PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

March 17, 2014

COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

CSB Bank RSSD# 614340

206 North Main Street Capac, Michigan 48014

Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago

230 South LaSalle Street Chicago, Illinois 60604-1413

NOTE:

This document is an evaluation of this bank's record of meeting the credit needs of its entire community, including low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, consistent with safe and sound operation of the bank. This evaluation is not, nor should it be construed as, an assessment of the financial condition of this bank. The rating assigned to this bank does not represent an analysis, conclusion or opinion of the federal financial supervisory agency concerning the safety and soundness of this financial bank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| P | ERFORMANCE EVALUATION | 2 |
|----|--|----|
| S | COPE OF EXAMINATION | 2 |
| D | ESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION | 3 |
| | DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION'S OPERATIONS IN THE WARREN-TROY-FARMINGTON HILLS, MICHIGAN MD#47644 | |
| C | ONCLUSIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERFORMANCE CRITERIA | 9 |
| | LENDING TEST | 9 |
| F. | AIR LENDING OR OTHER ILLEGAL CREDIT PRACTICES REVIEW | 15 |
| A | PPENDIX A – 2000 DEMOGRAPHIC AND 2011 LENDING TABLES | 16 |
| A | PPENDIX B – SCOPE OF EXAMINATION | 21 |
| Δ | PPENDIX C - GLOSSARY | 22 |

BANK'S CRA RATING

CSB Bank is rated Satisfactory.

The bank provides credit within its assessment area in a manner consistent with its size, location, and local economic conditions. The average loan-to-deposit ratio is reasonable considering the characteristics of the bank, its competitors, and the credit needs within the assessment area. A majority of the bank's HMDA (Home Mortgage Disclosure Act)-reportable and small business loans are made inside its assessment area. The geographic distribution of loans indicates a reasonable dispersion among the census tracts within the assessment area, and the bank's lending reflects a reasonable penetration among borrowers of different income levels and businesses of different revenue sizes. In addition, no CRA-related complaints were received by the bank or the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago since the previous evaluation.

SCOPE OF EXAMINATION

The performance evaluation of CSB Bank was conducted using the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council's Small Bank CRA Evaluation Procedures. The performance evaluation included a review of lending performance in the bank's designated assessment area, which consists of 34 census tracts in portions of Lapeer, Macomb, and St. Clair Counties within the Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills, Michigan Metropolitan Division (MD) #47644 and two tracts located in non-metropolitan Sanilac County, which is a county contiguous to, but outside of, the MD.

Performance in the assessment area was evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Loan-to-Deposit Ratio A 16-quarter average loan-to-deposit ratio from March 31, 2010 to December 31, 2013 was calculated for the bank and compared to its national peer and a sample of local competitors.
- Lending in the Assessment Area The bank's HMDA-reportable and small business loans originated from January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2012 were reviewed to determine the percentage of loans originated in the assessment area.
- Geographic Distribution of Lending in the Assessment Area The bank's HMDAreportable and small business loans originated in the assessment area from January 1, 2011
 to December 31, 2012 were analyzed to determine the extent to which the bank is making
 loans in geographies of different income levels, particularly those designated as moderateincome.
- Lending to Borrowers of Different Incomes and to Businesses of Different Sizes The bank's HMDA-reportable and small business loans originated in the assessment area from

January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2012, were reviewed to determine the distribution among borrowers of different income levels, particularly those considered low- or moderate-income, and to businesses with different revenue sizes.

• *Response to Substantiated Complaints* – The bank or this Reserve Bank has not received any CRA-related complaints since the previous evaluation.

In addition to the above criteria, two community representatives were interviewed to gain a better understanding of the credit needs of the community.

DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION

CSB Bank is a small bank headquartered in Capac, Michigan and is the sole subsidiary of Capac Bancorp. As of December 31, 2013, the bank reported assets of \$231.1 million based on the Uniform Bank Performance Report. The bank's main office in Capac is located approximately 75 miles north of Detroit, Michigan and 40 miles east of Flint, Michigan. The bank operates eight offices serving St. Claire, Lapeer, and Macomb Counties. Customers may also conduct online banking transactions through the institution's website at http://www.csbbank.com.

The bank is predominantly a residential real estate lender, as these loans comprised 66.0 percent of total loans as of December 31, 2013. The bank also extends commercial loans, which equaled 28.2 percent of loans and agricultural and consumer loans which together totaled 5.5 percent of loans at December 31, 2013. The bank's deposit products include interest and non-interest bearing checking and savings accounts, money market demand accounts, negotiable orders of withdrawal, and certificates of deposit.

| Composition of Loan Portfolio as of December 31, 2013 (000's) | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Category | Туре | \$ | % | | | | | |
| Real Estate Secured | Residential | 71,199 | 66.0 | | | | | |
| Loans | Agricultural | 2,373 | 2.2 | | | | | |
| | Commercial | 25,238 | 23.4 | | | | | |
| | Total Real Estate Secured | 98,810 | 91.6 | | | | | |
| Non-Real Estate | Agricultural | 1,345 | 1.2 | | | | | |
| Secured Loans | Commercial | 5,188 | 4.8 | | | | | |
| | Consumer | 2,222 | 2.1 | | | | | |
| | Other Loans | 373 | 0.3 | | | | | |
| | Total | 107,938 | 100.0 | | | | | |
| Note: Percentages may not t | total to 100.0 percent due to rounding. | | | | | | | |

There are no known legal, financial or other factors impeding the bank's ability to help meet the credit needs in its communities.

The bank was rated Satisfactory under the CRA at its previous evaluation conducted on March 15, 2010.

DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTION'S OPERATIONS IN THE WARREN-TROY-FARMINGTON HILLS, MICHIGAN MD #47644

CSB Bank's assessment area is comprised of 36 census tracts, including 11 census tracts in Lapeer County; eight census tracts in Macomb County; two census tracts in Sanilac County; and 15 census tracts in St. Clair County. The assessment area has not changed since the previous CRA evaluation. The assessment area contains nine moderate-income and 27 middle-income tracts. Census tracts in Lapeer, Macomb and St. Clair Counties are located in the Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills, Michigan Metropolitan Division (MD), while the two census tracts in Sanilac County are located in a non-Metropolitan Statistical Area contiguous to the Lapeer County and St. Clair County portions of the assessment area. At the time of the 2000 U.S. Census, the assessment area had one upper-income census tract, 26 middle-income census tracts and nine moderate-income census tracts. Five, or 13.9 percent, of the bank's census tracts changed income levels between the 2000 and 2010 Census periods; two of the census tracts moved to higher income levels and three declined.

The bank operates eight branch offices with a full-service ATM at each branch location; all branches are in the MD portion of the assessment area. Since the previous evaluation, the bank has not closed any branches or removed any ATMs. The following tables present a comparison of the bank's branch and ATM locations to relevant assessment area demographic characteristics from the 2000 and 2010 U.S. Censuses. The bank operates four branches in moderate-income tracts and four branches in middle-income tracts. Since the 2000 U.S. Census, the census tract income level for the bank's Allenton branch changed from middle-income to moderate-income.

| Distribution of Branches and ATMs in the Assessment Area (2000 Census) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|-------|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Tract Number of Percentage Number of Percentage of Total of Income Level Branches of Branches ATMs of ATMs Families Busines | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low-Income | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| Moderate-Income | 3 | 37.5 | 3 | 37.5 | 24.9 | 26.6 | | | | |
| Middle-Income | 5 | 62.5 | 5 | 62.5 | 72.0 | 69.3 | | | | |
| Upper-Income | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 4.1 | | | | |
| Total | 8 | 100.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |

| Distribution of Branches and ATMs in the Assessment Area (2010 Census) | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------|---|-------|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Tract Number of Percentage Number of Percentage of Total of Income Level Branches of Branches ATMs Percentage Percentage of Total of ATMs Business | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low-Income | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| Moderate-Income | 4 | 50.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 25.3 | 26.3 | | | | |
| Middle-Income | 4 | 50.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 74.7 | 73.7 | | | | |
| Upper-Income | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| Total | 8 | 100.0 | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |

Combined Demographics Report, 2010 Census Data

| Income Categories | Tract Distribution | | Families by Tract Income | | | Families < Poverty Level as % of Families by Tract | | Families by Family Income | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--|----------------------|------------------------------|-------|--|
| | # | % | | # | % | # | % | # | % | |
| Low-income | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 8,194 | 21.7 | |
| Moderate-income | 9 | 25.0 | | 9,528 | 25.3 | 976 | 10.2 | 8,539 | 22.6 | |
| Middle-income | 27 | 75.0 | | 28,206 | 74.7 | 1,760 | 6.2 | 9,646 | 25.6 | |
| Upper-income | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 11,355 | 30.1 | |
| Unknown-income | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| Total Assessment Area | 36 | 100.0 | | 37,734 | 100.0 | 2,736 | 7.3 | 37,734 | 100.0 | |
| | Housing | | Housing | | | sing Types by T | ng Types by Tract | | | |
| | Units by | Owner-Occupied | | | ì | Rental | | Vacant | | |
| | Tract | | # | % | % | # | % | # | % | |
| Low-income | 0 | 0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| Moderate-income | 13,855 | 10,384 | | 24.0 | 74.9 | 2,304 | 16.6 | 1,167 | 8.4 | |
| Middle-income | 39,462 | 3 | 32,969 | 76.0 | 83.5 | 3,764 | 9.5 | 2,729 | 6.9 | |
| Upper-income | 0 | 0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| Unknown-income | 0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| Total Assessment Area | 53,317 | 4 | 13,353 | 100.0 | 81.3 | 6,068 | 11.4 | 3,896 | 7.3 | |
| | Total Busines | sses by | | | Busine | sses by Tract & | & Reven | Revenue Size | | |
| | Tract | | Less Than or = \$1 Million | | | Over \$1 Million | Revenue N Reporte | | | |
| | # | % | | # | % | # | % | # | % | |
| Low-income | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| Moderate-income | 1,755 | 26.3 | | 1,607 | 25.8 | 77 | 32.2 | 71 | 33.8 | |
| Middle-income | 4,914 | 73.7 | | 4,613 | 74.2 | 162 | 67.8 | 139 | 66.2 | |
| Upper-income | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| Unknown-income | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| Total Assessment Area | 6,669 | 100.0 | | 6,220 | 100.0 | 239 | 100.0 | 210 | 100.0 | |
| | Percentage of | Total B | usines | ses: | 93.3 | | 3.6 | | 3.1 | |

Based on 2012 D&B information according to 2010 ACS Boundaries.

Percentages may not add to 100 percent based on rounding.

A discussion of 2000 and 2010 U.S. Census demographic information follows, with data on population information, income characteristics, housing and employment provided. The 2000 U.S. Census demographic data is provided in Appendix A.

Population Characteristics

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the population in the assessment area is 138,585. The following table reflects the change in population within the assessment area from 2000 to 2010. Macomb County experienced the highest growth rate from 2000 to 2010. Macomb is the third most populated county in Michigan with nearly 841,000 residents and has experienced strong growth due to its large and diverse economy. Outside Macomb County, the remaining assessment area counties experienced minimal population growth, or shrinkage between Census periods indicating a large portion of the population growth in the assessment area is occurring in Macomb County.

| | Population Change | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2000 and 2010 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2000 Population 2010 Population Percentage | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area | | | Change | | | | | | | |
| Assessment Area | 131,861 | 138,585 | 5.1 | | | | | | | |
| Lapeer County | 87,904 | 88,319 | 0.5 | | | | | | | |
| Macomb County | 788,149 | 840,978 | 6.7 | | | | | | | |
| Sanilac County | 44,547 | 43,114 | -3.2 | | | | | | | |
| St. Clair County | 164,235 | 163,040 | -0.7 | | | | | | | |
| Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills, MI MD | 2,391,395 | 2,475,666 | 3.5 | | | | | | | |
| State of Michigan | 9,938,444 | 9,883,640 | -0.6 | | | | | | | |
| Source: 2000 and 2010 — U.S. Census Bureau: Decenn | Source: 2000 and 2010 – U.S. Census Bureau: Decennial Census | | | | | | | | | |

Income Characteristics

The following table compares income levels for the assessment area to the individual counties, the MD and the state. The median family income of \$67,767 in the assessment area is lower than the MD, but above the state-wide median family income. Median family income increased 5.9 percent between the 2000 U.S. Census and the 2006-2010 American Community Survey, reflecting a growth rate approximating the state-wide growth rate, and higher than the Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills MD. U.S. Census data from 2010 also indicates 7.3 percent of families in the assessment area are below the poverty level, while 44.3 percent of families are considered low- and moderate-income. This is a slight increase from the 2000 U.S. Census period, when 3.9 percent and 41.9 percent of families had income below the poverty level or were low- and moderate-income, respectively. The increase in families below the poverty level and low- and moderate-income families could negatively impact consumers' ability to qualify for loans.

| Median Family Income Change | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2000 and 2010 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2000 Median Family 2006-2010 Median | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Income | Family Income | Percentage | | | | | | | |
| Area | (\$) | (\$) | Change (%) | | | | | | | |
| Assessment Area | 59,996 | 63,767 | 5.9 | | | | | | | |
| Lapeer County | 57,817 | 63,061 | 9.1 | | | | | | | |
| Macomb County | 62,816 | 67,423 | 7.3 | | | | | | | |
| Sanilac County | 42,306 | 49,005 | 15.8 | | | | | | | |
| St. Clair County | 54,450 | 59,969 | 10.1 | | | | | | | |
| Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills, MI MD | 67,923 | 75,314 | 10.9 | | | | | | | |
| State of Michigan | 53,457 | 60,341 | 12.9 | | | | | | | |
| Source: 2000 – U.S. Census Bureau Decennial Census; | 2006-2010 American Commun | ity Survey | | | | | | | | |

Housing Characteristics

The table below compares trends in housing costs in the assessment area to the individual counties, the MD and the state. According to 2010 U.S. Census data, 81.3 percent of the housing units in the assessment area are owner-occupied, with 24.0 percent of owner-occupied units located in low- or moderate-income geographies, approximating the 2000 U.S. Census data distributions. The median housing value in the assessment area is \$168,059, which is 94.6 percent of the MD median housing value. Rental housing is somewhat more affordable in relation to MD rents, at \$717 per month, which is 88.3 percent of Metropolitan Division rent of \$812. The assessment area's median gross rent is very close to the state-wide value of \$723 per month.

| Trends in Housing Costs 2000 and 2006-2010 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2006-2010 2006-2010 2000 Median Median 2000 Median Median Housing Value Housing Value Gross Rent Gross Rent | | | | | | | | | | |
| Location | (\$) | (\$) | (\$) | (\$) | | | | | | |
| Assessment Area | 141,475 | 168,059 | 529 | 717 | | | | | | |
| Lapeer County | 139,400 | 165,200 | 541 | 680 | | | | | | |
| Macomb County | 134,900 | 157,000 | 603 | 752 | | | | | | |
| Sanilac County | 91,000 | 115,600 | 448 | 594 | | | | | | |
| St. Clair County | 122,700 | 150,300 | 537 | 691 | | | | | | |
| Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills, MI MD | 153,130 | 177,700 | 655 | 812 | | | | | | |
| State of Michigan | 110,300 | 144,200 | 546 | 723 | | | | | | |
| Source: 2000 – U.S. Census Bureau: Decennial Cens | us; 2006-2010 — U.S. Ce | ensus Bureau: American | Community Survey | | | | | | | |

A common method to compare the relative affordability of housing across geographic areas is the affordability ratio, which is defined in Appendix C. Based on the 2006-2010 American Community Survey, the assessment area counties' affordability ratios range from 0.33 to 0.35, which approximates the state and Metropolitan Division value of 0.34. Since the 2000 U.S. Census, housing has become more costly in relation to income as the affordability ratio at that time ranged

from 0.37 to 0.41 in assessment area counties. As income levels declined, housing prices increased, contributing to the indication that the housing costs are becoming less affordable in the assessment area.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago conducted a study on the change in the foreclosure inventory rate at the county level. The foreclosure inventory rate measures the number of residential properties in some phase of foreclosure and excludes properties that have completed the foreclosure cycle. The study indicates foreclosure inventory rates in the assessment area counties and the state were elevated during the 2007-2009 recession, peaking in December 2010 at a range of 3.2 to 4.5 percent in the counties and above the state-wide peak on the same date of 3.1 percent. Since that time, rates in all counties declined and range from 0.9 to 1.7 percent as of September 2013, which approximates the state-wide rate of 1.1 percent on the same date.

Employment Conditions

Since 2009, unemployment rates for the counties in the assessment area trended downward from highs reflective of the 2007-2009 recession. As shown in the table below, unemployment ranged from 15.6 percent to 17.5 percent in assessment area counties in 2009, and declined to a range of 9.1 percent to 10.8 percent in 2013. Despite the declines, the assessment area counties' unemployment rates remain elevated in relation to the MD, the state and the U.S. unemployment rates, based on 2013 data.

| Unemployment Rates (%) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|------|------|------|------|--|--|--|--|
| Region | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | | | | |
| Lapeer County | 17.2 | 15.3 | 13.1 | 11.8 | 10.8 | | | | |
| Macomb County | 15.6 | 13.7 | 11.5 | 10.4 | 9.1 | | | | |
| Sanilac County | 17.0 | 15.0 | 11.8 | 9.9 | 10.6 | | | | |
| St. Clair County | 17.5 | 14.9 | 13.1 | 12.2 | 10.6 | | | | |
| Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills, MI MD | 14.1 | 12.8 | 10.8 | 9.8 | 8.7 | | | | |
| State of Michigan | 13.3 | 12.5 | 10.3 | 9.1 | 8.8 | | | | |
| United States | 9.3 | 9.6 | 8.9 | 8.1 | 6.5 | | | | |
| Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics: Local Area Unemple | oyment Statistics | | | | | | | | |

The largest industries within the assessment area are the grocery and manufacturing industries due to the presence of Meijer and Kroger in St. Clair and Macomb Counties and the Chrysler operations in Macomb County, respectively. The table below lists the largest employers within the assessment area by number of employees.

| Large | Largest Employers in the Assessment Area | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Number | | | | | | | |
| | of | | | | | | | |
| Company | Employees | Industry | | | | | | |
| Meijer | 5,051 | Supermarkets/Other Grocery Stores | | | | | | |
| Chrysler Warren Truck | 4,000 | Heavy Duty Truck Manufacturing | | | | | | |
| Henry Ford Macomb Outpatient/Rehab | 4,000 | Offices-Physical, Occupational/Speech Therapists/Audiologists | | | | | | |
| Chrysler Corp. | 3,850 | Automobile Manufacturing | | | | | | |
| US Army Tank Automotive Command | 3,480 | National Security | | | | | | |
| McDonald's | 3,347 | Restaurants | | | | | | |
| Kroger | 3,004 | Supermarkets/Other Grocery Stores | | | | | | |
| Mt. Clemens Regional Medical Center | 2,335 | General Medical & Surgical Hospitals | | | | | | |
| Art Van Furniture | 1,990 | Furniture Stores | | | | | | |
| Source: America's Labor Market Information | System (ALMI | S) | | | | | | |

Community Contacts

Two community representatives were interviewed during the evaluation to gain a better understanding of the credit needs of the assessment area. The representatives indicated lending opportunities exist for commercial financing in partnership with local economic development agencies.

CONCLUSIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

LENDING TEST¹

CSB's performance relative to the lending test is rated satisfactory based on the bank's loan-to-deposit (LTD) ratio, the percentage of loans originated in the bank's assessment area, the geographic distribution of loans and the bank's record of lending to borrowers of different income levels and businesses of different sizes. The bank's primary business line is HMDA-reportable loans; therefore, this loan type is weighted more heavily than small business loans in the evaluation of the bank's performance.

Loan-to-Deposit Ratio

CSB Bank's LTD ratio is reasonable given the bank's size, financial condition, and the credit needs of the assessment area. The LTD ratio, shown in the following table, totaled 63.4 percent based on its 16-quarter average from March 31, 2010 through December 31, 2013. The bank's LTD ratio is

¹ For HMDA-related and small business loans originated in 2012, the point at which new census tract definitions became effective, 2010 U.S. Census demographic data was used in the analysis of the bank's lending. For HMDA-related and small business loans originated in calendar year 2011, the 2000 U.S. Census demographic data was used. Data on 2011 lending is provided in Appendix A of this evaluation.

lower than its national group, (insured commercial banks with assets between \$100 and \$300 million with three or more full service offices and located in a metropolitan statistical area), but it approximates several of its local competitor institutions.

| Comparative Loan-to-Deposit Ratios | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Institution | Loan-to-Deposit Ratio (%) | | | | |
| Institution | 16 – Quarter Average 63.4 74.3 | | | | |
| CSB Bank | 63.4 | | | | |
| National Peer Group 4 | 74.3 | | | | |
| Competitors | | | | | |
| Eastern Michigan Bank | 61.4 | | | | |
| Fifth Third Bank | 90.4 | | | | |
| Lapeer City Bank &Trust Company | 60.6 | | | | |
| PNC Bank | 78.0 | | | | |
| Talmer Bank &Trust Company | 63.7 | | | | |
| Tri-County Bank | 66.8 | | | | |

Assessment Area Concentration

A majority of the bank's HMDA-reportable and small business loans were originated inside the assessment area. The table below summarizes the bank's lending inside and outside the assessment area by product. The distribution of loans illustrates 84.1 percent of loans by number, and 84.6 percent by dollar amount, were originated inside the assessment area indicating the bank actively serves the credit needs within its assessment area.

| Lending Inside and Outside the Assessment Area | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|----------|--------|-------|----|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Loan Type | Inside | | | | Ou | tside | | | |
| | # | % | \$ | % | # | % | \$ | % | |
| Home Purchase Loans | 47 | 77.0 | 3,981 | 79.3 | 14 | 23.0 | 1,042 | 20.7 | |
| Refinanced Loans | 230 | 86.5 | 30,413 | 85.7 | 36 | 13.5 | 5,085 | 14.3 | |
| Home Improvement Loans | 26 | 100.0 | 2,887 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| Multi-Family Loans | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 225 | 100.0 | |
| Total HMDA-Reportable Loans | 303 | 85.4 | 37,281 | 85.4 | 52 | 14.6 | 6,352 | 14.6 | |
| Total Small Business Loans | 46 | 76.7 | 5,302 | 78.8 | 14 | 23.3 | 1,426 | 21.2 | |
| Total Loans | 349 | 84.1 | 42,583 | 84.6 | 66 | 15.9 | 7,778 | 15.4 | |

Geographic Distribution of Loans

An analysis of geographic distribution of loans was conducted to determine the dispersion of loans among the different census tracts by income level within the assessment area. The analysis focused on loan penetration in moderate-income census tracts since there are no low-income census tracts in the bank's assessment area. The geographic distribution of loans reflects reasonable dispersion throughout the assessment area.

HMDA-Reportable Loans

During 2012, the bank originated a higher proportion of HMDA-reportable loans in low- and moderate-income census tracts when compared to 2011 due to increased loan refinance activity. The bank originated 189 HMDA-reportable loans in 2012 compared to the 114 HMDA-reportable loans in 2011. In 2012, the bank originated 32.8 percent of its loans by number in moderate-income census tracts, which was significantly above the aggregate lender rate of 20.4 percent and the demographic measure of owner-occupied housing located in moderate-income tracts of 24.0 percent. This is an improvement from the bank's performance relative to aggregate lenders in 2011 and in relation to the level of owner-occupied housing in moderate-income tracts. In 2011, the bank originated 16.7 percent of its loans by number in moderate-income census tracts, compared to 22.1 percent for aggregate lenders. The bank's 2011 HMDA-reportable lending was below the demographic-measure of owner-occupied housing of 24.5 percent.

| 0) | | A | | | | Geographic Distribution of HMDA Reportable Loans | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----|-------|-------|-----------|--|-------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 0) | Assessment Area: 2012 COMBINED AA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bank & Aggregate Lending Comparison | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Product Type | Tract | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| nct | Income | | Count | ; | | Dollar | | Owner | | | | | | | |
| rod | Levels | В | ank | Agg | Ba | nk | Agg | Occupied | | | | | | | |
| Ь | | # | % | % | \$ (000s) | \$ % | \$ % | % of Units | | | | | | | |
| n) | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| hase | Moderate | 6 | 30.0 | 23.3 | 711 | 34.6 | 19.8 | 24.0 | | | | | | | |
| 'urc | Middle | 14 | 70.0 | 76.7 | 1,341 | 65.4 | 80.2 | 76.0 | | | | | | | |
| ıe F | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| Home Purchase | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| Ţ | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 2,052 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | | |
| | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| е | Moderate | 51 | 33.8 | 19.1 | 6,275 | 31.0 | 17.5 | 24.0 | | | | | | | |
| Refinance | Middle | 100 | 66.2 | 80.9 | 13,962 | 69.0 | 82.5 | 76.0 | | | | | | | |
| efin | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| R | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 151 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 20,237 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | | |
| | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| ent | Moderate | 5 | 27.8 | 25.3 | 571 | 27.1 | 21.1 | 24.0 | | | | | | | |
| Home mprovement | Middle | 13 | 72.2 | 74.7 | 1,537 | 72.9 | 78.9 | 76.0 | | | | | | | |
| Ho | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| Imp | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 18 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 2,108 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | l | Multi-Family | | | | | | | |
| <u>></u> | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| imi | Moderate | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.7 | | | | | | | |
| i-Fe | Middle | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 52.3 | | | | | | | |
| Multi-Family | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | | |
| | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| tals | Moderate | 62 | 32.8 | 20.4 | 7,557 | 31.0 | 18.1 | 24.0 | | | | | | | |
| To | Middle | 127 | 67.2 | 79.6 | 16,840 | 69.0 | 81.9 | 76.0 | | | | | | | |
| HMDA Totals | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| HIV | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | I 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 189 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 24,397 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | | |

Originations & Purchases

Information based on 2010 ACS data

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 percent due to rounding

Small Business Loans

For small business loans, in 2012 the bank originated 35.7 percent of its loans by number in moderate-income census tracts. This lending rate exceeds the demographic measure of 26.3 percent of businesses located in moderate-income census tracts in the assessment area. The bank's 2012 performance reflects an increase over 2011 performance, when 27.8 percent of the bank's small business loans were in moderate-income census tracts.

| | Small Business Lending, 2012 | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------------|------------------|------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Geographic Distribution | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Businesses | | | | | | | | | | |
| Census | | | | | by Census | | | | | | |
| Tract | | Bank | Loans | | Tract Income | | | | | | |
| Income | | | | | Level | | | | | | |
| Level | # | % | \$ | % | % | | | | | | |
| Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| Moderate | 10 | 35.7 | 1,101 | 41.5 | 26.3 | | | | | | |
| Middle | 18 | 64.3 | 1,554 | 58.5 | 73.7 | | | | | | |
| Upper | 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | Total 28 100.0 2,655 100.0 100.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: Percenta | iges may not add | to 100.0 percen | t due to roundin | 18. | | | | | | | |

Lending to Borrowers of Different Income Levels and to Businesses of Different Sizes

An analysis of HMDA-reportable and small business loans was conducted to determine the level of lending to borrowers of different income levels and businesses of varying revenues. The bank's loan distribution reflects a reasonable penetration among individuals of different income levels, including low- and moderate-income borrowers, and businesses of different sizes.

HMDA-Reportable Loans

In 2012, the bank originated 40.7 percent of its HMDA-reportable loans by number to low- and moderate-income borrowers. This lending exceeds the 2012 aggregate lender rate of 35.7 percent of loans originated to low- and moderate-income borrowers and approximates the demographic measure of 44.3 percent low- and moderate income families in the assessment area. The 2012 rate is lower than 2011 performance, when the bank originated 48.2 percent of HMDA-reportable loans by number to low- and moderate-income borrowers, although 2011 lending also exceeded the aggregate lenders rate of 39.7 percent and the demographic measure of low- and moderate-income families of 41.9 percent. The 2012 decline in the bank's low- and moderate-income borrower lending is attributed to lower home purchase rates for borrowers of all income levels, including low- and moderate-income.

| Bank & Agregate Lending Comparison Families by Family Income Levels Bank & Agregate South Sout | | Borrower Distribution of HMDA Reportable Loans | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|--|-----|-------------|-------|----------|--------|-------|--------|--|--|--|
| Borrower Income Count Bank Agg Bank S(000s) S % S % % % % % S(000s) S % S % % % % % S(000s) S % S % S % % % % % S(000s) S % S % S % % % % % S(000s) S % S % S % S % % % % % S(000s) S % | | Assessment Area: 2012 COMBINED AA | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low 3 15.0 23.4 302 14.7 15.2 21.7 | ē | Bank & Aggregate Lending Comparison | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low 3 15.0 23.4 302 14.7 15.2 21.7 | Тур | Borrower | | Families by | | | | | | | | |
| Low 3 15.0 23.4 302 14.7 15.2 21.7 | nct | Income | | Count | | | Dollar | | Family | | | |
| Low 3 15.0 23.4 302 14.7 15.2 21.7 | rod | Levels | В | ank | Agg | Ba | IIK | Agg | Income | | | |
| Moderate 5 25.0 26.8 400 19.5 23.7 22.6 | Ь | | # | % | % | \$(000s) | \$ % | \$ % | % | | | |
| Total 20 100.0 100.0 2,052 100.0 | n) | Low | 3 | 15.0 | 23.4 | 302 | 14.7 | 15.2 | 21.7 | | | |
| Total 20 100.0 100.0 2,052 100.0 | hase | Moderate | 5 | 25.0 | 26.8 | 400 | 19.5 | 23.7 | 22.6 | | | |
| Total 20 100.0 100.0 2,052 100.0 | 'urc | Middle | 4 | 20.0 | 22.0 | 443 | 21.6 | 25.7 | 25.6 | | | |
| Total 20 100.0 100.0 2,052 100.0 | Je P | Upper | 7 | 35.0 | 17.2 | 813 | 39.6 | 24.9 | 30.1 | | | |
| Total 20 100.0 100.0 2,052 100.0 | Hon | Unknown | 1 | 5.0 | 10.6 | 94 | 4.6 | 10.4 | 0.0 | | | |
| Moderate 38 25.2 19.1 4,392 21.7 15.7 22.6 | 1 | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 2,052 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| Middle Upper 41 27.2 29.6 7,157 35.4 35.9 30.1 Upper 41 27.2 29.6 7,157 35.4 35.9 30.1 Unknown 6 | | Low | 22 | 14.6 | 11.0 | 1,963 | 9.7 | 7.5 | 21.7 | | | |
| Total 151 100.0 100.0 20,237 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 4 22.2 19.0 295 14.0 11.0 21.7 Moderate 5 27.8 25.9 580 27.5 24.8 22.6 Middle 5 27.8 31.0 622 29.5 36.0 25.6 Upper 4 22.2 23.4 611 29.0 26.3 30.1 Unknown 0 0.0 0.6 0 0.0 1.9 0.0 Total 18 100.0 100.0 2,108 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Middle 0 0.0 0.0 0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Middle 0 0.0 0.0 0 0.0 0.0 30.1 Upper 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 0.0 30.1 Unknown 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 0.0 Total 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 0.0 Low 29 15.3 14.4 2,560 10.5 9.4 21.7 Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 Middle 53 28.0 26.0 7,183 29.4 26.9 25.6 Upper 52 27.5 26.2 8,581 35.2 33.1 30.1 Unknown 7 3.7 12.1 701 2.9 12.9 0.0 | بو | Moderate | 38 | 25.2 | 19.1 | 4,392 | 21.7 | 15.7 | 22.6 | | | |
| Total | anc | Middle | 44 | 29.1 | 27.2 | 6,118 | 30.2 | 27.2 | 25.6 | | | |
| Total 151 100.0 100.0 20,237 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 4 22.2 19.0 295 14.0 11.0 21.7 Moderate 5 27.8 25.9 580 27.5 24.8 22.6 Middle 5 27.8 31.0 622 29.5 36.0 25.6 Upper 4 22.2 23.4 611 29.0 26.3 30.1 Unknown 0 0.0 0.6 0 0.0 1.9 0.0 Total 18 100.0 100.0 2,108 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Middle 0 0.0 0.0 0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Middle 0 0.0 0.0 0 0.0 0.0 30.1 Upper 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 0.0 30.1 Unknown 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 0.0 Total 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 0.0 Low 29 15.3 14.4 2,560 10.5 9.4 21.7 Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 Middle 53 28.0 26.0 7,183 29.4 26.9 25.6 Upper 52 27.5 26.2 8,581 35.2 33.1 30.1 Unknown 7 3.7 12.1 701 2.9 12.9 0.0 | efin | Upper | 41 | 27.2 | 29.6 | 7,157 | 35.4 | 35.9 | 30.1 | | | |
| Low | N N | Unknown | 6 | 4.0 | 13.1 | 607 | 3.0 | 13.7 | 0.0 | | | |
| Moderate 5 27.8 25.9 580 27.5 24.8 22.6 Middle 5 27.8 31.0 622 29.5 36.0 25.6 Upper 4 22.2 23.4 611 29.0 26.3 30.1 Unknown 0 0.0 0.6 0 0.0 1.9 0.0 Total 18 100.0 100.0 2,108 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 0 0.0 0.0 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 21.7 Moderate 0 0.0 0.0 0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Middle 0 0.0 0.0 0 0.0 0.0 25.6 Upper 0 0.0 0.0 0 0.0 0.0 30.1 Unknown 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 0.0 Total 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 100.0 Low 29 15.3 14.4 2,560 10.5 9.4 21.7 Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 Middle 53 28.0 26.0 7,183 29.4 26.9 25.6 Upper 52 27.5 26.2 8,581 35.2 33.1 30.1 Unknown 7 3.7 12.1 701 2.9 12.9 0.0 | | Total | 151 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 20,237 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| Middle | | Low | 4 | 22.2 | 19.0 | 295 | 14.0 | 11.0 | 21.7 | | | |
| Total 18 100.0 100.0 2,108 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Middle 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Upper 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 0.0 25.6 Upper 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 0.0 100.0 1 | ent | Moderate | 5 | 27.8 | 25.9 | 580 | 27.5 | 24.8 | 22.6 | | | |
| Total 18 100.0 100.0 2,108 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Moderate 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Middle 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 30.1 Upper 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 0.0 Total 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 100.0 Low 29 15.3 14.4 2,560 10.5 9.4 21.7 Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 Middle 53 28.0 26.0 7,183 29.4 26.9 25.6 Upper 52 27.5 26.2 8,581 35.2 33.1 30.1 Unknown 7 3.7 12.1 701 2.9 12.9 0.0 | me 'em | Middle | 5 | 27.8 | 31.0 | 622 | 29.5 | 36.0 | 25.6 | | | |
| Total 18 100.0 100.0 2,108 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Moderate 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 22.6 Middle 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 30.1 Upper 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 0.0 Total 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 100.0 Low 29 15.3 14.4 2,560 10.5 9.4 21.7 Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 Middle 53 28.0 26.0 7,183 29.4 26.9 25.6 Upper 52 27.5 26.2 8,581 35.2 33.1 30.1 Unknown 7 3.7 12.1 701 2.9 12.9 0.0 | Ho rov | Upper | 4 | 22.2 | 23.4 | 611 | 29.0 | 26.3 | 30.1 | | | |
| Low | Imr | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | | | |
| Moderate 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 22.6 | | Total | 18 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 2,108 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| Total 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 29 15.3 14.4 2,560 10.5 9.4 21.7 Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 Middle 53 28.0 26.0 7,183 29.4 26.9 25.6 Upper 52 27.5 26.2 8,581 35.2 33.1 30.1 Unknown 7 3.7 12.1 701 2.9 12.9 0.0 | | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 | | | |
| Total 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 29 15.3 14.4 2,560 10.5 9.4 21.7 Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 Middle 53 28.0 26.0 7,183 29.4 26.9 25.6 Upper 52 27.5 26.2 8,581 35.2 33.1 30.1 Unknown 7 3.7 12.1 701 2.9 12.9 0.0 | hily | Moderate | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.6 | | | |
| Total 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 29 15.3 14.4 2,560 10.5 9.4 21.7 Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 Middle 53 28.0 26.0 7,183 29.4 26.9 25.6 Upper 52 27.5 26.2 8,581 35.2 33.1 30.1 Unknown 7 3.7 12.1 701 2.9 12.9 0.0 | Fan | Middle | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.6 | | | |
| Total 0 0.0 100.0 0 0.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 Low 29 15.3 14.4 2,560 10.5 9.4 21.7 Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 Middle 53 28.0 26.0 7,183 29.4 26.9 25.6 Upper 52 27.5 26.2 8,581 35.2 33.1 30.1 Unknown 7 3.7 12.1 701 2.9 12.9 0.0 | lt. | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.1 | | | |
| Low 29 15.3 14.4 2,560 10.5 9.4 21.7 Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 Middle 53 28.0 26.0 7,183 29.4 26.9 25.6 Upper 52 27.5 26.2 8,581 35.2 33.1 30.1 Unknown 7 3.7 12.1 701 2.9 12.9 0.0 | Μ̈́ | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | | | |
| Moderate 48 25.4 21.3 5,372 22.0 17.7 22.6 | | Total | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| | | Low | 29 | 15.3 | 14.4 | 2,560 | 10.5 | 9.4 | 21.7 | | | |
| | tals | Moderate | 48 | 25.4 | 21.3 | 5,372 | 22.0 | 17.7 | 22.6 | | | |
| | v To | Middle | 53 | 28.0 | 26.0 | 7,183 | 29.4 | 26.9 | 25.6 | | | |
| | ID.A | Upper | 52 | 27.5 | 26.2 | 8,581 | 35.2 | 33.1 | 30.1 | | | |
| Total 189 100.0 100.0 24,397 100.0 100.0 100.0 | H | Unknown | 7 | 3.7 | 12.1 | 701 | 2.9 | 12.9 | 0.0 | | | |
| | | Total | 189 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 24,397 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |

Originations & Purchases

Information based on 2010 ACS data

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 percent due to rounding

Small Business Loans

Small business lending in 2012 was concentrated to small businesses with gross revenues of \$1 million or less. The bank originated 67.9 percent of loans by number to borrowers with revenues of \$1 million or less, with 89.5 percent of those loans in amounts of \$100,000 or less. The performance in 2011 approximated 2012 lending, with 72.2 percent of loans originated to borrowers with gross revenues of \$1 million or less, 84.6 percent of which were in amounts of \$100,000 or less.

Loans in amounts of \$100,000 or less are typically considered most beneficial to small businesses, therefore the bank's level of lending evidences support of the small businesses in the assessment area.

| Small Business Loan Distribution, 2012 By Revenue and Loan Size | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|---------------|--|--|--|
| (000s) Category Bank Loans | | | | | | | | |
| | # | % | \$ | % | Revenues % | | | |
| | By R | levenue | | | | | | |
| \$1 Million or Less | 19 | 67.9 | 1,174 | 44.2 | 93.3 | | | |
| Over \$1 Million | 9 | 32.1 | 1,481 | 55.8 | 3.6 | | | |
| Not Known | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | | | |
| Total | 28 | 100.0 | 2,655 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| | By Lo | oan Size | | | | | | |
| \$100,000 or less | 20 | 71.4 | 780 | 29.4 | | | | |
| \$101,000 - \$250,000 | 5 | 17.9 | 880 | 33.1 | | | | |
| \$251,000 - \$1 Million | 3 | 10.7 | 995 | 37.5 | | | | |
| Total | 28 | 100.0 | 2,655 | 100.0 | | | | |
| By Loan Size and Revenue \$1 Million or Less | | | | | | | | |
| \$100,000 or less | 17 | 89.5 | 652 | 55.5 | | | | |
| \$101,000 - \$250,000 | 1 | 5.3 | 232 | 19.8 | | | | |
| \$251,000 - \$1 Million | 1 | 5.3 | 290 | 24.7 | | | | |
| Total | Total 19 100.0 1,174 100.0 | | | | | | | |
| Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 percent due to rounding. | | | | | | | | |

Response to Complaints

The bank or this Reserve Bank has not received any CRA-related complaints since the previous evaluation.

FAIR LENDING OR OTHER ILLEGAL CREDIT PRACTICES REVIEW

No evidence of discriminatory or other illegal credit practices inconsistent with helping to meet community credit needs was identified.

APPENDIX A – 2000 Demographic and 2011 Lending Tables

Combined Demographics Report

| Income Categories | Tract Distributi | | | Families by Tract Income | | Families < Po Level as % Families by | 6 of | Families by Family Income | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------------|--------|-----------------------------|---------|--|-------|------------------------------|-------|
| | # | % | | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Low-income | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 7,085 | 19.6 |
| Moderate-income | 9 | 25.0 | | 8,992 | 24.9 | 524 | 5.8 | 8,066 | 22.3 |
| Middle-income | 26 | 72.2 | | 26,035 | 72.0 | 861 | 3.3 | 9,513 | 26.3 |
| Upper-income | 1 | 2.8 | | 1,111 | 3.1 | 19 | 1.7 | 11,474 | 31.8 |
| Unknown-income | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total Assessment Area | 36 | 100.0 | | 36,138 | 100.0 | 1,404 | 3.9 | 36,138 | 100.0 |
| | Housing | | | | Hous | ing Types by T | Γract | | |
| | Units by | (| Owner- | Occupied | l | Rental | | Vacant | |
| | Tract | | # | % | % | # | % | # | % |
| Low-income | 0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Moderate-income | 12,742 | | 9,747 | 24.5 | 76.5 | 2,249 | 17.7 | 746 | 5.9 |
| Middle-income | 33,567 | 2 | 28,827 | 72.6 | 85.9 | 3,201 | 9.5 | 1,539 | 4.6 |
| Upper-income | 1,227 | | 1,144 | 2.9 | 93.2 | 45 | 3.7 | 38 | 3.1 |
| Unknown-income | 0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total Assessment Area | 47,536 | 3 | 9,718 | 100.0 | 83.6 | 5,495 | 11.6 | 2,323 | 4.9 |
| | Total Busines | sses by | | | Busines | sinesses by Tract & Revenue Size | | | |
| | Tract | | - | ss Than \$1 Millio | - | Over \$1 Million | | Revenue N Reporte | |
| | # | % | | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Low-income | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Moderate-income | 2,106 | 26.6 | | 1,929 | 26.1 | 89 | 34.2 | 88 | 35.2 |
| Middle-income | 5,484 | 69.3 5,168 | | 5,168 | 69.8 | 164 | 63.1 | 152 | 60.8 |
| Upper-income | 324 | 4.1 307 | | 4.1 | 7 | 2.7 | 10 | 4.0 | |
| Unknown-income | 0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | |
| Total Assessment Area | 7,914 | 100.0 | | 7,404 | 100.0 | 260 | 100.0 | 250 | 100.0 |
| | Percentage of | Total B | usines | ses: | 93.6 | | 3.3 | | 3.2 |

Based on 2011 D&B information according to 2000 Census Boundaries.

Percentages may not add to 100 percent based on rounding.

HMDA Geographic Distribution of Loans - 2011

| j | Geographic Distribution of HMDA Reportable Loans | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|-----|----------|----------|-----------|--------|-------|--------------|--|--|
| | Assessment Area: 2011 COMBINED AA | | | | | | | | | |
| ě | | В | Bank & A | ggregate | e Lending | Compar | ison | | | |
| Product Type | Tract | | | | 2011 | | | | | |
| nct | Income | | Count | t | | Dollar | | | | |
| rod | Levels | В | ank | Agg | Ba | nk | Agg | Occupied | | |
| Ь | | # | % | % | \$ (000s) | \$ % | \$ % | % of Units | | |
| - 0) | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| hase | Moderate | 6 | 22.2 | 25.1 | 327 | 17.0 | 18.9 | 24.5 | | |
| urc | Middle | 21 | 77.8 | 72.5 | 1,602 | 83.0 | 76.5 | 72.6 | | |
| e P | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 2.9 | | |
| Home Purchase | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| 五 | Total | 27 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1,929 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| a) | Moderate | 12 | 15.2 | 19.2 | 1,414 | 13.9 | 16.7 | 24.5 | | |
| Refinance | Middle | 67 | 84.8 | 74.7 | 8,762 | 86.1 | 74.6 | 72.6 | | |
| uije | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 2.9 | | |
| R | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| | Total | 79 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10,176 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| - | # Moderate | 1 | 12.5 | 35.2 | 100 | 12.8 | 25.2 | 24.5 | | |
| me | Middle | 7 | 87.5 | 61.4 | 679 | 87.2 | 67.2 | 72.6 | | |
| Home | Moderate Middle Upper Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 2.9 | | |
| | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| | Total | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 779 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | | | | | | | i | Multi-Family | | |
| <u>y</u> | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| ımı | Moderate | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 54.1 | | |
| i-Fe | Middle | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45.9 | | |
| Multi-Family | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| 2 | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| | Total | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| tals | Moderate | 19 | 16.7 | 22.1 | 1,841 | 14.3 | 17.6 | 24.5 | | |
| To | Middle | 95 | 83.3 | 73.2 | 11,043 | 85.7 | 75.2 | 72.6 | | |
| DA | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 2.9 | | |
| HMDA Totals | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| | Total | 114 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 12,884 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

Originations & Purchases

Information based on 2000 Census data

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 percent due to rounding

Small Business Geographic Distribution of Loans - 2011

| Small Business Lending Geographic Distribution | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Census Tract Income | Businesses by Census Bank Loans Tract Income | | | | | | | | | |
| Level | # | Level | | | | | | | | |
| T | | % | \$ | % | % | | | | | |
| Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0% | | | | | |
| Moderate | 5 | 27.8 | 953 | 36.0 | 26.6% | | | | | |
| Middle | 13 | 72.2 | 1,694 | 64.0 | 69.3% | | | | | |
| Upper | 0 0.0 0 0.0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 0.0 0 0.0 0.0% | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 18 | 100.0 | 2,647 | 100.0 | 100.0% | | | | | |
| Note: Percent | ages may not add | to 100.0 percent d | ue to rounding. | • | | | | | | |

Lending to Borrowers of Different Income Levels and to Businesses of Different Sizes - 2011

| | Borrower Distribution of HMDA Reportable Loans | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|-----|-------------|----------|-----------|---------|-------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| | Assessment Area: 2011 COMBINED AA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ě | | В | ank & A | ggregate | e Lending | Compari | ison | | | | | |
| Гур | Borrower | | Families by | | | | | | | | | |
| nct , | Income | | Count | | | Dollar | | Family | | | | |
| Product Type | Levels | В | ank | Agg | Ва | nk | Agg | Income | | | | |
| P ₁ | | # | % | % | \$(000s) | \$ % | \$ % | % | | | | |
| a) | Low | 8 | 29.6 | 24.9 | 506 | 26.2 | 15.6 | 19.6 | | | | |
| Jase | Moderate | 9 | 33.3 | 29.8 | 661 | 34.3 | 26.8 | 22.3 | | | | |
| urch | Middle | 3 | 11.1 | 19.7 | 227 | 11.8 | 22.8 | 26.3 | | | | |
| le P | Upper | 2 | 7.4 | 16.9 | 351 | 18.2 | 26.0 | 31.8 | | | | |
| Home Purchase | Unknown | 5 | 18.5 | 8.6 | 184 | 9.5 | 8.7 | 0.0 | | | | |
| 1 11 | Total | 27 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1,929 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |
| | Low | 12 | 15.2 | 10.6 | 1,242 | 12.2 | 6.9 | 19.6 | | | | |
| ച | Moderate | 22 | 27.8 | 18.3 | 2,498 | 24.5 | 15.5 | 22.3 | | | | |
| Refinance | Middle | 27 | 34.2 | 25.2 | 3,668 | 36.0 | 25.0 | 26.3 | | | | |
| | Upper | 17 | 21.5 | 24.6 | 2,478 | 24.4 | 31.5 | 31.8 | | | | |
| Ž | Unknown | 1 | 1.3 | 21.2 | 290 | 2.8 | 21.1 | 0.0 | | | | |
| | Total | 79 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10,176 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |
| | Low | 1 | 12.5 | 24.8 | 111 | 14.2 | 18.8 | 19.6 | | | | |
| ent | Moderate | 3 | 37.5 | 25.5 | 201 | 25.8 | 17.0 | 22.3 | | | | |
| me | Middle | 2 | 25.0 | 20.7 | 220 | 28.2 | 22.1 | 26.3 | | | | |
| Home | Upper | 2 | 25.0 | 24.1 | 247 | 31.7 | 31.1 | 31.8 | | | | |
| [[| Moderate Middle Upper Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 0.0 | | | | |
| | Total | 8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 779 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |
| | Low | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.6 | | | | |
| uily | Moderate | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.3 | | | | |
| Fam | Middle | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.3 | | | | |
| Multi-Family | Upper | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.8 | | | | |
| Mu | Unknown | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| | Total | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |
| | Low | 21 | 18.4 | 16.7 | 1,859 | 14.4 | 10.2 | 19.6 | | | | |
| tals | Moderate | 34 | 29.8 | 23.0 | 3,360 | 26.1 | 19.6 | 22.3 | | | | |
| Tol | Middle | 32 | 28.1 | 22.9 | 4,115 | 31.9 | 24.2 | 26.3 | | | | |
| HMDA Totals | Upper | 21 | 18.4 | 21.6 | 3,076 | 23.9 | 29.5 | 31.8 | | | | |
| HIM | Unknown | 6 | 5.3 | 15.8 | 474 | 3.7 | 16.5 | 0.0 | | | | |
| | Total | 114 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 12,884 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |

Originations & Purchases

Information based on 2000 Census data

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 percent due to rounding

| Small Business Loan Distribution, 2011 | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------|-------|-------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| By Revenue and Loan Size | | | | | | | | | | |
| (000s) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Businesses | | | | | |
| Category | | Bank I | Loans | | By Annual | | | | | |
| | | | | | Revenues | | | | | |
| | # | % | \$ | % | % | | | | | |
| | By F | Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| \$1 Million or Less | 13 | 72.2 | 1,568 | 59.3 | 93.6 | | | | | |
| Over \$1 Million | 5 | 27.8 | 1,079 | 40.7 | 3.3 | | | | | |
| Not Known | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 3.2 | | | | | |
| Total | 18 | 100.0 | 2,647 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | |
| | By L | oan Size | | | | | | | | |
| \$100,000 or less | 13 | 72.2 | 393 | 14.9 | | | | | | |
| \$101,000 - \$250,000 | 2 | 11.1 | 400 | 15.1 | | | | | | |
| \$251,000 - \$1 Million | 3 | 16.7 | 1,854 | 70.0 | | | | | | |
| Total | 18 | 100.0 | 2,647 | 100.0 | | | | | | |
| By Loan Size and Revenue \$1 Million or Less | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$100,000 or less | 11 | 84.6 | 373 | 23.8 | | | | | | |
| \$101,000 - \$250,000 0 0.0 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$251,000 - \$1 Million | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 percent due to rounding. | | | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX B – Scope of Examination

| SCOPE OF EXAMINATION | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| TIME PERIOD REVIEWED January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2012 | | | | | | | |
| FINANCIAL INSTITUTION CSB Bank | | | PRODUCTS REVIEWED HMDA-reportable loans Small business loans | | | | |
| AFFILIATE(S) | AFFILIATE RELATIONSHIP PRODUCTS REVIEWED | | | | | | |
| None | Not applicable | | Not applicable | | | | |
| LIST OF ASSE | ESSMENT AREAS AND TYP | E OF EXAMINATION | | | | | |
| ASSESSMENT AREA | TYPE OF EXAMINATION | OTHER INFORMATION | | | | | |
| Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills, Michigan MD#47644 | Full scope review | None | None | | | | |

APPENDIX C - Glossary

Affiliate: Any company that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with another company. A company is under common control with another company if the same company directly or indirectly controls both companies. A bank subsidiary is controlled by the bank and is, therefore, an affiliate.

Affordability ratio: To determine housing affordability, the affordability ratio is calculated by dividing median household income by median housing value. This ratio allows the comparison of housing affordability across assessment areas and/or communities. An area with a high ratio generally has more affordable housing than an area with a low ratio.

Aggregate lending: The number of loans originated and purchased by all lenders subject to reporting requirements as a percentage of the aggregate number of loans originated and purchased by all lenders in the MSA/assessment area.

Census tract: Small subdivisions of metropolitan and other densely populated counties. Census tract boundaries do not cross county lines; however, they may cross the boundaries of metropolitan statistical areas. They usually have between 2,500 and 8,000 persons, and their physical size varies widely depending upon population density. Census tracts are designed to be homogeneous with respect to population characteristics, economic status, and living conditions to allow for statistical comparisons.

Consumer loan: A loan to one or more individuals for household, family, or other personal expenditures. A consumer loan does not include a home mortgage, small business, or small farm loan. This definition includes the following categories of loans: motor vehicle, credit card, home equity, other secured loan, and other unsecured loan.

Family: Includes a householder and one or more other persons living in the same household who are related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. The number of family households always equals the number of families; however, a family household may also include non-relatives living with the family. Families are classified by type as either a married couple family or other family, which is further classified into "male householder" (a family with a male household and no wife present) or "female householder" (a family with a female householder and no husband present).

Fair market rent: Fair market rents (FMRs) are gross rent estimates. They include the shelter rent plus the cost of all tenant-paid utilities, except telephones, cable or satellite television service, and internet service. HUD sets FMRs to assure that a sufficient supply of rental housing is available to their program participants. To accomplish this objective, FMRs must be both high enough to permit a selection of units and neighborhoods and low enough to serve as many low-income families as possible. The level at which FMRs are set is expressed as a percentile point within the

rent distribution of standard-quality rental housing units. The current definition used is the 40th percentile rent, the dollar amount below which 40 percent of the standard-quality rental housing units are rented. The 40th percentile rent is drawn from the distribution of rents of all units occupied by recent movers (renter households who moved to their present residence within the past 15 months). HUD is required to ensure that FMRs exclude non-market rental housing in their computation. Therefore, HUD excludes all units falling below a specified rent level determined from public housing rents in HUD's program databases as likely to be either assisted housing or otherwise at a below-market rent, and units less than two years old.

Geography: A census tract or a block numbering area delineated by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in the most recent decennial census.

Home mortgage loans: Include home purchase and home improvement loans as defined in the HMDA regulation. This definition also includes multifamily (five or more families) dwelling loans, loans for the purchase of manufactured homes and refinancing of home improvement and home purchase loans.

Household: Includes all persons occupying a housing unit. Persons not living in households are classified as living in group quarters. In 100 percent tabulations, the count of households always equals the count of occupied housing units.

Low-income: Individual income that is less than 50 percent of the area median income, or a median family income that is less than 50 percent in the case of a geography.

Market share: The number of loans originated and purchased by the institution as a percentage of the aggregate number of loans originated and purchased by all lenders in the MSA/assessment area.

Median Family Income (MFI): The median income determined by the U.S. Census Bureau every ten years and used to determine the income level category of geographies. Also, the median income determined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) annually that is used to determine the income level category of individuals. For any given area, the median is the point at which half of the families have income above it and half below it.

Metropolitan Area: A metropolitan statistical area (**MSA**) or a metropolitan division (**MD**) as defined by the Office of Management and Budget. A MSA is a core area containing at least one urbanized area of 50,000 or more inhabitants, together with adjacent communities having a high degree of economic and social integration with that core. A MD is a division of a MSA based on specific criteria including commuting patterns. Only a MSA that has a population of at least 2.5 million may be divided into MDs. A metropolitan statistical area that crosses into two or more bordering states is called a multistate metropolitan statistical area (**MMSA**). Performance within each MMSA is analyzed separately as a full-scope review and receives its own ratings under the

Lending, Investment and Service Tests provided the financial institution has its main office, branch, or deposit-taking ATM located in each applicable state making up the MMSA.

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 of 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: Refers to a residential structure that contains five or more units.

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.

Small loans to business: A loan included in "loans to small businesses" as defined in the Consolidated Report of Condition and Income (Call Report). These loans have original amounts of \$1 million or less and are either secured by nonfarm nonresidential properties or are classified as commercial and industrial loans.

Small loans to farms: A loan included in "loans to small farms" as defined in the instructions for preparation of the Consolidated Report of Condition and Income (Call Report). These loans have original amounts of \$500 thousand or less and are either secured by farmland, including farm residential and other improvements, or are classified as loans to finance agricultural production and other loans to farmers.

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