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## First Quarter Bank Results: Good News, Bad News

After several quarters of poor performance in the banking sector, the first quarter of 1992 contained some good news. The nation's banks reported record profits, rising returns on assets (ROA), and declining problem loan ratios. The Twelfth Federal Reserve District, however, had mixed results. Outside of California, the District's banks performed well, echoing the improvements in the rest of the country. California's banks, in contrast, reported declining revenues relative to the previous year, low ROA, and rising problem loan ratios. These poor results confirm that the region's banks are suffering from hard times.

The results for California banks, however, may overstate the extent of their problems. California banks aggressively set aside reserves against future loan losses, and despite weak earnings, continued to build equity capital ratios. While these factors provide some cause for optimism, it is difficult to say how long the California banks' problems will persist. In this Letter, we describe the first quarter bank results and try to place these results in perspective.

In the nation: higher earnings, lower losses In the first quarter of 1992, commercial banks nationally earned a record $\$ 7.5$ billion, nearly $\$ 2$ billion more than in the same quarter of 1991. A favorable interest rate environment especially helped the nation's banks, as they enjoyed their highest net interest margins since 1988. Low interest rates also created opportunities to profit from the sale of investment securities, which contributed more than $\$ 680$ million to the year-over-year improvement in pre-tax earnings. Return on assets for U.S. banks stood at 0.88 in the first quarter of 1992, up from 0.67 a year earlier.

Banks used the increased earnings to add to loan loss reserves and to build equity capital cushions. Loan loss provisions nationwide were $\$ 7.2$ billion in the first quarter of 1992, roughly the same as a year ago. Equity capital as a percent of total assets rose from 6.7 percent in the first quarter of 1991 to 7.0 percent in the first quarter of this year.

Accompanying these improved financial results were declining problem loan ratios nationwide. Total problem loan ratios (defined as all loans 30 or more days past due or on nonaccrual status, divided by total loans) fell from 6.7 percent in the first quarter of 1991 to 6.0 percent in the first quarter of 1992. Fewer problem real estate loans, business loans, and consumer loans all contributed to the decline. Net chargeoffs also leveled off, suggesting that credit quality problems at banks nationally may have stabilized.

## California lags behind

Excluding California, Twelfth District bank performance was strong in the first quarter. Earnings were $\$ 467$ million, up 10 percent from the previous year's first quarter. Banks in every state except California and Arizona reported ROAs over 1.0. Problem loan ratios at banks in the Twelfth District, excluding California, were stable or declining in the quarter and were below national averages.

In California, first quarter earnings were $\$ 270$ million, down 64 percent from a year earlier. Much of this earnings decline can be attributed to loan loss provisions of $\$ 1.2$ billion-more than double the provision from the first quarter of 1991-and to the performance of a few of the
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largest banks in the state. Combined earnings at the ten largest California banks fell 80 percent from a year earlier, a drop of almost $\$ 490$ million. In contrast, the next ten largest banks reported a combined earnings increase of almost 80 percent (a little over $\$ 20$ million). But the problems in California are not confined to a few big banks. The remaining 450 banks in the state posted a 4 percent decline in combined earnings from the first quarter of 1991, a drop of about $\$ 4$ million. First quarter ROAs reflect the same pattern as earnings: 0.19 for the ten largest banks, 1.45 for the next ten largest banks, and 0.58 for the rest of California's banks.

Rising problem loan ratios are particularly evident at California banks. For all banks in the state, the ratio of problem loans to total loans rose 1.7 percentage points from a year earlier, to 7.5 percent (see Chart 1). In fact, problem loan ratios in all major loan categories rose from the first quarter of 1991 to the first quarter of 1992. Problem real estate loans, in particular, plague California banks. For example, the problem loan ratio for construction loans, which are a component of real estate loans, is over 27 percent for California banks with over $\$ 1$ billion in assets, while nationally the average is about 19 percent. Similarly, problem commercial real estate loans at these large banks were about 12 percent in the first quarter, compared to the national average of 8.7 percent. For the smaller California banks, problem real estate loan ratios were below national averages in the first quarter but rose significantly.

Chart 1
Problem Loan Ratios
sions in this regard, as these securities receive favorable treatment under the risk-based capital standards.
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## A ray of hope for California?

The figures above suggest that the difficulties facing California's banks are significant. While the industry nationwide exhibits steady improvement, the condition of California banks, particularly in the area of problem loan ratios, continues to worsen. However, the data do provide some reasons for optimism.

First, despite a very weak economic climate and large loan loss provisions, banks in California still reported positive earnings for the first quarter after two consecutive quarters of negative earnings. Second, banks in California are actively reclassifying credits, recognizing current and potential problem loans, and are making large additions to loan loss reserves. Thus, banks in the state are actively recognizing that problems exist and have begun to build the financial reserves to absorb future losses. Finally, despite the weakness in earnings, California banks increased equity capital ratios. The ratio for the state's banks was 6.5 percent of assets in the first quarter of 1992, up from 6.4 percent in the first quarter of 1991.

## Where have all the bank loans gone?

The first quarter results reflect another important development affecting the banking industry nationally, namely, slow growth in bank assets. Compared to year-earlier figures, total assets at the nation's banks grew only 2.3 percent. More important, total loans fell over 2.5 percent from the first quarter of 1991. This year-over-year decline in bank loans includes a 10.2 percent drop in business loans, a 3.7 percent decline in consumer loans, and a 2.9 percent increase in real estate loans. The only component of bank portfolios that showed any significant growth was securities holdings, which rose 15 percent. These asset growth patterns were even more pronounced in California: loans dropped 4 percent from the first quarter of 1991 to the first quarter of 1992, while securities holdings skyrocketed more than 43 percent.

Clearly, these bank asset growth figures reflect general economic conditions as well as a shift by some borrowers away from bank credit. Facing weak loan demand, banks have sought alternative assets and have accumulated large securities portfolios, especially of Treasury and govern-ment-backed mortgage securities. Regulatory pressures also may have influenced bank deci-
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## MARKET SHARE STATISTICS

dEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS REQUIRED TO HOLD RESERVES WITH THE FEDERAL RESERVE ON A WEEKLY BASIS
(PERCENT OF COMBINED MARKET TOTAL FOR MAY 1992, BY REGION)

|  | DISTRICT |  | ALASKA |  | ARIZONA |  |  | CALIf |  | HAWAII |  |  | 10AHO |  |  | hevada |  |  | OREGON |  |  | UTAH |  |  | WASH |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEPOSIT TYPE | CB SL | CU | CB | SL CU | CB | SL |  | CB SL | CU |  | SL |  | CB |  | Cu |  | SL | CU |  | SL | CU |  | SL |  |  | SL | CU |
| TOTAL DEPOSITS | 5440 | 6 | 71 | 425 | 92 | 0 | 7 | 4847 | 5 |  | 28 | 5 | 91 | 5 | 3 | 72 | 25 | 3 | 80 | 11. | 9 | 78 | 8 | 14 |  | 35 | 9 |
| DEMAND | 90.4 | 5 | 99 | 01 | 95 | 0 | 5 | $90 \quad 5$ | 6 | 89 | 4 | 7 | 94 | 0 | 6 | 98 | 2 | 0 | 94 | 1 | 5 | 89 | 4 | 7 | 90 | 7 | 4 |
| NOW | 6428 | 8 | 59 | 635 | 89 | 0 | 11 | 5835 | 6 |  | 30 | 3 | 93 | 3 | 3 | 78 | 16 | 6 | 84 | 8 | 8 | 83 | 4 | 13 |  | 24 | 12 |
| SAVINGS \& MmbAS | 6032 | 8 | 54 | 441 | 90 | 0 | 10 | 5638 | 6 |  | 31 | 8 | 93 | 4 | 3 | 82 | 15 | 4 | 76 | 11 | 13 | 71 | 6 | 23 |  | 26 | 18 |
| SMALL TIME | 3363 | 3 | 75 | 816 | 95 | 1 | 4 | 2573 | 3 |  | 50 | 4 | 89 | 10 | 1 |  | 56 | 3 | 76 | 18 | 6 | 78 | 15 | 7 |  | 56 | 4 |
| Large time | 4845 | 7 | 94 | 24 | 94 | 0 | 5 | 4349 | 8 |  | 16 | 3 | 88 | 6 | 5 | 59 | 41 | 0 | 79 | 11 | 10 | 73 | 11 | 16 |  | 48 | 2 |

$C B=$ COMMERCIAL BANKS; SL = SAVINGS \& LOANS AND SAVINGS BANKS; CU $=$ CREDIT UNIONS; MAY NOT SUM TO $100 \%$ DUE TO ROUNDING

## INTEREST RATES ON DEPOSITS AND LOANS AS OF MAY 1992 (\%)

| TYPE OF ACCOUNT OR LOAN |  | DATE | US | DISTRICT | ARI2 | CALIF | HAWAII | IDAHO | OREGON | UTAH | WASH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SAVINGS ACCOUNTS AND MMDAS** |  | MAR92 | 3.74 | 3.79 | 3.45 | 3.70 | 4.01 | 4.17 | 3.53 | 4.00 | 3.68 |
|  |  | APR92 | 3.63 | 3.70 | 3.25 | 3.60 | 4.02 | 4.01 | 3.42 | 3.91 | 3.65 |
|  |  | Mar92 | NA | 3.67 | 3.22 | 3.56 | 3.88 | 4.04 | 3.37 | 3.86 | 3.68 |
| 92 TO 182 days Certificates |  | MAR92 | 4.01 | 3.86 | 3.67 | 3.82 | 4.08 | 3.72 | 3.73 | 4.13 | 3.85 |
|  |  | APR92 | 3.90 | 3.81 | 3.61 | 3.75 | 4.08 | 3.68 | 3.66 | 4.02 | 3.93 |
|  |  | MAY92 | NA | 3.76 | 3.47 | 3.63 | 4.05 | 3.72 | 3.60 | 3.93 | 4.00 |
| 2-1/2 Years and over certificates |  | MAR92 | 5.49 | 5.10 | 4.50 | 5.16 | 5.71 | 5.46 | 5.09 | 5.32 | 4.93 |
|  |  | APR92 | 5.48 | 5.15 | 4.47 | 5.18 | 5.71 | 5.46 | 5.12 | 5.32 | 5.14 |
|  |  | MAY92 | NA | 5.17 | 4.47 | 5.08 | 5.63 | 5.62 | 5.37 | 5.30 | 5.30 |
| COMMERCIAL, SHORT-TERM* | AVE. RATE |  | 5.38 | 6.59 | 7.66 | 6.75 | 7.13 | NA | 6.88 | 7.20 | 5.91 |
|  | AVE. MAT. | (DAYS) | 44 | 199 | 145 | 226 | 91 | NA | 57 | 251 | 32 |
| COMMERCIAL, LONG-TERM* | AVE. RATE |  | 6.78 | 7.76 | NA | 7.29 | 8.72 | NA | NA | 8.64 | NA |
|  | AVE. MAT. | (MONTHS) | 40 | 41 | NA | 33 | 30 | NA | NA | 57 | NA |
| LOANS TO FARMERS* | AVE. RATE |  | 8.06 | 7.09 | 7.09 | 7.02 | NA | 7.78 | 6.91 | 5.01 | 7.75 |
|  | AVE. MAT. | (MONTHS) | 14 | 7 | NA | 9 | NA | NA | 7 | 2 | 6 |
| CONSUMER, AUTOMOBILE | AVE. RATE |  | 9.52 | 9.67 | 10.25 | 9.74 | NA | 10.50 | 8.98 | 9.82 | 8.96 |
| CONSUMER, PERSONAL | AVE. RATE |  | 14.28 | 13.80 | 14.38 | 14.50 | NA | 11.00 | 12.38 | 14.98 | 12.43 |
| CONSUMER, CREDIT CARDS | AVE. RATE |  | 17.97 | 18.52 | 18.00 | 18.98 | NA | NA | 19.25 | 21.00 | 17.97 |

[^0]
[^0]:    SOURCES: SURVEY OF TERMS OF BANK LENDING AND TERMS OF CONSUMER CREDIT; MOST COMMON INTEREST RATES ON SELECTED ACCOUNTS.

    * dATA ARE COMPOUNDED ANNUAL RATES. ** SAVINGS AND MMDAS COMBINED AS OF APRIL 1992.

