

TRUSTMARK CORP
Form 10-Q
August 05, 2016

UNITED STATES

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

Form 10-Q

☒ QUARTERLY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the quarterly period ended June 30, 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 000-03683

Trustmark Corporation

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Mississippi 64-0471500
(State or other jurisdiction of (I.R.S. Employer
incorporation or organization) Identification No.)

248 East Capitol Street, Jackson, Mississippi 39201
(Address of principal executive offices) (Zip Code)

(601) 208-5111

(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

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 ☐

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, 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 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 of the Exchange Act.

Large accelerated filer ☒ Accelerated filer ☐
Non-accelerated filer ☐ (Do not check if a smaller reporting company) Smaller reporting company ☐

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

As of July 31, 2016, there were 67,624,853 shares outstanding of the registrant’s common stock (no par value).

Forward-Looking Statements

Certain statements contained in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q constitute forward-looking statements within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. You can identify forward-looking statements by words such as “may,” “hope,” “will,” “should,” “expect,” “plan,” “anticipate,” “intend,” “believe,” “estimate,” “predict,” “potential,” “could,” “future” or the negative of those terms or other words of similar meaning. You should read statements that contain these words carefully because they discuss our future expectations or state other “forward-looking” information. These forward-looking statements include, but are not limited to, statements relating to anticipated future operating and financial performance measures, including net interest margin, credit quality, business initiatives, growth opportunities and growth rates, among other things, and encompass any estimate, prediction, expectation, projection, opinion, anticipation, outlook or statement of belief included therein as well as the management assumptions underlying these forward-looking statements. You should be aware that the occurrence of the events described under the caption “Risk Factors” in Trustmark’s filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission could have an adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition. Should one or more of these risks materialize, or should any such underlying assumptions prove to be significantly different, actual results may vary significantly from those anticipated, estimated, projected or expected.

Risks that could cause actual results to differ materially from current expectations of Management include, but are not limited to, changes in the level of nonperforming assets and charge-offs, local, state and national economic and market conditions, including conditions in the housing and real estate markets in the regions in which Trustmark operates and the extent and duration of the current volatility in the credit and financial markets as well as crude oil prices, changes in our ability to measure the fair value of assets in our portfolio, material changes in the level and/or volatility of market interest rates, the performance and demand for the products and services we offer, including the level and timing of withdrawals from our deposit accounts, the costs and effects of litigation and of unexpected or adverse outcomes in such litigation, our ability to attract noninterest-bearing deposits and other low-cost funds, competition in loan and deposit pricing, as well as the entry of new competitors into our markets through de novo expansion and acquisitions, economic conditions, including the potential impact of issues relating to the European financial system and monetary and other governmental actions designed to address the level and volatility of interest rates and the volatility of securities, currency and other markets, the enactment of legislation and changes in existing regulations or enforcement practices or the adoption of new regulations, changes in accounting standards and practices, including changes in the interpretation of existing standards, that affect our consolidated financial statements, changes in consumer spending, borrowings and savings habits, technological changes, changes in the financial performance or condition of our borrowers, changes in our ability to control expenses, changes in our compensation and benefit plans, including those associated with the planned termination of our noncontributory tax-qualified defined benefit pension plan, greater than expected costs or difficulties related to the integration of acquisitions or new products and lines of business, cyber-attacks and other breaches which could affect our information system security, natural disasters, environmental disasters, acts of war or terrorism, and other risks described in our filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Although we believe that the expectations reflected in such forward-looking statements are reasonable, we can give no assurance that such expectations will prove to be correct. Except as required by law, we undertake no obligation to update or revise any of this information, whether as the result of new information, future events or developments or otherwise.

PART I. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

ITEM 1. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Trustmark Corporation and Subsidiaries

Consolidated Balance Sheets

(\$ in thousands)

	(Unaudited)	
	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Assets		
Cash and due from banks (noninterest-bearing)	\$322,049	\$277,751
Federal funds sold and securities purchased under reverse repurchase agreements	3,198	250
Securities available for sale (at fair value)	2,388,306	2,345,422
Securities held to maturity (fair value: \$1,210,044-2016; \$1,195,367-2015)	1,173,204	1,187,818
Loans held for sale (LHFS)	213,546	160,189
Loans held for investment (LHFI)	7,405,181	7,091,385
Less allowance for loan losses, LHFI	71,796	67,619
Net LHFI	7,333,385	7,023,766
Acquired loans:		
Noncovered loans	325,196	372,711
Covered loans	13,839	17,700
Less allowance for loan losses, acquired loans	12,480	11,992
Net acquired loans	326,555	378,419
Net LHFI and acquired loans	7,659,940	7,402,185
Premises and equipment, net	192,732	195,656
Mortgage servicing rights	62,814	74,007
Goodwill	366,156	366,156
Identifiable intangible assets	24,058	27,546
Other real estate, excluding covered other real estate	69,502	77,177
Covered other real estate	388	1,651
FDIC indemnification asset	—	738
Other assets	554,456	562,350
Total Assets	\$13,030,349	\$12,678,896
Liabilities		
Deposits:		
Noninterest-bearing	\$2,921,016	\$2,998,694
Interest-bearing	6,610,508	6,589,536
Total deposits	9,531,524	9,588,230
Federal funds purchased and securities sold under repurchase agreements	606,336	441,042
Short-term borrowings	360,434	412,617
Long-term FHLB advances	751,106	501,155
Subordinated notes	49,985	49,969

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Junior subordinated debt securities	61,856	61,856
Other liabilities	145,641	150,970
Total Liabilities	11,506,882	11,205,839
Shareholders' Equity		
Common stock, no par value:		
Authorized: 250,000,000 shares		
Issued and outstanding: 67,623,601 shares - 2016; 67,559,128 shares - 2015	14,090	14,076
Capital surplus	364,516	361,467
Retained earnings	1,157,025	1,142,908
Accumulated other comprehensive loss, net of tax	(12,164)	(45,394)
Total Shareholders' Equity	1,523,467	1,473,057
Total Liabilities and Shareholders' Equity	\$13,030,349	\$12,678,896

See notes to consolidated financial statements.

Trustmark Corporation and Subsidiaries

Consolidated Statements of Income

(\$ in thousands except per share data)

(Unaudited)

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
Interest Income				
Interest and fees on LHFS & LHFI	\$73,745	\$68,167	\$146,031	\$134,378
Interest and fees on acquired loans	8,051	12,557	15,073	27,635
Interest on securities:				
Taxable	19,402	19,731	39,488	39,317
Tax exempt	929	1,097	1,902	2,260
Interest on federal funds sold and securities purchased under reverse repurchase agreements	4	2	5	2
Other interest income	200	392	430	785
Total Interest Income	102,331	101,946	202,929	204,377
Interest Expense				
Interest on deposits	3,122	3,204	6,160	6,451
Interest on federal funds purchased and securities sold under repurchase agreements	404	179	835	322
Other interest expense	2,428	1,614	4,817	3,263
Total Interest Expense	5,954	4,997	11,812	10,036
Net Interest Income	96,377	96,949	191,117	194,341
Provision for loan losses, LHFI	2,596	1,033	4,839	2,818
Provision for loan losses, acquired loans	607	825	1,916	1,172
Net Interest Income After Provision for Loan Losses	93,174	95,091	184,362	190,351
Noninterest Income				
Service charges on deposit accounts	11,051	11,920	22,132	23,005
Bank card and other fees	7,436	7,416	14,354	14,178
Mortgage banking, net	6,721	9,481	15,420	18,446
Insurance commissions	9,638	9,401	18,231	18,017
Wealth management	8,009	7,758	15,416	15,748
Other, net	1,372	(433)	2,260	(1,488)
Security losses, net	—	—	(310)	—
Total Noninterest Income	44,227	45,543	87,503	87,906
Noninterest Expense				
Salaries and employee benefits	67,018	57,393	124,219	114,562
Services and fees	14,522	15,005	28,997	29,126
Net occupancy - premises	5,928	6,243	12,116	12,434
Equipment expense	5,896	5,903	11,990	11,877

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

ORE/Foreclosure expense	1,193	921	1,374	2,036
FDIC assessment expense	2,959	2,615	5,770	5,555
Other expense	12,663	12,186	24,657	23,892
Total Noninterest Expense	110,179	100,266	209,123	199,482
Income Before Income Taxes	27,222	40,368	62,742	78,775
Income taxes	5,719	9,766	14,236	19,025
Net Income	\$21,503	\$30,602	\$48,506	\$59,750
Earnings Per Share				
Basic	\$0.32	\$0.45	\$0.72	\$0.88
Diluted	\$0.32	\$0.45	\$0.72	\$0.88
Dividends Per Share				
	\$0.23	\$0.23	\$0.46	\$0.46

See notes to consolidated financial statements.

Trustmark Corporation and Subsidiaries

Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Income

(\$ in thousands)

(Unaudited)

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
Net income per consolidated statements of income	\$21,503	\$30,602	\$48,506	\$59,750
Other comprehensive income, net of tax:				
Unrealized gains (losses) on available for sale securities and transferred securities:				
Unrealized holding gains (losses) arising during the period	5,787	(13,951)	27,612	(2,565)
Less: adjustment for net losses realized in net income	—	—	191	—
Change in net unrealized holding loss on securities transferred to held to maturity	1,836	1,021	3,518	1,895
Pension and other postretirement benefit plans:				
Net change in prior service costs	39	38	77	77
Recognized net loss due to lump sum settlement	1,388	296	1,649	553
Change in net actuarial loss	540	751	1,085	1,505
Derivatives:				
Change in the accumulated loss on effective cash flow hedge derivatives	(277)	174	(1,097)	(434)
Less: adjustment for loss realized in net income	96	130	195	260
Other comprehensive income (loss), net of tax	9,409	(11,541)	33,230	1,291
Comprehensive income	\$30,912	\$19,061	\$81,736	\$61,041

See notes to consolidated financial statements.

Trustmark Corporation and Subsidiaries

Consolidated Condensed Statements of Changes in Shareholders' Equity

(\$ in thousands)

(Unaudited)

	2016	2015
Balance, January 1,	\$1,473,057	\$1,419,940
Net income per consolidated statements of income	48,506	59,750
Other comprehensive income, net of tax	33,230	1,291
Common stock dividends paid	(31,301)	(31,294)
Common stock issued-net, long-term incentive plan	(949)	(842)
Repurchase and retirement of common stock	(750)	—
Excess tax expense from stock-based compensation arrangements	(126)	(217)
Compensation expense, long-term incentive plan	1,800	1,781
Balance, June 30,	\$1,523,467	\$1,450,409

See notes to consolidated financial statements.

Trustmark Corporation and Subsidiaries

Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows

(\$ in thousands)

(Unaudited)

	Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015
Operating Activities		
Net income per consolidated statements of income	\$48,506	\$59,750
Adjustments to reconcile net income to net cash provided by operating activities:		
Provision for loan losses, net	6,755	3,990
Depreciation and amortization	17,679	18,529
Net amortization of securities	4,273	4,355
Securities losses, net	310	—
Gains on sales of loans, net	(8,071)	(8,828)
Deferred income tax (benefit) provision	(2,100)	9,700
Proceeds from sales of loans held for sale	598,752	588,771
Purchases and originations of loans held for sale	(646,487)	(617,089)
Originations of mortgage servicing rights	(7,211)	(8,157)
Increase in bank-owned life insurance	(2,429)	(2,370)
Net (increase) decrease in other assets	(8,963)	10,464
Net decrease in other liabilities	(857)	(2,427)
Other operating activities, net	16,110	(1,015)
Net cash provided by operating activities	16,267	55,673
Investing Activities		
Proceeds from calls and maturities of securities held to maturity	141,881	62,454
Proceeds from calls and maturities of securities available for sale	213,709	218,337
Proceeds from sales of securities available for sale	24,693	—
Purchases of securities held to maturity	(121,931)	(48,946)
Purchases of securities available for sale	(240,482)	(328,576)
Net proceeds from bank-owned life insurance	604	655
Net (increase) decrease in federal funds sold and securities purchased under reverse repurchase agreements	(2,948)	1,885
Net (increase) decrease in member bank stock	(6)	3,815
Net (increase) decrease in loans	(272,617)	65,186
Purchases of premises and equipment	(5,135)	(6,062)
Proceeds from sales of premises and equipment	155	2,895
Proceeds from sales of other real estate	17,101	22,453
Purchases of software	(3,576)	(4,490)
Investments in tax credit and other partnerships	(46)	(116)
Net cash used in investing activities	(248,598)	(10,510)

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Financing Activities

Net (decrease) increase in deposits	(56,706)	93,816
Net increase in federal funds purchased and securities sold under repurchase agreements	165,294	33,919
Net decrease in short-term borrowings	(49,734)	(201,421)
Payments on long-term FHLB advances	(48)	(47)
Proceeds from long-term FHLB advances	250,000	—
Common stock dividends	(31,301)	(31,294)
Common stock issued-net, long-term incentive plan	—	(842)
Repurchase and retirement of common stock	(750)	—
Excess tax expense from stock-based compensation arrangements	(126)	(217)
Net cash provided by (used in) financing activities	276,629	(106,086)
Increase (Decrease) in cash and cash equivalents	44,298	(60,923)
Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of period	277,751	315,973
Cash and cash equivalents at end of period	\$ 322,049	\$ 255,050

See notes to consolidated financial statements.

Trustmark Corporation and Subsidiaries

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements

(Unaudited)

Note 1 – Business, Basis of Financial Statement Presentation and Principles of Consolidation

Trustmark Corporation (Trustmark) is a bank holding company headquartered in Jackson, Mississippi. Through its subsidiaries, Trustmark operates as a financial services organization providing banking and financial solutions to corporate institutions and individual customers through 194 offices in Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee and Texas.

The consolidated financial statements include the accounts of Trustmark and all other entities in which Trustmark has a controlling financial interest. All significant intercompany accounts and transactions have been eliminated in consolidation.

The accompanying unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements have been prepared in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) for interim financial information and with the instructions to Form 10-Q and Article 10 of Regulation S-X. Accordingly, they do not include all of the information and footnotes required by GAAP for complete financial statements and should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements, and notes thereto, included in Trustmark's 2015 Annual Report on Form 10-K.

Operating results for the interim periods disclosed herein are not necessarily indicative of the results that may be expected for a full year or any future period. In the opinion of Management, all adjustments (consisting of normal recurring accruals) considered necessary for the fair presentation of these consolidated financial statements have been included. The preparation of financial statements in conformity with these accounting principles requires Management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and income and expense during the reporting periods and the related disclosures. Although Management's estimates contemplate current conditions and how they are expected to change in the future, it is reasonably possible that in 2016 actual conditions could vary from those anticipated, which could affect Trustmark's financial condition and results of operations. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Note 2 – Securities Available for Sale and Held to Maturity

The following tables are a summary of the amortized cost and estimated fair value of securities available for sale and held to maturity at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	Securities Available for Sale				Securities Held to Maturity			
	Amortized Cost	Gross Gains	Gross (Losses)	Estimated Fair Value	Amortized Cost	Gross Gains	Gross (Losses)	Estimated Fair Value
June 30, 2016								
U.S. Government agency obligations								
Issued by U.S. Government agencies	\$61,262	\$ 501	\$(404)	\$61,359	\$—	\$—	\$—	\$—
Issued by U.S. Government sponsored agencies	257	29	—	286	31,142	1,774	—	32,916
Obligations of states and political subdivisions	125,268	4,020	(3)	129,285	53,473	3,010	(1)	56,482
Mortgage-backed securities								
Residential mortgage pass-through securities								
Guaranteed by GNMA	28,633	670	(21)	29,282	16,415	650	—	17,065
Issued by FNMA and FHLMC	420,789	7,753	—	428,542	42,267	847	—	43,114
Other residential mortgage-backed securities								
Issued or guaranteed by FNMA, FHLMC or GNMA	1,444,582	30,448	(673)	1,474,357	824,175	22,830	(1)	847,004

Commercial
mortgage-backed
securitiesIssued or
guaranteed by
FNMA,FHLMC or
GNMA

	256,631	8,621	(57)	265,195	205,732	7,874	(143)	213,463
Total	\$2,337,422	\$52,042	\$(1,158)	\$2,388,306	\$1,173,204	\$36,985	\$(145)	\$1,210,044

December 31, 2015

U.S. Government
agency obligations

Issued by U.S.

Government
agencies

Issued by U.S.

Government
sponsored

	258	23	—	281	101,782	3,282	—	105,064
--	-----	----	---	-----	---------	-------	---	---------

Obligations of
states and political

subdivisions	134,719	3,922	(32)	138,609	55,892	2,918	—	58,810
--------------	---------	-------	-------	---------	--------	-------	---	--------

Mortgage-backed
securitiesResidential
mortgage
pass-through

securities

Guaranteed by

GNMA

Issued by FNMA

and FHLMC

Other residential

mortgage-backed

securities

Issued or
guaranteed by
FNMA,FHLMC or
GNMACommercial
mortgage-backed
securities

	278,429	2,689	(1,892)	279,226	182,401	1,700	(1,164)	182,937
--	---------	-------	----------	---------	---------	-------	----------	---------

Issued or
guaranteed by
FNMA,

FHLMC or
GNMA

Asset-backed
securities and
structured

financial products	25,003	79	(125)	24,957	—	—	—	—
Total	\$2,339,562	\$ 20,164	\$(14,304)	\$2,345,422	\$1,187,818	\$ 13,504	\$(5,955)	\$1,195,367

During 2013, Trustmark reclassified approximately \$1.099 billion of securities available for sale to securities held to maturity. The securities were transferred at fair value, which became the cost basis for the securities held to maturity. At the date of transfer, the net unrealized holding loss on the available for sale securities totaled approximately \$46.6 million (\$28.8 million, net of tax). The net unrealized holding loss is amortized over the remaining life of the securities as a yield adjustment in a manner consistent with the amortization or accretion of the original purchase premium or discount on the associated security. There were no gains or losses recognized as a result of the transfer. At June 30, 2016, the net unamortized, unrealized loss on the transferred securities included in accumulated other comprehensive loss in the accompanying balance sheet totaled approximately \$28.3 million (\$17.5 million, net of tax).

Temporarily Impaired Securities

The tables below include securities with gross unrealized losses segregated by length of impairment at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	Less than 12 Months Gross		12 Months or More Gross		Total	Gross	
	Estimated	Unrealized	Estimated	Unrealized	Estimated	Unrealized	
	Fair Value	Losses	Fair Value	Losses	Fair Value	Losses	
June 30, 2016							
U.S. Government agency obligations							
Issued by U.S. Government agencies	\$13,093	\$ (117)	\$25,060	\$ (287)	\$38,153	\$ (404)	
Obligations of states and political subdivisions	1,277	(2)	973	(2)	2,250	(4)	
Mortgage-backed securities							
Residential mortgage pass-through securities							
Guaranteed by GNMA	3,273	(12)	1,738	(9)	5,011	(21)	
Other residential mortgage-backed securities							
Issued or guaranteed by FNMA, FHLMC or							
GNMA	56	—	118,346	(674)	118,402	(674)	
Commercial mortgage-backed securities							
Issued or guaranteed by FNMA, FHLMC or							
GNMA	4,481	(57)	11,096	(143)	15,577	(200)	
Total	\$22,180	\$ (188)	\$157,213	\$ (1,115)	\$179,393	\$ (1,303)	

December 31, 2015

U.S. Government agency obligations							
Issued by U.S. Government agencies	\$18,924	\$ (81)	\$30,591	\$ (653)	\$49,515	\$ (734)	
Obligations of states and political subdivisions	4,289	(12)	2,842	(20)	7,131	(32)	
Mortgage-backed securities							
Residential mortgage pass-through securities							

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Guaranteed by GNMA	20,300	(222)	1,863	(16)	22,163	(238)
Issued by FNMA and FHLMC	82,177	(313)	—	—	82,177	(313)
Other residential mortgage-backed securities						
Issued or guaranteed by FNMA, FHLMC or						
GNMA	1,135,533	(8,832)	238,152	(6,929)	1,373,685	(15,761)
Commercial mortgage-backed securities						
Issued or guaranteed by FNMA, FHLMC or						
GNMA	238,668	(2,902)	11,090	(154)	249,758	(3,056)
Asset-backed securities and structured financial						
products	6,778	(125)	—	—	6,778	(125)
Total	\$1,506,669	\$(12,487)	\$284,538	\$(7,772)	\$1,791,207	\$(20,259)

The unrealized losses shown above are due to increases in market rates over the yields available at the time of purchase of the underlying securities and not credit quality. Because Trustmark does not intend to sell these securities and it is more likely than not that Trustmark will not be required to sell the investments before recovery of their amortized cost bases, which may be maturity, Trustmark does not consider these investments to be other-than-temporarily impaired at June 30, 2016. There were no other-than-temporary impairments for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015.

Security Gains and Losses

Gains and losses as a result of calls and dispositions of securities, as well as any associated proceeds, were as follows for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
Available for Sale				
Proceeds from calls and sales of securities	\$ —	\$ —	\$24,693	\$ —
Gross realized gains	—	—	32	—
Gross realized (losses)	—	—	(342)	—

Realized gains and losses are determined using the specific identification method and are included in noninterest income as security losses, net.

Securities Pledged

Securities with a carrying value of \$2.033 billion and \$2.157 billion at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, respectively, were pledged to collateralize public deposits and securities sold under repurchase agreements and for other purposes as permitted by law. At both June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, none of these securities were pledged under the Federal Reserve Discount Window program to provide additional contingency funding capacity.

Contractual Maturities

The amortized cost and estimated fair value of securities available for sale and held to maturity at June 30, 2016, by contractual maturity, are shown below (\$ in thousands). Expected maturities may differ from contractual maturities because borrowers may have the right to call or prepay obligations with or without call or prepayment penalties.

	Securities		Securities	
	Available for Sale		Held to Maturity	
	Amortized	Estimated	Amortized	Estimated
	Cost	Fair Value	Cost	Fair Value
Due in one year or less	\$30,086	\$30,373	\$6,000	\$6,067
Due after one year through five years	106,107	110,221	40,461	42,006
Due after five years through ten years	3,127	3,221	38,154	41,325
Due after ten years	47,467	47,115	—	—
	186,787	190,930	84,615	89,398
Mortgage-backed securities	2,150,635	2,197,376	1,088,589	1,120,646
Total	\$2,337,422	\$2,388,306	\$1,173,204	\$1,210,044

Note 3 – Loans Held for Investment (LHFI) and Allowance for Loan Losses, LHFI

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, LHFI consisted of the following (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Loans secured by real estate:		
Construction, land development and other land	\$718,438	\$824,723
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	1,620,013	1,649,501
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	1,900,784	1,736,476
Other real estate secured	323,734	211,228
Commercial and industrial loans	1,466,511	1,343,211
Consumer loans	166,436	169,135
State and other political subdivision loans	805,401	734,615
Other loans	403,864	422,496
LHFI	7,405,181	7,091,385
Less allowance for loan losses, LHFI	71,796	67,619
Net LHFI	\$7,333,385	\$7,023,766

Loan Concentrations

Trustmark does not have any loan concentrations other than those reflected in the preceding table, which exceed 10% of total LHFI. At June 30, 2016, Trustmark's geographic loan distribution was concentrated primarily in its five key market regions: Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee and Texas. Accordingly, the ultimate collectability of a substantial portion of these loans is susceptible to changes in market conditions in these areas.

Nonaccrual/Impaired LHFI

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, the carrying amounts of nonaccrual LHFI were \$65.1 million and \$55.3 million, respectively. Included in these amounts were \$7.7 million and \$7.4 million, respectively, of nonaccrual LHFI classified as troubled debt restructurings (TDRs). No material interest income was recognized in the income statement on nonaccrual LHFI for each of the periods ended June 30, 2016 and 2015.

Trustmark considers all nonaccrual LHFI to be impaired loans. All commercial nonaccrual LHFI (including those classified as TDRs) over \$500 thousand are specifically evaluated for impairment (specifically evaluated impaired LHFI) using a fair value approach. The remaining nonaccrual LHFI, which primarily consist of consumer loans secured by 1-4 family residential property, are not specifically reviewed. Consumer loans secured by 1-4 family residential property are generally charged off or written down when the credit becomes severely delinquent and the balance exceeds the fair value of the property less costs to sell.

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, specifically evaluated impaired LHFI totaled \$37.3 million and \$26.5 million, respectively. Trustmark's specifically evaluated impaired LHFI are primarily collateral dependent loans. Fair value estimates for collateral dependent loans are derived from appraised values based on the current market value or as is value of the collateral, normally from recently received and reviewed appraisals. Current appraisals are ordered on an annual basis based on the inspection date. Appraisals are obtained from state-certified appraisers and are based on certain assumptions, which may include construction or development status and the highest and best use of the property. These appraisals are reviewed by Trustmark's Appraisal Review Department to ensure they are acceptable, and values are adjusted down for costs associated with asset disposal. Once this estimated net realizable value has been determined, the value used in the impairment assessment is updated. At the time a specifically evaluated impaired LHFI is deemed to be impaired, the full difference between book value and the most likely estimate of the collateral's net realizable value is charged off. Charge-offs related to specifically evaluated impaired LHFI totaled \$1.5 million and \$1.3 million for the first six months of 2016 and 2015, respectively. As subsequent events dictate and estimated net realizable values decline, required reserves may be established or further adjustments recorded. At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, reserves related to specifically evaluated impaired LHFI totaled \$7.4 million and \$7.0 million, respectively. Provision recapture on specifically evaluated impaired LHFI totaled \$1.1 million for the first six months of 2016 compared to provision expense of \$1.9 million for the first six months of 2015.

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, impaired LHFI, excluding the specifically evaluated impaired LHFI, totaled \$27.9 million and \$28.8 million, respectively. In addition, these impaired LHFI had allocated allowance for loan losses of \$2.3 million and \$2.0 million at the end of the respective periods. No material interest income was recognized in the income statement on impaired LHFI for each of the periods ended June 30, 2016 and 2015.

The following tables detail LHFI individually and collectively evaluated for impairment at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

June 30, 2016		
LHFI Evaluated for Impairment		
Individually	Collectively	Total

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Loans secured by real estate:			
Construction, land development and other land	\$5,663	\$ 712,775	\$ 718,438
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	22,298	1,597,715	1,620,013
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	16,037	1,884,747	1,900,784
Other real estate secured	1,836	321,898	323,734
Commercial and industrial loans	18,470	1,448,041	1,466,511
Consumer loans	70	166,366	166,436
State and other political subdivision loans	—	805,401	805,401
Other loans	754	403,110	403,864
Total	\$65,128	\$ 7,340,053	\$ 7,405,181

	December 31, 2015		
	LHFI Evaluated for Impairment		
	Individually	Collectively	Total
Loans secured by real estate:			
Construction, land development and other land	\$6,123	\$818,600	\$824,723
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	23,079	1,626,422	1,649,501
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	17,800	1,718,676	1,736,476
Other real estate secured	145	211,083	211,228
Commercial and industrial loans	7,622	1,335,589	1,343,211
Consumer loans	31	169,104	169,135
State and other political subdivision loans	—	734,615	734,615
Other loans	512	421,984	422,496
Total	\$55,312	\$7,036,073	\$7,091,385

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, the carrying amount of LHFI individually evaluated for impairment consisted of the following (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016					
	LHFI					
	Unpaid	With No Related	With an	Total	Average	
	Principal	Allowance	Allowance	Carrying	Related	Recorded
	Balance	Recorded	Recorded	Amount	Allowance	Investment
Loans secured by real estate:						
Construction, land development and other land	\$9,087	\$ 3,148	\$ 2,515	\$5,663	\$ 533	\$ 5,893
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	27,590	4,340	17,958	22,298	543	22,688
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	17,719	2,542	13,495	16,037	4,485	16,919
Other real estate secured	1,862	—	1,836	1,836	360	990
Commercial and industrial loans	20,960	13,275	5,195	18,470	3,600	13,046
Consumer loans	74	—	70	70	1	50
State and other political subdivision loans	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other loans	899	—	754	754	180	633
Total	\$78,191	\$ 23,305	\$ 41,823	\$65,128	\$ 9,702	\$ 60,219

	December 31, 2015					
	LHFI					
	Unpaid	With No Related	With an	Total	Average	
	Principal	Allowance	Allowance	Carrying	Related	Recorded
	Balance	Recorded	Recorded	Amount	Allowance	Investment

Loans secured by real estate:						
Construction, land development and other land	\$ 11,113	\$ 3,395	\$ 2,728	\$ 6,123	\$ 909	\$ 9,995
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	27,678	283	22,796	23,079	1,230	24,350
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	20,387	8,037	9,763	17,800	3,402	21,758
Other real estate secured	160	—	145	145	15	732
Commercial and industrial loans	9,880	1,137	6,485	7,622	3,304	9,863
Consumer loans	34	—	31	31	—	59
State and other political subdivision loans	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other loans	642	—	512	512	128	570
Total	\$69,894	\$ 12,852	\$ 42,460	\$55,312	\$ 8,988	\$ 67,327

A TDR occurs when a borrower is experiencing financial difficulties, and for related economic or legal reasons, a concession is granted to the borrower that Trustmark would not otherwise consider. Whatever the form of concession that might be granted by Trustmark, Management's objective is to enhance collectability by obtaining more cash or other value from the borrower or by increasing the probability of receipt by granting the concession than by not granting it. Other concessions may arise from court proceedings or may be imposed by law. In addition, TDRs also include those credits that are extended or renewed to a borrower who is not able to obtain funds from sources other than Trustmark at a market interest rate for new debt with similar risk.

All loans whose terms have been modified in a troubled debt restructuring are evaluated for impairment under FASB ASC Topic 310. Accordingly, Trustmark measures any loss on the restructuring in accordance with that guidance. A TDR in which Trustmark receives physical possession of the borrower's assets, regardless of whether formal foreclosure or repossession proceedings take place, is accounted for in accordance with FASB ASC Subtopic 310-40, "Troubled Debt Restructurings by Creditors." Thus, the loan is treated as if assets have been received in satisfaction of the loan and reported as a foreclosed asset. At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, Trustmark held \$392 thousand and \$1.0 million, respectively, of foreclosed residential real estate as a result of foreclosure or in substance repossession of consumer mortgage LHFI classified as TDRs. There were no consumer mortgage LHFI classified as TDRs in the process of formal foreclosure proceedings at June 30, 2016 compared to \$83 thousand at December 31, 2015.

A TDR may be returned to accrual status if Trustmark is reasonably assured of repayment of principal and interest under the modified terms and the borrower has demonstrated sustained performance under those terms for a period of at least six months. Otherwise, the restructured loan must remain on nonaccrual.

At June 30, 2016 and 2015, LHFI classified as TDRs totaled \$7.7 million and \$12.1 million, respectively, and were primarily comprised of credits with interest-only payments for an extended period of time which totaled \$5.4 million and \$8.3 million, respectively. The remaining TDRs at June 30, 2016 and 2015 resulted from real estate loans discharged through Chapter 7 bankruptcy that were not reaffirmed or from payment or maturity extensions.

For TDRs, Trustmark had a related loan loss allowance of \$1.7 million and \$1.9 million at June 30, 2016 and 2015, respectively. LHFI classified as TDRs are charged down to the most likely fair value estimate less an estimated cost to sell for collateral dependent loans, which would approximate net realizable value. There were no specific charge-offs related to TDRs for the six months ended June 30, 2016 compared to \$806 thousand for the six months ended 2015.

The following tables illustrate the impact of modifications classified as TDRs as well as those TDRs modified within the last 12 months for which there was a payment default during the period for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,							
	2016		2015		2016		2015	
	Pre-Modification		Post-Modification		Pre-Modification		Post-Modification	
	Outstanding	Recorded	Outstanding	Recorded	Outstanding	Recorded	Outstanding	Recorded
	Number	Investment	Number	Investment	Number	Investment	Number	Investment
Troubled Debt Restructurings								
Construction, land development and other land loans	1	\$ 14	\$ 14		—	\$ —		\$ —
Loans secured by 1-4 family residential properties	6	669	669		2	82		82
Loans secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	—	—	—		4	3,512		3,512
Consumer loans	1	2	2		—	—		—
Total	8	\$ 685	\$ 685		6	\$ 3,594		\$ 3,594

	Six Months Ended June 30,					
	2016			2015		
	Pre-Modification		Post-Modification	Pre-Modification		Post-Modification
	Outstanding		Outstanding	Outstanding		Outstanding
	Number of	Recorded	Recorded	Number of	Recorded	Recorded
Troubled Debt Restructurings	Contract	Investment	Investment	Contract	Investment	Investment
Construction, land development and other land loans	1	\$ 14	\$ 14	—	\$ —	\$ —
Loans secured by 1-4 family residential properties	8	740	740	8	460	460
Loans secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	—	—	—	4	3,512	3,512
Consumer loans	1	2	2	—	—	—
Total	10	\$ 756	\$ 756	12	\$ 3,972	\$ 3,972

	Six Months Ended June 30, 2016		2015	
	Number of Recorded	Number of Recorded	Number of Recorded	Number of Recorded
TDRs that Subsequently Defaulted	Contract	Investment	Contract	Investment
Loans secured by 1-4 family residential properties	1	\$ 16	4	\$ 245

Trustmark's TDRs have resulted primarily from allowing the borrower to pay interest-only for an extended period of time rather than from forgiveness. Accordingly, as shown above, these TDRs have a similar recorded investment for both the pre-modification and post-modification disclosure. Trustmark has utilized loans 90 days or more past due to define payment default in determining TDRs that have subsequently defaulted.

The following tables detail LHFI classified as TDRs by loan type at June 30, 2016 and 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016		Total
	Accruing	Nonaccruing	
Loans secured by real estate:			
Construction, land development and other land	\$—	\$ 577	\$577
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	—	3,187	3,187
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	—	3,501	3,501

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Other real estate secured	—	—	—
Commercial and industrial loans	—	437	437
Consumer loans	—	2	2
Total TDRs	\$—	\$ 7,704	\$7,704

	June 30, 2015		
	Accruing	Nonaccrual	Total
Loans secured by real estate:			
Construction, land development and other land	\$—	\$ 1,664	\$1,664
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	1,635	2,795	4,430
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	828	4,584	5,412
Other real estate secured	—	62	62
Commercial and industrial loans	—	495	495
Total TDRs	\$2,463	\$ 9,600	\$12,063

Credit Quality Indicators

Trustmark's loan portfolio credit quality indicators focus on six key quality ratios that are compared against bank tolerances. The loan indicators are total classified outstanding, total criticized outstanding, nonperforming loans, nonperforming assets, delinquencies and net loan losses. Due to the homogenous nature of consumer loans, Trustmark does not assign a formal internal risk rating to each credit and therefore the criticized and classified measures are unique to commercial loans.

In addition to monitoring portfolio credit quality indicators, Trustmark also measures how effectively the lending process is being managed and risks are being identified. As part of an ongoing monitoring process, Trustmark grades the commercial portfolio as it relates to credit file completion and financial statement exceptions, underwriting, collateral documentation and compliance with law as shown below:

- Credit File Completeness and Financial Statement Exceptions – evaluates the quality and condition of credit files in terms of content, completeness and organization and focuses on efforts to obtain and document sufficient information to determine the quality and status of credits. Also included is an evaluation of the systems/procedures used to insure compliance with policy.
- Underwriting – evaluates whether credits are adequately analyzed, appropriately structured and properly approved within loan policy requirements. A properly approved credit is approved by adequate authority in a timely manner with all conditions of approval fulfilled. Total policy exceptions measure the level of underwriting and other policy exceptions within a loan portfolio.
- Collateral Documentation – focuses on the adequacy of documentation to perfect Trustmark's collateral position and substantiate collateral value. Collateral exceptions measure the level of documentation exceptions within a loan portfolio. Collateral exceptions occur when certain collateral documentation is either not present, is not considered current or has expired.
- Compliance with Law – focuses on underwriting, documentation, approval and reporting in compliance with banking laws and regulations. Primary emphasis is directed to the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA) and Regulation O requirements.

Commercial Credits

Trustmark has established a loan grading system that consists of ten individual credit risk grades (risk ratings) that encompass a range from loans where the expectation of loss is negligible to loans where loss has been established. The model is based on the risk of default for an individual credit and establishes certain criteria to delineate the level of risk across the ten unique credit risk grades. Credit risk grade definitions are as follows:

- Risk Rate (RR) 1 through RR 6 – Grades one through six represent groups of loans that are not subject to adverse criticism as defined in regulatory guidance. Loans in these groups exhibit characteristics that represent low to moderate risk measured by using a variety of credit risk criteria such as cash flow coverage, debt service coverage, balance sheet leverage, liquidity, management experience, industry position, prevailing economic conditions, support from secondary sources of repayment and other credit factors that may be relevant to a specific loan. In general, these loans are supported by properly margined collateral and guarantees of principal parties.
- Other Assets Especially Mentioned (Special Mention) - (RR 7) – a loan that has a potential weakness that if not corrected will lead to a more severe rating. This rating is for credits that are currently protected but potentially weak because of an adverse feature or condition that if not corrected will lead to a further downgrade.
- Substandard (RR 8) – a loan that has at least one identified weakness that is well defined. This rating is for credits where the primary sources of repayment are not viable at the time of evaluation or where either the capital or collateral is not adequate to support the loan and the secondary means of repayment do not provide a sufficient level of support to offset the identified weakness. Loss potential exists in the aggregate amount of substandard loans but does not necessarily exist in individual loans.

- Doubtful (RR 9) – a loan with an identified weakness that does not have a valid secondary source of repayment. Generally these credits have an impaired primary source of repayment and secondary sources are not sufficient to prevent a loss in the credit. The exact amount of the loss has not been determined at this time.
- Loss (RR 10) – a loan or a portion of a loan that is deemed to be uncollectible.

By definition, credit risk grades special mention (RR 7), substandard (RR 8), doubtful (RR 9) and loss (RR 10) are criticized loans while substandard (RR 8), doubtful (RR 9) and loss (RR 10) are classified loans. These definitions are standardized by all bank regulatory agencies and are generally equally applied to each individual lending institution. The remaining credit risk grades are considered pass credits and are solely defined by Trustmark.

Each commercial loan is assigned a credit risk grade that is an indication for the likelihood of default and is not a direct indication of loss at default. The loss at default aspect of the subject risk ratings is neither uniform across the nine primary commercial loan groups or constant between the geographic areas. To account for the variance in the loss at default aspects of the risk rating system, the loss expectations for each risk rating is integrated into the allowance for loan loss methodology where the calculated loss at default is allotted for each individual risk rating with respect to the individual loan group and unique geographic area. The loss at default aspect of the reserve methodology is calculated each quarter as a component of the overall reserve factor for each risk grade by loan group and geographic area.

To enhance this process, loans of a certain size that are rated in one of the criticized categories are routinely reviewed to establish an expectation of loss, if any, and if such examination indicates that the level of reserve is not adequate to cover the expectation of loss, a special reserve or impairment is generally applied.

The distribution of the losses is accomplished by means of a loss distribution model that assigns a loss factor to each risk rating (1 to 9) in each commercial loan pool. A factor is not applied to risk rate 10 as loans classified as Losses are not carried on Trustmark's books over quarter-end as they are charged off within the period that the loss is determined.

The expected loss distribution is spread across the various risk ratings by the perceived level of risk for loss. The nine grade scale described above ranges from a negligible risk of loss to an identified loss across its breadth. The loss distribution factors are graduated through the scale on a basis proportional to the degree of risk that appears manifest in each individual rating and assumes that migration through the loan grading system will occur.

Each loan officer assesses the appropriateness of the internal risk rating assigned to their credits on an ongoing basis. Trustmark's Asset Review area conducts independent credit quality reviews of the majority of Trustmark's commercial loan portfolio concentrations both on the underlying credit quality of each individual loan portfolio as well as the adherence to Trustmark's loan policy and the loan administration process. In general, Asset Review conducts reviews of each lending area within a six to eighteen month window depending on the overall credit quality results of the individual area.

In addition to the ongoing internal risk rate monitoring described above, Trustmark's Credit Quality Review Committee meets monthly and performs a review of all loans of \$100 thousand or more that are either delinquent thirty days or more or on nonaccrual. This review includes recommendations regarding risk ratings, accrual status, charge-offs and appropriate servicing officer as well as evaluation of problem credits for determination of TDRs. Quarterly, the Credit Quality Review Committee reviews and modifies continuous action plans for all credits risk rated seven or worse for relationships of \$100 thousand or more. In addition, the following reviews are performed on an annual basis:

- Residential real estate developments - a development project analysis is performed on all projects regardless of size. Performance of the development is assessed through an evaluation of the number of lots remaining, payout ratios, and loan-to-value ratios. This analysis is reviewed by each senior credit officer for the respective market to determine the need for any risk rate or accrual status changes.
- Non-owner occupied commercial real estate - a cash flow analysis is performed on all projects with an outstanding balance of \$1.0 million or more. Confirmation is obtained that guarantor financial statements are current, taxes have

been paid and there are no other issues that need to be addressed. This analysis is reviewed by each senior credit officer in the respective market to determine the need for any risk rate or accrual status changes.

Consumer Credits

Consumer LHFIs that do not meet a minimum custom credit score are reviewed quarterly by Management. The Retail Credit Review Committee reviews the volume and percentage of approvals that did not meet the minimum passing custom score by region, individual location, and officer to ensure that Trustmark continues to originate quality loans.

Trustmark monitors the levels and severity of past due consumer LHFIs on a daily basis through its collection activities. A detailed assessment of consumer LFI delinquencies is performed monthly at both a product and market level by delivery channel, which incorporates the perceived level of risk at time of underwriting. Trustmark also monitors its consumer LFI delinquency trends by comparing them to quarterly industry averages.

The tables below illustrate the carrying amount of LHFI by credit quality indicator at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

June 30, 2016					
Commercial LHFI					
	Pass -	Special Mention -	Substandard -	Doubtful -	
	Categories	Category 7	Category 8	Category 9	Subtotal
	1-6				
Loans secured by real estate:					
Construction, land development and other					
land	\$640,320	\$ —	\$ 12,768	\$ 523	\$653,611
Secured by 1-4 family residential					
properties	126,489	474	6,721	402	134,086
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential					
properties	1,850,526	1,055	47,728	667	1,899,976
Other real estate secured	320,911	—	1,882	—	322,793
Commercial and industrial loans	1,403,933	365	61,475	723	1,466,496
Consumer loans	18	—	—	—	18
State and other political subdivision loans	787,373	6,450	11,578	—	805,401
Other loans	395,286	340	2,536	440	398,602
Total	\$5,524,856	\$ 8,684	\$ 144,688	\$ 2,755	\$5,680,983

Consumer LHFI						
	Past Due	Past Due				
	30-89 Days	90 Days or More	Nonaccrual	Subtotal	Total LHFI	
	Current					
Loans secured by real estate:						
Construction, land development and other						
land	\$64,041	\$301	\$ —	\$ 485	\$64,827	\$718,438
Secured by 1-4 family residential						
properties	1,457,757	8,052	1,276	18,842	1,485,927	1,620,013
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential						
properties	808	—	—	—	808	1,900,784
Other real estate secured	941	—	—	—	941	323,734
Commercial and industrial loans	15	—	—	—	15	1,466,511

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Consumer loans	164,430	1,779	140	69	166,418	166,436
State and other political subdivision loans	—	—	—	—	—	805,401
Other loans	5,262	—	—	—	5,262	403,864
Total	\$1,693,254	\$10,132	\$1,416	\$19,396	\$1,724,198	\$7,405,181

December 31, 2015

Commercial LHFI

Special
Mention

Doubtful

-

-

Pass -

Substandard -

Category

Category

Categories 1-7

Category 8

9

Subtotal

Loans secured by real estate:

Construction, land development and other

land	\$746,227	\$—	\$15,637	\$529	\$762,393
------	-----------	-----	----------	-------	-----------

Secured by 1-4 family residential

properties	125,268	345	7,525	190	133,328
------------	---------	-----	-------	-----	---------

Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential

properties	1,680,846	2,031	52,485	361	1,735,723
------------	-----------	-------	--------	-----	-----------

Other real estate secured	205,097	—	4,768	—	209,865
---------------------------	---------	---	-------	---	---------

Commercial and industrial loans	1,295,760	9,473	37,284	694	1,343,211
---------------------------------	-----------	-------	--------	-----	-----------

Consumer loans	—	—	—	—	—
----------------	---	---	---	---	---

State and other political subdivision loans	713,616	12,478	8,521	—	734,615
---	---------	--------	-------	---	---------

Other loans	414,089	183	2,663	375	417,310
-------------	---------	-----	-------	-----	---------

Total	\$5,180,903	\$24,510	\$128,883	\$2,149	\$5,336,445
-------	-------------	----------	-----------	---------	-------------

Consumer LHFI						
		Past Due	Past Due			
		30-89 Days	90 Days or More	Nonaccrual	Subtotal	Total LHFI
Loans secured by real estate:						
Construction, land development and other						
land	\$62,158	\$146	\$—	\$26	\$62,330	\$824,723
Secured by 1-4 family residential						
properties	1,485,914	7,565	2,058	20,636	1,516,173	1,649,501
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential						
properties	753	—	—	—	753	1,736,476
Other real estate secured	1,363	—	—	—	1,363	211,228
Commercial and industrial loans	—	—	—	—	—	1,343,211
Consumer loans	166,681	2,182	242	30	169,135	169,135
State and other political subdivision loans	—	—	—	—	—	734,615
Other loans	5,186	—	—	—	5,186	422,496
Total	\$1,722,055	\$9,893	\$2,300	\$20,692	\$1,754,940	\$7,091,385

Past Due LHFI

The following tables provide an aging analysis of past due and nonaccrual LHFI by loan type at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

June 30, 2016							
Past Due							
	30-59 Days	60-89 Days	90 Days or More (1)	Total	Nonaccrual	Current Loans	Total LHFI
Loans secured by real estate:							
Construction, land development and other							
land	\$311	\$—	\$—	\$311	\$5,663	\$712,464	\$718,438
Secured by 1-4 family residential							
properties	7,087	2,211	1,276	10,574	22,298	1,587,141	1,620,013
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential							
properties	347	138	1,966	2,451	16,037	1,882,296	1,900,784
Other real estate secured	83	—	—	83	1,836	321,815	323,734

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Commercial and industrial loans	1,760	67	—	1,827	18,470	1,446,214	1,466,511
Consumer loans	1,403	376	140	1,919	70	164,447	166,436
State and other political subdivision loans	85	—	—	85	—	805,316	805,401
Other loans	263	2	—	265	754	402,845	403,864
Total	\$11,339	\$2,794	\$ 3,382	\$17,515	\$ 65,128	\$7,322,538	\$7,405,181

(1) Past due 90 days or more but still accruing interest.

	December 31, 2015			90 Days or More (1)	Total	Nonaccrual Loans	Current Loans	Total LHFI
	Past Due 30-59 Days	Past Due 60-89 Days						
Loans secured by real estate:								
Construction, land development and other								
land	\$214	\$—	\$ —	\$214	\$ 6,123	\$818,386	\$824,723	
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	6,203	1,800	2,058	10,061	23,079	1,616,361	1,649,501	
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	437	88	—	525	17,800	1,718,151	1,736,476	
Other real estate secured	—	—	—	—	145	211,083	211,228	
Commercial and industrial loans	921	45	—	966	7,622	1,334,623	1,343,211	
Consumer loans	1,835	347	242	2,424	31	166,680	169,135	
State and other political subdivision loans	65	—	—	65	—	734,550	734,615	
Other loans	68	—	—	68	512	421,916	422,496	
Total	\$9,743	\$2,280	\$ 2,300	\$14,323	\$ 55,312	\$7,021,750	\$7,091,385	

19

(1) Past due 90 days or more but still accruing interest.
 Past Due Loans Held for Sale (LHFS)

LHFS past due 90 days or more totaled \$23.5 million and \$21.8 million at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, respectively. LHFS past due 90 days or more are serviced loans eligible for repurchase, which are fully guaranteed by the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA). GNMA optional repurchase programs allow financial institutions to buy back individual delinquent mortgage loans that meet certain criteria from the securitized loan pool for which the institution provides servicing. At the servicer's option and without GNMA's prior authorization, the servicer may repurchase such a delinquent loan for an amount equal to 100 percent of the remaining principal balance of the loan. This buy-back option is considered a conditional option until the delinquency criteria are met, at which time the option becomes unconditional. When Trustmark is deemed to have regained effective control over these loans under the unconditional buy-back option, the loans can no longer be reported as sold and must be brought back onto the balance sheet as loans held for sale, regardless of whether Trustmark intends to exercise the buy-back option. These loans are reported as held for sale with the offsetting liability being reported as short-term borrowings.

During the first quarter of 2015, Trustmark exercised its option to repurchase approximately \$28.5 million of delinquent loans serviced for GNMA. These loans were subsequently sold to a third party under different repurchase provisions. Trustmark retained the servicing for these loans, which are subject to guarantees by FHA/VA. As a result of this repurchase and sale, the loans are no longer carried as LHFS. The transaction resulted in a gain of \$304 thousand, which is included in mortgage banking, net for 2015. Trustmark did not exercise its buy-back option on any delinquent loans serviced for GNMA during the first six months of 2016.

Allowance for Loan Losses, LHFI

Trustmark's allowance for loan loss methodology for commercial LHFI is based upon regulatory guidance from its primary regulator and GAAP. The methodology segregates the commercial purpose and commercial construction LHFI portfolios into nine separate loan types (or pools) which have similar characteristics such as repayment, collateral and risk profiles. The nine basic loan pools are further segregated into Trustmark's five key market regions, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee and Texas, to take into consideration the uniqueness of each market. A 10-point risk rating system is utilized for each separate loan pool to apply a reserve factor consisting of quantitative and qualitative components to determine the needed allowance by each loan type. As a result, there are 450 risk rate factors for commercial loan types. The nine separate pools are shown below:

Commercial Purpose LHFI

- Real Estate – Owner-Occupied
- Real Estate – Non-Owner Occupied
- Working Capital
- Non-Working Capital
- Land
- Lots and Development
- Political Subdivisions

Commercial Construction LHFI

- 1 to 4 Family
- Non-1 to 4 Family

The quantitative factors of the allowance methodology reflect a twelve-quarter rolling average of net charge-offs by loan type within each key market region. This allows for a greater sensitivity to current trends, such as economic changes, as well as current loss profiles and creates a more accurate depiction of historical losses.

Qualitative factors used in the allowance methodology include the following:

- National and regional economic trends and conditions
- Impact of recent performance trends
- Experience, ability and effectiveness of management
- Adherence to Trustmark's loan policies, procedures and internal controls
- Collateral, financial and underwriting exception trends
- Credit concentrations
- Loan facility risk
- Acquisitions
- Catastrophe

Each qualitative factor is converted to a scale ranging from 0 (No risk) to 100 (High Risk), other than the last two factors, which are applied on a dollar-for-dollar basis to ensure that the combination of such factors is proportional. The resulting ratings from the individual factors are weighted and summed to establish the weighted-average qualitative factor within each key market region.

The allowance for loan loss methodology segregates the consumer LHFH portfolio into homogeneous pools of loans that contain similar structure, repayment, collateral and risk profiles. These homogeneous pools of loans are shown below:

- Residential Mortgage
- Direct Consumer
- Junior Lien on 1-4 Family Residential Properties
- Credit Cards
- Overdrafts

The historical loss experience for these pools is determined by calculating a 12-quarter rolling average of net charge-offs, which is applied to each pool to establish the quantitative aspect of the methodology. Where, in Management's estimation, the calculated loss experience does not fully cover the anticipated loss for a pool, an estimate is also applied to each pool to establish the qualitative aspect of the methodology, which represents the perceived risks across the loan portfolio at the current point in time. This qualitative methodology utilizes four separate factors made up of unique components that when weighted and combined produce an estimated level of reserve for each of the loan pools. The four qualitative factors include the following:

- Economic indicators
- Performance trends
- Management experience
- Credit concentrations

The risk measure for each factor is converted to a scale ranging from 0 (No risk) to 100 (High Risk) to ensure that the combination of such factors is proportional. The determination of the risk measurement for each qualitative factor is done for all markets combined. The resulting estimated reserve factor is then applied to each pool.

The resulting ratings from the individual factors are weighted and summed to establish the weighted-average qualitative factor of a specific loan portfolio. This weighted-average qualitative factor is then applied over the five loan pools.

Trustmark's loan policy dictates the guidelines to be followed in determining when a loan is charged off. Commercial purpose loans are charged off when a determination is made that the loan is uncollectible and continuance as a bankable asset is not warranted or an impairment evaluation indicates that a value adjustment is necessary. Consumer loans secured by 1-4 family residential real estate are generally charged off or written down when the credit becomes

severely delinquent and the balance exceeds the fair value of the property less costs to sell. Non-real estate consumer purpose loans, both secured and unsecured, are generally charged off in full during the month in which the loan becomes 120 days past due. Credit card loans are generally charged off in full when the loan becomes 180 days past due.

Changes in the allowance for loan losses, LHFI were as follows for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
Balance at beginning of period	\$69,668	\$71,321	\$67,619	\$69,616
Loans charged-off	(3,251)	(4,278)	(6,614)	(7,282)
Recoveries	2,783	3,090	5,952	6,014
Net charge-offs	(468)	(1,188)	(662)	(1,268)
Provision for loan losses, LHFI	2,596	1,033	4,839	2,818
Balance at end of period	\$71,796	\$71,166	\$71,796	\$71,166

The following tables detail the balance in the allowance for loan losses, LHFI by loan type at June 30, 2016 and 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	2016			Provision for		Balance
	Balance			Loan		
	January 1,	Charge-offs	Recoveries	Losses		June 30,
Loans secured by real estate:						
Construction, land development and other land	\$ 11,587	\$ (212)	\$ 657	\$ (1,314)		\$ 10,718
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	10,678	(970)	566	(459)		9,815
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	21,563	(105)	802	2,090		24,350
Other real estate secured	2,467	—	3	284		2,754
Commercial and industrial loans	15,815	(1,810)	318	3,628		17,951
Consumer loans	2,879	(889)	1,822	(780)		3,032
State and other political subdivision loans	809	—	—	104		913
Other loans	1,821	(2,628)	1,784	1,286		2,263
Total allowance for loan losses, LHFI	\$67,619	\$ (6,614)	\$ 5,952	\$ 4,839		\$71,796

	Disaggregated by Impairment Method		
	Individually	Collectively	Total
Loans secured by real estate:			
Construction, land development and other land	\$534	\$ 10,184	\$10,718
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	543	9,272	9,815
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	4,484	19,866	24,350
Other real estate secured	360	2,394	2,754
Commercial and industrial loans	3,600	14,351	17,951
Consumer loans	—	3,032	3,032
State and other political subdivision loans	—	913	913

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Other loans	179	2,084	2,263
Total allowance for loan losses, LHFI	\$9,700	\$ 62,096	\$71,796

	2015			Provision for	Balance
	Balance				
	January	Charge-offs	Recoveries	Loan	Balance
	1,			Losses	June 30,
Loans secured by real estate:					
Construction, land development and other land loans	\$ 13,073	\$ (928)	\$ 350	\$ 1,418	\$ 13,913
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	9,677	(1,195)	106	229	8,817
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	18,523	(158)	392	(292)	18,465
Other real estate secured	2,141	(24)	3	(160)	1,960
Commercial and industrial loans	19,917	(1,256)	1,432	2,715	22,808
Consumer loans	2,149	(1,012)	1,897	(1,150)	1,884
State and other political subdivision loans	1,314	—	—	(713)	601
Other loans	2,822	(2,709)	1,834	771	2,718
Total allowance for loan losses, LHFI	\$69,616	\$ (7,282)	\$ 6,014	\$ 2,818	\$71,166

	Disaggregated by Impairment Method		
	Individual	Collectively	Total
Loans secured by real estate:			
Construction, land development and other land loans	\$3,007	\$ 10,906	\$13,913
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	469	8,348	8,817
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	3,295	15,170	18,465
Other real estate secured	46	1,914	1,960
Commercial and industrial loans	7,196	15,612	22,808
Consumer loans	—	1,884	1,884
State and other political subdivision loans	—	601	601
Other loans	207	2,511	2,718
Total allowance for loan losses, LHFI	\$14,220	\$ 56,946	\$71,166

Note 4 – Acquired Loans

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, acquired loans consisted of the following (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016		December 31, 2015	
	Noncovered	Covered	Noncovered	Covered
Loans secured by real estate:				
Construction, land development and other land	\$37,682	\$334	\$41,623	\$1,021
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	73,313	8,363	86,950	10,058
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	115,989	3,709	135,626	4,638
Other real estate secured	24,015	1,257	23,860	1,286
Commercial and industrial loans	49,639	121	55,075	624
Consumer loans	4,295	—	5,641	—
Other loans	20,263	55	23,936	73
Acquired loans	325,196	13,839	372,711	17,700
Less allowance for loan losses, acquired loans	12,218	262	11,259	733
Net acquired loans	\$312,978	\$13,577	\$361,452	\$16,967

The following table presents changes in the net carrying value of the acquired loans for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

Noncovered		Covered	
Acquired	Acquired	Acquired	Acquired
Impaired	Not ASC	Impaired	Not ASC

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

		310-30 (1)	310-30 (1)
Carrying value, net at January 1, 2015	\$434,151	\$81,091	\$20,504
Accretion to interest income	28,193	479	2,308
Payments received, net	(164,671)	(15,484)	(8,592)
Other (2)	(1,589)	—	391
Less change in allowance for loan losses, acquired loans	(718)	—	785
Carrying value, net at December 31, 2015	295,366	66,086	15,396
Accretion to interest income	9,245	3	747
Payments received, net	(50,126)	(6,802)	(3,904)
Other (2)	165	—	(435)
Less change in allowance for loan losses, acquired loans	(957)	(2)	471
Carrying value, net at June 30, 2016	\$253,693	\$59,285	\$12,275

(1) "Acquired Not ASC 310-30" loans consist of revolving credit agreements and commercial leases that are not in scope for FASB ASC Topic 310-30, "Loans and Debt Securities Acquired with Deteriorated Credit Quality."

(2) Includes miscellaneous timing adjustments as well as acquired loan terminations through foreclosure, charge-off and other terminations.

Under FASB ASC Topic 310-30, the accretable yield is the excess of expected cash flows at acquisition over the initial fair value of acquired impaired loans and is recorded as interest income over the estimated life of the loans using the effective yield method if the timing and amount of the future cash flows is reasonably estimable. The following table presents changes in the accretable yield for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015
Accretable yield at beginning of period	\$(52,672)	\$(77,149)
Accretion to interest income	9,992	18,449
Disposals	2,427	4,700
Reclassification to / (from) nonaccretable difference (1)	(5,741)	(9,943)
Accretable yield at end of period	\$(45,994)	\$(63,943)

(1) Reclassifications from nonaccretable difference are due to lower loss expectations and improvements in expected cash flows.

The following tables present the components of the allowance for loan losses on acquired loans for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2016			Six Months Ended June 30, 2016		
	Noncovered	Covered	Total	Noncovered	Covered	Total
Balance at beginning of period	\$13,212	\$ 323	\$13,535	\$11,259	\$ 733	\$11,992
Provision for loan losses, acquired loans	652	(45)	607	2,283	(367)	1,916
Loans charged-off	(2,037)	(17)	(2,054)	(2,369)	(82)	(2,451)
Recoveries	391	1	392	1,045	(22)	1,023
Net charge-offs	(1,646)	(16)	(1,662)	(1,324)	(104)	(1,428)
Balance at end of period	\$12,218	\$ 262	\$12,480	\$12,218	\$ 262	\$12,480

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2015			Six Months Ended June 30, 2015		
	Noncovered	Covered	Total	Noncovered	Covered	Total
Balance at beginning of period	\$11,106	\$ 731	\$11,837	\$10,541	\$ 1,518	\$12,059
Provision for loan losses, acquired loans	917	(92)	825	1,576	(404)	1,172
Loans charged-off	(2,066)	66	(2,000)	(2,568)	(450)	(3,018)
Recoveries	1,970	(3)	1,967	2,378	38	2,416
Net (charge-offs) recoveries	(96)	63	(33)	(190)	(412)	(602)
Balance at end of period	\$11,927	\$ 702	\$12,629	\$11,927	\$ 702	\$12,629

As discussed in Note 3 - Loans Held for Investment (LHFI) and Allowance for Loan Losses, LHFI, Trustmark has established a loan grading system that consists of ten individual credit risk grades (risk ratings) that encompass a range from loans where the expectation of loss is negligible to loans where loss has been established. The model is

based on the risk of default for an individual credit and establishes certain criteria to segregate the level of risk across the ten unique risk ratings. These credit quality measures are unique to commercial loans. Credit quality for consumer loans is based on individual credit scores, aging status of the loan and payment activity.

The tables below illustrate the carrying amount of acquired loans by credit quality indicator at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

June 30, 2016					
Commercial Loans					
Pass -	Special Mention -	Substandard	Doubtful -		
Categories 6	Category 7	Category 8	Category 9		
				Subtotal	
Noncovered Loans:					
Loans secured by real estate:					
Construction, land development					
and other land	\$ 15,442	\$ 124	\$ 16,927	\$ 3,028	\$ 35,521
Secured by 1-4 family					
residential properties	17,369	7	4,571	316	22,263
Secured by nonfarm,					
nonresidential properties	94,781	1,099	19,506	603	115,989
Other real estate secured	19,655	—	3,659	697	24,011
Commercial and industrial loans	32,504	5	15,614	1,502	49,625
Consumer loans	—	—	—	—	—
Other loans	13,880	—	6,223	160	20,263
Total noncovered loans	193,631	1,235	66,500	6,306	267,672
Covered Loans: (1)					
Loans secured by real estate:					
Construction, land development					
and other land	260	—	7	—	267
Secured by 1-4 family					
residential properties	684	67	183	—	934
Secured by nonfarm,					
nonresidential properties	3,342	7	302	—	3,651
Other real estate secured	715	—	108	—	823
Commercial and industrial loans	101	20	—	—	121
Other loans	53	—	—	—	53
Total covered loans	5,155	94	600	—	5,849
Total acquired loans	\$ 198,786	\$ 1,329	\$ 67,100	\$ 6,306	\$ 273,521

	Consumer Loans					Total
	Past Due	Past Due				
	Current	30-89 Days	90 Days or More	Nonaccrual (2)	Subtotal	Acquired Loans
Noncovered Loans:						
Loans secured by real estate:						
Construction, land development						
and other land	\$2,032	\$ 129	\$ —	\$ —	\$2,161	\$ 37,682
Secured by 1-4 family						
residential properties	48,289	2,377	262	122	51,050	73,313
Secured by nonfarm,						
nonresidential properties	—	—	—	—	—	115,989
Other real estate secured	4	—	—	—	4	24,015
Commercial and industrial						
loans	14	—	—	—	14	49,639
Consumer loans	4,258	37	—	—	4,295	4,295
Other loans	—	—	—	—	—	20,263
Total noncovered loans	54,597	2,543	262	122	57,524	325,196
Covered Loans: (1)						
Loans secured by real estate:						
Construction, land development						
and other land	52	7	8	—	67	334
Secured by 1-4 family						
residential properties	6,745	409	275	—	7,429	8,363
Secured by nonfarm,						
nonresidential properties	58	—	—	—	58	3,709
Other real estate secured	434	—	—	—	434	1,257
Commercial and industrial						
loans	—	—	—	—	—	121
Other loans	2	—	—	—	2	55
Total covered loans	7,291	416	283	—	7,990	13,839
Total acquired loans	\$61,888	\$ 2,959	\$ 545	\$ 122	\$65,514	\$ 339,035

(1) Total dollar balances are presented in this table; however, these loans are covered by the loss-share agreement with the FDIC. TNB is at risk for only 20% of the losses incurred on these loans.

(2) Acquired loans not accounted for under FASB ASC Topic 310-30.

December 31, 2015					
Commercial Loans					
	Pass -	Special Mention -	Substandard -	Doubtful -	
	Categories	Category 7	Category 8	Category 9	Subtotal
1-6					
Noncovered Loans:					
Loans secured by real estate:					
Construction, land development					
and other land	\$ 15,839	\$ 253	\$ 19,252	\$ 3,874	\$ 39,218
Secured by 1-4 family					
residential properties	22,272	27	5,033	331	27,663
Secured by nonfarm,					
nonresidential properties	106,924	2,301	25,690	711	135,626
Other real estate secured	19,346	—	3,777	731	23,854
Commercial and industrial loans	36,670	844	15,526	2,035	55,075
Consumer loans	—	—	—	—	—
Other loans	17,150	—	6,624	162	23,936
Total noncovered loans	218,201	3,425	75,902	7,844	305,372
Covered Loans: (1)					
Loans secured by real estate:					
Construction, land development					
and other land	235	—	588	119	942
Secured by 1-4 family					
residential properties	869	107	534	—	1,510
Secured by nonfarm,					
nonresidential properties	4,060	35	472	—	4,567
Other real estate secured	730	—	111	—	841
Commercial and industrial loans	560	22	42	—	624
Other loans	70	—	—	—	70
Total covered loans	6,524	164	1,747	119	8,554
Total acquired loans	\$ 224,725	\$ 3,589	\$ 77,649	\$ 7,963	\$ 313,926

	Consumer Loans		Past Due		Nonaccrual (2)	Subtotal	Total Acquired Loans
	Current	30-89 Days	Past Due 90 Days or More				
Noncovered Loans:							
Loans secured by real estate:							
Construction, land development							
and other land	\$2,353	\$24	\$ 28	\$ —	\$2,405	\$ 41,623	
Secured by 1-4 family							
residential properties	56,371	1,841	930	145	59,287	86,950	
Secured by nonfarm,							
nonresidential properties	—	—	—	—	—	135,626	
Other real estate secured	6	—	—	—	6	23,860	
Commercial and industrial loans	—	—	—	—	—	55,075	
Consumer loans	5,498	142	1	—	5,641	5,641	
Other loans	—	—	—	—	—	23,936	
Total noncovered loans	64,228	2,007	959	145	67,339	372,711	
Covered Loans: (1)							
Loans secured by real estate:							
Construction, land development							
and other land	70	9	—	—	79	1,021	
Secured by 1-4 family							
residential properties	7,472	314	762	—	8,548	10,058	
Secured by nonfarm,							
nonresidential properties	71	—	—	—	71	4,638	
Other real estate secured	445	—	—	—	445	1,286	
Commercial and industrial loans	—	—	—	—	—	624	
Other loans	3	—	—	—	3	73	
Total covered loans	8,061	323	762	—	9,146	17,700	
Total acquired loans	\$72,289	\$2,330	\$ 1,721	\$ 145	\$76,485	\$ 390,411	

(1) Total dollar balances are presented in this table; however, these loans are covered by the loss-share agreement with the FDIC. TNB is at risk for only 20% of the losses incurred on these loans.

(2) Acquired loans not accounted for under FASB ASC Topic 310-30.

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, there were no acquired impaired loans accounted for under FASB ASC Topic 310-30 classified as nonaccrual loans. At June 30, 2016, approximately \$715 thousand of acquired loans not accounted for under FASB ASC Topic 310-30 were classified as nonaccrual loans, compared to approximately \$1.0 million of acquired loans at December 31, 2015.

The following tables provide an aging analysis of contractually past due and nonaccrual acquired loans, by loan type at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016 Past Due		90 Days			Current	Total Acquired
	30-59 Days	60-89 Days	or More (1)	Total	Nonaccrual (2)	Loans	Loans
Noncovered loans:							
Loans secured by real estate:							
Construction, land development							
and other land	\$73	\$56	\$12,882	\$13,011	\$—	\$24,671	\$37,682
Secured by 1-4 family residential							
properties	2,003	418	331	2,752	181	70,380	73,313
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential							
properties	167	124	462	753	269	114,967	115,989
Other real estate secured	—	21	2,313	2,334	—	21,681	24,015
Commercial and industrial loans	35	1	—	36	231	49,372	49,639
Consumer loans	11	26	—	37	—	4,258	4,295
Other loans	—	85	—	85	—	20,178	20,263
Total noncovered loans	2,289	731	15,988	19,008	681	305,507	325,196
Covered loans:							
Loans secured by real estate:							
Construction, land development							
and other land	—	7	8	15	—	319	334
Secured by 1-4 family residential							
properties	318	141	275	734	—	7,629	8,363
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential							
properties	—	—	172	172	—	3,537	3,709
Other real estate secured	—	—	—	—	—	1,257	1,257
Commercial and industrial loans	—	—	—	—	34	87	121
Other loans	—	—	—	—	—	55	55
Total covered loans	318	148	455	921	34	12,884	13,839
Total acquired loans	\$2,607	\$879	\$16,443	\$19,929	\$715	\$318,391	\$339,035

(1) Past due 90 days or more but still accruing interest.

(2) Acquired loans not accounted for under FASB ASC Topic 310-30.

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

December 31, 2015

Past Due

90 Days

Current

Total Acquired

30-59 Days 60-89 Days or More (1) Total

Nonaccrual (2) Loans

Loans

Noncovered loans:

Loans secured by real estate:

Construction, land
development and

other land

\$24

\$ 114

\$ 13,021

\$13,159

\$ —

\$28,464

\$ 41,623

Secured by 1-4 family
residential

properties

1,544

636

1,220

3,400

387

83,163

86,950

Secured by nonfarm,
nonresidential

properties

192

195

5,913

6,300

144

129,182

135,626

Other real estate secured

9

—

737

746

—

23,114

23,860

Commercial and industrial

loans

82

4

184

270

429

54,376

55,075

Consumer loans

119

23

1

143

—

5,498

5,641

Other loans

85

16

—

101

—

23,835

23,936

Total noncovered loans

2,055

988

21,076

24,119

960

347,632

372,711

Covered loans:

Loans secured by real estate:

Construction, land
development and

other land

9

—

119

128

—

893

1,021

Secured by 1-4 family
residential

properties

428

132

978

1,538

—

8,520

10,058

Secured by nonfarm,
nonresidential

properties

167

478

—

645

—

3,993

4,638

Other real estate secured

—

—

—

—

—

1,286

1,286

Commercial and industrial

loans

—

—

—

—

51

573

624

Other loans

—

—

—

—

—

73

73

Total covered loans

604

610

1,097

2,311

51

15,338

17,700

Total acquired loans

\$2,659

\$ 1,598

\$ 22,173

\$26,430

\$ 1,011

\$362,970

\$ 390,411

(1) Past due 90 days or more but still accruing interest.

(2) Acquired loans not accounted for under FASB ASC Topic 310-30.

Note 5 – Mortgage Banking

The activity in the mortgage servicing rights (MSR) is detailed in the table below for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015
Balance at beginning of period	\$74,007	\$64,358
Origination of servicing assets	7,211	8,157
Change in fair value:		
Due to market changes	(13,899)	3,708
Due to runoff	(4,505)	(4,801)
Balance at end of period	\$62,814	\$71,422

During the first six months of 2016 and 2015, Trustmark sold \$590.7 million and \$579.9 million, respectively, of residential mortgage loans. Pretax gains on these sales were recorded to noninterest income in mortgage banking, net and totaled \$8.1 million for the first six months of 2016 compared to \$8.8 million for the first six months of 2015. Trustmark's mortgage loans serviced for others totaled \$6.119 billion at June 30, 2016, compared with \$5.971 billion at December 31, 2015. The table below details the mortgage loans sold and serviced for others at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Federal National Mortgage Association	\$3,843,796	\$3,750,685
Government National Mortgage Association	2,177,968	2,111,797
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation	61,064	67,817
Other	35,983	41,013
Total mortgage loans sold and serviced for others	\$6,118,811	\$5,971,312

Trustmark is subject to losses in its loan servicing portfolio due to loan foreclosures. Trustmark has obligations to either repurchase the outstanding principal balance of a loan or make the purchaser whole for the economic benefits of a loan if it is determined that the loan sold was in violation of representations or warranties made by Trustmark at the time of the sale, herein referred to as mortgage loan servicing putback expenses. Such representations and warranties typically include those made regarding loans that had missing or insufficient file documentation, loans that do not meet investor guidelines, loans in which the appraisal does not support the value and/or loans obtained through fraud by the borrowers or other third parties. Generally, putback requests may be made until the loan is paid in full. However, mortgage loans delivered to Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA) and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (FHLMC) on or after January 1, 2013 are subject to the Lending and Selling Representations and Warranties Framework updated in May 2014, which provides certain instances in which FNMA and FHLMC will not exercise their remedies, including a putback request, for breaches of certain selling representations and warranties, such as payment history and quality control review.

When a putback request is received, Trustmark evaluates the request and takes appropriate actions based on the nature of the request. Effective January 1, 2013, Trustmark was required by FNMA and FHLMC to provide a response to putback requests within 60 days of the date of receipt. Currently, putback requests primarily relate to 2009 through 2013 vintage mortgage loans. The total mortgage loan servicing putback expenses incurred by Trustmark during the first six months of 2016 were \$210 thousand compared to \$105 thousand during the same time period in 2015.

Changes in the reserve for mortgage loan servicing putback expense for mortgage loans delivered to FNMA in periods not covered by the November 2013 Resolution Agreement between Trustmark and FNMA and to other entities were as follows for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015
Balance at beginning of period	\$1,685	\$1,170
Provision for putback expenses	210	105
(Losses) gains	(944)	126

Balance at end of period \$951 \$1,401

There is inherent uncertainty in reasonably estimating the requirement for reserves against potential future mortgage loan servicing putback expenses. Future putback expenses are dependent on many subjective factors, including the review procedures of the purchasers and the potential refinance activity on loans sold with servicing released and the subsequent consequences under the representations and warranties. Trustmark believes that it has appropriately reserved for potential mortgage loan servicing putback requests.

Note 6 –Other Real Estate and Covered Other Real Estate

Other Real Estate, excluding Covered Other Real Estate

At June 30, 2016, Trustmark’s geographic other real estate distribution was concentrated primarily in its five key market regions: Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee and Texas. The ultimate recovery of a substantial portion of the carrying amount of other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, is susceptible to changes in market conditions in these areas.

For the periods presented, changes and gains, net on other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, were as follows (\$ in thousands):

	Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015
Balance at beginning of period	\$77,177	\$92,509
Additions	8,224	20,532
Disposals	(12,908)	(21,300)
Write-downs	(2,991)	(993)
Balance at end of period	\$69,502	\$90,748
Gain, net on the sale of other real estate included in		
ORE/Foreclosure expense	\$2,659	\$2,268

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, by type of property consisted of the following (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Construction, land development and other land properties	\$41,881	\$47,550
1-4 family residential properties	7,869	10,732
Nonfarm, nonresidential properties	17,840	16,717
Other real estate properties	1,912	2,178
Total other real estate, excluding covered other real estate	\$69,502	\$77,177

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, by geographic location consisted of the following (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Alabama	\$18,031	\$21,578
Florida	28,052	29,579
Mississippi (1)	14,435	14,312
Tennessee (2)	7,432	9,974
Texas	1,552	1,734
Total other real estate, excluding covered other real estate	\$69,502	\$77,177

(1) Mississippi includes Central and Southern Mississippi Regions

(2)Tennessee includes Memphis, Tennessee and Northern Mississippi Regions
Covered Other Real Estate

For the periods presented, changes and gains (losses), net on covered other real estate were as follows (\$ in thousands):

	Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015
Balance at beginning of period	\$ 1,651	\$ 6,060
Transfers from covered loans	456	177
FASB ASC 310-30 adjustment for the residual recorded		
investment	(12)	(917)
Net transfers from covered loans	444	(740)
Disposals	(1,679)	(1,188)
Write-downs	(28)	(377)
Balance at end of period	\$ 388	\$ 3,755
Gain (loss), net on the sale of covered other real estate included in		
ORE/Foreclosure expense	\$ 786	\$ (99)

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, covered other real estate by type of property consisted of the following (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Construction, land development and other land properties	\$—	\$ 638
1-4 family residential properties	287	223
Nonfarm, nonresidential properties	101	399
Other real estate properties	—	391
Total covered other real estate	\$ 388	\$ 1,651

Note 7 – Deposits

At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, deposits consisted of the following (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Noninterest-bearing demand	\$2,921,016	\$2,998,694
Interest-bearing demand	1,777,387	1,938,497
Savings	3,159,868	2,970,997
Time	1,673,253	1,680,042
Total	\$9,531,524	\$9,588,230

Note 8 – Securities Sold Under Repurchase Agreements

Trustmark utilizes securities sold under repurchase agreements as a source of borrowing in connection with overnight repurchase agreements offered to commercial deposit customers by using its unencumbered investment securities as collateral. Trustmark accounts for its securities sold under repurchase agreements as secured borrowings in accordance with FASB ASC Topic 860-30, “Transfers and Servicing – Secured Borrowing and Collateral.” Securities sold under repurchase agreements are stated at the amount of cash received in connection with the transaction. Trustmark monitors collateral levels on a continual basis and may be required to provide additional collateral based on the fair value of the underlying securities. Trustmark’s repurchase agreements are transacted under master repurchase agreements that give Trustmark, in the event of default by the counterparty, the right of offset with the same counterparty. As of June 30, 2016, all repurchase agreements were short-term and consisted primarily of sweep repurchase arrangements, under which excess deposits are “swept” into overnight repurchase agreements with Trustmark. The following table presents the securities sold under repurchase agreements by collateral pledged at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
U.S. Government agency obligations		
Issued by U.S. Government sponsored agencies	\$ 15,172	\$ 22,516
Obligations of states and political subdivisions	9,747	—
Mortgage-backed securities		
Other residential mortgage-backed securities		
Issued or guaranteed by FNMA, FHLMC or GNMA	128,132	102,604
Total securities sold under repurchase agreements	\$ 153,051	\$ 125,120

Note 9 – Defined Benefit and Other Postretirement Benefits

Qualified Pension Plans

Trustmark maintains a noncontributory tax-qualified defined benefit pension plan (Trustmark Capital Accumulation Plan, the “Plan”), in which substantially all associates who began employment prior to 2007 participate. The Plan provides retirement benefits that are based on the length of credited service and final average compensation, as defined in the Plan, and vest upon three years of service. Benefit accruals under the plan have been frozen since 2009, with the exception of certain associates covered through plans obtained in acquisitions that were subsequently merged into the Plan. Other than the associates covered through these acquired plans that were merged into the Plan, associates have not earned additional benefits, except for interest as required by law, since the Plan was frozen. Current and former associates who participate in the Plan retain their right to receive benefits that accrued before the Plan was frozen.

On July 26, 2016, the Board of Directors of Trustmark authorized the termination of the Plan, effective as of December 31, 2016. To satisfy commitments made by Trustmark to associates (collectively, the “Continuing Associates”) covered through acquired plans that were merged into the Plan, the Board also approved the spin-off of the portion of the Plan associated with the accrued benefits of the Continuing Associates into a new plan titled the Trustmark Corporation Pension Plan for Certain Employees of Acquired Financial Institutions (the “Spin-Off Plan”), effective as of December 31, 2016, immediately prior to the termination of the Plan.

In order to terminate the Plan, in accordance with Internal Revenue Service and Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation requirements, Trustmark is required to fully fund the Plan on a termination basis and will contribute the additional assets necessary to do so. The final distributions will be made from current plan assets and a one-time pension settlement expense will be recognized when paid by Trustmark during the second quarter of 2017. Further, as a result of Trustmark’s de-risking investment strategy for the Plan as of June 30, 2016, the expected rate of return on plan assets during the second half of 2016 will decrease from 6.0% to 2.5%. Accordingly, Trustmark anticipates increased periodic benefit costs for the Plan during this period. Participants in the Plan will have a choice of receiving a lump sum cash payment or annuity payments under a group annuity contract purchased from an insurance carrier, subject to certain exceptions. As a result of the termination of the Plan, each participant will become fully vested in his or her accrued benefits under the Plan.

The Board reserved the right to defer or revoke the termination of the Plan if circumstances change such that deferral or revocation would be warranted, but has no intent to do so at this time.

The following table presents information regarding the net periodic benefit cost for the Plan for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
Service cost	\$108	\$129	\$216	\$260
Interest cost	830	864	1,660	1,726
Expected return on plan assets	(1,022)	(1,297)	(2,044)	(2,593)
Recognized net loss due to lump sum settlements	2,248	479	2,671	896
Recognized net actuarial loss	660	971	1,321	1,938
Net periodic benefit cost	\$2,824	\$1,146	\$3,824	\$2,227

The range of potential contributions to the Plan is determined annually by the Plan’s actuary in accordance with applicable IRS rules and regulations. Trustmark’s policy is to fund amounts that are sufficient to satisfy the annual minimum funding requirements and do not exceed the maximum that is deductible for federal income tax purposes. The actual amount of the contribution is determined annually based on the Plan’s funded status and return on plan assets as of the measurement date, which is December 31. For the plan year ending December 31, 2016, Trustmark’s minimum required contribution to the Plan is expected to be zero; however, Management and the Board of Directors

of Trustmark will monitor the Plan throughout 2016 to determine any additional funding requirements by the Plan's measurement date.

Supplemental Retirement Plans

Trustmark maintains a nonqualified supplemental retirement plan covering key executive officers and senior officers as well as directors who have elected to defer fees. The plan provides for retirement and/or death benefits based on a participant's covered salary or deferred fees. Although plan benefits may be paid from Trustmark's general assets, Trustmark has purchased life insurance contracts on the participants covered under the plan, which may be used to fund future benefit payments under the plan. The measurement date for the plan is December 31. As a result of the BancTrust merger on February 15, 2013, Trustmark became the administrator of an additional nonqualified supplemental retirement plan, for which the plan benefits were frozen prior to the merger date.

The following table presents information regarding the net periodic benefit cost for Trustmark's nonqualified supplemental retirement plans for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
Service cost	\$74	\$108	\$148	\$216
Interest cost	542	519	1,088	1,043
Amortization of prior service cost	62	62	125	125
Recognized net actuarial loss	214	246	435	499
Net periodic benefit cost	\$892	\$935	\$1,796	\$1,883

Note 10 – Stock and Incentive Compensation Plans

Trustmark has granted stock and incentive compensation awards subject to the provisions of the Stock and Incentive Compensation Plan (the Stock Plan). Current outstanding and future grants of stock and incentive compensation awards are subject to the provisions of the Stock Plan, which is designed to provide flexibility to Trustmark regarding its ability to motivate, attract and retain the services of key associates and directors. The Stock Plan also allows Trustmark to grant nonqualified stock options, incentive stock options, stock appreciation rights, restricted stock, restricted stock units and performance units to key associates and directors.

Restricted Stock Grants

Performance Awards

Trustmark's performance awards vest over three years and are granted to Trustmark's executive and senior management teams. Performance awards granted vest based on performance goals of return on average tangible equity and total shareholder return compared to a defined peer group. Performance awards are valued utilizing a Monte Carlo simulation model to estimate fair value of the awards at the grant date. These awards are recognized using the straight-line method over the requisite service period. These awards provide for achievement shares if performance measures exceed 100%. The restricted share agreement provides for voting rights and dividend privileges.

Time-Vested Awards

Trustmark's time-vested awards vest over three years and are granted to members of Trustmark's Board of Directors as well as Trustmark's executive and senior management teams. Time-vested awards are valued utilizing the fair value of Trustmark's stock at the grant date. These awards are recognized on the straight-line method over the requisite service period.

The following table summarizes the Stock Plan activity for the periods presented:

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2016	
	Performance	Time-Vested
	Awards	Awards
Nonvested shares, beginning of period	254,674	360,316
Released from restriction	(3,545)	(19,946)
Forfeited	(12,123)	(13,173)
Nonvested shares, end of period	239,006	327,197

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Six Months Ended June
30, 2016
Performance Time-Vested

	Awards	Awards
Nonvested shares, beginning of period	212,309	306,657
Granted	99,116	137,291
Released from restriction	(39,301)	(102,338)
Forfeited	(33,118)	(14,413)
Nonvested shares, end of period	239,006	327,197

The following table presents information regarding compensation expense for awards under the Stock Plan for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2016		Six Months Ended June 30, 2015	
Performance awards	\$307	\$318	\$407	\$564
Time-vested awards	532	612	1,393	1,217
Total compensation expense	\$839	\$930	\$1,800	\$1,781

Note 11 – Contingencies

Lending Related

Trustmark makes commitments to extend credit and issues standby and commercial letters of credit (letters of credit) in the normal course of business in order to fulfill the financing needs of its customers. The carrying amount of commitments to extend credit and letters of credit approximates the fair value of such financial instruments. These amounts are not material to Trustmark's financial statements.

Commitments to extend credit are agreements to lend money to customers pursuant to certain specified conditions. Commitments generally have fixed expiration dates or other termination clauses. Because many of these commitments are expected to expire without being drawn upon, the total commitment amounts do not necessarily represent future cash requirements. The exposure to credit loss in the event of nonperformance by the other party to the commitments to extend credit is represented by the contract amount of those instruments. Trustmark applies the same credit policies and standards as it does in the lending process when making these commitments. The collateral obtained is based upon the assessed creditworthiness of the borrower. At June 30, 2016 and 2015, Trustmark had unused commitments to extend credit of \$2.978 billion and \$2.540 billion, respectively.

Letters of credit are conditional commitments issued by Trustmark to insure the performance of a customer to a third-party. A financial standby letter of credit irrevocably obligates Trustmark to pay a third-party beneficiary when a customer fails to repay an outstanding loan or debt instrument. A performance standby letter of credit irrevocably obligates Trustmark to pay a third-party beneficiary when a customer fails to perform some contractual, nonfinancial obligation. When issuing letters of credit, Trustmark uses essentially the same policies regarding credit risk and collateral, which are followed in the lending process. At June 30, 2016 and 2015, Trustmark's maximum exposure to credit loss in the event of nonperformance by the other party for letters of credit was \$112.4 million and \$134.0 million, respectively. These amounts consist primarily of commitments with maturities of less than three years, which have an immaterial carrying value. Trustmark holds collateral to support standby letters of credit when deemed necessary. As of June 30, 2016 and 2015, the fair value of collateral held was \$28.0 million and \$28.7 million, respectively.

Legal Proceedings

Trustmark's wholly-owned subsidiary, TNB, has been named as a defendant in three lawsuits related to the collapse of the Stanford Financial Group. The first is a purported class action complaint that was filed on August 23, 2009 in the District Court of Harris County, Texas, by Peggy Roif Rotstain, Guthrie Abbott, Catherine Burnell, Steven Queyrouze, Jaime Alexis Arroyo Bornstein and Juan C. Olano (collectively, Class Plaintiffs), on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, naming TNB and four other financial institutions unaffiliated with Trustmark as defendants. The complaint seeks to recover (i) alleged fraudulent transfers from each of the defendants in the amount of fees and other monies received by each defendant from entities controlled by R. Allen Stanford (collectively, the Stanford Financial Group) and (ii) damages allegedly attributable to alleged conspiracies by one or more of the defendants with the Stanford Financial Group to commit fraud and/or aid and abet fraud on the asserted grounds that defendants knew or should have known the Stanford Financial Group was conducting an illegal and fraudulent scheme. Plaintiffs have demanded a jury trial. Plaintiffs did not quantify damages.

In November 2009, the lawsuit was removed to federal court by certain defendants and then transferred by the United States Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to federal court in the Northern District of Texas (Dallas) where multiple Stanford related matters are being consolidated for pre-trial proceedings. In May 2010, all defendants (including TNB) filed motions to dismiss the lawsuit. In August 2010, the court authorized and approved the formation of an Official Stanford Investors Committee (OSIC) to represent the interests of Stanford investors and, under certain

circumstances, to file legal actions for the benefit of Stanford investors. In December 2011, the OSIC filed a motion to intervene in this action. In September 2012, the district court referred the case to a magistrate judge for hearing and determination of certain pretrial issues. In December 2012, the court granted the OSIC's motion to intervene, and the OSIC filed an Intervenor Complaint against one of the other defendant financial institutions. In February 2013, the OSIC filed a second Intervenor Complaint that asserts claims against TNB and the remaining defendant financial institutions. The OSIC seeks to recover: (i) alleged fraudulent transfers in the amount of the fees each of the defendants allegedly received from Stanford Financial Group, the profits each of the defendants allegedly made from Stanford Financial Group deposits, and other monies each of the defendants allegedly received from Stanford Financial Group; (ii) damages attributable to alleged conspiracies by each of the defendants with the Stanford Financial Group to commit fraud and/or aid and abet fraud and conversion on the asserted grounds that the defendants knew or should have known the Stanford Financial Group was conducting an illegal and fraudulent scheme; and (iii) punitive damages. The OSIC did not quantify damages.

In July 2013, all defendants (including TNB) filed motions to dismiss the OSIC's claims. In March 2015, the court entered an order authorizing the parties to conduct discovery regarding class certification and setting a deadline for the parties to complete briefing on class certification issues. In April 2015, the court granted in part and denied in part the defendants' motions to dismiss the Class Plaintiffs' claims and the OSIC's claims. The court dismissed all of the Class Plaintiffs' fraudulent transfer claims and dismissed certain of the OSIC's claims. The court denied the motions by TNB and the other financial institution defendants to dismiss the OSIC's constructive fraudulent transfer claims.

On June 23, 2015, the court allowed the Class Plaintiffs to file a Second Amended Class Action Complaint (SAC), which asserted new claims against TNB and certain of the other defendants for (i) aiding, abetting and participating in a fraudulent scheme, (ii) aiding, abetting and participating in violations of the Texas Securities Act, (iii) aiding, abetting and participating in breaches of fiduciary duty, (iv) aiding, abetting and participating in conversion and (v) conspiracy. On July 14, 2015, the defendants (including TNB) filed motions to dismiss the SAC and to reconsider the court's prior denial to dismiss the OSIC's constructive fraudulent transfer claims against TNB and the other financial institutions that are defendants in the action. On July 27, 2016, the court denied the motion by TNB and the other financial institution defendants to dismiss the SAC and also denied the motion by TNB and the other financial institution defendants to reconsider the court's prior denial to dismiss the OSIC's constructive fraudulent transfer claims. Trustmark is evaluating this order and its options with respect to this litigation.

The second Stanford-related lawsuit was filed on December 14, 2009 in the District Court of Ascension Parish, Louisiana, individually by Harold Jackson, Paul Blaine, Carolyn Bass Smith, Christine Nichols, and Ronald and Ramona Hebert naming TNB (misnamed as Trust National Bank) and other individuals and entities not affiliated with Trustmark as defendants. The complaint seeks to recover the money lost by these individual plaintiffs as a result of the collapse of the Stanford Financial Group (in addition to other damages) under various theories and causes of action, including negligence, breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, negligent misrepresentation, detrimental reliance, conspiracy, and violation of Louisiana's uniform fiduciary, securities, and racketeering laws. The complaint does not quantify the amount of money the plaintiffs seek to recover. In January 2010, the lawsuit was removed to federal court by certain defendants and then transferred by the United States Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to federal court in the Northern District of Texas (Dallas) where multiple Stanford related matters are being consolidated for pre-trial proceedings. On March 29, 2010, the court stayed the case. TNB filed a motion to lift the stay, which was denied on February 28, 2012. In September 2012, the district court referred the case to a magistrate judge for hearing and determination of certain pretrial issues.

On April 11, 2016, Trustmark learned that a third Stanford-related lawsuit had been filed on April 11, 2016 in the Superior Court of Justice in Ontario, Canada, by The Toronto-Dominion Bank ("TD Bank"), naming TNB and three other financial institutions not affiliated with Trustmark as defendants. The complaint seeks a declaration specifying the degree to which each of TNB and the other defendants are liable in respect of any loss and damage for which TD Bank is found to be liable in a litigation commenced against TD Bank brought by the Joint Liquidators of Stanford International Bank Limited in the Superior Court of Justice, Commercial List in Ontario, Canada (the "Joint Liquidators' Action"), as well as contribution and indemnity in respect of any judgment, interest and costs TD Bank is ordered to pay in the Joint Liquidators' Action. To date, TNB has not been served in connection with this action.

TNB's relationship with the Stanford Financial Group began as a result of Trustmark's acquisition of a Houston-based bank in August 2006, and consisted of correspondent banking and other traditional banking services in the ordinary course of business. All Stanford-related lawsuits are in pre-trial stages.

TNB has been named as a defendant in two separately filed but now consolidated lawsuits involving two testamentary trusts created in the will of Kathleen Killebrew Paine for her two children, Carolyn Paine Davis and W.K. Paine. TNB is named as the Trustee in both trusts. The lawsuits were filed on June 30, 2014 in the Chancery Court of the First Judicial District of Hinds County, Mississippi by Jennifer Davis Michael, Elizabeth Paine Lindigrin, Wilmer

Harrison Paine, Kenneth Whitworth Paine, Robert Harvey Paine and Nathan Davis, who are all children of Mrs. Davis and Mr. Paine. The complaints allege that the plaintiffs are vested current beneficiaries of the respective trusts; that the plaintiffs should have been entitled to be considered for distributions of trust income; and that the interests of Mrs. Davis and Mr. Paine were favored over plaintiffs' interest in both the distribution of income and in the making of trust investments. Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages, refund of trust fees and sweep fees, punitive damages, attorneys' fees and pre- and post-judgment interest. On March 9, 2015, the court granted TNB's motion to add Mrs. Davis and Mr. W.K. Paine as cross-defendants. Following a bench trial that concluded on January 20, 2016, the judge ordered the parties to enter into mandatory mediation. On February 22, 2016, the mediator reported to the judge that the mediation had failed to resolve the matter. The judge will next conduct a scheduling conference for a timeframe for the parties to submit findings of fact and conclusions of law to the court. The judge will consider those submissions and then enter a ruling on the case at some point in the future.

Trustmark and its subsidiaries are also parties to other lawsuits and other claims that arise in the ordinary course of business. Some of the lawsuits assert claims related to the lending, collection, servicing, investment, trust and other business activities, and some of the lawsuits allege substantial claims for damages.

All pending legal proceedings described above are being vigorously contested. In accordance FASB ASC Topic 450-20, "Loss Contingencies," Trustmark will establish an accrued liability for litigation matters when those matters present loss contingencies that are both probable and reasonably estimable. At the present time, Trustmark believes, based on its evaluation and the advice of legal counsel, that a loss in any such proceeding is not both probable and reasonably estimable.

Note 12 – Earnings Per Share (EPS)

The following table reflects weighted-average shares used to calculate basic and diluted EPS for the periods presented (in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
Basic shares	67,620	67,557	67,615	67,541
Dilutive shares	150	128	146	122
Diluted shares	67,770	67,685	67,761	67,663

Weighted-average antidilutive stock awards were excluded in determining diluted EPS. The following table reflects weighted-average

antidilutive stock awards for the periods presented (in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
Weighted-average antidilutive stock awards	1	—	1	—

Note 13 – Statements of Cash Flows

The following table reflects specific transaction amounts for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015
Income taxes paid	\$18,756	\$10,286
Interest expense paid on deposits and borrowings	11,590	10,185
Noncash transfers from loans to other real estate (1)	8,668	19,792

(1) Includes transfers from covered loans to covered other real estate.

Note 14 – Shareholders’ Equity

Regulatory Capital

Trustmark and TNB are subject to minimum risk-based capital and leverage capital requirements, as described in the section captioned “Capital Adequacy” included in Part I. Item 1. – Business of Trustmark’s 2015 Annual Report on Form 10-K, which are administered by the federal bank regulatory agencies. These capital requirements, as defined by federal regulations, involve quantitative and qualitative measures of assets, liabilities and certain off-balance sheet instruments. Effective January 1, 2016, Trustmark’s and TNB’s minimum risk-based capital requirements include the year-one phased in capital conservation buffer of 0.625%. Failure to meet minimum capital requirements can result in certain mandatory and possibly additional discretionary actions by regulators that, if undertaken, could have a direct material effect on the financial statements of Trustmark and TNB and limit Trustmark’s and TNB’s ability to pay dividends. As of June 30, 2016, Trustmark and TNB exceeded all applicable minimum capital standards. In addition, Trustmark and TNB met applicable regulatory guidelines to be considered well-capitalized at June 30, 2016. To be categorized in this manner, Trustmark and TNB maintained minimum common equity Tier 1 risk-based capital, Tier 1 risk-based capital, total risk-based capital and Tier 1 leverage ratios as set forth in the accompanying table, and were not subject to any written agreement, order or capital directive, or prompt corrective action directive issued by their primary federal regulators to meet and maintain a specific capital level for any capital measures. There are no significant conditions or events that have occurred since June 30, 2016, which Management believes have affected Trustmark’s or TNB’s present classification.

The following table provides Trustmark's and TNB's actual regulatory capital amounts and ratios under regulatory capital standards in effect at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	Actual			To Be Well Capitalized	
	Regulatory Capital Amount	Capital Ratio	Minimum Requirement		
At June 30, 2016:					
Common Equity Tier 1 Capital (to Risk Weighted Assets)					
Trustmark Corporation	\$ 1,177,431	12.32 %	5.125	%	n/a
Trustmark National Bank	1,218,943	12.75 %	5.125	%	6.50 %
Tier 1 Capital (to Risk Weighted Assets)					
Trustmark Corporation	\$ 1,237,103	12.94 %	6.625	%	n/a
Trustmark National Bank	1,218,943	12.75 %	6.625	%	8.00 %
Total Capital (to Risk Weighted Assets)					
Trustmark Corporation	\$ 1,321,379	13.82 %	8.625	%	n/a
Trustmark National Bank	1,303,219	13.63 %	8.625	%	10.00 %
Tier 1 Leverage (to Average Assets)					
Trustmark Corporation	\$ 1,237,103	9.93 %	4.00	%	n/a
Trustmark National Bank	1,218,943	9.80 %	4.00	%	5.00 %
At December 31, 2015:					
Common Equity Tier 1 Capital (to Risk Weighted Assets)					
Trustmark Corporation	\$ 1,161,598	12.57 %	4.50	%	n/a
Trustmark National Bank	1,201,113	13.00 %	4.50	%	6.50 %
Tier 1 Capital (to Risk Weighted Assets)					
Trustmark Corporation	\$ 1,220,535	13.21 %	6.00	%	n/a
Trustmark National Bank	1,201,113	13.00 %	6.00	%	8.00 %
Total Capital (to Risk Weighted Assets)					
Trustmark Corporation	\$ 1,300,146	14.07 %	8.00	%	n/a
Trustmark National Bank	1,280,724	13.86 %	8.00	%	10.00 %
Tier 1 Leverage (to Average Assets)					
Trustmark Corporation	\$ 1,220,535	10.03 %	4.00	%	n/a
Trustmark National Bank	1,201,113	9.89 %	4.00	%	5.00 %

Stock Repurchase Program

On March 11, 2016, the Board of Directors of Trustmark authorized a stock repurchase program under which \$100.0 million of Trustmark's outstanding common stock may be acquired through March 31, 2019. The shares may be purchased from time to time at prevailing market prices, through open market or privately negotiated transactions, depending on market conditions. Trustmark repurchased approximately 34 thousand shares of its common stock during the three and six months ended June 30, 2016.

Other Comprehensive Income and Accumulated Other Comprehensive Loss

The following table presents the components of accumulated other comprehensive loss and the related tax effects allocated to each component for the six months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015 (\$ in thousands). Reclassification adjustments related to securities available for sale are included in security losses, net in the accompanying consolidated statements of income. The amortization of prior service cost, recognized net loss due to lump sum settlements and change in net actuarial loss on pension and other postretirement benefit plans are included in the computation of net periodic benefit cost (see Note 9 – Defined Benefit and Other Postretirement Benefits for additional details). Reclassification adjustments related to pension and other postretirement benefit plans are included in salaries and employee benefits in the accompanying consolidated statements of income. Reclassification adjustments related to the cash flow hedge derivative are included in other interest expense in the accompanying consolidated statements of income.

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2016			Three Months Ended June 30, 2015		
	Before Tax	Tax (Expense)	Net of Tax	Before Tax	Tax (Expense)	Net of Tax
	Amount	Benefit	Amount	Amount	Benefit	Amount
Securities available for sale and transferred securities:						
Unrealized holding gains (losses) arising during the period	\$9,372	\$ (3,585)	\$ 5,787	\$(22,593)	\$ 8,642	\$(13,951)
Reclassification adjustment for net losses realized in net income	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change in net unrealized holding loss on securities transferred to held to maturity	2,973	(1,137)	1,836	1,653	(632)	1,021
Total securities available for sale and transferred securities	12,345	(4,722)	7,623	(20,940)	8,010	(12,930)
Pension and other postretirement benefit plans:						
Net change in prior service costs	62	(23)	39	62	(24)	38
Recognized net loss due to lump sum settlements	2,248	(860)	1,388	479	(183)	296
Change in net actuarial loss	874	(334)	540	1,216	(465)	751
Reclassification related to net losses realized in net income	3,184	(1,217)	1,967	1,757	(672)	1,085

Cash flow hedge derivatives:

Change in accumulated loss on effective cash flow

hedge derivatives	(449)	172	(277)	282	(108)	174
-------------------	--------	-----	--------	-----	--------	-----

Reclassification adjustment for loss realized in net

income	156	(60)	96	209	(79)	130
--------	-----	-------	----	-----	-------	-----

Total cash flow hedge derivatives	(293)	112	(181)	491	(187)	304
-----------------------------------	--------	-----	--------	-----	--------	-----

Total other comprehensive income (loss)	\$ 15,236	\$ (5,827)	\$ 9,409	\$ (18,692)	\$ 7,151	\$ (11,541)
---	-----------	-------------	----------	-------------	----------	-------------

	Six Months Ended June 30, 2016			Six Months Ended June 30, 2015		
	Before Tax	Tax (Expense)	Net of Tax	Before Tax	Tax (Expense)	Net of Tax
	Amount	Benefit	Amount	Amount	Benefit	Amount
Securities available for sale and transferred securities:						
Unrealized holding losses arising during the period	\$44,714	\$ (17,102)	\$27,612	\$ (4,154)	\$ 1,589	\$ (2,565)
Reclassification adjustment for net gains realized in net income	310	(119)	191	—	—	—
Change in net unrealized holding loss on securities transferred to held to maturity	5,697	(2,179)	3,518	3,069	(1,174)	1,895
Total securities available for sale and transferred securities	50,721	(19,400)	31,321	(1,085)	415	(670)
Pension and other postretirement benefit plans:						
Net change in prior service costs	125	(48)	77	125	(48)	77
Recognized net loss due to lump sum settlements	2,671	(1,022)	1,649	896	(343)	553
Change in net actuarial loss	1,756	(671)	1,085	2,437	(932)	1,505
Reclassification related to net losses realized in net income	4,552	(1,741)	2,811	3,458	(1,323)	2,135
Cash flow hedge derivatives:						
Change in accumulated loss on effective cash flow hedge derivatives	(1,777)	680	(1,097)	(703)	269	(434)
Reclassification adjustment for loss realized in net income	316	(121)	195	421	(161)	260
Total cash flow hedge derivatives	(1,461)	559	(902)	(282)	108	(174)
Total other comprehensive income	\$53,812	\$ (20,582)	\$33,230	\$2,091	\$ (800)	\$ 1,291

The following table presents the changes in the balances of each component of accumulated other comprehensive loss for the periods presented (\$ in thousands). All amounts are presented net of tax.

Securities	Defined	Cash Flow	Total
Available for Sale	Benefit	Hedge	

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

	Securities	and Transferred	Pension Items	Derivatives	
Balance at January 1, 2016	\$ (17,394)	\$(27,840)	\$ (160) \$(45,394)
Other comprehensive income (loss) before reclassification	31,130		—	(1,097) 30,033
Amounts reclassified from accumulated other					
comprehensive loss	191		2,811	195	3,197
Net other comprehensive income (loss)	31,321		2,811	(902) 33,230
Balance at June 30, 2016	\$ 13,927		\$(25,029)	\$ (1,062) \$(12,164)
Balance at January 1, 2015	\$ (11,003)	\$(31,617)	\$ 136) \$(42,484)
Other comprehensive (loss) income before reclassification	(670)	2,135	(434) 1,031
Amounts reclassified from accumulated other					
comprehensive loss	—		—	260	260
Net other comprehensive income (loss)	(670)	2,135	(174) 1,291
Balance at June 30, 2015	\$ (11,673)	\$(29,482)	\$ (38) \$(41,193)

Note 15 – Fair Value

Financial Instruments Measured at Fair Value

The methodologies Trustmark uses in determining the fair values are based primarily on the use of independent, market-based data to reflect a value that would be reasonably expected upon exchange of the position in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. The predominant portion of assets that are stated at fair value are of a nature that can be valued using prices or inputs that are readily observable through a variety of independent data providers. The providers selected by Trustmark for fair valuation data are widely recognized and accepted vendors whose evaluations support the pricing functions of financial institutions, investment and mutual funds, and portfolio managers. Trustmark has documented and evaluated the pricing methodologies used by the vendors and maintains internal processes that regularly test valuations for anomalies.

Trustmark utilizes an independent pricing service to advise it on the carrying value of the securities available for sale portfolio. As part of Trustmark’s procedures, the price provided from the service is evaluated for reasonableness given market changes. When a questionable price exists, Trustmark investigates further to determine if the price is valid. If needed, other market participants may be utilized to determine the correct fair value. Trustmark has also reviewed and confirmed its determinations in thorough discussions with the pricing source regarding their methods of price discovery.

Mortgage loan commitments are valued based on the securities prices of similar collateral, term, rate and delivery for which the loan is eligible to deliver in place of the particular security. Trustmark acquires a broad array of mortgage security prices that are supplied by a market data vendor, which in turn accumulates prices from a broad list of securities dealers. Prices are processed through a mortgage pipeline management system that accumulates and segregates all loan commitment and forward-sale transactions according to the similarity of various characteristics (maturity, term, rate, and collateral). Prices are matched to those positions that are deemed to be an eligible substitute or offset (i.e., “deliverable”) for a corresponding security observed in the market place.

Trustmark estimates fair value of the MSR through the use of prevailing market participant assumptions and market participant valuation processes. This valuation is periodically tested and validated against other third-party firm valuations.

Trustmark obtains the fair value of interest rate swaps from a third-party pricing service that uses an industry standard discounted cash flow methodology. In addition, credit valuation adjustments are incorporated in the fair values to account for potential nonperformance risk. In adjusting the fair value of its interest rate swap contracts for the effect of nonperformance risk, Trustmark has considered any applicable credit enhancements such as collateral postings, thresholds, mutual puts, and guarantees. In conjunction with the FASB’s fair value measurement guidance, Trustmark made an accounting policy election to measure the credit risk of these derivative financial instruments, which are subject to master netting agreements, on a net basis by counterparty portfolio.

Trustmark has determined that the majority of the inputs used to value its interest rate swaps offered to qualified commercial borrowers fall within Level 2 of the fair value hierarchy, while the credit valuation adjustments associated with these derivatives utilize Level 3 inputs, such as estimates of current credit spreads. Trustmark has assessed the significance of the impact of the credit valuation adjustments on the overall valuation of its interest rate swaps and has determined that the credit valuation adjustment is not significant to the overall valuation of these derivatives. As a result, Trustmark classifies its interest rate swap valuations in Level 2 of the fair value hierarchy.

Trustmark also utilizes exchange-traded derivative instruments such as Treasury note futures contracts and option contracts to achieve a fair value return that offsets the changes in fair value of the MSR attributable to interest rates. Fair values of these derivative instruments are determined from quoted prices in active markets for identical assets therefore allowing them to be classified within Level 1 of the fair value hierarchy. In addition, Trustmark utilizes derivative instruments such as interest rate lock commitments in its mortgage banking area which lack observable inputs for valuation purposes resulting in their inclusion in Level 3 of the fair value hierarchy.

At this time, Trustmark presents no fair values that are derived through internal modeling. Should positions requiring fair valuation arise that are not relevant to existing methodologies, Trustmark will make every reasonable effort to obtain market participant assumptions, or independent evaluation.

Financial Assets and Liabilities

The following tables summarize financial assets and financial liabilities measured at fair value on a recurring basis as of June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, segregated by the level of valuation inputs within the fair value hierarchy utilized to measure fair value (\$ in thousands). There were no transfers between fair value levels for the six months ended June 30, 2016 and the year ended December 31, 2015.

	June 30, 2016			
	Total	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
U.S. Government agency obligations	\$61,645	\$—	\$61,645	\$—
Obligations of states and political subdivisions	129,285	—	129,285	—
Mortgage-backed securities	2,197,376	—	2,197,376	—
Securities available for sale	2,388,306	—	2,388,306	—
Loans held for sale	213,546	—	213,546	—
Mortgage servicing rights	62,814	—	—	62,814
Other assets - derivatives	15,573	5,031	5,870	4,672
Other liabilities - derivatives	12,741	925	11,816	—

	December 31, 2015			
	Total	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
U.S. Government agency obligations	\$68,416	\$—	\$68,416	\$—
Obligations of states and political subdivisions	138,609	—	138,609	—
Mortgage-backed securities	2,113,440	—	2,113,440	—
Asset-backed securities and structured financial products	24,957	—	24,957	—
Securities available for sale	2,345,422	—	2,345,422	—
Loans held for sale	160,189	—	160,189	—
Mortgage servicing rights	74,007	—	—	74,007
Other assets - derivatives	3,611	(149)	2,647	1,113
Other liabilities - derivatives	3,929	1,220	2,709	—

The changes in Level 3 assets measured at fair value on a recurring basis for the six months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015 are summarized as follows (\$ in thousands):

	MSR		Derivatives	
Balance, January 1, 2016	\$	74,007	\$	1,113
Total net (loss) gain included in Mortgage banking, net (1)		(18,404)		7,340
Additions		7,211		—
Sales		—		(3,781)
	\$	62,814	\$	4,672

Balance, June 30, 2016			
The amount of total (losses) gains for the period included in earnings that are attributable to the change in unrealized gains or losses still held at June 30, 2016			
	\$	(13,899)	\$ 1,157
Balance, January 1, 2015	\$	64,358	\$ 1,299
Total net (loss) gain included in Mortgage banking, net (1)		(1,093)	3,715
Additions		8,157	—
Sales		—	(3,393)
Balance, June 30, 2015	\$	71,422	\$ 1,621
The amount of total gains (losses) for the period included in earnings that are attributable to the change in unrealized gains or losses still held at June 30, 2015			
	\$	3,708	\$ (564)

(1) Total net (loss) gain included in Mortgage banking, net relating to the MSR includes changes in fair value due to market changes and due to run-off.

Trustmark may be required, from time to time, to measure certain assets at fair value on a nonrecurring basis in accordance with GAAP. Assets at June 30, 2016, which have been measured at fair value on a nonrecurring basis, include impaired LHFI. Loans for which it is probable Trustmark will be unable to collect the scheduled payments of principal or interest when due according to the contractual terms of the loan agreement are considered impaired. Specific allowances for impaired LHFI are based on comparisons of the recorded carrying values of the loans to the present value of the estimated cash flows of these loans at each loan's original effective interest rate, the fair value of the collateral or the observable market prices of the loans. Impaired LHFI are primarily collateral dependent loans and are assessed using a fair value approach. Fair value estimates for collateral dependent loans are derived from appraised values based on the current market value or as-is value of the property being appraised, normally from recently received and reviewed appraisals. Appraisals are obtained from state-certified appraisers and are based on certain assumptions, which may include construction or development status and the highest and best use of the property. These appraisals are reviewed by Trustmark's Appraisal Review Department to ensure they are acceptable. Appraised values are adjusted down for costs associated with asset disposal. At June 30, 2016, Trustmark had outstanding balances of \$37.3 million in impaired LHFI that were specifically identified for evaluation and written down to the fair value of the underlying collateral less cost to sell based on the fair value of the collateral or other unobservable input compared to \$26.5 million at December 31, 2015. These specifically evaluated impaired LHFI are classified as Level 3 in the fair value hierarchy. Impaired LHFI are periodically reviewed and evaluated for additional impairment and adjusted accordingly based on the same factors identified above.

Nonfinancial Assets and Liabilities

Certain nonfinancial assets measured at fair value on a nonrecurring basis include foreclosed assets (upon initial recognition or subsequent impairment), nonfinancial assets and nonfinancial liabilities measured at fair value in the second step of a goodwill impairment test, and intangible assets and other nonfinancial long-lived assets measured at fair value for impairment assessment.

Other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, includes assets that have been acquired in satisfaction of debt through foreclosure and is recorded at the lower of cost or estimated fair value. Fair value is based on independent appraisals and other relevant factors. In the determination of fair value subsequent to foreclosure, Management also considers other factors or recent developments, such as changes in market conditions from the time of valuation and anticipated sales values considering plans for disposition, which could result in an adjustment to lower the collateral value estimates indicated in the appraisals. At June 30, 2016, Trustmark's geographic other real estate distribution was concentrated primarily in its five key market regions: Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee and Texas. The ultimate recovery of a substantial portion of the carrying amount of other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, is susceptible to changes in market conditions in these areas. Periodic revaluations are classified as Level 3 in the fair value hierarchy since assumptions are used that may not be observable in the market.

Certain foreclosed assets, upon initial recognition, are remeasured and reported at fair value through a charge-off to the allowance for loan losses based upon the fair value of the foreclosed asset. The fair value of a foreclosed asset, upon initial recognition, is estimated using Level 3 inputs based on adjusted observable market data. Foreclosed assets measured at fair value upon initial recognition totaled \$8.2 million (utilizing Level 3 valuation inputs) during the six months ended June 30, 2016 compared with \$20.5 million for the same period in 2015. In connection with the measurement and initial recognition of the foregoing foreclosed assets, Trustmark recognized charge-offs of the allowance for loan losses totaling \$1.8 million and \$3.9 million for the first six months of 2016 and 2015, respectively. Other than foreclosed assets measured at fair value upon initial recognition, \$21.4 million of foreclosed assets were remeasured during the first six months of 2016, requiring write-downs of \$3.0 million to reach their current fair values compared to \$25.7 million of foreclosed assets that were remeasured during the first six months of 2015, requiring write-downs of \$993 thousand.

Fair Value of Financial Instruments

FASB ASC Topic 825, “Financial Instruments,” requires disclosure of the fair value of financial assets and financial liabilities, including those financial assets and financial liabilities that are not measured and reported at fair value on a recurring basis or non-recurring basis. A detailed description of the valuation methodologies used in estimating the fair value of financial instruments can be found in Note 19 – Fair Value included in Item 8 of Trustmark’s Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2015.

The carrying amounts and estimated fair values of financial instruments at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, are as follows (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016		December 31, 2015	
	Carrying	Estimated	Carrying	Estimated
	Value	Fair Value	Value	Fair Value
Financial Assets:				
Level 2 Inputs:				
Cash and short-term investments	\$325,247	\$325,247	\$278,001	\$278,001
Securities held to maturity	1,173,204	1,210,044	1,187,818	1,195,367
Level 3 Inputs:				
Net LHFI	7,333,385	7,426,286	7,023,766	7,136,105
Net acquired loans	326,555	326,555	378,419	378,419
FDIC indemnification asset	—	—	738	738
Financial Liabilities:				
Level 2 Inputs:				
Deposits	9,531,524	9,534,947	9,588,230	9,592,531
Short-term liabilities	966,770	966,770	853,659	853,659
Long-term FHLB advances	751,106	751,109	501,155	501,160
Subordinated notes	49,985	50,891	49,969	51,405
Junior subordinated debt securities	61,856	42,062	61,856	49,021

In cases where quoted market prices are not available, fair values are generally based on estimates using present value techniques. Trustmark's premise in present value techniques is to represent the fair values on a basis of replacement value of the existing instrument given observed market rates on the measurement date. These techniques are significantly affected by the assumptions used, including the discount rate and estimates of future cash flows. In that regard, the derived fair value estimates for those assets or liabilities cannot necessarily be substantiated by comparison to independent markets and, in many cases, may not be realizable in immediate settlement of the instruments. The estimated fair value of financial instruments with immediate and shorter-term maturities (generally 90 days or less) is assumed to be the same as the recorded book value. All nonfinancial instruments, by definition, have been excluded from these disclosure requirements. Accordingly, the aggregate fair value amounts presented do not represent the underlying value of Trustmark.

The fair values of net LHFI are estimated for portfolios of loans with similar financial characteristics. For variable rate LHFI that reprice frequently with no significant change in credit risk, fair values are based on carrying values. The fair values of certain mortgage LHFI, such as 1-4 family residential properties, are based on quoted market prices of similar loans sold in conjunction with securitization transactions, adjusted for differences in loan characteristics. The fair values of other types of LHFI are estimated by discounting the future cash flows using the current rates at which similar loans would be made to borrowers with similar credit ratings and for the same remaining maturities. The processes for estimating the fair value of net LHFI described above does not represent an exit price under FASB ASC Topic 820, "Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures," and such an exit price could potentially produce a different fair value estimate at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015.

Fair Value Option

Trustmark has elected to account for its mortgage LHFS purchased or originated on or after October 1, 2014 under the fair value option, with interest income on these mortgage LHFS reported in interest and fees on LHFS and LHFI. The fair value of the mortgage LHFS is determined using quoted prices for a similar asset, adjusted for specific attributes of that loan. The mortgage LHFS are actively managed and monitored and certain market risks of the loans may be mitigated through the use of derivatives. These derivative instruments are carried at fair value with changes in fair value recorded in noninterest income in mortgage banking, net. The changes in the fair value of the LHFS are largely offset by changes in the fair value of the derivative instruments. For the three and six months ended June 30, 2016, a net gain of \$1.0 million and \$3.8 million, respectively, was recorded in noninterest income in mortgage banking, net for changes in the fair value of the LHFS accounted for under the fair value option, compared to a net loss of \$2.2 million and \$1.8 million for the three and six months ended June 30, 2015, respectively. Interest and fees on LHFS and LHFI for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 included \$1.3 million and \$2.2 million, respectively, of interest earned on the LHFS accounted for under the fair value option, compared to \$1.3 million and \$2.3 million for the same time periods in 2015. Election of the fair value option allows Trustmark to reduce the accounting volatility that would otherwise result from the asymmetry created by accounting for the financial instruments at the lower of cost or fair value and the derivatives at fair value. The fair value option election does not apply to the GNMA optional repurchase loans which do not meet the requirements under FASB ASC Topic 825 to be accounted for under the fair value option. GNMA optional repurchase loans totaled \$33.6 million and \$36.0 million at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, respectively, and are included in LHFS on the accompanying consolidated balance sheets.

The following table provides information about the fair value and the contractual principal outstanding of the LHFS accounted for under the fair value option as of June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Fair value of LHFS	\$179,970	\$124,165
LHFS contractual principal outstanding	172,592	121,608
Fair value less unpaid principal	\$7,378	\$2,557

Note 16 – Derivative Financial Instruments

Derivatives Designated as Hedging Instruments

On April 4, 2013, Trustmark entered into a forward interest rate swap contract on junior subordinated debentures with a total notional amount of \$60.0 million. The interest rate swap contract was designated as a derivative instrument in a cash flow hedge under FASB ASC Topic 815, “Derivatives and Hedging,” with the objective of protecting the quarterly interest payments on Trustmark’s \$60.0 million of junior subordinated debentures issued to Trustmark Preferred Capital Trust I throughout the five-year period beginning December 31, 2014 and ending December 31, 2019 from the risk of variability of those payments resulting from changes in the three-month LIBOR interest rate. Under the swap, which became effective on December 31, 2014, Trustmark will pay a fixed interest rate of 1.66% and receive a variable interest rate based on three-month LIBOR on a total notional amount of \$60.0 million, with quarterly net settlements.

No ineffectiveness related to the interest rate swap designated as a cash flow hedge was recognized in the consolidated statements of income for the six months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015. The accumulated net after-tax loss related to the effective cash flow hedge included in accumulated other comprehensive loss totaled \$1.1 million and \$160 thousand at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, respectively. Amounts reported in accumulated other comprehensive loss related to this derivative are reclassified to other interest expense as interest payments are made on Trustmark's variable rate junior subordinated debentures. During the next twelve months, Trustmark estimates that \$604 thousand will be reclassified as an increase to other interest expense.

Derivatives not Designated as Hedging Instruments

Trustmark utilizes a portfolio of exchange-traded derivative instruments, such as Treasury note futures contracts and option contracts, to achieve a fair value return that economically hedges changes in the fair value of the MSR attributable to interest rates. These transactions are considered freestanding derivatives that do not otherwise qualify for hedge accounting. The total notional amount of these derivative instruments were \$325.0 million at June 30, 2016 compared to \$264.5 million at December 31, 2015. Changes in the fair value of these exchange-traded derivative instruments are recorded in noninterest income in mortgage banking, net and are offset by changes in the fair value of the MSR. The impact of this strategy resulted in a net negative ineffectiveness of \$1.9 million compared to a net positive ineffectiveness of \$2.1 million for the three months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015, respectively. For the six months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015, the impact was a net negative ineffectiveness of \$1.5 million compared to a net positive ineffectiveness of \$3.4 million, respectively.

As part of Trustmark's risk management strategy in the mortgage banking area, derivative instruments such as forward sales contracts are utilized. Trustmark's obligations under forward sales contracts consist of commitments to deliver mortgage loans, originated and/or purchased, in the secondary market at a future date. Changes in the fair value of these derivative instruments are recorded in noninterest income in mortgage banking, net and are offset by changes in the fair value of LHFS. Trustmark's off-balance sheet obligations under these derivative instruments totaled \$343.5 million at June 30, 2016, with a negative valuation adjustment of \$3.9 million, compared to \$190.5 million, with a positive valuation adjustment of \$262 thousand as of December 31, 2015.

Trustmark also utilizes derivative instruments such as interest rate lock commitments in its mortgage banking area. Interest rate lock commitments are residential mortgage loan commitments with customers, which guarantee a specified interest rate for a specified time period. Changes in the fair value of these derivative instruments are recorded in noninterest income in mortgage banking, net and are offset by the changes in the fair value of forward sales contracts. Trustmark's off-balance sheet obligations under these derivative instruments totaled \$240.0 million at June 30, 2016, with a positive valuation adjustment of \$4.7 million, compared to \$108.1 million, with a positive valuation adjustment of \$1.1 million as of December 31, 2015.

Trustmark offers certain derivatives products directly to qualified commercial lending clients seeking to manage their interest rate risk. Trustmark economically hedges interest rate swap transactions executed with commercial lending clients by entering into offsetting interest rate swap transactions with institutional derivatives market participants. Derivatives transactions executed as part of this program are not designated as qualifying hedging relationships and are, therefore, carried at fair value with the change in fair value recorded in noninterest income in bank card and other fees. Because these derivatives have mirror-image contractual terms, in addition to collateral provisions which mitigate the impact of non-performance risk, the changes in fair value are expected to substantially offset. As of June 30, 2016, Trustmark had interest rate swaps with an aggregate notional amount of \$390.1 million related to this program, compared to \$359.3 million as of December 31, 2015.

Credit-risk-related Contingent Features

Trustmark has agreements with its financial institution counterparties that contain provisions where if Trustmark defaults on any of its indebtedness, including default where repayment of the indebtedness has not been accelerated by the lender, then Trustmark could also be declared in default on its derivatives obligations.

As of June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, the termination value of interest rate swaps in a liability position, which includes accrued interest but excludes any adjustment for nonperformance risk, related to these agreements was \$7.7 million and \$2.6 million, respectively. As of June 30, 2016, Trustmark had posted collateral of \$6.8 million against its obligations because of negotiated thresholds and minimum transfer amounts under these agreements. If Trustmark had breached any of these triggering provisions at June 30, 2016, it could have been required to settle its obligations under the agreements at the termination value.

Credit risk participation agreements arise when Trustmark contracts with other financial institutions, as a guarantor or beneficiary, to share credit risk associated with certain interest rate swaps. These agreements provide for reimbursement of losses resulting from a third party default on the underlying swap. At both June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, Trustmark had entered into two risk participation agreements as a beneficiary with an aggregate notional amount of \$14.5 million and \$14.8 million, respectively. At June 30, 2016, Trustmark had entered into three risk participation agreements as a guarantor with an aggregate notional amount of \$24.5 million compared to one risk participation agreement as a guarantor with an aggregate notional amount of \$5.9 million at December 31, 2015. The aggregate fair values of these risk participation agreements were immaterial at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015.

Tabular Disclosures

The following tables disclose the fair value of derivative instruments in Trustmark's balance sheets as of June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 as well as the effect of these derivative instruments on Trustmark's results of operations for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Derivatives in hedging relationships		
Interest rate contracts:		
Interest rate swaps included in other assets	\$(1,721)	\$(259)
Derivatives not designated as hedging instruments		
Interest rate contracts:		
Futures contracts included in other assets	\$4,725	\$(207)
Exchange traded purchased options included in other assets	306	58
OTC written options (rate locks) included in other assets	4,672	1,113
Interest rate swaps included in other assets	7,557	2,888
Credit risk participation agreements included in other assets	34	18
Forward contracts included in other liabilities	3,944	(262)
Exchange traded written options included in other liabilities	925	1,220
Interest rate swaps included in other liabilities	7,829	2,954
Credit risk participation agreements included in other liabilities	43	17

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2016		Six Months Ended June 30, 2016	
Derivatives in hedging relationships				
Amount of loss reclassified from accumulated other				
comprehensive loss and recognized in other interest expense	\$(156)	\$(209)	\$(316)	\$(421)
Derivatives not designated as hedging instruments				
Amount of gain (loss) recognized in mortgage banking, net	\$4,591	\$(1,594)	\$11,730	\$2,956
Amount of (loss) gain recognized in bank card and other fees	(148)	118	(206)	34

The following table discloses the amount included in other comprehensive income (loss), net of tax, for derivative instruments designated as cash flow hedges for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2016		Six Months Ended June 30, 2016	
Derivatives in cash flow hedging relationship				
Amount of (loss) gain recognized in other comprehensive income (loss), net of tax	\$(277)	\$174	\$(1,097)	\$(434)

Trustmark's interest rate swap derivative instruments are subject to master netting agreements, and therefore, eligible for offsetting in the consolidated balance sheet. Trustmark has elected to not offset any derivative instruments in its consolidated balance sheets. Information about financial instruments that are eligible for offset in the consolidated balance sheets as of June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 is presented in the following tables (\$ in thousands):

Offsetting of Derivative
Assets
As of June 30, 2016

	Gross Amounts Not Offset in the					
	Statement of Financial Position					
	Gross	Gross Amounts	Net Amounts of			
	Amounts of	Offset in the	Assets presented in			
	Recognized	Statement of	the Statement of	Financial	Cash Collateral	
	Assets	Financial Position	Financial Position	Instruments	Received	Net
Derivatives	\$ 5,836	\$ —	\$ 5,836	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 5,836

Offsetting of Derivative
Liabilities
As of June 30, 2016

	Gross Amounts Not Offset in the					
	Statement of Financial					
	Position					
	Gross	Gross Amounts	Net Amounts of			
	Amounts	Offset in the	Liabilities presented			
	of	Recognized Statement of	in the Statement of	Financial	Cash Collateral	
	Liabilities	Financial Position	Financial Position	Instruments	Posted	Net Amount
Derivatives	\$ 7,829	\$ —	\$ 7,829	\$ —	\$ (5,902)) \$ 1,927

Offsetting of Derivative
Assets
As of December 31, 2015

	Gross Amounts Not Offset in the					
	Statement of Financial					
	Position					
	Gross	Gross Amounts	Net Amounts of			
	Amounts	Offset in the	Assets presented in			
	of	Recognized Statement of	the Statement of	Financial	Cash Collateral	
	Assets	Financial Position	Financial Position	Instruments	Received	Net Amount
Derivatives	\$ 2,629	\$ —	\$ 2,629	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 2,629

Offsetting of Derivative
Liabilities
As of December 31, 2015

	Gross Amounts Not Offset in the					
	Statement of Financial					
	Position					
	Gross	Gross Amounts	Net Amounts of	Financial	Cash Collateral	Net Amount
	Amounts	Offset in the	Liabilities presented	Instruments	Posted	
	of	Statement of	in the Statement of			
	Recognized					

	Liabilities	Financial Position	Financial Position				
Derivatives	\$ 2,954	\$ —	\$ 2,954	\$ —	\$ (1,195)	\$ 1,759

Note 17 – Segment Information

Trustmark’s management reporting structure includes three segments: General Banking, Wealth Management and Insurance. For a complete overview of Trustmark’s operating segments, see Note 21 – Segment Information included in Part II. Item 8. – Financial Statements and Supplementary Data, of Trustmark’s 2015 Annual Report on Form 10-K. There have been no significant changes in Trustmark’s operating segments during the periods presented.

The accounting policies of each reportable segment are the same as those of Trustmark except for its internal allocations. Noninterest expenses for back-office operations support are allocated to segments based on estimated uses of those services. Trustmark measures the net interest income of its business segments with a process that assigns cost of funds or earnings credit on a matched-term basis. This process, called “funds transfer pricing”, charges an appropriate cost of funds to assets held by a business unit, or credits the business unit for potential earnings for carrying liabilities. The net of these charges and credits flows through to the General Banking segment, which contains the management team responsible for determining TNB’s funding and interest rate risk strategies.

The following table discloses financial information by reportable segment for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
General Banking				
Net interest income	\$96,113	\$96,815	\$190,555	\$194,075
Provision for loan losses, net	3,203	1,858	6,755	3,990
Noninterest income	26,629	28,417	54,023	54,157
Noninterest expense	96,812	86,843	182,705	172,360
Income before income taxes	22,727	36,531	55,118	71,882
Income taxes	4,005	8,297	11,324	16,381
General banking net income	\$18,722	\$28,234	\$43,794	\$55,501
Selected Financial Information				
Average assets	\$12,743,248	\$12,036,687	\$12,709,507	\$12,054,143
Depreciation and amortization	\$8,724	\$9,172	\$17,209	\$18,047
Wealth Management				
Net interest income	\$207	\$48	\$452	\$103
Noninterest income	7,959	7,722	15,247	15,729
Noninterest expense	6,093	6,408	11,984	13,178
Income before income taxes	2,073	1,362	3,715	2,654
Income taxes	793	502	1,421	1,015
Wealth management net income	\$1,280	\$860	\$2,294	\$1,639
Selected Financial Information				
Average assets	\$5,763	\$4,256	\$4,076	\$3,052
Depreciation and amortization	\$43	\$49	\$87	\$95
Insurance				
Net interest income	\$57	\$86	\$110	\$163
Noninterest income	9,639	9,404	18,233	18,020
Noninterest expense	7,274	7,015	14,434	13,944
Income before income taxes	2,422	2,475	3,909	4,239
Income taxes	921	967	1,491	1,629
Insurance net income	\$1,501	\$1,508	\$2,418	\$2,610
Selected Financial Information				
Average assets	\$70,352	\$72,316	\$66,852	\$62,053
Depreciation and amortization	\$191	\$228	\$383	\$387
Consolidated				
Net interest income	\$96,377	\$96,949	\$191,117	\$194,341
Provision for loan losses, net	3,203	1,858	6,755	3,990
Noninterest income	44,227	45,543	87,503	87,906
Noninterest expense	110,179	100,266	209,123	199,482

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Income before income taxes	27,222	40,368	62,742	78,775
Income taxes	5,719	9,766	14,236	19,025
Consolidated net income	\$21,503	\$30,602	\$48,506	\$59,750

Selected Financial Information

Average assets	\$12,819,363	\$12,113,259	\$12,780,435	\$12,119,248
Depreciation and amortization	\$8,958	\$9,449	\$17,679	\$18,529

Note 18 – Accounting Policies Recently Adopted and Pending Accounting Pronouncements

ASU 2016-13, “Financial Instruments-Credit Losses (Topic 326): Measurement of Credit Losses on Financial Instruments.” Issued in June 2016, ASU 2016-13 will add FASB ASC Topic 326, “Financial Instruments-Credit Losses” and finalizes amendments to FASB ASC Subtopic 825-15, “Financial Instruments-Credit Losses.” The amendments of ASU 2016-13 are intended to provide financial statement users with more decision-useful information related to expected credit losses on financial instruments and other commitments to extend credit by replacing the current incurred loss impairment methodology with a methodology that reflects expected credit losses and requires consideration of a broader range of reasonable and supportable information to determine credit loss estimates. The amendments of ASU 2016-13 eliminate the probable initial recognition threshold and, in turn, reflect an entity’s current estimate of all expected credit losses. ASU 2016-13 does not specify the method for measuring expected credit losses, and an entity is allowed to apply methods that reasonably reflect its expectations of the credit loss estimate. Additionally, the amendments of ASU 2016-13 require that credit losses on available for sale debt securities be presented as an allowance rather than as a write-down. The amendments of ASU 2016-13 are effective for interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2019. Earlier application is permitted for interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2018. Management is currently evaluating the impact this ASU will have on Trustmark’s consolidated financial statements.

ASU 2016-09, “Compensation-Stock Compensation (Topic 718): Improvements to Employee Share-Based Payment Accounting.” Issued in March 2016, ASU 2016-09 seeks to reduce complexity in accounting standards by simplifying several aspects of the accounting for share-based payment transactions, including (1) accounting for income taxes; (2) classification of excess tax benefits on the statement of cash flow; (3) forfeitures; (4) minimum statutory tax withholding requirements; (5) classification of employee taxes paid on the statement of cash flows when an employer withholds shares for tax withholding purposes; (6) the practical expedient for estimating the expected term; and (7) intrinsic value. The amendments of ASU 2016-09 are effective for interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2016. Management is currently evaluating the impact this ASU will have on Trustmark’s consolidated financial statements; however, the adoption of ASU 2016-09 is not expected to have a material impact on Trustmark’s consolidated financial statements.

ASU 2016-07, “Investments - Equity Method and Joint Ventures (Topic 323): Simplifying the Transition to the Equity Method of Accounting.” Issued in March 2016, ASU 2016-07 affects all entities that have an investment that becomes qualified for the equity method of accounting as a result of an increase in the level of ownership interest or degree of influence. ASU 2016-07 simplifies the transition to the equity method of accounting by eliminating the retroactive adjustment of the investment when an investment qualifies for use of the equity method, among other things. The amendments of ASU 2016-07 are effective for interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2016. Management is currently evaluating the impact this ASU will have on Trustmark’s consolidated financial statements; however, the adoption of ASU 2016-07 is not expected to have a material impact on Trustmark’s consolidated financial statements.

ASU 2016-05, “Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Effect of Derivative Contract Novations on Existing Hedge Accounting Relationships.” Issued in March 2016, ASU 2016-05 clarifies that a change in the counterparty to a

derivative instrument that has been designated as the hedging instrument under ASC Topic 815 does not, in and of itself, require de-designation of that hedging relationship provided that all other hedge accounting criteria continue to be met. The amendments of ASU 2016-05 are effective for interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2016. Management is currently evaluating the impact this ASU will have on Trustmark's consolidated financial statements; however, the adoption of ASU 2016-05 is not expected to have a material impact on Trustmark's consolidated financial statements.

ASU 2016-02, "Leases (Topic 842)." Issued in February 2016, ASU 2016-02 was issued by the FASB to increase transparency and comparability among organizations by recognizing lease assets and lease liabilities on the balance sheet and by disclosing key information about leasing arrangements. ASU 2016-02 will, among other things, require lessees to recognize a lease liability, which is a lessee's obligation to make lease payments arising from a lease, measured on a discounted basis; and a right-of-use asset, which is an asset that represents the lessee's right to use, or control the use of, a specified asset for the lease term. ASU 2016-02 does not significantly change lease accounting requirements applicable to lessors; however, the ASU contains some targeted improvements that are intended to align, where necessary, lessor accounting with the lessee accounting model and with the updated revenue recognition guidance issued in 2014. The amendments of ASU 2016-02 are effective for interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2018. Management is currently evaluating the impact this ASU will have on Trustmark's consolidated financial statements; however, the adoption of ASU 2016-02 is not expected to have a material impact on Trustmark's consolidated financial statements.

ASU 2016-01, "Financial Instruments-Overall (Subtopic 825-10): Recognition and Measurement of Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities (An Amendment of the FASB Accounting Standards Codification)." Issued in January 2016, ASU 2016-01 is intended to enhance the reporting model for financial instruments to provide users of financial statements with improved decision-making information. The amendments of ASU 2016-01 include: (i) requiring equity investments, except those accounted for under the equity method of accounting or those that result in the consolidation of an investee, to be measured at fair value with changes in fair value

recognized in net income; (ii) requiring a qualitative assessment to identify impairment of equity investments without readily determinable fair values; and (iii) clarifying that an entity should evaluate the need for a valuation allowance on a deferred tax asset related to available for sale securities in combination with the entity's other deferred tax assets. The amendments of ASU 2016-01 are effective for interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2017. Management is currently evaluating the impact this ASU will have on Trustmark's consolidated financial statements; however, the adoption of ASU 2016-01 is not expected to have a material impact on Trustmark's consolidated financial statements.

ASU 2014-09, "Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606)." Issued in May 2014, ASU 2014-09 will add FASB ASC Topic 606, "Revenue from Contracts with Customers," and will supersede revenue recognition requirements in FASB ASC Topic 605, "Revenue Recognition," as well as certain cost guidance in FASB ASC Topic 605-35, "Revenue Recognition – Construction-Type and Production-Type Contracts." ASU 2014-09 provides a framework for revenue recognition that replaces the existing industry and transaction specific requirements under the existing standards. ASU 2014-09 requires an entity to apply a five-step model to determine when to recognize revenue and at what amount. The model specifies that revenue should be recognized when (or as) an entity transfers control of goods or services to a customer at the amount in which the entity expects to be entitled. Depending on whether certain criteria are met, revenue should be recognized either over time, in a manner that depicts the entity's performance, or at a point in time, when control of the goods or services are transferred to the customer. ASU 2014-09 provides that an entity should apply the following steps: (1) identify the contract(s) with a customer; (2) identify the performance obligations in the contract; (3) determine the transaction price; (4) allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations in the contract; and (5) recognize revenue when, or as, the entity satisfies a performance obligation. In addition, the existing requirements for the recognition of a gain or loss on the transfer of non-financial assets that are not in a contract with a customer are amended to be consistent with the guidance on recognition and measurement in ASU 2014-09. The amendments of ASU 2014-09 may be applied either retrospectively to each prior reporting period presented or retrospectively with the cumulative effect of initially applying ASU 2014-09 recognized at the date of initial application. If the transition method of application is elected, the entity should also provide the additional disclosures in reporting periods that include the date of initial application of (1) the amount by which each financial statement line item is affected in the current reporting period, as compared to the guidance that was in effect before the change, and (2) an explanation of the reasons for significant changes. ASU 2015-14, "Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606)-Deferral of the Effective Date," issued in August 2015, defers the effective date of ASU 2014-09 by one year. ASU 2015-14 provides that the amendments of ASU 2014-09 become effective for interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2017. Earlier application is permitted only as of annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2016, including interim reporting periods within that reporting period. All subsequently issued ASUs which provide additional guidance and clarifications to various aspects of FASB ASC Topic 606 will become effective when the amendments of ASU 2014-09 become effective. Management is currently evaluating the impact ASU 2014-09 will have on Trustmark's consolidated financial statements as well as the most appropriate method of application; however, regardless of the method of application selected, the adoption of ASU 2014-09 is not expected to have a material impact on Trustmark's consolidated financial statements.

ITEM 2.MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

The following provides a narrative discussion and analysis of Trustmark Corporation's (Trustmark) financial condition and results of operations. This discussion should be read in conjunction with the unaudited consolidated financial statements and the supplemental financial data included in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements – of this report.

Description of Business

Trustmark, a Mississippi business corporation incorporated in 1968, is a bank holding company headquartered in Jackson, Mississippi. Trustmark's principal subsidiary is Trustmark National Bank (TNB), initially chartered by the State of Mississippi in 1889. At June 30, 2016, TNB had total assets of \$13.029 billion, which represented approximately 99.99% of the consolidated assets of Trustmark.

Through TNB and its other subsidiaries, Trustmark operates as a financial services organization providing banking and other financial solutions through 194 offices and 2,818 full-time equivalent associates (measured at June 30, 2016) located in the states of Alabama (primarily in the central and southern regions of that state, which are collectively referred to herein as Trustmark's Alabama market), Florida (primarily in the northwest or "Panhandle" region of that state, which is referred to herein as Trustmark's Florida market), Mississippi, Tennessee (in the Memphis and Northern Mississippi regions, which are collectively referred to herein as Trustmark's Tennessee market), and Texas (primarily in Houston, which is referred to herein as Trustmark's Texas market). Trustmark's operations are managed along three operating segments: General Banking Division, Wealth Management Division and Insurance Division. For a complete overview of Trustmark's business, see the section captioned "The Corporation" included in Part I. Item 1. – Business of Trustmark's 2015 Annual Report on Form 10-K.

Executive Overview

Trustmark continued to achieve solid financial results with total revenues of \$140.6 million and \$278.6 million for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016, respectively. Trustmark continued to maintain and expand customer relationships as reflected by growth across all five market regions in the loans held for investment (LHFI) portfolio, which increased \$137.2 million, or 1.9%, during the second quarter of 2016 and \$313.8 million, or 4.4%, during the first six months of 2016. Credit quality remained strong and continued to be an important contributor to Trustmark's financial success. During the second quarter of 2016, Trustmark completed a voluntary early retirement program (ERP) as a proactive measure to manage noninterest expense. As a result of the ERP, 188 of the eligible associates retired by June 30, 2016. The ERP resulted in a one-time charge of \$9.3 million to noninterest expense (\$9.1 million included in salaries and employee benefits expense and \$230 thousand included in other expense) during the second quarter of 2016. Trustmark reported net income of \$21.5 million, or basic and diluted earnings per share (EPS) of \$0.32, in the second quarter of 2016. Excluding the one-time charge related to the ERP, net income for the second quarter of 2016 totaled \$27.2 million, or basic and diluted EPS of \$0.40. Trustmark also continued the realignment of its retail delivery channels to enhance productivity and efficiency as well as promote additional revenue growth. During the second quarter of 2016, Trustmark continued its measured approach to the optimization of its retail delivery channels by closing six branches with limited growth opportunities in the Alabama, Florida and Mississippi market regions. Trustmark is committed to investments to support profitable revenue growth as well as reengineering and efficiency opportunities to enhance shareholder value. Trustmark's capital position remained solid, reflecting the consistent profitability of its diversified financial services businesses. Trustmark's Board of Directors declared a quarterly cash dividend of \$0.23 per share. The dividend is payable September 15, 2016, to shareholders of record on September 1, 2016.

Recent Economic and Industry Developments

The economy showed moderate signs of improvement in the first six months of 2016; however, economic concerns remain as a result of the cumulative weight of continued soft labor markets in the United States, volatility in crude oil prices and slowing growth in markets in Western Europe, Japan, China, Russia and other emerging markets, combined with uncertainty regarding anticipated further tightening of monetary policy by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (FRB), the Brexit vote, and the upcoming presidential election. Doubts surrounding the near-term direction of global markets, and the potential impact of these trends on the United States economy, are expected to persist for some time. While Trustmark's customer base is wholly domestic, international economic conditions affect domestic economic conditions, and thus may have an impact upon Trustmark's financial condition or results of operations.

In the July 2016 "Summary of Commentary on Current Economic Conditions by Federal Reserve Districts" (the "Beige Book"), the twelve Federal Reserve Districts' reports suggested national economic activity continued to expand at a modest pace during the reporting period, and noted consumer spending was generally positive; labor markets conditions remained stable as employment continued to grow; growth in lending activity and improvement in loan quality occurred, with the exception of the Federal Reserve's Eleventh District, Dallas; as well as improvements in both the residential and commercial real estate markets. Reports by the twelve Federal Reserve Districts also noted that the natural resources and energy sector remained weak due to price pressures. Reports by the three Federal Reserve Districts covering the southeast United States, which include Trustmark's five key market regions, suggested that economic activity increased at a modest pace, with most businesses reporting improved sales and positive outlooks for the near term, with the exception of the energy sector. The Federal Reserve's Sixth District, Atlanta (which includes Trustmark's Alabama, Florida and Mississippi market regions) and the Eighth District, St. Louis (which includes Trustmark's Tennessee market region) also reported increased loan demand, improvements in residential and commercial real estate activity and increased construction. However, the Federal Reserve's Sixth District also reported inconsistency in commercial real estate growth, noting that the rate of improvement varied by

metropolitan area, submarket, and property type. The Federal Reserve's Eleventh District (which includes Trustmark's Texas market region) reported growth in the housing market and positive outlooks for the housing sector, with the exception of the Houston market which continued to weaken; no to slightly negative loan growth; depressed demand for oilfield services even as overall business activity improved; and continued deterioration in the financial positions of many oil-related firms despite the increase in prices.

In December 2015, the FRB increased the target range for the federal funds rate for the first time in over seven years. The FRB also indicated that it may further increase rates on a gradual basis through 2016, depending on economic conditions (although the FRB has recently signaled that it is likely to increase rates less frequently through the latter half of 2016 that had originally been anticipated). It is not possible to predict the timing or amount of any such additional increases. Low interest rates will continue to place pressure on net interest margins for Trustmark (as well as its competitors), as older, higher-yielding assets that mature or default and can only be replaced with lower-yielding instruments.

Financial Highlights

Trustmark reported net income of \$21.5 million, or basic and diluted EPS of \$0.32, in the second quarter of 2016, compared to \$30.6 million, or basic and diluted EPS of \$0.45, in the second quarter of 2015. The decline in net income when the second quarter of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015 was principally the result of the non-routine transaction expense resulting from the ERP. Excluding the non-routine transaction expense related to the ERP, net income for the second quarter of 2016 totaled \$27.2 million, or basic and diluted EPS of \$0.40. Trustmark's performance during the quarter ended June 30, 2016 produced a return on average tangible equity of 8.08%, a return on average assets of 0.67%, an average equity to average assets ratio of 11.80% and a dividend payout ratio of 71.88%, compared to a return on average tangible equity of 12.05%, a return on average assets of 1.01%, an average equity to average assets ratio of 12.01% and a dividend payout ratio of 51.11% during the quarter ended June 30, 2015.

Revenue, which is defined as net interest income plus noninterest income, totaled \$140.6 million for the quarter ended June 30, 2016 compared to \$142.5 million for the quarter ended June 30, 2015, a decrease of \$1.9 million, or 1.3%. The decrease in total revenue for the second quarter of 2016 was principally the result of declines in interest and fees on acquired loans and mortgage banking, net, which were partially offset by increases in interest and fees on loans held for sale (LHFS) and LHFI and other income, net.

Interest and fees on acquired loans decreased \$4.5 million, or 35.9%, when the second quarter of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, in accordance with prior expectations. This was primarily due to a \$3.5 million decline in accretion income and a \$731 thousand decline in recoveries from the settlement of debt as acquired loans have continued to pay down as anticipated. Mortgage banking, net declined \$2.8 million, or 29.1%, when the three months ended June 30, 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, principally due to a net negative hedge ineffectiveness of \$1.9 million in the second quarter of 2016 compared to a net positive hedge ineffectiveness of \$2.1 million in the second quarter of 2015. Interest and fees on LHFS and LHFI increased \$5.6 million, or 8.2%, when the second quarter of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, primarily due to an increase in the LHFI portfolio. LHFI totaled \$7.405 billion at June 30, 2016, an increase of \$958.1 million, or 14.9%, when compared to June 30, 2015, as a result of net growth across all of Trustmark's market regions and all categories in its LHFI portfolio, with the exception of loans secured by 1-4 family residential properties. Other income, net increased \$1.8 million when the three months ended June 30, 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, primarily reflecting a decrease in the net reduction of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) indemnification asset related to the acquired covered loans and covered other real estate. The decrease in the net reduction of the FDIC indemnification asset was principally due to the decline in the balance of the FDIC indemnification asset as a result of amortization and valuation adjustments over the life of the loss share agreements as well as the expiration of a loss share agreement with the FDIC on June 30, 2016. See the section caption "Acquired Loans" for further discussion of the acquired loans covered by loss share agreements with the FDIC.

Trustmark's provision for loan losses, LHFI for the three months ended June 30, 2016 totaled \$2.6 million, an increase of \$1.6 million when compared to a provision for loan losses, LHFI of \$1.0 million for the three months ended June 30, 2015. The increase in the provision for loan losses, LHFI for the second quarter of 2016 primarily reflects the net effect of revisions to the allowance for loan loss methodology for LHFI during 2015 and growth in the LHFI portfolio, partially offset by a decrease in net charge-offs of LHFI when compared to the second quarter of 2015. Please see the section captioned "Provision for Loan Losses, LHFI," for additional information regarding the provision for loan losses, LHFI. The provision for loan losses, acquired loans for the three months ended June 30, 2016 totaled \$607 thousand, a decrease of \$218 thousand when compared to the same time period in 2015. Please see the section captioned "Provision for Loan Losses, Acquired Loans," for additional information regarding the provision for loan losses, acquired loans. In total, the provision for loan losses, net was \$3.2 million for the second quarter of 2016, an increase of \$1.3 million, or 72.4%, when compared to the same time period in 2015.

Trustmark reported net income of \$48.5 million, or basic and diluted EPS of \$0.72, for the first six months of 2016, compared to \$59.8 million, or basic and diluted EPS of \$0.88, for the first six months of 2015. The decline in net income when the first six months of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015 was principally the result of the non-routine transaction expense resulting from the ERP, an increase in the provision for loan losses, LHFI and an increase in other interest expense related to Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLB) advances with the FHLB of Dallas. Trustmark's performance during the six months ended June 30, 2016 produced a return on average tangible equity of 9.16%, a return on average assets of 0.76%, an average equity to average assets ratio of 11.77% and a dividend payout ratio of 63.89%, compared to a return on average tangible equity of 11.96%, a return on average assets of 0.99%, an average equity to average assets ratio of 11.93% and a dividend payout ratio of 52.27% during the six months ended June 30, 2015.

Revenue totaled \$278.6 million for the first six months of 2016 compared to \$282.2 million for the same time period in 2015, a decrease of \$3.6 million, or 1.3%. The decrease in total revenue for the first six months of 2016 was principally the result of declines in interest and fees on acquired loans and mortgage banking, net and an increase in other interest expense, which were partially offset by increases in interest and fees on LHFS and LHFI and other income, net.

Interest and fees on acquired loans decreased \$12.6 million, or 45.5%, when the first six months of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, primarily due to a \$8.5 million decline in accretion income and a \$3.4 million decline in recoveries from the settlement of debt as acquired loans have continued to pay down as anticipated. Mortgage banking, net declined \$3.0 million, or 16.4%, when the six months ended June 30, 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, principally due to a net negative hedge ineffectiveness of \$1.5 million in the first six months of 2016 compared to a net positive hedge ineffectiveness of \$3.4 million in the first six months of 2015 partially offset by a \$1.7 million increase in the positive net valuation adjustment for the fair value of LHFS, interest rate lock commitments and forward sales contracts. Other interest expense increased \$1.6 million, or 47.6%, when the first six months of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, primarily due to an increase in interest expense on FHLB advances with the FHLB of Dallas, which Trustmark uses as a liquidity source. Trustmark had \$300.0 million of outstanding short-term advances and \$750.0 million of outstanding long-term advances at June 30, 2016, compared to \$150.0 million of outstanding short-term advances and no outstanding long-term advances at June 30, 2015. Interest and fees on LHFS and LHFI increased \$11.7 million, or 8.7%, when the first six months of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, primarily due to the \$958.1 million increase in the LHFI portfolio. Other income, net increased \$3.7 million when the six months ended June 30, 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, primarily reflecting a decrease in the net reduction of the FDIC indemnification asset related to the acquired covered loans and covered other real estate, a decrease in the net loss on the sale of premises and equipment due to a loss recorded during the first six months of 2015 on the sale of a former bank branch acquired in the February 2013 merger with BancTrust Financial Group, Inc. (BancTrust) and an increase in other miscellaneous income related to various contract bonuses and settlements received during the second quarter of 2016, partially offset by a decrease in the net revenues received related to Trustmark's nonqualified deferred compensation plan.

Trustmark's provision for loan losses, LHFI for the six months ended June 30, 2016 totaled \$4.8 million, an increase of \$2.0 million, or 71.7%, when compared to a provision for loan losses, LHFI of \$2.8 million for the six months ended June 30, 2015. The increase in the provision for loan losses, LHFI for the first six months of 2016 primarily reflects the net effect of revisions to the allowance for loan loss methodology for LHFI during 2015 and growth in the LHFI portfolio, partially offset by a decrease in the amount of specific reserves required related to impaired LHFI in the Mississippi and Texas market regions when compared to the first six months of 2015. Please see the section captioned "Provision for Loan Losses, LHFI," for additional information regarding the provision for loan losses, LHFI. The provision for loan losses, acquired loans for the six months ended June 30, 2016 totaled \$1.9 million, an increase of \$744 thousand, or 63.5%, when compared to the same time period in 2015. The increase in the provision for loan losses, acquired loans during the first six months of 2016 when compared to the same time period in 2015 was principally due to changes in expectations based on the periodic re-estimations performed during the period, primarily related to loans acquired from BancTrust, a decrease in charge-offs of acquired loans from both Heritage Banking Group (Heritage) and BancTrust partially offset by an increase in charge-offs of acquired loans from Bay Bank & Trust Co. (Bay Bank), and a decrease in recoveries of acquired loans from BancTrust. Please see the section captioned "Provision for Loan Losses, Acquired Loans," for additional information regarding the provision for loan losses, acquired loans. In total, the provision for loan losses, net was \$6.8 million for the first six months of 2016, an increase of \$2.8 million, or 69.3%, when compared to the same time period in 2015.

At June 30, 2016, nonperforming assets, excluding acquired loans and covered other real estate, totaled \$134.6 million, an increase of \$2.1 million, or 1.6%, compared to December 31, 2015 as a result of an increase in nonaccrual LHFI partially offset by a decline in other real estate, excluding covered other real estate. Total nonaccrual LHFI were \$65.1 million at June 30, 2016, representing an increase of \$9.8 million, or 17.7%, relative to December 31, 2015 principally due to LHFI migrating to nonaccrual status in the Mississippi, Texas and Tennessee market regions partially offset by substandard credits that were paid off or foreclosed in the Mississippi market region, returned to accrual status in the Florida market region, and charged off in the Texas market region during the first six months of 2016. Other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, declined \$7.7 million, or 9.9%, during the first six months of 2016 primarily due to properties sold as well as write-downs of properties in Trustmark's Alabama, Florida,

Mississippi and Tennessee market regions partially offset by properties foreclosed in the Florida, Mississippi and Alabama market regions.

LHFI totaled \$7.405 billion at June 30, 2016, an increase of \$313.8 million, or 4.4%, compared to December 31, 2015. The increase in LHFI during the first six months of 2016 represented net growth across all five of Trustmark's market regions, primarily in the loans secured by real estate, commercial and industrial loans and state and other political subdivision loans categories. For additional information regarding changes in LHFI and comparative balances by loan category, see the section captioned "LHFI."

Trustmark has continued to experience improvements in credit quality on LHFI. As of June 30, 2016, classified LHFI balances decreased \$9.9 million, or 5.4%, while criticized LHFI balances decreased \$20.9 million, or 10.4%, when compared to balances at June 30, 2015. The decline in the volume of classified and criticized LHFI was primarily a result of upgrades of credits to a pass category and from repayment of several credits of significant size.

Management has continued its practice of maintaining excess funding capacity to provide Trustmark with adequate liquidity for its ongoing operations. In this regard, Trustmark benefits from its strong deposit base, its highly liquid investment portfolio and its

access to funding from a variety of external funding sources such as upstream federal funds lines, FHLB advances and, on a limited basis, brokered deposits.

Total deposits were \$9.532 billion at June 30, 2016, a decrease of \$56.7 million, or 0.6% compared to December 31, 2015. During the first six months of 2016, noninterest-bearing deposits decreased \$77.7 million, or 2.6%, primarily due to declines in public and consumer demand deposit accounts partially offset by growth in commercial demand deposit accounts, while interest-bearing deposits increased \$21.0 million, or 0.3%, primarily due to growth in public interest-bearing accounts, all categories of savings accounts, public certificates of deposit and commercial money market accounts partially offset by all other categories of interest-bearing accounts.

Trustmark uses short-term borrowings to fund growth of earning assets in excess of deposits growth. Other short-term borrowings totaled \$966.8 million at June 30, 2016, an increase of \$113.1 million, or 13.3%, when compared with \$853.7 million at December 31, 2015 as a result of the increase in earning assets, principally LHFI, and the decline in deposits. The increase in other short-term borrowings was principally due to a \$145.0 million increase in upstream federal funds purchased as Trustmark has chosen to utilize this advantageous funding source. The increase in upstream federal funds purchased was partially offset by a \$50.0 million decline in outstanding short-term FHLB advances with the FHLB of Dallas.

Long-term FHLB advances totaled \$751.1 million at June 30, 2016, an increase of \$250.0 million, or 49.9%, when compared with \$501.2 million at December 31, 2015. During the second quarter of 2016, Trustmark obtained a \$250.0 million long-term FHLB advance from the FHLB of Dallas. Similar to the long-term advance obtained in December 2015, the advance has a variable rate and a two-year maturity. Trustmark chose to utilize these long-term advances as a funding source due to the advantageous rates available in comparison to other sources of funding.

Recent Legislative and Regulatory Developments

For information regarding legislation and regulation applicable to Trustmark, see the section captioned “Supervision and Regulation” included in Part I. Item 1. – Business of Trustmark’s 2015 Annual Report on Form 10-K.

In March 2016, the Board of Directors of the FDIC approved a final rule to increase Deposit Insurance Fund (DIF) to the statutorily required minimum level of 1.35 percent. Under a rule adopted by the FDIC in 2011, regular assessment rates for all banks will decline once the reserve ratio reaches 1.15 percent, which the FDIC expects will occur during the first half of 2016. The final rule approved in March 2016 will impose a surcharge of 4.5 cents per \$100 of the assessment base, after making certain adjustments, on banks with at least \$10.0 billion in assets. The FDIC expects the reserve ratio will likely reach 1.35 percent after approximately two years of payments of these surcharges. The final rule became effective on July 1, 2016. Surcharges will begin July 1, 2016. However, if the reserve ratio has not reached 1.15 percent by July 1, 2016, surcharges will begin the first quarter after the reserve ratio reaches 1.15 percent. At this time, it has not yet been determined if the reserve ratio has reached the 1.15 percent threshold. Trustmark expects this information will become available before the end of the third quarter of 2016. Trustmark expects that its FDIC assessment expense will decline under this final rule as the lower regular assessment rates and the allowable adjustments will more than offset the surcharge of 4.5 cents per \$100 of assessment base.

In April and May 2016, the FRB, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), and other federal financial agencies re-proposed restrictions on incentive-based compensation pursuant to Section 956 of the Dodd-Frank Act for financial institutions with \$1.0 billion or more in total consolidated assets. For institutions with at least \$1.0 billion but less than \$50.0 billion in total consolidated assets, such as Trustmark and TNB, the proposal would impose principles-based restrictions that are broadly consistent with existing interagency guidance on incentive-based compensation. Such institutions would be prohibited from entering into incentive compensation arrangements that

encourage inappropriate risk-taking by the institution (1) by providing an executive officer, employee, director, or principal shareholder with excessive compensation, fees, or benefits, or (2) that could lead to material financial loss to the institution. The proposal would also impose certain governance and recordkeeping requirements on institutions of Trustmark and TNB's size. The FRB and OCC would reserve the authority to impose more stringent requirements on institutions of Trustmark and TNB's size. Trustmark is evaluating the potential impact, if any, of the proposal on its results of operations and financial condition.

Selected Financial Data

The following table presents financial data derived from Trustmark's consolidated financial statements as of and for the periods presented (\$ in thousands, except per share data):

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
Consolidated Statements of Income				
Total interest income	\$ 102,331	\$ 101,946	\$ 202,929	\$ 204,377
Total interest expense	5,954	4,997	11,812	10,036
Net interest income	96,377	96,949	191,117	194,341
Provision for loan losses, LHFI	2,596	1,033	4,839	2,818
Provision for loan losses, acquired loans	607	825	1,916	1,172
Noninterest income	44,227	45,543	87,503	87,906
Noninterest expense	110,179	100,266	209,123	199,482
Income before income taxes	27,222	40,368	62,742	78,775
Income taxes	5,719	9,766	14,236	19,025
Net Income	\$ 21,503	\$ 30,602	\$ 48,506	\$ 59,750
Revenues (1)				
Total revenues	\$ 140,604	\$ 142,492	\$ 278,620	\$ 282,247
Per Share Data				
Basic earnings per share	\$0.32	\$0.45	\$0.72	\$0.88
Diluted earnings per share	0.32	0.45	0.72	0.88
Cash dividends per share	0.23	0.23	0.46	0.46
Performance Ratios				
Return on average equity	5.72	% 8.44	% 6.49	% 8.33
Return on average tangible equity	8.08	% 12.05	% 9.16	% 11.96
Return on average assets	0.67	% 1.01	% 0.76	% 0.99
Average equity/average assets	11.80	% 12.01	% 11.77	% 11.93
Net interest margin (fully taxable equivalent)	3.56	% 3.81	% 3.55	% 3.84
Dividend payout ratio	71.88	% 51.11	% 63.89	% 52.27
Credit Quality Ratios (2)				
Net charge-offs/average loans	0.03	% 0.07	% 0.02	% 0.04
Provision for loan losses/average loans	0.14	% 0.06	% 0.13	% 0.09
Nonperforming loans/total loans (incl LHFS*)	0.85	% 1.04	%	
Nonperforming assets/total loans (incl LHFS*)				
plus ORE**	1.75	% 2.38	%	
Allowance for loan losses/total loans (excl LHFS*)	0.97	% 1.10	%	

June 30,	2016	2015
Consolidated Balance Sheets		
Total assets	\$ 13,030,349	\$ 12,182,448
Securities	3,561,510	3,636,544
Total loans (including LHFS* and acquired loans)	7,957,762	7,061,011
Deposits	9,531,524	9,792,174
Total shareholders' equity	1,523,467	1,450,409
Stock Performance		
Market value - close	\$24.85	\$24.98
Book value	22.53	21.47
Tangible book value	16.76	15.58
Capital Ratios		
Total equity/total assets	11.69	% 11.91 %
Tangible equity/tangible assets	8.97	% 8.93 %
Tangible equity/risk-weighted assets	11.85	% 12.34 %
Tier 1 leverage ratio	9.93	% 10.14 %
Common equity tier 1 risk-based capital ratio	12.32	% 13.28 %
Tier 1 risk-based capital ratio	12.94	% 13.97 %
Total risk-based capital ratio	13.82	% 15.07 %

(1) Consistent with Trustmark's audited annual financial statements, revenue is defined as net interest income plus noninterest income

(2) Excludes Acquired Loans and Covered Other Real Estate

* LHFS is Loans Held for Sale

** ORE is Other Real Estate

Non-GAAP Financial Measures

In addition to capital ratios defined by U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and banking regulators, Trustmark utilizes various tangible common equity measures when evaluating capital utilization and adequacy. Tangible common equity, as defined by Trustmark, represents common equity less goodwill and identifiable intangible assets.

Trustmark believes these measures are important because they reflect the level of capital available to withstand unexpected market conditions. Additionally, presentation of these measures allows readers to compare certain aspects of Trustmark's capitalization to other organizations. These ratios differ from capital measures defined by banking regulators principally in that the numerator excludes shareholders' equity associated with preferred securities, the nature and extent of which varies across organizations. In Management's experience, many stock analysts use tangible common equity measures in conjunction with more traditional bank capital ratios to compare capital adequacy of banking organizations with significant amounts of goodwill or other tangible assets, typically stemming from the use of the purchase accounting method in accounting for mergers and acquisitions.

These calculations are intended to complement the capital ratios defined by GAAP and banking regulators. Because GAAP does not include these capital ratio measures, Trustmark believes there are no comparable GAAP financial measures to these tangible common equity ratios. Despite the importance of these measures to Trustmark, there are

no standardized definitions for them and, as a result, Trustmark's calculations may not be comparable with other organizations. Also there may be limits in the usefulness of these measures to investors. As a result, Trustmark encourages readers to consider its consolidated financial statements and the notes related thereto in their entirety and not to rely on any single financial measure.

The following table reconciles Trustmark's calculation of these measures to amounts reported under GAAP for the periods presented (\$ in thousands, except per share data):

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
TANGIBLE EQUITY				
AVERAGE BALANCES				
Total shareholders' equity	\$1,512,841	\$1,454,501	\$1,503,763	\$1,445,783
Less: Goodwill	(366,156)	(365,500)	(366,156)	(365,500)
Identifiable intangible assets	(24,961)	(30,385)	(25,835)	(31,386)
Total average tangible equity	\$1,121,724	\$1,058,616	\$1,111,772	\$1,048,897
PERIOD END BALANCES				
Total shareholders' equity	\$1,523,467	\$1,450,409		
Less: Goodwill	(366,156)	(365,500)		
Identifiable intangible assets	(24,058)	(32,042)		
Total tangible equity (a)	\$1,133,253	\$1,052,867		
TANGIBLE ASSETS				
Total assets	\$13,030,349	\$12,182,448		
Less: Goodwill	(366,156)	(365,500)		
Identifiable intangible assets	(24,058)	(32,042)		
Total tangible assets (b)	\$12,640,135	\$11,784,906		
Risk-weighted assets (c)	\$9,559,816	\$8,530,144		
NET INCOME ADJUSTED FOR INTANGIBLE AMORTIZATION				
Net income	\$21,503	\$30,602	\$48,506	\$59,750
Plus: Intangible amortization net of tax	1,045	1,210	2,154	2,439
Net income adjusted for intangible amortization	\$22,548	\$31,812	\$50,660	\$62,189
Period end shares outstanding (d)	67,623,601	67,557,395		
TANGIBLE EQUITY MEASUREMENTS				
Return on average tangible equity (1)	8.08	% 12.05	% 9.16	% 11.96
Tangible equity/tangible assets (a)/(b)	8.97	% 8.93	%	
Tangible equity/risk-weighted assets (a)/(c)	11.85	% 12.34	%	
Tangible book value (a)/(d)*1,000	\$16.76	\$15.58		
COMMON EQUITY TIER 1 CAPITAL (CET1)				
Total shareholders' equity	\$1,523,467	\$1,450,409		
AOCI-related adjustments	12,164	41,193		
CET1 adjustments and deductions:				
Goodwill net of associated deferred tax liabilities (DTLs)	(348,158)	(348,940)		
	(10,042)	(9,568)		

Other adjustments and deductions for
CET1 (2)

CET1 capital	(e)	1,177,431	1,133,094
Additional tier 1 capital instruments plus related surplus		60,000	60,000
Less: additional tier 1 capital deductions		(328)	(1,571)
Additional tier 1 capital		59,672	58,429
Tier 1 Capital		\$ 1,237,103	\$ 1,191,523

Common equity tier 1 risk-based capital ratio	(e)/(c)	12.32	%	13.28	%
--	---------	-------	---	-------	---

(1) Calculation = ((net income adjusted for intangible amortization/number of days in period)*number of days in
year)/total average tangible equity

(2) Includes other intangible assets, net of DTLs, disallowed deferred tax assets, threshold deductions and transition
adjustments, as applicable

Significant Non-Routine Transactions

Trustmark discloses certain non-GAAP financial measures, including net income adjusted for significant non-routine transactions, because Management uses these measures for business planning purposes, including to manage Trustmark's business against internal projected results of operations and to measure Trustmark's performance. Trustmark views net income adjusted for significant non-routine transactions as a measure of our core operating business, which excludes the impact of the items detailed below, as these items are generally not operational in nature. This non-GAAP measure also provides another basis for comparing period-to-period results as presented in the accompanying selected financial data table and the audited consolidated financial statements by excluding potential differences caused by non-operational and unusual or non-recurring items. Readers are cautioned that these adjustments are not permitted under GAAP. Trustmark encourages readers to consider its consolidated financial statements and the notes related thereto in their entirety, and not to rely on any single financial measure.

The following table presents adjustments to net income and select financial ratios as reported in accordance with GAAP resulting from significant non-routine items occurring during the periods presented (\$ in thousands, except per share data):

	Three Months Ended June 30,				Six Months Ended June 30,			
	2016		2015		2016		2015	
	Amount	Diluted EPS	Amount	Diluted EPS	Amount	Diluted EPS	Amount	Diluted EPS
Net Income (GAAP)	\$21,503	\$ 0.317	\$30,602	\$ 0.452	\$48,506	\$ 0.716	\$59,750	\$ 0.883
Significant non-routine transactions (net of taxes):								
Non-routine early retirement								
program expense	5,738	0.085	—	—	5,738	0.085	—	—
Net Income adjusted for significant								
non-routine transactions (Non-GAAP)	\$27,241	\$ 0.402	\$30,602	\$ 0.452	\$54,244	\$ 0.801	\$59,750	\$ 0.883
	Reported (GAAP)		Adjusted (Non-GAAP)		Reported (GAAP)		Adjusted (Non-GAAP)	
Return on equity	5.72	%	7.24	%	8.44	%	n/a	
Return on average tangible equity	8.08	%	10.14	%	12.05	%	n/a	
Return on assets	0.67	%	0.85	%	1.01	%	n/a	

n/a – Not Applicable

Results of Operations

Net Interest Income

Net interest income is the principal component of Trustmark's income stream and represents the difference, or spread, between interest and fee income generated from earning assets and the interest expense paid on deposits and borrowed funds. Fluctuations in interest rates, as well as volume and mix changes in earning assets and interest-bearing liabilities, can materially impact net interest income. The net interest margin is computed by dividing fully taxable equivalent (FTE) net interest income by average interest-earning assets and measures how effectively Trustmark utilizes its interest-earning assets in relationship to the interest cost of funding them. The accompanying Yield/Rate Analysis Table shows the average balances for all assets and liabilities of Trustmark and the interest income or expense associated with earning assets and interest-bearing liabilities. The yields and rates have been computed based upon interest income and expense adjusted to a FTE basis using a 35% federal marginal tax rate for all periods shown. Loans on nonaccrual have been included in the average loan balances, and interest collected prior to these loans having been placed on nonaccrual has been included in interest income. Loan fees included in interest associated with the average loan balances are immaterial.

Net interest income-FTE for the three months ended June 30, 2016 remained relatively unchanged when compared to the same time period in 2015, while the net interest margin for the second quarter of 2016 decreased 25 basis points to 3.56% when compared to the second quarter of 2015. Net interest income-FTE for the six months ended June 30, 2016 decreased \$2.3 million, or 1.1%, when compared with the same time period in 2015. The net interest margin for the six months ended June 30, 2016 decreased 29 basis points to 3.55% when compared to the same time period in 2015. The decrease in the net interest margin for both the three and six months ended June 30, 2016, reflected the prolonged low interest rate environment in the United States, and was primarily the result of a downward repricing of LHFI in response to increased competitive pricing pressures, decreases in the yield on acquired loans principally due to declines in accretion income and recoveries on settlement of debt related to acquired loans and increases in interest expense for other borrowings principally due to increases in the amount of outstanding FHLB advances with the FHLB of Dallas. The net interest margin excluding acquired loans, which equals the reported net interest income-FTE excluding interest and fees on

acquired loans, as a percentage of average earning assets excluding average acquired loans, for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 was 3.38% and 3.39%, respectively, a decrease of 11 basis points and 9 basis points, respectively, when compared to the same time periods in 2015, due to similar factors as discussed above.

Average interest-earning assets for the first six months of 2016 were \$11.339 billion compared to \$10.625 billion for the same time period in 2015, an increase of \$714.0 million, or 6.7%. The growth in average earning assets during the first six months of 2016 was primarily due to an increase in average loans (LHFS and LHFI) of \$867.8 million, or 13.2%, partially offset by a decrease in average acquired loans of \$140.4 million, or 27.8%. The increase in average loans (LHFS and LHFI) was primarily attributable to the \$958.1 million, or 14.9%, increase in the LHFI portfolio when balances at June 30, 2016 are compared to balances at June 30, 2015. This increase represented net growth across all of Trustmark's market regions and all categories in its LHFI portfolio, with the exception of loans secured by 1-4 family residential properties. The decline in average acquired loans was primarily attributable to pay-offs of acquired loans, principally related to the BancTrust merger.

During the first six months of 2016, interest and fees on LHFS and LHFI-FTE increased \$12.8 million, or 9.1%, when compared to the same time period in 2015, due to growth in LHFI, while the yield on loans (LHFS and LHFI) fell 17 basis points to 4.17% due to downward repricing of LHFI due to the current low interest rate environment and related competitive pressures. During the first six months of 2016, interest and fees on acquired loans decreased \$12.6 million, or 45.5%, compared to the same time period in 2015, due to declines in accretion income and recoveries on settlement of debt, primarily related to loans acquired in the BancTrust merger and Heritage acquisition, as acquired loans continue to pay-down as anticipated. As a result, the yield on acquired loans for the first six months of 2016 decreased to 8.33% compared to 11.05% during the first six months of 2015. As a result of these factors, interest income-FTE decreased \$486 thousand, or 0.2%, when the first six months of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015. The impact of these changes is also illustrated by the decline in the yield on total earning assets, which fell from 4.03% for the first six months of 2015 to 3.76% for the first six months of 2016, a decrease of 27 basis points.

Average interest-bearing liabilities for the first six months of 2016 totaled \$8.262 billion compared to \$7.779 billion for the same time period in 2015, an increase of \$482.4 million, or 6.2%. The increase in average interest-bearing liabilities was principally due to the increase in average other borrowings partially offset by a decline in average interest-bearing deposits. Average other borrowings increased \$722.1 million when the first six months of 2016 is compared to the first six months of 2015, primarily reflecting increased balances of both short-term and long-term FHLB advances obtained from the FHLB of Dallas as Trustmark chose to utilize these less costly sources of funding, partially offset by the maturity of a \$6.5 million FHLB advance with the FHLB of Atlanta, which was acquired in the BancTrust merger, during the fourth quarter of 2015. Average interest-bearing deposits for the first six months of 2016 decreased \$282.9 million, or 4.0%, when compared to the same time period in 2015, principally due to declines in average certificates of deposits, reflecting Trustmark's continued efforts to reduce high-cost deposit balances and customers continued movement away from longer-term commitments as a result of the low interest rate environment.

Total interest expense for the first six months of 2016 increased \$1.8 million, or 17.7%, when compared with the same time period in 2015, principally due to the increase in other interest expense. Other interest expense for the first six months of 2016 increased \$1.6 million, or 47.6%, when compared to the same time period in 2015 primarily due to the increase in FHLB advances with the FHLB of Dallas, while the rate on other borrowings declined from 2.15% for the first six months of 2015 to 0.94% for the first six months of 2016. The decline in the rate on other borrowings for the first six months of 2016 was principally due to the FHLB advances outstanding during the first six months of 2016 having a much lower interest rate than those advances outstanding during the first six months of 2015. During the first six months of 2016, interest expense on federal funds purchased and securities sold under repurchase agreements increased \$513 thousand, while the rate on federal funds purchased and securities sold under repurchase agreements increased 19 basis points to 0.33% when compared to the first six months of 2015. The increase in the rate on federal

funds purchased and securities sold under repurchase agreements for the first six months of 2016 was primarily due to the increase in rates by the FRB. As a result of these factors, the overall yield on interest-bearing liabilities increased 3 basis points to 0.29% when the first six months of 2016 is compared with the first six months of 2015.

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

The following tables provide the tax equivalent basis yield or rate for each component of the tax equivalent net interest margin for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2016			2015		
	Average		Yield/	Average		Yield/
	Balance	Interest	Rate	Balance	Interest	Rate
Assets						
Interest-earning assets:						
Federal funds sold and securities purchased under						
reverse repurchase agreements	\$1,263	\$4	1.27 %	\$557	\$2	1.44 %
Securities - taxable	3,336,503	19,402	2.34 %	3,398,758	19,731	2.33 %
Securities - nontaxable	134,081	1,429	4.29 %	158,503	1,688	4.27 %
Loans (LHFS and LHFI)	7,505,409	77,777	4.17 %	6,554,739	71,546	4.38 %
Acquired loans	349,740	8,051	9.26 %	482,992	12,557	10.43 %
Other earning assets	64,000	200	1.26 %	41,242	392	3.81 %
Total interest-earning assets	11,390,996	106,863	3.77 %	10,636,791	105,916	3.99 %
Cash and due from banks	271,135			272,292		
Other assets	1,240,846			1,288,507		
Allowance for loan losses, net	(83,614)			(84,331)		
Total Assets	\$12,819,363			\$12,113,259		
Liabilities and Shareholders' Equity						
Interest-bearing liabilities:						
Interest-bearing deposits	\$6,730,521	3,122	0.19 %	\$7,003,433	3,204	0.18 %
Federal funds purchased and securities sold under						
repurchase agreements	488,512	404	0.33 %	497,606	179	0.14 %
Other borrowings	1,028,393	2,428	0.95 %	241,777	1,614	2.68 %
Total interest-bearing liabilities	8,247,426	5,954	0.29 %	7,742,816	4,997	0.26 %
Noninterest-bearing demand deposits	2,927,469			2,772,741		
Other liabilities	131,627			143,201		
Shareholders' equity	1,512,841			1,454,501		
Total Liabilities and Shareholders' Equity	\$12,819,363			\$12,113,259		
Net Interest Margin		100,909	3.56 %		100,919	3.81 %
Less tax equivalent adjustment		4,532			3,970	
Net Interest Margin per Consolidated						
Statements of Income		\$96,377			\$96,949	

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

	Six Months Ended June 30, 2016			2015		
	Average		Yield/	Average		Yield/
	Balance	Interest	Rate	Balance	Interest	Rate
Assets						
Interest-earning assets:						
Federal funds sold and securities purchased under						
reverse repurchase agreements	\$823	\$5	1.22 %	\$388	\$2	1.04 %
Securities - taxable	3,345,209	39,488	2.37 %	3,354,784	39,317	2.36 %
Securities - nontaxable	137,883	2,926	4.27 %	163,736	3,477	4.28 %
Loans (LHFS and LHFI)	7,425,871	154,012	4.17 %	6,558,066	141,204	4.34 %
Acquired loans	364,088	15,073	8.33 %	504,440	27,635	11.05 %
Other earning assets	65,351	430	1.32 %	43,791	785	3.61 %
Total interest-earning assets	11,339,225	211,934	3.76 %	10,625,205	212,420	4.03 %
Cash and due from banks	276,524			281,222		
Other assets	1,247,062			1,295,989		
Allowance for loan losses, net	(82,376)			(83,168)		
Total Assets	\$12,780,435			\$12,119,248		
Liabilities and Shareholders' Equity						
Interest-bearing liabilities:						
Interest-bearing deposits	\$6,731,528	6,160	0.18 %	\$7,014,448	6,451	0.19 %
Federal funds purchased and securities sold under						
repurchase agreements	502,846	835	0.33 %	459,617	322	0.14 %
Other borrowings	1,027,491	4,817	0.94 %	305,411	3,263	2.15 %
Total interest-bearing liabilities	8,261,865	11,812	0.29 %	7,779,476	10,036	0.26 %
Noninterest-bearing demand deposits	2,881,876			2,757,428		
Other liabilities	132,931			136,561		
Shareholders' equity	1,503,763			1,445,783		
Total Liabilities and Shareholders' Equity	\$12,780,435			\$12,119,248		
Net Interest Margin						
		200,122	3.55 %		202,384	3.84 %
Less tax equivalent adjustment						
		9,005			8,043	
Net Interest Margin per Consolidated						
Statements of Income		\$191,117			\$194,341	

Provision for Loan Losses, LHFI

The provision for loan losses, LHFI is determined by Management as the amount necessary to adjust the allowance for loan losses, LHFI to a level, which, in Management's best estimate, is necessary to absorb probable losses within the

existing loan portfolio. The provision for loan losses, LHFI reflects loan quality trends, including the levels of and trends related to nonaccrual LHFI, past due LHFI, potential problem LHFI, criticized LHFI, net charge-offs or recoveries and growth in the LHFI portfolio among other factors. Accordingly, the amount of the provision reflects the necessary increases in the allowance for loan losses, LHFI related to newly identified criticized LHFI as well as the actions taken related to other LHFI including, among other things, any necessary increases or decreases in required allowances for specific loans or loan pools. The provision for loan losses, LHFI totaled \$2.6 million and \$4.8 million, respectively, for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016, an increase of \$1.6 million and \$2.0 million, respectively, when compared to the same time periods in 2015. See the section captioned “Allowance for Loan Losses, LHFI” for further analysis of the provision for loan losses, LHFI.

Provision for Loan Losses, Acquired Loans

The provision for loan losses, acquired loans is recognized subsequent to acquisition to the extent it is probable that Trustmark will be unable to collect all cash flows expected at acquisition plus additional cash flows expected to be collected arising from changes in estimates after acquisition, considering both the timing and amount of those expected cash flows. Provisions may be required when actual losses of unpaid principal incurred exceed previous loss expectations to date, or future cash flows previously expected to be collectible are no longer probable of collection. The provision for loan losses, acquired loans is reflected as a valuation allowance netted against the carrying value of the acquired loans accounted for under Federal Accounting Standards Board (FASB) Accounting Standard Codification (ASC) Topic 310-30, "Loans and Debt Securities Acquired with Deteriorated Credit Quality." The increase in the provision for loan losses, acquired loans during the first six months of 2016 when compared to the same time period in 2015 was principally due to changes in expectations based on the periodic re-estimations performed during the period, primarily related to loans acquired from BancTrust, a decrease in charge-offs of acquired loans from both Heritage and BancTrust partially offset by an increase in charge-offs of acquired loans from Bay Bank, and a decrease in recoveries of acquired loans primarily from BancTrust.

The following table presents the provision for loan losses, acquired loans, by acquisition for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2016	2015	2016	2015
BancTrust	\$619	\$1,022	\$2,355	\$1,707
Bay Bank	49	(93)	(52)	(111)
Heritage	(61)	(104)	(387)	(424)
Total provision for loan losses, acquired loans	\$607	\$825	\$1,916	\$1,172

Noninterest Income

Noninterest income represented 31.5% of total revenue, before securities losses, net, for both the three and six months ended June 30, 2016, respectively, compared to 32.0% and 31.1% of total revenue, before securities losses, net, for the three and six months ended June 30, 2015, respectively. The following table provides the comparative components of noninterest income for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,				Six Months Ended June 30,			
	2016	2015	\$ Change	% Change	2016	2015	\$ Change	% Change
Service charges on deposit accounts	\$11,051	\$11,920	\$(869)	-7.3 %	\$22,132	\$23,005	\$(873)	-3.8 %
Bank card and other fees	7,436	7,416	20	0.3 %	14,354	14,178	176	1.2 %
Mortgage banking, net	6,721	9,481	(2,760)	-29.1 %	15,420	18,446	(3,026)	-16.4 %
Insurance commissions	9,638	9,401	237	2.5 %	18,231	18,017	214	1.2 %
Wealth management	8,009	7,758	251	3.2 %	15,416	15,748	(332)	-2.1 %
Other, net	1,372	(433)	1,805	n/m	2,260	(1,488)	3,748	n/m
	44,227	45,543	(1,316)	-2.9 %	87,813	87,906	(93)	-0.1 %

Total Noninterest Income
before

securities losses, net										
Security losses, net	—	—	—	—	(310)	—	(310)	n/m		
Total Noninterest Income	\$44,227	\$45,543	\$(1,316)	-2.9	%	\$87,503	\$87,906	\$(403)	-0.5	%

n/m - percentage changes greater than +/- 100% are not considered meaningful

Changes in various components of noninterest income are discussed in further detail below. For analysis of Trustmark's insurance commissions and wealth management income, please see the section captioned "Results of Segment Operations."

Mortgage Banking, Net

The following table illustrates the components of mortgage banking income included in noninterest income for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,					Six Months Ended June 30,				
	2016	2015	\$ Change	% Change		2016	2015	\$ Change	% Change	
Mortgage servicing income, net	\$5,177	\$4,696	\$481	10.2	%	\$10,235	\$9,593	\$642	6.7	%
Change in fair value-MSR from runoff	(2,500)	(2,587)	87	-3.4	%	(4,505)	(4,800)	295	-6.2	%
Gain on sales of loans, net	5,480	5,114	366	7.2	%	8,071	8,830	(759)	-8.6	%
Other, net	498	206	292	n/m		3,140	1,451	1,689	n/m	
Mortgage banking income before										
hedge ineffectiveness	8,655	7,429	1,226	16.5	%	16,941	15,074	1,867	12.4	%
Change in fair value-MSR from										
market changes	(7,033)	6,076	(13,109)	n/m		(13,899)	3,708	(17,607)	n/m	
Change in fair value of derivatives	5,099	(4,024)	9,123	n/m		12,378	(336)	12,714	n/m	
Net (negative) positive hedge										
ineffectiveness	(1,934)	2,052	(3,986)	n/m		(1,521)	3,372	(4,893)	n/m	
Mortgage banking, net	\$6,721	\$9,481	\$(2,760)	-29.1	%	\$15,420	\$18,446	\$(3,026)	-16.4	%

n/m - percentage changes greater than +/- 100% are not considered meaningful

The decrease in net revenue from mortgage banking for the three months ended June 30, 2016 when compared to the same time period in 2015 was principally due to a net negative hedge ineffectiveness in the second quarter of 2016 compared to a net positive hedge ineffectiveness in the second quarter of 2015. The decrease in net revenue from mortgage banking for the six months ended June 30, 2016 when compared to the same time period in 2015 was principally due to a net negative hedge ineffectiveness in the first six months of 2016 compared to a net positive hedge ineffectiveness in the first six months of 2015 partially offset by an increase in the positive net valuation adjustment for the fair value of LHFS, interest rate lock commitments and forward sales contracts. Mortgage loan production for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 was \$404.0 million and \$711.5 million, respectively, a decrease of \$12.9 million, or 3.1%, and \$10.0 million, or 1.4%, respectively, when compared to the same time periods in 2015. Loans serviced for others totaled \$6.119 billion at June 30, 2016, compared with \$5.732 billion at June 30, 2015, an increase of \$386.6 million, or 6.7%, primarily due to increased loan sales.

Representing a significant component of mortgage banking income is gain on the sales of loans, net. The increase in the gain on sales of loans, net when the three months ended June 30, 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, resulted from both higher profit margins from secondary marketing activities as well as higher volumes of loans sold. Loan sales totaled \$355.3 million for the three months ended June 30, 2016, an increase of \$8.4 million when

compared with the same time period in 2015. The decrease in the gain on sales of loans, net when the six months ended June 30, 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, resulted from lower profit margins from secondary marketing activities partially offset by higher volumes of loans sold. Loan sales totaled \$590.7 million for the six months ended June 30, 2016, an increase of \$10.7 million when compared with the same time period in 2015. The increase in loans sales for the first six months of 2016 when compared to the same time period in 2015 was primarily due to Trustmark's decision during 2015 to sell the vast majority of these lower-rate, longer-term home mortgages in the secondary market, rather than replacing the run-off in its single-family loan portfolio.

Other mortgage banking income, net includes the net valuation adjustment recognized in income in accordance with FASB ASC Topic 825, "Financial Instruments," for the fair value of LHFS accounted for under the fair value option and the net valuation adjustment recognized in income in accordance with FASB ASC Topic 815, "Derivatives and Hedging," for the fair value of interest rate lock commitments and forward sales contracts. Valuation adjustments are primarily the result of changes in volume and profit margins for the related instruments during the period. The increase in other mortgage banking income, net when comparing the first six months of 2016 with the same time period in 2015 primarily resulted from an increase in the positive net valuation adjustment in the fair value of LHFS, interest rate lock commitments and forward sales contracts during the period, which was principally due to higher increases in volumes and profit margins during the first six months of 2016. For additional information regarding the LHFS accounted for under the fair value option, please see the section captioned "Fair Value Option" included in Note 15 – Fair Value set forth in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements – of this report. See the section captioned "Derivatives" for further discussion of the mortgage related derivative instruments.

Other Income, Net

The following table illustrates the components of other income, net included in noninterest income for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,					Six Months Ended June 30,				
	2016	2015	\$ Change	% Change		2016	2015	\$ Change	% Change	
Partnership amortization for tax credit										
purposes	\$(2,479)	\$(2,480)	\$ 1	-0.0	%	\$(4,958)	\$(4,952)	\$(6)	0.1	%
Decrease in FDIC indemnification asset	(118)	(1,798)	1,680	-93.4	%	(217)	(2,768)	2,551	-92.2	%
Increase in life insurance cash										
surrender value	1,702	1,673	29	1.7	%	3,394	3,348	46	1.4	%
Other miscellaneous income	2,267	2,172	95	4.4	%	4,041	2,884	1,157	40.1	%
Total other, net	\$1,372	\$(433)	\$ 1,805	n/m		\$2,260	\$(1,488)	\$ 3,748	n/m	

n/m - percentage changes greater than +/- 100% are not considered meaningful

The increase in other income, net when the three months ended June 30, 2016 are compared to the same time period in 2015 was primarily the result of a decrease in the net reduction of the FDIC indemnification asset. The increase in other income, net when the first six months of 2016 are compared to the same time period in 2015 was primarily the result of a decrease in the net reduction of the FDIC indemnification asset and increases in other miscellaneous income. The increase in other miscellaneous income for the first six months of 2016 compared to the same time period in 2015 was principally due to a decrease in the net loss on the sale of premises and equipment due to a loss recorded during the first six months of 2015 on the sale of a former bank branch acquired in the February 2013 merger with BancTrust and an increase in other miscellaneous income related to various contract bonuses and settlements received during the second quarter of 2016, partially offset by a decrease in the net revenues received related to Trustmark's nonqualified deferred compensation plan. The decrease in the net reduction of the FDIC indemnification asset for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 was principally due to the decline in the balance of the FDIC indemnification asset as a result of amortization and valuation adjustments over the life of the loss share agreements as well as the expiration of a loss share agreement with the FDIC on June 30, 2016. See the section caption "Acquired Loans" for further discussion of the acquired loans covered by loss share agreements with the FDIC.

Noninterest Expense

The following table illustrates the comparative components of noninterest expense for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,					Six Months Ended June 30,				
	2016	2015	\$ Change	% Change		2016	2015	\$ Change	% Change	
Salaries and employee benefits	\$67,018	\$57,393	\$ 9,625	16.8	%	\$124,219	\$114,562	\$ 9,657	8.4	%

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Services and fees	14,522	15,005	(483)	-3.2	%	28,997	29,126	(129)	-0.4	%
Net occupancy-premises	5,928	6,243	(315)	-5.1	%	12,116	12,434	(318)	-2.6	%
Equipment expense	5,896	5,903	(7)	-0.1	%	11,990	11,877	113	1.0	%
ORE/Foreclosure expense:										
Write-downs	1,880	345	1,535	n/m		2,981	1,370	1,611	n/m	
Net (gain)/loss on sale	(1,578)	(802)	(776)	96.8	%	(3,445)	(2,170)	(1,275)	58.8	%
Carrying costs	891	1,378	(487)	-35.3	%	1,838	2,836	(998)	-35.2	%
Total ORE/Foreclosure expense	1,193	921	272	29.5	%	1,374	2,036	(662)	-32.5	%
FDIC assessment expense	2,959	2,615	344	13.2	%	5,770	5,555	215	3.9	%
Other expense	12,663	12,186	477	3.9	%	24,657	23,892	765	3.2	%
Total noninterest expense	\$ 110,179	\$ 100,266	\$ 9,913	9.9	%	\$ 209,123	\$ 199,482	\$ 9,641	4.8	%

n/m - percentage changes greater than +/- 100% are not considered meaningful

Changes in the various component of noninterest expense are discussed in further detail below. Management considers disciplined expense management a key area of focus in the support of improving shareholder value. During the second quarter of 2016, Trustmark completed a voluntary ERP as a proactive measure to manage noninterest expense. As a result of the ERP, 188 of the eligible associates retired by June 30, 2016. The ERP resulted in a one-time charge of \$9.3 million to noninterest expense (\$9.1 million included in salaries and employee benefits expense and \$230 thousand included in other expense) during the second quarter of 2016.

Salaries and Employee Benefits

The increase in salaries and employee benefits, the largest category of noninterest expense, for both the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 when compared to the same time periods in 2015 was principally due to the ERP completed during the second quarter of 2016. Excluding the non-routine expenses related to the ERP, salaries and employee benefits for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 increased \$563 thousand, or 1.0%, and \$595 thousand, or 0.5%, respectively, when compared to the same time periods in 2015.

ORE/Foreclosure Expense

The increase in ORE/Foreclosure expense for the three months ended June 30, 2016 compared with the same time period in 2015 was principally due to an increase in write-downs of other real estate partially offset by an increase in the net gain on the sale of other real estate as well as declines in other real estate carrying costs. The decrease in ORE/Foreclosure expense for the six months ended June 30, 2016 compared with the same time period in 2015 was principally due to an increase in the net gain on the sale of other real estate as well as declines in other real estate carrying costs partially offset by increase in write-downs of other real estate. The increase in write-downs for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 compared with the same time periods in 2015 was principally due to a negative provision for other real estate write-downs recorded during the second quarter of 2015. The provision for other real estate write-downs for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 totaled \$135 thousand and \$295 thousand, respectively, compared to a negative provision for other real estate write-downs of \$1.2 million and \$1.5 million, respectively, for the same time periods in 2015. The negative provision for other real estate write-downs for the second quarter of 2015 was principally due to a property that was sold that previously had an associated reserve for other real estate write-down. For additional analysis of other real estate and foreclosure expenses, please see the section captioned “Nonperforming Assets, Excluding Acquired Loans and Covered Other Real Estate.”

FDIC Assessment Expense

The increase in FDIC assessment expense for the three months ended June 30, 2016 when compared with the same time period in 2015 primarily resulted from a projected increase in Trustmark’s assessment rate due to an increase in FDIC defined higher-risk assets.

Other Expense

The following table illustrates the comparative components of other noninterest expense for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30,					Six Months Ended June 30,			
	2016	2015	\$ Change	% Change		2016	2015	\$ Change	% Change
Loan expense	\$3,024	\$3,342	\$ (318)	-9.5 %		\$6,067	\$6,063	\$ 4	0.1 %
Amortization of intangibles	1,692	1,959	(267)	-13.6 %		3,488	3,950	(462)	-11.7 %
Other miscellaneous expense	7,947	6,885	1,062	15.4 %		15,102	13,879	1,223	8.8 %
Total other expense	\$12,663	\$12,186	\$ 477	3.9 %		\$24,657	\$23,892	\$ 765	3.2 %

The increase in other expenses for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 when compared to the same time periods in 2015 was principally due to increases in other miscellaneous expenses, primarily resulting from a property

valuation adjustment recorded during the second quarter of 2016 related to properties transferred to assets held for sale, higher customer-related fraud losses and non-routine expenses related to the ERP during the second quarter of 2016, partially offset by a decline in franchise taxes. During the second quarter of 2016, Trustmark continued its measured approach to the optimization of its retail delivery channels by closing six branches with limited growth opportunities in the Alabama, Florida and Mississippi market regions. These six branches and a property previously purchased in anticipation of a future branch were transferred to assets held for sale during the second quarter at the lower of the current net book value or the fair value less costs to sell. A property valuation adjustment of \$750 thousand was recorded as a result of transferring these properties to assets held for sale.

Results of Segment Operations

For a description of the methodologies used to measure financial performance and financial information by reportable segment, please see Note 17 – Segment Information included in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements – of this report. The following discusses changes in the results of operations of each reportable segment for the six months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015.

General Banking

Net interest income for the General Banking Division decreased \$3.5 million, or 1.8%, when the six months ended June 30, 2016 is compared with the same time period in 2015. The decline in net interest income was mostly due to declines in interest and fees on acquired loans and an increase in other interest expense, which were partially offset by increases in interest and fees on LHFS and LHFI. The provision for loan losses, net for the six months ended June 30, 2016 totaled \$6.8 million compared to \$4.0 million for the same period in 2015, an increase of \$2.8 million, or 69.3%. For more information on these net interest income items, please see the sections captioned “Financial Highlights” and “Results of Operations.”

Noninterest income for the General Banking Division decreased \$134 thousand, or 0.2%, during the first six months of 2016 compared to the same time period in 2015. Noninterest income for the General Banking Division represented 22.1% of total revenues for this segment for the first six months of 2016 as opposed to 21.8% for the same time period in 2015. Noninterest income for the General Banking Division includes service charges on deposit accounts; bank card and other fees; mortgage banking, net; other income, net and securities losses, net. For more information on these noninterest income items, please see the analysis included in the section captioned “Noninterest Income.”

Noninterest expense for the General Banking Division increased \$10.3 million, or 6.0%, during the first six months of 2016 compared with the same time period in 2015, principally due to the non-routine expenses related to the ERP recorded in the second quarter of 2016. For more information on these noninterest expense items, please see the analysis included in the section captioned “Noninterest Expense.”

Wealth Management

During the first six months of 2016, net income for the Wealth Management Division increased \$655 thousand, or 40.0%, when compared to the same time period in 2015. Net interest income for the Wealth Management Division increased \$349 thousand when the first six months of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015 due to an increase in the interest income earned on deposit accounts held by the Wealth Management Division. Noninterest income, which includes income related to investment management, trust and brokerage services, decreased \$482 thousand, or 3.1%, when the first six months of 2016 are compared to the same time period in 2015. The decrease in noninterest income for the Wealth Management Division was primarily attributable to declines in commissions and annuity income generated by the brokerage services unit, partially offset by an increase in trust asset management fee income. Noninterest income for the Wealth Management Division for the second quarter of 2016 increased \$237 thousand, or 3.1%, when compared to the second quarter of 2015, and \$671 thousand, or 9.2%, when compared to the first quarter of 2016, principally due to increases in trust asset management fee income and variable annuity income generated by the brokerage services unit. Noninterest expense decreased \$1.2 million, or 9.1%, during the first six months of 2016 compared to the same time period in 2015, principally due to decreases in salaries and employee benefits, primarily due to lower commissions and salary expense, and data processing charges related to software as well as a gain recorded in other expense during the first quarter of 2016 related to the recapture of funds from a trust account.

At June 30, 2016 and 2015, Trustmark held assets under management and administration of \$11.081 billion and \$11.082 billion, respectively, and brokerage assets of \$1.605 billion and \$1.607 billion, respectively.

Insurance

Net income for the Insurance Division during the first six months of 2016 decreased \$192 thousand, or 7.4%, compared to the same time period in 2015. Noninterest income for the Insurance Division increased \$213 thousand, or 1.2%, when the first six months of 2016 are compared to the same time period in 2015. Insurance commissions,

which make up predominantly all of noninterest income for the Insurance Division, totaled \$9.6 million for the second quarter of 2016, an increase of \$235 thousand, or 2.5%, compared to the second quarter of 2015, and an increase of \$1.0 million, or 12.2%, compared to the first quarter of 2016. The increase in insurance commissions during the first six months of 2016 when compared to the same time period in 2015 was primarily due to new business commission volume primarily in commercial property and casualty and group health coverage partially offset by declines in business commission volume primarily in personal property and casualty coverage, resulting from both a continued focus on new business and the addition of experienced account executives with an established book of business during 2015. General business activity in Trustmark's geographic markets continues to improve marginally, resulting in increases in the demand for coverage on inventories, property, equipment, general liability and workers' compensation. Noninterest expense for the Insurance Division increased \$490 thousand, or 3.5%, when the first six months of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015, primarily due to higher salaries and commissions expense resulting from modest general merit increases and improved performance.

Income Taxes

For the three and six months ended June 30, 2016, Trustmark's combined effective tax rate was 21.0% and 22.7%, compared to 24.2% for the same time periods in 2015. Trustmark invests in partnerships that provide income tax credits on a Federal and/or State basis (i.e., new market tax credits, low income housing tax credits or historical tax credits). The income tax credits related to these partnerships are utilized as specifically allowed by income tax law and are recorded as a reduction in income tax expense.

Financial Condition

Earning assets serve as the primary revenue streams for Trustmark and are comprised of securities, loans, federal funds sold, securities purchased under reverse repurchase agreements and other earning assets. Average earning assets totaled \$11.339 billion, or 88.7% of total average assets, at June 30, 2016, compared to \$10.625 billion, or 87.7% of total average assets, at June 30, 2015, an increase of \$714.0 million, or 6.7%.

Securities

The securities portfolio is utilized by Management to manage interest rate risk, generate interest income, provide liquidity and use as collateral for public deposits and wholesale funding. Risk and return can be adjusted by altering duration, composition and/or balance of the portfolio. The weighted-average life of the portfolio decreased to 3.9 years at June 30, 2016, compared to 5.2 years at December 31, 2015.

When compared with December 31, 2015, total investment securities increased by \$28.3 million during the first six months of 2016. This increase resulted primarily from purchases of government-sponsored enterprise (GSE) guaranteed securities and improvements in the fair market value of the available for sale securities, which were largely offset by maturities and pay-downs of the loans underlying these securities. Trustmark sold \$25.0 million of securities during the first six months of 2016, which generated a net loss of \$310 thousand, compared to no securities sold during the first six months of 2015.

During 2013, Trustmark reclassified approximately \$1.099 billion of securities available for sale as securities held to maturity to mitigate the potential adverse impact of a rising interest rate environment on the fair value of the available for sale securities and the related impact on tangible common equity. The securities were transferred at fair value, which became the cost basis for the securities held to maturity. At the date of transfer, the net unrealized holding loss on the available for sale securities totaled approximately \$46.6 million. The net unrealized holding loss is amortized over the remaining life of the securities as a yield adjustment in a manner consistent with the amortization or accretion of the original purchase premium or discount on the associated security. There were no gains or losses recognized as a result of the transfer. At June 30, 2016, the net unamortized, unrealized loss on the transferred securities included in accumulated other comprehensive loss (AOCL) in the accompanying consolidated balance sheets totaled \$28.3 million (\$17.5 million net of tax) compared to \$34.0 million (\$21.0 million net of tax) at December 31, 2015.

Available for sale securities are carried at their estimated fair value with unrealized gains or losses recognized, net of taxes, in AOCL, a separate component of shareholders' equity. At June 30, 2016, available for sale securities totaled \$2.388 billion, which represented 67.1% of the securities portfolio, compared to \$2.345 billion, or 66.4%, at December 31, 2015. At June 30, 2016, unrealized gains, net on available for sale securities totaled \$50.9 million compared to \$5.9 million at December 31, 2015. At June 30, 2016, available for sale securities consisted of obligations of states and political subdivisions, GSE guaranteed mortgage-related securities and direct obligations of government agencies and GSEs.

Held to maturity securities are carried at amortized cost and represent those securities that Trustmark both intends and has the ability to hold to maturity. At June 30, 2016, held to maturity securities totaled \$1.173 billion and represented 32.9% of the total securities portfolio, compared with \$1.188 billion, or 33.6%, at December 31, 2015.

Management continues to focus on asset quality as one of the strategic goals of the securities portfolio, which is evidenced by the investment of approximately 95% of the portfolio in GSE-backed obligations and other Aaa-rated securities as determined by Moody's Investors Services (Moody's). None of the securities owned by Trustmark are collateralized by assets which are considered sub-prime. Furthermore, outside of stock ownership in the FHLB of Dallas, FHLB of Atlanta and Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Trustmark does not hold any other equity investment in a GSE.

As of June 30, 2016, Trustmark did not hold securities of any one issuer with a carrying value exceeding ten percent of total shareholders' equity, other than certain GSEs which are exempt from inclusion. Management continues to closely monitor the credit quality as well as the ratings of the debt and mortgage-backed securities issued by the GSEs and held in Trustmark's securities portfolio.

The following table presents Trustmark's securities portfolio by amortized cost and estimated fair value and by credit rating, as determined by Moody's, at June 30, 2016 (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016		Estimated Fair	
	Amortized Cost		Value	
	Amount	%	Amount	%
Securities Available for Sale				
Aaa	\$2,212,154	94.7 %	\$2,259,021	94.6 %
Aa1 to Aa3	81,164	3.5 %	83,984	3.5 %
A1 to A3	988	—	1,006	—
Not Rated (1)	43,116	1.8 %	44,295	1.9 %
Total securities available for sale	\$2,337,422	100.0 %	\$2,388,306	100.0 %
Securities Held to Maturity				
Aaa	\$1,119,731	95.4 %	\$1,153,562	95.3 %
Aa1 to Aa3	39,792	3.4 %	42,326	3.5 %
A1 to A3	812	0.1 %	833	0.1 %
Not Rated (1)	12,869	1.1 %	13,323	1.1 %
Total securities held to maturity	\$1,173,204	100.0 %	\$1,210,044	100.0 %

(1) Not rated issues primarily consist of Mississippi municipal general obligations

The table above presenting the credit rating of Trustmark's securities is formatted to show the securities according to the credit rating category, and not by category of the underlying security. At June 30, 2016, approximately 94.6% of the available for sale securities and 95.4% of the held to maturity securities were rated Aaa.

LHFS

At June 30, 2016, LHFS totaled \$213.5 million, consisting of \$180.0 million of residential real estate mortgage loans in the process of being sold to third parties and \$33.6 million of GNMA optional repurchase loans. At December 31, 2015, LHFS totaled \$160.2 million, consisting of \$124.2 million of residential real estate mortgage loans in the process of being sold to third parties and \$36.0 million of GNMA optional repurchase loans. Please refer to the nonperforming assets table that follows for information on GNMA loans eligible for repurchase which are past due 90 days or more.

During the first quarter of 2015, Trustmark exercised its option to repurchase approximately \$28.5 million delinquent loans serviced for GNMA. These loans were subsequently sold to a third party under different repurchase provisions. Trustmark retained the servicing for these loans, which are subject to guarantees by FHA/VA. As a result of this repurchase and sale, the loans are no longer carried as LHFS. The transaction resulted in a gain of \$304 thousand, which is included in mortgage banking, net for the first six months of 2015. Trustmark did not exercise its buy-back option on any delinquent loans serviced for GNMA during the first six months of 2016.

For additional information regarding the GNMA optional repurchase loans, please see the section captioned "Past Due LHFS" included in Note 3 – Loans Held for Investment (LHFI) and Allowance for Loan Losses, LHFI of Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements – of this report.

LHFI

The table below shows the carrying value of the LHFI portfolio by loan type at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016		December 31, 2015	
	Amount	%	Amount	%
Loans secured by real estate:				
Construction, land development and other land	\$718,438	9.7 %	\$824,723	11.6 %
Secured by 1- 4 family residential properties	1,620,013	21.9 %	1,649,501	23.3 %
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	1,900,784	25.7 %	1,736,476	24.5 %
Other real estate secured	323,734	4.4 %	211,228	3.0 %
Commercial and industrial loans	1,466,511	19.8 %	1,343,211	18.9 %
Consumer loans	166,436	2.2 %	169,135	2.4 %
State and other political subdivision loans	805,401	10.9 %	734,615	10.4 %
Other loans	403,864	5.4 %	422,496	5.9 %
LHFI	\$7,405,181	100.0 %	\$7,091,385	100.0 %

LHFI increased \$313.8 million, or 4.4%, compared to December 31, 2015. The increase in LHFI during the first six months of 2016 represented net growth across all five of Trustmark's market regions, primarily in the loans secured by real estate, commercial and industrial loans and state and other political subdivision loans categories.

LHFI secured by real estate increased \$141.0 million, or 3.2%, during the first six months of 2016 as growth in in the Alabama, Texas and Mississippi market regions was partially offset by declines in the Tennessee and Florida market regions. LHFI secured by construction, land development and other land decreased \$106.3 million, or 12.9%, during the first six months of 2016, primarily due to other construction loans that were moved to the appropriate permanent categories partially offset by new loans primarily in the other construction loans and 1-4 family construction categories. During the first six months of 2016, \$352.4 million in other construction loans were moved to the appropriate permanent categories upon completion, including \$195.4 million in non-owner occupied, \$57.4 million in owner occupied and \$99.6 million in multi-family residential. Excluding all reclassifications between loan categories, growth in other construction loans across all five market regions totaled \$215.9 million for the first six months of 2016. The 1-4 family construction loan portfolio increased \$15.0 million, or 9.7%, during the first six months of 2016, principally due to growth in Trustmark's Alabama and Texas market regions.

The commercial real estate loan portfolio increased \$164.3 million, or 9.5%, during the first six months of 2016, principally due to construction loans that moved to permanent financing. Excluding the reclassifications from other construction loans, the commercial real estate loans portfolio declined \$87.9 million, or 5.1%, during the first six months of 2016. The decrease in the commercial real estate loan portfolio, excluding the other construction reclassifications, was primarily attributable to declines in non-owner occupied loans in Trustmark's Texas, Mississippi, Florida and Tennessee market regions as well as declines in owner occupied loans in the Mississippi, Tennessee and Texas market regions, which were partially offset by growth in non-owner occupied loans in Trustmark's Alabama market region. Other real estate secured LHFI increased \$112.5 million, or 53.3%, during the first six months of 2016, primarily due to multi-family residential loans in Trustmark's Texas, Tennessee, Mississippi and Alabama market regions that were moved from other construction loans to permanent financing. Excluding all reclassifications between loan categories, other real estate secured LHFI increased \$775 thousand, or 0.4%, during the first six months of 2016. LHFI secured by 1-4 family residential properties declined \$29.5 million, or 1.8%, during the first six month of 2016, principally in the Mississippi, Tennessee and Texas market regions partially offset by growth in the Alabama market region. The decline in LHFI secured by 1-4 family residential properties reflects Trustmark's decision in 2015

to sell the vast majority of these lower-rate, longer-term home mortgages in the secondary market, rather than replacing the run-off in its single-family loan portfolio.

The commercial and industrial loan portfolio increased \$123.3 million, or 9.2%, during the first six months of 2016, due to growth in the Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida market regions, partially offset by declines in the Texas market region. Trustmark's exposure to the energy sector is primarily included in the commercial and industrial loan portfolio in Trustmark's Mississippi and Texas market regions. At June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, energy-related LHFI had outstanding balances of approximately \$258.3 million and \$213.0 million, respectively, which represented approximately 3.5% of Trustmark's total LHFI portfolio at June 30, 2016 compared to approximately 3.0% of the total LHFI portfolio at December 31, 2015. Trustmark has no loan exposure where the source of repayment, or the underlying security of such exposure, is tied to the realization of value from energy reserves. Should oil prices remain at current levels or below for a prolonged period of time, there is potential for downgrades to occur. Management will continue to monitor this exposure.

State and other political subdivision LHFI increased \$70.8 million, or 9.6%, during the first six months of 2016 principally due to growth in traditional public finance loans, such as investments that entail the use of tax anticipation notes, public school improvements, facility improvements and renovations, in all five of Trustmark's market regions. The other loan portfolio, which includes lending to nonprofits and real estate investment trusts, decreased \$18.6 million, or 4.4%, during the first six months of 2016, which primarily represented declines in Trustmark's Mississippi, Texas and Tennessee market regions partially offset by growth in the Alabama market region.

The following table provides information regarding Trustmark's home equity loans and home equity lines of credit which are included in the LHFI secured by 1-4 family residential properties for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Home equity loans	\$58,261	\$61,635
Home equity lines of credit	376,415	376,998
Percentage of loans and lines for which Trustmark holds first lien	59.0 %	58.9 %
Percentage of loans and lines for which Trustmark does not hold first lien	41.0 %	41.1 %

Due to the increased risk associated with second liens, loan terms and underwriting guidelines differ from those used for products secured by first liens. Loan amounts and loan-to-value ratios are limited and are lower for second liens than first liens. Also, interest rates and maximum amortization periods are adjusted accordingly. In addition, regardless of lien position, the passing credit score for approval of all home equity lines of credit is higher than that of term loans. The allowance for loan losses, LHFI is also reflective of the increased risk related to second liens through application of a greater loss factor to this portion of the portfolio.

The following tables provide information regarding the interest rate terms of Trustmark's LHFI as of June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands). Trustmark's variable rate LHFI are based primarily on various prime and LIBOR interest rate bases.

	June 30, 2016		
	Fixed	Variable	Total
Loans secured by real estate:			
Construction, land development and other land	\$219,004	\$499,434	\$718,438
Secured by 1- 4 family residential properties	1,562,370	57,643	1,620,013
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	1,083,524	817,260	1,900,784
Other real estate secured	148,109	175,625	323,734
Commercial and industrial loans	513,704	952,807	1,466,511
Consumer loans	147,055	19,381	166,436
State and other political subdivision loans	710,884	94,517	805,401
Other loans	201,172	202,692	403,864
LHFI	\$4,585,822	\$2,819,359	\$7,405,181

December 31, 2015		
Fixed	Variable	Total

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Loans secured by real estate:			
Construction, land development and other land	\$311,049	\$513,674	\$824,723
Secured by 1- 4 family residential properties	1,573,640	75,861	1,649,501
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	1,116,689	619,787	1,736,476
Other real estate secured	160,147	51,081	211,228
Commercial and industrial loans	611,198	732,013	1,343,211
Consumer loans	149,742	19,393	169,135
State and other political subdivision loans	682,028	52,587	734,615
Other loans	210,186	212,310	422,496
LHFI	\$4,814,679	\$2,276,706	\$7,091,385

In the following tables, LHFI reported by region (along with related nonperforming assets and net charge-offs) are associated with location of origination except for loans secured by 1-4 family residential properties (representing traditional mortgages), credit cards and indirect consumer auto loans. These loans are included in the Mississippi Region because they are centrally analyzed and approved as part of a specific line of business located at Trustmark's headquarters in Jackson, Mississippi.

The following table presents the LHFI composition by region at June 30, 2016 and reflects a diversified mix of loans by region (\$ in thousands):

LHFI Composition by Region	June 30, 2016					
	Total	Alabama	Florida	Mississippi	Tennessee	Texas
Loans secured by real estate:						
Construction, land development and other land	\$718,438	\$135,760	\$60,555	\$263,590	\$39,429	\$219,104
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	1,620,013	66,770	48,831	1,379,746	106,845	17,821
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	1,900,784	268,607	161,025	878,342	137,101	455,709
Other real estate secured	323,734	19,172	4,285	144,120	33,028	123,129
Commercial and industrial loans	1,466,511	132,295	16,788	746,681	274,851	295,896
Consumer loans	166,436	19,229	3,175	123,956	17,807	2,269
State and other political subdivision loans	805,401	62,656	29,902	537,269	30,265	145,309
Other loans	403,864	37,703	19,402	264,620	40,707	41,432
LHFI	\$7,405,181	\$742,192	\$343,963	\$4,338,324	\$680,033	\$1,300,669
Construction, Land Development and Other Land Loans by Region						
Lots	\$56,331	\$11,135	\$19,657	\$18,974	\$3,420	\$3,145
Development	58,621	6,908	6,084	26,007	681	18,941
Unimproved land	113,354	15,635	17,240	44,565	17,441	18,473
1-4 family construction	169,967	39,818	9,888	71,814	2,117	46,330
Other construction	320,165	62,264	7,686	102,230	15,770	132,215
Construction, land development and other land loans	\$718,438	\$135,760	\$60,555	\$263,590	\$39,429	\$219,104
Loans Secured by Nonfarm, Nonresidential Properties by Region						
Non-owner occupied:						
Retail	\$291,267	\$83,170	\$36,264	\$98,482	\$20,141	\$53,210
Office	220,773	30,879	29,886	80,288	6,507	73,213
Nursing homes/assisted living	108,982	—	—	103,691	5,291	—
Hotel/motel	181,738	37,641	19,481	44,432	31,788	48,396
Mini-storage	110,733	5,259	5,574	52,453	548	46,899
Industrial	86,429	18,173	9,365	16,447	4,357	38,087
Health care	26,461	2,222	849	23,390	—	—
Convenience stores	17,817	227	—	10,192	1,060	6,338
Other	74,425	6,188	11,059	24,706	3,072	29,400
Total non-owner occupied loans	1,118,625	183,759	112,478	454,081	72,764	295,543
Owner-occupied:						
Office	143,101	14,698	22,726	77,502	8,208	19,967
Churches	89,589	8,907	2,157	45,630	24,262	8,633
Industrial warehouses	127,959	6,508	3,838	60,985	10,826	45,802
Health care	117,189	20,453	6,311	62,472	8,179	19,774
Convenience stores	81,780	7,197	2,425	48,219	1,308	22,631
Retail	34,116	3,976	5,735	18,470	2,128	3,807
Restaurants	35,019	3,656	1,677	23,948	3,582	2,156

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Auto dealerships	13,676	7,926	44	4,536	1,170	—
Other	139,730	11,527	3,634	82,499	4,674	37,396
Total owner-occupied loans	782,159	84,848	48,547	424,261	64,337	160,166
Loans secured by nonfarm, nonresidential						
properties	\$1,900,784	\$268,607	\$161,025	\$878,342	\$137,101	\$455,709

73

Allowance for Loan Losses, LHFI

Trustmark's allowance for loan loss methodology is based on guidance provided in SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin (SAB) No. 102, "Selected Loan Loss Allowance Methodology and Documentation Issues," as well as other regulatory guidance. Trustmark's allowance has been developed using different factors to estimate losses based upon specific evaluation of identified individual LHFI considered impaired, estimated identified losses on various pools of LHFI and/or groups of risk rated LHFI with common risk characteristics and other external and internal factors of estimated probable losses based on other facts and circumstances. The level of Trustmark's allowance reflects Management's continuing evaluation of specific credit risks, loan loss experience, current loan portfolio growth, present economic, political and regulatory conditions and unidentified losses inherent in the current loan portfolio. For a complete description of Trustmark's allowance for loan loss methodology and the quantitative and qualitative factors included in the valuation allowance, please see Note 3 – Loans Held for Investment (LHFI) and Allowance for Loan Losses, LHFI included in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements – of this report.

At June 30, 2016, the allowance for loan losses, LHFI, was \$71.8 million, an increase of \$4.2 million, or 6.2%, when compared with December 31, 2015. The increase in the allowance for loan loss was principally due to an increase in the required qualitative reserve for commercial LHFI across all five of Trustmark's market regions during the first six months of 2016. Total allowance coverage of nonperforming LHFI, excluding specifically reviewed impaired LHFI, increased to 231.13% at June 30, 2016, compared to 210.32% at December 31, 2015 due to the increase in the allowance for loan losses, LHFI balance and an increase in specifically reviewed impaired LHFI during the first six months of 2016. Allocation of Trustmark's \$71.8 million allowance for loan losses, LHFI, represented 1.05% of commercial LHFI and 0.70% of consumer and home mortgage LHFI, resulting in an allowance to total LHFI of 0.97% as of June 30, 2016. This compares with an allowance to total LHFI of 0.95% at December 31, 2015, which was allocated to commercial LHFI at 1.05% and to consumer and mortgage LHFI at 0.66%.

The following tables present changes in the allowance for loan losses, LHFI by geographic market region for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2016					
	Total	Alabama	Florida	Mississippi	Tennessee	Texas
Balance at beginning of period	\$69,668	\$ 5,946	\$ 2,622	\$ 45,106	\$ 5,360	\$10,634
LHFI charged-off	(3,251)	(499)	(158)	(1,480)	(453)	(661)
Recoveries	2,783	63	753	1,717	201	49
Net (charge-offs) recoveries	(468)	(436)	595	237	(252)	(612)
Provision for loan losses, LHFI	2,596	1,189	(364)	(833)	726	1,878
Balance at end of period	\$71,796	\$ 6,699	\$ 2,853	\$ 44,510	\$ 5,834	\$11,900

	Three Months Ended June 30, 2015					
	Total	Alabama	Florida	Mississippi	Tennessee	Texas
Balance at beginning of period	\$71,321	\$ 4,264	\$5,781	\$ 44,418	\$ 7,322	\$9,536
LHFI charged-off	(4,278)	(294)	(953)	(2,494)	(293)	(244)
Recoveries	3,090	78	414	1,466	188	944
Net (charge-offs) recoveries	(1,188)	(216)	(539)	(1,028)	(105)	700
Provision for loan losses, LHFI	1,033	623	(1,168)	2,046	(483)	15
Balance at end of period	\$71,166	\$ 4,671	\$4,074	\$ 45,436	\$ 6,734	\$10,251

Six Months Ended June 30, 2016

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

	Total	Alabama	Florida	Mississippi	Tennessee	Texas
Balance at beginning of period	\$67,619	\$ 5,469	\$2,766	\$ 43,184	\$ 5,230	\$10,970
LHFI charged-off	(6,614)	(651)	(426)	(3,270)	(714)	(1,553)
Recoveries	5,952	152	1,695	3,581	454	70
Net (charge-offs) recoveries	(662)	(499)	1,269	311	(260)	(1,483)
Provision for loan losses, LHFI	4,839	1,729	(1,182)	1,015	864	2,413
Balance at end of period	\$71,796	\$ 6,699	\$2,853	\$ 44,510	\$ 5,834	\$11,900

	Six Months Ended June 30, 2015					
	Total	Alabama	Florida	Mississippi	Tennessee	Texas
Balance at beginning of period	\$69,616	\$ 3,647	\$3,920	\$ 47,290	\$ 5,674	\$9,085
LHFI charged-off	(7,282)	(550)	(1,478)	(4,148)	(566)	(540)
Recoveries	6,014	190	967	2,977	677	1,203
Net (charge-offs) recoveries	(1,268)	(360)	(511)	(1,171)	111	663
Provision for loan losses, LHFI	2,818	1,384	665	(683)	949	503
Balance at end of period	\$71,166	\$ 4,671	\$4,074	\$ 45,436	\$ 6,734	\$10,251

Charge-offs exceeded recoveries for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015. Net charge-offs for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 totaled \$468 thousand and \$662 thousand, a decrease of \$720 thousand, or 60.6%, and \$606 thousand, or 47.8%, respectively, when compared to the same time periods in 2015. The decrease in net charge-offs when the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 is compared to the same time periods in 2015 was primarily due to declines in the net charge-offs in the Florida and Mississippi market regions, partially offset by an increase in net charge-offs in the Texas market region.

The provision for loan losses, LHFI represents the change in the estimated loan losses determined utilizing Trustmark's allowance for loan loss methodology net of charge-offs and recoveries of LHFI charged against net income. The provision for loan losses, LHFI, for the first six months of 2016 totaled 0.13% of average loans (LHFS and LHFI), compared with 0.09% of average loans (LHFS and LHFI) for the same time period in 2015. The increase in the provision for loan losses, LHFI for the second quarter of 2016 primarily reflects the net effect of revisions to the allowance for loan loss methodology for LHFI during 2015 and growth in the LHFI portfolio, partially offset by a decrease in net charge-offs of LHFI when compared to the second quarter of 2015. The increase in the provision for loan losses, LHFI for the first six months of 2016 primarily reflects the net effect of revisions to the allowance for loan loss methodology for LHFI during 2015 and growth in the LHFI portfolio, partially offset by a decrease in the amount of specific reserves required related to impaired LHFI in the Mississippi and Texas market regions when compared to the first six months of 2015. For a complete description of the revisions made to Trustmark's allowance for loan loss methodology during 2015, please see Note 5 –LHFI and Allowance for Loan Losses, LHFI included in Part II. Item 8. – Financial Statements and Supplementary Data, of Trustmark's 2015 Annual Report on Form 10-K.

Nonperforming Assets, Excluding Acquired Loans and Covered Other Real Estate

The table below provides the components of nonperforming assets, excluding acquired loans and covered other real estate, by geographic market region at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015 (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016	December 31, 2015
Nonaccrual LHFI		
Alabama	\$1,379	\$1,776
Florida	1,806	5,180
Mississippi	54,543	40,754
Tennessee	5,345	5,106
Texas	2,055	2,496
Total nonaccrual LHFI	65,128	55,312
Other real estate		
Alabama	18,031	21,578
Florida	28,052	29,579
Mississippi	14,435	14,312
Tennessee	7,432	9,974
Texas	1,552	1,734

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Total other real estate, excluding covered other real estate	69,502	77,177		
Total nonperforming assets	\$ 134,630	\$ 132,489		
Nonperforming assets/total loans (LHFI and LHFS) and ORE	1.75	%	1.81	%
Loans past due 90 days or more				
LHFI	\$ 3,382	\$ 2,300		
LHFS - Guaranteed GNMA serviced loans (1)	\$ 23,473	\$ 21,812		

75

(1) No obligation to repurchase

See the previous discussion of LHFS for more information on Trustmark's serviced GNMA loans eligible for repurchase and the impact of Trustmark's repurchases of delinquent mortgage loans under the GNMA optional repurchase program.

Nonaccrual LHFI

At June 30, 2016, nonaccrual LHFI totaled \$65.1 million, or 0.85% of total LHFS and LHFI, reflecting an increase of \$9.8 million, or 0.14% of total LHFS and LHFI, relative to December 31, 2015. The increase in nonaccrual LHFI was principally the result of LHFI migrating to nonaccrual status in the Mississippi, Texas and Tennessee market regions partially offset by substandard credits that were paid off or foreclosed in the Mississippi market region, returned to accrual status in the Florida market region, and charged off in the Texas market region during the first six months of 2016. LHFI migrating to nonaccrual status in Trustmark's Mississippi market region totaled approximately \$22.1 million during the first six months of 2016. Of this total \$14.6 million, or 66.3%, represented three substandard credits, two energy-related loans and one healthcare provider. As of June 30, 2016, nonaccrual energy-related LHFI represented 4.5% of Trustmark's total energy-related portfolio. For additional information regarding nonaccrual LHFI, see the section captioned "Nonaccrual/Impaired LHFI" included in Note 3 – Loans Held for Investment (LHFI) and Allowance for Loan Losses, LHFI in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements of this report.

Other Real Estate, Excluding Covered Other Real Estate

At June 30, 2016, other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, decreased of \$7.7 million, or 9.9%, when compared with December 31, 2015. The decrease in other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, was primarily due to properties sold as well as write-downs of properties in Trustmark's Alabama, Florida, Mississippi and Tennessee market regions partially offset by properties foreclosed in the Florida, Mississippi and Alabama market regions.

The following tables illustrate changes in other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, by geographic market region for the periods presented (\$ in thousands):

Three Months Ended June 30, 2016						
	Total	Alabama	Florida	Mississippi	Tennessee	Texas
Balance at beginning of period	\$71,806	\$19,137	\$27,907	\$14,511	\$8,699	\$1,552
Additions	4,918	1,187	2,109	1,223	399	—
Disposals	(5,371)	(1,390)	(1,922)	(1,097)	(962)	—
Write-downs	(1,851)	(903)	(42)	(202)	(704)	—
Balance at end of period	\$69,502	\$18,031	\$28,052	\$14,435	\$7,432	\$1,552

Three Months Ended June 30, 2015						
	Total	Alabama	Florida	Mississippi	Tennessee	Texas
Balance at beginning of period	\$90,175	\$21,795	\$34,746	\$15,143	\$10,072	\$8,419
Additions	11,876	2,842	807	818	146	7,263
Disposals	(11,192)	(3,671)	(4,149)	(1,673)	(56)	(1,643)
Write-downs	(111)	883	(345)	(194)	(455)	—
Balance at end of period	\$90,748	\$21,849	\$31,059	\$14,094	\$9,707	\$14,039

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

	Six Months Ended June 30, 2016					
	Total	Alabama	Florida	Mississippi	Tennessee	Texas
Balance at beginning of period	\$77,177	\$21,578	\$29,579	\$ 14,312	\$ 9,974	\$1,734
Additions	8,224	1,594	2,989	2,909	732	—
Disposals	(12,908)	(4,358)	(4,204)	(2,318)	(1,846)	(182)
Write-downs	(2,991)	(783)	(312)	(468)	(1,428)	—
Balance at end of period	\$69,502	\$18,031	\$28,052	\$ 14,435	\$ 7,432	\$1,552

	Six Months Ended June 30, 2015					
	Total	Alabama	Florida	Mississippi	Tennessee	Texas
Balance at beginning of period	\$92,509	\$21,196	\$35,324	\$17,397	\$10,292	\$8,300
Additions	20,532	5,618	3,732	2,093	193	8,896
Disposals	(21,300)	(5,144)	(6,915)	(5,254)	(830)	(3,157)
Write-downs	(993)	179	(1,082)	(142)	52	—
Balance at end of period	\$90,748	\$21,849	\$31,059	\$14,094	\$9,707	\$14,039

Other real estate is revalued on an annual basis or more often if market conditions necessitate. Subsequent to foreclosure, losses on the periodic revaluation of the property are charged against the reserve for other real estate write-downs or net income in ORE/Foreclosure expense, if a reserve does not exist. Write-downs of other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, increased \$2.0 million when the first six months of 2016 is compared to the same time period in 2015. The increase in write-downs on other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, during the first six months of 2016 compared to the same time period in 2015 was primarily due to a negative provision for other real estate write-downs recorded during the first six months of 2015 in the Alabama, Tennessee and Mississippi market regions.

The provision for other real estate write-downs for the three and six months ended June 30, 2016 totaled \$135 thousand and \$295 thousand, respectively, compared to a negative provision for other real estate write-downs of \$1.2 million and \$1.5 million, respectively, for the same time periods in 2015. The negative provision for other real estate write-downs for the second quarter of 2015 was principally due to a property that was sold that previously had an associated reserve for other real estate write-down.

Other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, in Trustmark's Florida market region included \$880 thousand of BancTrust properties foreclosed during the first six months of 2016, \$309 thousand of write-downs of BancTrust other real estate and the sale of \$2.6 million of BancTrust other real estate in Florida during the first six months of 2016. Excluding other real estate resulting from the BancTrust merger, other real estate, excluding covered other real estate, decreased \$1.7 million during the first six months of 2016.

For additional information regarding other real estate, including covered other real estate, see Note 6 – Other Real Estate and Covered Other Real Estate included in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements of this report.

Acquired Loans

As of June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, acquired loans consisted of the following (\$ in thousands):

	June 30, 2016		December 31, 2015	
	Noncovered	Covered	Noncovered	Covered
Loans secured by real estate:				
Construction, land development and other land	\$37,682	\$334	\$41,623	\$1,021
Secured by 1-4 family residential properties	73,313	8,363	86,950	10,058
Secured by nonfarm, nonresidential properties	115,989	3,709	135,626	4,638
Other real estate secured	24,015	1,257	23,860	1,286
Commercial and industrial loans	49,639	121	55,075	624

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

Consumer loans	4,295	—	5,641	—
Other loans	20,263	55	23,936	73
Acquired loans	325,196	13,839	372,711	17,700
Less allowance for loan losses, acquired loans	12,218	262	11,259	733
Net acquired loans	\$312,978	\$13,577	\$361,452	\$16,967

During the first six months of 2016, noncovered and covered acquired loans declined \$47.5 million, or 12.7%, and \$3.9 million, or 21.8%, respectively, compared to balances at December 31, 2015. The decrease in both noncovered and covered acquired loans during the first six months of 2016 was primarily the result of pay-downs and pay-offs of these acquired loans. Based on the most recent re-estimation of expected cash flows, Trustmark anticipates that acquired loan balances, excluding any settlement of debt, will decline approximately \$25.0 million to \$30.0 million during the third quarter of 2016. Trustmark also expects the yield on the acquired loans, excluding any recoveries, to be approximately 5.5% to 6.5% for the third quarter of 2016. As the balances in the acquired loan portfolio continue to run-off, Trustmark expects that the income benefit provided by this portfolio will also decline. For additional information regarding acquired loans, including changes in the net carrying value, see Note 4 – Acquired Loans included in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements of this report.

Trustmark's loss share agreement with the FDIC covering the acquired covered loans other than loans secured by 1-4 family residential properties expired on June 30, 2016. Trustmark's loss share agreement with the FDIC covering the acquired covered loans secured by 1-4 family residential properties will expire in 2021. Effective July 1, 2016, all acquired covered loans excluding the acquired covered loans secured by 1-4 family residential properties (which totaled \$5.5 million as of June 30, 2016) were reclassified to acquired noncovered loans.

Deposits

Trustmark's deposits are its primary source of funding and consist of core deposits from the communities Trustmark serves. Deposits include interest-bearing and noninterest-bearing demand accounts, savings, money market, certificates of deposit and individual retirement accounts. Total deposits were \$9.532 billion at June 30, 2016 compared to \$9.588 billion at December 31, 2015, a decrease of \$56.7 million, or 0.6%. During the first six months of 2016, noninterest-bearing deposits decreased \$77.7 million, or 2.6%, primarily due to declines in public and consumer demand deposit accounts partially offset by growth in commercial demand deposit accounts, while interest-bearing deposits increased \$21.0 million, or 0.3%, primarily due to growth in public interest-bearing accounts, all categories of savings accounts, public certificates of deposit and commercial money market accounts partially offset by all other categories of interest-bearing accounts.

Short-term Borrowings

Trustmark uses short-term borrowings to fund growth of earning assets in excess of deposit growth. Short-term borrowings consist primarily of federal funds purchased, securities sold under repurchase agreements, short-term FHLB advances and GNMA optional repurchase loans. Short-term borrowings totaled \$966.8 million at June 30, 2016, an increase of \$113.1 million, or 13.3%, when compared with \$853.7 million at December 31, 2015 as a result of the increase in earning assets, principally LHFI, and the decline in deposits. Federal funds purchased and securities sold under repurchase agreements totaled \$606.3 million at June 30, 2016 compared to \$441.0 million at December 31, 2015, an increase of \$165.3 million, or 37.5%. Of these amounts \$164.3 million and \$144.0 million, respectively, represented customer related transactions, such as commercial sweep repurchase balances. Excluding customer related transactions, federal funds purchased totaled \$442.0 million at June 30, 2016, an increase of \$145.0 million when compared with \$297.0 million at December 31, 2015 as Trustmark has chosen to use this advantageous funding source. Other short-term borrowings decreased \$52.2 million, or 12.6%, during the first six months of 2016 primarily due to a \$50.0 million decline in the amount of outstanding short-term FHLB advances with the FHLB of Dallas.

Long-term FHLB Advances

Long-term FHLB advances totaled \$751.1 million at June 30, 2016, an increase of \$250.0 million, or 49.9%, when compared with \$501.2 million at December 31, 2015. During the second quarter of 2016, Trustmark obtained a \$250.0 million long-term FHLB advance from the FHLB of Dallas. Similar to the long-term advance obtained in December 2015, the advance has a variable rate and a two-year maturity. Trustmark chose to utilize these long-term advances as a funding source due to the advantageous rates available in comparison to other sources of funding.

Defined Benefit Plans

As disclosed in Note 9 – Defined Benefit and Other Postretirement Benefits included in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements of this report, Trustmark maintains a noncontributory tax-qualified defined benefit pension plan (Trustmark Capital Accumulation Plan, the “Plan”), in which substantially all associates who began employment prior to 2007 participate. The Plan provides retirement benefits that are based on the length of credited service and final average compensation, as defined in the Plan, and vest upon three years of service. Benefit accruals under the plan have been frozen since 2009, with the exception of certain associates covered through plans obtained in acquisitions

that were subsequently merged into the Plan. Other than the associates covered through these acquired plans that were merged into the Plan, associates have not earned additional benefits, except for interest as required by law, since the Plan was frozen. Current and former associates who participate in the Plan retain their right to receive benefits that accrued before the Plan was frozen.

On July 26, 2016, the Board of Directors of Trustmark authorized the termination of the Plan, effective as of December 31, 2016. To satisfy commitments made by Trustmark to associates covered through acquired plans that were merged into the Plan (collectively, the “Continuing Associates”), the Board of Directors also approved the spin-off of the portion of the Plan associated with the accrued benefits of the Continuing Associates into a new plan titled the Trustmark Corporation Pension Plan for Certain Employees of Acquired Financial Institutions (the “Spin-Off Plan”), effective as of December 31, 2016, immediately prior to the termination of the Plan.

In order to terminate the Plan, in accordance with Internal Revenue Service and Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) requirements, Trustmark is required to fully fund the Plan on a termination basis and will contribute the additional assets necessary to do so. Based on plan assets and PBGC rules as of June 30, 2016, Trustmark estimates that termination of the Plan would require approximately \$67.0 million (after giving effect to the necessary transfer of plan assets to the Spin-Off Plan) to fully fund the Plan on a termination basis and would result in a one-time pension settlement expense of approximately \$12.0 million. Further, as a result of Trustmark's de-risking investment strategy for the Plan as of June 30, 2016, the expected rate of return on plan assets during the second half of 2016 will be decreased from 6% to 2.5%. Accordingly, Trustmark anticipates that its periodic benefit cost for the Plan for the remainder of 2016 will increase by approximately \$1.2 million. Trustmark expects final distributions for the Plan to be made during the second quarter of 2017. Participants in the Plan will have a choice of receiving a lump sum cash payment or annuity payments under a group annuity contract purchased from an insurance carrier, subject to certain exceptions. As a result of the termination of the Plan, each participant will become fully vested in his or her accrued benefits under the Plan.

After the distribution of plan assets and termination of the Plan during the second quarter of 2017, Trustmark estimates that its projected benefit obligation and annual pension expense related to the Spin-Off Plan will be approximately \$10.0 million and \$900 thousand, respectively. As a result of these actions, Trustmark estimates that annual pension expense will be reduced by approximately \$3.0 million to \$4.0 million.

The Board of Directors reserved the right to defer or revoke the termination of the Plan if circumstances change such that deferral or revocation would be warranted, but has no intent to do so at this time.

Legal Environment

Information required in this section is set forth under the heading "Legal Proceedings" of Note 11 – Contingencies included in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements – of this report.

Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

Information required in this section is set forth under the heading "Lending Related" of Note 11 – Contingencies included in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements – of this report.

Contractual Obligations

Payments due from Trustmark under specified long-term and certain other binding contractual obligations were scheduled in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2015. The most significant obligations, other than obligations under deposit contracts and short-term borrowings, were for operating leases for banking facilities. There have been no material changes in Trustmark's contractual obligations since year-end.

Capital Resources

At June 30, 2016, Trustmark's total shareholders' equity was \$1.523 billion, an increase of \$50.4 million, or 3.4%, from its level at December 31, 2015. During the first six months of 2016, shareholders' equity increased primarily as a result of net income of \$48.5 million and an increase in the net unrealized gains on available for sale securities of \$27.8 million, net of tax, partially offset by common stock dividends of \$31.3 million. Trustmark utilizes a capital model in order to provide Management with a monthly tool for analyzing changes in its strategic capital ratios. This allows Management to hold sufficient capital to provide for growth opportunities and protect the balance sheet against sudden adverse market conditions, while maintaining an attractive return on equity to shareholders.

Regulatory Capital

Trustmark and TNB are subject to minimum risk-based capital and leverage capital requirements, as described in the section captioned “Capital Adequacy” included in Part I. Item 1. – Business of Trustmark’s 2015 Annual Report on Form 10-K, which are administered by the federal bank regulatory agencies. These capital requirements, as defined by federal regulations, involve quantitative and qualitative measures of assets, liabilities and certain off-balance sheet instruments. Effective January 1, 2016, Trustmark’s and TNB’s minimum risk-based capital requirements include the year-one phased in capital conservation buffer of 0.625%. Failure to meet minimum capital requirements can result in certain mandatory and possibly additional discretionary actions by regulators that, if undertaken, could have a direct material effect on the financial statements of Trustmark and TNB and limit Trustmark’s and TNB’s ability to pay dividends. As of June 30, 2016, Trustmark and TNB exceeded all applicable minimum capital standards. In addition, Trustmark and TNB met applicable regulatory guidelines to be considered well-capitalized at June 30, 2016. To be categorized in this manner, Trustmark and TNB maintained minimum common equity Tier 1 risk-based capital, Tier 1 risk-based capital, total risk-based capital and Tier 1 leverage ratios, and were not subject to any written agreement, order or capital directive, or prompt corrective action directive issued by their primary federal regulators to meet and maintain a specific capital level for any capital measures. There are no significant conditions or events that have occurred since June 30, 2016, which Management believes have affected Trustmark’s or TNB’s present classification.

During 2006, Trustmark enhanced its capital structure with the issuance of trust preferred securities and Subordinated Notes (the Notes). For regulatory capital purposes, the trust preferred securities currently qualify as Tier 1 capital. Trustmark will continue to utilize \$60.0 million in trust preferred securities issued by Trustmark Preferred Capital Trust I (the Trust) as Tier 1 capital up to the regulatory limit, as permitted by the grandfather provision in the Dodd-Frank Act and the Basel III Final Rule.

Refer to the section captioned “Regulatory Capital” included in Note 14 – Shareholders’ Equity in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements of this report for an illustration of Trustmark’s and TNB’s actual regulatory capital amounts and ratios under regulatory capital standards in effect at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015.

Dividends on Common Stock

Dividends per common share for the six months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015 were \$0.46. Trustmark’s indicated dividend for 2016 is \$0.92 per common share, which is the same as dividends per common share in 2015.

Liquidity

Liquidity is the ability to ensure that sufficient cash flow and liquid assets are available to satisfy current and future financial obligations, including demand for loans and deposit withdrawals, funding operating costs and other corporate purposes. Consistent cash flows from operations and adequate capital provide internally generated liquidity. Furthermore, Management maintains funding capacity from a variety of external sources to meet daily funding needs, such as those required to meet deposit withdrawals, loan disbursements and security settlements. Liquidity strategy also includes the use of wholesale funding sources to provide for the seasonal fluctuations of deposit and loan demand and the cyclical fluctuations of the economy that impact the availability of funds. Management keeps excess funding capacity available to meet potential demands associated with adverse circumstances.

The asset side of the balance sheet provides liquidity primarily through maturities and cash flows from loans and securities as well as the ability to sell certain loans and securities while the liability portion of the balance sheet provides liquidity primarily through noninterest and interest-bearing deposits. Trustmark utilizes federal funds purchased, FHLB advances, securities sold under repurchase agreements as well as the Federal Reserve Discount

Window (Discount Window) and, on a limited basis as discussed below, brokered deposits to provide additional liquidity. Access to these additional sources represents Trustmark's incremental borrowing capacity.

Deposit accounts represent Trustmark's largest funding source. Average deposits totaled to \$9.613 billion for the first six months of 2016 and represented approximately 75.2% of average liabilities and shareholders' equity, compared to average deposits of \$9.772 billion, which represented 80.6% of average liabilities and shareholders' equity for the first six months of 2015.

Trustmark utilizes a limited amount of brokered deposits to supplement other wholesale funding sources. At June 30, 2016, brokered sweep Money Market Deposit Account (MMDA) deposits totaled \$32.8 million compared to \$42.3 million at December 31, 2015.

At June 30, 2016, Trustmark had \$442.0 million in upstream federal funds purchased, compared to \$297.0 million at December 31, 2015. Trustmark maintains adequate federal funds lines to provide sufficient short-term liquidity. The increase in upstream federal funds purchased was primarily the result of the increase in earning assets and the decline in deposits as Trustmark chose to utilize this advantageous funding source.

Trustmark also maintains a relationship with the FHLB of Dallas, which provided \$300.0 million of outstanding short-term advances and \$750.0 million of outstanding long-term advances at June 30, 2016, compared to \$350.0 million of outstanding short-term advances and \$500.0 million of outstanding long-term advances at December 31, 2015. Trustmark has chosen to utilize the long-term FHLB advances with the FHLB of Dallas as a funding source due to the advantageous rates available in comparison to other sources of funding. Under the existing borrowing agreement, Trustmark had sufficient qualifying collateral to increase FHLB advances with the FHLB of Dallas by \$1.454 billion at June 30, 2016. In addition, at June 30, 2016, Trustmark had \$1.1 million in FHLB advances outstanding with the FHLB of Atlanta, which were acquired in the BancTrust merger, compared to \$1.2 million at December 31, 2015. Trustmark has non-member status and thus no additional borrowing capacity with the FHLB of Atlanta.

Additionally, Trustmark has the ability to enter into wholesale funding repurchase agreements as a source of borrowing by utilizing its unencumbered investment securities as collateral. At June 30, 2016, Trustmark had approximately \$1.377 billion available in repurchase agreement capacity compared to \$1.194 billion at December 31, 2015. The increase in repurchase agreement capacity at June 30, 2016, was primarily due to an increase in the unencumbered investment portfolio balance resulting from a lower public deposit pledge requirement due in part to the decline in public demand deposits.

Another borrowing source is the Discount Window. At June 30, 2016, Trustmark had approximately \$975.2 million available in collateral capacity at the Discount Window primarily from pledges of commercial and industrial LHFI, compared with \$883.7 million at December 31, 2015.

TNB has outstanding \$50.0 million in aggregate principal amount of the Notes due December 15, 2016. At June 30, 2016, the carrying amount of the Notes was \$50.0 million. The Notes are unsecured and subordinate and junior in right of payment to TNB's obligations to its depositors, its obligations under bankers' acceptances and letters of credit, its obligations to any Federal Reserve Bank or the FDIC and its obligations to its other creditors, and to any rights acquired by the FDIC as a result of loans made by the FDIC to TNB.

During 2006, Trustmark completed a private placement of \$60.0 million of trust preferred securities through a newly formed Delaware trust affiliate, the Trust. The trust preferred securities mature September 30, 2036 and are redeemable at Trustmark's option. The proceeds from the sale of the trust preferred securities were used by the Trust to purchase \$61.9 million in aggregate principal amount of Trustmark's junior subordinated debentures.

The Board of Directors of Trustmark currently has the authority to issue up to 20.0 million preferred shares with no par value. The ability to issue preferred shares in the future will provide Trustmark with additional financial and management flexibility for general corporate and acquisition purposes. At June 30, 2016, Trustmark had no shares of preferred stock issued and outstanding.

Liquidity position and strategy are reviewed regularly by Management and continuously adjusted in relationship to Trustmark's overall strategy. Management believes that Trustmark has sufficient liquidity and capital resources to meet presently known cash flow requirements arising from ongoing business transactions.

Asset/Liability Management

Overview

Market risk reflects the potential risk of loss arising from adverse changes in interest rates and market prices. Trustmark has risk management policies to monitor and limit exposure to market risk. Trustmark's primary market risk is interest rate risk created by core banking activities. Interest rate risk is the potential variability of the

income generated by Trustmark's financial products or services, which results from changes in various market interest rates. Market rate changes may take the form of absolute shifts, variances in the relationships between different rates and changes in the shape or slope of the interest rate term structure.

Management continually develops and applies cost-effective strategies to manage these risks. Management's Asset/Liability Committee sets the day-to-day operating guidelines, approves strategies affecting net interest income and coordinates activities within policy limits established by the Board of Directors of Trustmark. A key objective of the asset/liability management program is to quantify, monitor and manage interest rate risk and to assist Management in maintaining stability in the net interest margin under varying interest rate environments.

Derivatives

Trustmark uses financial derivatives for management of interest rate risk. Management's Asset/Liability Committee, in its oversight role for the management of interest rate risk, approves the use of derivatives in balance sheet hedging strategies. The most common derivatives employed by Trustmark are interest rate lock commitments, forward contracts (both futures contracts and options on

futures contracts), interest rate swaps, interest rate caps and interest rate floors. As a general matter, the values of these instruments are designed to be inversely related to the values of the assets that they hedge (i.e., if the value of the hedged asset falls, the value of the related hedge rises). In addition, Trustmark has entered into derivatives contracts as counterparty to one or more customers in connection with loans extended to those customers. These transactions are designed to hedge interest rate, currency or other exposures of the customers and are not entered into by Trustmark for speculative purposes. Increased federal regulation of the derivatives markets may increase the cost to Trustmark to administer derivatives programs.

On April 4, 2013, Trustmark entered into a forward interest rate swap contract on junior subordinated debentures with a total notional amount of \$60.0 million. The interest rate swap contract was designated as a derivative instrument in a cash flow hedge under FASB ASC Topic 815, with the objective of protecting the quarterly interest payments on Trustmark's \$60.0 million of junior subordinated debentures issued to the Trust throughout the five-year period beginning December 31, 2014 and ending December 31, 2019 from the risk of variability of those payments resulting from changes in the three-month LIBOR interest rate. Under the swap, which became effective on December 31, 2014, Trustmark pays a fixed interest rate of 1.66% per annum and receives a variable interest rate based on three-month LIBOR on a total notional amount of \$60.0 million, with quarterly net settlements.

No ineffectiveness related to the interest rate swap designated as a cash flow hedge was recognized in the consolidated statements of income during the six months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015. The accumulated net after-tax loss related to the effective cash flow hedge included in AOCL totaled \$1.1 million and \$160 thousand at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, respectively. Amounts reported in AOCL related to this derivative are reclassified to other interest expense as interest payments are made on Trustmark's variable rate junior subordinated debentures. During the next twelve months, Trustmark estimates that \$604 thousand will be reclassified as an increase to other interest expense.

As part of Trustmark's risk management strategy in the mortgage banking business, various derivative instruments such as interest rate lock commitments and forward sales contracts are utilized. Rate lock commitments are residential mortgage loan commitments with customers, which guarantee a specified interest rate for a specified period of time. Trustmark's obligations under forward contracts consist of commitments to deliver mortgage loans, originated and/or purchased, in the secondary market at a future date. The gross notional amount of Trustmark's off-balance sheet obligations under these derivative instruments totaled \$583.5 million at June 30, 2016, with a positive valuation adjustment of \$728 thousand, compared to \$298.6 million, with a positive valuation adjustment of \$1.4 million at December 31, 2015.

Trustmark utilizes a portfolio of exchange-traded derivative instruments, such as Treasury note futures contracts and option contracts, to achieve a fair value return that economically hedges changes in fair value of the MSR attributable to interest rates. These transactions are considered freestanding derivatives that do not otherwise qualify for hedge accounting under GAAP. The total notional amount of these derivative instruments were \$325.0 million at June 30, 2016 compared to \$264.5 million at December 31, 2015. These exchange-traded derivative instruments are accounted for at fair value with changes in the fair value recorded in noninterest income in mortgage banking, net and are offset by the changes in the fair value of the MSR. The MSR fair value represents the present value of future cash flows, which among other things includes decay and the effect of changes in interest rates. Ineffectiveness of hedging the MSR fair value is measured by comparing the change in value of hedge instruments to the change in the fair value of the MSR asset attributable to changes in interest rates and other market driven changes in valuation inputs and assumptions. The impact of this strategy resulted in a net negative ineffectiveness of \$1.9 million compared to a net positive ineffectiveness of \$2.1 million for the three months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015, respectively, and a net negative ineffectiveness of \$1.5 million compared to a net positive ineffectiveness of \$3.4 million for the six months ended June 30, 2016 and 2015, respectively. The net negative ineffectiveness was primarily due to the tightening in the mortgage spread during the first six months of 2016 compared the same time period in 2015.

Trustmark offers certain interest rate derivatives products directly to qualified commercial lending clients seeking to manage their interest rate risk under loans they have entered into with TNB. Trustmark economically hedges interest rate swap transactions executed with commercial lending clients by entering into offsetting interest rate swap transactions with institutional derivatives market participants. Derivatives transactions executed as part of this program are not designated as qualifying hedging relationships under GAAP and are, therefore, carried on Trustmark's financial statements at fair value with the change in fair value recorded in noninterest income in bank card and other fees. Because these derivatives have mirror-image contractual terms, in addition to collateral provisions which mitigate the impact of non-performance risk, the changes in fair value are expected to substantially offset. As of June 30, 2016, Trustmark had interest rate swaps with an aggregate notional amount of \$390.1 million related to this program, compared to \$359.3 million as of December 31, 2015.

Trustmark has agreements with its financial institution counterparties that contain provisions where if Trustmark defaults on any of its indebtedness, including default where repayment of the indebtedness has not been accelerated by the lender, then Trustmark could also be deemed to be in default on its derivatives obligations.

As of June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, the termination value of interest rate swaps in a liability position, which includes accrued interest but excludes any adjustment for nonperformance risk, related to these agreements was \$7.7 million and \$2.6 million, respectively. As of June 30, 2016, Trustmark had posted collateral of \$6.8 million against its obligations because of negotiated thresholds and minimum transfer amounts under these agreements. If Trustmark had breached any of these triggering provisions at June 30, 2016, it could have been required to settle its obligations under the agreements at the termination value (which is expected to approximate fair market value).

Credit risk participation agreements arise when Trustmark contracts with other financial institutions, as a guarantor or beneficiary, to share credit risk associated with certain interest rate swaps. These agreements provide for reimbursement of losses resulting from a third party default on the underlying swap. At both June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015, Trustmark had entered into two risk participation agreements as a beneficiary with an aggregate notional amount of \$14.5 million and \$14.8 million, respectively. At June 30, 2016 Trustmark had entered into three risk participation agreement as a guarantor with an aggregate notional amount of \$24.5 million compared to one risk participation agreement as a guarantor with an aggregate notional amount of \$5.9 million at December 31, 2015. The aggregate fair values of these risk participation agreements were immaterial at June 30, 2016 and December 31, 2015.

Trustmark's participation in the derivatives markets is subject to increased federal regulation of these markets. Trustmark believes that it may continue to use financial derivatives to manage interest rate risk and also to offer derivatives products to certain qualified commercial lending clients in compliance with the Volcker Rule. However, the increased federal regulation of the derivatives markets has increased the cost to Trustmark of administering its derivatives programs. Some of these costs (particularly compliance costs related to the Volcker Rule and other federal regulations) are expected to recur in the future.

Market/Interest Rate Risk Management

The primary purpose in managing interest rate risk is to invest capital effectively and preserve the value created by the core banking business. This is accomplished through the development and implementation of lending, funding, pricing and hedging strategies designed to maximize net interest income performance under varying interest rate environments subject to specific liquidity and interest rate risk guidelines.

Financial simulation models are the primary tools used by Management's Asset/Liability Committee to measure interest rate exposure. Using a wide range of scenarios, Management is provided with extensive information on the potential impact on net interest income caused by changes in interest rates. Models are structured to simulate cash flows and accrual characteristics of Trustmark's balance sheet. Assumptions are made about the direction and volatility of interest rates, the slope of the yield curve and the changing composition of Trustmark's balance sheet, resulting from both strategic plans and customer behavior. In addition, the model incorporates Management's assumptions and expectations regarding such factors as loan and deposit growth, pricing, prepayment speeds and spreads between interest rates.

Based on the results of the simulation models using static balances, the table below summarizes the effect various one-year interest rate shift scenarios would have on net interest income compared to a base case, flat scenario at June 30, 2016 and 2015. At June 30, 2016 and 2015, the impact of a 200 basis point drop scenario was not calculated due to the low interest rate environment.

Estimated %
Change

	in Net Interest Income	
Change in Interest Rates	2016	2015
+200 basis points	0.4 %	2.0 %
+100 basis points	0.3 %	1.1 %
-100 basis points	-6.1 %	-5.4 %

As shown in the table above, the interest rate shocks for the first six months of 2016 illustrate little change in net interest income in rising rate scenarios while displaying modest exposure to a falling rate environment. The exposure to falling rates is primarily due to a downward repricing of various earning assets with minimal contribution from liabilities given the already low cost of deposits in the base scenario. Management cannot provide any assurance about the actual effect of changes in interest rates on net interest income. The estimates provided do not include the effects of possible strategic changes in the balances of various assets and liabilities throughout 2016 or additional actions Trustmark could undertake in response to changes in interest rates. Management will continue to prudently manage the balance sheet in an effort to control interest rate risk and maintain profitability over the long term.

Another component of interest rate risk management is measuring the economic value-at-risk for a given change in market interest rates. The economic value-at-risk may indicate risks associated with longer-term balance sheet items that may not affect net interest income at risk over shorter time periods. Trustmark uses computer-modeling techniques to determine the present value of all asset and liability cash flows (both on- and off-balance sheet), adjusted for prepayment expectations, using a market discount rate. The economic value of equity (EVE), also known as net portfolio value, is defined as the difference between the present value of asset cash flows and the present value of liability cash flows. The resulting change in EVE in different market rate environments, from the base case scenario, is the amount of EVE at risk from those rate environments. The following table summarizes the effect that various interest rate shifts would have on net portfolio value at June 30, 2016 and 2015. At June 30, 2016 and 2015, the impact of a 200 basis point drop scenario was not calculated due to the historically low interest rate environment.

	Estimated % Change	
	in Net Portfolio Value	
Change in Interest Rates	2016	2015
+200 basis points	5.3 %	3.9 %
+100 basis points	3.6 %	3.0 %
-100 basis points	-9.3 %	-8.0 %

Trustmark determines the fair value of the MSR using a valuation model administered by a third party that calculates the present value of estimated future net servicing income. The model incorporates assumptions that market participants use in estimating future net servicing income, including estimates of prepayment speeds, discount rate, default rates, cost to service (including delinquency and foreclosure costs), escrow account earnings, contractual servicing fee income and other ancillary income such as late fees. Management reviews all significant assumptions quarterly. Mortgage loan prepayment speeds, a key assumption in the model, is the annual rate at which borrowers are forecasted to repay their mortgage loan principal. The discount rate used to determine the present value of estimated future net servicing income, another key assumption in the model, is an estimate of the required rate of return investors in the market would require for an asset with similar risk. Both assumptions can, and generally will, change as market conditions and interest rates change.

By way of example, an increase in either the prepayment speed or discount rate assumption will result in a decrease in the fair value of the MSR, while a decrease in either assumption will result in an increase in the fair value of the MSR. In recent years, there have been significant market-driven fluctuations in loan prepayment speeds and discount rates. These fluctuations can be rapid and may continue to be significant. Therefore, estimating prepayment speed and/or discount rates within ranges that market participants would use in determining the fair value of the MSR requires significant management judgment.

At June 30, 2016, the MSR fair value was approximately \$62.8 million, compared to \$71.4 million at June 30, 2015. The impact on the MSR fair value of a 10% adverse change in prepayment speed or a 100 basis point increase in discount rate at June 30, 2016, would be a decline in fair value of approximately \$2.7 million and \$1.8 million, respectively, compared to a decline in fair value of approximately \$2.3 million and \$2.5 million, respectively, at June 30, 2015. Changes of equal magnitude in the opposite direction would produce similar increases in fair value in the respective amounts.

Critical Accounting Policies

For an overview of Trustmark's critical accounting policies, see the section captioned "Critical Accounting Policies" included in Part II. Item 7. – Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, of Trustmark's 2015 Annual Report on Form 10-K. There have been no significant changes in Trustmark's critical accounting policies during the first six months of 2016.

For additional information regarding Trustmark's basis of presentation and accounting policies, see Note 1 – Business, Basis of Financial Statement Presentation and Principles of Consolidation included in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements of this report.

Accounting Policies Recently Adopted and Pending Accounting Pronouncements

For a complete list of recently adopted and pending accounting policies and the impact on Trustmark, see Note 18 – Accounting Policies Recently Adopted and Pending Accounting Pronouncements included in Part I. Item 1. – Financial Statements – of this report.

ITEM 3. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK

The information required by this item is included in the discussion of Market/Interest Rate Risk Management found in Management's Discussion and Analysis.

ITEM 4. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

As of the end of the period covered by this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, an evaluation was carried out by Trustmark's Management, with the participation of its Chief Executive Officer and Treasurer and Principal Financial Officer (Principal Financial Officer), of the effectiveness of Trustmark's disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rule 13a-15(e) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934). Based on that evaluation, the Chief Executive Officer and the Principal Financial Officer concluded that Trustmark's disclosure controls and procedures were effective as of the end of the period covered by this report.

Changes in Internal Control over Financial Reporting

There has been no change in Trustmark's internal control over financial reporting during the last fiscal quarter that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, Trustmark's internal control over financial reporting.

PART II. OTHER INFORMATION

ITEM 1. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

Trustmark's wholly-owned subsidiary, TNB, has been named as a defendant in three lawsuits related to the collapse of the Stanford Financial Group. The first is a purported class action complaint that was filed on August 23, 2009 in the District Court of Harris County, Texas, by Peggy Roif Rotstain, Guthrie Abbott, Catherine Burnell, Steven Queyrouze, Jaime Alexis Arroyo Bornstein and Juan C. Olano (collectively, Class Plaintiffs), on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, naming TNB and four other financial institutions unaffiliated with Trustmark as defendants. The complaint seeks to recover (i) alleged fraudulent transfers from each of the defendants in the amount of fees and other monies received by each defendant from entities controlled by R. Allen Stanford (collectively, the Stanford Financial Group) and (ii) damages allegedly attributable to alleged conspiracies by one or more of the defendants with the Stanford Financial Group to commit fraud and/or aid and abet fraud on the asserted grounds that defendants knew or should have known the Stanford Financial Group was conducting an illegal and fraudulent scheme. Plaintiffs have demanded a jury trial. Plaintiffs did not quantify damages.

In November 2009, the lawsuit was removed to federal court by certain defendants and then transferred by the United States Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to federal court in the Northern District of Texas (Dallas) where multiple Stanford related matters are being consolidated for pre-trial proceedings. In May 2010, all defendants (including TNB) filed motions to dismiss the lawsuit. In August 2010, the court authorized and approved the formation of an Official Stanford Investors Committee (OSIC) to represent the interests of Stanford investors and, under certain circumstances, to file legal actions for the benefit of Stanford investors. In December 2011, the OSIC filed a motion to intervene in this action. In September 2012, the district court referred the case to a magistrate judge for hearing and determination of certain pretrial issues. In December 2012, the court granted the OSIC's motion to intervene, and the OSIC filed an Intervenor Complaint against one of the other defendant financial institutions. In February 2013, the OSIC filed a second Intervenor Complaint that asserts claims against TNB and the remaining defendant financial institutions. The OSIC seeks to recover: (i) alleged fraudulent transfers in the amount of the fees each of the defendants allegedly received from Stanford Financial Group, the profits each of the defendants allegedly made from Stanford Financial Group deposits, and other monies each of the defendants allegedly received from Stanford Financial Group; (ii) damages attributable to alleged conspiracies by each of the defendants with the Stanford Financial Group to commit fraud and/or aid and abet fraud and conversion on the asserted grounds that the defendants

knew or should have known the Stanford Financial Group was conducting an illegal and fraudulent scheme; and (iii) punitive damages. The OSIC did not quantify damages.

In July 2013, all defendants (including TNB) filed motions to dismiss the OSIC's claims. In March 2015, the court entered an order authorizing the parties to conduct discovery regarding class certification and setting a deadline for the parties to complete briefing on class certification issues. In April 2015, the court granted in part and denied in part the defendants' motions to dismiss the Class Plaintiffs' claims and the OSIC's claims. The court dismissed all of the Class Plaintiffs' fraudulent transfer claims and dismissed certain of the OSIC's claims. The court denied the motions by TNB and the other financial institution defendants to dismiss the OSIC's constructive fraudulent transfer claims.

On June 23, 2015, the court allowed the Class Plaintiffs to file a Second Amended Class Action Complaint (SAC), which asserted new claims against TNB and certain of the other defendants for (i) aiding, abetting and participating in a fraudulent scheme, (ii) aiding, abetting and participating in violations of the Texas Securities Act, (iii) aiding, abetting and participating in breaches of fiduciary duty, (iv) aiding, abetting and participating in conversion and (v) conspiracy. On July 14, 2015, the defendants (including TNB) filed motions to dismiss the SAC and to reconsider the court's prior denial to dismiss the OSIC's constructive fraudulent transfer claims against TNB and the other financial institutions that are defendants in the action. On July 27, 2016, the court denied the motion by TNB and the other financial institution defendants to dismiss the SAC and also denied the motion by TNB and the other financial

institution defendants to reconsider the court's prior denial to dismiss the OSIC's constructive fraudulent transfer claims. Trustmark is evaluating this order and its options with respect to this litigation.

The second Stanford-related lawsuit was filed on December 14, 2009 in the District Court of Ascension Parish, Louisiana, individually by Harold Jackson, Paul Blaine, Carolyn Bass Smith, Christine Nichols, and Ronald and Ramona Hebert naming TNB (misnamed as Trust National Bank) and other individuals and entities not affiliated with Trustmark as defendants. The complaint seeks to recover the money lost by these individual plaintiffs as a result of the collapse of the Stanford Financial Group (in addition to other damages) under various theories and causes of action, including negligence, breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, negligent misrepresentation, detrimental reliance, conspiracy, and violation of Louisiana's uniform fiduciary, securities, and racketeering laws. The complaint does not quantify the amount of money the plaintiffs seek to recover. In January 2010, the lawsuit was removed to federal court by certain defendants and then transferred by the United States Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to federal court in the Northern District of Texas (Dallas) where multiple Stanford related matters are being consolidated for pre-trial proceedings. On March 29, 2010, the court stayed the case. TNB filed a motion to lift the stay, which was denied on February 28, 2012. In September 2012, the district court referred the case to a magistrate judge for hearing and determination of certain pretrial issues.

On April 11, 2016, Trustmark learned that a third Stanford-related lawsuit had been filed on April 11, 2016 in the Superior Court of Justice in Ontario, Canada, by The Toronto-Dominion Bank ("TD Bank"), naming TNB and three other financial institutions not affiliated with Trustmark as defendants. The complaint seeks a declaration specifying the degree to which each of TNB and the other defendants are liable in respect of any loss and damage for which TD Bank is found to be liable in a litigation commenced against TD Bank brought by the Joint Liquidators of Stanford International Bank Limited in the Superior Court of Justice, Commercial List in Ontario, Canada (the "Joint Liquidators' Action"), as well as contribution and indemnity in respect of any judgment, interest and costs TD Bank is ordered to pay in the Joint Liquidators' Action. To date, TNB has not been served in connection with this action.

TNB's relationship with the Stanford Financial Group began as a result of Trustmark's acquisition of a Houston-based bank in August 2006, and consisted of correspondent banking and other traditional banking services in the ordinary course of business. All Stanford-related lawsuits are in pre-trial stages.

TNB has been named as a defendant in two separately filed but now consolidated lawsuits involving two testamentary trusts created in the will of Kathleen Killebrew Paine for her two children, Carolyn Paine Davis and W.K. Paine. TNB is named as the Trustee in both trusts. The lawsuits were filed on June 30, 2014 in the Chancery Court of the First Judicial District of Hinds County, Mississippi by Jennifer Davis Michael, Elizabeth Paine Lindigrin, Wilmer Harrison Paine, Kenneth Whitworth Paine, Robert Harvey Paine and Nathan Davis, who are all children of Mrs. Davis and Mr. Paine. The complaints allege that the plaintiffs are vested current beneficiaries of the respective trusts; that the plaintiffs should have been entitled to be considered for distributions of trust income; and that the interests of Mrs. Davis and Mr. Paine were favored over plaintiffs' interest in both the distribution of income and in the making of trust investments. Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages, refund of trust fees and sweep fees, punitive damages, attorneys' fees and pre- and post-judgment interest. On March 9, 2015, the court granted TNB's motion to add Mrs. Davis and Mr. W.K. Paine as cross-defendants. Following a bench trial that concluded on January 20, 2016, the judge ordered the parties to enter into mandatory mediation. On February 22, 2016, the mediator reported to the judge that the mediation had failed to resolve the matter. The judge will next conduct a scheduling conference for a timeframe for the parties to submit findings of fact and conclusions of law to the court. The judge will consider those submissions and then enter a ruling on the case at some point in the future.

Trustmark and its subsidiaries are also parties to other lawsuits and other claims that arise in the ordinary course of business. Some of the lawsuits assert claims related to the lending, collection, servicing, investment, trust and other business activities, and some of the lawsuits allege substantial claims for damages.

All pending legal proceedings described above are being vigorously contested. In accordance FASB Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) Topic 450-20, "Loss Contingencies," Trustmark will establish an accrued liability for litigation matters when those matters present loss contingencies that are both probable and reasonably estimable. At the present time, Management believes, based on the advice of legal counsel and Management's evaluation, that a loss in any such proceeding is not both probable and reasonably estimable. All matters will continue to be monitored for further developments that would make such loss contingency both probable and reasonably estimable. In view of the inherent difficulty of predicting the outcome of legal proceedings, Trustmark cannot predict the eventual outcomes of the currently pending matters or the timing of their ultimate resolution. Management currently believes, however, based upon the advice of legal counsel and Management's evaluation and after taking into account its current insurance coverage, that the legal proceedings currently pending should not have a material adverse effect on Trustmark's consolidated financial condition.

ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS

There has been no material change in the risk factors previously disclosed in Trustmark's Annual Report on Form 10-K for its fiscal year ended December 31, 2015.

ITEM 2. UNREGISTERED SALES OF EQUITY SECURITIES AND USE OF PROCEEDS

On March 11, 2016, the Board of Directors of Trustmark authorized a stock repurchase program under which up to \$100.0 million of Trustmark's common shares may be acquired through March 31, 2019. The following table provides information with respect to purchases by Trustmark or made on behalf of Trustmark of its common stock during the three months ended June 30, 2016 (\$ in thousands, except per share amounts):

Period	Total Number of Shares Purchased	Average Price Paid Per Share	Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plan	Approximate Dollar Value of Shares that May Yet Be Purchased Under the Plan at the End of the Period
April 1, 2016 to April 30, 2016	33,622	\$ 22.31	33,622	\$ 99,250
May 1, 2016 to May 31, 2016	—	—	—	99,250
June 1, 2016 to June 30, 2016	—	—	—	99,250
Total	33,622	\$ 22.31	33,622	

ITEM 3. DEFAULTS UPON SENIOR SECURITIES

None

ITEM 4. MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURES

Not applicable

ITEM 5. OTHER INFORMATION

None

ITEM 6. EXHIBITS

The exhibits listed in the Exhibit Index are filed herewith or are incorporated herein by reference.

EXHIBIT INDEX

- 3-a Restated Articles of Incorporation of Trustmark, as restated April 28, 2016. Incorporated herein by reference to Exhibit 3.1 to Trustmark's Form 8-K Current Report filed on May 2, 2016.

Edgar Filing: TRUSTMARK CORP - Form 10-Q

- 3-b Bylaws of Trustmark, as amended and restated April 28, 2016. Incorporated herein by reference to Exhibit 3.2 to Trustmark's Form 8-K Current Report filed on May 2, 2016.
- 31-a Certification by Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
- 31-b Certification by Principal Financial Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
- 32-a Certification by Chief Executive Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. ss. 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
- 32-b Certification by Principal Financial Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. ss. 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
- 101 XBRL Interactive Data.

All other exhibits are omitted, as they are inapplicable or not required by the related instructions.

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

TRUSTMARK CORPORATION

BY: /s/ Gerard R. Host
Gerard R. Host
President and Chief Executive Officer

BY: /s/ Louis E. Greer
Louis E. Greer
Treasurer, Principal Financial Officer and
Principal Accounting Officer

DATE: August 5, 2016

DATE: August 5, 2016