CPP **ANNUAL USE OF CAPITAL SURVEY - 2010**

NAME OF INSTITUTION
(Include Holding Company Where Applicable)

Duke Financial Group, Inc.

Person to be contacted regarding this report:	Brenda L. Coulter	RSSD: (For Bank Holding Companies)	1127913
UST Sequence Number:	1166	Holding Company Docket Number: (For Thrift Holding Companies)	N/A
CPP/CDCI Funds Received:	12,000,000	FDIC Certificate Number: (For Depository Institutions)	N/A
CPP/CDCI Funds Repaid to Date:	0	Credit Union Charter Number: (For Credit Unions)	N/A
Date Funded (first funding):	Jun 19, 2009	City:	Minneapolis
Date Repaid[1]:	N/A	State:	Minnesota

[1]If repayment was incremental, please enter the most recent repayment date.

American taxpayers are quite interested in knowing how banks have used the money that Treasury has invested under the Capital Purchase Program (CPP) and Community Development Capital Initiative (CDCI). To answer that question, Treasury is seeking responses that describe generally how the CPP/CDCI investment has affected the operation of your business. We understand that once received, the cash associated with TARP funding is indistinguishable from other cash sources, unless the funds were segregated, and therefore it may not be feasible to identify precisely how the CPP/CDCI investment was deployed or how many CPP/CDCI dollars were allocated to each use. Nevertheless, we ask you to provide as much information as you can about how you have used the capital Treasury has provided, and how your uses of that capital have changed over time. Treasury will be pairing this survey with a summary of certain balance sheet and other financial data from your institution's regulatory filings, so to the extent you find it helpful to do so, please feel free to refer to your institution's quarterly call reports to illustrate your answers. This is your opportunity to speak to the taxpayers in your own words, which will be posted on our website.

What specific ways did your institution utilize CPP/CDCI capital? Check all that apply and elaborate as appropriate, especially if the uses have shifted over time. Your responses should reflect actions taken over the past year (or for the portion of the year in which CPP/CDCI funds were outstanding).

☒	Increase lending or reduce lending less than otherwise would have occurred.	During 2010, we have continued to renew and advance new funds to credit worthy businesses and individuals. Loan demand remains at extremely low levels, especially in southern California.
☐	To the extent the funds supported increased lending, please describe the major type of loans, if possible (residential mortgage loans, commercial mortgage loans, small business loans, etc.).	N/A
☒	Increase securities purchased (ABS, MBS, etc.).	Our investment portfolio had a net decrease of approximately $12 million during 2010 as a result of sales and normal cash flow runoff from the portfolio. On a combined basis, our banks purchased approximately $51million in securities, primarily MBS and CMOs, during 2010.

☐	Make other investments	N/A
☒	Increase reserves for non-performing assets	During 2010, over $11 million was added to the allowance for loan losses to cover charge-offs of non-performing loans as well as maintain an adequate level of reserves.
☒	Reduce borrowings	As each subsidiary bank received loan repayments, borrowings were reduced by over $65 million during 2010.
☐	Increase charge-offs	N/A
☐	Purchase another financial institution or purchase assets from another financial institution	N/A
☒	Held as non-leveraged increase to total capital	Total assets decreased at each of our subsidiary banks during 2010 as a result of significantly reduced loan demand and loan repayments. Capital ratios improved as a result. During 2010, an additional $2.6 million was added to bank capital from the CPP funds.

What actions were you able to avoid because of the capital infusion of CPP/CDCI funds?

During 2010, Duke injected an additional $2.6 million in one of our subsidiary banks. As of December 31, 2010, our banks remain well capitalized and well positioned to continue serving their respective local communities. Without the CPP funds, our subsidiary Banks would have had to decrease assets by an additional $28.9 million in 2010, assuming a 9% leverage capital ratio. At least 70 percent of this decrease would have come from further reductions in the loan portfolios.

What actions were you able to take that you may not have taken without the capital infusion of CPP/CDCI funds?

During 2010, the effects of the economy continued to adversely impact our bank customers in Minnesota and California. The level of nonperforming assets remained high at our banks in Minnesota and increased at our California bank. This resulted in continued high level of charge-offs as well as the need to increase the allowance for loan losses. The CPP funds allowed Duke to inject additional capital of $2.6 million into our California bank in order to maintain higher levels of capital to protect the bank from future losses and to support future loan growth as such time as the economy recovers. In addition, aggregate borrowings were reduced by approximately $ $65 million during 2010. At December 31,2010, each bank's capital, as well as Duke's capital, is strong and well above the "well-capitalized" requirements.

Please describe any other actions that you were able to undertake with the capital infusion of CPP/CDCI funds.

No other comments to add at this time.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1505-0222. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 80 hours per response.