

FIRST BANCORP /PR/
Form 10-K
March 16, 2017

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-K

(Mark one)

ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(D) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the Fiscal Year Ended December 31, 2016

or

TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(D) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the transition period from _____ to _____

Commission File Number 1-14793

FIRST BANCORP.

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Puerto Rico
(State or other jurisdiction of

66-0561882
(I.R.S. Employer

incorporation or organization)

Identification No.)

1519 Ponce de León Avenue, Stop 23
Santurce, Puerto Rico
(Address of principal executive office)

00908
(Zip Code)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code:

(787) 729-8200

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Common Stock (\$0.10 par value)

New York Stock Exchange

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act:

7.125% Noncumulative Perpetual Monthly Income Preferred Stock, Series A (CUSIP: 318672201);

8.35% Noncumulative Perpetual Monthly Income Preferred Stock, Series B (CUSIP: 318672300);

7.40% Noncumulative Perpetual Monthly Income Preferred Stock, Series C (CUSIP: 318672409);

7.25% Noncumulative Perpetual Monthly Income Preferred Stock, Series D (CUSIP: 318672508); and

7.00% Noncumulative Perpetual Monthly Income Preferred Stock, Series E (CUSIP: 318672607)

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act. Yes No

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Act. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes No

Indicate by checkmark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Website, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes No

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K (§229.405 of this chapter) is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of registrant's knowledge, in definite proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K.

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of "large accelerated filer," "accelerated filer" and "smaller reporting company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large accelerated filer

Accelerated
filer

Non-accelerated filer (Do not check if a Smaller reporting company or smaller reporting company)

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Act). Yes No

The aggregate market value of the voting common equity held by non-affiliates of the registrant as of June 30, 2016 (the last trading day of the registrant's most recently completed second fiscal quarter) was \$501,752,414 based on the closing price of \$3.97 per share of the registrant's common stock on the New York Stock Exchange on June 30, 2016. The registrant had no nonvoting common equity outstanding as of June 30, 2016. For the purposes of the foregoing calculation only, the registrant has defined affiliates to include (a) the executive officers named in Part III of this Annual Report on Form 10-K; (b) all directors of the registrant; and (c) each shareholder, including the registrant's employee benefit plans but excluding shareholders that file on Schedule 13G, known to the registrant to be the beneficial owner of 5% or more of the outstanding shares of common stock of the registrant as of June 30, 2016. The registrant's response to this item is not intended to be an admission that any person is an affiliate of the registrant for any purposes other than this response.

Indicate the number of shares outstanding of each of the registrant's classes of common stock, as of the latest practicable date: 217,509,055 shares as of March 3, 2017.

Documents incorporated by reference: Portions of the definitive proxy statement relating to the registrant's annual meeting of stockholders scheduled to be held on May 23, 2017 are incorporated by reference in this Form 10-K in response to items 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of Part III.

FIRST BANCORP.

2016 ANNUAL REPORT ON FORM 10-K

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PART I</u>	
Item 1.	Business	5
Item 1A.	Risk Factors	27
Item 1B.	Unresolved Staff Comments	45
Item 2.	Properties	45
Item 3.	Legal Proceedings	46
Item 4.	Mine Safety Disclosures	46
	<u>PART II</u>	
Item 5.	Market for Registrant’s Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities	46
Item 6.	Selected Financial Data	51
Item 7.	Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations	53
Item 7A.	Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk	144
Item 8.	Financial Statements and Supplementary Data	145
Item 9.	Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure	252
Item 9A.	Controls and Procedures	252
Item 9B.	Other Information	252
	<u>PART III</u>	
Item 10.	Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance	253
Item 11.	Executive Compensation	253
Item 12.	Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters	253
Item 13.	Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence	253
Item 14.	Principal Accounting Fees and Services	253
	<u>PART IV</u>	
Item 15.	Exhibits, Financial Statement Schedules	254
Item 16.	Form 10-K Summary	254
SIGNATURES		258

Forward Looking Statements

This Form 10-K contains forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the “Securities Act”), and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “Exchange Act”), which are subject to the safe harbor created by such sections. When used in this Form 10-K or future filings by First BanCorp. (the “Corporation”) with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”), in the Corporation’s press releases or in other public or stockholder communications, or in oral statements made with the approval of an authorized executive officer, the words or phrases “would,” “intends,” “will likely result,” “expect to,” “should,” “anticipate,” “look forward,” “believes,” and other terms of similar meaning or import in connection with any discussion of future operating, financial or other performance are meant to identify “forward-looking statements.”

First BanCorp. wishes to caution readers not to place undue reliance on any such “forward-looking statements,” which speak only as of the date made, and to advise readers that these forward-looking statements are not guarantees of future performance and involve certain risks, uncertainties, estimates and assumptions by us that are difficult to predict. Various factors, some of which are beyond our control, could cause actual results to differ materially from those expressed in, or implied by, such forward-looking statements. Factors that might cause such a difference include, but are not limited to, the risks described or referenced below in Item 1A. “Risk Factors,” and the following:

- the ability of the Puerto Rico government or any of its public corporations or other instrumentalities to repay its respective debt obligations, including the effect of payment defaults on the Puerto Rico government general obligations, bonds of the Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico (the “GDB”) and certain bonds of government public corporations, and recent and any future downgrades of the long-term and short-term debt ratings of the Puerto Rico government, which could exacerbate Puerto Rico’s adverse economic conditions and, in turn, further adversely impact the Corporation;
- uncertainty as to the ultimate outcomes of actions resulting from the enactment by the U.S. government of the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA) to address Puerto Rico’s financial problems;
- uncertainty about whether the Corporation will be able to continue to fully comply with the written agreement dated June 3, 2010 (the “Written Agreement”) that the Corporation entered into with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (the “New York FED” or “Federal Reserve”), that, among other things, requires the Corporation to serve as a source of strength to FirstBank Puerto Rico (“FirstBank” or the “Bank”) and that, except with the consent generally of the New York FED and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (the “Federal Reserve Board”, referred to together with the New York FED as the “Federal “Reserve”), prohibits the Corporation from paying dividends to stockholders or receiving dividends from FirstBank, making payments on trust preferred securities or subordinated debt, incurring, increasing or guaranteeing debt and repurchasing any capital securities and uncertainty whether such consent will be provided for future interest payments on the subordinated debt despite the consents that enabled the Corporation to pay all the accrued but deferred interest payments plus the interest for the second, third and fourth quarters of 2016 on

the Corporation's subordinated debentures associated with its trust preferred securities and for future monthly dividends on its non-cumulative perpetual preferred stock despite the consents that enabled the Corporation to pay monthly dividends on its non-cumulative perpetual preferred stock for December 2016, January and February 2017;

- a decrease in demand for the Corporation's products and services and lower revenues and earnings because of the continued recession in Puerto Rico;
- uncertainty as to the availability of certain funding sources, such as brokered certificates of deposit ("brokered CDs");
- the Corporation's reliance on brokered CDs to fund operations and provide liquidity;
- the risk of not being able to fulfill the Corporation's cash obligations or resume paying dividends to the Corporation's common stockholders in the future due to the Corporation's need to receive regulatory approvals to declare or pay any dividends and to take dividends or any other form of payment representing a reduction in capital from FirstBank or FirstBank's failure to generate sufficient cash flow to make a dividend payment to the Corporation;
- the weakness of the real estate markets and of the consumer and commercial sectors and their impact on the credit quality of the Corporation's loans and other assets, which have contributed and may continue to contribute to, among other things, high levels of non-performing assets, charge-offs and provisions for loan and lease losses and may subject the Corporation to further risk from loan defaults and foreclosures;
- the ability of FirstBank to realize the benefits of its deferred tax assets subject to the remaining valuation allowance;

- adverse changes in general economic conditions in Puerto Rico, the United States (“U.S.”), and the U.S. Virgin Islands (“USVI”), and British Virgin Islands (“BVI”), including the interest rate environment, market liquidity, housing absorption rates, real estate prices, and disruptions in the U.S. capital markets, which reduced interest margins and affected funding sources, and has affected demand for all of the Corporation’s products and services and reduced the Corporation’s revenues and earnings, and the value of the Corporation’s assets, and may continue to have these effects;
- an adverse change in the Corporation’s ability to attract new clients and retain existing ones;
- the risk that additional portions of the unrealized losses in the Corporation’s investment portfolio are determined to be other-than-temporary, including additional impairments on the Puerto Rico government’s obligations;
- uncertainty about regulatory and legislative changes for financial services companies in Puerto Rico, the U.S., the USVI and the BVI, which could affect the Corporation’s financial condition or performance and could cause the Corporation’s actual results for future periods to differ materially from prior results and anticipated or projected results;
- changes in the fiscal and monetary policies and regulations of the U.S. federal government and the Puerto Rico and other governments, including those determined by the Federal Reserve Board, the New York FED, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (“FDIC”), government-sponsored housing agencies, and regulators in Puerto Rico, the USVI and the BVI, including changes resulting from the recent U.S. election;
- the risk of possible failure or circumvention of controls and procedures and the risk that the Corporation’s risk management policies may not be adequate;
- the risk that the FDIC may increase the deposit insurance premium and/or require special assessments to replenish its insurance fund, causing an additional increase in the Corporation’s non-interest expenses;
- the impact on the Corporation’s results of operations and financial condition of acquisitions and dispositions;
- a need to recognize impairments on the Corporation’s financial instruments, goodwill or other intangible assets relating to acquisitions;

- the risk that downgrades in the credit ratings of the Corporation's long-term senior debt will adversely affect the Corporation's ability to access necessary external funds;
- the impact on the Corporation's businesses, business practices and results of operations of a potential higher interest rate environment;
- uncertainty as to whether FirstBank will be able to satisfy its regulators regarding, among other things, its asset quality, liquidity plans, maintenance of capital levels and compliance with applicable laws, regulations and related requirements; and
- general competitive factors and industry consolidation.

The Corporation does not undertake, and specifically disclaims any obligation, to update any "forward-looking statements" to reflect occurrences or unanticipated events or circumstances after the date of such statements except as required by the federal securities laws.

Investors should refer to Item 1A. Risk Factors, in this Annual Report on Form 10-K, for a discussion of such factors and certain risks and uncertainties to which the Corporation is subject.

PART I

First BanCorp., incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, is sometimes referred to in this Annual Report on Form 10-K as “the Corporation,” “we,” “our” or “the registrant.”

Item 1. Business

GENERAL

First BanCorp. is a publicly owned financial holding company that is subject to regulation, supervision and examination by the Federal Reserve Board. The Corporation was incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to serve as the bank holding company for FirstBank. The Corporation is a full service provider of financial services and products with operations in Puerto Rico, the United States and the USVI and BVI. As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had total assets of \$11.9 billion, total deposits of \$8.8 billion and total stockholders' equity of \$1.8 billion.

The Corporation provides a wide range of financial services for retail, commercial and institutional clients. As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation controlled two wholly owned subsidiaries: FirstBank and FirstBank Insurance Agency, Inc. (“FirstBank Insurance Agency”). FirstBank is a Puerto Rico-chartered commercial bank, and FirstBank Insurance Agency is a Puerto Rico-chartered insurance agency.

FirstBank is subject to the supervision, examination and regulation of both the Office of the Commissioner of Financial Institutions of Puerto Rico (“OCIF”) and the FDIC. Deposits are insured through the FDIC Deposit Insurance Fund. In addition, within FirstBank, the Bank’s USVI operations are subject to regulation and examination by the United States Virgin Islands Banking Board; its BVI operations are subject to regulation by the British Virgin Islands Financial Services Commission; and its operations in the state of Florida are subject to regulation and examination by the Florida Office of Financial Regulation and the FDIC. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (“CFBP”) regulates FirstBank’s consumer financial products and services. FirstBank Insurance Agency is subject to the supervision, examination and regulation of the Office of the Insurance Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and operates three offices in Puerto Rico, and two offices in the USVI and BVI.

As of December 31, 2016, FirstBank conducts its business through its main office located in San Juan, Puerto Rico, 48 banking branches in Puerto Rico, 11 branches in the USVI and BVI, and 11 branches in the state of Florida (U.S.). As of December 31, 2016 FirstBank has 6 wholly owned subsidiaries with operations in Puerto Rico: First Federal Finance Corp. (d/b/a Money Express La Financiera), a finance company specializing in the origination of small loans

with 28 offices in Puerto Rico; First Management of Puerto Rico, a domestic corporation, which holds tax-exempt assets; FirstBank Puerto Rico Securities Corp., a broker-dealer subsidiary engaged in municipal securities underwriting and selling for local Puerto Rico municipal bond issuers and other investment banking activities, such as advisory services, capital raising efforts on behalf of clients and assistance with financial transaction structuring; FirstBank Overseas Corporation, an international banking entity organized under the International Banking Entity Act of Puerto Rico; and two other companies that hold and operate certain particular other real estate owned properties.

BUSINESS SEGMENTS

The Corporation has six reportable segments: Commercial and Corporate Banking; Consumer (Retail) Banking; Mortgage Banking; Treasury and Investments; United States Operations; and Virgin Islands Operations. These segments are described below as well as in Note 33, "Segment Information," to the Corporation's audited financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2016 included in Item 8 of this Form 10-K.

Commercial and Corporate Banking

The Commercial and Corporate Banking segment consists of the Corporation's lending and other services for large customers represented by specialized and middle-market clients and the public sector. FirstBank has developed expertise in a wide variety of industries. The Commercial and Corporate Banking segment offers commercial loans, including commercial real estate and construction loans, and floor plan financings, as well as other products, such as cash management and business management services. A substantial portion of the commercial and corporate banking portfolio is secured by the underlying value of the real estate collateral and the personal guarantees of the borrowers. This segment also includes the Corporation's broker-dealer activities.

Consumer (Retail) Banking

The Consumer (Retail) Banking segment consists of the Corporation's consumer lending and deposit-taking activities conducted mainly through FirstBank's branch network in Puerto Rico. Loans to consumers include auto, boat and personal loans, credit cards, and lines of credit. Deposit products include interest bearing and non-interest bearing checking and savings accounts, Individual

Retirement Accounts (IRA) and retail certificates of deposit (“retail CDs”). Retail deposits gathered through each branch of FirstBank’s retail network serve as one of the funding sources for the lending and investment activities.

Mortgage Banking

These operations consist of the origination, sale, and servicing of a variety of residential mortgage loan products and related hedging activities. Originations are sourced through different channels such as FirstBank branches and purchases from mortgage bankers, and in association with new project developers. The Mortgage Banking segment focuses on originating residential real estate loans, some of which conform to Federal Housing Administration (the “FHA”), Veterans Administration (the “VA”) and Rural Development (the “RD”) standards. Loans originated that meet the FHA’s standards qualify for the FHA’s insurance program whereas loans that meet the standards of the VA and RD are guaranteed by those respective federal agencies.

Mortgage loans that do not qualify under these programs are commonly referred to as conventional loans. Conventional real estate loans can be conforming or non-conforming. Conforming loans are residential real estate loans that meet the standards for sale under the Fannie Mae (“FNMA”) and Freddie Mac (“FHLMC”) programs whereas loans that do not meet those standards are referred to as non-conforming residential real estate loans. The Corporation’s strategy is to penetrate markets by providing customers with a variety of high quality mortgage products to serve their financial needs through a faster and simpler process and at competitive prices. The Mortgage Banking segment also acquires and sells mortgages in the secondary markets. Residential real estate conforming loans are sold to investors like FNMA and FHLMC. Most of the Corporation’s residential mortgage loan portfolio consists of fixed-rate, fully amortizing, full documentation loans. The Corporation has commitment authority to issue Government National Mortgage Association (“GNMA”) mortgage-backed securities. Under this program, the Corporation has been selling FHA/VA mortgage loans into the secondary market since 2009.

Treasury and Investments

The Treasury and Investments segment is responsible for the Corporation’s treasury and investment management functions. The treasury function, which includes funding and liquidity management, lends funds to the Commercial and Corporate Banking, Mortgage Banking, and the Consumer (Retail) Banking segments to finance their respective lending activities and borrows from those segments. Funds not gathered by the different business units are obtained by the Treasury function through wholesale channels, such as brokered deposits, advances from the Federal Home Loan Bank (“FHLB”), and repurchase agreements with investment securities, among others.

United States Operations

The United States Operations segment consists of all banking activities conducted by FirstBank on the United States mainland. FirstBank provides a wide range of banking services to individual and corporate customers primarily in southern Florida through 11 branches. The United States Operations segment offers an array of both consumer and commercial banking products and services. Consumer banking products include checking, savings and money market accounts, retail CDs, internet banking services, residential mortgages, home equity loans, lines of credit, and automobile loans. Retail deposits, as well as FHLB advances and brokered CDs assigned to this operation, serve as funding sources for its lending activities. Deposits gathered through FirstBank's branches in the United States also serve as one of the funding sources for lending and investment activities in Puerto Rico.

The commercial banking services include checking, savings and money market accounts, retail CDs, internet banking services, cash management services, remote data capture, and automated clearing house, or ACH, transactions. Loan products include the traditional commercial and industrial and commercial real estate products, such as lines of credit, term loans and construction loans.

Virgin Islands Operations

The Virgin Islands Operations segment consists of all banking activities conducted by FirstBank in the USVI and BVI, including retail and commercial banking services, with a total of 11 branches serving the islands in the USVI of St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John, and the island of Tortola in the BVI. The Virgin Islands Operations segment is driven by its consumer, commercial lending and deposit-taking activities.

Loans to consumers include auto, boat, lines of credit, and personal and residential mortgage loans. Deposit products include interest bearing and non-interest bearing checking and savings accounts, IRAs, and retail CDs. Retail deposits gathered through each branch serve as the funding sources for its own lending activities.

Employees

As of March 1, 2017, the Corporation and its subsidiaries employed 2,701 persons. None of its employees is represented by a collective bargaining group. The Corporation considers its employee relations to be good.

SIGNIFICANT EVENTS SINCE THE BEGINNING OF 2016

Repurchase of Trust Preferred Securities and Dividend Payments on Trust Preferred Securities and Preferred Stock

During the first quarter of 2016, the Corporation completed the repurchase of \$10 million of trust preferred securities of the FBP Statutory Trust II that were auctioned in a public sale at which the Corporation was invited to participate. The Corporation repurchased and cancelled the repurchased trust preferred securities, resulting in a commensurate reduction in the related Floating Rate Junior Subordinated Debentures. The Corporation's winning bid equated to 70% of the \$10 million par value. The 30% discount, plus accrued interest, resulted in a gain of approximately \$4.2 million.

During the second quarter of 2016, the Corporation received approval from the Federal Reserve and OCIF that enabled it to pay \$31.2 million for all the accrued but deferred interest payments plus the interest for the second quarter on the Corporation's subordinated debentures associated with its trust preferred securities. Subsequently, the Corporation received quarterly approvals that enabled it to pay the interest for the third and fourth quarters of 2016. As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation is current on all interest payments related to its subordinated debt. Future interest payments are subject to Federal Reserve and OCIF approval. It is the intent of the Corporation to request approvals in future periods to continue regularly scheduled quarterly interest payments.

For the first time since July 2009, following receipt of the requisite regulatory approval, on December 8, 2016, the Corporation announced the declaration of a cash dividend on its outstanding shares of Series A through E Noncumulative Perpetual Monthly Income Preferred Stock for the month of December 2016. The Corporation paid cash dividends on its Series A through E Preferred Stock in February and January 2017 and declared the cash dividend for March 2017. Although there is no assurance that any dividends will be declared on the Corporation's Series A through E Preferred Stock in any future periods, the Corporation intends to continue to request regulatory approval pursuant to the requirements of the Written Agreement to enable it to continue to pay the monthly dividends on its Series A through E Preferred Stock. The Corporation has received approval to pay the monthly dividends on the Corporation's Series A through E Preferred Stock through March 2017.

Sale of Non-Performing Assets

During the fourth quarter of 2016, the Corporation completed the sale of a pool of non-performing assets with a book value of \$16.3 million (principal balance of \$20.1 million), in a cash transaction. The proceeds from this sale were \$11.3 million net of escrow and principal and interest collected on behalf of the purchaser subsequent to the effective date of the transaction. Approximately \$2.8 million of reserves had been allocated to the loans. This transaction resulted in total net charge-offs of \$4.6 million and an incremental pre-tax loss of \$1.8 million recorded as a charge to the provision for loan and lease losses.

Sale of the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority (“PREPA”) Loan

During the first quarter of 2017, the Corporation received an unsolicited offer and sold its outstanding participation in the PREPA line of credit with a book value of \$64 million at the time of sale (principal balance of \$75 million), thereby reducing its direct exposure to the Puerto Rico government. A specific reserve of approximately \$10.2 million had been allocated to this loan. Gross proceeds from the sale of \$53.2 million have resulted in an incremental loss of \$0.6 million as compared to the book value, net of reserve. This loss was recognized at the time of the sale in the first quarter of 2017.

Puerto Rico Government Fiscal Situation, Government Actions, enactment of PROMESA and Exposure

A significant portion of our financial activities and credit exposure is concentrated in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which has been in an economic recession since 2006. Based on the most recent information available, the main economic indicators suggest that the Puerto Rico economy remains weak. For fiscal years 2017 and 2018, the Puerto Rico government projects a continued economic contraction in the Commonwealth’s real gross national product (“GNP”) of 2.2% and 2.8%, respectively, while the Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico economic activity index (“GDB-EAI”) in December 2016 decreased 2.9% on a year-over-year basis to 121.1, the lowest number in 25 years. The GDB-EAI is a coincident index of economic activity for Puerto Rico made up of four indicators (non-farm payroll employment, electric power generation, cement sales and gasoline consumption). The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in Puerto Rico was 12.4% in December 2016, which is higher than in any U.S. state. Puerto Rico population decreased by an estimated 6.8% from 2010 – 2015, driven primarily by falling birth rate, a rising death rate, and migration to the United States mainland, according to the U.S. census data.

On April 6, 2016, the Puerto Rico Emergency Moratorium and Financial Rehabilitation Act (“Act 21”) was enacted, which gives Puerto Rico’s governor emergency powers to deal with the challenging fiscal situation, including the ability to declare a moratorium on any debt payment. Puerto Rico’s governor also issued an executive order intended to protect the GDB’s liquidity by allowing withdrawals only to fund necessary costs for essential services such as health, public safety and education services.

On June 30, 2016, pursuant to Act 21, the Puerto Rico governor ordered a moratorium on the payment of \$780 million of the Puerto Rico government’s general obligations and guaranteed debt, along with the payment obligations of certain other issuers. The Puerto Rico government has continued to default on general obligation bonds, including the payment due on January 1, 2017. This followed a default on the principal payment of \$367 million of GDB notes due on May 1, 2016. On August 1, 2016, the GDB defaulted on a \$28 million payment of interest due to its creditors, including interest due on GDB bonds held by the Corporation. The GDB default marked the first time the GDB, or any other Puerto Rico agency or instrumentality, failed to pay interest on Puerto Rico government bonds held by the Corporation. On October 1, 2016, the Puerto Rico Public Buildings Authority failed to make a full payment of interest due on its obligation bonds, including bonds held by the Corporation. Generally, based on specific facts and circumstances of the issuer, a default event requires us to classify the defaulted bonds as a non-performing asset. Accordingly, during the third quarter of 2016, bonds of the GDB and the Puerto Rico Public Buildings Authority with an aggregate fair value as of December 31, 2016 of \$20.5 million (\$35.6 million- amortized cost, including accrued interest of \$0.9 million) were classified as non-performing and placed in non-accrual status by the Corporation. These bonds are held as part of the available-for-sale securities portfolio. In the first quarter of 2016, the Corporation recorded a \$6.3 million other-than-temporary impairment (“OTTI”) charge on the aforementioned bonds of the GDB and the Puerto Rico Public Buildings Authority. This was the third OTTI charge on these securities recorded since June 30, 2015, as OTTI charges of \$12.9 million and \$3.0 million were booked in the second and fourth quarters of 2015. The credit-related impairment loss estimates were based on the probability of default and loss severity in the event of default in consideration of the latest available information about the Puerto Rico government’s financial condition, including the enactment of a debt moratorium law and the declaration of a state of emergency at the GDB, the issuance of the GDB and the Commonwealth’s audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, as well as issuance of exchange proposals with the Commonwealth’s creditors related to its outstanding bond obligations. In addition to bonds of the GDB and the Puerto Rico Public Buildings Authority, the Corporation owns bonds of the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority in the aggregate amount of \$7.9 million carried on the Corporation’s books at the aggregate fair value of \$6.3 million, which are current as to contractual payments as of December 31, 2016.

On June 30, 2016, President Obama signed HR5278 Bill, PROMESA, which established an oversight board, a process for restructuring debt, and expedited procedures for approving critical infrastructure projects in order to address the Puerto Rico government fiscal situation. The independent seven-member oversight board that was appointed by the House of Representatives, Senate and President Obama pursuant to PROMESA (the “PROMESA oversight board”) has fiscal oversight over Puerto Rico’s finances for an initial term of five years. This marks the largest federal intervention ever in to the U.S. municipal bond market. PROMESA enables Puerto Rico to restructure its debt. The PROMESA oversight board had its first meeting on September 30, 2016, and its term will expire once Puerto Rico has posted four structurally balanced budgets in a row and is deemed to have adequate access to the capital markets. The PROMESA oversight board has the power to approve or reject the general government’s proposed budgets until the PROMESA oversight board is satisfied that the budgets are structurally responsible and based on reasonable expectations and accounting standards.

During their first meeting, the PROMESA oversight board announced the designation of a number of entities as covered entities under PROMESA, including the Commonwealth, all of its public corporations and retirement systems, the University of Puerto Rico and all affiliates and subsidiaries of the foregoing. The designation of an entity as a covered entity has various implications under PROMESA. First, it means that the Governor will have to submit such entity's annual budgets and, if the PROMESA oversight board so requests, its fiscal plans, to the PROMESA oversight board for its review and approval. Second, covered territorial instrumentalities may not issue debt or guarantee, exchange, modify, repurchase, redeem, or enter into similar transactions with respect to their debts without the prior approval of the PROMESA oversight board. Third, pursuant to certain contracting guidelines approved by the PROMESA oversight board, prior PROMESA oversight board approval is required in connection with any transaction undertaken by a covered entity that (i) is outside the ordinary course of business or (ii) has a material financial impact. Finally, covered entities could also potentially be eligible to use the restructuring procedures provided by PROMESA. The first, Title VI, is a largely out-of-court process through which a government entity and its financial creditors can agree on terms to restructure such entity's debt. If a supermajority of creditors of a certain category agree, that agreement can bind all other creditors in such category. The second, Title III, draws on the federal bankruptcy code and provides a court-supervised process for a comprehensive restructuring led by the PROMESA oversight board.

PROMESA also created a bipartisan Congressional Task Force on Economic Growth in Puerto Rico. The Task Force consists of an eight-member panel of Congressional members that will review federal laws and programs to improve Puerto Rico's economy. The Task Force submitted a report during December 2016 with over 75 recommendations to Congress to jump start Puerto Rico's economy that included dealing with Medicaid, competitive tax treatment for U.S. subsidiaries, granting child tax credits and increasing loans for small businesses and the rum cover-over tax. They also stated that if the government conducts a plebiscite authorized by Congress, they would analyze and take any appropriate legislative action. As of the date of submission of this Form 10-K, the U.S. Congress has not taken action on any of the recommendations in the report.

On November 8, 2016, a new governor of Puerto Rico was elected and assumed office in January 2017. In addition a new Resident Commissioner was designated to represent Puerto Rico in the U.S. House of Representatives. Since taking office, Puerto Rico's governor signed an executive order reducing spending by 10%, created an expedited process for infrastructure projects, implemented a zero-based budgeting methodology, introduced several bills to promote economic development and outlined several labor reforms aimed at reducing the cost of doing business in Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico's governor also signed an extension to an excise tax on foreign manufacturers which contributes a significant amount of revenue to the general fund. Furthermore, Puerto Rico's governor signed the "Financial Emergency and Fiscal Responsibility Act," which replaces the prior administration's debt moratorium with a new approach that segregates revenues available after the payment of essential services to pay debt service.

In January 2017, the PROMESA oversight board sent a letter to the Puerto Rico governor outlining a minimum of \$4.5 billion in fiscal measures that would need to be included in the government's next fiscal plan in order for the PROMESA oversight board to certify it, the first step before negotiations with creditors can occur. In response to the Puerto Rico governor's request for more time to develop a fiscal plan, the PROMESA oversight board established a number of milestones and conditions it would require if the then-current deadlines were extended. On January 28, 2017, the PROMESA oversight board officially extended various deadlines including moving to (i) February 28, 2017 the deadline for the updated fiscal plan, (ii) March 15, 2017 for the PROMESA oversight board to certify the fiscal plan and (iii) May 1, 2017 for the stay on debt-related litigation. On February 28, 2017, the Puerto Rico governor submitted to the PROMESA oversight board the Puerto Rico government fiscal plan which, among other initiatives, calls for significant reductions, in operational expenses and subsidies for municipalities and the University of Puerto Rico. The plan, which relies on significant change in economic assumptions vis a vis the baseline, projects a surplus before debt service of \$11.6 billion in the aggregate during the ten year projection period (against \$35.1 billion in contractual debt service). Estimated savings under the fiscal plan of \$3.8 billion fall short of the \$4.5 billion figure the PROMESA oversight board recommended. This initial fiscal plan was rejected by the PROMESA oversight board, which claimed the proposal relied on overly optimistic baseline revenue assumptions, economic projections and forecasted savings resulting from measures to reduce public expenditures. A revised fiscal plan was submitted by the Puerto Rico governor on March 11, 2017, including \$262 million in additional revenue and changes to healthcare funding. On March 13, 2017, the PROMESA oversight board certified the revised fiscal plan, provided that two amendments are made. One amendment would institute the PROMESA oversight board's earlier proposal for furloughing most government employees four days a month, with two days for teachers and none for law enforcement officers, by July 1st, 2017 (the beginning of fiscal year 2018), and eliminate the annual Christmas bonus for government workers if the Puerto Rico government does not come up with plans to increase liquidity by \$200 million and implement its plan to "right-size" its operations in a fiscal year 2018 budget proposal by April 30. If it does, the cost-savings measures would be delayed until September 1st. A further determination would then be made as to whether the savings measures are needed or to what extent needed. The other amendment would require an agreement between the Puerto Rico government and the PROMESA oversight board to reduce pension costs 10% by 2020 to be reached within 30 days and finalized by June 30th.

With respect to PREPA, on December 23, 2015, PREPA and more than 70% of its creditors reached an agreement on an Amended and Restated Restructuring Support Agreement ("RSA") that would provide, among other things, for a restructuring of some of PREPA's outstanding debt at 85 cents on the dollar. The RSA also included a Bond Purchase Agreement ("BPA") whereby certain of those creditors would purchase new bonds to be issued by PREPA. The implementation of the RSA would provide the basis for PREPA to provide more reliable and lower-cost service, fund its capital needs for the medium term, help ensure environmental compliance, diversify generation resources to include more natural gas, and provide jobs.

Legislation to establish the necessary securitization framework for the new PREPA debt was passed on February 16, 2016. In June 2016, the Puerto Rico Energy Commission approved a "transition" charge to PREPA customers that will secure the new debt that will be issued to facilitate the PREPA restructuring. In May and June of 2016, certain

bondholders purchased \$115 million of bonds pursuant to the BPA. The BPA was amended in late June and bondholders purchased another \$264 million on June 30, 2016. Following the BPA amendment, PREPA made the full principal and interest payment due on July 1, 2016. On January 1, 2017, PREPA made its full interest payment and did so without requiring any type of BPA.

On January 27, 2017, the Puerto Rico Fiscal Agency and Financial Advisory Authority (“AAFAF”) notified all creditors involved that it was extending the January 31, 2017 expiration date of the RSA until March 31, 2017. In addition, AAFAF also notified the parties together with its financial advisors Rothchild, that it would lead negotiations with PREPA creditors.

As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had \$323.3 million of direct exposure to the Puerto Rico government, its municipalities and public corporations, compared to \$360.7 million as of December 31, 2015. Approximately \$191.9 million of the exposure consisted of loans and obligations of municipalities in Puerto Rico that are supported by assigned property tax revenues and for which, in most cases, the good faith, credit and unlimited taxing power of the applicable municipality have been pledged to their repayment. Approximately 89% of the Corporation’s municipality exposure consists primarily of senior priority obligations concentrated in five of the largest municipalities in Puerto Rico (San Juan, Carolina, Bayamon, Mayaguez and Guaynabo). These municipalities are required by law to levy special property taxes in such amounts as shall be required for the payment of all of their respective general obligation bonds and loans. The PROMESA oversight board has not designated any of the Puerto Rico’s 78 municipalities as covered entities under PROMESA. In addition to municipalities, the total exposure to the Puerto Rico government included \$6.9 million of

loans to units of the Puerto Rico central government, and approximately \$81.9 million consisted of loans to public corporations (entities covered by PROMESA), including the direct exposure to PREPA with a book value of \$65.5 million as of December 31, 2016 that was sold in the first quarter of 2017 as described above. The PREPA credit facility was placed in non-accrual status in the first quarter of 2015, and interest payments recorded on a cost-recovery basis. The Corporation's total direct exposure also includes obligations of the Puerto Rico government with an amortized cost of \$42.7 million as part of its available-for-sale investment securities portfolio, net of \$22.2 million in cumulative OTTI charges, and recorded at a fair value of \$26.8 million as of December 31, 2016.

Furthermore, as of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had \$127.7 million outstanding (book value of \$111.8 million) in credit facilities extended to the hotel industry in Puerto Rico under which the borrower and the operations of the underlying collateral are the primary sources of repayment and the Puerto Rico Tourism Development Fund (the "TDF") provides a secondary guarantee for payment performance, compared to \$129.4 million outstanding as of December 31, 2015. The TDF is a subsidiary of the GDB that facilitates private sector financings to Puerto Rico's hotel industry. Adverse developments related to the Puerto Rico government's fiscal situation introduced additional uncertainty regarding the TDF's ability to honor its guarantee, including the enactment of Act 21. These facilities were placed in non-accrual status and classified as impaired in the first quarter of 2016, and interest payments are now applied against principal. Approximately \$2.0 million of interest payments received on loans guaranteed by the TDF since late March 2016 have been applied against principal. The Corporation has been receiving payments on the largest of these three facilities sufficient to cover the monthly contractual payments. This facility matured on February 1, 2017 and is currently under renegotiation. In addition, the borrower's cash flows related to the other two facilities are insufficient to cover debt service and the Corporation is not receiving collections from the TDF guarantee. As such, these two facilities are collateral dependent loans and charge-offs amounting to \$13.9 million were recorded during the second half of 2016, of which \$13.0 million was charged against reserves established in prior periods. These loans have been adversely classified since the third quarter of 2015. As of December 31, 2016, the loans guaranteed by the TDF are being carried at 72% of unpaid principal balance, net of reserves and accumulated charge-offs. The Corporation measures impairment on these loans based on the fair value of the collateral and the existence of the government guarantee. Developments of the Puerto Rico government debt restructuring process, with the automatic stay on litigations under PROMESA set to expire on May 1, 2017, and actions taken or those that may have to be taken by the Commonwealth or the PROMESA oversight board to address Puerto Rico's fiscal and economic crisis could ultimately adversely affect the value of the Puerto Rico government guarantees, including the TDF guarantee. If as a result of developments, including discussions with regulators, loan rating downgrades, progress in the debt restructuring process, or for other reasons, the Corporation determines that additional impairment charges are necessary, such an action would adversely affect the Corporation's results of operations in the period in which such determination is taken. The Corporation's collections of principal and interest from the TDF in 2016 amounted to \$0.6 million compared to \$5.3 million in 2015.

In addition, the Corporation had \$119.9 million in exposure to residential mortgage loans that are guaranteed by the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority. Residential mortgage loans guaranteed by the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority are secured by the underlying properties and the guarantees serve to cover shortfalls in collateral in the event of a borrower default. The Puerto Rico government guarantees up to \$75 million of the principal guaranteed under the mortgage loans insurance program. According to the most recently released audited financial statements of the Puerto Rico Housing Financing Authority, as of June 30, 2015, the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority's mortgage loans insurance program covered loans aggregating approximately \$552 million. The regulations adopted by the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority require the establishment of adequate reserves to guarantee the solvency of the mortgage loans insurance fund. As of June 30, 2015, the most recent date as to which information is available,

the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority had a restricted net position for such purposes of approximately \$77.4 million.

Furthermore, as of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had \$408.8 million of public sector deposits in Puerto Rico. Approximately 28% is from municipalities and municipal agencies in Puerto Rico and 72% is from public corporations and the central government and agencies in Puerto Rico.

WEBSITE ACCESS TO REPORT

The Corporation makes available annual reports on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K, and amendments to those reports, filed or furnished pursuant to section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act, free of charge on or through its internet website at www.1firstbank.com (under “Investor Relations”), as soon as reasonably practicable after the Corporation electronically files such material with, or furnishes it to, the SEC.

The Corporation also makes available the Corporation’s corporate governance guidelines and principles, the charters of the audit, asset/liability, compensation and benefits, credit, compliance, risk, corporate governance and nominating committees and the codes of conduct and independence principles mentioned below, free of charge on or through its internet website at www.1firstbank.com (under “Investor Relations”):

- Code of Ethics for CEO and Senior Financial Officers

- Code of Ethics applicable to all employees
- Corporate Governance Standards
- Independence Principles for Directors
- Luxury Expenditure Policy

The corporate governance guidelines and principles and the aforementioned charters and codes may also be obtained free of charge by sending a written request to Mr. Lawrence Odell, Executive Vice President and General Counsel, PO Box 9146, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00908.

The public may read and copy any materials that First BanCorp. files with the SEC at the SEC's Public Reference Room at 100 F Street, NE, Washington, DC 20549. In addition, the public may obtain information on the operation of the Public Reference Room by calling the SEC at 1-800-SEC-0330. The SEC maintains an Internet site that contains reports, proxy, and information statements, and other information regarding issuers that file electronically with the SEC (www.sec.gov).

MARKET AREA AND COMPETITION

Puerto Rico, where the banking market is highly competitive, is the main geographic service area of the Corporation. As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation also had a presence in the state of Florida and in the USVI and BVI. Puerto Rico banks are subject to the same federal laws, regulations and supervision that apply to similar institutions in the United States mainland.

Competitors include other banks, insurance companies, mortgage banking companies, small loan companies, automobile financing companies, leasing companies, brokerage firms with retail operations, and credit unions in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the state of Florida. The Corporation's businesses compete with these other firms with respect to the range of products and services offered and the types of clients, customers and industries served.

The Corporation's ability to compete effectively depends on the relative performance of its products, the degree to which the features of its products appeal to customers, and the extent to which the Corporation meets clients' needs and expectations. The Corporation's ability to compete also depends on its ability to attract and retain professional and

other personnel, and on its reputation.

The Corporation encounters intense competition in attracting and retaining deposits and in its consumer and commercial lending activities. The Corporation competes for loans with other financial institutions, some of which are larger and have greater resources available than those of the Corporation. Management believes that the Corporation has been able to compete effectively for deposits and loans by offering a variety of account products and loans with competitive features, by pricing its products at competitive interest rates, by offering convenient branch locations, and by emphasizing the quality of its service. The Corporation's ability to originate loans depends primarily on the rates and fees charged and the service it provides to its borrowers in making prompt credit decisions. There can be no assurance that in the future the Corporation will be able to continue to increase its deposit base or originate loans in the manner or on the terms on which it has done so in the past.

SUPERVISION AND REGULATION

References herein to applicable statutes or regulations are brief summaries of portions thereof which do not purport to be complete and which are qualified in their entirety by reference to those statutes and regulations. Although most of the regulations required under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (the "Dodd-Frank Act") now have been adopted, numerous additional regulations and changes to regulations may be adopted as a result of the Dodd-Frank Act, and future legislation may increase the regulation and oversight of the Corporation and FirstBank. Any change in applicable laws or regulations may have a material adverse effect on the business of commercial banks and bank holding companies, including FirstBank and the Corporation.

Dodd-Frank Act

The Dodd-Frank Act significantly changed the regulation of financial institutions and the financial services industry. The Dodd-Frank Act includes numerous provisions that have affected and will affect large and small financial institutions alike, including banks and bank holding companies and how they will be regulated in the future. As a result of the Dodd-Frank Act, there has been and will be in the future additional regulatory oversight and supervision of the Corporation and its subsidiaries.

The Dodd-Frank Act, among other things, imposes new capital requirements on bank holding companies; provides that a bank holding company must serve as a source of financial and managerial strength to each of its subsidiary banks and stand ready to commit resources to support each of them; changes the base for FDIC insurance assessments to a bank's average consolidated total assets minus average tangible equity, rather than upon its deposit base, and permanently raises the current standard deposit insurance

limit to \$250,000; and expands the FDIC's authority to raise insurance premiums. The legislation also calls for the FDIC to raise the ratio of reserves to deposits from 1.15% to 1.35% for deposit insurance purposes by September 30, 2020 and to "offset the effect" of increased assessments on insured depository institutions with assets of less than \$10 billion.

The Dodd-Frank Act establishes as an independent entity, within the Federal Reserve, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (the "CFPB"), which has broad rulemaking, supervisory and enforcement authority over consumer financial products and services, including deposit products, residential mortgages, home-equity loans and credit cards, and contains provisions on mortgage-related matters such as steering incentives and determinations as to a borrower's ability to repay the principal amount and prepayment penalties.

The CFPB has primary examination and enforcement authority over FirstBank and other banks with over \$10 billion in assets with respect to consumer financial products and services.

The Dodd-Frank Act also limits interchange fees payable on debit card transactions. The Federal Reserve Board's current debit card interchange rule caps a debit card issuer's base fee at 21 cents per transaction and allows an additional 5 basis-point charge per transaction to help cover fraud losses. The debit card interchange rule has reduced our interchange fee revenue in line with industry-wide expectations since 2011.

The Dodd-Frank Act includes provisions that affect corporate governance and executive compensation at all publicly-traded companies and allows financial institutions to pay interest on business checking accounts. The legislation also restricts proprietary trading, places restrictions on the owning or sponsoring of hedge and private equity funds, and regulates the derivatives activities of banks and their affiliates.

Section 171 of the Dodd-Frank Act (the "Collins Amendment"), among other things, eliminates certain trust-preferred securities from Tier I capital. Preferred securities issued under the U.S. Treasury's Troubled Asset Relief Program ("TARP") are exempt from this treatment. Bank holding companies, such as the Corporation, were required to fully phase out these instruments from Tier 1 capital by January 1, 2016; however, these instruments may remain in Tier 2 capital until the instruments are redeemed or mature.

Regulatory Capital and Liquidity Coverage Developments. The federal banking agencies adopted new rules for U.S. banks that revise important aspects of the minimum regulatory capital requirements, the components of regulatory capital, and the risk-based capital treatment of bank assets and off-balance sheet exposures. The final rules, which currently apply to the Corporation and FirstBank, generally are intended to align U.S. regulatory capital requirements with international regulatory capital standards adopted by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision ("Basel Committee"), in particular the most recent international capital accord adopted in 2010 (and revised in 2011) known as "Basel III." The current rules increase the quantity and quality of capital required by, among other things, establishing a minimum common equity capital requirements and an additional common equity Tier 1 capital conservation buffer. In addition, the current rules revise and harmonize the bank regulators' rules for calculating risk-weighted assets to

enhance risk sensitivity and address weaknesses that have been identified, by applying a variation of the Basel III “standardized approach” for the risk-weighting of bank assets and off-balance sheet exposures to all U.S. banking organizations other than large internationally active banks.

Consistent with Basel III and the Collins Amendment, the current rules also establish a more conservative standard for including an instrument such as trust-preferred securities as Tier 1 capital for bank holding companies with total consolidated assets of \$15 billion or more as of December 31, 2009. Bank holding companies such as the Corporation were required to fully phase out these instruments from Tier I capital by January 1, 2016, although qualifying trust preferred securities may be included as Tier 2 capital until the instruments are redeemed or mature. As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had \$210 million in trust preferred securities that are subject to a full phase-out from Tier 1 capital under the final regulatory capital rules discussed above. During the first quarter of 2016, the Corporation repurchased \$10.0 million in trust preferred securities that had been issued by FBP Statutory Trust II. This transaction is described in more detail in “Significant Events Since the Beginning of 2016” above for additional information.

These regulatory capital requirements are discussed in further detail in “Regulation and Supervision – Bank and Bank Holding Company Regulatory Capital Requirements.”

The current capital rules became effective for the Corporation and our subsidiary bank on a multi-year transitional basis starting on January 1, 2015, and in general will be fully effective as of January 1, 2019; the new general minimum regulatory capital requirements and the “standardized approach” for risk weighting of a banking organization’s assets, however, currently fully apply to us. The rules have increased our regulatory capital requirements and require us to hold more capital against certain of our assets and off-balance sheet exposures. The Corporation’s estimated pro-forma common equity Tier 1 ratio, Tier 1 capital ratio, total capital ratio, and the leverage ratio under the Basel III rules, giving effect as of December 31, 2016 to all the provisions that will be phased-in between January 1, 2015 and January 1, 2019, were 16.9%, 17.3%, 20.8%, and 13.6%, respectively. These ratios would exceed the fully phased-in minimum capital ratios under Basel III.

International Regulatory Capital and Liquidity Coverage Developments

International regulatory developments can affect the regulation and supervision of U.S. banking organizations, including the Corporation and FirstBank. Both the Basel Committee and the Financial Stability Board (established in April 2009 by the Group of Twenty (“G-20”) Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors) have agreed to take action to strengthen regulation and supervision of the financial system with greater international consistency, cooperation and transparency, including the adoption of Basel III and a commitment to raise capital standards and liquidity buffers within the banking system under Basel III.

In late 2014, the Basel Committee issued its final requirements for a Net Stable Funding Ratio (“NSFR”). The NSFR compares the amount of an institution’s available stable funding (“ASF”, the ratio’s numerator) to its required stable funding (“RSF”, the ratio’s denominator) to measure how the institution’s asset base is funded. ASF is defined as the portion of capital and liabilities expected to be reliable over the time horizon considered by the NSFR, which extends to one year. While the NSFR is intended to be applied to large, internationally active banks, at the discretion of national supervisors it can be applied to other banking organizations or classes of banking organizations. As proposed by the U.S. federal banking agencies in May 2016, however, the NSFR requirements would not apply to the Corporation.

Prudential Regulation Developments. U.S. banking organizations, including the Corporation and FirstBank, operate under the federal banking agencies’ rules and general supervisory guidance for stress testing practices applicable to banking organizations with more than \$10 billion in total consolidated assets. These regulatory actions require bank holding companies with total consolidated assets of between \$10 billion and \$50 billion, consistent with the Dodd-Frank Act, to comply with annual company-run stress testing requirements, and outlines broad principles for a satisfactory stress testing framework, including principles related to governance, controls and use of results, and describes various stress testing approaches and how stress testing should be used at various levels within an organization.

Under these requirements, the Corporation is subject to two stress testing rules that implement provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act, one issued by the Federal Reserve Board that applies to First BanCorp. on a consolidated basis and one issued by the FDIC that applies to the Bank. These Dodd-Frank Act stress tests are designed to require banking organizations to assess the potential impact of different economic scenarios on their earnings, losses, and capital over a set time period, with consideration given to certain relevant factors, including the organization's condition, risks, exposures, strategies, and activities. The Dodd-Frank Act stress tests require banking organizations with total consolidated assets of more than \$10 billion but less than \$50 billion, including the Corporation and the Bank, to conduct annual company-run stress tests using certain scenarios that the Federal Reserve Board publishes by February 15 of each year, report the results to their primary federal regulator and the Federal Reserve Board by July 31 of the same year, and publicly disclose a summary of the results by October 31 of that year.

The Federal Reserve Board and the other federal banking agencies have published final supervisory guidance describing their supervisory expectations for the Dodd-Frank Act stress tests to be conducted by financial institutions, including the Corporation and the Bank. The final guidance provides flexibility to accommodate different risk profiles, sizes, business lines, market areas, and complexity approaches for banking institutions in the \$10 billion to \$50 billion asset range, and provides examples of practices that would be consistent with supervisory expectations. This guidance now is fully applicable to the Corporation and the Bank. The final guidance also confirms that banking organizations with assets between \$10 billion and \$50 billion are not subject to the more extensive capital planning and stress-testing requirements that apply to bank holding companies with assets of at least \$50 billion, including the Federal Reserve capital plan rule, the annual Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review, the Dodd-Frank Act supervisory stress tests, and related data collections. Targeted changes to the Federal Reserve capital planning and stress-testing regulations most recently were made in November 2015, and were effective as of January 1, 2016. In

addition, in February 2017, the federal banking agencies issued the economic scenarios (baseline, adverse and severely adverse) to be used by banking organizations with total consolidated assets of more than \$10 billion for the 2017 company-run stress tests under the Dodd-Frank Act.

The Federal Reserve's rules that govern the supervision and regulation of large U.S. bank holding companies and foreign banking organizations, as required by the Dodd-Frank Act, generally apply only to institutions with total consolidated assets of \$50 billion or more, which would not affect the Corporation. The Federal Reserve's rules, however, require publicly traded U.S. bank holding companies with total consolidated assets of \$10 billion or more, such as the Corporation, to establish enterprise-wide risk committees. These requirements complement the stress testing and resolution planning requirements for large bank holding companies that the Federal Reserve previously finalized. The current rules require the Corporation's risk management framework to be commensurate with the Corporation's structure, risk profile, complexity, activities and size, and must include policies and procedures establishing risk-management governance, risk-management policies, and risk control infrastructure for the Corporation's global operations and processes and systems for implementing and monitoring compliance with such policies and procedures. In addition, one independent director must chair the risk committee, with the banking organization determining the appropriate proportion of independent directors on the committee, based on its size, scope, and complexity, provided that it meets the minimum requirement of one independent director. Also, at least one director with risk-management experience must be appointed to the risk committee. The Corporation is in compliance with these requirements.

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. CFPB regulations issued over the past few years implement the Dodd-Frank Act amendments to the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, the Truth in Lending Act (“TILA”), and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (“RESPA”). In general, among other changes, these regulations collectively: (i) require lenders to make a reasonable good faith determination of a prospective residential mortgage borrower’s ability to repay based on specific underwriting criteria and set standards for mortgage lenders to determine whether a consumer has the ability to repay the mortgage, (ii) require stricter underwriting of “qualified mortgages,” discussed below, that presumptively satisfy the ability to pay requirement (thereby providing the lender a safe harbor from non-compliance claims), (iii) specify new limitations on loan originator compensation and establish criteria for the qualifications of, and registration or licensing of loan originators, (iv) further restrict certain high-cost mortgage loans by expanding the coverage of the Home Ownership and Equity Protections Act of 1994, (v) expand mandated loan escrow accounts for certain loans, (vi) revise existing appraisal requirements under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and require provision of a free copy of all appraisals to applicants for first lien loans, (vii) establish new appraisal standards for most “higher-risk mortgages” under TILA, (viii) combine in a single, new form required loan disclosures under TILA and RESPA, (ix) define a “qualified mortgage” for purposes of the Dodd Frank Act, and (x) affords safe harbor legal protections for lenders making qualified loans that are not “higher priced.”

The CFPB also has issued a final regulation setting forth new mortgage servicing rules that now apply to the Bank.

The regulations affect notices given to consumers as to delinquency, foreclosure alternatives and loss mitigation, modification applications, interest rate adjustments and options for avoiding “force-placed” insurance. Servicers are prohibited from processing foreclosures when a loan modification is pending, and must wait until a loan is more than 120 days delinquent before initiating a foreclosure action.

The servicer must provide direct and ongoing access to its personnel, and provide prompt review of any loss mitigation application. Servicers must maintain accurate and accessible mortgage records for the life of a loan and until one year after the loan is paid off or transferred.

In October 2016, the CFPB adopted further changes to these mortgage servicing rules. The new changes generally clarify and amend provisions regarding force-placed insurance notices, policies and procedures, early intervention, loss mitigation requirements and periodic statement requirements under the CFPB mortgage servicing rules. The amendments also address proper compliance regarding certain servicing requirements when a consumer is a potential or confirmed successor in interest, is in bankruptcy, or sends a cease communication request under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. These amendments variously become effective in October 2017 and April 2018. These new mortgage servicing standards are expected to add to our costs of conducting a mortgage servicing business.

Sections 1098 and 1100A of Dodd-Frank Act direct the Bureau to publish rules and forms that combine certain disclosures that consumers receive in connection with applying for and closing on a mortgage loan under the TILA and the RESPA. Consistent with this requirement, the Bureau has amended Regulation X (Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act) and Regulation Z (Truth in Lending) to establish new disclosure requirements and forms in Regulation Z for most closed-end consumer credit transactions secured by real property. In addition to combining the existing disclosure requirements and implementing new requirements imposed by the Dodd-Frank Act, the rule provides extensive guidance regarding compliance with those requirements.

The Volcker Rule. This section of the Dodd-Frank Act, subject to important exceptions, generally prohibits a banking entity such as the Corporation or FirstBank from acquiring or retaining any ownership in, or acting as sponsor to, a hedge fund or private equity fund (“covered fund”). The Volcker Rule also prohibits these entities from engaging, for their own account, in short-form proprietary trading of certain securities, derivatives, commodity futures and options on these instruments.

Final regulations implementing the Volcker Rule have been adopted by the financial regulatory agencies and are now generally effective.

The Corporation and the Bank are not engaged in proprietary trading as defined in the Volcker Rule. In addition, a review of the Corporation's investments was undertaken to determine if any meet the Volcker Rule's definition of covered funds. Based on that review, the Corporation's investments are not considered covered funds under the Volcker Rule.

Future Legislation and Regulation. While the federal agencies have adopted regulations that implement many requirements of the Dodd-Frank Act, important regulatory actions (e.g., the adoption of rules regarding the compensation of financial institutions executives) that could have an impact on the Corporation and the Bank remain to be taken. Additional consumer protection laws may be enacted, and the FDIC, Federal Reserve and CFPB have adopted and may adopt in the future new regulations that have addressed or may address, among other things, banks' credit card, overdraft, collection, privacy and mortgage lending practices. Additional consumer protection regulatory activity is possible in the near future.

Such proposals and legislation, if finally adopted and implemented, would change banking laws and our operating environment and that of our subsidiaries in ways that could be substantial and unpredictable. We cannot determine whether such proposals and legislation will be adopted, or the ultimate effect that such proposals and legislation, if enacted, or regulations issued to implement the same, would have upon our financial condition or results of operations.

Bank Holding Company Activities and Other Limitations

The Corporation is registered and subject to regulation under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended (the “Bank Holding Company Act” or “BHC Act”). Under the provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act, a bank holding company must obtain Federal Reserve Board approval before it acquires direct or indirect ownership or control of more than 5% of the voting shares of another bank, or merges or consolidates with another bank holding company. The Federal Reserve Board also has authority under certain circumstances to issue cease and desist orders against, and assess substantial civil money penalties, against bank holding companies and their non-bank subsidiaries. In addition, the Corporation is subject to ongoing regulation, supervision, and examination by the Federal Reserve Board, and is required to file with the Federal Reserve Board periodic and annual reports and other information concerning its own business operations and those of its subsidiaries.

A bank holding company is prohibited under the Bank Holding Company Act, with limited exceptions, from engaging, directly or indirectly, in any business unrelated to the businesses of banking or managing or controlling banks. One of the exceptions to these prohibitions permits ownership by a bank holding company of the shares of any corporation if the Federal Reserve Board, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, by regulation or order has determined that the activities of the corporation in question are so closely related to the businesses of banking or managing or controlling banks as to be a proper incident thereto.

The Bank Holding Company Act also permits a bank holding company to elect to become a financial holding company and engage in a broad range of activities that are financial in nature. The Corporation filed an election with the Federal Reserve Board and became a financial holding company under the Bank Holding Company Act. Financial holding companies may engage, directly or indirectly, in any activity that is determined to be (i) financial in nature, (ii) incidental to such financial activity, or (iii) complementary to a financial activity and does not pose a substantial risk to the safety and soundness of depository institutions or the financial system generally. The Bank Holding Company Act specifically provides that the following activities have been determined to be “financial in nature”: (a) lending, trust and other banking activities; (b) insurance activities; (c) financial or economic advice or services; (d) pooled investments; (e) securities underwriting and dealing; (f) domestic activities permitted for existing bank holding company; (g) foreign activities permitted for existing bank holding company; and (h) merchant banking activities.

A financial holding company that ceases to meet certain standards is subject to a variety of restrictions, depending on the circumstances, including precluding the undertaking of new activities or the acquisition of shares or control of other companies. Until compliance is restored, the Federal Reserve Board has broad discretion to impose appropriate

limitations on the financial holding company's activities. If compliance is not restored within 180 days, the Federal Reserve Board may ultimately require the financial holding company to divest its depository institutions or, in the alternative, to discontinue or divest any activities that are permitted only to non-financial holding company bank holding companies. The Corporation and FirstBank must be well-capitalized and well-managed for regulatory purposes, and FirstBank must earn "satisfactory" or better ratings on its periodic Community Reinvestment Act (the "CRA") examinations to preserve the financial holding company status. The Corporation currently is restricted in its ability to undertake new financial activities.

The potential restrictions are different if the lapse pertains to the CRA. In that case, until all the subsidiary institutions are restored to at least a "satisfactory" CRA rating status, the financial holding company may not engage, directly or through a subsidiary, in any of the additional financial activities permissible under the Bank Holding Company Act or make additional acquisitions of companies engaged in the additional activities. However, completed acquisitions and additional activities and affiliations previously begun are left undisturbed, as the Bank Holding Company Act does not require divestiture for this type of situation.

Under provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act and Federal Reserve Board policy, a bank holding company such as the Corporation is expected to act as a source of financial and managerial strength to its banking subsidiaries and to commit support to them. This support may be required at times when, absent such policy, the bank holding company might not otherwise provide such support. In the event of a bank holding company's bankruptcy, any commitment by the bank holding company to a federal bank regulatory agency to maintain capital of a subsidiary bank will be assumed by the bankruptcy trustee and be entitled to a priority of payment.

In addition, any capital loans by a bank holding company to any of its subsidiary banks must be subordinated in right of payment to deposits and to certain other indebtedness of such subsidiary bank. As of December 31, 2016, and the date hereof, FirstBank was and is the only depository institution subsidiary of the Corporation. The Dodd-Frank Act directs the Federal Reserve Board to adopt regulations adopting the statutory source-of-strength requirements, but implementing regulations have not yet been proposed.

Sarbanes-Oxley Act

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) implemented a range of corporate governance and other measures to increase corporate responsibility, to provide for enhanced penalties for accounting and auditing improprieties at publicly traded companies, and to protect investors by improving the accuracy and reliability of disclosures under the federal securities laws. In addition, SOX established membership requirements and responsibilities for the audit committee, imposed restrictions on the relationship between the Corporation and our external auditors, imposed additional responsibilities for the external financial statements on our chief executive officer and chief financial officer, expanded the disclosure requirements for corporate insiders, required management to evaluate its disclosure controls and procedures and its internal control over financial reporting, and required the auditors to issue a report on the internal control over financial reporting.

The Corporation includes in its annual report on Form 10-K its management’s assessment regarding the effectiveness of the Corporation’s internal control over financial reporting. The internal control report includes a statement of management’s responsibility for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting for the Corporation; management’s assessment as to the effectiveness of the Corporation’s internal control over financial reporting based on management’s evaluation, as of year-end; and the framework used by management as criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the Corporation’s internal control over financial reporting.

As of December 31, 2016, First BanCorp’s management concluded that the Corporation’s internal control over financial reporting was effective. The Corporation’s independent registered public accounting firm reached the same conclusion.

Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008

Turmoil in the U.S. financial sector during 2008 resulted in the passage of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (the “EESA”) and the adoption of several programs by the U.S. Treasury, as well as several actions by the Federal Reserve Board. The EESA authorized the U.S. Treasury to access up to \$700 billion to protect the U.S. economy and restore confidence and stability to the financial markets. One such program under the TARP was action by the U.S. Treasury to make significant investments in U.S. financial institutions through the Capital Purchase Program (“CPP”). The U.S. Treasury’s stated purpose in implementing the CPP was to improve the capitalization of healthy institutions, which would improve the flow of credit to businesses and consumers, and boost the confidence of depositors, investors, and counterparties alike. All federal banking and thrift regulatory agencies encouraged eligible institutions to participate in the CPP.

The Corporation applied for, and the U.S. Treasury approved, a capital purchase in the amount of \$400,000,000. The Corporation entered into a Letter Agreement, dated as of January 16, 2009, including the Securities Purchase

Agreement Standard Terms (collectively the “Letter Agreement”) with the U.S. Treasury, pursuant to which the Corporation issued and sold to the Treasury for an aggregate purchase price of \$400,000,000 in cash (i) 400,000 shares of Fixed Rate Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series F (the “Series F Preferred Stock”), and (ii) a warrant to purchase 389,483 shares of the Corporation’s common stock at an exercise price of \$154.05 per share, subject to certain anti-dilution and other adjustments (the “warrant”). The TARP transaction closed on January 16, 2009. On July 20, 2010, we exchanged the Series F Preferred Stock, plus accrued dividends on the Series F Preferred Stock, for 424,174 shares of a new series of preferred stock, fixed rate Cumulative Mandatorily Convertible Preferred Stock, Series G (the “Series G Preferred Stock”), and amended the warrant. On October 7, 2011, we exercised our right to convert the Series G Preferred Stock into 32,941,797 shares of common stock. As a result of the issuance of \$525 million of common stock in October 2011, the warrant was adjusted to provide for the issuance of approximately 1,285,899 shares of common stock at an exercise price of \$3.29 per share. On August 16, 2013, a secondary offering of the Corporation’s common stock was completed by certain of the Corporation’s existing stockholders, which included the sale by the U.S. Treasury of 13 million shares in such secondary offering. In the fourth quarter of 2014, the U.S. Treasury sold an additional 4.4 million shares in accordance with its first pre-defined written trading plan. On March 9, 2015, the U.S. Treasury announced the sale of an additional 5 million shares of First BanCorp.’s common stock through its second pre-defined written trading plan. As of December 31, 2016, the U.S. Treasury owned approximately 4.7% of the Corporation’s outstanding common stock, excluding the shares underlying the warrant.

Under the terms of the amended Letter Agreement with the U.S. Treasury dated as of July 7, 2010 (i) the Corporation amended its compensation, bonus, incentive and other benefit plans, arrangements and agreements (including severance and employment agreements) to the extent necessary to be in compliance with the executive compensation and corporate governance requirements of Section 111(b) of the EESA and applicable guidance or regulations issued by the U.S. Treasury on or prior to January 16, 2009 and (ii) each Senior Executive Officer, as defined in the amended Letter Agreement, executed a written waiver releasing the U.S. Treasury and the Corporation from any claims that such officers may otherwise have as a result of the Corporation’s amendment of such arrangements and agreements to be in compliance with Section 111(b). Until such time as the U.S. Treasury ceases to own any debt or equity securities of the Corporation acquired pursuant to the amended Letter Agreement, the Corporation must remain in compliance with these requirements.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

On February 17, 2009, the Congress enacted the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (“ARRA”). The ARRA includes federal tax cuts, expansion of unemployment benefits and other social welfare provisions, and domestic spending on education, health care, and infrastructure, including the energy sector.

The ARRA includes provisions relating to compensation paid by institutions that receive government assistance under TARP, including institutions that had already received such assistance, effectively amending the existing compensation and corporate governance requirements of Section 111(b) of the EESA. The provisions include restrictions on the amounts and forms of compensation payable, provisions for possible reimbursement of previously paid compensation and a requirement that compensation be submitted to a non-binding “say on pay” shareholder vote.

The U.S. Treasury issued regulations implementing the compensation requirements under ARRA, which amended the requirements of EESA. The regulations made effective the compensation provisions of ARRA and include rules requiring: (i) review of prior compensation by a Special Master; (ii) restrictions on paying or accruing bonuses, retention awards or incentive compensation for certain employees; (iii) regular review of all employee compensation arrangements by the company’s senior risk officer and compensation committee to ensure that the arrangements do not encourage unnecessary and excessive risk-taking or manipulation of the reporting of earnings; (iv) recoupment of bonus payments based on materially inaccurate information; (v) the prohibition of severance or change in control payments for certain employees; (vi) the adoption of policies and procedures to avoid excessive luxury expenses; and (vii) the mandatory “say on pay” vote by shareholders. In addition, the regulations also introduced several additional requirements and restrictions, including: (a) the Special Master review of ongoing compensation in certain situations; (b) prohibition on tax gross-ups for certain employees; (c) disclosure of perquisites; and (d) disclosure regarding compensation consultants.

USA PATRIOT Act and Other Anti-Money Laundering Requirements.

As a regulated depository institution, FirstBank is subject to the Bank Secrecy Act, which imposes a variety of reporting and other requirements, including the requirement to file suspicious activity and currency transaction reports that are designed to assist in the detection and prevention of money laundering and other criminal activities. In addition, under Title III of the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001, also known as the International Money Laundering Abatement and Anti-Terrorism Financing Act of 2001, all financial institutions are required to, among other things, identify their customers, adopt formal and comprehensive anti-money laundering programs, scrutinize or prohibit altogether certain transactions of special concern, and be prepared to respond to inquiries from U.S. law enforcement agencies concerning their customers and their transactions. Presently, only certain types of financial institutions (including banks, savings associations and money services businesses) are subject to final rules implementing the anti-money laundering program requirements of the USA PATRIOT Act.

Regulations implementing the Bank Secrecy Act and the USA PATRIOT Act are published and primarily enforced by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, a bureau of the U.S. Treasury. Failure of a financial institution to comply with the requirement of the Bank Secrecy Act or the USA PATRIOT Act could have serious legal and reputational consequences for the institution, including the possibility of regulatory enforcement or other legal action, including significant civil money penalties, against the Corporation or the Bank. The Corporation also is required to comply with federal economic and trade sanctions requirements enforced by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (“OFAC”), a bureau of the U.S. Treasury. The Corporation has adopted appropriate policies, procedures and controls to address compliance with the Bank Secrecy Act, USA PATRIOT Act and economic/trade sanctions requirements, and to implement banking agency, U.S. Treasury and OFAC regulations.

Community Reinvestment

The CRA encourages banks to help meet the credit needs of the local communities in which the banks offer their services, including low- and moderate-income individuals, consistent with the safe and sound operation of the bank.

The CRA requires the federal supervisory agencies, as part of the general examination of supervised banks, to assess the bank's record of meeting the credit needs of its community, assign a performance rating, and take such record and rating into account in their evaluation of certain applications by such bank. The CRA also requires all institutions to make public disclosure of their CRA ratings. FirstBank received a "satisfactory" CRA rating in its most recent examination by the FDIC.

Failure to adequately serve the communities could result in the denial by the regulators to merge, consolidate or acquire new assets, as well as expand or relocate branches.

State Chartered Non-Member Bank and Banking Laws and Regulations in General

FirstBank is subject to regulation and examination by the OCIF, the CFPB and the FDIC, and is subject to comprehensive federal and state regulations dealing with a wide variety of subjects. The federal and state laws and regulations that are applicable to banks regulate, among other things, the scope of their businesses, their investments, their reserves against deposits, the timing and availability of deposited funds, and the nature and amount of and collateral for certain loans. In addition to the impact of regulations, commercial banks are affected significantly by the actions of the Federal Reserve Board as it attempts to control the money supply and credit availability in order to influence the economy. Among the instruments used by the Federal Reserve Board to implement these objectives are open market operations in U.S. government securities, adjustments of the discount rate, and changes in reserve requirements against bank deposits. These instruments are used in varying combinations to influence overall economic growth and the distribution of credit, bank loans, investments and deposits. Their use also affects interest rates charged on loans or paid on deposits. The monetary policies and regulations of the Federal Reserve Board have had a significant effect on the operating results of commercial banks in the past and are expected to continue to do so in the future. The effects of such policies upon our future business, earnings and growth cannot be predicted.

There are periodic examinations by the OCIF, the CFPB and the FDIC of FirstBank to test the Bank's conformance to safe and sound banking practices and compliance with various statutory and regulatory requirements. This regulation and supervision establishes a comprehensive framework and oversight of activities in which a banking institution can engage. The regulation and supervision by the FDIC are intended primarily for the protection of the FDIC's insurance fund and depositors. The regulatory structure also gives the regulatory authorities discretion in connection with their supervisory and enforcement activities and examination policies, including policies with respect to the classification of assets and the establishment of adequate loan loss reserves for regulatory purposes. This enforcement authority includes, among other things, the ability to assess civil money penalties, issue cease-and-desist or removal orders and to initiate injunctive actions against banking organizations and institution-affiliated parties. In general, these enforcement actions may be initiated for violations of laws and regulations and for engaging in unsafe or unsound practices. In addition, certain bank actions are required by statute and implementing regulations. Other actions or

failure to act may provide the basis for enforcement action, including the filing of misleading or untimely reports with regulatory authorities.

Written Agreement

FirstBank was notified by the FDIC that the Consent Order under which the Bank had been operating since June 2, 2010 was terminated effective April 29, 2015. FirstBank is required to maintain capital at specified levels pursuant to applicable law and its agreement with its regulators and currently exceeds all minimum capital requirements. Although the Consent Order has been terminated, First BanCorp. is still subject to the Written Agreement that the Corporation entered into with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York on June 3, 2010.

The Written Agreement provides, among other things, that the holding company must serve as a source of strength to FirstBank, and that, except with the consent generally of the New York FED and/or Federal Reserve Board, (1) the holding company may not pay dividends to stockholders or receive dividends from FirstBank, (2) the holding company and its nonbank subsidiaries may not make payments on trust-preferred securities or subordinated debt, and (3) the holding company cannot incur, increase, or guarantee debt or repurchase any capital securities. The Written Agreement also requires that the holding company submit a capital plan that reflects sufficient capital at First BanCorp. on a consolidated basis, which must be acceptable to the New York FED, and follow certain guidelines with respect to the appointment or change in responsibilities of senior officers. The foregoing summary is not complete and is qualified in all respects by reference to the actual language of the Written Agreement.

The Corporation submitted its Capital Plan under the Written Agreement setting forth its plans for how to improve capital positions to comply with the Written Agreement over time. In addition to the Capital Plan, the Corporation submitted to its regulators a liquidity and brokered CD plan, including a contingency funding plan, a non-performing asset reduction plan, a budget and profit plan, a strategic plan, and a plan for the reduction of classified and special mention assets. As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had

completed all of the items included in the Capital Plan and is continuing to work on reducing non-performing loans. The Written Agreement also requires the submission to the regulators of quarterly progress reports.

Dividend Restrictions

The Federal Reserve's "Applying Supervisory Guidance and Regulations on the Payment of Dividends, Stock Redemptions, and Stock Repurchases at Bank Holding Companies" (the "Supervisory Letter") discusses the ability of bank holding companies to declare dividends and to repurchase equity securities. The Supervisory Letter is generally consistent with prior Federal Reserve supervisory policies and guidance, although it places greater emphasis on discussions with the regulators prior to dividend declarations and redemption or repurchase decisions even when not explicitly required by the regulations. The Federal Reserve provides that the principles discussed in the letter are applicable to all bank holding companies, but are especially relevant for bank holding companies that are either experiencing financial difficulties and/or receiving public funds under the U.S. Treasury's TARP CPP. To that end, the Supervisory Letter specifically addresses the Federal Reserve's supervisory considerations for TARP participants.

The Federal Reserve Board has also issued a policy statement that, as a matter of prudent banking, a bank holding company should generally not maintain a given rate of cash dividends unless its net income available to common shareholders has been sufficient to fund fully the dividends and the prospective rate of earnings retention appears to be consistent with the organization's capital needs, asset quality, and overall financial condition. The Corporation is subject to certain restrictions generally imposed on Puerto Rico corporations with respect to the declaration and payment of dividends (i.e., that dividends may be paid out only from the Corporation's net assets in excess of capital or, in the absence of such excess, from the Corporation's net earnings for such fiscal year and/or the preceding fiscal year).

In prior years, the principal source of funds for the Corporation's parent holding company was dividends declared and paid by its subsidiary, FirstBank. Pursuant to the Written Agreement with the Federal Reserve, the Corporation cannot directly or indirectly take dividends or any other form of payment representing a reduction in capital from the Bank without the prior written approval of the Federal Reserve. The ability of FirstBank to declare and pay dividends on its capital stock is regulated by the Puerto Rico Banking Law, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (the "FDIA"), and FDIC regulations. In general terms, the Puerto Rico Banking Law provides that when the expenditures of a bank are greater than receipts, the excess of expenditures over receipts shall be charged against undistributed profits of the bank and the balance, if any, shall be charged against the required reserve fund of the bank. If the reserve fund is not sufficient to cover such balance in whole or in part, the outstanding amount must be charged against the bank's capital account. The Puerto Rico Banking Law provides that, until said capital has been restored to its original amount and the reserve fund to 20% of the original capital, the bank may not declare any dividends. In general terms, the FDIA and the FDIC regulations restrict the payment of dividends when a bank is undercapitalized, when a bank has failed to pay insurance assessments, or when there are safety and soundness concerns regarding such bank.

We suspended dividend payments on our common stock and preferred dividends commencing with the preferred dividend payments for the month of August 2009. We must obtain the regulators' approval before we declare, set apart or pay any dividends on any of our common stock or preferred stock. During the fourth quarter of 2016, following

receipt of the requisite regulatory approval, the Corporation announced the declaration of a cash dividend on its outstanding shares of Series A through E Noncumulative Perpetual Monthly Income Preferred Stock for the month of December 2016. The Corporation has to date received approval to pay the monthly dividends on the Corporation's Series A through E Preferred Stock through March 2017, although there is no assurance that such approvals for future periods will be forthcoming. Although there is no assurance that any dividends will be declared on the Corporation's Series A through E Preferred Stock in any future periods, the Corporation intends to continue to request the Federal Reserve's approval pursuant to the requirements of the Written Agreement to enable it to continue to pay the monthly dividends on its Series A through E Preferred Stock. Furthermore, so long as any shares of preferred stock remain outstanding, we cannot declare, set apart or pay any dividends on shares of our common stock unless any accrued and unpaid dividends on our preferred stock for the twelve monthly dividend periods ending on the immediately preceding dividend payment date have been paid or are paid contemporaneously and the full monthly dividend on our preferred stock for the then current month has been or is contemporaneously declared and paid or declared and set apart for payment.

Limitations on Transactions with Affiliates and Insiders

Certain transactions between financial institutions such as FirstBank and its affiliates are governed by Sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act and by Federal Reserve Regulation W. An affiliate of a financial institution in general is any corporation or entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with the financial institution.

In a holding company context, the parent bank holding company and any companies that are controlled by such parent bank holding company are affiliates of the financial institution. Generally, Sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act (i) limit the extent to which the financial institution or its subsidiaries may engage in "covered transactions" (defined below) with any one affiliate to an amount equal to 10% of such financial institution's capital stock and surplus, and contain an aggregate limit on all such transactions with all affiliates to an amount equal to 20% of such financial institution's capital stock and surplus and (ii) require that all "covered

transactions” be on terms substantially the same, or at least as favorable to the financial institution or affiliate, as those provided to a non-affiliate. The term “covered transaction” includes the making of loans, purchase of assets, issuance of a guarantee and other similar transactions. In addition, loans or other extensions of credit by the financial institution to the affiliate are required to be collateralized in accordance with the requirements set forth in Section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act. The Dodd-Frank Act added derivatives and securities lending and borrowing transactions to the list of “covered transactions” subject to Section 23A restrictions.

In addition, Sections 22(h) and (g) of the Federal Reserve Act, implemented through Regulation O, place restrictions on loans to executive officers, directors, and principal stockholders. Under Section 22(h) of the Federal Reserve Act, loans to a director, an executive officer, a greater than 10% stockholder of a financial institution, and certain related interests of these persons, may not exceed, together with all other outstanding loans to such persons and affiliated interests, the financial institution’s loans to one borrower limit, generally equal to 15% of the institution’s unimpaired capital and surplus. Section 22(h) of the Federal Reserve Act also requires that loans to directors, executive officers, and principal stockholders be made on terms substantially the same as offered in comparable transactions to other persons and also requires prior board approval for certain loans. In addition, the aggregate amount of extensions of credit by a financial institution to insiders cannot exceed the institution’s unimpaired capital and surplus. Furthermore, Section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act places additional restrictions on loans to executive officers.

Executive Compensation

In 2010, the federal banking agencies adopted interagency guidance governing incentive-based compensation programs, which applies to all banking organizations regardless of asset size. This guidance uses a principles-based approach to ensure that incentive-based compensation arrangements appropriately tie rewards to longer-term performance and do not undermine the safety and soundness of banking organizations or create undue risks to the financial system. The interagency guidance is based on three major principles: (i) balanced risk-taking incentives; (ii) compatibility with effective controls and risk management; and (iii) strong corporate governance. The guidance further provides that, where appropriate, the banking agencies will take supervisory or enforcement action to ensure that material deficiencies that pose a threat to the safety and soundness of the organization are promptly addressed.

In May 2016, as required under section 956 of the Dodd-Frank Act, the federal banking agencies, along with other federal regulatory agencies, proposed regulations (first proposed in 2011) governing incentive-based compensation practices at covered banking institutions, which would include, among others, all banking organizations with assets of \$1 billion or greater. These proposed rules are intended to better align the financial rewards for covered employees with an institution’s long-term safety and soundness. Portions of these proposed rules would apply to the Corporation and FirstBank. Those applicable provisions would generally (i) prohibit types and features of incentive-based compensation arrangements that encourage inappropriate risk because they are “excessive” or “could lead to material financial loss” at the banking institution; (ii) require incentive-based compensation arrangements to adhere to three basic principles: (1) a balance between risk and reward; (2) effective risk management and controls; and (3) effective governance; and (iii) require appropriate board of directors (or committee) oversight and recordkeeping and disclosures to the banking institution’s primary regulatory agency. The nature and substance of any final action to adopt these proposed rules, and the timing of any such action, are not known at this time.

Bank and Bank Holding Company Regulatory Capital Requirements

The Federal Reserve Board has adopted risk-based and leverage capital adequacy guidelines pursuant to which it assesses the adequacy of capital in examining and supervising a bank holding company and in analyzing applications to it under the Bank Holding Company Act. The Federal Reserve Board's historical risk-based capital guidelines were based upon the 1988 capital accord ("Basel I") of the Basel Committee. These historical requirements, however, which included a legacy simplified risk-weighting system for the calculations of risk-based assets, as well as lower leverage capital requirements, were superseded by new risk-based and leverage capital requirements that went into effect, on a multi-year transitional basis, on January 1, 2015. The FDIC has adopted substantively identical requirements that apply to insured banks under its regulation and supervision. These requirements are part of a revised regulatory capital framework for U.S. banking organizations (the "Basel III rules") adopted by the banking agencies that is based on international regulatory capital requirements adopted by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision over the past several years.

The Basel III rules introduced new minimum capital ratios and capital conservation buffer requirements, change the composition of regulatory capital, require a number of new adjustments to and deductions from regulatory capital, and introduced a new "Standardized Approach" for the calculation of risk-weighted assets that replaced the risk-weighting requirements under prior U.S. regulatory capital rules. The new minimum regulatory capital requirements and the Standardized Approach for the calculation of risk-weighted assets became effective for the Corporation on January 1, 2015. The capital conservation buffer requirements, and the regulatory capital adjustments and deductions under the Basel III rules are being phased-in over several years ending on December 31, 2018.

The Basel III rules introduced a new and separate ratio of Common Equity Tier 1 capital ("CET1") to risk-weighted assets. CET1, a narrower subcomponent of total Tier 1 capital, generally consists of common stock and related surplus, retained earnings, accumulated other comprehensive income ("AOCI"), and qualifying minority interests. Certain banking organizations, however, including the

Corporation and FirstBank, were allowed to make a one-time permanent election in early 2015 to continue to exclude AOCI items. The Corporation and FirstBank elected to permanently exclude capital in AOCI in order to avoid significant variations in the level of capital depending upon the impact of interest rate fluctuations on the fair value of the securities portfolio. In addition, the Basel III rules require the Corporation to maintain an additional CET1 capital conservation buffer of 2.5%. The capital conservation buffer must be maintained to avoid limitations on both (i) capital distributions (e.g. repurchases of capital instruments or dividend or interest payments on capital instruments) and (ii) discretionary bonus payments to executive officers and heads of major business lines. Under the fully phased-in rules, the Corporation will be required to maintain: (i) a minimum CET1 to risk-weighted assets ratio of at least 4.5%, plus the 2.5% “capital conservation buffer,” resulting in a required minimum CET1 ratio of at least 7%, (ii) a minimum ratio of total Tier 1 capital to risk-weighted assets of at least 6.0%, plus the 2.5% capital conservation buffer, resulting in a required minimum Tier 1 capital ratio of 8.5%, (iii) a minimum ratio of total Tier 1 plus Tier 2 capital to risk-weighted assets of at least 8.0%, plus the 2.5% capital conservation buffer, resulting in a required minimum total capital ratio of 10.5%, and (iv) a required minimum leverage ratio of 4%, calculated as the ratio of Tier 1 capital to average on-balance sheet (non-risk adjusted) assets. The phase-in of the capital conservation buffer began on January 1, 2016 with a first year requirement of 0.625% of additional CET1, which will be progressively increased over a four-year period, increasing by that same percentage amount on each subsequent January 1 until it reaches the fully phased-in 2.5% CET1 requirement on January 1, 2019.

In addition, the Basel III rules require a number of new deductions from and adjustments to CET1, including deductions from CET1 for certain intangible assets, and deferred tax assets dependent upon future taxable income; the four-year phase-in period for these adjustments generally began on January 1, 2015. Mortgage servicing assets and deferred tax assets attributable to temporary differences, among others, are required to be deducted to the extent that any one such category exceeds 10% of CET1 or all such categories in the aggregate exceed 15% of CET1.

In addition, the Basel III rules require that certain non-qualifying capital instruments, including cumulative preferred stock and trust preferred securities (“TRuPs”), be excluded from Tier 1 capital. In general, banking organizations such as the Corporation began to phase out TRuPs from Tier 1 capital on January 1, 2015. The outstanding balance owed on the Corporation’s TRuPs were fully phased out from Tier 1 capital as of January 1, 2016. However, the Corporation’s TRuPs may continue to be included in Tier 2 capital until the instruments are redeemed or mature.

The Corporation and FirstBank compute risk weighted assets using the Standardized Approach required by the Basel III rules. The Standardized Approach for risk-weightings has expanded the risk-weighting categories from the four major risk-weighting categories under the previous regulatory capital rules (0%, 20%, 50%, and 100%) to a much larger and more risk-sensitive number of categories, depending on the nature of the assets. In a number of cases, the Standardized Approach results in higher risk weights for a variety of asset categories. Specific changes to the risk-weightings of assets include, among other things: (i) applying a 150% risk weight instead of a 100% risk weight for high volatility commercial real estate acquisition, development and construction loans, (ii) assigning a 150% risk weight to exposures that are 90 days past due (other than qualifying residential mortgage exposures, which remain at an assigned risk-weighting of 100%), (iii) establishing a 20% credit conversion factor for the unused portion of a commitment with an original maturity of one year or less that is not unconditionally cancellable, in contrast to the 0% risk-weighting under the prior rules and (iv) requiring capital to be maintained against on-balance-sheet and off-balance-sheet exposures that result from certain cleared transactions, guarantees and credit derivatives, and collateralized transactions (such as repurchase agreement transactions).

Prompt Corrective Action. The Prompt Corrective Action (“PCA”) provisions of the FDIA require the federal bank regulatory agencies to take prompt corrective action against any undercapitalized insured depository institution. The FDIA establishes five capital categories: well-capitalized, adequately capitalized, undercapitalized, significantly undercapitalized, and critically undercapitalized. Well-capitalized insured depository institutions (“institutions”) significantly exceed the required minimum level for each relevant capital measure. Adequately capitalized institutions include institutions that meet but do not significantly exceed the required minimum level for each relevant capital measure. Undercapitalized institutions consist of those that fail to meet the required minimum level for one or more relevant capital measures. Significantly undercapitalized institutions are those with capital levels significantly below the minimum requirements for any relevant capital measure. Critically undercapitalized institutions have minimal capital and are at serious risk for government seizure.

Under certain circumstances, a well-capitalized, adequately capitalized or undercapitalized institution may be treated as if the institution were in the next lower capital category. An institution is generally prohibited from making capital distributions (including paying dividends), or paying management fees to a holding company if the institution would thereafter be undercapitalized. Institutions that are adequately capitalized but not well-capitalized cannot accept, renew or roll over brokered CDs except with a waiver from the FDIC and are subject to restrictions on the interest rates that can be paid on such deposits. Undercapitalized institutions may not accept, renew or roll over brokered CDs.

The federal bank regulatory agencies are permitted or, in certain cases, required to take certain actions with respect to institutions falling within one of the three undercapitalized categories. Depending on the level of an institution’s capital, the agencies’ corrective powers include, among other things:

- prohibiting the payment of principal and interest on subordinated debt;
- prohibiting the holding company from making distributions without prior regulatory approval;
- placing limits on asset growth and restrictions on activities;
- placing additional restrictions on transactions with affiliates;
- restricting the interest rate the institution may pay on deposits;
- prohibiting the institution from accepting deposits from correspondent banks; and
- in the most severe cases, appointing a conservator or receiver for the institution.

An institution that is undercapitalized is required to submit a capital restoration plan, and such a plan will not be accepted unless, among other things, the institution's holding company guarantees the plan up to a certain specified amount. Any such guarantee from an institution's holding company is entitled to a priority of payment in bankruptcy.

The banking agencies' Basel III rules, discussed above, revise the PCA requirements by (i) introducing a separate CET1 ratio requirement for each PCA capital category (other than critically undercapitalized) with the required CET1 ratio being 6.5% for well-capitalized status; (ii) increasing the minimum Tier 1 capital ratio requirement for each PCA capital category with the minimum Tier 1 capital ratio for well-capitalized status being 8% (as compared to the previous 6%); and (iii) eliminating the previous provision that allows a bank with a composite supervisory rating of 1 to have a 3% leverage ratio and still be adequately capitalized and maintaining the minimum leverage ratio for well-capitalized status at 5%. The Basel III rules do not change the total risk-based capital requirement (10% for well-capitalized status) for any PCA capital category. The new PCA requirements became effective on January 1, 2015.

A bank's capital category, as determined by applying the prompt corrective action provisions of the law, may not constitute an accurate representation of the overall financial condition or prospects of a bank, such as the Bank, and should be considered in conjunction with other available information regarding the financial condition and results of operations of the bank.

Set forth below are the Corporation's and FirstBank's capital ratios as of December 31, 2016 based on Federal Reserve and FDIC guidelines:

	First BanCorp.	Banking Subsidiary FirstBank	General Well-Capitalized Minimum
As of December 31, 2016			
Total capital (Total capital to			

risk-weighted assets)	21.34%	20.80%	10.00%
Common Equity Tier 1 Capital (Common Equity Tier 1 capital to risk-weighted assets)	17.74%	16.92%	6.50%
Tier 1 capital ratio (Tier 1 capital to risk-weighted assets)	17.74%	19.53%	8.00%
Leverage ratio (1)	13.70%	15.10%	5.00%

(1) Tier 1 capital to average assets.

Deposit Insurance

The increase in deposit insurance coverage to up to \$250,000 per customer, the FDIC's expanded authority to increase insurance premiums, as well as the increase in the number of bank failures after the 2008 financial crisis resulted in an increase in deposit insurance assessments for all banks, including FirstBank. The Dodd-Frank Act changed the requirements for the Deposit Insurance Fund by requiring that the designated reserve ratio for the Deposit Insurance Fund for any year not be less than 1.35 percent of estimated insured deposits or the comparable percentage of the new deposit assessment base. In addition, the FDIC must take steps as necessary for the reserve ratio to reach 1.35 percent of estimated insured deposits by September 30, 2020. If the reserve ratio exceeds 1.5 percent, the FDIC must dividend to Deposit Insurance Fund members the amount above the amount necessary to maintain the Deposit Insurance Fund at 1.5 percent, but the FDIC Board of Directors may, in its sole discretion, suspend or limit the declaration of payment of dividends. The FDIC has adopted a Deposit Reserve Fund restoration plan that projects that the designated reserve ratio will reach 1.35 percent by the 2020 deadline. The FDIC has also adopted a final rule raising its industry target ratio of reserves to

insured deposits to 2 percent, 65 basis points above the statutory minimum, but the FDIC does not project that goal to be met for several years.

The FDIC assessment rules currently define the assessment base for deposit insurance as required by the Dodd-Frank Act, specify assessment rates, implement the Dodd-Frank Act's Deposit Insurance Fund dividend provisions, and revise the risk-based assessment system for all large insured depository institutions (institutions with at least \$10 billion in total assets), such as FirstBank. In March 2016, the FDIC adopted a rule, which became effective on July 1, 2016, to increase the Deposit Insurance Fund to the statutorily required minimum level of 1.35 percent. Among other things, the rule imposes on banks with at least \$10 billion in assets (which would include the Bank) a surcharge of 4.5 cents per \$100 of their assessment base, after making certain adjustments. The FDIC has stated that it expects the reserve ratio will reach 1.35 percent before the end of 2018. If the reserve ratio does not reach 1.35 percent by the end of 2018, however, the FDIC will impose a shortfall assessment on March 31, 2019, on insured depository institutions with total consolidated assets of \$10 billion or more.

FDIC Insolvency Authority

Under Puerto Rico banking laws (discussed below), the OCIF may appoint the FDIC as conservator or receiver of a failed or failing FDIC-insured Puerto Rican bank such as the Bank, and the FDIA authorizes the FDIC to accept such an appointment. In addition, the FDIC has broad authority under the FDIA to appoint itself as conservator or receiver of a failed or failing state bank, including a Puerto Rican bank. If the FDIC is appointed conservator or receiver of a bank upon the bank's insolvency or the occurrence of other events, the FDIC may sell or transfer some, part or all of a bank's assets and liabilities to another bank, or liquidate the bank and pay out insured depositors, as well as uninsured depositors and other creditors to the extent of the closed bank's available assets. As part of its insolvency authority, the FDIC has the authority, among other things, to take possession of and administer the receivership estate, pay out estate claims, and repudiate or disaffirm certain types of contracts to which the bank was a party if the FDIC believes such contract is burdensome and its disaffirmance will aid in the administration of the receivership. In resolving the estate of a failed bank, the FDIC as receiver will first satisfy its own administrative expenses, and the claims of holders of U.S. deposit liabilities also have priority over those of other general unsecured creditors.

Activities and Investments

The activities as "principal" and equity investments of FDIC-insured, state-chartered banks such as FirstBank are generally limited to those that are permissible for national banks. Under regulations dealing with equity investments, an insured state-chartered bank generally may not directly or indirectly acquire or retain any equity investments of a type, or in an amount, that is not permissible for a national bank.

Federal Home Loan Bank System

FirstBank is a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank (“FHLB”) system. The FHLB system consists of eleven regional Federal Home Loan Banks governed and regulated by the Federal Housing Finance Agency. The Federal Home Loan Banks serve as reserve or credit facilities for member institutions within their assigned regions. They are funded primarily from proceeds derived from the sale of consolidated obligations of the FHLB system, and they make loans (advances) to members in accordance with policies and procedures established by the FHLB system and the board of directors of each regional FHLB.

FirstBank is a member of the FHLB of New York and, as such, is required to acquire and hold shares of capital stock in the FHLB of New York in an amount calculated in accordance with the requirements set forth in applicable laws and regulations. FirstBank is in compliance with the stock ownership requirements of the FHLB of New York. All loans, advances and other extensions of credit made by the FHLB to FirstBank are secured by a portion of FirstBank’s mortgage loan portfolio, certain other investments and the capital stock of the FHLB held by FirstBank.

Ownership and Control

Because of FirstBank’s status as an FDIC-insured bank, as defined in the Bank Holding Company Act, the Corporation, as the owner of FirstBank’s common stock, is subject to certain restrictions and disclosure obligations under various federal laws, including the Bank Holding Company Act and the Change in Bank Control Act (the “CBCA”). Regulations pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act generally require prior Federal Reserve Board approval for an acquisition of control of an insured institution (as defined in the Act) or holding company thereof by any person (or persons acting in concert). Control is deemed to exist if, among other things, a person (or group of persons acting in concert) acquires 25% or more of any class of voting stock of an insured institution or holding company thereof. Under the CBCA, control is presumed to exist subject to rebuttal if a person (or group of persons acting in concert) acquires 10% or more of any class of voting stock and either (i) the corporation has registered securities under Section 12 of the Exchange Act, or (ii) no person (or group of persons acting in concert) will own, control or hold the power to vote a greater percentage of that class of voting securities immediately after the transaction. The concept of acting in concert is very broad and also is subject to certain rebuttable presumptions, including among others, that relatives, business partners, management officials, affiliates and others

are presumed to be acting in concert with each other and their businesses. The regulations of the FDIC implementing the CBCA are generally similar to those described above.

The Puerto Rico Banking Law requires the approval of the OCIF for changes in control of a Puerto Rico bank. See “Puerto Rico Banking Law.”

Standards for Safety and Soundness

The FDIA requires the FDIC and the other federal bank regulatory agencies to prescribe standards of safety and soundness, by regulations or guidelines, relating generally to operations and management, asset growth, asset quality, earnings, stock valuation, and compensation. The implementing regulations and guidelines of the FDIC and the other federal bank regulatory agencies establish general standards relating to internal controls and information systems, internal audit systems, loan documentation, credit underwriting, interest rate exposure, asset growth and compensation, fees and benefits. In general, the regulations and guidelines require, among other things, appropriate systems and practices to identify and manage the risks and exposures specified in the guidelines. The regulations and guidelines prohibit excessive compensation as an unsafe and unsound practice and describe compensation as excessive when the amounts paid are unreasonable or disproportionate to the services performed by an executive officer, employee, director or principal shareholder. Failure to comply with these standards can result in administrative enforcement or other adverse actions against the bank.

Brokered Deposits

FDIC regulations adopted under the FDIA govern the receipt of brokered deposits by banks. Well-capitalized institutions are not subject to limitations on brokered deposits, while adequately-capitalized institutions are able to accept, renew or rollover brokered deposits only with a waiver from the FDIC and subject to certain restrictions on the interest paid on such deposits. Undercapitalized institutions are not permitted to accept brokered deposits.

Puerto Rico Banking Law

As a commercial bank organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, FirstBank is subject to supervision, examination and regulation by OCIF pursuant to the Puerto Rico Banking Law of 1933, as amended (the “Banking Law”).

The Banking Law contains various provisions relating to FirstBank and its affairs, including its incorporation and organization, the rights and responsibilities of its directors, officers and stockholders and its corporate powers, lending limitations, capital requirements, and investment requirements. In addition, the Commissioner is given extensive rule-making power and administrative discretion under the Banking Law.

The Banking Law authorizes Puerto Rico commercial banks to conduct certain financial and related activities directly or through subsidiaries, including the leasing of personal property and the operation of a small loan business.

The Banking Law requires every bank to maintain a legal reserve, which shall not be less than twenty percent (20%) of its demand liabilities, except government deposits (federal, state and municipal) that are secured by actual collateral. The reserve is required to be composed of any of the following securities or a combination thereof: (1) legal tender of the United States; (2) checks on banks or trust companies located in any part of Puerto Rico that are to be presented for collection during the day following the day on which they are received; (3) money deposited in other banks provided said deposits are authorized by the Commissioner and subject to immediate collection; (4) federal funds sold to any Federal Reserve Bank and securities purchased under agreements to resell executed by the bank with such funds that are subject to be repaid to the bank on or before the close of the next business day; and (5) any other

asset that the Commissioner identifies from time to time.

Section 17 of the Banking Law permits Puerto Rico commercial banks to make loans to any one person, firm, partnership or corporation in an aggregate amount of up to fifteen percent (15%) of the sum of: (i) the bank's paid-in capital; (ii) the bank's reserve fund; (iii) 50% of the bank's retained earnings, subject to certain limitations; and (iv) any other components that the Commissioner may determine from time to time. If such loans are secured by collateral worth at least twenty five percent (25%) more than the amount of the loan, the aggregate maximum amount may reach one third (33.33%) of the sum of the bank's paid-in capital, reserve fund, 50% of retained earnings, subject to certain limitations, and such other components that the Commissioner may determine from time to time. There are no restrictions under the Banking Law on the amount of loans that may be wholly secured by bonds, securities and other evidences of indebtedness of the Government of the United States, or of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or by bonds, not in default, of municipalities or instrumentalities of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Banking Law prohibits Puerto Rico commercial banks from making loans secured by their own stock, and from purchasing their own stock, unless such purchase is made pursuant to a stock repurchase program approved by the Commissioner or is necessary to prevent losses because of a debt previously contracted in good faith. The stock purchased by the Puerto Rico commercial bank must be sold by the bank in a public or private sale within one year from the date of purchase.

The Banking Law provides that no officer, director, agent or employee of a Puerto Rico commercial bank may serve as an officer, director, agent or employee of another Puerto Rico commercial bank, financial corporation, savings and loan association, trust corporation, corporation engaged in granting mortgage loans or any other institution engaged in the money lending business in Puerto Rico. This prohibition is not applicable to any such position with an affiliate of a Puerto Rico commercial bank.

The Banking Law requires that Puerto Rico commercial banks prepare each year a balance summary of their operations, and submit such balance summary for approval at a regular meeting of stockholders, together with an explanatory report thereon. The Banking Law also requires that at least ten percent (10%) of the yearly net income of a Puerto Rico commercial bank be credited annually to a reserve fund. This credit is required to be done every year until such reserve fund shall be equal to the total paid-in-capital of the bank.

The Banking Law also provides that when the expenditures of a Puerto Rico commercial bank are greater than receipts, the excess of the expenditures over receipts shall be charged against the undistributed profits of the bank, and the balance, if any, shall be charged against the reserve fund, as a reduction thereof. If there is no reserve fund sufficient to cover such balance in whole or in part, the outstanding amount shall be charged against the capital account and no dividend shall be declared until said capital has been restored to its original amount and the amount in the reserve fund equals twenty percent (20%) of the original capital.

The Banking Law requires the prior approval of the Commissioner with respect to a transfer of capital stock of a bank that results in a change of control of the bank. Under the Banking Law, a change of control is presumed to occur if a person or a group of persons acting in concert, directly or indirectly, acquires more than 5% of the outstanding voting capital stock of the bank. The Commissioner has interpreted the restrictions of the Banking Law as applying to acquisitions of voting securities of entities controlling a bank, such as a bank holding company. Under the Banking Law, the determination of the Commissioner whether to approve a change of control filing is final and non-appealable.

The Finance Board, which is composed of the Commissioner, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Consumer Affairs, the President of the Economic Development Bank, the President of the Government Development Bank, and the President of the Planning Board, has the authority to regulate the maximum interest rates and finance charges that may be charged on loans to individuals and unincorporated businesses in Puerto Rico. The current regulations of the Finance Board provide that the applicable interest rate on loans to individuals and unincorporated businesses, including real estate development loans but excluding certain other personal and commercial loans secured by mortgages on real estate properties, is to be determined by free competition. Accordingly, the regulations do not set a maximum rate for charges on retail installment sales contracts, small loans, and credit card purchases and set aside previous regulations which regulated these maximum finance charges. Furthermore, there is no maximum rate set for installment sales contracts involving motor vehicles, commercial, agricultural and industrial equipment, commercial electric appliances and insurance premiums.

International Banking Act of Puerto Rico (“IBE Act 52”)

The business and operations of FirstBank International Branch (“FirstBank IBE” or the “IBE division of FirstBank”) and FirstBank Overseas Corporation (the IBE subsidiary of FirstBank) are subject to supervision and regulation by the Commissioner. FirstBank and FirstBank Overseas Corporation were created under the IBE Act 52, which provides for total Puerto Rico tax exemption on net income derived by IBEs operating in Puerto Rico on the specific activities identified in the IBE Act. An IBE that operates as a unit of a bank pays income taxes at the corporate standard rates to the extent that the IBE’s net income exceeds 20% of the bank’s total net taxable income. Under the IBE Act 52, certain sales, encumbrances, assignments, mergers, exchanges or transfers of shares, interests or participation(s) in the capital of an international banking entity (an “IBE”) may not be initiated without the prior approval of the Commissioner. The

IBE Act 52 and the regulations issued thereunder by the Commissioner (the “IBE Regulations”) limit the business activities that may be carried out by an IBE. Such activities are limited in part to persons and assets located outside of Puerto Rico.

Pursuant to the IBE Act 52 and the IBE Regulations, each of FirstBank IBE and FirstBank Overseas Corporation must maintain locally books and records of all its transactions in the ordinary course of business. FirstBank IBE and FirstBank Overseas Corporation are also required thereunder to submit to the Commissioner quarterly and annual reports of their financial condition and results of operations, including annual audited financial statements.

The IBE Act 52 empowers the Commissioner to revoke or suspend, after notice and hearing, a license issued thereunder if, among other things, the IBE fails to comply with the IBE Act 52, the IBE Regulations or the terms of its license, or if the Commissioner finds that the business or affairs of the IBE are conducted in a manner that is not consistent with the public interest.

In 2012, the Puerto Rico government approved Act Number 273 (“Act 273”). Act 273 replaces, prospectively, IBE Act 52 with the objective of improving the conditions for conducting international financial transactions in Puerto Rico. An IBE existing on the date of approval of Act 273, such as FirstBank IBE and FirstBank Overseas Corporation, can continue operating under IBE Act 52, or, it can voluntarily convert to an International Financial Entity (“IFE”) under Act 273 so it may broaden its scope of Eligible IFE Activities, as defined below, and obtain a grant of tax exemption under Act 273.

IFEs are licensed by the Commissioner, and authorized to conduct certain Act 273 specified financial transactions (“Eligible IFE Activities”). Once licensed, an IFE can request a grant of tax exemption (“Tax Grant”) from the Puerto Rico Department of Economic Development and Commerce, which will enumerate and secure the following tax benefits provided by Act 273 as contractual rights (i.e., regardless of future changes in Puerto Rico law) for a fifteen (15) year period:

(i) to the IFE:

- a fixed 4% Puerto Rico income tax rate on the net income derived by the IFE from its Eligible IFE Activities; and
- full property and municipal license tax exemptions on such activities.

(ii) to its shareholders:

- 6% income tax rate on distributions to Puerto Rico resident shareholders of earnings and profits derived from the Eligible IFE Activities; and
- full Puerto Rico income tax exemption on such distributions to non-Puerto Rico resident shareholders.

The primary purpose of IFEs is to attract United States and foreign investors to Puerto Rico. Consequently, Act 273 authorizes them to engage in traditional banking and financial transactions, principally with non-residents of Puerto Rico. Furthermore, the scope of Eligible IFE Activities encompasses a wider variety of transactions than those previously authorized to IBEs.

Act 187, as amended, enacted on November 17, 2015 requires the Commissioner to issue a Certificate of Compliance every two years in order to certify the compliance with law of companies organized under IBE Act 52.

As of the date of the issuance of this Annual Report on Form 10-K, FirstBank IBE and FirstBank Overseas Corporation are operating under IBE Act 52.

Puerto Rico Income Taxes

Under the Puerto Rico Internal Revenue Code of 2011, as amended (the “2011 PR Code”), the Corporation and its subsidiaries are treated as separate taxable entities and are not entitled to file consolidated tax returns and, thus, the

Corporation is not able to utilize losses from one subsidiary to offset gains in another subsidiary. Accordingly, in order to obtain a tax benefit from a net operating loss (“NOL”), a particular subsidiary must be able to demonstrate sufficient taxable income within the applicable NOL carry forward period. The 2011 PR Code provides a dividend received deduction of 100% on dividends received from “controlled” subsidiaries subject to taxation in Puerto Rico and 85% on dividends received from other taxable domestic corporations.

Under the 2011 PR Code, First BanCorp. is subject to a maximum statutory tax rate of 39%. The 2011 PR Code also includes an alternative minimum tax of 30% that applies if the Corporation’s regular income tax liability is less than the alternative minimum tax requirements.

The Corporation has maintained an effective tax rate lower than the maximum statutory rate in Puerto Rico mainly by investing in government obligations and mortgage-backed securities exempt from U.S. and Puerto Rico income taxes and by doing business through FirstBank IBE, and through the Bank’s subsidiary, FirstBank Overseas Corporation, whose interest income and gain on sales is exempt from Puerto Rico income taxation.

On May 28 and September 30, 2015, the Puerto Rico legislature approved Act 72-2015 and Act 159-2015, respectively, which enacted amendments to the 2011 PR Code. The amendments related to the income tax provision include changes to the alternative minimum tax computation, and changes to the use limitation on NOLs and capital losses for 2015 and future taxable years. The change in the tax law affected the Corporation’s income tax computation by limiting the NOL deduction to 80% of taxable income, compared to a 90% limitation in prior years.

Act 72-2015, as amended, also introduced a value added tax (the “VAT”) on consumption, effective April 1, 2016, to replace the current sales and use tax (“SUT”), and certain temporary changes on SUT for the transition into the VAT. However, Act 54-2016, enacted on May 26, 2016, repealed the VAT sections of Act 72-2015 and made permanent the changes to SUT. The still in force changes in SUT include: an increase in tax rate from 7% to 11.5% on taxable goods and services, effective since July 1, 2015, and a 4% SUT on business to business services, and professional services, with certain exceptions, effective since October 1, 2015.

United States Income Taxes

The Corporation is also subject to federal income tax on its income from sources within the United States and on any item of income that is, or is considered to be, effectively connected with the active conduct of a trade or business within the United States. The U.S. Internal Revenue Code provides for tax exemption of any portfolio interest received by a foreign corporation from sources within

the United States; therefore, the Corporation is not subject to federal income tax on certain U.S. investments that qualify under the term “portfolio interest.”

Insurance Operations Regulation

FirstBank Insurance Agency is registered as an insurance agency with the Insurance Commissioner of Puerto Rico and is subject to regulations issued by the Insurance Commissioner relating to, among other things, the licensing of employees and sales and solicitation and advertising practices, and by the Federal Reserve as to certain consumer protection provisions mandated by the GLB Act and its implementing regulations.

Mortgage Banking Operations

In addition to FDIC and CFPB regulation, FirstBank is subject to the rules and regulations of the FHA, VA, FNMA, FHLMC, GNMA, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (the “HUD”) with respect to originating, processing, selling and servicing mortgage loans and the issuance and sale of mortgage-backed securities. Those rules and regulations, among other things, prohibit discrimination and establish underwriting guidelines that include provisions for inspections and appraisals, require credit reports on prospective borrowers and fix maximum loan amounts, and, with respect to VA loans, fix maximum interest rates. Moreover, lenders such as FirstBank are required annually to submit audited financial statements to the FHA, VA, FNMA, FHLMC, GNMA and HUD and each regulatory entity has its own financial requirements. FirstBank’s affairs are also subject to supervision and examination by the FHA, VA, FNMA, FHLMC, GNMA and HUD at all times to assure compliance with applicable regulations, policies and procedures. Mortgage origination activities are subject to, among other requirements, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, Federal Truth-in-Lending Act, and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder that, among other things, prohibit discrimination and require the disclosure of certain basic information to mortgagors concerning credit terms and settlement costs. FirstBank is licensed by the Commissioner under the Puerto Rico Mortgage Banking Law, and, as such, is subject to regulation by the Commissioner, with respect to, among other things, licensing requirements and the establishment of maximum origination fees on certain types of mortgage loan products.

Section 5 of the Puerto Rico Mortgage Banking Law requires the prior approval of the Commissioner for the acquisition of control of any mortgage banking institution licensed under such law. For purposes of the Puerto Rico Mortgage Banking Law, the term “control” means the power to direct or influence decisively, directly or indirectly, the management or policies of a mortgage banking institution. The Puerto Rico Mortgage Banking Law provides that a transaction that results in the holding of less than 10% of the outstanding voting securities of a mortgage banking institution shall not be considered a change in control.

Item 1A. Risk Factors

RISKS RELATING TO THE CORPORATION’S BUSINESS

We are operating under an agreement with our regulators.

We are subject to supervision and regulation by the Federal Reserve Board. We are a bank holding company and a financial holding company under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended.

As a financial holding company, we are permitted to engage in a broader range of “financial” activities than those permitted to bank holding companies that are not financial holding companies. At this time, we currently are not able to engage in new financial activities, and we may not be able to acquire shares or control of other companies.

As a result of the Written Agreement, which is designed to enhance our ability to act as a source of strength to FirstBank, as well as other requirements, we must obtain regulatory approval before declaring or paying dividends, receiving dividends from FirstBank, making payments on subordinated debt or trust-preferred securities, incurring, increasing or guaranteeing debt (whether such debt is incurred, increased or guaranteed, directly or indirectly, by us or any of our non-banking subsidiaries) or purchasing or redeeming any capital stock. The Written Agreement also required us to submit to the Federal Reserve a capital plan and requires that we comply with certain notice provisions prior to appointing new directors or senior executive officers and comply with certain payment restrictions on severance payments and indemnification restrictions.

If we fail to comply with the Written Agreement and other requirements from our regulators, we may become subject to additional regulatory enforcement action and other adverse regulatory actions that might have a material and adverse effect on our operations.

Our high level of non-performing loans may adversely affect our future results from operations.

We continue to have a high level of non-performing loans as of December 31, 2016, which increased \$117.3 million to \$568.2 million as of December 31, 2016, or 26%, from \$450.9 million as of December 31, 2015. Our non-performing loans represent

approximately 6% of our \$8.9 billion loan portfolio as of December 31, 2016. In addition, we have a high level of total non-performing assets, which increased \$124.6 million to \$734.5 million as of December 31, 2016, or 20%, from \$609.9 million as of December 31, 2015. The increase in total non-performing assets was related, among other things, to the placement in non-accrual status of the Corporation's \$111.8 million exposure to commercial loans guaranteed by the TDF and bonds of the GDB and the Puerto Rico Public Buildings Authority with an aggregate fair value of \$20.5 million as of December 31, 2016. If we are unable to effectively maintain the quality of our loan portfolio, our financial condition and results of operations may be materially and adversely affected.

Certain funding sources may not be available to us and our funding sources may prove insufficient and/or costly to replace.

FirstBank relies primarily on customer deposits, the issuance of brokered CDs, and advances from the FHLB of New York to maintain its lending activities and to replace certain maturing liabilities. As of December 31, 2016, we had \$1.4 billion in brokered CDs outstanding, representing approximately 16% of our total deposits, and a reduction of \$657.8 million from the year ended December 31, 2015. Approximately \$798.8 million in brokered CDs mature over the next twelve months, and the average term to maturity of the retail brokered CDs outstanding as of December 31, 2016 was approximately 1.2 years. None of these CDs are callable at the Corporation's option.

Although FirstBank has historically been able to replace maturing deposits and advances, we may not be able to replace these funds in the future if our financial condition or general market conditions change. The use of brokered deposits has been particularly important for the funding of our operations. If we are unable to issue brokered deposits, or are unable to maintain access to other funding sources, our results of operations and liquidity would be adversely affected.

Alternate sources of funding may carry higher costs than sources currently utilized. If we are required to rely more heavily on more expensive funding sources, profitability would be adversely affected. We may determine to seek debt financing in the future to achieve our long-term business objectives. Any future debt financing by the Corporation requires the prior approval of the Federal Reserve, and the Federal Reserve may not approve such financing. Additional borrowings, if sought, may not be available to us, or if available, may not be on acceptable terms. The availability of additional financing will depend on a variety of factors such as market conditions, the general availability of credit, our credit ratings and our credit capacity. In addition, the Bank may seek to sell loans as an additional source of liquidity. If additional financing sources are unavailable or are not available on acceptable terms, our profitability and future prospects could be adversely affected.

We depend on cash dividends from FirstBank to meet our cash obligations.

As a holding company, dividends from FirstBank have provided a substantial portion of our cash flow used to service the interest payments on our trust-preferred securities and other obligations. As outlined in the Written Agreement, we cannot receive any cash dividends from FirstBank without the prior written approval of our regulators. In addition, FirstBank is limited by law in its ability to make dividend payments and other distributions to us based on its earnings and capital position. Our inability to receive approval from our regulators to receive dividends from FirstBank, or FirstBank's failure to generate sufficient cash flow to make dividend payments to us, may adversely affect our ability to meet all projected cash needs in the ordinary course of business and may have a detrimental impact on our financial condition.

The Banking Law of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico requires that a minimum of 10% of FirstBank's net income for the year be transferred to legal surplus until such surplus equals the total of paid-in-capital on common and preferred stock. Amounts transferred to the legal surplus account from the retained earnings account are not available for distribution to the stockholders without the prior consent of the Puerto Rico Commissioner of Financial

Institutions. The Puerto Rico Banking Law provides that when the expenditures of a Puerto Rico commercial bank are greater than receipts, the excess of the expenditures over receipts shall be charged against the undistributed profits of the bank, and the balance, if any, shall be charged against the reserve fund, as a reduction thereof. If there is no reserve fund sufficient to cover such balance in whole or in part, the outstanding amount shall be charged against the capital account and the Bank cannot pay dividends until it can replenish the reserve fund to an amount of at least 20% of the original capital contributed. During 2016 and 2015, \$9.6 million and \$2.8 million, respectively, were transferred to the legal surplus reserve. FirstBank's legal surplus reserve amounted to \$52.4 million and \$42.8 million as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

If we do not obtain Federal Reserve approval to pay interest, principal or other sums on subordinated debentures or trust-preferred securities, a default may occur.

The Written Agreement provides that we cannot declare or pay any dividends or make any distributions of interest, principal or other sums on subordinated debentures or trust-preferred securities without prior written approval of the Federal Reserve. With respect to our outstanding subordinated debentures, we had elected to defer the interest payments that were due in quarterly periods since March 2012. However, during the second quarter of 2016, the Corporation received approval from the Federal Reserve that enabled it to pay \$31.2 million for all the accrued but deferred interest payments plus the interest for the second quarter on the Corporation's subordinated debentures associated with its trust preferred securities. Subsequently, the Corporation received approval that enabled it to pay interest for the third quarter and fourth quarters of 2016. Future interest payments are subject to Federal Reserve approval. It is the intent of the Corporation to request approvals in future periods to continue regularly scheduled quarterly interest payments, although there is no assurance that such approvals will be granted.

Under the indentures, we have the right, from time to time, and without causing an event of default, to defer payments of interest on the subordinated debentures by extending the interest payment period at any time and from time to time during the term of the subordinated debentures for up to twenty consecutive quarterly periods. We may need to elect extension periods for future quarterly interest payments if the Federal Reserve advises us that it will not approve such future quarterly interest payments. Our inability to receive approval from the Federal Reserve to make distributions of interest, principal or other sums on our trust-preferred securities and subordinated debentures could result in a default under those obligations if we need to defer such payments for longer than twenty consecutive quarterly periods.

Credit quality may result in additional losses.

The quality of our credits has continued to be under pressure as a result of continued recessionary conditions in the markets we serve that have led to, among other things, high unemployment levels, low absorption rates for new residential construction projects and further declines in property values. Our business depends on the creditworthiness of our customers and counterparties and the value of the assets securing our loans or underlying our investments. When the credit quality of the customer base materially decreases or the risk profile of a market, industry or group of customers changes materially, our business, financial condition, allowance levels, asset impairments, liquidity, capital and results of operations are adversely affected.

We have a commercial and construction loan portfolio held for investment in the amount of \$3.9 billion as of December 31, 2016. Due to their nature, these loans entail a higher credit risk than consumer and residential mortgage loans, since they are larger in size, concentrate more risk in a single borrower and are generally more sensitive to economic downturns. Furthermore, given the slowdown in the real estate market, the properties securing these loans may be difficult to dispose of if they are foreclosed. As of December 31, 2016, we had \$375.1 million in non-performing commercial and construction loans held for investment. During 2015, the Corporation increased the reserve for loan losses by approximately \$35 million related to commercial loans extended to or guaranteed by the Puerto Rico government (excluding municipalities). In addition, the Corporation recorded other-than-temporary impairment charges totaling \$22.2 million in the last two years, on Puerto Rico government debt securities as a result of the Puerto Rico government's fiscal situation, including an OTTI charge of \$6.3 million in 2016. See "Risks Relating to the Business Environment and Our Industry – The Corporation's credit quality and the value of our portfolio of Puerto Rico government securities has been and in the future may be adversely affected by Puerto Rico's economic condition and may be affected by actions taken by the Puerto Rico government or the PROMESA oversight board to address the ongoing fiscal and economic crisis in Puerto Rico." We may incur additional credit losses over the near term, either because of continued deterioration of the quality of the loans or because of sales of such loans, which would likely accelerate the recognition of losses. Any such losses would adversely impact our overall financial performance and results of operations.

Our allowance for loan and lease losses may not be adequate to cover actual losses, and we may be required to materially increase our allowance, which may adversely affect our capital, financial condition and results of operations.

We are subject to the risk of loss from loan defaults and foreclosures with respect to the loans we originate and purchase. We establish a provision for loan and lease losses, which leads to reductions in our income from operations, in order to maintain our allowance for inherent loan and lease losses at a level that our management deems to be appropriate based upon an assessment of the quality of the loan and lease portfolio. Management may fail to accurately estimate the level of inherent loan and lease losses or may have to increase our provision for loan and lease losses in the future as a result of new information regarding existing loans, future increases in non-performing loans, changes in economic and other conditions affecting borrowers or for other reasons beyond our control. In addition, the bank regulatory agencies periodically review the adequacy of our allowance for loan and lease losses and may require an increase in the provision for loan and lease losses or the recognition of additional classified loans and loan

charge-offs, based on judgments different than those of management.

The level of the allowance reflects management's estimates based upon various assumptions and judgments as to specific credit risks, evaluation of industry concentrations, loan loss experience, current loan portfolio quality, present economic, political and regulatory conditions and unidentified losses inherent in the current loan portfolio. The determination of the appropriate level of the allowance for loan and lease losses inherently involves a high degree of subjectivity and requires management to make significant estimates and judgments regarding current credit risks and future trends, all of which may undergo material changes. If our estimates prove to be incorrect, our allowance for credit losses may not be sufficient to cover losses in our loan portfolio and our expense relating to the additional provision for credit losses could increase substantially.

Any such increases in our provision for loan and lease losses or any loan losses in excess of our provision for loan and lease losses would have an adverse effect on our future financial condition and results of operations. Given the difficulties facing some of our largest borrowers, these borrowers may fail to continue to repay their loans on a timely basis or we may not be able to assess accurately any risk of loss from the loans to these borrowers. Also, additional economic weakness, which has resulted in downgrades of Puerto Rico's general obligation debt to non-investment grade, among other consequences, could require additional increases in reserves.

Changes in collateral values of properties located in stagnant or distressed economies may require increased reserves.

Further deterioration of the value of real estate collateral securing our construction, commercial and residential mortgage loan portfolios would result in increased credit losses. As of December 31, 2016, approximately 1%, 18% and 37% of our loan portfolio consisted of construction, commercial mortgage and residential real estate loans, respectively.

A substantial part of our loan portfolio is located within the boundaries of the U.S. economy. Whether the collateral is located in Puerto Rico, the USVI, the BVI, or the U.S. mainland, the performance of our loan portfolio and the collateral value backing the transactions are dependent upon the performance of and conditions within each specific real estate market. Puerto Rico has been in an economic recession since 2006. Sustained weak economic conditions that have affected Puerto Rico over the last several years have resulted in declines in collateral values.

Construction and commercial loans, mostly secured by commercial and residential real estate properties, entail a higher credit risk than consumer and residential mortgage loans since they are larger in size, may have less collateral coverage, concentrate more risk in a single borrower and are generally more sensitive to economic downturns. As of December 31, 2016, commercial mortgage and construction real estate loans amounted to \$1.7 billion or 19% of the total loan portfolio.

We measure the impairment of a loan based on the fair value of the collateral, if collateral dependent, which is generally obtained from appraisals. Updated appraisals are obtained when we determine that loans are impaired and are updated annually thereafter. In addition, appraisals are also obtained for certain residential mortgage loans on a spot basis based on specific characteristics such as delinquency levels, age of the appraisal and loan-to-value ratios. The appraised value of the collateral may decrease or we may not be able to recover collateral at its appraised value. A significant decline in collateral valuations for collateral dependent loans may require increases in our specific provision for loan losses and an increase in the general valuation allowance. Any such increase would have an adverse effect on our future financial condition and results of operations. During the year ended December 31, 2016, net charge-offs on construction, commercial mortgage and residential mortgage loan portfolios totaled \$1.5 million, \$19.6 million and \$30.7 million, respectively.

The acquisition of certain assets and deposits of Doral Bank through an alliance with another financial institution has magnified certain of the Corporation's risks and presented new risks.

On February 27, 2015, the Corporation, through an alliance with another local financial institution that was the successful lead bidder with the FDIC on the failed Doral Bank, acquired certain assets and deposits of Doral Bank. The transaction presents new risks and magnifies certain of the risks the Corporation already faces that are described in these "Risk Factors", including the following:

- risks associated with weak economic conditions in the economy and in the real estate market in Puerto Rico, which adversely affect real estate prices, the job market, consumer confidence and spending habits, which may affect, among other things, the continued status of the loans acquired as performing loans, charge-offs and provision expense;
- changes in interest rates and market liquidity, which may reduce interest margins;
- changes in market rates and prices that may adversely impact the value of financial assets and liabilities; and
- failure to realize the anticipated acquisition benefits in the amounts and within the time frames expected.

Interest rate shifts may reduce net interest income.

Shifts in short-term interest rates may reduce net interest income, which is the principal component of our earnings. Net interest income is the difference between the amounts received by us on our interest-earning assets and the interest paid by us on our interest-bearing liabilities. Differences in the re-pricing structure of our assets and liabilities may result in changes in our profits when interest rates change.

Increases in interest rates may reduce the value of holdings of securities.

Fixed-rate securities acquired by us are generally subject to decreases in market value when interest rates rise, which may require recognition of a loss (e.g., the identification of an other-than-temporary impairment on our available-for-sale investment portfolio), thereby adversely affecting our results of operations. Market-related reductions in value also influence our ability to finance these securities. Furthermore, increases in interest rates may result in an extension of the expected average life of certain fixed-income securities, such as fixed-rate pass-through mortgage-backed securities. Such an extension could exacerbate the drop in market value related to shifts in interest rates.

Increases in interest rates may reduce demand for mortgage and other loans.

Higher interest rates increase the cost of mortgage and other loans to consumers and businesses and may reduce demand for such loans, which may negatively impact our profits by reducing the amount of loan interest income.

Accelerated prepayments may adversely affect net interest income.

In general, fixed-income portfolio yields would decrease if the re-investment of pre-payment amounts is at lower rates. Net interest income could also be affected by prepayments of mortgage-backed securities. Acceleration in the prepayments of mortgage-backed securities would lower yields on these securities, as the amortization of premiums paid upon the acquisition of these securities would accelerate. Conversely, acceleration in the prepayments of mortgage-backed securities would increase yields on securities purchased at a discount, as the accretion of the discount would accelerate. These risks are directly linked to future period market interest rate fluctuations. Also, net interest income in future periods might be affected by our investment in callable securities because decreases in interest rates might prompt the early redemption of such securities.

Changes in interest rates on loans and borrowings may adversely affect net interest income.

Basis risk is the risk of adverse consequences resulting from unequal changes in the difference, also referred to as the “spread” or basis, between the rates for two or more different instruments with the same maturity and occurs when market rates for different financial instruments or the indices used to price assets and liabilities change at different times or by different amounts. For example, the interest expense for liability instruments such as brokered CDs might not change by the same amount as interest income received from loans or investments. To the extent that the interest rates on loans and borrowings change at different rates and by different amounts, the margin between our LIBOR-based assets and the higher cost of the brokered CDs might be compressed and adversely affect net interest income.

If all or a significant portion of the unrealized losses in our investment securities portfolio on our consolidated balance sheet is determined to be other-than-temporarily impaired, we would recognize a material charge to our earnings and our capital ratios would be adversely affected.

For the years ended December 31, 2014, 2015 and 2016, we recognized a total of \$0.4 million, \$16.5 million and \$6.7 million, respectively, in other-than-temporary impairments. The 2015 and 2016 impairments were primarily related to Puerto Rico government debt securities held by the Corporation, which may continue to be adversely affected by the Puerto Rico government financial difficulties. See “Risks Relating to the Business Environment and Our Industry – The Corporation’s credit quality and the value of our portfolio of Puerto Rico government securities has been and in the future may be adversely affected by Puerto Rico’s economic condition and may be affected by actions taken by the Puerto Rico government or the PROMESA oversight board to address the ongoing fiscal and economic crisis in Puerto Rico.” To the extent that any portion of the unrealized losses in our investment securities portfolio of

\$66.6 million as of December 31, 2016 is determined to be other-than-temporary and, in the case of debt securities, the loss is related to credit factors, we would recognize a charge to earnings in the quarter during which such determination is made and capital ratios could be adversely affected. Even if we do not determine that the unrealized losses associated with this portfolio require an impairment charge, increases in unrealized losses on available-for-sale securities adversely affect our tangible common equity ratio, which may adversely affect credit rating agency and investor sentiment towards us. Any negative perception also may adversely affect our ability to access the capital markets or might increase our cost of capital. Valuation and other-than-temporary impairment determinations will continue to be affected by external market factors including default rates, severity rates and macro-economic factors.

Downgrades in our credit ratings could further increase the cost of borrowing funds.

The Corporation's ability to access new non-deposit sources of funding, even if approved by the Federal Reserve, could be adversely affected by downgrades in our credit ratings. The Corporation's liquidity is to a certain extent contingent upon its ability to obtain external sources of funding to finance its operations. The Corporation's current credit ratings and any downgrades in such credit ratings can hinder the Corporation's access to new forms of external funding and/or cause external funding to be more expensive, which could in turn adversely affect results of operations. Also, changes in credit ratings may further affect the fair value of unsecured derivatives that consider the Corporation's own credit risk as part of the valuation.

Defective and repurchased loans may harm our business and financial condition.

In connection with the sale and securitization of loans, we are required to make a variety of customary representations and warranties relating to the loans sold or securitized. Our obligations with respect to these representations and warranties are generally outstanding for the life of the loan, and relate to, among other things:

- compliance with laws and regulations;
- underwriting standards;
- the accuracy of information in the loan documents and loan files; and
- the characteristics and enforceability of the loan

A loan that does not comply with these representations and warranties may take longer to sell, may impact our ability to obtain third party financing for the loan, and may not be saleable or may be saleable only at a significant discount. If such a loan is sold before we detect non-compliance, we may be obligated to repurchase the loan and bear any associated loss directly, or we may be obligated to indemnify the purchaser against any loss, either of which could reduce our cash available for operations and liquidity. Management believes that it has established controls to ensure that loans are originated in accordance with the secondary market's requirements, but mistakes may be made, or certain employees may deliberately violate our lending policies.

Our controls and procedures may fail or be circumvented, our risk management policies and procedures may be inadequate and operational risk could adversely affect our consolidated results of operations.

We may fail to identify and manage risks related to a variety of aspects of our business, including, but not limited to, operational risk, interest-rate risk, trading risk, fiduciary risk, legal and compliance risk, liquidity risk and credit risk. We have adopted and periodically improved various controls, procedures, policies and systems to monitor and manage risk. Any improvements to our controls, procedures, policies and systems, however, may not be adequate to identify and manage the risks in our various businesses. If our risk framework is ineffective, either because it fails to keep pace with changes in the financial markets or our businesses or for other reasons, we could incur losses or suffer reputational damage or find ourselves out of compliance with applicable regulatory mandates or expectations.

We may also be subject to disruptions from external events that are wholly or partially beyond our control, which could cause delays or disruptions to operational functions, including information processing and financial market settlement functions. In addition, our customers, vendors and counterparties could suffer from such events. Should these events affect us, or the customers, vendors or counterparties with which we conduct business, our consolidated results of operations could be negatively affected. When we record balance sheet reserves for probable loss contingencies related to operational losses, we may be unable to accurately estimate our potential exposure, and any reserves we establish to cover operational losses may not be sufficient to cover our actual financial exposure, which may have a material impact on our consolidated results of operations or financial condition for the periods in which we recognize the losses.

Cyber-attacks, system risks and data protection breaches could present significant reputational, legal and regulatory costs.

First BanCorp. is under continuous threat of cyber-attacks especially as we continue to expand customer services via the internet and other remote service channels. Three of the most significant cyber-attack risks that we face are e-fraud, denial-of-service and computer intrusion that might result in loss of sensitive customer data. Loss from

e-fraud occurs when cybercriminals breach and extract funds from customer bank accounts. Denial-of-service disrupts services available to our customers through our on-line banking system. Computer intrusion attempts might result in the breach of sensitive customer data, such as account numbers and social security numbers, and any cyber-attacks could present significant reputational, legal and/or regulatory costs to the Corporation if successful. Our risk and exposure to these matters remains heightened because of the evolving nature and complexity of the threats from organized cybercriminals and hackers, and our plans to continue to provide electronic banking services to our customers.

If personal, non-public, confidential or proprietary information of our customers in our possession were to be mishandled or misused, we could suffer significant regulatory consequences, reputational damage and financial loss. Such mishandling or misuse could include, for example, the erroneous provision of information to parties who are not permitted to have the information, either by fault of our systems, employees, or counterparties, or the interception or other inappropriate use of such information by third parties.

We rely on other companies to perform key aspects of our business infrastructure.

Third parties perform key aspects of our business operations such as data processing, information security, recording and monitoring transactions, online banking interfaces and services, internet connections and network access. While we believe that we have selected these third party vendors carefully, we do not control their actions. Any problems caused by these third parties, including those resulting from disruptions in communication services provided by a vendor, failure of a vendor to handle current or higher volumes, failure of a vendor to provide services for any reason, the provision by a vendor of poor performance of services, or failure of a vendor to notify us of a reportable event, could adversely affect our ability to deliver products and services to our customers and otherwise conduct our business. Financial or operational difficulties of a third party vendor could also hurt our

operations if those difficulties interfere with the vendor's ability to serve us. Replacing these third party vendors could also create significant delay and expense. Accordingly, use of such third parties creates an inherent risk to our business operations.

Hurricanes and other weather-related events could cause a disruption in our operations or other consequences that could have an adverse impact on our results of operations.

Our operations are located in regions susceptible to hurricanes. Such weather events can cause disruption to our operations and could have a material adverse effect on our overall results of operations. While we maintain hurricane insurance, including coverage for lost profits and extra expense, there is no insurance against the disruption to the markets that we serve that a catastrophic hurricane could produce. Further, a hurricane in any of our market areas could adversely impact the ability of borrowers to timely repay their loans and may adversely impact the value of any collateral held by us. The severity and impact of future hurricanes and other weather-related events are difficult to predict and may be exacerbated by global climate change. The effects of future hurricanes and other weather-related events could have an adverse effect on our business, financial condition or results of operations.

Competition for our executives and other key employees is intense, and we may not be able to attract and retain the highly skilled people we need to support our business.

Our success depends, in large part, on our ability to attract and retain key people. Competition for the best people in most activities in which we engage can be intense, and we may not be able to hire people or retain them, particularly in light of uncertainty concerning compensation restrictions applicable to banks but not applicable to other financial services firms. The unexpected loss of services of one or more of our key personnel could adversely affect our business because of the loss of their skills, knowledge of our markets and years of industry experience and, in some cases, because of the difficulty of promptly finding qualified replacement employees. Similarly, the loss of our executives or other key employees, either individually or as a group, could result in a loss of customer confidence in our ability to execute banking transactions on their behalf.

As a TARP recipient, we are subject to the executive compensation provisions of the EESA, including amendments to such provisions implemented under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, which limit the types of compensation arrangements that the Corporation may enter into with our most senior leaders. Our competitors may be in an advantageous position to retain and attract senior leaders since we are the only institution in Puerto Rico that is currently subject to TARP-related compensation provisions. Our compensation practices are subject to review and oversight by the Federal Reserve Board. We also may be subject to limitations on compensation practices by the FDIC or other regulators, which may or may not affect our competitors. Limitations on our compensation practices could have a negative impact on our ability to attract and retain talented senior leaders in support of our long term strategy.

Our compensation practices are subject to oversight by the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC. Any deficiencies in our compensation practices may be incorporated into our supervisory ratings, which can affect our ability to make acquisitions or perform other actions. In addition, the regulation of our compensation practices may change in the future.

Our compensation practices are subject to oversight by the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC. As discussed above, the Corporation currently is subject to the executive compensation restrictions as a TARP recipient and the 2010 interagency guidance governing the incentive compensation activities of regulated banks and bank holding

companies. Our failure to satisfy these restrictions and guidelines could expose us to adverse regulatory criticism, lowered supervisory ratings, and restrictions on our operations and acquisition activities. In addition, the federal banking agencies have proposed new regulations under the Dodd-Frank Act that place restrictions on the incentive compensation practices of banking organizations with \$1 billion or more in assets.

The scope and content of the U.S. banking regulators' policies on executive compensation are continuing to develop and are likely to continue evolving in the near future. It cannot be determined at this time whether compliance with such policies will adversely affect the ability of the Corporation and its subsidiaries to hire, retain and motivate their key employees.

Further increases in the FDIC deposit insurance premium or in FDIC required reserves may have a significant financial impact on us.

The FDIC insures deposits at FDIC-insured depository institutions up to certain limits (currently, \$250,000 per depositor account). The FDIC charges insured depository institutions premiums to maintain the Deposit Insurance Fund (the "DIF"). In the event of a bank failure, the FDIC takes control of a failed bank and, if necessary, pays all insured deposits up to the statutory deposit insurance limits using the resources of the DIF. The FDIC is required by law to maintain adequate funding of the DIF, and the FDIC may increase premium assessments to maintain such funding.

The Dodd-Frank Act requires the FDIC to increase the DIF's reserves against future losses, which will require institutions with assets greater than \$10 billion, such as FirstBank, to bear an increased responsibility for funding the prescribed reserve to support the DIF. Among other things, the Dodd-Frank Act requires the FDIC to bolster the DIF by increasing the required reserve ratio for the industry to 1.35 percent (ratio of reserves to insured deposits) by September 30, 2020.

The FDIC's revised rule on deposit insurance assessments implements a provision in the Dodd-Frank Act that changes the assessment base for deposit insurance premiums from one based on domestic deposits to one based on average consolidated total assets minus average Tier 1 capital. The rule changes the assessment rate schedules for insured depository institutions so that approximately the same amount of revenue would be collected under the new assessment base as would be collected under the previous rate schedule and the schedules previously proposed by the FDIC. The rule also revises the risk-based assessment system for all large insured depository institutions (generally, institutions with at least \$10 billion in total assets, such as FirstBank). Under the rule, the FDIC uses a scorecard method to calculate assessment rates for all such institutions.

In March 2016, the FDIC adopted a final rule imposing a quarterly deposit insurance assessment surcharge on banks with at least \$10 billion in assets of 4.5 cents per \$100 of their assessment base, after making certain adjustments once the Deposit Insurance Fund Reserve Ratio reaches or exceeds 1.15 percent. For purposes of this surcharge, the first \$10 billion of assets are subtracted from the regular insurance assessment base to determine the surcharge base. The assessment surcharge became effective on July 1, 2016, is assessed as of the third quarter of 2016 and subsequent periods, and applies to FirstBank. The Bank's current surcharge base is slightly higher than the \$10 billion threshold. The surcharge assessments will continue through December 31, 2018 or until the Deposit Insurance Fund Reserve Ratio reaches or exceeds 1.35 percent. In addition, under existing regulations, the FDIC reduced the initial base assessment rate, which reduces the standard risk-based assessment rate. This resulted in a decrease in the total FDIC insurance premium expense (standard risk-based assessment plus assessment surcharge expense) of approximately \$1.6 million in the second half of 2016, as the benefit of the reduction in the initial base assessment rate exceeded the surcharge amount. In addition, under the Final Rule, if the Deposit Insurance Fund Reserve Ratio does not reach 1.35 percent by December 31, 2018, a shortfall assessment may be assessed on large banks in the first quarter of 2019 and collected by the FDIC on June 30, 2019. The FDIC also adopted a final rule raising its industry target ratio of reserves to insured deposits to 2 percent, 65 basis points above the statutory minimum, but the FDIC does not project that goal to be met for several years.

The FDIC may further increase FirstBank's premiums or impose additional assessments or prepayment requirements in the future. The Dodd-Frank Act has removed the statutory cap for the reserve ratio, leaving the FDIC free to set this cap going forward.

Our businesses may be adversely affected by litigation.

From time to time, our customers, or the government on their behalf, may make claims and take legal action relating to our performance of fiduciary or contractual responsibilities. We may also face employment lawsuits or other legal claims. In any such claims or actions, demands for substantial monetary damages may be asserted against us, resulting in financial liability or an adverse effect on our reputation among investors or on customer demand for our products and services. We may be unable to accurately estimate our exposure to litigation risk when we record balance sheet reserves for probable loss contingencies. As a result, reserves we establish to cover any settlements or judgments may not be sufficient to cover our actual financial exposure, which has occurred in the past and may again occur, resulting in a material adverse impact on our consolidated results of operations or financial condition.

In the ordinary course of our business, we are also subject to various regulatory, governmental and law enforcement inquiries, investigations and subpoenas. These may be directed generally to participants in the businesses in which we are involved or may be specifically directed at us. In regulatory enforcement matters, claims for disgorgement, the imposition of penalties and the imposition of other remedial sanctions are possible.

In the past, following periods of volatility in the market price of a company's securities, securities class action litigation has often been instituted. A securities class action suit against us could result in substantial costs, potential liabilities and the diversion of management's attention and resources.

The resolution of legal actions or regulatory matters, when unfavorable, has had and could in the future have a material adverse effect on our consolidated results of operations for the quarter in which such actions or matters are resolved or a reserve is established.

Our businesses may be negatively affected by adverse publicity or other reputational harm.

Our relationships with many of our customers are predicated upon our reputation as a fiduciary and a service provider that adheres to the highest standards of ethics, service quality and regulatory compliance. Adverse publicity, regulatory actions, like the Written Agreement, litigation, operational failures, the failure to meet customer expectations and other issues with respect to one or more of our businesses could materially and adversely affect our reputation, or our ability to attract and retain customers or obtain sources of funding for the same or other businesses. Preserving and enhancing our reputation also depends on maintaining systems and procedures that address known risks and regulatory requirements, as well as our ability to identify and mitigate additional risks that arise due to changes in our businesses, the market places in which we operate, the regulatory environment and customer expectations. If we fail to promptly address matters that bear on our reputation, our reputation may be materially adversely affected and our business will suffer.

Changes in accounting standards issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board may adversely affect our financial statements.

Our financial statements are subject to the application of U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”), which are periodically revised and expanded. Accordingly, from time to time, we are required to adopt new or revised accounting standards issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board (“FASB”). The FASB has issued several financial accounting and reporting

standards that will govern key aspects of the Corporation's financial statements or interpretations thereof when those standards become effective, including those areas where the Corporation is required to make assumptions or estimates. For example, the FASB's new accounting standard on credit losses, which will become effective for the Corporation on January 1, 2020, will require earlier recognition of credit losses on financial assets. The new accounting model requires that lifetime "expected credit losses" of financial assets not recorded at fair value through net income, such as loans and held-to-maturity securities, be recorded at inception of the financial asset, replacing the multiple existing impairment model under GAAP which generally require that a loss be "incurred" before it is recognized. For additional information on this and other accounting standards, see Note 1 to the Consolidated Financial Statements.

Changes to financial accounting or reporting standards or interpretations, whether promulgated or required by the FASB or other regulators, could present operational challenges and could require the Corporation to change certain of the assumptions or estimates it previously used in preparing its financial statements, which could negatively impact how it records and reports its financial condition and results of operations generally and/or with respect to particular businesses. For additional information on the key areas for which assumption and estimates are used in preparing the Corporation's financial statements, see Note 1 to the Consolidated Financial Statements.

Any impairment of our goodwill or amortizable intangible assets may adversely affect our operating results.

If our goodwill or amortizable intangible assets become impaired, we may be required to record a significant charge to earnings. Under GAAP, we review our amortizable intangible assets for impairment when events or changes in circumstances indicate the carrying value may not be recoverable.

Goodwill is tested for impairment at least annually. Factors that may be considered a change in circumstances, indicating that the carrying value of the goodwill or amortizable intangible assets may not be recoverable, include reduced future cash flow estimates and slower growth rates in the industry.

The goodwill impairment evaluation process requires us to make estimates and assumptions with regards to the fair value of our reporting units. Actual values may differ significantly from these estimates. Such differences could result in future impairment of goodwill that would, in turn, negatively impact our results of operations and the reporting unit where the goodwill is recorded. We conducted our most recent evaluation of goodwill during the fourth quarter of 2016.

The Step 1 evaluation of goodwill allocated to the Florida reporting unit under our valuation approaches (market and discounted cash flow analyses) indicated that the fair value of the unit was above the carrying amount of its equity book value as of the valuation date (October 1), which meant that Step 2 was not undertaken. Goodwill with a carrying value of \$28.1 million was not impaired as of December 31, 2016 or 2015, nor was any goodwill written off due to impairment during 2016, 2015, and 2014. If we are required to record a charge to earnings in our consolidated financial statements because an impairment of the goodwill or amortizable intangible assets is determined, our results of operations could be adversely affected.

Recognition of deferred tax assets is dependent upon the generation of future taxable income by the Bank.

As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had a deferred tax asset of \$281.7 million (net of a valuation allowance of \$207.2 million), including \$171.5 million associated with FirstBank's Net Operating Losses ("NOLs"). Under Puerto Rico law, the Corporation and its subsidiaries, including FirstBank, are treated as separate taxable entities and are not entitled to file consolidated tax returns. To obtain the full benefit of the applicable deferred tax asset attributable to NOLs, FirstBank must have sufficient taxable income within the applicable carry forward period (7 years for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2005, 12 years for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2004 and before January 1, 2013, and 10 years for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012). The Bank incurred all of its

NOLs on or after 2009. Accounting for income taxes requires that companies assess whether a valuation allowance should be recorded against their deferred tax asset based on an assessment of the amount of the deferred tax asset that is more likely than not to be realized.

The Corporation recorded a partial reversal of its valuation allowance in the amount of \$302.9 million in the fourth quarter of 2014. The Corporation's valuation allowance as of December 31, 2016 amounted to \$207.2 million. Due to significant estimates utilized in determining the valuation allowance and the potential for changes in facts and circumstances, it is reasonably possible that, in the future, the Corporation will not be able to reverse the remaining valuation allowance or that the Corporation will need to increase its current deferred tax asset valuation allowance.

The Corporation's judgments regarding tax accounting policies and the resolution of tax disputes may impact the Corporation's earnings and cash flow.

Significant judgment is required in determining the Corporation's effective tax rate and in evaluating its tax positions. The Corporation provides for uncertain tax positions when such tax positions do not meet the recognition thresholds or measurement criteria prescribed by applicable GAAP.

Fluctuations in federal, state, local and foreign taxes or a change to uncertain tax positions, including related interest and penalties, may impact the Corporation's effective tax rate. When particular tax matters arise, a number of years may elapse before such matters are audited and finally resolved. In addition, tax positions may be challenged by the Puerto Rico Department of Treasury ("PRTD"),

the United States Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) and the tax authorities in the jurisdictions in which we operate and we may estimate and provide for potential liabilities that may arise out of tax audits to the extent that uncertain tax positions fail to meet the recognition standard under applicable GAAP. Unfavorable resolution of any tax matter could increase the effective tax rate and could result in a material increase in our tax expense. Resolution of a tax issue may require the use of cash in the year of resolution.

We must respond to rapid technological changes, and these changes may be more difficult or expensive than anticipated.

If competitors introduce new products and services embodying new technologies, or if new industry standards and practices emerge, our existing product and service offerings, technology and systems may become obsolete. Further, if we fail to adopt or develop new technologies or to adapt our products and services to emerging industry standards, we may lose current and future customers, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. The financial services industry is changing rapidly and, in order to remain competitive, we must continue to enhance and improve the functionality and features of our products, services and technologies. These changes may be more difficult or expensive than we anticipate.

RISKS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT AND OUR INDUSTRY

Continuation of the economic slowdown and decline in the real estate market in Puerto Rico could continue to harm our results of operations.

The residential mortgage loan origination business has historically been cyclical, enjoying periods of strong growth and profitability followed by periods of shrinking volumes and industry-wide losses. The market for residential mortgage loan originations has declined over the past few years and this trend may continue to reduce the level of mortgage loans we produce in the future and adversely affect our business. During periods of rising interest rates, the refinancing of many mortgage products tends to decrease as the economic incentives for borrowers to refinance their existing mortgage loans are reduced. In addition, the residential mortgage loan origination business is impacted by home values.

The actual rates of delinquencies, foreclosures and losses on loans have been higher during the economic slowdown. Rising unemployment, volatile interest rates and declines in housing prices have had a negative effect on the ability of borrowers to repay their mortgage loans. Any sustained period of increased delinquencies, foreclosures or losses could continue to harm our ability to sell loans, the prices we receive for loans, the values of mortgage loans held for sale or residual interests in securitizations, which could continue to harm our financial condition and results of operations. In addition, any additional material decline in real estate values would further weaken the collateral loan-to-value ratios and increase the possibility of loss if a borrower defaults. In such event, we will be subject to the risk of loss on such real estate arising from borrower defaults to the extent not covered by third-party credit enhancement.

The Corporation’s credit quality and the value of our portfolio of Puerto Rico government securities has been and in the future may be adversely affected by Puerto Rico’s economic condition and may be affected by actions taken by the Puerto Rico government or the PROMESA oversight board to address the ongoing fiscal and economic crisis in Puerto Rico.

A significant portion of our financial activities and credit exposure is concentrated in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which has been in an economic recession since 2006. Based on the most recent information available, the main economic indicators suggest that the Puerto Rico economy remains weak. For fiscal years 2017 and 2018, the Puerto

Rico government projects a continued economic contraction in the Commonwealth's GNP of 2.2% and 2.8%, respectively, while the GDB-EAI in December 2016 decreased 2.9% on a year-over-year basis to 121.1, the lowest number in 25 years. The GDB-EAI is a coincident index of economic activity for Puerto Rico made up of four indicators (non-farm payroll employment, electric power generation, cement sales and gasoline consumption). The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in Puerto Rico was 12.4% in December 2016, which is higher than in any U.S. state. Puerto Rico population decreased by an estimated 6.8% from 2010-2015, driven primarily by falling birth rate, a rising death rate, and migration to the United States mainland, according to the U.S. census data.

Based on information published by the Puerto Rico government, General Fund net revenues for the fiscal year 2015-2016 totaled approximately \$9.175 billion, a year-over-year increase of \$214.4 million. Fiscal year revenues were \$116.7 million below revised estimates. General Fund net revenues for the first semester of fiscal year 2017 were \$3.97 billion, an increase of \$75 million year-over-year, and exceeded estimates by approximately \$77 million.

On April 6, 2016, the Puerto Rico Emergency Moratorium and Financial Rehabilitation Act was enacted, which gives Puerto Rico's governor emergency powers to deal with the challenging fiscal situation, including the ability to declare a moratorium on any debt payment. Puerto Rico's governor also issued an executive order intended to protect the GDB's liquidity by allowing withdrawals only to fund necessary costs for essential services such as health, public safety and education services.

On June 30, 2016, pursuant to the debt moratorium law, the Puerto Rico governor ordered a moratorium on the payment of \$780 million of the Puerto Rico government's general obligations and guaranteed debt, along with the payment obligations of certain other issuers. The Puerto Rico government has continued to default on general obligation bonds, including the payment due on January 1, 2017. This followed a default on the principal payment of \$367 million of GDB notes due on May 1, 2016. On August 1, 2016, the GDB defaulted on a \$28 million payment of interest due to its creditors, including interest due on GDB bonds held by the Corporation. The GDB

default marked the first time the GDB, or any other Puerto Rico agency or instrumentality, failed to pay interest on Puerto Rico government bonds held by the Corporation. On October 1, 2016, the Puerto Rico Public Buildings Authority failed to make a full payment of interest due on its obligation bonds, including bonds held by the Corporation. Generally, based on specific facts and circumstances of the issuer, a default event requires us to classify the defaulted bonds as a non-performing asset. Accordingly, during the third quarter of 2016, bonds of the GDB and the Puerto Rico Public Buildings Authority with an aggregate fair value as of December 31, 2016 of \$20.5 million (\$35.6 million- amortized cost, including accrued interest of \$0.9 million) were classified as non-performing and placed in non-accrual status by the Corporation. These bonds are held as part of the available-for-sale securities portfolio. In the first quarter of 2016, the Corporation recorded a \$6.3 million OTTI charge on the aforementioned bonds of the GDB and the Puerto Rico Public Buildings Authority. This was the third OTTI charge on these securities recorded since June 30, 2015, as OTTI charges of \$12.9 million and \$3.0 million were booked in the second and fourth quarters of 2015. The credit-related impairment loss estimates were based on the probability of default and loss severity in the event of default in consideration of the latest available information about the Puerto Rico government's financial condition, including the enactment of a debt moratorium law and the declaration of a state of emergency at the GDB, the issuance of the GDB and the Commonwealth's audited financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, as well as issuance of exchange proposals with the Commonwealth's creditors related to its outstanding bond obligations. In addition to bonds of the GDB and the Puerto Rico Public Buildings Authority, the Corporation owns bonds of the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority in the aggregate amount of \$7.9 million carried on the Corporation's books at the aggregate fair value of \$6.3 million, which are current as to contractual payments as of December 31, 2016.

On June 30, 2016, President Obama signed HR5278 Bill, PROMESA, which established an oversight board, a process for restructuring debt, and expedited procedures for approving critical infrastructure projects in order to address the Puerto Rico government fiscal situation. The independent seven-member oversight board that was appointed by the House of Representatives, Senate and President Obama pursuant to PROMESA has fiscal oversight over Puerto Rico's finances for an initial term of five years. This marks the largest federal intervention ever into the U.S. municipal bond market. PROMESA enables Puerto Rico to restructure its debt. The PROMESA oversight board had its first meeting on September 30, 2016, and its term will expire once Puerto Rico has posted four structurally balanced budgets in a row and is deemed to have adequate access to the capital markets. The PROMESA oversight board has the power to approve or reject the general government's proposed budgets until the oversight board is satisfied that the budgets are structurally responsible and based on reasonable expectations and accounting standards.

During their first meeting, the PROMESA oversight board announced the designation of a number of entities as covered entities under PROMESA, including the Commonwealth, all of its public corporations and retirement systems, the University of Puerto Rico and all affiliates and subsidiaries of the foregoing. The designation of an entity as a covered entity has various implications under PROMESA. First, it means that the Governor will have to submit such entity's annual budgets and, if the PROMESA oversight board so requests, its fiscal plans, to the PROMESA oversight board for its review and approval. Second, covered territorial instrumentalities may not issue debt or guarantee, exchange, modify, repurchase, redeem, or enter into similar transactions with respect to their debts without the prior approval of the PROMESA oversight board. Third, pursuant to certain contracting guidelines approved by the PROMESA oversight board, prior PROMESA oversight board approval is required in connection with any transaction undertaken by a covered entity that (i) is outside the ordinary course of business or (ii) has a material financial impact. Finally, covered entities could also potentially be eligible to use the restructuring procedures provided by PROMESA. The first, Title VI, is a largely out-of-court process through which a government entity and its financial creditors can agree on terms to restructure such entity's debt. If a supermajority of creditors of a certain

category agree, that agreement can bind all other creditors in such category. The second, Title III, draws on the federal bankruptcy code and provides a court-supervised process for a comprehensive restructuring led by the PROMESA oversight board.

PROMESA contains many provisions that, although similar to the provisions of Chapter 9 or other chapters of the United States Bankruptcy Code, are not identical and may not be interpreted in the same manner. Puerto Rico's economy may be adversely affected by expenditures cuts or revenue raising measures implemented as a result of PROMESA. An increase in the tax burden of Puerto Rico residents may aggravate the population decline and economic recession. Additionally austerity measures that further reduce governmental expenditures or services, may also increase the rate at which residents leave and reduce the disposable income of residents of Puerto Rico. This decline may, in turn, lead to a decrease in economy activity that will affect the government's ability to collect revenues as projected. Holders of bonds issued by the Commonwealth and its instrumentalities may be subject to voluntary or involuntary haircuts of interest or principal or both on their bonds as a result of one of the two methods to restructure Puerto Rico's debt contained in PROMESA.

PROMESA also created a bipartisan Congressional Task Force on Economic Growth in Puerto Rico. The Task Force consists of an eight-member panel of Congressional members that will review federal laws and programs to improve Puerto Rico's economy. The Task Force submitted a report during December 2016 with over 75 recommendations to Congress to jump start Puerto Rico's economy that included dealing with Medicaid, competitive tax treatment for U.S. subsidiaries, granting child tax credits and increasing loans for small businesses and the rum cover-over tax. They also stated that if the government conducts a plebiscite authorized by Congress, they would analyze and take any appropriate legislative action. As of the date of submission of this Form 10-K, the U.S. Congress has not taken action on any of the recommendations in the report.

On November 8, 2016, a new governor of Puerto Rico was elected and assumed office in January 2017. In addition a new Resident Commissioner was designated to represent Puerto Rico in the U.S. House of Representatives. Since taking office, Puerto Rico's governor signed an executive order reducing spending by 10%, created an expedited process for infrastructure projects, implemented a zero-based budgeting methodology, introduced several bills to promote economic development and outlined several labor reforms aimed at reducing the cost of doing business in Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico's governor also signed an extension to an excise tax on foreign manufacturers which contributes a significant amount of revenue to the general fund. Furthermore, Puerto Rico's governor signed the "Financial Emergency and Fiscal Responsibility Act," which replaces the prior administration's debt moratorium with a new approach that segregates revenues available after the payment of essential services to pay debt service.

In January 2017, the PROMESA oversight board sent a letter to the Puerto Rico governor outlining a minimum of \$4.5 billion in fiscal measures that would need to be included in the government's next fiscal plan in order for the PROMESA oversight board to certify the fiscal plan, which is the first step before negotiations with creditors can occur. In response to the Puerto Rico governor's request for more time to develop a fiscal plan, the PROMESA oversight board established a number of milestones and conditions it would require if the then-current deadlines were extended. On January 28, 2017, the PROMESA oversight board officially extended various deadlines including moving to (i) February 28, 2017 the deadline for the updated fiscal plan, (ii) March 15, 2017 for the PROMESA oversight board to certify the fiscal plan and (iii) May 1, 2017 for the stay on debt-related litigation. On February 28, 2017, the Puerto Rico governor submitted to the PROMESA oversight board the Puerto Rico government fiscal plan which, among other initiatives, calls for significant reductions in operational expenses and subsidies for municipalities and the University of Puerto Rico. The plan, which relies on significant change in economic assumptions vis a vis the baseline, projects a surplus before debt service of \$11.6 billion in the aggregate during the ten year projection period (against \$35.1 billion in contractual debt service). Estimated savings under the fiscal plan of \$3.8 billion fall short of the \$4.5 billion figure the PROMESA oversight board recommended. This initial fiscal plan was rejected by the PROMESA oversight board, which claimed the proposal relied on overly optimistic baseline revenue assumptions, economic projections and forecasted savings resulting from measures to reduce public expenditures. A revised fiscal plan was submitted by the Puerto Rico governor on March 11, 2017, including \$262 million in additional revenue and changes to healthcare funding. On March 13, 2017, the PROMESA oversight board certified the revised fiscal plan, provided that two amendments are made. One amendment would institute the PROMESA oversight board's earlier proposal for furloughing most government employees four days a month, with two days for teachers and none for law enforcement officers, by July 1st, 2017 (the beginning of fiscal year 2018), and eliminate the annual Christmas bonus for government workers if the Puerto Rico government does not come up with plans to increase liquidity by \$200 million and implement its plan to "right-size" its operations in a fiscal year 2018 budget proposal by April 30th. If it does, the cost-savings measures would be delayed until September 1st. A further determination would then be made as to whether the savings measures are needed or to what extent needed. The other amendment would require an agreement between the Puerto Rico government and the PROMESA oversight board to reduce pension costs 10% by 2020 to be reached within 30 days and finalized by June 30th.

With respect to the PREPA, on December 23, 2015, PREPA and more than 70% of its creditors reached an agreement on an RSA that would provide, among other things, for a restructuring of some of PREPA's outstanding debt at 85 cents on the dollar. The RSA also included a BPA whereby certain of those creditors would purchase new bonds to be issued by PREPA. The implementation of the RSA would provide the basis for PREPA to provide more reliable and lower-cost service, fund its capital needs for the medium term, help ensure environmental compliance, diversify generation resources to include more natural gas, and provide jobs.

Legislation to establish the necessary securitization framework for the new PREPA debt was passed on February 16, 2016. In June 2016, the Puerto Rico Energy Commission approved a "transition" charge to PREPA customers that will secure the new debt that will be issued to facilitate the PREPA restructuring. In May and June of 2016, certain bondholders purchased \$115 million of bonds pursuant to the BPA. The BPA was amended in late June and

bondholders purchased another \$264 million on June 30, 2016. Following the BPA amendment, PREPA made the full principal and interest payment due on July 1, 2016. On January 1, 2017, PREPA made its full interest payment and did so without requiring any type of BPA

On January 27, 2017, the AAFAF notified all creditors involved that it was extending the January 31, 2017 expiration date of the RSA until March 31, 2017. In addition, AAFAF also notified the parties together with its financial advisors Rothchild, that it would lead negotiations with PREPA creditors.

As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had \$323.3 million of direct exposure to the Puerto Rico government, its municipalities and public corporations, compared to \$360.7 million as of December 31, 2015. Approximately \$191.9 million of the exposure consisted of loans and obligations of municipalities in Puerto Rico that are supported by assigned property tax revenues and for which, in most cases, the good faith, credit and unlimited taxing power of the applicable municipality have been pledged to their repayment. Approximately 89% of the Corporation's municipality exposure consists primarily of senior priority obligations concentrated in five of the largest municipalities in Puerto Rico (San Juan, Carolina, Bayamon, Mayaguez and Guaynabo). These municipalities are required by law to levy special property taxes in such amounts as shall be required for the payment of all of their respective general obligation bonds and loans. Although the PROMESA oversight board has not designated any of the Commonwealth's 78 municipalities as covered entities under PROMESA, it may decide to do so in the future. While the fiscal plan submitted by the Puerto Rico governor to the PROMESA oversight board on February 28, 2017 did not contemplate a restructuring of the debt of Puerto

Rico's municipalities, the plan did call for the gradual elimination of budgetary subsidies provided to municipalities, which constitute a material portion of the operating revenues of certain municipalities. The PROMESA oversight board had previously expressly called for the elimination of these budgetary subsidies as part of any certified fiscal plan. Furthermore, municipalities are also likely to be affected by the negative economic and other effects resulting from expense, revenue or cash management measures taken to address the Puerto Rico government's fiscal and liquidity shortfalls. In addition to municipalities, the total exposure to the Puerto Rico government entities covered by PROMESA included \$6.9 million of loans to units of the Puerto Rico central government, and approximately \$81.9 million consisted of loans to public corporations (entities covered by PROMESA), including the direct exposure to PREPA with a book value of \$65.5 million as of December 31, 2016 that was sold in the first quarter of 2017 as described above. See "Significant Events Since the Beginning of 2016 – Sale of the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority Loan". The PREPA credit facility was placed in non-accrual status in the first quarter of 2015, and interest payments recorded on a cost-recovery basis. The Corporation's total direct exposure also includes obligations of the Puerto Rico government with an amortized cost of \$42.7 million as part of its available-for-sale investment securities portfolio, net of \$22.2 million in cumulative OTTI charges, and recorded at a fair value of \$26.8 million as of December 31, 2016.

Furthermore, as of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had \$127.7 million outstanding (book value of \$111.8 million) in credit facilities extended to the hotel industry in Puerto Rico under which the borrower and the operations of the underlying collateral are the primary sources of repayment and the TDF provides a secondary guarantee for payment performance, compared to \$129.4 million outstanding as of December 31, 2015. The TDF is a subsidiary of the GDB that facilitates private sector financings to Puerto Rico's hotel industry. Adverse developments related to the Puerto Rico government's fiscal situation introduced additional uncertainty regarding the TDF's ability to honor its guarantee, including the enactment of Act 21. These facilities were placed in non-accrual status and classified as impaired in the first quarter of 2016, and interest payments are now applied against principal. The Corporation has been receiving payments on the largest of these three facilities sufficient to cover the monthly contractual payments. This facility matured on February 1, 2017 and is currently under renegotiation. In addition, the borrowers' cash flows related to the other two facilities are insufficient to cover debt service and the Corporation is not receiving collections from the TDF guarantee. As such, these two facilities are collateral dependent loans and charge-offs amounting to \$13.9 million were recorded during the second half of 2016, of which \$13.0 million was charged against reserves established in prior periods. These loans have been adversely classified since the third quarter of 2015. As of December 31, 2016, the loans guaranteed by the TDF are being carried at 72% of unpaid principal balance, net of reserves and accumulated charge-offs. The Corporation measures impairment on these loans based on the fair value of the collateral and the existence of the government guarantee. Developments of the Puerto Rico government debt restructuring process, with the automatic stay on litigations under PROMESA set to expire on May 1, 2017, and actions taken or those that may have to be taken by the Commonwealth or the PROMESA oversight board to address Puerto Rico's fiscal and economic crisis could ultimately adversely affect the value of the Puerto Rico government guarantees, including the TDF guarantee. If as a result of developments, including discussions with regulators, loan rating downgrades, progress in the debt restructuring process, or for other reasons, the Corporation determines that additional impairment charges are necessary, such an action would adversely affect the Corporation's results of operations in the period in which such determination is taken.

In addition, the Corporation had \$119.9 million in exposure to residential mortgage loans that are guaranteed by the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority. Residential mortgage loans guaranteed by the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority are secured by the underlying properties and the guarantees serve to cover shortfalls in collateral in the event of a borrower default. The Puerto Rico government guarantees up to \$75 million of the principal guaranteed

under the mortgage loans insurance program. According to the most recently released audited financial statements of the Puerto Rico Housing Financing Authority, as of June 30, 2015, the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority's mortgage loans insurance program covered loans aggregating approximately \$552 million. The regulations adopted by the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority require the establishment of adequate reserves to guarantee the solvency of the mortgage loans insurance fund. As of June 30, 2015, the most recent date as to which information is available, the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority had a restricted net position for such purposes of approximately \$77.4 million.

Furthermore, as of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had \$408.8 million of public sector deposits in Puerto Rico. Approximately 28% is from municipalities and municipal agencies in Puerto Rico and 72% is from public corporations and the central government and agencies in Puerto Rico.

The decline in Puerto Rico's economy since 2006 has resulted in, among other things, a decline in our loan originations, an increase in the level of our non-performing assets, higher loan loss provisions and charge-offs, and an increase in the rate of foreclosure loss on mortgage loans, all of which adversely affected our profitability. During the next four fiscal years, the Commonwealth expects to confront various events that may significantly reduce its revenues or increase its expenditures. To the extent the Commonwealth is unable to address these events, its ability to continue operating and providing essential services to its population may be severely compromised. Any further potential deterioration of economic activity could result in further adverse effects on our profitability and credit quality.

Continuation of the economic slowdown and decline in the U.S. Virgin Islands could continue to harm our results of operations.

The fiscal health of the government of the USVI over the past 10 years has shown signs of deterioration evidenced by persistent budgetary deficits and projected future revenue shortfalls. The accumulated deficit position in the general fund at the end of the fiscal

year 2015 was in excess of \$74 million and the annual deficit for fiscal year 2016 is projected to be nearly \$14 million. In addition to the general fund situation, the USVI is also experiencing growth in its unfunded actuarial accrued liability.

The government of the USVI has developed a five-year financial plan, designed to return the general fund to fiscal stability. The fiscal stabilization plan includes a number of revenue enhancement initiatives as well as reductions to government operating expenses. Many of the USVI government's revenue enhancement initiatives are subject to legislative approval and are in the form of tax increases which could potentially have an adverse effect on the economy. The fiscal stabilization plan is also predicated on access of the government to the financial markets in order to issue deficit financing to cover the operating deficits for 2017 and 2018, which is uncertain.

As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation has total exposure to the USVI government and its instrumentalities of \$84.7 million. All loans are currently performing and up to date with its principal and interest payments.

Difficult market conditions have affected the financial industry and may adversely affect us in the future.

Given that most of our business is in Puerto Rico and the United States and given the degree of interrelation between Puerto Rico's economy and that of the United States, we are exposed to downturns in the U.S. economy, including factors such as unemployment and underemployment levels in the United States and real estate valuations. The deterioration of these conditions could adversely affect the credit performance of mortgage loans, credit default swaps and other derivatives, and result in significant write-downs of asset values by financial institutions, including government-sponsored entities as well as major commercial banks and investment banks.

Despite improving labor markets in the U.S. in the past year, an elevated amount of underemployment and household debt, the volatile interest rate environment, along with a continued sluggish recovery in the consumer real estate market and certain commercial real estate markets in the U.S., pose challenges for the U.S. economic performance and the financial services industry.

In particular, we may face the following risks:

- Our ability to assess the creditworthiness of our customers may be impaired if the models and approaches we use to select, manage, and underwrite the loans become less predictive of future behaviors.
- The models used to estimate losses inherent in the credit exposure require difficult, subjective, and complex judgments, including forecasts of economic conditions and how these economic predictions might impair the ability of the borrowers to repay their loans, which may no longer be capable of accurate estimation and which may, in turn, impact the reliability of the models.
- Our ability to borrow from other financial institutions or to engage in sales of mortgage loans to third parties (including mortgage loan securitization transactions with government-sponsored entities and repurchase agreements) on favorable terms, or at all, could be adversely affected by further disruptions in the capital markets or other events, including deteriorating investor expectations.
- Competitive dynamics in the industry could change as a result of consolidation of financial services companies in connection with current market conditions.
- We expect to face increased regulation of our industry. Compliance with such regulation may increase our costs and limit our ability to pursue business opportunities.

- There may be downward pressure on our stock price.

The deterioration of economic conditions in the U.S. and disruptions in the financial markets could adversely affect our ability to access capital, our business, financial condition and results of operations and our ability to comply with the Written Agreement, which could result in further regulatory enforcement actions.

The failure of other financial institutions could adversely affect us.

Our ability to engage in routine funding transactions could be adversely affected by future failures of financial institutions and the actions and commercial soundness of other financial institutions. Financial institutions are interrelated as a result of trading, clearing, counterparty and other relationships. We have exposure to different industries and counterparties and routinely execute transactions with counterparties in the financial services industry, including brokers and dealers, commercial banks, investment banks, investment companies and other institutional clients. In certain of these transactions, we are required to post collateral to secure the obligations to the counterparties. In the event of a bankruptcy or insolvency proceeding involving one of such counterparties, we may experience delays in recovering the assets posted as collateral, or we may incur a loss to the extent that the counterparty was holding collateral in excess of the obligation to such counterparty, such as the loss of our assets that we pledged to Lehman Brothers, Inc., which we have been trying to recover, so far unsuccessfully.

In addition, many of these transactions expose us to credit risk in the event of a default by our counterparty or client. In addition, the credit risk may be exacerbated when the collateral held by us cannot be realized or is liquidated at prices not sufficient to recover

the full amount of the loan or derivative exposure due to us. Any losses resulting from our routine funding transactions may materially and adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations.

Legislative and regulatory actions taken now or in the future may increase our costs and impact our business, governance structure, financial condition or results of operations.

We and our subsidiaries are subject to extensive regulation by multiple regulatory bodies. These regulations may affect the manner and terms of delivery of our services. If we do not comply with governmental regulations, we may be subject to fines, penalties, lawsuits or material restrictions on our businesses in the jurisdiction where the violation occurred, which may adversely affect our business operations. Changes in these regulations can significantly affect the services that we are asked to provide as well as our costs of compliance with such regulations. In addition, adverse publicity and damage to our reputation arising from the failure or perceived failure to comply with legal, regulatory or contractual requirements could affect our ability to attract and retain customers.

The financial crisis of 2008 resulted in government regulatory agencies and political bodies placing increased focus and scrutiny on the financial services industry. The U.S. government intervened on an unprecedented scale, responding by temporarily enhancing the liquidity support available to financial institutions, establishing a commercial paper funding facility, temporarily guaranteeing money market funds and certain types of debt issuances and increasing insurance on bank deposits.

These programs have subjected financial institutions, particularly those participating in TARP, to additional restrictions, oversight and costs. In addition, new proposals for legislation are periodically introduced in the U.S. Congress that could further substantially increase regulation of the financial services industry, impose restrictions on the operations and general ability of firms within the industry to conduct business consistent with historical practices, including in the areas of interest rates, financial product offerings and disclosures, and have an effect on bankruptcy proceedings with respect to consumer residential real estate mortgages, among other things. Federal and state regulatory agencies also frequently adopt changes to their regulations or change the manner in which existing regulations are applied.

Financial deregulation measures proposed by the Trump administration and members of the U.S. Congress may create regulatory uncertainty for the financial sector, increase competition in certain of our investment strategies and adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

The Trump administration's short-term legislative agenda may include certain deregulatory measures for the U.S. financial services industry including changes to the Volcker Rule, the U.S. Risk Retention Rules, Basel III capital requirements, the FSOC's authority and other aspects of the Dodd-Frank Act. On February 3, 2017, President Trump signed an executive order calling for the administration to review U.S. financial laws and regulations in order to determine their consistency with a set of core principles identified in the order. One bill, the Financial CHOICE Act (the "CHOICE Act"), which was sponsored by Rep. Jeb Hensarling last year but was not enacted, is being discussed as an avenue for amending the Dodd-Frank Act and may be subject to revisions and reintroduction in the current session of Congress. The most recent version of the CHOICE Act would eliminate the power of the FSOC to designate non-bank financial institutions as systematically important, repeal the Volcker Rule and change the structure and powers of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. In addition, the CHOICE Act would allow certain qualifying banking organizations with a satisfactory composite supervisory rating and a non-risk weighted leverage ratio of at least 10% to elect to be exempt from enhanced risk-weighted capital ratios, liquidity requirements and other regulations currently applicable to large banking organizations, and would revise the U.S. Risk Retention Rules to remove the risk retention requirement for all asset-backed securitizations other than for certain non-qualifying residential mortgage securitizations. The CHOICE Act also would significantly alter stress testing, possibly exempting qualifying banking organizations from stress tests altogether and eliminating the Federal Reserve Board's

ability to make “qualitative” objections to capital plans submitted by other banking organizations. In addition, the CHOICE Act would also significantly enhance the SEC’s enforcement capabilities and increase the maximum civil penalties and criminal sanctions under federal securities laws, including under the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.

Whether the CHOICE Act will be enacted, and, if so, whether additional amendments would be added during the legislative process remains unclear. However, the results of the recent elections have increased the likelihood that the CHOICE Act or similar financial reform legislation will be enacted. In addition, in the absence of legislative change, the Trump administration may influence the substance of regulatory supervision through, among other things, the appointment of individuals to the Federal Reserve Board. As a result of the recent notice of resignation by one member of the Federal Reserve Board, President Trump is expected to soon be able to nominate persons to fill three of the Federal Reserve Board’s seven seats, including a Vice Chairman for Supervision. In turn, the nomination of new Federal Reserve Board members by Mr. Trump may increase the likelihood that the Federal Reserve Board will depart from adopting capital and liquidity requirements for U.S. banking organizations that are more stringent than those that have been agreed upon at the international level, including the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision’s Basel III framework.

Measures focused on deregulation of the U.S. financial services industry may have the effect of increasing competition for our credit-focused businesses or otherwise reducing investment opportunities. Increased competition from banks and other financial institutions in the credit markets could have the effect of reducing credit spreads, which may adversely affect the revenues of our credit and other businesses whose strategies including the provision of credit to borrowers.

Determining the full extent of the impact on us of any such potential financial reform legislation, or whether any such particular proposal will become law, at this point in time is highly speculative. However, any such changes may impose additional costs on us, require the attention of our senior management or result in limitations on the manner in which business is conducted.

We could be adversely affected by changes in tax laws and regulations or the interpretation of such laws and regulations.

The Corporation and its subsidiaries are subject to Puerto Rico income tax laws on their income from all sources. As Puerto Rico corporations, First BanCorp. and its subsidiaries are treated as foreign corporations for U.S. and USVI income tax purposes and are generally subject to U.S. and USVI income tax only on their income from sources within the U.S. and USVI or income effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in those regions. These tax laws are complex and subject to different interpretations. We must make judgments and interpretations about the application of these inherently complex tax laws when determining our provision for income taxes, our deferred tax assets and liabilities, and our valuation allowance. In addition, legislative changes, particularly changes in tax laws, could adversely impact our results of operations.

Financial services legislation and regulatory reforms may have a significant impact on our business and results of operations and on our credit ratings.

The Corporation faces increased regulation and regulatory scrutiny as a result of, among other things, its participation in the Troubled Assets Relief Program. The U.S. Treasury acquired shares of common stock from the Corporation in October 2011 in exchange for shares of preferred stock that it owned because of the Corporation's issuance of preferred stock to U.S. Treasury in January 2009 pursuant to the TARP. In July 2010, the Corporation issued to U.S. Treasury a warrant, which amends, restates and replaces the original warrant that it issued to U.S. Treasury in January 2009 under the TARP. The Corporation's participation in the TARP also imposes limitations on the payments it may make to its senior leaders. For more details on the implications of TARP please refer to the risks factors titled as follow: "Competition for our executives and other key employees is intense, and we may not be able to attract and retain the highly skilled people we need to support our business" above.

As discussed above, the Dodd-Frank Act significantly changed the regulation of financial institutions and the financial services industry. The Dodd-Frank Act includes, and the regulations developed and to be developed thereunder include or will include, provisions affecting large and small financial institutions alike. In addition, U.S. banking organizations, including the Corporation and FirstBank, are subject to new and more stringent regulatory capital requirements that generally increase the amounts of capital that we need to hold.

As of December 31, 2016, the Corporation had \$210 million in trust preferred securities that are now subject to the full phase-out from Tier 1 capital under the final regulatory capital rules discussed above.

Although First BanCorp. and FirstBank were able to meet well-capitalized capital ratios upon implementation of the requirements, and we expect both companies will continue to exceed the minimum risk-based and leverage capital ratio requirements for well-capitalized status under the new capital rules, we may not remain well capitalized.

Additional regulatory proposals and legislation, if finally adopted, could change banking laws and our operating environment and that of our subsidiaries in substantial and unpredictable ways. The ultimate effect that such legislation, if enacted, or regulations would have upon our financial condition or results of operations may be adverse.

We are subject to regulatory capital adequacy guidelines, and if we fail to meet these guidelines our business and financial condition will be adversely affected.

Under regulatory capital adequacy guidelines, and other regulatory requirements, the Corporation and our banking subsidiary must meet guidelines that include quantitative measures of assets, liabilities and certain off balance sheet items, subject to qualitative judgments by regulators regarding components, risk weightings and other factors. If we fail to meet these minimum capital guidelines and other regulatory requirements, our business and financial condition will be materially and adversely affected. If we fail to maintain certain capital levels, or are deemed not well managed under regulatory exam procedures, or if we experience certain regulatory violations, our status as a financial holding company, and our ability to offer certain financial products will be compromised and our financial condition and results of operations could be adversely affected.

Rulemaking changes implemented by the CFPB will result in higher regulatory and compliance costs related to originating and servicing residential mortgage loans and may adversely affect our results of operations.

The Dodd-Frank Act significantly changed the regulation of single-family residential mortgage lending in the United States. Among other things, the law transferred rule-making and enforcement powers from a number of federal agencies to the CFPB, imposed new risk retention and recordkeeping requirements on lenders (such as the Bank) that sell single-family residential mortgage loans in the secondary market, required revision of disclosure documents, limited loan originator compensation and expanded recordkeeping and reporting requirements under other federal statutes.

New regulations implement the Dodd-Frank Act amendments to the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, the Truth in Lending Act, and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act. See “Regulation and Supervision – Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.”

Among other consequences of these numerous changes, the requirements relating to the evaluation of the borrower’s ability to repay the loan may result in reduced credit availability and higher borrowing costs to cover the costs of compliance. The ability of borrowers to raise new defenses in foreclosure proceedings on defaulted mortgage loans also may lead to increased foreclosure costs, extend foreclosure timeliness, and increase the severity of loan losses. Increased repurchase and indemnity requests with respect to mortgage loans sold into the secondary markets may also result.

These and other changes required by the Dodd-Frank Act have required substantial modifications to the entire mortgage lending and servicing industry. Their impact may involve changes to our operations and increased compliance costs in making single-family residential mortgage loans. There are new laws and regulations that come into effect in 2017 and 2018 affecting the residential mortgage business and commercial business which may cause us to incur additional increased regulatory and compliance costs. Notwithstanding the above, the new administration has expressed its disagreement with the burden of new regulations and requirements. In addition, House Financial Services Committee Chairman Jeb Hensarling issued a press release on January 26, 2017 stating that replacing the Dodd-Frank Act is a top administration and congressional priority. At this point, however, it is uncertain whether any of these regulatory burdens will be relaxed.

Compliance with stress testing requirements may be challenging.

The Corporation is currently subject to supervisory guidance for stress testing practices issued by the federal banking agencies. The current guidance outlines broad principles for a satisfactory stress testing framework and describes various stress testing approaches and how stress testing should be used at various levels within an organization. As previously discussed, the Corporation is also subject to two new stress testing rules that implement provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act, one issued by the Federal Reserve Board that applies to First BanCorp. on a consolidated basis and one issued by the FDIC that applies to the Bank.

The Corporation submitted its second annual company-run stress test to regulators in July 2016, which was published in October 2016.

Future public disclosure of stress test results could result in reputational harm if the Corporation’s results are worse than those of its competitors or otherwise indicate that the Corporation’s risk profile is excessive or elevated. Furthermore, given that the Corporation will be subject to multiple stress testing requirements that are administered at different levels by more than one federal banking agency, and compliance with such requirements will be

complicated, if the Corporation fails to fully comply with these requirements, it may be subject to regulatory action.

Monetary policies and regulations of the Federal Reserve Board could adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In addition to being affected by general economic conditions, our earnings and growth are affected by the policies of the Federal Reserve Board. An important function of the Federal Reserve Board is to regulate the money supply and credit conditions. Among the instruments used by the Federal Reserve Board to implement these objectives are open market operations in U.S. government securities, adjustments of the discount rate and changes in reserve requirements against bank deposits. These instruments are used in varying combinations to influence overall economic growth and the distribution of credit, bank loans, investments and deposits. Their use also affects interest rates charged on loans or paid on deposits.

The monetary policies and regulations of the Federal Reserve Board have had a significant effect on the operating results of commercial banks in the past and are expected to continue to do so in the future. The effects of such policies upon our business, financial condition and results of operations may be adverse.

We are subject to numerous laws designed to protect consumers, including the Community Reinvestment Act and fair lending laws, and failure to comply with these laws could lead to a wide variety of sanctions.

The Community Reinvestment Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, the Fair Housing Act and other fair lending laws and regulations impose nondiscriminatory lending requirements on financial institutions. The Department of Justice and other federal agencies are responsible for enforcing these laws and regulations. A successful regulatory challenge to an institution's performance under the Community Reinvestment Act or fair lending laws and regulations could result in a wide variety of sanctions, including damages and civil money penalties, injunctive relief, restrictions on mergers and acquisitions activity, restrictions on expansion and

restrictions on entering new business lines. Private parties may also have the ability to challenge an institution's performance under fair lending laws in private class action litigation. Such actions could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We face a risk of noncompliance and enforcement action related to the Bank Secrecy Act and other anti-money laundering statutes and regulations.

The Bank Secrecy Act, the USA PATRIOT Act and other laws and regulations require financial institutions, among other duties, to institute and maintain an effective anti-money laundering program and file suspicious activity and currency transaction reports as appropriate. The Financial Crimes Enforcement Network is authorized to impose significant civil money penalties for violations of those requirements and has recently engaged in coordinated enforcement efforts with the individual f