

From: jshinabarger@svbt.com [mailto:jshinabarger@svbt.com]  
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2010 4:48 PM  
To: Comments  
Subject: FDIC Proposed Guidance on Overdraft Coverage

Jamie Shinabarger  
1500 Main St.  
Jasper, IN 47546-1617

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 President/CEO of Springs Valley Bank & Trust a \$240+ Million community bank located in rural Southern Indiana. Our charter resides in French, Lick Indiana (Orange County) but we also have operations in Jasper, Indiana (Dubois County). Orange County is one of the most economically disadvantaged counties in the state while Dubois County is entirely on the other end of the spectrum.

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.

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:

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. We already apply a "common-sense, community bank" approach to each customer's account and deal with excessive OD customers on a one-to one basis. Many times the bank compromises on the assessed fees and/or informs the customer about alternatives.

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.

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.

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,

Jamie Shinabarger  
812-634-4891