

Edgar Filing: First Bancorp, Inc /ME/ - Form 10-K

First Bancorp, Inc /ME/

Form 10-K

March 08, 2013

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, DC 20549

FORM 10-K

☒ Annual Report Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of The Securities Exchange Act of 1934
For the Fiscal Year ended December 31, 2012

Commission File Number 0-26589

THE FIRST BANCORP, INC.

(Exact name of Registrant as specified in its charter)

MAINE

(State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)

01-0404322

(I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)

MAIN STREET, DAMARISCOTTA, MAINE 04543

(Address of principal executive offices) (Zip code)

(207) 563-3195

Registrant's telephone number, including area code

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act:

Common Stock

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act.

Yes ☐ No ☒

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Act.

Yes ☐ No ☒

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days.

Yes ☒ No ☐

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K (§ 229.405 of this chapter) is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K.

☐

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, or a non-accelerated filer. See definition of "accelerated filer and large accelerated filer" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):

Large accelerated filer ☐ Accelerated filer ☒ Non-accelerated filer ☐

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Act).

Edgar Filing: First Bancorp, Inc /ME/ - Form 10-K

Yes ☐ No ☒

State the aggregate market value of the voting and non-voting common equity held by non-affiliates computed by reference to the price at which the common equity was last sold, or the average bid and asked price of such common equity, as of the last business day of the registrant's most recently completed second fiscal quarter.

Common Stock: \$150,599,000

Indicate the number of shares outstanding of each of the registrant's classes of common stock as of February 28, 2013

Common Stock: 9,892,466 shares

Table of Contents

<u>ITEM 1. Discussion of Business</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>ITEM 1A. Risk Factors</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>ITEM 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>ITEM 2. Properties</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>ITEM 3. Legal Proceedings</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>ITEM 4. Mine Safety Disclosures</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>ITEM 5. Market for Registrant's Common Equity and Related Shareholder Matters</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>ITEM 6. Selected Financial Data</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>ITEM 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>ITEM 7A. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk</u>	<u>55</u>
<u>ITEM 8. Financial Statements and Supplemental Data</u>	<u>57</u>
<u>ITEM 9. Changes in and/or Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u>	<u>104</u>
<u>ITEM 9A. Controls and Procedures</u>	<u>104</u>
<u>ITEM 9B. Other Information</u>	<u>105</u>
<u>ITEM 10. Directors and Executive Officers of the Registrant</u>	<u>105</u>
<u>ITEM 11. Executive Compensation</u>	<u>105</u>
<u>ITEM 12. Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management</u>	<u>105</u>
<u>ITEM 13. Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence</u>	<u>105</u>
<u>ITEM 14. Principal Accounting Fees and Services</u>	<u>105</u>
<u>ITEM 15. Exhibits, Financial Statement Schedules</u>	<u>106</u>
 <u>SIGNATURES</u>	 <u>108</u>

ITEM 1. Discussion of Business

The First Bancorp, Inc. (the "Company") was incorporated under the laws of the State of Maine on January 15, 1985, for the purpose of becoming the parent holding company of The First National Bank of Damariscotta, which was chartered as a national bank under the laws of the United States on May 30, 1864. At the Company's Annual Meeting of Shareholders on April 30, 2008, the Company's name was changed from First National Lincoln Corporation to The First Bancorp, Inc. On January 14, 2005, the acquisition of FNB Bankshares ("FNB") of Bar Harbor, Maine, was completed, adding seven banking offices and one investment management office in Hancock and Washington counties of Maine. FNB's subsidiary, The First National Bank of Bar Harbor, was merged into The First National Bank of Damariscotta at closing, and since January 31, 2005, the combined banks have operated under a new name: The First, N.A. (the "Bank").

On October 26, 2012, the Bank completed the purchase of a branch at 63 Union Street in Rockland, Maine, from Camden National Bank (Camden National). The branch represents one of 15 Maine branches Camden National acquired from Bank of America and divested by Camden National to resolve competitive concerns in that market raised by the U.S. Department of Justice's Antitrust Division. As part of the transaction, the Bank acquired approximately \$32.3 million in deposits as well as a small volume of loans. On the same date, the Bank completed the purchase of a full-service bank building at 145 Exchange Street in Bangor, Maine, also from Camden National, and opened a full-service branch in this building in February of 2013. This Bangor location offers an excellent opportunity to enter the expanding Eastern Maine market. The total value of the transaction was \$6.6 million, which includes the premises and equipment for the two locations, the premium paid for the Rockland deposits, a small amount of loans, plus core deposit intangible and goodwill.

As of December 31, 2012, the Company's securities consisted of one class of common stock, one class of preferred stock, and warrants to purchase common stock. At that date, there were 9,859,914 shares of common stock outstanding. In addition, there were 12,500 shares of cumulative perpetual preferred stock outstanding with a preference value of \$1,000 per share, all of which were issued to the U.S. Treasury under its Capital Purchase Program (the "CPP Shares"). Incident to the issuance of the CPP Shares, the Company issued to the U.S. Treasury warrants to purchase up to 225,904 shares of the Company's common stock at a price per share of \$16.60 (the "Warrants"). The CPP Shares and the Warrants (and any shares of common stock issuable pursuant to the Warrants) are freely transferable by the U.S. Treasury to third parties and the Company has filed a registration statement with the Securities and Exchange Commission to allow for possible resale of such securities.

The common stock and preferred stock of the Bank are the principal assets of the Company, which has no other subsidiaries. The Bank's capital stock consists of one class of common stock of which 120,000 shares, par value \$2.50 per share, are authorized and outstanding, and one class of non-cumulative perpetual preferred stock, \$1,000 preference value, of which 12,500 shares are authorized and outstanding. All of the Bank's common stock and preferred stock is owned by the Company.

The Bank emphasizes personal service, and its customers are primarily small businesses and individuals to whom the Bank offers a wide variety of services, including deposit accounts, consumer and commercial and mortgage loans. The Bank has not made any material changes in its mode of conducting business during the past five years. The banking business in the Bank's market area is seasonal with lower deposits in the winter and spring and higher deposits in the summer and fall. This swing is predictable and has not had a materially adverse effect on the Bank.

In addition to traditional banking services, the Company provides investment management and private banking services through First Advisors, which is an operating division of the Bank. First Advisors is focused on taking advantage of opportunities created as the larger banks have altered their personal service commitment to clients not meeting established account criteria. First Advisors is able to offer a comprehensive array of private banking, financial planning, investment management and trust services to individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations and municipalities of varying asset size, and to provide the highest level of personal service. The staff includes investment and trust professionals with extensive experience.

The financial services landscape has changed considerably over the past five years in the Bank's primary market area. Two large out-of-state banks have continued to experience local change as a result of mergers and acquisitions at the regional and national level. Credit unions have continued to expand their membership and the scope of banking services offered. Non-banking entities such as brokerage houses, mortgage companies and insurance companies are

offering very competitive products. Many of these entities and institutions have resources substantially greater than those available to the Bank and are not subject to the same regulatory restrictions as the Company and the Bank. The Company believes that there will continue to be a need for a bank in the Bank's primary market area with local management having decision-making power and emphasizing loans to small and medium-sized businesses and to individuals. The Bank has concentrated on extending business loans to such customers in the Bank's primary market area and to extending investment and trust services to clients with accounts of all sizes. The Bank's Management also makes decisions based upon, among other things, the knowledge of the Bank's employees regarding the communities and customers in the Bank's primary market area. The individuals employed by the Bank, to a large extent, reside near the branch offices and thus are generally familiar with their communities and customers. This is important in local decision-making and allows the Bank to respond to customer questions and concerns on a timely basis and fosters quality customer service.

The Bank has worked and will continue to work to position itself to be competitive in its market area. The Bank's ability to make decisions close to the marketplace, Management's commitment to providing quality banking products, the caliber of the professional staff, and the community involvement of the Bank's employees are all factors affecting the Bank's ability to be competitive.

Supervision and Regulation

The Company is a financial holding company within the meaning of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended (the "BHC Act"), and section 225.82 of Regulation Y issued by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (the "Federal Reserve Board" or "FRB"), and is required to file with the Federal Reserve Board an annual report and other information required pursuant to the Act. The Company is subject to examination by the Federal Reserve Board. Virtually all of the Company's cash revenues are generally derived from dividends paid to the Company by the Bank. These dividends are subject to various legal and regulatory restrictions which are summarized in Note 17 to the accompanying financial statements. The Bank is regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (the "OCC") and is subject to the provisions of the National Bank Act. As a result, it must meet certain liquidity and capital requirements, which are discussed in the following sections.

General

As a financial holding company, the Company is subject to regulation under the Act and to inspection, examination and supervision by its primary regulator, the FRB. The Company is also subject to the disclosure and regulatory requirements of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, both as administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC"). As a company with securities listed on the NASDAQ, the Company is subject to the rules of the NASDAQ for listed companies. The Bank is subject to regulation and examination primarily by the OCC and is subject to regulations of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (the "FDIC").

Bank Holding Company Activities

As a bank holding company ("BHC") that has elected to become a financial holding company pursuant to the BHC Act, we may affiliate with securities firms and insurance companies and engage in other activities that are financial in nature or incidental or complementary to activities that are financial in nature. "Financial in nature" activities include securities underwriting, dealing and market making; sponsoring mutual funds and investment companies; insurance underwriting and agency; merchant banking; and activities that the FRB, in consultation with the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, determines to be financial in nature or incidental to such financial activity. "Complementary activities" are activities that the FRB determines upon application to be complementary to a financial activity and do not pose a safety and soundness risk.

FRB approval is not generally required for us to acquire a company (other than a bank holding company, bank or savings association) engaged in activities that are financial in nature or incidental to activities that are financial in nature, as determined by the FRB. Prior notice to the FRB may be required, however, if the company to be acquired has total consolidated assets of \$10 billion or more. Prior FRB approval is required before we may acquire the beneficial ownership or control of more than 5% of the voting shares or substantially all of the assets of a bank

holding company, bank or savings association. In addition, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "Dodd-Frank Act") also does not allow us to merge, acquire all or substantially all of the assets of, or acquire control of another company if our total resulting consolidated liabilities would exceed 10% of the aggregate consolidated liabilities of all financial companies.

Because we are a financial holding company, if the Bank receives a rating under the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977, as amended (the "CRA"), of less than satisfactory, the Bank and/or the Company will be prohibited, until the rating is raised to satisfactory or better, from engaging in new activities or acquiring companies other than bank holding companies, banks or savings associations, except that we could engage in new activities, or acquire companies engaged in activities, that are closely related to banking under the BHC Act. In addition, if the FRB finds that the Bank is not well capitalized or well managed, we would be required to enter into an agreement with the FRB to comply with all applicable capital and management requirements and which may contain additional limitations or conditions. Until corrected, we could be prohibited from engaging in any new activity or acquiring companies engaged in activities that are not closely related to banking under the BHC Act without prior FRB approval. If we fail to correct any such condition within a prescribed period, the FRB could order us to divest our banking subsidiaries or, in the alternative, to cease engaging in activities other than those closely related to banking under the BHC Act. Under the Riegle-Neal Interstate Banking and Branching Act (the "Riegle-Neal" Act), a bank holding company may acquire banks in states other than its home state, subject to any state requirement that the bank has been organized and operating for a minimum period of time, not to exceed five years, and the requirement that the bank holding company not control, prior to or following the proposed acquisition, more than 10% of the total amount of deposits of insured depository institutions nationwide or, unless the acquisition is the bank holding company's initial entry into the state, more than 30% of such deposits in the state (or such lesser or greater amount set by the state). The Riegle-Neal Act also authorizes banks to merge across state lines, thereby creating interstate branches. Banks are also permitted to acquire and to establish new branches in other states.

In determining whether to approve a proposed bank acquisition, federal bank regulators will consider, among other factors, the effect of the acquisition on competition, financial condition, and future prospects including current and projected capital ratios and levels, the competence, experience, and integrity of management and record of compliance with laws and regulations, the convenience and needs of the communities to be served, including the acquiring institution's record of compliance under the CRA, the effectiveness of the acquiring institution in combating money laundering activities and the risk to the stability of the United States banking system.

The Company is a legal entity separate and distinct from the Bank. A primary source of funds to pay dividends on our common and preferred stock is dividends from the Bank. Various federal and state statutory provisions and regulations limit the amount of dividends the Bank may pay without regulatory approval. Federal bank regulatory agencies have the authority to prohibit the Bank from engaging in unsafe or unsound practices in conducting its business. The payment of dividends, depending on the financial condition of the Bank, could be deemed an unsafe or unsound practice. The ability of the Bank to pay dividends in the future is currently, and could be further, influenced by bank regulatory policies and capital guidelines.

The Bank is subject to restrictions under federal law that limit the transfer of funds or other items of value from a subsidiary to the Company and any nonbank subsidiaries (including affiliates) in so-called "covered transactions." In general, covered transactions include loans and other extensions of credit, investments and asset purchases, as well as certain other transactions involving the transfer of value from a subsidiary bank to an affiliate or for the benefit of an affiliate. Unless an exemption applies, covered transactions by a subsidiary bank with a single affiliate are limited to 10% of the subsidiary bank's capital and surplus and, with respect to all covered transactions with affiliates in the aggregate, to 20% of the subsidiary bank's capital and surplus. Also, loans and extensions of credit to affiliates generally are required to be secured by qualifying collateral. A bank's transactions with its nonbank affiliates are also generally required to be on arm's-length terms.

The FRB has a policy that a BHC is expected to act as a source of financial and managerial strength to each of its subsidiary banks and, under appropriate circumstances, to commit resources to support each such subsidiary bank. This support may be required at times when the BHC may not have the resources to provide the support. The OCC may order an assessment of the BHC if the capital of one of its national bank subsidiaries were to become impaired. If the BHC failed to pay the assessment within three months, the OCC could order the sale of the BHC's holdings of stock in the national bank to cover the deficiency.

In the event of the "liquidation or other resolution" of an insured depository institution, the claims of deposits payable in the United States (including the claims of the FDIC as subrogee of insured depositors) and certain claims for administrative expenses of the FDIC as a receiver will have priority over other general unsecured claims against the institution. If an insured depository institution fails, claims of insured and uninsured U.S. depositors, along with claims of the FDIC, will have priority in payment ahead of unsecured creditors, including the BHC, and depositors whose deposits are solely payable at such insured depository institution's non-U.S. offices.

Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act

The Dodd-Frank Act, enacted on July 21, 2010, will result in broad changes to the U.S. financial system and is the most significant financial reform legislation since the 1930s. Financial regulatory agencies have issued numerous rulemakings to implement its provisions, but a number of rulemakings required by the Dodd-Frank Act have either not yet been proposed or have not been finalized. As a result, the ultimate impact of the Dodd-Frank Act is not yet known, but it has affected, and we expect it will continue to affect, most of our businesses in some way, either directly through regulation of specific activities or indirectly through regulation of concentration risks, capital or liquidity. Until the remaining provisions of the December 2011 FRB proposal are finalized, we are unable to fully estimate their impact on the Company, but we expect the final rules may significantly increase our compliance and regulatory requirements.

Federal regulatory agencies issued numerous other rulemakings in 2011 and 2012 to implement various other requirements of the Dodd-Frank Act, but many of these other proposed rules remain open for comment. Agencies have proposed rules establishing a comprehensive framework for the regulation of derivatives, restricting banking entities from engaging in proprietary trading or owning interests in or sponsoring hedge funds or private equity funds (the "Volcker Rule"), and requiring sponsors of asset-backed securities ("ABS") to retain an ownership stake in the ABS. In November 2012, the Financial Stability Oversight Council proposed new regulations for addressing perceived risks that money market mutual funds may pose to the financial stability of the United States. Once final recommendations are issued, the SEC is required to adopt the recommendations or explain its reasons for not implementing the recommendations. Although we have analyzed these and other proposed rules, the absence of final rules and the complexity of some of the proposed rules make it difficult for the Company to estimate the financial, compliance or operational impacts of the proposals.

The Dodd-Frank Act also established the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (the "CFPB") to ensure consumers receive clear and accurate disclosures regarding financial products and to protect consumers from hidden fees and unfair or abusive practices. The CFPB, which has now been in operation for over a year, has begun exercising supervisory review of banks under its jurisdiction and has concentrated much of its initial rulemaking efforts on a variety of mortgage-related topics required under the Dodd-Frank Act, including ability-to-repay and qualified mortgage standards, mortgage servicing standards, loan originator compensation standards, high-cost mortgage requirements, appraisal and escrow standards and requirements for higher-priced mortgages. Several of the CFPB's rulemakings were issued in January 2013, and we continue to analyze their requirements to determine the impact of the rules to our businesses. During 2013, we expect the CFPB to focus its rulemaking efforts on integrating disclosure requirements for lenders and settlement agents and expanding the scope of information lenders must report in connection with mortgage and other housing-related loan applications. In addition to the exercise of its rulemaking authority, the CFPB is continuing its on-going examination activities with respect to a number of consumer businesses and products.

Customer Information Security

The FDIC, the OCC and other bank regulatory agencies have published guidelines (the "Guidelines") establishing standards for safeguarding nonpublic personal information about customers that implement provisions of the Graham-Leach-Bliley Act (the "GLBA"). Among other things, the Guidelines require each financial institution, under the supervision and ongoing oversight of its Board of Directors or an appropriate committee thereof, to develop, implement and maintain a comprehensive written information security program designed to ensure the security and confidentiality of customer information, to protect against any anticipated threats or hazards to the security or integrity of such information, and to protect against unauthorized access to or use of such information that could result in substantial harm or inconvenience to any customer.

Privacy

The FDIC, the OCC and other regulatory agencies have published privacy rules pursuant to provisions of the GLBA ("Privacy Rules"). The Privacy Rules, which govern the treatment of nonpublic personal information about consumers by financial institutions, require a financial institution to provide notice to customers (and other consumers in some circumstances) about its privacy policies and practices, describe the conditions under which a financial institution may disclose nonpublic personal information to nonaffiliated third parties, and provide a method for consumers to prevent a financial institution from disclosing that information to most nonaffiliated third parties by "opting-out" of that disclosure, subject to certain exceptions.

USA Patriot Act

The USA Patriot Act of 2001, designed to deny terrorists and others the ability to obtain anonymous access to the U.S. financial system, has significant implications for depository institutions, broker-dealers and other businesses involved in the transfer of money. The USA Patriot Act, together with the implementing regulations of various federal regulatory agencies, have caused financial institutions, including the Bank, to adopt and implement additional or amend existing policies and procedures with respect to, among other things, anti-money laundering compliance, suspicious activity and currency transaction reporting, customer identity verification and customer risk analysis. The statute and its underlying regulations also permit information sharing for counter-terrorist purposes between federal law enforcement agencies and financial institutions, as well as among financial institutions, subject to certain conditions, and require the Federal Reserve Board (and other federal banking agencies) to evaluate the effectiveness of an applicant in combating money laundering activities when considering applications filed under Section 3 of the Act or under the Bank Merger Act.

The Bank Secrecy Act

The Bank Secrecy Act (the "BSA") requires all financial institutions, including banks and securities broker-dealers, to, among other things, establish a risk-based system of internal controls reasonably designed to prevent money laundering and the financing of terrorism. It includes a variety of recordkeeping and reporting requirements (such as cash and suspicious activity reporting) as well as due diligence/know-your-customer documentation requirements. The Bank has established an anti-money laundering program to comply with the BSA requirements.

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("SOX") implements a broad range of corporate governance and accounting measures for public companies (including publicly-held bank holding companies such as the Company) designed to promote honesty and transparency in corporate America and better protect investors from the type of corporate wrongdoings that occurred at Enron and WorldCom, among other companies. SOX's principal provisions, many of which have been implemented through regulations released and policies and rules adopted by the securities exchanges in 2003 and 2004, provide for and include, among other things:

- The creation of an independent accounting oversight board;
- Auditor independence provisions which restrict non-audit services that accountants may provide to clients;
- Additional corporate governance and responsibility measures, including the requirement that the chief executive officer and chief financial officer of a public company certify financial statements;
- The forfeiture of bonuses or other incentive-based compensation and profits from the sale of an issuer's securities by directors and senior officers in the twelve-month period following initial publication of any financial statements that later require restatement;
- An increase in the oversight of, and enhancement of certain requirements relating to, audit committees of public companies and how they interact with the public company's independent auditors;
- Requirements that audit committee members must be independent and are barred from accepting consulting, advisory or other compensatory fees from the issuer;
- Requirements that companies disclose whether at least one member of the audit committee is a 'financial expert' (as such term is defined by the SEC and if not, why not);
-

Expanded disclosure requirements for corporate insiders, including accelerated reporting of stock transactions by insiders and a prohibition on insider trading during pension blackout periods;

A prohibition on personal loans to directors and officers, except certain loans made by insured financial institutions, such as the Bank, on nonpreferential terms and in compliance with bank regulatory requirements;

· Disclosure of a code of ethics and filing a Form 8-K in the event of a change or waiver of such code; and

· A range of enhanced penalties for fraud and other violations.

The Company complies with the provisions of SOX and its underlying regulations. Management believes that such compliance efforts have strengthened the Company's overall corporate governance structure and does not expect that such compliance has to date had, or will in the future have, a material impact on the Company's results of operations or financial condition.

Capital Requirements

The OCC has established guidelines with respect to the maintenance of appropriate levels of capital by FDIC-insured banks. The Federal Reserve Board has established substantially identical guidelines with respect to the maintenance of appropriate levels of capital, on a consolidated basis, by BHCs. If a banking organization's capital levels fall below the minimum requirements established by such guidelines, a bank or BHC will be expected to develop and implement a plan acceptable to the FDIC or the Federal Reserve Board, respectively, to achieve adequate levels of capital within a reasonable period, and may be denied approval to acquire or establish additional banks or non-bank businesses, merge with other institutions or open branch facilities until such capital levels are achieved. Federal regulations require federal bank regulators to take "prompt corrective action" with respect to insured depository institutions that fail to satisfy minimum capital requirements and imposes significant restrictions on such institutions. See "Prompt Corrective Action" below.

Leverage Capital Ratio

The regulations of the OCC require national banks to maintain a minimum "Leverage Capital Ratio" or "Tier 1 Capital" (as defined in the Risk-Based Capital Guidelines discussed in the following paragraphs) to Total Assets of 4.0%. Any bank experiencing or anticipating significant growth is expected to maintain capital well above the minimum levels. The Federal Reserve Board's guidelines impose substantially similar leverage capital requirements on bank holding companies on a consolidated basis. It is possible that banking regulators may increase minimum capital requirements for banks should the current economic situation persist or worsen.

Risk-Based Capital Requirements

OCC regulations also require national banks to maintain minimum capital levels as a percentage of a bank's risk-adjusted assets. A bank's qualifying total capital ("Total Capital") for this purpose may include two components: "Core" (Tier 1) Capital and "Supplementary" (Tier 2) Capital. Core Capital consists primarily of common stockholders' equity, which generally includes common stock, related surplus and retained earnings, certain non-cumulative perpetual preferred stock and related surplus, and minority interests in the equity accounts of consolidated subsidiaries, and (subject to certain limitations) mortgage servicing rights and purchased credit card relationships, less all other intangible assets (primarily goodwill). Supplementary Capital elements include, subject to certain limitations, a portion of the allowance for loan losses, perpetual preferred stock that does not qualify for inclusion in Tier 1 capital, long-term preferred stock with an original maturity of at least 20 years and related surplus, certain forms of perpetual debt and mandatory convertible securities, and certain forms of subordinated debt and intermediate-term preferred stock.

The risk-based capital rules assign a bank's balance sheet assets and the credit equivalent amounts of the bank's off-balance sheet obligations to one of four risk categories, weighted at 0%, 20%, 50% or 100%, as applicable. Applying these risk-weights to each category of the bank's balance sheet assets and to the credit equivalent amounts of the bank's off-balance sheet obligations and summing the totals results in the amount of the bank's total Risk-Adjusted Assets for purposes of the risk-based capital requirements. Risk-Adjusted Assets can either exceed or be less than reported balance sheet assets, depending on the risk profile of the banking organization. Risk-Adjusted Assets for institutions such as the Bank will generally be less than reported balance sheet assets because its retail banking activities include proportionally more residential mortgage loans, many of its investment securities have a low risk

weighting and there is a relatively small volume of off-balance sheet obligations.

The risk-based capital regulations require all banks to maintain a minimum ratio of Total Capital to Risk-Adjusted Assets of 8.0%, of which at least one-half (4.0%) must be Core (Tier 1) Capital. For the purpose of calculating these ratios: (i) a banking organization's Supplementary Capital eligible for inclusion in Total Capital is limited to no more than 100% of Core Capital; and (ii) the aggregate amount of certain types of Supplementary Capital eligible for inclusion in Total Capital is further limited. For example, the regulations limit the portion of the allowance for loan losses eligible for inclusion in Total Capital to 1.25% of Risk-Adjusted Assets. The Federal Reserve Board has established substantially identical risk-based capital requirements, which are applied to bank holding companies on a consolidated basis. The risk-based capital regulations explicitly provide for the consideration of interest rate risk in the overall evaluation of a bank's capital adequacy to ensure that banks effectively measure and monitor their interest rate risk, and that they maintain capital adequate for that risk. A bank deemed by its federal banking regulator to have excessive interest rate risk exposure may be required to maintain additional capital (that is, capital in excess of the minimum ratios discussed above). The Bank believes, based on its level of interest rate risk exposure, that this provision will not have a material adverse effect on it.

On December 31, 2012, the Company's consolidated Total and Tier 1 Risk-Based Capital Ratios were 16.05% and 14.80%, respectively, and its Leverage Capital Ratio was 8.46%. Based on the above figures and accompanying discussion, the Company exceeds all regulatory capital requirements and is considered well capitalized.

Basel III Capital Requirements

In December 2010, the Basel Committee on Bank Supervision (the "BCBS") finalized a set of international guidelines for determining regulatory capital known as "Basel III." These guidelines were developed in response to the financial crisis of 2008 and 2009 and were intended to address many of the weaknesses identified in the banking sector as contributing to the crisis including excessive leverage, inadequate and low quality capital and insufficient liquidity buffers. The Basel III guidelines would:

- raise the quality of capital to be better able to absorb losses on both a going concern and gone concern basis;
- increase the risk coverage of the capital framework, specifically for trading activities, securitizations, exposures to off-balance sheet vehicles, and counterparty credit exposures arising from derivatives;
- raise the level of minimum capital requirements;
- establish an international leverage ratio;
- develop capital buffers;
- raise standards for the supervisory review process (Pillar 2) and public disclosures (Pillar 3).

U.S. regulatory authorities have been considering the BCBS capital guidelines and proposals, and in June 2012, the U.S. banking regulators jointly issued three notices of proposed rulemaking that are essentially intended to implement the BCBS capital guidelines for U.S. banks. Together these notices of proposed rulemaking would, among other things:

- implement in the United States the Basel III regulatory capital reforms including those that revise the definition of capital, increase minimum capital ratios, and introduce a minimum Tier 1 common equity ratio of 4.5% and a capital conservation buffer of 2.5% (for a total minimum Tier 1 common equity ratio of 7.0%) and a potential countercyclical buffer of up to 2.5%, which would be imposed by regulators at their discretion if it is determined that a period of excessive credit growth is contributing to an increase in systemic risk;
- revise "Basel I" rules for calculating risk-weighted assets to enhance risk sensitivity;
- modify the existing Basel II advanced approaches rules for calculating risk-weighted assets to implement Basel III;
- comply with the Dodd-Frank Act provision prohibiting the reliance on external credit ratings.

Although the proposals contemplated an effective date of January 1, 2013, with phased in compliance requirements, the rules have not yet been finalized by the U.S. banking regulators due to the volume of comments received and concerns expressed during the comment period. The U.S. banking regulators have approved a final rule to implement changes to the market risk capital rule, which requires banking organizations with significant trading activities to adjust their capital requirements to better account for the market risks of those activities.

Although uncertainty exists regarding final capital rules, we evaluate the impact of Basel III on our capital ratios based on our interpretation of the proposed capital requirements, and we estimate that our Tier 1 common equity ratio under the Basel III proposals exceeded the fully phased-in minimum of 7.0% by 123 basis points at December 31,

2012. The proposed Basel III capital rules and interpretations and assumptions used in estimating our Basel III calculations are subject to change depending on final promulgation of Basel III capital rulemaking. From time to time, the OCC, the FRB and the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (the "FFIEC") propose changes and amendments to, and issue interpretations of, risk-based capital guidelines and related reporting instructions. In addition, the FRB has closely monitored capital levels of the institutions it supervises during the ongoing financial disruption, and may require such institutions to modify capital levels based on FRB determinations. Such determinations, proposals or interpretations could, if implemented in the future, affect our reported capital ratios and net risk-adjusted assets.

Prompt Corrective Action

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 ("FDICIA") requires, among other things, that the federal banking regulators take "prompt corrective action" with respect to, and imposes significant restrictions on, any bank that fails to satisfy its applicable minimum capital requirements. FDICIA establishes five capital categories consisting of "well capitalized," "adequately capitalized," "undercapitalized," "significantly undercapitalized" and "critically undercapitalized." Under applicable regulations, a bank that has a Total Risk-Based Capital Ratio of 10.0% or greater, a Tier 1 Risk-Based Capital Ratio of 6.0% or greater and a Leverage Capital Ratio of 5.0% or greater, and is not subject to any written agreement, order, capital directive or prompt corrective action directive to meet and maintain a specific capital level for any capital measure is deemed to be "well capitalized." A bank that has a Total Risk-Based Capital Ratio of 8.0% or greater, a Tier 1 Risk-Based Capital Ratio of 4.0% or greater and a Leverage Capital Ratio of 4.0% (or 3% for banks with the highest regulatory examination rating that are not experiencing or anticipating significant growth or expansion) or greater and does not meet the definition of a well-capitalized bank is considered to be "adequately capitalized." A bank that has a Total Risk-Based Capital Ratio of less than 8.0% or has a Tier 1 Risk-Based Capital Ratio that is less than 4.0%, except as noted above, or a Leverage Capital Ratio of less than 4.0% is considered "undercapitalized." A bank that has a Total Risk-Based Capital Ratio of less than 6.0%, or a Tier 1 Risk-Based Capital Ratio that is less than 3.0% or a Leverage Capital Ratio that is less than 3.0% is considered to be "significantly undercapitalized," and a bank that has a ratio of tangible equity to total assets equal to or less than 2% is deemed to be "critically undercapitalized." A bank may be deemed to be in a capital category lower than is indicated by its actual capital position if it is determined to be in an unsafe or unsound condition or receives an unsatisfactory examination rating. FDICIA generally prohibits a bank from making capital distributions (including payment of dividends) or paying management fees to controlling stockholders or their affiliates if, after such payment, the bank would be undercapitalized.

Under FDICIA and the applicable implementing regulations, an undercapitalized bank will be (i) subject to increased monitoring by its primary federal banking regulator; (ii) required to submit to its primary federal banking regulator an acceptable capital restoration plan (guaranteed, subject to certain limits, by the bank's holding company) within 45 days of being classified as undercapitalized; (iii) subject to strict asset growth limitations; and (iv) required to obtain prior regulatory approval for certain acquisitions, transactions not in the ordinary course of business, and entries into new lines of business. In addition to the foregoing, the primary federal banking regulator may issue a "prompt corrective action directive" to any undercapitalized institution. Such a directive may (i) require sale or re-capitalization of the bank, (ii) impose additional restrictions on transactions between the bank and its affiliates, (iii) limit interest rates paid by the bank on deposits, (iv) limit asset growth and other activities, (v) require divestiture of subsidiaries, (vi) require replacement of directors and officers, and (vii) restrict capital distributions by the bank's parent holding company. In addition to the foregoing, a significantly undercapitalized institution may not award bonuses or increases in compensation to its senior executive officers until it has submitted an acceptable capital restoration plan and received approval from its primary federal banking regulator.

No later than 90 days after an institution becomes critically undercapitalized, the primary federal banking regulator for the institution must appoint a receiver or, with the concurrence of the FDIC, a conservator, unless the agency, with the concurrence of the FDIC, determines that the purpose of the prompt corrective action provisions would be better served by another course of action. FDICIA requires that any alternative determination be "documented" and reassessed on a periodic basis. Notwithstanding the foregoing, a receiver must be appointed after 270 days unless the appropriate federal banking agency and the FDIC certify that the institution is viable and not expected to fail.

Deposit Insurance Assessments

The Bank is a member of the Deposit Insurance Fund (DIF) maintained by the FDIC. Through the DIF, the FDIC insures the deposits of the Bank up to prescribed limits for each depositor. The DIF was formed March 31, 2006, upon the merger of the Bank Insurance Fund and the Savings Insurance Fund in accordance with the Federal Deposit Insurance Reform Act of 2005 (the "FDIR Act"). The FDIR Act established a range of 1.15% to 1.50% within which the FDIC Board of Directors may set the Designated Reserve Ratio (the "reserve ratio" or "DRR"). The FDIR Act also granted the FDIC Board the discretion to price deposit insurance according to risk for all insured institutions regardless of the level of the reserve ratio.

In 2009, the FDIC undertook several measures in an effort to replenish the DIF. On February 27, 2009, the FDIC adopted a final rule modifying the risk-based assessment system and set new initial base assessment rates beginning April 1, 2009. Annual rates ranged from a minimum of 12 cents per \$100 of domestic deposits for well-managed, well-capitalized institutions with the highest credit ratings, to 45 cents per \$100 for those institutions posing the most risk to the DIF. Risk-based adjustments to the initial assessment rate could have lowered the rate to 7 cents per \$100 of domestic deposits for well-managed, well-capitalized banks with the highest credit ratings or raised the rate to 77.5 cents per \$100 for depository institutions posing the most risk to the DIF. On May 22, 2009, the FDIC adopted a final rule imposing a 5 basis point special assessment on each insured depository institution's assets minus Tier 1 capital as of June 30, 2009. The amount of the special assessment for any institution was limited to 10 basis points times the institution's assessment base for the second quarter 2009. On November 17, 2009, the FDIC amended its regulations to require insured institutions to prepay their estimated quarterly risk-based assessments for fourth quarter 2009, and all of 2010, 2011, and 2012. For purposes of determining the prepayment, the FDIC used the institution's assessment rate in effect on September 30, 2009. Any unused prepaid assessment will be refunded on June 28, 2013.

The Dodd-Frank Act gave the FDIC greater discretion to manage the DIF, raised the minimum DRR to 1.35% and removed the upper limit of the range. In October 2010, the FDIC Board adopted a Restoration Plan to ensure that the DIF reserve ratio reaches 1.35% by September 30, 2020, as required by the Dodd-Frank Act. At the same time, the FDIC Board proposed a comprehensive, long-range plan for DIF management. In December 2010, as part of the comprehensive plan, the FDIC Board adopted a final rule to set the DRR at 2%, and in February 2011, the FDIC Board approved the remainder of the comprehensive plan. The Restoration Plan eliminated a 3 basis point increase in the annual assessment rates that was to take effect January 1, 2011.

On February 7, 2011, the FDIC Board approved a final rule on assessments, dividends, assessment base and large bank pricing that took effect on April 1, 2011. To maintain the DIF, member institutions are assessed an insurance premium based on an assessment base and an assessment rate. Generally, the assessment base is an institution's average consolidated total assets minus average tangible equity. For large and highly complex institutions (those that are very large and are structurally and operationally complex or that pose unique challenges and risks in the case of failure), the assessment rate is determined by combining supervisory ratings and certain financial measures into scorecards. The score received by an institution will be converted into an assessment rate for the institution. The FDIC retains the ability to adjust the total score of large and highly complex institutions based upon quantitative or qualitative measures not adequately captured in the scorecards.

All FDIC-insured depository institutions must also pay a quarterly assessment towards interest payments on bonds issued by the Financing Corporation, a federal corporation chartered under the authority of the Federal Housing Finance Board. The bonds (commonly referred to as FICO bonds) were issued to capitalize the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. FDIC-insured depository institutions paid approximately 1.00 to 1.02 cents per \$100 of assessable deposits during the first nine months of 2011. To coincide with Dodd-Frank Act mandated changes to the insurance assessment base, the FDIC established lower FICO assessment rates, 0.66 cents per \$100 of assessment base for 2012 and 0.64 cents per \$100 of assessment base for first quarter 2013.

The FDIC may terminate a depository institution's deposit insurance upon a finding that the institution's financial condition is unsafe or unsound or that the institution has engaged in unsafe or unsound practices or has violated any applicable rule, regulation, order or condition enacted or imposed by the institution's regulatory agency. The termination of deposit insurance for one or more of our bank subsidiaries could have a material adverse effect on our earnings, depending on the collective size of the particular banks involved.

Brokered Deposits and Pass-Through Deposit Insurance Limitations

Under FDICIA, a bank cannot accept brokered deposits unless it either (i) is "Well Capitalized" or (ii) is "Adequately Capitalized" and has received a written waiver from its primary federal banking regulator. For this purpose, "Well Capitalized" and "Adequately Capitalized" have the same definitions as in the Prompt Corrective Action regulations. See "Prompt Corrective Action" above. Banks that are not in the "Well Capitalized" category are subject to certain limits on the rates of interest they may offer on any deposits (whether or not obtained through a third-party deposit broker). Pass-through insurance coverage is not available in banks that do not satisfy the requirements for acceptance of brokered deposits, except that pass-through insurance coverage will be provided for employee benefit plan deposits in institutions which at the time of acceptance of the deposit meet all applicable regulatory capital requirements and send written notice to their depositors that their funds are eligible for pass-through deposit insurance. The Bank currently accepts brokered deposits.

Real Estate Lending Standards

FDICIA requires the federal bank regulatory agencies to adopt uniform real estate lending standards. The FDIC and the OCC have adopted regulations which establish supervisory limitations on Loan-to-Value ("LTV") ratios in real estate loans by FDIC-insured banks, including national banks. The regulations require banks to establish LTV ratio limitations within or below the prescribed uniform range of supervisory limits.

Standards for Safety and Soundness

Pursuant to FDICIA the federal bank regulatory agencies have prescribed, by regulation, standards and guidelines for all insured depository institutions and depository institution holding companies relating to: (i) internal controls, information systems and internal audit systems; (ii) loan documentation; (iii) credit underwriting; (iv) interest rate risk exposure; (v) asset growth; and (vi) compensation, fees and benefits. The compensation standards prohibit employment contracts, compensation or benefit arrangements, stock option plans, fee arrangements or other compensatory arrangements that would provide "excessive" compensation, fees or benefits, or that could lead to material financial loss. In addition, the federal bank regulatory agencies are required by FDICIA to prescribe standards specifying: (i) maximum classified assets to capital ratios; (ii) minimum earnings sufficient to absorb losses without impairing capital; and (iii) to the extent feasible, a minimum ratio of market value to book value for publicly-traded shares of depository institutions and depository institution holding companies.

Consumer Protection Provisions

FDICIA also includes provisions requiring advance notice to regulators and customers for any proposed branch closing and authorizing (subject to future appropriation of the necessary funds) reduced insurance assessments for institutions offering "lifeline" banking accounts or engaged in lending in distressed communities. FDICIA also includes provisions requiring depository institutions to make additional and uniform disclosures to depositors with respect to the rates of interest, fees and other terms applicable to consumer deposit accounts.

FDIC Waiver of Certain Regulatory Requirements

The FDIC issued a rule, effective on September 22, 2003, that includes a waiver provision which grants the FDIC Board of Directors extremely broad discretionary authority to waive FDIC regulatory provisions that are not specifically mandated by statute or by a separate regulation.

Future Legislation or Regulation

In light of recent conditions in the U.S. and global financial markets and the U.S. and global economy, legislators, the presidential administration and regulators have continued their increased focus on regulation of the financial services industry. Proposals that further increase regulation of the financial services industry have been and are expected to continue to be introduced in the U.S. Congress, in state legislatures and abroad. In addition, not all regulations authorized or required under the Dodd-Frank Act have been proposed or finalized by federal regulators. Further legislative changes and additional regulations may change our operating environment in substantial and unpredictable ways. Such legislation and regulations could increase our cost of doing business, affect our compensation structure, restrict or expand the activities in which we may engage or affect the competitive balance among banks, savings associations, credit unions, and other financial institutions. We cannot predict whether future legislative proposals will

be enacted and, if enacted, the effect that they, or any implementing regulations, would have on our business, results of operations or financial condition. The same uncertainty exists with respect to regulations authorized or required under the Dodd-Frank Act but that have not yet been proposed or finalized.

Impact of Monetary Policy

Our business and earnings are affected significantly by the fiscal and monetary policies of the federal government and its agencies. We are particularly affected by the policies of the FRB, which regulates the supply of money and credit in the United States. Among the instruments of monetary policy available to the FRB are (a) conducting open market operations in United States government securities, (b) changing the discount rates of borrowings of depository institutions, (c) imposing or changing reserve requirements against depository institutions' deposits, and (d) imposing or changing reserve requirements against certain borrowings by banks and their affiliates. These methods are used in varying degrees and combinations to directly affect the availability of bank loans and deposits, as well as the interest rates charged on loans and paid on deposits. The policies of the FRB may have a material effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition. The nature of future monetary policies and the effect of such policies on the future business and earnings of the Company and the Bank cannot be predicted. See Item 7 - Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, regarding the Bank's net interest margin and the effect of interest-rate volatility on future earnings.

Employees

At December 31, 2012, the Company had 228 employees and full-time equivalency of 222 employees. The Company enjoys good relations with its employees. A variety of employee benefits, including health, group life and disability income, a defined contribution retirement plan, and an incentive bonus plan, are available to qualifying officers and other employees.

Company Website

The Company maintains a website at www.thefirstbancorp.com where it makes available, free of charge, its annual report on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K, and amendments to those reports filed or furnished pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, as well as all Section 16 reports on Forms 3, 4, and 5, as soon as reasonably practicable after such reports are electronically filed with, or furnished to, the SEC. The Company's reports filed with, or furnished to, the SEC are also available at the SEC's website at www.sec.gov. Information contained on the Company's website does not constitute a part of this report. Interactive reports for our 10-K and 10-Q filings are available in XBRL format at the Company's website.

The First Bancorp - 2012 Form 10-K - Page 9

ITEM 1A. Risk Factors

The risks and uncertainties described below are not the only ones the Company faces. Additional risks and uncertainties that we are unaware of, or that we currently deem immaterial, also may become important factors that affect us and our business. If any of these risks were to occur, our business, financial condition or results of operations could be materially and adversely affected.

Risk Associated With Our Business

We are subject to credit risk and may incur losses if loans are not repaid.

There are inherent risks associated with our lending activities. These risks include, among other things, the impact of changes in interest rates and changes in the economic conditions in the markets where we operate as well as those across the United States and abroad. Increases in interest rates and/or weakening economic conditions could adversely impact the ability of borrowers to repay outstanding loans or the value of the collateral securing these loans. We seek to mitigate the risks inherent in our loan portfolio by adhering to specific underwriting practices. Although we believe that our underwriting criteria are appropriate for the various kinds of loans we make, we may incur losses on loans that meet our underwriting criteria, and these losses may exceed the amounts set aside as reserves in our allowance for loan losses.

Our loan portfolio includes commercial and commercial real estate loans that may have higher risks than other types of loans.

Our commercial, commercial real estate, and commercial construction loans at December 31, 2012 and 2011 were \$354.9 million and \$375.0 million, respectively, or 40.8% and 43.4% of total loans. Commercial and commercial real estate loans generally carry larger loan balances and can involve a greater degree of financial and credit risk than other loans. As a result, banking regulators continue to give greater scrutiny to lenders with a high concentration of commercial real estate loans in their portfolios, and such lenders are expected to implement stricter underwriting, internal controls, risk management policies and portfolio stress testing, as well as higher capital levels and loss allowances. The increased financial and credit risk associated with these types of loans are a result of several factors, including the concentration of principal in a limited number of loans and borrowers, the size of loan balances, the effects of general economic conditions on income-producing properties and the increased difficulty of evaluating and monitoring these types of loans.

Regulators have the right to request banks to maintain elevated levels of capital or liquidity due to commercial real estate loan concentrations, and could do so, especially if there is a further downturn in our local real estate markets. In addition, when underwriting a commercial or industrial loan, we may take a security interest in commercial real estate, and, in some instances upon a default by the borrower, we may foreclose on and take title to the property, which may lead to potential financial risks for us under applicable environmental laws. If hazardous substances were discovered on any of these properties, we may be liable to governmental agencies or third parties for the costs of remediation of the hazard, as well as for personal injury and property damage. Many environmental laws can impose liability regardless of whether the Company knew of, or were responsible for, the contamination.

Furthermore, the repayment of loans secured by commercial real estate is typically dependent upon the successful operation of the related real estate or commercial project. If the cash flows from the project are reduced, a borrower's ability to repay the loan may be impaired. This cash flow shortage may result in the failure to make loan payments. In such cases, we may be compelled to modify the terms of the loan. In addition, the nature of these loans is such that they are generally less predictable and more difficult to evaluate and monitor. As a result, repayment of these loans may, to a greater extent than residential loans, be subject to adverse conditions in the real estate market or economy. Our allowance for loan losses may be insufficient and require additional provision from earnings.

The Bank maintains an allowance for loan losses based on, among other things, national and regional economic conditions, historical loss experience and delinquency trends. We make various assumptions and judgments about the collectability of our loan portfolio, including the creditworthiness of borrowers and the value of the real estate and other assets serving as collateral for the repayment of loans. In determining the size of the allowance for loan losses, we rely on our experience and our evaluation of economic conditions. However, we cannot predict loan losses with

certainty, and we cannot provide assurance that charge-offs in future periods will not exceed the allowance for loan losses. If, as a result of general economic conditions, previously incorrect assumptions or an increase in defaulted loans, we determine that additional increases in the allowance for loan losses are necessary, we will incur additional provision expenses. In addition, regulatory agencies review the Bank's allowance for loan losses and may require additions to the allowance based on their judgment about information available to them at the time of their examination. Management could also decide that the allowance for loan losses should be increased. If charge-offs in future periods exceed the allowance for loan losses, we will need additional provisions to increase the allowance for loan losses. Furthermore, growth in the loan portfolio would generally lead to an increase in the provision for loan losses. Any increases in the allowance for loan losses will result in a decrease in net income and capital, and may have a material adverse effect on our financial condition, results of operations and cash flows. See the section captioned "Credit Risk Management and Allowance for Loan Losses" in Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, located elsewhere in this report for further discussion related to our process for determining the appropriate level of the allowance for loan losses.

The Maine foreclosure process can be lengthy and add additional losses for the Bank.

Residential foreclosures in Maine occur through the judicial system. Under ideal circumstances, it can take as little as six months to foreclose on a Maine property, however, if the borrower contests the foreclosure or the court delays the foreclosure, the process may take as long as two years. In 2009, the Maine Legislature passed "An Act to Preserve Home Ownership and Stabilize the Economy by Preventing Unnecessary Foreclosures." This law provides for mediation of foreclosure of residential mortgages and borrowers may choose mediation at which parties must attend and evaluate foreclosure alternatives in good faith. This law also provides that issues such as reinstatement of the mortgage, modification of the loan and restructuring of the mortgage debt are to be addressed at these mediations. Given the uncertain timeframe related to foreclosure in Maine, the Bank can incur additional legal fees and other costs, such as payment of property taxes and insurance, if the foreclosure process is extended. In addition, the value of the property may further decline if the borrower fails to maintain the property in good order.

Our level of troubled debt restructured ("TDR") has increased and could adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations.

Our efforts in 2011 and 2012 to assist homeowners and other borrowers increased our overall level of TDRs. In each case when a loan was modified, Management determined it was in the Bank's best interest to work with the borrower with modified terms rather than to proceed to foreclosure. Once a loan is classified as a TDR, however, it remains classified as a TDR until the balance is fully repaid, whether or not the loan is performing under the modified terms. As of December 31, 2012 there were 101 loans with an outstanding balance of \$30.0 million that have been restructured. This compares to 59 loans with a value of \$22.9 million as of December 31, 2011.

As of December 31, 2012, 70 loans with an aggregate balance of \$24.9 million were performing under the modified terms, seven loans with an aggregate balance \$1.7 million were more than 30 days past due and 24 loans with an aggregate balance of \$3.4 million were on nonaccrual. As a percentage of aggregate outstanding balances, 83.0% was performing under the modified terms, 5.8% was more than 30 days past due and 11.2% was on nonaccrual. Although a large percentage of TDRs continue to be performing, as a group our TDRs are relatively unseasoned and the full collection of principal and interest on some TDRs may not occur, which could adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations.

Changes in interest rates could adversely affect our net interest income and profitability.

Our earnings and cash flows are largely dependent upon our net interest income. Net interest income is the difference between interest income earned on interest-earning assets, such as loans and securities, and interest expense paid on interest-bearing liabilities, such as deposits and borrowed funds. Interest rates are highly sensitive to many factors that are beyond our control, including general economic conditions, demand for loans, securities and deposits, and policies of various governmental and regulatory agencies and, in particular, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Changes in monetary policy, including changes in interest rates, could influence not only the interest we receive on loans and securities and the amount of interest we pay on deposits and borrowings, but such changes could also affect

- our ability to originate loans and obtain deposits;
- the fair value of our financial assets and liabilities; and
- the average duration of our loans and securities that are collateralized by mortgages.

If the interest rates paid on deposits and other borrowings increase at a faster rate than the interest rates received on loans and other investments, our net interest income, and therefore earnings, could be adversely affected. Earnings could also be adversely affected if the interest rates received on loans and other investments fall more quickly than the interest rates paid on deposits and other borrowings. If interest rates decline, our higher-rate loans and investments may be subject to prepayment risk, which could negatively impact our net interest margin. Conversely, if interest rates increase, our loans and investments may be subject to extension risk, which could negatively impact our net interest margin as well. Any substantial, unexpected, prolonged change in market interest rates could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition, results of operations and cash flows. See Item 7A. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk located elsewhere in this report for further discussion related to our management of interest rate risk.

The value of our investment portfolio may be negatively affected by changes in interest rates and disruptions in securities markets.

The market for some of the investment securities held in our portfolio has become volatile over the past several years. Volatile market conditions may detrimentally affect the value of these securities due to the perception of heightened credit and liquidity risks. There can be no assurance that the declines in market value associated with these disruptions will not result in other than temporary impairments of these assets, which would lead to accounting charges that could have a material adverse effect on our net income and capital levels. Our mortgage-backed portfolio may be subject to extension risk as interest rates rise and borrowers are unable to refinance their current mortgages into lower rate mortgages, extending the average life of the bonds. As of December 31, 2012, we had \$291.6 million and \$143.3 million in available for sale and held to maturity investment securities, respectively. Numerous factors, including lack of liquidity for re-sales of certain investment securities, absence of reliable pricing information for investment securities, adverse changes in business climate, adverse actions by regulators, or unanticipated changes in the competitive environment could have a negative effect on our investment portfolio in future periods. If an impairment charge is significant enough it could affect the ability of the Bank to renew funding. This could have a material adverse effect on our liquidity and the Bank's ability to upstream dividends to the Company and for the Company to then pay dividends to shareholders. It could also negatively impact our regulatory capital ratios and result in our not being classified as "well-capitalized" for regulatory purposes.

Illiquidity could impair our ability to fund operations and jeopardize our financial condition.

Liquidity is essential to our business. An inability to raise funds through traditional deposits, brokered deposit renewals or rollovers, secured or unsecured borrowings, the sale of securities or loans and other sources could have a substantial negative effect on our liquidity. Our access to funding sources in amounts adequate to finance our activities could be impaired by factors that affect us specifically or the financial services industry or economy in general, or could be available only under terms which are unacceptable to us. We rely primarily on commercial and retail deposits and, to a lesser extent, brokered deposit renewals and rollovers, advances from the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston (the "FHLB") and other secured and unsecured borrowings to fund our operations. Factors that could detrimentally impact our access to liquidity sources include a decrease in the level of our business activity as a result of a downturn in the markets in which our loans are concentrated, adverse regulatory action against us, changes in market interest rates or increased competition for funding within our market. Disruptions in the capital markets or interest rate changes may make the terms of wholesale funding sources less favorable and may make it difficult to sell securities when needed to provide additional liquidity. In addition, if we fall below the FDIC's thresholds to be considered "well capitalized", we will be unable to continue to rollover or renew brokered funds, and the interest rate paid on deposits would be subject to restrictions. As a result, there is a risk that our cost of funding will increase or we will not have sufficient funds to meet our obligations when they become due.

Loss of lower-cost funding sources could lead to margin compression and decrease net interest income.

Checking and savings, NOW, and money market deposit account balances and other forms of customer deposits can decrease when customers perceive alternative investments, such as the stock market, as providing a better risk/return tradeoff. If customers move money out of bank deposits and into other investments, we could lose a relatively low-cost source of funds, increasing our funding costs and reducing our net interest income and net income. Advances from the FHLB are currently a relatively low-cost source of funding. The availability of qualified collateral on the Bank's balance sheet determines the level of advances available from FHLB and a deterioration in quality in the Bank's loan portfolio can adversely impact the availability of this source of funding, which could increase our funding

costs and reduce our net interest income.

The soundness of other financial institutions could adversely affect us.

Since mid-2007, the financial services industry as a whole, as well as the securities markets generally, have been materially and adversely affected by very significant declines in the values of nearly all asset classes and by a very serious lack of liquidity. Financial institutions in particular have been subject to increased volatility and an overall loss in investor confidence. Our ability to engage in routine funding transactions could be adversely affected by the actions and commercial soundness of other financial institutions. Financial services companies are interrelated as a result of trading, clearing, counterparty, or other relationships. We have exposure to many different industries and counterparties, and we routinely execute transactions with counterparties in the financial services industry, including brokers and dealers, commercial banks, investment banks, mutual and hedge funds, and other institutional clients. As a result, defaults by, or even rumors or questions about, one or more financial services companies, or the financial services industry generally, have led to market-wide liquidity problems and could lead to losses or defaults by us or by other institutions. In addition, many of these transactions expose us to credit risk in the event of default of our counterparty or client. Further, our credit risk may be exacerbated when the collateral held by us cannot be realized or is liquidated at prices not sufficient to recover the full amount of the loan or derivative exposure due us. There is no assurance that any such losses would not materially and adversely affect our business, financial condition or results of operations.

Lack of loan demand may adversely impact net interest income.

During the past two years our loan portfolio has decreased \$18.3 million. Loan demand in the Bank's market area has been limited as a result of continued weak economic conditions. This has had the greatest impact on the commercial loan portfolio. In addition, in order to reduce the Bank's exposure to interest rate risk, the Bank has sold residential mortgages to the secondary market that have been refinanced by borrowers seeking to take advantage of lower interest rates. Should this trend continue, net interest income may be negatively impacted if loans are replaced by lower-yielding investment securities or if the balance sheet is allowed to shrink.

Our recent acquisitions may negatively impact earnings.

On October 26, 2012, the Company completed the purchase of the former Bank of America branch at 63 Union Street in Rockland, Maine, from Camden National Bank. As part of the transaction, the Company acquired approximately \$32.3 million in deposits as well as a small volume of loans. On the same date, the Company completed the purchase of a full-service bank building at 145 Exchange Street in Bangor, Maine, also from Camden National, and opened a full-service branch in this building in February of 2013. While these locations offer an excellent opportunity for the Company to expand its presence in Mid-Coast Maine and enter a new market in Eastern Maine, there is no guarantee that the increased operating costs for facilities and personnel will be offset by growth in loans and deposits in the new locations.

A decline in real estate values in our primary market area could adversely impact results of operations and financial condition.

Most of the Bank's lending is in Mid-Coast and Down East Maine. As a result of this geographic concentration, a significant broad-based deterioration in economic conditions in this area or Northern New England could have a material adverse impact on the quality of the Bank's loan portfolio, and could result in a decline in the demand for our products and services and, accordingly, could negatively impact our results of operations. Such a decline in economic conditions could impair borrowers' ability to pay outstanding principal and interest on loans when due and, consequently, adversely affect the cash flows of our business. The Bank's loan portfolio is largely secured by real estate collateral. A substantial portion of the real and personal property securing the loans in the Bank's portfolio is located in Mid-Coast and Down East Maine. Conditions in the real estate market in which the collateral for the Bank's loans is located strongly influence the level of the Bank's non-performing loans and results of operations. The recent decline in the Mid-Coast and Down East Maine area real estate values, as well as other external factors, could adversely affect the Bank's loan portfolio.

Our investment management activities are dependent on the value of investment securities which may lead to revenue fluctuations.

First Advisors is the investment management arm of the Bank, operating under trust powers granted from the OCC in the Bank's charter. First Advisors provides trustee, investment management and custody services for individual, municipal and business clients, predominately in the Bank's market area. First Advisors' revenues are directly tied to

the market performance of the investments it manages for clients, and these may be adversely affected by a decline in the market value of these investments caused by normal fluctuations in the bond and stock markets.

We are dependent upon the services of our management team and if we are unable to retain the services of our management team, our business may suffer.

Our future success and profitability are substantially dependent upon the management and banking abilities of our senior executives. Changes in key personnel may be disruptive to our business and could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. We believe that our future results will also depend in part upon our attracting and retaining highly skilled and qualified management. Competition for the best people in most activities in which we are engaged can be intense, and we may not be able to retain or hire the people we want and/or need. In order to attract and retain qualified employees, we must compensate such employees at market levels. Typically, those levels have caused employee compensation to be our greatest expense. If we are unable to continue to attract and retain qualified employees, or do so at rates necessary to maintain our competitive position, our performance, including our competitive position, could suffer, and, in turn, have a material adverse effect on us. Although we have incentive compensation plans aimed, in part, at long-term employee retention, the unexpected loss of services of one or more of our key personnel could still occur, and such events may have a material adverse effect on us because of the loss of the employee's skills, knowledge of our market, years of industry experience and the difficulty of promptly finding qualified replacement personnel for our talented executives and/or relationship managers.

Pursuant to the standardized terms of the CPP, among other things, we agreed to institute certain restrictions on the compensation of certain senior executive management positions that could have an adverse effect on our ability to hire or retain the most qualified senior executives. Other restrictions were imposed under the Recovery Act, the Dodd-Frank Act and other legislation or regulations. Our ability to attract and/or retain talented executives and/or relationship managers may be negatively affected by these developments or any new executive compensation limits. Our internal control systems are inherently limited and may fail or be circumvented.

We face the risk that the design of our controls and procedures, including those intended to mitigate the risk of fraud by employees or outsiders, may prove to be inadequate or may be circumvented, thereby causing delays in detection of errors or inaccuracies in data and information. Although Management regularly reviews and updates our internal controls, disclosure controls and procedures, and corporate governance policies and procedures, the Company's systems of internal controls, disclosure controls and corporate governance policies and procedures are inherently limited. The inherent limitations of our system of internal controls include the use of judgment in decision-making that can be faulty; breakdowns can occur because of human error or mistakes; and controls can be circumvented by individual acts or by collusion of two or more people. The design of any system of controls is based in part upon certain assumptions about the likelihood of future events, and any design may not succeed in achieving its stated goals under all potential future conditions. Because of the inherent limitation of a cost-effective control system, misstatements due to error or fraud may occur and may not be detected, which may have an adverse effect on the Company's business, results of operations or financial condition. Additionally, any plans of remediation for any identified limitations may be ineffective in improving internal controls.

We continually encounter technological change that may be difficult to keep up with.

The financial services industry is continually undergoing rapid technological change with frequent introductions of new technology-driven products and services. The effective use of technology increases efficiency and enables financial institutions to better serve customers and to reduce costs. Our future success depends, in part, upon our ability to address the needs of our customers by using technology to provide products and services that will satisfy customer demands, as well as to create additional efficiencies in our operations. Our largest competitors have substantially greater resources to invest in technological improvements. We may not be able to effectively implement new technology-driven products and services or be successful in marketing these products and services to our customers. Failure to successfully keep pace with technological change affecting the financial services industry could have a material adverse effect on us.

We are subject to security, transactional and operational risks relating to the use of technology that could damage our reputation and our business.

We rely heavily on communications and information systems to conduct our business serving both internal and customer constituencies. Any failure, interruption or breach in security of these systems could result in failures or

disruptions in our customer relationship management, general ledger, deposit, loan, and other systems. While we have policies and procedures, security applications and fraud mitigation applications, designed to prevent or limit the effect of the failure, interruption, fraud attacks or security breach of our information systems, there can be no assurance that any such failures, interruptions, fraud attacks or security breaches will not occur or, if they do occur, that they will be adequately addressed. Fraud attacks targeting customer-controlled devices, plastic payment card terminals, and merchant data collection points provide another source of potential loss, again through no fault of our own. The occurrence of any failures, interruptions or security breaches of information systems used to process customer transactions could damage our reputation, result in a loss of customer business, subject us to additional regulatory scrutiny, or expose us to civil litigation and possible financial liability, any of which could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition, results of operations and cash flows.

We are subject to claims and litigation that may impact our earnings and/or our reputation.

From time to time, customers, vendors or other parties may make claims and take legal actions against us. Whether any particular claims and legal actions are founded or unfounded, if such claims and legal actions are not resolved in a manner favorable to us, they may result in financial liability and/or adversely affect the market perception of the Company and its products and services. Any financial liability or reputation damage could have a material adverse effect on our business, which, in turn, could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations. We maintain reserves for certain claims when deemed appropriate based upon our assessment that a loss is probable, consistent with applicable accounting guidance. At any given time we may have legal actions asserted against us in various stages of litigation. Resolution of a legal action can often take years. We are also involved, from time to time, in other reviews, investigations and proceedings (both formal and informal) by governmental and self-regulatory agencies regarding our business, including, among other things, accounting and operational matters, certain of which may result in adverse judgments, settlements, fines, penalties, injunctions or other relief. The number and risk of these investigations and proceedings has increased in recent years with regard to many firms in the financial services industry due to legal changes to the consumer protection laws provided for by the Dodd-Frank Act, the creation of the CFPB, and the uncertainty as to whether federal preemption of certain state consumer laws remains intact for federally chartered financial institutions like the Bank. A weakening of federal pre-emption would potentially increase our compliance and operational costs and risks since we are a national bank and we would potentially face new state and local enforcement activity. There have also been a number of highly publicized cases involving fraud or misconduct by employees in the financial services industry in recent years, and we face the risk that employee misconduct could occur. It is not always possible to deter or prevent employee misconduct, and the precautions we take to prevent and detect this activity may not be effective in all cases. Any financial liability for which we have not adequately maintained reserves or insurance coverage, and/or any damage to our reputation from such claims and legal actions, could have a material adverse effect on us.

Damage to our reputation could significantly harm our businesses.

Our ability to attract and retain customers, clients, investors and highly-skilled management and employees is impacted by our reputation. Public perception of the financial services industry declined since the recent downturn in the U.S. economy. We continue to face increased public and regulatory scrutiny resulting from the financial crisis and economic downturn. Significant harm to our reputation can also arise from other sources, including employee misconduct, actual or perceived unethical behavior, litigation or regulatory outcomes, failing to deliver minimum or required standards of service and quality, compliance failures, disclosure of confidential information, and the activities of our clients, customers and counterparties, including vendors. Actions by the financial services industry generally or by certain members or individuals in the industry can also significantly adversely affect our reputation. We could also suffer significant reputational harm if we fail to properly identify and manage potential conflicts of interest. The actual or perceived failure to adequately address conflicts of interest could affect the willingness of clients to deal with us, which could adversely affect our businesses. Our actual or perceived failure to address these and other issues gives rise to reputational risk that could cause significant harm to us and our business prospects, and may have a material adverse effect on us.

Our recent results may not be indicative of our future results.

We may not be able to sustain our historical rate of growth or may not even be able to grow our business at all. In addition, our recent growth may distort some of our historical financial ratios and statistics. Various factors, such as economic conditions, regulatory and legislative considerations and competition, may also impede our ability to

expand our market presence. If we experience a significant decrease in our historical rate of growth, our results of operations and financial condition may be adversely affected due to a high percentage of our operating costs being fixed expenses.

Risks Associated With Our Industry

Our business has been and may continue to be adversely affected by conditions in the financial markets and economic conditions generally.

Negative developments in 2008 and 2009 in the financial services industry have resulted in uncertainty in the financial markets in general and a related general economic downturn, which have continued into 2013. In addition, as a consequence of the recent U.S. recession, businesses across a wide range of industries have faced serious difficulties due to the decrease in consumer spending, reduced consumer confidence brought on by deflated home values, among other things, and reduced liquidity in the credit markets. Unemployment also increased significantly over the past several years.

As a result of these financial and economic crises, many lending institutions, including us, have experienced in recent years declines in the performance of their loans, including construction, land development and land loans, commercial real estate loans and other commercial and consumer loans (see "Credit Risk Management and Allowance for Loan Losses" in ITEM 7: Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations).

Moreover, competition among depository institutions for core deposits and quality loans has increased significantly. In addition, the values of real estate collateral supporting many commercial loans and home mortgages have declined and may continue to decline. BHC stock prices have been negatively affected, and the ability of banks and BHCs to raise capital or borrow in the debt markets has been more difficult compared to years prior to the economic downturn. As a result, bank regulatory agencies have been and are expected to continue to be very aggressive in responding to concerns and trends identified in examinations, including the issuance of formal or informal enforcement actions or orders. New legislation responding to these developments may negatively impact us by restricting our business operations, including our ability to originate or sell loans, and adversely impact our financial performance or our stock price.

In addition, further negative market developments may affect consumer confidence levels and may cause adverse changes in payment patterns, causing increases in delinquencies and default rates, which may impact our charge-offs and provision for credit losses. A worsening of these conditions would likely exacerbate the adverse effects of these difficult market conditions on us and others in the financial services industry.

Overall, during the past four years, the general business environment has had an adverse effect on our business, and there can be no assurance that the environment will improve in the near term. Until conditions improve, we expect our business, financial condition and results of operations to be adversely affected.

The downgrade of the U.S. credit rating and Europe's debt crisis could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and liquidity.

Standard & Poor's lowered its long term sovereign credit rating on the United States of America from AAA to AA+ on August 5, 2011. A further downgrade or a downgrade by other rating agencies could have a material adverse impact on financial markets and economic conditions in the United States and worldwide. Any such adverse impact could have a material adverse effect on our liquidity, financial condition and results of operations. Many of our investment securities are issued by U.S. government agencies and U.S. government sponsored entities. In addition, the possibility that certain European Union ("EU") member states will default on their debt obligations has negatively impacted economic conditions and global markets. The continued uncertainty over the outcome of international and the EU's financial support programs and the possibility that other EU member states may experience similar financial troubles could further disrupt global markets. The negative impact on economic conditions and global markets could also have a material adverse effect on our liquidity, financial condition and results of operations.

We operate in a highly regulated environment and may be adversely affected by changes in law and regulations.

Bank holding companies and nationally chartered banks operate in a highly regulated environment and are subject to supervision and examination by various regulatory agencies. The Company is subject to the BHC Act, as amended, and to regulation and supervision by the Federal Reserve Board. The Bank is subject to regulation and supervision by the OCC. The cost of compliance with regulatory requirements may adversely affect our results of operations or financial condition. Federal and state laws and regulations govern numerous matters including: changes in the ownership or control of banks and bank holding companies; maintenance of adequate capital and the financial condition of a financial institution; permissible types, amounts and terms of extensions of credit and investments; permissible non-banking activities; the required level of reserves against deposits; and restrictions on dividend

payments. The OCC possesses cease and desist powers to prevent or remedy unsafe or unsound practices or violations of law by banks subject to their regulation, and the Federal Reserve Board possesses similar powers with respect to bank holding companies. These and other restrictions limit the manner in which we may conduct our business and obtain financing. Under regulatory capital adequacy guidelines and other regulatory requirements, we must meet guidelines that include quantitative measures of assets, liabilities, and certain off-balance sheet items, subject to qualitative judgments by regulators about components, risk weightings and other factors. If we fail to meet these minimum capital guidelines and other regulatory requirements, our financial condition would be materially and adversely affected. Our failure to maintain the status of "well-capitalized" under our regulatory framework could affect the confidence of our customers in us, thus compromising our competitive position, or could cause our regulators to take corrective or other supervisory action.

The Dodd-Frank Act created a new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, tightened capital standards and will continue to result in new laws and regulations that are expected to increase our costs of operations.

The Dodd-Frank Act is significantly changing the current bank regulatory structure and affecting the lending, deposit, investment, trading and operating activities of financial institutions and their holding companies. The Dodd-Frank Act requires various federal agencies to adopt a broad range of new rules and regulations, and to prepare numerous studies and reports for Congress. The federal agencies are given significant discretion in drafting the implementing rules and regulations, and consequently, many of the details and the impacts of the Dodd-Frank Act may not be known for many months or years. However, it is expected that the legislation and implementing regulations may materially increase our operating and compliance costs.

The Dodd-Frank Act created a new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with broad powers to supervise and enforce consumer protection laws. The CFPB has broad rule-making authority for a wide range of consumer protection matters that apply to all banks and savings institutions, including the authority to prohibit "unfair, deceptive or abusive" acts and practices. The CFPB's authority to prescribe rules governing the provision of consumer financial products and services could result in rules and regulations that reduce the profitability of such products or services, or impose new disclosure or substantive requirements on us that could increase the cost to us of providing such products and services. The Dodd-Frank Act also weakens the federal preemption rules that have been applicable to national banks and federal savings associations, and gives state attorneys general the ability to enforce federal consumer protection laws, which could increase our operating costs.

Effective July 21, 2011, the Dodd-Frank Act eliminated the federal prohibitions on paying interest on demand deposits, thus allowing businesses to have interest bearing checking accounts, which could result in an increase in our interest expense.

The Dodd-Frank Act also broadens the base for FDIC deposit insurance assessments. Assessments are now based on the average consolidated total assets less tangible equity capital of a financial institution, rather than deposits. The Dodd-Frank Act also permanently increases the maximum amount of deposit insurance for banks, savings institutions and credit unions to \$250,000 per depositor, retroactive to January 1, 2009. The legislation also increases the required minimum reserve ratio for the Deposit Insurance Fund, from 1.15% to 1.35% of insured deposits, but directs the FDIC to offset the effects of increased assessments on depository institutions, such as the Bank, with less than \$10 billion in assets. Any increase in our deposit insurance premiums will result in an increase in our non-interest expense.

The Dodd-Frank Act requires publicly traded companies to give stockholders a non-binding vote on executive compensation and so-called "golden parachute" payments. It also provides that the listing standards of the national securities exchanges shall require listed companies to implement and disclose "clawback" policies mandating the recovery of incentive compensation paid to executive officers in connection with accounting restatements. The legislation also directs the Federal Reserve Board to promulgate rules prohibiting excessive compensation paid to bank holding company executives. These rules could adversely affect our ability to hire and retain qualified management, which could have an adverse effect on our business.

The short-term and long-term impact of changing regulatory capital requirements and anticipated new capital rules are uncertain.

On June 7, 2012, the Federal Reserve Board issued proposed rules that would substantially amend the regulatory risk-based capital rules applicable to us. The proposed rules implement the Basel III regulatory capital reforms and changes required by the Dodd-Frank Act. Basel III was initially intended to be implemented beginning January 1, 2013, however on November 9, 2012, the U.S. federal banking agencies announced that the proposed rules would not

become effective on January 1, 2013, and it is not clear when the proposed rules will become effective.

Various provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act increase the capital requirements of financial institutions. The proposed rules include new minimum risk-based capital and leverage ratios, which would be phased in during 2013 and 2014, and would refine the definition of what constitutes "capital" for purposes of calculating these ratios. The proposed new minimum capital requirements would be:

- a new common equity Tier 1 capital ratio of 4.5%;
- a Tier 1 capital ratio of 6% (increased from 4%);
- a total capital ratio of 8% (unchanged from current rules); and
- a Tier 1 leverage ratio of 4% for all institutions.

The proposed rules would also establish a "capital conservation buffer" of 2.5% above the new regulatory minimum capital ratios, and would result in the following minimum ratios:

- a common equity Tier 1 capital ratio of 7.0%,
- a Tier 1 capital ratio of 8.5%, and
- a total capital ratio of 10.5%.

The new capital conservation buffer requirement would be phased in beginning in January 2016 at 0.625% of risk-weighted assets and would increase each year until fully implemented in January 2019. An institution would be subject to limitations on paying dividends, engaging in share repurchases, and paying discretionary bonuses if its capital level falls below the buffer amount. These limitations would establish a maximum percentage of eligible retained income that could be utilized for such actions. While the proposed Basel III changes and other regulatory capital requirements will result in higher regulatory capital standards, it is difficult at this time to predict when or how any new standards will ultimately be applied. In addition, in the current economic and regulatory environment, bank regulators may impose capital requirements that are more stringent than those required by applicable existing regulations.

The application of more stringent capital requirements could, among other things, result in lower returns on equity, require the raising of additional capital, and result in adverse regulatory actions if we were to be unable to comply with such requirements. Furthermore, the imposition of liquidity requirements in connection with the implementation of Basel III could result in our having to lengthen the term of our funding, restructure our business models, and/or increase our holdings of liquid assets. Implementation of changes to asset risk weightings for risk based capital calculations, items included or deducted in calculating regulatory capital or additional capital conservation buffers, could result in management modifying our business strategy and could limit our ability to make distributions, including paying dividends or buying back our shares.

Significant competition in the financial services industry may impact our results.

We face substantial competition in all areas of our operations from a variety of different competitors, many of which are larger and have more financial resources than we do. We compete with other providers of financial services such as commercial and savings banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions, money market and mutual funds, mortgage companies, asset managers, insurance companies and a wide array of other local, regional and national institutions which offer financial services. Mergers between financial institutions within Maine and in neighboring states have added competitive pressure. If we are unable to compete effectively, we will lose market share and our income generated from loans, deposits, and other financial products will decline.

Risks Associated With Our Common Stock

There may not be a robust trading market for the common stock.

Although our common stock is traded on the NASDAQ Global Select market, the trading volume of the common stock has historically not been substantial. For the year ended December 31, 2012, the average monthly trading volume of our common stock was 336,734 shares, or approximately 3.42% of the average number of outstanding common shares for the year. Due to the limited trading volume in our common stock, the intraday spread between bid and ask prices of the shares can be quite high. There can be no assurance that a more robust, active or economical trading market for our common stock will develop. The market value and liquidity of our common stock may, as a result, be adversely affected.

The price of our common stock may fluctuate.

The price of our common stock on the NASDAQ Global Select Market constantly changes and recently, given the uncertainty in the financial markets, has fluctuated widely. We expect the market price of our common stock will continue to fluctuate. Holders of our common stock will be subject to the risk of volatility and changes in prices. Our common stock price can fluctuate as a result of many factors which are beyond our control, including:

- quarterly fluctuations in our operating and financial results;
- operating results that vary from the expectations of Management and investors;
- changes in expectations as to our future financial performance, including financial estimates;
- events negatively impacting the financial services industry which result in a general decline for the industry;
- announcements of material developments affecting our operations or our dividend policy;
- future sales of our equity securities;
- new laws or regulations or new interpretations of existing laws or regulations applicable to our business;
- changes in accounting standards, policies, guidance, interpretations or principles; and
- general domestic economic and market conditions.

In addition, recently the stock market generally has experienced extreme price and volume fluctuations, and industry factors and general economic and political conditions and events, such as economic slowdowns or recessions, interest rate changes or credit loss trends, could also cause our stock price to decrease regardless of our operating results.

The inability to receive dividends from the Bank would negatively affect our ability to pay dividends to shareholders. The Company is a legal entity separate and distinct from the Bank. With the exception of cash raised from debt and equity issuances, we receive substantially all of our cash flow from dividends from the Bank. These dividends are the principal source of funds to pay dividends on our equity securities. Federal banking law and regulations limit the amount of dividends that the Bank can pay. For further information on the regulatory restrictions on the payment of dividends by the Bank, see "Supervision and Regulation" in Item 1. In the event the Bank is unable to pay dividends to the Company, we may not be able to service debt, pay obligations or pay dividends on our equity securities. Our right to participate in a distribution of assets upon a subsidiary's liquidation or reorganization is subject to the prior claims of the subsidiary's creditors.

If we do not manage our capital position strategically, our return on equity could be lower compared to our competitors as a result of our high level of capital.

If we are unable to use strategically our excess capital, or to successfully continue capital management programs, such as stock repurchase programs or quarterly dividends to our shareholders, then our goal of generating a return on average equity that is competitive, increasing earnings per share and book value per share without assuming undue risk, could be delayed or may not be attained. Failure to achieve a competitive return on average equity might decrease investments in our common stock and might cause our common stock to trade at lower prices.

We may issue additional equity securities or engage in other transactions which dilute our book value or affect the priority of the common stock, which may adversely affect the market price of our common stock.

Our Board of Directors may determine from time to time that we need to raise additional capital by issuing additional shares of our common stock or other securities. Except pursuant to the rules of the NASDAQ Stock Market, we are not restricted from issuing additional shares of common stock, including securities that are convertible into or exchangeable for, or that represent the right to receive, common stock. Because our decision to issue securities in any future offering will depend on market conditions and other factors beyond our control, we cannot predict or estimate

the amount, timing or nature of any future offerings, or the prices at which such offerings may be affected. Such offerings could be dilutive to common shareholders or reduce the market price of our common stock. Holders of our common stock are not entitled to preemptive rights or protection against dilution. New investors also may have rights, preferences and privileges that are senior to, and that adversely affect, our then current common shareholders. We may attempt to increase our capital resources or, if our or the Bank's capital ratios fall below the required minimums, we could be forced to raise additional capital, by making offerings of debt or preferred equity securities, including medium-term notes, trust preferred securities, senior or subordinated notes and preferred stock. Upon liquidation, holders of our shares of preferred stock and lenders with respect to other borrowings will receive distributions of our available assets prior to the holders of our common stock. Our Board of Directors is authorized to issue one or more series of preferred stock from time to time without any action on the part of our shareholders. Our Board of Directors also has the power, without shareholder approval, to set the terms of any such series of preferred stock that may be issued, including voting rights, dividend rights and preferences over our common stock with respect to dividends or upon our dissolution, winding-up and liquidation and other terms. If we issue preferred stock in the future that has a preference over our common stock with respect to the payment of dividends or upon our liquidation, dissolution or winding up, or if we issue preferred stock with voting rights that dilute the voting power of our common stock, the rights of holders of our common stock or the market price of our common stock could be adversely affected. Potential acquisitions may disrupt our business and dilute shareholder value.

Acquiring other banks, businesses, or branches involves various risks commonly associated with acquisitions, including:

- potential exposure to unknown or contingent liabilities of the target;
- exposure to potential asset quality issues of the target;
- difficulty and expense of integrating the operations and personnel of the target;
- potential disruption to our business;
- potential diversion of Management's time and attention;
- the possible loss of key employees and customers of the target;
- difficulty in estimating the value of the assets and liabilities of the target;
- potential changes in banking or tax laws or regulations that may affect the target.

Merger or acquisition discussions and, in some cases, negotiations may take place and future mergers or acquisitions involving cash, debt or equity securities may occur at any time. Acquisitions typically involve the payment of a premium over book and market values, and, therefore, some dilution of our tangible book value and net income per common share may occur in connection with any future transaction. Furthermore, failure to realize the expected revenue increases, cost savings, increases in geographic or product presence, and/or other projected benefits from an acquisition could have a material adverse effect on us.

Our participation in the TARP Capital Purchase Program may depress the market value of our common stock.

On January 9, 2009, the Company issued \$25 million in Fixed Rate Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series A, to the U.S. Treasury under the Capital Purchase Program ("the CPP Shares"). The CPP Shares call for cumulative dividends at a rate of 5.0% per year for the first five years, and at a rate of 9.0% per year in following years. On August 24, 2011, the Company repurchased \$12.5 million of the CPP Shares, and after the repurchase, \$12.5 million of the CPP shares remains outstanding. The Company may redeem the remaining CPP Shares at any time using any funds available, subject to the prior approval of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

During the time that Treasury holds any equity or debt instrument the Company issued, the Company is required to comply with certain restrictions relating to the compensation of the Company's chief executive officer, chief financial officer and three other most highly compensated executive officers. Additional restrictions with regard to increasing shareholder dividends and repurchase of Company stock were in place for the first three years of participation in the program and were lifted on January 9, 2012. The Company's earnings may be adversely impacted if the remaining \$12.5 million of CPP shares is not repaid before January 9, 2014, at which time the annual dividend rate on the CPP shares increases from 5.0% to 9.0%. This in turn, may impact the price of the Company's shares.

ITEM 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments

None

The First Bancorp - 2012 Form 10-K - Page 22

ITEM 2. Properties

The principal office of the Company and the Bank is located in Damariscotta, Maine. The Bank operates 16 full-service banking offices in five counties in the Mid-Coast, Eastern and Down East regions of Maine:

Lincoln County	Knox County	Hancock County	Washington County
Boothbay Harbor	Camden	Bar Harbor	Eastport
Damariscotta	Rockland Park Street	Blue Hill	Calais
Waldoboro	Rockland Union Street	Ellsworth	
Wiscasset	Rockport	Northeast Harbor	Penobscot County
		Southwest Harbor	Bangor (opened February 2013)

First Advisors, the investment management and trust division of the Bank, operates from four offices in Bangor, Bar Harbor, Ellsworth and Damariscotta. The Bank also maintains an Operations Center in Damariscotta. The Company owns all of its facilities except for the land on which the Ellsworth branch is located, and except for the Camden office and the Southwest Harbor drive-up facility, for which the Bank has entered into long-term leases. Management believes that the Bank's current facilities are suitable and adequate in light of its current needs and its anticipated needs over the near term.

ITEM 3. Legal Proceedings

There are no material pending legal proceedings to which the Company or the Bank is a party or to which any of its property is subject, other than routine litigation incidental to the business of the Bank. None of these proceedings is expected to have a material effect on the financial condition of the Company or of the Bank.

ITEM 4. Mine Safety Disclosures

Not applicable.

ITEM 5. Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Shareholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities

The common stock of The First Bancorp (ticker symbol FNLC) trades on the NASDAQ Global Select Market System. As of December 31, 2012, there were 9,859,914 shares outstanding and held of record by approximately 3,547 shareholders. The following table reflects the high and low prices of actual sales in each quarter of 2012 and 2011. Such quotations do not reflect retail mark-ups, mark-downs or brokers' commissions.

	<u>2012</u>		<u>2011</u>	
	High	Low	High	Low
1st Quarter	\$16.38	\$14.00	\$15.95	\$13.40
2nd Quarter	17.44	13.41	15.96	13.79
3rd Quarter	18.96	16.02	15.30	11.69
4th Quarter	18.14	14.32	15.95	11.75

The last transaction in the Company's stock on NASDAQ during 2012 was on December 31 at \$16.47 per share. There are no warrants outstanding with respect to the Company's common stock other than warrants to purchase up to 225,904 shares of its common stock (subject to adjustment) at \$16.60 per share issued to the U.S. Treasury incident to the Company's participation in the CPP program. The Company has no securities outstanding which are convertible into common equity.

The ability of the Company to pay cash dividends depends on receipt of dividends from the Bank. Dividends may be declared by the Bank out of its net profits as the directors deem appropriate, subject to the limitation that the total of all dividends declared by the Bank in any calendar year may not exceed the total of its net profits of that year plus retained net profits of the preceding two years. The amount available for dividends in 2013 will be that year's net income plus \$6.8 million. The payment of dividends from the Bank to the Company may be additionally restricted if the payment of such dividends resulted in the Bank failing to meet regulatory capital requirements. The Bank is also required to maintain minimum amounts of capital-to-total-risk-weighted-assets, as defined by banking regulators. At December 31, 2012, the Bank was required to have minimum Tier 1 and Tier 2 risk-based capital ratios of 4.00% and 8.00%, respectively. The Bank's actual ratios were 14.41% and 15.66%, respectively, as of December 31, 2012. The table below sets forth the cash dividends declared in the last two fiscal years:

	Amount	
	Per	
Date Declared	Share	Date Payable
March 17, 2011	\$0.195	April 29, 2011
June 15, 2011	\$0.195	July 29, 2011
September 15, 2011	\$0.195	October 28, 2011
December 15, 2011	\$0.195	January 31, 2012
March 15, 2012	\$0.195	April 30, 2012
June 20, 2012	\$0.195	July 31, 2012
September 20, 2012	\$0.195	October 31, 2012
December 20, 2012	\$0.195	January 31, 2013

Repurchase of Shares and Use of Proceeds

During the year ended December 31, 2012, the Company repurchased no common stock.

Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities

The Company had no unregistered sales of equity securities in 2012.

Securities Authorized for Issuance Under Equity Compensation Plans

The following table lists the amount and weighted-average exercise price of securities authorized for issuance under equity compensation plans:

Plan category	Number of securities to be issued upon exercise of outstanding options, warrants and rights (a)	Weighted-average exercise price of outstanding options, warrants and rights (b)	Number of securities remaining available for future issuance under equity compensation plans (excluding securities reflected in column (a)) (c)
Equity compensation plans approved by security holders	42,000	\$ 18.00	380,273
Equity compensation plans not approved by security holders	-	\$ -	-
Total	42,000	\$ 18.00	380,273

Performance Graph

Set forth below is a line graph comparing the five-year cumulative total return of \$100.00 invested in the Company's common stock ("FNLC"), assuming reinvestment of all cash dividends and retention of all stock dividends, with a comparable amount invested in the Standard & Poor's 500 Index ("S&P 500") and the NASDAQ Combined Bank Index ("NASD Bank"). The NASD Bank index is a capitalization-weighted index designed to measure the performance of all NASDAQ stocks in the banking sector.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
FNLC	100.00	143.84	115.08	124.43	127.90	143.72
S&P 500	100.00	63.00	79.67	91.67	93.60	108.58
NASD Bank	100.00	78.46	65.67	74.96	67.09	79.63

ITEM 6. Selected Financial Data

The First Bancorp, Inc. and Subsidiary

	<u>Years ended December 31,</u>									
Dollars in thousands, except for per share amounts	2012		2011		2010		2009		2008	
Summary of Operations										
Interest Income	\$51,825		\$55,702		\$57,260		\$62,569		\$71,372	
Interest Expense	12,938		14,709		16,671		18,916		33,669	
Net Interest Income	38,887		40,993		40,589		43,653		37,703	
Provision for Loan Losses	7,835		10,550		8,400		12,160		4,700	
Non-Interest Income	11,278		11,750		9,135		12,754		9,646	
Non-Interest Expense	26,271		26,038		25,130		26,658		22,994	
Net Income	12,688		12,364		12,116		13,042		14,034	
Per Common Share Data										
Basic Earnings per Share	\$ 1.22		\$ 1.14		\$ 1.10		\$ 1.22		\$ 1.45	
Diluted Earnings per Share	1.22		1.14		1.10		1.22		1.44	
Cash Dividends Declared	0.780		0.780		0.780		0.780		0.765	
Book Value per Common Share	14.60		14.12		12.80		12.66		12.09	
Tangible Book Value per Common Share	11.47		11.20		9.84		9.65		9.01	
Market Value	16.47		15.37		15.79		15.42		19.89	
Financial Ratios										
Return on Average Equity ¹	8.84	%	9.37	%	9.53	%	10.66	%	12.02	%
Return on Average Tangible Equity ^{1,2}	10.40		10.80		10.97		12.76		16.14	
Return on Average Assets ¹	0.89		0.87		0.89		0.96		1.10	
Average Equity to Average Assets	10.96		10.72		11.20		10.85		9.14	
Average Tangible Equity to Average Assets ²	8.96		8.70		9.06		8.69		6.83	
Net Interest Margin Tax-Equivalent ^{1,2}	3.14		3.27		3.38		3.66		3.33	
Dividend Payout Ratio	63.93		68.42		70.91		63.93		52.76	
Allowance for Loan Losses/Total Loans	1.44		1.50		1.50		1.43		0.90	
Non-Performing Loans to Total Loans	2.20		3.21		2.39		1.95		1.27	
Non-Performing Assets to Total Assets	1.89		2.32		1.87		1.80		1.31	
Efficiency Ratio ²	51.01		49.75		48.15		43.39		46.07	
At Year End										
Total Assets	\$ 1,414,999		\$ 1,372,867		\$ 1,393,802		\$ 1,331,394		\$ 1,325,744	
Total Loans	869,284		864,988		887,596		952,492		979,273	
Total Investment Securities	449,382		424,306		416,052		287,818		247,839	
Total Deposits	958,850		941,333		974,518		922,667		925,736	
Total Borrowings	282,905		265,663		257,330		249,778		272,074	
Total Shareholders' Equity	156,323		150,858		149,848		147,938		117,181	
Market price per common share of stock during 2012							High		Low	
							\$18.96		\$13.41	

¹Annualized using a 366-day basis in 2012 and 365-day basis in 2011²These ratios use non-GAAP financial measures. See Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations for additional disclosures and information.

ITEM 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations

The First Bancorp, Inc. (the "Company") was incorporated in the State of Maine on January 15, 1985, and is the parent holding company of The First, N.A. (the "Bank").

The Company generates almost all of its revenues from the Bank, which was chartered as a national bank under the laws of the United States on May 30, 1864. The Bank, which has sixteen offices along coastal and eastern Maine, emphasizes personal service to the communities it serves, concentrating primarily on small businesses and individuals. The Bank offers a wide variety of traditional banking services and derives the majority of its revenues from net interest income – the spread between what it earns on loans and investments and what it pays for deposits and borrowed funds. While net interest income typically increases as earning assets grow, the spread can vary up or down depending on the level and direction of movements in interest rates. Management believes the Bank has modest exposure to changes in interest rates, as discussed in "Interest Rate Risk Management" elsewhere in Management's Discussion. The banking business in the Bank's market area historically has been seasonal with lower deposits in the winter and spring and higher deposits in the summer and fall. This seasonal swing is fairly predictable and has not had a materially adverse effect on the Bank.

Non-interest income is the Bank's secondary source of revenue and includes fees and service charges on deposit accounts, income from the sale and servicing of mortgage loans, and income from investment management and private banking services through First Advisors, a division of the Bank.

Forward-Looking Statements

This report contains statements that are "forward-looking statements." We may also make written or oral forward-looking statements in other documents we file with the SEC, in our annual reports to Shareholders, in press releases and other written materials, and in oral statements made by our officers, directors or employees. You can identify forward-looking statements by the use of the words "believe", "expect", "anticipate", "intend", "estimate", "assume", "outlook", "will", "should", "may", "might", "could", and other expressions that predict or indicate future events or trends and which do not relate to historical matters. You should not rely on forward-looking statements, because they involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors, some of which are beyond the control of the Company. These risks, uncertainties and other factors may cause the actual results, performance or achievements of the Company to be materially different from the anticipated future results, performance or achievements expressed or implied by the forward-looking statements.

Some of the factors that might cause these differences include the following: changes in general national, regional or international economic conditions or conditions affecting the banking or financial services industries or financial capital markets, volatility and disruption in national and international financial markets, government intervention in the U.S. financial system, reductions in net interest income resulting from interest rate volatility as well as changes in the balance and mix of loans and deposits, reductions in the market value of wealth management assets under administration, changes in the value of securities and other assets, reductions in loan demand, changes in loan collectibility, default and charge-off rates, changes in the size and nature of the Company's competition, changes in legislation or regulation and accounting principles, policies and guidelines, and changes in the assumptions used in making such forward-looking statements. In addition, the factors described under "Risk Factors" in Item 1A of this Annual Report on Form 10-K, may result in these differences. You should carefully review all of these factors, and you should be aware that there may be other factors that could cause these differences. These forward-looking statements were based on information, plans and estimates at the date of this annual report, and we assume no obligation to update any forward-looking statements to reflect changes in underlying assumptions or factors, new information, future events or other changes.

Although the Company believes that the expectations reflected in such forward-looking statements are reasonable, actual results may differ materially from the results discussed in these forward-looking statements. Readers are cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements, which speak only as of the date hereof. The Company undertakes no obligation to republish revised forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date hereof or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events. Readers are also urged to

carefully review and consider the various disclosures made by the Company, which attempt to advise interested parties of the factors that affect the Company's business.

Critical Accounting Policies

Management's discussion and analysis of the Company's financial condition and results of operation is based on the consolidated financial statements which are prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. The preparation of such financial statements requires Management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses and related disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities. On an ongoing basis, Management evaluates its estimates, including those related to the allowance for loan losses, goodwill, the valuation of mortgage servicing rights, and other-than-temporary impairment on securities. Management bases its estimates on historical experience and on various other assumptions that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances, the results of which form the basis in making judgments about the carrying values of assets that are not readily apparent from other sources. Actual results could differ from the amounts derived from Management's estimates and assumptions under different assumptions or conditions.

Allowance for Loan Losses. Management believes the allowance for loan losses requires the most significant estimates and assumptions used in the preparation of the consolidated financial statements. The allowance for loan losses is based on Management's evaluation of the level of the allowance required in relation to the estimated loss exposure in the loan portfolio. Management believes the allowance for loan losses is a significant estimate and therefore regularly evaluates it to determine the appropriate level by taking into consideration factors such as prior loan loss experience, the character and size of the loan portfolio, business and economic conditions and Management's estimation of potential losses. The use of different estimates or assumptions could produce different provisions for loan losses.

Goodwill. Management utilizes numerous techniques to estimate the value of various assets held by the Company, including methods to determine the appropriate carrying value of goodwill as required under Financial Accounting Standards Board ("FASB") Accounting Standards Codification ("ASC") Topic 350 "Intangibles – Goodwill and Other." Goodwill from a purchase acquisition is subject to ongoing periodic impairment tests, which include an evaluation of the ongoing assets, liabilities and revenues from the acquisition and an estimation of the impact of business conditions.

Mortgage Servicing Rights. The valuation of mortgage servicing rights is a critical accounting policy which requires significant estimates and assumptions. The Bank often sells mortgage loans it originates and retains the ongoing servicing of such loans, receiving a fee for these services, generally 0.25% of the outstanding balance of the loan per annum. Mortgage servicing rights are recognized at fair value when they are acquired through the sale of loans, and are reported in other assets. They are amortized into non-interest income in proportion to, and over the period of, the estimated future net servicing income of the underlying financial assets. The rights are subsequently carried at the lower of amortized cost or fair value. Management uses an independent firm which specializes in the valuation of mortgage servicing rights to determine the fair value. The most important assumption is the anticipated loan prepayment rate, and increases in prepayment speed results in lower valuations of mortgage servicing rights. The valuation also includes an evaluation for impairment based upon the fair value of the rights, which can vary depending upon current interest rates and prepayment expectations, as compared to amortized cost. Impairment is determined by stratifying rights by predominant characteristics, such as interest rates and terms. The use of different assumptions could produce a different valuation. All of the assumptions are based on standards the Company believes would be utilized by market participants in valuing mortgage servicing rights and are consistently derived and/or benchmarked against independent public sources.

Other-Than-Temporary Impairment on Securities. One of the significant estimates related to investment securities is the evaluation of other-than-temporary impairments. The evaluation of securities for other-than-temporary impairments is a quantitative and qualitative process, which is subject to risks and uncertainties and is intended to determine whether declines in the fair value of investments should be recognized in current period earnings. The risks and uncertainties include changes in general economic conditions, the issuer's financial condition and/or future prospects, the effects of changes in interest rates or credit spreads and the expected recovery period of unrealized losses. Securities that are in an unrealized loss position are reviewed at least quarterly to determine if other-than-temporary impairment is present based on certain quantitative and qualitative factors and measures. The

primary factors considered in evaluating whether a decline in value of securities is other-than-temporary include: (a) the length of time and extent to which the fair value has been less than cost or amortized cost and the expected recovery period of the security, (b) the financial condition, credit rating and future prospects of the issuer, (c) whether the debtor is current on contractually obligated interest and principal payments, (d) the volatility of the securities' market price, (e) the intent and ability of the Company to retain the investment for a period of time sufficient to allow for recovery, which may be at maturity and (f) any other information and observable data considered relevant in determining whether other-than-temporary impairment has occurred, including the expectation of receipt of all principal and interest when due.

Use of Non-GAAP Financial Measures

Certain information in Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations and elsewhere in this Report contains financial information determined by methods other than in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America ("GAAP"). Management uses these "non-GAAP" measures in its analysis of the Company's performance and believes that these non-GAAP financial measures provide a greater understanding of ongoing operations and enhance comparability of results with prior periods as well as demonstrating the effects of significant gains and charges in the current period. The Company believes that a meaningful analysis of its financial performance requires an understanding of the factors underlying that performance. Management believes that investors may use these non-GAAP financial measures to analyze financial performance without the impact of unusual items that may obscure trends in the Company's underlying performance. These disclosures should not be viewed as a substitute for operating results determined in accordance with GAAP, nor are they necessarily comparable to non-GAAP performance measures that may be presented by other companies.

In several places in this report, net interest income is presented on a fully taxable equivalent basis. Specifically included in interest income was tax-exempt interest income from certain investment securities and loans. An amount equal to the tax benefit derived from this tax exempt income has been added back to the interest income total, which adjustments increased net interest income accordingly. Management believes the disclosure of tax-equivalent net interest income information improves the clarity of financial analysis, and is particularly useful to investors in understanding and evaluating the changes and trends in the Company's results of operations. Other financial institutions commonly present net interest income on a tax-equivalent basis. This adjustment is considered helpful in the comparison of one financial institution's net interest income to that of another institution, as each will have a different proportion of tax-exempt interest from its earning assets. Moreover, net interest income is a component of a second financial measure commonly used by financial institutions, net interest margin, which is the ratio of net interest income to average earning assets. For purposes of this measure as well, other financial institutions generally use tax-equivalent net interest income to provide a better basis of comparison from institution to institution. The Company follows these practices. The following table provides a reconciliation of tax-equivalent financial information to the Company's consolidated financial statements, which have been prepared in accordance with GAAP. A 35.0% tax rate was used in 2012, 2011 and 2010.

	Years ended December 31,		
Dollars in thousands	2012	2011	2010
Net interest income as presented	\$38,887	\$40,993	\$40,589
Effect of tax-exempt income	3,128	2,710	2,281
Net interest income, tax equivalent	\$42,015	\$43,703	\$42,870

The Company presents its efficiency ratio using non-GAAP information. The GAAP-based efficiency ratio is noninterest expenses divided by net interest income plus noninterest income from the Consolidated Statements of Income and Comprehensive Income. The non-GAAP efficiency ratio excludes securities losses and other-than-temporary impairment charges from noninterest expenses, excludes securities gains from noninterest income, and adds the tax-equivalent adjustment to net interest income. The following table provides a reconciliation between the GAAP and non-GAAP efficiency ratio:

	Years ended December 31,		
In thousands of dollars	2012	2011	2010
Non-interest expense, as presented	\$26,271	\$26,038	\$25,130
Adjusted non-interest expense	26,271	26,038	25,130
Net interest income, as presented	38,887	40,993	40,589
Effect of tax-exempt income	3,128	2,710	2,281

Edgar Filing: First Bancorp, Inc /ME/ - Form 10-K

Non-interest income, as presented	11,278	11,750	9,135
Effect of non-interest tax-exempt income	177	182	193
Net securities gains	(1,968)	(3,293)	(2)
Adjusted net interest income plus non-interest income	\$51,502	\$52,342	\$52,196
Non-GAAP efficiency ratio	51.01 %	49.75 %	48.15 %
GAAP efficiency ratio	52.37 %	49.37 %	50.54 %

The First Bancorp - 2012 Form 10-K - Page 29

The Company presents certain information based upon average tangible common shareholders' equity instead of total average shareholders' equity. The difference between these two measures is the Company's intangible assets, specifically goodwill from prior acquisitions, and preferred stock. Management, banking regulators and many stock analysts use the tangible common equity ratio and the tangible book value per common share in conjunction with more traditional bank capital ratios to compare the capital adequacy of banking organizations with significant amounts of goodwill or other intangible assets, typically stemming from the use of the purchase accounting method in accounting for mergers and acquisitions. The following table provides a reconciliation of tangible average shareholders' equity to the Company's consolidated financial statements, which have been prepared in accordance with GAAP:

In thousands of dollars	Years ended December 31,		
	2012	2011	2010
Average shareholders' equity as presented	\$155,822	\$152,254	\$151,739
Less preferred stock (average)	(12,341)	(20,290)	(24,606)
Less intangible assets (average)	(28,422)	(28,698)	(28,982)
Average tangible common shareholders' equity	\$115,059	\$103,266	\$98,151

Executive Summary

Net income for the year ended December 31, 2012 was \$12.7 million, up \$324,000 or 2.6% from the \$12.4 million posted for the year ended December 31, 2011. Earnings per common share on a fully diluted basis were \$1.22 for the year ended December 31, 2012, up \$0.08 or 7.0% from the \$1.14 posted for the year ended December 31, 2011. Net interest income on a tax-equivalent basis declined \$1.7 million or 3.9% for the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to the year ended December 31, 2011. This decrease was attributable to margin compression due to the unprecedented low interest rate environment now entering its fifth straight year. As a result, our net interest margin slipped from 3.27% in 2011 to 3.14% in 2012. This year-over-year decline in net interest income was offset by a lower provision for loan losses.

During 2012, total assets increased \$42.1 million or 3.1%. The loan portfolio was up \$4.3 million or 0.5%. The investment portfolio was up \$25.1 million or 5.9% for the year. On the liability side of the balance sheet, low-cost deposits have increased \$59.7 million or 19.1% for the year. We continue to see an inflow of low-cost deposits due to the low interest rate environment and had a \$25 million lift in low-cost deposits in the fourth quarter due to the acquisition of the former Bank of America branch in Rockland. Local certificates of deposit decreased \$874,000 or 4.0%.

Credit quality improved significantly in 2012. Non-performing loans stood at 2.20% of total loans on December 31, 2012 compared to 3.21% of total loans on December 31, 2011. This compares to nonperforming loans at 1.73% for our Uniform Bank Performance Report peer group ("UBPR peer group") as of December 31, 2012. Net chargeoffs were \$8.3 million or 0.95% of average loans in 2012 compared to net charge offs of \$10.9 million or 1.23% of average loans in 2011. Net charge offs for the UBPR peer group in 2012 were 0.58% of average loans. We provisioned \$7.8 million for loan losses in 2012, down \$2.7 million from the \$10.5 million provision made during 2011. The allowance as a percentage of loans outstanding stood at 1.44% in 2012 compared to 1.50% in 2011.

The Company's operating ratios remain good, with a return on average tangible common equity of 10.40% for the year ended December 31, 2012 compared to 10.80% and 10.97% for the year ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively. Our return on average tangible equity was in the top 40% of all banks in the UBPR peer group, which had an average return of 9.18% for the year. Our efficiency ratio continues to be an important component in our overall performance and at 51.01% in 2012, is only slightly above the 49.75% and 48.15% posted for 2011 and 2010, respectively. As of December 31, 2012, the average efficiency ratio for our UBPR peer group was 66.38%, which put us in the top 10% of all banks in the UBPR peer group.

Results of Operations

Net Interest Income

Net interest income on a tax-equivalent basis decreased 3.9% or \$1.7 million to \$42.0 million for the year ended Dece