From: badens@royalbanksnet.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: Thursday, September 16, 2010 10:48:11 AM

Stephen Baden
8021 Olive Blvd.
University City, MO 63130-2022

September 16, 2010

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

Dear Mr. Golden:

As President of Royal Banks of Missouri, a banking institution in St. Louis, Missouri with $450,000,000 in total assets, I am writing to express my opinions on specific provisions of the exposure draft.

I am strongly opposed to the portion of the proposal that requires all financial instruments - including loans - to be reported at fair value (market value) on the balance sheet.

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.

If there are issues with our borrower's ability to repay a loan, we work through the collection process with the borrower rather than sell the loan.

There is no active market for many of our loans, and estimating a market value makes no real sense.

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.

Marking all loans to market would cause our bank's capital to sway with fluctuations in the markets - even if the entire loan portfolio is performing. Instead of providing better information about our bank's health or its ability to pay dividends, the proposal would mask it.

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.

Our investors have expressed no interest in receiving this information. We believe our investors would not view these costs, which must come out of bank earnings, as being either reasonable or worthwhile.

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.

It is very important that any new processes are agreed upon and well understood by regulators, auditors, and bankers prior to finalizing the rules.

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.

I support the change of the requirement that a hedge is "reasonably effective" (as opposed to being "highly effective"). This should make it easier for banks like mine to implement hedge accounting.

It is very important that the term "reasonably effective" be better defined.

The "shortcut" and the "critical terms match" methods should be maintained. This greatly helps medium and smaller banks like mine to reduce the cost of compliance with the hedge accounting rules.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

President
Royal Banks of Missouri

This message has been verified by CapwizXC as authentic and sent by this individual. Authentication ID: [OCR14Am9]