

From: jimgander@dishmail.net
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 23, 2010 8:28:27 PM

James E. Gander II
509 Oak Leaf Rd
Luray, VA 22835-5103

September 23, 2010

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

Dear Mr. Golden:

As an outside Director of Page Valley Bank, in Luray, Virginia , I am writing to express my opinions on specific provisions of the exposure draft. Page Valley is a small community bank with assets of about \$140 million. We have been in continuous operation for over 100 years and pride ourselves in this fact.

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.

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

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.

For the reasons stated above, I would respectfully request 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.

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.

I appreciate you considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

540 743 4136
Director
Page Valley Bank