PUBLICDISCLOSURE

January14,2008

COMMUNITYREINVESTMENTACT PERFORMANCEEVALUATION

CapitalSouthBank Birmingham,Alabama

RSSDIDNumber:567231

SEN:681722

FEDERALRESERVEBANKOFATLANTA 1000PeachtreeStreet,N.E. Atlanta,Georgia30309-4470

Note: This document is an evaluation of this instit ution's record of meeting the credit needs of itse ntire community, including low-and moderate-incomeneigh borhoods, consistent with safe and sound operation of the institution. This evaluation is not, nor should it be construed as, an assessment of the financial condition of the following the safety and soundness of this financial institution.

APPENDIXG-GeneralInformation

TABLEOFCONTENTS

	PAGE
INSTITUTION	3
OverallRating	3
LendingandCommunityDevelopmentTestTable	4
ScopeofExamination Description of Institution	5
Description of Institution Conclusions with Respect to Performance Tests	6 7
LendingTest	7
CommunityDevelopmentTest	9
STATE-ALABAMA	12
StateRating	12
ScopeofExamination	12
DescriptionofOperationsinAlabama The state of the state	12
ConclusionswithRespecttoPerformanceTest s	12
METROPOLITANAREA-BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA	14
ScopeofExamination	14
DescriptionofOperations	14
ConclusionswithRespecttoPerformanceTes ts	19
METROPOLITANAREASNOTREVIEWEDUSINGFULL-SCOPEPR OCEDURES	24
Huntsville, Alabama, Assessment Area	24
Montgomery, Alabama, Assessment A rea 24	
STATE/METROPOLITANAREA-FLORIDA/JACKSONVILLEASSE SSMENTAREA	25
State/AssessmentAreaRating	25
ScopeofExamination ScopeofExamination	25
DescriptionofOperationsinFlorida	25
Conclusions with Respect to Performance Tests	30
APPENDIXA-ScopeofExamination	
APPENDIXB-SummaryofStateRatings	
APPENDIXC-Demographic/LoanDistributionTables- LimitedReviewArea	
APPENDIXD-AggregateLendingTables	
APPENDIXE—Glossary	
APPENDIXF–Definitions and Abbreviations	

TABLES

	PAGE
COMPOSITIONOFTHELOANPORTFOLIO	6
ANALYSISOFLENDINGINTHEASSESSMENTAREA	8
COMMUNITYDEVELOPMENTLOANS	10
COMMUNITYDEVELOPMENTSERVICES	11
ASSESSMENTAREAUNEMPLOYMENTTABLE-BirminghamAss essmentArea	15
ASSESSMENTAREADEMOGRAPHICS-BirminghamAssessmen tArea	17
ASSESSMENTAREALOANDISTRIBUTIONTABLE(HMDA/Comme rcial)–BirminghamAA	18
COMMUNITYDEVELOPMENTDONATIONS-BirminghamAssess mentArea	22
DISTRIBUTIONOFBRANCHESANDATMs-BirminghamAss essmentArea	22
ASSESSMENTAREAUNEMPLOYMENTTABLE—JacksonvilleA ssessmentArea	26
ASSESSMENTAREADEMOGRAPHICS-JacksonvilleAssessm entArea	28
ASSESSMENTAREALOANDISTRIBUTIONTABLE(HMDA/Comme rcial)–JacksonvilleAA	29
DISTRIBUTIONOFBRANCHESANDATMs-JacksonvilleAs sessmentArea	33

INSTITUTION

INSTITUTION'S CRARATING

Thisinstitutionisrated : <u>Satisfactory.</u>
TheLendingTestisrated : <u>Satisfactory.</u>

TheCommunityDevelopmentTestisrated : <u>Satisfactory.</u>

LENDINGTEST

The bank's loan-to-deposit ratio is **MORE THAN REASONABLE** given the institution's size, financial condition, and assessment area credit needs. A **MAJORITY** of the bank's HMDA and commercial loans are made in the bank's assessment area. The geographi cdistribution of loans reflects **REASONABLE** dispersion throughout the assessment area. The distribution of borrowers reflects **REASONABLE** penetration among customers of different income levels and businesses of different sizes. The bank has not received any CRA-related complaints since the previous examination.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TEST

The institution's community development performance demonstrates **ADEQUATE** responsiveness to the community development needs of its assessment areas through community development loans, qualified investments, and community developments ervices, as appropriate, considering the institution's capacit yand the need and availability of such opportunities for community development in the institution's assessment areas.

INSTITUTION(Continued)

The following table indicates the performance level of CapitalSouth Bank with respect to the lending a community development tests.

PERFORMANCELEVELS	<u>CapitalSou</u>	hBank_		
	PERFORMANCETESTS			
	LendingTest	CommunityDevelopment		
		Test		
Outstanding				
Satisfactory	X	X		
NeedstoImprove				
SubstantialNoncompliance				

INSTITUTION(Continued)

SCOPEOFEXAMINATION

CapitalSouth Bank's CRA performance review was base the Interagency Intermediate Small Institution Exam in September 1,2005, intermediate small banks with as may be evaluated using two separately rated tests; a bank's election. The community development test in investments, and services in light of community development elections.

inationProcedures.Undertheseprocedures,effect iveasof setsizes greater than \$250 million but less than \$1 billion a lending test and a community development test, at the cludes an evaluation of community development loans, elopment needs and the capacity of the bank.

For the lending test, a sample of commercial loans as well as loans subject to the reporting requireme nts of Regulation C-Home Mortgage Disclosure (HMDA) were reviewed for the period January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2006 as these loans make up a substant ial percentage of the bank's loan portfolio. Becaus ethe bank is required to report all HMDA loans, the tota I volume of these loans is reflected in the analysi Commercialloans are not reported, so a statistical samplewasusedfortheanalysis. Forthisreason thedollar amount of HMDA loans appears higher than that of th e commercial loans in the tables. The community development evaluation included an analysis of comm unity development loans originated; qualified investments and donations made; and community devel opment services provided from October 20, 2003 throughJanuary14,2008.

Forpurposes of CRA, HMD Aloans are those loans def inedintheFederalReserveBoard'sRegulationC. The HMDA loan categories are home purchase, home refina nce, home improvement, and multifamily loans. A small business loan is defined as a business loan w ithanoriginalamount of \$1 millionorless. Aco mmunity development loan is a loan that has a purpose of pr oviding affordable housing to, or community service sfor low-ormoderate-incomepersons, revitalizing ors tabilizinglow-ormoderate-incomegeographies, des ignated disaster areas, or distressed or underserved nonmet ropolitan middle-income geographies, or economic developmentthroughthefinancingofsmallbusiness esandfarmsthatmeetcertaineligibilitystandard s.

The bank has designated four assessment areas for C RA: Jefferson County and portions of Shelby County in the Birmingham, Alabama MSA; portions of Madison Co unty in the Huntsville, Alabama MSA; portions of Montgomery and Elmore Counties in the Montgomery, A labama MSA; and Duval County in the Jackson ville, Florida MSA.

INSTITUTION(Continued)

DESCRIPTIONOFINSTITUTION

In September 2005, the bank changed its name from B Bank, afull-service community bank head quartered i CapitalSouth Bancorp, also headquartered in Birming merged with or acquired two institutions and one mo (November 2006), Monticello Bank, Jackson ville, Fl subsidiary, Mortgage Lion, Incorporated, Jacksonvil Bank operated under the same holding company as Ban occurred after the lending review period, no loan d addition, the bank has opened four branch offices a the examination, the bank had 10 branch offices and Floridaassessmentareas. The bankhadassets tot

ank of Alabama to Capital South Bank. Capital South nBirmingham, Alabama, is a wholly owned subsidiary of ham. Since the previous examination, the bank has rtgage subsidiary, Capital Bank, Montgomery, Alabam a orida(September 2007), and Monticello Bank's mortg age le, Florida (September 2007). Prior to the merger, Capital k of Alabama. Since the Monticello Bank acquisitio n ata from Monticello Bank is reflected in the analys is. In nd closed two branch offices. Therefore, as of the dateof 11 automated teller machines (ATMs) in its Alabama and aling\$813.0millionasofSeptember30,2007.

Thecomposition of the loan portfolio according to andIncome(CallReport)wasasfollows:

the September 30, 2007 Consolidated Reports of Cond

ition

COMPOSITIONOFLOANPORTFOLIO							
	9/30/2	2007	12/31/	2006	12/31/	2005	
LoanType	\$(000s)	Percent	\$(000s)	Percent	\$(000s)	Percent	
ConstructionandDevelopment	196,495	30.6%	125,542	33.7%	77,489	27.3%	
SecuredbyOne-toFour-FamilyDwellings	155,499	24.2%	59,275	15.9%	62,887	22.2%	
OtherRealEstate:							
Farmland	6,269	1.0%	4,611	1.2%	2,117	0.7%	
Multifamily	36,291	5.7%	27,823	7.5%	31,467	11.1%	
Nonfarmnonresidential	138,999	21.7%	85,671	23.0%	61,806	21.8%	
CommercialandIndustrial	101,596	15.8%	64,661	17.4%	42,570	15.0%	
LoanstoIndividuals	6,862	1.1%	4,410	1.2%	5,246	1.8%	
AgriculturalLoans	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Total	\$642,011	100.00%	\$371,993	100.00%	\$283,582	100.00%	

*Thistabledoesnotincludetheentireloanportf stateandpoliticalsubdivisions, and other loanst olio.Specifically,itexcludesloanstodepositor hatdonotmeetanyothercategory.Contraassets yinstitutions,bankersacceptances,leasefinancin greceivables,obligationsof arealsonotincludedinthistable

As indicated by the table above, the bank's loan po nonfarm nonresidential real estate loans and commer These loans were sampled for our analysis and arer Construction and development loans made up 30.6 per

rtfolio as of September 30, 2007 consisted primaril cial and industrial loans at 37.5 percent of the po eferred to as commercial loans throughout this eval centoftheportfolio. The construction and develo

INSTITUTION(Continued)

loans were made almost entirely to builders and rea 1 estate developers. From December 31, 2003 to September 30, 2007, the bank's loan portfolio exper ienced growth of 205.8 percent. The most significa nt growthin the bank's loan portfolio, by dollar amou nt and percentage, occurred in the loans secured by one-to-four family dwellings.

CapitalSouth Bank offers a wide variety of credit p roducts to meet community credit needs. These cred it products include consumerins tallment, realestate, commercial, and community development loans. The bank's business strategyen courages commercial and consume realest at elements.

Thebank generally complies with the requirements or restrain the bank from meeting the credit needs of economic factors that affected the bank's ability t "Satisfactory" rating under small bank procedures a Reserve Bank of Atlanta on October 20,2003.

fthe CRA. No known legal impediments exist that would its assessment areas. There were no significant lo cal o comply with the regulation. The bank received a tits previous CRA examination conducted by the Fed eral

CONCLUSIONSWITHRESPECTTOPERFORMANCETESTS LENDINGTEST

Overview

The bank's overall CRA rating was based primarily o Alabama. Greaterweight was given to performance i the bank's deposits and loans are in the Alabama as review period, 97.1 percent of the HMDA loans and 8 Alabama assessment areas. In addition, 98.8 percen branches were located in the Alabama assessment are

n CapitalSouth Bank's performance in the state of
nthe state of Alabama because the greater percenta geof
sessment areas. Of the total loans originated duri ng the
9.2 percent of the commercial loans were made in th
t of the bank's deposits and 88.8 percent of the ba
nk's
asasofJune30,2007.

Basedonthebank's size and lending capacity and the percentage of loans extended in its assessment as the overall rating of the institution for the lending the len

The following narrative details the bank's efforts with regard to each performance criterion.

was

INSTITUTION(Continued)

Loan-To-DepositAnalysis

CapitalSouthBank's average loan-to-deposit (LTD) r 93.4percentandisconsidered MORETHAN REA and assessmentare acredit needs. The bank's LTD r 2005 to a high of 99.9 percent as of March 31,2005 with the average LTD ratio of four financial instit sizes ranging between \$750 million and \$1 billiond of similar asset size operating in Alabamaranged f 93.4 percent. There was only one bank of similar a ratio of 98.2 percent.

MORETHAN REASONABLE given the institution's size, financial condition, atioranged from a low of 84.1 percentas of Septem ber 30, . Capital South Bank's average LTD ratio was compared utions operating in the bank's assessment areas that uning the review period. The average LTD ratios for banks rom a low of 81.9 percent to Capital South Bank's high of see bank of similar assets ize operating in Florida, which had an average LTD.

atio for the 16 quarters ending September 30, 2007

<u>AssessmentAreaConcentration</u>

A **MAJORITY** of the bank's lending occurred inside its assessme nt areas. The following table shows the distribution of loans that were originated from Jan uary 1,2005 to December 31,2006 inside and outsid e the bank's assessmentareas, by number of loans and dol laramount, according to loantype.

LendingInsideandOutsidetheAssessmentArea

LoanType	Inside				Outside			
	#	%	\$(000s)	%	#	%	\$(000s)	%
HomeImprovement	2	100.0	\$64	100.0	0	0.0	\$0	0.0
HomePurchase-Conventional	19	67.9	\$2,357	48.4	9	32.1	\$2,516	51.6
Multi-FamilyHousing	27	100.0	\$16,553	100.0	0	0.0	\$0	0.0
Refinancing	22	71.0	\$4,630	72.1	9	29.0	\$1,795	27.9
TotalHMDArelated	70	79.5	\$23,604	84.6	18	20.5	\$4,311	15.4
SmallBusiness	139	86.9	\$38,122	80.6	21	13.1	\$9,160	19.4
TotalSmallBus.related	139	86.9	\$38,122	80.6	21	13.1	\$9,160	19.4
TOTALLOANS	209	84.3	\$61,726	82.1	39	15.7	\$13,471	17.9

Note: Affiliate loans not included

As indicated by the table above, 84.3 percent of th businesses inside the bank's assessment areas. Als inside the bank's assessment areas. This level of serving the creditneeds of its assessment areas.

e bank's loans by number were made to customers and o, 82.1 percent of the loans by dollar amount were made lending inside the assessment area indicates that he bank is

INSTITUTION(Continued)

GeographicDistribution

The bank's geographic distribution of loans reflect s **REASONABLE** dispersion throughout the bank's assessmentareas. This conclusion was based upon the bank's performan cein the Birmingham assessmentarea for the state of Alabama and the Jackson ville assessmentarea for the state of Floridain comparison to available demographic data for each area and aggregate HMDA1 ending data. The geographic analysis of HMDA, and commercial lending within the Birmingham and Jackso nville assessmentare as is discussed later in this report.

DistributionbyBorrowerProfile

The distribution of borrowers reflects **REASONABLE** penetration among customers of different income le vels and businesses of different revenue sizes. This co nclusion was also based upon the bank's performance inthe BirminghamassessmentareainthestateofAlabama andtheJacksonvilleassessmentareainthestateo fFlorida incomparisontoavailabledemographicdataforeac hareaandaggregateHMDAlendingdata. Theanalys isof HMDA, and commercial lending within the Birmingham andJacksonvilleassessmentareasbyborrowerprofi le. isdiscussedlaterinthisreport.

ResponsivenesstoComplaints

ThebankhasnotreceivedanyCRA-related complaint ssince the previous examination.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TEST

Overview

According to the community development test, an ins community; engage in different types of community development activities based on those needs and the institution's capacity; and take reasonable stepst oapplyits community development resources strateg ically to meet those needs. Areas examined include community development lending, qualified investments, and community developments revices.

Taking into consideration the bank's capacity, competition, and the need and availability of opportunities for community development in the bank's assessment area system of the same of t

CapitalSouthBankoriginated49communitydevelopme ntloanstotalingapproximately\$39millionduring the reviewperiod.Mostoftheloanswereforthepurp oseofpurchasingandrenovatingaffordablehousing forlow-

INSTITUTION(Continued)

or moderate-income families. Of the \$39 million in community development loans, \$38.3 million were intheAlabamaassessmentareasandapproximately\$ 600,000wasintheFloridaassessmentarea.

CAPITALSOUTHBANKCOMMUNITYDEVELOPMENTLOANS							
AssessmentArea	NumberofLoans	LoanAmount	Multifa milyUnits				
Birmingham, Alabama	37	\$35,543,561.97	1,133				
Huntsville, Alabama	3	\$725,000	50				
Jacksonville,Florida	1	\$600,000	16				
Montgomery, Alabama	8	\$2,095,750	59				
Total	49	\$38,964,311.97	1,258				

The bank has elected to support some community deve lopment initiatives through its purchase of municip al bondsandcontributionstovariouscharitableandc ommunitydevelopmentorganizationsthatsupportthe needs of low- and moderate-income families or individuals . Community development investments by Capital Sout h Bank during the review period consisted of donation s that totaled \$12,920. All \$12,920 in qualified investments were in the Birmingham, Alabama assessm ent area. A description of these investments can b e foundinthe"BirminghamAssessmentArea"sectiono fthisevaluation.

Capital South Bank offers free checking and free bus iness checking accounts that benefit low- and moder ateincome individuals and small businesses. Additiona lly, the bank offers Internet and Telephone Banking and innovativelendingprogramssuchas"CreditBuildin gloans", which waive certain fees and are designed tohelp fthetenbranchesandtwooftheeleven ATMsarel ocatedin individuals build a positive credithistory. One o low-or moderate-income census tracts. However, so me branches are located within close proximity to L MI census tracts. Four of the branch locations offer Saturday service hours and Capital South Bank offers free ATM services at any Publix network. Officers and e mployees of the bank have also used their financial expertisetoprovidefinancialservicesthatbenefi tresidentsintheassessmentarea. The following tabledepicts thebank's community developments ervices for ther eviewperiod.

INSTITUTION(Continued)

	CAPITALSOUTHBANKCOMMUNITYDEVELOPMENTSERVICES								
ASSESSMENT AREA	ORGANIZATION	POSITION/SERVICE							
Birmingham, Alabama	IrondaleCityCouncil	A bank officer was the Financ e Chairman of this council, which provided incentive packages and alternative funding sources to kick offcommercial and industrial projects for small bu sinessenter prises.							
	Campfire	A bank officer was a member of the Central Alabama Council, which provides technical and educational training t o children from low-andmoderate-incomefamilies.							
	CuentaAmigaCheckingAccount	CuentaAmigaisaCap italSouthBankcheckingaccountdesignedfor Hispanic customers. Personalized checks, statement s, deposit tickets,andallaccountinformationareinSpanish .							
	KPILatino-BusinessRoundtable	A bank officer spo ke on a weekly Hispanic radio station regarding subjects such as financial privacy, credit history, and small business accounting standards.							
Jacksonville, Florida	JuniorAchievementofNorthFlorida	A bank officer provided education to children from low- and moderate-income families about business and economics and encouragedthemtostayinschool.							
	AmericanBankersAssociation EducationFoundation–Educational workshops	A bank officer provided financial education awarene ss to high school students from low- and moderate-income famil ies, which includedhowtoestablishandmaintaingoodcredit.							

COMPLIANCEWITHANTIDISCRIMINATIONLAWS

CapitalSouth Bank solicits applications from all se income areas. The bank's policies and internal con credit applications is based solely on financial an antidiscrimination policy. No evidence of prohibit was noted during the examination. The bank complie laws and regulations.

gments of its communities, including low- and moder atetrolprocedures are adequate to ensure that the eva luation of deconomic considerations. The bank has adopted an eddiscrimination or the use of other illegal creditores swith the substantive provisions of antidiscrimina tion

STATE:ALABAMA

CRARATINGFORALABAMA: Satisfactory.

TheLendingTestisrated:Satisfactory.

The Community Development Test is rated: Satisfact ory.

SCOPEOFEXAMINATION

CapitalSouth Bank operates in three assessment area area, the Huntsville assessment area, and the Montg state of Alabama was based primarily on its perform reviewed using full-scope examination procedures. for full-scope procedures because the greater perce assessment areas are in the Birminghamassessment assessment areas were reviewed using limited-scope and data, including performance and demographic inf assessment areas did not affect the overall rating.

s in the state of Alabama: The Birmingham assessmen to omeryassessmentarea. Capital South Bank's rating for the ance in the Birmingham assessment area, which was The Birmingham, Alabama assessment area was selected ntage of loans, deposits, and branches in the Alabama rea. As noted on page 24, the Huntsvilleand Montgomery examination procedures; however, using available factsormation, the conclusions regarding performance in these

DESCRIPTIONOFOPERATIONSINALABAMA

Overview

CapitalSouthBankoperates seven of its ten branche areas. As of June 30, 2007, the bankhad \$424.8 mi represented 98.8 percent of CapitalSouthBank's tot 97.1 percent of the HMDA loans and 89.2 percent of assessmentareas.

sandsevenofitselevenATMsinitsAlabamaasses sment
llionindepositsintheAlabamaassessmentareas, which
aldeposits.Ofthetotallendingduringtherevie wperiod,
the commercial loans were originated in the Alabama

STATE:ALABAMA(Continued)

CONCLUSIONSWITHRESPECTTOPERFORMANCETESTS

LENDINGTEST

The geographic distribution of loans reflects a **REASONABLE** dispersion of loans to low- and moderate-incomecensustracts in the bank's assessment areas. The distribution of borrowers, given the demogra phics of the area, reflects **REASONABLE** penetration among individuals of different income levels and businesses of different sizes. The bank has not received any CRA related complaints since the previous examination. These conclusions were based on the bank's performance in the Birmingham, Alabama assessment area, which is discussed in detail later in this report.

COMMUNITYDEVELOPMENTTEST

CapitalSouthBank's community development performan ceinthestate of Alabama demonstrates **ADEQUATE** responsiveness to the community development needs of its assessment areas through community development to loans, qualified investments, and community development needs of its assessment areas through community development to loans, qualified investments, and community development needs of its assessment areas through community development it it ution's capacity and the need and availability of such opportunities for community development in Capital South Bank's Alabama assessment areas.

CapitalSouth Bank originated 48 community developme nt loans totaling \$38.3 million in the Alabama assessment areas. Most of the loans were for the p urpose of providing affordable housing for low- and fiedinvestmentsintheAlabamaassessmentareasto moderate-incomefamilies. The bank also made quali taling services to low- and moderate-income individuals an approximately \$12,920. These investments provided d small businesses and revitalized and stabilized low -and moderate-income geographies. The bank provid esan adequate level of community development services th at benefit residents of Capital South Bank's assessm ent areas in Alabama. Of the bank's seven branches in Alabama, one is located in a low- or moderate-incom e censustractandtwobranchesarelocatedinclose proximitytolow-ormoderate-incomecensustracts.

METROPOLITANAREA:BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA

SCOPEOFEXAMINATION

CapitalSouth Bank's performance in the Birmingham a examination procedures. This assessment area includes part of the Birmingham MSA. Of CapitalSouth Bank's percent of the HMDA loans and 63.3 percent of the cassessment area. In addition, as of June 30, 2007, T2 Birminghamassessmentarea. Commercialloanswere gives bank's lending test performance for the Birmingham assessment area to report all HMDA loanallysis. Commercialloans are not reported, so a statistic the dollar amount of HMDA loans appears higher than that

ssessment area was reviewed using full-scope des Jefferson County, portions of Shelby County, an dis total lending reviewed during this examination, 62 .9 ommercial loans were originated in the Birmingham 72.8 percent of the bank's total deposits were in the givenmoreweightthanHMDAloansindeterminingth e assess mentare a because they are the predominant product. ns, the total volume of these loans is reflected in the thisreason statistical sample was used for the analysis. For thatofthecommercialloansinthetables.

RSSDIDNumber:567231

DESCRIPTIONOFINSTITUTION'SOPERATIONSINTHEBIRM INGHAM,ALABAMAMSA Overview

CapitalSouth Bank operates four banking offices and June 30, 2007, the bank had deposits of \$312.9 mill percent of the bank's total deposits.

four ATMs in the Birmingham assessment area. As o fininthe Birmingham assessment area, representing 72.8

DemographicDatabyCensusTracts

Forallloansoriginated during the review period, assessment area. The assessment area includes 166 moderate-incometracts, 50 are middle-incometracts

2000censusdemographicdatawasusedtodefinethe bank's census tracts. Sixteen are low-income tracts, 45 a respectively, and 55 are upper-incometracts.

PopulationInformation

According to the 2000 census, the population of the represents approximately 18.2 percent of the state addition, 13,194 or 1.6 percent of persons in the B Between the 2000 census and population estimates as assessment area increased by 29,542 persons, or 3.7 persons of Hispanicorigin increased by 10,077 pers

Birminghamassessmentareawas 805,340 persons, which of Alabama's total population of 4,447,100 persons. In irmingham assessment area were of Hispanic origin. of July 1,2006, the population of the bank's Birm ingham percent. During this same time period, the population of ons, or 176.4 percent.

METROPOLITANAREA:BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA(Cont inued)

HousingCharacteristics

2000censusdataindicatesthatthemedianvalueof housingunitsintheassessmentareawas\$95,692, whichis 24.7 percent higher than the median housing value f or the state of Alabama at \$76,700. The median age of housing in the assessmentarea is 30 years, which is the higher than the median age of the housing storage of the housing

HUDEstimatedMedianFamilyIncomesfor2005and20 06

The 2005 HUD estimated median family income for the Birmingham, Alabama MSA, which includes the Birminghamassessmentarea, was \$54,350. Basedon the HUD estimated median family income, low-income families were those families with gross annual inco mes of \$27,175 or less. Moderate-income families w ere families with gross annual incomes ranging from \$27 ,176to\$43,480.The2006HUDestimatedmedianfam ily incomefortheBirmingham,AlabamaMSAwas\$57,400. BasedontheHUDestimatedmedianfamilyincome, annual incomes of \$28,700 or less. Moderate-income low-income families were those families with gross familieswerefamilieswithgrossannualincomesra ngingfrom\$28,701to\$45,920.

EmploymentStatistics

According to 2005 REIS, the bank's Birminghamasses smentarea's employment was dependent on awide arror ay of industries including, but not limited to, govern mentagencies, retail trade, construction, manufact uring, health care and so cial services.

The following table provides the unemployment rates for the Birmingham assessment area and the state o f Alabama.

UNEMPLOYMENTRATES (NotSeasonallyAdjusted)								
Region	2005(annualized)	2006(annualized)	September2007 (monthly)					
JeffersonCounty 3.9% 3.6% 3.5%								
ShelbyCounty	ShelbyCounty 2.7% 2.5% 2.4%							
BirminghamMSA	3.6%	3.3%	2.7%					
StateofAlabama	3.9%	3.6%	3.0%					

METROPOLITANAREA:BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA(Cont inued)

Competition

The Birmingham assessment area is a highly competit ive banking market. According to the June 30, 2007 FDIC/OTS Summary of Deposits Report, there are 33 f inancial institutions operating 268 branches in the assessmentarea. Capital South Bankranked 11 thoutof the 33 financial institutions in the assessmentarea are financial institutions operating 268 branches in the assessmentarea. Capital South Bankranked 11 bank's competition in the area are financial institutions operating 268 branches in the assessmentarea. Special south Bankranked 11 bank's competition in the area are financial institutions operating 268 branches in the assessmentarea are financial institutions operating 268 branches in the assessmentarea.

CommunityContacts

As a part of the CRA examination, information was o btained from two local community organizations regardinglocaleconomic conditions and community contacts and community organizations reditneeds. Both contacts stated that there is a need for elucating the hard there are still ample opportunities for banks to provide loans and financial education to both individuals and businesses.

METROPOLITANAREA:BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA(Cont inued)

The following tables show selected demographic and lending data for the Birmingham Assessment Areabas ed on 2000 census data. Certain components of the dat toparticular parts of the analysis.

AssessmentAreaDemographics

AssessmentArea:BirminghamAL

IncomeCategories	Tract Distribut			٠	Families <poverty Levelas%of FamiliesbyTract</poverty 		FamiliesbyFamily Income		
	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%
Low-income	16	9.6	1	12,468	6.2	5,203	41.7	41,841	20.7
Moderate-income	45	27.1	4	44,878	22.2	9,351	20.8	32,913	16.3
Middle-income	50	30.1	(60,798	30.1	4,584	7.5	39,472	19.5
Upper-income	55	33.1	8	84,081	41.6	2,118	2.5	87,999	43.5
Unknown-income	0	0.0		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TotalAssessmentArea	166	100.0	20	02,225	100.0	21,256	10.5	202,225	100.0
	HousingUnits byTract				Housi	ingTypesbyTra	ct		
			Owner-	-Occupie	i	Rental		Vacant	
			#	%	%	#	%	#	%
Low-income	25,276		6,654		26.3	14,136	55.9	4,486	17.7
Moderate-income	78,237	4	0,337	20.0	51.6	29,049	37.1	8,851	11.3
Middle-income	97,396	6	3,706	31.5	65.4	26,624	27.3	7,066	7.3
Upper-income	123,048	9	1,347	45.2	74.2	25,185	20.5	6,516	5.3
Unknown-income	0		0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TotalAssessmentArea	323,957	20	2,044	100.0	62.4	94,994	29.3	26,919	8.3
	TotalBusines Tract				BusinessesbyTract&RevenueSize				
			Les	ssThanor Millior	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			RevenueNot Reported	
	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%
Low-income	4,060	13.4		3,291	12.6	650	19.6	119	12.9
Moderate-income	4,978	16.4		4,336	16.6	485	14.6	157	17.0
Middle-income	7,856	25.9		6,858	26.3	755	22.8	243	26.3
Upper-income	13,440	44.3	1	1,614	44.5	1,422	42.9	404	43.8
Unknown-income	0	0.0		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TotalAssessmentArea	30,334	100.0		26,099	100.0	3,312	100.0	923	100.0
	PercentageofT	otalBusi	nesses:		86.0		10.9		3.0

Based on 2000 Census Information.

METROPOLITANAREA:BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA(Cont inued)

LoanDistributionTable

AssessmentArea:BirminghamA	L
----------------------------	---

AssessmentArea:BirminghamAL HMDA									
IncomeCategories		ByTract	Income	HIV	ByBorrowerIncome				
Income Categories	#	%	\$(000s)	%	#	%	\$(000s)	%	
	"	70	Φ(0003)		urchase	70	Φ(0003)	70	
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	1	14.3%	64	4.5%	1	14.3%	150	10.5%	
Middle	2	28.6%	385	27.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	4	57.1%	973	68.4%	2	28.6%	364	25.6%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	908	63.9%	
Total	7	100.0%	1,422	100.0%	7	100.0%	1,422	100.0%	
Total		100.070	1,422		nance	100.070	1,722	100.070	
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	2	11.8%	89	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Middle	4	23.5%	453	11.7%	4	23.5%	232	6.0%	
Upper	11	64.7%	3,341	86.0%	6	35.3%	1,617	41.6%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	41.2%	2,034	52.4%	
Total	17	100.0%	3,883	100.0%	17	100.0%	3,883	100.0%	
Total	17	100.070	3,003		rovement	100.070	3,003	100.070	
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	1	50.0%	48	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Middle	1	50.0%	16	25.0%	1	50.0%	16	25.0%	
	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	48	75.0%	
Upper Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Total	2				2	100.0%	64	100.0%	
Total		2 100.0% 64 100.0% 2 Multi-Family					04	100.076	
Low	1	5.6%	1,109	7.7%	ranny 0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	12			56.9%	0		0		
Middle	5	66.7%	8,220	35.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0% 0.0%	
	0	27.8% 0.0%	5,118 0	0.0%	0	0.0% 0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%	14,447	100.0%	
Total	18		14,447		18				
1 otal	18	100.0%	14,447	100.0%	Totals	100.0%	14,447	100.0%	
Low	1	2.3%	1,109	5.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	16	36.4%		42.5%	1	2.3%	150	0.0%	
Middle	12	27.3%	8,421 5,972	30.1%	5	11.4%	248	1.3%	
	15	34.1%	4,314	21.8%	9	20.5%	2,029	10.2%	
Upper Unknown	0	0.0%		0.0%	29		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	44	1	0		44	65.9%	17,389	87.8% 100.0%	
Total	44	100.0%	19,816	100.0%		100.0%	19,816	100.0%	
		COMMERCIAL # % \$(000s)					q	%	
				ByTract		,		-	
Low		20	22.	•		545	37.	.4%	
Moderate		12	22.7% 13.6%		2,773		18.7%		
Middle		11	12.5%		1,501		10.1%		
Upper		45		1%	5,001		33.7%		
Unknown		0)%	0		0.0%		
Total	-	38	100.0%		14,819			.0%	
		50	100		venue	01)	100	.070	
\$1MillionorLess		59	67	0%	•	531	58	.2%	
Over\$1Million		29				187		.8%	
NotKnown		0		33.0% 0.0%		0,187		0%	
Total		38		.0%		818		.0%	
	<u> </u>		100	ByLoa			100		
\$100,000orless		49	55.	7%		267	15.	.3%	
\$100,001-\$250,000		16		2%		254		.2%	
\$250,001-\$1Million		22		0%		999	60.7%		
Over\$1Million		1		1%		299		8%	
Total		38		.0%		819			
Originations and Durchases	1 '		100		17,	/	100.0%		

OriginationsandPurchases

METROPOLITANAREA:BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA(Con tinued)

CONCLUSIONSWITHRESPECTTOPERFORMANCETESTS LENDINGTEST

Overview

For this analysis, HMDA and commercial loans made f rom January 1,2005 though December 31,2006 were reviewed. As notedearlier, commercial lending was given more weight than HMDA lending indetermining the bank's lending testrating because it is the predom in antloan product. The dollar total reflected for commercial loans is less than for HMDA loans because it reflected to the sample.

GeographicDistribution

For this analysis, the geographic distribution of H MDA lending and commercial lending was compared wit h available demographic information. Performance con text issues were also considered, including the performance of other lenders.

HMDAlendinginlow-incometractsat2.3 percentis tracts at 3.3 percent. However, HMDA lending in mo greaterthanthepercentageofowner-occupiedunits in multifamily loans in low- and moderate- income trace distributiontable in Appendix D, the bank's 2005 H than the aggregate performance at 1.8 percent. In tracts at 57.9 percent is significantly greater than aggregate comparison loan distribution table in Appetracts in 2006 while the aggregate performance was moderate-incometractsat 20.0 percent is greatert.

less than the percentage of owner-occupied units i nthese derate-income tracts at 36.4 percent is significant ly inthesetractsat20.0percent.Thebankalsoor iginated13 ts. According to the 2005 aggregate comparison loa n MDAlendinginlow-incometractsat5.3percentis greater addition, the bank's HMDA lending in moderate-incom e n the aggregate at 13.7 percent. According to the 2006 endix D, the bank had no HMDA lending in low-income 2.0 percent. However; the bank's HMDA lending in hantheaggregateat13.9percent.

Of the 88 commercial loans sampled that were origin percent were extended to businesses in low-income c businesses in the setracts at 12.6 percent. Howeve to businesses in moderate-incometracts, which is 16.6 percent. These numbers indicate the bank's will moderate-income censustracts.

ensustracts, which is greater than the percentage of small r,13.6 percent of the bank's commercial loans were extended essthant he percentage of small businesses in the bank's commercial loans were extended elimentes that the percentage of small businesses in the bank's assessment area, 2 2.7 ensustracts, which is greater than the percentage of small businesses in the bank's assessment area, 2 2.7 ensustracts, which is greater than the percentage of small businesses in the bank's assessment area, 2 2.7 ensustracts, which is greater than the percentage of small loans were extended extended essthant he percentage of small businesses in the bank's assessment area, 2 2.7 ensustracts, which is greater than the percentage of small loans were extended essthant he percentage of small businesses in the bank's commercial bank's commercial businesses in the loans were extended essthant he percentage of small businesses in the loans were extended loans to businesses in the loans were extended by the loans were extended esstablished by the loans were extended by the loan

METROPOLITANAREA:BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA(Cont inued)

Based on demographic factors, competition, and aggraphic distribution of HMDA and c throughout the assessmentarea.

egatelendingdata,CapitalSouthBank'sperformance with ommerciallendingreflectsa **REASONABLE**dispersion

DistributionbyBorrowerProfile

For this analysis, the distribution of HMDA lending acrossbusiness revenues izes was compared with ava the bank did not collect income on 29 loans (65.9 p without income were originations of multifamily loa context is sues were also considered, including the

across borrower income levels and commercial lendi ng ilabledemographic information. Of the 44 HMDA loa ns, ercent). Eighteen out of these 29 loans (62.1 perc ent) nswhereincome information is not collected. Perf ormance performance of other banks.

Ofthe 44 HMDA loans originated in the assessmenta rea, I loans, none were originated to low-income borrowers, wassessment area was 20.7 percent. Of the 15 loans, 6.7 percent which is significantly less than the percentage of aggregate comparison loan distribution table in Appendia lending to low-income borrowers in 2005, while the aggree HMDA lending to moderate-income borrowers at 5.3 percent area to 16.9 percent. The 2006 aggregate comparing Capital South Bankhad no HMDA lending to moderate was 6.8 percent. Also, the bankhad no HMDA lending greeformance was 17.5 percent.

rea,15hadincomeinformation(34.1percent).Of the15
rs , while the percentage of low-income families in the
6.7percentwereoriginated to moderate-income bor rowers,
moderate-income families at 16.3 percent. The 2005
endix D shows that Capital South Bank had no HMDA
aggregate performance was 7.3 percent. Also, theb ank's
5.3 pe rcent is significantly less than the aggregate
mparison loan distribution table in Appendix D show sthat
me borrowers in 2006, while the aggregate performance
g to moderate-income borrowers, while the aggregate

Itisimportanttoconsiderperformancecontextinf orn performancedescribedbelowisconsistentwiththe balender, and mitigates the low lending levels described below and motavailable were multifamily loans. The low- and moderate-income families, assuming that on calculating the upper limit of low- and moderate-income family moderate-income family one-third of low- and moderate-income fam

ormationwithregardtothisparticularanalysis. Thelending bank's strategy as a commercial lender rather than a HMDA bed in the previous paragraph. 18 of the 29 loans where herents on these multifamily properties are afford able for on e-third of family income is available for rent, and come at 50 percent and 80 percent of the HUD adjust ed 0 percent of the 2005 HUD adjusted median family in come

METROPOLITANAREA:BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA(Cont inued)

is \$14,493 or \$1,208 per month. Therefore, \$1,208 would be the maximum affordable rent for a moderate income family. One-third of 80 percent of the 2006 HUDadjustedmedianfamilyincomeis\$15,307or\$1 ,276 permonth. Therefore, \$1,276 would be the maximum affordablerentforamoderate-income family. Theb ank indicatesthatthesemultifamilypropertieshavea monthlyrentalrangeof\$325to\$695.The\$325to\$ 695rental range would be affordable for moderate-income famil ies, as well as for low-income families whose maxim um erefore, in addition to the 1-4 family HMDA lending rent capacity is \$755 in 2005 and \$797 in 2006. Th reflected in the table, the bank financed propertie s containing approximately 533 units that are affor dable to low-andmoderate-incomefamilies.

Of the 88 commercial loans in the sample originated 67.0 percent were originated to businesses with rep less than the percentage of businesses in the asses 86.0 percent. In addition, the bank originated am \$250,000 or less. Also, 55.7 percent of the commer which indicates a willingness to lend to small busi

tobusinesses located within the bank's assessment area, orted gross annual revenues of \$1 million or less. This is smentarea with gross annual revenues of \$1 million or less at a jority (73.8 percent) of its commercial loans for amounts of cialloans were originated in amounts of \$100,000 rless, nesses.

Based on demographic data, competition, aggregate lending data, and in particular, the bank's record of affordable multi-family lending. CapitalSouth Bank's lending performance reflects a **REASONABLE** penetrationamongcustomersofdifferentincomelevels and businesses of various revenues izes.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TEST

Capital South Bank's community development performan ce demonstrates ADEQUATE responsiveness to the community development needs of the assessment area through community development loans, qualified investments and contributions, and community develo pmentservices, considering the institution's capac ityand the need and availability of such opportunities for community development in the assessment area. Opportunities exist in the assessment area to parti cipate in community development activities; however ,many financialinstitutions, including several multi-bil liondollarbanks, are competing for these CRA-qual ifiedloans, investmentsandservices.

METROPOLITANAREA:BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA(Cont inued)

CapitalSouth Bank originated 37 community developme nt loans totaling \$35.5 million. Most of these loa ns were for the purpose of providing affordable housin gfor low-and moderate-income families. In addition, two loans totaling \$6.9 million were for the purpose of revitalizing and stabilizing low- and moderate-income geographies. Specifically, these loans were part of Operation New Birmingham's redevelopment initiation ve to revitalize vacant loft space into residential condominium slocated in allow-income censustract.

Qualified investments for the review period totaled investments for the review period, which consisted

\$12,920. The following table depicts the bank's q ualified entirely of donations.

CAPITALSOUTHBANK COMMUNITYDEVELOPMENTDONATIONS				
NAME	AMOUNT			
Birmingham,AlabamaAssessmentArea				
PelhamMunicipalBond	\$210,000			
BoysandGirlsClubofCentralAlabama	\$4,200			
JuniorAchievement	\$100			
SalvationArmy	\$3,770			
UnitedWay	\$4,100			
YWCACentralAlabama	\$750			
Total:Birmingham,AlabamaAssessmentArea	\$222,920			

CapitalSouthBankopeneditsfirstbilingualbranch Alabama. As noted on page 14, the Hispanic populat area. Currently, two of the four branches in the B providedisclosuresinSpanishtoassistHispanicc

during the review period, which is located in Birm ingham, ion has increased significantly in the bank's asses sment irmingham assessment area have bilingual staff and will ustomersifrequested.

CAPITALSOUTHBANK-DISTRIBUTIONOFBRANCHESANDAT M'S BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA									
TRACT INCOMELEVEL NUMBEROF BRANCHES PERCENTAGE OF OF ATM'S NUMBER OF OF OFATM'S PERCENTAGE OFTOTAL FAMILIES PERCENTAGE OF BUSINESSES									
Low-Income	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6.2%	13.4%			
Moderate-Income	Moderate-Income 1 25.0% 1 25.0% 22.2% 16.4%								
Middle-Income	Middle-Income 1 25.0% 1 25.0% 30.1% 25.9%								
Upper-Income	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	41.6%	44.3%			
Total	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

METROPOLITANAREA:BIRMINGHAMASSESSMENTAREA(Cont inued)

As shown in the above table, the bank's branch dist tractcategories with the exception of the lowin co and one of the branches in an upper-incometractar

ribution is consistent with the demographic profile softhe mecategory. However, the branchinth emiddle-inc eadjacent to low-ormoderate-incometracts.

 $Bank management and staff have also participated in \\the assessment area. A description of these servic$

several CRA-related community development services in escanbe found in the "Institution" section of this sevaluation.

METROPOLITANAREA-LIMITEDREVIEW

The following assessment areas of CapitalSouth Bank were not reviewed using full-scope examination procedures; however, through the use of available f acts and data, including performance and demographic c information, conclusions regarding performance, which is child not impact the overall rating, are provided. Please refer to the tables in Appendix C for demographica and lending information regarding this area.

The following table compares the bank's overall sta~tewide performance to the assessment areas.

AssessmentAreas	LendingTest	CommunityDevelopmentTest		
Huntsville,Alabama	Consistent	Consistent		
Montgomery, Alabama	Consistent	Consistent		

STATE/METROPOLITANAREA:FLORIDA/JACKSONVILLEASSES SMENTAREA

CRARATINGFORFLORIDA:Satisfactory.

TheLendingTestisrated:Satisfactory.

The Community Development Testis rated: Satisfact ory.

SCOPEOFEXAMINATION

CapitalSouth Bank's performance in Florida was eval uated using a full-scope examination of the Jackson ville assessment area, which is made up of Duval County, in the Jacksonville MSA. Of total lending reviewed during this examination, 2.9 percent of the HMDA lo ans and 10.8 percent of the commercial loans were originatedinthe Jackson ville assessmentarea. In addition, 1.2 percent of the bank's total deposits wereinthe Jacksonville assessment area as of June 30, 2007. The bank's branch offices in Florida are all locate d in ationsfortheStateofFloridaandtheJacksonvill Jacksonville, Florida. As are sult, separate evalu eassessment areawerenotnecessaryandconsequentlywerenotp erformed.

DESCRIPTIONOFINSTITUTION'SOPERATIONSINTHEJACK SONVILLE,FLORIDAMSA Overview

Forthis analysis, HMDA and commercial loans made f rom January 1,2005 through December 31,2006 were reviewed. Capital South Bank operates three branche s and four ATMs in the Florida assessment area. However, two branches and two ATMs were part of the Monticello Bank acquisition which occurred in September, 2007. Therefore, only one branchand wo ATMs were in operation and are reflected in the ending analysis. This branchopened in July 2005.

CONCLUSIONSWITHRESPECTTOPERFORMANCETESTS

DemographicDatabyCensusTracts

Forallloansoriginated during the review period, 2000 census demographic data was used to define the bank's assessment area. The assessment area contains 150 census tracts. Eleven are low-income tracts, 44 ar e moderate-incometracts, 69 are middle-incometracts and 26 are upper-incometracts.

PopulationInformation

According to the 2000 census, the population of the Jackson ville assessmentare awas 778,879 persons, which represents approximately 4.9 percent of the state of Florida's total population of 15,982,378 persons.

Betweenthe 2000 census and population estimates as of July 1,2006, the population of the bank's Jack sonville assessmentarea increased by 59,085 persons, or 7.6 percent.

HousingCharacteristics

2000censusdataindicatesthatthemedianvalueof housingunitsintheassessmentareawas\$86,149, whichis 7.6percentlowerthanthemedianhousingvaluefor intheassessmentareais26years, whichisthehi gherthanthemedianageofthehousingstockfort hestateof Floridaat20years.

HUDEstimatedMedianFamilyIncomesfor2005and20 06

The 2005 HUD estimated median family income for the Jacksonville, Florida MSA, which includes the Jacksonvilleassessmentarea, was \$57,700. Basedo nthe HUD estimated median family income, low-incom e families were those families with gross annual inco mes of \$28,850 or less. Moderate-income families w ere families with gross annual incomes ranging from \$28 ,851to\$46,160.The2006HUDestimatedmedianfam ily income for the Jackson ville, Florida MSA was \$60,30 0. Based on the HUDestimated median family income low-income families were those families with gross annual incomes of \$30,150 or less. Moderate-income familieswerefamilieswithgrossannualincomesra ngingfrom\$30,151to\$48,240.

EmploymentStatistics

According to 2005 REIS, the bank's Jackson ville ass essmentarea's employment was dependent on wide arr ay of industries including, but not limited to, govern mentagencies, retail trade, and health care and so cial services.

The following table provides the unemployment rates for the Jacksonville assessment area and the state of Florida.

UNEMPLOYMENTRATES										
(NotSeasonallyAdjusted)										
Region 2005(annualized) 2006(annualized) September 2007 (monthly)										
Duval	Duval 4.0% 3.5% 4.1%									
JacksonvilleMSA 3.8% 3.3% 3.9%										
StateofFlorida	3.8%	3.3%	4.3%							

STATE/METROPOLITANAREA:FLORIDA/JACKSONVILLEASSES SMENTAREA(Continued)

Competition

The Jacksonville assessment area is a highly compet this market. According to the June 30, 2007 FDIC/O institutions operating 193 branches in the assessme financial institutions in the assessment area with an only one branch in the assessment area. Among the all sizes, including local, statewide, multi-region as seem to adversely affect the bank's ability to serve

TS Summary of Deposits Report, there are 29 financial almentarea. Capital South Bank ranked 26 th out of the 29 adepositmarkets hareof 0.02 percent. Capital South Bank had bank's competition in the area are financial institations of al, and national banks. However, local competition does not etheoredit needs of its assessmentarea.

CommunityContact

AsapartoftheCRA examination, information was brained from one local community organization regar local economic conditions and community credit need s. The contact stated that there is still a need f or multifamily housing revitalization, specifically in the Springfield Historical District. The contact stated that there are still ample opportunities for banks to pr ovide loans toward revitalization since the area has been designated an Empowerment Zone.

The following tables show demographic and lending d at a for the Jacksonville assessment area based on t he 2000census data. Certain components of the datai nthe table are discussed in this evaluation as the yapply to particular parts of the analysis.

AssessmentAreaDemographics

AssessmentArea:JacksonvilleFL

IncomeCategories	Tract Distribut						FamiliesbyFamily Income		
	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%
Low-income	11	7.3		8,098	4.0	2,875	35.5	43,014	21.2
Moderate-income	44	29.3	4	47,971	23.6	7,433	15.5	38,555	19.0
Middle-income	69	46.0	9	99,490	49.0	7,137	7.2	47,259	23.3
Upper-income	26	17.3	4	47,668	23.5	1,196	2.5	74,399	36.6
Unknown-income	0	0.0		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TotalAssessmentArea	150	100.0	20	03,227	100.0	18,641	9.2	203,227	100.0
	HousingUnits byTract				Housi	ousingTypesbyTract			
			Owner	-Occupie	i	Rental		Vacant	
			#	%	%	#	%	#	%
Low-income	15,754		5,794	3.0	36.8	7,576	48.1	2,384	15.1
Moderate-income	83,963	3	9,947	20.8	47.6	34,969	41.6	9,047	10.8
Middle-income	160,310	9.	5,292	49.7	59.4	53,979	33.7	11,039	6.9
Upper-income	69,751	5	0,689	26.4	72.7	15,501	22.2	3,561	5.1
Unknown-income	0		0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TotalAssessmentArea	329,778	19	1,722	100.0	58.1	58.1 112,025 34.0		26,031	7.9
	TotalBusines Tract				Busines	sinessesbyTract&RevenueSize			
			Le	ssThanor Millior		Over\$1 Million	RevenueNot Reported		
	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%
Low-income	2,007	6.5		1,618	6.1	294	9.5	95	9.9
Moderate-income	8,924	29.1		7,597	28.5	1,072	34.7	255	26.6
Middle-income	13,043	42.5	1	11,515	43.3	1,131	36.6	397	41.5
Upper-income	6,694	21.8		5,892	22.1	592	19.2	210	21.9
Unknown-income	0	0.0		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TotalAssessmentArea	30,668	100.0		26,622	100.0	3,089	100.0	957	100.0
	PercentageofT	otalBusi	talBusinesses:		86.8		10.1		3.1

Basedon2000CensusInformation.

LoanDistributionTable

AssessmentArea:JacksonvilleFL

AssessmentArea:JacksonvilleFL									
		D 75	IDA ByBorrowerIncome						
IncomeCategories	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	ByTrac	•	0/	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	-		0/	
	#	%	\$(000s)	%	#	%	\$(000s)	%	
_		1			urchase I				
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Middle	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	1	100.0%	237	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	237	100.0%	
Total	1	100.0%	237	100.0%	1	100.0%	237	100.0%	
		•			nance				
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Middle	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Total	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
				HomeImp	rovement				
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Middle	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Total	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
		•	•	Multi-	Family		•	•	
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	1	100.0%	600	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Middle	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	600	100.0%	
Total	1	100.0%	600	100.0%	1	100.0%	600	100.0%	
					Totals				
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	1	50.0%	600	71.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Middle	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	1	50.0%	237	28.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	837	100.0%	
Total	2	100.0%	837	100.0%	2	100.0%	837	100.0%	
1000	 	100.070	327		ERCIAL	100.070	027	1001070	
		#	C	%		00s)	•	%	
				ByTract	Income				
Low		2	13	.3%	4	72	4.	2%	
Moderate		3	20	20.0%		592		5.3%	
Middle		3	20.	20.0%		1,340		.0%	
Upper		7	46.	.7%	8,	8,786		.5%	
Unknown		0	0.0			0		0%	
Total		15	100	0.0%	11,	190	100	0.0%	
			•	ByRe	venue		•		
\$1MillionorLess		8	53.	.3%	3,374		30	.2%	
Over\$1Million		6	40.0%		5,315		47.5%		
NotKnown	1		6.7%		2,500		22.3%		
Total		15	100	0.0%	11,189		100	0.0%	
				ByLoa					
\$100,000orless		1	6.	7%	25		0.2%		
\$100,001-\$250,000		6	40	.0%	1,213		10.8%		
\$250,001-\$1Million		5	33.3%		2,837		25.4%		
Over\$1 Million		3		.0%		115	63.6%		
Total		15		0.0%			100.0%		
0.1.1.1.170.1	13 100.0%			11,190		100.0%			

OriginationsandPurchases

CONCLUSIONSWITHRESPECTTOPERFORMANCETESTS LENDINGTEST

Overview

For this analysis, HMDA and commercial loans made f reviewed. Capital South Bank's primary loan product Therefore, commercial lending was given greater wei assessmentarea.

rom January 1,2005 though December 31,2006 were in the Jackson ville assessment area is commercial loans. ght than HMDA in performing the lending test for th is

GeographicDistribution

For this analysis, the geographic distribution of H MDA lending and commercial lending was compared wit h available demographic information. Performance con text issues were also considered, including the performance of other lenders.

STATE/METROPOLITANAREA:FLORIDA/JACKSONVILLEASSES SMENTAREA(Continued)

The bank originated only two HMDA loans in the asse ssmentarea. The bank had no HMDA lending in lowneofthe incometracts while the percentage of owner-occupie dunits in these tracts is 3.0 percent. However, o twoHMDAloans(50percent)wasinamoderate-incom etract, which is greater than the percentage of ow neroccupiedunitsinthesetractsat20.8percent.Th ebankmadenoHMDAloansin2005.Accordingtoth e2005 aggregatecomparisonloandistributiontableforth eJacksonvilleassessmentareainAppendixD,thea ggregate HMDA lending in low-income census tracts was 2.1 pe rcent and 19.0 percent in moderate-income tracts. According to the 2006 aggregate comparison loan dis tribution table in Appendix D, the bank had no HMDA lending in low-incometracts in 2006 while the aggr egate performance was 2.0 percent. However, the ba nk's HMDAlendinginmoderate-incometractsat50.0iss ignificantlygreaterthantheaggregateat19.9per cent.

Of the 15 commercial loans sampled that were origin percentwereextended to businesses in low-incomec businesses in these tracts at 6.1 percent. However to businesses in moderate-incometracts, which is labeled the same sampled that were origin percentwere extended to businesses in low-incomec tracts.

ated to businesses in the bank's assessment area, 1 3.3 ensustracts, which is greater than the percentage of small ,20.0 percent of the bank's commercial loans were extended essthan the percentage of small businesses in the etracts at llingness to extend loans to businesses located in low- and

Based on demographic factors, competition, and aggraphic distribution of HMDA and c throughout the assessmentarea.

egatelendingdata, Capital South Bank's performance with ommercial lending reflects a **REASONABLE** dispersion

RSSDIDNumber:567231

DistributionbyBorrowerProfile

For this analysis, the distribution of HMDA lending acrossbusiness revenue sizes was compared with ava income on either of its two HMDA loans. One of thes multifamily loan where income information is not co such as the bank opening its branchin July 2005 an other banks was also considered.

across borrower income levels and commercial lendi ng ilabledemographic information. The bank did note ollect etwo loans (50.0 percent) without income was a llected. Performance context is sues were also considered, dbeing primarily a commercial lender. The performance of

Of the 2 HMDA loans originated in the assessment ar low-income families in the assessment area is 21.2 percent. According to the 2005 aggregate compariso area in Appendix D, the aggregate HMDA lending to to moderate-income borrowers. According to the 200 Jacksonville assessment area in Appendix D, the aggregate and 17.5 percent to moderate-income borrowers.

ea, neither had income information. The percentage of percentand the percent of moderate-income families is 19.0 n loan distribution table for the Jackson ville asse ssment ow-income borrowers was 5.4 percent and 18.8 percen to 6 aggregate comparison loan distribution table for the regate HMDA lending to low-income borrowers was 5.5 rs.

In addition, one of the two loans where income was multifamily properties are affordable for low- and income is available for rent, and calculating theu pper percent of the HUD adjusted median family income, r adjusted median family income is \$15,387 or \$1,282 affordable rent for a moderate-income family. One-family income is \$16,080 or \$1,340 permonth. Ther moderate-income family. The bank indicates that the \$525 to \$800. The \$525 to \$800 rental range would bow-income families whose maximum rent capacity was contain 16 units that are affordable to low-and moderate.

not available was a multifamily loan. The rents on these moderate-incomefamilies, assuming that one-thirdo ffamily pperlimitoflow-andmoderate-incomeat50percen tand80 espectively. One-third of 80 percent of the 2005 H UD per month. Therefore, \$1,282 would be the maximum third of 80 percent of the 2006 HUD adjusted median efore,\$1,340wouldbethemaximumaffordablerent fora ese multifamily properties have a monthly rental ra ngeof beaffordableformoderate-incomefamilies.aswell asfor \$801 in 2005 and \$838 in 2006. These properties

derate-incomefamilies.

Of the 15 commercial loans in the sample originated to businesses located within the bank's assessment area, orted gross annual revenues of \$1 million or less. This is smentare a with gross annual revenues of \$1 million or less at were in amounts of \$250,000 or less, indicating the bank's willingness to lend to businesses with rep orted gross annual revenues of \$1 million or less at were in amounts of \$250,000 or less, indicating the bank's willingness to lend to businesses located within the bank's assessment area, orted gross annual revenues of \$1 million or less. This is were in amounts of \$250,000 or less, indicating the bank's willingness to lend to small businesses.

Basedondemographic data, competition, and the per formance context associated with the bank's multi-f amily loans, Capital South Bank's lending performance reflects a **REASONABLE** penetration among customers of different incomelevels and businesses of various evenuesizes.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TEST

CapitalSouth Bank's community development performan ce in the Jacksonville assessment area demonstrates

ADEQUATE responsiveness to the community development needs of its assessment area through community development lending, and community development serv ices, as appropriate, considering the bank's capacity and the need and availability of such opportunities for community development in the bank's assessment area.

Thebank made one community development loan totali multifamily loan was located in a moderate-incomec addition, this loan was for a property located in a government program that encourages comprehensive pl and social development of the needies turban and ruby the Department of Housing and Urban Development development investments during the review period. community development services in the assessment ar "Institution" section of this evaluation.

ing\$600,000intheJacksonvilleassessmentarea. This ensustract and provided 16 affordable housing units. In nempowerment Zone, which is defined as a federal anning and investmentaimed at the economic, physical ralareas in the United States. This program is a ministered (HUD). The bank did not participate in any communisty. Bank staff has participated in some CRA-related ea. A description of these services can be found in the

RSSDIDNumber:567231

CAPITALSOUTHBANK-DISTRIBUTIONOFBRANCHESANDAT M'S JACKSONVILLEASSESSMENTAREA									
TRACT INCOME LEVEL	OF OF OFBRANCHES OF OFATM'S OFTOTAL OF								
Low-Income	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.0%	6.5%			
Moderate-	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	23.6%	29.1%			
Middle-Income	1	33.3%	1	25.0%	49.0%	42.5%			
Upper-Income	2 66.7% 2 50.0% 23.5% 21.8%								
Total	3	100.0%	4	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

As shown in the table above, the bank's branch dist tracts. However, of the bank's three branches, two censustracts. Additionally, the bank maintains an

ributionissomewhatskewedtowardupper-incomecen sus are located in close proximity to low-ormoderate -income ATM in a moderate -income tract.

APPENDIXA-SCOPEOFEXAMINATION

The examination included a review of all HMDA-repor table lending, commercial lending, and community development lending, as well as qualified investmen ts and services for CapitalSouth Bank from October 20, 2003throughJanuary14,2008forallfourofitsa ssessmentareas.

TIMEPERIODREVIEWED					
October20,2003–January14,200)8				
FINANCIALINSTITUTION				PRODUCTSR	
CapitalSouthBank,Birmingham	,Alabam	a		HMDA Loans, C CommunityDeve	Commercial Loans, and clopmentLoans
AFFILIATE(S)		AFFILIATERELATIO	NSHIP	PRODUCTSR	_
CapitalSouthBancorp		BankHoldingCompany		None	
LISTOFASSESSMENTARE	ASANDT	TYPEOFEXAMINATIO	N	I	
		TYPE BRANCHES			OTHER
ASSESSMENTAREA		OFEXAMINATION	VIS	SITED	INFORMATION
Birmingham,Alabama		ll-ScopeExam Procedures		Hispano mOffice	
Huntsville, Alabama	Li: P				
Jacksonville,Florida		ll-ScopeExam rocedures			
Montgomery, Alabama		mited-ScopeExam Procedures			

APPENDIXB

SUMMARYOFSTATEANDMULTISTATEMETROPOLITANASSESS MENTAREAS

StateAreaName	LendingTestRating	Community DevelopmentTest Rating	OverallStateRating
Alabama	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Florida	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

AssessmentAreaDemographics

AssessmentArea:HuntsvilleAL

IncomeCategories		Tract Distribution			oy me	Families <po Levelas% Familiesby</po 	of	FamiliesbyFamily Income			
	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%		
Low-income	6	12.5		2,903	7.1	1,309	45.1	9,578	23.5		
Moderate-income	15	31.3		12,903	31.7	1,980	15.3	7,133	17.5		
Middle-income	15	31.3		14,120	34.7	667	4.7	8,310	20.4		
Upper-income	12	25.0		10,814	26.5	233	2.2	15,719	38.6		
Unknown-income	0	0.0		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
TotalAssessmentArea	48	100.0	,	40,740	100.0	4,189	10.3	40,740	100.0		
	HousingUnits byTract				Housi	ngTypesbyTra	ct				
			Owner	-Occupie	i	Rental		Vacant			
			#	%	%	#	%	#	%		
Low-income	6,314		1,147	2.9	18.2	4,037	63.9	1,130	17.9		
Moderate-income	26,613	1	1,153	27.8	41.9	12,127	45.6	3,333	12.5		
Middle-income	22,746	1:	5,642	38.9	68.8	5,625	24.7	1,479	6.5		
Upper-income	15,887	1:	2,233	30.4	77.0	2,832	17.8	822	5.2		
Unknown-income	0		0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
TotalAssessmentArea	71,560	40	0,175	100.0	56.1	24,621	34.4	6,764	9.5		
	TotalBusines Tract		sby BusinessesbyTract&RevenueSize								
			Le	ssThanor Millior		Over\$1 Million	ı	Revenue! Reporte			
	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%		
Low-income	1,480	19.7		1,247	19.1	206	26.0	27	14.4		
Moderate-income	1,868	24.9		1,633	25.0	177	22.4	58	31.0		
Middle-income	2,197	29.2		1,895	29.0	241	30.5	61	32.6		
Upper-income	1,969	26.2		1,761	26.9	167	21.1	41	21.9		
Unknown-income	0	0.0		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
TotalAssessmentArea	7,514	100.0		6,536	100.0	791	100.0	187	100.0		
	PercentageofT	otalBusi	nesses:		87.0		10.5		2.5		

Based on 2000 Census Information.

LoanDistributionTable

AssessmentArea:HuntsvilleAL

		113303	sment in cu.	HN	ÍDA				
IncomeCategories		ByTract	Income	11.14	I	ByBorrow	erIncome		
meome caregories	#	%	\$(000s)	%	#	%	\$(000s)	%	
		/-	+(0000)		urchase	, ,	+(0000)		
Low	1	11.1%	56	10.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	3	33.3%	143	27.6%	1	11.1%	51	9.8%	
Middle	4	44.4%	247	47.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	1	11.1%	73	14.1%	3	33.3%	166	32.0%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5		302		
	9	100.0%	519	100.0%	9	55.6% 100.0%	519	58.2% 100.0%	
Total	9	100.0%	319		nance	100.0%	319	100.0%	
T	0	1 0.00				I 0.00/	1 0	0.00/	
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	1	50.0%	46	27.2%		0.0%	0	0.0%	
Middle	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	1	50.0%	123	72.8%	1	50.0%	123	72.8%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	46	27.2%	
Total	2	100.0%	169	100.0%	2	100.0%	169	100.0%	
					rovement		Ī		
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Middle	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Total	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
				Multi-	Family				
Low	1	50.0%	500	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	1	50.0%	100	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Middle	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	600	100.0%	
Total	2	100.0%	600	100.0%	2	100.0%	600	100.0%	
					Totals				
Low	2	15.4%	556	43.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Moderate	5	38.5%	289	22.4%	1	7.7%	51	4.0%	
Middle	4	30.8%	247	19.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Upper	2	15.4%	196	15.2%	4	30.8%	289	22.4%	
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	61.5%	948	73.6%	
Total	13	100.0%	1,288	100.0%	13	100.0%	1,288	100.0%	
10111	13	100.070	1,200		ERCIAL	100.070	1,200	100.070	
		#	q	%	\$ (000s) %				
				ByTract	Income				
Low		5	23.	.8%	1,4	471	21.	5%	
Moderate		6	28.	.6%	2,	912	42.	6%	
Middle		0	0.0			0	0.0%		
Upper		10		.6%		447		8%	
Unknown		0		0%		0		0%	
Total		21		.0%		830		.0%	
		21	100		venue	550	100	.070	
\$1MillionorLess		12	57	.1%		26	10	.6%	
Over\$1Million		9		9%		101		4%	
NotKnown	0			0%		0		0%	
Total		21		.0%		827		.0%	
		2.1	100	ByLoa		327	100	.070	
\$100,000orless		11	52	.4%	•	23	6	2%	
\$100,0001-\$250,000		2		5%		45	6.2% 5.0%		
\$250,001-\$250,000 \$250,001-\$1Million		7		.3%		43 277		.6%	
Over\$1 Million				.5% 8%				1%	
Total		1 21		.0%		785			
OriginationsandPurchases		<i>Δ1</i>	100	.0%	0,0	830	100	.0%	

Assessment Area Demographics

AssessmentArea:MontgomeryAL

IncomeCategories		Tract Distribution			oy me	Families <po Levelas% Familiesby</po 	of	FamiliesbyFamily Income			
	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%		
Low-income	8	15.1		5,210	9.0	2,305	44.2	13,219	22.8		
Moderate-income	13	24.5	1	12,042	20.8	2,879	23.9	9,683	16.7		
Middle-income	19	35.8	1	19,628	33.8	1,909	9.7	11,633	20.0		
Upper-income	13	24.5	2	21,146	36.4	466	2.2	23,491	40.5		
Unknown-income	0	0.0		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
TotalAssessmentArea	53	100.0	:	58,026	100.0	7,559	13.0	58,026	100.0		
	HousingUnits byTract				Housi	ngTypesbyTra	ct				
		Owner-Occupie			l	Rental		Vacant			
			#	%	%	#	%	#	%		
Low-income	10,955	:	3,076	5.5	28.1	5,553	50.7	2,326	21.2		
Moderate-income	19,920	1	1,002	19.6	55.2	6,507	32.7	2,411	12.1		
Middle-income	31,522	19	9,481	34.7	61.8	9,699	30.8	2,342	7.4		
Upper-income	33,918	2.	2,626	40.3	66.7	9,114	26.9	2,178	6.4		
Unknown-income	0		0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
TotalAssessmentArea	96,315	50	6,185	100.0	58.3	30,873	32.1	32.1 9,257 9.6			
	TotalBusines Tract				Busines	ssesbyTract&R	evenueSi	ize			
			Les	ssThanor: Million	T-	Over\$1 Million		Revenue! Reporte			
	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%		
Low-income	1,492	17.3		1,170	15.9	196	21.8	126	35.6		
Moderate-income	1,259	14.6		1,102	15.0	123	13.7	34	9.6		
Middle-income	2,457	28.5		2,116	28.7	271	30.1	70	19.8		
Upper-income	3,410	39.6		2,977	40.4	309	34.4	124	35.0		
Unknown-income	0	0.0		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
TotalAssessmentArea	8,618	100.0		7,365	100.0	899	100.0	354	100.0		
	PercentageofT	otalBusi	nesses:		85.5		10.4		4.1		

Based on 2000 Census Information.

LoanDistributionTable

AssessmentArea:MontgomeryAL HMDA ByTractIncome ByBorrowerIncome **IncomeCategories** \$(000s) \$(000s) % HomePurchase Low 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% Moderate 1 50.0% 27 15.1% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% Middle 0 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% 152 84.9% 0 Upper 1 50.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% Unknown 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 2 100.0% 179 100.0% 100.0% 179 100.0% Total 100.0% 100.0% 179 Refinance 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% Low Moderate 1 33.3% 136 23.5% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% Middle 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% Upper 2 66.7% 442 76.5% 33.3% 290 50.2% Unknown 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 66.7% 288 49.8% 578 100.0% 100.0% 3 100.0% 100.0% 578 Total HomeImprovement Low 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% Moderate 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% Middle 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% Upper 0 Unknown 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% **Total** 0 0 0.0% 0 **Multi-Family** 0 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% Low 0.0% Moderate 2 33.3% 62.3% 0 0 0.0% 564 0.0% Middle 4.2% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 1 16.7% 38 3 Upper 50.0% 304 33.6% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% Unknown 0 0.0% 100.0% 906 100.0% 0 Total 100.0% 906 100.0% 100.0% 906 100.0% **HMDATotals** Low 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% Moderate 727 43.7% 4 36.4% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% Middle 1 9.1% 38 2.3% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% Upper 898 54.0% 290 17.4% 54 5% 9.1% 6 Unknown 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 10 90.9% 1,373 82.6% Total 11 100.0% 1,663 100.0% 100.0% 1,663 100.0% COMMERCIAL # \$(000s) % ByTractIncome Low 2 150 2.8% 13.3% Moderate 2 13.3% 58 1.1% Middle 3 20.0% 1,464 27.7% Upper 8 53.3% 3,611 68.4% Unknown 0.0% 0.0% 0 0 Total 15 100.0% 5,283 100.0% ByRevenue \$1MillionorLess 11 73.3% 2,118 40.1% Over\$1 Million 4 26.7% 3,164 59.9% NotKnown 0 0.0% 0 0.0% Total 15 100.0% 5,282 100.0% ByLoanSize \$100,000orless 9 60.0% 427 8.1% \$100,001-\$250,000 6.7% 114 2.2% \$250,001-\$1 Million 4 26.7% 2,242 42.4% Over\$1 Million 6.7% 2,500 47.3% 15 100.0% 5,283 100.0% **Total**

APPENDIXD-AGGREGATELENDINGTABLES

${\bf 2005 Aggregate Comparison Loan Distribution Table}$

AssessmentArea:BirminghamAL ByBorrowerIncome **IncomeCategories** Bank Aggregate Bank Aggregate %\$(000s) %\$(000s) %\$(000s) %\$(000s) # HomePurchase 0 0.0% 0.0% 1.4% 0.8% 0 0.0% 0.0% 6.8% 3.5% Low 17.9% Moderate 0 0.0% 0.0% 9.9% 5.0% 1 100.0% 100.0% 11.9% Middle 100.0% 100.0% 29.8% 22.9% 0 0.0% 0.0% 17.2% 1 20.6% 0 0.0% 0.0% 58.9% 71.3% 0 0.0% 0.0% 36.1% 50.5% Upper Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 18.6% 17.0% Total 1 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 1 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Low 0 0.0% 0.0% 2.2% 1.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 7.5% 3.6% Moderate 2 33.3% 35.2% 17.9% 8.6% 0 0.0% 0.0% 15.2% 9.8% Middle 16.7% 11.1% 28.3% 3 50.0% 46.2% 19.5% 15.7% 1 21.6% Upper 3 50.0% 53.8% 51.7% 68.9% 2 33 3% 28.9% 35.9% 50.7% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 16.7% 24.9% 21.8% 20.1% Unknown 6 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Total 6 HomeImprovement 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 2.4% 0.0% 13.3% 6.9% Low 1.6% 0 Moderate 100.0% 100.0% 21.6% 15.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 22.4% 15.1% 1 Middle 0 0.0% 0.0% 32.1% 27.3% 0 0.0% 0.0% 25.2% 21.2% 100.0% Upper 0 0.0% 0.0% 43.8% 56.1% 1 100.0% 34.5% 48.6% 0.0% 0.0% Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 4.5% 8.1% Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Multi-Family 9.1% 0.0% 0.0% Low 1 14.1% 9.0% 1.6% 0 0.0% 0.0% Moderate 8 72.7% 57.2% 29.5% 6.7% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Middle 2 18.2% 28.7% 37.2% 28.2% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Upper 0 0.0% 0.0% 24.4% 63.6% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%11 11 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 11 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% TotalHMDATotals Low 1 5.3% 13.3% 1.8% 1.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 7.3% 3.4% Moderate 11 57.9% 55.8% 13.7% 6.6% 1 5.3% 1.8% 16.9% 10.6% Middle 21.1% 29.3% 29.3% 22.6% 3 15.8% 1.4% 20.3% 16.0% 4 3 15.8% 69.8% 3 1.5% 35.9% 48.5% Upper 1.6% 55.3% 15.8% Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 12 63.2% 95.3% 19.5% 21.5% 19 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 19 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Total

${\color{blue} 2006 Aggregate Comparison Loan Distribution Table} \\ {\color{blue} Assessment Area: Birming ham AL} \\ {\color{blue} }$

			1 155C55IIICII		HM							
IncomeCategories	ByTractIncome						ByBorrowerIncome					
income Categories		Bank			egate		Bank	Aggrega				
	#	%	%\$(000s)	%	%\$(000s)	#	%	%\$(000s)	%	%\$(000s)		
		1	1 1		HomeP		ſ	1 1		i		
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	3.3%		
Moderate	1	16.7%	5.0%	10.7%	5.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.1%	12.2%		
Middle	1	16.7%	18.5%	30.1%	24.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	20.4%	16.8%		
Upper	4	66.7%	76.5%	57.5%	69.1%	2	33.3%	28.6%	37.3%	50.8%		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4	66.7%	71.4%	18.1%	16.9%		
Total	6	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	6	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
						nance						
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	3.5%		
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	17.8%	9.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	10.4%		
Middle	3	27.3%	11.7%	29.7%	23.4%	1	9.1%	3.2%	19.6%	15.7%		
Upper	8	72.7%	88.3%	50.1%	66.5%	4	36.4%	42.5%	36.5%	50.3%		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6	54.5%	54.3%	20.6%	20.0%		
Total	11	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	11	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
					HomeImp	rovement						
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	2.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	12.1%	5.7%		
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	20.4%	13.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	24.7%	17.2%		
Middle	1	100.0%	100.0%	34.2%	27.1%	1	100.0%	100.0%	23.8%	19.4%		
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	42.3%	57.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	36.2%	53.0%		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	4.7%		
Total	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
		i			Multi-	Family	i					
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	4.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Moderate	4	57.1%	56.5%	33.8%	7.8%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Middle	3	42.9%	43.5%	29.9%	47.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	22.1%	40.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Total	7	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	7	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
				_	HMDA	Totals			_			
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	3.3%		
Moderate	5	20.0%	32.8%	13.9%	7.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	17.5%	11.2%		
Middle	8	32.0%	30.8%	30.1%	24.9%	2	8.0%	1.1%	20.2%	15.8%		
Upper	12	48.0%	36.4%	53.9%	66.8%	6	24.0%	16.6%	36.9%	48.7%		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17	68.0%	82.2%	18.5%	21.0%		
Total	25	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	25	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

${\bf 2005 Aggregate Comparison Loan Distribution Table}$

AssessmentArea:HuntsvilleAL HMDA ByTractIncome ByBorrowerIncome **IncomeCategories** Bank Aggregate Bank Aggregate %\$(000s % %\$(000s) %\$(000s) \$(000s) HomePurchase Low 0 0.0% 0.0% 1.7% 1.1% 0 0.0% 0.0% 17.4% 11.0% Moderate 47.8% 0.0% 0.0% 21.7% 17.3% 2 50.0% 30.8% 22.6% 0 Middle 2 50.0% 52.2% 44.4% 42.6% 0 0.0% 0.0% 18.4% 17.6% Upper 0 0.0% 0.0% 23.0% 33.7% 3 75.0% 81.8% 27.2% 39.1% Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 25.0% 18.2% 15.3% 15.0% Total 4 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 4 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Low 0 0.0% 0.0% 1.5% 1.2% 0.0% 0.0% 11.3% 6.7% Moderate 0 0.0% 0.0% 31.1% 20.5% 0 0.0% 0.0% 17.5% 12.7% 40.1% 17.3% Middle 0 0.0% 0.0% 35.9% 0 0.0% 0.0% 19.6% Upper 0 0.0% 0.0% 27.3% 42.4% 0 0.0% 0.0% 28.8% 42.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 22.8% 21.4% Unknown Total 0 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% HomeImprovement 3.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 12.5% Low 6.4% 4.5% Moderate 0 0.0% 0.0% 28.9% 21.1% 0 0.0% 0.0% 26.2% 16.3% Middle 0 0.0% 0.0% 41.7% 28.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 27.1% 18.7% 26.5% 29.8% 47.7% Upper 0 0.0% 0.0% 44.6% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 12.8% Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 4.5% Total 0 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% Multi-Family 0 0.0% 0.0% 12.9% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Low 5.4% 0 Moderate 0 0.0% 0.0% 61.3% 25.4% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0 Middle 0 0.0% 0.0% 9.7% 17.3% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Upper 0 0.0% 0.0% 16.1% 51.9% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% Unknown 0 0.0%0.0% 0.0%0.0% Total 0 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% **HMDATotals** 0 1.7% Low 0.0% 0.0% 1.5% 0.0% 0.0% 14.9% 8.6% Moderate 2 50.0% 47.8% 31.0% 22.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 20.2% 14.5% Middle 2 50.0% 52.2% 38.2% 0 0.0% 19.2% 16.4% 42.6% 0.0% Upper 0 0.0% 0.0% 24.7% 38.3% 3 75.0% 81.8% 27.8% 37.8%

OriginationsandPurchases

0

4

0.0%

100.0%

0.0%

100.0%

0.0%

100.0%

0.0%

100.0%

25.0%

100.0%

18.2%

100.0%

17.9%

100.0%

22.6%

100.0%

Unknown

Total

2006AggregateComparisonLoanDistributionTable AssessmentArea:HuntsvilleAL

HMDA ByTractIncome ByBorrowerIncome **IncomeCategories** Bank Aggregate Bank Aggregate %\$(000s % %\$(000s) %\$(000s) %\$(000s) HomePurchase Low 1 20.0% 17.7% 2.4% 1.5% 0 0.0% 0.0% 14.4% 9.3% Moderate 20.0% 15.2% 1 20.0% 14.6% 30.0% 22.1% 1 16.1% 19.3% Middle 2 40.0% 44.6% 44.3% 42.2% 0 0.0% 0.0% 19.8% 18.4% Upper 20.0% 23.1% 23.2% 34.1% 0 0.0% 0.0% 32.4% 45.3% 1 Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 4 80.0% 83.9% 14.0% 11.8% Total 5 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 5 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Low 0 0.0% 0.0% 1.6% 0.8% 0.0% 0.0% 13.0% 8.2% 27.2% Moderate 50.0% 29.7% 19.4% 0 0.0% 0.0% 19.7% 14.4% 0.0% 42.1% 0.0% 16.1% Middle 0 0.0% 38.7% 0 0.0% 18.7% Upper 50.0% 72.8% 26.6% 41.1% 50.0% 72.8% 31.7% 45.4% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 50.0% 27.2% 16.8% 15.9% Unknown Total 2 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% HomeImprovement 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 2.3% 0.0% 9.7% Low 1.4% 15.6% Moderate 0 0.0% 0.0% 28.6% 23.7% 0 0.0% 0.0% 25.1% 18.5% Middle 0 0.0% 0.0% 39.1% 32.2% 0 0.0% 0.0% 19.5% 15.2% 30.0% Upper 0 0.0% 0.0% 42.7% 0 0.0% 0.0% 35.8% 49.8% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 6.7% Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 4.0% Total 0 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% Multi-Family 50.0% 83.3% 16.7% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Low 1 13.7% 0 Moderate 50.0% 16.7% 70.8% 23.4% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 1 0 Middle 0 0.0% 0.0% 8.3% 4.9% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Upper 0 0.0% 0.0% 4.2% 58.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Unknown 0 0.0%0.0%2 Total 2 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% **HMDATotals** 2 Low 22.2% 51.2% 2.2% 1.7% 0.0% 0.0% 14.0% 8.6% Moderate 3 33.3% 17.7% 29.9% 21.3% 11.1% 4.7% 19.7% 14.5% Middle 2 22.2% 13.0% 43.2% 0 0.0% 19.4% 16.9% 39.6% 0.0% Upper 2 22.2% 18.1% 37.4% 11.1% 11.3% 32.3% 44.0% 24.6% 1 15.9% Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 7 77.8% 84.0% 14.7% Total 9 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

	HMDA												
IncomeCategories			yTractIncon			ByBorrowerIncome							
inconic Categories		Bank			egate		Bank			regate			
	#	%	%\$(000s)	%	%\$(000s)	#	%	%\$(000s)	%	%\$(000s)			
	HomePurchase												
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	2.2%			
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%	14.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	13.0%			
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	49.8%	45.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	23.2%	20.5%			
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	29.3%	39.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	36.2%	47.5%			
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.1%	16.8%			
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
		ı		•		nance	i		•	i			
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	4.0%			
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%	13.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	19.4%	14.5%			
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	49.9%	45.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	23.6%	21.3%			
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	28.7%	40.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	31.9%	41.8%			
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.3%	18.3%			
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
				_	HomeImp	rovement			_				
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	5.1%			
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.4%	15.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	22.0%	17.3%			
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	50.6%	45.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	27.2%	23.8%			
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	29.1%	37.7%	0	0.0%	0.0%	39.7%	48.6%			
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	5.2%			
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
				_	Multi-	Family			_				
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	1.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	35.6%	17.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	49.2%	64.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	17.5%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
				_	HMDA	Totals							
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	1.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	2.9%			
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%	14.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%	13.4%			
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	49.9%	45.7%	0	0.0%	0.0%	23.5%	20.4%			
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	29.0%	39.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	34.7%	44.3%			
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%	19.0%			
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

${\color{blue} 2006 Aggregate Comparison Loan Distribution Table} \\ {\color{blue} Assessment Area: Jackson ville FL} \\ {\color{blue} 1}$

	ASSESSMENTATEA: JACKSONVINET L HMDA												
Your Goden and an		By	TractIncon	ne	ByBorrowerIncome								
IncomeCategories		Bank			egate		Bank			regate			
	#	%	%\$(000s)	%	%\$(000s)		%	%\$(000s)	%	%\$(000s)			
		1		•	HomeP	urchase	1		•	i			
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	1.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	2.3%			
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	19.7%	15.7%	0	0.0%	0.0%	16.4%	12.1%			
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	51.0%	47.7%	0	0.0%	0.0%	21.9%	19.2%			
Upper	1	100.0%	100.0%	27.7%	35.7%	0	0.0%	0.0%	35.6%	45.5%			
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1	100.0%	100.0%	22.2%	20.9%			
Total	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
		ı		1	Refii	nance	1		1	i			
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	1.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	4.3%			
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	15.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.6%	14.4%			
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	51.1%	47.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	23.5%	21.4%			
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	26.1%	36.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	32.3%	41.9%			
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.3%	18.0%			
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
		ı		•	HomeImp	rovement	1		•	i			
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	4.4%			
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.6%	15.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	20.3%	16.0%			
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	52.5%	49.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	27.6%	25.2%			
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%	33.8%	0	0.0%	0.0%	39.4%	48.3%			
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	6.0%			
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
		ı		1		Family	i		1	i			
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	0.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Moderate	1	100.0%	100.0%	22.2%	14.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	69.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	15.9%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
Total	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
		1		1	HMDA		ı			i			
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	5.5%	3.0%			
Moderate	1	50.0%	71.7%	19.9%	15.5%	0	0.0%	0.0%	17.5%	12.7%			
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	51.1%	48.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	22.8%	19.6%			
Upper	1	50.0%	28.3%	27.0%	35.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	34.4%	42.7%			
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2	100.0%	100.0%	19.8%	22.0%			
Total	2	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	2	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

			Assessmen			IDA						
V	ByTractIncome						ByBorrowerIncome					
IncomeCategories		Bank	Ĭ		egate		Bank		Aggregate			
	#	%	%\$(000s)	%	%\$(000s)	#	%	%\$(000s)	%	%\$(000s)		
		1	1 1	i	HomeP	-	1	1 1	i	1		
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%	0	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	5.4%		
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	4.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	20.6%	16.5%		
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	32.3%	25.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	20.6%	19.5%		
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	57.5%	69.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	33.5%	45.1%		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	16.2%	13.5%		
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
				1	Refii	nance	i		1	ı		
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	1.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	4.3%		
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%	6.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	16.1%	11.4%		
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	34.5%	26.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%	16.0%		
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	50.5%	65.9%	0	0.0%	0.0%	33.7%	46.1%		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	24.0%	22.2%		
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
					HomeImp	rovement						
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	2.8%	0	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%	8.2%		
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	15.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	29.9%	20.3%		
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	35.7%	31.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	23.8%	19.3%		
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	40.7%	51.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	31.9%	49.8%		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	2.4%		
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
				1	Multi-	Family	•		1			
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	1.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	19.4%	8.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	38.7%	30.8%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	35.5%	59.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
					HMDA	Totals						
Low	0	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.9%	0	0.0%	0.0%	8.7%	4.7%		
Moderate	0	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	5.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	19.4%	13.8%		
Middle	0	0.0%	0.0%	33.2%	26.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	17.1%		
Upper	0	0.0%	0.0%	54.5%	67.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	42.4%		
Unknown	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	18.6%	22.0%		
Total	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

2006AggregateComparisonLoanDistributionTable AssessmentArea:MontgomeryAL

ByTractIncome ByBorrowerIncome **IncomeCategories** Bank Aggregate Bank Aggregate %\$(000s % %\$(000s) %\$(000s) %\$(000s) HomePurchase Low 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.9% 0.6% 0 0.0% 0.0% 7.8% 4.6% 15.1% 0.0% 0.0% 20.0% 14.7% Moderate 1 50.0% 10.4% 5.4% 0 Middle 0 0.0% 0.0% 32.5% 27.5% 0 0.0% 0.0% 21.6% 19.7% Upper 50.0% 84.9% 56.2% 66.5% 0 0.0% 0.0% 36.5% 48.0% 1 Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2 100.0% 100.0% 14.0% 12.9% Total 2 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Low 0 0.0% 0.0% 2.0% 1.3% 0.0% 0.0% 8.0% 4.5% Moderate 33.3% 23.5% 13.1% 7.1% 0 0.0% 0.0% 17.7% 12.9% 0.0% 35.5% 0.0% Middle 0 0.0% 29.0% 0 0.0% 20.8% 17.0% Upper 2 66.7% 76.5% 49.4% 62.6% 33.3% 50.2% 33.7% 46.7% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 66.7% 49.8% 19.8% 18.9% Unknown Total 3 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% HomeImprovement 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Low 3.8% 2.9% 11.2% 5.3% Moderate 0 0.0% 0.0% 15.2% 10.3% 0 0.0% 0.0% 25.3% 16.0% Middle 0 0.0% 0.0% 39.0% 33.4% 0 0.0% 0.0% 26.2% 24.6% Upper 0 0.0% 0.0% 42.0% 53.4% 0 0.0% 0.0% 35.0% 50.5% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 2.3% 3.7% Total 0 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% Multi-Family 0 0.0% 0.0% 15.8% 4.3% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Low 0 Moderate 2 33.3% 62.3% 10.5% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 1.1% 0 Middle 1 16.7% 4.2% 47.4% 55.1% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Upper 3 50.0% 33.6% 26.3% 39.5% 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Unknown 0 0.0%0.0% 6 Total 6 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 6 **HMDATotals** 0 Low 0.0% 0.0% 1.4% 1.0% 0.0% 0.0% 8.0% 4.4% 43.7% Moderate 4 36.4% 11.5% 5.8% 0 0.0% 0.0% 19.5% 13.5% Middle 2.3% 0 0.0% 18.0% 9.1% 33.8% 29.4% 0.0% 21.5% 1 Upper 54.5% 54.0% 53.3% 63.8% 9.1% 17.4% 35.5% 45.3% 6 1 Unknown 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 10 90.9% 82.6% 15.6% 18.7% Total 11 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

RSSDIDNumber:567231

APPENDIXE-GLOSSARY

Aggregatelending: The number of loans originated and purchased by all reporting lenders in specified income categories as a percentage of the aggregate number of loans originated and purchased by all reporting lenders in the metropolitan area/assessment area.

Census tract: A small subdivision of metropolitan and other dens ely populated counties. Census tract boundaries do not cross countylines; however, they may cross the boundaries of metropolitan statistic alareas. Census tracts usually have between 2,500 and 8,000 persons, and their physical size varies widely depe nding upon population density. Census tracts are designe d to be homogeneous with respect to population characteristics, economic status, and living condition to status and other dens ely populated counties. Census tract alareas.

Community development: Affordable housing (including multifamily rental housing) for low-or moderate-income individuals; community services targeted to promoteeconomic development by financing businesse Small Business Administration's Development Company or Small Business Investment Company programs (13 CFR 121.301) or have gross annual revenues of \$1 million or less; or, activities that revitalize or statistical business abilize low-or moderate-income individuals; activities that the sor farms that meet the size eligibility standards of the statistical business Investment Company programs (13 CFR 121.301) or have gross annual revenues of \$1 million or less; or, activities that revitalize or statistical business Investment Company or Small Business Investment Company programs (13 CFR 121.301) or have gross annual revenues of \$1 million or less; or, activities that revitalize or statistical business Investment Company or Small Business Investment Company programs (13 CFR 121.301) or have gross annual revenues of \$1 million or less; or, activities that revitalize or statistical business Investment Company or Small Business Investment Company

Consumer loan(s): Aloan(s) too neormore individuals for household a mily, or other personal expenditures. A consumer loan does not include a home mortgage, seemall business, or small farm loan. This definition includes the following categories: motor vehicle loes ans, credit card loans, home equity loans, other seem cured consumer loans, and other unsecured consumer loans.

Family: Includes ahouseholder and one or more other perso nsliving in the same household who are related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. The number of family households always equals househo

Fullreview: Performanceunderthelending,investmentandserv icetestsisanalyzedconsideringperformance context,quantitative factors (for example, geograp hic distribution, borrower distribution, and total number and dollar amount of investments), and qualitative fact ors (for example, innovativeness, complexity and responsiveness).

Geography: Acensustractorablocknumberingareadelineate dbythe U.S. Bureau of the Census in the most recent decennial census.

Home Mortgage Disclosure Act ("HMDA"): The statute that requires certain mortgage lenders business or have banking offices in a metropolitan mortgagelendingactivity. Thereports included at loanrequested, and disposition of the application (for example, approved, denied, and withdrawn) that do statistical area to file annual summary reports of asuchasrace, gender and income of applications, amount of the application (for example, approved, denied, and withdrawn)

Home mortgage loans: Includes home purchase and home improvement loans as defined in the HMDA regulation. This definition also includes multifam purchaseofmanufacturedhomesandrefinancingsof homeimprovementandhomepurchaseloans.

RSSDIDNumber:56<u>7231</u>

APPENDIXE-GLOSSARY(Continued)

Household: Includes all persons occupying ahousing unit. Per room not living in households are classified as living in group quarters. In 100 percent tabulations, the count of households always equals the count of occupiedhousing units.

Limited review: Performance under the lending, investment and serv ice tests is analyzed using only quantitative factors (for example, geographic distribution, borrower distribution, total number and do llar amountofinvestments, and branch distribution).

Low-income: Individual income that is less than 50 percent of incomethatisless than 50 percent of ageography.

Market share: The number of loans originated and purchased by the aggregatenumberofloansoriginated and purchased by all reporting lenders in the metropolitan area a seessment area.

Metropolitanarea("MA"): Anyprimarymetropolitanstatisticalarea("PMSA") "metropolitanstatisticalarea ("MSA"),orconsolidatedmetropolitanstatisticala rea("CMSA"),asdefinedbytheOfficeofManagemen tand Budget, with a population of 250 thousand or more, federal financial supervisory agency.

Middle-income: Individual income that is at least 80 percent and less than 120 percent of the area median income, or a median family income that is at least 80 percent and less than 120 percent, in the case o f a geography.

Moderate-income: Individual income that is at least 50 percent and less than 80 percent of the area median income, or a median family income that is at least 50 percent and less than 80 percent, in the case of a geography.

Multifamily:Referstoaresidentialstructurethatcontainsf iveormoreunits.

Other products: Includes any unreported optional category of loans for which the institution collects and maintainsdataforconsiderationduringaCRAexami andotherloandataaninstitutionmayprovideconc erningitslendingperformance.

Owner-occupied units: Includes units occupied by the owner or co-owner, even if the unit has not been fully paid for or is mortgaged.

Qualified investment: A qualified investment is defined as any lawful in organith at has a sits primary purpose community development.

RSSDIDNumber:567231

APPENDIXE-GLOSSARY(Continued)

Ratedarea: Aratedareaisastateormultistatemetropolitan area. Foraninstitutionwithdomesticbranchesi n only one state, the institution's CRA rating would be the state rating. If an institution maintains d omestic branches inmore than one state, the institution will llreceive a rating for each state in which those b ranches are located. If an institution maintains domestic bran area, the institution will receive a rating for each state in which those b ranches are opolitan area, the institution will receive a rating for each state in which those b ranches are opolitan area, the institution will receive a rating for each state in which those b ranches are

Small loan(s) to business(es): A loan included in "loans to small businesses" as defined in the Consolidated Report of Condition and Income ("Call Report") and the Thrift Financial Reporting ("TFR") instructions

These loans have original amounts of \$1 million or nonresidential realestate or are classified as commercial and industrial loans. However, thrift institutions may also exercise the option to report loans secured by nonfarm residential real estate as "small business loans" if the loans are reported on the TFR as non-mortgage,

Upper-income: Individual income that is more than 120 percent o f the area median income, or a median familyincomethatismorethan 120 percent, in the case of a geography.

RSSDIDNumber:567231

APPENDIXF-DEFINITIONSANDABBREVIATIONS

Throughoutthis evaluation, the following definition ns are used for the various income levels. These levels are defined in the CRA.

Low-Income- An individual income, or median family income for geographies, that i

theareamedianincome.

geographies, that is less than 50 percent of

Moderate-Income- An individual income, or median family income for

lessthan80percentoftheareamedianincome.

geographies, that is at least 50 percent but

Middle-Income- An individual income, or median family income for

lessthan120percentoftheareamedianincome.

 $geographies, that is at least 80\,percent\,but$

Upper-Income- Anindividualincomeormedianfamilyincomeforg

areamedianincome.

eographies that is 120 per centor more of the

Abbreviations

ATMs- AutomatedTellerMachines

CRA- CommunityReinvestmentAct(RegulationBB)

FDIC- FederalDepositInsuranceCorporation

HMDA- HomeMortgageDisclosureAct(RegulationC)

HUD- DepartmentofHousingandUrbanDevelopment

LTD- Loan-to-DepositRatio

MSA- MetropolitanStatisticalArea

REIS- RegionalEconomicInformationSystems

SBA- SmallBusinessAdministration

ROUNDINGCONVENTION

Because percentages presented in tables were rounde d to the nearest whole number in most cases, some columnsmaynottotalexactly100percent.

APPENDIXG-GENERALINFORMATION

The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) requires each federal financial supervisory agency to use its aut hority when examining financial institutions subject to it supervision, to assess the institution's record of meeting the credit needs of its entire community, including low and moderate-income neighborhoods, consistent wit have safe and sound operation of the institution. Upon conclusion of such examination, the agency must pre pare a written evaluation of the institution's record of meeting the conclusion of such examination, the agency must pre pare a eeting the credit needs of its community.

This document is an evaluation of the CRA performan ce of <u>CapitalSouth Bank</u> prepared by the <u>Federal ReserveBankofAtlanta</u>, theinstitution's supervisory agency, as of <u>January 14,2008</u>. The agency evaluates performance in assessment area(s), as they are deli neated by the institution, rather than individual b ranches. This assessment are avaluation may include visits to some, but not necessarily all, of the institution n's branches. The agency rates the CRA performance of an institut ion consistent with the provisions set for thin App endix A to 12 CFR Part 228.