

From: jond@security-banks.com
To: [Director - FASB](#)
Subject: Comments on No. 1810-100, "Accounting for Financial Instruments and Revisions to the Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities" Exposure Draft
Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2010 10:23:07 AM

Jon Dahlke
735 11th St E
Glencoe, MN 55336-2220

September 21, 2010

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

Dear Mr. Golden:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on FASB's Exposure Draft: Accounting for Financial Instruments and Revisions to the Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities.

I am writing to urge FASB to not go forward with the proposal.

The accounting that would result from this proposal would greatly misrepresent the financial condition of our bank and other community banks.

Community banks fund their operations by taking deposits and holding loans for the long term. Most financial instruments this bank holds are not readily marketable.

We oppose the proposed accounting treatment for core deposits which calls for them to be regularly remeasured using a present value calculation. This would not provide accurate information and the calculations would be expensive and time consuming, particularly for smaller banks like ours that have limited staff resources to conduct the analysis.

Conservative community bankers (and bank regulators) see the need for more flexibility in setting the allowance for loan and lease losses. We are all well aware that economic cycles occur and it is very difficult to absorbing losses and raising capital during times of economic difficulties, such as the current environment.

Accounting standards and guidance should not be pro-cyclical. Recent market conditions have demonstrated the pro-cyclical nature of mark-to-market accounting as declining values of financial instruments necessitated write-downs and sales, causing further write-downs and sales.

These accounting changes will increase the volatility of bank balance sheets, forcing them to face higher capital requirements or decrease lending at a time when regulators are calling for more capital and our economy needs more, not less, credit availability.

Security Bank & Trust is a \$250 MM asset, family owned bank in rural

Minnesota. The costs to the bank would be detrimental to the customers we serve. Increased labor costs, LL reserves and capital requirements would reduce the interest rates we are able to pay on our deposits as well as drive up the price of borrowings to our customers. Your proposed changes are a NO-WIN situation for Community Bankers and their loyal, local customers.

I hope you will take all the letters from the COMMUNITY BANKERS into consideration before you take any further action with this conceptual idea and realize it is not good for main street, USA.

Again, we thank your for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Jon Dahlke
3208642017