

From: jweisgram@asbpierre.com [<mailto:jweisgram@asbpierre.com>]  
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2010 10:58 AM  
To: Comments  
Subject: FDIC Proposed Guidance on Overdraft Coverage

Judy Weisgram  
P.O. Box 1178  
Pierre, SD 57501-1178

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:

We are a community bank in a mostly rural area in the heart of South Dakota. With the flight to safety our assets have grown to \$128 Million.

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 beneficially relationship with customers. If we engaged in "price-gouging" tactics, we COULD NOT do business in our community.

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 know our customers and do have conversations with them regarding better alternatives than overdrafting their account but we feel in the end it is their choice.

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. Our process let's the business taking a POS transaction know there is money at the time but if they do not process their POS transactions on a timely basis, that may cause an overdraft due to other transactions coming through. This increases our risk and we feel we should be compensated for that risk.

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,  
Judy Weisgram  
6052249233