From: bcarvill@tompkinstrust.com [mailto:bcarvill@tompkinstrust.com]
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2010 11:23 AM
To: Comments
Subject: FDIC Proposed Guidance on Overdraft Coverage

Becky Carvill
PO Box 460
Ithaca, NY 14851-0460

September 27, 2010

Comments to FDIC

Dear Comments to FDIC:

By electronic delivery to:
OverdraftComments@fdic.gov

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
550 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20429-9990

Re: Overdraft Payment Supervisory Guidance, FIL-47-2010, August 11, 2010

Dear Sir or Madame:

I am an Operations Officer and Supervisor at Tompkins Financial Corporation which is a holding company for a wealth management organization, an insurance agency and three Community Banks, Tompkins Trust Company headquartered in Ithaca, New York, The Bank of Castile headquartered in Castile, New York and Mahopac National Bank headquartered in Mahopac, New. Each of these areas has it's own unique market. I have been with this Company for 27 years and have experienced first hand the challenges that we have faced both on the retail side and more recently on the operational side that new regulations have caused and not all of them turn out to work like they are suppose to.

We struggle every day to implement these new regulations. There isn't a clear place we can go that defines mandated regulations in a way that we can understand them and believe me we aren't lawyers! Then we're challenged by technology burdens that come with the new regulations. Our core vendor cannot keep up with the demands. This causes more manual processes than you can imagine.

This type of change will only continue to drive up the cost for Banks as we struggle to keep up with the demands on multiple levels.

I strongly oppose the FDIC's proposed guidance (FIL-47-2010) that addresses overdraft coverage programs. Simply put now is not the time to introduce further regulation targeted at overdraft coverage products. My bank has just implemented new requirements under Regulation DD (Truth in

Savings) and Regulation E (Electronic Fund Transfers) at great expense and manpower. Having to rework our bank's deposit products and to accommodate a regulatory moving target does not help my bank serve its customers.

Our customers have become confused for example with this last Reg E change. The same terminology of opting in or opting out applies to Reg P as well as Reg E but there is a whole set of different rules and a whole different regulatory letter that applies. Do you truly think our customer understands that? More regulation; more confusion and is it beneficial?

I am not the type that normally has much to say in such matters but I can say that more regulation doesn't mean it will be better for the common person on main street when it comes to this issue. Also, when will it be the responsibility of the consumer to be accountable for their actions? Do you realize the chronic abusers of this program were, in general, the first consumers to opt in? Do you think they are going to change their spending habits? Not until they are forced to be responsible. If you believe monitoring or sending out a letter will change their habits then you don't understand main street Americans.

Please consider your actions carefully before enacting or creating more changes.

I urge the FDIC to carefully consider this measure to ensure that the guidance does not impede my bank's ability to provide overdraft coverage services to my customers. If we are forced to abandon or significantly alter these services due to regulatory burden, the result could lead more consumers into becoming unbanked or relying on other products such as prepaid debit cards and check cashing services, which have higher fees and foster unsound financial practices.

Sincerely,
Becky Carvill
607-274-7223