

From: ledwards@reliancebank.com [mailto:ledwards@reliancebank.com]
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2010 9:58 AM
To: Comments
Subject: FDIC Proposed Guidance on Overdraft Coverage

Larry Edwards
1119 12th St
Altoona, PA 16601-3419

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:

Reliance Bank is a Mutual Saving Bank doing business in Altoona Pa for over 70 years. We have always been a strong, community minded organization that cares about our customers. The heart of this bill will take another piece of the caring out of our hands.

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.

My bank does not manipulate transaction processing to generate more fees and higher revenue. My bank is accountable to its community and its success is dependent on a mutually beneficially relationship with customers. If we engaged in "price-gouging" tactics, we COULD NOT do business in our community.

To specifically exempt ad hoc programs from this guidance. Ad hoc overdraft coverage is an extension of my bank's customer service and is based on our knowledge of the individual customer. Including ad hoc overdraft coverage in this guidance would damage the relationship between my bank and its customers.

The elimination of the requirement that banks monitor programs for excessive or chronic use (six overdrafts in a rolling twelve month period) and then contact the customer (in person or via telephone) to discuss less costly alternatives. This mandate would be extremely burdensome and operationally unworkable for my bank and would result in an excessive number of calls, causing us to either discontinue our overdraft coverage program, or to close the customer's account and return all payments.

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,

Larry L Edwards
814 949-6288