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Although PBGC’s board has strengthened the corporation’s governing bylaws, the three-member board of directors is still limited in its ability to provide policy direction and oversight to PBGC. In implementing our earlier recommendation, the board revised the corporation’s bylaws to more clearly define the roles and responsibilities of PBGC’s board members, representatives, director, and senior management. PBGC also contracted with a consulting firm to provide a background report to assist the board in its review of alternative corporate governance structures, including restructuring the board of directors as GAO suggested in 2007. However, because of its small size, the board has not been able to develop procedures and mechanisms to monitor PBGC’s operations, such as standing committees, which are mechanisms used by other government corporations. PBGC may also be exposed to challenges as the board, its representatives, and the director will likely change with the upcoming presidential transition in January 2009. While PBGC management has experienced a partial leadership change in recent years and provides operational and financial information to those newly appointed, PBGC Inspector General and GAO reports have recently identified additional financial and operational challenges facing the corporation. This additional information could help the new board members better understand the vulnerabilities and challenges facing the corporation.

PBGC is subject to routine congressional oversight, but certain other government corporations have other types of reporting requirements in place—such as congressional notifications and reporting protocols for their advisory committees—to ensure effective communication exist between the corporations and Congress. Congressional oversight of PBGC in recent years has ranged from formal committee hearings to investigations and studies conducted by its congressional support agencies. For example, since 2002, PBGC officials have testified 19 times before several different committees on issues such as the status of its financial condition. Further, GAO, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Congressional Research Service have issued a variety of reports and testimonies on PBGC financial and operational matters. However, PBGC does not have reporting requirements applied to other government corporations for providing additional information to Congress. For example, the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation are required to notify Congress prior to conducting certain financial transactions. The advisory committee of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation formally reports to its board of directors, while the Export-Import Bank of the United States’ advisory committee formally reports to its board and Congress each year on matters related to their respective organizations. In addition, the advisory boards of other government entities with retirement-related responsibilities—such as the Social Security Administration, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board—provide reports to their overseeing bodies.
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September 10, 2008

The Honorable Charles Rangel
Chairman
Committee on Ways and Means
House of Representatives

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) insures the pension benefits of 44 million private sector workers and retirees in over 30,000 employer-sponsored pension plans. Since its creation in 1974, PBGC’s assets have increased significantly, making its financial portfolio one of the largest of any federal government corporation. PBGC holds approximately $68 billion in assets and approximately $82 billion in liabilities from underfunded plans—many of which were terminated in the past decade. As a result, PBGC has an accumulated deficit that currently stands at about $14 billion. Recognizing the effect PBGC’s financial condition could have on the federal budget, in 2003, we placed PBGC’s largest insurance program on GAO’s High Risk list; a list composed of federal programs that need attention and transformation.1 PBGC’s insurance program remains on the list today.

PBGC is governed by a three-member board of directors consisting of the Secretaries of the Treasury, Labor, and Commerce, who are responsible for providing policy direction and oversight of PBGC. In July 2007, we reported that the board structure was not sufficient in size to include the expertise or diverse set of interests needed to provide policy direction and oversight of PBGC. Consequently, we asked Congress to consider restructuring the corporation’s board of directors by appointing additional members with diverse backgrounds who possess knowledge and expertise useful to PBGC’s responsibilities. We also recommended that the board develop policies and mechanisms consistent with corporate governance practices and develop formal guidelines to articulate the roles and responsibilities of the board chair, members, their representatives, and the director.2 You asked us to update the progress PBGC has made in improving its governance structure to provide policy direction and

---


oversight since our report. Specifically, this report addresses (1) the steps PBGC has taken to improve its policy direction and oversight and (2) how Congress applies oversight to PBGC and what other oversight mechanisms exist for government corporations.

To identify the steps PBGC has taken to improve its governance structure, we updated our prior work, collecting and reviewing documents related to PBGC’s bylaws, which were published in May 2008. We also reviewed reports on PBGC’s organizational structure. To identify how Congress has recently exercised oversight of PBGC, we reviewed congressional hearings from 2002 to the present related to PBGC matters, examined the work of the Congressional Budget Office, the Congressional Research Service, and PBGC’s Office of Inspector General, and reviewed PBGC’s congressional reporting requirements. To identify oversight mechanisms that exist at other government corporations, we collected information on the federal government corporations we identified for our July 2007 review that have similar missions or designations to those of PBGC. Moreover, we reviewed government agencies with retirement-related responsibilities to determine what additional mechanisms may exist. We also met with officials from PBGC and the Department of Labor.

We conducted this performance audit between June 2008 and September 2008 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. Appendix I discusses our scope and methodology in further detail.

Results in Brief

Although PBGC’s board has strengthened the corporation’s governing bylaws, the three-member board of directors is still limited in its ability to provide policy direction and oversight to PBGC. In implementing our earlier recommendation, the board revised the corporation’s bylaws to more clearly define the roles and responsibilities of PBGC’s board members, representatives, director, and senior management. PBGC also contracted with a consulting firm to provide a background report to assist the board in its review of alternative corporate governance structures, including restructuring the board of directors as we suggested in 2007. However, because of its small size, the board has not been able to develop procedures and mechanisms to monitor PBGC’s operations, such as standing committees, which are mechanisms used by other government
corporations. PBGC may also be exposed to challenges as the board, its representatives, and the director will likely change with the upcoming presidential transition in January 2009. While PBGC management has experienced a partial leadership change in recent years and provided operational and financial information to those newly appointed, PBGC’s Inspector General and our reports have recently identified additional financial and operational challenges facing the corporation. This additional information could help the new board members and their representatives better understand the vulnerabilities and challenges facing the corporation.

PBGC is subject to routine congressional oversight, but some government corporations have other types of reporting requirements in place—such as congressional notifications and reporting protocols for their advisory committees—to ensure effective communication exists between the corporations and Congress. Congressional oversight of PBGC in recent years has ranged from formal committee hearings to investigations and studies conducted by congressional support agencies. For example, since 2002, PBGC officials have testified 19 times before several different committees on issues such as the status of PBGC’s financial condition. Further, GAO, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Congressional Research Service have issued a variety of reports and testimonies on PBGC financial and operational matters. However, PBGC does not have reporting requirements applied to other government corporations for providing additional information to Congress. For example, the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation are required to notify Congress prior to conducting certain financial transactions. The advisory committee of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation formally reports to its board of directors, while the Export-Import Bank of the United States’ advisory committee formally reports to its board and Congress each year on matters related to their respective organizations. In addition, the advisory boards of other government entities with retirement-related responsibilities—such as the Social Security Administration, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board—provide reports to their overseeing bodies.

To ensure that recently identified management and financial challenges facing PBGC are shared with those newly appointed, we are making a recommendation that PBGC provide Office of Inspector General and GAO reports on the corporation’s financial and management challenges to the newly appointed board members, board representatives, and director so that they can take appropriate action as needed. In response to our draft
report, PBGC's director stated that PBGC agreed with our recommendation.

Background

Congress passed the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) to protect the interests of participants and beneficiaries of private sector employee benefit plans. Before the enactment of ERISA, few rules governed the funding of defined benefit pension plans, and participants had no guarantee that they would receive promised benefits. ERISA established PBGC to insure private sector plan participants' benefits and to encourage the continuation and maintenance of private sector defined benefit pension plans by providing timely and uninterrupted payment of pension benefits.

PBGC is a wholly owned government corporation—that is, the federal government does not share ownership interests with nonfederal entities, and PBGC is subject to requirements under the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945, as amended, such as annual budgets, audits, and management reports. According to public administration experts, a government corporation is appropriate for the administration of government programs that are

- predominately of a business nature,
- produce revenue and are potentially self-sustaining,
- involve a large number of business-type transactions with the public, and
- require greater budget flexibility than a government department or agency.

---


4A defined benefit plan is a pension plan where the plan sponsor provides a benefit generally expressed as a monthly payment based on a formula that combines salary and years of service to the company. Defined benefit plans usually express benefits as an annuity, but may offer departing participants the opportunity to receive lump sum distributions.

5ERISA also established rules for funding defined benefit plans, instituted pension insurance premiums, promulgated certain fiduciary rules and mandated annual reporting requirements.

The United States government is not liable for any obligation or liability incurred by PBGC.\textsuperscript{7} The corporation is funded through insurance premiums from employers that sponsor insured pension plans, as well as assets from terminated pension plans and investment income.

PBGC insures certain private sector defined benefit plans through its single-employer and multiemployer insurance programs.\textsuperscript{8} Through its single-employer insurance program, PBGC paid nearly $4.1 billion in benefits to 622,000 participants and beneficiaries across the United States in fiscal year 2006 (see fig. 1). The geographic breakdown of PBGC-insured participants largely matches the overall population. Appendix II includes information on PBGC’s single-employer plans by each U.S. state and territory, as shown in figure 1.

\textsuperscript{7}29 U.S.C § 1302(a), (g)(2).

\textsuperscript{8}PBGC administers two insurance programs: the single-employer and multiemployer insurance programs. A single-employer plan is established and maintained by only one employer. Single-employer plans can be established unilaterally by the sponsor or through a collective bargaining agreement with a labor union. 29 U.S.C. § 1002(41). A multiemployer plan is a collectively bargained arrangement between a labor union and a group of employers in a particular trade or industry. Management and labor representatives must jointly govern multiemployer plans. 29 U.S.C. § 1002(37).
PBGC is governed by a board of directors that consists of the Secretaries of the Treasury, Labor, and Commerce, with the Secretary of Labor serving as chair of the board.\(^9\) Prior to the passage of the Pension Protection Act of 2006,\(^10\) ERISA provided the Secretary of Labor with

\(^9\)29 U.S.C. § 1302(d). PBGC board members have designated officials and staff within their respective agencies to conduct much of the day-to-day work related to PBGC on their behalf. These officials are referred to as board representatives and act as liaisons between their cabinet secretaries and PBGC. They hold the rank of assistant secretary or above.

responsibility for administering PBGC’s operations, personnel, and budget. The Secretary has historically delegated the responsibility for administering PBGC to an executive director. The Pension Protection Act replaced the chair of the board as PBGC’s administrator with a Senate-confirmed director. The corporation is also aided by a seven-member Advisory Committee appointed by the President to represent the interest of labor, employees, and the general public. This committee has an advisory role, but has no statutory authority to set PBGC policy or conduct formal oversight. PBGC also has an Office of Inspector General that reports to the board through the chair. With 22 staff, the Office of Inspector General generally conducts audits, inspections, and investigations of PBGC’s programs and operations in order to promote program administration effectiveness and deter waste, fraud, and abuse of PBGC resources.

PBGC’s board has taken steps to improve its governance structure by revising the corporation’s bylaws. PBGC also contracted with a consulting firm to assist the board in its review of alternative corporate governance structures. However, the board consists of three cabinet secretaries, a fact that limits their ability to provide policy direction and oversight. PBGC may also face additional challenges as the board members, their representatives, and director will all likely change with the upcoming presidential transition, thus limiting the corporation’s institutional knowledge.

*Revised Bylaws Improve Policy Direction and Oversight, but Board Structure Continues to Limit Attention and Oversight*

PBGC has taken steps to improve its policy direction and oversight through the revision of its bylaws. In our July 2007 report, we recommended PBGC’s board of directors establish formal guidelines that articulate the authorities of the board, the Department of Labor, other board members, and their respective representatives. As part of its May 2008 bylaw revision, the board of directors more clearly defined the roles and responsibilities of its members, representatives, and director. For example, the new bylaws state that the board is responsible for

---

1129 U.S.C § 1302(h)(b) specifies that the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to PBGC’s advisory committee.
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The new bylaws explicitly outline the board’s responsibilities, which include approval of policy matters significantly affecting the pension insurance program or its stakeholders; approval of the corporation’s investment policy; and review of certain management and Inspector General reports. In addition, the new bylaws explicitly define the role and responsibilities of the director and the corporation’s senior officer positions. See appendix III to view PBGC’s new bylaws.

Our July 2007 report also asked Congress to consider restructuring the board of directors to appoint additional members of diverse backgrounds who possess knowledge and expertise useful to PBGC’s responsibilities and can provide the attention needed for strong corporate oversight. In response to these findings, PBGC contracted with a consulting firm to review governance models and provide a background report to assist the board in its review of alternative corporate governance structures. The consulting firm’s final report describes the advantages and disadvantages of the corporate board structures and governance practices of other government corporations and select private sector companies, and concludes that there are several viable alternatives for PBGC’s governance structure and practices.

Board’s Limited Ability to Provide Policy Direction and Oversight Persists

Our July 2007 report found that PBGC’s board has limited time and resources to provide policy direction and oversight and has not established procedures and mechanisms to monitor PBGC operations. Although board members have met more frequently since 2003, the three cabinet secretaries who compose the board have numerous other responsibilities. Because of their responsibilities and the small size of the board, it is difficult for the board to establish and manage oversight mechanisms, such as the use of standing committees—which are common mechanisms used by both government and private corporate boards. According to board officials, the board representatives, assisted by their staff, undertake some of the oversight functions that could be conducted by standing committees. Other government corporations, such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), the Overseas Private

Each representative has a dedicated staff person whose assignments include working on PBGC matters. In 2007, we reported that although the board representatives can draw on the expertise of other staff within their respective agencies as needed, these staff persons have other job responsibilities, which could limit the amount of time they can dedicate to PBGC.
Investment Corporation (OPIC), and the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak), have established standing committees to conduct certain oversight functions. For example, FDIC’s board of directors established standing committees, such as the Case Review Committee and the Audit Committee, to conduct certain oversight functions.

Instead, PBGC’s board continues to rely on the Inspector General and PBGC’s management oversight committees to ensure that PBGC is operating effectively. However, our prior work found that while the board requires the Inspector General to brief it at its semiannual meetings, there were no formal protocols requiring the Inspector General to routinely meet with the board or its representatives and staff. Consequently, when the board and its representatives likely change, it is unclear whether the board would be aware of this informal protocol. Further, we reported that the board relies on PBGC’s executive committees and working groups for monitoring and reviewing PBGC’s operations. However, these committees and working groups are neither independent of the PBGC director nor required to formally report all matters to the board.

PBGC may also be exposed to challenges as the board, its representatives, and director will likely change with the upcoming presidential transition in January 2009, thus limiting institutional knowledge of the challenges facing the corporation. As we noted in 2007, because PBGC’s board is composed of cabinet secretaries, PBGC board members, their representatives, and the director typically change with each administration. Other government corporations’ authorizing statutes—such as OPIC’s—have established board structures with staggered terms for their directors, possibly avoiding gaps in their organization’s institutional knowledge. PBGC management has experienced partial leadership transitions in recent years, and in anticipation of the forthcoming complete leadership change, PBGC is developing additional policies.

14PBGC’s executive management has established committees and working groups for policy and oversight. According to PBGC, the Executive Management Committee is responsible for corporate policy decisions and coordination of the work of various PBGC offices. The Internal Control Committee has oversight responsibility for PBGC’s internal controls. The Budget Planning and Integration Team provides a standardized process to promote integrated approaches for the alignment of budgetary resources and strategic planning. The Operations Integration Board provides a forum for senior leadership to commission and review corporationwide programs, projects, and internal policies.
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materials to include in its official transition package for newly appointed officials. This new information includes information on standards of ethical conduct, appointments, compensation levels, and information on presidential transitions. While PBGC typically provides newly appointed members, representatives, and directors with information on its operations and financial position, PBGC’s Office of Inspector General and our work recently identified additional financial and operational challenges facing the corporation. This additional information could help the new board members and their representatives better understand the vulnerabilities and challenges facing the corporation.

Congressional oversight of PBGC in recent years has ranged from formal congressional hearings to the use of its support agencies, such as GAO, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), and the Congressional Research Service (CRS). However, unlike some other government corporations, PBGC does not have certain reporting requirements for providing additional information to Congress. In general, our prior work has shown that congressional oversight is designed to fulfill a number of purposes, including but not limited to ensuring executive compliance with legislative intent; improving the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy of government operations; evaluating program performance; and conducting investigations.

Since 2002, PBGC officials have testified 19 times before various congressional committees—mostly on broad issues related to the status of the private sector defined benefit pension policy and its effect on PBGC (see table 1). For example, in 2005, the PBGC director testified before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure’s Subcommittee on Aviation regarding pension challenges facing the airline industry. The director’s testimony discussed the possible effects such defaults would have on the defined benefit pension industry and the financial position of the corporation. Congress also recently began exercising oversight of PBGC through the confirmation process of PBGC’s director. With the passage of the Pension Protection Act of 2006, PBGC’s director now must be confirmed by the Senate.\textsuperscript{16} During the confirmation hearing conducted in 2007, members expressed concerns about key defined benefit pension

policy issues and PBGC’s financial condition, as well as sought the nominee’s thoughts on addressing weaknesses in PBGC’s governance structure, such as the concerns we raised about the corporate governance practices.  

Table 1: PBGC Appearances before Congress since 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Congressional committee</th>
<th>Subject of hearing or testimony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 27, 2002</td>
<td>Committee on Finance; United States Senate</td>
<td>Enron Corporation’s defined benefit pension plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 2002</td>
<td>Committee on Ways and Means; Subcommittee on Oversight; House of Representatives</td>
<td>The state of defined benefit pension system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 14, 2003</td>
<td>Committee on Appropriations; Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education; United States Senate</td>
<td>Restoration of U.S. Airways pension plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 11, 2003</td>
<td>Committee on Finance; United States Senate</td>
<td>The state of defined benefit pension system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 30, 2003</td>
<td>Committee on Ways and Means; Subcommittee on Selected Revenue Measures; House of Representatives</td>
<td>Defined benefit pension plan funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 4, 2003</td>
<td>Committee on Education and the Workforce; House of Representatives</td>
<td>Defined benefit pension plan funding and the health of PBGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 15, 2003</td>
<td>Committee on Governmental Affairs; Subcommittee on Financial Management, the Budget and International Security; United States Senate</td>
<td>Defined benefit pension plan funding and the health of PBGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 14, 2003</td>
<td>Special Committee on Aging; United States Senate</td>
<td>The financial health of PBGC and future of defined benefit pension plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 7, 2004</td>
<td>Committee on Science, Commerce and Transportation; United States Senate</td>
<td>The financial and policy challenges facing the private defined benefit pension system and PBGC’s federal pension insurance program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 1, 2005</td>
<td>Committee on Finance; United States Senate</td>
<td>Defined benefit pension plan funding and the health of PBGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 2, 2005</td>
<td>Committee on Government Reform; Subcommittee Government Management, Finance and Accountability; House of Representatives</td>
<td>Defined benefit pension plan funding and the health of PBGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 2, 2005</td>
<td>Committee on Education and Workforce; House of Representatives</td>
<td>Defined benefit pension plan funding and the health of PBGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 8, 2005</td>
<td>Committee on Ways and Means; Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures; House of Representatives</td>
<td>Defined benefit pension plan funding and the health of PBGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 26, 2005</td>
<td>Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions; Subcommittee on Retirement Security and Aging; United States Senate</td>
<td>Defined benefit pension plan funding and the health of PBGC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17The Senate Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions both have jurisdiction over the nomination.
Beyond formal congressional hearings, PBGC staff told us that they frequently discuss pension policy matters with congressional staff. In addition, PBGC must annually submit reports to Congress on its prior fiscal year’s financial and operational matters, which include information on PBGC’s financial statements, internal controls, and compliance with certain laws and regulations.\textsuperscript{18} For example, the Pension Protection Act of 2006 requires that PBGC provide a comparison of the average return on investment earned with respect to asset investments by the corporation, which PBGC includes in its annual report.

Through its support agencies—GAO, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Congressional Research Service—Congress has also provided oversight and reviewed PBGC. Specifically, Congress has asked GAO to conduct assessments of policy, management, and the financial condition of PBGC. For example, we conducted more than 10 reviews of PBGC over the past 5 years, including assessments related to PBGC’s 2005 corporate reorganization and weaknesses in its governance structure, human capital management, and contracting practices. Our work also raised concerns about PBGC’s financial condition and the state of the defined benefit industry. In addition, CBO has published nine specific reports on PBGC since 2005.\textsuperscript{19} For example, in April 2008, CBO reported that PBGC’s

\textsuperscript{18}PBGC is required each year to submit to Congress and the President an annual report, which must include the actuarial assumptions and methods PBGC uses to evaluate the expected 5-year operations and status of its pension benefit guaranty funds, and a comparison of its funds’ investment returns with a designated index. 29 U.S.C. § 1308.

\textsuperscript{19}The U.S. Congressional Budget Office is charged with providing Congress with objective, nonpartisan, and timely analyses to aid in economic and budgetary decisions on the wide array of programs covered by the federal budget and the information and estimates required for the congressional budget process.
investment policy is likely to produce higher returns over the long run, but noted the new strategy increases the risk that PBGC will not have sufficient assets to cover retirees’ benefit payments when the economy and financial markets are weak.\textsuperscript{20} Further, CRS has published eight studies related to PBGC since 2006. Appendix IV includes a list of selected GAO, CBO, and CRS reports and testimonies related to PBGC.

**Some Government Corporations Have Additional Congressional Reporting Requirements**

Some government corporations have additional reporting requirements for notifying Congress of significant actions. The Millennium Challenge Corporation is required to formally notify the appropriate congressional committees 15 days prior to the allocation or transfer of funds related to the corporation’s activities.\textsuperscript{21} The Commodity Credit Corporation is subject to a similar requirement, which obliges the Secretary of Agriculture to alert the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives prior to making adjustments to a certain price support program.\textsuperscript{22} The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is required to submit a detailed report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives at least 60 days prior to issuing, among other things, political risk insurance for losses due to business interruption for the first time.\textsuperscript{23} These examples demonstrate how Congress has required additional reporting requirements for certain activities conducted by government corporations. While PBGC generally has no requirements to formally notify Congress prior to taking significant financial or operational actions, PBGC officials said that they informally


\textsuperscript{21}The Millennium Challenge Corporation is a U.S. government corporation designed to work with foreign countries to reduce global poverty through the promotion of sustainable economic growth. 22 U.S.C. §§ 7701, 7703.

\textsuperscript{22}The Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) is a U.S. government corporation created to stabilize, support, and protect farm income and prices. CCC also helps maintain balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities and aids in their distribution. 15 U.S.C. § 714.

\textsuperscript{23}OPIC undertakes programs to provide political risk insurance to U.S. investors, contractors, exporters and financial institutions involved in international transactions. 22 U.S.C. § 2194b. Political risk insurance can cover currency inconvertibility, expropriation, and political violence, and is available for investments in new ventures, expansions of existing enterprises, privatizations, and acquisitions with positive developmental benefits.
notify Congress prior to certain policy shifts. For example, in fiscal year 2008, PBGC officials met with congressional staff before modifying the investment policy to decrease the corporation’s fixed-income asset investments. In addition to its annual reporting requirements, PBGC is required to report proposals for certain premium rate revisions, including reasons for such revisions, to specific congressional committees; however, these premium rate revisions are not considered effective until 30 days after enactment of a law approving them.24

Like other government corporations, PBGC has an advisory committee. PBGC’s advisory committee is charged with advising the corporation on its policies and procedures related to the corporation’s appointment of trustees in termination proceedings, investments of monies, whether terminated plans should be liquidated immediately or continued in operation, and any other matters the corporation may request. Unlike PBGC’s advisory committee, the advisory boards or committees of other government corporations—such as the Export-Import Bank and FDIC—are subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act25 and some submit formal reports to their board chair and directors (see table 2). In contrast, PBGC’s advisory committee is not subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act. According to PBGC officials, the corporation is exempt because of the proprietary nature of its work. PBGC’s advisory committee typically reports only to the director, although representatives of PBGC’s board members frequently attend advisory committee meetings and officials said that the committee can submit concerns to the board if it believes it is warranted.


Table 2: Examples of Advisory Committees at Government Corporations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal government corporation</th>
<th>Advisory committee</th>
<th>Reports to</th>
<th>Number of members</th>
<th>Subject to Federal Advisory Committee Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Export-Import Bank of the United States</td>
<td>Advisory Committee of the Export-Import Bank of the United States</td>
<td>Board of Directors and Congress</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation</td>
<td>Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation</td>
<td>Advisory Committee on Economic Inclusion</td>
<td>Chairman of the board</td>
<td>Not to exceed 20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation</td>
<td>Advisory Committee of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GAO analysis.

Beyond reporting to the chairman of its board, the Export-Import Bank’s advisory committee is also required to submit an annual report to Congress on the extent to which the Export-Import Bank is providing competitive financing to expand U.S. exports, along with suggestions for improvements. In addition to government corporations, some government agencies with retirement-related responsibilities—such as the Social Security Administration (SSA), the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board—have advisory committees as part of their governance structures, which annually report to their respective overseeing bodies. For example, when Congress established SSA as a separate and distinct agency from the Department of Health and Human Services, it also established an independent seven-member bipartisan Advisory Board to advise the President, Congress, and the commissioner of Social Security on respective policy issues.

Conclusions

With more than 44 million Americans insured by PBGC, it is essential that the corporation is soundly governed and efficiently managed to guarantee that retirement income will be available to all those covered. Despite PBGC’s efforts to improve its bylaws, the three-member board of directors is still one of the smallest and least diverse of any government corporation. Other government corporations’ governance structures include oversight mechanisms, such as standing committees, and additional reporting requirements to conduct certain oversight functions and assist their boards of directors. While PBGC’s board should be restructured, additional reporting requirements, like some government corporations have, may not be appropriate for PBGC given the proprietary
nature of its financial work; thus, any reporting changes would need to be carefully considered.

The limitations of the board structure will become even more apparent in the coming months as the board, its representatives, and the corporation’s director will likely be replaced with a new presidential administration. Because board members and their representatives serve by virtue of their positions in the federal government, there is no assurance that these individuals will have the needed expertise to understand the corporation’s business or financial vulnerabilities. Without adequate information and preparation, this transition could limit not only the progress made by the current board, its representatives, and director, but may also curtail the corporation’s ability to insure and deliver retirement benefits to millions of Americans that rely on the corporation.

**Recommendation for Executive Action**

To ensure that recently identified management and financial challenges facing PBGC are shared with those newly appointed, we recommend that PBGC provide Office of Inspector General and GAO reports on the corporation’s financial and management challenges to the newly appointed board members, board representatives, and director so that they can take appropriate action as needed.

**Agency Comments and Our Evaluation**

We obtained written comments on a draft report from PBGC’s director, which are reproduced in appendix V. In addition, the Departments of the Treasury, Labor, and Commerce provided joint technical comments, which were incorporated into the report where appropriate.

In response to our draft report, the PBGC director stated that PBGC prepares substantial in-depth briefing materials on its operational issues for incoming administrations. The director agreed with our recommendation, stating that PBGC will ensure that the transition materials provided to those newly appointed will also include pertinent PBGC Office of Inspector General and GAO reports. Further, the director stated that PBGC will continue to work in concert with the board to provide oversight information necessary to address the important issues that they confront in providing pension security to Americans.
We are sending copies of this report to the Secretaries of the Treasury, Labor, and Commerce, as well as the PBGC director and other interested parties. We will also make copies available to others on request. If you or your staff has any questions concerning this report, please contact me on (202) 512-7215 or bovbjergb@gao.gov. Contact points for our Office of Congressional Relations and Public Affairs may be found on the last page of this report. GAO staff who made key contributions to this report are listed in appendix VI.

Barbara D. Bovbjerg
Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues
Appendix I: Scope and Methodology

To identify the steps that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) has taken to improve its governance structure, we reviewed our work issued in July 2007, as well as collected and reviewed documents related to PBGC’s bylaws, which were last published in May 2008. We reviewed reports on PBGC’s organizational structure and financial condition. We also identified provisions of the Employee Retirement and Income Security Act of 1974, the Pension Protection Act of 2006, and chapter 91 of the U.S. Code, which is commonly known as the Government Corporation Control Act (GCCA), that outline the authority of PBGC’s board of directors as well as the administrative responsibilities of PBGC’s director. To understand the board of directors’ role, we reviewed documentation related to the board members’ activities to identify what types of actions the board members had considered and taken.

To determine how Congress exercises oversight of PBGC, we identified the number of times PBGC officials testified before Congress since 2002, and reviewed the issues discussed at each formal hearing. Further, we reviewed the work of the Congressional Budget Office, the Congressional Research Service, PBGC’s Office of Inspector General, and our work on PBGC’s financial and management challenges. To determine the oversight mechanisms and reporting requirements that exist at other government corporations, we collected information on select federal government corporations that we identified in our July 2007 work, which are listed under the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945, as amended, and have similar missions or designations to those of PBGC. We reviewed information on the following government corporations:

- Commodity Credit Corporation,
- Export-Import Bank of the United States,
- Federal Crop Insurance Corporation,
- Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation,
- Federal Financing Bank,
- Federal Prison Industries (UNICOR),

---

1PBGC’s board published a copy of its bylaw amendments in the Federal Register. 29 U.S.C. § 1302(f). See also 73 Fed. Reg. 29985, which is reproduced in appendix III.
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- Financing Corporation,
- Government National Mortgage Association,
- Millennium Challenge Corporation,
- National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak)
- Overseas Private Investment Corporation,
- Resolution Funding Corporation,
- Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation,
- Tennessee Valley Authority, and
- United States Postal Service.

We also reviewed government agencies with retirement-related responsibilities to determine what other oversight mechanisms may exist; the agencies include the Social Security Administration, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board. Moreover, we met with officials from PBGC and the Department of Labor.
## Appendix II: Selected PBGC Single-Employer Plan Pension Data by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>Claims</td>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Payees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$23,807,269</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>415,872</td>
<td>12,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,171,886</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86,673</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10,460,945</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>545,397</td>
<td>6,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9,578,594</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>165,700</td>
<td>3,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>978,952,261</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>3,233,642</td>
<td>31,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>202,019,557</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>483,819</td>
<td>7,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>339,608,195</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>504,152</td>
<td>7,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,878,368</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>138,983</td>
<td>1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12,606,511</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>83,384</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>369,603,170</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>2,065,553</td>
<td>41,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>601,098,985</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>744,446</td>
<td>19,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>142,207,993</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>119,957</td>
<td>3,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,709,939</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>142,722</td>
<td>1,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>8,945,225,727</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>1,746,522</td>
<td>33,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1,406,771,939</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>867,713</td>
<td>24,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95,456,903</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>428,284</td>
<td>6,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42,691,574</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>258,904</td>
<td>2,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>99,638,280</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>616,310</td>
<td>5,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75,296,341</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>493,403</td>
<td>4,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9,781,410</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>151,088</td>
<td>2,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86,663,529</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>728,300</td>
<td>18,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>528,083,138</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>831,350</td>
<td>13,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>598,758,451</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>1,490,039</td>
<td>25,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>192,710,240</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>686,475</td>
<td>8,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21,019,449</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>234,496</td>
<td>3,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>293,981,974</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>722,134</td>
<td>12,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>207,534</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>118,228</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,328,458</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>256,808</td>
<td>1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>594,387</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>189,526</td>
<td>3,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,769,380</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>194,990</td>
<td>3,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>330,487,687</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>1,185,568</td>
<td>12,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,380,110</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>89,021</td>
<td>1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>3,303,673,171</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>2,399,744</td>
<td>32,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix II: Selected PBGC Single-Employer Plan Pension Data by State

#### Claims 1975-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Claims</th>
<th>Payees</th>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Mean Monthly Pension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>373,760,939</td>
<td>29,134</td>
<td>125,373,643</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>128,733</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>456,710</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>3,304,343,666</td>
<td>58,535</td>
<td>374,856,178</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>381,366,835</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>15,248,545</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34,524,982</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>15,248,545</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>4,668,703,939</td>
<td>80,524</td>
<td>547,528,915</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41,309,238</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>6,245,574</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64,941,570</td>
<td>14,022</td>
<td>50,759,828</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1,936,569</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>184,947,667</td>
<td>13,563</td>
<td>60,579,227</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>191,265,052</td>
<td>16,491</td>
<td>83,429,213</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29,595,562</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>12,095,719</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8,194,563</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>7,167,453</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,753,225,929</td>
<td>11,957</td>
<td>71,827,569</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>261,758,583</td>
<td>8,549</td>
<td>88,815,895</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,236,685,805</td>
<td>12,218</td>
<td>110,762,806</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>282,816,207</td>
<td>9,251</td>
<td>48,528,938</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90,887</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>2,223,900</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16,614,401</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>8,826,510</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Territories</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>766,996</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>204,359</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>9,200,275</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>$32,626,780,271</td>
<td>622,353</td>
<td>$4,082,193,800</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: PBGC’s Pension Insurance Data Book 2006. Information derived from PBGC Fiscal Year Closing File (9/30/06), Pension Plan Coverage Topic Module (May 2005) to the 2001 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), PBGC Case Administration System, PBGC Premium Filings, PBGC Participant System (PRISM), and fiscal year calculations. Claims and plan coverage data by state of plan administration; benefits and participant coverage data by state of payee residence. SIPP used to estimate participant coverage data.
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Chairman's message, and certain statutory reporting requirements;
(iv) Approval of the Corporation's Investment Policy Statement;
(v) Approval of the issuance of any notes or other instruments to the
Secretary of the Treasury under Section 4007(c) of ERISA;
(vi) Approval of all final
procedural regulations prior to publication in the Federal Register, except for amendments that establish new interest rates and factors under
Parts 4044 (Appendices C and D) and 4281 of this chapter, which may be
approved by the Director of the Corporation;
(vii) Approval of all reports or
recommendations to the Congress required by Title IV of ERISA;
(viii) Approval of any policy matter that would have a significant impact on
the pension insurance program or its stakeholders; and
(ix) Review of reports from the
Corporation's Inspector General that the Inspector General deems appropriate
to deliver to the Board.
(4) The Board shall review the
Corporation's Investment Policy Statement at least every two years and
approve the Investment Policy Statement at least every four years.
(5)(1) Each Board Member shall
designate in writing an official, not below the level of Assistant Secretary, to
serve as the Board Member's Representative. Such designation shall be
effective until revoked or until a date or event specified therein. A Board
Representative may act for all purposes under those bylaws, except that an
action of a Board Representative on a Board Member's behalf with respect to
the powers described in paragraph (3)(ii) through (iv) of this section, shall be
valid only upon ratification by
writing by the Board Member. Any
Board Representative may order for
Board action any matter under consideration by the Board Representative.
(2) A Board Member may designate in
writing an official, not below the level of Assistant Secretary, to serve as the Board Member's Alternate
Representative at a meeting. An Alternate Representative may act for all
purposes at that meeting, except that the Alternate Representative's actions shall
be valid only upon ratification in
writing by either the Board Member or the Board Representative. Any action of the
Alternate Representative involving the powers described in paragraph
(3)(ii) through (iv) of this section or any matter that has been referred to the
Board under paragraph (3)(i) of this
section must be ratified in writing by the Board Member.
(3) For purposes of this section, ratification shall include approval of the
minutes of the meeting of the Board of
Directors.
(c) Final procedural regulations and
all proposed regulations shall be approved by the Director of the Corporation prior to publication in the
Federal Register; however, all final
procedural regulations and all proposed regulations shall first be reviewed for
comment by each Board Representative, except for amendments that establish new interest rates and factors under
Parts 4044 (Appendices C and D) and 4281 of this chapter. A Board
Representative may, within 31 days of
receiving a final procedural regulation or proposed regulation for review, request that it be referred to the Board
Representatives for approval.
§ 6002.5 Meetings.
Regular meetings of the Board of
Directors shall be held as often as
required to provide appropriate oversight and guidance to the
Corporation and at such times as the
Chair shall select. Special meetings of the Board of Directors shall be called by
the Chair on the request of any other Board Member. Reasonable notice of
any meetings shall be given to each
Board Member. The General Counsel of the Corporation shall serve as Secretary
to the Board of Directors and keep its
minutes. As soon as practicable after
each meeting, a draft of the minutes of such meeting shall be distributed to
each Member of the Board for approval.
§ 6002.6 Place of meetings; use of
conference call communications
equipment.
Meetings of the Board of Directors shall be held at the principal office of the
Corporation unless otherwise
determined by the Board of Directors or the Chair. Any Member may participate
in a meeting of the Board of Directors
through the use of conference call
telephone or similar communications
equipment, by means of which all
persons participating in the meeting can
speak to and hear each other. Any Board Member so participating in a meeting
shall be deemed present for all
purposes. Actions taken by the Board of
Directors at meetings conducted through
the use of such equipment, including the
votes of each Member, shall be
recorded in the usual manner in the
minutes of the meetings of the Board of
Directors.
§ 6002.7 Voting without a meeting.
A resolution of the Board of Directors signed by each of the Board Members or
each of the Board Representatives shall
have the same effect as if it were
to a meeting and shall be kept in the
Corporate Minutes Book. A resolution for an action taken on any matter for
which a Board Member has been disqualified under § 4002.8 may be signed by the Board Representative
of the disqualified Board Member.
§ 6002.8 Conflict of interest.
Any Board Member may
disqualify himself or herself from participation in a Board action on any matter if the
Board Member may have or may appear
to have a conflict of interest. The Board Member shall notify the other Board Members of a
disqualification. The
disqualified Member's Board
Representative, acting independently of that
Member, may vote on the matter in the
Member's place. The disqualified
Board Member need not and may not
vote on any action taken on the matter
without his or her disqualification.
§ 6003.1 Director of the Corporation and
Senior Officers.
(a)(1) Director of the Corporation. The Corporation shall be administered by a
Director appointed by the President
with the advice and consent of the
Senate. Subject to policies established
by Board, the Director shall have
responsibility for the Corporation's management, including its personnel, organization and budget processes, and shall carry out the Corporation's functions under Title IV of ERISA. The Director shall submit the Corporation's budget to the Chair of the Board for review and approval.
(b) There shall be the following senior
officers of the Corporation, reporting
directly to the Director:
(1) Deputy Directors for Policy and
Operations, who shall be first and
second assistant, respectively;
(2) General Counsel, who shall serve as
Secretary to the Board;
(3) Chief Financial Officer;
(4) Chief Information Officer;
(5) Chief Management Officer;
(6) Chief of Staff;
(7) Chief Insurance Officer.
(b) Under prior approval of the
Board, the Director may establish such
additional or other senior officers as
necessary. Before making an
appointment to a senior officer position,
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§ 4092.10 Emergency procedures.
(a) An emergency exists if a quorum of the Corporation’s Board cannot readily be assembled or act through written consent because of the declaration of a government-wide emergency. These emergency procedures shall remain in effect during the emergency and upon the termination of the emergency shall cease to be operative unless and until another emergency occurs. These emergency procedures shall operate in conjunction with the FBGC Continuity of Operations Plan (“COOP Plan”) of the Corporation, and any government-wide COOP protocols in effect.
(b) During an emergency, the business of the FBGC shall continue to be managed in accordance with its COOP Plan. The functions of the Board of Directors will be carried out by those Members of the Board of Directors in office at the time the emergency arises, or by persons designated by the agencies’ COOP plans to act in place of the Board Members, who are available to act during the emergency. If no such persons are available, then the authority of the Board shall be transferred to the Board Representatives who are available. If no Board Representatives are available, then the Director of the Corporation shall perform essential Board functions.
(c) During an emergency, meetings of the Board may be called by any available Member of the Board. The notice thereof shall specify the time and place of the meeting. In the event possible, notice shall be given in accordance with these bylaws. Notice shall be given to those Board Members whom it is feasible to reach at the time of the emergency, and notice may be given at any time less than 24 hours before the meeting if deemed necessary by the person giving notice.

§ 4092.11 Seal.
The seal of the Corporation shall be in such form as may be approved from time to time by the Board.

§ 4092.12 Amendments.
These bylaws may be amended or reenacted by a unanimous vote of the Board.

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 20th day of May, 2008

Charles E.F. Millard,
Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation

Issued on the date set forth above pursuant to Resolution 2008-09 of the Board of Directors authorizing adoption of the revised bylaws contained in this final rule.

Judith R. Starr,
Secretary, Board of Directors, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
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the Director shall consult with the Board.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
Coast Guard
33 CFR Part 165
[USCG-2008-0038]
Portland Rose Festival Fireworks Display
AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.
ACTION: Notice of enforcement of regulation.
SUMMARY: The Coast Guard will enforce the “Portland Rose Festival Fireworks Display safety zone on the Willamette River,” from 8:30 p.m. through 11:30 p.m. on May 30, 2008. This action is necessary to provide a safe display for the public and to keep them clear of the fall out area of the fireworks. During the enforcement period, no person or vessel may enter the safety zone without permission of the Captain of the Port.
DATES: The regulations in 33 CFR 165.1315(a)(2) will be enforced from 8:30 p.m. through 11:30 p.m. on May 30, 2008.
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Coast Guard will enforce the safety zone for the Portland Rose Festival fireworks display in 33 CFR 165.1315(a)(2) from 8:30 p.m. through 11:30 p.m. on May 30, 2008.

The provisions of 33 CFR 165.1315, a vessel may not enter the safety zone unless the Captain of the Coast Guard determines that the vessel is not a threat to life safety and is not engaging in prohibited activities. Under the provisions of 33 CFR 165.1315, a vessel may not enter the safety zone unless the Captain of the Coast Guard determines that the vessel is not a threat to life safety and is not engaging in prohibited activities.

A. Why Are Revisions to State Programs Necessary?
States that have received final authorization under the EPA or other state programs.

The notice is issued under authority of 33 CFR 165.1315(a)(2) and U.S.C. 552(a). In addition to this notice in the Federal Register, the Coast Guard will provide the maritime community with advance notification of this enforcement period via the Local Notice to Mariners and a marine information broadcast. If the COPT determines that the regulated area need not be enforced for the full duration stated in this notice, he may use a Broadcast Notice to Mariners to grant general permission to enter the regulated area.
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Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
1200 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005-4026

September 8, 2008

Ms. Barbara D. Bovbjerg, Director
Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues
U.S. Government Accountability Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Ms. Bovbjerg:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft version of your report entitled, "Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation – Need for Improved Oversight Persists." PBGC appreciates GAO's work in reviewing this important area.

PBGC especially appreciates the recognition that the report gives to the work of the Board and management in revising our by-laws, which the Board approved in May of this year. In August, PBGC issued Order GA 15-6, "Documents for PBGC Board of Directors" to help implement the by-laws, document Board interactions, and enable our Office of General Counsel to better document and monitor the Board review process.

The draft report notably highlights the variety of ways in which PBGC receives Congressional oversight, ranging from hearings to the support of agencies such as the Congressional Budget Office, the Congressional Research Service, and GAO. It is worthwhile noting that GAO alone over the past decade has produced scores of reports and testimonies about PBGC and its central issues. Indeed, Appendix IV of your draft report cites 28 selected reports and testimonies related to PBGC from the three support agencies in recent years.

Your draft report further acknowledges the work that management is undertaking to prepare for the upcoming Presidential transition. As you know from your review of PBGC’s governance structure in 2007, PBGC has prepared substantial in-depth briefing materials on its operational and financial issues for incoming administrations. We agree with the recommendation to ensure that these transition materials include pertinent IG and GAO reports.

In moving forward on corporate governance, PBGC will work in concert with its Board to provide the oversight information necessary to address the important issues that we confront in providing pension security to millions of Americans. Again, thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Charles E.F. Millard
Director
Barbara D. Bovbjerg, (202) 512-7215 or bovbjergb@gao.gov

The following team members made key contributions to this report: Blake Ainsworth, Assistant Director; Jason Holsclaw, Analyst-in-Charge; Susannah Compton; William King; Matthew Lee; Charlie Willson; and Craig Winslow.
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