

From: ceo@thecitizensbank.com [<mailto:ceo@thecitizensbank.com>]  
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2010 11:08 AM  
To: Comments  
Subject: FDIC Proposed Guidance on Overdraft Coverage

Scott Everson  
201 South Fourth Street  
Martins Ferry, OH 43935-1311

September 27, 2010

Comments to FDIC

Dear Comments to FDIC:

By electronic delivery to:  
[OverdraftComments@fdic.gov](mailto: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:

As a community banker in East- Central Ohio with a bank that has a long and storied history of providing exceptional customer service and meeting the needs of the communities that we serve, I am firmly against any additional regulatory burden as it relates to the services that we offer, and that are demanded, by our loyal customers. In specific, 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.

I fear that this proposal will ultimately do a great disservice to my customers, many of which appreciate the assurances that accidental overdraft coverage offers in preventing a bill being returned unpaid or a merchant-imposed fee being levied. If regulatory barriers and requirements become too burdensome, I will be faced with discontinuing these services and returning all check and ACH transactions, exposing my customers to fees far greater than those imposed by my bank.

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.

If the FDIC proceeds with adoption of the proposed guidance, please consider the following:

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, close the customer's account and return all payments, or cause us to increase the pricing on all customer accounts to cover this increased business cost.

To eliminate the requirement to set daily thresholds on overdraft fees. We price this fee to manage the associated risk and as a deterrent to encourage consumers to engage in more financially-responsible practices.

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,  
Scott Everson  
7406330445