

# Silicon Valley Bank Collapses

March 2023

The collapse of **Silicon Valley Bank** (“SVB”), along with another niche lender, Signature Bank, have caused headline news, along with a bout of volatility throughout equity and bond markets.

Specifically, there has been a notable and sharp sell off in many regional U.S. Banks, while at the same time the broader bond market witnessed an increase in value, as investors sought the relative safety of bonds and yields, and yield expectations therefore declined.

## What is SVB and what happened?

Quite unsurprising given its name, SVB was a specialized bank mainly focused on the technology sector and, in particular, venture capital (“VC”), tech start-up and biotech firms; doing business with approximately 50% of all U.S. venture-backed technology and life-sciences companies. It was the 16<sup>th</sup> largest bank in the U.S. with approximately \$200 billion in assets.

As these companies drew record amounts of investment capital in 2020 and 2021, SVB’s deposits also grew dramatically, which SVB could not lend out to traditional sources such as commercial loans and mortgages. Instead, SVB invested in assets, such as long-term U.S. Treasuries, to maximize returns – while paying a floating rate on its deposits. This created a troubling mismatch in the exposure of their liabilities and assets.

Given the rapid rise in interest rates over the last year, the previously high-flying tech sector was amongst the hardest hit; funds dried up, and those companies started to withdraw deposits to meet their cash needs. As a result, SVB was forced to sell its longer duration assets at significant losses (when interest rates rise, bond prices generally decline; the greater the duration, the greater the impact) to fund these withdrawals.

On March 8, the parent of SVB, SVB Financial Group, announced it had sold \$21 billion in securities resulting in a \$1.8 billion loss and that they would raise an additional \$2.25 billion of equity capital to secure their balance sheet. This created panic in the tight knit communities in which its customers

participate, resulting in over \$40 billion in withdrawals on March 9 alone. On March 10, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (“FDIC”) took control of the bank.

## Uniqueness

Both the deposit base and the investment portfolio of SVB appear relatively unique in terms of the American banking sector. Additionally, given the nature of its customers, about 95% of SVB’s deposit balances were not covered by the FDIC (which covers deposits of up to \$250,000), further fueling SVB’s issues. Finally, given SVB was below a certain size, it was not subject to some of the U.S. Federal Reserve’s stricter liquidity requirements which govern larger banks, allowing it to operate in a more unconstrained manner.

## The Response

On March 12, policy makers announced that all depositors at both SVB and Signature Bank would not lose money, even on deposits in excess of \$250,000. The Fed and the Treasury also ensured that depositors would be able to continue to withdraw money from their accounts.

The Fed also created a new lending facility for banks, not forcing bonds to be sold at a loss in order to meet liquidity needs, greatly reducing systemic risk.

## What May Come Next?

While it is likely the banking sector will remain volatile in the near term, with the potential for some additional firms to announce they are also under stress, the actions announced by policymakers should help to reduce the risk of another “run on the bank.” The challenges at SVB were relatively unique, and a perfect storm of factors led to its swift collapse.

Secondary risks include a continued ripple through the economic system, leading to more cautious lending and a resulting slowdown in spending and growth. While such a slowdown is potentially negative to the growth outlook broadly, this may also influence inflation expectations and thus result in less hawkishness from the Fed (and other central banks). This may ultimately result in fewer interest rate increases than the market had otherwise expected.

There could also be regulatory changes, which could include changes to liquidity requirements, and could create some additional uncertainty for banks.

Finally, there is also the possibility that despite strong policy action to stabilize the sector, and notwithstanding any new regulatory initiatives; depositors could remain weary and move money out of smaller banks in favour of larger banks.

### Conclusion

While the swiftness of the SVB's collapse was unsettling, it is not that unique in the history of the American banking system. With hundreds of banks in operation, and some focused narrowly on certain sectors or geographies, it is bound to happen, especially as monetary policy is being tightened.

At this juncture, it appears that the collapse of SVB and Signature Bank is more about their specific exposures and internal risk management practices, rather than broader systemic issues that were experienced through the 2008 great financial crisis.

The responses announced by the FDIC, the Fed and Treasury should help provide some measure of stability and containment.

**Please contact your BMO financial professional if you any questions or would like to discuss your investments.**



BMO Private Wealth provides this publication for informational purposes only and it is not and should not be construed as professional advice to any individual. The information contained in this publication is based on material believed to be reliable at the time of publication, but BMO Private Wealth cannot guarantee the information is accurate or complete. Individuals should contact their BMO representative for professional advice regarding their personal circumstances and/or financial position. The comments included in this publication are not intended to be a definitive analysis of tax applicability or trust and estates law. The comments are general in nature and professional advice regarding an individual's particular tax position should be obtained in respect of any person's specific circumstances.

BMO Private Wealth is a brand name for a business group consisting of Bank of Montreal and certain of its affiliates in providing private wealth management products and services. Not all products and services are offered by all legal entities within BMO Private Wealth. Banking services are offered through Bank of Montreal. Investment management, wealth planning, tax planning, and philanthropy planning services are offered through BMO Nesbitt Burns Inc. and BMO Private Investment Counsel Inc. If you are already a client of BMO Nesbitt Burns Inc., please contact your Investment Advisor for more information. An insurance policy should be accompanied by an illustration. Insurance services and products are offered through BMO Estate Insurance Advisory Services Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of BMO Nesbitt Burns Inc. Estate, trust, and custodial services are offered through BMO Trust Company. BMO Private Wealth legal entities do not offer tax advice. BMO Trust Company and BMO Bank of Montreal are Members of CDIC.

© Registered trademark of Bank of Montreal, used under license.

All rights are reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, or referred to in any other publication, without the express written permission of BMO Private Wealth.