



DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON, D.C.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A Message from the Secretary of the Treasury

Over the past two years, the Administration, along with Congress and financial regulators, implemented emergency policies that ended the worst recession since the Great Depression and put the nation on a path to economic recovery. Yet today, the country still faces significant and persistent challenges: the need to create millions of new jobs, build a new and stable foundation for prosperity, and address a medium- and long-term fiscal situation that could undermine future economic growth.

The 2010 Financial Report of the U.S. Government, issued by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, is a comprehensive report on the Government's financial position and an important tool for understanding how to move forward to meet these challenges.

While the Government's immediate priority is to support economic recovery and combat unemployment, we must also address the nation's significant fiscal challenges. In FY 2010, the deficit decreased as a result of increases in tax receipts and a decline in outlays. Yet persistent growth of health care costs and the aging of the population remain key causes of long-term deficits. The Affordable Care Act marked an important step in controlling health care costs and has the potential to significantly lower the long-term growth trend for Medicare and Medicaid costs. The Affordable Care Act will also drive critical innovations in the health care system that will help improve quality and further constrain costs over the long term.

Today, we must balance our efforts to accelerate economic recovery and job growth in the near term with continued efforts to address the challenges posed by the long-term deficit outlook. The Administration's top priority remains restoring good jobs to American workers and accelerating the pace of economic recovery. Two key pieces of legislation signed by the President, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment (HIRE) Act of 2010, have helped further this goal by creating or saving over three million jobs. But as we combat unemployment, we must also address the challenge of bringing future debt down to sustainable levels. The work of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform has emphasized that to sustain economic growth in the medium- and long-term, we need to make difficult choices to reduce deficits and the national debt.

The Administration has already taken common-sense steps, such as proposing a three-year freeze on non-security discretionary funding, calling for a two-year pay freeze for federal civilian workers, and restoring the rule that the Government pays for its priorities to promote fiscal responsibility. These efforts must continue in the months and years ahead. This report—a comprehensive overview of the Federal Government's finances—shows the significance of our efforts and the necessity of maintaining focus on both economic recovery and fiscal responsibility.



Timothy F. Geithner

Contents

A Message from the Secretary of the Treasury	
A Citizen's Guide	i
Management's Discussion and Analysis	1
Statement of the Acting Comptroller General of the United States	27
Financial Statements	
Introduction	35
Statements of Net Cost	35
Statements of Operations and Changes in Net Position.....	36
Reconciliations of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit.....	37
Statements of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities	38
Balance Sheets.....	38
Statements of Social Insurance.....	39
Notes to the Financial Statements	
Note 1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies	49
Note 2. Cash and Other Monetary Assets.....	61
Note 3. Accounts and Taxes Receivable, Net.....	63
Note 4. Loans Receivable, Mortgage Backed Securities, and Loan Guarantee Liabilities, Net..	64
Note 5. TARP Direct Loans and Equity Investments, Net	68
Note 6. Beneficial Interest in Trust	74
Note 7. Inventories and Related Property, Net	75
Note 8. Property, Plant, and Equipment, Net	77
Note 9. Debt and Equity Securities	78
Note 10. Derivatives	80
Note 11. Investments in and Liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises and Other Financial and Housing Market Stabilization	82
Note 12. Other Assets.....	86
Note 13. Accounts Payable.....	87
Note 14. Federal Debt Securities Held by the Public and Accrued Interest	88
Note 15. Federal Employee and Veteran Benefits Payable	91
Note 16. Environmental and Disposal Liabilities.....	97
Note 17. Benefits Due and Payable	99
Note 18. Insurance and Guarantee Program Liabilities	100
Note 19. Other Liabilities	101
Note 20. Collections and Refunds of Federal Revenue	103
Note 21. Prior Period Adjustments.....	106
Note 22. Contingencies	107
Note 23. Commitments.....	112
Note 24. Earmarked Funds	115
Note 25. Fiduciary Activities.....	125
Note 26. Social Insurance.....	127
Note 27. Stewardship Land and Heritage Assets.....	137

Supplemental Information (Unaudited)

Fiscal Projections for the U.S. Government – Fiscal Year 2010139
Statement of Long Term Fiscal Projections139
The Sustainability of Fiscal Policy142
Alternative Scenarios.....146
Fiscal Projections in Context.....148
Conclusion.....149
Social Insurance150
Social Security and Medicare150
Railroad Retirement, Black Lung, and Unemployment Insurance173
Deferred Maintenance183
Unexpended Budget Balances184
Tax Burden184
Tax Gap185
Other Claims for Refunds.....186
Tax Assessments186
Risk Assumed.....187
Unmatched Transactions and Balances188

Stewardship Information (Unaudited)

Stewardship Investments191
Non-Federal Physical Property.....192
Human Capital.....192
Research and Development192

Appendixes

A. Significant Government Entities.....195
B. Material Weaknesses Reported by Auditors and Federal Managers’ Financial
Integrity Act (FMFIA) Tables199
C. Government Corporations Required to Submit Audited Financial Statements to OMB207
D. Accountability of Tax Dollars Act Agencies Required to Submit Audited Financial
Statements to OMB209
E. Selected Components of CFO Act Agencies Required to Submit Audited Financial
Statements to OMB213
F. Compliance with the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996.....215
G. Acronyms217

Government Accountability Office Auditor’s Report221

List of Social Insurance Charts

Chart 1	OASDI Beneficiaries per 100 Covered Workers, 1970-2084.....	155
Chart 2	OASDI Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures, 1970-2084	156
Chart 3	OASDI Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures as a Percent of Taxable Payroll, 1970-2084	157
Chart 4	OASDI Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures as a Percent of GDP, 1970-2084.....	158
Chart 5	Total Medicare (HI and SMI) Expenditures and Noninterest Income as a Percent of GDP, 1970-2084.....	162
Chart 6	Medicare Part A Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures, 1970-2084	163
Chart 7	Medicare Part A Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures as a Percent of Taxable Payroll, 1970-2084	164
Chart 8	Medicare Part A Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures as a Percent of GDP, 1970-2084.....	165
Chart 9	Medicare Part B and Part D Premium and State Transfer Income and Expenditures, 1970-2084.....	166
Chart 10	Medicare Part B and Part D Premium and State Transfer Income and Expenditures as a Percent of GDP, 1970-2084.....	167
Chart 11	Estimated Railroad Retirement Income (Excluding Interest and Financial Interchange Income) and Expenditures, 2010-2084	174
Chart 12	Estimated Railroad Retirement Income (Excluding Interest and Financial Interchange Income) and Expenditures as a Percent of Tier II Taxable Payroll, 2010-2084	175
Chart 13	Estimated Black Lung Income and Expenditures (Excluding Interest), 2011-2040.....	178
Chart 14	Estimated Unemployment Trust Fund Cashflow Using Expected Economic Conditions, 2011-2020	180
Chart 15	Unemployment Trust Fund Solvency as of September 30, 2010.....	182

This page is intentionally blank.


**CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO THE
2010 FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT**

A Citizen's Guide to the Fiscal Year 2010 Financial Report of the United States Government

OVERVIEW

The Citizen's Guide to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 Financial Report of the U.S. Government presents the Nation's financial position and condition of the U.S. Government and discusses key financial topics, including continuing economic recovery efforts and fiscal sustainability.

Despite the severe economic downturn and recession that began at the end of 2007, the instability of the financial markets in 2008, and the necessary measures taken to help the economy recover in 2008 and 2009, the economy began to grow again in FY 2010. After falling by 2.7 percent during FY 2009, real Gross Domestic Product (GDP)¹ rose at an average annual rate of 3.2 percent over the four quarters of FY 2010; the economy added 691,000 private nonfarm payroll jobs during FY 2010, after losing 6.3 million private jobs from private nonfarm payrolls during FY 2009. Increased Federal tax receipts and a decline in outlays resulted in a narrowing of the primarily cash-based U.S. budget deficit from \$1.4 trillion to \$1.3 trillion in FY 2010 while net operating cost increased significantly from \$1.3 trillion to \$2.1 trillion due in large part to increased estimated costs for federal employee and veteran benefits. See *'Where We Are Now'*, p. iv.




Some Government programs act as “automatic stabilizers,” helping to support the economy during a downturn by increasing spending and reducing tax collections. This support is “automatic” because increased spending on programs like unemployment benefits, Social Security, and Medicaid and a reduction in tax receipts happen even without any legislative changes in policies. These automatic

¹ Real GDP measures the value of final goods and services produced in the economy, adjusted for changes in the overall price level (i.e., for inflation).

stabilizers had caused deficits and net operating costs to surge in recent years, but should decline as the economy recovers.

Policies enacted to foster economic recovery, including the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA), the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (EESA), and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act or ARRA), continue to affect the Government’s financial position. Implementation of these and other initiatives represent unprecedented efforts to stabilize the financial markets, jump-start the Nation's economy, and create or save millions of jobs. Already, the Government and the taxpayer have begun to see returns on some of these investments as evidenced by substantial repayments made under the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP). *See ‘The Economic Recovery Effort’, p. vii.*

While the Government’s immediate priority is to continue to foster economic recovery, there are longer term fiscal challenges that must ultimately be addressed. Persistent growth of health care costs and the aging of the population due to the retirement of the “baby boom” generation and increasing longevity will make it increasingly difficult to fund critical social programs, including notably Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Chart 2 shows this growing gap between receipts and total spending, indicating that, as currently structured, the Government's fiscal path cannot be sustained indefinitely (see Chart 2). *See ‘Where We Are Headed’ p. viii.*



This Guide highlights important information contained in the *2010 Financial Report of the United States Government*. The Secretary of the Treasury, Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and Acting Comptroller General of the United States believe that the information discussed in this Guide is important to all Americans.

Where We Are Now


The Economy

The economy began to grow again during FY 2010, after emerging in FY 2009 from the longest and deepest recession since World War II. Although the residential homebuilding sector slumped further during much of fiscal year 2010, nonresidential investment and consumer spending increased. The economy began adding jobs consistently in January 2010, and during FY 2010, added 691,000 private nonfarm payroll jobs (after losing 6.3 million private jobs from private nonfarm payrolls during the previous fiscal year). Overall inflation turned positive over the course of the year, as energy prices increased, but remained well in check, reflecting persistent slack in the economy. The core inflation rate (which excludes food and energy) remained positive, but slowed to half the rate of the previous fiscal year. Real wages rose, but at a much slower pace than in FY 2009, due to the combination of slower nominal wage growth and rising consumer prices. The level of corporate profits increased in FY 2010 over the previous fiscal year, though on a quarterly basis, profits rose faster during the first half of the fiscal year than the latter half. Federal tax receipts rose and spending growth declined, such that in FY 2010, the budget deficit narrowed to \$1,294 billion or 8.9 percent of GDP. The economy continued to receive significant support during the fiscal year by a wide variety of measures implemented under the Recovery Act, which authorizes the Government to spend \$787 billion towards stimulating domestic demand.

What Came In and What Went Out


What came in? Total Government revenues (calculated using a modified cash basis of accounting) remained relatively unchanged, increasing by just over \$18 billion to remain at about \$2.2 trillion in FY 2010 as the economy continues to recover. Chart 3 shows that corporate tax revenue rebounded during FY 2010, increasing by nearly 40 percent, after decreasing by more than 50 percent during FY 2009. However, in dollar terms, the \$49.3 billion corporate tax increase and a slight increase in other tax revenue was partially offset

by a slight decrease (2.4 percent or \$42.1 billion) in personal income tax revenue to keep total revenues relatively stable. Together, personal and corporate taxes accounted for about 86 percent of total revenues.



What went out? To derive its net cost (\$4.3 trillion in FY 2010), the Government subtracts revenues earned from Government programs (e.g., Medicare premiums, National Park entry fees, and postal service fees) from its gross costs. Chart 4 shows that the largest contributors to the Government's net cost in recent years consistently include the Departments of Health and Human Services (HHS) and Defense (DoD) and the Social Security Administration (SSA). The bulk of HHS and SSA costs are attributable to major social insurance and postemployment benefits programs administered by those agencies. Similarly, much of DoD's costs are also associated with its Military Retirement Fund, as well as its current operations. In fact, across the Government, just the change in actuarial and other estimated costs associated with the change in estimated postemployment benefit, accounted for more than \$538 billion or 62 percent of the total change in the Government's net cost of \$861.3 billion

for FY 2010. Further, the long-term nature of these costs and their sensitivity to a wide range of complex assumptions can, in some cases, cause significant fluctuation in agency and Governmentwide costs from year to year. Chart 4 shows that this has been the case at VA in its administration of veterans benefit programs where an actuarial cost decrease of more than \$480 billion in FY 2009 was followed by a \$373 billion increase in FY 2010. At VA and other agencies that administer postemployment benefit programs, these fluctuations are attributable to an array of assumptions and variables including interest rates, inflation, beneficiary eligibility, life expectancy, and cost of living. As such, in FY 2010, a new Federal accounting standard² requires agencies to separately identify the gains and losses associated with changes in assumptions and use a more standardized approach to calculate them.



Finally, Chart 4 shows that the Treasury Department’s administration of many of the recently implemented economic recovery programs makes it another significant contributor to total Government costs. Altogether, the agencies reflected in Chart 4 account for nearly three-fourths of total Government net cost.

To arrive at the Government’s “bottom line” net operating cost, the Government subtracts taxes and other revenues (Chart 3) from its net cost. A nearly 25 percent increase in net cost, combined with relatively constant revenues of \$2.2 trillion, translated into two-thirds increase in the Government’s “bottom line” net operating cost from \$1.3 trillion in FY 2009 to \$2.1 trillion in FY 2010.

Cost vs. Deficit: What’s the Difference?

The *Budget of the United States Government* (President’s Budget) is the Government’s primary financial planning and control tool. It describes how the Government spent and plans to spend the public’s money, comparing receipts, or cash received by the Government, with outlays, or payments made by the Government to the public.

Dollars in Billions	2010	2009
Net Operating Cost	\$ (2,080.3)	\$ (1,253.7)
Change in:		
Liabilities for Veteran's Compensation	\$ 223.8	\$ (149.2)
Liabilities for Military and Civilian Employee Benefits	\$ 279.3	\$ 114.0
Liabilities for Government Sponsored Enterprises	\$ 268.0	\$ 78.1
Downward Reestimate for TARP	\$ 86.4	\$ (110.0)
Other, Net	\$ (71.3)	\$ (96.3)
Budget Deficit	\$ (1,294.1)	\$ (1,417.1)

Source: Statements of Reconciliations of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit

Outlays are measured primarily on a cash basis and receipts are measured on a purely cash basis. The *Financial Report of the United States Government* (Financial Report) reports on the Government’s accrual-based costs, the sources used to finance those costs, how much the Government owns and owes, and the outlook for fiscal sustainability. It compares the Government’s revenues, or amounts that the Government has collected and expects to collect, but has not necessarily received, with its costs (recognized when owed, but not necessarily paid) to derive net operating cost. Together, the President’s Budget and the Financial Report present a complementary perspective on the Nation’s financial health and provide a valuable decision-making and management tool for the country’s

² Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standard 33, *Pensions, Other Retirement Benefits, and Other Postemployment Benefits: Reporting the Gains and Losses from the Changes in Assumptions and Selecting Discount Rates and Valuation Dates.*

leaders. Table 1 on the previous page shows that, for FY 2010, the major differences between deficit and cost are amounts reported in the Financial Report for anticipated changes in amounts the Government will owe for Federal employee and veteran benefits, as well as anticipated future investments in Government Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs), specifically Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.


What We Own and What We Owe

Chart 5 is a summary of what the Government owns in assets and what it owes in liabilities. As of September 30, 2010, the Government held about \$2.9 trillion in assets, comprised mostly of net property, plant, and equipment (\$828.9 billion in FY 2010) and a combined total of \$942.5 billion in net loans receivable and investments. During FY 2010, the Government's total assets increased by \$215.9 billion, due mostly to a nearly \$100 billion increase in net loans receivable and investments.

As indicated in Chart 5, the Government's largest liabilities are: (1) Federal debt held by the public and accrued interest, the balance of which increased from \$7.6 trillion to \$9.1 trillion during FY 2010 due primarily to the continued need to fund the budget deficit, and (2) Federal employee postemployment and veteran benefits payable, which increased during FY 2010, from \$5.3 trillion to \$5.7 trillion.

In addition to debt held by the public, the Government reports about \$4.6 trillion of intragovernmental debt outstanding, which arises when one part of the Government borrows from another. It represents debt held by Government funds, including the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, which are typically required to invest any excess annual receipts in Federal debt securities. Because these amounts are both liabilities of the Treasury and assets of the Government trust funds, they are eliminated in the consolidation process for the Governmentwide financial statements. The sum of debt held by the public and intragovernmental debt equals gross Federal debt (\$13.7 trillion as of September 30, 2010), which (with some adjustments) is subject to a statutory ceiling (i.e., the debt limit). As of September 30, 2010, the debt limit was \$14.3 trillion, having been raised multiple times in recent years.


If budget deficits continue to occur, the Government will have to borrow more from the public. Instances where the debt held by the public increases faster than the economy for extended periods can pose additional challenges. The remainder of this Guide examines these and other indicators of the challenges the Government will face in maintaining long-term fiscal sustainability.



The Economic Recovery Effort

Since the financial crisis in 2008, the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), and other U.S. Government bodies have taken actions to help stabilize financial markets and pave the way for sustained economic recovery.

The Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA) established the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA), to regulate the housing Government-Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs), including Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. HERA also authorized the Treasury Department to provide financial support for the housing GSEs through such programs as the Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreements (SPSPA) program, which provides that the Government will make funding advances to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac as needed to ensure that the GSEs have sufficient assets to support their liabilities; and the GSE-guaranteed mortgage-backed securities (MBS) purchase program (which was terminated as of December 31, 2009). As of September 30, 2010, Treasury's cumulative payments to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were \$85.1 billion and \$63.1 billion, respectively and a combined \$359.9 billion has been accrued as a contingent liability. Under the MBS program, Treasury has purchased approximately \$225.5 billion of MBS, and has received back \$75 billion in principal and interest. These efforts have helped bring down mortgage rates to historically low levels and provide liquidity to housing markets.



The Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (EESA) created the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) and provided the Secretary of the Treasury with the authorities and facilities necessary to help restore liquidity and stability to the U.S. financial system and help ensure that such authorities are used in a manner that protects home values, college funds, retirement accounts, and life savings; preserves homeownership; promotes jobs and economic growth; maximizes overall returns to taxpayers; and provides public accountability. EESA provided authority for TARP to purchase or guarantee up to \$700 billion in troubled assets. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act reduced cumulative authority to \$475 billion, in line with expected investment amounts.

Many of the investments under TARP, particularly those aimed at stabilizing banks through the Capital Purchase Program, have delivered positive returns for taxpayers. In addition, Treasury is beginning to recover investments in the auto industry, and American International Group (AIG) has announced a restructuring plan, which, if completed as announced, will accelerate the company's timeline for repaying the Federal Government. Chart 6 shows how TARP's net investments have changed during FY 2010. Since TARP's inception on October 8, 2008 through September 30, 2010, Treasury has disbursed \$387.7 billion in direct loans and investments under TARP. Over half (\$204.1 billion) of those funds has been repaid, and the investments have generated \$27.8 billion from cash received through interest and dividends, as well as proceeds from the sale and repurchase of assets in excess of cost. As of September 30, 2010, TARP had \$179.2 billion in gross outstanding direct loans and equity investments, valued at \$142.5 billion.

Due to the inherent uncertainty in the assumptions used in estimating TARP valuations, the ultimate cost of TARP investments is also subject to uncertainty, and will depend on, among other things, how the economy, financial markets, and particular companies perform. Additional information concerning the TARP program and other related initiatives can be found at www.financialstability.gov.

Improvement in the economic and financial outlook since the spring of 2009 reflects a broad and aggressive policy response that included the HERA and TARP initiatives and programs, other financial stability policies implemented by the FDIC and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, accommodative monetary policy, and the Recovery Act. Readers may find the most up-to-date information on where and how Recovery Act funds are being used at www.recovery.gov


Where We Are Headed

An important purpose of the Financial Report is to help citizens and policymakers assess whether current fiscal policy is sustainable and, if it is not, the urgency and magnitude of policy reforms necessary to make it sustainable. A sustainable policy is one where the ratio of debt held by the public to GDP (the debt-to-GDP ratio) is stable in the long run. Sustainability concerns only whether long-run revenues and expenditures are in balance; it does not concern fairness or efficiency implications of the reforms necessary to achieve sustainability.

To determine if current fiscal policies are sustainable, the projections in this report assume current policies will be sustained indefinitely and draw out the implications for the growth of public debt as a share of GDP. The projections are therefore neither forecasts nor predictions. If policy changes are enacted, perhaps in response to projections like those presented here, then the projections will of course prove to be untrue.

The Primary Deficit, Interest, and the Debt

The primary deficit – the difference between non-interest spending and receipts – is the only determinant of the ratio of public debt to GDP that the Government controls directly. (The other determinants are interest rates and growth in GDP). Chart 2 on page iii and Chart 7 both show receipts, non-interest spending, and the difference – the primary deficit – expressed as a share of GDP. The primary deficit-to-GDP ratio grew rapidly in 2008 and 2009 due to the financial crisis and the recession, and the policies pursued to combat both, and is projected to fall rapidly to near zero in the next few years as the economy recovers. After 2020, the primary deficit-to-GDP ratio is projected to increase, reaching 2 percent in 2030 and remaining at or above 1.8 percent through the end of the 75-year projection period and beyond.



The revenue share of GDP fell substantially in 2009 and 2010 because of the recession and tax reductions enacted as part of the Recovery Act and is projected to return to near its long-run average as the economy recovers and the Recovery Act tax cuts expire. After the economy is fully recovered, receipts are projected to grow slightly more rapidly than GDP as increases in real incomes cause a larger share of income to fall into higher individual income tax brackets.

The projected increase in non-interest spending as a percent of GDP is principally due to growth in spending for Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.³ Between 2017 when the projected primary deficit is about zero and 2035


³ The 2010 Medicare Trustees Report projects that, with enactment of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), the Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund will remain solvent until 2029 under current law – 12 years longer than was projected in the 2009 Trustees Report. The projected share of scheduled benefits that can be paid from trust fund income is 85 percent in 2029, declines to about 77 percent in 2050, and then increases to 89 percent in 2084. The Social Security Trust Funds also face a long-run shortfall. Under current law, the OASDI Trust Funds are projected to be exhausted in 2037 and the projected share of scheduled benefits payable from trust fund income is 78 percent in 2037 and 75 percent in 2084. There is uncertainty about whether the projected reductions in health care cost growth, based on current law, will be fully achieved.

when the non-interest spending share of GDP plateaus, these expenditure categories account for essentially all of the increase in the ratio of non-interest spending to GDP. These spending increases reflect rapid aging of the population as the baby boom generations retire, as well as rising health care costs. After 2035, it is projected that continued increases in longevity will cause the population to become still older, but at a very gradual pace.

The primary deficit projections in Chart 7, along with those for interest rates and GDP, determine the projections for the ratio of debt held by the public to GDP that are shown in Chart 8. That ratio was 62 percent at the end of fiscal year 2010, and under current policy is projected to exceed 70 percent in 2020, 130 percent in 2040, and 350 percent in 2085.

Continued aging of the population due to increasing longevity will place upward pressure on the debt-to-GDP ratio beyond 75 years if there is no change in policy.

Chart 8 also shows the 2009 Financial Report projection of debt held by the public as a percent of GDP. The 2010 projection is lower than the 2009 projection in every year of the projection period almost entirely as a result of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), which is projected to significantly lower Medicare spending and raise receipts. As discussed in the Financial Report, there is uncertainty about whether the projected cost reductions in health care cost growth will be fully achieved.



The Fiscal Gap and the Cost of Delaying Policy Reform

It is estimated that preventing the debt-to-GDP ratio from rising over the next 75 years would require running primary surpluses over the period that average 0.5 percent of GDP. This compares with an average primary deficit of 1.9 percent of GDP under current policy. The difference, the “75-year fiscal gap,” is 2.4 percent of GDP.

Closing the 75-year fiscal gap requires some combination of expenditure reductions and revenue increases that amount to 2.4 percent of GDP on average over the next 75 years. The timing of such changes has important implications for the well-being of future generations. For example, it is estimated that the magnitude of reforms necessary to close the 75-year fiscal gap is 50 percent larger if reforms are concentrated into the last 55 years of the 75-year period than if they are spread over the entire 75 years.

Conclusion

The United States took a potentially significant step towards fiscal sustainability in 2010 by enacting the ACA. The legislated changes for Medicare, Medicaid, and other parts of the health care system hold the prospect of lowering the long-term growth trend for health care costs and significantly reducing the long-term fiscal gap. But even with the new law, the debt-to-GDP ratio is projected to increase continually over the next 75 years and beyond if current policies are kept in place, which means current policies are not sustainable. Subject to the important caveat that policy changes not be so abrupt that they slow the economy’s recovery, the sooner policies are put in place to avert these trends, the smaller are the revenue increases and/or spending decreases necessary to return the Nation to a sustainable fiscal path.

While this Report’s projections of expenditures and receipts under current policies are highly uncertain, there is little question that current policies cannot be sustained indefinitely.

Looking Ahead

The Nation continues to face extraordinary financial and fiscal challenges. Signs of progress are already evident as Treasury and the Government as a whole have initiated an array of efforts to foster continued economic recovery. Realizing the true return on those efforts requires perseverance and patience. However, even as the Government continues its current efforts to foster economic growth, it cannot lose sight of the long-term fiscal challenges associated with its social insurance programs. The Nation must bring social insurance expenses and resources into balance before the deficit and debt reach unprecedented heights. Delays will only increase the magnitude of the reforms needed and will place more of the burden on future generations. While there is still more work to be done and both near- and long-term challenges remain, the Federal Government has already accomplished a great deal during this fiscal year and anticipates continued progress in the years to come.

Find Out More

You will find more detail on the issues discussed in this Guide in the *2010 Financial Report of the United States Government*, issued by the U.S. Department of the Treasury. The Report provides a comprehensive view of both the Government's current financial position and prospects for moving forward. It further discusses the steps the Federal Government has taken to restore stability in the U.S. financial system and the fiscal challenges of the future. The issues discussed in the Citizens' Guide and the *Financial Report* affect, and should be of interest to, every citizen. The *Financial Report's* comprehensive reporting is intended to inform and support the decision-making needs of lawmakers and the public and to help keep the United States on solid financial ground.

You are encouraged to explore the information the Report contains and to ask questions about how the Government manages taxpayers' money. The *2010 Financial Report of the United States Government* and other information about the Nation's finances are available at:

- U.S. Department of the Treasury's Financial Management Service, <http://www.fms.treas.gov/fr/index.html>;
- OMB's Office of Federal Financial Management, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/financial/index.html>; and
- GAO, <http://www.gao.gov/financial.html>.

This Citizen's Guide highlights information in the 2010 Financial Report. The Government Accountability Office's (GAO) complete audit report on the U.S. Government's consolidated financial statements can be found beginning on page 221 of the Financial Report. GAO disclaimed an opinion on the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance (SOSI) because of significant uncertainties (discussed in note 26 in the Financial Report) primarily related to the achievement of projected reductions in Medicare cost growth reflected in the 2010 SOSI. However, GAO issued an unqualified or 'clean' opinion on the 2009, 2008, and 2007 SOSIs. In addition, certain material financial reporting control weaknesses and other limitations on the scope of its work prevented GAO from expressing an opinion on the remaining FY 2010 and 2009 financial statements in the Financial Report.

Government's Financial Position and Condition

The Financial Report of the U.S. Government (Report) provides the President, Congress, and the American people a comprehensive view of how the Federal Government is managing taxpayer dollars. It discusses the Government's financial position and condition, its revenues and costs, assets and liabilities, and other responsibilities and commitments, as well as important financial issues that affect the Nation and its citizens both now and in the future.

The following table presents several key indicators of the Government's financial position and condition, which are discussed in greater detail in the Report.

NATION BY THE NUMBERS		
A Snapshot of		
The Government's Financial Position & Condition		
billions of dollars	2010	2009
Gross Costs	\$ (4,472.3)	\$ (3,735.6)
Earned Revenues	\$ 309.2	\$ 300.9
Gain / (Loss) from Assumptions	\$ (132.9)	n/a
Net Cost	\$ (4,296.0)	\$ (3,434.7)
Total Taxes and Other Revenues	\$ 2,216.5	\$ 2,198.4
Other	\$ (0.8)	\$ (17.4)
Net Operating Cost	\$ (2,080.3)	\$ (1,253.7)
Assets:	\$ 2,883.8	\$ 2,667.9
Less: Liabilities, comprised of:		
Debt Held By the Public	\$ (9,060.0)	\$ (7,582.7)
Federal Employee & Veteran Benefits	\$ (5,720.3)	\$ (5,283.7)
Other	\$ (1,576.3)	\$ (1,257.4)
Total Liabilities	\$ (16,356.6)	\$ (14,123.8)
Net Position (Assets Minus Liabilities)	\$ (13,472.8)	\$ (11,455.9)
Sustainability Measures:		
Statement of Social Insurance:¹		
Closed Group (current participants) ²	\$ (43,058)	\$ (52,145)
Open Group (current + future participants) ³	\$ (30,857)	\$ (45,878)
Social Insurance as Percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)⁴:		
Closed Group (current participants)	-5.1%	-6.6%
Open Group (current + future participants)	-3.7%	-5.8%
Budget Results		
Unified Budget Deficit	\$ (1,294.1)	\$ (1,417.1)
<small>1 Present value of projected revenues and expenditures for scheduled benefits over the next 75 years of certain benefit programs that are referred to as Social Insurance (e.g., Social Security, Medicare). Not considered liabilities on the balance sheet.</small>		
<small>2 Includes current participants (i.e., receiving and/or are eligible to receive benefits) for the Social Security and Medicare programs ages 15 and over at the start of the 75-year projection period, except for the 2007 Medicare programs for which current participants are assumed to be at least 18 years of age at the start of the 75-year projection period.</small>		
<small>3 Includes all current and future projected participants over the 75-year projection period.</small>		
<small>4 Social Insurance values as reported in the Statement of Social Insurance. GDP values from the 2010 Social Security and Medicare Trustees Reports represent the present value of GDP over the 75 year projection period.</small>		

This page is intentionally blank.

MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

The fiscal year (FY) 2010 *Financial Report of the United States Government (Report)* provides the President, Congress, and the American people with a comprehensive view of the Federal Government's finances, i.e., its financial position and condition, its revenues and costs, assets and liabilities, and other obligations and commitments. The Report also discusses important financial issues and significant conditions that may affect future operations. This year's Report gives particular emphasis to two key issues: the Government's ongoing efforts to strengthen the economy and create jobs, and the need to achieve fiscal sustainability over the medium and long term.

Pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 331(e)(1), the Department of the Treasury must submit the Report, which is subject to audit by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), to the President and Congress no later than six months after the September 30 fiscal year end. To encourage timely and relevant reporting, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) accelerated both individual agency and governmentwide reporting deadlines.

The Report is prepared from the audited financial statements of specifically designated Federal agencies, including the Cabinet departments and many smaller, independent agencies (see organizational chart on the next page). GAO issued, as it has for the past thirteen years, a "disclaimer" of opinion on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2010 and 2009. Additionally, GAO issued a disclaimer of opinion on the 2010 and 2006 Statement of Social Insurance (SOSI). A disclaimer of opinion indicates that sufficient information was not available for the auditors to determine whether the reported financial statements were fairly presented. GAO issued unqualified opinions on the 2009, 2008, and 2007 Statements of Social Insurance. In FY 2010, 28 of the 35 most significant agencies earned unqualified opinions on their financial statement audits.¹

The FY 2010 *Financial Report* consists of:

- Management's Discussion and Analysis (MD&A), which provides management's perspectives on and analysis of information presented in the Report, such as financial and performance trends;
- Principal financial statements and the related footnotes to the financial statements;
- Supplemental and Stewardship Information; and
- GAO's Audit Report.

In addition, the Government has produced a Citizen's Guide to provide the American taxpayer with a quick reference to the key issues in the Report and an overview of the Government's financial position and condition.


Mission & Organization

The Government's fundamental mission is derived from the Constitution: ***"...to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."*** The Congress authorizes and agencies implement programs as missions and initiatives evolve over time in pursuit of key public services and objectives, such as providing for national defense, promoting affordable health care, fostering income security, boosting agricultural productivity, providing veteran benefits and services, facilitating commerce, supporting housing and the transportation systems, protecting the environment, contributing to the security of energy resources, and helping States provide education.

Exhibit 1 provides an overview of how the U.S. Government is organized.

¹ The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA), and the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation (FCSIC) are among the 35 significant entities. However, because these entities operate on a calendar year basis (December 31 year end), their 2010 audits are not yet complete.

Exhibit 1



The Government's Financial Position and Condition

A complete assessment of the Government's financial or fiscal condition requires analysis of historical results, projections of future revenues and expenditures, and an assessment of the Government's long-term fiscal sustainability. As discussed later in this Report and as summarized in Table 1, the Government's financial statements show its financial position at the end of the fiscal year, explain how and why the financial position changed during the year, and provide insight into how the Government's financial condition may change in the future.

In particular, the Statement of Social Insurance (SOSI) compares the actuarial present value of the Government's estimated expenditures for future scheduled benefits for Social Security, Medicare, and other social insurance programs over a 75-year period to a subset of the revenues that support these programs (e.g., the payroll taxes and revenue from taxation of benefits that support Social Security and Medicare Part A and premiums, but not the general revenues that support Medicare Parts B and D). Expected expenditures for other major programs (including defense, Medicaid, and education), future tax revenues, and the net cost of the Government's ongoing economic recovery efforts will also affect the Government's future fiscal condition. The sustainability of social insurance and other major programs is discussed below in the section "The Long-Term Fiscal Outlook: Where We Are Headed".

The natural starting point for assessing the Government's long-term financial condition is its current financial position, both in dollar terms and in relation to the economy as a whole. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) measures the size of the Nation's economy in terms of the total value of all final goods and services that are produced in a year. Considering financial results relative to GDP serves as a useful indicator of the economy's capacity to sustain the Government's many programs. For example:

Dollars in Billions	2010	2009
Gross Cost	\$ (4,472.3)	\$ (3,735.6)
Less: Earned Revenue	\$ 309.2	\$ 300.9
(Loss)/Gain from Changes in Assumptions ¹	\$ (132.9)	n/a
Net Cost of Operations	\$ (4,296.0)	\$ (3,434.7)
Less: Taxes and Other Revenue:	\$ 2,216.5	\$ 2,198.4
Unmatched Transactions & Balances	\$ (0.8)	\$ (17.4)
Net Operating Cost²	\$ (2,080.3)	\$ (1,253.7)
Assets³:		
Cash & Other Monetary Assets	\$ 428.6	\$ 393.2
Loans Receivable and Investments, Net ⁴	\$ 942.5	\$ 843.3
Property, Plant & Equipment, Net	\$ 828.9	\$ 784.1
Other	\$ 683.8	\$ 647.3
Total Assets	\$ 2,883.8	\$ 2,667.9
Liabilities³:		
Federal Debt Held by the Public	\$ (9,060.0)	\$ (7,582.7)
Federal Employee & Veterans Benefits	\$ (5,720.3)	\$ (5,283.7)
Other	\$ (1,576.3)	\$ (1,257.4)
Total Liabilities	\$ (16,356.6)	\$ (14,123.8)
Net Position (Assets minus Liabilities)	\$ (13,472.8)	\$ (11,455.9)
Social Insurance Net Expenditures⁵:		
Social Security (OASDI)	\$ (7,947)	\$ (7,677)
Medicare (Parts A, B, & D)	\$ (22,813)	\$ (38,107)
Other	\$ (97)	\$ (94)
Total Social Insurance Net Expenditures	\$ (30,857)	\$ (45,878)
Social Insurance Net Expenditures as a % of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)⁶		
Social Security (OASDI)	-0.9%	-1.0%
Medicare (Parts A, B, & D)	-2.7%	-4.8%
Other	0.0%	0.0%
Total Net Expenditures as % of GDP	-3.7%	-5.8%

1 Separate reporting of these amounts was initially required in FY 2010.

2 Source: Statements of Operations and Change in Net Position.

3 Source: Balance Sheet

4 Includes Loans Receivable and Mortgage-Backed Securities, Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) Investments, and Investments in Government-Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs).

5 Source: Statements of Social Insurance (SOSI). Amounts equal estimated present value of projected revenues and expenditures for scheduled benefits over the next 75 years of certain 'Social Insurance' programs (Social Security, Medicare Parts A, B, & D, Railroad Retirement - Black Lung is projected through 2040). Amounts reflect 'Open Group' totals (all current and projected program participants during the 75-year projection period).

6 Social Insurance values as reported in the Statement of Social Insurance. GDP values from the 2010 Social Security and Medicare Trustees Reports represent the present value of GDP over the 75-year projection period.

Note: totals may not equal sum of components due to rounding.

- Government primarily cash-based outlays of \$3.5 trillion, net of receipts of \$2.2 trillion (approximately 24 percent and 15 percent of GDP, respectively) yielded a unified budget deficit for FY 2010 of slightly under \$1.3 trillion.²
- The Government borrows from the public to finance the gap between cash-based outlays and receipts and to finance certain cash transactions that are not reflected in the deficit. For FY 2010, debt held by the public, including accrued interest totaled approximately \$9.1 trillion (62 percent of GDP).
- Social insurance programs and Medicaid continue to represent a large share of Government cash-based expenditures. As reported in the Statement of Social Insurance (SOSI), over the next 75 years, the present value of expenditures for OASDI, Medicare (parts A, B, and D), Railroad Retirement, and Black Lung, are, absent policy changes, projected to exceed dedicated receipts for these programs by almost \$31 trillion (nearly 3.7% of GDP over the 75-year period)³; a \$15 trillion decline from net expenditures of \$46 trillion projected in the 2009 Report. Much of this decrease is attributable to estimated effects of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) on the Medicare program. Medicare Parts B and D are primarily financed by general revenues. By accounting convention, general revenues are eliminated in consolidation at the governmentwide level and, as such, are not included in this calculation.

Fiscal Year 2010 Financial Statement Audit Results

For FY 2010, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a disclaimer of audit opinion on the accrual-based Governmentwide financial statements for the fourteenth consecutive year. In addition, GAO issued a disclaimer of opinion on its audit of the 2010 and 2006 Statement of Social Insurance (SOSI). GAO had issued unqualified opinions on the 2009, 2008, and 2007 SOSI. GAO disclaimed an opinion on the 2010 SOSI because of significant uncertainties (discussed in note 26), primarily related to the achievement of projected reductions in Medicare cost growth reflected in the 2010 SOSI.

Twenty of the 24 agencies required to issue audited financial statements under the Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act received unqualified audit opinions (Table 2), as did eight of 11 additional significant reporting agencies, as listed in Appendix A.

Table 2: Summary of FY 2010 Financial Statement Audit Results by Agency

CFO Act Agencies	FY 2010 Audit Opinion
Department of Agriculture (USDA)	Unqualified
Department of Commerce (DOC)	Unqualified
Department of Defense (DOD)	Disclaimer
Department of Education (Education)	Unqualified
Department of Energy (DOE)	Unqualified
Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)	Unqualified*
Department of Homeland Security (DHS)**	Disclaimer
Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Unqualified
Department of the Interior (DOI)	Unqualified
Department of Labor (DOL)	Disclaimer
Department of Justice (DOJ)	Unqualified
Department of State (State)	Unqualified
Department of Transportation (DOT)	Unqualified
Department of the Treasury (Treasury)	Unqualified
Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)	Unqualified
Agency for International Development (USAID)	Unqualified
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Unqualified
General Services Administration (GSA)	Unqualified
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)	Qualified
National Science Foundation (NSF)	Unqualified
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)	Unqualified
Office of Personnel Management (OPM)	Unqualified
Small Business Administration (SBA)	Unqualified
Social Security Administration (SSA)	Unqualified

* HHS received a disclaimer of opinion on its 2010 Statement of Social Insurance.

** DHS' Balance Sheet and Statement of Custodial Activity were the only statements subject to audit.

² Final Monthly Treasury Statement (as of September 30, 2010).

³ The Black Lung program is projected through 2040.

The Governmentwide Reporting Entity

These financial statements cover the three branches of the Government (legislative, executive, and judicial). Legislative and judicial branch reporting focuses primarily on budgetary activity. Executive branch entities, as well as the Government Printing Office and U.S. Capitol Police (legislative branch agencies) are required, by law, to prepare audited financial statements. Some other legislative branch entities voluntarily produce audited financial reports.

A number of entities and organizations are excluded due to the nature of their operations, including the Federal Reserve System (considered to be an independent central bank under the general oversight of Congress), all fiduciary funds, and Government-Sponsored Enterprises, including the Federal Home Loan Banks, the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae), and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac). The Government increased its investment in the recovery effort in FY 2009 under the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act (EESA), which gave the Secretary of the Treasury temporary authority to purchase and guarantee assets from a wide range of financial institutions. Following U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) for Federal entities, the Government has not consolidated into its financial statements the assets, liabilities, or results of operations of any financial organization or commercial entity in which Treasury holds either a direct, indirect, or beneficial majority equity investment. Even though some of the equity investments are significant, the entities in which the Federal Government holds equity investments meet the criteria under paragraph 50 of the Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts (SFFAC) No. 2, which directs that such investments should not be consolidated into the financial reports of the Federal Government, either in part or as a whole. However, the investments in these entities and any related liabilities are recorded in the financial statements. A list of the significant agencies and entities contributing to this report is included in Appendix A.⁴

Limitations of the Financial Statements

The principal financial statements have been prepared to report the financial position and results of operations of the Federal Government and the financial condition of its social insurance programs, pursuant to the requirements of 31 U.S.C. § 331(e)(1). These statements are in addition to the financial reports used to monitor and control budgetary resources that are prepared from the same books and records.

The following pages contain a more detailed discussion of the Government's financial results for FY 2010, the budget, the economy, the debt, the Government's ongoing economic recovery efforts, and a long-term perspective about fiscal sustainability, including the Government's ability to meet its social insurance benefits obligations. The information in this Report, when combined with the President's Budget, collectively provides a valuable tool for managing current operations and planning future initiatives.

The President's Budget and The Financial Report

Each year, the Administration issues two reports that detail financial results for the Federal Government: the *President's Budget*, which provides a plan for future initiatives and the resources needed to support them, as well as prior year fiscal and performance results; and this *Financial Report*, which provides the President, Congress, and the American people a broad, comprehensive overview of the cost on an accrual basis of the Government's operations, the sources used to finance them, its balance sheet, and the overall financial outlook.

Treasury generally prepares the financial statements in this Report on an "accrual basis" of accounting as prescribed by GAAP for Federal entities.⁵ These principles are tailored to the Government's unique characteristics and circumstances. For example, agencies prepare a uniquely structured "Statement of Net Cost," which is intended to present net Government resources used in its operations. Also, unique to Government is the preparation of

⁴ Since programs are not administered at the governmentwide level, performance goals and measures for the federal Government, as a whole, are not reported here. The outcomes and results of those programs are addressed at the individual agency level and can be found in each agency's financial report.

⁵ Under GAAP, most U.S. Government revenues are recognized on a 'modified cash' basis, or when they become measurable. The Statement of Social Insurance presents the present value of the estimated future revenues and expenditures for scheduled benefits over the next 75 years for the Social Security, Medicare, Railroad Retirement programs; and through 2040 for the Black Lung program.

separate statements to reconcile differences and articulate the relationship between the budget and financial accounting results.

President's Budget	Financial Report of the U.S. Government
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Prepared primarily on a "cash basis"</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiative-based and prospective: focus on current and future initiatives planned and how resources will be used to fund them. • Receipts ("cash in"), taxes and other collections recorded when received. • Outlays ("cash out"), largely recorded when payment is made. 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Prepared on an "accrual and modified cash basis"</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency-based and retrospective – prior and present resources used to implement initiatives. • Revenue: Tax revenue (more than 90 percent of total revenue) recognized on modified cash basis (see Financial Statement Note 1.B). Remainder recognized when earned, but not necessarily received. • Costs: recognized when owed, but not necessarily paid.

Note – See Statements of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities and Reconciliations of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficits.

Budget Deficit vs. Net Operating Cost

As the economy continues along a path of gradual recovery, the Government's primarily cash-based⁶ budget deficit decreased slightly, from \$1.4 trillion to \$1.3 trillion, following significant deficit increases during FY 2008 and especially FY 2009 due to the impacts of the financial crisis and recession and the policy actions taken in response. This increase was attributable in part to Government programs that act as "automatic stabilizers," which help to support the economy during a downturn by increasing spending and reducing tax collections. This support is "automatic" because increased spending on programs like unemployment benefits, Social Security, and Medicaid, and a reduction in tax receipts happen even without any legislative changes in policies. These automatic stabilizers, in addition to recent economic recovery efforts, caused the deficit to surge in recent years. However, the deficit decreased in the past year due to slight increases in cash tax receipts and a decline in outlays.

The Government's largely accrual-based net operating cost (which increased from an already record high of about \$1.3 trillion in FY 2009 to nearly \$2.1 trillion in FY 2010) typically exceeds the deficit due largely to the inclusion of cost accruals such as those for estimated future postemployment benefit liabilities. Table 3 shows the primary differences between the budget deficit and net operating cost in FY 2010. The majority of the differences stem from changes in liabilities associated with the Government's postemployment programs for its military and civilian employees (\$279.3 billion), as well as its veterans (\$223.8 billion). The longer-term actuarial costs of these programs are included in the Government's net operating cost, calculated on an accrual basis as described above, but not in the largely cash-based budget deficit. Agencies and their actuaries estimate their liability for these benefits over the long-term, but funds have yet to actually be spent. As will be discussed further in the following section, a new accounting standard effective for FY 2010 requires agencies to more clearly indicate the impact that changes in assumptions have on their overall net costs. Similarly, Table 3 shows that another significant difference is the \$268 billion increase in estimated long-term liabilities associated with the continued support of Government-Sponsored Enterprises, such as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac under agreements with them.

Dollars in Billions	2010	2009	\$ Change
Net Operating Cost	\$ (2,080.3)	\$ (1,253.7)	\$ (826.6)
Change in:			
Liabilities for Veteran's Compensation	\$ 223.8	\$ (149.2)	\$ 373.0
Liabilities for Military and Civilian Employee Benefits	\$ 279.3	\$ 114.0	\$ 165.3
Liabilities for Government Sponsored Enterprises	\$ 268.0	\$ 78.1	\$ 189.9
Downward Reestimate for TARP	\$ 86.4	\$ (110.0)	\$ 196.4
Other, Net	\$ (71.3)	\$ (96.3)	\$ 25.0
Budget Deficit	\$ (1,294.1)	\$ (1,417.1)	\$ 123.0

Source: Statements of Reconciliations of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit

⁶ Interest outlays on Treasury debt held by the public are recorded in the budget when interest accrues, not when the interest payment is made. For Federal credit programs, outlays are recorded when loans are disbursed, in an amount representing the present value cost to Government (excluding administrative costs), or the credit subsidy cost. Credit programs record cash payments to and from the public in nonbudgetary financing accounts.

The Government's Net Position: "Where We Are"

The Government's financial position and condition have traditionally been expressed through the Budget, focusing on surpluses, deficits, and debt. However, this primarily cash-based discussion of the Government's net outlays (deficit) or net receipts (surplus) tells only part of the story. The Government's accrual-based net position is the difference between its assets and liabilities. The Government's "bottom line" net operating cost is the difference between its revenues and costs.


Revenues and Costs: "What Came In & What Went Out"

The Government's *Statement of Operations and Change in Net Position*, much like a corporation's income statement, shows the Government's "bottom line" and its impact on net position (i.e., assets net of liabilities). The Government nets its costs against both: (1) earned revenues from Government programs (e.g., Medicare premiums, National Park entry fees, and postal service fees) to derive net cost; and (2) taxes and other revenue to arrive at the Government's "bottom line" net operating cost.

Chart A and Table 4 show that the Government has incurred a total net operating cost (i.e., costs have exceeded its revenues) over the past several years, causing net position to decline. In summary, Table 4 shows that during FY 2010, the Government's "bottom line" net operating cost of \$2,080.3 billion increased by two-thirds or \$827 billion over 2009's net operating cost of \$1,253.7 billion. This significant increase was attributable almost entirely to a nearly 25 percent increase in net cost as taxes and other revenues were nearly identical to last year.

The Reconciliation of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit Statement

shows how the Government's net operating cost from the primarily accrual-based financial statements relates to the more widely-known and primarily cash-based budget deficit. As summarized in Table 3 on the previous page, most of this difference is attributable to cost related to changes in the estimated present value of the Federal Government's net postemployment liabilities. The impact of these accrual costs is more evident starting in FY 2010 with the




Dollars in Billions	2010		2009		Increase / (Decrease)	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
Gross Cost	\$ (4,472.3)		\$ (3,735.6)			
(Loss)/Gain from Changes in Assumptions	\$ (132.9)		n/a			
Adjusted Gross Cost*	\$ (4,605.2)		\$ (3,735.6)		\$ 869.6	23.3%
Less: Earned Revenue	\$ 309.2		\$ 300.9		\$ 8.3	2.8%
Net Cost of Operations (Net Cost)	\$ (4,296.0)		\$ (3,434.7)		\$ 861.3	25.1%
Less: Taxes and Other Revenue	\$ 2,216.5		\$ 2,198.4		\$ 18.1	0.8%
Unmatched Transactions and Balances	\$ (0.8)		\$ (17.4)		\$ 16.6	95.4%
Net Operating Cost	\$ (2,080.3)		\$ (1,253.7)		\$ 826.6	65.9%

* Starting in FY 2010, agencies were required to separately display costs attributable to gains/losses from assumption changes associated with postemployment programs. Adjusted Gross Cost is shown separately above to establish a consistent basis of comparison with FY 2009.

issuance of a new federal accounting standard⁷, requiring agencies to explicitly report on gains and losses attributable to changes in actuarial assumptions. These actuarial amounts are presented in Table 4 and discussed further in this section.

Revenue: “What Came In”

The *Statement of Net Cost* reports “earned” revenue generated by Federal programs, including Medicare premiums paid by program participants and postal service fees. The *Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position* shows the Government’s taxes and other revenues (i.e., revenues other than “earned”). As shown in Chart B, at just over \$2.2 trillion, total Government revenues in FY 2010 were nearly identical to FY 2009, increasing by about \$18.1 billion, as the economy continues to recover. Corporate tax revenue rebounded from a more than 50 percent decline in FY 2009 to increase by nearly 40 percent during FY 2010. However, in dollar terms, the \$49.3 billion corporate tax increase and a slight increase in other tax revenue was partially offset by a slight decrease (2.4 percent or \$42.1 billion) in personal income tax revenue to keep total revenues relatively stable. Together, personal and corporate income taxes accounted for more than 86 percent of total revenues in FY 2010.



Cost: “What Went Out”

The *Statement of Net Cost* also shows how much it costs to operate the Federal Government, recognizing expenses when they happen, regardless of when payment is made (accrual basis). It shows the derivation of the Government’s *net cost* or the difference between: (1) the costs of goods produced and services rendered by the Government and (2) the earned revenues generated by those goods and services during the fiscal year. This amount, in turn, is offset against the Government’s taxes and other revenue in the *Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position* to calculate the “bottom line” or *net operating cost*.





Chart C shows the cost trends in the entities that contributed the most to the Government’s total net cost (gross cost less earned revenue) of \$4,296.0 billion in FY 2010 (a 25 percent or \$861.3 billion increase over FY 2009). The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the Department of Defense (DoD), and the Social Security Administration (SSA) have

⁷ Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standard 33, ‘Pensions, Other Retirement Benefits, and Other Postemployment Benefits: Reporting the Gains and Losses from the Changes in Assumptions and Selecting Discount Rates and Valuation Dates.’

consistently incurred the largest agency shares of the Government's total net cost of operations in recent years, combining to comprise almost 60 percent of the Government's FY 2010 total net cost. The bulk of HHS and SSA costs (which totaled \$857.6 billion and \$753.9 billion, respectively in FY 2010) are attributable to major social insurance programs administered by these agencies, e.g., Medicare and Social Security. The *Statement of Social Insurance* (SOSI) and the related information in this report discuss the projected future revenues, expenditures, and future sustainability of these programs in greater detail. DoD costs relate primarily to operational activities and the longer-term costs of military retirement and health benefits. These long-term "actuarial" costs also represented a significant portion of costs at the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), relating to VA's veterans' benefits programs. Chart C also shows the Department of the Treasury as a significant contributor to the Government's net cost in FY 2010, due in large part to costs associated with the ongoing economic recovery efforts discussed later.

As indicated above, the actuarial and other estimated costs associated with the Government's postemployment benefits programs for its military and civilian employees represent a significant portion of total costs for a few select agencies, including VA, DoD, and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). In the aggregate, just the change in actuarial and other estimated costs associated with the change in estimated postemployment benefit liabilities (see Table 3), accounted for more than \$538 billion or 62 percent of the total change in the Government's net cost of \$861.3 billion for FY 2010 (Table 4). As shown in Chart D, actuarial costs typically have their greatest impact at the VA, DoD, and OPM

corresponding to those agencies' administration of the Government's pension and other postemployment benefits programs. These agencies employ a complex series of assumptions, including but not limited to interest rates, inflation, beneficiary eligibility life expectancy, and cost of living to make annual actuarial projections of their long-term benefits liabilities and the related costs. Annual changes in these assumptions can cause those projections, and consequently total costs, to fluctuate, sometimes significantly, from year to year. For example, as illustrated in Chart C, at VA alone, assumption and experience changes resulted in a \$373 billion increase in VA's and the Governmentwide Net Cost, following more than \$480 billion decrease the previous year. The \$373 billion increase for VA reflects an increase in actuarial costs at VA from (\$149.2) billion in FY 2009 to \$223.8 billion in FY 2010 as indicated in Table 3.



As indicated earlier, a new accounting standard not only requires discrete presentation of actuarial gains and losses, but also prompts the use of a more standardized approach to discount rates and valuation dates in an attempt to mitigate the volatility in the effect of these assumptions in recent years. Chart D shows that actuarial gains and losses from changes in assumptions accounted for a net \$132.9 billion of the Government's total net cost and illustrates the varying impact that these assumptions can have. The extent to which normalization occurs will become evident after successive years of use of the new standard.

As noted earlier, taxes and other revenues of \$2,216.5 billion are deducted from the Government's total net cost of \$4,296.0 billion (including actuarial costs) to derive a "bottom line" net operating cost (including a slight adjustment for unmatched transactions and balances as described in the Required Supplementary Information section of this Report). As previously shown in Table 4, the relatively unchanged taxes and other revenues, combined with the nearly 25 percent increase in net costs, resulted in a "bottom line" net operating cost of about \$2.1 trillion (\$2,080.3 billion) for FY 2010, an increase of 66 percent or \$827 billion over the FY 2009 net operating cost of about \$1.3 trillion.

Assets and Liabilities: "What We Own and What We Owe"

As indicated earlier, net position at the end of the year is derived by netting the Government's assets against its liabilities, as presented in the *Balance Sheet* (summarized in Table 5). It is important to note that the balance sheet does not include the financial value of the Government's sovereign powers to tax, regulate commerce, and set monetary policy. It also excludes its control over nonoperational resources, including national and natural resources, for which the Government is a steward. In addition, as is the case with the *Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position*, the *Balance Sheet* includes a separate presentation of the portion of net position earmarked for specific funds and programs. Moreover, the Government's exposures are broader than the liabilities presented on the balance sheet, if such items as the Government's future social insurance exposures (namely, Medicare and Social Security), as well as other commitments and contingencies, are taken into account. These exposures are discussed later in this MD&A section as well as in the supplemental disclosures of this Report.

Assets – "What We Own"

As of September 30, 2010, the Government held about \$2.9 trillion in assets, comprised mostly of net property, plant, and equipment (\$828.9 billion in FY 2010) and a combined total of \$942.5 billion in net loans

receivable and investments, including nearly \$145 billion associated with the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) efforts and \$109 billion in Government-Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs) investments in (GSEs and TARP not shown separately in Table 5). During FY 2010, the Government's total assets increased by \$215.9 billion, due in large part to the nearly \$100 billion increase in Net Loans Receivable and Investments as economic recovery efforts continued. On September 17, 2008, the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve announced the Supplementary Financing Program (SFP) - a temporary program to help the Federal Reserve in funding its authorized expenditures under its liquidity and lending initiatives aimed at addressing the ongoing crisis in financial markets. As of September 30, 2010, \$200 billion or nearly half of the Government's \$428.5 billion cash balance was associated with this program, compared to \$165 billion as of September 30, 2009. In addition to assets recorded on the balance sheet, the Government discloses that it also owns certain other stewardship assets such as land (e.g., national parks and forests) and heritage assets (e.g., national memorials and historic structures).

Liabilities – "What We Owe"


As indicated in Table 5 and Chart E, the Government's largest liability is Federal debt held by the public and accrued interest, the balance of which increased to \$9.1 trillion during FY 2010.

Table 5: Assets and Liabilities

Net Position Dollars in Billions	2010		2009		Increase (Decrease)	
					\$	%
Assets						
Cash & Other Monetary Assets	\$	428.6	\$	393.2	\$	35.4 9.0%
Loans Receivable and Investments, Net*	\$	942.5	\$	843.3	\$	99.2 11.8%
Inventories	\$	286.2	\$	284.6	\$	1.6 0.6%
Property, Plant & Equipment, Net	\$	828.9	\$	784.1	\$	44.8 5.7%
Other	\$	397.6	\$	362.7	\$	34.9 9.6%
Total Assets	\$	2,883.8	\$	2,667.9	\$	215.9 8.1%
Less: Liabilities, comprised of:						
Federal Debt Held by the Public	\$	(9,060.0)	\$	(7,582.7)	\$	1,477.3 19.5%
Federal Employee & Veterans Benefits	\$	(5,720.3)	\$	(5,283.7)	\$	436.6 8.3%
Other	\$	(1,576.3)	\$	(1,257.4)	\$	318.9 25.4%
Total Liabilities	\$	(16,356.6)	\$	(14,123.8)	\$	2,232.8 15.8%
Net Position (Assets Minus Liabilities)	\$	(13,472.8)	\$	(11,455.9)	\$	(2,016.9) -17.6%

*Includes Net Loans Receivable and Mortgage-Backed Securities, Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) Investments, and Investments in Government-Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs).

The other major component of the Government's liabilities is Federal employee postemployment and veteran benefits payable, which increased \$436.6 billion during FY 2010, from \$5,283.7 billion to \$5,720.3 billion. As indicated earlier, this increase was due to increases in future benefit liability estimates made by VA (\$223.8 billion increase), DoD (\$164.2 billion), and OPM and other agencies administering Federal civilian pension plans (\$115.1 billion). OPM administers the largest civilian pension plan, covering nearly 2.8 million current employees⁸ and 2.5 million annuitants.⁹ The military pension plan covers over 3.1 million current military personnel (including active service, reserve, and National Guard) and approximately 2.2 million retirees and annuitants.¹⁰



Federal Debt

The unified budget surplus or deficit is the difference between total Federal spending and receipts (e.g., taxes) in a given year. The Government borrows from the public (increases Federal debt levels) to finance deficits. During a budget surplus (i.e., when receipts exceed spending), the Government typically uses those excess funds to reduce the debt held by the public. *The Statements of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities* reports how the annual unified budget surplus or deficit relates to the Federal Government's borrowing and changes in cash and other monetary assets. It also explains how a budget surplus or deficit normally affects changes in debt balances.

The Government's publicly held debt, or debt held by the public, including accrued interest, totaled approximately \$9.1 trillion at the end of FY 2010 – an increase of nearly \$1.5 trillion. As indicated, typically, budget surpluses have resulted in borrowing reductions, and budget deficits have yielded borrowing increases. However, the Government's debt operations are much more complex than this would imply. Each year, trillions of dollars of debt matures and new debt takes its place. In FY 2010, new borrowings were \$8.5 trillion and repayments of maturing debts held by the public were \$7.1 trillion. Both represented slight decreases over new borrowings and debt repayments for FY 2009, respectively.

Historically, the Government has incurred debt when it borrows from the public to finance budget deficits. The economic recovery efforts of the past two years have precipitated a need to borrow additional funds from the public. However, as will be discussed later, part of this increase has financed investments on which the Government has already made significant recovery.

Debt was held by the public in the form of Treasury securities, such as bills, notes, and bonds, and accrued interest payable. The "public" consists of individuals, corporations, state and local governments, Federal Reserve Banks, foreign governments, and other entities outside the Government. Debt held by the public is a balance sheet liability.

In addition to debt held by the public, the Government has outstanding nearly \$4.6 trillion in intragovernmental debt, which arises when one part of the Government borrows from another. It represents debt issued by the Treasury and held by Government accounts, including the Social Security (\$2.6 trillion) and Medicare (\$350.5 billion) trust

⁸ As of 9/30/2009 OPM Office of Actuaries.


⁹ OPM FY 2010 Annual Financial Report, p. 9.

¹⁰ DoD FY 2010 Agency Financial Report, p. 8; DoD Military Retirement Fund (MRF) financial statements, p. 10.

funds. Intragovernmental debt is primarily held in Government trust funds in the form of special nonmarketable securities by various parts of the Government. Laws establishing Government trust funds generally require excess trust fund receipts (including interest earnings) to be invested in these special securities. Because these amounts are both liabilities of the Treasury and assets of the Government trust funds, they are eliminated as part of the consolidation process for the governmentwide financial statements (see Note 14 of the Report). When those securities are redeemed, e.g., to pay future Social Security benefits, the Government will need to obtain the resources necessary to reimburse the trust funds.

The sum of debt held by the public and intragovernmental debt equals gross Federal debt, which (with some adjustments) is subject to a statutory ceiling (i.e., the debt limit). Prior to 1917, the Congress approved each debt issuance. In 1917, to facilitate planning in World War I, Congress established a dollar ceiling for Federal borrowing. The statutory limit has been increased roughly 100 times since it was established, and always in time to prevent the United States from defaulting on its debt or other statutory obligations. At the end of FY 2010, the amount of debt subject to the limit was \$13.5 trillion, \$783 billion under the current limit. The debt limit has been raised multiple times in recent years. In December 2009, the limit was raised to \$12.4 trillion, and in February 2010, it was increased again to \$14.3 trillion, where it remains as of September 30, 2010. If overall budget deficits continue, the Government will have to borrow more from the public in order to finance program needs and pay interest on debt held by the public. Instances where debt held by the public increases faster than the economy for extended periods can pose additional challenges.

The Federal debt held by the public measured as a percent of GDP compares the country's debt to the size of its economy. Over time, the ratio of Federal debt-to-GDP has varied widely. For most of the Nation's history, the debt to GDP ratio has tended to increase during wartime and decline during peacetime. That pattern continued to hold following World War II until the 1970s. As shown in Chart F, wartime spending and borrowing had pushed the debt to GDP ratio to an all-time high of 109% in 1946, but the ratio came down rapidly in the post-war years.



It fell to 80 percent by 1950 and 46% in 1960. The postwar low point was reached in 1974 at 24 percent. Since then, Federal debt held by the public as a percent of GDP has increased. It grew rapidly from the mid 1970s until the early 1990s. In the 1990s, strong economic growth and fundamental fiscal decisions, including measures to reduce the Federal deficit and implementation of binding "Pay As You Go" ("PAYGO") rules, generated a significant reduction in the debt-to-GDP ratio over the course of the 1990s. From a peak of 49 percent of GDP in 1993-1994, the debt-to-GDP ratio fell to 33 percent in 2001. During the last decade, much of this progress was undone as PAYGO rules were allowed to lapse, significant tax cuts were implemented, and entitlements were expanded. By September 2008, the debt-to-GDP ratio was 40% of GDP. The extraordinary demands of the recent economic and fiscal crisis and ensuing recovery have pushed up debt held by the public to nearly 53 percent in 2009 and 62 percent in 2010.

The preceding section has focused on the financial results for the Federal Government for FY 2010. The following sections discuss the Government's economic recovery efforts and as well as perspective on the issue of fiscal sustainability.

Economic Recovery Efforts

This section provides an overview of the Economy at the end of FY 2010 and discusses the many important recovery efforts that have been initiated by the Department of the Treasury and across the Government.

The Economy in Fiscal Year 2010

A review of the Nation's key macroeconomic indicators can help place the discussion of the Government's financial results in a broader context. As summarized in Table 6, the economy began to grow again during FY 2010, after emerging in FY 2009 from the longest and deepest recession since World War II. During the recession, which began in December 2007 and ended in June 2009, payrolls fell by 7.3 million. Although employment rose during FY 2010, the unemployment rate remained relatively high.

	FY 2010	FY 2009
Real GDP Growth	3.2%	-2.7%
Residential Construction Growth	-5.6%	-21.4%
Average monthly private payroll job change (thousands)	58	-528
Unemployment rate (percent, end of period)	9.6%	9.8%
Consumer Price Index	1.1%	-1.3%
CPI, excluding food and energy	0.8%	1.5%
Treasury constant maturity 10-year rate (end of period)	2.5%	3.3%
Moody's Baa bond rate (end of period).	5.6%	6.2%

*Some FY 2009 data may differ from the FY 2009 Report due to update and revision.

After falling by 2.7 percent during FY 2009, real GDP rose at an annual average rate of 3.2 percent over the four quarters of FY 2010. Quarterly performance was comparatively strong during the first and second quarters of FY 2010, with real GDP rising 5.0 percent and 3.7 percent, respectively. The pace of expansion slowed during the latter half of the fiscal year, and in the final quarter, real GDP grew 2.5 percent at an annual rate. The economy added nearly 691,000 private nonfarm payroll jobs during FY 2010, after losing 6.3 million private jobs during FY 2009. The unemployment rate remained high during FY 2010, edging down from 9.8 percent in September 2009 to 9.6 percent in September 2010. After declining outright in the previous fiscal year, consumer price inflation increased, mostly due to rising energy prices, but remained in check. Underlying inflation (the core rate, excluding food and energy) slowed to roughly half the rate of the previous fiscal year. Real wages rose, but at a much slower pace than the previous fiscal year's strong gains, reflecting the combination of slower nominal wage growth and rising consumer prices. The level of corporate profits rose in FY 2010 after declining in each of the three previous fiscal years, although on a quarterly basis, growth was faster during the first half of the year than the latter half. Federal tax receipts rose and spending growth declined in FY 2010. As a result, the Federal unified budget deficit narrowed to \$1,294 billion, or 8.9 percent of GDP (compared with 10 percent in FY 2009).

The following key points summarize economic performance in FY 2010:

- After falling 0.9 percent in FY 2009, consumer spending advanced 2.0 percent over the four quarters of FY 2010, reflecting a rising pattern of growth over the year, including an increase of 2.8 percent during the final quarter.
- Residential construction fell by 5.6 percent over the four quarters of FY 2010, although in the fiscal year's third quarter, this component surged by nearly 26 percent, as activity increased in connection with the first time homebuyer's tax credit. Nonresidential fixed investment grew 8.3 percent, after declining by almost 18 percent in the previous fiscal year.
- Labor market conditions improved slowly over the course of FY 2010. Nonfarm private payroll employment increased at an average rate of 58,000 jobs per month in 2010, compared with the 528,000 average decline in private payroll jobs per month in FY 2009. During FY 2010, the number of unemployed persons fell from 15.2 million to 14.8 million.

- The pace of job creation or loss fluctuated over the course of the fiscal year; in the first half, total nonfarm payroll employment fell at an average rate of 1,000 jobs per month, versus an average rate of increase of 80,000 jobs per month in the second half, with much of the fluctuation due to movements in temporary Census Bureau jobs related to the 2010 Census.
- The unemployment rate peaked at 10.1 percent in October 2009, a 26-year high, and gradually declined to a low of 9.5 percent in June and July 2010, before edging higher to 9.6 percent during the last two months of the fiscal year, just 0.2 percentage points lower than the rate at the end of FY 2009.
- The overall price level, as measured by the consumer price index (CPI), rose 1.1 percent during FY 2010, as energy prices increased. In FY 2009, the CPI had declined by 1.3 percent, reflecting outright declines in energy prices. Core inflation (which excludes food and energy) remained very well-contained, slowing to 0.8 percent in FY 2010 from 1.5 percent the previous fiscal year.
- Financial markets conditions and measures of financial risk generally remained stable in FY 2010.
 - Corporate debt yields on bonds of moderate risk stood at about 290 basis points above the rate on 10-year Treasury securities at the end of FY 2009. After narrowing to about 240 basis points mid-way through FY 2010, this spread widened again to 305 basis points by the end of the fiscal year.
 - The difference between the 3-month London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR) and the 3-month Treasury rate stood at 15 basis points at the end of FY 2009. After widening to nearly 50 basis points in June, the spread narrowed again, to end the fiscal year at 13 basis points.

The Economic Recovery Effort

In mid-September 2008, the Nation was in the midst of one of the worst financial crises in our history. The economy was contracting sharply. Fear of a possible depression froze markets. Immediate, strong action was needed to avoid a complete collapse of the financial system. The Department of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), and other U.S. Government bodies undertook an array of unprecedented steps at that time to avert a collapse and continue to administer a number of programs to pave the way for sustained economic recovery.

HERA

The Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA) established a new regulatory agency, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA), to regulate the housing Government-Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs),¹¹ Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the Federal Home Loan Banks. FHFA placed Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac under conservatorship in September 2008 in order to preserve GSE assets and restore those GSEs to a sound and solvent financial condition. Pursuant to HERA, the Treasury Department took three additional steps to help ensure the solvency and liquidity of the GSEs:

- entering into senior preferred stock purchase arrangements (SPSPAs) with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac;
- establishing a GSE credit facility; and
- establishing a GSE mortgage-backed securities (MBS) purchase program.

The SPSPAs were designed to instill confidence in investors that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would remain viable entities critical to the functioning of the housing and mortgage markets. These agreements provide that the Government will make funding advances to the GSEs if, at the end of any quarter, the FHFA, acting as the conservator, determines that the liabilities of either GSE, individually, exceed its respective assets. The SPSPAs have helped ensure that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac can continue to fulfill their critical role in the mortgage market by providing liquidity and stabilizing the market.

The maximum amount available to each GSE under this agreement was originally \$100 billion and in May 2009 was raised to \$200 billion. In December 2009, Treasury amended the SPSPAs to replace the existing \$200 billion per GSE funding commitment cap with a formulaic cap for the next three years that will adjust upwards quarterly by the cumulative amount of any losses realized by either GSE and downward by the cumulative amount

¹¹ The housing GSEs (Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the Federal Home Loan Bank System) are chartered by the Federal Government and pursue a federally mandated mission to support housing finance. Some GSEs are distinctly established as corporate entities - owned by shareholders of stock traded on the New York Stock Exchange. The obligations of the housing GSEs are not guaranteed by the Federal Government, however, Treasury's actions under HERA provided significant financial support to the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

of any gains, but not below \$200 billion per GSE, and will become fixed at the end of the three years, December 31, 2012. At the conclusion of the three-year period, the remaining commitment will then be fixed and available to be drawn per the terms of the agreements. As of September 30, 2010, Treasury's cumulative payments to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were \$85.1 billion and \$63.1 billion, respectively, and a combined \$359.9 billion has been accrued as a contingent liability. The losses the GSEs continue to report are largely the result of delinquencies and defaults on loans that were originated and guaranteed in 2006, 2007, and 2008. Less than one percent of losses have come from loans originated in 2009 and 2010.

The U.S. Government's investment in and support of the GSEs through the SPSPAs was structured in such a way that virtually all profits in the companies revert to the Government in the form of dividends on the preferred shares in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. To get a true picture of the Government's exposure in the companies, it is critical to factor in those dividends and net them against the draws that the companies make from Treasury. For instance, while for FY 2010, the GSE's draws exceeded dividends by \$40.5 billion, in the quarter ending September 30, 2010, the Government received more in dividend payments than the companies drew from the Treasury SPSPAs.¹²

The GSE MBS Purchase Program was created to help support the availability of mortgage credit by temporarily providing additional capital to the mortgage market. By purchasing those securities, Treasury has sought to broaden access to mortgage funding for current and prospective homeowners as well as to promote market stability. In total, the Treasury Department purchased MBS worth approximately \$225.5 billion, \$29.9 billion of which were purchased in FY 2010. In total, Treasury has received back \$61.1 billion in principal and \$13.9 billion in interest from MBS holdings. As of September 30, 2010, the valuation of MBS held under HERA programs was \$172.2 billion. This activity, combined with purchases by the Federal Reserve, has helped bring down mortgage rates to historically low levels and provide liquidity and stability to housing markets. The GSE MBS purchase program and GSE credit facility expired on December 31, 2009.

HERA also established the HOPE for Homeowners Program,¹³ which provides another means of helping borrowers faced with foreclosure to refinance through the Federal Housing Administration.

EESA, TARP, and the Office of Financial Stability

The Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (EESA) provided authority and facilities that the Secretary of the Treasury could use to restore liquidity and stability to the financial system of the United States, and ensured that such authority and facilities have been used in a manner that protected home values, college funds, retirement accounts, and life savings; preserved home ownership; promoted jobs and economic growth; maximized overall returns to the taxpayers of the United States; and provided public accountability for the exercise of such authority.

The EESA authorized the establishment of the Office of Financial Stability (Treasury-OFS) within the Office of Domestic Finance of the Treasury Department to implement the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP). TARP, in conjunction with other Federal Government actions, helped to unfreeze capital and credit markets, bringing down the cost of borrowing for businesses, individuals, and state and local governments, restoring confidence in the financial system, and restarting economic growth. TARP did so faster and at a much lower cost than anticipated.

The EESA provided authority for the TARP to purchase or guarantee up to \$700 billion in troubled assets. Treasury-OFS used this authority to help strengthen the U.S. financial system, restore health and liquidity to credit markets to facilitate borrowing by consumers and businesses, and prevent avoidable foreclosures in the housing market. In December 2009, the Secretary of the Treasury certified the extension of TARP authority from its original termination date of December 30, 2009 until October 3, 2010. The Secretary identified two principal objectives for the extension of TARP — to preserve capacity to respond to unforeseen threats to financial stability and to address continuing challenges — and indicated that Treasury-OFS did not expect to use more than \$550 billion of the \$700 billion authorized by Congress. In July 2010, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act reduced the cumulative authority to \$475 billion. Many of the investments under the program, particularly those aimed at stabilizing banks, have thus far delivered positive returns for taxpayers.

Due to improved market conditions, lower utilization of the program, and careful stewardship, the expected cost of TARP over its lifetime continues to decline on a budget basis, from \$341 billion in the August 2009 Mid-session

¹² Department of the Treasury FY 2010 Performance and Accountability Report, p. 21.

¹³ HOPE for Homeowners is a voluntary program for the refinancing of distressed loans by providing Federal Housing Administration insurance for refinanced loans that meet certain eligibility requirements. Both borrower and lender must agree to participate in the program.


Review of the President's 2010 Budget (assuming the full \$700 billion of TARP was utilized) to \$117 billion in the FY 2011 President's Budget released in February 2010 (assuming \$546 billion of \$700 billion TARP authority was utilized), to possibly less than \$50 billion, if a proposed restructuring of AIG, as mentioned below, is completed as announced. Under the proposed restructuring, Treasury would receive 1.1 billion shares of AIG common stock in exchange for its TARP investment. This cost is based on the October 1, 2010 market price, but actual proceeds from any future sale would be based on the market price at the time of sale, which could differ materially from the October 1, 2010 market price. Treasury would receive an additional 563 million shares from the trust established by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY). It should be noted that the budget-basis lifetime cost of TARP differs from the cost reflected in the financial statements in that lifetime costs assume that all planned expenditures are made, whereas financial statement costs are based only on transactions through September 30, 2010. As such, the cost of TARP since inception as reported in the financial statements was \$18.5 billion, consisting of \$23.1 billion of reported TARP net income for FY 2010 and \$41.6 billion of reported net cost for FY 2009.

Chart G shows how TARP's net investments have changed during FY 2010. Since its inception through September 30, 2010, Treasury disbursed \$387.7 billion in direct loans and investments. Over half (\$204.1 billion) of those TARP funds have been repaid, and the investments generated \$27.8 billion from cash received through interest and dividends, as well as proceeds from the sale and repurchase of assets in excess of cost. As of September 30, 2010, TARP had \$179.2 billion in gross outstanding direct loans and equity investments, valued at \$142.5 billion.

Treasury is moving quickly to recover the Government's investments. The Department aims to dispose of its investments as quickly as practicable, consistent with the duty to promote financial stability and to protect taxpayers' interests.

- Treasury continues to carefully manage TARP assets and has recovered more than 75 percent of TARP funds provided to banks, principally through the Capital Purchase Program (CPP). These capital support programs are expected to deliver returns for taxpayers.
- Treasury is beginning to recover investments in the auto industry. General Motors Company (GM) has repaid its remaining outstanding loan balance and recently agreed to repurchase the preferred stock issued to Treasury. In addition, as a result of GM's initial public offering, in November 2010, Treasury received approximately \$13.5 billion in net proceeds and reduced its equity stake in GM from 60.8 percent to 33.3 percent. The ultimate loss estimate on investments in Chrysler and Ally Financial, Inc (formerly GMAC) is expected to be less than last year.
- The restructuring plan announced by AIG on September 30, 2010, assuming it is completed as announced (closing remains subject to contingencies), will accelerate the timeline for repaying the Federal Government and put taxpayers in a considerably stronger position to recoup Treasury investments in the company. Giving effect to the September 30, 2010, announced restructuring of the AIG investments, including the Treasury's beneficial interest in the AIG Trust, the Treasury would realize a positive return on the AIG investment on a pro forma basis considering the AIG common stock price as of October 1, 2010. On December 8, 2010, the parties entered into a master transaction agreement that supersedes, but does not represent a material departure from, the terms contained in the September 30 AIG restructuring agreement.

Treasury also expanded its housing programs under TARP, launching the Housing Finance Agency (HFA) Innovation Fund for the Hardest Hit Housing Markets (HHF) to help state housing finance agencies provide additional relief to homeowners in the states hit hardest by unemployment and declines in home prices. In addition, Treasury and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) enhanced the FHA Refinance program to



enable homeowners whose mortgages exceed the value of their homes to refinance into more affordable mortgages if their lenders agree to reduce the unpaid principal balance by at least ten percent.

Finally, it should be noted that the TARP cost estimates are only estimates, based on current market prices where available. Since market prices change, such estimates will change. The ultimate cost of the outstanding TARP investments is, therefore, subject to significant uncertainty and will depend on, among other things, how the economy, financial markets, and particular companies perform. Additional information concerning the TARP program and other related initiatives can be found at www.financialstability.gov.

The Recovery Act

Improvement in the economic and financial outlook since the spring of 2009 reflects a broad and aggressive policy response that included the initiatives and programs under HERA and TARP as discussed above, other financial stability policies implemented by the FDIC and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, accommodative monetary policy, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA or the Recovery Act). The purpose of the original \$787 billion ARRA package is to jump-start the economy and to create and save jobs. Approximately one-third of ARRA is dedicated to tax cuts for businesses and working families. Another third goes toward emergency relief for those who have borne the brunt of the recession. The final third is devoted to investments to create jobs, spur economic activity, and lay the foundation for future sustained growth. Cumulative ARRA amounts paid out by Federal agencies as of September 30, 2010 totaled \$307.9 billion, as compared to \$110.7 billion as of September 30, 2009.¹⁴ It is important to note that amounts spent by the Federal, State, and Local government agencies, as well as by the private sector are constantly changing. Readers may find the most up-to-date information on where and how these funds are being used at www.recovery.gov

The Long-Term Fiscal Outlook: “Where We Are Headed”

While the Government's immediate priority is to continue to foster economic recovery, there are longer term fiscal challenges that must ultimately be addressed. Persistent growth of health care costs and the aging of the population due to the retirement of the 'baby boom' generation and increasing longevity will make it increasingly difficult to fund critical social programs, including Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Fiscal Sustainability

An important purpose of the Financial Report is to help citizens and policymakers assess whether current fiscal policy is sustainable and, if it is not, to highlight the urgency and magnitude of policy reforms necessary to make it sustainable. A sustainable policy is one where the ratio of debt held by the public to Gross Domestic Product (the debt-to-GDP ratio) is stable in the long run. Sustainability concerns only whether long-run revenues and expenditures are in balance; it does not concern fairness or efficiency implications of the reforms necessary to achieve sustainability.

To determine if current fiscal policies are sustainable, the projections discussed here assume current policies will be sustained indefinitely and draw out the implications for the growth of debt held by the public as a share of GDP. The projections are therefore neither forecasts nor predictions. If policy changes are enacted, perhaps in response to projections like those presented here, then the projections will of course prove to be untrue.

The projections in this Report indicate that the trajectory of current policy is not sustainable. If current policies are kept in place indefinitely, the debt to GDP ratio is projected to exceed 350 percent in 2085 and to rise continuously thereafter. Closing the gap between spending and receipts over the next 75 years (the “75-year fiscal gap”) is estimated to require some combination of spending reductions and revenue increases that amount to 2.4 percent of GDP over the period. While the precise size of the fiscal gap is highly uncertain, there is little question that current fiscal policies cannot be sustained indefinitely.

It is important to address the Nation's fiscal imbalances soon. Delaying action increases the magnitude of spending reductions and/or revenue increases necessary to stabilize the debt-to-GDP ratio. For example, it is


¹⁴ Agency Financial & Activity Reports as of September 30, 2010 and 2009. For more information, see the Recovery Act website at www.Recovery.gov.

estimated that the magnitude of reforms necessary to close the 75-year fiscal gap is 50 percent larger if reforms are concentrated into the last 55 years of the 75-year period than if they are spread over the entire 75 years.


The estimates of the cost of policy delay in this Report assume policy does not affect GDP. Reducing deficits too abruptly would be counterproductive if it slows the economy's recovery. In the near term, it is crucial to strike the proper balance between deficit reduction and economic growth.

The Primary Deficit, Interest, and Debt

The primary deficit - the difference between non-interest spending and receipts - is the only determinant of the ratio of debt to GDP that the Government controls directly. (The other determinants are interest rates and growth in GDP). Chart H shows receipts, non-interest spending, and the difference - the primary deficit - expressed as a share of GDP. The primary deficit-to-GDP ratio grew rapidly in 2008 and 2009 due to the financial crisis and the recession, and the policies pursued to combat both, and is projected to fall rapidly to near zero as the economy recovers. After 2020, the primary deficit-to-GDP ratio is projected to increase, reaching 2 percent in 2030 and remaining at or above 1.8 percent through the end of the 75-year projection period and beyond.



The revenue share of GDP fell substantially in 2009 and 2010 because of the recession and tax reductions enacted as part of the Recovery Act and is projected to return to near its long-run average as the economy recovers and the Recovery Act tax cuts expire. After the economy is fully recovered, receipts are projected to grow slightly more rapidly than GDP as increases in real incomes cause a larger share of income to fall into higher individual income tax brackets. These projections assume that Congress and the President will continue to enact legislation to prevent the share of income subject to the Alternative Minimum Tax from rising.





The projected increase in non-interest spending as a percent of GDP is principally due to growth in spending for Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. As shown in Chart I, the Social Security and Medicare spending shares of GDP are each projected to increase about

1-1/2 percentage points over the next 25 years as the baby boom generation retires. After 2035, the projected Social Security spending share of GDP is relatively steady, while the projected Medicare spending share of GDP continues to increase, albeit at a slower rate, due to projected increases in health care costs. The Medicaid spending share of GDP is also projected to rise over time for the same reasons.

The primary deficit projections in Chart H, along with those for interest rates and GDP, determine the projections for the ratio of debt to GDP that are shown in Chart J. That ratio was 62 percent at the end of fiscal year 2010 and under current policy is projected to exceed 70 percent in 2020, 130 percent in 2040, and 350 percent in 2085. Continued aging of the population due to increasing longevity will place upward pressure on the debt-to-GDP ratio beyond 75 years if there is no change in policy.

Chart J also shows the 2009 Financial Report projection of the debt to GDP ratio. The 2010 projection is lower than the 2009 projection in every year of the projection period almost entirely as a result of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), which is projected to significantly lower Medicare spending and raise receipts. Further, as discussed in Note 26, there is uncertainty about whether the projected reductions in health care cost growth will be fully achieved. Note 26 includes an alternative projection to illustrate the uncertainty of projected Medicare costs.

The change in debt held by the public from one year to the next is essentially equal to the unified budget deficit, the difference between total spending (which consists of non-interest spending plus interest spending) and total receipts. Chart K shows that the rapid rise in total spending and the unified deficit is almost entirely due to projected interest payments on the debt. Interest spending was 1.4 percent of GDP in 2010 and under current policies is projected to reach 5 percent in 2030 and 19 percent in 2085.



The Fiscal Gap and the Cost of Delaying Policy Reform

It is estimated that preventing the debt-to-GDP ratio from rising over the next 75 years would require running primary surpluses over the period that average 0.5 percent of GDP. This compares with an average primary deficit of 1.9 percent of GDP under current policy. The difference, the “75-year fiscal gap,” is 2.4 percent of GDP.

Table 7 illustrates the cost of delaying policy to close the fiscal gap by comparing three policies closing the fiscal gap that begin on different dates. The first policy begins immediately; it increases the primary surplus by 2.4 percent of GDP in every year between 2011 and 2085. This is accomplished by invoking some combination of spending reductions and revenue increases that amounts to an average of 2.4 percent of GDP in every year. The

second policy shown in Table 7 begins in 2021. Because debt grows unabated between 2010 and 2020 and the same fiscal

Period of Delay	Change in Average Primary Surplus
No Delay: Reform in 2011	2.4 percent of GDP between 2011 and 2085
Ten Years: Reform in 2021	2.9 percent of GDP between 2021 and 2085
Thirty Years: Reform in 2031	3.7 percent of GDP between 2031 and 2085

consolidation must be squeezed into ten fewer years, the primary surplus must increase by 2.9 percent of GDP in every year between 2021 and 2085 in order to close the 75-year fiscal gap. Similarly, beginning the policy change in 2031 requires that the primary surplus increase by 3.7 percent of GDP in every year between 2031 and 2085 in order to close the 75-year fiscal gap. The difference between the primary surplus boost starting in 2021 and 2031 (2.9 and 3.7 percent of GDP, respectively) and the primary surplus boost starting in 2011 (2.4 percent of GDP) is a measure of the additional burden policy delay would impose on future generations. Future generations are harmed by policy delay because the higher is the primary surplus during their lifetimes the greater is the difference between the taxes they pay and the programmatic spending they benefit from.

Conclusion

The United States took a potentially significant step towards fiscal sustainability in 2010 by enacting the ACA. The legislated changes for Medicare, Medicaid, and other parts of the health care system hold the prospect of lowering the long-term growth trend for health care costs and significantly reducing the long-term fiscal gap. But even with the new law, the debt-to-GDP ratio is projected to increase continually over the next 75 years and beyond if current policies are kept in place, which means current policies are not sustainable. Subject to the important caveat that policy changes are not so abrupt that they slow the economy's recovery, the sooner policies are put in place to avert these trends, the smaller are the revenue increases and/or spending decreases necessary to return the Nation to a sustainable fiscal path.

While this Report's projections of expenditures and receipts under current policies are highly uncertain, there is little question that current policies cannot be sustained indefinitely.

These and other issues concerning fiscal sustainability are discussed in further detail in the Supplemental Information section of this Report.

Statement of Social Insurance – A Current Look at a Possible Future

For the “social insurance” programs -- Social Security, Medicare, Railroad Retirement, and Black Lung - the Statement of Social Insurance (SOSI) reports: (1) the actuarial present value of all future program revenue (mainly taxes and premiums) - excluding interest - to be received from or on behalf of current and future participants; (2) the estimated future scheduled expenditures to be paid to or on behalf of current and future participants; and (3) the difference between (1) and (2). Amounts reported in the SOSI and in the supplemental information in this report are based on each program's official actuarial calculations. By accounting convention, the general revenues are eliminated in the consolidation of the financial statements at the governmentwide level and as such, the general revenues that are used to finance Medicare Parts B and D are not included in these calculations even though the expenditures on these programs are included.

The SOSI provides perspective on the Government's long-term estimated exposures and costs for social insurance programs. Table 8 summarizes amounts reported in the SOSI. From Table 8, net social insurance expenditures are projected to be approximately \$31 trillion as of January 1, 2010 for the “Open Group”, a decline

from net expenditures of \$46 trillion projected in the 2009 Report.¹⁵ Much of this decrease is attributable to estimated effects of the ACA on the Medicare program. As discussed in Note 26, there is uncertainty about whether the projected reductions in health care cost growth will be fully achieved. While these expenditures are not considered Government liabilities, they do have the potential to become expenses and liabilities in the future, based on the continuation of the social insurance programs' provisions contained in current law.

The social insurance trust funds account for all related program income and expenses. Medicare and Social Security taxes, premiums, and other income are credited to the funds; fund disbursements may only be made for benefit payments and program administrative costs. Any excess revenues are invested in special non-marketable U.S. Government securities at a market rate of interest. The trust funds represent the accumulated value, including interest, of all prior program surpluses, and provide automatic funding authority to pay for future benefits.

The retirement of the “baby boom generation” and increases in health care costs are still anticipated to have a prolonged impact on the long-run financial condition of Medicare and Social Security, which is analyzed annually in the Medicare and Social Security Trustees' Reports. According to the Medicare Trustees' Report, the projected Medicare costs have decreased from last year's projection because of program changes made in the ACA. Under current law, including the assumption of the full implementation of ACA program changes, spending on Medicare is projected to rise from its pre-recession level of 3.2 percent of GDP to 5.5 percent in 2035 and 6.4 percent in 2084. The Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund is now expected to remain solvent until 2029, 12 years longer than was projected in the prior year, after which point tax income is estimated to be sufficient to pay 85 percent of benefits, declining to 77 percent in 2050 and then increasing to 89 percent by 2084.

As for Social Security (the Old Age Survivors and Disability Insurance Trust Funds or OASDI), combined spending is projected to rise from 4.8 percent of GDP in 2009 to 6.1 percent in 2035, before retreating to 5.9 percent in 2050. The Social Security Trustees' Report indicates that annual OASDI income, including interest on trust fund assets, will exceed annual cost and trust fund assets will increase every year until 2025, at which time it will be necessary to begin drawing down on trust fund assets to cover part of expenditures until assets are exhausted in 2037. After trust fund exhaustion, continuing tax income would be sufficient to pay 78 percent of scheduled benefits in 2037 and 75 percent in 2084.¹⁶ Given that revenues for these programs are not projected to rise over time as a share of GDP, it is apparent that these programs are on a fiscally unsustainable path (as was previously discussed). Additional information from the Trustees Reports may be found in the Supplemental Information section of this Report.

Dollars in Billions	2010		2009		Increase / (Decrease)		
					\$	%	
Open Group (Net):							
Social Security (OASDI)	\$	(7,947)	\$	(7,677)	\$	270	4%
Medicare (Parts A, B, & D)	\$	(22,813)	\$	(38,107)	\$	(15,294)	-40%
Other	\$	(97)	\$	(94)	\$	3	3%
Total Social Insurance Expenditures, Net (Open Group)	\$	(30,857)	\$	(45,878)	\$	(15,021)	-33%
Total Social Insurance Expenditures, Net (Closed Group)	\$	(43,057)	\$	(52,145)	\$	(9,088)	-17%
Social Insurance Net Expenditures as a % of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)*							
Open Group		2010		2009			
Social Security (OASDI)		-0.9%		-1.0%			
Medicare (Parts A, B, & D)		-2.7%		-4.8%			
Other		0.0%		0.0%			
Total (Open Group)		-3.7%		-5.8%			
Total (Closed Group)		-5.1%		-6.6%			

Source: Statement of Social Insurance (SOSI). Amounts equal estimated present value of projected revenues and expenditures for scheduled benefits over the next 75 years of certain 'Social Insurance' programs (e.g., Social Security, Medicare). 'Open Group' totals reflect all current and projected program participants during the 75-year projection period. 'Closed Group' totals reflect only current participants.

* GDP values from the 2010 & 2009 Social Security and Medicare Trustees Reports represent the present value of GDP over the 75 years. As the GDP used for Social Security and Medicare differ slightly in the Trust Fund Reports, the two values are averaged to estimate the Total Net Expenditures as % of GDP.

¹⁵ 'Closed' Group and 'Open' Group differ by the population included in each calculation. From the SOSI, the 'Closed' Group includes: (1) participants who have attained eligibility and (2) participants who have not attained eligibility. The 'Open' Group adds future participants to the 'Closed' Group. See 'Social Insurance' in the Supplemental Information section in this report for more information.

¹⁶ A Summary of the 2010 Annual Social Security and Medicare Trust Fund Reports, pp. 10-11.

As indicated earlier, GAO disclaimed an opinion on the 2010 SOSI, because of significant uncertainties (discussed in note 26), primarily related to the achievement of projected reductions in Medicare cost growth reflected in the 2010 SOSI.

Systems, Controls, and Legal Compliance

Systems

As Federal agencies demonstrate success in obtaining and keeping an unqualified opinion on their audited financial statements, the Federal Government continues to face challenges in implementing financial systems that meet Federal requirements, but progress has been made. The number of agencies reporting compliance with the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act (FFMIA) in FY 2010 remains at 17, and the number of auditors reporting compliance with FFMIA remains at 14 (see Appendix F). The annual compliances reported each year underscores the importance of current initiatives to standardize the financial management practices across the Federal Government.

Controls

Federal managers have a fundamental responsibility to develop and maintain effective internal control. Effective internal controls help to ensure that programs are managed with integrity and resources are used efficiently and effectively through three objectives: effective and efficient operations, reliable financial reporting, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. The safeguarding of assets is a subcomponent of each objective.

The OMB Circular No. A-123, *Management's Responsibility for Internal Control*, is the policy document that implements the requirements of 31 U.S.C. 3512 (c), (d) (commonly known as the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act or FMFIA). Circular No. A-123 primarily focuses on providing agencies with a framework for assessing and managing risks more strategically and effectively. The Circular contains multiple appendices that address, at a more detailed level, one or more of the objectives of effective internal control. Appendix A provides a methodology for agency management to assess, document, test, and report on internal controls over financial reporting. Appendix B requires agencies to maintain internal controls that reduce the risk of fraud, waste, and error in Government charge card programs. Appendix C implements the requirements of the Improper Payments Information Act, which includes the measurement, reporting, and remediation of improper payments.

In addition to the FY 2010 agency financial statement audit results, the total number of material weaknesses decreased from 38 to 31 and the total number of repeat material weaknesses decreased from 29 to 26. Improvements were made in the controls over the financial statement preparation process, Property, Plant, and Equipment reporting, and liability reporting. Effective internal controls are a challenge not only at the agency level, but also at the governmentwide level. GAO reported that at the governmentwide level, material weaknesses resulted in ineffective internal control over financial reporting. While progress is being made at many agencies and across the Government in identifying and resolving internal control deficiencies, continued diligence and commitment are needed.

Legal Compliance

Federal agencies are required to comply with a wide range of laws and regulations, including appropriations, employment, health and safety, and others. Responsibility for compliance primarily rests with agency management. Compliance is addressed as part of agency financial statement audits. Agency auditors test for compliance with selected laws and regulations related to financial reporting. Certain individual agency audit reports contain instances of noncompliance. None of these instances were material to the Government-wide financial statements. However, GAO reported that its work on compliance with laws and regulations was limited by the material weaknesses and scope limitations discussed in its report.

Financial Management Progress and Priorities

The Office of Federal Financial Management (OFFM) within the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is responsible for the Federal Government's financial management policy and manages governmentwide financial management priorities. As required in the Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act (31 U.S.C. 3512), OMB is required to provide an annual report on the status of federal financial management and the goals for improvement.¹⁷ This section summarizes recent progress and outlines several key initiatives intended to achieve improved results moving forward.

Progress To Date

Since the passage of the CFO Act of 1990, the Federal financial community has made important strides in instilling strong accounting and financial reporting practices. Over the past 20 years, an increasing number of Federal agencies have initiated and sustained disciplined and consistent financial reporting operations, implemented effective internal controls around financial reporting, and have successfully integrated transaction processing and accounting records. These efforts have resulted in improved results on financial statement audits, with 20 out of the 24 major "CFO Act" agencies achieving a clean opinion in FY 2010. In addition, the number of auditor-identified material weaknesses stands at 31, a more than 50 percent decline from the 61 material weaknesses that were identified at the start of this past decade.

The foundations for the accomplishments achieved over the past 20 years are numerous. In particular, and as envisioned by OMB Circular A-123, *Management's Responsibility for Internal Control*, the Federal financial management community approached these reporting challenges holistically, integrating both programmatic and financial management disciplines in building successful financial reporting programs. Given the size and complexity of the programs and transactions involved, these results would not have been possible without the advances in Federal financial management.

Ongoing Challenges

Despite the progress identified above, critical gaps in financial management performance remain. Weaknesses in basic financial management practices continue to prevent four major agencies, and the Government as a whole, from achieving a clean audit opinion. The cost of maintaining effective financial operations is increasing, driven largely by the growing and high costs agencies are incurring to modernize agency financial systems. While Federal agencies have mobilized resources to meet the new and growing demand for real-time transparency into where recovery-related and other Federal dollars are going, more work is necessary to sustain these solutions in a cost-effective manner over the long term. Federal agencies reported approximately \$125 billion in improper payments in FY 2010 and continue to maintain thousands of unneeded real property assets on their books. These instances of Government waste compromise the integrity of Federal programs, lead to damaging inefficiencies, and erode citizens' trust in Government.

Improvement Initiatives

It has never been more vital that the Government's financial managers are performing at high levels to meet these challenges and are maximizing the return on every dollar invested in financial management activities. To do so, three areas emerge as the optimal priority areas for the Federal financial management community:

- **Eliminating Waste** – Efforts to cut Government waste should be prioritized through renewed focus and emphasis on eliminating improper payments, removing unneeded real property from the Government's books, and strengthening the audit framework for Federally-funded State and local activities.

¹⁷ The CFO Act requires OMB to submit to Congress an annual "financial management status report," the relevant components of which are included in this Financial Report. Specifically, the "Financial Management Progress and Priorities" section of the MD&A updates and outlines the financial management priorities and planned actions associated with these priorities. Also, specific data on the results of Federal agency financial management efforts (e.g., audit results, material weakness totals, etc.) are included in the Other Accompanying Information Section of this Financial Report.

- **Closing the Efficiency and Technology Gap in Financial Operations** – Expensive and long-term investments in technology solutions to support financial reporting and accounting must be reconsidered in favor of shorter-term, lower cost, and easier to manage solutions that meet critical business needs, drive operational efficiency, and leverage shared service solutions where cost-effective.
- **Promoting Accountability and Innovation through Open Government** – Efforts should be directed towards improving the content and quality of currently reported information to provide better value to taxpayers and Government decision-makers. Further, solutions must be developed and deployed in partnerships that extend beyond the borders of the Federal financial management community, to involve Federal and State stakeholders, and most critically, members of the public.

Eliminating Waste

- *Addressing Improper Payments.* The Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (IPIA) created a framework for assessing every Federal program and dollar for risk of improper payments, annually measuring the accuracy of payments, and initiating improvements to ensure that errors are reduced and eliminated. Addressing improper payments is a central component of Administration efforts to eliminate waste. Over the past year, the President has issued Executive Order 13520 on Reducing Improper Payments, a Presidential memorandum on intensifying and expanding agency efforts to recapture improper payments, and a Presidential memorandum directing that a Do Not Pay List be established to help prevent improper payments from being made to ineligible recipients. In addition, the President also signed into law the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act, which amends IPIA. While agencies are currently implementing these initiatives, we are starting to see early results. Based on information submitted by agencies in their FY 2010 Performance and Accountability Reports, the Government-wide error rate is 5.49 percent, a decrease from the FY 2009 rate of 5.65 percent or \$3.8 billion less in estimated improper payments. In addition, agencies recaptured \$687 million in improper payments to contractors and vendors in FY 2010, an approximately 300 percent increase from FY 2009. More information on agency improper payments and the Administration's improper payment initiatives can be found at PaymentAccuracy.gov.
- *Accelerating Efforts to Better Manage Federal Real Property.* The Administration is focused on improving the management of real property assets. It supports creating incentives to dispose of unneeded Federal real property, including the incentive for all Federal agencies to retain net proceeds from the sale of excess property. On June 10, 2010, the President signed a memorandum on *Disposing of Unneeded Federal Real Estate—Increasing Sales Proceeds, Cutting Operating Costs, and Improving Energy Efficiency*, which directed Federal agencies to accelerate efforts to remove excess and surplus property. This effort is expected to produce billions of dollars in cost savings through reducing annual operating costs, reducing square footage through space realignment efforts such as consolidating existing space within owned buildings and reflecting the impact of telework on properties, as well as through the proceeds retained through the sale of a building. To date, Federal agencies have identified \$1.7 billion of the \$3 billion in non-defense savings opportunities that the President has required agencies to achieve by the end of FY 2012.
- *Improving Grants Management.* Each year, the Federal Government provides over \$500 billion in grants to State, local and tribal governments, colleges and universities, and other non-profit organizations—roughly one-sixth of the Federal budget. In 2009, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) authorized an additional \$275 billion in grants to recipients through new ARRA programs and existing programs. In 2009, OFFM initiated and completed a pilot project for early review of and reporting on internal controls for major ARRA programs using the Single Audit process, as required under OMB Circular A-133. In 2010, OFFM continues the Phase 2 of the project for fiscal year 2010 single audits. OMB also requires the agencies to review the audit findings and highlight the high risk areas along agency corrective action plans. This process, along with other efforts to strengthen A-133, is intended to mitigate instances of fraud, waste, abuse, and improper payments in Federal grant programs. OFFM also committed to working with the grants community to make the grant process efficient and citizen-friendly through streamlining grant applications and reports and modernizing the grants system, Grants.gov.

Closing the Efficiency and Technology Gap in Financial Operations

- *Decreasing the Cost of Financial System Modernizations.* Complexity and inefficiency in our financial management operations has led to an increasingly expensive environment for modernizing financial systems. Also, once deployed, our modern systems do not consistently meet our business needs or produce the right information to support decision-making. In June, OMB froze activity on agency financial system plans pending their immediate review and approval. To date, a total of 20 agencies have reviewed and aligned their financial

system plans through splitting projects into smaller, simpler segments with clear deliverables; focusing on the most critical business needs first; and ensuring ongoing, transparent project oversight. As a result, agencies are more focused on their core business priorities while still being held accountable for demonstrating results. Not only have these reviews helped to change how government does business, they have also helped to reduce budget costs. In addition, several high-risk projects were identified during the reviews, which will be under close scrutiny and subject to intense oversight to include continued review by OMB, in consultation with the Financial Systems Advisory Board. Additional next steps include the establishment of Customer Control Boards that will help to organize agencies that are leveraging similar solutions. This will allow the agencies to pool resources, share strategies, and organize solutions across the Government in an effort to support the combined interests of agencies to modernize at a pace and scope that fits their individual business needs.

- *Implementing Common Solutions for Financial Management Functions:* Existing and new capabilities are being evaluated to automate and centrally implement financial management activities. For example, through a common electronic vendor invoicing solution, it is possible to input vendor invoice data rather than manually keying the information into a financial system. The Treasury Department will identify and pilot potential solutions to capture vendor invoices. In addition, Treasury is also working aggressively to identify electronic solutions to assist with intragovernmental transactions.

Promoting Accountability and Innovation through Open Government

- *Improving Data Quality for Federal Spending Information.* Ensuring the quality of Federal spending information has been central to OMB's efforts in implementing the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act. In December 2009, the Administration established the Open Government Directive (M-10-06), which required each agency take specific steps to ensure that data is reported quickly, efficiently, and accurately. The Directive further required agencies to designate a senior official to be accountable for the quality, objectivity of, and internal controls over, Federal spending information publicly disseminated through USAspending.gov. The Open Government Directive was quickly followed by the Data Quality Framework in February, which provides specific guidance on data quality plans as they relate to Federal spending data. Pursuant to this guidance, Federal agencies developed these specific data quality plans that outline a governance structure, risk assessment process, governing principles and controls, communications, and monitoring of Federal spending information. This framework heavily relies on agencies' existing internal control programs as required under OMB Circular A-123. Agencies are required to modify and enhance internal controls over Federal spending data to meet the changing environment of disseminating more information to the public at a quicker pace. In April and August 2010, OMB issued guidance to Federal agencies on improving information quality and required the reporting of grants and contracts sub-award information. Both prime Federal contractors and prime Federal grant recipients are required to report sub-award information, for display into USAspending.gov. Access to both prime and now sub-award data offers the public with unprecedented amounts of information on Federal spending. This increased transparency will ensure that the Federal Government is held fully accountable for the administration of Federal programs. Notwithstanding these accomplishments, efforts must continue to address existing and burgeoning data quality concerns. Informed by stakeholder input and recommendations, OMB and Federal agencies will work to ensure that high quality Federal spending information is available to promote accountability and ultimately be used to improve the performance of our Federal programs.
- *Partnering For Solutions.* The Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation (Partnership Fund) was established by the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-117) to fund pilot projects to improve delivery of Federal assistance programs administered through state and local governments or where Federal-state cooperation could be beneficial. Funding supports pilots and evaluations of promising innovations that confront these challenges in Federal, state and/or local administration. Partnership Fund pilots advance four goals:
 - improve payment accuracy;
 - improve administrative efficiency;
 - improve service delivery;
 - reduce access barriers for eligible beneficiaries.

OMB is actively working with a Collaborative Forum of federal agencies, state and local administrators, industry and other stakeholders to identify pilot opportunities that could inform the expansion of innovations to other state or local agencies as well as further potential administrative or legislative action to facilitate these goals. In aggregate, pilots must save at least as much as they cost.

- *Strengthening the Reporting Model.* The Federal Government's "reporting model" defines the information that is included in federal entity financial statements and other required supplemental information (e.g., Management's Discussion and Analysis) and the scope of internal controls related to financial reporting. Inclusion in the financial statements or required supplemental information also affects the nature and extent of the auditor's responsibilities. The overall goal of this initiative is to maintain public faith and confidence in Federal financial management by proposing improvements to the usefulness of financial reports to decision makers and the public and strengthening audit requirements on areas where financial risks are the most significant. Particular emphasis is being placed on obtaining improved information on the cost of Government activities and the results achieved. OMB, working with the CFO Council, developed a new statement of spending that focused on how and where Federal money was spent. This new statement will be piloted in FY 2011 and will establish reliable reporting of how taxpayer dollars are being spent.

The sweeping challenges we face in the Government today require our financial managers to move beyond the status quo and to generate a higher return on investment for our financial management activities. The Financial Management Community has made critical progress- decreasing the Government-wide Improper Payment rate resulting in \$3.8 billion less in estimated improper payments, increasing the amount of recaptured improper payments by approximately 300 percent, and identifying \$1.7 billion in non-defense saving opportunities with real property. The steps outlined above leverage the tools and capacities in place today, but refocus energies on critical and emerging priorities – cutting wasteful spending, improving the efficiency of our operations and information technology, and laying a foundation for data quality and collaboration as we enter a new era of transparency and open Government.

Additional Information

This *Financial Report's* Appendix contains the names and websites of the significant Government entities included in the Report's financial statements. Details about the information in this *Financial Report* can be found in these entities' financial statements included in their Performance and Accountability and Annual Financial Reports. This *Financial Report*, as well as those from previous years, is also available at the Treasury, OMB, and GAO websites at: <http://www.fms.treas.gov/fr/index.html>; <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/financial/index.html>; and <http://www.gao.gov/financial.html>, respectively. Other related Government publications include, but are not limited to the:

- *Budget of the United States Government,*
- *Treasury Bulletin,*
- *Monthly Treasury Statement of Receipts and Outlays of the United States Government,*
- *Monthly Statement of the Public Debt of the United States,*
- *Economic Report of the President,* and
- *Trustees' Reports* for the Social Security and Medicare Programs.



Office of the
Comptroller General
of the United States

United States Government Accountability Office
Washington, DC 20548

December 21, 2010

The President

The President of the Senate

The Speaker of the House of Representatives

Given the federal government's fiscal challenges, there is a significant need for transparency and for the Congress, the administration, and federal managers to have reliable, useful, and timely financial and performance information. Even though significant progress has been made since the enactment of key financial management reforms in the 1990s, our report on the U.S. government's consolidated financial statements illustrates that much work remains to improve federal financial management. Consequently, financial management needs to be a top priority of this administration and the new Congress.

The recent economic recession and the federal government's actions to stabilize financial markets and promote economic recovery continued to significantly affect the federal government's financial condition. The U.S. government's consolidated financial statements for fiscal year 2010 include, as they did for fiscal year 2009, substantial assets and liabilities resulting from such actions. Although the federal government has received positive returns from investments in certain large financial institutions, it continues to report significant costs related to these actions. The ultimate cost of all of the federal government's market stabilization and economic recovery actions and the effect of such actions on its financial condition will not be known for some time.

The federal government faces long-term challenges resulting from large and growing structural deficits that are driven on the spending side primarily by rising health care costs and known demographic trends. These challenges are clearly shown in the comprehensive long-term fiscal projections presented in this *2010 Financial Report of the United States Government (2010 Financial Report)*. While the economy is still fragile and in need of careful attention, there is wide agreement on the need to look not only at the near term but also at steps that begin to change the long-term fiscal path as soon as possible without slowing the economy.

Our report on the U.S. government's consolidated financial statements is enclosed. In summary, we found the following:

- Certain material weaknesses in internal control over financial reporting and other limitations on the scope of our work resulted in conditions that prevented us from expressing an opinion on the fiscal years 2010 and 2009 accrual-based financial statements.¹ About 32 percent of the federal government's reported total assets as of September 30, 2010, and approximately 25 percent of the federal government's reported net cost for fiscal year 2010 relate to three agencies' fiscal year 2010 financial statements that, as of the date of our report, either received disclaimers of opinion or were not audited.²
- Because of significant uncertainties, as discussed in our report, we are unable to, and we do not, express an opinion on the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance. About \$22.8 trillion, or 74 percent, of the federal government's reported total present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue for 2010 relate to the Department of Health and Human Services' 2010 Statement of Social Insurance, which received a disclaimer of opinion. In our opinion, the Statements of Social Insurance for 2009, 2008, and 2007 present fairly, in all material respects, the financial condition of the federal government's social insurance programs, in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.³
- Material weaknesses resulted in ineffective internal control over financial reporting (including safeguarding of assets).
- Our work to test compliance with selected provisions of laws and regulations in fiscal year 2010 was limited by the material weaknesses and other scope limitations discussed in our report.

While significant progress has been made in improving federal financial management since the federal government began preparing consolidated financial statements 14 years ago, three major impediments continued to prevent us from rendering an opinion on the federal government's accrual-based consolidated financial statements over this period:

¹The accrual-based consolidated financial statements for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2010 and 2009, consist of the (1) Statements of Net Cost, (2) Statements of Operations and Changes in Net Position, (3) Reconciliations of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit, (4) Statements of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities, and (5) Balance Sheets, including the related notes to these financial statements. Most revenues are recorded on a modified cash basis. The 2010, 2009, 2008, 2007, and 2006 Statements of Social Insurance, including the related notes, are also included in the consolidated financial statements. The Statements of Social Insurance do not interrelate with the accrual-based consolidated financial statements.

²Of the 24 Chief Financial Officers Act agencies, the agencies that, as of the date of our report, received disclaimers of opinions on all of their fiscal year 2010 financial statements were the Department of Defense and the Department of Labor. For the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2010, only the Consolidated Balance Sheet and the Statement of Custodial Activity were subjected to audit; the auditor was unable to express an opinion on these two financial statements.

³Beginning in fiscal year 2006, the Statement of Social Insurance became a principal financial statement and was audited as part of the applicable federal agencies' financial statements. We disclaimed an opinion on the fiscal year 2006 consolidated financial statements, including the Statement of Social Insurance.

(1) serious financial management problems at the Department of Defense (DOD) that have prevented DOD's financial statements from being auditable, (2) the federal government's inability to adequately account for and reconcile intragovernmental activity and balances between federal agencies, and (3) the federal government's ineffective process for preparing the consolidated financial statements.

In addition to the material weaknesses underlying these major impediments, we noted three other material weaknesses. Until the problems outlined in our report are adequately addressed, they will continue to have adverse implications for the federal government and American taxpayers.

The material weaknesses discussed in our report continued to

- hamper the federal government's ability to reliably report a significant portion of its assets, liabilities, costs, and other related information;
- affect the federal government's ability to reliably measure the full cost as well as the financial and nonfinancial performance of certain programs and activities;
- impair the federal government's ability to adequately safeguard significant assets and properly record various transactions; and
- hinder the federal government from having reliable financial information to operate in an efficient and effective manner.

Additional details regarding the material weaknesses and their effect on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements and on the management of federal government operations can be found in our report.

The federal government reported a net operating cost of about \$2.1 trillion and a unified budget deficit of approximately \$1.3 trillion for fiscal year 2010, and as of September 30, 2010, debt held by the public increased to about 62 percent of gross domestic product (GDP).

In December 2007, the United States entered what has turned out to be its deepest recession since the end of World War II. GDP fell 4.1 percent from the beginning of the recession through the second quarter of 2009, which marked the recession's end. Since the end of the recession, GDP has grown slowly and unemployment remains at a high level.

As of September 30, 2010, the federal government's actions to stabilize the financial markets and to promote economic recovery resulted in assets of over \$400 billion, which is net of about \$75 billion in valuation losses. In addition, the federal government reported incurring significant liabilities and related net cost resulting from these actions. Because the valuation of these assets and liabilities is based on assumptions and estimates that are inherently subject to substantial uncertainty arising from the uniqueness of

certain transactions and the likelihood of future changes in general economic, regulatory, and market conditions, actual results may be materially different from the reported amounts. For example, assets and liabilities reported by the federal government that are subject to substantial uncertainty include the following:

- The federal government's consolidated financial statements for fiscal year 2010 include approximately \$109 billion of investments in Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) (net of about \$46 billion in valuation losses), about \$360 billion of liabilities for future payments to these entities, and about \$276 billion of related net cost. The notes to the fiscal year 2010 financial statements also discuss an estimated additional \$102 billion of future payments that could be incurred under an "extreme case" scenario, based on the estimates as of September 30, 2010.
- The federal government reported Troubled Asset Relief Program direct loans and equity investments of approximately \$142 billion as of September 30, 2010 (net of about \$37 billion in valuation losses, including about \$21 billion related to American International Group, Inc., (AIG) and about \$15 billion related to loans to and equity investments in certain entities in the automotive industry, including General Motors Company).
- The federal government reported Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) liabilities of about \$73 billion as of September 30, 2010, related to estimated failures of insured financial institutions, guarantees, and bank resolutions. The FDIC's Deposit Insurance Fund (DIF) reported a negative reserve to estimated insured deposits. Although FDIC has implemented a restoration plan to replenish the DIF's reserves to the statutory minimum, further losses could occur if potentially vulnerable insured institutions ultimately fail, guarantees result in greater than anticipated losses, or economic and market conditions deteriorate.
- Further deterioration in the residential real-estate market could result in additional losses for the Federal Housing Administration beyond the reported loan guarantee liability of about \$35 billion as of September 30, 2010.
- The federal government reported that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's (PBGC) liabilities exceeded its assets by \$23 billion as of September 30, 2010. PBGC is subject to further losses if plan terminations that are reasonably possible occur.

The ultimate cost of the federal government's actions to stabilize the financial markets and promote economic recovery will not be known for some time as these uncertainties are resolved and further federal government actions are taken in fiscal year 2011 and later. Looking ahead, the federal government will need to continue to determine the most expeditious manner in which to bring closure to its financial stabilization initiatives while optimizing its investment returns. Further, there are risks that the federal government's financial condition could be affected in the future by other factors, including the following:

- Although the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009⁴ provided some fiscal relief to the states, expected continued state fiscal challenges could place pressure on the federal government to provide further relief to them.
- Several initiatives undertaken during the past 2 years by the Federal Reserve to stabilize the financial markets have led to a significant change in the reported composition and size of the Federal Reserve's balance sheet, including the net purchase of over \$1.25 trillion in mortgage-backed securities guaranteed by Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae) as of September 2010. These purchases were funded primarily through an increase in deposits at the Federal Reserve by depository institutions. The Federal Reserve announced plans to replace about \$300 billion of the mortgage-backed securities with longer-term Department of the Treasury (Treasury) securities and purchase \$600 billion in additional longer-term Treasury securities. The valuation of these securities is subject to interest rate risk and may decline or increase in value in an environment of increasing or decreasing interest rates, respectively. If the Federal Reserve sells these securities at a loss, additional federal government deposits at the Federal Reserve may be needed, future payments of Federal Reserve earnings to the federal government may be reduced, or both.⁵
- Problems in the nation's financial sector exposed serious weaknesses in the U.S. financial regulatory system, which, if not effectively addressed, may cause the system to fail to prevent similar or even worse crises in the future. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act⁶ (Dodd-Frank Act), among other things, creates a new financial stability oversight council, creates a new consumer financial protection bureau, requires more derivatives to be cleared and traded through regulated exchanges, and provides federal regulators with enhanced power to supervise and liquidate large failing firms. Importantly, the future structures of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and the roles they will serve in the mortgage markets must still be determined, as the Dodd-Frank Act does not address these two key government-sponsored enterprises.

The federal government faces even larger fiscal challenges in the long term. As discussed in the *2010 Financial Report*, the federal government is on an unsustainable long-term fiscal path driven on the spending side primarily by rising health care costs and known demographic trends. Under new financial reporting standards, this *2010 Financial Report* includes comprehensive long-term fiscal projections for the U.S. government, expanding on similar information presented in recent years' financial reports. These projections show continual increases in debt as a percentage of GDP, meaning fiscal policy is unsustainable over the long term. Also, the projections show that the present value of

⁴Pub. L. No. 111-5, 123 Stat. 115 (Feb. 17, 2009).

⁵Under Federal Reserve System policy, Federal Reserve Bank earnings in excess of statutory dividends to member banks are paid to the federal government. The federal government reported such net earnings of about \$76 billion for fiscal year 2010.

⁶Pub. L. No. 111-203 (July 21, 2010).

projected non-interest spending exceeds receipts by about \$16.3 trillion over the next 75-year period. The projections relating to Social Security and Medicare are based on the same assumptions underlying the information presented in the Statement of Social Insurance and assume reductions in Medicare cost growth. GAO also prepares long-term fiscal projections for the U.S. government.⁷ Under GAO's Alternative simulation, absent policy change, debt held by the public as a share of GDP would exceed the historical high reached in the aftermath of World War II by 2020.⁸

- - - -

Our report on the U.S. government's consolidated financial statements would not be possible without the commitment and professionalism of inspectors general throughout the federal government who are responsible for annually auditing the financial statements of individual federal entities. We also appreciate the cooperation and assistance of Department of the Treasury and Office of Management and Budget officials as well as the federal entities' chief financial officers. We look forward to continuing to work with these individuals, the administration, and the Congress to achieve the goals and objectives of federal financial management reform.

Our report begins on page 221. Our guide⁹ to the *Financial Report of the United States Government* is intended to help those who seek to obtain a better understanding of the *Financial Report* and is available on GAO's Web site at www.gao.gov. In addition, the Web site includes a guide¹⁰ to understanding the differences between accrual and cash measures of the deficit and provides a useful perspective on the different purposes cash

⁷GAO, *The Federal Government's Long-Term Fiscal Outlook: Fall 2010 Update*, GAO-11-201SP (Washington, D.C.: November 2010).

⁸GAO's Alternative simulation incorporates Congressional Budget Office and Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services alternative projections for health care cost growth, which assume certain cost controls are not maintained over the long term and physician payments are not reduced as specified under current law. Also in this simulation, all tax provisions are extended to 2020 and the alternative minimum tax (AMT) exemption amount is indexed to inflation through 2020; revenues are then brought back to the 40-year historical average as a share of GDP; and discretionary spending grows with GDP during the entire period—keeping it just below the 40-year historical average as a share of GDP.

⁹GAO, *Understanding the Primary Components of the Annual Financial Report of the United States Government*, GAO-05-958SP (Washington, D.C.: September 2005). In September 2009, we issued an update to this guide to reflect recent changes to the federal accounting standards and resulting changes to the *Financial Report*; see GAO-09-946SP (Washington, D.C.: September 2009).

¹⁰See <http://www.gao.gov/special.pubs/longterm/deficit/>, which is based on information in GAO, *Understanding Similarities and Differences between Accrual and Cash Deficits*, GAO-07-117SP (Washington, D.C.: December 2006). In January 2007 and 2008, we issued updates to this guide for fiscal years 2006 and 2007; see GAO-07-341SP (Washington, D.C.: January 2007) and GAO-08-410SP (Washington, D.C.: January 2008).

and accrual measures serve in providing a comprehensive picture of the federal government's fiscal condition today and over time.

Our report was prepared under the direction of Robert F. Dacey, Chief Accountant, and Gary T. Engel, Director, Financial Management and Assurance. If you have any questions, please contact me on (202) 512-5500 or them on (202) 512-3406.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Gene L. Dodaro". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent initial "D".

Gene L. Dodaro
Acting Comptroller General
of the United States

cc: The Majority Leader of the Senate
The Minority Leader of the Senate
The Majority Leader of the House
The Minority Leader of the House

This page is intentionally blank.

Financial Statements of the United States Government for the Years Ended September 30, 2010, and 2009

Statements of Net Cost

These statements present the net cost of fiscal years 2010 and 2009 Government¹ operations, including the operations related to earmarked funds (funds financed by specifically identified revenues, often supplemented by other financing sources, which remain available over time). The Government's fiscal year begins October 1 and ends September 30. Costs and earned revenues are categorized on the Statement of Net Cost by significant entity, providing greater accountability by showing the relationship of the agencies' net cost to the Governmentwide net cost. Costs and earned revenues are presented in this report by department on an accrual basis, while the budget presents costs and revenues by obligations and receipts, generally on a cash basis. The focus of the budget of the United States is by agency. Budgets are prepared, defended, and monitored by agency. In reporting by agency, we are assisting the external users in assessing the budget integrity, operating performance, stewardship, and systems and controls of the Government.

These statements contain the following four components:

- Gross cost—is the full cost of all the departments and entities. These costs are assigned on a cause-and-effect basis, or reasonably allocated to the corresponding departments and entities.
- Earned revenue—is exchange revenue resulting from the Government providing goods and services to the public at a price.
- Loss (gain) from changes in assumptions—is the loss or gain from changes in long-term assumptions used to measure the liabilities reported for Federal civilian and military employee pensions, other post-employment benefits and other retirement benefits, including veterans' compensation.
- Net cost—is computed by subtracting earned revenue from gross cost, plus/minus the loss/gain from changes in assumptions.

Net cost for Governmentwide reporting purposes includes the General Services Administration (GSA) and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) agency allocations, and is net of intragovernmental eliminations. For this reason, individual agency net cost amounts will not agree with the agency's financial statements. Because of their specific functions, most of the costs originally associated with GSA and OPM have been allocated to their user agencies for Governmentwide reporting purposes. The remaining costs for GSA and OPM on the Statements of Net Cost are the administrative operating costs, the expenses from prior and past costs from health and pension plan amendments, and the actuarial gains and losses for these agencies. The interest on securities issued by the Department of the Treasury (Treasury) and held by the public is reported on Treasury's financial statements, but because of its importance, and the dollar amounts involved, it is reported separately in these statements.

The Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) released the Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) No. 33, *Pensions, Other Retirement Benefits, and Other Postemployment Benefits: Reporting the Gains and Losses from Changes in Assumptions and Selecting Discount Rates and Valuation Dates* effective in fiscal year 2010. The standard requires the Governmentwide statements of net cost to present the amounts reported under the gain/loss on pension, other retirement benefits, or other postemployment benefits assumption changes as a separate component that will provide more transparent information regarding the underlying costs associated with these liabilities.

¹ For purposes of this document, "Government" refers to the United States Government.

Statements of Operations and Changes in Net Position

These statements report the results of Government operations which include the results of operations for earmarked funds. They include non-exchange revenues that are generated principally by the Government's sovereign power to tax, levy duties, and assess fines and penalties. These statements also present the cost of Government operations, net of revenue earned from the sale of goods and services to the public (exchange revenue). They further include certain adjustments and unreconciled transactions that affect the net position.

Revenue

Individual income tax and tax withholdings include Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA)/Self-Employment Contributions Act (SECA) taxes and other taxes. These taxes are characterized as non-exchange revenue.

Excise taxes consist of taxes collected for various items, such as airline tickets, gasoline products, distilled spirits and imported liquor, tobacco, firearms, and others. These are also characterized as non-exchange revenue.

Other taxes and receipts include Federal Reserve banks earnings, tax related fines, penalties and interest, and railroad retirement taxes.

Miscellaneous earned revenues consists of earned revenues received from the public with virtually no associated cost. These revenues include rents and royalties on the Outer Continental Shelf Lands resulting from the leasing and development of mineral resources on public lands.

Earmarked revenues are required by statute to be used for designated activities, benefits or purposes and must be accounted for separately from the rest of the Government's non-earmarked revenues. See Note 24—Earmarked Funds for detailed information.

Intragovernmental interest represents interest earned from the investment of surplus earmarked revenues, which finance the deficit spending of non-earmarked operations. These investments are recorded as intragovernmental debt holdings and are included in Note 14—Federal Debt Securities, in the table titled Intragovernmental Debt Holdings: Federal Debt Securities Held as Investments by Government Accounts. These interest payments and the associated investments are eliminated in the consolidation process.

Net Cost of Government Operations

The net cost of Government operations (gross cost [including losses/(gains) from changes in assumptions] less earned revenue) flows through from the Statements of Net Cost. The net cost associated with earmarked activities is separately reported.

Intragovernmental Transfers

Intragovernmental transfers reflect amounts required by statute to be transferred from the General Fund of the Treasury to earmarked funds (an example is the annual transfer to the Department of Health and Human Services' (HHS) Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund (Medicare Parts B and D) which receives approximately 75 percent of its funding from the General Fund.

Unmatched Transactions and Balances

Unmatched transactions and balances are adjustments needed to bring the change in net position into balance due to unreconciled intragovernmental differences, agency reporting errors, timing differences, and General Fund transactions in the consolidated financial statements. See Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies and the Supplemental Information—Unmatched Transactions and Balances for detailed information.

Net Position, Beginning of Period

The net position, beginning of period, reflects the net position reported on the prior year's balance sheet as of the end of that fiscal year. The net position for earmarked funds is shown separately.

Prior period adjustments are revisions to adjust the beginning net position and balances presented on the prior year financial statements due to corrections of errors or changes in accounting principles. See Note 1B—Basis of Accounting and Revenue Recognition and Note 21—Prior Period Adjustments for detailed information.

Net Position, End of Period

The net position, end of period, amount reflects the net position as of the end of the fiscal year. The net position for earmarked funds is separately shown.

Reconciliations of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit

These statements reconcile the results of operations (net operating cost) on the Statements of Operations and Changes in Net Position to the unified budget deficit. The premise of the reconciliation is that the accrual and budgetary accounting bases share transaction data.

Receipts and outlays in the budget are measured primarily on a cash basis and differ from the accrual basis of accounting used in the *Financial Report*. Refer to Note 1B, Basis of Accounting and Revenue Recognition for details. These statements begin with the net results of operations (net operating cost), where operating revenues are reported on a modified cash basis of accounting and the net cost of Government operations on an accrual basis of accounting and reports activities where the bases of accounting for the components of net operating cost and the unified budget deficit differ.

Components of Net Operating Cost Not Part of the Budget Deficit

This information includes the operating components, such as the changes in benefits payable for veterans, military and civilian employees, the environmental liabilities, and depreciation expense not included in the budget results.

Components of the Budget Deficit Not Part of Net Operating Cost

This information includes the budget components, such as capitalized fixed assets which are recorded as outlays in the budget when purchased, and reflected in net operating cost through depreciation expense over the useful life of the asset and increases in other assets that are not included in the operating results.

Statements of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities

The primary purpose of these statements is to report how the annual unified budget deficit relates to the change in the Government's cash and other monetary assets and debt held by the public. It explains why the unified budget deficit normally would not result in an equivalent change in the Government's cash and other monetary assets.

These statements reconcile the unified budget deficit to the change in cash and other monetary assets during the fiscal year and explain how the budget deficits (fiscal years 2010 and 2009) were financed. A budget deficit is the result of outlays (expenditures) exceeding receipts (revenue) during a particular fiscal year.

The budget deficit is financed through borrowings from the public. Other transactions also require cash disbursements and are not part of the deficit. These other transactions, such as the payment of interest on debt held by the public, contributed to the use of cash. The budget deficit also includes certain amounts that are recognized in the budget and will be disbursed in a future period or are adjustments that did not affect the cash balance. These amounts include interest accrued on debt issued by Treasury and held by the public and subsidy expense related to direct and guaranteed loans as well as equity investment activity and did not contribute to the change in the cash balance.

These statements show the adjustments for noncash outlays included in the budget and items affecting the cash balance not included in the budget to explain the change in cash and other monetary assets.

Balance Sheets

The balance sheets show the Government's assets, liabilities, and net position. When combined with stewardship information, this information presents a more comprehensive understanding of the Government's financial position. The net position for earmarked funds is shown separately.

Assets

Assets included on the balance sheets are resources of the Government that remain available to meet future needs. The most significant assets that are reported on the balance sheets are property, plant, and equipment (PP&E), net, inventories and related property, net; cash and other monetary assets; loans receivable and mortgage-backed securities, net; and Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) Direct Loans and Equity Investments, Net. There are, however, other significant resources available to the Government that extend beyond the assets presented in these financial statements. Those resources include stewardship assets, including natural resources, and the Government's sovereign powers to tax, regulate commerce, set monetary policy, and the power to print additional currency.

Liabilities and Net Position

Liabilities are obligations of the Government resulting from prior actions that will require financial resources. The most significant liabilities reported on the balance sheets are Federal debt securities held by the public and accrued interest and Federal employee and veteran benefits payable. Liabilities also include environmental and disposal liabilities, liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises, and social insurance benefits due and payable as of the reporting date.

As with reported assets, the Government's responsibilities, policy commitments, and contingencies are much broader than these reported balance sheet liabilities. They include the social insurance programs in the Statements of Social Insurance and are disclosed in the Supplemental Information—Social Insurance section and a wide range of other programs under which the Government provides benefits and services to the people of this Nation, as well as certain future loss contingencies.

The Government has entered into contractual commitments requiring the future use of financial resources and has unresolved contingencies where existing conditions, situations, or circumstances create uncertainty about future losses. Commitments, as well as contingencies that do not meet the criteria for recognition as liabilities on the balance sheets, but for which there is at least a reasonable possibility that losses have been incurred, are disclosed in Note 22—Contingencies and Note 23—Commitments.

The collection of earmarked taxes and other earmarked revenue is credited to the corresponding Earmarked Fund that will use these funds to meet a particular Government purpose. If the collections from taxes and other sources exceed the payments to the beneficiaries, the excess revenue is invested in Treasury securities or "loaned" to Treasury's General Fund; therefore, the trust fund balances do not represent cash. An explanation of the trust funds for social insurance and many of the other large trust funds is included in Note 24—Earmarked Funds. That note also contains information about trust fund receipts, disbursements, and assets.

Because of its sovereign power to tax and borrow, and the country's wide economic base, the Government has unique access to financial resources through generating tax revenues and issuing Federal debt securities. This provides the Government with the ability to meet present obligations and those that are anticipated from future operations and are not reflected in net position.

Statements of Social Insurance

The Statements of Social Insurance provide estimates of the status of the most significant social insurance programs: Social Security, Medicare, Railroad Retirement, and Black Lung social insurance programs, which are administered by the Social Security Administration (SSA), HHS, the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB), and the Department of Labor (DOL), respectively. The estimates are actuarial present values² of the projections and are based on the economic and demographic assumptions representing the trustees' reasonable estimates as set forth in the relevant Social Security and Medicare trustees' reports and in the relevant agency performance and accountability reports for the RRB and the DOL (Black Lung).

The magnitude and complexity of social insurance programs, coupled with the extreme sensitivity of projections relating to the many assumptions of the programs, produce a wide range of possible results. In preparing the Statements of Social Insurance, Government management considers and selects assumptions and data that it believes provide a reasonable basis for the assertions in the statement. However, because of the large number of factors that affect the Statements of Social Insurance and the fact that such assumptions are inherently subject to substantial uncertainty (arising from the likelihood of future events, significant uncertainties, and contingencies), there will be differences between the estimates in the Statements of Social Insurance and the actual results, and those differences may be material. Note 26—Social Insurance describes the social insurance programs, reports long-range estimates that can be used to assess the financial condition of the programs, and explains some of the factors that impact the various programs. Using this information, readers can apply their own judgment as to the condition and sustainability of the individual programs.

² Present values recognize that a dollar paid or collected in the future is worth less than a dollar today, because a dollar today could be invested and earn interest. To calculate a present value, future amounts are thus reduced using an assumed interest rate, and those reduced amounts are summed.

**United States Government
Statements of Net Cost
for the Years Ended September 30**

	Gross Cost	Earned Revenue	Net Cost	Gross Cost	Earned Revenue	Net Cost
(In billions of dollars)	2010			2009		
Department of Defense	929.0	39.8	889.2	718.4	35.6	682.8
Department of Health and Human Services.....	920.4	62.7	857.7	866.4	59.5	806.9
Social Security Administration	754.2	0.3	753.9	736.6	0.4	736.2
Department of the Treasury.....	402.3	29.4	372.9	254.6	19.4	235.2
Department of Veterans Affairs	240.2	4.7	235.5	(38.8)	4.0	(42.8)
Interest on Treasury Securities held by the public.....	214.8	-	214.8	189.1	-	189.1
Department of Labor.....	179.0	-	179.0	140.2	-	140.2
Department of Agriculture.....	136.6	6.0	130.6	132.0	10.5	121.5
Department of Education.....	100.8	11.3	89.5	44.9	6.5	38.4
Department of Transportation.....	80.4	0.6	79.8	80.1	0.5	79.6
Department of Homeland Security	58.9	8.9	50.0	62.1	8.4	53.7
U.S. Postal Service.....	57.3	65.7	(8.4)	58.2	67.1	(8.9)
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	56.7	1.3	55.4	62.6	1.0	61.6
Office of Personnel Management.....	43.5	18.0	25.5	41.2	16.9	24.3
Department of Justice.....	32.7	1.2	31.5	31.2	1.1	30.1
Department of Energy	28.9	3.8	25.1	46.8	3.9	42.9
Department of State	24.5	2.8	21.7	25.6	2.5	23.1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	22.1	0.1	22.0	24.2	0.1	24.1
Department of the Interior.....	20.7	2.4	18.3	20.8	2.2	18.6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	16.8	16.1	0.7	63.4	18.8	44.6
Department of Commerce	16.5	2.3	14.2	13.9	2.1	11.8
Railroad Retirement Board.....	14.6	5.8	8.8	22.7	11.2	11.5
Environmental Protection Agency	12.7	0.5	12.2	10.1	0.6	9.5
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.....	11.9	8.1	3.8	22.9	10.5	12.4
Agency for International Development	10.7	0.2	10.5	11.8	0.7	11.1
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	9.7	10.8	(1.1)	10.2	11.0	(0.8)
Federal Communications Commission.....	9.5	0.5	9.0	8.8	0.5	8.3
National Science Foundation.....	6.9	-	6.9	6.1	-	6.1
Small Business Administration	5.4	0.4	5.0	6.3	0.4	5.9
National Credit Union Administration.....	3.2	1.1	2.1	6.1	1.3	4.8
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.....	1.2	0.9	0.3	1.3	0.8	0.5
Securities and Exchange Commission	1.1	1.4	(0.3)	1.1	1.1	-
Smithsonian Institution	0.8	-	0.8	0.9	-	0.9
General Services Administration	0.6	0.6	-	1.0	0.5	0.5
Export-Import Bank of the United States.....	0.4	0.7	(0.3)	1.5	0.8	0.7
Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation	-	0.1	(0.1)	-	0.3	(0.3)
All other entities	47.3	0.7	46.6	51.3	0.7	50.6
Subtotal before loss/(gain) from changes in assumptions in 2010.....	4,472.3	309.2	4,163.1	3,735.6	300.9	3,434.7

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

**United States Government
Statements of Net Cost, continued
for the Years Ended September 30**

	Gross	Earned	Net	Gross	Earned	Net
	Cost	Revenue	Cost	Cost	Revenue	Cost
(In billions of dollars)	2010			2009		
Loss/(gain) from changes in assumptions in 2010 (Note 1):						
Department of Veterans Affairs	101.4	-	101.4	-	-	-
Office of Personnel Management.....	84.1	-	84.1	-	-	-
Department of Homeland Security	5.7	-	5.7	-	-	-
Department of State	0.6	-	0.6	-	-	-
Department of Health and Human Services	(0.1)	-	(0.1)	-	-	-
Department of Defense	(58.8)	-	(58.8)	-	-	-
Subtotal of loss/(gain) from changes in assumptions	132.9	-	132.9	-	-	-
Total.....	<u>4,605.2</u>	<u>309.2</u>	<u>4,296.0</u>	<u>3,735.6</u>	<u>300.9</u>	<u>3,434.7</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

**United States Government
Statements of Operations and Changes in Net Position
for the Years Ended September 30**

	Non-		Consolidated	Non-		Consolidated
	Earmarked Funds	Earmarked Funds		Earmarked Funds	Earmarked Funds	
(In billions of dollars)	2010			2009 (Restated)		
Revenue:						
Individual income tax and tax withholdings ...	902.6	830.3	1,732.9	912.7	862.3	1,775.0
Corporation income taxes	179.6		179.6	130.3		130.3
Unemployment taxes		45.2	45.2		38.1	38.1
Excise taxes	22.6	49.0	71.6	18.6	48.9	67.5
Estate and gift taxes	18.8		18.8	23.4		23.4
Customs duties	25.1		25.1	21.7		21.7
Other taxes and receipts	96.9	30.6	127.5	56.2	31.4	87.6
Miscellaneous earned revenues	11.3	4.5	15.8	50.4	4.4	54.8
Intragovernmental interest		195.0	195.0		184.6	184.6
Total revenue	<u>1,256.9</u>	<u>1,154.6</u>	<u>2,411.5</u>	<u>1,213.3</u>	<u>1,169.7</u>	<u>2,383.0</u>
Eliminations.....			(195.0)			(184.6)
Consolidated revenue			<u>2,216.5</u>			<u>2,198.4</u>
Net Cost:						
Net cost.....	2,553.5	1,742.5	4,296.0	1,906.6	1,528.1	3,434.7
Intragovernmental interest	195.0		195.0	184.6		184.6
Total net cost	<u>2,748.5</u>	<u>1,742.5</u>	<u>4,491.0</u>	<u>2,091.2</u>	<u>1,528.1</u>	<u>3,619.3</u>
Eliminations.....			(195.0)			(184.6)
Consolidated net cost.....			<u>4,296.0</u>			<u>3,434.7</u>
Intragovernmental transfers	(482.1)	482.1		(406.8)	406.8	
Unmatched transactions and balances (Note 1)	(0.8)		(0.8)	(17.4)		(17.4)
Net operating (cost)/revenue	<u>(1,974.5)</u>	<u>(105.8)</u>	<u>(2,080.3)</u>	<u>(1,302.1)</u>	<u>48.4</u>	<u>(1,253.7)</u>
Net position, beginning of period	(12,208.6)	752.7	(11,455.9)	(10,908.1)	704.6	(10,203.5)
Prior period adjustments—changes in accounting principles (Note 21)	63.4		63.4	1.6	(0.3)	1.3
Net operating (cost)/revenue.....	(1,974.5)	(105.8)	(2,080.3)	(1,302.1)	48.4	(1,253.7)
Net position, end of period	<u>(14,119.7)</u>	<u>646.9</u>	<u>(13,472.8)</u>	<u>(12,208.6)</u>	<u>752.7</u>	<u>(11,455.9)</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

United States Government
Reconciliations of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit
for the Years Ended September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Net operating cost	(2,080.3)	(1,253.7)
Components of Net Operating Cost Not Part of the Budget Deficit:		
Increase in Liability for Military Employee Benefits (Note 15):		
Increase in military pension liabilities.....	85.6	23.0
Increase in military health liabilities.....	78.9	5.2
(Decrease) in other military benefits.....	(0.3)	(2.6)
Increase in liability for military employee benefits.....	164.2	25.6
Increase/(decrease) in liability for veteran's compensation (Note 15):		
Increase/(decrease) in liabilities for veterans.....	115.9	(101.2)
Increase/(decrease) in liabilities for survivors.....	107.0	(46.9)
Increase/(decrease) in liabilities for burial benefits.....	0.9	(1.1)
Increase/(decrease) in liability for veteran's compensation.....	223.8	(149.2)
Increase in liabilities for civilian employee benefits (Note 15):		
Increase in civilian pension liabilities.....	103.5	74.6
Increase in civilian health liabilities.....	3.3	10.4
Increase in other civilian benefits.....	8.3	3.4
Increase in liabilities for civilian employee benefits.....	115.1	88.4
(Decrease) in environmental and disposal liabilities (Note 16):		
(Decrease)/increase in Energy's environmental and disposal liabilities ..	(17.5)	1.6
(Decrease) in all others' environmental and disposal liabilities.....	(3.0)	(2.6)
(Decrease) in environmental and disposal liabilities.....	(20.5)	(1.0)
Depreciation expense.....	57.5	59.5
Property, plant, and equipment disposals and revaluations.....	(9.8)	6.5
Increase in benefits due and payable.....	3.5	16.4
Increase in insurance and guarantee program liabilities.....	9.4	81.1
Increase in other liabilities.....	62.4	12.1
Seigniorage and sale of gold.....	(0.4)	(0.4)
(Decrease) in accounts payable.....	(0.3)	(0.1)
(Increase)/decrease in net accounts and taxes receivable.....	(7.1)	5.6
TARP yearend downward re-estimate.....	(23.6)	(110.0)
Decrease/(increase) in Beneficial interest in trust.....	2.7	(23.5)
Increase in liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises.....	268.0	78.1
Increase in valuation loss on investments in Government-Sponsored Enterprises.....	8.1	37.9
Components of the budget deficit that are not part of net operating cost:		
Capitalized Fixed Assets:		
Department of Defense.....	(59.4)	(81.5)
All other agencies.....	(33.1)	(30.9)
Total capitalized fixed assets.....	(92.5)	(112.4)
Effect of prior year TARP downward re-estimate.....	110.0	-
(Increase)/decrease in inventory.....	(1.6)	5.0
(Increase) in investments in Government-Sponsored Enterprises.....	(52.5)	(95.6)
(Increase) in debt and equity securities.....	(5.8)	(22.4)
(Increase) in other assets.....	(24.7)	(69.2)
Principal repayments of precredit reform loans.....	8.0	(10.1)
All other reconciling items.....	(7.7)	14.3
Unified budget deficit.....	(1,294.1)	(1,417.1)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

**United States Government
Statements of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities
for the Years Ended September 30**

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009 (Restated)
Unified budget deficit	(1,294.1)	(1,417.1)
Adjustments for noncash outlays included in the budget:		
Interest accrued by Treasury on debt held by the public	206.8	171.9
TARP yearend downward re-estimate	(86.4)	110.0
TARP Subsidy expense/(income) (Note 5)....	(24.2)	41.4
Other Federal entity subsidy expense/(income) (Note 4)	(9.4)	(44.5)
Subtotal	86.8	278.8
Items affecting the cash balance not included in the Budget:		
<i>Net Transactions from financing activity:</i>		
Borrowings from the public	8,525.5	8,931.0
Repayment of debt held by the public	(7,054.5)	(7,185.6)
Agency securities	0.7	-
Subtotal	1,471.7	1,745.4
<i>Transactions from monetary and other activity:</i>		
Interest paid by Treasury on debt held by the public	(201.2)	(170.7)
Net TARP direct loans and equity investments activity	111.8	(291.0)
Net GSE—mortgage backed securities activity	9.1	(170.0)
Net loan receivable activity	(160.3)	(93.0)
Allocations of special drawing rights	(1.0)	48.3
Other	12.6	38.0
Subtotal	(229.0)	(638.4)
Cash and other monetary assets (Note 2):		
(Decrease)/increase in cash and other monetary assets	35.4	(31.3)
Balance, beginning of period	393.2	424.5
Balance, end of period	428.6	393.2

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

For fiscal year 2009, \$110 billion of noncash outlays related to TARP downward re-estimates were included in the budget. For budgetary purposes, the effect of the yearend downward re-estimates (reduction of net outlays) is not recognized until the subsequent fiscal year. As such, for fiscal year 2010, the budget deficit reflected a reduction of noncash outlays for this \$110 billion. Also, \$23.6 billion of primarily noncash outlays related to fiscal year 2010 year end re-estimates were included in the current or prior year budget.

**United States Government
Balance Sheets
as of September 30**

(In billions of dollars)

	2010	2009
Assets:		
Cash and other monetary assets (Note 2)	428.6	393.2
Accounts and taxes receivable, net (Note 3).....	94.6	87.4
Loans receivable and mortgage backed securities, net (Note 4)...	688.6	538.9
TARP direct loans and equity investments, net (Note 5)	144.7	239.7
Beneficial interest in trust (Note 6)	20.8	23.5
Inventories and related property, net (Note 7).....	286.2	284.6
Property, plant, and equipment, net (Note 8)	828.9	784.1
Debt and equity securities (Note 9)	98.9	93.1
Investments in Government-Sponsored Enterprises (Note 11)	109.2	64.7
Other assets (Notes 10 and 12)	183.3	158.7
Total assets.....	<u>2,883.8</u>	<u>2,667.9</u>
Stewardship land and heritage assets (Note 27)		
Liabilities:		
Accounts payable (Note 13)	72.9	73.2
Federal debt securities held by the public and accrued interest (Note 14)	9,060.0	7,582.7
Federal employee and veteran benefits payable (Note 15)	5,720.3	5,283.7
Environmental and disposal liabilities (Note 16).....	321.3	341.8
Benefits due and payable (Note 17).....	164.3	160.8
Insurance and guarantee program liabilities (Note 18)	175.6	166.2
Loan guarantee liabilities (Note 4).....	65.8	69.4
Liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises (Note 11).....	359.9	91.9
Other liabilities (Notes 10 and 19)	416.5	354.1
Total liabilities	<u>16,356.6</u>	<u>14,123.8</u>
Contingencies (Note 22) and Commitments (Note 23)		
Net position:		
Earmarked funds (Note 24)	646.9	752.7
Non-earmarked funds.....	<u>(14,119.7)</u>	<u>(12,208.6)</u>
Total net position	<u>(13,472.8)</u>	<u>(11,455.9)</u>
Total liabilities and net position	<u>2,883.8</u>	<u>2,667.9</u>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

**United States Government
Statements of Social Insurance (Note 26)
Present Value of Long-Range (75 Years, except Black Lung) Actuarial Projections**

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
Federal Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance (Social Security): ¹⁴					
<i>Revenue (Contributions and Earmarked Taxes) from:</i>					
Participants who have attained eligibility age (62 and over)	672	575	542	477	533
Participants who have not attained eligibility age	19,914	18,559	18,249	17,515	16,568
Future participants	19,532	18,082	17,566	16,121	15,006
All current and future participants	40,118	37,217	36,357	34,113	32,107
<i>Expenditures for Scheduled Future Benefits for:</i>					
Participants who have attained eligibility age (62 and over)	(8,096)	(7,465)	(6,958)	(6,329)	(5,866)
Participants who have not attained eligibility age	(32,225)	(30,207)	(29,021)	(27,928)	(26,211)
Future participants	(7,744)	(7,223)	(6,933)	(6,619)	(6,480)
All current and future participants	(48,065)	(44,894)	(42,911)	(40,876)	(38,557)
<i>Present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue</i>	(7,947) ¹	(7,677) ²	(6,555) ³	(6,763) ⁴	(6,449) ⁵
Federal Hospital Insurance (Medicare Part A): ¹⁴					
<i>Revenue (Contributions and Earmarked Taxes) from:</i>					
Participants who have attained eligibility age (65 and over)	248	209	202	178	192
Participants who have not attained eligibility age	7,216	6,348	6,320	5,975	5,685
Future participants	6,944	5,451	5,361	4,870	4,767
All current and future participants	14,408	12,008	11,883	11,023	10,644
<i>Expenditures for Scheduled Future Benefits for:</i>					
Participants who have attained eligibility age (65 and over)	(2,648)	(2,958)	(2,747)	(2,558)	(2,397)
Participants who have not attained eligibility age	(12,032)	(18,147)	(17,365)	(15,639)	(15,633)
Future participants	(2,411)	(4,673)	(4,506)	(5,118)	(3,904)
All current and future participants	(17,091)	(25,778)	(24,619)	(23,315)	(21,934)
<i>Present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue</i>	(2,683) ¹	(13,770) ²	(12,736) ³	(12,292) ⁴	(11,290) ⁵
Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance (Medicare Part B): ¹⁴					
<i>Revenue (Premiums) from:</i>					
Participants who have attained eligibility age (65 and over)	538	498	461	433	409
Participants who have not attained eligibility age	3,460	4,224	3,859	3,184	3,167
Future participants	839	1,270	1,158	1,172	906
All current and future participants	4,836	5,992	5,478	4,789	4,481
<i>Expenditures for Scheduled Future Benefits for:</i>					
Participants who have attained eligibility age (65 and over)	(2,166)	(2,142)	(1,986)	(1,834)	(1,773)
Participants who have not attained eligibility age	(12,587)	(16,342)	(14,949)	(12,130)	(12,433)
Future participants	(2,984)	(4,672)	(4,262)	(4,257)	(3,407)
All current and future participants	(17,737)	(23,156)	(21,197)	(18,221)	(17,613)
<i>Present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue</i> ⁶	(12,901) ¹	(17,165) ²	(15,719) ³	(13,432) ⁴	(13,131) ⁵

Totals may not equal the sum of components due to rounding.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

United States Government
Statements of Social Insurance (Note 26), continued
Present Value of Long-Range (75 Years, except Black Lung) Actuarial Projections

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance (Medicare Part D): ¹⁴					
<i>Revenue (Premiums and State Transfers) from:</i>					
Participants who have attained eligibility age (65 and over)	165	140	123	167	173
Participants who have not attained eligibility age	1,626	1,442	1,380	1,627	1,700
Future participants	694	618	604	611	492
All current and future participants	<u>2,486</u>	<u>2,199</u>	<u>2,107</u>	<u>2,405</u>	<u>2,366</u>
<i>Expenditures for Scheduled Future Benefits for:</i>					
Participants who have attained eligibility age (65 and over)	(646)	(595)	(581)	(794)	(792)
Participants who have not attained eligibility age	(6,355)	(6,144)	(6,527)	(7,273)	(7,338)
Future participants	(2,714)	(2,632)	(2,856)	(2,699)	(2,121)
All current and future participants	<u>(9,715)</u>	<u>(9,371)</u>	<u>(9,964)</u>	<u>(10,766)</u>	<u>(10,250)</u>
<i>Present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue</i> ⁶	<u>(7,229)</u> ¹	<u>(7,172)</u> ²	<u>(7,857)</u> ³	<u>(8,361)</u> ⁴	<u>(7,884)</u> ⁵
Railroad Retirement:					
<i>Revenue (Contributions and Earmarked Taxes) from:</i>					
Participants who have attained eligibility	5	5	5	5	5
Participants who have not attained eligibility	47	48	43	41	40
Future participants	66	70	54	54	56
All current and future participants	<u>118</u>	<u>123</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<i>Expenditures for Scheduled Future Benefits for:</i>					
Participants who have attained eligibility	(105)	(102)	(97)	(93)	(92)
Participants who have not attained eligibility	(88)	(91)	(88)	(86)	(84)
Future participants	(27)	(30)	(26)	(26)	(25)
All current and future participants	<u>(220)</u>	<u>(223)</u>	<u>(212)</u>	<u>(205)</u>	<u>(201)</u>
<i>Present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue</i> ⁷	<u>(103)</u> ¹	<u>(100)</u> ²	<u>(109)</u> ³	<u>(105)</u> ⁴	<u>(101)</u> ⁵
Black Lung (Part C):					
<i>Present value of future revenue in excess of future expenditures</i> ⁸	<u>6</u> ⁹	<u>6</u> ¹⁰	<u>5</u> ¹¹	<u>5</u> ¹²	<u>4</u> ¹³
Total present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue	<u>(30,857)</u>	<u>(45,878)</u>	<u>(42,970)</u>	<u>(40,948)</u>	<u>(38,851)</u>

Totals may not equal the sum of components due to rounding.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

**United States Government
Statements of Social Insurance (Note 26), continued
Present Value of Long-Range (75 Years, except Black Lung) Actuarial Projections**

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
Social Insurance Summary: ¹⁴					
<i>Participants who have attained eligibility age:</i>					
Revenue (e.g., Contributions and earmarked taxes)	1,628	1,427	1,333	1,260	1,312
Expenditures for scheduled future benefits	(13,661)	(13,262)	(12,369)	(11,608)	(10,920)
Present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue	(12,033)	(11,835)	(11,036)	(10,348)	(9,608)
<i>Participants who have not attained eligibility age:</i>					
Revenue (e.g., Contributions and earmarked taxes)	32,263	30,621	29,851	28,342	27,160
Expenditures for scheduled future benefits	(63,287)	(70,931)	(67,950)	(63,056)	(61,696)
Present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue	(31,024)	(40,310)	(38,099)	(34,714)	(34,536)
Closed-group – Total present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue.....	(43,057)	(52,145)	(49,135)	(45,062)	(44,145)
<i>Future participants:</i>					
Revenue (e.g., Contributions and earmarked taxes)	28,075	25,491	24,743	22,828	21,227
Expenditures for scheduled future benefits	(15,875)	(19,224)	(18,578)	(18,714)	(15,933)
Present value of future revenue in excess of future expenditures	12,200	6,267	6,165	4,114	5,294
Open-group – Total present value of future expenditures in excess of future revenue.....	(30,857)	(45,878)	(42,970)	(40,948)	(38,851)

¹ The projection period is 1/1/2010 -12/31/2084 and the valuation date is 1/1/2010.

² The projection period is 1/1/2009 -12/31/2083 and the valuation date is 1/1/2009.

³ The projection period is 1/1/2008 -12/31/2082 and the valuation date is 1/1/2008.

⁴ The projection period is 1/1/2007 -12/31/2081 and the valuation date is 1/1/2007.

⁵ The projection period is 1/1/2006 -12/31/2080 and the valuation date is 1/1/2006.

⁶ These amounts represent the present value of the future transfers from the General Fund of the Treasury to the Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund. These future intragovernmental transfers are included as income in both HHS' and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services' Financial Reports but are not income from the Governmentwide perspective of this report.

⁷ These amounts approximate the present value of the future financial interchange and the future transfers from the General Fund of the Treasury to the Social Security Equivalent Benefit Account (see discussion of Railroad Retirement Program in the required supplemental information section of this report). They are included as income in the Railroad Retirement Financial Report but are not income from the Governmentwide perspective of this report.

⁸ Does not include interest expense accruing on the outstanding debt.

⁹ The projection period is 9/30/2010 -9/30/2040 and the valuation date is 9/30/2010.

¹⁰ The projection period is 9/30/2009 -9/30/2040 and the valuation date is 9/30/2009.

¹¹ The projection period is 9/30/2008 -9/30/2040 and the valuation date is 9/30/2008.

¹² The projection period is 9/30/2007 -9/30/2040 and the valuation date is 9/30/2007.

¹³ The projection period is 9/30/2006 -9/30/2040 and the valuation date is 9/30/2006.

¹⁴ Participants for the Social Security and Medicare programs are assumed to be the "closed-group" of individuals who are at least age 15 at the start of the projection period, and are participating as either taxpayers, beneficiaries, or both, except for the 2007 Medicare programs for which current participants are assumed to be at least 18 instead of 15 years of age.

Totals may not equal the sum of components due to rounding.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

United States Government Notes to the Financial Statements for the Years Ended September 30, 2010, and 2009

Note 1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

A. Reporting Entity

This *Financial Report* includes the financial status and activities of the executive branch, the legislative branch (the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives report on a cash basis), and the judicial branch (which also reports on a cash basis) of the Government. The judicial branch reports on a limited basis and is not required by law to submit financial statement information to Treasury. Appendix A of this report contains a list of significant Government entities included and excluded in the *Financial Report*. Certain entities are excluded from the *Financial Report* because they are Government-Sponsored Enterprises (GSE), such as the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac), or their activities are not included in the Federal budget, such as the Thrift Savings Fund and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

During fiscal year 2008, the Government began a number of additional emergency economic measures relating to the economy that involved various financing programs. Key initiatives effective for fiscal year 2008 involved programs concerning Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac (GSEs), provision of a credit facility for GSEs and Federal Home Loan Banks, purchase of Mortgage-Backed Securities (MBS), and setup of a Money Market Guarantee Program (see Note 11—Investments in and Liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises and Other Financial and Housing Market Stabilization). The Government increased its investment in the recovery effort in fiscal year 2009. The Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (EESA) gave the Secretary of the Treasury temporary authority to purchase and guarantee assets in a wide range of financial institutions and markets (see Note 5—TARP Direct Loans and Equity Investments, Net).

Following Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) for Federal entities, the Government has not consolidated into its financial statements the assets, liabilities, or results of operations of any financial organization or commercial entity in which Treasury holds either a direct, indirect, or beneficial equity investment. Even though some of the equity investments are significant, under Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts (SFFAC) No. 2, these entities meet the criteria of paragraph 50 and do not appear in the Federal budget section “Federal Programs by Agency and Account.” As such, these entities are not consolidated into the financial reports of the Government. However, the values of the investment in such entities are presented on the balance sheet.

Material intragovernmental transactions are eliminated in consolidation, except as described below in this note and in the Supplemental Information—Unmatched Transactions and Balances. The financial reporting period ends September 30 and is the same as used for the annual budget.

B. Basis of Accounting and Revenue Recognition

These financial statements were prepared using U.S. GAAP, primarily based on SFFAS's. Under these principles:

- Expenses are generally recognized when incurred.
- Nonexchange revenues, including taxes, duties, fines, and penalties, are recognized when collected and adjusted to the change in net measurable and legally collectable amounts receivable. Related refunds and other offsets, including those that are measurable and legally payable, are netted against nonexchange revenue.
- Exchange (earned) revenues are recognized when the Government provides goods and services to the public for a price. Exchange revenues include user charges such as admission to Federal parks and premiums for certain Federal insurance.

The basis of accounting used for budgetary purposes, which is primarily on a cash and obligation basis and follows budgetary concepts and policies, differs from the basis of accounting used for the financial statements which follow U.S. GAAP. See the Reconciliations of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit in the Financial Statements section.

Beginning in fiscal year 2010, the Government has implemented the requirements of new standards related to: pensions, other retirement benefits, and other postemployment benefits; long-term fiscal projections; and subsequent events.

- Pensions, other retirement benefits (ORB), and other postemployment benefits (OPEB):
For further information on these new requirements, see Note 1.L—Federal Employee and Veteran Benefits Payable.
- Long-term fiscal projections:
As required by SSFAS No. 36¹, the Government is now required to include a statement presenting for all its activities (a) the present value of projected receipts and non-interest spending under current policy without change, (b) the relationship of these amounts to projected Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and (c) changes in the present value of projected receipts and non-interest spending from the prior year (not effective for fiscal year 2010). The Government is also required to provide supplementary information that explains and illustrates projected trends in the relationship between receipts and spending, deficits (or surpluses), debt held by the public as a share of GDP, possible results using alternative scenarios, and the likely impact of delaying corrective action when a fiscal gap exists. Finally, the Government is also required to disclose, the assumptions underlying the projections, the factors influencing trends, and significant changes in the projections from period to period. Refer to the *Fiscal Projections for the U.S. Government—Fiscal Year 2010* segment in the Supplementary Information for these required disclosures.
- Subsequent events:
The objective of SSFAS No. 39², is to incorporate the accounting and financial reporting guidance regarding subsequent events that have been included in the Statements of Auditing Standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) into SFFAS. Accordingly, SFFAS No. 39, does not establish new accounting guidance with regard to subsequent events.

¹ SSFAS No. 36, Reporting Comprehensive Long-Term Fiscal Projections for the U.S. Government.

² SSFAS No. 39, Subsequent Events: Codification of Accounting and Financial Reporting Standards Contained in the AICPA Statements on Auditing Standards.

C. Loans Receivable, Mortgage-Backed Securities, and Loan Guarantee Liabilities, Net

Direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed after fiscal year 1991 are reported based on the present value of the net cashflows estimated over the life of the loan or guarantee. The difference between the outstanding principal of the direct loans and the present value of their net cash inflows is recognized as a subsidy cost allowance. The present value of estimated net cash outflows of the loan guarantees is recognized as a liability for loan guarantees.

The subsidy expense for direct or guaranteed loans disbursed during a fiscal year is the present value of estimated net cash outflows for those loans or guarantees. A subsidy expense also is recognized for modifications made during the year to loans and guarantees outstanding and for reestimates made as of the end of the fiscal year to the subsidy allowances or loan guarantee liability for loans and guarantees outstanding.

Direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed before fiscal year 1992 are valued under two different methodologies within the Government: the allowance-for-loss method and the present-value method. Under the allowance-for-loss method, the outstanding principal of direct loans is reduced by an allowance for uncollectible amounts; the liability for loan guarantees is the amount the agency estimates would more likely than not require future cash outflow to pay default claims. Under the present-value method, the outstanding principal of direct loans is reduced by an allowance equal to the difference between the outstanding principal and the present value of the expected net cashflows. The liability for loan guarantees is the present value of expected net cash outflows due to the loan guarantees.

The MBS are treated similar to direct loans, and the value of the Government's position and the associated credit subsidy requirements are determined based on the net present value of the securities' forecasted future cashflows. For more details on MBS', see Note 4—Loans Receivable, Mortgage-Backed Securities, and Loan Guarantee Liabilities, Net.

D. Accounts and Taxes Receivable

Accounts receivable represent claims to cash or other assets from entities outside the Government that arise from the sale of goods or services, duties, fines, certain license fees, recoveries, or other provisions of the law. Accounts receivable are reported net of an allowance for uncollectible accounts. An allowance is established when it is more likely than not the receivables will not be totally collected. The allowance method varies among the agencies in the Government and is usually based on past collection experience and is re-estimated periodically as needed. Methods include statistical sampling of receivables, specific identification and intensive analysis of each case, aging methodologies, and percentage of total receivables based on historical collection.

Taxes receivable consist primarily of uncollected tax assessments, penalties, and interest when taxpayers have agreed the amounts are owed or a court has determined the assessments are owed. The Balance Sheets do not include unpaid assessments when neither taxpayers nor a court have agreed that the amounts are owed (compliance assessments) or the Government does not expect further collections due to factors such as the taxpayer's death, bankruptcy, or insolvency (writeoffs). Taxes receivable are reported net of an allowance for the estimated portion deemed to be uncollectible. The allowance for doubtful accounts is based on projections of collectibles from a statistical sample of unpaid tax assessments.

E. TARP Direct Loans and Equity Investments, Net

TARP equity investments are accounted for at fair value which is defined as the estimated amount of proceeds that would be received if the equity investments were sold to a market participant. Consistent with the present value accounting concepts embedded in SFFAS No. 2, *Accounting for Direct Loans and Loan Guarantees*, TARP Direct Loans and Equity Investments, net, disbursed and outstanding are recognized as assets at the net present value of their estimated future cashflows and outstanding asset guarantees are recognized as liabilities or assets at the net present value of their estimated future cashflows. Market risk is considered in the calculation and determination of the estimated net present values.

The subsidy allowance for TARP's Direct Loans and Equity Investments, net, represents the difference between the face value of the outstanding direct loan and equity investment balance and the net present value of the expected future cashflows, and is reported as an adjustment to the face value of the direct loan or equity investment.

The recorded subsidy allowance for a direct loan, equity investment or asset guarantee is based on a set of estimated future cashflows.

The Government used the following methodologies for valuation of the TARP Direct Loans and Equity Investments:

The estimated future cashflows for TARP direct loans were derived using analytical models that estimate the cashflows to and from the Government over the life of the loan. These cashflows include the scheduled principal, interest, and other payments to the Government, including estimated proceeds from equity interest obtained or additional notes. These models also include estimates of default and recoveries, incorporating the value of any collateral provided by the contract. The probability and timing of default and losses relating to a default are estimated by using applicable historical data when available, or publicly available proxy data, including credit rating agency historical performance data. The models include an adjustment for market risk which is intended to capture the risk of unexpected losses, but are not intended to represent fair value, i.e., the proceeds that would be expected to be received if the loans were sold to a market participant.

TARP preferred stock cashflows are projected using an analytical model developed to incorporate the risk of losses associated with adverse events, such as failure of the institution or increases in market interest rates. The model estimates how cashflows vary depending on: (1) current interest rates, which may affect the decision whether to repay the preferred stock; and (2) the strength of a financial institution's assets. Inputs to the model include institution specific accounting data obtained from regulatory filings, an institution's stock price volatility, and historical bank failure information, as well as market prices of comparable securities trading in the market. The Government estimates the values and projects the cashflows of warrants using an option-pricing approach based on the current stock price and its volatility. Investments in common stock which are exchange traded are valued at the market price. The result of using market prices, either quoted prices for the identical asset or quoted prices for comparable assets, is that the equity investments are recorded at estimated fair value.

F. Beneficial Interest in Trust

The beneficial interest in trust represents the Government's beneficial interest in the American International Group (AIG) stock held by a trust established by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), under the terms of a credit facility agreement with AIG and the FRBNY. The value of beneficial interest is based on the market value of the trust's AIG holdings as of the reporting date; as the underlying AIG common stock is actively traded on the New York Stock Exchange, this represents the best independent valuation available for the Government's beneficial interest (See Note 6—Beneficial Interest in Trust for further details).

G. Inventories and Related Property

Inventory is tangible personal property that is (1) held for sale, principally to Federal agencies, (2) in the process of production for sale, or (3) to be consumed in the production of goods for sale or in the provision of services for a fee. Inventories within the Government are valued using historical cost. However, most of the inventories are held by the Department of Defense (DOD) and its inventory value for most activities is not reported in accordance with GAAP. Historical cost methods include first-in-first-out, weighted average, and moving average. To a lesser degree, the DOD also uses latest acquisition cost (LAC) methods adjusted for holding gains and losses to approximate the historical cost of resale inventory items remaining in the legacy systems. When using historical cost valuation, estimated repair costs reduce the value of inventory held for repair. Excess, obsolete, and unserviceable inventories are valued at estimated net realizable value. When latest acquisition cost is used to value inventory held for sale, it is adjusted for holding gains and losses in order to approximate historical cost.

Related property includes commodities, seized and monetary instruments, forfeited and foreclosed property, raw materials and work in process. Operating materials and supplies are valued at historical cost, latest acquisition cost, and standard price using the purchase and consumption method of accounting. Operating materials and supplies that are valued at latest acquisition cost and standard pricing are not adjusted for holding gains and losses.

H. Property, Plant, and Equipment

Property, plant, and equipment consists of tangible assets including equipment, buildings, construction in progress, internal use software, assets acquired through capital leases, including leasehold improvements, and other assets used to provide goods and services.

Property, plant, and equipment used in Government operations are carried at acquisition cost, with the exception of DOD military equipment (e.g., ships, aircraft, combat vehicles, and weapons) and some National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) equipment. DOD military equipment is valued at estimated historical costs, which are calculated using internal DOD records. DOD identified the universe of military equipment by accumulating information relating to program funding and associated military equipment, equipment useful life, and program acquisitions and disposals to create a baseline. The equipment baseline is updated using expenditure information and information related to acquisition and logistics to identify acquisitions and disposals. NASA also uses estimates of historical cost to value some of its equipment for which historical cost information is not readily available, such as components of the International Space Station.

All property, plant, and equipment is capitalized if the acquisition costs (or estimated acquisition cost for DOD) are in excess of capitalization thresholds that vary considerably between the Federal entities. Depreciation and amortization expense applies to property, plant, and equipment reported on the balance sheets except for land, unlimited duration land rights and construction in progress. Depreciation and amortization are recognized using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the assets. All property, plant, and equipment are assigned useful lives depending on their category and vary considerably between the Federal entities. The cost of acquisition, betterment, or reconstruction of all multi-use heritage assets is capitalized as general property, plant, and equipment and is depreciated. Construction in progress is used for the accumulation of the cost of construction or major renovation of fixed assets during the construction period. The assets are transferred out of construction in progress when the project is substantially completed. Internal use software includes purchased commercial off-the-shelf software, contractor-developed software, and software internally developed.

I. Debt and Equity Securities

Debt and Equity securities are classified as held-to-maturity, available-for-sale, and trading securities and investments. Held-to-maturity debt and equity securities are reported at amortized cost, net of unamortized premiums and discounts. Available-for-sale debt and equity securities are reported at fair value. Trading debt and equity securities are reported at fair value.

J. Investments in and Liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises and Other Financial and Housing Market Stabilization

The senior preferred stock liquidity preference (preferred stock) and associated common stock warrant (warrant(s)) in GSEs are presented at their fair value as permitted by Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-136. This Circular includes language that generally requires agencies to value non-Federal investments at acquisition cost, and also permits the use of other measurement basis, such as fair value, in certain situations. Treasury performs annual valuations, as of September 30th, to provide a “sufficiently reliable” estimate of the outstanding commitments in order for Treasury to record the remaining liability in accordance with SFFAS No. 5. The valuations incorporated various forecasts, projections, and cashflow analyses to develop an estimate of the potential liability. Annual valuations are performed, as of September 30, of the preferred stock and warrants and any changes in valuation, including impairment, are recorded and disclosed in accordance with SFFAS No. 7,

Accounting for Revenue and Other Financing Sources. Since the valuation is an annual process, the changes in valuation of the preferred stock and warrants are deemed usual and recurring. Accordingly, changes in valuation are recorded as an exchange transaction which is either an expense or revenue. Since the costs of preferred stock and warrants are exchange transactions, any change in valuation is also recorded as an exchange transaction.

The GSE Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreements (SPSPAs) provide that Treasury will increase its investment in the GSEs' senior preferred stock if at the end of any quarter the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA), acting as the conservator, determines the liabilities of either GSE, individually, exceed its respective assets. Based on U.S. GAAP, these contingent liquidity commitments, predicated on the future occurrence of any shareholders' deficits of the GSEs at the end of any reporting quarter, are potential liabilities of Treasury. The potential liabilities to the GSEs are assessed annually and recorded at the gross amount, without considering the increase in preferred stock liquidity preference, future divided payments, or future commitment fees, due to the uncertainties involved. The Government currently accounts for the GSE MBS purchase program and the two programs of the Housing Financing Agency (HFA) Initiative (the New Issue Bond Program (NIBP) and Temporary Credit and Liquidity Program (TCLP)) under the provisions of credit reform and the use of estimates is dictated by the SFFAS No. 2. See Note 11—Investments in and Liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises and Other Financial and Housing Market Stabilization for further details.

K. Federal Debt

Accrued interest on Treasury Securities Held by the Public is recorded as an expense when incurred, instead of when paid. Certain Treasury securities are issued at a discount or premium. These discounts and premiums are amortized over the term of the security using an interest method for all long-term securities and the straight line method for short-term securities. Treasury also issues Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities (TIPS). The principal for TIPS is adjusted daily over the life of the security based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all Urban Consumers.

L. Federal Employee and Veteran Benefits Payable

Generally, Federal employee and veteran benefits payable are recorded during the time employee services are rendered. The related liabilities for defined benefit pension plans, veterans' compensation and burial benefits, post-retirement health benefits, life insurance benefits, and Federal Employee and Compensation Act benefits are recorded at estimated present value of future benefits, less any estimated present value of future normal cost contributions. The estimated present value for veterans' pension benefits is disclosed but is not included in the Federal employee and veteran benefits payable line. These benefits are expensed when services are provided.

Normal cost is the portion of the actuarial present value of projected benefits allocated as an expense for employee services rendered in the current year. Actuarial gains and losses (and prior service cost, if any) are recognized immediately in the year they occur, without amortization.

Beginning in fiscal year 2010, the Federal Government has implemented the requirements of a new standard related to Federal Employee and Veteran Benefits Payable. SFFAS No. 33³ highlights gains and losses from changes in assumptions. As required by SFFAS No. 33, gains and losses from changes in long-term assumptions used to estimate Federal employee pensions, ORB, and OPEB liabilities are reflected separately on the Statement of Net Cost and the components of the expense related to Federal employee pension, ORB, and OPEB liabilities are disclosed in Note 15—Federal Employee and Veteran Benefits Payable. Based on SFFAS No 33, fiscal year 2009 amounts were not reclassified to conform to fiscal year 2010 presentation. In addition, SFFAS No. 33 also provides a standard for selecting the discount rate assumption for present value estimates of Federal employee pension, ORB, and OPEB liabilities.

³ SFFAS No.33, *Pensions, Other Retirement Benefits, and Other Postemployment Benefits: Reporting the Gains and Losses from Changes in Assumptions and Selecting Discount Rates and Valuation Dates.*

M. Environmental and Disposal Liabilities

Environmental and disposal liabilities are recorded at the estimated current cost of removing, containing, treating, and/or disposing of radioactive waste, hazardous waste, chemical and nuclear weapons, and other environmental contaminations, assuming the use of current technology. Hazardous waste is a solid, liquid, or gaseous waste that, because of its quantity or concentration, presents a potential hazard to human health or the environment. Remediation consists of removal, decontamination, decommissioning, site restoration, site monitoring, closure and post-closure cost, treatment, and/or safe containment. Where technology does not exist to clean up radioactive or hazardous waste, only the estimable portion of the liability, typically monitoring and safe containment is recorded.

N. Insurance and Guarantee Program Liabilities

Insurance and guarantee programs provide protection to individuals or entities against specified risks except for those specifically covered by Federal employee and veteran benefits, social insurance, and loan guarantee programs. Insurance and guarantee program funds are commonly held in revolving funds in the Government and losses sustained by participants are paid from these funds. Many of these programs receive appropriations to pay excess claims and/or have authority to borrow from the Treasury. The values of insurance and guarantee program liabilities are particularly sensitive to changes in underlying estimates and assumptions. Insurance and guarantee programs with recognized liabilities in future periods (i.e., liabilities that extend beyond one year) are reported at their actuarial present value.

O. Deferred Maintenance

Deferred maintenance is maintenance that was not performed when it should have been or scheduled maintenance that was delayed or postponed. Maintenance is the act of keeping fixed assets in acceptable condition, including preventative maintenance, normal repairs, and other activities needed to preserve the assets, so they continue to provide acceptable services and achieve their expected life. Maintenance excludes activities aimed at expanding the capacity of assets or otherwise upgrading them to serve needs different from those originally intended. Deferred maintenance expenses are not accrued in the Statements of Net Cost or recognized as liabilities on the Balance Sheets. However, deferred maintenance information is disclosed in the Unaudited Supplemental Information section of this report.

P. Contingent Liabilities

Liabilities for contingencies are recognized on the Balance Sheets when both:

- A past transaction or event has occurred, and
- A future outflow or other sacrifice of resources is probable and measurable.

The estimated contingent liability may be a specific amount or a range of amounts. If some amount within the range is a better estimate than any other amount within the range, then that amount is recognized. If no amount within the range is a better estimate than any other amount, then the minimum amount in the range is recognized and the range is disclosed.

Contingent liabilities that do not meet the above criteria for recognition, but for which there is at least a reasonable possibility that a loss may have been incurred, are disclosed in Note 22—Contingencies.

Q. Commitments

In the normal course of business, the Government has a number of unfulfilled commitments that may require the use of its financial resources. Note 23—Commitments describes the components of the Government's actual commitments that need to be disclosed because of their nature and/or their amount. They include long-term leases, undelivered orders, and other commitments.

R. Social Insurance

A liability for social insurance programs (Social Security, Medicare, Railroad Retirement, Black Lung, and Unemployment) is recognized for any unpaid amounts currently due as of the reporting date. No liability is recognized for future benefit payments not yet due. For further information, see the Unaudited Supplemental Information—Social Insurance section, and Note 26—Social Insurance.

S. Related Party Transactions

Federal Reserve banks (FRBs) and private banks, which are not part of the reporting entity, serve as the Government's depository and fiscal agents. They process Federal payments and deposits to the Treasury General Account (which functions as the Government's checking account for deposits and disbursements) and service Treasury securities. As of September 30, 2010, the FRBs had total holdings of \$813.6 billion, including a net of \$1.9 billion in Treasury securities held by the FRB as collateral for securities lending activities. As of September 30, 2009, the FRB had total holdings of \$769.2 billion, excluding a very small amount in Treasury securities lent by the FRB to dealers. These securities are held in the FRBs' System Open Market Account (SOMA) for the purpose of conducting monetary policy. Additionally, under the Supplementary Financing Program (SFP), the Government had on deposit \$200 billion and \$165 billion with the Federal Reserve as of September 30, 2010, and 2009 respectively, to support Federal Reserve initiatives (see Note 2—Cash and Other Monetary Assets). FRBs earnings that exceed statutory amounts of surplus established for FRBs are paid to the Government and are recognized as nonexchange revenue. Those earnings totaled \$75.8 billion and \$34.3 billion for the years ended September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively and reflect the increase in securities held by the FRB. Also, the FRBs hold Special Drawing Rights Certificates (SDRCs) (see Note 19—Other Liabilities, international monetary liabilities and gold certificates). The U.S. Government—primarily Treasury and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the FRBs engaged in concurrent and/or coordinated actions during fiscal years 2009 and 2010 to help stabilize the financial system and the housing market. See further details in Note 5—TARP Direct Loans and Equity Investments, net, Note 6—Beneficial Interest in Trust, and Note 11—Investments in and Liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises and Other Financial and Housing Market Stabilization.

FRBs issue Federal Reserve notes, the circulating currency of the United States. Specific assets owned by FRBs, typically Treasury securities, collateralize these notes. Federal Reserve notes are backed by the full faith and credit of the Government.

The Government generally does not guarantee payment of the liabilities of Government-Sponsored Enterprises such as Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, or the Federal Home Loan Banks, which are privately owned. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have been placed under conservatorship as of September 7, 2008. On December 24, 2009, Treasury amended the SPSPAs to replace the existing fixed \$200 billion cap per the Government-Sponsored Enterprises (GSE) on Treasury advances, with a formulaic cap for the next 3 years that will adjust upwards quarterly by the cumulative amount of any losses realized by either Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac and downwards by the cumulative amount of any gains, but not below \$200 billion per GSE. At the conclusion of the 3-year period, the remaining commitment will then be fixed and available to be drawn per the terms of the agreements (referred to as the "Adjusted Cap"). As of September 30, 2010, the Government has committed to provide up to \$508 billion in capital (i.e., adjusted cap amounts as of September 30, 2010) to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to the extent that these entities liabilities exceed assets (see Note 11—Investments in and Liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises and Other Financial and Housing Market Stabilization). These entities also are excluded from the reporting entity.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) has possession of two long term notes with the National Railroad Passenger Service Corporation (more commonly referred to as AMTRAK). The first note is for \$4 billion and

matures in 2975 and; the second note is for \$1.1 billion and matures in 2082 with renewable 99 year terms. Interest is not accruing on these notes as long as the current financial structure of AMTRAK remains unchanged. If the financial structure of AMTRAK changes, both principal and accrued interest are due and payable. DOT does not record the notes in its financial statements because the present value of the notes was immaterial at September 30, 2010. These notes were discounted according to rates published in OMB M-10-07 Appendix C and the maturity dates of 2975 and 2082.

In addition, DOT has possession of all the preferred stock shares (109.4 million) of AMTRAK. Congress through the DOT continues to fund AMTRAK since 1981; originally through the purchase of preferred stock, notes receivable and then through grants after 1997. The AMTRAK Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 (Act) changed the structure of the preferred stock by rescinding the voting rights and eliminating the preferred stock's liquidation preference over the common stock. The Act also eliminated further issuance of preferred stock to the DOT. DOT does not record the AMTRAK stock in its financial statements because it is not publicly traded and no fair market value can be placed on it.

AMTRAK is not a department, agency or instrumentality of the Government or the DOT. The nine members of AMTRAK's Board of Directors are appointed by the President of the United States and are subject to confirmation by the United States Senate. Once appointed, Board Members, as a whole, act independently without the consent of the Government or any of its officers to set AMTRAK policy, determine its budget and decide operational issues. The Secretary of Transportation is statutorily appointed to the nine member Board. Traditionally, the Secretary of Transportation has designated the Administrator of the Federal Rail Administration to represent the Secretary at Board meetings.

The Export-Import Bank of the United States (Ex-Im Bank) has contractual agreements with the Private Export Funding Corporation (PEFCO). PEFCO, which is owned by a consortium of private-sector banks, industrial companies and financial services institutions, makes medium-term and long-term fixed-rate and variable-rate loans to foreign borrowers to purchase U.S. made equipment when such loans are not available from traditional private sector lenders on competitive terms. Ex-Im Bank's credit and guarantee agreement with PEFCO extends through December 31, 2020. Through its contractual agreements with PEFCO, Ex-Im Bank exercises a broad measure of supervision over PEFCO's major financial management decisions, including approval of both the terms of individual loan commitments and the terms of PEFCO's long-term debt issues, and is entitled to representation at all meetings of PEFCO's board of directors, advisory board and exporters' council.

The contractual agreements provide that Ex-Im Bank will (1) guarantee the due and punctual payment of principal and interest on export loans made by PEFCO and (2) guarantee the due and punctual payment of interest on PEFCO's long-term secured debt obligations when requested by PEFCO. Related to the amounts for Ex-Im Bank as shown in Note 4—Loans Receivable, Mortgage Backed Securities, and Loan Guarantee Liabilities, Net, these guarantees to PEFCO, aggregating \$5.1 billion and \$5.0 billion at September 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively, are included within the principal amounts guaranteed by the United States. The allowance related to these transactions is included within the guaranteed loan liability. Ex-Im Bank received fees totaling \$0.03 billion and \$0.04 billion in fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively, for the agreements, which are included as earned revenue on the Statements of Net Costs.

T. Unmatched Transactions and Balances

The reconciliation of the change in net position requires that the difference between ending and beginning net position equals the excess of revenues over net cost, plus or minus prior period adjustments.

The unmatched transactions and balances are needed to bring the change in net position into balance. The primary factors affecting this out of balance situation are:

- Unmatched intragovernmental transactions and balances between Federal agencies,
- General fund transactions, and
- Timing differences and errors in Federal agencies' reporting.

Refer to the Unaudited Supplemental Information—Unmatched Transactions and Balances for detailed information.

U. Derivatives

A derivative is a financial instrument or other contract with all three of the following characteristics:

- It has (1) one or more underlyings and (2) one or more notional amounts or payment provisions or both. Those terms determine the amount of the settlement or settlements, and, in some cases, whether or not a settlement is required.
- It requires no initial net investment or an initial net investment that is smaller than would be required for other types of contracts that would be expected to have a similar response to changes in market factors.
- Its terms require or permit net settlement, it can readily be settled net by a means outside the contract, or it provides for delivery of an asset that puts the recipient in a position not substantially different from net settlement.

An underlying is a specified interest rate, security price, commodity price, foreign exchange rate, index of prices or rates, or other variable. An underlying may be a price or rate of an asset or liability but is not the asset or liability itself. A notional (or face) amount is a number of currency units, shares, bushels, pounds, or other units specified in the contract. The settlement of a derivative instrument with a notional amount is determined by interaction of that notional amount with the underlying. The interaction may be simple multiplication, or it may involve a formula with leverage factors or other constants. A payment provision specifies a fixed or determinable settlement to be made if the underlying behaves in a specified manner.

The accounting for derivative instruments are governed by FASB Accounting Standards Codification Section 815 (formerly SFAS No. 133, *Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities* and amended by SFAS No. 161, *Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities*) which aims to highlight to financial statement users additional disclosures on an entity's objectives in its use of derivatives and the method of accounting for such financial instruments. This standard requires that entities with derivatives disclose the following:

- how and why an entity uses derivatives,
- how derivatives and related hedged items are accounted for under this accounting standard, and
- how derivatives and related hedged items affect an entity's financial statements.

For further information, see Note 10—Derivatives.

V. Reclassifications

Certain fiscal year 2009 amounts have been reclassified to conform to the fiscal year 2010 presentation in the following notes: 3—Accounts and Taxes Receivable and 12—Other Assets. This reclassification is discussed in further in note 10—Derivatives. The reclassification from note 3 to note 12 is also reflected in the Balance Sheet and in the Reconciliation of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit.

W. Restatements

Certain fiscal year 2009, line item amounts have been restated within the Statements of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities. Specifically, due to a correction, with regard to transactions from monetary and other activity, the previously reported amounts for net loan activity and for other activity were both adjusted by \$151.7 billion.

Certain fiscal year 2009 amounts have been restated to correct errors within the notes to the financial statements. See Note 23—Commitments and Note 24—Earmarked Funds for further information. With regard to commitments, these errors did not impact the principal financial statements. With regard to earmarked funds, the errors affected the fiscal year 2009 earmarked other taxes and receipts and intragovernmental transfers shown on the consolidated Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position.

X. Fiduciary Activities

Fiduciary activities are the collection or receipt, and the management, protection, accounting, investment and disposition by the Government of cash or other assets in which non-federal individuals or entities have an ownership interest that the Government must uphold. Fiduciary cash and other fiduciary assets are not assets of the Government and are not recognized on the Balance Sheet. See Note 25—Fiduciary Activities, for further information.

Y. Use of Estimates

The Government has made certain estimates and assumptions relating to the reporting of assets, liabilities, revenues, expenses, and the disclosure of contingent liabilities to prepare these financial statements. There are a large number of factors that affect these assumptions and estimates, which are inherently subject to substantial uncertainty arising from the likelihood of future changes in general economic, regulatory and market conditions. As such, actual results will differ from these estimates and such differences may be material.

Significant transactions subject to estimates include loans receivable and mortgage backed securities, net; TARP direct loans and equity investments; investments in other non-Federal securities (including GSEs and foreign and domestic public entities) and related impairment, if any; tax receivables; loan guarantees; depreciation; liability for liquidity commitment (GSEs); actuarial liabilities; contingent legal liabilities; credit reform subsidy costs; and insurance and guarantee program liabilities.

The Government recognizes the sensitivity of credit reform modeling to slight changes in some model assumptions and uses regular review of model factors, statistical modeling, and annual reestimates to reflect the most accurate cost of the credit programs to the U.S. Government. Two of the emergency economic programs that the Government implemented in the latter part of September 2008, the purchase program for MBS and the GSE credit line facility, are accounted for pursuant to the provisions of credit reform and the use of estimates as dictated by the *Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990* (FCRA). FCRA loan receivables and loan guarantees are disclosed in Note 4—Loans Receivable, Mortgage Backed Securities, and Loan Guarantee Liabilities, Net. Additionally, all TARP credit activity, including investments in common and preferred stock and loans and asset guarantees, are also subject to credit reform accounting (see Note 5—TARP Direct Loans and Equity Investments, Net).

The forecasted future cashflows used to determine credit reform amounts as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, are sensitive to slight changes in model assumptions, such as general economic conditions, specific stock price volatility of the entities in which the Government has an equity interest, estimates of expected default, and prepayment rates. Forecasts of future financial results have inherent uncertainty and the TARP Direct Loans and Equity Investments, Net line item as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, is reflective of relative illiquid, troubled assets whose values are particularly sensitive to future economic conditions and other assumptions.

The GSE senior preferred stock purchase agreements provide that the Government will make funding advances to the GSEs, if at the end of any quarter, FHFA, acting as the conservator, determines that the liabilities of either GSE, individually, exceed its respective assets. These contingent liquidity commitments predicated on the future occurrence of any shareholders' deficits of the GSEs at the end of any reporting quarter, are potential liabilities of the Government. Valuation analyses were performed to attempt to provide a "sufficiently reliable" estimate of the outstanding commitment which is recorded as a liability in accordance with SFFAS No. 5, *Accounting for Liabilities of the Federal Government*. The valuation incorporated various forecasts, projections and cashflow analysis to develop an estimate of potential liability. Note 11—Investments in and Liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises and Other Financial and Housing Market Stabilization discusses the results of the valuation and the contingent liability recorded as of September 30, 2010, and 2009.

Z. Credit Risk

Credit risk is the potential, no matter how remote, for financial loss from a failure of a borrower or a counterparty to perform in accordance with underlying contractual obligations. The Government takes on credit risk when it makes direct loans or credits to foreign entities or becomes exposed to institutions which engage in financial transactions with foreign countries.

The Government also takes on credit risk related to committed but undisbursed direct loans, liquidity commitment to GSEs, MBS portfolio, investments, loans, and asset guarantees of the TARP, guarantee of money market funds, and the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program. Except for the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program, these activities focus on the underlying problems in the credit markets, and the ongoing instability in those markets exposes the Government to potential unknown costs and losses. The extent of the risk assumed is described in more detail in the notes to the financial statements, and where applicable, is factored into credit reform models and reflected in fair value measurements.

Note 2. Cash and Other Monetary Assets

Cash and Other Monetary Assets as of September 30		
(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Unrestricted cash:		
Cash held by Treasury for Governmentwide operations	103.6	104.0
Other	9.0	8.4
Restricted cash:		
Cash held by Treasury for Governmentwide operations	200.0	165.0
Other	19.4	17.7
Total cash.....	<u>332.0</u>	<u>295.1</u>
International monetary assets	70.4	71.4
Gold	11.1	11.1
Foreign currency.....	15.1	15.6
Total cash and other monetary assets.....	<u>428.6</u>	<u>393.2</u>

Unrestricted cash includes cash held by Treasury for Governmentwide operations (Operating Cash) and all other unrestricted cash held by the Federal agencies. Operating Cash represents balances from tax collections, other revenue, Federal debt receipts, and other various receipts net of cash outflows for budget outlays and other payments. Operating Cash includes balances invested with commercial depositories in Treasury Tax and Loan Accounts (including funds invested through the Term Investment Option program and the Repo Pilot program). Treasury checks outstanding are netted against Operating Cash until they are cleared by the Federal Reserve System. Other unrestricted cash not included in Treasury's Operating Cash balance includes balances representing cash, cash equivalents, and other funds held by agencies, such as undeposited collections, deposits in transit, demand deposits, amounts held in trust, imprest funds, and amounts representing the balances of petty cash.

Restricted cash is restricted due to the imposition on cash deposits by law, regulation, or agreement. Restricted cash is primarily composed of the SFP and cash held by the Foreign Military Sales programs. On September 18, 2008, Treasury began issuing specific cash management bills to fund the SFP. The SFP is a temporary program that deposits cash with the Federal Reserve to support Federal Reserve initiatives aimed at addressing the ongoing crisis in financial markets. As of September 30, 2010, there were a total of eight SFP cash management bills outstanding that totaled \$200.0 billion. As of September 30, 2009, there were five SFP cash management bills outstanding that totaled \$165.0 billion. The Foreign Military Sales program included \$18.6 billion and \$17.2 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively. All cash held by depository institutions is either insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) or collateralized by securities pledged by the depository institution or through securities held under reverse repurchase agreements. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (signed on July 21, 2010) made changes related to the FDIC's deposit insurance mandate. These changes include a permanent increase in the standard deposit insurance amount to \$250,000 (retroactive to January 1, 2008) and unlimited deposit insurance coverage for non-interest bearing transaction accounts for two years, from December 31, 2010, to the end of 2012.

International monetary assets include the U.S. reserve position in the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and U.S. holdings of Special Drawing Rights (SDRs).

The U.S. reserve position in the IMF reflects the reserve asset portion of the financial subscription that the United States has paid in as part of its participation in the IMF. The IMF promotes international monetary cooperation and a stable payment system to facilitate growth in the world economy. Its primary activities are surveillance of member economies, financial assistance as appropriate and technical assistance.

Only a portion of the U.S. financial subscriptions to the IMF is made in the form of reserve assets; the remainder is provided in the form of a letter of credit from the United States to the IMF. The balance available under the letter of credit totaled \$45.2 billion and \$53.1 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively. The U.S. reserve position in the IMF has a U.S. dollar equivalent of \$12.9 billion and \$13.4 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively.

SDRs are in international monetary reserves issued by the IMF. These interest-bearing assets can be obtained by IMF allocations, transactions with IMF member countries, interest earnings on SDR holdings, or U.S. reserve position in the IMF. SDR holdings are an asset of Treasury's Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF), which held SDRs totaling \$57.4 billion and \$58.0 billion equivalent as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively.

The IMF allocates SDRs to its members in proportion to each member's quota in the IMF. The SDR Act, enacted in 1968, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to issue SDRCs to the Federal Reserve in exchange for dollars. The amount of SDRCs outstanding cannot exceed the dollar value of SDR holdings. The Secretary of the Treasury determines when Treasury will issue or redeem SDRCs. SDRCs outstanding totaled \$5.2 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009 respectively, and are included in Note 19—Other Liabilities.

As of September 30, 2010, and 2009, other liabilities included \$55.0 billion and \$56.0 billion of interest-bearing liability to the IMF for SDR allocations. The SDR allocation item represents the cumulative total of SDRs distributed by the IMF to the United States in allocations that occurred in 1970, 1971, 1972, 1979, 1980, 1981, and 2009.

Gold is valued at the statutory price of \$42.2222 per fine troy ounce. The number of fine troy ounces was 261,498,900 as of September 30, 2010, and 2009. The market value of gold on the London Fixing was \$1,307 and \$996 per fine troy ounce as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively. Gold totaling \$11.1 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, was pledged as collateral for gold certificates issued and authorized to the FRBs by the Secretary of the Treasury. Gold certificates were valued at \$11.0 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, which are included in Note 19—Other Liabilities. Treasury may redeem the gold certificates at any time. Foreign currency is translated into U.S. dollars at the exchange rate at fiscal yearend. The foreign currency is maintained by various U.S. Federal agencies and foreign banks.

Note 3. Accounts and Taxes Receivable, Net

Accounts and Taxes Receivable as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Accounts Receivable:		
Gross accounts receivable	75.1	77.5
Allowance for uncollectible accounts.....	<u>(18.0)</u>	<u>(21.0)</u>
Accounts receivable, net	57.1	56.5
Taxes Receivable:		
Gross taxes receivable	141.9	131.2
Allowance for doubtful accounts.....	<u>(104.4)</u>	<u>(100.3)</u>
Taxes receivable, net	37.5	30.9
Total accounts and taxes receivable, net	<u>94.6</u>	<u>87.4</u>

Accounts receivable includes related interest receivable of \$6.7 billion and \$5.7 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively.

Note 4. Loans Receivable, Mortgage-Backed Securities, and Loan Guarantee Liabilities, Net

Direct Loan, Mortgage-Backed Securities, and Defaulted Guaranteed Loan Programs as of September 30

	Face Value of Loans Outstanding		Long-term Cost of/(Income From) Direct Loans and Defaulted Guaranteed Loans Outstanding		Loans Receivable and Mortgage-Backed Securities, Net		Subsidy Expense/ (Income) for the Fiscal Year	
	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009
(In billions of dollars)								
Federal Direct Student Loans - Education	231.3	157.8	2.4	4.5	228.9	153.3	(1.6)	(9.6)
GSE Mortgage Backed Securities Purchase Program - Treasury	164.3	173.3	(7.9)	(11.1)	172.2	184.4	(0.6)	(12.9)
Federal Family Education Loans - Education	138.9	84.0	-	3.1	138.9	80.9	(1.1)	(4.1)
Electric Loans - USDA.....	40.7	40.0	2.2	2.3	38.5	37.7	-	0.2
Rural Housing Services - USDA.....	29.8	28.4	7.0	6.9	22.8	21.5	0.5	0.3
State and Local Housing Finance Agency Initiative- Treasury.....	15.3	-	1.2	-	14.1	-	1.7	-
Housing and Urban Development Loans.....	11.3	5.4	(0.2)	0.8	11.5	4.6	1.3	1.1
Water and Environmental Loans - USDA	11.0	10.4	0.8	0.8	10.3	9.6	0.1	(0.1)
Farm Loans - USDA.....	8.2	7.3	0.3	0.3	7.9	7.0	(0.1)	0.8
Disaster Loan Programs - SBA	7.9	8.4	1.5	1.6	6.5	6.8	0.2	-
Export-Import Bank Loans	8.9	7.7	3.6	3.1	5.3	4.6	(0.2)	(0.1)
Telecommunications Loans - USDA....	4.3	4.1	-	-	4.3	4.1	-	0.2
Food Aid - USDA	5.6	6.1	2.0	1.9	3.7	4.2	-	(0.4)
U.S. Agency for International Development Loans	5.3	5.6	1.9	1.8	3.4	3.8	-	-
Housing for the Elderly and Disabled - HUD.....	3.2	3.5	-	-	3.2	3.5	-	-
All Other Programs.....	26.6	19.4	9.2	6.5	17.1	12.9	0.6	1.3
Total Direct Loans and Defaulted Guaranteed Loans.....	<u>712.6</u>	<u>561.4</u>	<u>24.0</u>	<u>22.5</u>	<u>688.6</u>	<u>538.9</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>(23.3)</u>

Loan Guarantees as of September 30

	Principal Amount of Loans under Guarantee		Principal Amount Guaranteed by the United States		Loan Guarantee Liabilities		Subsidy Expense (Income) for the Fiscal Year	
	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009
(In billions of dollars)								
Federal Housing Administration Loans - HUD.....	1,025.1	804.2	968.0	757.3	35.0	34.1	(3.0)	(0.7)
Federal Family Education Loans - Education.....	390.5	457.3	382.0	445.4	14.5	20.6	(13.3)	(25.9)
Small Business Loans - SBA.....	76.2	74.9	64.4	62.2	4.5	4.0	4.2	4.8
Export-Import Bank Guarantees.....	61.7	57.7	61.7	57.7	1.4	2.2	(0.2)	(0.2)
Veterans Housing Benefit Programs - VA.....	214.7	183.4	58.1	50.4	4.9	3.9	1.3	-
Rural Housing Services - USDA.....	51.0	34.8	45.8	31.3	1.8	1.1	0.5	0.2
Israeli Loan Guarantee Program - AID ...	11.9	12.2	11.9	12.2	1.9	1.8	-	0.3
Export Credit Guaranteed Programs - USDA.....	6.6	7.0	6.5	6.9	0.2	0.2	-	-
Overseas Private Investment Corporation Credit Program.....	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.9	0.1	0.1	-	-
Business and Industry Loans - USDA.....	5.9	4.4	4.4	3.3	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.1
Federal Ship Financing Fund (Title XI) - DOT.....	2.0	2.4	2.0	2.4	0.2	0.3	-	0.1
All Other Guaranteed Loan Programs.....	19.8	18.1	18.4	16.8	0.7	0.7	-	0.1
Total Loan Guarantees.....	1,870.4	1,661.3	1,628.2	1,450.8	65.8	69.4	(10.2)	(21.2)

The Government has two different types of loans and loan guarantees. One major type of loan is direct loans such as the Department of Education's (Education) Federal Direct Student Loans. Direct Loans includes purchases of asset-backed securities, such as, the Treasury's GSE MBS Purchase Program. The second type is loan guarantee programs, such as, HUD's Federal Housing Administration Loans program.

Direct loans and loan guarantee programs are used to promote the Nation's welfare by making financing available to segments of the population not served adequately by non-Federal institutions, or otherwise providing for certain activities or investments. For those unable to afford credit at the market rate, Federal credit programs provide subsidies in the form of direct loans offered at an interest rate lower than the market rate. For those to whom non-Federal financial institutions are reluctant to grant credit because of the high risk involved, Federal credit programs guarantee the payment of these non-Federal loans and absorb the cost of defaults.

The amount of the long-term cost of post-1991 direct loans and loan guarantees outstanding equals the subsidy cost allowance for direct loans and the liability for loan guarantees as of September 30. The amount of the long-term cost of pre-1992 direct loans and loan guarantees equals the allowance for uncollectible amounts (or present value allowance) for direct loans and the liability for loan guarantees. The long-term cost is based on all direct loans and guaranteed loans disbursed in this fiscal year and previous years that are outstanding as of September 30. It includes the subsidy cost of these loans and guarantees estimated as of the time of loan disbursement and subsequent adjustments such as modifications, reestimates, amortizations, and writeoffs.

Net loans receivable includes related interest and foreclosed property, and is included in the assets section of the Balance Sheets. Foreclosed property is property that is transferred from borrowers to a Federal credit program, through foreclosure or other means, in partial or full settlement of post-1991 direct loans or as a compensation for losses that the Government sustained under post-1991 loan guarantees. Please refer to the individual financial statements of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for significant detailed information regarding foreclosed property.

The total subsidy expense/(income) is the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees recognized during the fiscal year. It consists of the subsidy expense/(income) incurred for direct and guaranteed loans disbursed during the fiscal year, for modifications made during the fiscal year of loans and guarantees outstanding, and for upward or downward re-estimates as of the end of the fiscal year of the cost of loans and guarantees outstanding. This expense/(income) is included in the Statements of Net Cost.

Major Loan Programs

Education has two major education loan programs. The first program, the Federal Direct Student Loan Program, established in fiscal year 1994, offers four types of education loans: Stafford, Unsubsidized Stafford, PLUS for parents, and consolidation loans. Evidence of financial need is required for a student to receive a subsidized Stafford loan. The other three types of loans are available to borrowers at all income levels. These loans usually mature 9 to 13 years after the student is no longer enrolled. They are unsecured. The second program, the FFEL Program, established in fiscal year 1965, is a guaranteed loan program. Like the Federal Direct Student Loan Program, it offered four types of loans: Stafford, Unsubsidized Stafford, PLUS for parents, and consolidation loans. The FFEL program was terminated in the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act, which removed the authority guarantee new loans after July 1, 2010. During fiscal year 2010, FFEL loans receivable continued to increase significantly, principally due to the Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act of 2008 (ECASLA). The ECASLA gave Education temporary loan purchase authority to purchase FFEL loans and interests in those loans. This authority was to expire on September 30, 2009; however, Public Law 110-350 extended the authority through September 30, 2010.

The Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA), Public Law 110-289, authorized the Treasury to enter into the GSE MBS Purchase Program. Under this program, the Treasury, using private sector asset managers, purchased on the open market a portfolio of mortgage-backed securities issued by the GSEs. By purchasing these credit-guaranteed securities, the Treasury sought to broaden access to mortgage funding for current and prospective homeowners and to promote stability in the mortgage market. The asset managers were also authorized to enter into other trade/sell transactions such as pair offs, turns, assignments, and dollar rolls to further support the market under the HERA provision/mandate. The authority granted by Congress to purchase MBS expired on December 31, 2009 at which point the purchase of new securities ended, though the Treasury still retains its portfolio of previously purchased securities.

The Treasury's GSE MBS Purchase Program portfolio consists of mortgage pass-through securities issued by Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae.

Under HERA, Treasury together with the FHFA, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and HUD announced in October 2009 an initiative to provide support to state and local HFAs. HFAs have historically played a central role in providing a safe, sustainable path to homeownership for working families in all 50 states and many localities across the country. This initiative is designed to support low mortgage rates and expand resources for low and middle income borrowers to purchase or rent homes, making them more affordable over the long term. In December 2009, several transactions closed as part of the HFA Initiative's two separate programs: (1) TCLP and (2) the NIBP. As part of the TCLP, the Treasury has entered into participation agreements with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, supporting credit and liquidity facilities that the GSEs are providing to 11 states as part of the program.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) offers direct and guaranteed loans through credit programs in the Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services (FFAS) mission area through the Farm Service Agency (FSA), and the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC), and in the Rural Development (RD) mission area.

The FFAS delivers commodity, credit, conservation, disaster and emergency assistance programs that help strengthen and stabilize the agricultural economy. The FSA offers direct and guaranteed loans to farmers who are temporarily unable to obtain private, commercial credit and through this supervised credit, the goal is to graduate its borrowers to commercial credit. The CCC offers both credit guarantee and direct credit programs for buyers of U.S. exports, suppliers, and sovereign countries in need of food assistance. The RD provides affordable housing and essential community facilities to rural communities through its rural housing loan and grant programs. The Rural Utilities Program administers a variety of loan programs for electric energy, telecommunications, and water and environmental projects in rural America.

The Small Business Administration's (SBA's) Disaster Assistance Loan Program makes direct loans to disaster victims primarily for homes and personal property.

The Export-Import Bank aids in financing and promoting U.S. exports. The average repayment term for these loans is approximately 7 years.

HUD's Federal Housing Administration (FHA) provides mortgage insurance to encourage lenders to make credit available to expand home ownership. FHA predominantly serves borrowers that the conventional market does not serve adequately. This includes first-time homebuyers, minorities, low-income families, and residents of underserved areas. Borrowers obtain an FHA insured mortgage and pay an upfront premium and an annual premium to FHA. The proceeds from those premiums are used to fund FHA program costs, including claims on defaulted mortgages and holding costs, property management fees, property sales, and other associated costs. The possibility of a sizable volume of delinquencies remains a significant risk for the housing market and for FHA in the near term. Nonetheless, HUD anticipates that the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund will remain financially sound. FHA continues to be a financially conservative and stabilizing presence for credit markets in times of economic disruption.

Please refer to the individual financial statements of the agencies listed in the tables for significant detailed information regarding their direct and guaranteed loan programs.

Note 5. TARP Direct Loans and Equity Investments, Net

The TARP was authorized by the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (EESA or "The Act"). The Act gave the Secretary of the Treasury broad flexible authority to establish the TARP to purchase and guarantee mortgages, mortgage related securities, and other troubled assets from financial institutions. This permitted the Secretary of the Treasury to inject capital into, and receive equity interests in, banks and other financial institutions. Treasury established several programs under the TARP to help stabilize the financial system and restore the flow of credit to consumers and businesses, and tackle the foreclosure crisis. On October 3, 2010, the authority to make new commitments to purchase or guarantee troubled assets expired.

The following TARP programs were designed to stabilize the financial system and restore the flow of credit to consumers and businesses. Treasury made direct loans and made equity investments and entered into the asset guarantees program. The table below is a list of TARP programs and types.

Program	Program Type
Capital Purchase Program	Equity Investment/Subordinated Debentures
American International Group, Inc. Investment Program *	Equity Investment
Targeted Investment Program	Equity Investment
Automotive Industry Financing Program	Equity Investment and Direct Loan
Consumer and Business Lending Initiative	Direct Loan, Subordinated Debentures and Equity Investments
Public-Private Investment Program	Equity Investment and Direct Loan
Asset Guarantee Program	Asset Guarantee
Housing Programs Under TARP **	Expenditure

* Formerly known as the Systemically Significant Failing Institutions Program.
 ** Housing Programs Under TARP are not designed to recoup money spent on loan modifications. As such, these programs do not include direct loans, equity investments, or asset guarantees.

TARP direct loans and equity investments, net and asset guarantee program balances as of September 30, 2010, and 2009 are as follows:

Troubled Asset Relief Program as of September 30		
(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Direct Loans and Equity Investments, Net.....	142.5	237.9
Asset Guarantee Program	2.2	1.8
Total	<u>144.7</u>	<u>239.7</u>

The direct loans and equity investments, net represents the estimated net outstanding amount of direct loans and equity investments.

The table below is a summary of TARP loans and equity investments.

Troubled Asset Relief Program Direct Loans and Equity Investments as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	Direct Loans and Equity Investments		Subsidy Cost Allowance		Net Direct Loans and Equity Investments		Subsidy Expense (Income) for the Fiscal Year	
	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009
Automotive Industry Financing Program	67.3	73.8	(14.6)	(31.5)	52.7	42.3	(16.6)	30.4
Capital Purchase Program	49.8	133.9	(1.5)	7.8	48.3	141.7	3.9	(15.0)
American International Group, Inc. Investment Program	47.5	43.2	(21.4)	(30.0)	26.1	13.2	(7.7)	30.4
Public-Private Investment Program	13.7	-	0.7	-	14.4	-	(0.7)	-
Consumer and Business Lending Initiative	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.3	1.0	0.4	0.3	(0.3)
Targeted Investment Program	-	40.0	-	0.3	-	40.3	(1.9)	(1.9)
Total.....	179.2	291.0	(36.7)	(53.1)	142.5	237.9	(22.7)	43.6

Capital Purchase Program

In October 2008, Treasury began implementation of the TARP with the Capital Purchase Program (CPP), designed to help stabilize the financial system by assisting in building the capital base of certain viable U.S. financial institutions to increase the capacity of those institutions to lend to businesses and consumers and support the economy. Under this program, Treasury purchased senior perpetual preferred stock from qualifying federally or state regulated banks, savings associations, and certain bank and savings and loan holding companies (Qualified Financial Institution (QFI)). In addition to the senior preferred stock, Treasury received warrants from public QFIs to purchase shares of common stock. The senior preferred stock has a stated dividend rate of 5.0 percent through year five, increasing to 9.0 percent in subsequent years. The dividends are cumulative for bank holding companies and subsidiaries of bank holding companies and non-cumulative for others and payable when and if declared by the institution's board of directors. QFIs that are Sub-chapter S corporations issued subordinated debentures in order to maintain compliance with the Internal Revenue Code. The maturity of the subordinated debentures is 30 years and interest rates are 7.7 percent for the first 5 years and 13.8 percent for the remaining years. For fiscal years 2010 and 2009, repayments totaled \$81.4 billion and \$70.7 billion, respectively.

American International Group, Inc. Investment Program (AIG)

Treasury provided assistance to AIG in order to prevent its disorderly failure as well as to prevent broader disruption to the financial markets. In November 2008, Treasury invested \$40 billion in AIG's cumulative Series D perpetual cumulative preferred stock with a dividend rate of 10.0 percent compounded quarterly. The \$40 billion from Treasury was used to repay a portion of a loan from the FRBNY. On April 17, 2009, AIG and Treasury restructured their November 2008 agreement. Under the restructuring, Treasury exchanged \$40 billion of cumulative Series D preferred stock for \$41.6 billion of non-cumulative 10 percent Series E preferred stock. The amount of Series E preferred stock is equal to the original \$40 billion plus dividends not paid as of April 17, 2009. In addition to the exchange, Treasury agreed to make available an additional \$29.8 billion capital facility (Series F preferred stock) to allow AIG to draw additional funds if needed to assist in AIG's restructuring. For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2010, and September 30, 2009, \$4.3 billion and \$3.2 billion, respectively, has been funded by Treasury to AIG under this additional capital facility. Consistent with SFFAS No. 2, the unused portion of the AIG capital facility is not recognized as an asset as of September 30, 2010 and 2009. As of September 30, 2010, AIG had not made any dividend payments on any of the perpetual preferred stock.

According to the terms of the preferred stock, if AIG misses four dividend payments, Treasury may appoint to the AIG board of directors, the greater of two members or 20.0 percent of the total number of directors of the Company. The ability to appoint such directors shall remain in place until dividends payable on all outstanding shares of the Series E Preferred Stock have been declared and paid in full for four consecutive quarterly dividend periods, subject to revesting for each and every subsequent missed dividend payment. On April 1, 2010, Treasury appointed two directors to the Company's board as a result of non-payments of dividends. The additional two directors increased the total number of AIG directors to twelve. See Note 6—Beneficial Interest in Trust, for details on the announced plans for restructuring the Federal Government's investments in AIG.

Targeted Investment Program (TIP)

The TIP was designed to prevent a loss of confidence in financial institutions that could result in significant market disruptions, threatening the financial strength of similarly situated financial institutions, impairing broader financial markets, and undermining the overall economy.

In fiscal year 2009, Treasury invested \$20 billion in each of Bank of America and Citigroup under TIP. Under each agreement, the Treasury purchased \$20 billion of perpetual preferred stock with an annual cumulative dividend rate of 8 percent and received a warrant for the purchase of common stock. In December 2009, Bank of America and Citigroup repaid the amounts invested by Treasury along with dividends through the date of repayment.

Automotive Industry Financing Program (AIFP)

The objective of the Automotive Industry Financing Program is to prevent a significant disruption of the American automotive industry, which would have a negative effect on the economy of the United States. The various activities undertaken by Treasury in the automotive industry include:

General Motors (GM)—In fiscal year 2009, the Treasury provided \$49.5 billion to GM through various loan agreements including the initial loan for general and working capital purposes and the final loan for debtor in possession (DIP) financing while GM was in bankruptcy. Treasury assigned its rights in these loans (with the exception of \$1.0 billion which remained in GM for wind down purposes and \$7.1 billion that would be assumed) and previously received common stock warrants to a newly created entity (General Motors Company). General Motors Company used the assigned loans and warrants to credit bid for substantially all of the assets of GM in a sale pursuant to Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code (see 11 U.S.C. 363). Upon closing of the Section 363 sale, the credit bid loans and warrants were extinguished and Treasury received \$2.1 billion in 9.0 percent cumulative perpetual preferred stock and 60.8 percent of the common equity interest in General Motors Company. In addition, General Motors Company assumed \$7.1 billion of the DIP loan, simultaneously paying \$0.4 billion (return of warranty program funds), resulting in a balance of \$6.7 billion. Recovery of the \$1.0 billion remaining in GM is subject to the final outcome of the bankruptcy proceedings. During fiscal year 2010, Treasury had received the remaining \$6.7 billion as full repayment of the DIP loan assumed.

As a result of General Motors Company's initial public offering (IPO), in November 2010, Treasury sold 412 million shares of General Motors Company's common stock. Treasury received approximately \$13.5 billion in net proceeds, and its equity stake in General Motors Company decreased from 60.8 percent to 33.3 percent. The net proceeds per share received during IPO approximated Treasury's valuation reflected in these financial statements as of September 30, 2010. In addition, on October 27, 2010, General Motors Company agreed to repurchase from Treasury the \$2.1 billion in preferred stock at a price of 102 percent of the liquidation value of the preferred stock.

GMAC LLC Rights Offering—In December 2008, Treasury agreed, in principal, to lend up to \$1.0 billion to GM for participation in a rights offering by GMAC (now known as Ally Financial, Inc.) in support of GMAC's reorganization as a bank holding company. The loan was secured by the GMAC common interest acquired in the rights offering. The loan agreement specified that at any time, at the option of the lender (Treasury), the unpaid principal and accrued interest was exchangeable for the membership interest purchased by GM during the rights offering. The loan was funded for \$884.0 million. In May 2009, Treasury exercised its exchange option under the loan and received 190,921 membership interests, representing approximately 35.36 percent of the voting interest at the time, in GMAC in full satisfaction of the loan.

GMAC—In December 2008, Treasury purchased preferred membership interests for \$5.0 billion with an 8 percent annual distribution right (dividends) from GMAC. In May 2009, Treasury had invested \$7.5 billion in 9 percent Mandatory Convertible Preferred Stock in GMAC to support its ability to originate new loans to Chrysler dealers and consumers, and help address GMAC's capital needs. As of September 30, 2009, Treasury owned \$13.1 billion in preferred shares in GMAC, through purchases and the exercise of warrants, in addition to 35.36 percent of the common equity in GMAC, as described previously under GMAC LLC Rights Offering.

In December 2009, Treasury invested \$2.5 billion in 8 percent Trust Preferred Securities and \$1.25 billion in GMAC's Series F-2 shares which are convertible into GMAC common stock at the option of GMAC or Treasury. Absent an optional conversion, the Series F-2 shares automatically convert to common stock after 7 years from the issuance date. In addition, as part of the December 2009 transactions, Treasury exchanged its preferred membership interests and its 9 percent Mandatory Convertible Preferred Stock for a combination of additional Series F-2 convertible shares and GMAC's common shares. The additional shares in GMAC common stock increased Treasury's ownership in GMAC from 35.36 percent to 56.3 percent.

As of September 30, 2010, Treasury owned \$2.7 billion of Trust Preferred Securities and \$11.4 billion of Series F-2 Convertible Securities in GMAC, through purchases, exchanges, and the exercise of warrants, in addition to 56.3 percent of common equity in GMAC.

Chrysler Holding LLC (Chrysler)

In January 2009, Treasury provided a \$4.0 billion General Purpose Loan to a parent company of Chrysler (Chrysler Holdings). On April 30, 2009, Chrysler filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy. In May 2009, Treasury provided an additional \$1.9 billion to Chrysler under the terms of a DIP credit agreement. On June 10, 2009, substantially all of the assets of Chrysler were sold to a newly-created entity (New Chrysler). Recovery of the DIP loan is subject to the bankruptcy process associated with the Chrysler assets remaining after the sale to New Chrysler.

In June 2009, Treasury entered into a credit agreement to lend an additional \$6.6 billion. Also, New Chrysler assumed \$0.5 billion of the General Purpose Loan, and the balance of \$3.5 billion remained outstanding from the Chrysler Holdings. As of September 30, 2009, Treasury had funded approximately \$4.6 billion of the \$6.6 billion in new commitments to New Chrysler. Treasury also obtained other consideration relating to these new commitments, including a 9.85 percent equity interest in New Chrysler and additional notes with principal balances of approximately \$0.3 billion and \$0.1 billion.

As of September 30, 2009, Treasury had loans outstanding from New Chrysler of \$5.1 billion and owned a 9.85 percent equity interest in New Chrysler and additional notes with principal balances of approximately \$0.3 billion and \$0.1 billion. In addition, as of September 30, 2009, Treasury had loans outstanding due from old Chrysler entities of \$3.5 billion (General Purpose Loan) and \$1.9 billion (DIP Loan).

In fiscal year 2010, pursuant to the terms of a settlement agreement, Treasury received approximately \$1.9 billion and subsequently wrote-off the remaining \$1.6 billion of the General Purpose Loan. As of September 30, 2010, Treasury had loans outstanding from New Chrysler of \$5.1 billion and owned a 9.85 percent equity interest in New Chrysler and additional notes with principal balances of approximately \$0.3 and \$0.1 billion. Additionally, as of September 30, 2010, Treasury had an interest in an old Chrysler entity as a result of the \$1.9 billion DIP Loan, recovery of which is subject to the bankruptcy process associated with the Chrysler assets remaining after the sale to New Chrysler.

The Consumer and Business Lending Initiative (CBLI)

The Consumer and Business Lending Initiative is intended to help unlock the flow of credit to consumers and small businesses. The following three programs were established to help accomplish this: Term Asset-Backed Securities Loan Facility (TALF), Small Business Administration (SBA) 7(a) Securities Purchase Program, and the Community Development Capital Initiative (CDCI)

TALF, which was created to help jump start the market for securitized consumer and small business loans, was created by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and Treasury to provide low-cost funding to investors in certain classes of ABS. Treasury participates in the program as part of Treasury's Consumer and Business Lending Initiative by providing liquidity and credit protection to the FRBNY. As part of the program, the FRBNY has entered into a put agreement with the TALF, LLC, a special purpose vehicle created by the FRBNY. In the event of a TALF borrower default, the FRBNY will seize the collateral and sell it to the TALF, LLC under this agreement. Under the TALF, the FRBNY, as implementer of the TALF program, originates loans on a non-recourse basis to holders of certain AAA rated ABS. The TALF, LLC receives a monthly fee equal to the differences between the TALF loan rate and the FRBNY's fee (spread) as compensation for entering into the put agreement. The accumulation of this fee will be used to fund purchases. In the event there are insufficient funds to purchase the

collateral, Treasury has committed to invest up to \$20.0 billion in non-recourse subordinate notes issued by the TALF, LLC. On July 19, 2010, the Treasury commitment was reduced to \$4.3 billion. Treasury disbursed \$0.1 billion upon creation of the TALF, LLC and the remainder can be drawn to purchase collateral in the event the accumulated fees are not sufficient to cover purchases. As of September 30, 2010, approximately \$29.7 billion of loans due to FRBNY remained outstanding.

The SBA 7(a) Securities Purchase Program was created to provide additional liquidity to the SBA 7(a) market so that banks are able to make more small business loans. Under this program, Treasury purchases 7(a) Securities collateralized with 7(a) loans (these loans are guaranteed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government) packaged on or after July 1, 2008. As of September 30, 2010, the Department has entered into trades to purchase about \$0.4 billion. Of this amount, about \$0.2 billion has settled with the remaining trades to be settled by December 30, 2010.

The CDCI Initiative was created to provide additional low-cost capital to small banks to encourage more lending to small businesses. Under the terms of the initiatives, Treasury purchases senior preferred stock (or subordinated debt) from eligible CDFI financial institutions. The senior preferred stock has an initial dividend rate of 2 percent. CDFIs may apply to receive capital up to 5 percent of risk-weighted assets. To encourage repayment while recognizing the unique circumstances facing CDFIs, the dividend rate will increase to 9 percent after 8 years. CDFIs participating in the CPP, subject to certain criteria, were eligible to exchange, through September 30, 2010, their current CPP preferred shares (subordinated debt) for CDCI preferred shares (subordinated debt).

Public Private Investment Program (PPIP)

The PPIP is part of Treasury's efforts to help restart the markets and provide liquidity for legacy assets. Under this program, Treasury makes equity and debt investments in investment vehicles (referred to as Public Private Investment Funds or "PPIFs") established by private investment managers. The equity investment is used to match private capital and will equal not more than 50 percent of the total equity invested. The debt investment, at the option of the investment manager, equals to 50 percent or 100 percent of the total equity (including private equity). The PPIFs invest primarily in commercial mortgage-backed securities and non-agency residential MBS. At least 90 percent of the assets underlying any eligible asset must be situated in the United States. On September 30, 2009, Treasury signed limited partnership and loan agreements with two investment managers, committing to potentially disburse up to \$6.7 billion. However, as of September 30, 2009, no private fund managers had made any investments and Treasury had not disbursed any funds for PPIP.

As of September 30, 2010, Treasury had signed definitive limited partnership and loan agreements with eight investment managers, committing to disburse up to \$22.1 billion. During fiscal year 2010, Treasury disbursed \$4.9 billion as equity investment and \$9.2 billion as loans to these eight PPIFs.

Asset Guarantee Program (AGP)

The AGP provided guarantees for assets held by systemically significant financial institutions that face a risk of losing market confidence due in large part to a portfolio of distressed or illiquid assets. The AGP was applied with extreme discretion in order to improve market confidence in the systemically significant institution and in financial markets broadly.

In January 2009, Treasury finalized the terms of a guarantee agreement with Citigroup. Under the agreement, Treasury, FDIC, and the FRBNY provided protection against the possibility of large losses on an asset pool of approximately \$301 billion of loans and securities which remained on Citigroup's balance sheet. Treasury's guarantee was limited to \$5 billion. As a premium for the guarantee, Citigroup issued approximately \$7.0 billion of cumulative preferred stock (subsequently converted to trust preferred securities with similar terms) with an 8.0 percent stated dividend rate and a warrant for the purchase of common stock; approximately \$4.0 billion and the warrant was issued to Treasury and approximately \$3.0 billion was issued to the FDIC. For fiscal years 2010 and 2009, the AGP's subsidy income was about \$1.5 billion and \$2.2 billion, respectively.

On December 23, 2009, Treasury, the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and Citigroup terminated this program. The Government parties did not pay any losses under the program and kept \$5.2 billion of \$7 billion in trust preferred securities as well as warrants for common shares that were issued by Citigroup as consideration for such guarantee. On September 29, 2010, Treasury exchanged its remaining trust preferred securities for other Citigroup trust preferred securities containing market terms to facilitate a sale. On September 30, 2010, Treasury agreed to sell its trust preferred securities held for \$2.2 billion. The sale was settled on October 5, 2010.

Housing Programs Under TARP

Fiscal year 2010 has seen an expansion of programs under TARP to provide stability for both housing market and homeowners. These programs assist homeowners who are experiencing financial hardships to remain in their homes while they get back on their feet or relocate to a more sustainable living situation. These programs fall into three initiatives:

- Making Home Affordable Program;
- Housing Finance Agency Hardest-Hit Fund, and
- Federal Housing Administration Refinance Program.

As of September 30, 2010, and 2009, Treasury has committed up to \$45.6 billion, and \$27.1 billion, respectively, for these programs. From inception through September 30, 2010, approximately \$0.5 billion have been disbursed.

For more details on the TARP, please see the Performance and Accountability Report for Treasury.

Note 6. Beneficial Interest in Trust

Under the initial terms of a credit facility agreement with AIG and the FRBNY, a 77.9 percent equity interest in AIG (in the form of Series C Convertible Participating Serial Preferred Stock convertible into approximately 77.9 percent of the issued and outstanding shares of common stock) was issued to a trust established by the FRBNY. Subsequent to the initial agreement, a reverse stock split of AIG's common stock increased this to 79.8 percent. The Government is the sole beneficiary of that trust, so that when the stock is ultimately liquidated the proceeds will be deposited into the General Fund of the U. S. Treasury. The Government will be the ultimate recipient of any dividends on the stock and any proceeds from the liquidation of the stock. The accounting and reporting for any activities related to the Government's beneficial interest in the stock held by the trust will be done by Treasury. The trustees of the trust are independent of both Treasury and the FRBNY, and are not involved in day-to-day management of AIG.

As the Government is the sole beneficiary of the trust, it is anticipated that the Government will ultimately realize an economic benefit from its beneficial interest in the trust. The \$23.5 billion value recorded is based on the market value of the trust's AIG holdings on September 30, 2009; as the underlying AIG common stock is actively traded on the New York Stock Exchange, this represents the best independent valuation available for the Government's beneficial interest. As of September 30, 2010, the underlying market value of the trust's AIG holdings had declined by approximately \$2.7 billion to \$20.8 billion. The carrying value of the beneficial interest in the trust was reduced by this amount, and a corresponding expense recorded on the Statement of Net Cost.

The Government's proceeds will be received when AIG's credit line with the FRBNY is terminated, AIG has redeemed the preferred stock owned by Treasury through TARP, and the trustees sell the stock held by the trust. The Government will re-value its beneficial interest in the trust each year until the trust is liquidated. Like any asset, future events may increase or decrease the value of the Government's interest in the trust.

Treasury's participation in enhancing AIG's capital and liquidity in order to facilitate an orderly restructuring of the company is in addition to the FRBNY activities in this regard. On September 30, 2010, Treasury, the FRBNY, and AIG announced plans for a restructuring of the Federal Government's investments in AIG. The AIG Recapitalization agreement is intended to convert the trust's preferred stock into common stock that will be transferred to Treasury, as custodian for the U.S. Government, upon the closing of the restructuring. Under this agreement, it is anticipated that Treasury would sell its shares in the open market over time. This planned conversion of the trust's preferred stock into common stock and distribution of such stock to Treasury in conjunction with the conversion of TARP's AIG preferred stock into AIG common stock, would result in Treasury holding 92 percent of AIG's common stock, with the TARP holding approximately 61 percent of such amount. Actual execution of the recapitalization agreement is contingent on numerous material conditions being satisfied prior to the closing of the agreement. If the closing does not occur on or prior to March 15, 2011, any one of AIG, the FRBNY, or Treasury may terminate the agreement. On December 8, 2010, the parties entered into a master transaction agreement that supersedes, but does not represent a material departure from, the terms contained in the September 30 AIG restructuring agreement.

Note 7. Inventories and Related Property, Net

Inventories and Related Property as of September 30						
(In billions of dollars)	All			All		
	Defense	Others	Total	Defense	Others	Total
	2010			2009		
Inventory purchased for resale	81.2	0.7	81.9	87.8	0.8	88.6
Inventory and operating material and supplies held for repair	46.5	0.6	47.1	46.0	0.6	46.6
Inventory—excess, obsolete, and unserviceable	8.4	0.1	8.5	7.8	-	7.8
Operating materials and supplies held for use.....	131.6	2.3	133.9	128.9	5.3	134.2
Operating materials and supplies held in reserve for future use	-	0.4	0.4	-	0.9	0.9
Operating materials and supplies—excess, obsolete, and unserviceable	2.6	0.1	2.7	3.4	0.1	3.5
Stockpile materials	-	49.0	49.0	-	47.2	47.2
Stockpile materials held for sale	0.6	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.9
Other related property	1.0	0.9	1.9	1.0	1.1	2.1
Allowance for loss	<u>(39.7)</u>	<u>(0.3)</u>	<u>(40.0)</u>	<u>(46.9)</u>	<u>(0.3)</u>	<u>(47.2)</u>
Total inventories and related property, net ..	<u>232.2</u>	<u>54.0</u>	<u>286.2</u>	<u>228.7</u>	<u>55.9</u>	<u>284.6</u>

Inventory purchased for resale is the cost or value of tangible personal property purchased by an agency for resale. DOD values approximately 72 percent of its resale inventory using the moving average cost (MAC) method. An additional 9 percent (fuel inventory) is reported using the first-in-first-out method. DOD reports the remaining 19 percent of resale inventories at an approximation of historical cost using LAC adjusted for holding gains and losses. The LAC method is used because its legacy inventory systems do not maintain historical cost data.

Please refer to the individual financial statements of DOD for significant detailed information regarding its inventories.

Inventory and operating materials and supplies held for repair are damaged inventory that require repair to make them suitable for sale (inventory) or is more economical to repair than to dispose of (operating materials and supplies).

Inventory—excess, obsolete, and unserviceable consists of:

- Excess inventory that exceeds the demand expected in the normal course of operations and which does not meet management's criteria to be held in reserve for future sale.
- Obsolete inventory that is no longer needed due to changes in technology, laws, customs, or operations.
- Unserviceable inventory that is damaged beyond economic repair.

Excess, obsolete, and unserviceable inventory is reported at net realizable value.

Operating materials and supplies held for use are tangible personal property to be consumed in normal operations.

Operating materials and supplies held in reserve for future use are materials retained because they are not readily available in the market or because they will not be used in the normal course of operations, but there is more than a remote chance they will eventually be needed. DOD, which accounts for most of the reported operating materials and supplies held for use, uses LAC, MAC, and Standard Price and expenses a significant amount of them when purchased instead of when consumed.

Operating materials and supplies—excess, obsolete, and unserviceable consists of:

- Excess operating materials and supplies are materials that exceed the demand expected in the normal course of operations, and do not meet management's criteria to be held in reserve for future use.
- Obsolete operating materials and supplies are materials no longer needed due to changes in technology, laws, customs, or operations.
- Unserviceable operating materials and supplies are materials damaged beyond economic repair.

DOD, which accounts for most of the reported excess, obsolete, and unserviceable operating materials and supplies, revalues it to a net realizable value of zero through the allowance account.

Please refer to the individual financial statements of DOD for significant detailed information regarding operating materials and supplies.

Stockpile materials include strategic and critical materials held in reserve for use in national defense, conservation, or national emergencies due to statutory requirements; for example, nuclear materials and oil, and stockpile materials that are authorized to be sold. The majority of the amount reported by DOD is stockpile materials held for sale, and the amount reported by others is stockpile materials held in reserve, with the majority of it being reported by the Department of Energy (DOE). Please refer to their individual financial statements for more information on stockpile materials.

Other related property consists of the following:

- Commodities include items of commerce or trade that have an exchange value used to stabilize or support market prices. Please refer to the financial statements of the USDA for detailed information regarding commodities.
- Seized monetary instruments are comprised only of monetary instruments that are awaiting judgment to determine ownership. The related liability is included in other liabilities. Other property seized by the Government, such as real property and tangible personal property, is not considered a Government asset. It is accounted for in agency property-management records until the property is forfeited, returned, or otherwise liquidated. Please refer to the individual financial statements of the Department of Justice (DOJ), Treasury, and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) for significant detailed information regarding seized property.
- Forfeited property is comprised of monetary instruments, intangible property, real property, and tangible personal property acquired through forfeiture proceedings; property acquired by the Government to satisfy a tax liability; and unclaimed and abandoned merchandise. Please refer to the individual financial statements of DOJ, Treasury, and DHS for significant detailed information regarding forfeited property.
- Foreclosed property is comprised of assets received in satisfaction of a loan receivable or as a result of payment of a claim under a guaranteed or insured loan (excluding commodities acquired under price support programs). All properties included in foreclosed property are assumed to be held for sale. Please refer to the individual financial statements of USDA and HUD for significant detailed information regarding foreclosed property.
- Other property not classified above.

Note 8. Property, Plant, and Equipment, Net

Property, Plant, and Equipment as of September 30, 2010

(In billions of dollars)	<u>Cost</u>		<u>Accumulated Depreciation/ Amortization</u>		<u>Net</u>	
	<u>Defense</u>	<u>All Others</u>	<u>Defense</u>	<u>All Others</u>	<u>Defense</u>	<u>All Others</u>
Buildings, structures, and facilities.....	207.4	211.6	112.0	110.8	95.4	100.8
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment.....	912.6	159.5	466.9	96.7	445.7	62.8
Construction in progress.....	38.6	41.3	N/A	N/A	38.6	41.3
Land.....	10.5	11.7	N/A	N/A	10.5	11.7
Internal use software.....	9.4	17.6	6.1	9.3	3.3	8.3
Assets under capital lease.....	1.0	3.2	0.6	1.4	0.4	1.8
Leasehold improvements.....	1.0	6.1	0.4	3.2	0.6	2.9
Other property, plant, and equipment.....	1.2	7.8	-	4.2	1.2	3.6
Subtotal.....	<u>1,181.7</u>	<u>458.8</u>	<u>586.0</u>	<u>225.6</u>	<u>595.7</u>	<u>233.2</u>
Total property, plant, and equipment, net.....		<u>1,640.5</u>		<u>811.6</u>		<u>828.9</u>

Property, Plant, and Equipment as of September 30, 2009

(In billions of dollars)	<u>Cost</u>		<u>Accumulated Depreciation/ Amortization</u>		<u>Net</u>	
	<u>Defense</u>	<u>All Others</u>	<u>Defense</u>	<u>All Others</u>	<u>Defense</u>	<u>All Others</u>
Buildings, structures, and facilities.....	191.7	201.4	108.0	104.6	83.7	96.8
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment.....	877.5	151.4	446.9	91.6	430.6	59.8
Construction in progress.....	30.8	41.2	N/A	N/A	30.8	41.2
Land.....	10.5	11.7	N/A	N/A	10.5	11.7
Internal use software.....	9.0	15.0	5.6	7.5	3.4	7.5
Assets under capital lease.....	1.0	2.8	0.6	1.3	0.4	1.5
Leasehold improvements.....	0.7	5.7	0.5	2.8	0.2	2.9
Other property, plant, and equipment.....	0.1	8.5	-	5.5	0.1	3.0
Subtotal.....	<u>1,121.3</u>	<u>437.7</u>	<u>561.6</u>	<u>213.3</u>	<u>559.7</u>	<u>224.4</u>
Total property, plant, and equipment, net.....		<u>1,559.0</u>		<u>774.9</u>		<u>784.1</u>

Debt and Equity Securities as of September 30, 2009

(In billions of dollars)	By Category									Total
	Held-to-Maturity			Available-for-Sale			Trading			
	Cost Basis	Unamor- tized Premium/ Discount	Net Invest- ment	Cost Basis	Unreal- ized Gain	Fair Value	Cost Basis	Unreal- ized Gain	Fair Value	
Debt securities:										
Non-U.S. Government	0.2	-	0.2	12.1	0.4	12.5	2.7	0.3	3.0	15.7
Commercial.....	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	0.1	0.1
Mortgage/asset backed	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.9	(0.1)	2.8	2.8
Corporate and other bonds..	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.7	(0.1)	8.6	8.6
All other debt securities	1.1	-	1.1	-	-	-	1.5	0.1	1.6	2.7
Equity securities:										
Common stocks	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.9	(0.1)	0.8	0.8
Unit trust.....	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.0	5.1	22.1	22.1
All other equity securities.....	-	-	-	3.0	-	3.0	2.0	(0.2)	1.8	4.8
Other	<u>2.2</u>	-	<u>2.2</u>	-	-	-	<u>11.0</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>13.3</u>
Total debt and equity securities categorized as held-to-maturity, available-for-sale or trading	<u>3.5</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>15.1</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>15.5</u>	<u>46.8</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>51.9</u>	70.9
Total RRB debt and equity securities.....										<u>22.2</u>
Total debt and equity securities										<u>93.1</u>

Debt and Equity Securities as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	By Agency	
	2010	2009
Debt and Equity Securities:		
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	49.5	43.6
Railroad Retirement Board	22.7	22.2
Exchange Stabilization Fund	12.6	13.6
Tennessee Valley Authority	8.2	8.0
All other	5.9	5.7
Total Debt and Equity Securities	<u>98.9</u>	<u>93.1</u>

These debt and equity securities do not include nonmarketable Treasury securities, which have been eliminated in consolidation. Held-to-maturity debt and equity securities are reported at amortized cost, net of unamortized discounts and premiums. Available-for-sale debt and equity securities are reported at fair value. Trading debt and equity securities are reported at fair value. The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) and the TVA invest primarily in fixed maturity and equity securities, classified as trading. TVA also has a small investment in available-for-sale securities. The National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust (NRRIT), on behalf of the RRB, manages and invests railroad retirement assets that are to be used to pay retirement benefits to the Nation's railroad workers under the Railroad Retirement Program. As an investment company, NRRIT is subject to different accounting standards that do not require the classifications presented above. NRRIT's total debt and equity securities are presented as a separate line item. Please refer to NRRIT's financial statements for more detailed information concerning this specific investment information. The TVA balance includes \$7.0 billion and \$6.8 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively, for the Tennessee Valley Authority Retirement System (TVARS). Please refer to the individual financial statements of PBGC, NRRIT, Treasury, TVA and TVARS for more detailed information related to debt and equity securities. These agencies comprise 94.0 percent of the total reported debt and equity securities of \$98.9 billion as of September 30, 2010.

Note 10. Derivatives

Derivatives are financial instruments that entities use to hedge their particular exposure to some sort of financial risk. These financial risks include interest rate risk, market price risk, credit risk, foreign exchange risk and commodity risk. As FASAB (which determines GAAP for Federal entities) is silent on this issue, the accounting for derivative instruments are governed by FASB Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) 815 Derivatives and Hedging (formerly SFAS No. 133, *Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities* and amended by SFAS No. 161, *Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities*), which aims to highlight to financial statement users additional disclosures on an entity's objectives in its use of derivatives and the method of accounting for such financial instruments. Derivatives are accounted for at market value in accordance with this standard. Derivatives are marked to market with changes in value reported within financial income. The hedge strategy (i.e., fair value, cashflow or foreign currency) employed determines the financial statement impact on their statement of operations and net position. Per ASC 815, the fair value of derivative instruments shall be presented on a gross basis when they are subject to master netting agreements. Neither PBGC nor TVA, the only federal entities with derivative instruments, have such agreements.

PBGC uses derivatives to mitigate investment risks, enhance investment returns (derivatives are not used to leverage investment portfolios) and as a liquid and cost efficient substitute for positions in physical securities. PBGC utilizes a no hedging designation which results in the gain or loss on a derivative instrument being recognized currently in earnings. As of September 30, 2010, and 2009 respectively, PBGC had \$(0.02) billion and \$2.8 billion worth of derivatives in an asset position (now recorded in other assets) and \$(0.01) billion and \$2.9 billion worth of derivatives in a liability position (recorded in other liabilities).

In fiscal year 2010, PBGC reported its derivative amounts differently than in fiscal year 2009. The large differences between the amounts reflected in the current fiscal year from the fiscal year 2009 amounts is that in fiscal year 2010 PBGC added investments in derivatives to its derivative asset amounts but also recorded interest rate and credit default swaps, which were previously reported gross of receivables and payables, at their net amounts, resulting in a reduction in derivative assets and derivative liabilities of substantially equal amounts that entirely negated the increase due to derivative investments.

For presentation purposes, PBGC's fiscal year 2009 derivative assets of \$2.8 billion, which were originally recorded in fiscal year 2009 accounts receivable, were reclassified to fiscal year 2009 other assets to increase comparability between all derivative assets as TVA records its derivative assets as other assets in the balance sheet.

Other than certain derivative instruments in investment funds, TVA uses derivatives purely for hedging purposes and not for speculative purposes. The accounting for changes in fair value of these instruments depends on whether TVA uses regulatory accounting to defer the derivative gains and losses, and whether the derivative instrument qualifies for hedge accounting treatment. As of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively, TVA had \$0.2 billion and \$0.04 billion worth of derivatives in an asset position (recorded in other assets), and \$1.6 billion and \$1.0 billion worth of derivatives in a liability position (recorded in other liabilities).

The gain/(loss) on derivatives was \$0.2 billion and \$0.2 billion for PBGC and \$(0.1) billion and \$(0.3) billion for TVA for fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively.

Please refer to the individual financial statements of PBGC and TVA for more detailed information related to derivatives.

Note 11. Investments in and Liabilities to Government Sponsored Enterprises and Other Financial and Housing Market Stabilization

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are stockholder-owned GSEs. Congress established the GSEs to increase the supply of mortgage loans and to reduce the accompanying costs. A key Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac business responsibility is to package purchased mortgages into securities. These securities are subsequently sold to investors. Proceeds from sales are used to buy additional mortgages and keep money flowing through the mortgage markets.

Increasingly difficult conditions in the housing market challenged the soundness and profitability of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, thereby undermining the entire housing market. This led Congress to pass the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (HERA). This Act created the new Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA), with enhanced regulatory authority over the GSEs, and provided the Secretary of the Treasury with certain authorities intended to ensure the financial stability of the GSEs, if necessary.

On September 7, 2008, FHFA placed the GSEs under conservatorship and Treasury entered into a Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement (SPSPA) with each GSE. These actions were taken to preserve the GSEs' assets, ensure a sound and solvent financial condition, and mitigate systemic risks that contributed to current market instability. The actions taken by Treasury are temporary, and are intended to provide financial stability until Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac can return to normal operations or until the Administration and Congress address how they should be structured going forward. As of September 30, 2010, there are no plans to bring these organizations into the government. The FHFA director may terminate the conservatorship if safe and solvent conditions can be established. Per SFFAC No. 2, *Entity and Display*, these entities meet the criteria of "bailed out" entities under paragraph 50. Accordingly, the Federal Government has not consolidated them into the financial statements, but included disclosure of the relationship(s) with the entities and any actual or potential material costs or liabilities in the consolidated financial statements.

In November 2008, the Federal Reserve announced it would purchase up to \$500 billion in agency MBS and since extended it to \$1.25 trillion by the end of the first quarter of 2010. In March 2010, the Federal Reserve completed purchases of \$1.25 trillion in agency-guaranteed MBS under the large-scale asset purchase programs (LSAPs), but continued to conduct transactions to facilitate orderly settlement of outstanding purchases. As of August 19, 2010, the settlement of all remaining outstanding MBS from these purchases was completed.

Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreements (SPSPA)

Under the SPSPAs, Treasury initially received from each GSE: (1) 1,000,000 shares of non-voting variable liquidation preference senior preferred stock with a liquidation preference value of \$1,000 per share and (2) a non-transferable warrant for the purchase at a nominal cost of 79.9 percent of common stock on a fully-diluted basis. The warrants expire on September 7, 2028.

The senior preferred stock accrues dividends at 10.0 percent per year, payable quarterly. This rate shall increase to 12 percent if, in any quarter, the dividends are not paid in cash, until all accrued dividends have been paid. GSE Senior Preferred Stock dividends of \$12.1 billion and \$4.3 billion were received as of September 30, 2010, and September 30, 2009, respectively, and are included in earned revenue on the Statement of Net Cost. In addition, beginning on March 31, 2011, the GSEs are scheduled to begin paying Treasury a periodic commitment fee on a quarterly basis. This fee will be initially set by December 31, 2010, based on mutual agreement between Treasury and each GSE in consultation with the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. The fee shall be established for 5-year periods, and may be waived by Treasury for one year at a time if warranted by adverse mortgage market conditions. It may be paid in cash or may be added to the liquidation preference.

These initial agreements, which have no expiration date, provide that Treasury will disburse funds to the GSEs if at the end of any quarter the FHFA determines that the liabilities of either GSE exceed its assets. The maximum amount available to each GSE under this agreement was \$100 billion and was increased to \$200 billion in May 2009. In December 2009, the Department amended the SPSPAs to replace the \$200 billion per GSE funding commitment cap with a formulaic cap for the next 3 years that will adjust upwards quarterly by the cumulative amount of any losses realized by either GSE and downward by the cumulative amount of any gains, but not below \$200 billion per GSE, and will become fixed at the end of the 3 years, December 31, 2012. At the conclusion of the 3 year period, the remaining commitment will then be fixed and available to be drawn per the terms of the agreements (referred to hereafter as the "Adjusted Caps").

Actual payments to the GSEs through September 30, 2010, totaled \$148.2 billion, of which \$52.6 billion and \$95.6 billion were paid in fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively. Additionally, estimated liabilities of \$359.9 billion and \$91.9 billion have been recorded as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively. The \$359.9 billion liability as of September 30, 2010, represents the total estimated future payments for the life of the agreement under the Adjusted Caps using a “baseline” scenario, the lower end of an estimated range. The “baseline” scenario estimated the ultimate payments to be made to the GSEs under the SPSPAs totaled \$508.1 billion. This amount consists of the \$148.2 billion of payments made through September 30, 2010, and the \$359.9 billion liability as of that date. An “extreme case” scenario estimate of \$610 billion in ultimate payments is the upper end of the range, or \$101.9 billion more than the “baseline” scenario. SFFAS No. 5 provides that when a probable contingent liability is a range of amounts and no amount within the range is a better estimate than any other amount, the estimated contingent liability should be based on the minimum value in the range.

OMB issued guidance to Treasury on October 7, 2009, allowing the use of fair value accounting for non-Federal securities beginning with reporting for fiscal year 2009. As a result, the GSE investments are reported at fair value at September 30, 2010, and 2009. Annual valuations are performed, as of September 30, of the preferred stock and warrants. In accordance with SFFAS No. 7, the annual valuation is classified as usual and recurring and thus recorded as an expense or revenue to the financial statements

Changing Regulatory Environment

On July 9, 2010, FHFA published, in the Federal Register, a proposed rule to clarify certain terms of conservatorship and receivership operations for the GSEs. The key issues addressed in the proposed rule are the status and priority of claims and the relationships among various classes of creditors and equity-holders under conservatorships or receiverships.

The GSE MBS purchase authority expired December 31, 2009. Additionally, on July 21, 2010, the President signed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, or the Dodd-Frank Act, into law. Dodd-Frank Act may result in the GSEs being subjected to new and additional regulatory oversight and standards, which would lead to increased restrictions on their day-to-day business and operations. Also, it contains a provision requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct a study and develop recommendations regarding the options for ending the conservatorship. The Secretary’s report and recommendations are required to be submitted to Congress by January 31, 2011.

As of September 30, 2010, and September 30, 2009, GSE investments consisted of the following:

Investments in GSE as of September 30, 2010					
(In billions of dollars)	Liquidation Preference Value At Beginning of Year	Current Year Increase in Liquidation Preference Value	Gross Investment as of 9/30/10	Cumulative Valuation Gain/(Loss)	9/30/10 Fair Value
Fannie Mae Senior Preferred Stock	45.8	40.1	85.9	(29.4)	56.5
Freddie Mac Senior Preferred Stock	51.5	12.4	63.9	(12.7)	51.2
Fannie Mae Warrants Common Stock	3.1	-	3.1	(2.1)	1.0
Freddie Mac Warrants Common Stock	2.3	-	2.3	(1.8)	0.5
Total GSE Investment.....	<u>102.7</u>	<u>52.5</u>	<u>155.2</u>	<u>(46.0)</u>	<u>109.2</u>
Investments in GSE as of September 30, 2009					
(In billions of dollars)	Liquidation Preference Value At Beginning of Year	Current Year Increase in Liquidation Preference Value	Gross Investment as of 9/30/09	Cumulative Valuation Gain/(Loss)	9/30/09 Fair Value
Fannie Mae Senior Preferred Stock	0.8	44.9	45.7	(20.6)	25.1
Freddie Mac Senior Preferred Stock	0.8	50.7	51.5	(23.2)	28.3
Fannie Mae Warrants Common Stock	3.1	-	3.1	3.6	6.7
Freddie Mac Warrants Common Stock	2.3	-	2.3	2.3	4.6
Total GSE Investment.....	<u>7.0</u>	<u>95.6</u>	<u>102.6</u>	<u>(37.9)</u>	<u>64.7</u>

GSE Mortgage-Backed Securities Purchase Program

Under this program, Treasury, via asset managers, purchased GSE MBS in the open market. The asset managers were also authorized to enter into other trade/sell transactions such as pair-offs, turns, assignments, and dollar rolls. By purchasing these credit-guaranteed securities, the Treasury sought to broaden access to mortgage funding for current and prospective homeowners and to promote stability in the mortgage market. MBSs are accounted for under the Federal Credit Reform Act and are included in Note 4—Loans Receivable, Mortgage Backed Securities, and Loan Guarantee Liabilities, Net.

Temporary Guarantee Program for Money Market Funds

In September 2008, the Treasury Department established a Temporary Guarantee Program (Program) for Money Market Funds. Under this program, Treasury guaranteed to investors that they would receive the stable share price (SSP) for shares held in participating money market funds up to the number of shares held as of the close of business on September 19, 2008. To participate in the program, eligible money market funds had to submit an application and pay a premium of 1 basis point if the fund's net asset value (NAV) is greater than or equal to 99.75 percent of the SSP, or 1.5 basis points of the SSP if the fund's NAV is less than 99.75 percent of the SSP but greater than or equal to 99.50 percent of the SSP.

Under this program, any outlays would have been paid out initially from the ESF, and then from funds available under the EESA. Under Section 131 of the Act such outlays would be reimbursed from funds available under TARP.

The temporary guarantee program was extended and continued to provide coverage through September 19, 2009, to shareholders up to amounts that they held in participating money market funds as of the close of business on September 19, 2008. As of September 30, 2009, the program had expired and Treasury did not receive any claims for payment. As of September 30, 2009, Treasury had collected a total of approximately \$1.2 billion in program participation payments that are recorded as earned revenue in the Statement of Net Cost. All participant payments are invested into Government securities.

Note 12. Other Assets

Other Assets as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Advances and prepayments	90.8	77.0
FDIC Receivable from Resolution Activity	49.7	32.1
NCUA Loans	10.1	18.4
Regulatory assets	15.2	14.4
Other	17.5	16.8
Total other assets	<u>183.3</u>	<u>158.7</u>

Advances and prepayments are assets that represent funds disbursed in contemplation of the future performance of services, receipt of goods, the incurrence of expenditures, or the receipt of other assets. These include advances to contractors and grantees, travel advances, and prepayments for items such as rents, taxes, insurance, royalties, commissions, and supplies.

With regard to regulatory assets, the DOE's Power Marketing Authorities (PMAs) and the TVA record certain amounts as assets in accordance with FASB ASC 980-Regulated Operations (formerly) SFAS No. 71, Accounting for the Effects of Certain Types of Regulation. The provisions of FASB ASC 980 require that regulated enterprises reflect rate actions of the regulator in their financial statements, when appropriate. These rate actions can provide reasonable assurance of the existence of an asset, reduce or eliminate the value of an asset, or impose a liability on a regulated enterprise. In order to defer incurred costs under FASB ASC 980, a regulated entity must have the statutory authority to establish rates that recover all costs, and those rates must be charged to and collected from customers. If the PMAs' or TVA's rates should become market-based, FASB ASC 980 would no longer be applicable, and all of the deferred costs under that standard would be expensed.

The FDIC has the responsibility for resolving failed institutions in an orderly and efficient manner. The resolution process involves valuing a failing institution, marketing it, soliciting and accepting bid for the sale of the institution, determining which bid is least costly to the insurance fund, and working with the acquiring institution through the closing process. FDIC records receivables for resolutions that include payments by the Deposit Insurance Fund to cover obligations to insured depositors, advances to receiverships and conservatorships for working capital, and administrative expenses paid on behalf of receiverships and conservatorships.

The National Credit Union Administration (NCUA) provides a variety of loans as a liquidity lender to credit unions experiencing unusual or unexpected liquidity shortfalls. These loans can be either short- or long-term. NCUA also provides loans to stimulate economic development in low-income communities.

Other items included in "other" are purchased power generating capacity, deferred nuclear generating units, nonmarketable equity investments in international financial institutions, and the balance of assets held by the experience rated carriers participating in the Health Benefits and Life Insurance Program (pending disposition on behalf of OPM).

Note 13. Accounts Payable

Accounts Payable as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)

	2010	2009
Department of Defense.....	31.1	35.4
Department of the Treasury.....	5.4	4.8
Department of Veterans Affairs.....	5.0	4.5
Department of Education.....	4.8	1.9
Department of Homeland Security.....	2.6	2.8
Department of Justice.....	2.5	2.3
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	2.4	2.7
General Services Administration.....	2.4	2.3
Agency for International Development.....	2.1	1.8
Department of Energy.....	2.0	1.7
U.S. Postal Service.....	1.9	1.7
Department of State.....	1.8	2.0
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	1.3	1.3
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	1.0	1.0
Department of the Interior.....	1.0	0.9
All other.....	5.6	6.1
Total accounts payable.....	<u>72.9</u>	<u>73.2</u>

Accounts payable includes amounts due for goods and property ordered and received, services rendered by other than Federal employees, and accounts payable for cancelled appropriations.

Note 14. Federal Debt Securities Held by the Public and Accrued Interest

Federal Debt Securities Held by the Public and Accrued Interest

(In billions of dollars)	Balance September 30, 2009	Net Change During Fiscal Year 2010	Balance September 30, 2010	Average Interest Rate	
				2010	2009
Treasury securities (public):					
Marketable securities:					
Treasury bills	1,986.2	(202.5)	1,783.7	0.2%	0.3%
Treasury notes	3,773.0	1,479.6	5,252.6	2.6%	3.0%
Treasury bonds	677.5	168.5	846.0	6.1%	6.5%
Treasury inflation-protected securities (TIPS)	551.3	42.3	593.6	2.2%	2.1%
Total marketable Treasury securities	6,988.0	1,487.9	8,475.9		
Nonmarketable securities	563.9	(17.0)	546.9	2.8%	3.7%
Net unamortized premium/ (discounts)	(33.9)	-	(33.9)		
Total Treasury securities, net (public)	7,518.0	1,470.9	8,988.9		
Agency securities:					
Tennessee Valley Authority	22.6	0.8	23.4		
All other agencies	0.4	(0.1)	0.3		
Total agency securities, net of unamortized premiums and discounts	23.0	0.7	23.7		
Accrued interest payable	41.7	5.7	47.4		
Total Federal debt securities held by the public and accrued interest	<u>7,582.7</u>	<u>1,477.3</u>	<u>9,060.0</u>		

Types of marketable securities:

Bills—Short-term obligations issued with a term of 1 year or less.

Notes—Medium-term obligations issued with a term of at least 1 year, but not more than 10 years.

Bonds—Long-term obligations of more than 10 years.

TIPS—Term of more than 5 years.

Federal debt securities held by the public outside the Government are held by individuals, corporations, State or local governments, FRBs, foreign governments, and central banks. The above table details Government borrowing primarily to finance operations and shows marketable and nonmarketable securities at face value less net unamortized discounts including accrued interest.

Securities that represent Federal debt held by the public are issued primarily by the Treasury and include:

- Interest-bearing marketable securities (bills, notes, bonds, and inflation-protected).
- Interest-bearing nonmarketable securities (government account series held by deposit and fiduciary funds, foreign series, State and local government series, domestic series, and savings bonds).
- Non-interest-bearing marketable and nonmarketable securities (matured and other).

Section 3111 of Title 31, United States Code (U.S.C.) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to use money received from the sale of an obligation and other money in the General Fund of the Treasury to buy, redeem, or refund, at or before maturity, outstanding bonds, notes, certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills, or savings certificates of the Government. There were no buyback operations in fiscal years 2010 and 2009.

Gross Federal debt (with some adjustments) is subject to a statutory ceiling (i.e., the debt limit). Prior to 1917, the Congress approved each debt issuance. In 1917, to facilitate planning in World War I, Congress established a dollar ceiling for Federal borrowing. On December 28, 2009, Public Law 111-123 was enacted, which increased the statutory debt limit to \$12,394.0 billion. On February 12, 2010, Public Law 111-139 was enacted, which increased the statutory debt limit to \$14,294.0 billion. As of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively, debt outstanding was \$13,510.8 billion and \$11,853.1 billion. The debt subject to the limit includes Treasury securities held by the public and Government guaranteed debt of Federal agencies (shown in the table above) and intragovernmental debt holdings (shown in the following table).

**Intragovernmental Debt Holdings: Federal Debt Securities
Held as Investments by Government Accounts as of September 30**

(In billions of dollars)	Balance 2009	Net Change During Fiscal Year 2010	Balance 2010
Social Security Administration, Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund	2,296.3	102.8	2,399.1
Office of Personnel Management, Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund	754.2	26.2	780.4
Department of Defense, Military Retirement Fund.....	240.8	41.2	282.0
Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund	309.7	(30.2)	279.5
Social Security Administration, Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund.....	207.9	(20.7)	187.2
Department of Defense, Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund	126.8	15.5	142.3
Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.....	61.8	9.2	71.0
Department of Energy, Nuclear Waste Disposal	44.6	3.0	47.6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Funds	26.4	20.6	47.0
Office of Personnel Management, Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund	35.1	7.0	42.1
Office of Personnel Management, Employees Life Insurance Fund.....	36.1	1.5	37.6
Department of Transportation, Highway Trust Fund.....	11.5	13.0	24.5
Department of the Treasury, Exchange Stabilization Fund.....	18.6	1.8	20.4
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation Fund	17.5	2.4	19.9
Department of Labor, Unemployment Trust Fund.....	19.6	(0.9)	18.7
Office of Personnel Management, Employees Health Benefits Fund.....	15.4	0.8	16.2
Department of State, Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	15.3	0.6	15.9
Housing and Urban Development, Federal Housing Authority- Liquidating Account.....	10.7	(6.5)	4.2
All other programs and funds	109.1	(6.4)	102.7
Subtotal.....	<u>4,357.4</u>	<u>180.9</u>	<u>4,538.3</u>
Unamortized net (discounts)/premiums	33.9	4.5	38.4
Total intragovernmental debt holdings, net	<u><u>4,391.3</u></u>	<u><u>185.4</u></u>	<u><u>4,576.7</u></u>

Intragovernmental debt holdings represent the portion of the gross Federal debt held as investments by Government entities such as trust funds, revolving funds, and special funds. This includes trust funds that are earmarked funds. For more information on earmarked funds, see Note 24—Earmarked Funds. These intragovernmental debt holdings are eliminated in the consolidation of these financial statements.

Note 15. Federal Employee and Veteran Benefits Payable

Federal Employee and Veteran Benefits Payable as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	Civilian		Military		Total	
	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009
Pension and accrued benefits	1,632.9	1,529.4	1,262.7	1,177.1	2,895.6	2,706.5
Post-retirement health and accrued benefits	355.5	352.2	904.7	825.8	1,260.2	1,178.0
Veterans compensation and burial benefits	N/A	N/A	1,474.8	1,317.5	1,474.8	1,317.5
Life insurance and accrued benefits	44.0	39.7	11.7	12.1	55.7	51.8
FECA benefits	21.8	17.9	8.3	8.1	30.1	26.0
Liability for other benefits	0.4	0.3	3.5	3.6	3.9	3.9
Total Federal employee and veteran benefits payable	<u>2,054.6</u>	<u>1,939.5</u>	<u>3,665.7</u>	<u>3,344.2</u>	<u>5,720.3</u>	<u>5,283.7</u>

Change in Pension and Accrued Benefits

(In billions of dollars)	Civilian	Military	Total
Actuarial accrued pension liability as of September 30, 2009....	1,529.4	1,177.1	2,706.5
Pension Expense:			
Expected Normal costs	31.8	24.0	55.8
Interest on pension liability during the period.....	93.4	67.0	160.4
Prior (or past) service cost from the initiation of a new plan	0.1	-	0.1
Actuarial (gains)/losses (from experience).....	(39.8)	(21.6)	(61.4)
Actuarial (gains)/losses (from assumption changes)	90.5	66.6	157.1
Total pension expense.....	176.0	136.0	312.0
Less benefits paid.....	72.5	50.4	122.9
Actuarial accrued pension liability as of September 30, 2010 ..	<u>1,632.9</u>	<u>1,262.7</u>	<u>2,895.6</u>

Change in Post-Retirement Health and Accrued Benefits

(In billions of dollars)	Civilian	Military	Total
Actuarial accrued post-retirement health benefits liability, as of September 30, 2009	352.2	825.8	1,178.0
Post-Retirement Health Benefits Expense:			
Prior (and past) service costs from plan amendments.....	(0.1)	-	(0.1)
Normal costs.....	13.4	21.4	34.8
Interest on liability.....	21.7	48.0	69.7
Actuarial (gains)/losses (from experience).....	(18.2)	154.7	136.5
Actuarial (gains)/losses (from assumption changes)	(0.1)	(125.4)	(125.5)
Total post-retirement health benefits expense	16.7	98.7	115.4
Less claims paid.....	13.4	19.8	33.2
Actuarial accrued post-retirement health benefits liability, as of September 30, 2010	<u>355.5</u>	<u>904.7</u>	<u>1,260.2</u>

The Government offers its employees life and health insurance, as well as retirement and other benefits. The liabilities for these benefits, which include both actuarial amounts and amounts due and payable to beneficiaries and health care carriers, apply to civilian and military employees.

OPM administers the largest civilian plan. DOD administers the largest military plan. Other significant pension plans with more than \$10 billion in accrued benefits payable include those of the Coast Guard (DHS) and Foreign Service (Department of State).

Significant Long-Term Economic Assumptions Used in Determining Pension Liability and the Related Expense

	Civilian		Military	
	2010	2009	2010	2009
Rate of interest.....	5.10%	6.25%	5.00%	5.75%
Rate of inflation	2.50%	3.50%	2.40%	3.00%
Projected salary increases	3.50%	4.25%	3.60%	3.75%

Significant Long-Term Economic Assumptions Used in Determining Post-Retirement Health Benefits and the Related Expense

	Civilian		Military	
	2010	2009	2010	2009
Rate of interest.....	5.10%	6.25%	5.00%	5.75%
Ultimate medical trend rate	7.00%	8.00%	5.65%	6.25%

In fiscal year 2010, agencies implemented SFFAS No. 33, “*Pension, Other Retirement Benefits, and Other Postemployment Benefits*: Reporting the Gains and Losses from Changes in Assumptions and Selecting Discount Rates and Valuation Dates. The standard requires the separate presentation of gains and losses from changes in long-term assumptions used to estimate liabilities associated with pensions, other retirement benefits (ORB), and other postemployment benefits (OPEB) on the Statement of Net Cost. SFFAS No. 33 also provides a standard for selecting the discount rate assumption for present value estimates of Federal employee pension, ORB, and OPEB liabilities. In addition, SFFAS No. 33 provides a standard for selecting the valuation date for estimates of Federal employee pension, ORB, and OPEB liabilities that will establish a consistent method for such measurements.

DOD’s long-term ultimate medical trend rate for fiscal year 2010 post-retirement health benefits liability is 5.65 percent. For disclosure and comparison purposes, DOD’s estimate of a single equivalent medical trend rate for fiscal year 2010 is 5.8 percent, which is an approximation of the single equivalent rate that would produce that same actuarial liability as the actual rates used. Please refer to the individual financial statements of DOD for further details regarding Military Retirement Health Benefits–Medical Trend.

Civilian Employees

Pensions

OPM administers the largest civilian pension plan, which covers substantially all full-time, permanent civilian Federal employees. This plan includes two components of defined benefits. These are the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) and the Federal Employees’ Retirement System (FERS). The basic benefit components of the CSRS and the FERS are financed and operated through the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (CSRDF).

CSRDF monies are generated primarily from employees’ contributions, agency contributions, payments from the General Fund, and interest on investments in Treasury securities. See Note 24—Earmarked Funds.

The Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board administers the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) Fund. The TSP Fund investment options include two fixed income funds (the G and F Funds), three stock funds (the C, S, and I Funds) and five lifecycle funds (L 2040, L 2030, L 2020, L 2010, and L Income). The L-Funds diversify participant accounts among the G, F, C, S, and I Funds, using professionally determined investment mixes (allocations) that are tailored to different time horizons. Treasury securities held in the G-Fund are included in Federal debt securities held by the public and accrued interest in the Balance Sheets. The G-Fund held \$123.6 billion and \$113.3 billion in non-marketable Treasury securities as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively.

Post-Retirement Health Benefits

The post-retirement civilian health benefit liability is an estimate of the Government's future cost of providing post-retirement health benefits to current employees and retirees. Although active and retired employees pay insurance premiums under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHB), these premiums cover only a portion of the costs. The OPM actuary applies economic assumptions to historical cost information to estimate the liability.

Life Insurance Benefits

One of the largest other employee benefits is the Federal Employee Group Life Insurance (FEGLI) Program. Employee and annuitant contributions and interest on investments fund a portion of this liability. The actuarial life insurance liability is the expected present value of future benefits to pay to, or on behalf of, existing FEGLI participants. The OPM actuary uses interest rate, inflation, and salary increase assumptions that are consistent with the pension liability.

Workers' Compensation Benefits

The DOL determines both civilian and military agencies' liabilities for future workers' compensation benefits for civilian Federal employees, as mandated by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA), for death, disability, medical, and miscellaneous costs for approved compensation cases, and a component for incurred, but not reported, claims. The FECA liability is determined annually using historical benefit payment patterns related to injury years to predict the ultimate payments. These estimated payments have been discounted to present value using OMB's interest rate assumptions for 10-year U.S. Treasury notes. For 2010, a 3.65 percent interest rate was assumed in year one and 4.30 percent was assumed for year two and thereafter.

The DOL calculates the FECA liability using wage inflation factors cost of living adjustments or (COLA) and medical inflation factors (consumer price index—medical or CPIM). The table below reflects the compensation COLAs and CPIMs used in the estimations for various charge-back years.

Fiscal Year	COLA	CPIM
2011	2.23%	3.45%
2012	1.13%	3.43%
2013	1.70%	3.64%
2014	1.90%	3.66%
2015+	1.93%	3.73%

Military Employees (Including Veterans)

Pensions

The DOD Military Retirement Fund (MRF) finances military retirement and survivor benefit programs. The increase in the Military Retirement Pension liability is due to additional benefit accruals (normal cost), interest on the pension liability, assumption and benefit changes, and actuarial experience. Liabilities in the future will depend on expected changes due to interest and benefit accruals, future benefit changes, assumption changes, and actuarial experience.

The Fund receives income from three sources: monthly normal cost payments from the Services to pay for the current year's service cost; annual payments from Treasury to amortize the unfunded liability and pay for the increase in the normal cost attributable to Concurrent Receipt per Public Law 108-136; and investment income.

The military retirement system consists of a funded, noncontributory, defined benefit plan. It applies to military personnel (Departments of Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Marine Corps). This system includes nondisability retirement pay, disability retirement pay, and survivor annuity programs. Military personnel who remain on active duty for 20 years or longer are eligible for retirement. There are three different retirement benefit formulas that are currently being used by the military: Final Pay, High-3 Year Average, and Career Status

Bonus/Military Retirement Reform Act of 1986 (REDUX). The date an individual enters the military determines which retirement system they would fall under and if they have the option to pick their retirement system. For more information on these benefits, see DOD's websites (<http://www.dfas.mil/army2/bonuses/redux.html>, and <http://www.defenselink.mil/militarypay/retirement/index.html>).

Post-Retirement Health Benefits

Military retirees and their dependents are entitled to health care in military medical facilities if a facility can provide the needed care. Prior to becoming Medicare eligible, military retirees and their dependents also are entitled to participate in TRICARE, which reimburses (net of beneficiary copay and deductible requirements) for the cost of health care from civilian providers. TRICARE options are available in indemnity, preferred provider organization (PPO), and health maintenance organization (HMO) designs.

Since fiscal year 2002, TRICARE, as second payer to Medicare, covers military retirees and their dependents after they become Medicare eligible. This TRICARE coverage for Medicare eligible beneficiaries requires that the beneficiary enroll in Medicare Part B and is referred to as TRICARE for Life (TFL). Health care under TFL can be obtained from military medical facilities on an "as available" basis or from civilian providers. Military retiree health care actuarial liability figures include costs incurred in military medical facilities, as well as claims paid to civilian providers and certain administrative costs. Costs paid to civilian providers are net of Medicare's portion of the cost.

Chapter 56 of Title 10, U.S.C. created the DOD Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund, which became operative on October 1, 2002. The purpose of this fund is to account for the health benefits of Medicare-eligible military retirees, their dependents, and survivors who are Medicare eligible. The Fund receives contributions from the Uniformed Services and Treasury, as well as interest earnings on its investments and pays costs incurred in military medical facilities, as well as claims for care provided by civilian providers under TFL, administration costs associated with processing the TFL claims, and capitated payments for coverage provided by U.S. Family Health Plans.

In addition to the health care benefits for civilian and military retirees and their dependents, the VA also provides medical care to veterans on an "as available" basis, subject to the limits of the annual appropriations. In accordance with 38 CFR 17.36 (c), VA's Secretary makes an annual enrollment decision that defines the veterans, by priority, who will be treated for that fiscal year subject to change based on funds appropriated, estimated collections, usage, the severity index of enrolled veterans, and changes in cost. Accordingly, VA recognizes the medical care expenses in the period the medical care services are provided. For the fiscal years 2006 through 2010, the average medical care cost per year was \$36.8 billion.

Veterans Compensation and Burial Benefits

The Government compensates disabled veterans and their survivors. Veterans compensation is payable as a disability benefit or a survivor's benefit. Entitlement to compensation depends on the veteran's disabilities having been incurred in, or aggravated during, active military service; death while on duty; or death resulting from service-connected disabilities, if not on active duty.

Burial benefits include a burial and plot or interment allowance payable for a veteran who, at the time of death, is qualified to receive compensation or a pension, or whose death occurred in a VA facility.

The liability for veterans' compensation and burial benefits payable increased by \$157.3 billion in fiscal year 2010, and decreased by \$149.2 billion in fiscal year 2009. The fiscal year 2010 change consists of: 1) the adoption of SFFAS No. 33 for \$(66.5) billion; 2) changes in experience, primarily due to benefits recognized for conditions related to Agent Orange for \$122.4 billion; and 3) changes in assumptions, primarily economic, of \$101.4 billion.

The net cost of Veterans Compensation and Burial benefits for fiscal year 2010 is \$223.8 billion, and does not include the \$(66.5) billion effect of adopting SFFAS No. 33, a cumulative effect of changes in accounting principle that adjusted the opening balance of Cumulative Results of Operations, as opposed to affecting current period Net Cost of Operations. The fiscal year 2010 increase in net cost of \$223.8 billion compared the fiscal year 2009 decrease of \$(149.2) billion results in a year to year increase of \$373 billion. The corresponding change for fiscal year 2009 was a decrease of \$488.2 billion.

The Veterans Compensation and Burial benefits liability is a valuation of a long period of estimated cash flows. As a result, changes in economic assumptions can have a dramatic effect on the liability. If those changes to economic assumptions are in different directions from one period to the next, the changes to net cost from period to period are more pronounced as demonstrated over the past several years.

Veterans Compensation and Burial Benefits Payable as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Compensation:		
Veterans	1,189.7	1,130.7
Survivors	280.8	183.2
Burial benefits	4.3	3.6
Total veterans compensation and burial benefits payable.....	<u>1,474.8</u>	<u>1,317.5</u>

Significant Economic Assumptions Used in Determining Veterans Compensation and Burial Benefits as of September 30

	2010	2009
Rate of interest	4.73%	3.17%
Rate of inflation.....	2.86%	1.30%

Life Insurance Benefits

The largest veterans' life insurance programs consist of the following:

- National Service Life Insurance (NSLI) covers policyholders who served during World War II.
- Veterans' Special Life Insurance (VSLI) was established in 1951 to meet the insurance needs of veterans who served during the Korean Conflict and through the period ending January 1, 1957.
- Veterans' Reopened Insurance (VRI), which provided a 1-year reopening for insurance coverage in 1965 for those eligible to have obtained NSLI or VSLI and were disabled.

The components of veteran life insurance liability for future policy benefits are presented below.

Veterans Life Insurance Liability as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Insurance death benefits:		
NSLI	6.8	7.3
VSLI	1.6	1.6
VRI	0.3	0.3
Other	0.5	0.4
Total death benefits.....	<u>9.2</u>	<u>9.6</u>
Death benefit annuities.....	0.1	0.1
Disability income and waiver	0.6	0.6
Insurance dividends payable.....	1.7	1.8
Unearned premiums.....	0.1	-
Total veterans life insurance liability.....	<u>11.7</u>	<u>12.1</u>

Insurance dividends payable consists of dividends left on a deposit with VA, related interest payable, and dividends payable to policyholders.

The VA supervises Servicemembers Group Life Insurance and Veterans Group Life Insurance programs that provide life insurance coverage to members of the uniformed armed services and veterans who served during the Vietnam era or thereafter. The VA also provides certain veterans and/or their dependents with pension benefits, based on annual eligibility reviews, if the veteran died or was disabled for nonservice-related causes. The actuarial present value of the future liability for pension benefits is a non-exchange transaction and is not required to be recorded on the Balance Sheet. The projected amounts of future payments for pension benefits (presented for informational purposes only) as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, were \$80.8 billion and \$91.4 billion, respectively.

Note 16. Environmental and Disposal Liabilities

Environmental and Disposal Liabilities as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Department of Energy:		
Environmental Management Program	165.2	180.0
Legacy Environmental Liabilities - other	56.5	57.7
Active and Surplus Facilities	28.5	29.9
Total Department of Energy.....	<u>250.2</u>	<u>267.6</u>
Department of Defense:		
Environmental Restoration	27.9	30.2
Disposal of Weapon Systems Program	24.3	25.3
Environmental Corrective Other	5.4	5.7
Base Realignment and Closure.....	5.3	5.1
Total Department of Defense.....	<u>62.9</u>	<u>66.3</u>
All other agencies	<u>8.2</u>	<u>7.9</u>
Total environmental and disposal liabilities	<u><u>321.3</u></u>	<u><u>341.8</u></u>

During World War II and the Cold War, DOE (or predecessor agencies) developed a massive industrial complex to research, produce, and test nuclear weapons. This included nuclear reactors, chemical-processing buildings, metal machining plants, laboratories, and maintenance facilities that manufactured tens of thousands of nuclear warheads and conducted more than one thousand nuclear tests.

At all sites where these activities took place, some environmental contamination occurred. This contamination was caused by the production, storage, and use of radioactive materials and hazardous chemicals, which resulted in contamination of soil, surface water, and groundwater. The environmental legacy of nuclear weapons production also includes thousands of contaminated buildings and large volumes of waste and special nuclear materials requiring treatment, stabilization, and disposal.

Estimated cleanup costs at sites for which there are no current feasible remediation approaches, such as the Nevada nuclear test site, are excluded from the estimates, although applicable stewardship and monitoring costs for these sites are included. The cost estimate would be higher if some remediation were assumed for these areas; however, because DOE has not identified effective remedial technologies for these sites, no basis for estimating costs is available.

Estimating DOE's environmental cleanup liability requires making assumptions about future activities and is inherently uncertain. The future course of DOE's environmental cleanup and disposal will depend on a number of fundamental technical and policy choices, many of which have not been made. The sites and facilities could be restored to a condition suitable for any desirable use, or could be restored to a point where they pose no near-term health risks. Achieving the former conditions would have a higher cost, but may or may not, warrant the costs, or be legally required. The environmental liability estimates include contingency estimates intended to account for the uncertainties associated with the technical cleanup scope of the program.

DOE's environmental liability estimates are dependent on annual funding levels and achievement of work as scheduled. Congressional appropriations at lower than anticipated levels or unplanned delays in project completion would cause increases in life-cycle costs.

DOE is also required to recognize closure and post-closure costs for its active and surplus facilities and environmental corrective action costs for current operations. The cleanup cost associated with active and surplus facilities that is allocated to operating periods beyond the balance sheet date is identified as the unrecognized portion. For facilities newly contaminated since fiscal year 1997, cleanup costs allocated to future periods and not included in the liability amounted to \$608.0 million and \$627.0 million for fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively. The unrecognized portion of the cleanup cost is recognized over a predetermined period of time.

Please refer to the financial statements of the DOE for significant detailed information regarding DOE's environmental and disposal liabilities, including cleanup costs.

DOD follows the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and other applicable Federal or State laws to clean up contamination. The CERCLA and RCRA require the DOD to clean up contamination in coordination with regulatory agencies, current owners of property damaged by the Department, and third parties that have a partial responsibility for the environmental restoration. Failure to comply with agreements and legal mandates puts the DOD at risk of incurring fines and penalties.

DOD must restore active installations, installations affected by base realignment and closure, and other areas formerly used as defense sites. DOD also bears responsibility for disposal of chemical weapons and environmental costs associated with the disposal of weapons systems (primarily nuclear powered aircraft carriers and submarines). DOD is responsible, as well, for training range and other non-range unexploded ordnance cleanup.

DOD uses engineering estimates and independently validated models to estimate environmental costs. The engineering estimates are used after obtaining extensive data during the remedial investigation/feasibility phase of the environmental project.

DOD expenses associated environmental costs systematically over the life of the asset using two methods: physical capacity for operating landfills and life expectancy in years for all other assets. The Department expenses the full cost to clean up contamination for stewardship property, plant, and equipment at the time the asset is placed into service. DOD has expensed the costs for cleanup associated with general property, plant, and equipment placed into service before October 1, 1997, except for costs intended to be recovered through user charges; for those costs, DOD has expensed cleanup costs associated with that portion of the asset life that has passed since it was placed into service. DOD systematically recognizes the remaining cost over the remaining life of the asset. The unrecognized portion of the cleanup cost associated with general property, plant, and equipment is \$2.9 billion and \$2.1 billion for fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively. Not all components of DOD are able to compile the necessary information for this disclosure, thus the amount reported may not accurately reflect DOD's total unrecognized costs associated with general property, plant, and equipment. DOD is implementing procedures to address these deficiencies.

DOD is unable to estimate and report a liability for environmental restoration and corrective action for buried chemical munitions and agents, because the extent of the buried chemical munitions and agents is unknown at this time. DOD is also unable to provide a complete estimate for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program. DOD has ongoing studies and will update its estimate as additional liabilities are identified. DOD has the potential to incur costs for restoration initiatives in conjunction with returning overseas Defense facilities to host nations. However, DOD is unable to provide a reasonable estimate at this time because the extent of required restoration is unknown.

Please refer to the financial statements of the DOD for further detailed information regarding DOD's environmental and disposal liabilities, including cleanup costs.

Note 17. Benefits Due and Payable

Benefits Due and Payable as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance	51.7	50.2
Grants to States for Medicaid	27.2	25.0
Federal Disability Insurance	23.7	24.3
Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance (Medicare Parts B and D)	23.3	24.4
Federal Hospital Insurance (Medicare Part A)	21.8	22.4
Unemployment Insurance	6.3	4.5
Supplemental Security Income	5.4	5.3
All other Benefits Programs	4.9	4.7
Total benefits due and payable	<u>164.3</u>	<u>160.8</u>

Benefits due and payable are amounts owed to program recipients or medical service providers as of September 30 that have not been paid. For a description of the programs, see the Unaudited Supplemental Information—Social Insurance section.

Note 18. Insurance and Guarantee Program Liabilities

Insurance and Guarantee Program Liabilities as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Insurance and Guarantee Program Liabilities:		
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation—Benefit Pension Plans	90.0	83.1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Funds	72.6	70.5
All other insurance and guarantee programs	13.0	12.6
Total insurance and guarantee program liabilities	<u>175.6</u>	<u>166.2</u>

PBGC insures pension benefits for participants in covered defined benefit pension plans. As a wholly-owned corporation of the U.S. Government, PBGC's financial activity and balances are included in the consolidated financial statements of the U.S. Government. However, under current law, PBGC's liabilities may be paid only from PBGC's assets and not from the General Fund of the Treasury or assets of the Government in general. As of September 30, 2010, and 2009, PBGC had total liabilities of \$102.5 billion and \$92.1 billion, and its total liabilities exceeded its total assets by \$23.0 billion and \$21.9 billion, respectively. In addition, as discussed in Note 22—Contingencies, PBGC reported reasonably possible contingent losses of about \$190 billion and \$168.2 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively.

Of the total FDIC amount as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, \$21.3 billion and \$38.9 billion, respectively, represents the recorded contingent liability and loss provision for institutions insured by the Deposit Insurance Fund that are likely to fail. In addition, \$42.8 billion and \$20.1 billion pertain to liabilities due to resolutions of failed or failing institutions and to pending depositor claims as of September 30, 2010, and 2009 respectively. Another \$7.9 billion and \$10.3 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009 respectively, pertains to the Temporary Liquidity Guarantee Program, which guarantees certain newly issued debt and certain noninterest-bearing transaction accounts in an effort to counter the system-wide crisis in the nation's financial sector. The remaining amounts represent contingent liabilities for litigation. As of September 30, 2010, the Deposit Insurance Fund had total liabilities of \$107.4 billion, and its total liabilities exceeded its total assets by \$8.0 billion.

Of the \$13.0 billion and \$12.6 billion under all other insurance and guarantee programs as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively, \$4.6 billion and \$5.9 billion pertains to the USDA's Federal Crop Insurance Program. The Federal Crop Insurance Program is administered by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, whose mission is to provide an actuarially sound risk management program to reduce agricultural producers' economic losses due to natural disasters. Also, \$6.4 billion and \$5.3 billion represent National Credit Union Administration's Temporary Corporate Credit Union Stabilization Fund as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively. This Program guarantees the timely payment of principal and interest on certain unsecured debt of participating credit unions.

Note 19. Other Liabilities

Other Liabilities as of September 30	2010	2009
(In billions of dollars)		
Unearned revenue and assets held for others:		
DOE's unearned fees for nuclear waste disposal and other unearned revenue	74.2	39.8
Assets held on behalf of others	<u>64.9</u>	<u>56.6</u>
Subtotal	<u>139.1</u>	<u>96.4</u>
Employee-related liabilities:		
Accrued Federal employees wages and benefits	42.7	38.9
Selected DOE contractors' and D.C. employees' pension benefits	<u>50.2</u>	<u>41.8</u>
Subtotal	<u>92.9</u>	<u>80.7</u>
International monetary liabilities and gold certificates		
Exchange Stabilization	60.1	61.2
Gold Certificates (Note 2)	<u>11.0</u>	<u>11.0</u>
Subtotal	<u>71.1</u>	<u>72.2</u>
Subsidies and grants:		
Farm and other subsidies	13.2	13.9
Grant payments due to State and local governments and others	<u>18.1</u>	<u>16.5</u>
Subtotal	<u>31.3</u>	<u>30.4</u>
Miscellaneous liabilities:		
Legal and other contingencies	31.4	26.1
Bonneville Power Administration non-Federal power projects and capital lease liabilities, and disposal liabilities	9.4	10.2
Other miscellaneous	<u>41.3</u>	<u>38.1</u>
Subtotal	<u>82.1</u>	<u>74.4</u>
Total other liabilities	<u><u>416.5</u></u>	<u><u>354.1</u></u>

Other liabilities represent liabilities that are not separately identified on the Balance Sheets and are presented on a comparative basis by major category.

Unearned Revenue and Assets Held for Others

The Government recognizes a liability when it receives money in advance of providing goods and services or assumes custody of money belonging to others. The Government's unearned revenue from fees DOE has collected from utility companies for the future cost of managing the disposal of nuclear waste is about \$28.0 billion and \$26.2 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively. Other unearned revenue includes U.S.P.S. income for such things as prepaid postage, outstanding money orders, and prepaid P.O. Box rentals. In fiscal year 2010, FDIC collected prepaid assessments of \$33.4 billion from the financial institutions to address the Deposit Insurance Fund's (DIF) liquidity needs. Assets held on behalf of others include funds collected in advance and undelivered defense articles. The Foreign Military Sales program holds \$53.9 billion and \$47.0 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively for articles and services for future delivery to foreign governments.

Employee-Related Liabilities

This category includes amounts owed to employees at yearend and actuarial liabilities for certain non-Federal employees. Actuarial liabilities for Federal employees and veteran benefits are included in Note 15 and are reported on another line on the balance sheet. The largest liability in the employee-related liabilities category is the amount owed at the end of the fiscal year to Federal employees for wages and benefits (including accrued annual leave). In addition, DOE is liable to certain contractors such as the University of California, which operates the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, for contractor employee pension and postretirement benefits, which is about \$28.3 billion and \$24.4 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively. Also, the Government owed about \$9.7 billion and \$9.0 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively, for estimated future pension benefits of the District of Columbia's judges, police, firefighters, and teachers.

International Monetary Liabilities and Gold Certificates

The Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) was created to contribute to exchange rate stability and counter disorderly conditions in the foreign exchange market. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to deal in gold, foreign exchange, securities, and instruments of credit, under the exclusive control of the Secretary of the Treasury subject to the approval of the President. The dealings of the ESF are to be consistent with U.S. obligations to the International Monetary Fund.

Gold Certificates are issued in nondefinitive or book-entry form to the Federal Reserve banks. The Government's liability incurred by issuing the Gold Certificates, as reported on the Balance Sheet, is limited to the gold being held by the Department of the Treasury at the legal standard value established by law. Upon issuance of Gold Certificates to the Federal Reserve banks, the proceeds from the certificates are deposited into the operating cash of the U.S. Government. All of the Department of the Treasury's certificates issued are payable to the Federal Reserve banks.

Subsidies and Grants

The Government supports the public good through a wide variety of subsidy and grant programs in such areas as agriculture, medical and scientific research, education, and transportation. USDA programs such as the Conservation Reserve, Tobacco Transition Payment, and Direct and Counter-Cyclical Payment programs account for the majority of the subsidies due, about \$9.9 billion, and \$11.3 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively.

The Government awards hundreds of billions of dollars in grants annually. These include project grants that are competitively awarded for agency-specific projects, such as HHS grants to fund projects to "enhance the independence, productivity, integration and inclusion into the community of people with developmental disabilities." Other grants are formula grants, such as matching grants. Formula grants go to State governments for such things as education and transportation programs. These grants are paid in accordance with distribution formulas that have been provided by law or administrative regulations. Of the total liability reported for grants as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, DOT, Education, and HHS collectively owed their grantees about \$14.9 billion and \$13.8 billion, respectively. Refer to the financial statements and footnotes of the respective agencies for additional information.

Miscellaneous Liabilities

Some of the more significant liabilities included in this category are for (1) legal and other contingencies (see Note 22—Contingencies), (2) Bonneville Power Administration liability to pay annual budgets of several power projects for its electrical generating capacity, and (3) payables due to derivative contracts and the purchases of securities. In addition, many Federal agencies reported relatively small amounts of miscellaneous liabilities that are not otherwise classified.

Note 20. Collections and Refunds of Federal Revenue

Collections of Federal Tax Revenue for the Year Ended September 30, 2010

(In billions of dollars)	Federal Tax Revenue Collections	Tax Year to Which Collections Relate			
		2010	2009	2008	Prior Years
Individual income and tax withholdings	1,988.8	1,315.9	635.9	20.2	16.8
Corporation income taxes	277.9	188.5	75.5	1.6	12.3
Unemployment taxes	45.3	24.9	11.4	8.9	0.1
Excise taxes	73.8	54.9	18.6	0.1	0.2
Estate and gift taxes	19.8	-	7.9	0.9	11.0
Railroad retirement taxes	4.6	3.5	1.1	-	-
Fines, penalties, interest, and other revenue	3.8	3.6	0.1	0.1	-
Customs duties	26.4	26.4	-	-	-
Subtotal	<u>2,440.4</u>	<u>1,617.7</u>	<u>750.5</u>	<u>31.8</u>	<u>40.4</u>
Less: amounts collected for non-Federal entities	<u>(0.9)</u>				
Total	<u>2,439.5</u>				

Treasury is the Government's principal revenue-collecting agency. Collections of individual income and tax withholdings includes FICA/SECA and individual income taxes. These taxes are characterized as non-exchange revenue.

Excise taxes consist of taxes collected for various items, such as airline tickets, gasoline products, distilled spirits and imported liquor, tobacco, firearms, and others. These are also characterized as non-exchange revenue.

Federal Tax Refunds Disbursed for the Year Ended September 30, 2010

(In billions of dollars)	Refunds Disbursed	Tax Year to Which Refunds Relate			
		2010	2009	2008	Prior Years
Individual income and tax withholdings	366.1	1.3	312.2	35.6	17.0
Corporation income taxes	98.3	2.7	16.2	16.8	62.6
Unemployment taxes	0.1	-	0.1	-	-
Excise taxes	2.2	0.6	0.9	0.3	0.4
Estate and gift taxes	0.9	-	0.2	0.4	0.3
Customs duties	1.3	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.3
Total.....	<u>468.9</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>329.8</u>	<u>53.2</u>	<u>80.6</u>

Reconciliation of Revenue to Tax Collections for the Year Ended September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
Consolidated revenue per the Statements of Operations and Changes in Net Position	2,216.5	2,198.4
Tax refunds	468.9	439.3
ARRA and Stimulus Act Recovery Rebate Payments	-	(2.0)
First-time Homebuyers Tax Credit	(8.7)	(9.4)
Making work pay credit	(13.7)	-
Earned income tax credit and child tax credit imputed revenue	(77.4)	(66.7)
Other tax credits	(10.5)	-
Beneficial Interest in Trust	2.7	(23.5)
Federal Reserve earnings	(75.8)	(34.3)
Nontax-related fines and penalties reported by agencies	(46.6)	(18.7)
Nontax-related earned revenue	<u>(15.9)</u>	<u>(54.8)</u>
Collections of Federal tax revenue	<u>2,439.5</u>	<u>2,428.3</u>

Consolidated revenue in the Statements of Operations and Changes in Net Position is presented on a modified cash basis, is net of tax refunds, and includes other nontax related revenue. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) and Stimulus Act Recovery Rebate Payments, First-time Homebuyer Credit and Earned Income Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit amounts (unaudited) are included in gross cost in the Statements of Net Cost as a component of Treasury. Beneficial Interest in Trust is presented as an asset on the Balance Sheet. On the other hand, collections of Federal tax revenue are reported on a gross cash basis. The table above reconciles total revenue to Federal tax collections.

Collections of Federal Tax Revenue for the Year Ended September 30, 2009

(In billions of dollars)	Federal Tax Revenue Collections	Tax Year to Which Collections Relate			
		2009	2008	2007	Prior Years
Individual income and tax withholdings	2,036.6	1,296.4	702.6	22.3	15.3
Corporation income taxes	225.5	138.2	69.0	1.7	16.6
Unemployment taxes	38.2	21.1	9.7	7.3	0.1
Excise taxes	69.8	57.1	12.5	0.1	0.1
Estate and gift taxes	24.7	0.1	4.0	0.8	19.8
Railroad retirement taxes	4.7	3.6	1.1	-	-
Fines, penalties, interest, and other revenue	6.0	5.8	0.1	0.1	-
Customs duties	23.0	23.0	-	-	-
Subtotal	<u>2,428.5</u>	<u>1,545.3</u>	<u>799.0</u>	<u>32.3</u>	<u>51.9</u>
Less: amounts collected for non-Federal entities	<u>(0.2)</u>				
Total	<u>2,428.3</u>				

Federal Tax Refunds Disbursed for the Year Ended September 30, 2009

(In billions of dollars)	Refunds Disbursed	Tax Year to Which Refunds Relate			
		2009	2008	2007	Prior Years
Individual income and tax withholdings	339.6	1.1	293.8	30.4	14.3
Corporation income taxes	95.2	6.6	32.6	17.4	38.6
Unemployment taxes	0.1	-	0.1	-	-
Excise taxes	1.8	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.6
Estate and gift taxes	1.2	-	0.3	0.5	0.4
Customs duties	1.4	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.4
Total	<u>439.3</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>327.6</u>	<u>48.5</u>	<u>54.3</u>

Note 21. Prior Period Adjustments

(In billions of dollars)	Changes to Net Position	
	2010	2009
Prior Period Adjustments		
Department of Veterans Affairs.....	66.5	-
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	(3.0)	-
Department of Interior	-	(0.3)
Department of Defense	-	1.6
Other prior period adjustments	(0.1)	-
Total Prior Period Adjustments.....	<u>63.4</u>	<u>1.3</u>

During fiscal year 2010, VA adopted SFFAS 33, *Pensions, Other Retirement Benefits, and Other Postemployment Benefits: Reporting Gains and Losses from Changes in Assumptions, and Selecting Discount Rates and Valuation Dates*. This resulted in a \$66.5 billion reduction in the Veterans Compensation and Burial Actuarial Liabilities and an increase to VA's net position by \$66.5 billion. Additionally, NASA reviewed the consumption method in relation to its business processes and operations and determined that it did not reflect NASA's business processes and operations and that the purchase method explained in SFFAS No. 3, *Accounting for Inventory and Related Property*, is the preferred method. Accordingly, NASA reduced its assets and net position by \$3.0 billion.

During fiscal year 2009, a DOD component implemented an Enterprise Resource Planning system that provided a means to revalue inventory from LAC to moving average cost, which is the Department's current policy for reporting inventory. The result was a prior period adjustment due to a change in accounting principle that increased the 2009 beginning net position by \$1.6 billion. Additionally, DOI adopted SFFAS 31, *Accounting for Fiduciary Activities*, which resulted in the removal of net fiduciary assets and liabilities of \$(0.3) billion from its net position.

Note 22. Contingencies

Financial Treatment of Loss Contingencies

Loss contingencies that are assessed to be at least reasonably possible are disclosed in this note. Loss contingencies involve situations where there is an uncertainty of a possible loss. The reporting of loss contingencies depends on the likelihood that a future event or events will confirm the loss or impairment of an asset or the incurrence of a liability. Terms used to assess the range for the likelihood of loss are probable, reasonably possible, and remote. Loss contingencies that are assessed as probable and measurable are accrued in the financial statements. Loss contingencies that are assessed as remote are not reported in the financial statements, nor disclosed in the notes. All other material loss contingencies are disclosed in this note. The following table provides criteria for how Federal agencies are to account for loss contingencies, based on the likelihood of the loss and measurability.¹

Likelihood of future outflow or other sacrifice of resources.	Loss amount can be reasonably measured.	Loss range can be reasonably measured.	Loss amount or range cannot be reasonably measured.
Probable. Future confirming event(s) are more likely to occur than not. ²	Accrue the liability. Report on Balance Sheet and Statement of Net Cost.	Accrue liability of the best estimate or minimum amount in loss range if there is no best estimate, and disclose nature of contingency and range of estimated liability.	Disclose nature of contingency and include a statement that an estimate cannot be made.
Reasonably possible. Possibility of future confirming event(s) occurring is more than remote and less than likely.	Disclose nature of contingency and estimated loss amount.	Disclose nature of contingency and estimated loss range.	Disclose nature of contingency and include a statement that an estimate cannot be made.
Remote. Possibility of future event(s) occurring is slight.	No disclosure.	No disclosure.	No disclosure.

¹ In addition, a third condition must be met to be a loss contingency: a past event or an exchange transaction must occur.

² For loss contingencies related to litigation, probable is defined as the future confirming event or events are more likely than not to occur, with the exception of pending or threatened litigation and unasserted claims. For the pending or threatened litigation and unasserted claims, the future confirming event or events are likely to occur.

The Government is subject to loss contingencies that include insurance and litigation cases. These loss contingencies arise in the normal course of operations and their ultimate disposition is unknown. Based on information currently available, however, it is management's opinion that the expected outcome of these matters, individually or in the aggregate, will not have a material adverse effect on the financial statements, except for the insurance and litigation described in the following sections:

Insurance Contingencies

At the time an insurance policy is issued, a contingency arises. The contingency is the risk of loss assumed by the insurer, that is, the risk of loss from events that may occur during the term of the policy. The Government has insurance contingencies that are reasonably possible in the amount of \$224.2 billion as of September 30, 2010, and \$198.7 billion as of September 30, 2009. The major programs are identified below:

- PBGC reported \$190.0 billion and \$168.2 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively, for the estimated aggregate unfunded vested benefits exposure to the PBGC for private-sector single-employer and multiemployer defined pension plans that are classified as a reasonably possible exposure to loss.
- FDIC reported \$34.2 billion and \$30.5 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively, for identified additional risk in the financial services industry that could result in additional loss to the Deposit Insurance Fund should potentially vulnerable insured institutions ultimately fail. Actual losses, if any, will largely depend on future economic and market conditions.

Insurance in Force

Insurance in Force is the accumulation of policy limits for all policies issued and outstanding at a point in time. The Government has Insurance in Force in the amount of \$1,394.8 billion as of September 30, 2010, and \$1,252.2 billion as of September 30, 2009. These amounts represent estimated maximum exposure to insurance claims and guarantee programs. The major programs are identified below:

- The DHS reported \$1,230.0 billion and \$1,190.0 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively, for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).
- The DOT reported \$98.3 billion as of September 30, 2010, for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Aviation Insurance Program.

Deposit Insurance

Deposit insurance covers all types of deposit accounts such as checking, NOW and savings accounts, money market deposit accounts, and certificates of deposit (CDs) received at an insured bank, savings association, or credit union. The insurance covers the balance of each depositor's account and shares, dollar-for-dollar, up to the insurance limit, including principal and any accrued interest through the date of the insured financial institution's closing. As a result, the Government has the following exposure from Federally-insured financial institutions:

- FDIC has estimated insured deposits of \$5,423.0 billion as of September 30, 2010, and \$5,309.0 billion as of September 30, 2009, for the Deposit Insurance Fund.
- NCUA has estimated insured shares of \$750.9 billion as of September 30, 2010, and \$713.6 billion as of September 30, 2009, for the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund.

Legal Contingencies

Legal contingencies as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, are summarized in the table below:

(In billions of dollars)	2010			2009		
	Accrued Liabilities ¹	Estimated Range of Loss for Certain Cases ²		Accrued Liabilities ¹	Estimated Range of Loss for Certain Cases ²	
		Lower End	Upper End		Lower End	Upper End
Legal contingencies						
Probable.....	4.3	4.3	5.2	3.4	3.4	3.9
Reasonably possible		118.4	122.6		10.2	22.3

¹ Accrued liabilities are recorded and presented in the related line items of the balance sheet.
² Does not reflect the total range of loss; many cases assessed as reasonably possible of an unfavorable outcome did not include estimated losses that could be determined.

The Government is party to various administrative claims and legal actions brought against it, some of which may ultimately result in settlements or decisions against the Government.

Management and legal counsel have determined that it is “probable” that some of these actions will result in a loss to the Government and the loss amounts are reasonably measurable. The estimated liabilities for these cases are \$4.3 billion and \$3.4 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively, and are included in “Other Liabilities” on the Balance Sheet. For example, USDA is subject to various claims and contingencies related to lawsuits. For cases in which payment has been deemed probable and for which the amount of potential liability has been estimated, about \$1.3 billion has been accrued in the financial statements as of September 30, 2010 and 2009. The Cobell v. Salazar lawsuit brought against the Interior Department and Treasury Department on behalf of 500,000 individual Indian trust beneficiaries for an historical accounting of their trust accounts and reform of trust management systems. In December 2009, the parties agreed to settle the lawsuit, contingent upon authorizing legislation and court approval. The President signed legislation authorizing the settlement on December 8, 2010. The total amount of the settlement is \$3.4 billion. If the court gives preliminary approval to the settlement, the entire class of plaintiffs will receive notice of their rights under the settlement and an opportunity to object. The parties anticipate seeking final approval in late spring.

There are also administrative claims and legal actions pending where adverse decisions are considered by management and legal counsel as “reasonably possible” with an estimate of potential loss or a range of potential loss. The estimated potential losses for such claims and actions range from \$118.4 billion to \$122.6 billion as of September 30, 2010, and from \$10.2 billion to \$22.3 billion as of September 30, 2009. For example, to date, DHS has received 93,357 administrative tort claims. If all of these claimants filed suit against the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and prevailed, the total amount at issue would be well in excess of \$100 billion. This is unlikely to occur because of motions to dismiss and other legal remedies that would limit or eliminate FEMA’s potential liability. The claims are against FEMA for personal injuries allegedly resulting from exposure to formaldehyde in temporary housing units (i.e., travel trailers, and mobile homes) issued by FEMA in response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

Numerous litigation cases are pending where the outcome is uncertain or it is reasonably possible that a loss has been incurred and where estimates cannot be made. There are other litigation cases where the plaintiffs have not made claims for specific dollar amounts, but the claimed amounts may be significant. The ultimate resolution of these legal actions for which the potential loss could not be determined may materially affect the U.S. Government's financial position or operating results. Examples of specific cases are summarized below:

- Tribal Trust Fund Cases - Numerous cases have been filed in U.S. District Court in which Native American Tribes seek a declaration that the United States has not provided the tribes with a full and complete accounting of their trust funds, and seek an order requiring the Government to provide such an accounting. It is not possible at this time to determine the likelihood of an unfavorable outcome or an estimate of the amount or range of any potential loss.
- Various parties filed administrative claims and lawsuits against the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) as a result of Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Most of the Hurricane Katrina tort actions that have been filed are consolidated before a single judge sitting in the Eastern District of Louisiana. The court has classified the individual cases that have been consolidated into seven categories: Levee, MRGO, Insurance, Responder, Dredging Limitations, St. Rita Nursing Home and Barge. Approximately 500,000 administrative claims related to the allegations in this consolidated action have been filed.

Environmental and Disposal Contingencies

Environmental and disposal contingencies as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, are summarized in the table below:

(In billions of dollars)	Accrued Liabilities ¹	2010 Estimated Range of Loss for Certain Cases ²		Accrued Liabilities ¹	2009 Estimated Range of Loss for Certain Cases ²	
		Lower End	Upper End		Lower End	Upper End
Environmental and disposal contingencies						
Probable	15.8	15.8	16.0	13.5	13.5	13.7
Reasonably possible		0.2	0.3		0.4	0.4

¹ Accrued liabilities are recorded and presented in the related line items of the balance sheet.
² Does not reflect the total range of loss; many cases assessed as reasonably possible of an unfavorable outcome did not include estimated losses that could be determined.

The Government is subject to loss contingencies for a variety of environmental cleanup costs for the storage and disposal of hazardous material and the operations and closures of facilities at which environmental contamination may be present.

Management and legal counsel have determined that it is "probable" that some of these actions will result in a loss to the Government and the loss amounts are reasonably measurable. The estimated liabilities for these cases are \$15.8 billion and \$13.5 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively, and are included in "Other Liabilities" on the Balance Sheet. DOE is subject to Spent Nuclear Fuel litigation for damages suffered by all utilities as a result of the delay in beginning disposal of spent nuclear fuel and also damages for alleged exposures to radioactive and/or toxic substances. Significant claims for partial breach of contract and a large number of class action and/or multiple plaintiff tort suits have been filed with estimated liability amounts of \$15.5 billion and \$13.2 billion as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively. However, DOE reported that several developments have made it difficult to predict the amount of the Government's likely liability, which at this time is undetermined.

Other Contingencies

DOT and HHS reported the following other contingencies:

- The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) reimburses states for construction costs on projects related to the Federal Highway System of roads. FHWA has pre-authorized \$40.2 billion and \$41.0 billion to the states to establish budgets for its construction projects for fiscal years ending September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively. Congress has not provided appropriations for these projects and no liability is accrued in the consolidated financial statements.
- Contingent liabilities have been reported as a result of Medicaid audit and program disallowances that are currently being appealed by the States. The Medicaid amounts are \$5.4 billion and \$3.8 billion for fiscal years ending September 30, 2010, and 2009, respectively.

Treaties

The U.S. Government is a party to major treaties and other international agreements. These treaties and other international agreements address various issues including, but not limited to, trade, commerce, security, and arms that may involve financial obligations or give rise to possible exposure to losses. A comprehensive analysis to determine any such financial obligations or possible exposure to loss and their related effect on the consolidated financial statements of the U.S. Government has not yet been performed.

Note 23. Commitments

Long-Term Operating Leases as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)

	2010	2009
General Services Administration.....	26.1	24.8
U.S. Postal Service	7.8	7.6
Department of Health and Human Services ..	1.7	1.5
Department of State	1.3	1.0
Securities and Exchange Commission	1.1	0.6
Department of Agriculture	1.0	0.9
Department of Defense.....	0.7	0.5
Other Operating Leases.....	3.9	4.8
Total long-term operating leases.....	<u>43.6</u>	<u>41.7</u>

The Government has entered into contractual commitments that require future use of financial resources. It has significant amounts of long-term lease obligations and undelivered orders. Undelivered orders represent the value of goods and services ordered that have not yet been received.

The Government has other contractual commitments that may require future use of financial resources. For example, the Government has callable subscriptions in certain Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), which are autonomous international financial entities that finance economic and social development projects in developing countries. Callable capital stock shares in the MDB, serve as a supplement pool of resources that may be called, and converted into ordinary paid in shares, if the MDB cannot otherwise meet certain obligations through its other available resources. MDBs are able to use callable capital as backing to obtain very favorable financing terms when borrowing from world capital markets. To date, there has never been a call on this capital for any of the major MDBs and none is anticipated.

Undelivered Orders and Other Commitments as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009 (Restated)
Undelivered Orders:		
Department of Defense	348.6	342.9
Department of Education	237.5	224.5
Department of the Treasury	144.8	156.4
EOP Foreign Military Sales Program	112.4	103.0
Department of Transportation	102.1	97.6
Department of Health and Human Services	92.9	89.4
Department of Housing and Urban Development	64.8	68.2
Department of Agriculture	54.8	44.3
Department of Energy	49.2	42.4
Department of Homeland Security	37.7	35.6
Department of State	19.2	15.0
Agency for International Development	15.7	12.4
National Science Foundation	11.8	11.0
Department of Justice	11.5	11.4
Environmental Protection Agency	11.4	12.6
General Services Administration	10.6	7.0
All other agencies	58.8	46.3
Total undelivered orders	1,383.8	1,320.0
Other Commitments:		
Callable capital subscriptions for multilateral development banks	63.9	62.2
Contract Options and Negotiations	10.2	10.2
Fuel Purchase Obligations	7.9	8.6
Power Purchase Obligations	5.5	7.4
Agriculture Direct Loans and Guarantees	4.8	6.1
Long-term Satellite and Systems	3.9	4.7
Conservation Reserve Program	1.8	1.8
All other commitments	6.0	4.5
Total other commitments	104.0	105.5

Other Commitments and Risks

The U. S. Government has entered into agreements that could potentially require claims on Government resources in the future. For example, The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (TRIA or the Act) was signed into law on November 26, 2002. This law was enacted to address market disruptions resulting from terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. On December 26, 2007, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007 (Reauthorization Act) was enacted extending the Program through December 31, 2014. The Act helps to ensure available and affordable commercial property and casualty insurance for terrorism risk, and simultaneously allows private markets to stabilize. The Terrorism Risk Insurance Program is activated upon the certification of an “act of terrorism” by the Secretary of the Treasury in concurrence with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. If a certified act of terrorism occurs, insurers may be eligible to receive reimbursement from the Government for insured losses above a designated deductible amount. Insured losses above this amount will be shared between insurance companies and the Government. The Act also gives Treasury authority to recoup Federal payments made under the Program through policyholder surcharges under certain circumstances and contains provisions designed to manage litigation arising from or relating to a certified act of terrorism. There were no claims under TRIA as of September 30, 2010, or September 30, 2009.

Restatements

As of September 30, 2009, other commitments were reduced by \$290.2 billion to correct for errors by Treasury and Department of Homeland Security. Treasury removed \$289.4 billion related to activity with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac since commitments relating to such were already disclosed in Note 11—Investments in and Liabilities to Government-Sponsored Enterprises from other commitments.

Note 24. Earmarked Funds

Earmarked Funds as of September 30, 2010 ¹

(In billions of dollars)	Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund	Military Retirement Fund	Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund	Medicare- Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (MERHCF)	Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (Medicare Part A)	Civil Service Health Benefits Program Trust Funds
Assets:						
Cash and other monetary assets	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fund balance with Treasury	(0.4)	-	-	0.2	-	1.1
Investments in U.S. Treasury securities, net of unamortized premiums/discounts	2,399.1	318.6	780.4	164.4	279.5	58.4
Other Federal assets	26.7	3.1	10.1	1.8	28.5	1.3
Non-Federal assets	1.9	-	0.4	0.6	1.0	1.0
Total assets	<u>2,427.3</u>	<u>321.7</u>	<u>790.9</u>	<u>167.0</u>	<u>309.0</u>	<u>61.8</u>
Liabilities:						
Liabilities due and payable to beneficiaries	51.7	4.2	5.5	0.7	21.8	4.0
Other Federal liabilities	4.9	0.1	0.1	0.1	25.2	0.4
Other non-Federal liabilities	-	1,258.4	1,550.9	573.1	0.2	341.7
Total liabilities	56.6	1,262.7	1,556.5	573.9	47.2	346.1
Total net position	<u>2,370.7</u>	<u>(941.0)</u>	<u>(765.6)</u>	<u>(406.9)</u>	<u>261.8</u>	<u>(284.3)</u>
Total liabilities and net position	<u>2,427.3</u>	<u>321.7</u>	<u>790.9</u>	<u>167.0</u>	<u>309.0</u>	<u>61.8</u>
Change in net position:						
Beginning net position	2,270.2	(898.8)	(696.0)	(361.4)	292.4	(290.8)
Investment revenue	108.4	10.4	36.4	5.3	14.2	1.8
Individual income taxes	552.8	-	-	-	183.6	-
Unemployment and excise taxes ..	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other taxes and receipts	-	-	-	-	0.6	-
Miscellaneous earned revenues ..	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other changes in fund balance (e.g., appropriations, transfers)	14.2	83.5	33.2	21.1	14.8	9.6
Non-program expenses	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program net cost	574.9	136.1	139.2	71.9	243.8	4.9
Ending net position	<u>2,370.7</u>	<u>(941.0)</u>	<u>(765.6)</u>	<u>(406.9)</u>	<u>261.8</u>	<u>(284.3)</u>

¹ By law, certain expenses (costs), revenues, and other financing sources related to the administration of the above funds are not charged to the funds and are therefore financed and/or credited to other sources.

Earmarked Funds as of September 30, 2010 ¹

(In billions of dollars)	Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund	Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund (Medicare Parts B and D)	Exchange Stabilization Fund	All Other Earmarked Funds	Intra- Earmarked Fund Eliminations	Total Earmarked Funds
Assets:						
Cash and other monetary assets	-	-	70.9	0.2	-	71.1
Fund balance with Treasury ..	(0.4)	2.0	-	104.2	-	106.7
Investments in U.S. Treasury securities, net of unamortized premiums/discounts.....	187.2	71.0	20.4	198.5	-	4,477.5
Other Federal assets.....	2.2	25.6	0.1	23.7	(54.9)	68.2
Non-Federal assets	3.4	4.9	12.5	82.7	-	108.4
Total assets	<u>192.4</u>	<u>103.5</u>	<u>103.9</u>	<u>409.3</u>	<u>(54.9)</u>	<u>4,831.9</u>
Liabilities:						
Liabilities due and payable to beneficiaries	24.3	23.3	-	7.9	-	143.4
Other Federal liabilities.....	1.4	26.4	-	86.6	(54.9)	90.3
Other non-Federal liabilities ...	-	0.3	60.1	166.6	-	3,951.3
Total liabilities	<u>25.7</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>60.1</u>	<u>261.1</u>	<u>(54.9)</u>	<u>4,185.0</u>
Total net position	<u>166.7</u>	<u>53.5</u>	<u>43.8</u>	<u>148.2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>646.9</u>
Total liabilities and net position	<u>192.4</u>	<u>103.5</u>	<u>103.9</u>	<u>409.3</u>	<u>(54.9)</u>	<u>4,831.9</u>
Change in net position:						
Beginning net position	186.6	44.0	43.8	162.7	-	752.7
Investment revenue.....	9.6	3.1	-	5.8	-	195.0
Individual income taxes	93.9	-	-	0.0	-	830.3
Unemployment and excise taxes	-	-	-	94.2	-	94.2
Other taxes and receipts	-	-	-	30.5	(0.5)	30.6
Miscellaneous earned revenues.....	-	-	-	4.5	-	4.5
Other changes in fund balance (e.g., appropriations, transfers) ..	(1.6)	209.7	0.1	97.5	-	482.1
Non-program expenses.....	-	-	-	1.5	-	1.5
Program net cost	<u>121.8</u>	<u>203.3</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>245.5</u>	<u>(0.5)</u>	<u>1,741.0</u>
Ending net position	<u>166.7</u>	<u>53.5</u>	<u>43.8</u>	<u>148.2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>646.9</u>

¹ By law, certain expenses (costs), revenues, and other financing sources related to the administration of the above funds are not charged to the funds and are therefore financed and/or credited to other sources.

Earmarked Funds as of September 30, 2009 ¹

(In billions of dollars)	Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund	Military Retirement Fund	Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund	Medicare- Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (MERHCF)	Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (Medicare Part A)	Civil Service Health Benefits Program Trust Funds
Assets:						
Cash and other monetary assets	-	-	-	-	0.1	-
Fund balance with Treasury	(0.2)	-	-	-	0.4	1.0
Investments in U.S. Treasury Securities, net of unamortized premiums/discounts	2,296.3	275.5	754.2	146.8	309.7	50.5
Other Federal assets	26.8	2.9	10.2	1.6	28.5	1.2
Non-Federal assets	2.3	-	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.9
Total assets	2,325.2	278.4	764.8	148.8	339.4	53.6
Liabilities and net position:						
Liabilities due and payable to beneficiaries	50.3	3.7	5.3	0.7	22.4	3.8
Other Federal liabilities	4.7	-	0.1	0.1	24.4	0.3
Other non-Federal liabilities	-	1,173.5	1,455.4	509.4	0.2	340.3
Total liabilities	55.0	1,177.2	1,460.8	510.2	47.0	344.4
Total net position	2,270.2	(898.8)	(696.0)	(361.4)	292.4	(290.8)
Total liabilities and net position	2,325.2	278.4	764.8	148.8	339.4	53.6
Change in net position:						
Beginning net position	2,128.7	(901.1)	(653.6)	(366.7)	302.9	(285.5)
Prior period adjustment	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beginning net position, adjusted	2,128.7	(901.1)	(653.6)	(366.7)	302.9	(285.5)
Investment revenue	107.7	2.8	37.1	1.1	15.6	1.9
Individual income taxes	571.2	-	-	-	194.1	-
Unemployment and excise taxes	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other taxes and receipts	-	-	-	-	0.5	-
Miscellaneous earned revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other changes in fund balance (e.g., appropriations, transfers)	12.1	72.5	31.4	21.4	14.5	9.1
Non-program expenses	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program net cost	549.5	73.0	110.9	17.2	235.2	16.3
Ending net position	2,270.2	(898.8)	(696.0)	(361.4)	292.4	(290.8)

¹ By law, certain expenses (costs), revenues, and other financing sources related to the administration of the above funds are not charged to the funds and are therefore financed and/or credited to other sources.

Earmarked Funds as of September 30, 2009 ¹

(In billions of dollars)	Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund	Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund (Medicare Parts B and D)	Exchange Stabilization Fund	All Other Earmarked Funds (Restated)	Intra- Earmarked Fund Eliminations	Total Earmarked Funds (Restated)
Assets:						
Cash and other monetary assets	-	0.3	71.7	0.1	-	72.2
Fund balance with Treasury	(0.3)	2.9	-	103.3	-	107.1
Investments in U.S. Treasury Securities, net of unamortized premiums/discounts.....	207.9	61.8	19.8	185.9	-	4,308.4
Other Federal assets	2.6	27.9	-	19.6	(57.0)	64.3
Non-Federal assets	3.2	4.3	13.5	81.4	-	107.1
Total assets	<u>213.4</u>	<u>97.2</u>	<u>105.0</u>	<u>390.3</u>	<u>(57.0)</u>	<u>4,659.1</u>
Liabilities and net position:						
Liabilities due and payable to beneficiaries	25.5	24.4	-	6.4	-	142.5
Other Federal liabilities	1.3	28.5	-	57.3	(57.0)	59.7
Other non-Federal liabilities.....	-	0.3	61.2	163.9	-	3,704.2
Total liabilities	26.8	53.2	61.2	227.6	(57.0)	3,906.4
Total net position	186.6	44.0	43.8	162.7	-	752.7
Total liabilities and net position	<u>213.4</u>	<u>97.2</u>	<u>105.0</u>	<u>390.3</u>	<u>(57.0)</u>	<u>4,659.1</u>
Change in net position:						
Beginning net position	196.7	52.0	39.8	191.4	-	704.6
Prior period adjustment	-	-	-	(0.3)	-	(0.3)
Beginning net position, adjusted	196.7	52.0	39.8	191.1	-	704.3
Investment revenue	10.6	3.0	-	4.8	-	184.6
Individual income taxes	97.0	-	-	(0.0)	-	862.3
Unemployment and excise taxes	-	-	-	87.0	-	87.0
Other taxes and receipts	-	-	0.2	31.0	(0.3)	31.4
Miscellaneous earned revenue.....	-	-	-	4.4	-	4.4
Other changes in fund balance (e.g., appropriations, transfers)..	(1.3)	183.8	-	63.3	-	406.8
Non-program expenses	-	-	-	2.8	-	2.8
Program net cost	116.4	194.8	(3.8)	216.1	(0.3)	1,525.3
Ending net position	<u>186.6</u>	<u>44.0</u>	<u>43.8</u>	<u>162.7</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>752.7</u>

¹ By law, certain expenses (costs), revenues, and other financing sources related to the administration of the above funds are not charged to the funds and are therefore financed and/or credited to other sources.

Earmarked funds are financed by specifically identified revenues, often supplemented by other financing sources, which remain available over time. These specifically identified revenues and other financing sources are required by statute to be used for designated activities, benefits, or purposes and must be accounted for separately from the Government's general revenues. Earmarked funds generally include trust funds, public enterprise revolving funds (not including credit reform financing funds), and special funds.

In the Federal budget, the term "trust fund" means only that the law requires a particular fund be accounted for separately, used only for a specified purpose, and designated as a trust fund. A change in law may change the future receipts and the terms under which the fund's resources are spent. In the private sector, trust fund refers to funds of one party held and managed by a second party (the trustee) in a fiduciary capacity. The activity of earmarked funds differs from fiduciary activities primarily in that earmarked fund assets are Government-owned.

Public enterprise revolving funds include expenditure accounts authorized by law to be credited with offsetting collections, mostly from the public, that are generated by and earmarked to finance a continuing cycle of business-type operations. Some of the financing for these funds may be from appropriations.

Special funds are Federal funds earmarked by law for a specific purpose. Special funds include the special fund receipt account and the special fund expenditure account.

The tables above depict major earmarked funds chosen based on their significant financial activity and importance to taxpayers. All other Government earmarked funds not shown separately are aggregated as "all other."

Total assets represent the unexpended balance from all sources of receipts and amounts due to the earmarked funds, regardless of source, including related Governmental transactions. These are transactions between two different entities within the Government (for example, monies received by one entity of the Government from another entity of the Government).

The intragovernmental assets are comprised of fund balances with Treasury, investments in Treasury securities—including unamortized amounts, and other assets that include the related accrued interest receivable on Federal investments. These amounts were eliminated in preparing the principal financial statements.

The non-Federal assets represent only the activity with individuals and organizations outside of the Government.

Most of the earmarked fund assets are invested in intragovernmental debt holdings. The Government does not set aside assets to pay future benefits or other expenditures associated with earmarked funds. The cash receipts collected from the public for an earmarked fund are deposited in the U.S. Treasury, which uses the cash for general Government purposes. Treasury securities are issued to Federal agencies as evidence of its receipts. Treasury securities are an asset to the Federal agencies and a liability to the U.S. Treasury and, therefore, they do not represent an asset or a liability in the *Financial Report of the U.S. Government*. These securities require redemption if a fund's disbursements exceeds its receipts. Redeeming these securities will increase the Government's financing needs and require more borrowing from the public (or less repayment of debt), or will result in higher taxes than otherwise would have been needed, or less spending on other programs than otherwise would have occurred, or some combination thereof. See Note 14—Federal Debt Securities Held by the Public and Accrued Interest for further information related to the investments in Federal debt securities.

Depicted below is a description of the major earmarked funds shown in the above tables, which also includes the names of the Government agencies that administer each particular fund. For detailed information regarding these earmarked funds, please refer to the financial statements of the corresponding administering agencies. For information on the benefits due and payable liability associated with certain earmarked funds, see Note 17—Benefits Due and Payable.

Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund

The Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, administered by the SSA, provides a basic annuity to workers to protect them from loss of income at retirement and provide a guaranteed income to survivors in the event of the death of a family's primary wage earner.

Payroll and self-employment taxes primarily fund the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. Interest earnings on Treasury securities, Federal agencies' payments for the Social Security benefits earned by military and Federal civilian employees, and Treasury payments for a portion of income taxes collected on Social Security benefits provide the fund with additional income. The law establishing the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund is set forth in 42 U.S.C. § 401.

Military Retirement Fund

The Military Retirement Fund, administered by DOD, provides retirement benefits for Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force personnel and their survivors. The fund is financed by DOD contributions, appropriations, and interest earnings on Treasury securities. The laws establishing the Military Retirement Fund and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund are set forth in 10 U.S.C. § 1461-1467.

Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund

The CSRDF covers two Federal civilian retirement systems: the CSRS—for employees hired before 1984, and the FERS—for employees hired after 1983. OPM administers the CSRS and the FERS systems. The laws establishing the CSRDF and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund are set forth in 5 U.S.C. § 8331-8348. Funding sources include:

- Federal civilian employees' contributions.
- Agencies' contributions on behalf of employees.
- Appropriations.
- Interest earnings on Treasury securities.

Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund

The Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund, administered by the Secretary of the Treasury and established by 10 U.S.C. § 1111, finances and pays the liabilities under the DOD retiree health care programs for military retirees, their dependents and survivors who are Medicare-Eligible. Such beneficiaries include qualifying members, former members, and dependents of the Uniformed Services. The assets of the fund are comprised of any amounts appropriated to the trust fund, payments to the fund authorized by 10 U.S.C. § 1116, and interest earned on investments authorized by 10 U.S.C. § 1117.

Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (Medicare Part A)

The Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, administered by HHS, finances the Hospital Insurance Program (Medicare Part A). This program funds the cost of inpatient hospital and related care for individuals age 65 or older who meet certain insured status requirements, and eligible disabled people.

The Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund is financed primarily by payroll taxes, including those paid by Federal agencies. It also receives income from interest earnings on Treasury securities and a portion of income taxes collected on Social Security benefits. The law establishing the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund is set forth in 42 U.S.C. § 1395i.

Civil Service Health Benefits Program Trust Funds

The Civil Service Health Benefits Program (HBP) provides health benefits to Federal employees and dependents as well as to Federal retirees, including USPS retirees, and survivor annuitants. The program is operated through two revolving trust funds. The HBP administers a wide variety of health and wellness plans including Fee-For-Service and HMO plans. Retired employees can choose to continue coverage upon separation from the Government. OPM administers the HBP.

The law establishing the first HBP trust fund, the FEHB Fund, and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund is set forth in 5 U.S.C. § 8909. The FEHB fund is funded on a “pay-as-you-go” basis and funding sources include:

- Federal civilian employees’ contributions.
- Agencies’ contributions on behalf of employees.
- Appropriations (for “employer” share related to retirement program annuitants).
- Interest earnings on Treasury securities.

The *Postal Accountability and Enhancement* (Postal Act of 2006) (P.L. No 109-435, Title VIII), made significant changes in the funding of retiree health benefits for employees of the USPS, including the requirement for the USPS to make scheduled payments to the second HBP trust fund, the newly-created Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits (PSRHB) Fund.

The laws establishing the PSRHB Fund and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund are set forth in 5 U.S.C. § 8909a. The Postal Civil Service Retirement and Health Benefits Funding Amendments of 2006 requires the USPS to make scheduled payment contributions to the PSRHB Fund ranging from \$5.4 billion to \$5.8 billion per year from fiscal year 2007 through fiscal year 2016. Thereafter, the USPS will make annual payments in the amount of the normal cost payment. The PSRHB Fund is also funded by interest earnings on Treasury securities. However, Public Law 111-68 changed the USPS contribution for fiscal year 2009 to \$1.4 billion rather than \$5.4 billion. For fiscal year 2010, the USPS contribution is \$5.5 billion.

Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund

The Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund provides financial assistance and protection against the loss of earnings due to a wage earner’s disability. The SSA administers this trust fund.

Like the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, payroll taxes primarily fund the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund. The fund also receives income from interest earnings on Treasury securities, Federal agencies’ payments for the Social Security benefits earned by military and Federal civilian employees, and a portion of income taxes collected on Social Security benefits. The law establishing the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund is set forth in 42 U.S.C. § 401.

Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund (Medicare Parts B and D)

The Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, administered by HHS, finances the Supplementary Medical Insurance Program (Medicare Part B) and the Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit Program (Medicare Part D). These programs provide supplementary medical insurance for enrolled eligible participants to cover physician and outpatient services not covered by Medicare Part A and to obtain qualified prescription drug coverage, respectively. Medicare Part B financing is not based on payroll taxes; it is based on monthly premiums, income from the General Fund of the Treasury, and interest earnings on Treasury securities. The law establishing the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund is set forth in 42 U.S.C. § 1395t.

Medicare Part D was created by the *Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003* (P.L. No. 108-173). Medicare Part D financing is similar to Part B; it is based on monthly premiums and income from the General Fund of the Treasury, not on payroll taxes. It also receives transfers from States. The law creating the Medicare prescription drug account within the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund is set forth in 42 U.S.C. § 1395w-116.

Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF)

The Exchange Stabilization Fund uses funds to purchase or sell foreign currencies, hold U.S. foreign exchange and SDR assets, and to provide financing to foreign governments. SDR assets in the International Monetary Fund, investments in Treasury securities, and investments in Foreign Currency Denominated assets are the sources of revenues or financing sources to the ESF. The Gold Reserve Act of 1934, the Bretton Woods Agreement Act of 1945, P.L. 95-147 and P.L. 94-564 established and authorized the use of the fund. The law establishing the ESF account and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund are set forth in 31 U.S.C. § 5302.

All Other Earmarked Funds

The Government is responsible for the management of numerous earmarked funds that serve a wide variety of purposes. The earmarked funds presented on an individual basis in the preceding table represent the majority of the Government's net position attributable to earmarked funds. All other earmarked activity is aggregated in accordance with SFFAS No. 27. For the years ending September 30, 2010, and 2009, there were approximately 621 and 625 earmarked funds, respectively. The earmarked funds within the "all other" aggregate, along with the agencies that administer them, include the following:

- Railroad Retirement Trust Fund—administered by RRB.
- National Flood Insurance Program—administered by DHS.
- Land and Water Conservation Fund, Reclamation Fund, Water and Related Resources Fund, Lower Colorado River Basin Fund, Historic Preservation Fund, and Abandoned Mine Land Fund—administered by DOI.
- Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae) and Recovery Act Funds—administered by HUD.
- National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Digital Television Transition and Public Safety Fund and Broadband Technology Opportunities Program-Recovery Act Fund—administered by the Department of Commerce (DOC).
- Decommissioning and Decontamination Fund—administered by DOE.
- Black Lung Disability Trust Fund (BLDTF)—administered by DOL.
- Securities Transactions and Registration Fees—administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).
- Universal Service Fund—administered by FCC.
- Crime Victims Fund—administered by DOJ
- Superfund (Hazardous Substance) and Leaking Underground Storage Tanks—administered by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
- Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund—administered by USDA.

Unemployment Trust Fund (UTF) and Excise Taxes

In addition to the previous listed earmarked funds within the “all other” aggregate, there are 11 other earmarked funds, also within the “all other” aggregate that represent all the earmarked unemployment and excise tax revenues shown on the consolidated Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position. The Unemployment Trust Fund represents all the earmarked unemployment tax revenues and the remaining 10 other earmarked funds represent all the earmarked excise tax revenues.

The Unemployment Trust Fund provides temporary assistance to workers who lose their jobs. The program is administered through a unique system of Federal and State partnerships, established in Federal law, but executed through conforming State laws by State officials. DOL administers the Federal operations of the program.

Employer taxes provide the primary funding source for the UTF and constitute all the earmarked unemployment tax revenues as shown on the consolidated Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position. For the years ending September 30, 2010, and 2009, UTF unemployment tax revenues were \$45.2 billion and \$38.1 billion, respectively. However, interest earnings on Treasury securities also provide income to the fund. Appropriations have supplemented the fund’s income during periods of high and extended unemployment. The law establishing the UTF and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund is set forth in 42 U.S.C. § 1104.

In addition, there are 10 other earmarked funds within the “all other” aggregate that represent all of the earmarked excise tax revenue shown on the consolidated Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position. Two of these earmarked funds, the Highway Trust Fund and the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, represent more than 90 percent of the total earmarked excise tax revenues. Both of these earmarked funds are administered by the DOT and, for more detailed information regarding them, please refer to DOT’s financial statements.

The Highway Trust Fund was established to promote domestic interstate transportation and to move people and goods. The fund provides Federal grants to States for highway construction, certain transit programs, and related transportation purposes. The law establishing the Highway Trust Fund and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund is set forth in 26 U.S.C. § 9503. Funding sources include earmarked excise taxes on gasoline and other fuels, certain tires, the initial sale of heavy trucks, and highway use by commercial motor vehicles. For the years ending September 30, 2010, and 2009, Highway Trust Fund excise tax revenues were \$35.0 billion and \$35.0 billion, respectively. As funds are needed for payments, the Highway Trust Fund corpus investments are liquidated and funds are transferred to the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, or other DOT entities, for payment of obligations.

The Airport and Airway Trust Fund provides for airport improvement and airport facilities maintenance. It also funds airport equipment, research, and a portion of the Federal Aviation Administration’s administrative operational support. The law establishing the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and authorizing the depositing of amounts to the credit of the trust fund is set forth in 26 U.S.C. § 9502. Funding sources include:

- Taxes received from transportation of persons and property in the air and fuel used in commercial and general aviation.
- International departure taxes.
- Interest earnings on Treasury securities.

For the years ending September 30, 2010, and 2009, Airport and Airway Trust Fund excise tax revenues were \$10.6 billion and \$10.6 billion, respectively. These revenue amounts do not reflect any transfers from the Highway Trust Fund to the Airport and Airway Trust Fund for fuel which was used in aviation, but which was taxed at highway rates under P.L. 109-59 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).

Miscellaneous Earned Revenues

Miscellaneous earned revenues due to earmarked funds activity primarily relate to royalties retained by various earmarked funds within DOI.

Intra-Earmarked Fund Eliminations

The intra-earmarked fund eliminations represent the activity between earmarked funds that are administered by different Federal agencies and which are eliminated to produce consolidated earmarked revenues and net costs as shown on the Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position. Significant examples of such intra-earmarked fund activity include the financial interchanges and transactions between the Railroad Retirement Trust Fund, the Social Security Trust Funds, and the Medicare Trust Funds, which are administered by the RRB, SSA and HHS, respectively. The financial interchanges and transactions between RRB's Railroad Retirement Trust Fund, SSA's Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and HHS' Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund are intended to put the latter three trust funds in the same position they would have been in had railroad employment been covered under the Social Security Act. For further information, see the Railroad Retirement program description within Note 26—Social Insurance.

Restatement

As of September 30, 2009, due to a correction by SSA to address additional clarifying Treasury guidance, other taxes and receipts were decreased and other changes in fund balance were increased by \$20.8 billion. This was due to the improper reporting of net appropriations received amounts in fiscal year 2009 in other taxes and receipts, which are intended to reflect non-exchange revenue. However, net appropriations received are other budgetary financing sources and are not non-exchange revenue. This correction relates only to SSA's all other earmarked funds. This restatement decreases and increases fiscal year 2009 earmarked other taxes and receipts and earmarked intragovernmental transfers, respectively by \$20.8 billion on the consolidated Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position, but has no impact on fiscal year 2009 earmarked ending net position as reported. In addition, this restatement also increases fiscal year 2009 non-earmarked other taxes and receipts and non-earmarked intragovernmental transfer by \$20.8 billion each on the consolidated Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position with no impact on fiscal year 2009 non-earmarked ending net position as reported.

Note 25. Fiduciary Activities

Fiduciary activities are the collection or receipt, and the management, protection, accounting, investment and disposition by the Government of cash or other assets in which non-Federal individuals or entities have an ownership interest that the Government must uphold. Fiduciary cash and other assets are not assets of the Government and accordingly are not recognized on the consolidated Governmentwide Balance Sheet. Examples of the Government's fiduciary activities include the Thrift Savings Plan, which is administered by the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, and the Indian Tribal and individual Indian Trust Funds, which are administered by the DOI.

Schedule of Fiduciary Net Assets as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009
FRTIB-Thrift Savings Plan	264.0	234.0
Department of the Interior	3.7	3.6
All other	4.9	5.0
Total fiduciary net assets.....	<u>272.6</u>	<u>242.6</u>

In accordance with the requirements of SFFAS No. 31, fiduciary investments in Treasury securities and fund balance with Treasury held by fiduciary funds are to be recognized on the Governmentwide Balance Sheet as debt held by the public and as liability for fiduciary fund balance with Treasury, respectively. Refer to Note 14—Federal Debt Securities Held by the Public and Accrued Interest for more information on Treasury securities.

As of September 30, 2010, total fiduciary investments in Treasury securities and in non-Treasury securities are \$127.5 billion and \$143.4 billion, respectively. As of September 30, 2009, total fiduciary investments in Treasury securities and in non-Treasury securities are \$116.9 billion and \$124.8 billion, respectively. As of September 30, 2010, and 2009, the total fiduciary fund balance with Treasury is \$0.8 billion and \$0.9 billion, respectively. A liability for this fiduciary fund balance with Treasury is reflected as other miscellaneous liabilities in Note 19—Other Liabilities.

As of September 30, 2010, and 2009, collectively, the fiduciary investments in Treasury securities and fiduciary fund balance with Treasury held by all Government entities represent \$2.9 billion and \$3.1 billion, respectively, of unrestricted cash included within cash held by Treasury for Governmentwide Operations shown in Note 2—Cash and Other Monetary Assets.

FRTIB-Thrift Savings Plan

The TSP is administered by an independent Government agency, the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board (FRTIB), which is charged with operating the TSP prudently and solely in the interest of the participants and their beneficiaries. Assets of the TSP are maintained in the Thrift Savings Fund (the Plan).

The TSP is a retirement savings and investment plan for Federal employees and members of the uniformed services. It was authorized by the United States Congress in the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (FERSA). The Plan provides Federal employees and members of the uniformed services with a savings and tax benefit similar to what many private sector employers offer their employees. The Plan was primarily designed to be a key part of the retirement package (along with a basic annuity benefit and Social Security) for employees who are covered by the FERS.

As of September 30, 2010, and 2009, the TSP held \$264.0 billion and \$234.0 billion, respectively, in net assets, which included \$123.6 billion and \$113.0 billion, respectively, of U.S. Government Securities (amounts are unaudited). The most recent audited financial statements for the TSP are as of December 31, 2009, and 2008. As of December 31, 2009, and 2008, the TSP held \$244.4 billion and \$202.8 billion, respectively in net assets, which included \$114.9 billion and \$108.2 billion, respectively, of U.S. Government Securities. These unaudited amounts above are included to enhance comparability of the TSP net assets with the remainder of the Government's fiduciary net assets as of September 30, 2010, and 2009.

Federal employees, who are participants of FERS, the CSRS, or equivalent retirement systems, as provided by statute, and members of the uniformed services, are eligible to join the Plan immediately upon being hired. Generally, FERS employees are those employees hired on or after January 1, 1984, while CSRS employees are employees hired before January 1, 1984, who have not elected to convert to FERS. Each group has different rules that govern contribution rates. As of December 31, 2009, and 2008, there were approximately 4.3 million and 4.0 million participants in the TSP, respectively, with approximately 2.8 million and 2.7 million, respectively, contributing their own money. For further information about FRTIB and the TSP, please refer to the FRTIB website at <http://www.frtib.gov>.

DOI–Indian Trust Funds

As stated above, DOI has responsibility for the assets held in trust on behalf of American Indian Tribes and individuals, and these account for all of DOI's fiduciary net assets. DOI maintains accounts for Tribal and Other Trust Funds (including the Alaska Native Escrow Fund and Individual Indian Money Trust Funds) in accordance with the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994. The fiduciary balances that have accumulated in these funds have resulted from land use agreements, royalties on natural resource depletion, other proceeds derived directly from trust resources, judgment awards, settlements of claims, and investment income. These funds are maintained for the benefit of individual Native Americans as well as for designated Indian tribes. For further information related to these assets, see the financial statements of the DOI.

All Other Entities with Fiduciary Activities

The Government is responsible for the management of other fiduciary net assets on behalf of various non-Federal entities. The component agencies presented individually in the table on the previous page represent the vast majority of the Government's fiduciary net assets. All other component entities with fiduciary net assets are aggregated in accordance with SFFAS No. 31. As of September 30, 2010, and 2009, including FRTIB and DOI, there are a total of 15 and 13 Federal entities, respectively, with fiduciary activities with a grand total of 58 and 55 fiduciary funds, respectively. For further information relating to the fiduciary activities of the remaining component entities within the "all other" aggregate, please refer to the financial statements for:

- Small Business Administration
- Library of Congress
- Department of the Treasury
- Department of State
- Department of Defense
- Department of Transportation
- Department of Labor
- Department of Agriculture
- Smithsonian Institution
- Department of Commerce
- National Labor Relations Board
- Government Accountability Office, and
- Peace Corps.

Note 26. Social Insurance

The Statement of Social Insurance presents the projected actuarial present value of the estimated future revenue and estimated future expenditures of the Social Security, Medicare, Railroad Retirement, and Black Lung social insurance programs which are administered by the SSA, HHS, RRB, and DOL, respectively. These estimates are based on the economic and demographic assumptions presented later in this note as set forth in the relevant Social Security and Medicare trustees' reports and in the agency financial report of HHS and in the relevant agency performance and accountability reports for SSA, RRB, and DOL. The projections are based on the continuation of program provisions contained in current law. The estimates in the consolidated Statements of Social Insurance (SOSI) are for persons who are participants or eventually will participate in the programs as contributors (workers) or beneficiaries (retired workers, survivors, and disabled) during the 75-year projection period (Black Lung is projected only through September 30, 2040 because the projection period will terminate on September 30, 2040).

Contributions and earmarked taxes consist of: payroll taxes from employers, employees, and self-employed persons; revenue from Federal income taxation of Old-Age and Survivors Disability Insurance (OASDI) and railroad retirement benefits; excise tax on coal (Black Lung); and premiums from, and State transfers on behalf of, participants in Medicare. Income for all programs is presented from a consolidated perspective. Future interest payments and other future intragovernmental transfers have been excluded upon consolidation. Expenditures include scheduled benefit payments and administrative expenses. Scheduled benefits are projected based on the benefit formulas under current law. However, current Social Security and Medicare law provides for full benefit payments only to the extent that there are sufficient balances in the trust funds.

Actuarial present values of estimated future revenue (excluding interest) and estimated future expenditures for the Social Security, Medicare, and Railroad Retirement social insurance programs are presented for three different groups of participants: (1) current participants who have attained eligibility age, (2) current participants who have not attained eligibility age, and (3) future participants who are new entrants expected to become participants in the future. Current participants in the Social Security and Medicare programs form the "closed group" of taxpayers and/or beneficiaries who are at least age 15 at the start of the projection period. For the 2007 Medicare projections, current participants are at least 18 years of age at the beginning of the projection period. Since the projection period for the Social Security, Medicare, and Railroad Retirement social insurance programs consists of 75 years, the period covers virtually all of the current participants' working and retirement years, a period that could be greater than 75 years in a relatively small number of instances. Future participants for Social Security and Medicare include births during the projection period and individuals below age 15 (below age 18 for the Medicare programs for 2007) as of January 1 of the valuation year. Railroad Retirement's future participants are the projected new entrants as of January 1 of the valuation year.

The present values of future expenditures in excess of future revenue are the current amount of funds needed to cover projected shortfalls, excluding the starting trust fund balances, over the projection period. They are calculated by subtracting the actuarial present values of future scheduled contributions and dedicated tax income by and on behalf of current and future participants from the actuarial present value of the future scheduled benefit payments to them or on their behalf.

The trust fund balances as of the valuation date for the respective programs, including interest earned, are in the table shown below. Substantially all of the Social Security (OASDI) and Medicare Hospital Insurance (HI), and Supplementary Medical Insurance (SMI) trust fund balances consist of investments in special non-marketable U.S. Treasury securities that are backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.

Social Insurance Programs Trust Fund Balances ¹					
(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
Social Security.....	2,540	2,419	2,238	2,048	1,859
Medicare:					
HI	304	321	312	300	285
SMI Part B	76	59	53	38	23
SMI Part D	1	1	3	1	-
Railroad Retirement	25	22	33	32	30
Black Lung.....	(6)	(6)	(10)	(10)	(10)

¹ As of the valuation date of the respective programs.

Social Security

The Old Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) program, created in 1935, and the Disability Insurance (DI) program, created in 1956, collectively referred to as OASDI or "Social Security," provides cash benefits for eligible U.S. citizens and residents. Eligibility and benefit amounts are determined under the laws applicable for the period. Current law provides that the amount of the monthly benefit payments for workers, or their eligible dependents or survivors, is based on the workers' lifetime earnings histories.

The primary financing of the OASDI Trust Funds are taxes paid by workers, their employers, and individuals with self-employment income, based on work covered by the OASDI Program. Refer to the *Social Insurance* segment in the Supplemental Information section for additional information on social security program financing.

That portion of each trust fund not required to pay benefits and administrative costs is invested, on a daily basis, in interest-bearing obligations of the U.S. Government. The Social Security Act authorizes the issuance by the Treasury of special nonmarketable, intragovernmental debt obligations for purchase exclusively by the trust funds. Although the special issues cannot be bought or sold in the open market, they are redeemable at any time at face value and thus bear no risk of fluctuation in principal value due to changes in market yield rates. Interest on the bonds is credited to the trust funds and becomes an asset to the funds and a liability to the General Fund of the Treasury. These Treasury securities and related interest are eliminated in consolidation at the Governmentwide level.

Medicare

The Medicare Program, created in 1965, has two separate trust funds: the Hospital Insurance (HI, Medicare Part A) and Supplementary Medical Insurance (SMI, Medicare Parts B and D) Trust Funds. HI pays for inpatient acute hospital services and major alternatives to hospitals (skilled nursing services, for example) and SMI pays for hospital outpatient services, physician services, and assorted other services and products through the Part B account and pays for prescription drugs through the Part D account. Though the events that trigger benefit payments are similar, HI and SMI have different earmarked financing structures. Similar to OASDI, HI is financed primarily by payroll contributions. Other income to the HI fund includes a small amount of premium income from voluntary enrollees, a portion of the Federal income taxes that beneficiaries pay on Social Security benefits and interest credited on Treasury securities held in the HI Trust Fund. These Treasury securities and related interest are eliminated in the consolidation at the Governmentwide level.

For SMI, transfers from the General Fund of the Treasury represent the largest source of income for both Parts B and D. Beneficiaries finance the remainder of Parts B and D costs via monthly premiums to these programs. With the introduction of Part D drug coverage, Medicaid is no longer the primary payer for beneficiaries dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid. For those beneficiaries, States must pay a portion of their estimated foregone drug costs into the Part D account (referred to as State transfers). As with HI, interest received on Treasury securities held in the SMI Trust Fund is credited to the fund and these Treasury securities and related interest are eliminated in consolidation at the Governmentwide level. Refer to the *Social Insurance* segment in the Supplemental Information section for additional information on Medicare program financing.

The Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act (MMA), enacted on December 8, 2003, created the Part D account in the SMI Trust Fund to account for the prescription drug benefit that began in 2006. The MMA established within SMI two Part D accounts related to prescription drug benefits: the Medicare Prescription Drug Account and the Transitional Assistance Account. The Medicare Prescription Drug Account was used in conjunction with the broad, voluntary prescription drug benefits that commenced in 2006. The Transitional Assistance Account was used to provide transitional assistance benefits, beginning in 2004 and extending through 2005, for certain low-income beneficiaries prior to the start of the new prescription drug benefit.

Affordable Care Act (ACA)

The Affordable Care Act improves the financial outlook for Medicare substantially; however, the effects of some of the new law's provisions on Medicare are not known at this time, with the result that the projections are much more uncertain than normal, especially in the longer-range future. For example, the ACA initiative for aggressive research and development has the potential to reduce Medicare costs in the future; however, as specific reforms have not yet been designed, tested, or evaluated, their ability to reduce costs cannot be estimated at this time, and thus no specific savings have been reflected in the projections for the initiative.

Another important example involves lower payment rate updates to most categories of Medicare providers in 2011 and later. These updates will be adjusted downward by the increase in productivity experienced in the economy overall. Since the provision of health services tends to be labor-intensive and is often customized to match an individual's specific needs, most categories of health providers have not been able to improve their productivity to the same extent as the economy at large. Over time, the productivity adjustments mean that the prices paid for health services by Medicare will grow about 1.1 percent per year more slowly than the increase in prices that providers must pay to purchase the goods and services they use to provide health care services. Unless providers could reduce their cost per service correspondingly, through productivity improvements, or other steps, they would eventually become unwilling or unable to treat Medicare beneficiaries.

It is possible that providers can improve their productivity, reduce wasteful expenditures, and take other steps to keep their cost growth within the bounds imposed by the Medicare price limitations. Similarly, the implementation of payment and delivery system reforms, facilitated by the ACA research and development program, could help constrain cost growth to a level consistent with the lower Medicare payments. These outcomes are far from certain, however. Many experts doubt the feasibility of such sustained improvements and anticipate that over time the Medicare price constraints would become unworkable and that Congress would likely override them, much as they have done to prevent the reductions in physician payment rates otherwise required by the sustainable growth rate formula in current law.

The reductions in provider payments reflected in these updates, if implemented for all future years as required under current law, could have secondary impacts, for beneficiary access to care; utilization, intensity and quality of services; and other factors. These possible impacts are speculative, and at present there is not consensus among experts as to their potential scope. Further research and analysis will help to better inform this issue and may enable the development of specific projections of secondary effects under current law in the future.

The SOSI projections are based on current law. Therefore, the productivity adjustments are assumed to occur in all future years, as required by the Affordable Care Act. In addition, reductions in Medicare payment rates for physician services, totaling 30 percent over the next 3 years, are assumed to be implemented as required under current law, despite the virtual certainty that Congress will continue to override these latter reductions. Therefore, it is important to note that the actual future costs for Medicare are likely to exceed those shown by these current-law projections.

The extent to which actual future Part A and Part B costs exceed the projected current-law amounts due to changes to the productivity adjustments and physician payments depends on both the specific changes that might be legislated and on whether Congress would pass further provisions to help offset such costs. As noted, these examples only reflect hypothetical changes to provider payment rates.

It is likely that in the coming years Congress will consider, and pass, numerous other legislative proposals affecting Medicare. Many of these will likely be designed to reduce costs in an effort to make the program more affordable. In practice, it is not possible to anticipate what actions Congress might take, either in the near term or over longer periods.

The Medicare Board of Trustees, in their annual report to Congress, references an alternative scenario to illustrate the potential understatement of costs under current law. This alternative scenario assumes that the productivity adjustments are gradually phased out over the 15 years starting in 2020 and that the physician fee reductions are overridden. These examples were developed by management for illustrative purposes only; the calculations have not been audited; and the examples do not attempt to portray likely or recommended future outcomes. Thus, the illustrations are useful only as general indicators of the substantial impacts that could result from future legislation affecting the productivity adjustments and physician payments under Medicare and of the broad range of uncertainty associated with such impacts. The table below contains a comparison of the Medicare 75-year present values of income and expenditures under current law with those under the alternative scenario illustration.

Medicare Present Values (in billions) (Unaudited)		
	2010 Consolidated SOSI	Illustrative Alternative Scenario ^{1,2}
Income		
Part A.....	\$14,408	\$14,408
Part B ³	4,836	7,684
Part D ⁴	2,486	2,486
Total Income	\$21,730	\$24,578
Expenditures		
Part A.....	\$17,091	\$21,745
Part B.....	17,737	28,284
Part D.....	9,715	9,715
Total Expenditures	\$44,543	\$59,744
Part A	\$2,683	\$7,337
Part B	12,901	20,600
Part D	7,229	7,229
Excess of Expenditures over Income	\$22,813	\$35,166
¹ These amounts are not presented in the 2010 Trustees' Report. ² At the request of the Trustees, the Office of the Actuary at CMS has prepared an illustrative set of Medicare Trust Fund projections that differ from current law. No endorsement of the illustrative alternative to current law by the Trustees, CMS, or the Office of the Actuary should be inferred. ³ Excludes \$12,901 billion and \$20,600 of General Revenue Contributions from the 2010 Consolidated SOSI projection and the Illustrative Alternative Scenario's projection, respectively; i.e., to reflect Part B income on a consolidated Governmentwide basis. ⁴ Excludes \$7,229 billion of General Revenue Contributions from both the 2010 Consolidated SOSI projection and the Illustrative Alternative Scenario's projection, respectively; i.e., to reflect Part D income on a consolidated Governmentwide basis.		

As expected, the differences between the current-law projections and the illustrative alternative are substantial for Part A and Part B. All Part A fee-for-service providers are affected by the productivity adjustments, so the current law projections reflect an estimated 1.1 percent reduction in annual Part A cost growth each year. If the productivity adjustments were gradually phased out, as illustrated under the alternative scenario, the present value of

Part A expenditures is estimated to be roughly 27 percent higher than the current-law projection. As indicated above, the present value of Part A income is unchanged under the alternative scenario.

The Part B expenditure projections are significantly higher under the alternative scenario than under current law, both because of the assumed gradual phase-out of the productivity adjustments and the assumption that the scheduled physician fee reductions would be overridden and based on annual increases in the Medicare Economic Index. The productivity adjustments are assumed to affect more than half of Part B expenditures at the time their phase-out is assumed to begin. Similarly, physician fee schedule services are assumed to be roughly 30 percent higher under the alternative scenario than under current law at that time. The combined effect of these two factors results in a present value of Part B expenditures under the alternative scenario that is approximately 59 percent higher than the current-law projection.

The Part D projections are unaffected under the alternative projection because the services are not impacted by the productivity adjustments or the physician fee schedule reductions.

Social Security and Medicare—Demographic and Economic Assumptions

The Boards of Trustees¹ of the OASDI and Medicare Trust Funds provide in their annual reports to Congress short-range (10-year) and long-range (75-year) actuarial estimates of each trust fund. Because of the inherent uncertainty in estimates for 75 years into the future, the Boards use three alternative sets of economic and demographic assumptions to show a range of possibilities. Assumptions are made about many economic and demographic factors, including gross domestic product (GDP), earnings, the CPI, the unemployment rate, the fertility rate, immigration, mortality, disability incidence and terminations and, for the Medicare projections, health care cost growth. The assumptions used for the most recent set of projections shown in Tables 1A (Social Security) and Table 1B (Medicare) are generally referred to as the “intermediate assumptions,” and reflect the trustees’ reasonable estimate² of expected future experience. For further information on Social Security and Medicare demographic and economic assumptions, refer to SSA’s Performance and Accountability Report and HHS’ Agency Financial Report.

¹ There are six trustees: the Secretaries of the Treasury (managing trustee), Health and Human Services, and Labor; the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration; and two public trustees who are generally appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a 4-year term. By law, the public trustees are members of two different political parties.

² Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standard (SFFAS) No. 33: *Pensions, Other Retirement Benefits, and Other Postemployment Benefits: Reporting the Gains and Losses From Changes in Assumptions and Selecting Discount Rates and Valuation Dates*, effective for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2009, revised SFFAS No. 17: *Accounting for Social Insurance*, paragraphs 25, 27 (2), and 27 (4), by replacing term “best estimate” with “reasonable estimate.”

Table 1A
Social Security – Demographic and Economic Assumptions

Demographic Assumptions					
Year	Total Fertility Rate ¹	Age-Sex Adjusted Death Rate ² (per 100,000)	Net Immigration ³ (persons)	Period Life Expectancy at Birth ⁴	
				Male	Female
2010	2.08	784.4	1,215,000	75.8	80.4
2020	2.05	723.8	1,125,000	77.1	81.2
2030	2.01	661.8	1,085,000	78.3	82.2
2040	2.00	606.8	1,050,000	79.3	83.1
2050	2.00	558.6	1,035,000	80.3	84.0
2060	2.00	516.4	1,030,000	81.2	84.8
2070	2.00	479.1	1,025,000	82.1	85.6
2080	2.00	446.1	1,025,000	82.9	86.3

Economic Assumptions						
Year	Real Wage Differential ⁵ (percent)	Average Annual Wage in Covered Employment ⁶ (percent change)	CPI ⁷ (percent change)	Real GDP ⁸ (percent change)	Total Employment ⁹ (percent change)	Average Annual Interest Rate ¹⁰ (percent)
2020	1.1	3.9	2.8	2.2	0.5	5.7
2030	1.2	4.0	2.8	2.1	0.5	5.7
2040	1.2	4.0	2.8	2.2	0.5	5.7
2050	1.2	4.0	2.8	2.1	0.5	5.7
2060	1.1	3.9	2.8	2.1	0.4	5.7
2070	1.1	3.9	2.8	2.1	0.4	5.7
2080	1.2	4.0	2.8	2.1	0.4	5.7

¹ The total fertility rate for any year is the average number of children who would be born to a woman in her lifetime if she were to experience the birth rates by age observed in, or assumed for, the selected year, and if she were to survive the entire childbearing period. The ultimate total fertility rate of 2.0 is assumed to be reached in 2034.

² The age-sex-adjusted death rate is the crude rate that would occur in the enumerated total population as of April 1, 2000, if that population were to experience the death rates by age and sex assumed for the selected year. The death rate is a summary measure and not a basic assumption; it summarizes the effects of the basic assumptions from which it is derived.

³ Net immigration is the number of persons who enter during the year (both legally and otherwise) minus the number of persons who leave during the year. It is a summary measure and not a basic assumption; it summarizes the basic assumptions from which it is derived.

⁴ The period life expectancy for a group of persons born in the selected year is the average that would be attained by such persons if the group were to experience in succeeding years the death rates by age assumed for the given year. It is a summary measure and not a basic assumption; it summarizes the effects of the basic assumptions from which it is derived.

⁵ The real-wage differential is the difference between the percentage increases, before rounding, in the average annual wage in covered employment, and the average annual CPI.

⁶ The average annual wage in covered employment is the total amount of wages and salaries for all employment covered by the OASDI program in a year divided by the number of employees with any such earnings during the year. It is a summary measure and not a basic assumption; it summarizes the basic assumptions from which it is derived.

⁷ The CPI is the annual average value for the calendar year of the CPI for urban wage earners and clerical workers.

⁸ The real GDP is the value of total output of goods and services produced in the U.S., expressed in 2005 dollars. It is a summary measure and not a basic assumption; it summarizes the effects of the basic assumptions from which it is derived.

⁹ Total employment represents total of civilian and military employment in the U.S. economy. It is a summary measure and not a basic assumption; it summarizes the basic assumptions from which it is derived.

¹⁰ The average annual interest rate is the average of the nominal interest rates, which, in practice, are compounded semiannually for special-issue Treasury obligations sold only to the trust funds in each of the 12 months of the year. It is a summary measure and not a basic assumption; it summarizes the basic assumptions from which it is derived.

**Table 1B
Medicare – Demographic and Economic Assumptions**

Demographic Assumptions								
Year	Total Fertility Rate ¹	Age-Sex Adjusted Death Rate ² (per 100,000)	Net Immigration ³ (persons)					
2010	2.08	784.4	1,215,000					
2020	2.05	723.8	1,125,000					
2030	2.01	661.8	1,085,000					
2040	2.00	606.8	1,050,000					
2050	2.00	558.6	1,035,000					
2060	2.00	516.4	1,030,000					
2070	2.00	479.1	1,025,000					
2080	2.00	446.1	1,025,000					

Economic Assumptions								
Year	Real Wage Differential ⁴ (percent)	Average Annual Wage in Covered Employment (percent change)	CPI ⁵ (percent change)	Real GDP ⁶ (percent change)	Per Beneficiary Cost (percent change) ⁷			Real Interest Rate ⁸ (percent)
					HI	SMI		
						Part B	Part D	
2010	3.1	5.1	2.0	2.3	1.1	3.8	4.3	0.9
2020	1.1	3.9	2.8	2.2	3.5	5.0	7.3	2.9
2030	1.2	4.0	2.8	2.1	4.7	4.8	5.9	2.9
2040	1.2	4.0	2.8	2.2	4.8	4.5	5.3	2.9
2050	1.2	4.0	2.8	2.1	3.9	4.1	5.1	2.9
2060	1.1	3.9	2.8	2.1	3.7	4.1	4.8	2.9
2070	1.1	3.9	2.8	2.1	3.6	3.9	4.6	2.9
2080	1.2	4.0	2.8	2.1	3.3	3.8	4.4	2.9

¹ The total fertility rate for any year is the average number of children who would be born to a woman in her lifetime if she were to experience the birth rates by age observed in, or assumed for, the selected year, and if she were to survive the entire childbearing period. The ultimate total fertility rate of 2.0 is assumed to be reached in 2034.

² The age-sex-adjusted death rate is the crude rate that would occur in the enumerated total population as of April 1, 2000, if that population were to experience the death rates by age and sex assumed for the selected year. The death rate is a summary measure and not a basic assumption; it summarizes the effects of the basic assumptions from which it is derived.

³ Net immigration is the number of persons who enter during the year (both legally and otherwise) minus the number of persons who leave during the year. It is a summary measure and not a basic assumption; it summarizes the basic assumptions from which it is derived.

⁴ The real-wage differential is the difference between the percentage increases, before rounding, in the average annual wage in covered employment, and the average annual CPI.

⁵ The CPI is the annual average value for the calendar year of the CPI for urban wage earners and clerical workers.

⁶ The real GDP is the value of total output of goods and services produced in the U.S., expressed in 2005 dollars. It is a summary measure and not a basic assumption; it summarizes the effects of the basic assumptions from which it is derived.

⁷ These increases reflect the overall impact of more detailed assumptions that are made for each of the different types of service provided by the Medicare program (for example, hospital care, physician services, and pharmaceutical costs). These assumptions include changes in the payment rates, utilization, and intensity of each type of service.

⁸ The average annual interest rate earned on new trust fund securities, above and beyond the rate of inflation.

Railroad Retirement

The Railroad Retirement and Survivor Benefit program pays full retirement annuities at age 60 to railroad workers with 30 years of service. The program pays disability annuities based on total or occupational disability. It also pays annuities to spouses, divorced spouses, widow(er)s, remarried widow(er)s, surviving divorced spouses, children, and parents of deceased railroad workers. Medicare covers qualified railroad retirement beneficiaries in the same way as it does Social Security beneficiaries. The Railroad Retirement and Survivors' Improvement Act of 2001 (RRSIA) liberalized benefits for 30-year service employees and their spouses, eliminated a cap on monthly benefits for retirement and disability benefits, lowered minimum service requirements from 10 to 5 years, and provided for increased benefits for widow(er)s.

The RRB and the SSA share jurisdiction over the payment of retirement and survivor benefits. RRB has jurisdiction if the employee has at least 5 years (if performed after 1995) of railroad service. For survivor benefits, RRB requires that the employee's last regular employment before retirement or death be in the railroad industry. If a railroad employee or his or her survivors do not qualify for railroad retirement benefits, the RRB transfers the employee's railroad retirement credits to SSA.

Payroll taxes paid by railroad employers and their employees are a primary source of income for the Railroad Retirement and Survivor Benefit Program. By law, railroad retirement taxes are coordinated with Social Security taxes. Employees and employers pay tier I taxes at the same rate as Social Security taxes. Tier II taxes finance railroad retirement benefit payments that are higher than Social Security levels.

Other sources of program income include: financial transactions with the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, earnings on investments, Federal income taxes on railroad retirement benefits, and appropriations (provided after 1974 as part of a phase out of certain vested dual benefits). The financial interchange between RRB's Social Security Equivalent Benefit (SSEB) Account, the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund are intended to put the latter three trust funds in the same position they would have been had railroad employment been covered under the Social Security Act. From a Governmentwide perspective, these future financial interchanges and transactions are intragovernmental transfers and are eliminated in consolidation.

Railroad Retirement—Employment, Demographic and Economic Assumptions

The most recent set of projections are prepared using employment, demographic and economic assumptions and reflect the Board Members' best estimate of expected future experience.

Three employment assumptions were used in preparing the projections and reflect optimistic, moderate and pessimistic future passenger rail and freight employment. The average railroad employment is assumed to be 217,000 in 2010 under the moderate employment assumption. This employment assumption, based on a model developed by the Association of American Railroads, assumes that (1) passenger service employment will remain at the level of 43,000 and (2) the employment base, excluding passenger service employment, will decline at a constant 2.0 percent annual rate for 23 years, at a falling rate over the next 25 years, and remain level thereafter. All the projections are based on an open-group (i.e., future entrants) population.

The moderate (middle) economic assumptions include a long-term cost of living increase of 3.0 percent, an interest rate of 7.5 percent, and a wage increase of 4.0 percent. The cost of living assumption reflects the expected level of price inflation. The interest rate assumption reflects the expected return on NRRIT investments. The wage increase reflects the expected increase in railroad employee earnings.

Sources of the demographic assumptions including mortality rates and total termination rates, remarriage rates for widows, retirement rates and withdrawal rates, are listed in Table 2. For further details on the employment, demographic, economic and all other assumptions, refer to the *U.S. Railroad Retirement Board Annual Report*, and the 24th *Actuarial Valuation of the Assets and Liabilities under the Railroad Retirement Acts* (Valuation Report) as of December 31, 2007, with Technical Supplement.

**Table 2
Railroad Retirement Demographic Actuarial Assumptions (Sources)**

Mortality Rates ¹	Mortality after age retirement	2007 RRB Annuitants Mortality Table
	Mortality after disability retirement	2007 RRB Disabled Mortality Table for Annuitants with Disability Freeze
		2007 RRB Disabled Mortality Table for Annuitants without Disability Freeze
	Mortality during active service	2003 RRB Active Service Mortality Table
	Mortality of widow annuitants	1995 RRB Mortality Table for Widows
Total Termination Rates ²	Termination for spouses	2007 RRB Spouse Total Termination Table
	Termination for disabled children	2004 RRB Total Termination Table for Disabled Children
Widow Remarriage Rate ³	1997 RRB Remarriage Table	
Retirement Rates ⁴	Age retirement	See the Valuation Report
	Disability retirement	See the Valuation Report
Withdrawal Rates ⁵	See the Valuation Report	

¹ These mortality tables are used to project the termination of eligible employee benefit payments within the population.

² Total termination rates are used to project the termination of dependent benefits to spouses and disabled children.

³ This rate is used to project the termination of spousal survivor benefits.

⁴ The retirement rates are used to determine the expected annuity to be paid based on age and years of service for both age and disability retirees.

⁵ The withdrawal rates are used to project all withdrawals from the railroad industry and resultant effect on the population and accumulated benefits to be paid.

Black Lung–Disability Benefit Program

The Black Lung Disability Benefit Program provides for compensation and medical benefits for eligible coal miners who are totally disabled due to pneumoconiosis (black lung disease) as a result of their coal mine employment. The same program also provides for survivor benefits for eligible survivors of coal miners who died due to pneumoconiosis. DOL operates the Black Lung Disability Benefit Program. BLDTF provides benefit payments to eligible coal miners totally disabled by pneumoconiosis and to eligible survivors when no responsible mine operator can be assigned the liability.

Black lung disability benefit payments are funded by excise taxes from coal mine operators based on the sale of coal, as are the fund's administrative costs. These taxes are collected by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and transferred to the BLDTF, which was established under the authority of the Black Lung Benefits Revenue Act, and administered by the Treasury. Prior to October 3, 2008, the Black Lung Benefits Revenue Act provided for repayable advances to the BLDTF from the general fund of Treasury, in the event that BLDTF resources were not adequate to meet program obligations.

Black Lung–Demographic and Economic Assumptions

The demographic assumptions used for the most recent set of projections are the number of beneficiaries and their life expectancy. The beneficiary population data is updated from information supplied by the program. The beneficiary population is a nearly closed universe in which attrition by death exceeds new entrants by a ratio of more than ten to one. SSA Life Tables are used to project the life expectancies of the beneficiary population.

The economic assumptions used for the most recent set of projections are coal excise tax revenue estimates, Federal civilian pay raises, medical cost inflation, and the interest rate on new debt issued by the BLDTF. Projections are sensitive to changes in the tax rate and changes in interest rates on debt issued by the BLDTF.

Estimates of future receipts of the black lung excise tax are based on projections of future coal production and sale prices prepared by the Energy Information Agency of DOE. Treasury's Office of Tax Analysis provides the first 11 years of tax receipt estimates. The remaining years are estimated using a growth rate based on both historical tax receipts and Treasury's estimated tax receipts. The coal excise tax rate structure is \$1.10 per ton of underground-mined coal and \$0.55 per ton of surface-mined coal sold, with a cap of 4.4 percent of sales price. Based on Treasury's interpretation of the Act, the higher excise tax rates will continue until the earlier of December 31, 2018, or the first December 31 after 2008, in which there exist no (1) balance of repayable debt described in section 9501 of the Internal Revenue Code and (2) unpaid interest on the debt. Starting in 2019, the tax rates revert to \$0.50 per ton of underground-mined coal and \$0.25 per ton of surface-mine coal sold, and a limit of 2.0 percent of sales price.

OMB supplies assumptions for future monthly benefit rate increases based on increases in the Federal pay scale and future medical cost inflation based on increases in the CPIM, which are used to calculate future benefit costs. During the current projection period, future benefit rate increases 5.0 percent in 2011 and 4.0 percent in each year thereafter and medical cost increases 3.4 percent in 2011, and ranges from 3.5 percent to 3.8 percent thereafter. Estimates for administrative costs for the first 11 years of the projection are supplied by DOL's Budget Office, based on current year enacted amounts, while later years are based on the number of projected beneficiaries.

P.L. 110-343, Division B—Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008, enacted on October 3, 2008, in section 113, (1) allowed for the temporary increase in coal excise tax rates to continue an additional 5 years beyond the current statutory limit and (2) restructured the BLDTF debt by refinancing the outstanding repayable advances (which had higher interest rates) with the proceeds from issuing discounted debt instruments similar in form to zero-coupon bonds (which had lower interest rates), plus a one-time appropriation. The Act also allowed that any debt issued by the BLDTF subsequent to the refinancing may be used to make benefit payments, other authorized expenditures, or to repay debt and interest from the initial refinancing. All debt issued by the BLDTF was effected as borrowing from the Treasury's Bureau of the Public Debt.

Note 27. Stewardship Land and Heritage Assets

Stewardship land is Federally-owned land that is set aside for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations, and land on which military bases are located. Except for military bases, this land is not used or held for use in general Government operations. Stewardship land is land that the Government does not expect to use to meet its obligations, unlike the assets listed in the Balance Sheets. Stewardship land is measured in non-financial units such as acres of land and lakes, and a number of National Parks and National Marine Sanctuaries. Examples of stewardship land include national parks, national forests, wilderness areas, and land used to enhance ecosystems to encourage animal and plant species, and to conserve nature. This category excludes lands administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and held in trust.

The majority of public lands that are under the management of DOI were acquired by the Government during the first century of the Nation's existence between 1781 and 1867. Stewardship land accounts for 28 percent of the current U.S. landmass.

DOI uses units as a measure to more accurately reflect the major categories of uses of stewardship land. As of September 30, 2010, they have 552 national wildlife refuges, 378 park units, 134 geographic management areas, 67 fish hatcheries, and many other categories. At the end of fiscal year 2010, DOD had 203 thousand acres of public land and 16,140 thousand acres of withdrawn public land, the USDA's Forest Service managed an estimated 155 national forests, while the DOC had 13 National Marine Sanctuaries, which included near-shore coral reefs and open ocean. This is just a sample of the types of stewardship lands reported.

Stewardship lands are used and managed in accordance with the statutes authorizing their acquisition or directing their use and management. Additional detailed information concerning stewardship land, such as agency stewardship policies, physical units by major categories, and the condition of stewardship land, can be obtained from the financial statements of DOI, DOC, DOD, and USDA.

Heritage assets are Government-owned assets that have one or more of the following characteristics:

- Historical or natural significance.
- Cultural, educational, or artistic importance.
- Significant architectural characteristics.

The cost of heritage assets often is not determinable or relevant to their significance. Like stewardship land, the Government does not expect to use these assets to meet its obligations. The most relevant information about heritage assets is non-financial. The public entrusts the Government with these assets and holds it accountable for their preservation. Examples of heritage assets include the Mount Rushmore National Memorial and Yosemite National Park. Other examples of heritage assets include the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, and the Bill of Rights preserved by the National Archives. Also included are national monuments/structures such as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, and the Washington Monument, as well as the Library of Congress. Many other sites such as battlefields, historic structures, and national historic landmarks are placed in this category, as well.

Many laws and regulations govern the preservation and management of heritage assets. Established policies by individual Federal agencies for heritage assets ensure the proper care and handling of the assets under their control and preserve these assets for the benefit of the American public.

Some heritage assets are used both to remind us of our heritage and for day-to-day operations. These assets are referred to as multi-use heritage assets. One typical example is the White House. The cost of acquisition, betterment or reconstruction of all multi-use heritage assets is capitalized as general property, plant, and equipment and is depreciated.

The Government classifies heritage assets into two broad categories: collection type and non-collection type. Collection type heritage assets include objects gathered and maintained for museum and library collections. Non-collection type heritage assets include national wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers, natural landmarks, forests, grasslands, historic places and structures, memorials and monuments, buildings, national cemeteries and archeological sites.

The discussion of the Government's heritage assets is not all-inclusive. Rather, it highlights significant heritage assets reported by Federal agencies. Please refer to the individual financial statements of the DOC, the DOD, the National Archives and Records Administration, and the websites for the Library of Congress (<http://www.loc.gov/index.html>) and the Smithsonian Institution (<http://www.si.edu>), for additional information on multi-use heritage assets, agency stewardship policies, and physical units by major categories and conditions.

This page is intentionally blank.

United States Government Supplemental Information (Unaudited) for the Years Ended September 30, 2010, and 2009

Fiscal Projections for the U.S. Government— Fiscal Year 2010

This section is prepared pursuant to Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standard (SFFAS) 36, *Reporting Comprehensive Long-Term Fiscal Projections for the U.S. Government*. It is intended to help readers of the Financial Report of the U.S. Government (FR) assess whether future budgetary resources will be sufficient to sustain public services and to meet future obligations as they come due, assuming that the Federal Government's current policies for spending and taxation are continued.¹ Such an assessment requires prospective information about receipts and spending, the resulting debt, and how these amounts relate to the economy. The assessment is also referred to as reporting on "fiscal sustainability."

The information in this section is important not only for its financial, but also its social and political, implications. Financial reports should provide information that can help readers assess the likelihood that the Government will be able to continue providing the equivalent level of public services and to assess whether financial burdens without related benefits will be shifted to future taxpayers. Fiscal sustainability reporting should assist the reader in understanding these financial, social, and political implications.²

The projections and analysis presented here are mathematical extensions and extrapolations based on an array of assumptions as described below, including the assumption that current Federal policy does not change. These projections cannot be interpreted as forecasts or predictions of the future, in part because they encompass hypothetical future trends or events that are improbable. This is the first year in which this information is included with the other Supplemental Information, and the methods and assumptions used in producing this section are still under development.

Statement of Long Term Fiscal Projections

Table 1, on the following page, presents projections of the Federal Government's receipts and non-interest spending.³ Receipt categories include individual income taxes, Social Security and Medicare payroll taxes, and all other receipts. On the spending side, the projections include both mandatory (entitlement) programs, such as Social Security and Medicare, which provide benefits under standing law, and discretionary programs, such as defense spending, which are funded through annual appropriations. The data in Table 1 are presented as in the Federal budget, which differs in some respects from the presentation of these data in the trustees' reports for Social Security and Medicare (these differences are explained below). The key assumptions used in preparing these projections are summarized in the next section. The projections for Social Security and Medicare are based on the same economic and demographic assumptions as are used for the 2010 trustees' reports for these programs. Projections for the other categories are also consistent with the assumptions used for the trustees' reports. The Federal budget provides the framework used for the projections. In order to produce a more realistic projection of the fiscal outlook under current policy, the projections assume several likely departures from current law, noted below.

¹ Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standard 36, *Fiscal Projections for the U.S. Government*, par. 7.

² SFFAS 36, par. 8.

³ For the purposes of this analysis, spending is defined in terms of outlays. In the context of Federal budgeting, spending can either refer to budget authority – the authority to commit the government to spend an amount – or to outlays, which reflect actual payments made.

Table 1: Long Range Projections of Federal Receipts and Spending		
75-Year Present Values: FY 2011-2085 as of 9/30/2010		
	Dollars in Trillions	% GDP
Receipts:		
Social Security Payroll Taxes	37.8	4.4
Medicare Payroll Taxes	12.4	1.4
Individual Income Taxes	90.6	10.5
All Other Receipts	34.4	4.0
Total Receipts	175.2	20.2
Non-interest Spending:		
Defense Discretionary	31.0	3.6
Nondefense Discretionary	30.7	3.6
Social Security	49.1	5.7
Medicare Part A (supported by payroll taxes)	17.3	2.0
Medicare Parts B & D (net of premiums; supported by general revenues)	20.4	2.4
Medicaid	24.2	2.8
Other Mandatory	18.8	2.2
Total Non-interest Spending	191.6	22.1
Non-interest Spending less Receipts	16.3	1.9

Note: The 75-year present value of nominal GDP, which drives the calculations above, is \$865.6 trillion.

The projections in Table 1 are expressed in present value dollars as of October 1, 2010, and as a percentage of the present value of Gross Domestic Product (GDP).⁴ The present value of a future amount, say \$1 billion in March 2020, is the amount of money that if invested on October 1, 2010 in an account earning the government borrowing rate would have a balance of \$1 billion in March 2020. The present value of a receipt or expenditure category over 75 years is simply the sum of the annual present value amounts. GDP measures the total value of all final goods and services produced in the U.S. and is thus a good measure of the overall size of the economy. When expressing a receipt or expenditure category over 75 years as a percent of GDP, the present value dollar amount is divided by the present value of GDP over 75 years. Measuring budget quantities as a percentage of GDP is a useful indicator of the economy's capacity to sustain Government programs. The interest rates used to compute present values (the rates of interest earned in the hypothetical account) are the rates that underlie the projections in the 2010 Social Security trustees' report.

The projections shown in Table 1⁵ are made over a 75-year time frame, consistent with the time frame featured in the Social Security and Medicare trustees' reports. As discussed later, one notable difference introduced in broadening the fiscal perspective to the Government as a whole is that the projections are based on fiscal years starting on October 1, 2010, whereas the trustees' reports feature projections made on a calendar-year basis. This change allows the projections to start from more current numbers, including the actual results from fiscal year 2010.

⁴ GDP is the total market value of all final goods and services produced domestically during a given period of time. The components of GDP are: private sector consumption and investment, government consumption and investment, and net exports (exports less imports). Equivalently, GDP is a measure of the gross income generated domestically over the same time period.

⁵ Of the \$16.3 trillion 75-year present value net excess of non-interest spending over receipts (1.9 percent of the 75-year present value of GDP) expressed in Table 1, \$5.3 trillion or 0.6 percent of GDP relates to programs funded by the government's general revenues and \$11.1 or 1.3 percent of GDP relates to Social Security (OASDI) and Medicare Part A, which are funded by payroll taxes and which are not funded in any material respects by the government's general revenues. If payroll and self-employment taxes and related assets in the OASDI Trust Funds or Medicare Part A become insufficient to cover related benefits, as indicated by projections, additional funding for each of these two programs would be necessary or scheduled benefits would need to be reduced. If the government's general revenues are insufficient to cover both mandated transfers to Medicare Parts B and D and spending for other general government programs funded by the government's general revenues, as indicated by the projections, either Medicare Parts B and D revenues (premiums and state transfers), or the government's general revenues would need to be increased, spending for Medicare Parts B and D and/or other general government spending would need to be reduced, and/or additional amounts would need to be borrowed from the public.

The discussion below also considers the period of time beyond the 75-year window, noting most importantly that the assumptions become more uncertain the further in time the projections are extended.

This analysis and discussion of long-term fiscal projections for the U.S. Government does not include activities of State and local governments.

Assumptions Used and Relationship to Other Financial Statements

A fundamental assumption underlying the projections in Table 1 is that current Federal policy – as defined below – does not change. **It is important to note that the projection of receipts and expenditures under current policy is not a forecast or prediction of the most likely outcome.** Indeed, the primary reason to project current policy amounts is to help inform the question of whether policy should change. If policy does change, the projections will of course prove to be untrue.

In addition, actual expenditures and receipts could be materially different than those projected even if policy does not change. This is because the long-range projections are inherently uncertain and because simplifying assumptions are made. One key simplifying assumption is that interest rates paid on public debt are assumed to be similar to those paid in the past, regardless of the amount of debt outstanding.

The projections in Table 1 focus on future cash flows, and do not reflect either the accrual basis or the modified-cash basis of accounting. The differences among the bases are largely based on timing. Cash-based projections reflect receipt or spending at the time cash is received or when a payment is made by the Government. In contrast, accrual-based projections reflect amounts in the time period in which income is earned (even if not yet received) or when an expense or obligation is incurred (even if cash has not yet been disbursed). The cash basis is consistent with methods used to prepare the Statement of Social Insurance (SOSI) and the generally cash-based Federal budget.

The following summarizes the assumptions used for the key categories of receipts and spending presented in Table 1 and in the related analysis:

- **Social Security:** Social Security (OASDI) spending in the Financial Report projections is based on the projected expenditures in the Social Security trustees' report for benefits (as indicated in the more detailed discussion of Social Insurance on page 150, plus the Railroad Retirement interchange, but excluding administrative expenses. The projections of Social Security payroll taxes and future Social Security spending are based on budget historical data for FY 2010. The projected growth rates for future spending and payroll taxes are drawn from the spending and tax growth rate projections underlying the latest trustees' report.
- **Medicare:** Current law Medicare spending is based on incurred expenditures from the 2010 Medicare trustees' report, which reflects the changes in Medicare that resulted from passage of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), and, therefore, projects lower costs than in previous reports. However, some adjustments are required to convert these amounts to Medicare spending as measured in the budget. Medicare Part B and D premiums, as well as State contributions to Part D, are subtracted from gross spending in measuring Part B and Part D outlays in the budget.⁶ The budget treats these premiums as "negative spending" rather than receipts, since they represent payment for a service and are in that sense "business like." Government receipts are defined as payments obtained through the Government's sovereign power to tax. With these adjustments, Medicare spending net of administrative costs corresponds to Medicare spending in the budget. The long-term fiscal projection uses historical budget data from FY 2010 for Medicare spending and Part A payroll tax revenues, with both growing at growth rates presented in the trustees' report. Also, as discussed in Note 26, there is uncertainty about whether the projected reductions in health care cost growth will be fully achieved. Note 26 includes an alternative projection to illustrate the uncertainty of projected Medicare costs.

⁶ Medicare Part B and D premiums and State contributions to Part D are subtracted from the Part B and D spending displayed in Table 1. The total 75-year present value of these subtractions is \$7.7 trillion, or 0.9 percent of GDP.

- **Medicaid:** The Medicaid program was also affected by the changes legislated in the ACA. Medicaid enrollment will be larger because of health reform, and many newly insured Americans will be covered through Medicaid. To reflect these changes, certain adjustments were made in the model that has been used to project Medicaid in past years for the Financial Report. The model starts with the projections from the *2008 Actuarial Report* prepared by the Office of the Actuary, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS).⁷ As projections in that report only extend until 2018, the model assumes that Medicaid benefits in 2019 and later years grow at the same rate per beneficiary as Medicare benefits grow. Effects of the ACA, as calculated by CMS, were added to the base projections, as were other adjustments, to align base projections with the latest budget data. The Medicaid projections reflect the temporary increase in Medicaid spending due to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) as well as the phase-out of the Medicaid spending authorized by ARRA.
- **Other Spending:** Other spending components are assumed to increase by the rate of growth in nominal GDP, implying that such spending will remain constant as a percentage of GDP. In these projections, aside from the expected reductions in Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) spending, defense spending grows at the same rate as nominal GDP. Adjustments are also made for other components of temporary spending that are not expected to persist in the long run: the discretionary and mandatory spending authorized by ARRA and other notable stabilization measures including temporary expansions in unemployment insurance benefits, the implementation of the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP), the purchase of government-sponsored enterprise (GSE) preferred stock, as well as higher net spending for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC).
- **Receipts (Other than Social Security and Medicare):** Instead of attempting a projection of the entire income distribution, the Financial Report projections link individual income taxes to wages and salaries, and all other receipts to GDP. Individual income taxes are projected to return to their historical ratio to wages and salaries over the next four years, and from that point on to increase gradually to reflect the progressive nature of the Federal income tax, which implies that as real wages rise over time, the average taxpayer will move into higher tax brackets. The levels of individual income taxes are also adjusted over the next several years for the phase-out of the temporary tax cuts enacted by ARRA.
- **Interest Spending:** Interest spending is determined by projected interest rates and the level of outstanding debt held by the public. The long-run interest rate assumptions match those of the 2010 Social Security Trustees Report. These same rates are used to convert future cash flows to present values as of the start of fiscal year 2011. The specific interest rates used are the same as those used to discount future payroll taxes in the Social Security trustees' report. The trustees' reports rates are converted to a fiscal year basis from a calendar year basis.

Departures from Current Law and Policy

It was noted earlier that the long-term fiscal projections are made on the basis of current Federal policy, even where current Federal policy would not be continued under provisions of current law. For example, the projections presented in Table 1 and throughout this analysis are made without regard to the statutory limit on outstanding Federal debt. The projection also assumes several other departures from current law: continued discretionary appropriations in the projection period, the continued payment of Social Security and Medicare benefits beyond the projected point of trust fund exhaustion, extension of some of the 2001/2003 tax cuts and the indexing of the alternative minimum tax (AMT), and the reauthorization of many mandatory programs with future expiration dates. The projections do not assume continued action to override the scheduled reductions in Medicare physician fees. These physician reductions are reflected in the projections incorporated here, just as they are reflected in the Medicare trustees' report and in the Statement of Social Insurance.

The Sustainability of Fiscal Policy

An important purpose of the Financial Report is to help citizens and policymakers assess whether current fiscal policy is sustainable and, if it is not, the urgency and magnitude of policy reforms necessary to make it sustainable. A sustainable policy is one where the ratio of debt held by the public to GDP (debt to GDP) is stable over time. The

⁷ Christopher J. Truffer, John D. Klemm, E. Dirk Hoffman, and Christian J. Wolfe, *2008 Actuarial Report on the Financial Condition for Medicaid*, Office of the Actuary, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, United States Department of Health and Human Services.

discussion below focuses on balancing revenues and expenditures over time, and does not consider fairness or efficiency implications of the reforms necessary to achieve sustainability.

It is shown below that, under current policy, the ratio of debt to GDP is projected to rise continuously over the next 75 years, eventually exceeding 350 percent in 2085. If these projections were extended beyond 2085, the deficit excluding interest would continue as the population continues to age and if the other assumptions made for the 75-year horizon continue to hold. The persistence of the deficit excluding interest beyond the 75-year horizon implies that the ratio of debt to GDP would continue to grow beyond the 75-year horizon. The continuing rise in this ratio means that current policy is unsustainable.

Current Policy Projections for Primary Deficits

A key determinant of growth in the debt-to-GDP ratio and hence fiscal sustainability is the primary deficit-to-GDP ratio. The primary deficit is the difference between non-interest spending and receipts, and the primary deficit-to-GDP ratio is simply the primary deficit expressed as a percent of GDP. As shown in Chart 1, the primary deficit-to-GDP ratio grew rapidly in 2008 and 2009 due to the financial crisis and the recession and the policies pursued to combat both, and is projected to fall rapidly to near zero as the economy recovers. The projection period begins in 2011. After 2020, the primary deficit-to-GDP ratio is projected to increase, reaching 2 percent in 2030 and remaining at or above 1.8 percent through the end of the 75-year projection period and beyond.

The level of revenues as a percentage of GDP has been depressed by the recession and tax reductions enacted as part of the ARRA. As the economy recovers and the tax cuts expire, it is projected that the revenue share of GDP will return to near its long-run average. Beyond that point individual income taxes are projected to grow gradually as increases in real incomes cause more taxpayers and a larger share of total income to fall into higher tax brackets.⁸ This projection assumes that Congress and the President will continue to enact legislation that prevents the share of income subject to the Alternative Minimum Tax from rising. On the spending side, the projected increase in non-interest spending as a percentage of GDP is principally due to growth in Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security spending, as is shown in Chart 2. The Social Security spending share of GDP is projected to increase about 1.2 percentage points over the next 25 years as the baby boom generation retires. The same demographic patterns will affect Medicare spending. After 2035, the Social Security spending share of GDP is relatively steady, while the Medicare spending share of GDP continues to increase, albeit at a slower rate, due to projected increases in health care costs. For the same reason, Medicaid spending is also projected to rise over time.


Both Medicare and Medicaid have been significantly affected by the recently passed health reform legislation, the Affordable Care Act (ACA). An effect of the reform is to expand health coverage. The long-term budgetary effect will depend on the effectiveness of provisions designed to reduce health care cost growth. The 2010 Medicare trustees' report projects that the new law could hold down future Medicare cost growth substantially compared with previous projections if fully implemented. The Medicare spending projections in this Report are based on the projections in the 2010 Medicare Trustees Report. If the trustees' report projections hold true, there will be a substantial slowdown in future Medicare and Medicaid spending growth. That assumption is reflected in these long-run fiscal projections. However, even with this reduced Medicare and Medicaid spending, there is still a persistent gap between projected receipts and projected total Federal non-interest spending.

Current Policy Projections for Debt and Interest Payments

The primary deficit projections in Chart 1, along with projections for interest rates and GDP, determine the projections for the ratio of debt held by the public to GDP that are shown in Chart 3. That ratio was 62 percent at the end of fiscal year 2010, and under current policy, it is projected to exceed 70 percent in 2020, 130 percent in 2040, and 350 percent in 2085. Continued upward pressure on spending for the elderly after 75 years because of increasing longevity implies that the debt-to-GDP ratio would continue to rise beyond that point if there is no change in policy. The continuing rise of the debt-to-GDP ratio suggests that current policy is unsustainable.

Chart 3 also displays the projection of debt held by the public as a percent of GDP as published in the 2009 Financial Report. The 2010 projection is lower than the 2009 projection in every year of the projection period, with the size of the gap increasing rapidly over time. The reduction in projected debt has decreased the size of the fiscal gap dramatically since 2009. The improved outlook this year is almost entirely attributable to lower projected spending for Medicare and Medicaid and increased projected receipts that result from the ACA. The lower level of projected publicly held debt relative to last year's projection reflects lower projected primary deficits. As reported in Table 1, primary deficits over the 75-year projection average 1.9 percent of GDP. For comparison, the projections in last year's report implied that the average primary deficit would be 5.5 percent of GDP. As noted, this improvement in projected primary deficits is largely attributable to the enactment of the ACA.

⁸ Projected revenues also account for increases (as a share of GDP) in employer-sponsored health insurance costs, which are tax exempt.




The change in debt held by the public from one year to the next is equal to the unified budget deficit, the difference between total spending and total receipts.⁹ Total spending consists of non-interest spending plus interest spending. Chart 4 reveals clearly that the rapid rise in total spending and the unified deficit is almost entirely due to projected interest payments on the debt. As a percent of GDP, interest spending was 1.4 percent in 2010, and under current policies it is projected to reach 5 percent by 2030 and 19 percent by 2085.

The Fiscal Gap

The fiscal gap measures how much the primary surplus (receipts less non-interest spending) must increase in order for fiscal policy to achieve a target debt-to-GDP ratio in a particular future year. In these projections, the fiscal gap is estimated over a 75-year period, from 2011 to 2085, and the target debt-to-GDP ratio is equal to the ratio at beginning of the projection period, in this case the end of fiscal year 2010 debt-to-GDP ratio of 62 percent of GDP.

The 75-year fiscal gap under current policy is estimated at 2.4 percent of GDP, as reflected in Table 2. As noted in Table 1, the difference between projected programmatic (non-interest) spending and receipts is 1.9 percent of GDP (reflecting the deficit condition of excess spending over receipts). However, eliminating this primary deficit of 1.9 percent of GDP is not sufficient to stabilize the debt-to-GDP ratio. Because interest rates are assumed to exceed the growth rate of GDP, reaching primary balance will still leave debt rising relative to GDP. The average primary surplus needed to return the debt-to-GDP ratio to its initial level and fully close the fiscal gap is 0.5 percent of GDP per year.


⁹ Debt held by the public is also affected by certain transactions not included in the unified budget deficit, such as changes in Treasury's cash balances and the nonbudgetary activity of Federal credit financing accounts. These transactions are assumed to net to zero in the long-range projections.



The Cost of Closing the 75-Year Fiscal Gap

The longer policy action to close the fiscal gap is delayed, the larger the post-reform primary surplus must be to stabilize the debt-to-GDP ratio by the end of the 75 year period. Varying the years in which reforms are introduced while holding constant the ultimate target ratio of debt to GDP helps to illustrate the cost of delaying policy changes that close the fiscal gap. The reforms considered here increase the primary surplus relative to current policy by a fixed percent of GDP starting in the reform year. Three such policies are considered, each beginning in a different year. The analysis shows that the longer policy action is delayed, the larger the post-reform primary surplus must be to stabilize the debt-to-GDP ratio in 2085. Future generations are harmed by policy delay because higher primary surpluses imply lower spending and/or higher taxes than would be needed with earlier deficit reduction.

As previously shown in Chart 1, under current policy, primary deficits occur in virtually every year of the projection period. Table 2 shows primary surplus changes necessary to make the debt-to-GDP ratio in 2085 equal to its level in 2010 under each of the three policies. If reform begins in 2011, then it is sufficient to raise the primary surplus share of GDP by 2.4 percentage points in every year between 2011 and 2085 in order to have a debt-to-GDP ratio in 2085 equal to the level in 2010. This raises the average 2011-2085 primary surplus-to-GDP ratio from -1.9 percent to 0.5 percent. In contrast, if reform is begun in 2021 or 2031, the primary surplus must be raised by 2.9 percent and 3.7 percent of GDP, respectively, in order to reach a debt-to-GDP ratio in 2085 equal to the level in 2010. The difference between the primary surplus boost starting in 2021 and 2031 (2.9 and 3.7 percent of GDP, respectively) and the primary surplus boost starting in 2011 (2.4 percent of GDP) is a measure of the additional burden policy delay would impose on future generations. This policy change could take the form of a reduction in spending, an increase in taxes, or some combination of both that produced the same improvement in the budget surplus. The costs of delay are due to the debt-to-GDP ratio rising during the interim period, which increases the future amount of interest that must be covered with the primary surplus. Delaying reform increases the cost of reaching the target debt-to-GDP ratio even if the target year is extended beyond 2085, since the starting debt-to-GDP ratio will be higher.




These estimates likely understate the cost of delay because they do not assume interest rates will rise as the debt-to-GDP ratio grows. If a higher debt-to-GDP ratio increases the interest rate, making it more costly for the government to service its debt and simultaneously slowing private investment, the primary surplus required to return the debt-to-GDP ratio to its 2010 level will also increase. This dynamic may accelerate with higher ratios of debt to GDP, potentially leading to the point where there may be no feasible level of taxes and spending that would reduce the debt-to-GDP ratio to its 2010 level.

Table 2	
Costs of Delaying Fiscal Consolidation	
Period of Delay	Change in Average Primary Surplus
No Delay: Reform in 2011	2.4 percent of GDP between 2011 and 2085
Ten Years: Reform in 2021	2.9 percent of GDP between 2021 and 2085
Thirty Years: Reform in 2031	3.7 percent of GDP between 2031 and 2085

Alternative Scenarios


The long-run outlook for the budget is extremely uncertain and therefore it makes sense to consider possible alternative projections to indicate the range of uncertainty. There are many dimensions to the projections for which reasonable variations could be considered. Some of the key issues concern long-run economic and demographic assumptions. The long-run fiscal gap is partly the result of demographic patterns that have emerged over the last 50 years with lower birth rates and reduced mortality. The population is aging rapidly and will continue to do so over the next several decades, which puts pressure on programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid nursing



care. A shift in expected fertility could have important long-run effects on the budget outlook. The current assumption is that U.S. fertility will remain close to the replacement rate of approximately 2 children per woman. If the fertility rate were to increase significantly, there would be more workers in the future to support the elderly and to help service existing debt. Conversely, if the fertility rate were to fall below replacement, the strains on the budget would become even more severe. Improvements in mortality operate like a decline in fertility. Increases in immigration operate like an increase in fertility.

One of the most important assumptions underlying the projections is the expected growth of health care costs. Enactment of the ACA reduced the expected long-run growth rates of health care costs, but these growth rates are still highly uncertain. As an illustration of the dramatic effect of variations in health care growth rates, Chart 5 shows the effect on future primary deficits of growth rates that are one percent higher or two percent higher than the growth rates in the base projection. The one percent higher health care cost growth scenario raises the average of non-interest spending less receipts over 75 years to 3.8 percent of GDP, compared to 1.9 percent of GDP assumed in the base projection and displayed in Table 1. The two percent higher health cost growth scenario raises the average of non-interest spending less receipts over 75 years even further, to 10.5 percent of GDP. The dramatic deterioration caused by higher health care cost growth shows the critical importance that effective implementation of the ACA has on the long-run fiscal outlook.

Other key economic assumptions in this report include the future growth rate of real GDP, which itself depends on assumptions such as future growth in the labor force and labor productivity. Historically, U.S. labor productivity has increased at a rate of about 2 percent or more per year, but there have been periods when productivity grew less rapidly and other periods in which it grew faster. Productivity growth has averaged 2.5 percent per year over the last 15 years, which is above its long-run trend. In these budget projections, the rate of productivity growth is assumed to be somewhat below its long-run trend, which is a conservative assumption. It is unlikely that higher productivity growth will be sufficient to resolve the long-run budget problem. Faster growth will lead to higher wages, which will lead to more tax revenue in the near term, but these gains will be partly offset by higher payments for Social Security and other benefit programs in the long term, because benefits are tied to wages. Also, medical costs show a positive relationship with GDP, so higher GDP growth may be matched by higher Medicare and Medicaid spending. Real interest rates are another factor that affects the calculations. The higher are real interest rates, the more costly it is to sustain debt. Inflation is not a major factor in these calculations. Changes in the trend



rate of inflation have offsetting effects on future revenues and future spending, so the budget effect is more nearly neutral in the long run.

Fiscal Projections in Context

As indicated earlier, the projections discussed here are neither forecasts nor predictions. Their purpose is to help readers assess whether current fiscal policy is sustainable and, if it is not sustainable, the magnitude of needed reforms to make it sustainable. If policy changes, perhaps in response to projections like those presented here, then the projections will of course prove to be untrue.

In addition, projections of how Federal finances will evolve over several decades under current policies are extremely uncertain. However, the conclusion that current policies are unsustainable is almost certainly robust to reasonable alternative assumptions.

One way to place these long-range fiscal projections in context is in comparison to projections for other developed nations. Several countries have begun to produce long-range fiscal projections in the last two decades. However, comparisons are difficult because the coverage of the reports and the time horizon projected vary across countries. The horizon for most of these reports is less than 75 years, and the projections are not always updated annually. Some of the countries that have produced long-range projections have shown sustainable policies in the long run, although the recent financial crisis will have worsened the near-term budget outlook in almost every country. Early developers of such fiscal projections include Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and the Netherlands.¹⁰

¹⁰ The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) released a policy brief in October 2009 (available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/40/26/43836144.pdf>) describing the efforts of different member countries to produce long-term fiscal projections.

Conclusion

The United States took a potentially significant step towards fiscal sustainability in 2010 by reforming its system of health insurance. The legislated changes for Medicare, Medicaid, and other health coverage hold the prospect of lowering the long-term growth trend for future health care costs and significantly reducing the long-term fiscal gap. But even with the new law, the projections discussed above indicate that, under current policies and the assumptions used in this report, the debt-to-GDP ratio will continually increase over the next 75 years and beyond, which means current policies are not sustainable. As indicated earlier, the longer policy action to avert these trends is delayed, the larger are the projected revenue increases and/or spending decreases necessary to reach a target debt-to-GDP ratio. These projections, however, are neither forecasts nor predictions. They are presented here to provide a foundation upon which readers can form their own conclusions about fiscal sustainability.

Social Insurance

The social insurance programs consisting of Social Security, Medicare, Railroad Retirement, and Black Lung were developed to provide income security and health care coverage to citizens under specific circumstances as a responsibility of the Government. Because taxpayers rely on these programs in their long-term planning, social insurance program information should indicate whether the current law provisions of the programs can be sustained, and more generally what effect they will likely have on the Government's financial condition. The resources needed to run these programs are raised through taxes and fees. Eligibility for benefits rests in part on earnings and time worked by the individuals. Social Security benefits are generally redistributed intentionally toward lower-wage workers (i.e., benefits are progressive). In addition, each social insurance program has a uniform set of entitling events and schedules that apply to all participants.

Social Security and Medicare

Social Security

The OASI Trust Fund was established on January 1, 1940, as a separate account in the Treasury. The DI Trust Fund, another separate account in the Treasury, was established on August 1, 1956. OASI pays cash retirement benefits to eligible retirees and their eligible dependents and survivors, and the much smaller DI fund pays cash benefits to eligible individuals who are unable to work because of medical conditions and certain family members of such eligible individuals. Though the events that trigger benefit payments are quite different, both trust funds have the same earmarked financing structure: primarily payroll taxes and income taxes on benefits. All financial operations of the OASI and DI Programs are handled through these respective funds. The two funds are often referred to as simply the combined OASDI Trust Funds. At the end of calendar year 2009, OASDI benefits were paid to approximately 53 million beneficiaries.

The primary financing of these two funds are taxes paid by workers, their employers, and individuals with self-employment income, based on work covered by the OASDI Program. Since 1990, employers and employees have each paid 6.2 percent of taxable earnings. The self-employed pay 12.4 percent of taxable earnings. Payroll taxes are computed on wages and net earnings from self-employment up to a specified maximum annual amount, referred to as maximum taxable earnings (\$106,800 in 2010), that increases each year with economy-wide average wages.

Legislation passed in 1984 subjected up to half of OASDI benefits to tax and allocated the revenue to the OASDI Trust Funds, and in 1993 legislation upped the potentially taxed portion of benefits to 85 percent and allocated the additional revenue to the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

Medicare


The Medicare Program, created in 1965, also has two separate trust funds: the Hospital Insurance (HI, Medicare Part A) and Supplementary Medical Insurance (SMI, Medicare Parts B and D) Trust Funds.¹ HI pays for inpatient acute hospital services and major alternatives to hospitals (skilled nursing services, for example) and SMI pays for hospital outpatient services, physician services, and assorted other services and products through the Part B account and pays for prescription drugs through the Part D account. Though the events that trigger benefit payments are similar, HI and SMI have different earmarked financing structures. Similar to OASDI, HI is financed primarily by payroll contributions. Currently, employers and employees each pay 1.45 percent of earnings, while self-employed workers pay 2.9 percent of their net earnings. Beginning 2013, employees and self-employed individuals with earnings above certain thresholds will pay an additional HI tax of 0.9 percent on earnings above those thresholds. Other income to the HI fund includes a small amount of premium income from voluntary enrollees, a portion of the Federal income taxes that beneficiaries pay on Social Security benefits (as explained above), and interest credited on Treasury securities held in the HI Trust Fund. As is explained in the next section, these Treasury securities and related interest have no effect on the consolidated statement of Governmentwide finances.

For SMI, transfers from the General Fund of the Treasury represent the largest source of income covering about 75 percent and 82 percent of program costs for Parts B and D, respectively. Beneficiaries pay monthly

¹ Medicare legislation in 2003 created the new Part D account in the SMI Trust Fund to track the finances of a new prescription drug benefit that began in 2006. As in the case of Medicare Part B, approximately three-quarters of revenues to the Part D account will come from future transfers from the General Fund of the Treasury. Consequently, the nature of the relationship between the SMI Trust Fund and the Federal budget described below is largely unaffected by the presence of the Part D account though the magnitude will be greater.

premiums that finance approximately 25 percent and 18 percent of costs for Parts B and D, respectively. With the introduction of Part D drug coverage, Medicaid is no longer the primary payer of drug benefits for beneficiaries dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid. For those beneficiaries, States must pay the Part D account a portion of their estimated foregone drug costs for this population (referred to as State transfers). As with HI, interest received on Treasury securities held in the SMI Trust Fund is credited to the fund. These Treasury securities and related interest have no effect on the consolidated statement of Governmentwide finances. See Note 26—Social Insurance, for additional information on Medicare program financing.

**Figure 1
Social Security, Medicare, and Governmentwide Finances**



Social Security, Medicare, and Governmentwide Finances

The current and future financial status of the separate Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds is the focus of the trustees’ reports, a focus that may appropriately be referred to as the “trust fund perspective.” In contrast, the Government primarily uses the *unified budget* concept as the framework for budgetary analysis and presentation. It represents a comprehensive display of all Federal activities, regardless of fund type or on- and off-budget status, and has a broader focus than the trust fund perspective that may appropriately be referred to as the “budget perspective” or the “Governmentwide perspective.” Social Security and Medicare are among the largest expenditure categories of the U.S. Federal budget. Together, they now account for more than a third of all Federal spending and the percentage is projected to rise dramatically for the reasons discussed below. This section describes in detail the important relationship between the trust fund perspective and the Governmentwide perspective.

Figure 1 is a simplified graphical depiction of the interaction of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds with the rest of the Federal budget.² The boxes on the left show sources of funding, those in the middle represent the trust funds and other Government accounts (of which the General Fund is a part) into which that funding flows, and the boxes on the right show simplified expenditure categories. The figure is intended to illustrate how the various sources of program revenue flow through the budget to beneficiaries. The general approach is to group revenues and expenditures that are linked specifically to Social Security and/or Medicare separately from those for other government programs.

² The Federal unified budget encompasses all Government financing and is synonymous with a Governmentwide perspective.

Each of the trust funds has its own sources and types of revenue. With the exception of General Fund transfers to SMI, each of these revenue sources represents revenue from the public that are earmarked specifically for the respective trust fund, and cannot be used for other purposes. In contrast, personal and corporate income taxes and other revenue go into the General Fund of the Treasury and are drawn down for any Government program for which Congress has approved spending.³ The arrows from the boxes on the left represent the flow of the revenues into the trust funds and other Government accounts.

The heavy line between the top two boxes in the middle of Figure 1 represents intragovernmental transfers to the SMI Trust Fund from other Government accounts. The Medicare SMI Trust Fund is shown separately from the two Social Security trust funds (OASI and DI) and the Medicare HI Trust Fund to highlight the unique financing of SMI. SMI is currently the only one of the programs that is funded through transfers from the General Fund of the Treasury, which is part of the other Government accounts (the Part D account receives transfers from the States). The transfers finance roughly three-fourths of SMI Program expenses. The transfers are automatic; their size depends on how much the program requires, not on how much revenue comes into the Treasury. If General Fund revenues become insufficient to cover both the mandated transfer to SMI and expenditures on other general Government programs, Treasury would have to borrow to make up the difference. In the longer run, if transfers to SMI increase beyond growth in general revenues as shown below, they are projected to increase significantly in coming years—then Congress must either raise taxes, cut other Government spending, reduce SMI benefits, or borrow even more.

The dotted lines between the middle boxes of Figure 1 also represent intragovernmental transfers but those transfers arise in the form of “borrowing/lending” between the Government accounts. Interest credited to the trust funds arises when the excess of program income over expenses is loaned to the General Fund. The vertical lines labeled *Surplus Borrowed* represent these flows from the trust funds to the other Government accounts. These loans reduce the amount the General Fund has to borrow from the public to finance a deficit (or likewise increase the amount of debt paid off if there is a surplus). However, the General Fund has to credit interest on the loans from the trust fund programs, just as if it borrowed the money from the public. The credits lead to future obligations for the General Fund (which is part of the other Government accounts). These transactions are indicated in Figure 1 by the vertical arrows labeled *Interest Credited*. The credits increase trust fund income exactly as much as they increase credits (future obligations) in the General Fund. From the standpoint of the Government as a whole, at least in an accounting sense, these interest credits are a wash.

It is important to understand the additional implications of these loans from the trust funds to the other Government accounts. When the trust funds get the receipts that they loan to the General Fund, these receipts provide additional authority to spend on benefits and other program expenses. The General Fund, in turn, has taken on the obligation of paying interest on these loans every year and repaying the principal when trust fund income from other sources falls below expenditures—the loans will be called in and the General Fund will have to finance the benefits paid by the trust fund through general revenues or borrowing, just as for any Governmental program.

Actual dollar amounts roughly corresponding to the flows presented in Figure 1 are shown in Table 1 for fiscal year 2010. In Table 1, revenues from the public (left side of Figure 1) and expenditures to the public (right side of Figure 1) are shown separately from transfers between Government accounts (middle of Figure 1). Note that the transfers (\$213.8 billion) and interest credits (\$101.0 billion) received by the trust funds appear as negative entries under “Other Government” and are thus offsetting when summed for the total budget column. These two intragovernmental transfers are the key to the differences between the trust fund and budget perspectives.

³ Other programs also have dedicated revenues in the form of taxes and fees (and other forms of receipt) and there are a large number of earmarked trust funds in the Federal budget. Total trust fund receipts account for about 40 percent of total Government receipts with the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds accounting for about two-thirds of trust fund receipts. For further discussion, see the report issued by the Government Accountability Office, *Federal Trust and Other Earmarked Funds*, GAO-01-199SP, January 2001. In the figure and the discussion that follows, all other programs, including these other earmarked trust fund programs, are grouped under “Other Government Accounts” to simplify the description and maintain the focus on Social Security and Medicare.

From the Governmentwide perspective, only revenues received from the public (and States in the case of Medicare, Part D) and expenditures made to the public are important for the final balance. Trust fund revenue from the public consists of payroll taxes, benefit taxes, and premiums. For HI, the difference between total expenditures made to the public (\$249.0 billion) and revenues (\$203.4 billion) was (\$45.6 billion) in 2010, indicating that HI had a relatively small negative effect on the overall budget outcome *in that year*. For the SMI account, revenues from the public (premiums) were relatively small, representing about a quarter of total expenditures made to the public in 2010. The difference (\$206.2 billion) resulted in a net draw on the overall budget balance in that year. For OASDI, the difference between total expenditures made to the public (\$706.2 billion) and revenues from the public (\$669.4 billion) was (\$36.8) billion in 2010, indicating that OASDI had a negative effect on the overall budget outcome *in that year*.

The trust fund perspective is captured in the bottom section of each of the three trust fund columns. For HI, total expenditures exceeded total revenues by \$31.0 billion in 2010, as shown at the bottom of the first column. This cash deficit was made up by calling in past loans made to the General Fund (i.e., by redeeming Trust Fund assets). For SMI, total revenues of \$278.5 billion (\$61.8 + \$216.7), including \$213.7 billion transferred from other Government accounts (the General Fund), exceeded total expenditures by \$10.5 billion. Transfers to the SMI Program from other Government accounts (the General Fund), amounting to about 80 percent of program costs, are obligated under current law and, therefore, appropriately viewed as revenue from the trust fund perspective. For OASDI, total revenues of \$787.9 billion (\$669.4 + \$118.5), including interest and a small amount of other Government transfers, exceeded total expenditures of \$706.2 billion by \$81.7 billion.

Table 1
Revenues and Expenditures for Medicare and Social Security
Trust Funds and the Total Federal Budget
for the Fiscal Year ended September 30, 2010

(In billions of dollars)	Trust Funds					Total ¹
	HI	SMI	OASDI	Total	All Other	
Revenues from the public and States:						
Payroll and benefit taxes, State grants...	197.4		669.4	866.8		866.8
Premiums	6.0	57.3		63.3		63.3
Other taxes and fees		4.5		4.5	1,227.1	1,231.6
Total	203.4	61.8	669.4	934.6	1,227.1	2,161.7
Total expenditures to the public ²	249.0	268.0	706.2	1,223.2	2,232.6	3,455.8
Net results—budget perspective³	(45.6)	(206.2)	(36.8)	(288.6)	(1,005.5)	(1,294.1)
Revenues from other Government accounts:						
Transfers	0.1	213.7		213.8	(213.8)	
Interest credits	14.5	3.0	118.5	136.0	(136.0)	
Total	14.6	216.7	118.5	349.8	(349.8)	
Net results—trust fund perspective (change in Trust Fund balance)³	(31.0)	10.5	81.7	61.2	N/A	N/A

¹ This column is the sum of the preceding two columns and shows data for the total Federal budget. The figure \$1,294.1 billion was the total Federal deficit in fiscal year 2010.

² The OASDI figure includes \$4.4 billion transferred to the Railroad Retirement Board for benefit payments and is, therefore, an expenditure to the public.

³ Net results are computed as revenues less expenditures.

Notes: Amounts may not add due to rounding.
 "N/A" indicates not applicable.

Cashflow Projections

Background


Economic and Demographic Assumptions. The Boards of Trustees⁴ of the OASDI and Medicare Trust Funds provide in their annual reports to Congress short-range (10-year) and long-range (75-year) actuarial estimates of each trust fund. Because of the inherent uncertainty in estimates for 75 years into the future, the Boards use three alternative sets of economic and demographic assumptions to show a range of possibilities. The economic and demographic assumptions used for the most recent set of intermediate projections for Social Security and Medicare are shown in the "Social Security" and "Medicare" sections of Note 26—Social Insurance.

Beneficiary-to-Worker Ratio. Underlying the pattern of expenditure projections for both the OASDI and Medicare Programs is the impending demographic change that will occur as the large baby-boom generation, born in the years 1946 to 1964, retires or reaches eligibility age. The consequence is that the number of beneficiaries will increase much faster than the number of workers who pay taxes that are used to pay benefits. The pattern is

⁴ There are six trustees: the Secretaries of the Treasury (managing trustee), Health and Human Services, and Labor; the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration; and two public trustees who are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a 4-year term. By law, the public trustees are members of two different political parties.

illustrated in Chart 1 which shows the ratio of OASDI beneficiaries to 100 covered workers for the historical period and estimated for the next 75 years. In 2010, there were about 34 beneficiaries for every 100 workers. By 2030, there will be about 46 beneficiaries for every 100 workers. A similar demographic pattern confronts the Medicare Program. For example, for the HI Program, there were about 30 beneficiaries for every 100 workers in 2010; by 2030, there are expected to be about 43 beneficiaries for every 100 workers. This ratio for both programs will continue to increase to about 49 beneficiaries for every 100 workers by the end of the projection period, after the baby-boom generation has moved through the Social Security system and as birth rates decline and longevity increase.


**Chart 1—OASDI Beneficiaries per 100 Covered Workers
1970-2084**



Social Security Projections

Nominal Income and Expenditures. Chart 2 shows historical values and actuarial estimates of combined OASDI annual income (excluding interest) and expenditures for 1970-2084 in nominal dollars. The estimates are for the open-group population. That is, the estimates include taxes paid from, and on behalf of, workers who will enter covered employment during the period, as well as those already in covered employment at the beginning of that period. These estimates also include scheduled benefit payments made to, and on behalf of, such workers during that period. Note that expenditure projections in Chart 2 and subsequent charts are based on current-law benefit formulas, regardless of whether the income and assets are available to finance them.

**Chart 2—OASDI Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures
1970-2084**




Currently, Social Security tax revenues exceed benefit payments and will continue to do so until 2015, when revenues are projected to fall below benefit payments, after which the gap between expenditures and revenues continues to widen.

Income and Expenditures as a Percent of Taxable Payroll. Chart 3 shows annual income (excluding interest but including both payroll and benefit taxes) and expenditures expressed as percentages of taxable payroll, commonly referred to as the income rate and cost rate, respectively.


The OASDI cost rate is projected to increase rapidly and first exceeds the income rate in 2015, producing cashflow deficits thereafter. As described above, surpluses that occur prior to 2016 are “loaned” to the General Fund and accumulate, with interest, reserve spending authority for the trust fund. The reserve spending authority represents an obligation for the General Fund. Beginning in 2015, Social Security will start using interest credits to meet full benefit obligations. The Government will need to raise taxes, reduce benefits, increase borrowing from the public, and/or cut spending for other programs to meet its obligations to the trust fund. By 2037, the trust fund reserves (and thus reserve spending authority) are projected to be exhausted. Even if a trust fund's assets are exhausted, however, tax income will continue to flow into the fund. Present tax rates would be sufficient to pay 78 percent of scheduled benefits after trust fund exhaustion in 2037 and 75 percent of scheduled benefits in 2084.

Chart 3—OASDI Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures as a Percent of Taxable Payroll 1970-2084



Income and Expenditures as a Percent of GDP. Chart 4 shows estimated annual income (excluding interest) and expenditures, expressed as percentages of GDP, the total value of goods and services produced in the United States. This alternative perspective shows the size of the OASDI Program in relation to the capacity of the national economy to sustain it. The gap between expenditures and income generally widens with expenditures generally growing as a share of GDP and income declining slightly relative to GDP. Social Security’s expenditures are projected to grow from 4.8 percent of GDP in 2010 to 6.02 percent in 2084. In 2084, expenditures are projected to exceed income by 1.42 percent of GDP.

Chart 4—OASDI Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures as a Percent of GDP 1970-2084



Sensitivity Analysis. Actual future income from OASDI payroll taxes and other sources and actual future expenditures for scheduled benefits and administrative expenses will depend upon a large number of factors: the size and composition of the population that is receiving benefits, the level of monthly benefit amounts, the size and characteristics of the work force covered under OASDI, and the level of workers' earnings. These factors will depend, in turn, upon future marriage and divorce rates, birth rates, death rates, migration rates, labor force participation and unemployment rates, disability incidence and termination rates, retirement age patterns, productivity gains, wage increases, cost-of-living increases, and many other economic and demographic factors.

This section presents estimates that illustrate the sensitivity of long-range expenditures and income for the OASDI Program to changes in *selected individual assumptions*. In this analysis, the intermediate assumption is used as the reference point, and one assumption at a time is varied. The variation used for each individual assumption reflects the levels used for that assumption in the low-cost (Alternative I) and high-cost (Alternative III) projections. For example, when analyzing sensitivity with respect to variation in real wages, income and expenditure projections using the intermediate assumptions are compared to the outcome when projections are done by changing only the real wage assumption to either low-cost or high-cost alternatives.

The low-cost alternative is characterized by assumptions that generally improve the financial status of the program (relative to the intermediate assumption) such as slower improvement in mortality (beneficiaries die younger). In contrast, assumptions under the high-cost alternative generally worsen the financial outlook. One exception occurs with the CPI assumption (see below).

Table 2 shows the effects of changing individual assumptions on the present value of estimated OASDI expenditures in excess of income (the *shortfall* of income relative to expenditures in present value terms). The assumptions are shown in parentheses. For example, the intermediate assumption for the annual rate of *reduction in age-sex-adjusted death rates* is 0.79 percent. For the low-cost alternative, a slower reduction rate (0.33 percent) is assumed as it means that beneficiaries die at a younger age relative to the intermediate assumption, resulting in lower expenditures. Under the low-cost assumption, the shortfall drops from \$7,947 billion to \$6,076 billion, a 24 percent smaller shortfall. The high-cost death rate assumption (1.32 percent) results in an increase in the shortfall, from \$7,947 billion to \$9,991 billion, a 26 percent increase in the shortfall. Clearly, alternative death rate assumptions have a substantial impact on estimated future cashflows in the OASDI Program.

A higher fertility rate means more workers relative to beneficiaries over the projection period, thereby lowering the shortfall relative to the intermediate assumption. An increase in the rate from 2.0 to 2.3 percent results in an 12 percent smaller shortfall (i.e., expenditures less income), from \$7,947 billion to \$6,978 billion.

Higher real wage growth results in faster income growth relative to expenditure growth. Table 2 shows that a real wage differential that is 0.6 greater than the intermediate assumption of 1.2 results in a drop in the shortfall from \$7,947 billion to \$5,893 billion, a 26 percent decline.

The CPI change assumption operates in a somewhat counterintuitive manner, as seen in Table 2. A lower rate of change results in a higher shortfall. This arises as a consequence of holding the real wage assumption constant while varying the CPI so that wages (the income base) are affected sooner than benefits. If the rate is assumed to be 1.8 percent rather than 2.8 percent, the shortfall rises about 6 percent, from \$7,947 billion to \$8,444 billion.

The effect of net immigration is similar to fertility in that, over the 75-year projection period, higher immigration results in proportionately more workers (taxpayers) than beneficiaries. The low-cost assumption for net immigration results in a 6 percent drop in the shortfall, from \$7,947 billion to \$7,475 billion, relative to the intermediate case; and the high-cost assumption results in a 6 percent higher shortfall.

Finally, Table 2 shows the sensitivity of the shortfall to variations in the real interest rate or, in present value terminology, the sensitivity to alternative discount rates assuming a higher discount rate results in a lower present value. The shortfall of \$6,303 billion is 21 percent lower when the real interest rate is 3.6 percent rather than 2.9 percent, and 33 percent higher shortfall when the real interest rate is 2.1 percent rather than 2.9 percent.

Table 2
Present Values of Estimated OASDI Expenditures in Excess of Income
Under Various Assumptions, 2010-2084

(Dollar values in billions; values of assumptions shown in parentheses)

Assumption	Financing Shortfall Range		
	Low	Intermediate	High
Average annual reduction in death rates.....	6,076 (0.33)	7,947 (0.79)	9,991 (1.32)
Total fertility rate	6,978 (2.3)	7,947 (2.0)	8,892 (1.7)
Real wage differential	5,893 (1.8)	7,947 (1.2)	9,312 (0.6)
CPI change	7,400 (3.8)	7,947 (2.8)	8,444 (1.8)
Net immigration.....	7,475 (1,370,000) ¹	7,947 (1,065,000) ¹	8,394 (780,000) ¹
Real interest rate.....	6,303 (3.6)	7,947 (2.9)	10,579 (2.1)

¹ Amounts represent the average annual net immigration over the 75-year projection period.

Source: 2010 OASDI Trustees Report and SSA.

Medicare Projections

Medicare Legislation. The Affordable Care Act as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (the “Affordable Care Act” or ACA) significantly improves projected Medicare finances. The most important cost saving provision in the ACA is a revision in payment rates for parts A and B services other than for physicians’ services. Relative to payment rates made under prior law that were based on the rate at which prices for inputs used to provide Medicare services increase, the ACA reduces those payment rates by the rate at which productive efficiency in the overall economy increases, which is projected to average 1.1 percent per year. The ACA also achieves substantial cost savings by reducing payment rates for private health plans providing Parts A and B services (Part C or Medicare Advantage) to more closely match per beneficiary costs. Partly offsetting these changes was an increase in prescription drug coverage. In addition, the ACA increases Part A revenues by: (a) taxing high-cost employer-provided health care plans and thereby giving employers incentives to increase the share of compensation paid as taxable earnings, and (b) imposing a new 0.9 percent surtax on earnings in excess of \$200,000 (individual tax return filers) or \$250,000 (joint tax return filers) starting in 2013.


The 2010 Medicare Trustees Report warns that the “actual future costs for Medicare are likely to exceed those shown by the current-law projections’ that underlie both the Trustees Report and this Financial Report. This warning is primarily due to the fact that productivity growth in the provisions of Medicare services have in the past been much smaller than productivity growth in the overall economy, which suggests that the new productivity-based downward adjustments to Medicare payment rates may not be sustainable. This concern is reinforced by the fact that similar adjustments to payment rates for Medicare physicians’ services mandated by a 1996 Medicare reform have been consistently overridden by new law.

Health Care Cost Growth. In addition to the growth in the number of beneficiaries per worker, the Medicare Program has the added pressure of expected growth in the use and cost of health care per person that is driven in large part by new technology. Growth in Medicare cost per beneficiary in excess in growth in per capita GDP is referred to as “excess cost growth.” In last year’s Financial Report, excess cost growth was assumed to be about 1 percentage point—that is, Medicare expenditures per beneficiary were assumed to grow, on average, about one percentage point faster than per capita GDP over the long range. An assumption for excess cost growth was smaller than in recent history; excess cost growth averaged 1-1/2 percentage points between 1990 and 2007.⁵ The combination of more beneficiaries per worker and 1 percent excess cost growth caused projected Medicare expenditures to grow substantially more rapidly than GDP in the 2009 Financial Report. In this year’s Report, however, long-term excess cost growth is essentially zero because of the productivity adjustments to payment rates called for by the ACA. As a result, the long term projected Medicare spending share of GDP in this Report is driven primarily by the same demographic trends that drive the OASDI spending share of GDP.

⁵ Congressional Budget Office, the Long-Term Budget Outlook, June 2009.


Total Medicare. Chart 5 shows expenditures and current-law noninterest revenue sources for HI and SMI combined as a percentage of GDP. The total expenditure line shows Medicare costs rising to 6.37 percent of GDP by 2084. Revenues from taxes and premiums (including State transfers under Part D) are expected to increase from 1.79 percent of GDP in 2010 to 3.06 percent of GDP in 2084. Payroll tax income increases gradually as a percent of GDP because the new tax on earnings in excess of \$250,000 for joint tax return filers and \$200,000 for individual tax return filers applies to an increasing share of earnings because the \$250,000 and \$200,000 thresholds are not indexed for price changes. Premiums combined for Parts B and D of SMI are approximately fixed as a share of Parts B and D costs, so they also increase as a percent of GDP. General revenue contributions for SMI, as determined by current law, are projected to rise as a percent of GDP from 1.37 percent to 3.13 percent over the same period. Thus, revenues from taxes and premiums (including State transfers) will fall substantially as a share of total noninterest Medicare income (from 57 percent in 2010 to 49 percent in 2084) while general revenues will rise (from 43 percent to 51 percent). The gap between total noninterest Medicare income (including general revenue contributions) and expenditures begins around 2010 and then steadily continues to widen, reaching 0.2 percent of GDP by 2081.

Chart 5—Total Medicare (HI and SMI) Expenditures and Noninterest Income as a Percent of GDP 1970-2081




Medicare, Part A (Hospital Insurance)—Nominal Income and Expenditures. Chart 6 shows historical and actuarial estimates of HI annual income (excluding interest) and expenditures for 1970-2084 in nominal dollars. The estimates are for the open-group population.

**Chart 6—Medicare Part A Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures
1970-2084**



Medicare, Part A Income and Expenditures as a Percent of Taxable Payroll. Chart 7 illustrates income (excluding interest) and expenditures as a percentage of taxable payroll over the next 75 years. The chart shows that the expenditure rate exceeds the income rate in 2008, and cash deficits continue thereafter. Trust fund interest earnings and assets provide enough resources to pay full benefit payments until 2029 with general revenues used to finance interest and loan repayments to make up the difference between cash income and expenditures during that period. Pressures on the Federal budget will thus emerge well before 2029. Present tax rates would be sufficient to pay 85 percent of scheduled benefits after trust fund exhaustion in 2029 and 89 percent of scheduled benefits in 2084.


Chart 7—Medicare Part A Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures as a Percent of Taxable Payroll 1970-2084



Source: http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/TRSUM/images/LD_ChartC.html

Medicare, Part A Income and Expenditures as a Percent of GDP. Chart 8 shows estimated annual income (excluding interest) and expenditures, expressed as percentages of GDP, and the total value of goods and services produced in the United States. This alternative perspective shows the size of the HI Program in relation to the capacity of the national economy to sustain it. Medicare Part A’s expenditures are projected to grow from 1.7 percent of GDP in 2010, to 1.99 percent in 2030, and to 2.11 percent by 2084. The gap between expenditure and income shares of GDP widens and peaks at 0.53 percent in 2047 and then commences a steady decline, reaching 0.24 percent of GDP in 2084.


Chart 8—Medicare Part A Income (Excluding Interest) and Expenditures as a Percent of GDP 1970-2084



Medicare, Parts B and D (Supplementary Medical Insurance). Chart 9 shows historical and actuarial estimates of Medicare Part B and Part D premiums (and Part D State transfers) and expenditures for each of the next 75 years, in nominal dollars. The gap between premiums and State transfer revenues and program expenditures, a gap that will need to be filled with transfers from general revenues, grows throughout the projection period.


**Chart 9—Medicare Part B and Part D Premium and State Transfer Income and Expenditures
1970-2084**

(In billions of nominal dollars)



Medicare Part B and Part D Premium and State Transfer Income and Expenditures as a Percent of GDP.
 Chart 10 shows expenditures for the Supplementary Medical Insurance Program over the next 75 years expressed as a percentage of GDP, providing a perspective on the size of the SMI Program in relation to the capacity of the national economy to sustain it. SMI expenditures as a share of GDP are expected to grow rapidly from 1.92 percent in 2010 to 3.4 percent in 2035, and then grow more slowly reaching 4.26 in 2084. This growth pattern reflects growth in Medicare spending per beneficiary that is positive for the first half of the projection period before turning negative as a result of provisions in the ACA and to population ageing that is rapid through 2035 as the baby boom generation move into their advanced years and then slows to a modest pace consistent with increasing longevity. Premium and State transfer income grows from about 0.42 in 2010 to 1.14 percent in GDP in 2084, so the portion financed by General Fund transfers to SMI is projected to be about 76 percent throughout the projections period.

Chart 10—Medicare Part B and Part D Premium and State Transfer Income and Expenditures as a Percent of GDP 1970-2084



Medicare Sensitivity Analysis. This section illustrates the sensitivity of long-range cost and income estimates for the Medicare Program to changes in *selected individual assumptions*. As with the OASDI analysis, the intermediate assumption is used as the reference point, and one assumption at a time is varied. The variation used for each individual assumption reflects the levels used for that assumption in the low-cost and high-cost projections (see description of sensitivity analysis for OASDI).

Table 3 shows the effects of changing various assumptions on the present value of estimated HI expenditures in excess of income (the *shortfall* of income relative to expenditures in present value terms). The assumptions are shown in parentheses. Clearly, net HI expenditures are extremely sensitive to alternative assumptions about the growth in health care cost. For the low-cost alternative, the slower growth in health costs causes the shortfall to drop from \$2,683 billion to a surplus of \$2,146 billion, a 180 percent change from the \$2,683 billion shortfall to the \$2,146 billion surplus. The high-cost assumption results in a near quadrupling of the shortfall, from \$2,683 billion to \$10,346 billion.

Variations in the next four assumptions in Table 3 result in relatively minor changes in net HI expenditures. The higher or lower fertility assumptions cause an approximate 13 and 14 percent change in the shortfall relative to the intermediate case. The higher or lower real wage growth rate results in about a 22 and 44 percent change in the shortfall relative to the intermediate case. Wages are a key cost factor in the provision of health care. Higher wages also result in greater payroll tax income. HI expenditures exceed HI income by a wide and increasing margin in the future (Charts 6 to 8). CPI and net immigration changes have very little effect on net HI expenditures. Higher immigration increases the net shortfall modestly as higher payroll tax revenue is more than offset by higher medical care expenditures.

Table 3 also shows that the present value of net HI expenditures is 24 percent lower if the real interest rate is 3.6 percent rather than 2.9 percent and 34 percent higher if the real interest rate is 2.1 percent rather than 2.9 percent.

Table 3
Present Values of Estimated Medicare Part A Expenditures in Excess of
Income Under Various Assumptions, 2010-2084

(Dollar values in billions; values of assumptions shown in parentheses)

Assumption ¹	Financing Shortfall Range		
	Low	Intermediate	High
Average annual growth in health costs ²	(2,146) (2.0)	2,683 (3.0)	10,346 (4.0)
Total fertility rate ³	2,308 (2.3)	2,683 (2.0)	3,035 (1.7)
Real wage differential	1,507 (1.8)	2,683 (1.2)	3,284 (0.6)
CPI change	2,466 (3.8)	2,683 (2.8)	2,924 (1.8)
Net immigration.....	2,605 (1,370,000)	2,683 (1,065,000)	2,774 (780,000)
Real interest rate.....	2,107 (3.6)	2,683 (2.9)	3,603 (2.1)

¹ The sensitivity of the projected HI net cashflow to variations in future mortality rates is also of interest. At this time, however, relatively little is known about the relationship between improvements in life expectancy and the associated changes in health status and per beneficiary health expenditures. As a result, it is not possible at present to prepare meaningful estimates of the Part A, mortality sensitivity.

² Annual growth rate is the aggregate cost of providing covered health care services to beneficiaries. The low-cost and high-cost alternatives assume that costs increase 1 percent slower or faster, respectively, than the intermediate assumption, *relative to growth in taxable payroll*.

³ The total fertility rate for any year is the average number of children who would be born to a woman in her lifetime if she were to experience the birth rates by age observed in, or assumed for, the selected year and if she were to survive the entire childbearing period.

⁴ Amount represents the average annual net immigration over the 75-year projection period.

Table 4 shows the effects of various assumptions about the growth in health care costs on the present value of estimated SMI (Medicare Parts B and D) expenditures in excess of income. As with HI, net SMI expenditures are very sensitive to changes in the health care cost growth assumption. For the low-cost alternative, the slower assumed growth in health costs reduces the Governmentwide resources needed for Part B from \$12,901 billion to \$9,288 billion and in Part D from \$7,229 billion to \$5,050 billion, about a 30 percent difference in each case. The high-cost assumption increases Governmentwide resources needed to \$18,546 billion for Part B and to \$10,695 billion for Part D, about a 44 percent and a 48 percent difference for Part B and Part D, respectively.

Table 4
Present Values of Estimated Medicare Parts B and D Future Expenditures Less Premium Income and State Transfers Under Three Health Care Cost Growth Assumptions, 2010-2084

(In billions of dollars)

Medicare Program ¹	Governmentwide Resources Needed		
	Low (3.1)	Intermediate (4.1)	High (5.1)
Part B	9,288	12,901	18,546
Part D	5,050	7,229	10,695

¹ Annual growth rate is the aggregate cost of providing covered health care services to beneficiaries. The low and high scenarios assume that costs increase one percent slower or faster, respectively, than the intermediate assumption.

Source: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

Sustainability of Social Security and Medicare

75-Year Horizon

According to the 2010 Medicare Trustees Report, the HI Trust Fund is projected to remain solvent until 2029 and, according to the 2010 Social Security Trustees Report, the OASDI Trust Funds are projected to remain solvent until 2037. In each case, some general revenues must be used to satisfy the authorization of full benefit payments until the year of exhaustion. This occurs when the trust fund balances accumulated during prior years are needed to pay benefits, which leads to a transfer from general revenues to the trust funds. Moreover, under current law, General Fund transfers to the SMI Trust Fund will occur into the indefinite future and will continue to grow with the growth in health care expenditures.

The potential magnitude of future financial obligations under these three social insurance programs is, therefore, important from a unified budget perspective as well as for understanding generally the growing resource demands of the programs on the economy. A common way to present future cashflows is in terms of their *present value*. This approach recognizes that a dollar paid or collected next year is worth less than a dollar today, because a dollar today could be saved and earn a year's worth of interest.

Table 5 shows the magnitudes of the primary expenditures and sources of financing for the three trust funds computed on an open-group basis for the next 75 years and expressed in present values. The data are consistent with the Statements of Social Insurance included in the principal financial statements. For HI, revenues from the public are projected to fall short of total expenditures by \$2,683 billion in present value terms which is the additional amount needed in order to pay scheduled benefits over the next 75 years.⁶ From the trust fund perspective, the amount needed is \$2,379 billion in present value after subtracting the value of the existing trust fund balances (an asset to the trust fund account but an intragovernmental transfer to the overall budget). For SMI, revenues from the

⁶ Interest income is not a factor in this table as dollar amounts are in present value terms.

public for Parts B and D combined are estimated to be \$20,130 billion⁷ less than total expenditures for the two accounts, an amount that, from a budget perspective, will be needed to keep the SMI program solvent for the next 75 years. From the trust fund perspective, however, the present values of total revenues and total expenditures for the SMI Program are roughly equal due to the annual adjustment of revenue from other Government accounts to meet program costs.⁸ For OASDI, projected revenues from the public fall short of total expenditures by \$7,947 billion⁹ in present value dollars, and, from the trust fund perspective, by \$5,407 billion.

From the Governmentwide perspective, the present value of the total resources needed for the Social Security and Medicare Programs over and above current-law funding sources (payroll taxes, benefit taxes, and premium payments from the public) is \$30,760 billion. From the trust fund perspective, which counts the trust funds (\$2,921 billion in present value) and the general revenue transfers to the SMI Program (\$20,130 billion in present value) as dedicated funding sources, additional resources needed to fund the programs are \$7,709 billion in present value.

⁷ The actuarial present value of estimated 75-year future expenditures in excess of estimated 75-year future revenue for Medicare Parts A, B, and D decreased from \$38,107 billion in 2009 to \$22,813 billion in 2010, a reduction of \$15,294 billion. As explained at the beginning of this section, the decrease is primarily attributable to provisions of ACA as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (the "Affordable Care Act" or ACA). The funding shortfall change by program is \$(11,088) billion for Part A, \$(4,264) billion for Part B, and \$57 billion for Part D.

⁸ The SMI Trust Fund has \$77 billion of existing assets.

⁹ For 2010, the actuarial present value of estimated future expenditures in excess of estimated future revenue, increased from \$7,677 billion in 2009 to \$7,947 billion in 2010. This increase is primarily attributable to the inclusion of an additional year for the Social Security Program in the projection period and valuing the shortfall in 2010 present value dollars rather than 2009 present value dollars, and the increase in taxable payroll that is expected to come about because of the new tax on high-cost health plans scheduled to go into effect starting in 2018 increase employer incentives for paying compensation as earnings subject to payroll tax rather than as untaxed health benefits. There were other changes to economic and demographic assumptions, and to projection methods, that were largely offsetting in their effect on the Social Security Program's projections.

Table 5
Present Values of Costs Less Revenues of 75-Year Open-Group Obligations
HI, SMI, and OASDI

(In billions of dollars, as of January 1, 2010)

	HI	SMI		OASDI	Total
		Part B	Part D		
Revenues from the public:					
Taxes.....	14,408	-	-	40,118	54,526
Premiums, State transfers.....		4,836	2,486		7,322
Total.....	14,408	4,836	2,486	40,118	61,848
Total costs to the public.....	17,090	17,737	9,715	48,065	92,607
Net results — budget perspective*					
.....	2,682	12,901	7,229	7,947	30,760
Revenues from other					
Government accounts.....	-	12,901	7,229	-	20,130
Trust fund balance as of					
1/1/2010.....	304	76	1	2,540	2,921
Net results — trust fund perspective*					
.....	<u>2,379</u>	<u>(76)</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>5,407</u>	<u>7,709</u>

*Net results are computed as costs less revenues.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: 2010 OASDI and Medicare Trustees' Reports.

Infinite Horizon

The 75-year horizon represented in Table 5 is consistent with the primary focus of the Social Security and Medicare Trustees' Reports. For the OASDI Program, for example, an additional \$7.9 trillion in present value will be needed above currently scheduled taxes to pay for scheduled benefits (\$5.4 trillion from the trust fund perspective). Yet, a 75-year projection is not a complete representation of all future financial flows through the infinite horizon. For example, when calculating unfunded obligations, a 75-year horizon includes revenue from some future workers but only a fraction of their future benefits. In order to provide a more complete estimate of the long-run unfunded obligations of the programs, estimates can be extended to the infinite horizon. The open-group infinite horizon net obligation is the present value of all expected future program outlays less the present value of all expected future program tax and premium revenues. Such a measure is provided in Table 6 for the three trust funds represented in Table 5.

From the budget or Governmentwide perspective, the values in line 1 plus the values in line 4 of Table 6 represent the value of resources needed to finance each of the programs into the infinite future. The sums are shown in the last line of the table (also equivalent to adding the values in the second and fifth lines). The total resources needed for all the programs sums to \$77.9 trillion in present value terms. This need can be satisfied only through increased borrowing, higher taxes, reduced program spending, or some combination.

The second line shows the value of the trust fund at the beginning of 2010. For the HI and OASDI Programs this represents, from the trust fund perspective, the extent to which the programs are funded. From that perspective, when the trust fund is subtracted, an additional \$6.3 trillion and \$16.2 trillion, respectively, are needed to sustain the programs into the infinite future. As described above, from the trust fund perspective, the SMI Program is fully funded, from a Governmentwide basis, the substantial gap that exists between premiums and State transfer revenue and program expenditures in the SMI Program (\$31.5 trillion and \$21 trillion) represents future general revenue obligations of the Federal budget.

In comparison to the analogous 75-year number in Table 5, extending the calculations beyond 2084, captures the full lifetime benefits, and taxes and premiums of all current and future participants. The shorter horizon understates financial needs by capturing relatively more of the revenues from current and future workers and not capturing all of the benefits that are scheduled to be paid to them.

Table 6
Present Values of Costs Less Tax, Premium and State Transfer Revenue
through the Infinite Horizon, HI, SMI, OASDI

(In trillions of dollars as of January 1, 2010)

	HI	SMI		OASDI	Total
		Part B	Part D		
Present value of future costs less future taxes, premiums, and State transfers for current participants	7.2	10.6	5.2	20.0	43.0
Less current trust fund balance	0.3	0.1	-	2.5	2.9
Equals net obligations for past and current participants	6.9	10.5	5.2	17.5	40.1
Plus net obligations for future participants	(0.6)	21.0	15.8	(1.3)	34.9
Equals net obligations through the infinite future for all participants	<u>6.3</u>	<u>31.5</u>	<u>21.0</u>	<u>16.2</u>	<u>75.0</u>
Present values of future costs less the present values of future income over the infinite horizon	<u>6.6</u>	<u>31.6</u>	<u>21.0</u>	<u>18.7</u>	<u>77.9</u>

Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: 2010 OASDI and Medicare Trustees' Reports.

Railroad Retirement, Black Lung, and Unemployment Insurance

Railroad Retirement

The Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) was created in the 1930s to establish a retirement benefit program for the nation's railroad workers. As the Social Security Program legislated in 1935 would not give railroad workers credit for service performed prior to 1937, legislation was enacted in 1934, 1935, and 1937 (collectively the Railroad Retirement Acts of the 1930s) to establish a railroad retirement program separate from the Social Security Program.

Railroad retirement pays full retirement annuities at age 60 to railroad workers with 30 years of service. The program pays disability annuities based on total or occupational disability. It also pays annuities to spouses, divorced spouses, widow(er)s, remarried widow(er)s, surviving divorced spouses, children, and parents of deceased railroad workers. Medicare covers qualified railroad retirement beneficiaries in the same way as it does Social Security beneficiaries.

Payroll taxes paid by railroad employers and their employees provide a primary source of income for the Railroad Retirement and Survivors' Benefit Program. By law, railroad retirement taxes are coordinated with Social Security taxes. Employees and employers pay tier I taxes at the same rate as Social Security taxes. Tier II taxes finance railroad retirement benefit payments that are higher than Social Security levels.

Other sources of program income include: financial interchanges with the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, earnings on investments, Federal income taxes on railroad retirement benefits, and appropriations (provided after 1974 as part of a phase out of certain vested dual benefits). See Note 26—Social Insurance, for additional information on railroad retirement program financing.

The RRSIA liberalized benefits for 30-year service employees and their spouses, eliminated a cap on monthly benefits for retirement and disability benefits, lowered minimum service requirements from 10 to 5 years, and provided for increased benefits for widow(er)s. Per the RRSIA, amounts in the Railroad Retirement Account and the SSEB Account that are not needed to pay current benefits and administrative expenses are transferred to the NRRIT whose sole purpose is to manage and invest railroad retirement assets. NRRIT's Board of Trustees is empowered to invest trust assets in nongovernmental assets, such as equities and debt, as well as, in Government securities. Prior to RRSIA, all investments were limited to Government securities.

Since its inception, NRRIT has received \$21.3 billion from RRB (including \$19.2 billion in fiscal year 2003, pursuant to RRSIA) and returned \$9.9 billion. During fiscal year 2010, the NRRIT made net transfers of \$2.0 billion to the RRB to pay retirement benefits. Administrative expenses of the trust are paid out of trust assets. The balance as of September 30, 2010, and 2009, of non-Federal securities and investments of the NRRIT are disclosed in Note 9—Securities and Investments.


Cashflow Projections

Economic and Demographic Assumptions. The economic and demographic assumptions used for the most recent set of projections are shown in the "Railroad Retirement" section of Note 26—Social Insurance.

Nominal Income and Expenditures. Chart 11 shows, in nominal dollars, estimated railroad retirement income (excluding interest and financial interchange income) and expenditures for the period 2010-2084 based on the intermediate set of assumptions used in the RRB's actuarial evaluation of the program. The estimates are for the open-group population, which includes all persons projected to participate in the Railroad Retirement Program as railroad workers or beneficiaries during the period. Thus, the estimates include payments from, and on behalf of, those who are projected to be employed by the railroads during the period as well as those already employed at the beginning of the period. They also include expenditures made to, and on behalf of, such workers during that period.

**Chart 11—Estimated Railroad Retirement Income
(Excluding Interest and Financial Interchange Income) and Expenditures
2010-2084**


(In billions of nominal dollars)



As Chart 11 shows, expenditures are expected to exceed tax income for the entire projection period. The imbalances continue to widen until about 2023, decrease slightly for next 7 years, and then begin to grow steadily after 2030.

Income and Expenditures as a Percent of Taxable Payroll. Chart 12 shows estimated expenditures and income as a percent of tier II taxable payroll. The imbalances grow until 2020 but then begin to decrease somewhat steadily as expenditures fall. Tax rates begin to decline after 2035, stabilizing in 2071 and after. Compared to last year, projected tax rates are lower, on average. The tier II tax rate is determined from a tax rate table based on the average account benefit ratio.

**Chart 12—Estimated Railroad Retirement Income
(Excluding Interest and Financial Interchange Income) and Expenditures
as a Percent of Tier II Taxable Payroll
2010-2084**



Source: Railroad Retirement Board

Calendar Year

Sensitivity Analysis. Actual future income from railroad payroll taxes and other sources and actual future expenditures for scheduled benefits and administrative expenses will depend upon a large number of factors as mentioned above. Two crucial assumptions are employment growth and the interest rate. Table 7 shows the sensitivity of the shortfall in the Railroad Retirement Program to variations in these two assumptions. The low-cost employment scenario has a 5.2 percent smaller shortfall of income to expenditures, and the high-cost scenario has a 4.8 percent higher shortfall. A higher discount rate reduces future values relative to a lower rate. As seen in the table, the shortfall is 29.4 percent lower if the interest rate is 11 percent rather than 7.5 percent and 78.7 percent higher when the interest rate is 4 percent rather than 7.5 percent.

Table 7
Present Values of Railroad Retirement Expenditures in Excess of Income
Under Various Employment and Interest Rate Assumptions, 2010-2084

(Dollar values in billions; values of assumptions shown in parentheses)

Assumption	Low	Middle	High
Employment ¹	97.2 (-0.5%)	102.5 (-2.0%)	107.4 (-3.5%)
Interest rate.....	72.4 (11%)	102.5 (7.5%)	183.2 (4.0%)

¹ The low and middle employment scenarios have passenger service employment remaining at 43,000 workers per year and the remaining employment base declining at 0.5 percent and 2.0 percent, respectively, for the next 23 years. The high-cost scenario has passenger service employment declining by 500 per workers per year until a level of 35,000 is reached with the remaining employment base declining by 3.5 percent per year for 25 years, at a reducing rate over the next 25 years, and remaining level thereafter.

Source: Railroad Retirement Board.

Sustainability of Railroad Retirement

Table 8 shows the magnitudes of the primary expenditures and sources of financing for the Railroad Retirement Program computed on an open-group basis for the next 75 years and expressed in present values as of January 1, 2010. The data are consistent with the Statements of Social Insurance.

From a Governmentwide perspective, revenues are expected to fall short of expenditures by approximately \$102.5 billion, which represents the present value of resources needed to sustain the Railroad Retirement Program. From a trust fund perspective, when the trust fund balance and the financial interchange and transfers are included, the combined balance of the NRRIT, the Railroad Retirement Account, and the SSEB Account show a slight surplus.

Table 8
Present Values of 75-Year Projections of Revenues and Expenditures for the Railroad Retirement Program^{1, 2}

(In billions of present-value dollars as of January 1, 2010)

Estimated future income (excluding interest) ³ received from or on behalf of:	
Current participants who have attained retirement age.....	5.4
Current participants not yet having attained retirement age.....	46.8
Those expected to become participants.....	65.5
All participants.....	<u>117.7</u>
Estimated future expenditures: ⁴	
Current participants who have attained retirement age.....	104.8
Current participants not yet having attained retirement age.....	88.0
Those expected to become participants.....	27.4
All participants.....	<u>220.2</u>
Net obligations from budget perspective (expenditures less income)	102.5
Railroad retirement program assets (mostly investments stated at market) ⁵	24.9
Financial interchange from Social Security Trust.....	<u>78.7</u>
Net obligations from trust fund perspective	<u><u>(1.1)</u></u>

¹ Represents combined values for the Railroad Retirement Account, SSEB Account, and NRRIT, based on middle employment assumption.

² The data used reflect the provisions of RRSIA of 2001.

³ Future income (excluding interest) includes tier I taxes, tier II taxes, and income taxes on benefits.

⁴ Future expenditures include benefits and administrative expenditures.

⁵ The value of the fund reflects the 7.5 percent interest rate assumption. The RRB uses the relatively high rate due to investments in private securities.

Note: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding. Employee and beneficiary status are determined as of 1/1/2009 whereas present values are as of 1/1/2010.

Black Lung

The Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 created the Black Lung Disability Benefit Program to provide compensation, medical, and survivor benefits for eligible coal miners who are totally disabled due to pneumoconiosis (black lung disease) arising out of their coal mine employment. The survivor benefits are available only for eligible survivors of coal miners who died due to pneumoconiosis. DOL operates the Black Lung Disability Benefit Program. The BLDTF provides benefit payments to eligible coal miners totally disabled by pneumoconiosis and to eligible survivors when no responsible mine operator can be assigned the liability. The beneficiary population is a nearly closed universe in which attrition by death exceeds new entrants by a ratio of more than ten to one.

Excise taxes on coal mine operators, based on the sale of coal, are the primary source of financing black lung disability payments and related administrative costs. The Black Lung Benefits Revenue Act provided for repayable advances to the BLDTF from the General Fund of the Treasury, in the event that BLDTF resources were not adequate to meet program obligations. Prior to legislation enacted in 2008 that allowed for the restructuring of BLDTF debt, the trust fund had accumulated large liabilities from significant and growing shortfalls of excise taxes relative to benefit payments and interest expenses.

The Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-343), enacted on October 3, 2008, contained several provisions that significantly improved the BLDTF’s financial position, including:

- Continuation of a previously-enacted increase in coal excise tax rates for an additional 5 years, through December 2018;
- Provision for the restructuring of BLDTF debt by refinancing the outstanding repayable advances with proceeds from issuing new debt instruments with lower interest rates; and
- A one-time appropriation that significantly reduced the outstanding debt of the BLDTF.


The Act also allowed that any debt issued by the BLDTF subsequent to the refinancing may be used to make benefit payments, other authorized expenditures, or to repay debt and interest from the initial refinancing. All debt issued by the BLDTF was effected as borrowing from the Treasury’s Bureau of the Public Debt.

On September 30, 2010, total liabilities of the BLDTF exceeded assets by \$6.2 billion. Prior to the enactment of P.L. 110-343, this shortfall was funded by repayable advances to the BLDTF, which are repayable with interest. Pursuant to P.L. 110-343, any shortfall will be financed with debt instruments similar in form to zero-coupon bonds.

From the budget or consolidated financial perspective, Chart 13 shows projected black lung expenditures (excluding interest) and excise tax collections for the period 2011-2040. The significant assumptions used in the most recent set of projections are shown in the “Black Lung” section of Note 26—Social Insurance. The projected decrease in cash inflows in the year 2019 and, thereafter, is the result of a scheduled reduction in the tax rate on the sale of coal. This rate reduction is projected to result in a 36 percent decrease in the amount of excise taxes collected between the years 2018 and 2019.

**Chart 13—Estimated Black Lung Income and Expenditures (Excluding Interest)
2011-2040**

(In millions of nominal dollars)



Source: Department of Labor

Table 9
Present Values of 30-Year Projections of Expenditures and Revenues
for the Black Lung Disability Benefit Program

(In billions of present value dollars, as of September 30, 2010)

Projected future expenditures	2.9
Projected future tax income	8.1
Net obligations from budget perspective (expenditures less income)	(5.2)
Accumulated balance due general fund	6.2
Net obligations from trust fund perspective	1.0

Note: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: Department of Labor projections and Treasury Department calculations.

Table 9 shows present values of 30-year projections of expenditures and revenues for the Black Lung Disability Benefit Program computed as of September 30, 2010. Cashflows were discounted using the rates on the debt in the BLDTF. From a Governmentwide (budget) perspective, the present value of expenditures is expected to be less than the present value of income by \$5.2 billion (a surplus). From a trust fund perspective, a large balance (\$6.2 billion) is owed to the General Fund. From that perspective, when that accumulated balance is combined with the cashflow surplus, the program has a shortfall of \$1.0 billion in present value dollars. This compares to a shortfall of \$0.6 billion reported in last year's *Financial Report*.

Unemployment Insurance

The Unemployment Insurance Program was created in 1935 to provide temporary partial wage replacement to workers who lost their jobs. The program is administered through a unique system of Federal and State partnerships established in Federal law but administered through conforming State laws by State agencies. DOL interprets and enforces Federal law requirements and provides broad policy guidance and program direction, while program details such as benefit eligibility, duration, and amount of benefits are established through individual State unemployment insurance statutes and administered through State unemployment insurance agencies.

The program is financed through the collection of Federal and State unemployment taxes that are credited to the UTF and reported as Federal tax revenue. The fund was established to account for the receipt, investment, and disbursement of unemployment taxes. Federal unemployment taxes are used to pay for Federal and State administration of the Unemployment Insurance Program, veterans' employment services, State employment services, and the Federal share of extended unemployment insurance benefits. Federal unemployment taxes are also used to maintain a loan account within the UTF, from which insolvent State accounts may borrow funds to pay unemployment insurance benefits.

Chart 14 shows the projected cash contributions and expenditures over the next 10 years under expected economic conditions (described below). The significant assumptions used in the projections include total unemployment rates, civilian labor force levels, percent of unemployed receiving benefits, total wages, distribution of benefit payments by State, State tax rate structures, State taxable wage bases, and interest rates on UTF investments. These projections, excluding interest earnings, indicate a negative net cashflow until 2012 followed by positive net cashflow for the remainder of the projection period.

The Worker, Homeownership, and Business Assistance Act of 2009, was enacted on November 6, 2009. The Act extended unemployment benefits to eligible recipients up to 14 additional weeks in all States. It also extended a total of up to 20 additional weeks in States with unemployment of 8.5 percent or greater. The Act also amended section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the 0.2 percent Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA) surtax on covered employers through June 30, 2011. No benefits are payable for weeks of unemployment commencing before the date of enactment of the Act.

P.L. 111-205 Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2010, enacted on July 22, 2010, amends the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 2008 with respect to the state-established individual emergency unemployment compensation account (EUCA) and to apply to claims for Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC) payments the terms and conditions of state unemployment compensation law relating to availability of work, active search for work, and refusal to accept work. The Act extends the final dates for entering a federal-state agreement under the EUC program through November 30, 2010. The Act also postpones the termination of the program until April 30, 2011, and amends the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act to extend until December 1, 2010, and requires Federal payments to states cover 100 percent of EUC.

**Chart 14—Estimated Unemployment Trust Fund Cashflow
Using Expected Economic Conditions
2011-2020**

(In billions of nominal dollars)




Table 10 shows present values of 10-year projections of revenues and expenditures for the Unemployment Insurance Program using a discount rate of 4.25 percent, the average of the interest rates underlying the 10-year projections. Three sets of numbers are presented in order to show the effects of varying economic conditions as reflected in different assumptions about the unemployment rate. For expected economic conditions, the estimates are based on an unemployment rate of 9.27 percent during fiscal year 2011, decreasing to below 6 percent in fiscal year

2015 and thereafter. Under Recovery Scenario One (decreasing unemployment rates), the unemployment rate decreases from 8.3 percent in fiscal year 2011 to 5.2 percent after fiscal year 2016. Under Recovery Scenario Two (higher than expected unemployment), the unemployment rate is assumed to reach 10.38 percent in fiscal year 2011 decreasing to below 6 percent in fiscal year 2016 and thereafter.

Each scenario uses an open-group that includes current and future participants of the Unemployment Insurance Program. Table 10 shows the impact on the UTF projections of varying projected unemployment rates. For example, in Recovery Scenario Two, while tax income is projected to increase as higher layoffs result in higher employer taxes, benefit outlays increase even more. From the Governmentwide (budget) perspective, under expected conditions, the present value of income exceeds the present value of expenditures by \$21.8 billion. From the same perspective, under Recovery Scenario Two, the present value of expenditures exceeds the present value of income by \$1.6 billion. From a trust fund perspective, the program has a (\$15.4) billion balance. When combined with the present value of net cash income under expected economic conditions, the program has a surplus of \$6.4 billion.

Table 10
Present Values of 10-Year Projections of Expenditures and Revenues for
Unemployment Insurance Under Three Alternative Scenarios
for Economic Conditions

(In billions of present value dollars, as of September 30, 2010)

	Economic Conditions		
	Expected	Recovery Scenario One	Recovery Scenario Two
Projected future expenditures	556.1	534.9	602.5
Projected future cash income	577.9	568.9	600.9
Net obligations from budget perspective (expenditures less income)	(21.8)	(34.0)	1.6
Trust fund assets	(15.4)	(15.4)	(15.4)
Net obligations from trust fund perspective ¹	(6.4)	(18.5)	17.1

¹ Net obligations from the trust fund perspective equals net obligations from the budget perspective minus trust fund assets. The positive values in this line are indicative of deficits.

Note: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.


Source: Department of Labor.

Unemployment Trust Fund Solvency

Each State’s accumulated UTF net assets or reserve balance should provide a defined level of benefit payments over a defined period. To be minimally solvent, a State’s reserve balance should provide for one year’s projected benefit payment needs based on the highest levels of benefit payments experienced by the State over the last 20 years. A ratio of 1.0 or greater indicates a state is minimally solvent. States below this level are vulnerable to exhausting their funds in a recession. States exhausting their reserve balance borrow funds from the Federal Unemployment Account (FUA) to make benefit payments. During fiscal year 2010, the balances in the FUA were depleted and the FUA borrowed from the Treasury General Fund.

Chart 15 presents the State by State results of this analysis as of September 30, 2010. As the chart illustrates, 44 state funds were below the minimal solvency ratio of 1.0 at September 30, 2010.

Chart 15—Unemployment Trust Fund Solvency as of September 30, 2010



Deferred Maintenance

Deferred maintenance is the estimated cost to bring Government-owned property, plant, and equipment to an acceptable condition, resulting from not performing maintenance on a timely basis. Deferred maintenance excludes the cost of expanding the capacity of assets or upgrading them to serve needs different from those originally intended. The consequences of not performing regular maintenance could include increased safety hazards, poor service to the public, higher costs in the future, and inefficient operations. Estimated deferred maintenance costs are not accrued in the Statements of Net Cost or recognized as a liability on the Balance Sheets.

The amounts disclosed for deferred maintenance are allowed to be measured using one of the following three methods:

- Condition assessment surveys are periodic inspections of the Government-owned property to determine the current condition and estimated cost to bring the property to an acceptable condition.
- Life-cycle cost forecast is an acquisition or procurement technique that considers operation, maintenance, and other costs in addition to the acquisition cost of assets.
- Management analysis method is founded on inflation-adjusted reductions in maintenance funding since the base year.

The amounts disclosed in the table below have all been measured using the condition assessment survey method. The standards for acceptable operating condition and the changes in these standards and changes in asset condition vary widely between the Federal entities.

Some deferred maintenance has been deemed critical. Such amounts and conditions are defined by the individual agencies with responsibility for the safekeeping of these assets. The critical maintenance amount is not included in the low or high estimates amounts and is reported separately. Low and high estimates are based on the materiality of the estimated cost of returning the asset to the acceptable condition versus the total value of the corresponding asset.

	Deferred Maintenance as of September 30					
	Deferred Maintenance Cost Range				Critical Maintenance	
	Low Estimate		High Estimate			
(In billions of dollars)	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009
Asset category:						
Buildings, structures and facilities	129.7	93.5	134.8	98.7	95.0	2.4
Furniture, fixtures and equipment	4.7	0.3	4.7	0.3	4.5	0.2
Other general property, plant, and equipment	5.3	12.9	5.3	12.9	4.9	0.2
Heritage assets.....	1.9	10.0	1.9	10.0	1.6	0.1
Stewardship land	3.5	3.1	5.2	4.5		-
Total deferred maintenance	145.1	119.8	151.9	126.4	106.0	2.9

The agencies material to property, plant, and equipment are the DOD, DOE, DOI, DHS, GSA, TVA, and USPS. These agencies comprise 91 percent of the Government’s total reported property, plant, and equipment cost of \$1,640.5 billion as of September 30, 2010.

Please refer to the individual financial statements of DOD, DOE, DOI, and DHS for detailed significant information on deferred maintenance, including the standards used for acceptable operating condition and changes in asset condition. As of the end of fiscal year 2010, GSA, TVA, and USPS had no material amounts of deferred maintenance cost.

Unexpended Budget Balances

The Federal budget and budget process largely use obligational accounting—a distinct administrative control through which Federal Agencies control, monitor, and report on the status of funds at their disposal. Unexpended budget balances consist of the unobligated and obligated, but unliquidated, budget balances.

Unobligated budget balances, including amounts for trust funds, are the cumulative amount of budget balances that are not obligated and that remain available for obligation. In 1-year accounts, the unobligated balance is not available for new obligations after the end of the fiscal year. In multiyear accounts, the unobligated balance may be carried forward and remains available for obligation for the period specified. In no-year accounts, the unobligated balance is carried forward until specifically rescinded by law or the head of the agency concerned determines that the purposes for which it was provided have been accomplished and disbursements have not been made against the appropriation for 2 consecutive years. The total unobligated budget balances as of September 30, 2009, and 2008, are \$1,012.7 billion and \$688.9 billion, respectively.

Obligated budget balances are the cumulative budget balances that have been obligated but not liquidated. The obligated balance can be carried forward for a maximum of 5 years after the appropriation has expired. The total obligated budget balances as of September 30, 2009, and 2008, are \$1,418.1 billion and \$1,104.4 billion, respectively.

The President's Budget is located at www.whitehouse.gov/omb; unexpended budget balances are shown in the supporting documentation section under "Balances of Budget Authority." The President's Fiscal Year 2011 Budget (issued on February 1, 2010), includes the actual amounts unobligated and obligated amounts for fiscal year 2009. The President's Budget with fiscal year 2010 actual amounts is expected to be published in February 2011.

Tax Burden

The Internal Revenue Code provides for progressive tax rates, whereby higher incomes are generally subject to higher tax rates. The following tables present the latest available information on income tax and related income, deductions, and credit for individuals by income level and for corporations by size of assets.

Individual Income Tax Liability for Tax Year 2008

Adjusted Gross Income (AGI)	Number of Taxable Returns (In thousands)	AGI (In millions of dollars)	Total Income Tax (In millions of dollars)	Average AGI per Return (In whole dollars)	Average Income Tax per Return (In whole dollars)	Income Tax as a Percentage of AGI
Under \$15,000	37,970	104,025	2,227	2,740	59	2.1%
\$15,000 under \$30,000	29,687	655,035	18,958	22,065	639	2.9%
\$30,000 under \$50,000	25,641	1,002,998	56,953	39,117	2,221	5.7%
\$50,000 under \$100,000	30,926	2,193,691	184,554	70,934	5,968	8.4%
\$100,000 under \$200,000	13,851	1,845,103	232,270	133,211	16,769	12.6%
\$200,000 under \$500,000	3,477	993,427	193,700	285,714	55,709	19.5%
\$500,000 or more	899	1,468,581	342,919	1,663,572	381,445	23.4%
Total	<u>142,451</u>	<u>8,262,860</u>	<u>1,031,581</u>			

Corporation Income Tax Liability for Tax Year 2007

Total Assets (In thousands of dollars)	Income Subject to Tax (In millions of dollars)	Total Income Tax after Credits (In millions of dollars)	Percentage of Income Tax after Credits to Taxable Income
Zero assets	26,280	8,593	32.7%
\$1 under \$500	8,205	1,582	19.3%
\$500 under \$1,000	4,292	1,017	23.7%
\$1,000 under \$5,000	15,577	4,628	29.7%
\$5,000 under \$10,000	10,008	3,299	33.0%
\$10,000 under \$25,000	16,650	5,547	33.3%
\$25,000 under \$50,000	13,139	4,347	33.1%
\$50,000 under \$100,000	16,621	5,392	32.4%
\$100,000 under \$250,000	27,977	9,100	32.5%
\$250,000 under \$500,000	35,046	10,876	31.0%
\$500,000 under \$2,500,000	145,944	44,586	30.6%
\$2,500,000 or more	928,546	232,408	25.0%
Total	<u>1,248,285</u>	<u>331,375</u>	<u>26.5%</u>

Tax Gap

The tax gap is the difference between what taxpayers should pay and what they actually pay due to not filing tax returns, not paying their reported tax liability on time, or failing to report their correct tax liability. The tax gap, about \$345.0 billion based on updated fiscal year 2001 estimates, represents the amount of noncompliance with the tax laws. Underreporting of income tax, employment taxes, and other taxes represents 82 percent of the tax gap. The IRS remains committed to finding ways to increase compliance and reduce the tax gap, while minimizing the burden on the vast majority of taxpayers who pay their taxes accurately and on time.

The tax gap is the aggregate amount of tax (i.e., excluding interest and penalties) that is imposed by the tax laws for any given tax year but is not paid voluntarily and timely. The tax gap arises from three types of noncompliance: not filing required tax returns on time or at all (the nonfiling gap), underreporting the correct amount of tax on timely-filed returns (the underreporting gap), and not paying on time the full amount reported on timely-filed returns (the underpayment gap). Of these three components, only the underpayment gap is observed; the nonfiling gap and the underreporting gap must be estimated. Each instance of noncompliance by a taxpayer contributes to the tax gap, whether or not the IRS detects it, and whether or not the taxpayer is even aware of the noncompliance. Obviously, some of the tax gap arises from intentional (willful) noncompliance, and some of it arises from unintentional mistakes.

The collection gap is the cumulative amount of assessed tax, penalties, and interest that has been assessed over many years, but has not been paid by a certain point in time and which the IRS expects to remain uncollectible. In essence, it represents the difference between the total balance of unpaid assessments and the net taxes receivable reported on the IRS' balance sheet. The tax gap and the collection gap are related and overlapping concepts, but they have significant differences. The collection gap is a cumulative balance sheet concept for a particular point in time, while the tax gap is like an income statement item for a single year. Moreover, the tax gap estimates include all noncompliance, while the collection gap includes only amounts that have been assessed (a small portion of all noncompliance).

Other Claims for Refunds

Management has estimated amounts that may be paid out as other claims for tax refunds. This estimate represents an amount (principal and interest) that may be paid for claims pending judicial review by the Federal courts or, internally, by appeals. The total estimated payout (including principal and interest) for claims pending judicial review by the Federal courts is \$8.8 billion and \$4.7 billion for fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively. For those under appeal, the estimated payout is \$8.0 billion and \$6.3 billion for fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively. There are also unasserted claims for refunds of certain excise taxes. Although these refund claims have been deemed to be probable, they do not meet the criteria in SFFAS No. 5 for reporting the amounts in the balance sheets or for disclosure in the Notes to the Financial Statements. However, they meet the criteria in SFFAS No. 7 for inclusion as supplemental information. To the extent judgments against the Government for these claims prompt other similarly situated taxpayers to file similar refund claims; these amounts could become significantly greater.

Tax Assessments

The Government is authorized and required to make inquiries, determinations, and assessments of all taxes which have not been duly paid. Unpaid assessments result from taxpayers filing returns without sufficient payment, as well as enforcement programs such as examination, under-reporter, substitute for return and combined annual wage reporting. Assessments with little or no future collection potential are called write-offs. Although compliance assessments and write-offs are not considered receivables under Federal accounting standards, they represent legally enforceable claims of the Government. There is, however, a significant difference in the collection potential between compliance assessments and receivables.

Compliance assessments and pre-assessment work in process are \$95.4 billion and \$77.2 billion for fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively. The amount of allowance for uncollectible amounts pertaining to compliance assessments cannot be reasonably estimated, and thus the net realizable value of the value of the pre-assessment work-in-process cannot be determined. The amount of assessments that agencies have statutory authority to collect at the end of the period, but have been written off and excluded from accounts receivable are \$99.0 billion and \$105.4 billion for fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively.

Risk Assumed

Risk assumed information is important for all Federal insurance and guarantee programs, except social insurance, life insurance and loan guarantee programs. Risk assumed is generally measured by the present value of unpaid expected losses net of associated premiums, based on the risk inherent in the insurance or guarantee coverage in force. In addition to the liability for unpaid insurance claims included in Note 18—Insurance and Guarantee Program Liabilities, for events that have already occurred, the Government is also required to report as supplementary information risk assumed amounts and the periodic changes in those amounts.

The assessments of losses expected based on the risk assumed are based on actuarial or financial methods that include information and assumptions applicable to the economic, legal and policy environment in force at the time the assessments are made. Management has estimated the loss amounts based on the risk assumed as well as the periodic changes.

Please refer to the individual financial statements of the PBGC, USDA and NCUA for further detailed information, including information as to the indicators of the range of uncertainty around expected estimates, including indicators of the sensitivity of the estimates to changes in major assumptions.

Risk Assumed Information as of September 30

(In billions of dollars)

	2010	2009
Present value of unpaid expected losses, net of associated premiums:		
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	190.0	168.2
National Credit Union Administration	7.5	5.9
Department of Agriculture	7.5	8.9
All other	2.0	1.6
Total	<u>207.0</u>	<u>184.6</u>
Periodic changes in risk assumed amounts:		
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	21.8	121.4
National Credit Union Administration	1.6	5.7
Department of Agriculture	(1.4)	(1.0)
All other	0.4	0.4
Total	<u>22.4</u>	<u>126.5</u>

Unmatched Transactions and Balances

(In millions of dollars)	Fiscal Year 2010	Fiscal Year 2009
Change in intra-Governmental unmatched balances:		
Debt/investment	1,369.9	(1,202.7)
Interest payable/receivable	3.6	13.6
Loans payable/receivable	6,399.2	(6,396.5)
Benefit program contributions payable/receivable	110.2	(25.7)
Accounts payable/receivable	(4,111.7)	4,380.6
Advances from/to others and deferred credits/prepayments	(953.8)	1,121.7
Transfers payable/receivable	80.6	(61.2)
	2,898.0	(2,170.2)
Unmatched intra-Governmental transactions:		
Federal securities interest revenue/expense—investment exchange	1.3	40.1
Borrowings interest revenue/expense—exchange	(26.3)	55.9
Borrowings gains/losses	(1.7)	125.3
Nonexpenditure transfers-in/out	1,683.5	234.0
Expenditure transfers-in/out	649.9	20,357.0
Transfers-in/out without reimbursement	(752.8)	10,221.6
Imputed financing source/cost	(15.4)	(15.0)
Benefit program revenue/cost	(1,448.3)	(1,240.2)
	90.2	29,778.7
General fund transactions:		
Fund balance with Treasury	(4,697.6)	98,104.3
Appropriations of unavailable special or trust fund receipts— transfers out/in	(976.7)	94.4
Appropriations received/warrants	22,060.4	(5,454.1)
Other taxes and receipts/trust fund warrants	2,235.1	3,753.3
Custodial and non-entity collections transferred out/in	(713,283.8)	(2,528,596.1)
Other general fund transactions	693,163.0	2,424,135.8
	(1,499.6)	(7,962.4)
Net intra-agency reporting errors and restatements	(719.2)	(2,229.2)
Unmatched transactions and balances, net	769.4	17,416.9

() Parentheses indicate a decrease to Net Position.

The Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position includes an amount for unmatched transactions and balances that result from the consolidation of Federal reporting entities. Transactions between Federal entities must be eliminated in consolidation to calculate the financial position of the U.S. Government. Many of the amounts included in the table represent intragovernmental activity and balances that differed between Federal agency trading partners and often totaled significantly more in the absolute than the net amounts shown. In addition, included in the “General Fund Transactions” section are certain intragovernmental accounts, primarily related to agency unreconciled transactions with the General Fund, totaling hundreds of billions of dollars. The table also reflects other consolidating adjustments and other adjustments that contributed to the unmatched transactions and balances amount.

Unmatched transactions and balances between Federal entities impact not only in the period in which differences originate but also in the periods where differences are reconciled. As a result, it would not be proper to conclude that increases or decreases in the unmatched amounts shown in the “Unmatched Transactions and Balances” table reflect improvements or deteriorations in the Government’s ability to reconcile intragovernmental transactions. The Federal community considers the identification and accurate reporting of intragovernmental activity a priority.

This page is intentionally blank.

United States Government Stewardship Information (Unaudited) for the Years Ended September 30, 2010, and 2009

Stewardship Investments

Stewardship investments focus on Government programs aimed at providing long-term benefits by improving the Nation's productivity and enhancing economic growth. These investments can be provided through direct Federal spending or grants to State and local governments for certain education and training programs, research and development, and federally financed but not Federally-owned property, such as bridges and roads. When incurred, these investments are included as expenses in determining the net cost of operations. Stewardship investments for the current year and for the immediately preceding 4 years are shown below in Table 11.

Table 11
Stewardship Investments
for the Years Ended September 30

(In billions of dollars)	Fiscal Year 2010	Fiscal Year 2009	Fiscal Year 2008	Fiscal Year 2007	Fiscal Year 2006
Investments in non-Federal physical property	66.7	65.1	57.8	56.2	54.4
Investments in human capital	122.3	60.3	77.2	76.1	107.4
Research and development:					
Investments in basic research.....	31.5	27.4	27.6	26.5	25.2
Investments in applied research.....	26.2	19.1	21.4	22.2	21.7
Investments in development.....	77.3	101.0	79.2	66.3	52.1
Total investments.....	<u>324.0</u>	<u>272.9</u>	<u>263.2</u>	<u>247.3</u>	<u>260.8</u>

Non-Federal Physical Property

The Government makes grants and provides funds for the purchase, construction, and/or major renovation of State and local government physical properties. Cost for non-Federal physical property programs are included as expenses in the Statements of Net Cost and are reported as investments in Table 11. They are measured on the same accrual basis of accounting used in the *Financial Report* statements. DOT, HUD, and DOD had \$55.2 billion (83 percent), \$5.7 billion (9 percent), and \$2.1 billion (3 percent), respectively, of the total non-Federal physical property investments in fiscal year 2010 as shown in Table 11. Within DOT, the Federal Highway Administration invested \$41.5 billion during fiscal year 2010, primarily via reimbursement from the Highway Trust Fund, for States' construction costs of interstate and national highways. The States' contribution is 10 percent for the Interstate System and 20 percent for most other programs.

Human Capital

The Government runs several programs that invest in human capital. Those investments go toward increasing and maintaining a healthy economy by educating and training the general public. Costs do not include training expenses for Federal workers.

Education, DOL, and VA had \$99.5 billion (81 percent), \$7.7 billion (6 percent), and \$9.5 billion (8 percent), respectively, of the total human capital investments in fiscal year 2010 as shown in Table 11. In comparison over the past 5 years, Education had an increase in fiscal years 2006 and 2010, due to an increase in Federal Family Education Loan and Direct Loan subsidy re-estimates and subsidy transfers due to increased loan consolidation activity; while VA increased in fiscal year 2010 due to implementation of the Post 9/11 GI Bill. Education administers a wide variety of programs related to general public education and training programs that are intended to increase or maintain national economic productive capacity. The Office of Federal Student Aid administers need-based financial assistance programs for students pursuing postsecondary education and makes available federal grants, direct loans, and work-study funding to eligible undergraduate and graduate students.

The significant human capital programs administered by DOL relate to grants for job training and employment programs. The significant human capital programs administered by VA also relate to grants for job training and rehabilitation programs for veterans.

Research and Development

Federal investments in Research and Development (R&D) comprise those expenses for basic research, applied research, and development that are intended to increase or maintain national economic productive capacity or yield other future benefits.

- Investments in basic research are for systematic studies to gain knowledge or understanding of the fundamental aspects of phenomena and of observable facts without specific applications toward processes or products in mind.
- Investments in applied research are for systematic studies to gain knowledge or understanding necessary for determining the means by which a recognized and specific need may be met.
- Investments in development are the systematic use of the knowledge and understanding gained from research for the production of useful materials, devices, systems, or methods, including the design and development of prototypes and processes.

With regard to basic and applied research, HHS had \$19.1 billion (61 percent) and \$13.0 billion (50 percent), of the total basic and applied research investments, respectively, in fiscal year 2010 as shown in Table 11. HHS also had similar R&D investment amounts (and percentage contributions) in each of the preceding 4 years.

Within HHS, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) conducts almost all (98 percent) of the Department's basic and applied research. The NIH Research Program includes all aspects of the medical research continuum, including basic and disease-oriented research, observational and population-based research, behavioral research, and clinical research, including research to understand both health and disease states, to move laboratory findings into

medical applications, to assess new treatments or compare different treatment approaches, and health services research.

The NIH regards the expeditious transfer of the results of its medical research for further development and commercialization of products of immediate benefit to improved health as an important mandate.

With regard to development, the DOD and NASA had \$65.3 billion (84 percent) and \$9.1 billion (12 percent), respectively, of total development investments in fiscal year 2010, as shown in Table 11. Development is comprised of five stages: advanced technology development, advanced component development and prototypes, system development and demonstration, management support, and operational systems development. Major outputs of DOD development are:

- Hardware and software components, and complete weapon systems ready for operational and developmental testing and field use, and
- Weapon systems finalized for complete operational and developmental testing.

NASA development programs include activities to extend our knowledge of Earth, its space environment, and the universe, and to invest in new aeronautics and advanced space transportation technologies that support the development and application of technologies critical to the economic, scientific, and technical competitiveness of the United States. Some outcomes and future outcomes of this development are:

- The Earth Science Research Program improves the capability to document the global distribution of a range of important environmental parameters related to the Earth's atmosphere, hydrosphere, biosphere, cryosphere, and land surface; to understand the processes that drive and connect them; and to improve our capability to predict the future evolution of the Earth system, including climate, weather, and natural hazards.
- Earth Systematic Missions provide Earth observing satellites that contribute to the provision of long-term environmental data sets that can be used to study the evolution of the Earth system on a range of temporal scales. This information is used to analyze, model, and improve understanding of the Earth system.
- The Mars Exploration program has been developed to conduct a rigorous, incremental, discovery-driven exploration of Mars to determine the planet's physical, dynamic, and geological characteristics, investigate the Martian climate in the context of understanding habitability, and investigate whether Mars ever had the potential to develop and harbor any kind of life.
- The Cosmic Origins missions explore how the expanding universe grew into a grand, cosmic web of galaxies; how stars and planets formed within the galaxies; how stars created the heavy elements, such as carbon, that are essential for life. Major breakthroughs in our knowledge of the cosmos have already been made with the current suite of missions.

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix A: Significant Government Entities

This appendix lists the organizations and agencies encompassed in the reporting entity for this publication as well as some organizations excluded from the reporting entity. The reporting entity is a specifically defined group of agencies, principally cabinet departments and other agencies of the executive branch, as stated in the law and accounting guidance.

The determination as to which organizations and agencies will be included in the reporting entity is governed by Federal laws and is also based on guidance issued by the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board in their Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concept No. 2, Entity and Display, which provides criteria for determining what should be included in the reporting entity for a consolidated Governmentwide report. The Board is now considering more specific guidance on the reporting entity for this report.

There are a total of 149 organizations and agencies included in the Financial Report of the United States Government. The lists below describe three groups of entity/fund types that comprise the reporting entity for the *Financial Report* and include entities from all three branches of Government.

Twenty-Four Chief Financial Officer Act Agencies

Department of Agriculture www.usda.gov	Department of Transportation www.dot.gov
Department of Commerce www.doc.gov	Department of the Treasury www.ustreas.gov
Department of Defense www.defenselink.mil	Department of Veterans Affairs www.va.gov
Department of Education www.ed.gov	Environmental Protection Agency www.epa.gov
Department of Energy www.doe.gov	General Services Administration www.gsa.gov
Department of Health and Human Services www.hhs.gov	National Aeronautics and Space Administration www.nasa.gov
Department of Homeland Security www.dhs.gov	National Science Foundation www.nsf.gov
Department of Housing and Urban Development www.hud.gov	Office of Personnel Management www.opm.gov
Department of the Interior www.doi.gov	Small Business Administration www.sba.gov
Department of Justice www.usdoj.gov	Social Security Administration www.ssa.gov
Department of Labor www.dol.gov	U.S. Agency for International Development www.usaid.gov
Department of State www.state.gov	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission www.nrc.gov

Eleven Additional Significant Entities

Export-Import Bank of the United States
www.exim.gov

Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation
www.fcsic.gov

Federal Communications Commission
www.fcc.gov

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
www.fdic.gov

National Credit Union Administration
www.ncua.gov

Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
www.pbgc.gov

Railroad Retirement Board
www.rrb.gov

Securities and Exchange Commission
www.sec.gov

Smithsonian Institution
www.si.edu

Tennessee Valley Authority
www.tva.gov

U.S. Postal Service
www.usps.gov

One Hundred Fourteen Additional Entities/Funds

Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission
Administrative Conference of the United States
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
African Development Foundation
American Battle Monuments Commission
Antitrust Modernization Commission
Appalachian Regional Commission
Appalachian Regional Development Fund
Architect of the Capitol
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board
Armed Forces Retirement Home
Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation
Broadcasting Board of Governors
Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection
Central Intelligence Agency
Chemical Safety Hazard Investigation Board
Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad
Commission of Fine Arts
Commission on Civil Rights
Commission on International Religious Freedom
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
Commission on Weapons of Mass Destruction
Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severely Disabled
Commodity Futures Trading Commission
Congressional Budget Office
Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China
Consumer Product Safety Commission
Corporation for National and Community Service
Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency
Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims

Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for DC
DC Courts
DC Courts–Defender Services
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
Delta Regional Authority
Denali Commission
Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program
Election Assistance Commission
Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
Executive Office of the President
Farm Credit Administration
Federal Election Commission
Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Appraisal Subcommittee
Federal Housing Finance Agency
Federal Housing Finance Board
Federal Labor Relations Authority
Federal Maritime Commission
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission
Federal Trade Commission
Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission
Government Accountability Office
Government Printing Office
Harry S. Truman Scholarship Trust Fund
Institute of Museum and Library Services
Interagency Council on the Homeless
Inter-American Foundation
International Trade Commission
James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation
Japan-United States Friendship Commission
John C. Stennis Center
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts
Library of Congress

Marine Mammal Commission	Office of Government Ethics
Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program Payment and Access Commission	Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation
Medicare Payment Advisory Commission	Office of Special Counsel
Merit Systems Protection Board	Office of the Director of National Intelligence
Military Sales Program	Office of the Federal Coordination for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects
Millennium Challenge Corporation	Open World Leadership Center
Morris K. Udall Scholarship Foundation	Overseas Private Investment Corporation
National Archives and Records Administration	Patient Centered Outcomes Research Trust Fund
National Capital Planning Commission	Peace Corps
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science	Presidio Trust
National Council on Disability	Public Defender Service
National Endowment for the Arts	Recovery Act Accountability and Transparency Board
National Endowment for the Humanities	Selective Service System
National Gallery of Art	Senate Preservation Fund
National Labor Relations Board	St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation
National Mediation Board	State Justice Institute
National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust	U.S. Capital Preservation Commission
National Transportation Safety Board	U.S. China Security Review Commission
National Veterans Business Development Corporation	U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	U.S. Institute of Peace
Northern Border Regional Commission	U.S. Trade and Development Agency
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	Vietnam Education Foundation
Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission	White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance
Office of Compliance	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Legislative and Judicial Branches

There are no legal or other requirements for the legislative or judicial branch to prepare consolidated audited financial statements or to provide accrual-based accounting data for inclusion in the Governmentwide financial statements. Therefore, these consolidated statements do not include accrual-based accounting data for such entities as the U.S. Courts or the Congress. Some legislative branch entities voluntarily prepare and submit such information (e.g., Government Accountability Office, Government Printing Office, and Library of Congress). The President's Budget includes cash-based, outlay data for the legislative and judicial branches and, to a limited extent, this outlay data is also a part of the information contained in this report.

Entities Excluded from these Statements

The following entities are not part of the Governmentwide reporting entity based on an assessment of these entities in accordance with the indicative criteria stated in SFFAC No. 2, Entity and Display. However, this list is not all inclusive of all entities excluded from these statements.

American International Group (AIG)	Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae)
AMTRAK	Thrift Savings Fund
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Including the Federal Reserve Banks)	The Financing Corporation
Citigroup	GMAC Financial (Ally Financial)
Federal Home Loan Banks	Public-Private Investment Funds (PPIF)
Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac)	Resolution Funding Corporation
	Student Loan Marketing Association (SLMA or Sallie Mae)

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix B: Material Weaknesses Reported by Auditors and Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) Tables

OMB audit guidance requires auditors to disclose material weaknesses in internal control over financial reporting. The FMFIA and OMB guidance require the head of each executive agency to annually report whether there is reasonable assurance that the agency's controls are achieving the intended objectives and whether the agency's financial management systems conform to governmentwide requirements.

Agency heads are required to identify material weaknesses related to agency programs and operations (pursuant to Section 2 of FMFIA) and non-conformances with governmentwide financial systems requirements (pursuant to Section 4 of FMFIA). Reporting material weaknesses under FMFIA is not limited to weaknesses over financial reporting.

The following tables include: the number of material weaknesses reported by independent auditors, the number of material weaknesses reported by agency heads under Section 2 of FMFIA, and the number of financial system non-conformances reported by agency heads under Section 4 of FMFIA. The number of material weaknesses may differ from those identified by independent auditors and those identified by agency heads. This difference is primarily due to the more in-depth review that management is required to perform on its internal control environment over financial reporting, per OMB Circular A-123, which may result in more material weaknesses being identified.

Table Definitions:


- **Beginning**—the number of material weaknesses (beginning balance) reported in the Independent Auditor's Report or FMFIA Report for the prior fiscal year.
- **New**—the number of new material weaknesses reported in the Independent Auditor's Report or FMFIA Report for the current fiscal year which could include reportable conditions/significant deficiencies reported from the prior fiscal year whose severity has risen to the level of a material weakness.
- **Resolved**—the number of material weaknesses reported in the Independent Auditor's Report or FMFIA Report for the current fiscal year that were reported as resolved or whose severity has been reduced so that it is no longer a material weakness.
- **Consolidated**—the number of material weaknesses reported in the Independent Auditor's Report or FMFIA Report that were combined with other repeat material weaknesses from a prior fiscal year or with a new material weakness from the current fiscal year.
- **Ending**—the number of material weaknesses (ending balance) reported in the Independent Auditor's Report or FMFIA Report for the current fiscal year. The number is calculated by adding the number of new material weaknesses reported from the current fiscal year to the number of material weaknesses reported the prior fiscal year and then subtracting the number of weaknesses resolved and consolidated weaknesses during the current fiscal year.

Fiscal Year 2010: Auditor-Identified Material Weaknesses

	Beginning	New	Resolved	Consolidated	Ending
Agriculture	2	0	0	0	2
Commerce	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	13	0	0	0	13
Education	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	0	0	0	0	0
HHS	2	0	0	0	2
Homeland	6	0	0	0	6
HUD	0	0	0	0	0
Interior	0	0	0	0	0
Justice	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	0	4	0	0	4
State	3	0	3	0	0
DOT	0	0	0	0	0
Treasury	2	0	1	0	1
VA	4	0	3	0	1
AID	1	0	0	0	1
EPA	3	0	3	0	0
GSA	0	0	0	0	0
NASA	1	0	1	0	0
NSF	0	0	0	0	0
NRC	0	0	0	0	0
OPM	0	1	0	0	1
SBA	1	0	1	0	0
SSA	0	0	0	0	0
Total	38	5	12	0	31

Fiscal Year 2010 Auditor-Identified Material Weaknesses by Category

This year great strides were made in the area of Financial Management and Reporting, and material weaknesses, were reduced by nearly 30 percent. By improving controls over the reporting process agencies are better positioned to prepare reliable, useful, and timely financial information for decision making. In addition, there were reductions in the material weaknesses over Property, Plant, and Equipment and Accounts Payable and Other Liabilities, both which reduced by a third. While progress is being made at many agencies and across the Government in identifying and resolving internal control deficiencies, continued diligence and commitment are needed.



In fiscal year 2010, the total number of material weaknesses and the number of repeat material weaknesses decreased from 38 to 31 and from 29 to 26, respectively. A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that result in more than a remote likelihood that a material misstatement of the financial statements will not be prevented or detected. The existence of material weaknesses does not necessarily mean the financial statements are unreliable. However, they are indicators and their existence suggests an increased likelihood that the financial statements include material misstatements.

Fiscal Year 2010: FMFIA Section 2—Consolidated Totals

The agency head is responsible for submitting an annual assurance statement on the effectiveness of the agency's internal control. The OMB Circular A-123 requires the Agency Head to separately address the effectiveness of internal control over operations separately from the internal control over financial reporting. The assurance statement must take one of the following forms: a) Unqualified statement of assurance (no material weaknesses reported); b) Qualified statement of assurance, considering the exceptions explicitly noted (one or more material weaknesses reported); or c) Statement of no assurance (no processes in place or pervasive material weaknesses).

A material weakness over operations includes reportable conditions in which the agency head determines to be significant enough to report outside of the agency. A material weakness over financial reporting is a reportable condition, or a combination thereof which results in more than a remote¹ likelihood that a material misstatement of the financial statements, or other significant financial reports, will not be prevented or detected.

¹ The term "remote" is defined in SFFAS No. 5, *Accounting for Liabilities of the Federal Government*, as the chance of the future event, or events, occurring is slight.

Fiscal Year 2010: FMFIA Section 2—Consolidated Totals

		Adequate and Effective Management Controls		Number of Material Weaknesses				
		Section 2 Operational	Section 2 Financial Reporting	Beginning	New	Resolved	Consolidated	Reassessed
Agriculture...	Unqualified	Qualified	3	0	0	0	1	2
Commerce ..	Qualified	Unqualified	1	0	1	0	0	0
Defense	Qualified	No Assurance	16	2	0	0	0	18
Education....	Unqualified	Unqualified	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	Unqualified	Unqualified	0	0	0	0	0	0
HHS	Qualified	Qualified	2	0	0	0	0	2
Homeland ...	Qualified	No Assurance	12	0	0	0	3	9
HUD	Unqualified	Unqualified	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interior.....	Qualified	Unqualified	1	0	0	0	0	1
Justice.....	Qualified	Unqualified	2	0	1	0	0	1
Labor.....	Unqualified	Qualified	0	3	0	0	0	3
State	Unqualified	Unqualified	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOT	Unqualified	Unqualified	0	1	0	0	0	1
Treasury.....	Qualified	Qualified	5	0	1	0	0	4
VA	Unqualified	Qualified	1	0	1	0	0	0
AID.....	Unqualified	Qualified	0	1	0	0	0	1
EPA.....	Unqualified	Qualified	3	0	3	0	0	0
GSA	Unqualified	Unqualified	0	0	0	0	0	0
NASA	Unqualified	Unqualified	1	0	1	0	0	0
NSF.....	Unqualified	Unqualified	0	0	0	0	0	0
NRC	Unqualified	Unqualified	0	0	0	0	0	0
OPM.....	Qualified	Qualified	1	2	0	0	0	3
SBA.....	Unqualified	Unqualified	1	0	1	0	0	0
SSA.....	Unqualified	Unqualified	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total			49	9	9	0	4	45

Fiscal Year 2010: FMFIA Section 2—Operational

	Adequate and Effective Management Controls			Number of Material Weaknesses					
	Unqualified	Qualified	No Assurance	Beginning	New	Resolved	Consolidated	Reassessed	Ending
Agriculture	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce.....		X		1	0	1	0	0	0
Defense.....		X		4	2	0	0	0	6
Education	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
HHS.....		X		1	0	0	0	0	1
Homeland.....		X		6	0	0	0	2	4
HUD	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Interior.....		X		1	0	0	0	0	1
Justice		X		2	0	1	0	0	1
Labor.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
State.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
DOT.....	X			0	1	0	0	0	1
Treasury.....		X		3	0	0	0	0	3
VA	X			1	0	1	0	0	0
AID	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
EPA.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
GSA.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
NASA	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
NSF	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
NRC	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
OPM.....		X		1	1	0	0	0	2
SBA.....	X			1	0	1	0	0	0
SSA.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	16	8	0	21	4	4	0	2	19

Fiscal Year 2010: FMFIA Section 2—Financial Reporting

	Adequate and Effective Management Controls			Number of Material Weaknesses					
	Unqualified	Qualified	No Assurance	Beginning	New	Resolved	Consolidated	Reassessed	Ending
Agriculture		X		3	0	0	0	1	2
Commerce	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense.....			X	12	0	0	0	0	12
Education.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
HHS		X		1	0	0	0	0	1
Homeland.....			X	6	0	0	0	1	5
HUD	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Interior.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Justice.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor.....		X		0	3	0	0	0	3
State.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
DOT	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasury.....		X		2	0	1	0	0	1
VA		X		0	0	0	0	0	0
AID.....		X		0	1	0	0	0	1
EPA.....		X		3	0	3	0	0	0
GSA	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
NASA	X			1	0	1	0	0	0
NSF.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
NRC	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
OPM.....		X		0	1	0	0	0	1
SBA.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
SSA.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14	8	2	28	5	5	0	2	26

Fiscal Year 2010: FMFIA Section 4—Financial Management Systems

	Systems Conform to Requirements		Number of Non-conformances						
	Yes	Yes, with Non-conformances	No	Beginning	New	Resolved	Consolidated	Reassessed	Ending
Agriculture.....		X		1	0	0	0	0	1
Commerce	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense			X	1	0	0	0	0	1
Education.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
HHS			X	2	0	0	0	0	2
Homeland			X	3	0	0	0	0	3
HUD	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Interior.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Justice.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor.....			X	0	1	0	0	0	1
State	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
DOT	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasury.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
VA.....		X		3	0	2	0	0	1
AID.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
EPA.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
GSA	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
NASA.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
NSF.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
NRC.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
OPM.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
SBA.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
SSA.....	X			0	0	0	0	0	0
Total.....	18	2	4	10	1	2	0	0	9

Appendix C: Government Corporations Required to Submit Audited Financial Statements to OMB

Government Corporation	Fiscal Year 2010 Audit Opinion
Commodity Credit Corporation	Unqualified
Community Development Financial Institutions Fund	Not Received
Corporation for National and Community Service	Unqualified
Export-Import Bank of the United States	Unqualified
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	Not Received
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	Not Received ¹
Federal Home Loan Banks	Not Received ¹
Federal Housing Administration	Unqualified
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated	Unqualified
Financing Corporation	Not Received ¹
Government National Mortgage Association	Unqualified
Millennium Challenge Corporation	Qualified
National Credit Union Administration Central Liquidity Facility	Not Received ¹
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	Not Received
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	Unqualified
Presidio Trust	Qualified
Resolution Funding Corporation	Not Received ¹
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	Unqualified
Tennessee Valley Authority	Unqualified

¹ The entity has a calendar yearend; the financial statements were not due as of the printing of this report.

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix D: Accountability of Tax Dollars Act Agencies Required to Submit Audited Financial Statements to OMB

The Accountability of Tax Dollars Act required executive agencies, not already required through separate legislation, to prepare and submit audited financial statements. The majority of these agencies are relatively small as compared to the CFO Act departments and agencies in both budgetary and human resources. This has contributed to several of the agencies having not yet submitted their audited financial statements. OMB continues to work with these agencies to meet this requirement.

Agency	Fiscal Year 2010 Audit Opinion
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Not Received
African Development Foundation	Unqualified
American Battle Monuments Commission	Not Received
Appalachian Regional Commission	Not Received
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board	Unqualified
Armed Forces Retirement Home	Unqualified
Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Fund.....	Not Received
Broadcasting Board of Governors.....	Unqualified
Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation	Unqualified
Central Intelligence Agency	Disclaimer
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	Unqualified
Commission on Civil Rights	Not Received
Commission of Fine Arts	Not Received
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad.....	Not Received
Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Handicapped.....	Not Received
Commodity Futures Trading Commission.....	Unqualified
Consumer Product Safety Commission	Disclaimer
Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for DC	Unqualified
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	Unqualified

Agency	Fiscal Year 2010 Audit Opinion
Delta Regional Authority	Unqualified
Denali Commission	Unqualified
Election Assistance Commission	Unqualified
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	Unqualified
Farm Credit Administration	Unqualified
Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation	Not Received ¹
Federal Communications Commission	Unqualified
Federal Election Commission	Unqualified
Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Appraisal Subcommittee.....	Not Received
Federal Housing Finance Agency	Unqualified
Federal Labor Relations Authority	Unqualified
Federal Maritime Commission	Unqualified
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	Unqualified
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.....	Unqualified
Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board.....	Not Received ¹
Federal Trade Commission.....	Unqualified
Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation.....	Not Received
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development.....	Not Received
Institute of Museum and Library Services	Unqualified
Inter-American Foundation.....	Unqualified
James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation	Not Received
Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission.....	Unqualified
Marine Mammal Commission.....	Unqualified
Merit Systems Protection Board.....	Unqualified

Agency	Fiscal Year 2010 Audit Opinion
Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation	Unqualified
National Archives and Records Administration	Unqualified
National Capital Planning Commission	Unqualified
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science	Not Received
National Council on Disability	Not Received
National Credit Union Administration	Not Received ¹
National Endowment for the Arts	Unqualified
National Endowment for the Humanities	Unqualified
National Labor Relations Board	Unqualified
National Mediation Board	Unqualified
National Transportation Safety Board	Unqualified
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	Unqualified
Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission	Unqualified
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects	Unqualified
Office of Government Ethics	Unqualified
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission	Unqualified
Office of Special Counsel	Unqualified
Peace Corps	Unqualified
Postal Regulatory Commission	Not Received
Railroad Retirement Board	Unqualified
Securities and Exchange Commission	Unqualified
Selective Service System	Unqualified
Smithsonian Institution	Not Received
SI/John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	Not Received
SI/National Gallery of Arts	Unqualified

Agency	Fiscal Year 2010 Audit Opinion
SI/Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	Unqualified
Trade and Development Agency.....	Unqualified
U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims.....	Unqualified
U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum	Unqualified
U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness.....	Unqualified
U.S. International Trade Commission	Qualified
Vietnam Education Foundation	Unqualified
White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance.....	Unqualified
¹ The entity has a calendar yearend; the financial statements were not due as of the printing of this report.	

Appendix E: Selected Components of CFO Act Agencies Required to Submit Audited Financial Statements to OMB

OMB designates those individual entity components that must prepare audited financial statements.

Agency Components:	Fiscal Year 2010 Opinion
Food and Nutrition Service (USDA).....	Unqualified
Forest Service (USDA)	Unqualified
Rural Development Mission Area (USDA).....	Unqualified
Department of Army General Funds (DOD)	Disclaimer
Department of Navy General Funds (DOD)	Disclaimer
Department of Air Force General Funds (DOD).....	Disclaimer
Military Retirement Trust Fund (DOD).....	Unqualified
U.S. Army Corp of Engineers Civil Works Program (DOD).....	Unqualified
Department of Army Working Capital Fund (DOD)	Disclaimer
Department of Navy Working Capital Fund (DOD)	Disclaimer
Department of Air Force Working Capital Fund (DOD).....	Disclaimer
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (HHS).....	Unqualified
Federal Aviation Administration (DOT).....	Unqualified
Internal Revenue Service (Treasury).....	Unqualified
Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (OPM).....	Unqualified
Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (OPM).....	Unqualified
Federal Employees Life Insurance Program (OPM)	Unqualified

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix F: Compliance with the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996

Under the FFMIA, the 24 CFO Act agencies listed below are required to maintain financial management systems that substantially comply with Federal financial management system requirements, applicable Federal accounting standards, and the U.S. Standard General Ledger at the transaction level. FFMIA provides that both the agency head and the independent auditor publish a determination of compliance on an annual basis.

The table below indicates the fiscal year 2010 compliance findings for each CFO Act agency.

	Agency Head	Auditor
Agriculture.....	No	No
Commerce.....	Yes	Yes
Defense.....	No	No
Education	Yes	No
Energy.....	Yes	Yes
HHS.....	No	No
Homeland.....	No	No
HUD	Yes	No
Interior	Yes	Yes
Justice	Yes	Yes
Labor	No	No
State.....	Yes	No
DOT.....	Yes	Yes
Treasury	No	No
VA	No	No
AID	Yes	Yes
EPA	Yes	Yes
GSA.....	Yes	Yes
NASA	Yes	Yes
NSF.....	Yes	Yes
NRC	Yes	Yes
OPM.....	Yes	Yes
SBA	Yes	Yes
SSA	Yes	Yes

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix G: Acronyms

This appendix lists the acronyms used in the Financial Statements and Notes to the Financial Statements section of this *Financial Report*.

ABS	Asset-Backed Securities
ACA	Affordable Care Act
AICPA	American Institute of Certified Accountants
AIFP	Automotive Industry Financing Program
AIG	American International Group, Inc.
AGP	Asset Guarantee Program
AMT	Alternative Minimum Tax
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009
ASC	Accounting Standards Codification
BLDTF	Black Lung Disability Trust Fund
CBLI	Consumer and Business Lending Initiative
CCC	Commodity Credit Corporation
CDs	Certificates of Deposits
CDCI	Community Development Capital Initiative
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CMS	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid
COLA	Cost of Living Adjustments
CPI	Consumer Price Index
CPIM	Consumer Price Index–Medical
CPP	Capital Purchase Program
CSRDF	Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund
CSRS	Civil Service Retirement System
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DI	Disability Insurance
DIF	Deposit Insurance Fund
DIP	Debtor-in-Possession
DOC	Department of Commerce
DOD	Department of Defense
DOE	Department of Energy
DOI	Department of the Interior
DOJ	Department of Justice
DOL	Department of Labor
DOT	Department of Transportation
ECASLA	Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loans Act of 2008
Education	Department of Education
EESA	Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESF	Exchange Stabilization Fund
EUC	Unemployment Account
EUCA	Unemployment Compensation Account
Ex-Im Bank	Export-Import Bank
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
Fannie Mae	Federal National Mortgage Association
FASAB	Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
FASB	Financial Accounting Standards Board
FCC	Federal Communication Commission
FCRA	Federal Credit Reform Act of 1991
FDIC	Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
FECA	Federal Employees Compensation Act
FEGLI	Federal Employee Group Life Insurance

FEHB	Federal Employees Health Benefits Program
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FERS	Federal Employees' Retirement System
FERSA	Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986
FFAS	Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services
FHA	Federal Housing Administration
FHFA	Federal Housing Financing Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FICA	Federal Insurance Contribution Act
FMFIA	Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act
FRBNY	Federal Reserve Bank of New York
FRBs	Federal Reserve banks
Freddie Mac	Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation
FRTIB	Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board
FSA	Farm Service Agency
FUA	Federal Unemployment Account
FUTA	Federal Unemployment Tax Act
GAAP	U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles
GAO	Government Accountability Office
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
Ginnie Mae	Government National Mortgage Association
GM	General Motors
GSA	General Services Administration
GSE	Government-Sponsored Enterprises
HBP	Health Benefits Program
HERA	Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008
HFA	Housing Financing Agencies
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
HI	Hospital Insurance
HMO	Health Maintenance Organization
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPO	Initial Public Offering
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
LAC	Latest acquisition cost
LSAPs	Large-Scale Asset Purchase Programs
MAC	Moving average cost
MBS	Mortgage-Backed Securities
MDBs	Multilateral Development Banks
MERHCF	Medicare Eligible Retire Health Care Fund
MMA	Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act
MRF	Military Retirement Fund
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NAV	Net Asset Value
NCUA	National Credit Union Administration
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NIBP	New Issue Bond Program
NIH	National Institutes of Health
NRRIT	National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust
NSLI	National Service Life Insurance
NTIA	National Telecommunications and Information Administration
OASDI	Old-Age and Survivors Disability Insurance
OASI	Old-Age and Survivors Insurance
OCO	Overseas Contingency Operations
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPEB	Other Postemployment Benefits

OPM	Office of Personnel Management
ORB	Other Retirement Benefits
PBGC	Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
PEFCO	Private Export Funding Corporation
PMA's	Power Marketing Authorities
PP&E	Property- Plant, and Equipment
PPIF	Public Private Investment Funds
PPIP	Public Private Investment Program
PPO	Preferred Provider Organization
PSRHB	Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits
QFI	Qualified Financial Institution
R&D	Research and Development
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RD	Rural Development
REDUX	Military Retirement Reform Act of 1986
RRB	Railroad Retirement Board
RRSIA	Railroad Retirement and Survivors Improvement Act
SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
Sallie Mae	Student Loan Marketing Association
SBA	Small Business Administration
SDRs	Special Drawing Rights
SDRCs	SDR Certificates
SEC	Securities and Exchange Commission
SECA	Self-Employment Contributions Act
SFAS	Statement of Financial Accounting Standards
SFFAC	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concept
SFFAS	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards
SFP	Supplementary Financing Program
SLMA	Student Loan Marketing Association
SMI	Supplementary Medical Insurance
SOMA	System Open Market Account
SOSI	Statement of Social Insurance
SPSPA	Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreements
SSA	Social Security Administration
SSEB	Social Security Equivalent Benefit
SSP	Stable Share Price
TALF	Term Asset-Backed Loan Facility
TARP	Troubled Asset Relief Program
TCLP	Temporary Credit Liquidity Program
TFL	TRICARE for Life
TIP	Targeted Investment Program
TIPS	Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities
Treasury	Department of the Treasury
TRIA	Terrorism Risk Insurance Act
TSP	Thrift Savings Plan
TVA	Tennessee Valley Authority
TVARS	Tennessee Valley Authority Retirement System
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S.C.	United States Code
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USPS	United States Postal Service
UTF	Unemployment Trust Fund
VA	Department of Veterans Affairs
VRI	Veterans Reopened Insurance
VSLI	Veterans Special Life Insurance

This page is intentionally blank.



United States Government Accountability Office
Washington, DC 20548

The President
The President of the Senate
The Speaker of the House of Representatives

The Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, is required to annually submit financial statements for the U.S. government to the President and the Congress. GAO is required to audit these statements.¹ This is (1) our report on the accompanying U.S. government's accrual-based consolidated financial statements for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2010 and 2009, and the 2010, 2009, 2008, 2007, and 2006 Statements of Social Insurance, and (2) our associated reports on internal control over financial reporting and on compliance with selected provisions of laws and regulations. As used in this report, accrual-based financial statements refer to all of the consolidated financial statements and notes, except for those related to the Statement of Social Insurance.²

Management of the federal government is responsible for (1) preparing annual consolidated financial statements in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP); (2) establishing, maintaining, and evaluating internal control to provide reasonable assurance that the control objectives of the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA)³ are met; and (3) complying with laws and regulations. Also, the 24 Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act agencies are responsible for

¹The Government Management Reform Act of 1994 has required such reporting, covering the executive branch of government, beginning with financial statements prepared for fiscal year 1997. 31 U.S.C. 331(e). The federal government has elected to include certain financial information on the legislative and judicial branches in the consolidated financial statements as well.

²The accrual-based consolidated financial statements for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2010 and 2009 consist of the (1) Statements of Net Cost, (2) Statements of Operations and Changes in Net Position, (3) Reconciliations of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit, (4) Statements of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities, and (5) Balance Sheets, including the related notes to these financial statements. Most revenues are recorded on a modified cash basis. The 2010, 2009, 2008, 2007, and 2006 Statements of Social Insurance, including the related notes, are also included in the consolidated financial statements. The Statements of Social Insurance do not interrelate to the accrual-based consolidated financial statements.

³31 U.S.C. 3512 (c), (d) (commonly referred to as FMFIA). This act requires executive agency heads to evaluate and report annually to the President and the Congress on the adequacy of their internal control and accounting systems and on actions to correct significant problems.

implementing and maintaining financial management systems that substantially comply with the requirements of the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996 (FFMIA).⁴ Appendix I discusses the objective, scope, and methodology of our work.

In summary, we found the following:

- Certain material weaknesses⁵ in internal control over financial reporting and other limitations on the scope of our work⁶ resulted in conditions that continued to prevent us from expressing an opinion on the accompanying accrual-based consolidated financial statements for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2010 and 2009.⁷
- Significant uncertainties (discussed in Note 26 to the consolidated financial statements), primarily related to the achievement of projected reductions in Medicare cost growth reflected in the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance, prevented us from expressing an opinion on that statement. The Statements of Social Insurance for 2009, 2008, and 2007⁸ are presented fairly, in all material respects, in conformity with GAAP; and we disclaim an opinion on the 2006 Statement of Social Insurance.
- Material weaknesses resulted in ineffective internal control over financial reporting (including safeguarding of assets).
- Our work to test compliance with selected provisions of laws and regulations in fiscal year 2010 was limited by the material weaknesses and other scope limitations discussed in this report.

⁴31 U.S.C. 3512 note (Federal Financial Management Improvement Act).

⁵A material weakness is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis.

⁶Three major impediments continued to prevent us from rendering an opinion on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements: (1) serious financial management problems at the Department of Defense (DOD) that have prevented DOD's financial statements from being auditable, (2) the federal government's inability to adequately account for and reconcile intragovernmental activity and balances between federal entities, and (3) the federal government's ineffective process for preparing the consolidated financial statements. In addition, the financial statements of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal years 2010 and 2009 and the Department of Labor for fiscal year 2010 were not auditable or not subjected to audit by agency auditors. Further, some of the financial statements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2010 were not fully auditable and for fiscal year 2009 all were not auditable.

⁷We previously reported that certain material weaknesses prevented us from expressing an opinion on the consolidated financial statements of the U.S. government for fiscal years 1997 through 2006 and on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements of the U.S. government for fiscal years 2007 through 2009.

⁸The valuation date is January 1 for all social insurance programs except the Black Lung program, which has a valuation date of September 30.

SIGNIFICANT MATTERS OF EMPHASIS

Before discussing our conclusions on the consolidated financial statements, the following key items deserve emphasis in order to put the information contained in the financial statements and the Management's Discussion and Analysis section of the *2010 Financial Report of the United States Government (2010 Financial Report)* into context.

The Federal Government's Actions to Stabilize Financial Markets and to Promote Economic Recovery

The accrual-based consolidated financial statements for fiscal year 2010 include, as they did for fiscal year 2009, substantial assets and liabilities resulting from the federal government's actions to stabilize financial markets and to promote economic recovery. Although the federal government has received positive returns from investments in certain large financial institutions, it continues to report significant costs related to these actions. Key actions that the federal government has taken to stabilize financial markets and to promote economic recovery are discussed in the Management's Discussion and Analysis section of the *2010 Financial Report* and certain Notes to the consolidated financial statements.

The ultimate cost of all of the federal government's market stabilization and economic recovery actions and the effect of such actions on its financial condition will not be known for some time. As of September 30, 2010, the federal government's actions to stabilize the financial markets and to promote economic recovery resulted in assets of over \$400 billion (e.g., the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) equity investments,⁹ investments in the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac), and mortgage-backed securities guaranteed by them),¹⁰ which is net of about \$75 billion in valuation losses. In addition, the federal government reported incurring significant liabilities as of September 30, 2010 (e.g., about \$360 billion related to estimated future payments to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac) and related net cost resulting from these actions. In valuing these assets and liabilities, management considered and selected assumptions and data that it believed provided a reasonable basis for the estimated values reported in the accrual-based consolidated financial statements. However, as discussed in Note 1 to the consolidated financial statements, there are many factors affecting these assumptions and estimates that are inherently subject to substantial uncertainty arising from the uniqueness of

⁹TARP was established by the Department of the Treasury (Treasury) under authority provided in the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (Pub. L. No. 110-343). The Act requires the U.S. Comptroller General to audit TARP's financial statements as well as report every 60 days on a variety of areas associated with oversight of TARP. For the TARP financial statement audits and the 60-day reports, see GAO's Web Site at www.gao.gov.

¹⁰The Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Pub. L. No. 110-289) authorized Treasury to purchase, until December 31, 2009, any amount of Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac securities, whether debt or equity.

certain transactions and the likelihood of future changes in general economic, regulatory, and market conditions. As such, there will be differences between the estimated values as of September 30, 2010, and the actual results, and such differences may be material. These differences will also affect the ultimate cost of the federal government's actions.

Long-Term Fiscal Challenges

While the economy is still fragile and in need of careful attention, there is wide agreement on the need to look not only at the near-term but also at steps that begin to change the long-term fiscal path as soon as possible without slowing the economy. As discussed in the *2010 Financial Report*, the federal government is on an unsustainable long-term fiscal path driven on the spending side primarily by rising health care costs and known demographic trends. Under new financial reporting standards, this *2010 Financial Report* includes comprehensive long-term fiscal projections for the U.S. government, expanding on similar information presented in recent years' financial reports. The projections show that the present value of projected non-interest spending exceeds receipts by about \$16.3 trillion over the next 75-year period.¹¹ The projections relating to Social Security and Medicare are based on the same assumptions underlying the information presented in the Statement of Social Insurance and assume reductions in Medicare cost growth. GAO also prepares long-term simulations for all federal government programs. Under GAO's Alternative simulation,¹² absent policy change, by 2020 roughly 92 cents of every dollar of federal revenue would be spent on net interest costs, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid; and debt held by the public as a share of gross domestic product (GDP) would by 2020 exceed the historical high reached in the aftermath of World War II.¹³ The federal government faces increasing pressures, yet a shrinking window of opportunity, for making policy changes regarding these challenges.

In February 2010, the President established the bipartisan National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform to identify policies to change this fiscal path and stabilize the debt-to-GDP ratio. The Commission's report was issued on December 1, 2010.¹⁴ Other policy groups have also developed proposals to deal with the federal government's long-term fiscal challenge.

¹¹On an open group basis (current and future participants).

¹²GAO, *The Federal Government's Long-Term Fiscal Outlook: Fall 2010 Update*, GAO-11-201SP (Washington, D.C.: November 2010).

¹³GAO's Alternative simulation incorporates Congressional Budget Office and Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services alternative projections for health care cost growth, which assume certain cost controls are not maintained over the long term and physician payments are not reduced as specified under current law. Also in this simulation, all tax provisions are extended to 2020 and the alternative minimum tax (AMT) exemption amount is indexed to inflation through 2020; revenues are then brought back to the 40-year historical average as a share of GDP; and discretionary spending grows with GDP during the entire period—keeping it just below the 40-year historical average as a share of GDP.

¹⁴*The Moment of Truth: Report of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform*, National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform (Washington, D.C.: Dec. 1, 2010).

Equity Interests in Certain Financial Organizations and Commercial Entities

As discussed in Note 1 to the consolidated financial statements, such financial statements do not include the assets, liabilities, or results of operations of any financial organizations or commercial entities in which Treasury holds either a direct, indirect, or beneficial equity interest. Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) have determined that none of these entities meet the criteria for a federal entity. The investments in and any liabilities to such entities, however, are valued and reported on the Balance Sheet.

DISCLAIMER OF OPINION ON THE ACCRUAL-BASED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Because of the federal government's inability to demonstrate the reliability of significant portions of the U.S. government's accompanying accrual-based consolidated financial statements for fiscal years 2010 and 2009, principally resulting from limitations related to certain material weaknesses in internal control over financial reporting and other limitations on the scope of our work, we are unable to, and we do not, express an opinion on such accrual-based consolidated financial statements. As a result of these limitations, readers are cautioned that amounts reported in the accrual-based consolidated financial statements and related notes may not be reliable.

The federal government did not maintain adequate systems or have sufficient, reliable evidence to support certain material information reported in the accompanying accrual-based consolidated financial statements. The underlying material weaknesses in internal control, which generally have existed for years, contributed to our disclaimer of opinion on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements. The material weaknesses that contributed to our disclaimer of opinion on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements were the federal government's inability to

- satisfactorily determine that property, plant, and equipment and inventories and related property, primarily held by DOD, were properly reported in the accrual-based consolidated financial statements;
- reasonably estimate or adequately support amounts reported for certain liabilities, such as environmental and disposal liabilities, or determine whether commitments and contingencies were complete and properly reported;
- support significant portions of the reported total net cost of operations, most notably related to DOD, and adequately reconcile disbursement activity at certain federal entities;
- adequately account for and reconcile intragovernmental activity and balances between federal entities;

- ensure that the federal government's accrual-based consolidated financial statements were (1) consistent with the underlying audited entities' financial statements, (2) properly balanced, and (3) in conformity with GAAP; and
- identify and either resolve or explain material differences between (1) certain components of the budget deficit reported in Treasury's records that are used to prepare the Reconciliation of Net Operating Cost and the Unified Budget Deficit, the Statement of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities, and the Fiscal Projections for the U.S. Government (included in Supplemental Information) and (2) related amounts reported in federal entities' financial statements and underlying financial information and records.

These material weaknesses continued to (1) hamper the federal government's ability to reliably report a significant portion of its assets, liabilities, costs, and other related information; (2) affect the federal government's ability to reliably measure the full cost as well as the financial and nonfinancial performance of certain programs and activities; (3) impair the federal government's ability to adequately safeguard significant assets and properly record various transactions; and (4) hinder the federal government from having reliable financial information to operate in an efficient and effective manner. Due to the material weaknesses and other limitations on the scope of our work discussed above, there may also be additional issues that could affect the accrual-based consolidated financial statements that were not identified. Appendix II describes these material weaknesses in more detail and highlights the primary effects of these material weaknesses on the accompanying accrual-based consolidated financial statements and on the management of federal government operations.

DISCLAIMER OF OPINION ON THE STATEMENT OF SOCIAL INSURANCE FOR 2010 AND UNQUALIFIED OPINIONS FOR 2009, 2008, AND 2007

Because of significant uncertainties (discussed in Note 26 to the consolidated financial statements), primarily related to the achievement of projected reductions in Medicare cost growth reflected in the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance, we were unable to obtain sufficient evidence to support the amounts presented in the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance. Consequently, we are unable to, and we do not, express an opinion on the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance. The Statement of Social Insurance presents the actuarial present value of the federal government's estimated future revenue to be received from or on behalf of participants and estimated future expenditures to be paid to or on behalf of participants, based on benefit formulas in current law and using a projection period sufficient to illustrate the long-term sustainability of the social insurance programs.¹⁵

¹⁵The projection period used for the Social Security, Medicare, and Railroad Retirement social insurance programs is 75 years. For the Black Lung program, the projections are through 2040.

The significant uncertainties, discussed in further detail in Note 26 to the consolidated financial statements, include:

- Medicare projections in the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance were based on full implementation of the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA),¹⁶ including a significant decrease in projected Medicare costs from the 2009 Statement of Social Insurance related to (1) reductions in physician payment rates totaling 30 percent over the next 3 years and (2) productivity improvements for most other categories of Medicare providers. However, there are significant uncertainties concerning the achievement of these projected decreases in Medicare costs.
- Management has noted that actual future costs for Medicare are likely to exceed those shown by the current-law projections presented in the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance due to the likelihood of modifications to the scheduled reductions.¹⁷ The extent to which actual future costs exceed the projected current-law amounts due to changes to the physician payments and productivity adjustments depends on both the specific changes that might be legislated and on whether legislation would include other provisions to help offset such costs.
- Management has developed an illustrative alternative projection intended to provide additional context regarding the long-term sustainability of the Medicare program and to illustrate the uncertainties in the Statement of Social Insurance projections. The present value of future estimated expenditures in excess of future estimated revenue for Medicare, included in the illustrative alternative projection, exceed the \$22.8 trillion estimate in the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance by \$12.4 trillion.

As a result, readers are cautioned that amounts reported in the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance and related Notes may not fairly present, in all material respects, the financial condition of the federal government's social insurance programs, in conformity with GAAP. The uncertainties related to the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance also affect the projected Medicare and Medicaid costs reported in the Fiscal Projections for the U.S. government, which is presented in Supplemental Information and is summarized in Management's Discussion and Analysis and other accompanying information.

In addition, the Supplemental Information section of the *2010 Financial Report* includes unaudited information concerning how changes in various assumptions would change the present value of future estimated expenditures in excess of future estimated revenue. As

¹⁶Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148, 124 Stat. 119 (Mar. 23, 2010), as amended by Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-152, 124 Stat. 1029 (Mar. 30, 2010).

¹⁷As of the date of our report, legislation was awaiting the President's signature that would override the scheduled reductions in physician payments through December 31, 2011 and reduce non-Medicare outlays by limiting a health insurance tax credit. See H.R. 4994, 111th Cong. § 101 (2010).

discussed in that section, Medicare projections are very sensitive to changes in the health care cost growth assumption.

In our opinion, the Statements of Social Insurance for 2009, 2008, and 2007 present fairly, in all material respects, the financial condition of the federal government's social insurance programs, in conformity with GAAP. We have not audited and do not express an opinion on the 2006 Statement of Social Insurance.

In preparing the Statements of Social Insurance, management considers and selects assumptions and data that it believes provide a reasonable basis for the assertions in the statement. However, because of the large number of factors that affect the Statement of Social Insurance and the fact that such assumptions are inherently subject to substantial uncertainty—arising from the likelihood of future changes in general economic, regulatory, and market conditions, as well as other more specific future events, such as legislative changes (e.g., changes in benefits or provider payments), other significant uncertainties, and contingencies—there will be differences between the estimates in the Statement of Social Insurance and the actual results, and those differences may be material. In addition to the inherent uncertainty that underlies the expenditure projections prepared for all parts of Medicare, the Supplementary Medical Insurance Part D projections have an added uncertainty in that they were prepared using very little program experience upon which to base the estimates.

The scheduled future benefits presented in the Statement of Social Insurance are based on benefit formulas in current law. However, consistent with the respective annual Trustees Reports, the Social Security and Medicare programs are not sustainable under current financing arrangements. Also, the law concerning these programs can be changed at any time by the Congress. In fact, payment of Social Security and Medicare Hospital Insurance (Part A) benefits are limited by law to the balances in the respective trust funds. Consequently, future scheduled benefits are limited to future revenues plus existing trust fund assets. As discussed in the Supplemental Information section of the *2010 Financial Report*, the Social Security and Medicare Hospital Insurance (Part A) trust funds are, based on achievement of the cost reductions discussed above, projected to be exhausted in 2037 and 2029, respectively, at which time they will be unable to pay the full amount of scheduled future benefits. For Social Security, projected future revenues as of January 1, 2010 would be sufficient to pay 78 percent of scheduled benefits in 2037, the year of trust fund exhaustion, and decreasing to 75 percent of scheduled benefits in 2084. Similarly, for Medicare Hospital Insurance (Part A), projected future revenues as of January 1, 2010 would be sufficient to pay 85 percent of scheduled benefits in 2029, the year of trust fund exhaustion, declining to 77 percent in 2050 and then increasing to 89 percent of scheduled benefits in 2084.

OTHER LIMITATIONS ON THE SCOPE OF OUR WORK

For fiscal years 2010 and 2009, there were limitations on the scope of our work in addition to the material weaknesses that contributed to our disclaimer of opinion on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements. Treasury and OMB depend on representations from certain federal entities to provide their representations to us regarding the U.S. government's consolidated financial statements. Treasury and OMB were unable to provide us with adequate representations regarding the U.S. government's accrual-based consolidated financial statements for fiscal years 2010 and 2009 primarily because of insufficient representations provided to them by certain agencies. In addition, the federal government was unable to provide us with adequate legal representations regarding the U.S. government's accrual-based consolidated financial statements for fiscal year 2009.

OTHER MATTERS

In fiscal year 2010, the federal government adopted several new federal accounting standards, including those for (1) reporting pensions, other retirement benefits, and other post-employment benefits [Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) No. 33], as discussed in Notes 1, 15, and 21 to the consolidated financial statements; and (2) reporting comprehensive long-term fiscal projections for the U.S. government [SFFAS No. 36], as discussed in Note 1 to the consolidated financial statements and Supplemental Information.

Also, as discussed in Notes 1 and 24 to the consolidated financial statements, the fiscal year 2009 Statements of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities and the fiscal year 2009 Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position were restated to correct certain balances. In addition, certain information in Note 23 to the consolidated financial statements was restated. Last year, we disclaimed an opinion on the fiscal year 2009 accrual-based consolidated financial statements due to certain material weaknesses and limitations on the scope of our work, including the material weakness related to the preparation of the consolidated financial statements. Given the material weaknesses and scope limitations discussed in this report, additional restatements may occur in the future.

MATERIAL WEAKNESSES RESULTED IN INEFFECTIVE INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING

The material weaknesses discussed in this report resulted in ineffective internal control over financial reporting. Consequently, the federal government's internal control did not provide reasonable assurance that misstatements, losses, or noncompliance material in relation to the consolidated financial statements would be prevented or detected and corrected on a timely basis. The federal government is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over financial reporting and evaluating its

effectiveness. Internal control over financial reporting is a process effected by those charged with governance, management, and other personnel, the objectives of which are to provide reasonable assurance that (1) transactions are properly recorded, processed, and summarized to permit the preparation of the financial statements in conformity with GAAP, and assets are safeguarded against loss from unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition and (2) transactions are executed in accordance with laws governing the use of budget authority and with other laws and regulations that could have a direct and material effect on the financial statements.

In planning and performing our audit, we considered internal control over financial reporting. We did not consider all internal controls relevant to operating objectives as broadly established under FMFIA, such as those controls relevant to preparing statistical reports and ensuring efficient operations. We do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting because the purpose of our work was to determine our procedures for auditing the financial statements, not to express an opinion on internal control. Based on the scope of our work and the effects of the other limitations on the scope of our audit noted throughout this report, our internal control work would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control, including those that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies.¹⁸

In addition to the material weaknesses that contributed to our disclaimer of opinion on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements, which were discussed above, we found the following three other material weaknesses in internal control. These other material weaknesses were the federal government's inability to

- determine the full extent to which improper payments occur and reasonably assure that appropriate actions are taken to reduce improper payments,
- identify and resolve information security control deficiencies and manage information security risks on an ongoing basis, and
- effectively manage its tax collection activities.

These material weaknesses are discussed in more detail in appendix III, including the primary effects of the material weaknesses on the accompanying accrual-based consolidated financial statements and on the management of federal government operations.

¹⁸A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

We also found two significant deficiencies in internal control that involve the following areas:

- implementing effective internal controls at certain federal entities for loans receivable and loan guarantee liabilities, which for the most part, involve credit subsidy estimation and related financial reporting processes; and
- preparing the Statement of Social Insurance for certain programs.

These significant deficiencies are discussed in more detail in appendix IV.

Further, individual federal entity financial statement audit reports identified additional control deficiencies that were reported by the entity's auditors as either material weaknesses or significant deficiencies at the individual entity level. We do not consider these additional deficiencies to represent material weaknesses or significant deficiencies with respect to the consolidated financial statements.

COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Our work to test compliance with selected provisions of laws and regulations that have a direct and material effect on the consolidated financial statements was limited by the material weaknesses and other scope limitations discussed in this report. U.S. generally accepted government auditing standards and OMB guidance require auditors to report on entities' compliance with selected provisions of laws and regulations. Certain individual entity audit reports contain instances of noncompliance. None of these instances were deemed to be reportable noncompliance with regard to the accompanying consolidated financial statements.

We caution that other noncompliance may have occurred and not been detected. Further, the results of our limited procedures may not be sufficient for other purposes. Our objective was not to, and we do not, express an opinion on compliance with laws and regulations.

OTHER INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THE FINANCIAL REPORT

Management's Discussion and Analysis, Stewardship Information, Supplemental Information, and other accompanying information, including the Citizen's Guide, included in the *2010 Financial Report* contain a wide range of information, some of which is not directly related to the consolidated financial statements. We did not audit and we do not express an opinion on this information. However, we compared the information that directly related to the Statements of Social Insurance for consistency with the 2009, 2008, and 2007 Statements of Social Insurance and discussed the methods of measurement and presentation of such information with Treasury officials. Based on

this limited work, we found no material inconsistencies with such Statements of Social Insurance or GAAP.

Readers are cautioned that the material weaknesses and scope limitations discussed in this audit report, including those related to our disclaimer of opinion on the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance, affect the reliability of certain information contained in the Management's Discussion and Analysis, Stewardship Information, Supplemental Information, and other accompanying information that is taken from the same data sources as the accrual-based consolidated financial statements and the 2010 Statement of Social Insurance.


CFO ACT AGENCY FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

The federal government's ability to efficiently and effectively manage and oversee its day-to-day operations and programs relies heavily on the ability of entity financial management systems¹⁹ to produce complete, reliable, timely, and consistent financial information for use by executive branch agencies and the Congress. FFMIA was designed to lead to system improvements that would result in CFO Act agency managers routinely having access to reliable, useful, and timely financial-related information to measure performance and increase accountability throughout the year. FFMIA requires auditors, as part of the 24 CFO Act agencies' financial statement audits, to report whether those agencies' financial management systems substantially comply with (1) federal financial management systems requirements, (2) applicable federal accounting standards, and (3) the federal government's Standard General Ledger (SGL) at the transaction level. For fiscal years 2010 and 2009, auditors for 10 of the 24 CFO Act agencies reported that the agencies' financial management systems did not substantially comply with one or more of the three FFMIA requirements. Agency management at the 24 CFO Act agencies also annually report on FFMIA compliance. Agency management at 7 CFO Act agencies reported that their agencies' systems were not in substantial compliance with one or more of the three FFMIA requirements for fiscal years 2010 and 2009. The differences in the assessments of substantial compliance between the auditors and agency management reflected differences in views between management and the auditors on the impact reported deficiencies had on agency's financial management systems. Long-standing financial management systems weaknesses at several large CFO Act agencies, along with the size and complexity of the federal government, continue to present a formidable

¹⁹The term financial management systems includes the financial systems and the financial portions of mixed systems necessary to support financial management, including automated and manual processes, procedures, controls, data, hardware, software, and support personnel dedicated to the operation and maintenance of system functions.

management challenge in providing accountability to the nation's taxpayers and have contributed significantly to our inability to determine the reliability of the accrual-based consolidated financial statements.

We provided a draft of this report to Treasury and OMB officials, who provided technical comments, which have been incorporated as appropriate. Treasury and OMB officials expressed their continuing commitment to address the problems this report outlines.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert F. Dacey". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping "y" at the end.

Robert F. Dacey
Chief Accountant
U.S. Government Accountability Office

December 13, 2010

APPENDIX I

Objective, Scope, and Methodology

Our objective was to audit the consolidated financial statements for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2010 and 2009 (as well as 2008, 2007, and 2006 with respect to the Statements of Social Insurance), including reporting on internal control over financial reporting and on compliance with selected provisions of laws and regulations.

The Government Management Reform Act of 1994 expanded the requirements of the Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act of 1990 by making the inspectors general of 24 major federal agencies²⁰ responsible for annual audits of agencywide financial statements prepared by these agencies and GAO responsible for the audit of the U.S. government's consolidated financial statements. The Accountability of Tax Dollars (ATD) Act of 2002²¹ requires most other executive branch entities to prepare and have audited annual financial statements. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Department of the Treasury (Treasury) have identified 35 federal entities²² that are significant to the U.S. government's consolidated financial statements, consisting of the 24 CFO Act agencies, several other federal executive branch agencies, and some government corporations (35 significant entities). Our work was performed in coordination and cooperation with the inspectors general and independent public accountants for these 35 significant entities to achieve our respective audit objectives. Our audit approach regarding the accrual-based consolidated financial statements focused on determining the current status of the material weaknesses that contributed to our disclaimer of opinion on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements and the other material weaknesses affecting internal control that we had reported in our report on the consolidated financial statements for fiscal year 2009.²³ We also separately audited the financial statements of the following significant federal entities and federal agency components:

- We audited and expressed an unqualified opinion on the Internal Revenue Service's (IRS) fiscal years 2010 and 2009 financial statements.²⁴ In fiscal years 2010 and 2009, IRS collected about \$2.3 trillion each year in tax payments and paid about \$467 billion and \$438 billion, respectively, in refunds to taxpayers. For fiscal year 2010, we continued to report material weaknesses that resulted in ineffective internal control over financial reporting. In addition, we found a significant deficiency in

²⁰31 U.S.C. 901(b), 3521(e). The 1994 act authorized the Office of Management and Budget to designate agency components that also would receive a financial statement audit. See 31 U.S.C. 3515(c).

²¹Pub. L. No. 107-289, 116 Stat. 2049 (Nov. 7, 2002); see 31 U.S.C. 3515.

²²See *Treasury Financial Manual*, volume I, part 2, chapter 4700, for a listing of the 35 entities.

²³For our report on the U.S. government's consolidated financial statements for fiscal year 2009, see U.S. Department of the Treasury, *Fiscal Year 2009 Financial Report of the United States Government* (Washington, D.C.: Feb. 2010), pp. 209-234, which can be found on GAO's Web site at www.gao.gov/financial.html.

²⁴GAO, *Financial Audit: IRS's Fiscal Years 2010 and 2009 Financial Statements*, GAO-11-142 (Washington, D.C.: Nov. 10, 2010).

IRS's internal control over tax refund disbursements, which resulted in the payment of erroneous tax refunds to taxpayers. Our tests of IRS's compliance in fiscal year 2010 with selected provisions of laws and regulations disclosed one area of noncompliance. We also found that IRS's financial management systems did not substantially comply with the requirements of the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996.

- We audited and expressed an unqualified opinion on the Schedules of Federal Debt managed by Treasury's Bureau of the Public Debt (BPD) for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2010 and 2009.²⁵ For these 2 fiscal years, the schedules reported (1) approximately \$9.0 trillion (2010) and \$7.6 trillion (2009) of federal debt held by the public;²⁶ (2) about \$4.5 trillion (2010) and \$4.3 trillion (2009) of intragovernmental debt holdings;²⁷ and (3) about \$215 billion (2010) and \$189 billion (2009) of interest on federal debt held by the public. We reported that as of September 30, 2010, BPD had effective internal control over financial reporting relevant to the Schedule of Federal Debt. Further, we reported that there was no reportable BPD noncompliance in fiscal year 2010 with a significant provision of law related to the Schedule of Federal Debt (statutory debt limit) we tested.
- We audited and expressed unqualified opinions on the fiscal years 2010 and 2009 financial statements of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).²⁸ We also reported that as of September 30, 2010, SEC did not have effective internal control over financial reporting due to two material weaknesses in internal control. In addition, we reported that there was no reportable noncompliance in fiscal year 2010 with the selected provisions of laws and regulations we tested.
- We audited and expressed an unqualified opinion on the fiscal years 2010 and 2009 financial statements of the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA).²⁹ We reported that FHFA had effective internal control over financial reporting, and we found no reportable noncompliance in fiscal year 2010 with the selected provisions of laws and regulations we tested.
- We audited and expressed an unqualified opinion on the Office of Financial Stability's (OFS) fiscal years 2010 and 2009 financial statements for the Troubled

²⁵GAO, *Financial Audit: Bureau of the Public Debt's Fiscal Years 2010 and 2009 Schedules of Federal Debt*, GAO-11-52 (Washington, D.C.: Nov. 8, 2010).

²⁶The public holding federal debt is comprised of individuals, corporations, state and local governments, the Federal Reserve Banks, and foreign governments and central banks.

²⁷Intragovernmental debt holdings represent federal debt issued by Treasury and held by certain federal government accounts such as the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

²⁸GAO, *Financial Audit: Securities and Exchange Commission's Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2009*, GAO-11-202 (Washington, D.C.: Nov. 15, 2010).

²⁹GAO, *Financial Audit: Federal Housing Finance Agency's Fiscal Years 2010 and 2009 Financial Statements*, GAO-11-151 (Washington, D.C.: Nov. 15, 2010).

Asset Relief Program (TARP).³⁰ We reported that although certain internal controls could be improved, OFS had effective internal control over financial reporting as of September 30, 2010. We also reported that we found no reportable noncompliance for the period ended September 30, 2010, with the selected provisions of laws and regulations we tested.

- We audited and expressed unqualified opinions on the December 31, 2009 and 2008, financial statements of two funds administered by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), including the Deposit Insurance Fund (DIF) and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC) Resolution Fund.³¹ We reported that as of December 31, 2009, FDIC's internal control over financial reporting was not effective because of a material weakness in internal control related to its process for estimating losses on loss-sharing agreements, and we found no reportable noncompliance for calendar year 2009 with the selected provisions of laws and regulations we tested.

In addition, we considered the CFO Act agencies' and certain other federal entities' fiscal years 2010 and 2009 financial statements and the related auditors' reports prepared by the inspectors general or contracted independent public accountants. Financial statements and audit reports for these significant entities provide information about the operations of each of these entities. The entity audit reports also contain details regarding any audit findings and related recommendations for the respective entity. We did not audit, and we do not express an opinion on, any of these individual federal entity financial statements.

We considered the Department of Defense's (DOD) assertion included in the *DOD Agency Financial Report for 2010* that certain major deficiencies related to noncompliant systems and noncompliant processes continued to impact the department's ability to prepare reliable financial statements. In addition, DOD refers to its ongoing efforts to address related material weaknesses reported by the DOD Inspector General. In the DOD Inspector General's fiscal year 2010 report on internal control over financial reporting, the Inspector General cited material weaknesses in several areas including (1) property, plant, and equipment; (2) inventory and operating material and supplies; (3) environmental liabilities; (4) intragovernmental eliminations; and (5) material amounts of unsupported accounting entries needed to prepare DOD's annual consolidated financial statements.

Because of the significance of the amounts presented in the Statement of Social Insurance related to the Social Security Administration (SSA) and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), our audit approach regarding the Statement of Social Insurance focused primarily on these two agencies. For each federal entity preparing a Statement of

³⁰GAO, *Financial Audit: Office of Financial Stability (Troubled Asset Relief Program) Fiscal Years 2010 and 2009 Financial Statements*, GAO-11-174 (Washington, D.C.: Nov. 15, 2010).

³¹GAO, *Financial Audit: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Funds' 2009 and 2008 Financial Statements*, GAO-10-705 (Washington, D.C.: June 25, 2010).

Social Insurance,³² we considered the entity's fiscal year 2010, 2009, 2008, 2007, and 2006 financial statements and the related auditor's reports prepared by the inspectors general or contracted independent public accountants. We believe our audit, including internal control and substantive audit procedures, reperformance procedures, and review of the other auditors' Statement of Social Insurance-related audit work, provides a reasonable basis for our opinions on the 2009, 2008, and 2007 Statements of Social Insurance.

We performed sufficient audit work to provide this report on the consolidated financial statements, internal control, and compliance with selected provisions of laws and regulations. We considered the limitations on the scope of our work regarding the accrual-based consolidated financial statements and the 2010 and 2006 Statements of Social Insurance in forming our conclusions. Our work was performed in accordance with U.S. generally accepted government auditing standards.

³²These entities consist of SSA, HHS, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Department of Labor.

APPENDIX II

Material Weaknesses Contributing to Our Disclaimer of Opinion on the Accrual-based Consolidated Financial Statements

The continuing material weaknesses discussed below contributed to our disclaimer of opinion on the federal government's accrual-based consolidated financial statements. The federal government did not maintain adequate systems or have sufficient, reliable evidence to support information reported in the accompanying accrual-based consolidated financial statements, as described below.

Property, Plant, and Equipment and Inventories and Related Property

The federal government could not satisfactorily determine that property, plant, and equipment (PP&E) and inventories and related property were properly reported in the accrual-based consolidated financial statements. Most of the PP&E and inventories and related property are the responsibility of the Department of Defense (DOD). As in past years, DOD did not maintain adequate systems or have sufficient records to provide reliable information on these assets. Other entities reported continued deficiencies in internal control procedures and processes related to PP&E.

Deficiencies in internal control over such assets could affect the federal government's ability to fully know the assets it owns, including their location and condition, and its ability to effectively (1) safeguard assets from physical deterioration, theft, or loss; (2) account for acquisitions and disposals of such assets and reliably report asset balances; (3) ensure that the assets are available for use when needed; (4) prevent unnecessary storage and maintenance costs or purchase of assets already on hand; and (5) determine the full costs of programs that use these assets.

Liabilities and Commitments and Contingencies

The federal government could not reasonably estimate or adequately support amounts reported for certain liabilities. For example, DOD was not able to estimate with assurance key components of its environmental and disposal liabilities. In addition, DOD could not support a significant amount of its estimated military postretirement health benefits liabilities included in federal employee and veteran benefits payable. These unsupported amounts related to the cost of direct health care provided by DOD-managed military treatment facilities. Further, the federal government could not determine whether commitments and contingencies, including any related to treaties and other international agreements entered into to further the federal government's interests, were complete and properly reported.

Problems in accounting for liabilities affect the determination of the full cost of the federal government's current operations and the extent of its liabilities. Also, deficiencies

in internal control supporting the process for estimating environmental and disposal liabilities could result in improperly stated liabilities as well as adversely affect the federal government's ability to determine priorities for cleanup and disposal activities and to appropriately consider future budgetary resources needed to carry out these activities. In addition, if disclosures of commitments and contingencies are incomplete or incorrect, reliable information is not available about the extent of the federal government's obligations.

Cost of Government Operations and Disbursement Activity

The previously discussed material weaknesses in reporting assets and liabilities; material weaknesses in financial statement preparation, as discussed below; and the lack of adequate disbursement reconciliations at certain federal entities affect reported net costs. As a result, the federal government was unable to support significant portions of the total net cost of operations, most notably those related to DOD.

With respect to disbursements, DOD and certain other federal entities reported continued material weaknesses and significant deficiencies in reconciling disbursement activity. For fiscal years 2010 and 2009, there was unreconciled disbursement activity, including unreconciled differences between federal entities' and the Department of Treasury's (Treasury) records of disbursements and unsupported federal entity adjustments, totaling billions of dollars, which could also affect the balance sheet.

Unreliable cost information affects the federal government's ability to control and reduce costs, assess performance, evaluate programs, and set fees to recover costs where required or authorized. If disbursements are improperly recorded, this could result in misstatements in the financial statements and in certain data provided by federal entities for inclusion in *The Budget of the United States Government* (President's Budget) concerning obligations and outlays.

Accounting for and Reconciliation of Intragovernmental Activity and Balances

Federal entities are unable to adequately account for and reconcile intragovernmental activity and balances. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Treasury require the chief financial officers (CFO) of 35 significant entities to reconcile, on a quarterly basis, selected intragovernmental activity and balances with their trading partners. In addition, these entities are required to report to Treasury, the entity's inspector general, and GAO on the extent and results of intragovernmental activity and balance-reconciliation efforts as of the end of the fiscal year.

A substantial number of the entities did not adequately perform the required reconciliations for fiscal years 2010 and 2009. For these fiscal years, based on trading partner information provided to Treasury in the 35 significant entities' closing packages, Treasury provided a *Material Differences Report* to each entity showing amounts for

certain intragovernmental activity and balances that significantly differed from those of the entity's corresponding trading partners as of the end of the fiscal year. Agencies are required to complete their *Material Differences Reports*, which includes providing explanations of the reasons for the differences. Based on our analysis of the completed *Material Differences Reports* for fiscal year 2010, we noted that a significant number of CFOs were unable to adequately explain the reasons for the differences with their trading partners or did not provide adequate documentation to support responses in their entities' *Material Differences Reports*. For both fiscal years 2010 and 2009, amounts reported by federal entity trading partners for certain intragovernmental accounts were not in agreement by significant amounts. In addition, a significant number of CFOs cited differing accounting methodologies, accounting errors, and timing differences for their material differences with their trading partners. Some CFOs simply indicated that they were unable to explain the differences with their trading partners with no indication as to when the differences would be resolved. As a result of these circumstances, the federal government's ability to determine the impact of these differences on the amounts reported in the accrual-based consolidated financial statements is significantly impaired.

Treasury continues to take steps to help resolve material differences in intragovernmental activity and balances. For example, beginning with the third quarter of fiscal year 2010 intragovernmental reporting, CFOs were required to certify the explanations included in their entities' completed *Material Differences Report*. Further, during fiscal year 2010, Treasury established additional focus groups, consisting of Treasury and agency personnel, to begin identifying and resolving certain reported material differences. Resolving the intragovernmental transactions problem remains a difficult challenge and will require a strong commitment by federal entities to fully implement guidance regarding business rules for intragovernmental transactions issued by OMB and Treasury as well as continued strong leadership by OMB and Treasury.³³

Preparation of Consolidated Financial Statements

While further progress was demonstrated in fiscal year 2010, the federal government continued to have inadequate systems, controls, and procedures to ensure that the consolidated financial statements are consistent with the underlying audited entity financial statements, properly balanced, and in conformity with U.S. generally accepted

³³On November 8, 2010, Treasury issued the Treasury Financial Manual (TFM) Bulletin No. 2011-04, *Intragovernmental Business Rules*, which rescinded and supersedes TFM Bulletin No. 2007-03, *Intragovernmental Business Rules* (Nov. 15, 2006). This guidance is effective for fiscal year 2011 and has updated the previous guidance to include, among other things, a new *Intragovernmental Dispute Resolution Request Form* to be certified by federal entity CFOs and disputes to be resolved by Treasury's Deputy Assistant Secretary—Accounting Policy, Office of the Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

accounting principles (GAAP). During our fiscal year 2010 audit, we found the following:³⁴

- Treasury's process for compiling the consolidated financial statements generally demonstrated that amounts in the Statement of Social Insurance were consistent with the underlying federal entities' financial statements and that the Balance Sheet and the Statement of Net Cost were also consistent with the 35 significant federal entities' financial statements prior to eliminating intragovernmental activity and balances. However, Treasury's process did not ensure that the information in the remaining three principal financial statements was fully consistent with the underlying information in the 35 significant federal entities' audited financial statements and other financial data.
- For fiscal year 2010, auditors for many of the CFO Act agencies continued to report control deficiencies regarding entities' financial reporting processes which, in turn, could affect the preparation of the consolidated financial statements. For example, auditors for several entities reported that a significant number of adjustments were required to prepare the entities' financial statements. Auditors are also required to separately audit financial information sent by the 35 significant federal entities to Treasury through a closing package. In connection with preparing the consolidated financial statements, several auditors reported significant deficiencies regarding the preparation of the closing package. Further, Treasury had to record significant adjustments to correct errors found in federal entities' audited closing package information.
- To make the fiscal years 2010 and 2009 consolidated financial statements balance, Treasury recorded net increases of \$0.8 billion and \$17.4 billion, respectively, to net operating cost on the Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position, which it labeled "Unmatched transactions and balances."³⁵ Treasury recorded an additional net \$3.8 billion and \$8 billion of unmatched transactions in the Statement of Net Cost for fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively. Treasury is unable to fully identify and quantify all components of these unreconciled activities.

³⁴Most of the issues we identified in fiscal year 2010 existed in fiscal year 2009, and many have existed for a number of years. Most recently, in July 2010, we reported the issues we identified to Treasury and OMB and provided recommendations for corrective action in GAO, *Management Report: Improvements Needed in Controls over the Preparation of the U.S. Consolidated Financial Statements*, GAO-10-757 (Washington, D.C.: Jul. 30, 2010).

³⁵Although Treasury was unable to determine how much of the unmatched transactions and balances, if any, relate to net operating cost, it reported this amount as a component of net operating cost in the accompanying consolidated financial statements.

- The federal government continues to be unable to determine the impact of unreconciled intragovernmental activity and balances on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements. Treasury's elimination of certain intragovernmental activity and balances continues to be impaired by the federal entities' problems in handling their intragovernmental transactions. As a result, Treasury recorded the net differences in intragovernmental elimination entries as part of the "Unmatched transactions and balances" discussed above. As previously discussed, amounts reported for federal entity trading partners for certain intragovernmental accounts were not in agreement by significant amounts. In addition, there are hundreds of billions of dollars of unreconciled differences between the General Fund of the U.S. Government and federal entity trading partners related to appropriation and other intragovernmental transactions. The ability to reconcile such transactions is hampered because only some of the General Fund of the U.S. Government is reported in the Department of the Treasury's financial statements.
- The federal government could not demonstrate that it had fully identified and reported all items needed to reconcile the operating results, which for fiscal year 2010 showed a net operating cost of \$2.1 trillion, to the budget results, which for the same period showed a unified budget deficit of \$1.3 trillion.
- The federal government has not established and implemented effective processes and procedures for identifying and reporting all items needed to prepare the Statement of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities.
- Over the past several years, significant actions have been taken to assist in ensuring that financial information is reported or disclosed in the consolidated financial statements in conformity with GAAP. However, Treasury's reporting of certain financial information required by GAAP continues to be impaired. Due to certain material weaknesses noted in this report—for example, commitments and contingencies related to treaties and other international agreements—Treasury is precluded from determining if additional disclosure is required by GAAP in the consolidated financial statements, and we are precluded from determining whether the omitted information is material. Further, Treasury's ability to report information in conformity with GAAP will also remain impaired until federal entities, such as DOD, can provide Treasury with complete and reliable information required to be reported in the consolidated financial statements.
- The consolidated financial statements include financial information for the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, to the extent that federal entities within those branches have provided Treasury such information. However, as we have reported in past years, there continue to be undetermined amounts of assets, liabilities, costs, and revenues that are not included, and the federal government did not provide evidence that the excluded financial information was immaterial.

- Other internal control deficiencies existed in the process for preparing the consolidated financial statements, involving (1) inadequate design and ineffective implementation of policies and procedures related to certain areas, and (2) inadequate monitoring to determine whether controls for preparing the consolidated financial statements were operating effectively. As a result, we identified numerous errors in draft consolidated financial statements that were subsequently corrected by Treasury.
- As in previous years, Treasury did not have adequate systems and personnel to address the magnitude of the fiscal year 2010 financial reporting challenges it faced, such as control deficiencies in Treasury's process for preparing the consolidated financial statements noted above. We found that personnel at Treasury's Financial Management Service had excessive workloads that required an extraordinary amount of effort and dedication to compile the consolidated financial statements; however, there were not enough personnel with specialized financial reporting experience to help ensure reliable financial reporting by the reporting date. In addition, the federal government does not perform interim compilations at the governmentwide level, which leads to almost all of the compilation effort being performed during a condensed time period at the end of the year.

During fiscal year 2010, Treasury, in coordination with OMB, continued implementing corrective action plans and made progress in addressing certain internal control deficiencies we have previously reported. Until the internal control deficiencies have been fully addressed, the federal government's ability to ensure that the consolidated financial statements are consistent with the underlying audited federal entities' financial statements, properly balanced, and in conformity with U.S. GAAP will be impaired. Resolving some of these internal control deficiencies will be a difficult challenge and will require a strong commitment from Treasury and OMB as they continue to execute and implement their corrective action plans.

Components of the Budget Deficit

Both the Reconciliation of Net Operating Cost and Unified Budget Deficit and the Statement of Changes in Cash Balance from Unified Budget and Other Activities report a unified budget deficit for fiscal years 2010 and 2009 of \$1.3 trillion and \$1.4 trillion, respectively.³⁶ The budget deficit is calculated by subtracting actual budget outlays (outlays) from actual budget receipts (receipts). Also, the Fiscal Projections for the U.S. Government included in Supplemental Information use such outlays and receipts.

For several years, we have been reporting material unreconciled differences between the total net outlays reported in selected federal entities' Statements of Budgetary Resources

³⁶The budget deficit, receipts, and outlays amounts are reported in Treasury's *Monthly Treasury Statement* and the President's Budget.

(SBR) and Treasury's central accounting records used to compute the budget deficit³⁷ reported in the consolidated financial statements. Unreconciled net outlays of \$40 billion and \$28 billion existed for fiscal years 2010 and 2009, respectively. OMB and Treasury have recognized that it will take a coordinated effort to establish effective processes and procedures for identifying, resolving, and explaining material differences in this and other components of the deficit between Treasury's central accounting records and information reported in entity financial statements and underlying entity financial information and records. Until these types of differences are timely reconciled by the federal government, their effect on the consolidated financial statements will continue to be unknown.

In fiscal year 2010, we again noted that several entities' auditors reported internal control deficiencies (1) affecting the entities' SBRs and (2) related to monitoring, accounting, and reporting of budgetary transactions. These control deficiencies could affect the reporting and calculation of the net outlay amounts in the entities' SBRs. In addition, such deficiencies may also affect the entities' ability to report reliable budgetary information to Treasury and OMB and may affect the unified budget deficit reported in the accrual-based consolidated financial statements. The unified budget deficit is also reported by Treasury in its *Combined Statement of Receipts, Outlays, and Balances*,³⁸ and in other federal government publications.

³⁷See GAO, *Financial Audit: Process for Preparing the Consolidated Financial Statements of the U.S. Government Needs Improvement*, GAO-04-45 (Washington, D.C.: Oct. 30, 2003).

³⁸Treasury's *Combined Statement of Receipts, Outlays, and Balances* presents budget results and cash related assets and liabilities of the federal government with supporting details. Treasury represents this report as the recognized official publication of receipts and outlays of the federal government based on entity reporting.

APPENDIX III

Other Material Weaknesses

Material weaknesses in internal control discussed in this report resulted in ineffective controls over financial reporting. In addition to the material weaknesses discussed in appendix II that contributed to our disclaimer of opinion on the accrual-based consolidated financial statements, we found the following three other material weaknesses in internal control.

Improper Payments

The federal government continues to make progress under the requirements of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 (IPIA)³⁹ in reporting on the nature and extent of improper payments.⁴⁰ Federal entities reported estimates of improper payment amounts that totaled \$125.4 billion in fiscal year 2010, which represented about 5.5 percent of \$2.3 trillion of reported outlays for the related programs. The \$125.4 billion estimate is an increase of \$16.2 billion from the prior year estimate of \$109.2 billion.⁴¹ Increases in reported estimates of improper payments were mostly attributable to four major programs: (1) Department of Labor's Unemployment Insurance program, (2) Department of the Treasury's Earned Income Tax Credit Program, (3) Department of Health and Human Services' (HHS) Medicaid program, and (4) HHS' Medicare Advantage program. The increases in the estimates for these programs primarily related to an increase in reported program outlays and, for the Unemployment Insurance and Earned Income Tax Credit programs, increases in reported error rates. Reported error rates declined in certain significant programs, including the Medicaid and Medicare Advantage programs, as well as the Department of Transportation's Federal Aid Highway program and Social Security Administration's Supplemental Security Income program. It is important to note that reported improper payment estimates include overpayments, underpayments, and payments for which adequate documentation was not

³⁹Pub. L. No. 107-300, 116 Stat. 2350 (Nov. 26, 2002), as amended by the Improper Payments Elimination And Recovery Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-204, 124 Stat. 2224 (July 22, 2010). The IPIA requires federal executive branch entities to review all programs and activities, identify those that may be susceptible to significant improper payments, estimate and report the annual amount of improper payments for those programs, and implement actions to reduce improper payments.

⁴⁰IPIA defines an improper payment as any payment that should not have been made or that was made in an incorrect amount (including overpayments and underpayments) under statutory, contractual, administrative, or other legally applicable requirements. It includes any payment to an ineligible recipient, any payment for an ineligible service, any duplicate payment, payments for services not received, and any payment that does not account for credit for applicable discounts.

⁴¹In their fiscal year 2010 Performance and Accountability Reports (PAR) and Annual Financial Reports (AFR), select federal entities updated their fiscal year 2009 improper payment estimates to reflect changes since issuance of their fiscal year 2009 PARs and AFRs. These updates increased the governmentwide improper payment estimate for fiscal year 2009 from \$98.7 billion to \$109.2 billion.

found, and they may include amounts of payments for years prior to the current fiscal year.

While progress has been made in meeting the requirements of IPIA, the federal government still faces challenges in determining the full extent to which improper payments occur and to reasonably assure that appropriate actions are taken to reduce improper payments. For example, three federal entities did not report estimated improper payment amounts for fiscal year 2010 for 7 risk-susceptible programs that had aggregate outlays of at least \$85 billion. Of these 7 programs, 6 risk-susceptible programs had reported improper payment estimated amounts in fiscal year 2008, but not in fiscal year 2009. Some entities cited insufficient documentation, incorrect computations, and changes in program requirements as causes of improper payments. Entity auditors also reported a variety of control deficiencies and challenges, such as financial systems limitations and contract monitoring issues that could allow improper payments to occur. Corrective actions needed to reduce improper payments may be unique to specific entities and programs. Furthermore, until the federal government has implemented effective processes to determine the full extent to which improper payments occur and reasonably assure that appropriate actions are taken across entities and programs to effectively reduce improper payments, the federal government will not have reasonable assurance that the use of taxpayer funds is adequately safeguarded.

On November 20, 2009, the President issued Executive Order 13520, *Reducing Improper Payments*, which further heightened awareness of the need to reduce improper payments and eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in federal programs. The order focuses on transparency, holding entities accountable, and creating incentives to reduce improper payments. The President also issued a March 10, 2010 memorandum on *Finding and Recapturing Improper Payments* that expands the use of payment recapture audits (recovery audit) for detecting and recapturing payment errors; and a June 18, 2010 memorandum directing that a “Do Not Pay List” be established to prevent improper payments from being made to ineligible recipients. Moreover, Congress passed the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010 (IPERA),⁴² which amends IPIA to expand upon the required steps for executive branch entities to identify, estimate, and report improper payment information. IPERA established additional requirements related to manager accountability, recovery auditing, compliance and noncompliance determinations and reporting, and an opinion on internal controls over improper payments. In general, the revised improper payment requirements established by IPERA become effective when OMB issues its implementing guidance, which is required no later than January 22, 2011. We view these actions as positive steps toward improving transparency over and reducing improper payments; however, it is too soon to determine whether the activities called for in the Executive Order, Presidential memoranda, and

⁴²Pub. L. No. 111-204, 124 Stat. 2224 (July 22, 2010).

IPERA will achieve their goal of reducing improper payments while continuing to ensure that federal programs serve and provide access to intended beneficiaries.

Information Security

Although progress has been made, serious and widespread information security control deficiencies continue to place federal assets at risk of inadvertent or deliberate misuse, financial information at risk of unauthorized modification or destruction, sensitive information at risk of inappropriate disclosure, and critical operations at risk of disruption. We have reported information security as a high-risk area across government since February 1997. During fiscal year 2010, federal entities reported control deficiencies related to preventing, limiting, or detecting unauthorized access to computing resources. Specifically, control deficiencies were identified related to (1) security management; (2) access to computer resources (data, equipment, and facilities) being reasonable and restricted to authorized individuals; (3) changes to information system resources being authorized and systems being configured and operating as intended; (4) segregation of incompatible duties; and (5) contingency planning for protecting information resources, minimizing the risk of unplanned interruptions, and providing for recovery of critical operations.

Such information security control deficiencies unnecessarily increase the risk that the reliability and availability of data that are recorded in or transmitted by federal financial management systems could be compromised. A primary reason for these deficiencies is that federal entities generally have not yet fully institutionalized comprehensive security management programs, which are critical to identifying information security control deficiencies, resolving information security problems, and managing information security risks on an ongoing basis. The federal government has taken important actions to improve information security, such as issuing extensive guidance on information security, reducing the number of federal access points to the Internet, and establishing security configurations for certain desktop computers. However, until entities identify and resolve information security control deficiencies and manage information security risks on an ongoing basis, federal data and systems, including financial information, will remain at risk.

Tax Collection Activities

During fiscal year 2010, material weaknesses and systemic deficiencies continued to affect the federal government's ability to effectively manage its tax collection activities. Due to errors and delays in recording taxpayer information, assessments, payments, and other activities, the federal government's records did not always reflect the correct amount that taxpayers owed and this contributed to the federal government's inability to timely release federal tax liens against taxpayers who fully satisfied or were otherwise relieved of their tax liability. Such errors and delays may cause undue burden and frustration to taxpayers who either have already paid taxes owed or who owe significantly lower amounts. In addition, these deficiencies indicate that internal controls

over the financial reporting process were not effective to (1) ensure that reported amounts of taxes receivable and tax assessments were accurate on an ongoing basis and could be relied upon by management as a tool to aid in making and supporting resource allocation decisions and (2) support timely and reliable financial statements, accompanying notes, and required supplemental and other accompanying information without extensive supplemental procedures and adjustments.

APPENDIX IV

Significant Deficiencies

In addition to the material weaknesses discussed in appendices II and III, we found two significant deficiencies in internal control as described below. Also, the significant deficiency in fiscal year 2009 regarding verification procedures for data input for the Troubled Asset Relief Program equity investment and direct loan valuations is no longer considered to be a significant deficiency as of September 30, 2010.

Loans Receivable and Loan Guarantee Liabilities

Internal control deficiencies were identified at certain federal entities accounting for the majority of the reported balances for loans receivable and loan-guarantee liabilities. The deficiencies, for the most part, involved credit subsidy estimation and related financial reporting processes. The issues and the complexities associated with estimating the costs of lending and other loan-related financing activities significantly increase the risk that misstatements in agency and governmentwide financial statements could occur and go undetected. Further, these control deficiencies can adversely affect the federal government's ability to support annual budget requests for these programs, make future budgetary decisions, manage program costs, and measure the performance of lending activities. A previously reported control deficiency relating to mortgage-backed securities was resolved in fiscal year 2010.

Preparation of the Statement of Social Insurance

Deficiencies were identified in certain controls over spreadsheets used by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to prepare its Statement of Social Insurance, including the lack of robust controls over spreadsheet changes and inputs that may result in output that varies from management's intentions. HHS, which administers the Medicare programs, contributes the majority of the amounts reported on the consolidated Statement of Social Insurance. Such control deficiencies could result in misstatements to the consolidated Statement of Social Insurance.

(198620)

This page is intentionally blank.