

From: dweedin@pinnbank.com
To: [Director - FASB](#)
Subject: File Reference: No. 1810-100, "Accounting for Financial Instruments and Revisions to the Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities"
Date: Friday, September 17, 2010 2:57:50 PM

Doug Weedin
P.O. Box 218
Cody, WY 82414-0218

September 17, 2010

Russell Golden
Technical Director
Financial Accounting Standards Board
401 Merritt 7, PO Box 5116
Norwalk, CT 06856-5116

Dear Mr. Golden:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the exposure draft, "Accounting for Financial Instruments and Revisions to the Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities."

As President of Pinnacle Bank - Wyoming with \$580 million in total assets, I am writing to express my opinions on specific provisions of the exposure draft.

Simply stated, I believe marking loans to market would be disastrous, unmanageable and would not accurately reflect the financial position of our bank.

Our bank does not sell our commercial loans. Basing our balance sheet on fair values leads readers of our financial statements to assume that we will sell the loans, which is not the case.

There is no active market for many of our loans, and estimating a market value would create speculation as to its accuracy and make no real sense. For banks such as ours it would only create volatility and be counter productive to the rules intent.

Even if we could easily obtain a market price, since the loan is just one part of the financial relationship that we have with the customer (multiple loans, investment and trust services, etc.), there is no financial incentive to sell.

The volatility in our bank's capital would be excessive if we were forced to mark loans to market. It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for those reading our balance sheet to determine capital adequacy.

Even if the banking regulators' Tier 1 capital excludes fair value fluctuations, we still will have to explain it to our investors, customers and depositors.

The costs and resources that we will need to comply with this new

requirement would be significant. This will require us to pay consultants and auditors to estimate market value.

For the reasons stated above, our bank respectfully requests that the fair value section of the exposure draft be dropped.

I support the Board's efforts to revise the methodology to estimate loan loss provisions. However, I have serious concerns about how such changes can be implemented by banks like mine.

I recommend that any final model be tested by banks my size in order to ensure that the model is solid and workable.

I do not support the proposal for recording interest income. Interest income should continue to be calculated based on contractual terms and not on an after-impairment basis.

Changing the way interest income is recorded to the proposed method makes the accounting more confusing and subjects otherwise firm data to the volatility that comes naturally from the provisioning process. I recommend maintaining the current method.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

President
Pinnacle Bank - Wyoming