

# Peoples Bancorp

OF NORTH CAROLINA, INC.

September 20, 2010

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

Re: File Reference: No. 1810-100, "Accounting for Financial Instruments and Revisions to the Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities"

Dear Mr. Golden:

As Chief Financial Officer (CFO) of Peoples Bancorp of North Carolina, Inc, a single bank Holding Company in Newton, NC with \$1.1 billion in total assets, I am writing to express my opinions on specific provisions of the exposure draft, "Accounting for Financial Instruments and Revisions to the Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities."

## I. COMMENTS ON FAIR VALUE

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 would lead readers of our financial statements to assume that we will sell the loans, which is not the case.

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.

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.

Russell Golden  
Page 2

For the reasons stated above, our bank respectfully requests that the fair value section of the exposure draft not be adopted.

## II. COMMENTS ON LOAN IMPAIRMENT

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.

## III. COMMENTS ON HEDGE ACCOUNTING

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.

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,



A. Joseph Lampron  
Executive Vice President and  
Chief Financial Officer