Peter G. Peterson Foundation
Our America. Our Future.
THE PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS
THE COMMITTEE FOR A RESPONSIBLE FEDERAL BUDGET

PETERSON-PEW COMMISSION ON BUDGET REFORM

CHAIRMEN
BILL FRENZEL
TIM PENNY
CHARLIE STENHOLM

COMMISSIONERS
BARRY ANDERSON
ROY ASH
CHARLES BOWSHER
STEVE COLL
DAN CRIPPEN
VIC FAZIO
WILLIS GRADISON
WILLIAM GRAY, III
WILLIAM HOAGLAND
DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN
JIM JONES
LOU KERR
JIM KOLBE
JAMES LYNN
JAMES MCINTYRE, JR.
DAVID MINGE
JIM NUSSLE
MARNE OBERNAUER, JR.
JUNE O'NEILL
RUDOLPH PENNER
PETER PETERSON
ROBERT REISCHAUER
ALICE RIVLIN
MARTIN SABO
GENE STEUERLE
DAVID STOCKMAN
PAUL VOLCKER
CAROL COX WAIT
DAVID M. WALKER
JOSEPH WRIGHT, JR.

PRESIDENT
MAYA MACGUINEAS

PROJECT DIRECTOR
JIM BATES

The following document is a staff working paper and is a part of a series of reports and memoranda prepared by Commission staff on budget concepts, budget process, and other issues. These papers are drafts that are subject to revision, and do not represent the official position of the Commission or its funders and any views and opinions expressed are those of the authors.

Background on Budget Concepts

The 1967 Budget Concepts Commission

In 1967, President Lyndon Johnson issued an executive order creating a commission to assess the state of budget concepts. The nine-member bipartisan commission included government officials, members of the public, and policymakers from Congress and the executive branch. The Peterson-Pew Commission on Budget Reform was modeled on the original commission.

Commission's key recommendations

The Budget Concepts Commission laid the foundation of today's unified, cash-based budget. Most of its recommendations were widely accepted and ultimately incorporated into subsequent presentations of the president's budget. The Commission recommended:

- Creating a single, comprehensive budget (replacing separate administrative, national income account, and cash budgets);
- Excluding from the budget totals the operations of the Federal Reserve (other than its net profit), government-sponsored enterprises (GSEs), , federal insurance programs, and loans and loan guarantees;
- Recognizing expenditures and corporate receipts on an accrual rather than cash basis;
- Rejecting the creation of a separate capital budget;
- Counting "user fees" as offsets against related spending programs.

While most]recommendations were adopted, such as the creation of a unified budget, others were not, including the exclusion of federal insurance programs from the budget and recognizing certain expenditures and receipts on an accrual basis.

What's changed?

Since 1967, there have been significant developments that have ramifications for budget concepts even though the budget's basic purposes remain unchanged:

Congressional budget process. With the enactment of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974, Congress became directly involved in setting overall fiscal policy through the budget resolution and hence became a more active participant in shaping budget concepts. For example, Congress played a significant role in the adoption of the lease-purchase rule.

Credit reform. Federal government took a measured step toward accrual budgeting with the 1990 Federal Credit Reform Act (FCRA). In order to compare loans and grants and loans and loan guarantees, the budget now shows appropriations to cover the discounted risk of default.

Composition of federal spending. The scope and composition of federal outlays have dramatically changed since 1967. Shortly after the creation of Medicare, total mandatory spending (excluding interest) amounted to a mere 30.5 percent of the federal budget. Today, mandatory spending constitutes around [is it close enough to delete the "arounds"]a staggering 55 percent of the budget, with that number expected to rise by around 7.5 percent by 2013.

Federal Accounting Standards Board (FASB). In 1990, the FASB was created to develop federal accounting standards similar private sector ones. Other laws required agencies and the entire federal government to produce audited financial statements linked to performance plans.

Today's financial crisis. The present financial crisis has implications for budget concepts, with the government taking a direct federal role in the management and financial affairs of GSEs and providing assistance to other financial and non-financial institutions. This will require reviewing key practices of how the budget displays the GSEs, equity purchases, and other financial assistance to the private sector.

Revisiting the purposes of the budget

A prerequisite to reassessing budget concepts is answering the question originally posed by the Budget Concepts Commission: What is the purpose of the budget? The 1967 Commission said the budget had two primary and seven secondary purposes:

Primary

1. Presenting the allocation of resources (both spending and tax);
2. Presenting fiscal policies.

Secondary

1. Managing cash and debt management;
2. Promoting national income analysis;
3. Assisting a flow of funds analysis (used for monetary policy);
4. Promoting analysis of federal credit activity on financial markets;
5. Providing insight on the impact on balance of trade in international markets;
6. Providing data comparable to state and local governments;
7. Providing data on governmental (capital) investment.

A central question is whether these purposes should be expanded to fulfill the budget goals. For instance, on the efficient allocation of resources, should the budget display different classes of expenditures (i.e., multiyear projects or contingent liabilities) comparably with other obligations to permit trade-offs between programs?

Key budgetary concepts

While every budget expert has a list of budgetary concepts that he/she would readdress, most ideas are in three areas: what activities should be included in the budget (e.g. on and off budget); how and when obligations are recorded in the budget; and what is revenue to the government.

What should be in the budget (on and off budget?)

Most budgetary experts support the concept of a unified budget, the hallmark of the 1967 Commission recommendations. Their concern has been with precisely which activities should be considered governmental operations and hence displayed on budget. At the same time, members of Congress have rejected the concept of a unified budget with respect to Social Security, and repeatedly enacted measures removing it from the unified total.

> Social Security. Multiple laws have been enacted removing Social Security from various budgetary documents and exempting it from most budgetary controls applicable to other programs. Specifically, the operations of the trust funds may not be included in the budgetary totals of either the president's budget submission or the concurrent budget resolution; legislation increasing Social Security expenditures or reducing revenue is not subject to the congressional pay-as-you-go rules or the spending and revenue limits set by the budget resolution; and, most importantly, it may not be tapped for savings under the expedited, filibuster-proof reconciliation procedures. From time to time, committee chairmen with jurisdiction over the Federal Highway Trust Fund have pointed to Social Security and threatened to take the Highway Trust Fund off budget.

> GSEs. Prior to the current financial crisis, all transactions of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were treated as outside the budget because they were seen as private firms owned by their shareholders even though their activities were subsidized and they operated under implicit governmental guarantees. With the financial crisis, the federal role changed, with the Treasury taking direct financial and management control in exchange for an ownership stake. Given these developments, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) recently decided to score their operations as federal, and it has done so on a credit reform basis (adjusted for cost of risk). The Bush Office of Management and Budget under the Bush administration, continued to view these transactions as off budget. The Obama administration's position is unknown. [i]

Fine-tuning credit reform

In a major departure from cash budgeting, loans and loan guarantees are now treated in the budget process on an accrual basis. Instead of reflecting disbursements of the loans to the public and payments from the public to the federal government, only the subsidy cost of loans are scored up front (e.g., estimated default and interest subsidies less recoveries and fees when the loan is disbursed). Similarly, the budget reflects the estimated subsidy of guaranteed loans that were previously invisible.

Even as consideration is given to expanding accruals beyond direct loans and loan guarantees, FCRA's implementation has been uneven:

> *Uncertain estimates*. The subsidy estimates are often highly speculative. While it is relatively easy to develop estimates where there are data on similar types of loan guarantees (either past or present), there is often little basis to make such estimates when the loan type is relatively unique. In such a case, complex financial analysis is required to make estimates.

> *In-house expertise*. OMB and the agencies have limited resources to devote to the necessary financial analysis to review subsidy estimates. OMB has only a handful of analysts to review the subsidy models for the federal government's entire portfolio of loans and loan guarantees. This leaves OMB dependent on the agencies, which are often more sensitive to industry concerns than to broader budgetary concerns.

Incentives to improve estimates. Under FCRA, both the agencies and Congress are held blameless if they underestimate the true subsidy costs of a new or expanded loan guarantee. That is, shortfalls in a mandatory account require no legislative action. Hence, there is little incentive for the agencies/OMB to improve their estimates.

Discount rate. The social costs of direct loans and loan guarantees are understated by the mandated use of Treasury rates for discounting risky future cash flows.

Administrative costs. Under FCRA, administrative costs are treated differently for loan guarantees than for direct loans. For loan guarantees, administrative costs are included in the subsidy estimate because the federal government must cover a private lender's costs not covered by the borrower. For direct loans, appropriations are not provided for the administrative costs that occur beyond the budget year. Proponents of loan guarantees cite this as evidence of a systematic bias in favor of direct loans under credit reform.

Extension of accrual concepts

One of the most rigorous debates among budget experts is whether to extend accrual concepts to entitlements, contingent liabilities, and other long-term obligations. This is a critical issue as the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, Pew, the Peterson Institute, and others attempt to focus attention on long-term entitlement costs.

Long-term liabilities. Some would either modify the budget or provide additional measures to reflect the long-term costs of such liabilities—similar to what is done in federal financial statements.

Federal insurance programs. Others would move to accrual budgeting for pension insurance programs and flood insurance.

Other incremental changes. It has been suggested that the budget build on FASB standards and score certain federal health and retirement benefits on an accrual basis.

Some experts remained concerned that a further extension of accrual budgets will erode the ability of the budget to measure borrowing needs, a task inherently based on cash accounting.

What is spending? (Definition of budget authority)

Under current law, budget authority is defined as authority to incur financial obligations through law, making funds available for obligation and expenditure, borrowing authority, contract authority, and offsetting receipts and collections.

Contract authority. It is not clear if it is appropriate to treat contract authority as a form of budget authority when the actual spending levels are determined by obligation limits set in annual appropriations bills.

In the case of the Federal Highway Trust Fund, which accounts for the bulk of contract authority, the contract authority level vastly exceeds the eventual obligation limits.

Refundable credits. Former CBO and OMB career budget expert Barry Anderson has pointed out that refundable tax credits have blurred the distinction between spending and revenue. In the case of the Earned Income Tax Credit, the credit against tax liability is scored as revenue while the cash payment to individuals with a credit in excess of their tax liability is treated as an outlay.

User fees. As previously noted, collections of user fees that are considered revenue from business-type actions are treated as a form of negative spending and offset against gross outlays. Some of these fees have the trappings of taxes or regulatory collections under the federal government's sovereign powers and hence might more appropriately be treated as revenue.

What's the difference between revenue and collections?

In 2007, the federal government took in $2.6 trillion in receipts (i.e., revenue) and $321 billion in offsetting collections and other receipts. Most receipts are in the form of taxes collected under the federal government's sovereign powers set forth in the U.S. Constitution. In addition to taxes, receipts include duties, social insurance premiums, court fines, compulsory licenses, and deposits of earnings by the Federal Reserve. Collections consist of collections from the public that are often of a "business "or "market type" in nature. Examples include the proceeds from postage stamp sales, admission charges, deposit insurance premiums, or Outer Continental Shelf royalties. The actual and proposed collections from the president's FY2009 budget are summarized below:

GROSS OUTLAYS, USER CHARGES, OTHER OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS AND RECEIPTS FROM THE PUBLIC, AND NET OUTLAYS (In billions)

	Actual 2007	*Estimate* 2008	*Estimate* 2009
Gross outlays	3,050.9	3,269.6	3,437.6
Offsetting collections and receipts from the public:			
User charges	229.5	248.0	252.1
Other	91.2	90.4	78.1
Subtotal, offsetting collections and receipts from the public:	320.7	338.4	330.2
Net outlays	2,730.2	2,931.2	3,107.4

Governmental receipts and collections are treated very differently in the budget. Receipts are tallied separately and compared with outlays to determine the amount of the deficit or surplus. By contrast, collections are treated as an offset to spending. In some cases, these collections can be spent without further appropriations. In others, they return to the Treasury and effectively reduce the deficit.

There are two conceptual issues concerning budgetary treatment of fees: first, whether user fees should be treated on the spending side of the ledger and offset against gross spending; and second, whether there is a consistent scheme for classifying transactions as receipts or as revenue.

What is the difference?

The Concepts Commission and other sources have suggested the following criteria for determining whether a receipt is a governmental receipt or should treated as an offset to spending:

<u>Governmental receipts</u>

- Arise from the federal government's sovereign powers and gifts and contributions.
- The receipt is "governmental" in character, involving "regulation" or "compulsion."
- It is primarily designed to raise revenue for government.
- The fee is only incidental to regulatory activity.
- Even if it is for earmarked activity, it may be a receipt if government retains total allocative authority over expenditures made from the earmarked collections.
- Examples: taxes, compulsory social insurance premiums, duties, court fines, Fed earnings, gifts and contributions.

<u>Offsetting collection/receipts</u>

- An offsetting collection is for a business-type, market-oriented activity and collections between governmental accounts.
- Its primary purpose is channeling demand for and use of resources (even if government-owned).
- It results from operation of business-type enterprises.
- It reflects prices paid for a product or service.

Examples of offsetting collections include Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulatory fees, passport charges, patent and trademark fees/charges, and food and safety fees;

- Examples of offsetting receipts include: Medicare Part B & D insurance premiums, federal employee health & life insurance fees, and spectrum fees; (intergovernmental—both offsetting receipts and collections) interest received by retirement and health benefit funds, interest from Federal Financing Bank, employer share of employee retirement.

In actual practice the distinction between revenue and collection is often murky and the treatment of like collections is inconsistent, ad hoc, and imposed by the law regardless of the nature of the underlying collection. An infamous case is SEC fees, where most observers believe the fees are an exercise of sovereign powers and should be classified as a receipt, but which the law directs be applied as an offset to salaries and expenses.

There are several rationales for deducting collections from spending totals. The Concepts Commission argued that the budget should reflect only resources allocated through the government's sovereign powers. It was also believed that reporting gross revenue would overstate the impact of government spending on the economy. "Netting" also provides an incentive for governmental agencies that provide market-type services to cover the costs of services to the public.

But critics argue that "netting" understates spending levels and provides an incentive for the government to overcharge users for products and services.

Capital budgeting

There have been periodic calls to establish a separate budget for capital expenditures such as exists in the private sector and many states. Both the original Budget Concepts Commission and the more recent President's Commission to Study Capital Budgeting under President Clinton rejected proposals to establish a separate capital budget.

Present treatment. Currently capital expenditures are treated the same as other proposed expenditures in the budget. With respect to both the president's budget and the budget resolution, they are included in the functional totals and the overall aggregates. The president's budget also includes a series of tables showing different classes of capital expenditure. Since capital expenditures are largely discretionary, they are part of the overall 302(a) allocation established under the budget resolution and in the 302(b) allocations the appropriations committees make to each subcommittee.

There are, however, two features of the budget process that are or have been unique to capital expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund. First, when there were separate caps on appropriations, there was a separate cap for Trust Fund-related spending, which effectively prevented trade-offs between highways and other programs. Second, expenditures are directly linked to receipts. If receipts increase, spending levels will automatically rise.

Capital budgeting. While there are many variations on capital budgeting, the basic model would sequester capital expenditures and receipts from all other payments. Some would also exclude the capital expenditures from the budgetary totals.

> Pros: Proponents of capital budgeting argue that the current process is biased against capital expenditures because full funding is required up front while the economic benefits are spread over a long period.
>
> Cons: The case against capital budgeting is that sequestering capital expenditures will distort decision-making by trade-offs between capital and other parts of the budget. There are also concerns that the definition of capital will inevitably be broadened to include other less tangible classes of capital, such as human capital. Finally, the 1999 Capital Budget Commission effectively refuted the premise for capital budgeting when it said there is no definitive evidence of a budget bias against capital expenditures.

Capital investment funds. The 1999 Commission suggested as a possible alternative the creation of capital investment funds to address the "lumpiness" issue, in which agencies require large up-front appropriations for capital-intensive projects. Under a capital investment fund, capital spending is aggregated across multiple agencies to smooth year-to-year funding spikes.

Tax expenditures

A concept frequently mentioned in need of review is tax expenditures. The term "tax expenditures" refers to tax breaks for a purpose comparable to a federal expenditure program. The 1974 Budget Act defines them as "a revenue loss attributable to provisions of federal tax law which allow a special exclusion, exemption, or deduction from gross income or which provide a special credit, preferential tax rate, or deferral of income tax liability."

Criticisms of tax expenditures tend to fall into conceptual and other concerns:

Conceptual concerns

1 Concerns about the concept of tax expenditures.
2 The measurement problem.

Other concerns

1 Relative efficiency compared to expenditure programs
2 Concerns about the progressivity of tax expenditures.
3 Proposals to increase scrutiny of tax expenditures.

Conceptual concerns. Not everyone is comfortable with the concept of tax expenditures because it is premised on an assumption that the government is entitled to levy taxes on a universal basis and that applying special treatment to certain classes of activities constitutes a tax preference. On a more basic level, some reject any concept of equivalence between a tax provision and expenditure, even if they are clearly designed to have similar effect.

Methodological concerns. There are major technical difficulties in estimating the cost of tax expenditures, both individually and in aggregate. A key challenge is determining what constitutes an exception to overall tax policy. OMB calculates the cost of individual tax expenditures on the basis of two separate baselines that make different assumptions about tax rates, income subject to taxes, capital recovery, and the treatment of foreign income. Another challenge is how to calculate the cost of individual provisions when they have interactions. A third is dealing with the broader problem that estimates do not capture behavioral effect.

Expenditure programs vs. tax expenditures. The concept of tax expenditures is predicated on the assumption that comparable outcomes can be achieved through expenditure programs and the tax code. Very little has been done to assess the extent to which tax expenditures actually contribute to achieving certain outcomes relative to expenditure programs and regulatory regimes. Chapter 20 of the *Analytic Perspectives* in the FY 2009 Budget notes that compared to these regimes, tax expenditures can have relatively low administrative and compliance costs and provide a broader range of policy tools (in the forms of deductions, credits, exemptions, phase outs, etc.). Yet tax regimes are limited by the complexity they add to the tax code, and may be ineffective in redistributing income because the tax system lacks information on those not paying taxes.

One avenue for reform would be to develop a systematic process for developing strategic plans for tax expenditures. Such a system could measure effectiveness in achieving certain outcomes and compare programs and regulations designed to achieve similar outcomes.

Progressivity. The operating assumption has been that tax expenditures are inherently regressive. An article (Burman, Todler and Geissler) reported that if all tax expenditures were eliminated (assuming no alternative minimum tax), income of the highest quintile would be reduced by 11.4 percent, while those in the bottom, second and third quintiles would be reduced 6.5, 8.1, and 6.8 percent, respectively. But Burman, et al also pointed out that the ultimate distributional effects depend on what is done with the money, whether in the form of a rebate, reduction in marginal tax rates, or increased spending.

Enhanced scrutiny. Some outside groups and members of Congress have called for greater scrutiny of tax expenditures. In some respect, the concerns are similar to concerns about earmarks. The concern is not with the total resources allocated to tax expenditures, but with the idea of granting special preferences to specific interests, particularly when they are enacted as part of much larger tax measures.

Since tax expenditures are already subject to the same PAYGO rules and revenue limits as other tax provisions, new rules would have to be developed to limit new tax expenditures. Additionally, the Commission could consider a base-closure style commission that would recommend packages of tax expenditures to repeal that would face an up-or-down vote by Congress.

Trust funds

The currently large trust fund balances have vexed policymakers and budget experts alike. Concerns run the gamut from putting Social Security back on budget to eliminating the funds.

There are currently 110 separate trust funds in the federal budget. By far the largest are the combined Social Security trust funds. Most were established by law with the intent of ensuring that dedicated expenditures go exclusively to the purpose for which they were dedicated. Beyond this, they may have little in common. Some are little different from special accounts and revolving accounts, which also receive earmarked collections.

The combined operations of the trust funds have a significant effect on the budget. According to CBO, the combined trust funds had an outgo of $1.2 trillion and receipts of $1.8 trillion. The resulting surplus has the effect of reducing the deficit and borrowing from the public.

Areas that could be addressed include: [not sure how to get periods after the numbers below.]

1. Moving the Social Security trust funds back on budget as a means to prevent efforts to move other trust funds off budget;
2. Assessing whether expenditures should be increased to match revenue or vice versa;
3. Sorting out the critical features of trust funds; and
4. Determining whether the concept of a trust fund is worth preserving.

Keeping trust funds on budget. Most budget experts continue to support the 1967 Commission's recommendation that trust funds be included in the unified budget and in the budgetary totals. However, multiple laws have taken Social Security off budget. CBO, OMB, and the budget committees sidestep this requirement by presenting separate summary tables showing both the on-budget and "unified" budget totals. It would require a law to move the Social Security trust funds back on budget.

Aligning revenue & expenditures. It has been argued that the federal government should either commit to spending an amount equal to the receipts of trust funds or alternatively cut taxes or user fees to match expenditures. With respect to Social Security this argument can have some additional resonance since the federal government cannot actually prefund retirement obligations because the assets cannot be tapped to cover future benefits (other than by increased overall governmental savings). More plausibly, the call for full funding could be raised with respect to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, which receives appropriations well below current collections, notwithstanding a large unmet need.

Sorting them out. A useful role for the Commission would be to simply the funds by their significant features, such as:

- whether expenditures are automatic (permanent appropriations) or require annual appropriations;
- the extent to which the trust funds are for genuinely businesslike or market-type activities;
- the extent to which they are intended to prefund benefits (as is the case for Social Security);
- the extent to which the expenditures are funded by dedicated funds instead of general revenue;
- any legal requirements that a portion of the trust funds be funded out of dedicated collections;
- if expenditures are less than collections, the extent that there is an unmet need for the dedicated purpose that could be accommodated if expenditures increased;
- the amount of collections that are actually spent on the intended purpose.

Trust funds, generally. A basic question is whether trust funds serve a useful budgetary purpose. Both the public and many policymakers equate federal trust funds with private trust funds, in which the trustee merely manages the trust funds' assets on behalf of the trustee and cannot unilaterally raise either receipts or lower benefits. This is not true of most federal trust funds where policymakers can, by law, change both the tax that contributes to and the benefit the flows from the "trust." Nonetheless, the perception that trust funds are inviolate makes it more politically difficult to address chronic deficits and unsustainable entitlement growth rates.

Others argue that the trust funds should be inviolate because parties are paying a dedicated tax or fee, and have a "moral right" to expect those funds to be used for the declared purpose. Further, the linkage of receipts to dedicated expenditures provides an incentive for industry for a market-type production or for beneficiaries for a benefit to support

Private securities

An immediate issue is whether government acquisition of securities and debt should be scored on a credit or cash basis. Prior to the financial crisis, both CBO and OMB scored equities on a cash basis. CBO similarly scored debt acquisitions on a credit basis.

The scoring changed with the enactment of TARP, [spell out?]which stipulated that "troubled assets" should be scored on a credit basis. CBO switched to credit-based scoring, while OMB continued to score the acquisitions of securities on a cash basis.

Leasing & public-private partnerships

Agencies continue to circumvent budget conventions designed to prevent them from disguising the true cost of building acquisitions.

In order to prevent agencies from having to pay up-front the full costs of relatively expensive leases, lease purchasing guidelines required that the full costs of long-term leases be scored up front similar to a direct purchase. Agencies, however, are increasing circumventing these rules by entering into complex public-private partnerships to acquire the buildings without having to pay the full up-front costs.

CBO and OMB have taken different approaches on scoring public-private partnerships. On several leases OMB has treated the public-private ventures as independent transactions between federal and private entities and therefore scored the transactions. On others, it has not. CBO has taken a more "holistic" view of each partnership and scored comparable transactions if the government is seen as controlling the hybrid entity.

Baselines

No budget concept produces a more visceral response from policymakers than baselines. What is often overlooked is that baselines, while not entirely benign or entirely neutral, merely reflect the prior decisions of policymakers to put entitlement and tax policies on automatic pilot.

Baselines are simply spending and revenue projections that are intended to reflect a continuation of revenue and expenditure policies. What constitutes a continuation of a policy varies depending on whether a "continuation" is defined as maintaining the same level of services, continuing the same policy, or operating under whatever law is currently in impact.

Budget laws set out the rules by which the baseline is calculated, and these rules are different for entitlements, recipients, and discretionary spending. Entitlements and receipts are generally assumed to operate at current law levels (except for preexisting entitlements in excess of $50 million that are assumed to expire). If, for example, the law provides for an increase in a tax, the baseline automatically adjusts to reflect the increase even if legislation is likely to be enacted to prevent the changes in taxes from taking effect. By contrast, discretionary spending is assumed to increase at the rate of inflation even though the appropriations law expired at the end of the preceding year. Occasionally the baseline rules have been modified to reflect adjustments above and beyond the general rate of inflation for such factors as expiring housing contracts and pay adjustments.

While intended to be neutral benchmarks, baselines reflect policies that have changing effects over time. For example, baseline projections show mandatory expenditures gradually squeezing out the share of budgetary resources otherwise available for discretionary priorities. In other words, the baseline reflects that a continuation of tax and entitlement policy will cause a dramatic change in discretionary spending priorities over the medium and long term.

Policymakers of all stripes have objections to baselines. Some contend they make it difficult to slow expenditure growth, as any reduction from a rising baseline may be seen as a "cut" even if it reflects a nominal increase. Others object because baselines can be easily manipulated to promote certain outcomes.

With the expiration of statutory PAYGO requirements and appropriations caps, nothing prevents the president and Congress from constructing their own baselines for presentation purposes or to enforce their own procedural rules (e.g. point of order and administrative PAYGO). The Bush administration repeatedly did this when it included a baseline that assumed extension of expiring tax cuts (so they would not have to offset the cuts through tax increases or cuts in expenditure progress) and backed out emergency-designated discretionary spending from the prior-year spending base.

It is critical that the administration, House and Senate operate off a common baseline. Nevertheless, some modest changes are possible, such as:

- Mandating that budget reports include multiple baseline projections based on different assumptions (similar to what CBO, OMB, and the congressional budget committees are already doing);
- Discontinuing discretionary adjustments that overstate pay;
- Reconsidering the baseline assumption that preexisting programs in excess of $50 million continue indefinitely.

---

[i] The Obama budget came out after this paper was completed. That budget has begun to change the way GSEs are displayed.