

From: kmccarter@seviercountybank.com [<mailto:kmccarter@seviercountybank.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2010 10:13 AM
To: Comments
Subject: FDIC Proposed Guidance on Overdraft Coverage

Kim McCarter
111 East Main Street
Sevierville, TN 37862-3513

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:

Kim McCarter
111 East Main Street
P.O. Box 5288
Sevierville, TN 37864-5288
865-453-6101
369M

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.

Further, any additional rules should be the result of an inter-agency effort to ensure consistency and fairness in its application for both banks and the customers we serve.

Lastly, 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 beneficial 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:

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.

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. Sevier County Bank has established a \$300.00 daily limit on overdraft fees as well as a \$5.00 daily balance tolerance for fees.

Not to prescribe the order of transaction posting. Banks should retain the ability to post transactions in the order they deem appropriate as long as they do not manipulate processing to maximize overdraft fee income. Sevier County Bank has always paid high to low transactions with the thought that a customer would rather their mortgage or car payments to be paid first.

To allow banks to charge a fee for returning items paid by check or ACH. Processing return items represent expense and employee attention and should not be provided free of charge. It is still our belief that as we are here to counsel and provide financial services for our community, it is ultimately the responsibility of the customer to keep their accounts in balance and be responsible for the checks, ACH, ATM, transactions that will be posting.

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,
Kim McCarter