



Jared Ross  
President  
League of Southeastern Credit Unions  
22 Inverness Parkway, Suite 200  
Birmingham, AL 35242

Ann E Misback  
Secretary of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System  
20<sup>th</sup> St. and Constitution Ave. NW,  
Washington, D.C. 20551

Re: Regulation D: Reserve Requirements of Depository Institutions - 12 CFR 204 - [RIN 700-AF 89]  
5/29/2020

To Ms. Misback,

The League of Southeastern Credit Unions & Affiliates (LSCU) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the interim final rule amending Regulation D. We support the interim final rule. Essentially, we think the rule provides the proper balance of flexibility to enable our credit unions to choose whether to suspend the six-transaction limit previously imposed on “savings deposit” accounts. Generally, our credit unions believe this rule can help their members have better access to their money, particularly in light of the challenges imposed by the coronavirus epidemic. However, some credit unions are concerned about any mandatory removal of the transaction limit. Those concerns will be discussed below.

The LSCU is a trade association representing 339 credit unions in Alabama, Florida and Georgia with nearly \$120 billion in total assets and approximately 10 million members. Our mission is “to create an environment that enables credit unions to grow and succeed.” We support this rule because our credit unions will have the flexibility to best serve their members according to their own unique circumstances.



We understand that Reg D's transaction limits were created as a tool<sup>1</sup> in the Fed's toolbox to govern the money supply in its monetary policy role. With the Fed's determination that that tool is no longer necessary to manage the money supply, it has reduced the reserve requirements and can also modify the regulatory scheme--the savings deposit transaction limitation that was enacted to support this tool.

Because this regulation was implemented some time ago, it is difficult to determine how much of a compliance burden it has put on our credit unions. It is equally unclear how much it limits members' access to or use of their funds. A Government Accountability Office report to Congress on Reg D found that more than 75% of credit unions were exempt from Reg D's reserve requirements.<sup>2</sup> And for those that had reserve requirements, their transaction deposits had a 3% reserve ratio.<sup>3</sup>

Generally, our affiliated credit unions support the modification of the rule. However, some credit unions have expressed concern over the change. We encourage the Fed to keep these concerns in mind when evaluating any further changes to the rule or any potential mandatory elimination of the transaction limits in the future. Some of their concerns are:

- Educating members on the nature, role and use of "savings deposit" accounts.
- Having to adjust the programming for core processors, ATMs, apps, online banking and other means of conducting transactions that may be controlled by vendors.
- Any complications and expenses associated with issuing debit cards to "savings deposit" accounts.
- The loss of income from less use of checking accounts and the various fees associated with them.
- Confusion to members over the increasing difficulty in distinguishing between checking and savings transaction accounts, such as courtesy pay issues or funds availability.
- The various costs associated with changing forms for disclosures and potential modification of account agreements and of policy and procedure changes and ultimate adoption.

In a survey to our credit unions, approximately 60 of 71 respondents enforced the six-withdrawal limit. Of those, 36 of 66 credit unions charged fees on excessive transactions. Similarly, 60 of 72 credit unions plan to end the practice of enforcing transactions limits. We learned 59 of 61 credit unions do not plan to

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Gov't Accountability Office, GAO -17-117, Federal Reserve: Observations on Regulation D and the Use of Reserve Requirements 5 (2016).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 35.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*



offset the loss of income from fees for violations of the transaction limit. While the loss of income does concern many credit unions, some may earn more in interchange fees for those that associate these accounts with a debit card. This reflects that credit unions can manage a challenge described in the GAO report that credit unions “must balance the administrative cost and opportunity costs of maintaining reserves against their transactions accounts with the operational costs (and benefit) of enforcing the six-transaction limit on convenient transfers and withdrawals for savings deposits.”<sup>4</sup>

Just as important to the burden on credit unions is the potential burden to consumers. Indeed, one reason LSCU supports the change is that it may benefit consumers at some institutions. The GAO report indicated that few consumers exceeded the transaction limit.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, few consumers complaints about financial institutions related to Reg D, indeed only .5% of deposit related complaints involved Reg D.<sup>6</sup>

In conclusion, we support the interim final rule to allow credit unions the option to enforce the transaction limit or to not enforce the transaction limit. At present, we oppose any effort to require credit unions to end enforcing transactions that do not think it prudent to do so. And we think any future plan to permanently remove the option to maintain transaction limits should have a long enough time frame to allow credit unions time to plan for the transition in a cost-effective way. Thank you for considering our input, and please let us know if we can provide any other information or assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jared Ross", is placed above a white rectangular box.

Jared Ross  
President  
League of Southeastern Credit Unions

---

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 27.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 40.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 42.