



DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20220

April 26, 2013

Ms. Janice K. Uhlig
Executive Director
Global Compensation, Global Human Resources
General Motors Company
300 Renaissance Drive
Detroit, MI 48265-3000

**Re: Compensation Payments and Structures for Senior Executive Officers
and Most Highly Compensated Employees (“Covered Employees 1-25”)**

Dear Ms. Uhlig:

Pursuant to the Department of the Treasury’s Interim Final Rule on TARP Standards for Compensation and Corporate Governance,¹ the Office of the Special Master has completed its review of the 2013 compensation submission by General Motors Company (“GM”), on behalf of its senior executive officers and next 20 most highly compensated employees (“Covered Employees 1 – 25” or “Covered Employees”). Attached as *Annex A* is a determination memorandum (accompanied by *Exhibits I* and *II*) providing the determinations of the Office of the Special Master with respect to 2013 compensation for Covered Employees 1 – 25. 31 C.F.R. § 30.16(a)(3)(i).

The Interim Final Rule requires the Office of the Special Master to determine whether the compensation structure for each Covered Employee 1 – 25 “will or may result in payments that are inconsistent with the purposes of section 111 of EESA or TARP,² or are otherwise contrary to the public interest” (as applied to Covered Employees of exceptional assistance recipients, the “public interest standard”). *Id.* The Office of the Special Master must make such determinations by applying six principles: avoid incentives to take excessive risk, maximize the company’s ability to repay the taxpayer, appropriately allocate the components of compensation, use performance-based compensation, employ pay structures and amounts that are consistent with, and not excessive taking into account, those at comparable entities, and base pay on the employee’s contribution to the value of the TARP recipient enterprise. *Id.* These principles are discussed in further detail in Part III of *Annex A*.

To apply the six principles and ensure that compensation structures satisfy the public interest standard, the Office of the Special Master developed practical guidelines (“guidelines”), which were identified in the determination letters issued by the Office of the Special Master on

¹ The Interim Final Rule and all determination letters issued by the Office of the Special Master are available at www.financialstability.gov (click on “Executive Compensation”).

² These purposes are “maximization of overall returns to the taxpayers of the United States and providing stability and preventing disruptions to financial markets.” 31 C.F.R. § 30.16(b)(1).

October 22, 2009, March 23, 2010, April 1, 2011, and April 6, 2012, relating to 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 compensation, respectively.³ Compensation in 2013 at the two remaining recipients of exceptional assistance must continue to comport with these guidelines, which generally include the following:

- Limit guaranteed cash. The majority of each Covered Employee's base salary should be paid in the form of stock that will immediately vest as earned, but will be redeemable only in three equal, annual installments beginning on the second anniversary of the date stock salary is earned (or the first anniversary if the TARP recipient has begun to repay its obligations). Although the Interim Final Rule limits incentives to one-third of annual compensation, the use of stock salary, as contemplated by the Interim Final Rule, provides a performance component for a portion of the employee's base compensation. Base salary paid in cash should in most cases not exceed \$500,000.
- Require that incentives be contingent on performance. Incentive compensation should be based on measurable performance goals that are designed by, and the achievement of which is determined by, the company's independent compensation committee.
- Focus on long-term value creation. A significant amount of compensation should reflect a company's long-term performance and value. In most circumstances a large proportion of compensation should be held or deferred for a period of at least three years.
- Minimal perquisites. Compensation structures that are not aligned with shareholder and taxpayer interests in the firm should be minimized or eliminated.

In applying the above guidelines, the Office of the Special Master has implemented certain restrictions on practices that present conflicting incentives. For example, Covered Employees are prohibited from engaging in any hedging or derivative transactions involving company stock that would undermine the long-term performance incentives created by the approved compensation structures.

Finally, the determinations of the Office of the Special Master take into account the requirements of the Interim Final Rule that generally apply to all TARP recipients whether or not they are subject to the jurisdiction of the Office of the Special Master: (a) prohibition of all bonuses and incentives, including cash bonuses and stock options (the only exception to the fixed-compensation-only rule is the ability to award a bonus in the form of long-term restricted stock that does not exceed one-third of compensation in the year of grant, has a minimum vesting period of two years and cannot be transferred by the employee, even if fully vested, earlier than pursuant to a schedule that reflects the company's actual repayment of TARP obligations in 25%


³ In this determination letter, the terms "public interest standard", "principles", and "guidelines" have distinct meanings. The term "public interest standard" refers to the determination standard laid out in the Interim Final Rule. The term "principles" refers to the six principles (listed above and further described in Part III of *Annex A*) that the Interim Final Rule instructs the Office of the Special Master to apply in determining whether compensation meets the public interest standard. The term "guidelines" refers to the practical guidelines developed by the Office of the Special Master to implement the principles and ensure satisfaction of the public interest standard. In addition, the term "Office of the Special Master" is used consistently to refer to the Office or the defined term "Special Master" as used in the Interim Final Rule.

increments), (b) requirement of a “clawback” of any bonus that is later determined to have been awarded based on materially inaccurate performance criteria, (c) limitation of golden parachute payments, and (d) prohibition of tax gross-ups.

GM’s compensation submission generally is consistent with these important principles and guidelines, but certain modifications were necessary to ensure that compensation for GM’s Covered Employees 1 – 25 satisfies the public interest standard. The Office of the Special Master’s determinations are described in detail in the attached determination memorandum.

Pursuant to the Interim Final Rule, GM may, within 30 days of the date hereof, request in writing that the Office of the Special Master reconsider the determinations set forth in the determination memorandum. If GM does not request reconsideration within 30 days, these initial determinations will be treated as final determinations. *Id.* § 30.16(c)(1).

Very truly yours,



Patricia Geoghegan
Office of the Special Master
for TARP Executive Compensation

Enclosures

cc: Melissa A. Howell

ANNEX A DETERMINATION MEMORANDUM

I. INTRODUCTION

The Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, as amended by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (“EESA”), requires the Secretary of the Treasury to establish standards related to executive compensation and corporate governance for institutions receiving financial assistance under the Troubled Asset Relief Program (“TARP”). Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008, 12 U.S.C. § 5221 (2010). Through the Department of the Treasury’s Interim Final Rule on TARP Standards for Compensation and Corporate Governance (the “Rule”), the Secretary delegated to the Office of the Special Master for TARP Executive Compensation (the “Office of the Special Master”) responsibility for reviewing compensation structures of certain employees at institutions that received exceptional financial assistance under TARP (“Exceptional Assistance Recipients”).⁴ 31 C.F.R. § 30.16(a); *id.* § 30.16(a)(3). For these employees, the Office of the Special Master must determine whether the compensation structure will or may result in payments “inconsistent with the purposes of section 111 of EESA or TARP, or...otherwise contrary to the public interest.” *Id.* § 30.16(a)(3)(i).

General Motors (“GM” or the “Company”), one of two remaining Exceptional Assistance Recipients, has submitted to the Office of the Special Master proposed 2013 compensation structures (the “Proposed Structures”) for review pursuant to Section 30.16(a)(3)(i) of the Rule. These compensation structures apply to five employees that the Company has identified for 2013 as senior executive officers (the “Senior Executive Officers,” or “SEOs”) for purposes of the Rule, and 19 employees the Company has identified as among the most highly compensated employees of the Company for purposes of the Rule (the “Most Highly Compensated Employees,” and, together with the SEOs, the “Covered Employees”). As further described below, one employee who otherwise would have been included in the Covered Employee group has departed the Company, but remains subject to the applicable rules for Covered Employees who have left the Company.

The Office of the Special Master has completed the review of the Company’s Proposed Structures for the Covered Employees pursuant to the principles set forth in the Rule. *Id.* § 30.16(b)(1). This Determination Memorandum sets forth the determinations of the Office of the Special Master, pursuant to Section 30.16(a)(3)(i) of the Rule, with respect to the Covered Employees.

II. BACKGROUND

On June 15, 2009, the Department of the Treasury (“Treasury”) promulgated the Rule, creating the Office of the Special Master and delineating its responsibilities. The Rule requires

⁴ The Interim Final Rule on TARP Standards for Compensation and Corporate Governance, technical corrections to the Rule, FAQs, and all Prior Determinations are available on the Department of the Treasury website at www.financialstability.gov (click on “Executive Compensation”).

that each Exceptional Assistance Recipient submit proposed compensation structures for each Senior Executive Officer and Most Highly Compensated Employee. 31 C.F.R. § 30.16(a)(3)(i).

On October 22, 2009, March 23, 2010, April 1, 2011, and April 6, 2012, in each case after reviewing submissions of proposed compensation structures and amounts from the Company, the Office of the Special Master issued determinations regarding the Company's compensation structures, and amounts potentially payable thereunder, for GM's senior executive officers and certain most highly compensated employees (the "Prior Determinations"). The Prior Determinations were made in light of six principles defined in the Rule and discussed in Part III below (the "principles"), and proposed compensation structures for Covered Employees were modified as needed to ensure that compensation would not "result in payments that are inconsistent with the purposes of section 111 of EESA or TARP, or are otherwise contrary to the public interest" (as applied to Covered Employees of Exceptional Assistance Recipients, the "public interest standard"). 31 C.F.R. § 30.16(a)(3)(i). To apply the principles and ensure that compensation structures satisfy the public interest standard, the Office of the Special Master developed practical guidelines (the "guidelines"), which informed the Prior Determinations and are described in the cover letter accompanying this Determination Memorandum.⁵ The Prior Determinations applied only to those individuals identified by the Company as subject to the Office of the Special Master's mandatory jurisdiction to review and approve compensation structures and payments, *see id.*, for the period under review and only with respect to compensation for services provided to GM for that period.

On January 4, 2013, the Office of the Special Master requested from each remaining Exceptional Assistance Recipient, including GM, certain data and documentary information necessary to facilitate the Office of the Special Master's review of the Company's 2013 compensation structures. The request required GM to submit data describing its proposed compensation structures, and the payments that would result from the proposals, concerning each Covered Employee.

In addition, the Rule authorizes the Office of the Special Master to request information from an Exceptional Assistance Recipient "under such procedures as the Office of the Special Master may determine." *Id.* § 30.16(d). GM was required to submit competitive market data indicating how the amounts payable under GM's proposed compensation structures relate to the amounts paid to persons in similar positions or roles at similar entities (see Part IV below for a discussion of GM's market data). GM was also required to submit a range of documentation, including information related to proposed performance metrics, internal policies designed to curb excessive risk, and certain previously existing compensation plans and agreements.

GM submitted this information to the Office of the Special Master on February 7, 2013. Following a preliminary review of the submission, on February 27, 2013, the Office of the Special Master determined that GM's submission was substantially complete for purposes of the Rule. *Id.* § 30.16(a)(3)(i). The Office of the Special Master then commenced a formal review of GM's proposed compensation structures for the Covered Employees. The Rule provides that the

⁵ For a further discussion of the guidelines, see pages 9 – 10 of the September 10, 2010, Final Report of Special Master Kenneth R. Feinberg, available at www.financialstability.gov (click on "Executive Compensation").

Office of the Special Master is required to issue a compensation determination within 60 days of receipt of a substantially complete submission. *Id.*

The Office of the Special Master's review of the Company's proposals was aided by analysis from a number of internal and external sources, including:

- Treasury personnel with significant experience related to executive compensation detailed to the Office of the Special Master;
- Competitive market data provided by the Company (and prepared by its independent compensation consultant) in connection with its submission to the Office of the Special Master;
- External information on comparable compensation structures extracted from the *U.S. Mercer Benchmark Database-Executive*; and
- Equilar's *ExecutiveInsight* database (which includes information drawn from publicly filed proxy statements).

The Office of the Special Master has also considered national and global developments in the regulation of executive compensation. In July 2010, Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "Dodd-Frank Act"), directing further regulation on incentive-based compensation. In early 2011, the FDIC and the SEC approved versions of a joint proposed rulemaking with five other agencies under the Dodd-Frank Act, mandating, among other things, the deferral of half of large banks' top executive bonuses.⁶ The Office of the Special Master continues to monitor evolving standards for executive compensation.

The Office of the Special Master considered all the sources above, in light of the statutory and regulatory standards described in Part III below, when evaluating the Company's proposed compensation structures for the Covered Employees for 2013.

III. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY STANDARDS

The Rule requires that the Office of the Special Master determine for each of the Covered Employees whether GM's proposed compensation structure, including amounts payable or potentially payable under the compensation structure, "will or may result in payments that are inconsistent with the purposes of Section 111 of EESA or TARP, or are otherwise contrary to the public interest." 31 C.F.R. § 30.16(a)(3). The Rule requires that, in making these compensation determinations, the Office of the Special Master shall apply six principles that are intended to be consistent with sound compensation practices appropriate for TARP recipients and to advance the purposes and considerations described in EESA, including the maximization of overall

⁶ See SEC Press Release No. 2011-77 (March 30, 2011). Internationally, the EU adopted a directive on remuneration policies which was further implemented in guidelines released in December 2010. The UK issued its final regulations under those guidelines in the same month. These developments may be considered a response to the meeting of the G20 in April 2009, and also more broadly as a response to the financial crisis and changing views on the regulation of executive compensation. Generally, the principles underlying the emerging regulations are consistent with the objectives of the Office of the Special Master.

returns to the taxpayers of the United States and providing stability and preventing disruptions to financial markets. EESA, Pub. L. No. 110-343 § 2, § 103 (2008). These principles are:

- (1) *Avoidance of incentives to take excessive risk.* The compensation structure should avoid incentives that encourage employees to take unnecessary or excessive risks that could threaten the value of the Exceptional Assistance Recipient, including incentives that reward employees for short-term or temporary increases in value or performance, or similar measures that may undercut the long-term value of the Exceptional Assistance Recipient. Compensation packages should be aligned with sound risk management. *Id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(i).
- (2) *Taxpayer return.* The compensation structure and amount payable should reflect the need for the Exceptional Assistance Recipient to remain a competitive enterprise, to retain and recruit talented employees who will contribute to the recipient's future success, so that the Company will ultimately be able to repay its TARP obligations. *Id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(ii).
- (3) *Appropriate allocation of components of compensation.* The compensation structure should appropriately allocate the components of compensation such as salary and short-term and long-term performance incentives, as well as the extent to which compensation is provided in cash, equity, or other types of compensation such as executive pensions, or other benefits, or perquisites, based on the specific role of the employee and other relevant circumstances, including the nature and amount of current compensation, deferred compensation, or other compensation and benefits previously paid or awarded. *Id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(iii).
- (4) *Performance-based compensation.* An appropriate portion of the compensation should be performance-based over a relevant performance period. Performance-based compensation should be determined through tailored metrics that encompass individual performance and/or the performance of the Exceptional Assistance Recipient or a relevant business unit taking into consideration specific business objectives. Performance metrics may relate to employee compliance with relevant corporate policies. In addition, the likelihood of meeting the performance metrics should not be so great that the arrangement fails to provide an adequate incentive for the employee to perform, and performance metrics should be measurable, enforceable, and actually enforced if not met. *Id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(iv).
- (5) *Comparable structures and payments.* The compensation structure, and amounts payable where applicable, should be consistent with, and not excessive taking into account, compensation structures and amounts for persons in similar positions or roles at similar entities that are similarly situated, including, as applicable, entities competing in the same markets and similarly situated entities that are financially distressed or that are contemplating or undergoing reorganization. *Id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(v).
- (6) *Employee contribution to TARP recipient value.* The compensation structure and amount payable should reflect the current or prospective contributions of an employee to the value of the Exceptional Assistance Recipient, taking into account multiple factors such

as revenue production, specific expertise, compliance with company policy and regulation (including risk management), and corporate leadership, as well as the role the employee may have had with respect to any change in the financial health or competitive position of the recipient. *Id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(vi).

The Rule provides that the Office of the Special Master shall have discretion to determine the appropriate weight or relevance of a particular principle depending on the facts and circumstances surrounding the compensation structure or payment for a particular employee. *Id.* § 30.16(b). To the extent two or more principles may appear inconsistent in a particular situation, the Rule requires that the Office of the Special Master exercise discretion in determining the relative weight to be accorded to each principle. *Id.*

The Rule provides that the Office of the Special Master may, in the course of applying these principles, take into account other compensation structures and other compensation earned, accrued, or paid, including compensation and compensation structures that are not subject to the restrictions of Section 111 of EESA. For example, the Office of the Special Master may consider payments obligated to be made by the Company pursuant to certain legally binding rights under valid written employment contracts entered into prior to enactment of the statute and the accompanying Rule. *Id.* § 30.16(a)(3).

IV. COMPENSATION STRUCTURES AND PAYMENTS

A. GM Market Data and Proposals

GM has provided the Office of the Special Master with detailed information concerning its proposed 2013 compensation structures for the Covered Employees, including amounts proposed to be paid under the compensation structure for each Covered Employee.

GM supported its proposal with detailed assessments of each Covered Employee's tenure and responsibilities at the Company and historical compensation structure. Fourteen of the employees listed as Covered Employees in 2012 remain on the list of Covered Employees for 2013, and ten employees are new entrants to the group.⁷

The submission also included market data that, according to the Company, indicated that the amounts potentially payable to each employee were comparable to the compensation payable to persons in similar positions or roles at a "peer group" of entities selected by the Company. The following overview of the market data submitted by GM is based on information supplied by the Company.

1. Overview of Market Data

GM's submission included market comparisons of total compensation levels for the Covered Employees provided by Compensation Advisory Partners, LLC ("CAP"), an independent third-party consultant specializing in executive compensation matters. CAP offers a

⁷ As further described below, one employee who otherwise would have been included in the Covered Employee group has departed the Company, but remain subject to the applicable rules for Covered Employees who have left the Company.

full range of executive compensation consulting services as it works with boards of directors and management teams to develop effective compensation programs, aligned with strong corporate governance standards.

One of the services CAP provided GM is the annual evaluation of compensation competitiveness for year-end 2012 (the “Report”). The evaluation involves comparing the compensation GM provides its executives to that provided by GM’s comparator companies⁸ for each element of compensation. GM’s comparator group consists of other large U.S.-based multinationals that are in the Fortune 100 and have complex business operations including significant research and development, design, engineering and manufacturing. For comparison, GM has approximately \$150 billion in revenue versus the average of its comparator group of \$65 billion. In addition, GM has approximately 213,000 employees compared with 125,000 as an average for its comparator group. Lastly, GM’s net income is approximately \$6.2 billion as compared to an average of \$5.0 billion among its comparator group.

Both the amount and type of compensation provided by GM and the comparator companies are evaluated along with the relative proportion of each type. CAP secures the data used for the evaluation from proxy statements for GM’s named executive officers and surveys conducted by major survey providers for all other executives. Comparisons are made by position based on level of responsibility and/or specific position responsibilities. The comparisons for all positions are consolidated to create an overall assessment of the competitiveness of GM’s executive compensation structures.

According to GM, on an overall basis, GM targets the median of the comparator group to set the compensation for its executives. This means, on an individual basis, an executive may be above or below the median based on his or her individual background and any differences in the scope of responsibilities of GM’s positions versus that of comparator companies. Based on the market data contained in the Report, the Office of the Special Master believes that the amounts of total direct compensation set forth in *Exhibit I*, on average, do not exceed the median of compensation for persons in similar roles at similar entities.

As in past years, an executive compensation specialist on the staff of the Office of the Special Master evaluated the Report based on decades of experience in structuring executive compensation and on testing a sample of the market information contained in the Report using one or more of the databases referred to in Part II above. Based on that evaluation, the Office of the Special Master has concluded that the market comparisons set forth in the Report provide a reasonable guide to compensation paid to “persons in similar positions or roles at similar entities that are similarly situated.”⁹

⁸ GM’s comparator group consists of Chevron Corp., ConocoPhillips, General Electric Co., Ford Motor Co., Hewlett-Packard Co., International Business Machines Corp., Procter & Gamble Co., Pfizer Inc., Boeing Co., Johnson & Johnson, PepsiCo Inc., United Technologies Corp., Dow Chemical Co., Lockheed Martin Corp., Caterpillar Inc., Johnson Controls Inc., Honeywell International Inc., and E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Co.

⁹ 31 C.F.R. § 30.16(b)(1)(v). See also the discussion of the relevant principles in Part III above.

2. GM's Proposal

a. Cash Salary

For 12 of the 24 Covered Employees, including four of the ten employees new to the Covered Employee group, the Company proposed raising cash salaries.

b. Stock Salary

GM proposed that Covered Employees receive substantial stock salary for 2013, including significant increases. As required by the Rule, these stock units would be fully vested upon grant.

c. Annual Long-Term Incentive Awards

GM proposed that all but five Covered Employees would receive annual long-term incentive awards. These employees would be eligible to receive awards representing up to one third of their total 2013 compensation, payable in long-term restricted stock units that generally would vest only if the Covered Employee remains employed by the Company on the third anniversary of the grant date. As required by the Rule, these awards would be paid only in 25% installments for each 25% of GM's TARP obligations that are repaid.

d. "Other" Compensation and Perquisites

GM proposed payments of "other" compensation, as well as perquisites, to the Covered Employees. These proposed payments varied in value.

B. Determinations of the Office of the Special Master

The Office of the Special Master has reviewed the Proposed Structures in detail by application of the six principles set forth in the Rule and described in Part III above. The Office of the Special Master's review also made use of the resources described in Part II. In order to consistently apply the principles and ensure the satisfaction of the public interest standard, the Office of the Special Master has determined that the guidelines established in 2009, and applied in 2010, 2011, and 2012, must continue to govern compensation in 2013.

After reviewing the Proposed Structures, the Office of the Special Master has concluded that they are in most respects consistent with the guidelines. However, certain aspects of the Proposed Structures and amounts potentially payable under the Proposed Structures require modification to ensure that they are consistent with the public interest standard.

The Office of the Special Master has determined, in light of the considerations that follow, that the compensation structures described in *Exhibits I* and *II* to this Determination Memorandum will not, by virtue of either their structural design or the amounts potentially payable under them, result in payments inconsistent with the public interest standard.

1. Cash Salary

The Office of the Special Master reviewed GM's proposed cash salary in light of the principle that compensation structures should generally be comparable to "compensation structures and amounts for persons in similar positions or roles at similar entities," 31 C.F.R. § 30.16(b)(1)(v). Based in part upon this principle, the Office of the Special Master has concluded that cash salaries generally target the 50th percentile as compared to persons in similar positions or roles at similar entities, because such levels of cash salaries balance the need to attract and retain talent with the need for compensation structures that reflect the circumstances of Exceptional Assistance Recipients.

The Office of the Special Master also reviewed GM's proposed cash salaries in light of the principle that compensation structures should be "performance-based over a relevant performance period," *id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(iv). Based in part upon this principle, the Office of the Special Master has determined that, other than in exceptional cases for good cause shown, a Covered Employee's cash salary should not exceed \$500,000.

After reviewing GM's proposal, the Office of the Special Master declined to approve the 12 requests for cash salary increases. The cash salaries that the Office of the Special Master has determined are consistent with the public interest standard for the Covered Employees are set forth in ***Exhibit I***. Based on the market data described above, the cash salaries listed in ***Exhibit I*** are, on average, six percent below the median cash salary for similar positions at similar companies. In addition, the cash salaries listed in ***Exhibit I*** are, on average, 54 percent below the median total cash compensation for similar positions at similar companies.¹⁰

2. Stock Salary

The Office of the Special Master reviewed the amount of stock salary GM proposed to pay the Covered Employees in light of the principles that compensation structures should generally be comparable to "compensation structures and amounts for persons in similar positions or roles at similar entities," *id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(v), and that a "compensation structure, and amount payable...should reflect the current or prospective contributions of an employee to the value of the [Company]." *Id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(vi). The Office of the Special Master found that the amounts of stock salary proposed by GM generally would place the Covered Employees around the 50th percentile of compensation for persons in similar roles at similar entities. Although GM asked for a number of increases in total direct compensation, the Office of the Special Master approved only limited amounts of increases. The stock salaries that the Office of the Special Master has determined are consistent with the public interest standard for 2013 are set forth in ***Exhibit I***.

The Office of the Special Master reviewed the structure of GM's stock salary proposal in light of the principle that compensation structures should align performance incentives with long-term value creation rather than short-term profits. *See id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(i). In light of this principle, the guidelines provide that stock salary may be redeemable only in three equal, annual installments beginning on the second anniversary of grant. The Proposed Structures are

¹⁰ Similar companies also pay cash bonuses, which are not permitted for executives whose pay packages are subject to review by the Office of the Special Master.

consistent with this requirement. Additionally, and as pointed out in Prior Determinations, because GM has made significant repayments of the Company's TARP obligations,¹¹ each redemption date of 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013 stock salary may be accelerated by one year.

3. Annual Long-Term Incentive Awards

The Office of the Special Master reviewed GM's proposed annual long-term incentive awards in light of the principle that performance-based compensation should be payable "over a relevant performance period." *Id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(iv). Based in part upon this principle, long-term incentives must be paid in the form of long-term restricted stock, and may be paid only if objective performance metrics are achieved and the employee continues to provide services to the Company for three years following the date of grant.¹²

The structure of GM's proposed annual long-term incentive awards generally satisfies these requirements. Under the Proposed Structures, annual long-term incentive awards for 2013 will be payable only upon the achievement of specified, objective performance criteria to be provided to the Office of the Special Master. In addition, as required by the Rule, these awards may be redeemed only in 25% installments for each 25% of GM's TARP obligations that are repaid, and must otherwise be forfeited.

The Office of the Special Master also reviewed the target amounts of annual long-term incentive awards GM proposed for the Covered Employees in light of the principle that an "appropriate portion of the compensation should be performance-based," *id.* § 30.16(b)(1)(iv), and "performance metrics should be measurable, enforceable, and actually enforced if not met." *Id.* Although GM's proposed annual long-term incentive awards are generally consistent with this principle, in the case of certain Covered Employees, the Office of the Special Master acknowledged that a lower allocation of long-term restricted stock was appropriate. The target annual long-term incentive awards that the Office of the Special Master has determined are consistent with the public interest standard for 2013 are set forth in *Exhibit I*.

4. "Other" Compensation and Perquisites

Perquisites and "other" compensation provided to a Covered Employee must be limited to \$25,000 on an annual basis. As described in *Exhibit II*, any exceptions to this limitation will require that the Company provide to the Office of the Special Master an independent justification for the payment that is satisfactory to the Office of the Special Master.¹³ To the extent that

¹¹ Including proceeds from the sale of GM common stock held by Treasury, GM's repayments totaled approximately \$30.4 billion as of the end of March 2013.

¹² In line with the proposed rulemaking under the Dodd-Frank Act referenced above, and in conformity with the minimum two-year vesting requirement of the Rule, pro-rata vesting of long-term incentive awards for 2013 services will be permitted after two years, allowing two thirds of the award to vest after two years, with the last third vesting on the third anniversary of the date of grant.

¹³ GM has identified certain employees subject to expatriate arrangements providing for the payment of certain "other" compensation in excess of this limitation. The Office of the Special Master has reviewed these arrangements and has concluded that such payments, not to exceed \$425,000 per employee, are consistent with the public interest standard.

payments exceeding this limitation have already been made to a Covered Employee in 2013, those amounts should be promptly returned to the Company.

5. Non-Qualified Deferred Compensation

Covered Employees must not accrue in 2013 additional amounts under supplemental executive retirement plans and other “non-qualified deferred compensation” plans, as described in *Exhibit II*.

6. Severance Plans

The Company must ensure that 2013 compensation structures for Covered Employees do not result in an increase in the amounts payable pursuant to severance arrangements.

7. Departing Employee

One employee who would have been a Covered Employee had this individual remained employed by the Company has departed the Company. With respect to this individual, the Office of the Special Master has determined that the payment of stock salary and cash salary at the rates in effect on January 1, 2013, through the date of the termination of employment, and payment of up to \$25,000 in perquisites and “other” compensation are consistent with the public interest standard. No other payments of total direct compensation to this employee for 2013 would be consistent with the public interest standard. Any exceptions to this limitation will require that the Company provide to the Office of the Special Master an independent justification for the payment that is satisfactory to the Office of the Special Master. For the avoidance of doubt, as mentioned in Part I, this employee remains subject to the applicable provisions of the Rule, and any other compensation this individual has accrued remains subject to the above provisions of this Part IV (or, if applicable, the corresponding provisions of the Prior Determinations) and *Exhibit II*.

V. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

As noted in Part III above, the Rule requires the Office of the Special Master to consider the extent to which compensation structures are “performance-based over a relevant performance period,” 31 C.F.R. § 30.16(b)(1)(iv). In light of the importance of this principle, as in the Prior Determinations, the Office of the Special Master requires that GM take certain corporate governance steps to ensure that the compensation structures for the Covered Employees, and the amounts payable or potentially payable under those structures, are consistent with the public interest standard. Among other requirements, GM must:

- Ensure that employees are prohibited from engaging in any derivative or similar transaction with respect to GM stock that would undermine the long-term performance incentives created by the compensation structures set forth in *Exhibits I and II*.
- Maintain a compensation committee comprised exclusively of independent directors, which must discuss, evaluate, and review with GM’s senior risk officers any risks that could threaten the value of GM. *Id.* § 30.4; *id.* § 30.5.

- Ensure that the compensation committee discloses to Treasury an annual narrative description of whether GM, its Board of Directors, or the committee has engaged a compensation consultant during the past three years, and, if so, the types of services provided by the compensation consultant or any affiliate, including any “benchmarking” or comparisons employed to identify certain percentile levels of pay. *Id.* § 30.11(c).
- Provide to Treasury an annual disclosure of any perquisite with a total value for GM’s fiscal year that exceeds \$25,000 for each of the Covered Employees, as well as a narrative description of the amount and nature of these perquisites, the recipient of these perquisites and a justification for offering these perquisites (including a justification for offering the perquisite, and not only for offering the perquisite with a value that exceeds \$25,000). *Id.* § 30.11(b).
- Ensure that any incentive award paid to a Covered Employee is subject to a clawback if the award was based on materially inaccurate financial statements (which term includes, but is not limited to, statements of earnings, revenues, or gains) or any other materially inaccurate performance metric criteria. GM must exercise its clawback rights except to the extent that it is unreasonable to do so. *Id.* § 30.8.
- GM was required to adopt an excessive or luxury expenditures policy, provide that policy to Treasury, and post it on GM’s website. If GM’s Board of Directors makes any material amendments to this policy, within 90 days of the adoption of the amended policy, the Board of Directors must provide the amended policy to Treasury and post the amended policy on its Internet website. *Id.* § 30.12.
- Except as explicitly permitted under the Rule, GM is prohibited from providing (formally or informally) tax gross-ups to any of the Covered Employees. *Id.* § 30.11(d).
- GM’s chief executive officer and chief financial officer must provide written certification of the Company’s compliance with the various requirements of Section 111 of EESA. The precise nature of the required certification is identified in the Rule. *Id.* § 30.15 Appx. B.

VI. CONCLUSION

The Office of the Special Master has reviewed the Proposed Structures for the Covered Employees for 2013 and, in light of the principles, applied the guidelines in order to ensure the satisfaction of the public interest standard. On the basis of that review, the Office of the Special Master has determined that the Proposed Structures submitted by GM are to a great extent consistent with the Prior Determinations but require certain modifications in order to meet the public interest standard.

The Office of the Special Master has reviewed the compensation structures set forth in *Exhibits I* and *II* in light of the principles set forth at 31 C.F.R. § 30.16(b). Pursuant to the authority vested in the Office of the Special Master by the Rule, and in accordance with Section 30.16(a)(3) thereof, the Office of the Special Master hereby determines that the compensation structures set forth in *Exhibits I* and *II*, including the amounts payable or potentially payable

under such compensation structures, will not result in payments that are inconsistent with the purposes of Section 111 of EESA or TARP, and will not otherwise be contrary to the public interest.

Pursuant to the Interim Final Rule, GM may, within 30 days of the date hereof, request in writing that the Office of the Special Master reconsider the determinations set forth in this Determination Memorandum. The request for reconsideration must specify a factual error or relevant new information not previously considered, and must demonstrate that such error or lack of information resulted in a material error in the initial determinations. If GM does not request reconsideration within 30 days, the determinations set forth herein will be treated as final determinations. *Id.* § 30.16(c)(1).

The foregoing determinations are limited to the compensation structures and employees described in *Exhibits I* and *II*, and shall not be relied upon with respect to any other employee. The determinations are limited to the authority vested in the Office of the Special Master by Section 30.16(a)(3)(i) of the Rule, and shall not constitute, or be construed to constitute, the judgment of the Office of the Special Master or Treasury with respect to the compliance of any compensation structure with any other provision of the Rule. Moreover, this Determination Memorandum has relied upon, and is qualified in its entirety by, the accuracy of the materials submitted by the Company to the Office of the Special Master, and the absence of any material misstatement or omission in such materials.

Finally, the foregoing determinations are limited to the compensation structures described herein, and no further compensation of any kind payable to any Covered Employee without the prior approval of the Office of the Special Master would be consistent with the public interest standard.

**EXHIBIT I
COVERED EMPLOYEES
2013 Compensation**

Company Name: General Motors Company

Employee ID	Cash Salary	Stock Salary (Performance based: The stock vests at grant and is redeemable in three equal, annual installments beginning on the first anniversary of grant.)	Long-Term Restricted Stock (Performance based: Awarded based on achievement of objective performance goals. Generally vests after 3 years of service. Transferability dependent on TARP repayment.)	Total Direct Compensation (Cash salary + stock salary + long term restricted stock.)
4859	\$1,700,000	\$7,300,000	\$0	\$9,000,000
0094	\$950,000	\$1,187,500	\$1,000,000	\$3,137,500
0230	\$495,000	\$840,000	\$665,000	\$2,000,000
1223	\$495,000	\$626,000	\$515,000	\$1,636,000
1565	\$495,000	\$660,000	\$525,000	\$1,680,000
2346	\$485,000	\$845,000	\$500,000	\$1,830,000
2387	\$495,000	\$835,000	\$600,000	\$1,930,000
2986	\$750,000	\$3,960,000	\$0	\$4,710,000
3178	\$460,000	\$618,000	\$450,000	\$1,528,000
3199	\$500,000	\$600,000	\$500,000	\$1,600,000
3348	\$650,000	\$1,525,000	\$0	\$2,175,000
3774	\$485,000	\$1,015,000	\$200,000	\$1,700,000
4894	\$495,000	\$2,730,000	\$0	\$3,225,000
5021	\$600,000	\$4,250,000	\$1,000,000	\$5,850,000
5046	\$475,000	\$480,000	\$320,000	\$1,275,000
5555	\$750,000	\$2,840,000	\$1,750,000	\$5,340,000
5697	\$750,000	\$2,410,000	\$1,550,000	\$4,710,000
6386	\$490,000	\$1,137,000	\$0	\$1,627,000
6524	\$495,000	\$700,000	\$555,000	\$1,750,000
7459	\$750,000	\$2,825,000	\$1,750,000	\$5,325,000
7537	\$600,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,000,000	\$3,000,000
9074	\$425,000	\$312,500	\$325,000	\$1,062,500
9635	\$500,000	\$1,150,000	\$750,000	\$2,400,000
9859	\$525,000	\$545,000	\$475,000	\$1,545,000

Comparison of 2013 compensation to prior year compensation for the employees listed above

- **Overall:** Overall cash decreased \$6.6 million or 30.7% and total direct compensation decreased \$3.0 million or 4.1% from 2012.
- **The 14 executives remaining in the top 25 from 2012:** Cash salaries remained the same and total direct compensation increased \$3.0 million or 6.1% from 2012. (This comparison is to target total direct compensation for 2012; the amount of long-term restricted stock actually awarded may have been lower than the target amount.)
- **The ten executives new to the top 25 in 2013:** Cash compensation decreased \$6.6 million or 57.0% and total direct compensation decreased \$6.0 million or 26.1% from 2012.

Note 1: The total number of Covered Employees may be less than 25 because of separations from service since April 1, 2013.

EXHIBIT II
TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF PAYMENTS AND STRUCTURES
CONSISTENT WITH THE PUBLIC INTEREST STANDARD

The following general terms and conditions shall govern the compensation structures described in *Exhibit I*. The Office of the Special Master's determination that those structures are consistent with the public interest standard is qualified in its entirety by the Company's adherence to these terms and conditions.

- **Salary payments.** Cash and stock base salaries reflect the annual rate for the employee and are effective as of January 1, 2013, and in the case of stock salary are payable on a *nunc pro tunc* basis from that date. To the extent the Office of the Special Master's determinations for 2013 reduce an employee's previous cash or stock salary rate, payments in excess of that rate prior to the date hereof must be offset by reductions to prospective 2013 cash salary payments or to any stock salary payable with respect to 2013.
- **Stock compensation generally.** For purposes of the Determination Memorandum, "stock" compensation includes common stock and stock units. Notwithstanding any transferability restrictions applicable to any stock compensation described in the Determination Memorandum, (1) an amount of stock sufficient to cover an employee's tax withholding obligations may become immediately transferable to the extent necessary to satisfy the employee's obligations, and (2) to the extent permitted by the Rule, stock may become immediately transferable upon an employee's death or separation from service resulting from disability, as defined in the Company's broad-based long-term disability plan.
- **Stock salary.** Stock salary must be determined as a dollar amount through the date salary is earned, be accrued at the same time or times as the salary would otherwise be paid in cash, and vest immediately upon grant, with the number of shares based on the fair market value on the date of award. Stock granted as stock salary may only be redeemed in three equal, annual installments as described in the Determination Memorandum. Whether a *nunc pro tunc* grant or payment that is labeled stock salary is considered salary or a bonus for purposes of the Rule is determined based on all the facts and circumstances.
- **Long-term restricted stock.** Long-term restricted stock for 2013 services may be granted only upon the achievement of objective performance criteria developed and reviewed in consultation with the Office of the Special Master. The compensation committee must certify (1) the achievement of such criteria, and (2) that the grant of incentives is appropriate in light of Company's overall circumstances at the time. Such stock must be forfeited unless conditioned upon the employee's continued employment through the third anniversary of grant, unless a termination of employment results from death or disability; provided, however, that (a) pro rata vesting is permitted after two years, allowing two-thirds of the grant to vest after two years, with the last third vesting on the third anniversary, and (b) all or a portion of such stock may, for good cause certified by the Company's compensation committee, continue to vest if the employee retires on or after the second anniversary of the grant date. The term "retirement" must meet an objective standard established in consultation with the Office of the Special Master.
- **Other compensation and perquisites.** No more than \$25,000 in total other compensation and perquisites (as defined by pertinent SEC regulations) may be provided to any Covered Employee, absent exceptional circumstances for good cause shown.
- **Supplemental executive retirement plans and non-qualified deferred compensation plans.** No amounts may be accrued under supplemental executive retirement plans, and no Company contributions may be made to other "non-qualified deferred compensation" plans, as defined by pertinent SEC regulations, for 2013. For the avoidance of doubt, the foregoing limitation does not (1) apply to employee-funded elective deferral arrangements or (2) preclude continuing recognition of age and service credit for Company employees for the purpose of vesting in previously accrued benefits under any plans referred to in this paragraph.
- **Qualified Plans.** For the avoidance of doubt, the Office of the Special Master has determined that participation by the Covered Employees in broad-based, tax-qualified retirement and health and welfare plans is consistent with the public interest standard, and amounts payable under such plans are not counted against the \$25,000 limit on other compensation and perquisites.