

Statement by Vice Chairman Travis Hill on the Request for Information on Deposits

July 30, 2024

I am supportive of the Request for Information (RFI). I think soliciting input on the behavior and characteristics of different types of deposits, including in particular differentiating among types of uninsured deposits, is a helpful step by the agency.¹ More generally, I think regulators need to think more holistically about the deposit landscape than we do today,² and I view this RFI as a small step in the right direction. In the long run, we should consider whether, how,³ and to what extent to collect more granular and frequent deposit data, and I think asking for broad feedback before proposing specific Call Report changes is useful.⁴ Finally, while any potential deposit insurance reform would ultimately be decided by Congress, I think seeking input from the public on the issue is constructive.

¹ And a contrast to certain actions taken last year. *See, e.g.*, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, [Special Assessment Pursuant to Systemic Risk Determination](#), 88 Fed. Reg. 88,329 (Nov. 29, 2023).

² *See* Travis Hill, [Reflections on Bank Regulatory and Resolution Issues](#) (July 24, 2024) (“I do think we should make an effort to modernize how we think of a bank’s funding mix, and to think more holistically about how we view a bank’s deposit franchise.”).

³ *See, e.g.*, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, [Rapid Phased Prototyping Initiative](#) (March 26, 2021) (FIL-19-2021).

⁴ As noted in the RFI, it also worth considering whether there are existing reporting elements that should no longer be collected.