increase competition and efficiency not only within the banking industry but throughout all financial service institutions. These changes affect the flows of entry and exit by institutions, the optimum size and scale of operations, growth prospects, and the degree of horizontal and vertical integration of servicing entities providing financial services.

In response to regulatory changes in the financial services industry of the 1990s, the Credit Union Membership Access Act of 1998 was critical to this market segment. In an environment of larger more diversified competitive institutions, credit unions had to have the ability to attract more members by expanding their "field of membership." Under the Federal Credit Union Act of 1934, membership was limited to "individuals sharing a common bond of occupation, association, or geographic area." In 1982, the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA) interpreted this common bond

(1) Ennis, Huberto M., "On the Size Distribution of Banks," *Economic Quarterly*, Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, Volume 87/4, Fall, 2001. pp.1-25

(2) Ibid.

requirement to allow certain credit unions to add multiple groups to their membership as “select employee groups” or SEG’s. In early 1998, the Supreme Court ruled against the NCUA and its interpretation of the common bond requirement. Later that year the Credit Union Membership Access Act expressly allowed for the addition of multiple groups to a credit union’s field-of-membership.⁽³⁾

Limited membership of federally chartered credit unions has created portfolio concentration risks over the years. By expanding and diversifying fields-of-membership, these risks can be mitigated, thus providing enhanced products and services to members.

CREDIT UNION INDUSTRY OVERVIEW

Credit union industry membership grew by almost 18 million in the 1990s from 61.1 million in 1991 to 78.9 million in 2000 and 80.7 million in 2001. This represented an average annual growth rate of 2.8 percent, almost three times the growth rate of the U.S. population (1.01 percent per year).

Table 1 presents credit union members grouped by the asset size of the credit unions to which they belonged. There has been a steady exodus of members in all asset categories below \$50 million. All the growth in membership has taken place in the four asset categories from \$50 million up to the \$500 million plus group. Upon further examination, there was a 23.7 million member increase in just those credit unions with assets of \$200 million and higher. This consolidation trend, especially in the larger asset size credit unions, is the significant story of the last decade.⁽⁴⁾

The number of operating credit unions has declined steadily over the last eleven years, from 13,524 in 1991 to 10,206 in 2001. In Table 2, data show that there has been a decline in the number of credit unions with assets below \$10 million. Every other category has grown in numbers from a 2.9 percent increase in the \$10-20 million category to a 323.1 percent increase in the \$500 million plus group. The sharpest decline was experienced by the smallest asset size group, those with assets under \$500,000. Almost two-thirds of all these credit unions have disappeared in the last decade. No doubt most of them either grew in size or merged with larger credit unions.

Table 3 presents member assets held by various asset size credit unions. Once again, it is clear that there has been a significant shift in funds toward the larger institutions. Smaller credit unions with assets below \$10 million have seen declines in asset holdings, while those above \$10 million have attracted funds. Also the larger the asset category the greater the asset growth, while the smaller the asset category the larger the decline in asset holdings.

(3) Frame, W. Scott, Gordon V. Karels, and Christine McClatchey, “The Effect of the Common Bond and Membership Expansion on Credit Union Risk,” *Working Paper 2001-10*, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, April 2001.

(4) All data in this study cover an eleven-year period from 1990 through 2001.

FACTORS UNDERLYING CREDIT UNION CONSOLIDATION

Credit union members desire the best terms for the products and services available from the financial services marketplace. As members, they have already decided to save with their credit union. Therefore, they must have "comparison shopped" and determined that their credit unions savings rates equaled or surpassed those of other financial institutions.

From data in Table 4, it may be observed that within the credit union industry there is a positive relationship between the level of savings rates and the size of the credit union. For every year of the period under analysis, larger credit unions paid out higher average savings rates to their members. Larger credit union (assets over \$50 million) payouts were 30 to 40 percent higher each year than those paid out by the smallest asset categories (under \$5 million)! The \$500+ million asset group has paid interest rates above the "all credit union" category every year of this study. Credit unions under \$100 million have paid lower rates each year, while the \$100 million to \$500 million asset groups generally paid approximately the overall industry average rates. For individuals who are members of more than one credit union, it is not difficult to expect them to keep most of their funds in the larger asset institutions. This study will examine the method by which larger credit unions can afford to be more competitive.

Credit union members utilize their institutions as a source of funds for a variety of loan needs. From unsecured borrowings to car loans, to home equity loans and mortgages, most credit unions offer a broad variety of lending products. The costs as well as the terms of these deals are critical to the members' financial situation and satisfaction.

Again, credit unions have been very successful at supplying members with funds when required. Data in Table 5 present average loan rates charged by credit unions of different asset sizes. These loans generate the greatest source of income needed to sustain a credit union's operations, but members are still interested in paying the lowest rate for their borrowings. It can be observed quite clearly that the largest credit unions (assets over \$200 million) charged their members rates lower than those of the industry average. In fact, the \$500 million plus asset group has charged rates at least 20 percent lower on average than those charged by the smallest credit unions (under \$5 million) every year. This has been another reason for the much more rapid expansion in membership and asset growth of large over small credit unions.

It is neither the volume of loans nor the interest charged on those loans that generates income for the credit union. All loans involve the risk of delinquency and/or default by the member, resulting in expenses that must be covered as part of the operations of the institution. Credit unions have a long history of working with members to keep these delinquencies as low as possible, using prudent managerial techniques. However, not all problem loans can be resurrected and paid in full.

Table 6 presents data comparing delinquent loan levels to total loans by credit union asset size. Variations between large and small credit unions are quite significant

for our data period. The smallest credit unions consistently exhibit delinquency ratios that are 4 to 5 times as high as those for the largest credit unions! Even when credit union size reaches \$10 million, delinquency rates are approximately double those of the \$500 million plus asset group.

Not all delinquent loans result in net charge-offs to operating income. Credit union managers across all asset sizes are proud of their record in this area. Table 7 presents data showing net charge-offs to average loans by asset size and, while larger credit unions sustain smaller write-offs, the differentials in size categories are not nearly as great as they were for delinquencies. The largest credit unions (\$500 million plus assets) generally have net charge-off/average loan ratios that are approximately one-half of the smallest credit unions (under \$2 million assets).

For asset groups above \$200 million, charge-off rates are equal or less than the overall average. In contrast, all credit unions with assets under \$20 million have charge-offs higher than industry averages. These differentials translate into significant average cost savings for larger institutions.

When operating expenses are examined by asset size, it is observed that per dollar of asset, the largest credit unions have the lowest expense ratios. Table 8 presents these data for the last eleven years, noting that the variance, while declining over the period, still is significantly lower for the largest credit unions. The operating expense/asset ratios for large credit unions (\$500 million plus assets) are approximately 60 to 65 percent of those for the smallest credit union (assets under \$5 million).

The \$500 million plus asset category has achieved operating expense ratios below the industry average in every year of the study. All groups with assets under \$100 million have higher operating ratios, while the \$100 to \$500 million categories have mixed levels in relation to the industry average. By holding down expenses, larger credit unions take advantage of economies of scale and scope, passing along these savings to their members.

Another set of data also contribute to the findings of this study. Table 9 presents net capital/asset ratios of credit unions by asset size. There are significant inverse relationships between the size of this ratio and the asset size of the credit union. The trends over time have been towards the increasing size of the net capital/asset ratio for all asset size credit unions. This shows that credit unions have been able to generate more income each year than expense, with the result being an increasing trend in the net capital/asset ratio. For each year, it may be observed that the smallest credit unions have the highest capital ratios.

The net capital account of a credit union represents reserves against the adverse effects of various risks that credit unions are exposed to in their operations. These data seem to conclude that smaller credit unions are more risky and, therefore, their managements feel it is prudent to keep higher levels of reserves in the form of capital. In contrast, larger credit unions, with more diversified loan and investment portfolios and lower relative expense levels, are able to operate with lower levels of the net capital.

Over the years, the net capital/asset ratios of even these larger credit unions have grown. Interestingly, percentage growth increased from the smallest credit unions to those in the \$1-2 million category. From that size on, the general trend was downward from a 57 percent increase to the 46 to 48 percent range.

In the annual CUNA yearbook survey of credit union services, it may be observed that selected services offered by credit unions expand significantly as the asset size of the credit union increases (Table 10). Credit unions with assets under \$10 million generally do not offer many services needed by their members. For organizations between \$10 million and \$50 million, the offerings grow significantly and above \$50 million, members can be quite confident of being offered the broadest spectrum of financial services.

SUMMARY

Analysis of the data presented in this study explains clearly the underlying reasons for growth and consolidation experienced by the credit union industry in the eleven-year period ending in 2001. Larger asset size credit unions simply provide their members with a more varied portfolio of financial services in a more efficient and cost effective manner. Loan rates are lower, savings rates are higher, delinquencies and charge-offs are lower, operating expenses are lower and lower reserve levels allow for more benefits to flow through to the membership (the owners of the credit union). Members have been better off at larger credit unions or at least at those with asset levels over \$50 million. It seems quite likely that continued consolidation in the industry will take place well into the 21st century.

Do these findings imply that the "small" credit union (assets under \$10 million) will soon disappear? No. There will always be small credit unions to provide services to new membership groups. Smaller credit unions (assets under \$20 million) have enhanced their competitive positions over the last decade. Strategies such as "shared branching" and sharing ATM networks have contributed to expanded member services. These initiatives may have slowed the rate of decline in those series, but were ultimately unsuccessful in stopping the declines. Yet data in Tables 1, 2, and 3 show a significant trend of declines in members, credit unions, and assets over the 1991 through 2001 period.

While smaller credit unions will continue to be formed, they will quickly realize that their membership will expect expanded-loan and savings products as well as other financial services. If they are able to grow their assets and expand their offerings, members will be served. However, if they lag behind member demands, select employee groups (SEGS) may find consolidation with a larger credit union will be the best strategy for their membership. A more diversified portfolio of services is needed to keep members in their credit union and not pursuing services from other financial institutions.

The industry has performed very well for its numbers and there is every reason to be optimistic about the future of credit unions as long as they continue to meet member needs and desires effectively and efficiently in the years ahead. However, the number of operating credit unions is likely to continue to decline with membership and assets continuing to grow faster at the largest institutions.

REFERENCES

Berger, Allen N., Rebecca S. Dernsetz, and Philip E. Strahan. "The Consolidation of the Financial Services Industry: Causes, Consequences and Implications for the Future." *Journal of Banking and Finance* 23. February 1999: 135-94.

Broadus, J. Alfred, Jr. "The Bank Merger Wave: Causes and Consequences." *Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond* 84. Summer 1998:1-11.

Dernovsek, Daria. "Large CUs are moving forward, but small CUs struggle with limited resources." *Credit Union Magazine*. April 2002.

Dernovsek, Daria. "The Challenges of Connectivity." *Credit Union Magazine*. April 2002.

Dunn, Mary. "A healthy environment is top regulatory goal for 2002." *Credit Union Magazine*. January 2002.

Ennis, Huberto M. "On the Size Distribution of Banks." *Economic Quarterly*. Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond 87/4. Fall 2001:1-25.

Fleming, Cathy. "Technology a savior for small CUs." *Credit Union Magazine*. September 2002.

Frame, W. Scott, Gordon V. Karels, and Christine McClatchey. "The Effect of the Common Bond and Membership Expansion on Credit Union Risk." *Working Paper 2001-10*. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta. April 2001.

Mica, David A. "Remember what got us here." *Credit Union Magazine*. September 2002.

Ortiz, Laura. "Shrinking As It Grows, CU Movement Close To Historical Mark." *The Credit Union Journal*. 11 November 2002.

Ortiz, Laura. "For Small CU, Loan Ratio Strong Despite Deposits." *The Credit Union Journal*. 25 November 2002.

Peterson, Ann Hayes. "A Shared Vision." *Credit Union Magazine*. November 2002.

Schenk, Mike. "Small CUs: big PCA hurdle?" *Credit Union Magazine*. June 2000.

Schenk, Mike. "Supporting Small CUs." *Credit Union Magazine*. November 2002.

"The Big Q and A with managers of small credit unions." *The Credit Union Journal*. 11 November 2002.

TABLES

TABLE 1

**Number of Credit Union Members
By Credit Union Asset Size
(in thousands)
1991 - 2001**

Year	0 - .5	.5 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 5	5 - 10	10 - 20	20 - 50	50 - 100	100 - 200	200 - 500	500 +	Annual Totals (Year End)	Median Asset Size
2001	162.7	247.0	542.0	1774.7	3136.0	4850.4	10,628.2	9,563.5	11,389.4	15,734.1	22,702.9	80,730.9	100-200
2000	189.7	297.0	631.4	2101.6	3431.5	5293.5	10,933.1	9,950.0	11,492.3	15,196.1	19,369.0	78,885.3	100-200
1999	208.6	317.0	677.3	2218.1	3618.7	5434.9	11,022.9	9,941.1	11,510.3	14,263.0	17,441.9	76,653.7	100-200
1998	241.5	346.4	773.3	2385.6	3807.9	5568.1	11,007.2	10,195.8	11,143.2	13,536.5	15,728.2	74,733.9	100-200
1997	274.8	379.5	818.9	2696.3	3989.3	5607.1	11,415.3	10,161.0	10,979.6	13,173.1	13,128.3	72,623.1	100-200
1996	288.3	421.1	901.0	2767.1	4142.1	5885.8	11,288.3	10,072.2	10,643.8	12,598.4	11,555.2	70,543.4	50-100
1995	311.6	472.5	959.9	2949.5	4289.4	5994.5	11,209.5	9,997.4	10,569.4	12,178.5	9,590.5	68,522.5	50-100
1994	332.0	493.7	1007.3	3122.6	4396.7	6058.1	11,392.5	9,913.6	10,322.4	10,759.9	8,819.8	66,618.6	50-100
1993	360.3	529.1	1090.8	3161.1	4403.0	6090.8	11,186.4	9,540.1	10,026.7	10,066.8	7,801.7	64,256.6	50-100
1992	433.5	577.9	1220.1	3379.1	4409.9	6318.7	11,222.9	9,087.4	9,448.7	9,576.7	7,000.4	62,615.3	50-100
1991	533.7	695.1	1391.0	3676.9	4806.7	6283.1	11,542.7	8,778.0	8,727.7	8,552.2	6,122.6	61,059.5	50-100
Eleven Year Change	-69.5%	-64.5%	61.0%	-51.7%	-34.3%	-22.8%	-7.7%	+8.9%	+30.5%	+84.0%	+270.8%	+32.2%	

Notes: Member data for credit Unions in the 50 U.S. States
Asset size in millions

Source: www.cuna.org/data/member_cu/members_only
CU stats, Recent Trends (10 year), Asset Size Groups

TABLE 2
Number of Credit Unions
By Credit Union Asset Size
1991 - 2001

Year	0 - .5	.5 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 5	5 - 10	10 - 20	20 - 50	50 - 100	100 - 200	200 - 500	500 +	Annual Totals (Year End)	Median Asset Size
2001	719	648	887	1635	1588	1435	1580	736	466	347	165	10,206	5-10
2000	833	734	987	1803	1637	1442	1509	712	438	309	132	10,536	5-10
1999	902	768	1054	1894	1722	1475	1505	703	427	288	122	10,862	5-10
1998	1032	835	1152	2006	1759	1472	1483	697	404	275	110	11,225	5-10
1997	1142	885	1215	2182	1773	1429	1480	653	383	253	87	11,482	5-10
1996	1198	950	1304	2218	1821	1456	1434	631	365	241	74	11,692	2-5
1995	1298	1045	1366	2337	1849	1465	1405	607	358	226	60	12,016	2-5
1994	1384	1099	1448	2459	1878	1472	1407	590	344	197	55	12,333	2-5
1993	1499	1175	1553	2465	1885	1473	1388	567	338	184	49	12,576	2-5
1992	1746	1258	1667	2555	1866	1487	1345	531	318	169	45	12,987	2-5
1991	2105	1442	1801	2622	1885	1395	1315	485	287	148	39	13,524	2-5
Eleven Year Change	- 65.8%	- 55.1%	- 50.7%	- 37.6%	- 15.8%	+ 2.9%	+ 20.2%	+ 51.8%	+ 62.4%	+ 134.5%	+ 323.1%	- 24.5%	

Notes: Member data for Credit Unions in the 50 U.S. States
Asset size in millions

Source: [www.cuna.org/data/member/cu/members only](http://www.cuna.org/data/member/cu/members%20only)
CU stats, Recent Trends (10 year), Asset Size Groups

TABLE 3

Assets of Credit Union Members
By Credit Union Asset Size
(in millions)
1991 - 2001

Year	0 - .5	.5 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 5	5 - 10	10 - 20	20 - 50	50 - 100	100 - 200	200 - 500	500 +	Annual Totals (Year End)	Median Asset Size
2001	189	480	1308	5523	11,477	20,500	50,824	52,279	65,657	108,731	192,712	509,680	200-500
2000	221	543	1452	6033	11,680	20,557	47,902	50,190	61,981	96,369	148,375	445,303	200-500
1999	239	563	1544	6315	12,293	21,053	47,790	49,299	60,043	88,362	130,670	418,171	200-500
1998	277	613	1689	6663	12,588	21,091	47,053	49,098	56,905	83,155	115,426	394,557	200-500
1997	309	651	1765	7238	12,711	20,317	46,410	45,793	53,790	76,507	91,255	356,746	100-200
1996	322	700	1909	7337	12,954	20,743	44,841	43,770	50,655	71,949	77,696	332,875	100-200
1995	343	773	1993	7675	13,144	20,856	43,858	41,729	49,474	67,692	65,413	312,951	100-200
1994	359	808	2102	8090	13,424	20,931	44,029	40,894	48,156	58,799	58,278	295,870	100-200
1993	383	860	2262	8117	13,440	20,913	43,240	39,109	47,079	55,268	51,720	282,400	100-200
1992	448	926	2437	8460	13,370	21,258	42,300	37,036	44,281	49,889	45,302	265,708	100-200
1991	525	1048	2638	8612	13,409	19,816	40,889	33,651	38,910	42,067	36,687	238,253	50-100
Eleven Year Change	-64.0%	-54.2%	-50.4%	-35.9%	-14.4%	+3.5%	+24.5%	+55.4%	+68.7%	+158.5%	+425.3%	+113.9%	

Notes: Member data for Credit Unions in the 50 U.S. States
Asset size in millions

Source: www.cuna.org/data/member_cu/members_only
CU stats, Recent Trends (10 year), Asset Size Groups

TABLE 4

**Credit Union Savings Rates
By Credit Union Asset Size
1991 – 2001**

Year	0-0.5	0.5-1	1-2	2-5	5-10	10-20	20-50	50-100	100-200	200-500	500+	All CU's
2001	2.62	3.18	3.34	3.51	3.46	3.50	3.53	3.66	3.62	3.74	4.05	3.79
2000	2.96	3.47	3.68	3.74	3.69	3.73	3.75	3.88	3.85	4.00	4.36	4.03
1999	2.92	3.34	3.61	3.67	3.62	3.64	3.62	3.70	3.66	3.77	4.04	3.80
1998	3.10	3.47	3.72	3.82	3.78	3.82	3.84	3.95	3.89	4.07	4.34	4.05
1997	3.09	3.47	3.73	3.81	3.80	3.83	3.88	3.95	3.91	4.13	4.42	4.07
1996	3.14	3.56	3.70	3.79	3.76	3.79	3.84	3.90	3.88	4.06	4.35	4.01
1995	3.12	3.49	3.61	3.68	3.67	3.71	3.74	3.82	3.83	4.02	4.38	3.95
1994	2.73	3.05	3.17	3.14	3.14	3.13	3.16	3.18	3.19	3.35	3.62	3.29
1993	2.75	3.13	3.24	3.23	3.23	3.24	3.26	3.29	3.31	3.43	3.69	3.38
1992	3.52	3.90	4.00	4.07	4.08	4.10	4.12	4.13	4.21	4.29	4.58	4.24
1991	4.60	5.18	5.42	5.53	5.61	5.65	5.66	5.67	5.77	5.85	6.04	5.75

Notes: Member data for Credit Unions in the 50 U.S. States
Asset size in millions

Source: www.cuna.org/data/member_cu/members_only
CU stats, Recent Trends (10 year), Asset Size Groups

TABLE 5
Credit Union Loan Rates
By Credit Union Asset Size
1991 – 2001

Year	0-0.5	0.5-1	1-2	2-5	5-10	10-20	20-50	50-100	100-200	200-500	500+	All CU's
2001	10.22	9.77	9.46	9.24	9.01	8.84	8.72	8.52	8.44	8.25	8.07	8.34
2000	10.28	9.83	9.44	9.21	9.01	8.87	8.78	8.62	8.55	8.39	8.20	8.47
1999	10.50	10.05	9.64	9.36	9.11	8.95	8.77	8.57	8.51	8.28	8.10	8.43
1998	10.61	10.12	9.88	9.55	9.34	9.19	9.05	8.92	8.77	8.63	8.43	8.76
1997	10.67	10.20	9.85	9.60	9.41	9.24	9.15	9.04	8.88	8.75	8.55	8.89
1996	10.77	10.20	9.87	9.65	9.43	9.30	9.19	9.12	8.96	8.78	8.63	8.97
1995	10.70	10.13	9.77	9.51	9.33	9.20	9.13	9.04	8.89	8.83	8.61	8.94
1994	11.16	10.54	10.06	9.70	9.44	9.21	9.03	8.86	8.68	8.53	8.35	8.78
1993	11.69	11.34	11.02	10.72	10.35	10.07	9.81	9.62	9.34	9.18	8.98	9.53
1992	12.49	12.23	11.87	11.62	11.34	11.04	10.80	10.56	10.34	10.14	9.86	10.50
1991	12.59	12.40	12.25	12.00	11.87	11.65	11.45	11.32	11.11	10.91	10.79	11.26

Notes: Member data for Credit Unions in the 50 U.S. States
Asset size in millions

Sources: www.cuna.org/data/member_cu/members_only
CU stats, Recent Trends (10 year), Asset Size Groups

TABLE 6
Credit Union Delinquent Loans/Total Loans
By Credit Union Asset Size
1991 – 2001

Year	0-0.5	0.5-1	1-2	2-5	5-10	10-20	20-50	50-100	100-200	200-500	500+	All CU's
2001	6.10	4.90	3.52	2.52	1.87	1.50	1.23	0.94	0.79	0.64	0.60	0.82
2000	5.66	4.06	3.13	2.25	1.61	1.23	1.07	0.82	0.69	0.57	0.52	0.74
1999	5.88	4.35	3.25	2.13	1.62	1.27	1.07	0.84	0.69	0.57	0.49	0.75
1998	5.98	4.26	3.32	2.20	1.74	1.32	1.16	0.95	0.81	0.69	0.60	0.88
1997	5.90	4.12	3.20	2.21	1.77	1.42	1.24	1.07	0.92	0.81	0.70	1.01
1996	5.53	4.03	3.10	2.12	1.77	1.43	1.22	1.05	0.89	0.81	0.71	1.02
1995	5.17	3.49	2.80	1.98	1.66	1.29	1.13	0.91	0.81	0.75	0.67	0.95
1994	5.02	3.33	2.52	1.94	1.49	1.22	1.02	0.83	0.73	0.65	0.59	0.88
1993	5.39	3.25	2.76	2.21	1.80	1.44	1.22	0.95	0.93	0.80	0.65	1.05
1992	5.56	3.44	3.09	2.24	2.00	1.76	1.43	1.14	0.90	1.25	0.83	1.28
1991	5.62	3.90	3.43	2.61	2.23	1.90	1.71	1.54	1.18	1.55	0.99	1.58

Notes: Member data for Credit Unions in the 50 U.S. States
Asset size in millions

Sources: www.cuna.org/data/member_cu/members_only
CU stats, Recent Trends (10 year), Asset Size Groups

TABLE 7

Net Charge-Offs/Average Loans
By Credit Union Asset Size
1991 - 2001

Year	0-5	.5-1	1-2	2-5	5-10	10-20	20-50	50-100	100-200	200-500	500+	All CU's
2001	1.16	1.00	0.72	0.70	0.55	0.53	0.50	0.44	0.49	0.42	0.44	0.46
2000	0.99	0.87	0.73	0.59	0.50	0.45	0.45	0.42	0.44	0.42	0.39	0.42
1999	1.10	0.89	0.72	0.66	0.59	0.54	0.51	0.53	0.49	0.49	0.46	0.50
1998	1.11	1.11	0.80	0.75	0.59	0.54	0.55	0.59	0.59	0.60	0.60	0.59
1997	1.27	0.85	0.76	0.67	0.56	0.55	0.57	0.58	0.59	0.63	0.58	0.59
1996	0.98	0.71	0.77	0.59	0.49	0.48	0.46	0.46	0.48	0.50	0.55	0.50
1995	0.81		0.59	0.49	0.40	0.38	0.38	0.40	0.37	0.42	0.43	0.41
		0.57										
1994	0.87	0.65	0.61	0.54	0.42	0.40	0.38	0.36	0.37	0.41	0.41	0.40
1993	1.14	0.81	0.61	0.64	0.59	0.46	0.44	0.43	0.53	0.50	0.47	0.49
1992	1.36	0.97	0.91	0.78	0.71	0.65	0.60	0.58	0.52	0.66	0.53	0.60
1991	1.07	1.02	0.91	0.80	0.74	0.70	0.69	0.70	0.61	0.60	0.53	0.65

Notes: Member data for Credit Unions in the 50 U.S. States
Asset size in millions

Sources: www.cuna.org/data/member_cu/members_only
CU stats, Recent Trends (10 year), Asset Size Groups

TABLE 8

**Operating Expenses/Asset Ratio
By Credit Union Asset Size
1991 – 2001**

Year	0-.5	.5-1	1-2	2-5	5-10	10-20	20-50	50-100	100-200	200-500	500+	All CU's
2001	4.51	4.15	4.13	3.95	3.86	3.90	3.89	3.71	3.73	3.41	2.82	3.35
2000	4.35	4.18	4.03	3.94	3.85	3.92	3.90	3.72	3.73	3.44	2.79	3.39
1999	4.39	4.29	3.96	3.83	3.77	3.78	3.77	3.60	3.65	3.33	2.74	3.32
1998	4.36	4.27	4.05	3.85	3.80	3.80	3.76	3.63	3.62	3.26	2.67	3.31
1997	4.39	4.17	3.98	3.81	3.74	3.76	3.73	3.61	3.57	3.15	2.61	3.29
1996	4.25	4.09	3.91	3.72	3.66	3.66	3.63	3.54	3.49	3.06	2.53	3.23
1995	4.27	4.04	3.81	3.64	3.59	3.56	3.55	3.47	3.37	3.02	2.40	3.17
1994	4.04	3.88	3.62	3.46	3.39	3.38	3.38	3.35	3.21	2.85	2.36	3.05
1993	4.05	3.90	3.63	3.43	3.34	3.33	3.31	3.30	3.17	2.74	2.32	3.01
1992	4.33	4.07	3.77	3.54	3.41	3.40	3.34	3.31	3.13	2.79	2.37	3.06
1991	4.41	4.18	3.96	3.67	3.56	3.46	3.41	3.39	3.13	2.85	2.43	3.14

Notes: Member data for Credit Unions in the 50 U.S. States
Asset size in millions

Sources: [www.cuna.org/data/member cu/members only](http://www.cuna.org/data/member_cu/members_only)
CU stats, Recent Trends (10 year), Asset Size Groups

TABLE 9
Net Capital/Asset Ratios
By Credit Union Asset Size
1991 - 2001

Year	0-5	.5-1	1-2	2-5	5-10	10-20	20-50	50-100	100-200	200-500	500+	All CU's
2001	19.13	17.06	16.10	14.51	13.39	12.63	11.78	11.16	10.88	10.89	10.20	10.93
2000	19.14	17.60	16.52	15.05	14.21	13.27	12.24	11.57	11.29	11.23	10.62	11.43
1999	18.22	16.68	15.49	14.12	13.27	12.61	11.69	11.05	10.83	10.76	10.27	11.00
1998	18.09	16.25	15.13	14.01	13.02	12.30	11.50	10.91	10.71	10.93	10.03	10.93
1997	17.50	15.95	14.64	13.78	12.92	12.41	11.60	10.93	10.84	11.10	10.19	11.10
1996	16.70	15.11	14.01	13.09	12.40	11.86	11.17	10.66	10.54	10.82	9.86	10.79
1995	15.79	14.07	13.16	12.45	11.64	11.24	10.61	10.15	10.19	10.48	9.31	10.34
1994	14.86	12.82	12.12	11.25	10.64	10.38	9.78	9.43	9.33	9.93	8.41	9.57
1993	14.20	12.13	10.98	10.34	9.67	9.46	9.13	8.72	8.94	9.22	8.16	9.00
1992	13.52	11.64	10.32	9.52	8.86	8.55	8.17	7.87	8.02	8.09	7.37	8.10
1991	13.82	11.55	10.25	9.31	8.59	8.24	7.63	7.30	7.43	7.47	6.89	7.63
Eleven Year Change	+38.4%	+47.7%	+57.1%	+55.9%	+55.9%	+53.3%	+54.6%	+52.9%	+46.4%	+45.8%	+48.0%	+43.3%

Notes: Member data for Credit Unions in the 50 U.S. States
Asset size in millions

Sources: www.cuna.org/data/member_cu/members_only
CU stats, Recent Trends (10 year), Asset Size Groups

TABLE 10

Percent of Credit Unions Offering Selected Services by Asset Size

	\$0-\$2	\$2-\$5	\$5-\$1	\$1-\$2	\$2-\$5	\$5-\$10	\$10-\$20	\$20-\$50	\$50-\$100	\$100-\$200	\$200-\$500	\$500+	All CUs
Once a member, always a member	84.9%	83.8%	89.9%	91.6%	95.9%	96.5%	97.6%	98.1%	97.1%	98.8%	99.0%	98.2%	95.4%
Common bond includes family members	85.7%	93.5%	93.4%	96.7%	97.6%	98.1%	98.2%	99.2%	98.9%	100.0%	98.5%	100.0%	97.5%
Multiple groups including SEGs	2.7%	5.0%	10.3%	16.6%	24.7%	38.4%	48.1%	56.6%	64.9%	75.9%	76.6%	75.9%	39.9%
Common bond includes community	33.3%	33.3%	34.8%	34.6%	33.0%	36.1%	36.9%	47.7%	56.6%	65.2%	57.7%	58.2%	41.0%
Service packages for retirees	5.3%	0.0%	1.1%	1.6%	2.6%	9.5%	19.6%	31.2%	39.4%	49.6%	48.8%	48.6%	17.4%
Special program for youth	12.3%	7.9%	6.2%	6.2%	11.4%	21.1%	34.2%	47.5%	59.0%	68.5%	65.6%	59.2%	29.5%
Stock/bond brokerage	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.6%	1.2%	4.9%	9.8%	21.1%	37.6%	60.1%	75.5%	78.0%	15.0%
Mutual funds	1.1%	0.4%	0.3%	0.9%	0.7%	3.7%	7.6%	18.1%	35.1%	60.0%	76.4%	82.6%	13.9%
Savings bonds	0.0%	1.3%	0.8%	2.6%	5.3%	10.6%	18.3%	29.0%	41.7%	53.9%	58.9%	57.7%	18.3%
Life savings insurance	51.1%	65.8%	58.4%	61.5%	57.1%	54.8%	51.9%	51.0%	41.5%	38.8%	37.1%	40.4%	52.9%
Direct Deposit													
Federal recurring payments	7.5%	8.2%	18.6%	31.1%	57.0%	77.2%	87.1%	91.2%	92.5%	92.5%	94.4%	99.1%	67.7%
Net pay	7.8%	23.7%	27.3%	36.5%	60.6%	81.2%	88.2%	91.8%	94.1%	94.1%	94.3%	97.2%	71.0%
Home Banking													
Audio Response	3.5%	7.5%	4.8%	7.0%	11.4%	34.4%	64.7%	87.6%	96.3%	98.1%	100.0%	100.0%	47.7%
PCs	1.2%	0.5%	0.6%	1.9%	5.6%	14.4%	31.6%	57.2%	79.3%	93.2%	99.5%	97.2%	31.7%
Have Web Site	3.3%	1.4%	3.5%	6.0%	18.1%	33.6%	61.1%	83.7%	92.7%	99.2%	99.5%	99.1%	46.8%
Cashier's Checks	2.1%	2.1%	6.0%	10.7%	25.8%	45.4%	65.1%	76.8%	83.2%	89.4%	94.0%	97.3%	48.6%
Travelers Checks	1.1%	2.1%	5.2%	15.8%	38.3%	62.1%	82.3%	93.2%	92.4%	96.9%	98.0%	98.2%	59.7%
Safe deposit boxes	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.2%	0.9%	2.7%	10.0%	29.1%	50.3%	64.2%	67.2%	64.0%	16.5%
Credit Counseling	18.1%	16.0%	15.5%	18.9%	23.1%	35.9%	39.9%	43.7%	45.6%	53.9%	62.3%	70.0%	34.5%
Formal financial planning	2.2%	2.1%	0.5%	1.3%	1.6%	3.6%	7.4%	16.2%	33.2%	52.9%	67.3%	70.0%	12.9%
ATM cards	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	3.7%	23.1%	53.5%	79.3%	90.8%	92.1%	97.7%	98.0%	100.0%	53.7%
Credit cards	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	4.0%	18.9%	43.9%	69.4%	87.2%	91.8%	96.5%	97.5%	96.4%	49.6%
Share drafts	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	14.7%	45.2%	74.8%	90.0%	96.6%	95.0%	98.8%	99.5%	100.0%	64.5%
Visa/Mastercard debit cards	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	2.7%	19.0%	41.1%	65.3%	79.2%	85.2%	93.7%	95.2%	96.3%	46.5%
Certificates	4.1%	11.8%	24.4%	40.3%	58.2%	73.8%	86.0%	93.2%	93.9%	98.4%	98.5%	97.3%	69.2%
IRAS	1.0%	2.5%	7.3%	17.4%	35.3%	58.0%	78.8%	90.3%	93.1%	97.7%	99.5%	100.0%	58.1%
SEP IRAS	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	4.8%	9.1%	18.9%	24.9%	32.8%	36.4%	43.9%	50.8%	61.5%	20.9%
ROTH IRAS	0.0%	0.8%	5.1%	9.9%	24.4%	45.3%	68.0%	85.7%	89.2%	96.1%	98.5%	98.2%	50.8%
Business checking	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	5.3%	14.1%	24.2%	34.3%	43.5%	47.0%	42.4%	48.1%	36.7%	25.8%
First mortgages	4.1%	0.4%	5.7%	9.3%	15.8%	31.6%	56.2%	78.3%	87.3%	94.9%	97.5%	100.0%	44.4%
Stock secured loans	2.1%	8.1%	7.9%	8.3%	9.9%	15.4%	16.5%	30.0%	32.3%	51.6%	52.8%	95.7%	20.0%
Plane/boat/R.V. loans	13.5%	47.5%	60.6%	72.3%	82.2%	87.7%	90.9%	93.0%	95.5%	96.9%	97.5%	95.5%	82.8%
Guaranteed student loans	0.0%	0.4%	1.6%	2.6%	4.4%	14.5%	23.1%	33.2%	43.5%	38.1%	52.5%	53.6%	19.3%
Other Student Loans	2.1%	3.9%	6.6%	5.8%	7.9%	15.3%	20.8%	26.5%	33.2%	34.0%	41.3%	46.3%	17.9%
Balloon Auto Loans	1.0%	2.1%	3.8%	4.4%	6.5%	11.2%	21.3%	31.1%	41.4%	49.4%	49.5%	42.7%	19.0%
Auto Leasing	2.1%	0.9%	0.3%	0.7%	2.3%	6.3%	8.6%	18.0%	25.0%	25.3%	30.3%	37.3%	10.1%

Source: Data taken from December 2001 CUNA Yearbook Survey