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JPMORGAN CHASE \& CO. CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL HIGHLIGHTS
ns, except per share, headcount and ratios) for the period ended,
income statement data
revenue
interest expense
sion profit
for credit losses
efore income tax expense and extraordinary

|  |  | 7,107 |  | 4,537 |  | 3,876 |  | 5,063 |  | 4,072 |  | 11,644 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ax expense |  | 2,312 |  | 1,211 |  | 598 |  | 1,551 |  | 1,351 |  | 3,523 |  |
| efore extraordinary gain nary gain ${ }^{(b)}$ |  | 4,795 |  | 3,326 |  | 3,278 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,512 \\ 76 \end{array}$ |  | 2,721 |  | 8,121 |  |
| me | \$ | 4,795 | \$ | 3,326 | \$ | 3,278 | \$ | 3,588 | \$ | 2,721 | \$ | 8,121 | \$ |
| mon share data nings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| efore extraordinary gain | \$ | 1.10 | \$ | 0.75 | \$ | 0.75 | \$ | 0.80 | \$ | 0.28 | \$ | 1.84 | \$ |
| arnings ${ }^{(c)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| efore extraordinary gain | \$ | 1.09 | \$ | 0.74 | \$ | 0.74 | \$ | 0.80 | \$ | 0.28 | \$ | 1.83 | \$ |
| ne |  | 1.09 |  | 0.74 |  | 0.74 |  | 0.82 |  | 0.28 |  | 1.83 |  |
| dends declared |  | 0.05 |  | 0.05 |  | 0.05 |  | 0.05 |  | 0.05 |  | 0.10 |  |
|  |  | 40.99 |  | 39.38 |  | 39.88 |  | 39.12 |  | 37.36 |  |  |  |
| shares outstanding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-average: Basic |  | 3,983.5 |  | 3,970.5 |  | 3,946.1 |  | 3,937.9 |  | 3,811.5 |  | 3,977.0 |  |
|  |  | 4,005.6 |  | 3,994.7 |  | 3,974.1 |  | 3,962.0 |  | 3,824.1 |  | 4,000.2 |  |
| shares at period-end ${ }^{(d)}$ |  | 3,975.8 |  | 3,975.4 |  | 3,942.0 |  | 3,938.7 |  | 3,924.1 |  |  |  |
| ice ${ }^{(e)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$ | 48.20 | \$ | 46.05 | \$ | 47.47 | \$ | 46.50 | \$ | 38.94 | \$ | 48.20 | \$ |
|  |  | 36.51 |  | 37.03 |  | 40.04 |  | 31.59 |  | 25.29 |  | 36.51 |  |
|  |  | 36.61 |  | 44.75 |  | 41.67 |  | 43.82 |  | 34.11 |  |  |  |
| apitalization |  | 145,554 |  | 177,897 |  | 164,261 |  | 172,596 |  | 133,852 |  |  |  |

ratios
i common equity ( $\left.\mathrm{ROE}^{c}\right)$ )
efore extraordinary gain
ne
tangible common equity ( $\left.\mathrm{ROTCE}^{c}\right)$
efore extraordinary gain

1Q10
4Q09
2Q10

| $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 , 1 0 1}$ | $\$$ | 27,671 | $\$$ | 23,164 | $\$$ | 26,622 | $\$$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 4 , 6 3 1}$ |  | 16,124 |  | 12,004 |  | 13,455 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 13,523 | $\mathbf{\$ 5 2 , 7 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 , 7 5 5}$ |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 0 , 4 7 0}$ |  | 11,547 |  | 11,160 |  | 13,167 |  |
|  | $\mathbf{3 , 3 6 3}$ |  | 7,010 |  | 7,284 |  | 8,104 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,031 | $\mathbf{2 2 , 0 1 7}$ |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 0}, 373$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\mathbf{\$} \quad \mathbf{4 , 7 9 5} \quad \$ \quad 3,326 \quad \$ \quad 3,278 \quad \$ \quad 3,588 \quad \$ \quad 2,721 \quad \$ \mathbf{8 , 1 2 1}$
\$

Six months en
2Q09
2010 10,373

11,644
3,523

8,121
\$
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| ne |  | 17 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 14 |  | 5 | 15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 assets ( ROA ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| efore extraordinary gain |  | 0.94 |  | 0.66 |  | 0.65 |  | 0.70 |  | 0.54 | 0.80 |
| ne |  | 0.94 |  | 0.66 |  | 0.65 |  | 0.71 |  | 0.54 | 0.80 |
| ratio |  | 58 |  | 58 |  | 52 |  | 51 |  | 53 | 58 |
| pital ratio ${ }^{(f)}$ |  | 12.1 |  | 11.5 |  | 11.1 |  | 10.2 |  | 9.7 |  |
| ital ratio |  | 15.8 |  | 15.1 |  | 14.8 |  | 13.9 |  | 13.3 |  |
| erage ratio |  | 6.9 |  | 6.6 |  | 6.9 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.2 |  |
| mmon capital ratio ${ }^{(g)}$ |  | 9.6 |  | 9.1 |  | 8.8 |  | 8.2 |  | 7.7 |  |
| balance sheet data (period-end) ${ }^{(f)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ssets | \$ | 397,508 | \$ | 426,128 | \$ | 411,128 | \$ | 424,435 | \$ | 395,626 |  |
|  |  | 312,013 |  | 344,376 |  | 360,390 |  | 372,867 |  | 345,563 |  |
|  |  | 699,483 |  | 713,799 |  | 633,458 |  | 653,144 |  | 680,601 |  |
| ets |  | 2,014,019 |  | 2,135,796 |  | 2,031,989 |  | 2,041,009 |  | 2,026,642 |  |
|  |  | 887,805 |  | 925,303 |  | 938,367 |  | 867,977 |  | 866,477 |  |
| n debt |  | 248,618 |  | 262,857 |  | 266,318 |  | 272,124 |  | 271,939 |  |
| stockholders equity |  | 162,968 |  | 156,569 |  | 157,213 |  | 154,101 |  | 146,614 |  |
| ckholders equity |  | 171,120 |  | 164,721 |  | 165,365 |  | 162,253 |  | 154,766 |  |
| nt |  | 232,939 |  | 226,623 |  | 222,316 |  | 220,861 |  | 220,255 |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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(unaudited)
(in millions, except ratios)
As of or for the period ended,

## Credit quality metrics

Allowance for credit losses $(f)$
Allowance for loan losses to total retained loans ${ }^{(f)}$
Allowance for loan losses to retained loans excluding purchased credit-impaired loans $(f)(h)$
Nonperforming assets
Net charge-offs
Net charge-off rate
Wholesale net charge-off rate
Consumer net charge-off rate

| $\mathbf{\$ 3 6 , 7 4 8}$ | $\$ 39,126$ | $\$ 32,541$ | $\$ 31,454$ | $\$ 29,818$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{5 . 1 5 \%}$ | $5.40 \%$ | $5.04 \%$ | $4.74 \%$ | $4.33 \%$ |

(a) Pre-provision profit is total net revenue less noninterest expense. The Firm believes that this financial measure is useful in assessing the ability of a lending institution to generate income in excess of its provision for credit losses.
(b) On September 25, 2008, JPMorgan
Chase acquired the banking operations of Washington Mutual Bank ( Washington Mutual ). The acquisition resulted in negative goodwill, and accordingly, the Firm recognized an extraordinary gain.
A preliminary gain of $\$ 1.9$ billion was recognized at December 31, 2008. The final total extraordinary gain that resulted from the Washington Mutual transaction was $\$ 2.0$ billion.
(c) The calculation of second-quarter 2009 earnings per share ( EPS ) and net income applicable to common equity includes a one-time, noncash reduction of $\$ 1.1$ billion, or $\$ 0.27$ per share, resulting from repayment of U.S.
Troubled Asset Relief Program ( TARP ) preferred capital.
Excluding this reduction, the adjusted ROE and ROTCE for the second quarter 2009 would have been $6 \%$ and $10 \%$, respectively. The
Firm views the adjusted ROE and ROTCE, both non-GAAP
financial measures, as meaningful because they enable the comparability to prior periods. For further discussion, see Explanation and Reconciliation
of the Firm suse
of Non-GAAP
Financial
measures on
pages 15-19 of this
Form 10-Q and
pages 50-52 of
JPMorgan
Chase s 2009
Annual Report.
(d) On June 5, 2009, the Firm issued $\$ 5.8$ billion, or 163 million shares, of its common stock at $\$ 35.25 \mathrm{per}$ share.
(e) Share prices shown for JPMorgan
Chase scommon stock are from the New York Stock
Exchange.
JPMorgan
Chase s common stock is also listed and traded on the London Stock
Exchange and the
Tokyo Stock
Exchange.
(f) Effective

January 1, 2010,
the Firm adopted new guidance that amended the accounting for the transfer of financial assets and the consolidation of variable interest entities ( VIEs ). Upon adoption of the new guidance, the Firm consolidated its Firm-sponsored
credit card securitization trusts,
Firm-administered multi-seller conduits and certain other consumer loan securitization entities, primarily mortgage-related, adding
$\$ 87.7$ billion and $\$ 92.2$ billion of assets and liabilities, respectively, and decreasing stockholders equity and the Tier I capital ratio by $\$ 4.5$ billion and 34 basis points, respectively. The reduction to stockholders equity was driven by the establishment of an allowance for loan losses of $\$ 7.5$
billion
(pretax) primarily related to receivables held in credit card securitization trusts that were consolidated at the adoption date.
(g) The Firm uses Tier

1 common capital
( Tier 1
common ) along with the other capital measures to assess and monitor its capital position. The Tier 1 common capital ratio ( Tier
1 common ratio )is Tier 1 common
divided byrisk-weighedassets. For furtherdiscussion, seeRegulatory capital
on pages 82-84 of
JPMorgan
Chase s 2009Annual Report.
(h) Excludes the
impact of homelending purchasedcredit-impairedloans for allperiods. Also
excludes, as of
December 31,
2009 ,
September 30,
2009, and June 30,
2009, the loans
held by the
Washington
Mutual Master
Trust ( WMMT ),
which were
consolidated onto
the balance sheet
at fair value during
the second quarter
of 2009; such loans
have been fully
repaid or charged
off as of June 30,
2010. See Note 15
on pages 198-205
of JPMorgan
Chase s 2009
Annual Report.
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## MANAGEMENT S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

This section of the Form 10-Q provides management s discussion and analysis ( MD\&A ) of the financial condition and results of operations of JPMorgan Chase. See the Glossary of terms on pages 181-184 for definitions of terms used throughout this Form 10-Q. The MD\&A included in this Form 10-Q contains statements that are forward-looking within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. Such statements are based on the current beliefs and expectations of JPMorgan Chase s management and are subject to significant risks and uncertainties. These risks and uncertainties could cause the Firm sactual results to differ materially from those set forth in such forward-looking statements. Certain of such risks and uncertainties are described herein (See Forward-looking Statements on pages 187-188 and Part II, Item 1A: Risk Factors on pages 196-197 of this Form 10-Q), and see Part I, Item 1A, Risk Factors on pages 4-10 of JPMorgan Chase s Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2009, filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ( 2009 Annual Report or 2009 Form 10-K ), to which reference is hereby made.

## INTRODUCTION

JPMorgan Chase \& Co., a financial holding company incorporated under Delaware law in 1968, is a leading global financial services firm and one of the largest banking institutions in the United States of America ( U.S. ), with $\$ 2.0$ trillion in assets, $\$ 171.1$ billion in stockholders equity and operations in more than 60 countries as of June 30, 2010. The Firm is a leader in investment banking, financial services for consumers and businesses, financial transaction processing and asset management. Under the J.P. Morgan and Chase brands, the Firm serves millions of customers in the U.S. and many of the world s most prominent corporate, institutional and government clients. JPMorgan Chase s principal bank subsidiaries are JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Association ( JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. ), a national bank with branches in 23 states in the U.S.; and Chase Bank USA, National Association ( Chase Bank USA, N.A.), a national bank that is the Firm s credit card issuing bank. JPMorgan Chase s principal nonbank subsidiary is J.P. Morgan Securities Inc., the Firm s U.S. investment banking firm.
JPMorgan Chase s activities are organized, for management reporting purposes, into six business segments, as well as Corporate/Private Equity. The Firm s wholesale businesses comprise the Investment Bank, Commercial Banking, Treasury \& Securities Services and Asset Management segments. The Firm s consumer businesses comprise the Retail Financial Services and Card Services segments. A description of the Firm s business segments, and the products and services they provide to their respective client bases, follows.

## Investment Bank

J.P. Morgan is one of the world s leading investment banks, with deep client relationships and broad product capabilities. The clients of the Investment Bank ( IB ) are corporations, financial institutions, governments and institutional investors. The Firm offers a full range of investment banking products and services in all major capital markets, including advising on corporate strategy and structure, capital-raising in equity and debt markets, sophisticated risk management, market-making in cash securities and derivative instruments, prime brokerage, and research.

## Retail Financial Services

Retail Financial Services ( RFS ) serves consumers and businesses through personal service at bank branches and through ATMs, online banking and telephone banking, as well as through auto dealerships and school financial-aid offices. Customers can use more than 5,100 bank branches (third-largest nationally) and 15,600 ATMs (second-largest nationally), as well as online and mobile banking around the clock. More than 26,900 branch salespeople assist customers with checking and savings accounts, mortgages, home equity and business loans, and investments across the 23 -state footprint from New York and Florida to California. Consumers also can obtain loans through more than 15,900 auto dealerships and 1,800 schools and universities nationwide.
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## Card Services

Card Services ( CS ) is one of the nation s largest credit card issuers, with nearly $\$ 143$ billion in loans and nearly 90 million open accounts. In the six months ended June 30, 2010, customers used Chase cards to meet nearly $\$ 148$ billion of their spending needs. Through its merchant acquiring business, Chase Paymentech Solutions, CS is a global leader in payment processing and merchant acquiring.

## Commercial Banking

Commercial Banking ( CB ) delivers extensive industry knowledge, local expertise and dedicated service to more than 24,000 clients nationally, including corporations, municipalities, financial institutions and not-for-profit entities with annual revenue generally ranging from $\$ 10$ million to $\$ 2$ billion, and over 30,000 real estate investors/owners. CB partners with the Firm s other businesses to provide comprehensive solutions, including lending, treasury services, investment banking and asset management to meet its clients domestic and international financial needs.

## Treasury \& Securities Services

Treasury \& Securities Services ( TSS ) is a global leader in transaction, investment and information services. TSS is one of the world s largest cash management providers and a leading global custodian. Treasury Services ( TS ) provides cash management, trade, wholesale card and liquidity products and services to small- and mid-sized companies, multinational corporations, financial institutions and government entities. TS partners with the CB, RFS and Asset Management businesses to serve clients firmwide. As a result, certain TS revenue is included in other segments results. Worldwide Securities Services holds, values, clears and services securities, cash and alternative investments for investors and broker-dealers, and manages depositary receipt programs globally.

## Asset Management

Asset Management ( AM ), with assets under supervision of $\$ 1.6$ trillion, is a global leader in investment and wealth management. AM clients include institutions, retail investors and high-net-worth individuals in every major market throughout the world. AM offers global investment management in equities, fixed income, real estate, hedge funds, private equity and liquidity products, including money-market instruments and bank deposits. AM also provides trust and estate, banking and brokerage services to high-net-worth clients, and retirement services for corporations and individuals. The majority of AM s client assets are in actively managed portfolios.
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## EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

This executive overview of MD\&A highlights selected information and may not contain all of the information that is important to readers of this Form 10-Q. For a complete description of events, trends and uncertainties, as well as the capital, liquidity, credit and market risks, and the critical accounting estimates, affecting the Firm and its various lines of business, this Form 10-Q should be read in its entirety.
The U.S. and global economic recovery proceeded in the second quarter of 2010, though the pace of growth slowed, particularly in the U.S. and Asia. Concerns about the outlook for fiscal policy in the developed economies, and the impact that might have on the global economic recovery, led to a decline in equity markets and a rally in the bond markets. However, conditions within the U.S. labor market continued to improve gradually and household spending increased, but at a slow pace. Business spending on equipment and technology rose significantly, supported by the strong financial condition of U.S. businesses; however, investment in nonresidential building projects remained weak. Furthermore, inflation continued to trend lower during the quarter and the Federal Reserve indicated that these economic conditions were likely to warrant an exceptionally low federal funds rate for an extended period.
In response to the recent financial crisis, the U.S. Congress and regulators, as well as legislative and regulatory bodies in other countries, continue to focus on the regulation of financial institutions. On July 21, 2010, the U.S. enacted the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the Dodd-Frank Act ), financial reform legislation that expands the range of financial companies and activities that are subject to federal oversight. This new law also provides more comprehensive regulation of the over-the-counter derivatives market; provides limitations on proprietary trading and the investment activities of banks; imposes limitations on debit card interchange transaction fees; and includes several other provisions that affect the Firm s business activities. As discussed in the Business outlook section, the full impact of this legislation is unclear, and many challenges and uncertainties remain.
Financial performance of JPMorgan Chase

## (in millions, except per share data and ratios) <br> Selected income statement data

Total net revenue
Total noninterest expense
Pre-provision profit
Provision for credit losses
Net income
Diluted earnings per share ${ }^{(a)}$
Return on common equity ${ }^{(b)}$

## Capital ratios

Tier 1 capital
Tier 1 common
(a) The calculation
of second
quarter 2009
EPS includes a
one-time,
noncash
reduction of
$\$ 1.1$ billion, or
$\$ 0.27$ per share

| Three months ended June 30, |  |  | Six months ended June 30, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 2009 | Change | 2010 | 2009 | Change |
| \$25,101 | \$25,623 | (2)\% | \$52,772 | \$50,648 | 4\% |
| 14,631 | 13,520 | 8 | 30,755 | 26,893 | 14 |
| 10,470 | 12,103 | (13) | 22,017 | 23,755 | (7) |
| 3,363 | 8,031 | (58) | 10,373 | 16,627 | (38) |
| 4,795 | 2,721 | 76 | 8,121 | 4,862 | 67 |
| \$ 1.09 | \$ 0.28 | 289 | \$ 1.83 | \$ 0.68 | 169 |
| 12\% | 3\% |  | 10\% | 4\% |  |

12.1 ..... 9.7
9.6 ..... 7.7
(\$0.28 per share
for the six
months ended
June 30, 2009),
resulting from
repayment of
TARP preferred
capital. For
further
discussion, see
Impact on
diluted EPS of redemption of TARP preferred stock issued to the U.S.
Treasury on page 19 of this Form 10-Q.
(b) The calculation of second quarter 2009
net income
applicable to common equity includes a one-time, noncash reduction of $\$ 1.1$ billion resulting from repayment of
TARP preferred capital.
Excluding this reduction, the adjusted ROE was 6\% for the second quarter and first six months of 2009. For further discussion of adjusted ROE, see
Explanation
and
reconciliation of the Firm s use of non-GAAP

## financial

measures on
pages 15-19 of
this Form 10-Q.

## Business overview

JPMorgan Chase reported second-quarter 2010 net income of $\$ 4.8$ billion, or $\$ 1.09$ per share, compared with net income of $\$ 2.7$ billion, or $\$ 0.28$ per share, in the second quarter of 2009 . Current-quarter EPS included a benefit from a $\$ 1.5$ billion, or $\$ 0.36$ per share, reduction of loan loss reserves, partially offset by a charge of $\$ 550$ million, or $\$ 0.14$ per share, for the United Kingdom ( U.K. ) Bank Payroll Tax. Prior-year EPS reflected a one-time, noncash reduction in net income applicable to common stockholders of $\$ 1.1$ billion, or $\$ 0.27$ per share, resulting from repayment of TARP preferred capital. ROE for the quarter was $12 \%$, compared with $3 \%$ in the prior year.
The increase in earnings from the second quarter of 2009 was driven by a significantly lower provision for credit losses, partially offset by lower net revenue and higher noninterest expense. The decline in net revenue was driven by lower principal transactions revenue, reflecting lower trading results, and lower investment banking fees, partially offset by higher securities gains. The lower provision for credit losses reflected improvements in both the consumer and wholesale provisions. The consumer provision reflected a reduction in the allowance for credit losses as a result of improved delinquency trends and reduced net charge-offs. The wholesale provision was a benefit in the second
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quarter of 2010, compared with an expense in the second quarter of 2009. Noninterest expense in the second quarter of 2010 included the impact of the U.K. Bank Payroll Tax on certain compensation awarded from December 9, 2009, to April 5, 2010, to relevant banking employees, and included higher litigation expense. JPMorgan Chase maintained very high liquidity, with a deposit-to-loan ratio of $127 \%$, and generated additional capital, ending the quarter with a strong Tier 1 common ratio of $9.6 \%$.
Credit trends continued to improve during the second quarter; however, the levels of charge-offs and delinquencies in the consumer-lending businesses remained extremely high. The wholesale businesses experienced reduced credit costs, reflecting a reduction in the allowance for credit losses mainly due to net repayments, loan sales, refinements to credit loss estimates, and improvement in the credit quality of the commercial and industrial portfolio. Total firmwide credit reserves fell to $\$ 36.7$ billion, as loan balances remained flat and credit costs declined, resulting in a ratio of firmwide reserves to total loans (excluding purchased credit-impaired loans) of $5.3 \%$.
Net income for the first six months of 2010 was $\$ 8.1$ billion, or $\$ 1.83$ per share, compared with $\$ 4.9$ billion, or $\$ 0.68$ per share, in the first half of 2009. The increase in earnings from the comparable 2009 six-month period was driven by a lower provision for credit losses and higher net revenue, partially offset by higher noninterest expense. The lower provision for credit losses and the higher noninterest expense reflected the same factors as those that drove the second quarter 2010 results. The higher net revenue reflected solid markets revenue in IB and elevated levels of securities gains from the investment portfolio in Corporate. Prior-year EPS reflected a one-time, noncash reduction in net income applicable to common stockholders of $\$ 1.1$ billion, or $\$ 0.28$ per share, resulting from repayment of TARP preferred capital.
JPMorgan Chase continued to support the economic recovery by assisting customers, providing sound lending and continuing its efforts to prevent foreclosure. The Firm loaned or raised capital for its clients of nearly $\$ 700$ billion during the first half of 2010, and its small-business originations were up $37 \%$. The Firm has offered 880,000 mortgage modifications and has approved 245,000 since the beginning of 2009. Of these, nearly 193,000 have achieved permanent modification as of June 30, 2010.
The discussion that follows highlights the current-quarter performance of each business segment, compared with the prior-year quarter. Managed basis starts with the reported U.S. GAAP results and, for each line of business and the Firm as a whole, includes certain reclassifications to present total net revenue on a tax-equivalent basis. Effective January 1, 2010, the Firm adopted new accounting guidance that required it to consolidate its Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts; as a result, reported and managed basis relating to credit card securitizations are equivalent for periods beginning after January 1, 2010. Prior to the adoption of the new accounting guidance, in 2009 and all other prior periods, the U.S. GAAP results for CS and the Firm were also adjusted for certain reclassifications that assumed credit card loans that had been securitized and sold by CS remained on the Consolidated Balance Sheets. These adjustments had no impact on net income as reported by the Firm as a whole or by the lines of business. For more information about managed basis, as well as other non-GAAP financial measures used by management to evaluate the performance of each line of business, see pages 15-19 of this Form 10-Q.
Investment Bank net income decreased, reflecting lower net revenue and higher noninterest expense, predominantly offset by a benefit from the provision for credit losses. The decrease in net revenue was driven by a decline in Fixed Income Markets revenue, largely reflecting lower results in credit markets, rates and commodities. Investment banking fees also decreased, driven by lower levels of equity underwriting, debt underwriting and advisory fees. Partially offsetting the revenue decline was an increase in Equity Markets revenue, reflecting solid client revenue. The provision for credit losses was a benefit in the second quarter of 2010, compared with an expense in the second quarter of 2009, and reflected a reduction in the allowance for loan losses, largely related to net repayments and loan sales. Noninterest expense in the second quarter of 2010 included the impact of the U.K. Bank Payroll Tax.
Retail Financial Services net income increased significantly from the prior year driven by a lower provision for credit losses. Net revenue decreased, driven by lower loan and deposit balances and declining deposit-related fees. These decreases were predominantly offset by a shift to wider-spread deposit products, and growth in mortgage fees and related income, debit card income and auto operating lease income. The provision for credit losses decreased from the prior year and reflected improved delinquency trends and reduced net charge-offs. Noninterest expense increased from the prior year, driven by higher default-related expense and sales force increases, partially offset by a decrease in
foreclosed asset expense.
Card Services reported net income compared with a net loss in the prior year, as a lower provision for credit losses was partially offset by lower net revenue. The decrease in net revenue was driven by a decline in net interest income, reflecting lower average loan balances, the impact of legislative changes and a decreased level of fees. These decreases
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were partially offset by lower revenue reversals associated with lower charge-offs and a prior-year write-down of securitization interests. The provision for credit losses decreased from the prior year, reflecting reduced net charge-offs and lower estimated losses, primarily related to improved delinquency trends and lower loan balances. Noninterest expense increased due to higher marketing expense.
Commercial Banking net income increased from the prior year, driven by a reduction in the provision for credit losses. Net revenue was relatively flat from the prior year, as growth in liability balances, wider loan spreads, gains on sales of loans and other real estate owned, and higher lending-related fees were predominantly offset by spread compression on liability products and lower loan balances. The provision for credit losses was a benefit in the second quarter of 2010 compared with an expense in the second quarter of 2009 and included a reduction to the allowance for credit losses, mainly due to refinements to credit loss estimates and improvement in the credit quality of the commercial and industrial portfolio. Noninterest expense was relatively flat compared with the prior year.
Treasury and Securities Services net income decreased from the prior year, driven by lower net revenue and higher noninterest expense. Worldwide Securities Services net revenue was relatively flat, as lower spreads in securities lending and the impact of lower volatility on foreign exchange were offset by higher market levels and net inflows of assets under custody. Similarly, TS net revenue was relatively flat, as lower deposit spreads were offset by higher trade loan and card product volumes. Noninterest expense for TSS increased, driven by higher performance-based compensation and continued investment in new product platforms, primarily related to international expansion. Asset Management net income increased from the prior year, as higher net revenue and a lower provision for credit losses were partially offset by higher noninterest expense. Net revenue increased, due to the effects of higher market levels, net inflows to products with higher margins and higher performance fees; partially offset by lower quarterly valuations of seed capital investments and lower net interest income due to narrower deposit spreads, largely offset by higher deposit balances. The increase in noninterest expense was driven by higher headcount.
Corporate/Private Equity net income decreased from the prior year, driven by lower net revenue and higher noninterest expense. Although lower than in the prior year, net revenue included elevated levels of securities gains from the repositioning of the investment portfolio and elevated levels of net interest income from the size of the investment portfolio. Net revenue also included modest private equity gains. Noninterest expense rose, largely due to higher litigation expense.

## Business outlook

The following forward-looking statements are based on the current beliefs and expectations of JPMorgan Chase s management and are subject to significant risks and uncertainties. These risks and uncertainties could cause the Firm sactual results to differ materially from those set forth in such forward-looking statements.
JPMorgan Chase s outlook for the third quarter of 2010 should be viewed against the backdrop of the global and U.S. economies, financial markets activity, the geopolitical environment, the competitive environment and client activity levels. Each of these linked factors will affect the performance of the Firm and its lines of business. Accordingly, the Firm continues to monitor closely U.S. and international economies and political environments.
As mentioned above, the Dodd-Frank Act was signed into law on July 21, 2010. There are a number of positive aspects of this new legislation, including systemic risk oversight and resolution authority. However, with hundreds of implementing rules to be written, there remain many challenges and uncertainties. The Firm continues to be committed to helping ensure that the reforms are implemented in a way that protects consumers and the competitiveness of the U.S. financial system, while ensuring the flow of safe and sound credit.
In addition to this legislation, any further legislation or regulations that are adopted in the U.S. or in other countries could limit or restrict the Firm s operations, impose additional costs on the Firm in order to comply with such new laws or regulations, or significantly and adversely affect the revenue of certain lines of business.
In the Retail Banking business within RFS, management expects continued strong revenue over the next several quarters, despite continued economic pressure on consumers and consumer spending levels. The Firm has already made changes consistent with and, in certain respects, beyond the requirements of the newly-enacted legislation in its policies relating to non-sufficient funds and overdraft fees. Management has refined its estimate of the cost of these changes to the business based on its most recent assessment of customer behavior and now estimates that Retail Banking net income may be reduced, on an annualized basis, by approximately $\$ 700$ million by the fourth quarter of

2010, an increase from management s prior estimate of approximately $\$ 500$ million. Results in the second quarter of 2010 reflect approximately $50 \%$ of the estimated quarterly impact of this reduction in net income.
In the Mortgage Banking \& Other Consumer Lending business within RFS, management expects revenue to continue to be negatively affected by continued elevated levels of repurchases of mortgages previously sold to, for example, U.S. government-sponsored entities. In the Real Estate Portfolios business within RFS, management believes that, at the current rate
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of delinquencies and loss severity, quarterly net charge-offs could be approximately $\$ 1.0$ billion for the home equity portfolio, $\$ 400$ million for the prime mortgage portfolio and $\$ 400$ million for the subprime mortgage portfolio over the next several quarters. Given current origination and production levels, combined with management s current estimate of portfolio runoff levels, the residential real estate portfolio is expected to decline by approximately $10 \%$ to $15 \%$ annually for the foreseeable future. Based on management s preliminary estimate, the effect of such a reduction in the residential real estate portfolio is expected to reduce the portfolio s 2010 net interest income up to $\$ 1.0$ billion from the 2009 level, excluding any impact from further changes in the interest rate environment.
Also, in RFS, management expects noninterest expense to remain modestly above 2009 levels, reflecting investments in new branch builds and sales force hires, as well as continued elevated servicing-, default- and foreclosed asset-related costs.
In CS, management expects full-year average outstandings in 2010 to decline by approximately $15 \%$ from 2009 levels, possibly to approximately $\$ 140$ billion of average outstandings by the end of the fourth quarter of 2010, due to runoff of both the Washington Mutual portfolio and lower-yielding promotional balances. In addition, management estimates that CS net income may be reduced, on an annualized basis, by approximately $\$ 750$ million as a result of the impact of the Credit Card Act of 2009, including the recent regulatory guidance defining reasonable and proportional fees. Results in the second quarter of 2010 reflect approximately $25 \%$ of the estimated quarterly impact of this reduction in net income. The net charge-off rate for CS (excluding the Washington Mutual credit card portfolio) is anticipated to continue to improve if current delinquency trends continue and could be approximately $8.5 \%$ in the third quarter of 2010; however, results will depend on the economic environment and any resulting reserve actions. While some normalization of the financial markets occurred during the second quarter of 2010 and consumer-lending net charge-offs and delinquencies have declined as noted above, the consumer credit portfolio remains under stress. Further declines in U.S. housing prices and increases in the unemployment rate remain possible; if this were to occur, it would adversely affect the Firm s results.
In IB, TSS and AM, revenue will be affected by market levels, volumes and volatility, which will influence client flows and assets under management, supervision and custody. In addition, IB and CB results will continue to be affected by the credit environment, which will influence levels of charge-offs, repayments and provision for credit losses.
In Private Equity (within the Corporate/Private Equity segment), earnings will likely continue to be volatile and be influenced by capital markets activity, market levels, the performance of the broader economy and investment-specific issues. Corporate s net interest income levels and securities gains will generally trend with the size and duration of the investment securities portfolio. Corporate net income (excluding Private Equity, merger-related items and any significant nonrecurring items) is anticipated to trend toward a level of approximately $\$ 300$ million per quarter. The Firm s second-quarter results reflected lower net interest margin, compared with the prior quarter. Management expects modest continued downward pressure on net interest margin in the third quarter of 2010, primarily resulting from continued repositioning of the investment securities portfolio in Corporate, runoff of loans with higher contractual interest rates in the Real Estate Portfolios and CS businesses, and the impact of the Card Act legislation on CS.
Management and the Firm s Board of Directors continuously evaluate alternatives to deploy the Firm s strong capital base in ways that will enhance shareholder value. Such alternatives could include the repurchase of common stock, increasing the common stock dividend and pursuing alternative investment opportunities. The Firm resumed its repurchases of common stock beginning in the second quarter under its pre-existing Board authorization. The Firm s current share repurchase activity is intended to offset share count increases resulting from employee equity awards and is consistent with the Firm s goal of maintaining an appropriate share count. The aggregate amount and timing of future repurchases will depend, among other factors, on market conditions and management s judgment regarding economic conditions, the Firm s earnings outlook, the need to maintain adequate capital levels (in light of business needs and regulatory requirements) and alternative investment opportunities. With regard to any decision by the Firm s Board of Directors concerning any increase in the level of the common stock dividend, their determination will be subject to their judgment that the likelihood of another severe economic downturn has sufficiently diminished; that there is evidence of sustained underlying growth in employment for at least several months; that overall business
performance and credit have stabilized or improved; and that such action is warranted, taking into consideration, among other factors, the Firm s earnings outlook, the need to maintain adequate capital levels (in light of business needs and regulatory requirements), alternative investment opportunities and appropriate dividend payout ratios. Ultimately, the Board would seek to return to the Firm s historical dividend ratio of approximately $30 \%$ to $40 \%$ of normalized earnings over time, though it would consider moving to that level in stages.
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## CONSOLIDATED RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

This section provides a comparative discussion of JPMorgan Chase s Consolidated Results of Operations on a reported basis. Factors that relate primarily to a single business segment are discussed in more detail within that business segment. For a discussion of the Critical Accounting Estimates Used by the Firm that affect the Consolidated Results of Operations, see pages 100-102 of this Form 10-Q and pages 127-131 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.

## Revenue

| (in millions) | Three months ended June 30, |  |  | Six months ended June 30, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2009 | Change | 2010 | 2009 | Change |
| Investment banking fees | \$ 1,421 | \$ 2,106 | (33)\% | \$ 2,882 | \$ 3,492 | (17)\% |
| Principal transactions | 2,090 | 3,097 | (33) | 6,638 | 5,098 | 30 |
| Lending- and deposit-related fees | 1,586 | 1,766 | (10) | 3,232 | 3,454 | (6) |
| Asset management, administration and commissions | 3,349 | 3,124 | 7 | 6,614 | 6,021 | 10 |
| Securities gains | 1,000 | 347 | 188 | 1,610 | 545 | 195 |
| Mortgage fees and related income | 888 | 784 | 13 | 1,546 | 2,385 | (35) |
| Credit card income | 1,495 | 1,719 | (13) | 2,856 | 3,556 | (20) |
| Other income | 585 | 10 | NM | 997 | 60 | NM |
| Noninterest revenue | 12,414 | 12,953 | (4) | 26,375 | 24,611 | 7 |
| Net interest income | 12,687 | 12,670 |  | 26,397 | 26,037 | 1 |
| Total net revenue | \$25,101 | \$25,623 | (2)\% | \$52,772 | \$50,648 | 4\% |

Total net revenue for the second quarter of 2010 was $\$ 25.1$ billion, down by $\$ 522$ million, or $2 \%$, from the second quarter of 2009. Total net revenue for the first six months of 2010 was $\$ 52.8$ billion, up by $\$ 2.1$ billion, or $4 \%$, from the prior year. The decrease from the prior-year quarter was driven by lower principal transactions revenue, reflecting lower trading results, and lower investment banking fees, partially offset by higher securities gains and other income. The increase from the first six months of 2009 was driven by higher principal transactions revenue, reflecting higher trading revenue and private equity gains (compared with private equity losses in the prior year) in Corporate/Private Equity; the absence of mark-to-market losses on hedges of retained loans in IB; higher securities gains in Corporate; and higher other income. These increases were partially offset by lower mortgage fees and related income in RFS and lower investment banking fees.
Investment banking fees for the second quarter and first six months of 2010 decreased from the comparable periods of 2009, predominantly reflecting a decline from the record level of equity underwriting fees last year and lower advisory fees. Debt underwriting fees also contributed to the decline in the second quarter of 2010; however, for the first six months of 2010, debt underwriting fees increased compared with the prior year. Overall industry-wide volumes across bonds and equity were lower in the second quarter and first six months of 2010 compared with the respective periods in 2009. For additional information on investment banking fees, which are primarily recorded in IB, see IB segment results on pages 21-24 of this Form 10-Q.
Principal transactions revenue, which consists of revenue from the Firm s trading and private equity investing activities, decreased from the second quarter of 2009, reflecting lower results in Corporate and lower fixed income revenue in IB, largely reflecting weaker results in credit markets, rates and commodities. The decrease was offset partially by gains from the widening of the Firm s credit spreads on certain structured liabilities in the IB compared with losses in the prior year. Trading revenue increased for the first six months of 2010, primarily due to the absence
of mark-to-market losses on hedges of retained loans in IB compared with the prior year. This increase was offset partially by lower fixed income revenue in IB, largely reflecting weaker results in rates, credit markets and commodities. Private equity gains in both the second quarter and first six months of 2010 improved from the losses incurred in the comparable 2009 periods. For additional information on principal transactions revenue, see IB and Corporate/Private Equity segment results on pages 21-24 and 51-53, respectively, and Note 3 on pages 110-124 of this Form 10-Q.
Lending- and deposit-related fees for the second quarter and first six months of 2010 decreased from the prior-year periods, reflecting declining deposit-related fees and lower deposit balances in RFS, offset partially by higher lending-related service fees in IB and CB. For additional information on lending- and deposit-related fees, which are mostly recorded in RFS, TSS and CB, see the RFS segment results on pages 25-35, the TSS segment results on pages 44-46 and the CB segment results on pages 41-43 of this Form 10-Q.
Asset management, administration and commissions revenue for the second quarter and first six months of 2010 rose from the comparable periods of 2009. The increase was driven by higher asset management fees in AM, which reflected the effect of higher market levels, higher placement fees, net inflows to products with higher margins, and higher performance fees. Also contributing to the increase was higher administration fees in TSS, resulting from the effect of
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higher market levels and net inflows of assets under custody. For additional information on these fees and commissions, see the segment discussions for AM on pages 47-51 and TSS on pages 44-46 of this Form 10-Q. Securities gains increased from the second quarter and first six months of 2009, due to continued repositioning of the Corporate investment portfolio in connection with managing the Firm s structural interest rate risk. The second quarter of 2009 included a $\$ 241$ million gain on the sale of MasterCard shares. For additional information on securities gains, which are mostly recorded in the Firm s Corporate business, and Corporate s investment securities portfolio, see the Corporate/Private Equity segment discussion on pages 51-53 of this Form 10-Q.
Mortgage fees and related income increased from the second quarter of 2009, due to higher net mortgage servicing revenue, predominantly reflecting higher mortgage servicing rights ( MSR ) risk management results. Partially offsetting this increase was lower production revenue, predominantly reflecting higher repurchase losses. Mortgage fees and related income decreased from the first six months of 2009 due to lower production revenue, reflecting higher repurchase losses and, to a lesser extent, lower net mortgage servicing revenue, as lower MSR risk management results were offset partially by higher operating revenue. For additional information on mortgage fees and related income, which is recorded primarily in RFS, see RFS s Mortgage Banking \& Other Consumer Lending discussion on pages 29-32 of this Form 10-Q.
Credit card income decreased from the second quarter and first six months of 2009, due predominantly to the impact of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs, effective January 1, 2010, that required the Firm to consolidate the assets and liabilities of its Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts. Adoption of the new guidance resulted in the elimination of all servicing fees received from Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts (offset by a respective increase in net interest income and the provision for loan losses, and elimination of securitization income/losses in other income). For a more detailed discussion of the impact of the adoption of the new consolidation guidance on the Consolidated Statements of Income, see Explanation and Reconciliation of the Firm s Use of Non-GAAP Financial Measures on pages 15-19 of this Form 10-Q. For additional information on credit card income, see the CS segment results on pages $36-40$ of this Form 10-Q.
Other income increased in the second quarter and first six months of 2010 compared with the prior-year periods, due largely to the absence of the write-down of securitization interests in 2010, compared with losses of $\$ 268$ million and $\$ 448$ million during the second quarter and first half of 2009, respectively. Higher auto operating lease income in RFS also contributed to the increase in other income.
Net interest income for the second quarter of 2010 was relatively flat compared with the prior-year quarter, as the impact of the adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs (which increased net interest income by approximately $\$ 1.4$ billion) offset the decline in loan and deposit balances. The Firm s interest-earning assets for the second quarter of 2010 were $\$ 1.7$ trillion, and the net yield on those assets, on a fully taxable-equivalent ( FTE ) basis, was $3.06 \%$, a decrease of one basis point from 2009. Compared with the first quarter of 2010, the net yield on interest-earning assets declined by 26 basis points, driven by lower yields on loans, primarily in CS and RFS, lower credit card outstandings, and lower yields on securities resulting from investment portfolio repositioning. Net interest income for the first six months of 2010 increased slightly from the prior-year period, driven by the impact of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs which increased net interest income by approximately $\$ 3.2$ billion, mainly as a result of the consolidation of Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts. Excluding the impact of the adoption of the new accounting guidance, net interest income decreased driven by lower average loan balances, primarily in CS, RFS and IB and lower yields on credit card receivables, reflecting the impact of legislative changes. The Firm s interest-earning assets for the first six months of 2010 were $\$ 1.7$ trillion, and the net yield on those assets, on a FTE basis, was $3.19 \%$, an increase of one basis point from 2009. For a more detailed discussion of the impact of the adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs on the Consolidated Statements of Income, see Explanation and Reconciliation of the Firm s Use of Non-GAAP Financial Measures on pages 15-19 of this Form 10-Q.

## Provision for credit losses

(in millions)

Three months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, $2010 \quad 2009 \quad$ Change
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| Wholesale | $\mathbf{\$ ( 5 7 2 )}$ | $\$ 1,244$ | NM | $\mathbf{\$ ( 8 0 8 )}$ | $\$ 2,774$ | NM |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | ---: | :--- |
| Consumer | $\mathbf{3 , 9 3 5}$ | 6,787 | $(42) \%$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 1 8 1}$ | 13,853 | $(19) \%$ |
| Total provision for credit <br> losses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 3 6 3}$ | $\$ 8,031$ | $(58) \%$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 3 7 3}$ | $\$ 16,627$ | $(38) \%$ |
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The provision for credit losses decreased from the second quarter and first six months of 2009. The decrease in the wholesale provision in both 2010 periods reflected a reduction in the allowance for credit losses, mainly due to net repayments and loan sales in IB; and refinements to credit loss estimates and improvement in the credit quality of the commercial and industrial portfolio in CB. The decrease in the consumer provision for both 2010 periods reflected improved delinquency trends and reduced net charge-offs across most consumer portfolios; it included reductions in the allowance for loan losses in CS of $\$ 1.5$ billion and $\$ 2.5$ billion in the second quarter and first six months of 2010, respectively (compared with additions of $\$ 250$ million and $\$ 1.4$ billion in the comparable 2009 periods). The first six months of 2010 also included a $\$ 1.2$ billion addition to the allowance for loan losses in RFS, related to further estimated deterioration in the Washington Mutual prime and option adjustable-rate mortgage ( ARM ) purchased credit-impaired portfolios. For a more detailed discussion of the loan portfolio and the allowance for credit losses, see the segment discussions for RFS on pages 25-35, CS on pages 36-40, IB on pages 21-24 and CB on pages 41-43, and the Allowance for Credit Losses section on pages 91-94 of this Form 10-Q.

## Noninterest expense

The following table presents the components of noninterest expense.

| (in millions) | Three months ended June 30, |  |  | Six months ended June 30, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2009 | Change | 2010 | 2009 | Change |
| Compensation expense ${ }^{(a)}$ | \$ 7,616 | \$ 6,917 | 10\% | \$14,892 | \$14,505 | $3 \%$ |
| Noncompensation expense: Occupancy | 883 | 914 | (3) | 1,752 | 1,799 | (3) |
| Technology, communications and equipment | 1,165 | 1,156 | 1 | 2,302 | 2,302 |  |
| Professional and outside services | 1,685 | 1,518 | 11 | 3,260 | 3,033 | 7 |
| Marketing | 628 | 417 | 51 | 1,211 | 801 | 51 |
| Other ${ }^{(b) /(c)(d)}$ | 2,419 | 2,190 | 10 | 6,860 | 3,565 | 92 |
| Amortization of intangibles | 235 | 265 | (11) | 478 | 540 | (11) |
| Total noncompensation expense | 7,015 | 6,460 | 9 | 15,863 | 12,040 | 32 |
| Merger costs |  | 143 | NM |  | 348 | NM |
| Total noninterest expense | \$14,631 | \$13,520 | 8\% | \$30,755 | \$26,893 | 14\% |
| (a) The second quarter and first six months of 2010 included a tax expense related to the U.K. Bank Payroll Tax on certain compensation awarded from |  |  |  |  |  |  |

December 9,
2009, to April 5,
2010, to
relevant
banking
employees.
(b) Includes
litigation
expense of
$\$ 792$ million
and $\$ 3.7$ billion
for the three and six months ended June 30,
2010, compared with $\$ 14$ million
and a net benefit
of $\$ 256$ million
for the three and six months ended June 30, 2009 ,
respectively.
(c) Includes
foreclosed
property
expense of
$\$ 244$ million
and
$\$ 547$ million for
the three and six months ended
June 30, 2010,
respectively, compared with
$\$ 294$ million
and
$\$ 619$ million for
the three and six months ended
June 30, 2009, respectively.
For additional
information
regarding
foreclosed
property, see
Note 13 on page 196 of

## JPMorgan

Chase s 2009
Annual Report.
(d) The second
quarter of 2009
included a
$\$ 675$ million
Federal Deposit
Insurance
Corporation
( FDIC )
special
assessment.
Total noninterest expense for the second quarter of 2010 was $\$ 14.6$ billion, up by $\$ 1.1$ billion, or $8 \%$, from the second quarter of 2009 . For the first six months of 2010 , total noninterest expense was $\$ 30.8$ billion, up by $\$ 3.9$ billion, or $14 \%$, from the comparable 2009 period. The increase for both periods was driven by higher noncompensation expense, predominantly due to significant additions to litigation reserves; and higher compensation expense, reflecting a payroll tax expense predominantly in IB, related to the U.K. Bank Payroll Tax on certain compensation awarded from December 9, 2009, to April 5, 2010, to relevant banking employees. These increases were partially offset by lower performance-based incentives, and by the absence of a $\$ 675$ million FDIC special assessment recognized in the second quarter of 2009 .
Compensation expense in the second quarter and first six months of 2010 increased compared with the prior-year periods, due to the impact of the U.K. Bank Payroll Tax described above; ongoing investments in the businesses, including sales force increases in RFS; and higher performance-based compensation expense in several businesses. This was offset partially by lower performance-based compensation expense in IB.
Noncompensation expense increased for the second quarter and first six months of 2010 compared with the prior-year periods, due predominantly to significant additions to litigation reserves; higher marketing expense in CS; and higher brokerage, clearing and exchange transaction processing expense in IB. The increase for both periods was partially offset by the absence of a $\$ 675$ million FDIC special assessment recognized in the second quarter of 2009. For a discussion of amortization of intangibles, refer to Note 16 on pages 166-167 of this Form 10-Q.
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There were no merger costs recorded in the second quarter or first six months of 2010. Merger costs of $\$ 143$ million and $\$ 348$ million were recorded in the second quarter and first six months of 2009, respectively. For additional information on merger costs, refer to Note 10 on page 139 of this Form 10-Q.
Income tax expense

|  | Three months ended June |  | Six months ended June 30, |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (in millions, except rate) | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 30, | 2009 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| Income before income tax expense |  |  |  |  |
| Income tax expense | $\mathbf{\$ 7 , 1 0 7}$ | $\$ 4,072$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 , 6 4 4}$ | $\$ 7,128$ |
| Effective tax rate | $\mathbf{2 , 3 1 2}$ | 1,351 | $\mathbf{3 , 5 2 3}$ | 2,266 |
|  | $\mathbf{3 2 . 5 \%}$ | $33.2 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 3 \%}$ | $31.8 \%$ |

The decrease in the effective tax rate for the second quarter and first six months of 2010 compared with the prior-year periods was primarily the result of lower state and local income taxes, as well as tax benefits recognized upon the resolution of tax audits in 2010. The decrease was partially offset by the impact of higher reported pretax income for 2010. For additional information on income taxes, see Critical Accounting Estimates Used by the Firm on pages 100-102 of this Form 10-Q.
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## EXPLANATION AND RECONCILIATION OF THE FIRM S USE OF NON-GAAP FINANCIAL MEASURES

The Firm prepares its consolidated financial statements using accounting principles generally accepted in the U.S. ( U.S. GAAP ); these financial statements appear on pages 104-107 of this Form 10-Q. That presentation, which is referred to as reported basis, provides the reader with an understanding of the Firm s results that can be tracked consistently from year to year and enables a comparison of the Firm s performance with other companies U.S. GAAP financial statements.
In addition to analyzing the Firm s results on a reported basis, management reviews the Firm s results and the results of the lines of business on a managed basis, which is a non-GAAP financial measure. The Firm s definition of managed basis starts with the reported U.S. GAAP results and includes certain reclassifications to present total net revenue for the Firm (and each of the business segments) on a FTE basis. Accordingly, revenue from tax-exempt securities and investments that receive tax credits is presented in the managed results on a basis comparable to taxable securities and investments. This non-GAAP financial measure allows management to assess the comparability of revenue arising from both taxable and tax-exempt sources. The corresponding income tax impact related to these items is recorded within income tax expense. These adjustments have no impact on net income as reported by the Firm as a whole or by the lines of business.
Prior to January 1, 2010, the Firm s managed-basis presentation also included certain reclassification adjustments that assumed credit card loans securitized by CS remained on the balance sheet. Effective January 1, 2010, the Firm adopted new accounting guidance that required the Firm to consolidate its Firm-sponsored credit card securitizations trusts. The income, expense and credit costs associated with these securitization activities are now recorded in the 2010 Consolidated Statements of Income in the same classifications that were previously used to report such items on a managed basis. As a result of the consolidation of the credit card securitization trusts, reported and managed basis relating to credit card securitizations are equivalent for periods beginning after January 1, 2010. For additional information on the new accounting guidance, see Note 15 on pages 151-163 of this Form 10-Q.
The presentation in 2009 of CS results on a managed basis assumed that credit card loans that had been securitized and sold in accordance with U.S. GAAP remained on the Consolidated Balance Sheets, and that the earnings on the securitized loans were classified in the same manner as the earnings on retained loans recorded on the Consolidated Balance Sheets. JPMorgan Chase used the concept of managed basis to evaluate the credit performance and overall financial performance of the entire managed credit card portfolio. Operations were funded and decisions were made about allocating resources, such as employees and capital, based on managed financial information. In addition, the same underwriting standards and ongoing risk monitoring are used for both loans on the Consolidated Balance Sheets and securitized loans. Although securitizations result in the sale of credit card receivables to a trust, JPMorgan Chase retains the ongoing customer relationships, as the customers may continue to use their credit cards; accordingly, the customer s credit performance affects both the securitized loans and the loans retained on the Consolidated Balance Sheets. JPMorgan Chase believed that this managed-basis information was useful to investors, as it enabled them to understand both the credit risks associated with the loans reported on the Consolidated Balance Sheets and the Firm s retained interests in securitized loans. For a reconciliation of 2009 reported to managed basis results for CS, see CS segment results on pages $36-40$ of this Form 10-Q. For information regarding the securitization process, and loans and residual interests sold and securitized, see Note 15 on pages 151-163 of this Form 10-Q.
Tangible common equity ( TCE ) represents common stockholders equity (i.e., total stockholders equity less preferred stock) less identifiable intangible assets (other than MSRs) and goodwill, net of related deferred tax liabilities.
ROTCE, a non-GAAP financial ratio, measures the Firm s earnings as a percentage of TCE and is, in management s view, a meaningful measure to assess the Firm s use of equity.
Management also uses certain non-GAAP financial measures at the business-segment level, because it believes these other non-GAAP financial measures provide information to investors about the underlying operational performance and trends of the particular business segment and, therefore, facilitate a comparison of the business segment with the performance of its competitors.
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The following summary table provides a reconciliation from the Firm s reported U.S. GAAP results to managed basis.
Three months ended June 30, 2010
Fully
(in millions, except per share and ratios)
Revenue

| Investment banking fees |  | 1,421 | NA | \$ |  | 1,421 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Principal transactions |  | 2,090 | NA |  |  | 2,090 |
| Lending- and deposit-related fees |  | 1,586 | NA |  |  | 1,586 |
| Asset management, administration and commissions |  | 3,349 | NA |  |  | 3,349 |
| Securities gains |  | 1,000 | NA |  |  | 1,000 |
| Mortgage fees and related income |  | 888 | NA |  |  | 888 |
| Credit card income |  | 1,495 | NA |  |  | 1,495 |
| Other income |  | 585 | NA | 416 |  | 1,001 |
| Noninterest revenue |  | 12,414 | NA | 416 |  | 12,830 |
| Net interest income |  | 12,687 | NA | 96 |  | 12,783 |
| Total net revenue |  | 25,101 | NA | 512 |  | 25,613 |
| Noninterest expense |  | 14,631 | NA |  |  | 14,631 |
| Pre-provision profit |  | 10,470 | NA | 512 |  | 10,982 |
| Provision for credit losses |  | 3,363 | NA |  |  | 3,363 |
| Income before income tax expense |  | 7,107 | NA | 512 |  | 7,619 |
| Income tax expense |  | 2,312 | NA | 512 |  | 2,824 |
| Net income |  | 4,795 | NA | \$ |  | 4,795 |
| Diluted earnings per share |  | 1.09 | NA | \$ |  | 1.09 |
| Return on assets |  | 0.94\% | NA | NM |  | 0.94\% |
| Overhead ratio |  | 58 | NA | NM |  | 57 |

(in millions, except per share and ratios)

## Revenue

| Investment banking fees | $\$ 2,106$ | $\$$ | $\$$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Principal transactions | 3,097 |  | $\$ 2,106$ |
| Lending- and deposit-related fees | 1,766 |  | 3,097 |
| Asset management, administration and commissions | 3,124 |  | 1,766 |
| Securities gains | 347 |  | 3,124 |
| Mortgage fees and related income | 784 |  | 347 |
| Credit card income | 1,719 | $(294)$ | 784 |


| Other income | 10 |  | 335 | 345 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Noninterest revenue | 12,953 | (294) | 335 | 12,994 |
| Net interest income | 12,670 | 1,958 | 87 | 14,715 |
| Total net revenue | 25,623 | 1,664 | 422 | 27,709 |
| Noninterest expense | 13,520 |  |  | 13,520 |
| Pre-provision profit | 12,103 | 1,664 | 422 | 14,189 |
| Provision for credit losses | 8,031 | 1,664 |  | 9,695 |
| Income before income tax expense | 4,072 |  | 422 | 4,494 |
| Income tax expense | 1,351 |  | 422 | 1,773 |
| Net income | \$ 2,721 | \$ | \$ | \$ 2,721 |
| Diluted earnings per share ${ }^{(a)}$ | \$ 0.28 | \$ | \$ | \$ 0.28 |
| Return on assets | 0.54\% | NM | NM | 0.51\% |
| Overhead ratio | 53 | NM | NM | 49 |
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| (in millions, except per share and ratios) | Six months ended June 30, 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reported results |  | Credit $\operatorname{card}^{(b)}$ | Fully tax-equivalent adjustments | Managed basis |  |
| Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investment banking fees |  | 2,882 | NA | \$ |  | \$ 2,882 |
| Principal transactions |  | 6,638 | NA |  |  | 6,638 |
| Lending- and deposit-related fees |  | 3,232 | NA |  |  | 3,232 |
| Asset management, administration and commissions |  | 6,614 | NA |  |  | 6,614 |
| Securities gains |  | 1,610 | NA |  |  | 1,610 |
| Mortgage fees and related income |  | 1,546 | NA |  |  | 1,546 |
| Credit card income |  | 2,856 | NA |  |  | 2,856 |
| Other income |  | 997 | NA | 827 |  | 1,824 |
| Noninterest revenue |  | 26,375 | NA | 827 |  | 27,202 |
| Net interest income |  | 26,397 | NA | 186 |  | 26,583 |
| Total net revenue |  | 52,772 | NA | 1,013 |  | 53,785 |
| Noninterest expense |  | 30,755 | NA |  |  | 30,755 |
| Pre-provision profit |  | 22,017 | NA | 1,013 |  | 23,030 |
| Provision for credit losses |  | 10,373 | NA |  |  | 10,373 |
| Income before income tax expense |  | 11,644 | NA | 1,013 |  | 12,657 |
| Income tax expense |  | 3,523 | NA | 1,013 |  | 4,536 |
| Net income |  | 8,121 | NA | \$ |  | \$ 8,121 |
| Diluted earnings per share | \$ | 1.83 | NA | \$ |  | \$ 1.83 |
| Return on assets |  | 0.80\% | NA | NM |  | 0.80\% |
| Overhead ratio |  | 58 | NA | NM |  | 57 |

(in millions, except per share and ratios)

## Revenue

| Investment banking fees | $\$ 3,492$ | $\$$ | $\$$ | $\$ 3,492$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Principal transactions | 5,098 |  | 5,098 |  |
| Lending- and deposit-related fees | 3,454 |  | 3,454 |  |
| Asset management, administration and commissions | 6,021 |  |  | 6,021 |
| Securities gains | 545 |  | 545 |  |
| Mortgage fees and related income | 2,385 |  |  | 2,385 |
| Credit card income | 3,556 | $(834)$ |  | 2,722 |
| Other income | 60 |  | 672 | 732 |
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| Three months ended June 30, (in millions) | Reported | $2010$ <br> Securitized | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Managed | Reported | $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ \text { Securitized }^{(a)} \end{gathered}$ | Managed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loans Period-end | \$ 699,483 | 3 NA | \$ 699,483 | \$ 680,601 | \$85,790 | \$ 766,391 |
| Total assets average | 2,043,64 | 7 NA | 2,043,647 | 2,038,372 | 81,588 | 2,119,960 |
| Six months ended June 30, (in millions) | Reported | 2010 <br> Securitized ${ }^{(a)}$ | Managed | Reported | $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ \text { Securitized }^{(a)} \end{gathered}$ | Managed |
| Loans Period-end | \$ 699,483 | NA | \$ 699,483 | \$ 680,601 | \$85,790 | \$ 766,391 |
| Total assets average | 2,041,177 | NA | 2,041,177 | 2,052,666 | 82,182 | 2,134,848 |
| (a) Loans securitized are defined as loans that were sold to nonconsolidated securitization trusts and were not included in reported loans as of or for the three and six months ended June 30, 2009. For further discussion of credit card securitizations, see Note 15 on pages 151-163 of this Form 10-Q. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Average tangible common equity

| (in millions) | Three months ended |  |  |  |  | Six months ended |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { June 30, } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { March } 31, \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dec. 31, } \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ | Sept. 30, 2009 | June 30, 2009 | $\begin{gathered} \text { June 30, } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | June 30, 2009 |
| Common stockholders |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| equity | \$159,069 | \$ 156,094 | \$ 156,525 | \$ 149,468 | \$140,865 | \$157,590 | \$138,691 |
| Less: Goodwill | 48,348 | 48,542 | 48,341 | 48,328 | 48,273 | 48,445 | 48,173 |
| Less: Certain identifiable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| intangible assets | 4,265 | 4,307 | 4,741 | 4,984 | 5,218 | 4,285 | 5,329 |
| Add: Deferred tax liabilities ${ }^{(a)}$ | 2,564 | 2,541 | 2,533 | 2,531 | 2,518 | 2,553 | 2,562 |

Tangible
common equity (TCE) $\quad \$ 109,020 \quad \$ 105,786 \quad \$ 105,976 \quad \$ 98,687 \quad \$ 89,892 \quad \$ 107,413 \quad \$ 87,751$
(a) Represents
deferred tax
liabilities
related to
tax-deductible
goodwill and to
identifiable
intangibles
created in
non-taxable
transactions,
which are netted
against goodwill
and other
intangibles
when
calculating
TCE.
Impact on ROE of redemption of TARP preferred stock issued to the U.S. Treasury
The calculation of second quarter and year-to-date of 2009 net income applicable to common equity includes a one-time, noncash reduction of $\$ 1.1$ billion resulting from the repayment of TARP preferred capital. Excluding this reduction ROE would have been $6 \%$ for both the second quarter and year-to-date 2009 as disclosed in the table below. The Firm views the adjusted ROE, a non-GAAP financial measure, as meaningful because it increases the comparability to prior periods.

|  | Three months ended June 30, 2009 |  |  |  | Six months ended June 30, 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (in millions, except ratios) | As reported |  | Excluding the <br> TARP <br> redemption |  | As reported |  | Excluding the TARP redemption |  |
| Return on equity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net income | \$ | 2,721 | \$ | 2,721 | \$ | 4,862 | \$ | 4,862 |
| Less: Preferred stock dividends |  | 473 |  | 473 |  | 1,002 |  | 1,002 |
| Less: Accelerated amortization from redemption of preferred stock issued to the |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U.S. Treasury |  | 1,112 |  |  |  | 1,112 |  |  |
| Net income applicable to common equity |  | 1,136 | \$ | 2,248 |  | 2,748 | \$ | 3,860 |
| Average common stockholders equity |  | 40,865 |  | 40,865 |  | 38,691 |  | 38,691 |
| Return on common equity |  | 3\% |  | 6\% |  | 4\% |  | 6\% |
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Impact on diluted earnings per share of redemption of TARP preferred stock issued to the U.S. Treasury
Net income applicable to common equity for the second quarter and year-to-date 2009 includes a one-time, noncash reduction of approximately $\$ 1.1$ billion resulting from the repayment of TARP preferred capital. The following table presents the calculations of the effect on net income applicable to common stockholders for the second quarter and year-to-date 2009 and the $\$ 0.27$ and $\$ 0.28$ reduction, respectively, to diluted EPS which resulted from the repayment.

| (in millions, except per share) | Three months ended June 30, 2009 |  | Six months ended June 30, 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | As reported | Effect of TARP redemption | As reported | Effect of TARP redemption |
| Diluted earnings per share |  |  |  |  |
| Net income | \$ 2,721 | \$ | \$ 4,862 | \$ |
| Less: Preferred stock dividends | 473 |  | 1,002 |  |
| Less: Accelerated amortization from redemption of preferred stock issued to the U.S. Treasury | 1,112 | 1,112 | 1,112 | 1,112 |
| Net income applicable to common equity | \$ 1,136 | \$ (1,112) | \$ 2,748 | \$ (1,112) |
| Less: Dividends and undistributed earnings allocated to participating securities | 64 | (64) | 157 | (65) |
| Net income applicable to common stockholders | \$ 1,072 | \$ $(1,048)$ | \$ 2,591 | \$ $(1,047)$ |
| Total weighted average diluted shares outstanding | 3,824.1 | 3,824.1 | 3,791.4 | 3,791.4 |
| Net income per share | \$ 0.28 | \$ (0.27) | \$ 0.68 | \$ (0.28) |
| Other financial measures |  |  |  |  |
| The Firm also discloses the allowance for loan lo credit-impaired loans and loans held by the WMM Credit Losses on pages 91-94 of this Form 10-Q. | to total retain For a further | oans, excludi ussion of this | home lendin dit metric, | chased owance for |
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## BUSINESS SEGMENT RESULTS

The Firm is managed on a line of business basis. The business segment financial results presented reflect the current organization of JPMorgan Chase. There are six major reportable business segments: the Investment Bank, Retail Financial Services, Card Services, Commercial Banking, Treasury \& Securities Services and Asset Management, as well as a Corporate/Private Equity segment. The business segments are determined based on the products and services provided, or the type of customer served, and reflect the manner in which financial information is currently evaluated by management. Results of these lines of business are presented on a managed basis.

## Description of business segment reporting methodology

Results of the business segments are intended to reflect each segment as if it were essentially a stand-alone business. The management reporting process that derives business segment results allocates income and expense using market-based methodologies. For a further discussion of those methodologies, see Business Segment Results Description of business segment reporting methodology on pages 53-54 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report. The Firm continues to assess the assumptions, methodologies and reporting classifications used for segment reporting, and further refinements may be implemented in future periods.

## Business segment capital allocation changes

Each business segment is allocated capital by taking into consideration stand-alone peer comparisons, economic risk measures and regulatory capital requirements. The amount of capital assigned to each business is referred to as equity. Effective January 1, 2010, the Firm enhanced its line of business equity framework to better align equity assigned to each line of business with the changes anticipated to occur in the business, and in the competitive and regulatory landscape. Equity was assigned to the lines of business based on the Tier 1 common standard, rather than the Tier 1 capital standard. For a further discussion of the changes, see Capital Management Line-of-business equity on pages 63-64 of this Form 10-Q.

## Segment Results Managed Basis ${ }^{(1)}$

The following table summarizes the business segment results for the periods indicated.

| Three months ended June 30, | Total net revenue |  |  | Noninterest expense |  |  | Net income/(loss) |  |  | Return on equity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (in millions, except ratios) | 2010 | 2009 | Change | 2010 | 2009 | Change | 2010 | 2009 | Change | 2010 | 2009 |
| Investment Bank ${ }^{(b)}$ | \$ 6,332 | \$ 7,301 | (13)\% | 4,522 | \$ 4,067 | 11\% | \$1,381 | \$1,471 | (6)\% | 14\% | 18\% |
| Retail Financial Services | 7,809 | 7,970 | (2) | 4,281 | 4,079 | 5 | 1,042 | 15 | NM | 15 |  |
| Card Services | 4,217 | 4,868 | (13) | 1,436 | 1,333 | 8 | 343 | (672) | NM | 9 | (18) |
| Commercial Banking | 1,486 | 1,453 | 2 | 542 | 535 | 1 | 693 | 368 | 88 | 35 | 18 |
| Treasury \& Securities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services | 1,881 | 1,900 | (1) | 1,399 | 1,288 | 9 | 292 | 379 | (23) | 18 | 30 |
| Asset Management | 2,068 | 1,982 | ) | 1,405 | 1,354 | 4 | 391 | 352 | 11 | 24 | 20 |
| Corporate/Private Equity ${ }^{(b)}$ | 1,820 | 2,235 | (19) | 1,046 | 864 | 21 | 653 | 808 | (19) | NM | NM |
| Total | \$25,613 | \$27,709 | (8)\% | \$14,631 | \$13,520 | 8\% | \$4,795 | \$2,721 | 76\% | 12\% | 3\% |


| Six months ended June 30, | Total net revenue |  |  | Noninterest expense |  |  |  | Net income/(loss) |  |  | Return on equity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (in millions, except ratios) | 2010 | 2009 | Change | 2010 |  | 2009 | Change | 2010 | 2009 | Change | 2010 | 2009 |
| Investment Bank ${ }^{(b)}$ | \$14,651 | \$15,672 | (7)\% | \$ 9,360 | \$ | 8,841 | 6\% | \$3,852 | \$ 3,077 | 25\% | 19\% | 19\% |
| Retail Financial Services | 15,585 | 16,805 | (7) | 8,523 |  | 8,250 | 3 | 911 | 489 | 86 | 7 | 4 |
| Card Services | 8,664 | 9,997 | (13) | 2,838 |  | 2,679 | 6 | 40 | $(1,219)$ | NM | 1 | (16) |
| Commercial Banking | 2,902 | 2,855 | 2 | 1,081 |  | 1,088 | (1) | 1,083 | 706 | 53 | 27 | 18 |


| Treasury \& Securities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Services | $\mathbf{3 , 6 3 7}$ | 3,721 | $(2)$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 2 4}$ | 2,607 | 4 | $\mathbf{5 7 1}$ | 687 | $(17)$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 28 |
| Asset Management | $\mathbf{4 , 1 9 9}$ | 3,685 | 14 | $\mathbf{2 , 8 4 7}$ | 2,652 | 7 | $\mathbf{7 8 3}$ | 576 | 36 | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 17 |
| Corporate/Private Equity ${ }^{(b)}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 4 7}$ | 1,896 | 119 | $\mathbf{3 , 3 8 2}$ | 776 | 336 | $\mathbf{8 8 1}$ | 546 | 61 | $\mathbf{N M}$ | NM |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 5 3 , 7 8 5}$ | $\$ 54,631$ | $(2) \%$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 0 , 7 5 5}$ | $\$ 26,893$ | $14 \%$ | $\mathbf{\$ 8 , 1 2 1}$ | $\$ 4,862$ | $67 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $4 \%$ |

(a) Represents
reported results
on a
tax-equivalent
basis. The
managed basis
also assumes that
credit card loans
in
Firm-sponsored
credit card
securitization
trusts remained
on the balance
sheet for 2009.
Firm-sponsored
credit card
securitizations
were consolidated
at their carrying
values on
January 1, 2010,
under the new
consolidation
guidance related to VIEs.
(b) Corporate/Private

Equity includes
an adjustment to
offset IB s
inclusion of the
credit
reimbursement
from TSS in total
net revenue; TSS
reports the
reimbursement to
IB as a separate
line on its income
statement (not
part of total
revenue).
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## INVESTMENT BANK

For a discussion of the business profile of IB, see pages 55-57 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report and Introduction on page 5 of this Form 10-Q.

Selected income statement data (in millions, except ratios)

Three months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

## Revenue

Investment banking fees
Principal transactions
Lending- and deposit-related fees
Asset management,
administration and commissions
All other income
(a)

| $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 4 0 5}$ | $\$ 2,239$ | $(37) \%$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 , 1 0 5}$ | 1,841 | 14 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ | 167 | 22 |
|  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{6 3 3}$ | 717 | $(12)$ |
| $\mathbf{8 6}$ | $(108)$ | NM |
|  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{4 , 4 3 2}$ | 4,856 | $(9)$ |
| $\mathbf{1 , 9 0 0}$ | 2,445 | $(22)$ |
|  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{6 , 3 3 2}$ | 7,301 | $(13)$ |
|  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{( 3 2 5 )}$ | 871 | NM |

2,923
2,677
$9 \quad \mathbf{5 , 8 5}$

6,007
1,599

4,522
4,067
11

2,135
2,363
(10)

6,078
4,750
28
expense
754
\$1,381
\$ 1,471
(6)
(6)

2,226
1,673
33

Net income

Financial ratios

| Return on common equity | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ | $18 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 9 \%}$ | $19 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Return on assets | $\mathbf{0 . 7 8}$ | 0.83 | $\mathbf{1 . 1 2}$ | 0.86 |
| Overhead ratio | $\mathbf{7 1}$ | 56 | $\mathbf{6 4}$ | 56 |
| Compensation expense as a $^{\text {percentage of total net revenue }}{ }^{(d)}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | 37 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | 38 |

Revenue by business
Investment banking fees:

| Advisory | \$ 355 | \$ 393 | (10) | \$ | 660 | \$ | 872 | (24) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Equity underwriting | 354 | 1,103 | (68) |  | 767 |  | 1,411 | (46) |
| Debt underwriting | 696 | 743 | (6) |  | 1,424 |  | 1,336 | 7 |
| Total investment banking fees | 1,405 | 2,239 | (37) |  | 2,851 |  | 3,619 | (21) |
| Fixed income markets | 3,563 | 4,929 | (28) |  | 9,027 |  | 9,818 | (8) |


| Equity markets Credit portfolio ${ }^{(a)}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,038 \\ 326 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 708 \\ (575) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47 \\ \mathrm{NM} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,500 \\ 273 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,481 \\ (246) \end{gathered}$ | NM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total net revenue | \$6,332 | \$7,301 | (13) | \$14,651 | \$15,672 | (7) |
| Revenue by region ${ }^{(a)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Americas | \$3,935 | \$4,118 | (4) | \$ 8,497 | \$ 8,434 | 1 |
| Europe/Middle East/Africa | 1,537 | 2,303 | (33) | 4,351 | 5,376 | (19) |
| Asia/Pacific | 860 | 880 | (2) | 1,803 | 1,862 | (3) |
| Total net revenue | \$6,332 | \$7,301 | (13) | \$14,651 | \$ 15,672 | (7) |
| (a) TSS was charged a credit reimbursement related to certain exposures managed within IB credit portfolio on behalf of clients shared with TSS. IB recognizes this credit reimbursement in its credit portfolio business in all other income. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) The decrease in net interest income in the second quarter was primarily due to lower loan balance, lower Prime Services spreads and spread tightening and increased liquidity in rates markets. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) Total net <br> revenue included tax-equivalent |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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adjustments,
predominantly
due to income
tax credits
related to
affordable
housing and
alternative
energy
investments, as
well as
tax-exempt
income from
municipal bond
investments of
$\$ 401$ million
and
$\$ 334$ million for
the quarters
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009,
respectively,
and
$\$ 804$ million
and
$\$ 699$ million for
year-to-date
2010 and 2009,
respectively.
(d) The
compensation
expense as a percentage of total net revenue ratio for the second quarter and year-to-date of 2010 excludes payroll tax expense related to the U.K. Bank Payroll Tax on certain compensation awarded from December 31, 2009, to April 5,
2010, to relevant
banking
employees,
which is a
non-GAAP
financial
measure. IB
excludes this tax
from the ratio
because it
enables
comparability
with prior
periods. If this
tax were
included in the
ratio for the
second quarter
and year-to-date
of 2010, the
ratio would
have been 46\%
and $40 \%$,
respectively.
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## Quarterly results

Net income was $\$ 1.4$ billion, down $6 \%$ compared with the prior year. These results reflected lower revenue and higher noninterest expense, predominantly offset by a benefit from the provision for credit losses.
Net revenue was $\$ 6.3$ billion, compared with $\$ 7.3$ billion in the prior year. Investment banking fees decreased by $37 \%$ to $\$ 1.4$ billion, consisting of equity underwriting fees of $\$ 354$ million (down $68 \%$ ), debt underwriting fees of $\$ 696$ million (down $6 \%$ ) and advisory fees of $\$ 355$ million (down $10 \%$ ). Fixed Income Markets revenue was $\$ 3.6$ billion, compared with $\$ 4.9$ billion in the prior year, largely reflecting lower results in credit markets, rates and commodities. These declines were offset partially by gains of $\$ 397$ million from the widening of the Firm s credit spreads on certain structured liabilities compared to losses of $\$ 773$ million in the prior year. Equity Markets revenue was $\$ 1.0$ billion, compared with $\$ 708$ million in the prior year, reflecting solid client revenue as well as gains of $\$ 191$ million from the widening of the Firm s credit spreads on certain structured liabilities compared with losses of $\$ 326$ million in the prior year. Credit Portfolio revenue was $\$ 326$ million, primarily reflecting net interest income and fees on retained loans.
The provision for credit losses was a benefit of $\$ 325$ million, compared with an expense of $\$ 871$ million in the prior year. The current-quarter provision reflected a reduction in the allowance for loan losses, largely related to net repayments and loan sales. The allowance for loan losses to end-of-period loans retained was $3.98 \%$, compared with $7.91 \%$ in the prior year. The decline in the allowance ratio was due largely to the consolidation of asset-backed commercial paper conduits in accordance with new accounting guidance, effective January 1, 2010. Excluding these balances, the current-quarter allowance coverage ratio was $6.49 \%$. Net charge-offs were $\$ 28$ million, compared with $\$ 433$ million in the prior year. Nonperforming loans were $\$ 2.3$ billion, down by $\$ 1.3$ billion from the prior year. Noninterest expense was $\$ 4.5$ billion, compared with $\$ 4.1$ billion in the prior year. Current-quarter results included the impact of the U.K. Bank Payroll Tax.
ROE was $14 \%$ on $\$ 40.0$ billion of average allocated capital.

## Year-to-date results

Net income was $\$ 3.9$ billion, up $25 \%$ compared with the prior year. These results reflect lower net revenue and higher noninterest expense, which was more than offset by a benefit from the provision for credit losses.
Net revenue was $\$ 14.7$ billion, compared with $\$ 15.7$ billion in prior year. Investment banking fees decreased $21 \%$ to $\$ 2.9$ billion, consisting of equity underwriting fees of $\$ 767$ million (down $46 \%$ ), advisory fees of $\$ 660$ million (down $24 \%$ ) and debt underwriting fees of $\$ 1.4$ billion (up $7 \%$ ). Fixed Income Markets revenue was $\$ 9.0$ billion, compared with $\$ 9.8$ billion in the prior year. The decrease reflected lower results in rates, credit markets, and commodities. Equity Markets revenue of $\$ 2.5$ billion was flat compared with the prior year, reflecting solid client revenue. Credit Portfolio revenue was $\$ 273$ million, primarily reflecting net interest income and fees on retained loans. The provision for credit losses was a benefit of $\$ 787$ million, compared with an expense of $\$ 2.1$ billion in the prior year. The current year provision reflected a reduction in the allowance for loan losses, largely related to net repayments and loan sales. Net charge-offs were $\$ 725$ million, compared with $\$ 469$ million in prior year.
Noninterest expense was $\$ 9.4$ billion, compared with $\$ 8.8$ billion in prior year, driven by increased litigation reserves, including those for mortgage-related matters, partially offset by lower performance-based compensation. Current year results also included the impact of the U.K. Bank Payroll Tax.
ROE was $19 \%$ on $\$ 40.0$ billion of average allocated capital.
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| Selected metrics <br> (in millions, except headcount and ratios) | Three months ended June 30, |  |  | Six months ended June 30, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selected balance sheet data (period-end) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans ${ }^{(a)}$ : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans retained ${ }^{(b)}$ | \$ 54,049 | \$ 64,500 | (16)\% | \$ 54,049 | \$ 64,500 | (16)\% |
| Loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value | 3,221 | 6,814 | (53) | 3,221 | 6,814 | (53) |
| Total loans | 57,270 | 71,314 | (20) | 57,270 | 71,314 | (20) |
| Equity | 40,000 | 33,000 | 21 | 40,000 | 33,000 | 21 |
| Selected balance sheet data (average) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total assets | \$710,005 | \$710,825 |  | \$693,157 | \$721,934 | (4) |
| Trading assets debt and equity instruments | 296,031 | 265,336 | 12 | 290,091 | 269,146 | 8 |
| Loans retained ${ }^{(b)}$ | 53,351 | 68,224 | (22) | 55,912 | 69,128 | (19) |
| Loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value | 3,530 | 8,934 | (60) | 3,341 | 10,658 | (69) |
| Total loans | 56,881 | 77,158 | (26) | 59,253 | 79,786 | (26) |
| Adjusted assets ${ }^{(c)}$ | 527,520 | 531,632 | (1) | 517,135 | 560,239 | (8) |
| Equity | 40,000 | 33,000 | 21 | 40,000 | 33,000 | 21 |
| Headcount | 26,279 | 25,783 | 2 | 26,279 | 25,783 | 2 |
| Credit data and quality statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net charge-offs | \$ 28 | \$ 433 | (94) | \$ 725 | \$ 469 | 55 |
| Nonperforming assets: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nonperforming loans: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nonperforming loans retained ${ }^{(b)(d)}$ | 1,926 | 3,407 | (43) | 1,926 | 3,407 | (43) |
| Nonperforming loans held-for-sale and |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| loans at fair value | 334 | 112 | 198 | 334 | 112 | 198 |
| Total nonperforming loans | 2,260 | 3,519 | (36) | 2,260 | 3,519 | (36) |
| Derivative receivables | 315 | 704 | (55) | 315 | 704 | (55) |
| Assets acquired in loan satisfactions | 151 | 311 | (51) | 151 | 311 | (51) |
| Total nonperforming assets | 2,726 | 4,534 | (40) | 2,726 | 4,534 | (40) |
| Allowance for credit losses: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allowance for loan losses | 2,149 | 5,101 | (58) | 2,149 | 5,101 | (58) |
| Allowance for lending-related commitments | 564 | 351 | 61 | 564 | 351 | 61 |
| Total allowance for credit losses | 2,713 | 5,452 | (50) | 2,713 | 5,452 | (50) |
| Net charge-off rate ${ }^{(b)(e)}$ | 0.21\% | 2.55\% |  | 2.61\% | 1.37\% |  |
| Allowance for loan losses to period-end loans retained ${ }^{(b)(e)}$ | 3.98 | 7.91 |  | 3.98 | 7.91 |  |

Allowance for loan losses to average loans retained $^{(b)(e)}$
Allowance for loan
nonperforming loa
Nonperforming loa
Nonperforming loa
Market risk aver
portfolio VaR 9
Trading activities:
Fixed income
Fixed income
Foreign exchange
Equities
Commodities and other
Diversification ${ }^{(f)}$
Total trading $\operatorname{VaR}^{(g)}$
Credit portfolio $\operatorname{VaR}^{(h)}$
Diversification ${ }^{(f)}$
Total trading and credit portfolio VaR
4.03

112
3.95
3.97
4.93
4.56
7.48
3.84

112
3.95
3.81
4.93
4.41

Market risk average trading and credit portfolio VaR $\mathbf{9 5 \%}$ confidence level
(a) Effective

January 1, 2010,
the Firm adopted
new consolidation
guidance related to
VIEs. Upon
adoption of the new guidance, the
Firm consolidated its

Firm-administered multi-seller conduits. As a result, \$15.1 billion
of related loans
were recorded in
loans on the
Consolidated
Balance Sheets.
(b) Loans retained
include credit
portfolio loans,
leveraged leases
and other accrual
loans, and exclude
loans held-for-sale
and loans
accounted for at
fair value.
(c) Adjusted assets, a non-GAAP
financial measure, equals total assets minus:
(1) securities purchased under resale agreements and securities borrowed less securities sold, not yet purchased;
(2) assets of consolidated VIEs; (3) cash and securities segregated and on deposit for regulatory and other purposes; (4) goodwill and intangibles; (5) securities received as collateral; and (6) investments purchased under the Asset-Backed Commercial Paper
Money Market
Mutual Fund
Liquidity Facility
( AML Facility ).
The amount of adjusted assets is presented to assist the reader
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in comparing
IB s asset and capital levels to other investment banks in the securities industry.
Asset-to-equity leverage ratios are commonly used as one measure to
assess a
company $s$
capital
adequacy. IB
believes an adjusted asset
amount that
excludes the assets discussed above, which were considered to have a low risk profile, provides a more meaningful measure of balance sheet leverage in the securities
industry.
(d) Allowance for loan losses of $\$ 617$ million and $\$ 1.6$ billion were held against these nonperforming loans at
June 30, 2010 and 2009,
respectively.
(e) Loans
held-for-sale and loans at fair value were
excluded when
calculating the
allowance coverage ratio and net
charge-off rate.
(f) Average value-at-risk ( VaR ) was less than the sum of the VaR of the components described above, which is due to portfolio diversification. The
diversification effect reflects the fact that the risks were not perfectly correlated. The risk of a portfolio of positions is therefore usually less than the sum of the
risks of the positions
themselves. For a further discussion of VaR, see pages
95-97 of this
Form 10-Q.
(g) Trading VaR includes predominantly all trading activities in IB, as well as syndicated
lending facilities that the Firm intends to distribute;
however,
particular risk
parameters of
certain products
are not fully
captured, for
example,
correlation risk.
Trading VaR
does not include
the debit
valuation
adjustments
( DVA ) taken
on derivative and structured
liabilities to reflect the credit quality of the Firm. See VaR discussion on pages 95-97 and the DVA
Sensitivity table on page 97 of
this Form 10-Q
for further
details. Trading
VaR includes
the estimated
credit spread
sensitivity of
certain
mortgage
products.
(h) Credit portfolio VaR includes the derivative credit valuation adjustments ( CVA ), hedges of the CVA and mark-to-market ( MTM )
hedges of the retained loan portfolio, which were all
reported in
principal
transactions
revenue. This
VaR does not
include the
retained loan
portfolio.
According to Dealogic, for the first six months of 2010, the Firm was ranked \#1 in Global Debt, Equity and Equity-Related; \#1 in Global Equity and Equity-Related; \#2 in Global Long-Term Debt; \#1 in Global Syndicated Loans and \#4 in Global Announced M\&A based on volume.
According to Dealogic, the Firm was ranked \#1 in Investment Banking fees generated for the first six months of 2010, based on revenue.

high-yield,
supranationals,
sovereigns,
agencies, covered
bonds,
asset-backed
securities and
mortgage-backed
securities; and
exclude money
market, short-term
debt, and U.S.
municipal
securities.
(d) Equity and
equity-related
rankings include
rights offerings
and Chinese
A-Shares.
(e) Global announced $M \& A$ is based on transaction value at announcement; all other rankings are based on transaction proceeds, with full credit to each book managerrequal if joint. Because of joint assignments, market share of all participants will add up to more than 100\%. M\&A for year-to-date 2010 and full-year 2009 reflects the removal of any withdrawn transactions. U.S. announced $M \& A$ represents any U.S. involvement ranking.

## Table of Contents

## RETAIL FINANCIAL SERVICES

Retail Financial Services ( RFS ) serves consumers and businesses through personal service at bank branches and through ATMs, online banking and telephone banking, as well as through auto dealerships and school financial-aid offices. Customers can use more than 5,100 bank branches (third-largest nationally) and 15,600 ATMs (second-largest nationally), as well as online and mobile banking around the clock. More than 26,900 branch salespeople assist customers with checking and savings accounts, mortgages, home equity and business loans, and investments across the 23 -state footprint from New York and Florida to California. Consumers also can obtain loans through more than 15,900 auto dealerships and 1,800 schools and universities nationwide. Prior to January 1, 2010, RFS was reported as: Retail Banking and Consumer Lending. Commencing January 1, 2010, Consumer Lending for reporting purposes is presented as: (1) Mortgage Banking \& Other Consumer Lending, and (2) Real Estate Portfolios. Mortgage Banking \& Other Consumer Lending comprises mortgage production and servicing, auto finance, and student and other lending activities. Real Estate Portfolios comprises residential mortgages and home equity loans, including the purchased credit-impaired portfolio acquired in the Washington Mutual transaction. This change is intended solely to provide further clarity around the Real Estate Portfolios. Retail Banking, which includes branch banking and business banking activities, is not affected by these reporting revisions.

Selected income statement data (in millions, except ratios)

Three months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

2009

$$
\$ \quad 1,951
$$

\$ $780 \quad \$ 1,003$

$$
(17) \%
$$

40

2,992
4,817

7,809

1,715
3,846
(55)

2
(4)
(2)
1,631 13

1,842
2,369 2,365
70

4,281
4,079
83
(16)

5
$\begin{array}{rrrr}\mathbf{1 , 8 1 3} & & 45 & \text { NM } \\ \mathbf{7 7 1} & & 30 & \mathrm{NM} \\ & & & \\ \mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 4 2} & \$ & 15 & \mathrm{NM}\end{array}$
3,612 3,262
11
4,771 4,822
$140 \quad 166$

8,523
8,250
3

Income before income tax
expense
Income tax expense
Net income

## Financial ratios

| Return on common equity | 15\% | \% | 7\% | 4\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overhead ratio | 55 | 51 | 55 | 49 |
| Overhead ratio excluding core deposit intangibles ${ }^{(a)}$ | 54 | 50 | 54 | 48 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) RFS uses the |  |  |  |  |
| (excluding the |  |  |  |  |
| amortization of |  |  |  |  |
| core deposit |  |  |  |  |
| intangibles |  |  |  |  |
| ( CDI )), $a$ |  |  |  |  |
| non-GAAP |  |  |  |  |
| financial |  |  |  |  |
| measure, to |  |  |  |  |
| evaluate the |  |  |  |  |
| underlying |  |  |  |  |
| expense trends |  |  |  |  |
| of the business. |  |  |  |  |
| Including CDI |  |  |  |  |
| amortization |  |  |  |  |
| expense in the |  |  |  |  |
| overhead ratio |  |  |  |  |
| calculation |  |  |  |  |
| would result in |  |  |  |  |
| a higher |  |  |  |  |
| overhead ratio |  |  |  |  |
| in the earlier |  |  |  |  |
| years and a |  |  |  |  |
| lower overhead |  |  |  |  |
| ratio in later |  |  |  |  |
| years. This |  |  |  |  |
| method would |  |  |  |  |
| therefore result |  |  |  |  |
| in an improving |  |  |  |  |
| overhead ratio |  |  |  |  |
| over time, all |  |  |  |  |
| things |  |  |  |  |
| remaining |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| non-GAAP ratio |  |  |  |  |
| excludes Retail |  |  |  |  |
| Banking s CDI |  |  |  |  |
| amortization |  |  |  |  |
| expense related |  |  |  |  |
| to prior |  |  |  |  |
| business |  |  |  |  |
| combination |  |  |  |  |
| transactions of |  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 69$ million and |  |  |  |  |
| \$82 million for |  |  |  |  |

the quarters
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009,
respectively,
and
$\$ 139$ million
and
$\$ 165$ million for
the six months
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009, respectively.
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## Quarterly results

Net income was $\$ 1.0$ billion, compared with $\$ 15$ million in the prior year.
Net revenue was $\$ 7.8$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 161$ million, or $2 \%$, compared with the prior year. Net interest income was $\$ 4.8$ billion, down by $\$ 213$ million, or $4 \%$, reflecting the impact of lower loan and deposit balances, partially offset by a shift to wider-spread deposit products. Noninterest revenue was $\$ 3.0$ billion, relatively flat compared with the prior year, as increased mortgage fees and related income, debit card income and auto operating lease income were offset by declining deposit-related fees.
The provision for credit losses was $\$ 1.7$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 2.1$ billion from the prior year. Although losses for the mortgage and home equity portfolios continued to be extremely high, the current-quarter provision reflected improved delinquency trends and reduced net charge-offs as compared with the prior period. Additionally, the prior-year provision included an addition to the allowance for loan losses of $\$ 1.2$ billion. Home equity net charge-offs were $\$ 796$ million ( $3.32 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 1.3$ billion ( $4.61 \%$ net charge-off rate) in the prior year. Subprime mortgage net charge-offs were $\$ 282$ million ( $8.63 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 410$ million ( $11.50 \%$ net charge-off rate). Prime mortgage net charge-offs were $\$ 264$ million ( $1.79 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 481$ million ( $3.07 \%$ net charge-off rate). The allowance for loan losses to ending loans retained, excluding purchased credit-impaired loans, was $5.26 \%$, compared with $4.41 \%$ in the prior year.
Noninterest expense was $\$ 4.3$ billion, an increase of $\$ 202$ million, or $5 \%$, from the prior year.

## Year-to-date results

Net income was $\$ 911$ million, compared with $\$ 489$ million in the prior year.
Net revenue was $\$ 15.6$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 1.2$ billion, or $7 \%$, compared with the prior year. Net interest income was $\$ 9.8$ billion, down by $\$ 427$ million, or $4 \%$, reflecting the impact of lower loan and deposit balances, partially offset by a shift to wider-spread deposit products. Noninterest revenue was $\$ 5.7$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 793$ million, or $12 \%$, as a decline in mortgage fees and related income and deposit-related fees were partially offset by an increase in debit card income and auto operating lease income.
The provision for credit losses was $\$ 5.4$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 2.3$ billion from the prior year. Although losses for the mortgage and home equity portfolios continued to be extremely high, the provision reflected improved delinquency trends and reduced net charge-offs as compared with the prior period. Additionally, the current period included an addition to the allowance for loan losses of $\$ 1.2$ billion compared with an addition of $\$ 2.9$ billion in the prior year. Home equity net charge-offs were $\$ 1.9$ billion ( $3.96 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 2.4$ billion ( $4.27 \%$ net charge-off rate) in the prior year. Subprime mortgage net charge-offs were $\$ 739$ million ( $11.12 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 774$ million ( $10.69 \%$ net charge-off rate). Prime mortgage net charge-offs were $\$ 723$ million ( $2.45 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 793$ million ( $1.88 \%$ net charge-off rate).
Noninterest expense was $\$ 8.5$ billion, an increase of $\$ 273$ million, or $3 \%$, from the prior year.
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Selected metrics
(in millions, except headcount and ratios)

Selected balance sheet data
(period-end)
Assets
Loans:
Loans retained
Loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value $^{(a)}$

Total loans
Deposits
Equity
Selected balance sheet data (average)
Assets

Loans:
Loans retained
Loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value ${ }^{(a)}$

Total loans
Deposits
Equity

Headcount

Credit data and quality statistics
Net charge-offs
Nonperforming loans:
Nonperforming loans retained
Nonperforming loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value

Total nonperforming loans ${ }^{(b)(c)(d)}$
Nonperforming assets ${ }^{(b)(c)(d)}$
Allowance for loan losses
Net charge-off rate ${ }^{(e)}$
Net charge-off rate excluding purchased credit-impaired loans ${ }^{(e)(f)}$
Allowance for loan losses to ending loans ${ }^{(e)}$
Allowance for loan losses to ending loans excluding purchased credit-impaired loans ${ }^{(e)(f)}$
Allowance for loan losses to nonperforming loans retained ${ }^{(b)(e)(f)}$

Three months ended June 30,
20102009 Change
Six months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

| $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 5 , 3 2 9}$ | $\$ 399,916$ | $(6) \%$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 5 , 3 2 9}$ | $\$ 399,916$ | $(6) \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 3 0 , 3 2 9}$ | 353,934 | $(7)$ | $\mathbf{3 3 0 , 3 2 9}$ | 353,934 | $(7)$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 , 5 9 9}$ | 13,192 | $(4)$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 5 9 9}$ | 13,192 | $(4)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3 4 2 , 9 2 8}$ | 367,126 | $(7)$ | $\mathbf{3 4 2 , 9 2 8}$ | 367,126 | $(7)$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5 9 , 9 7 4}$ | 371,241 | $(3)$ | $\mathbf{3 5 9 , 9 7 4}$ | 371,241 | $(3)$ |
| $\mathbf{2 8 , 0 0 0}$ | 25,000 | 12 | $\mathbf{2 8 , 0 0 0}$ | 25,000 | 12 |


| $\mathbf{\$ 3 8 1 , 9 0 6}$ | $\$ 410,228$ | $(7)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 8 7 , 8 5 4}$ | $\$ 416,813$ | $(7)$ |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 3 5 , 3 0 8}$ | 359,372 | $(7)$ | $\mathbf{3 3 9 , 1 3 1}$ | 363,127 | $(7)$ |
| $\mathbf{1 4 , 4 2 6}$ | 19,043 | $(24)$ | $\mathbf{1 5 , 7 3 4}$ | 17,792 | $(12)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3 4 9 , 7 3 4}$ | 378,415 | $(8)$ | $\mathbf{3 5 4 , 8 6 5}$ | 380,919 | $(7)$ |
| $\mathbf{3 6 2 , 0 1 0}$ | 377,259 | $(4)$ | $\mathbf{3 5 9 , 4 8 6}$ | 373,788 | $(4)$ |
| $\mathbf{2 8 , 0 0 0}$ | 25,000 | 12 | $\mathbf{2 8 , 0 0 0}$ | 25,000 | 12 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 6 , 8 7 9}$ | 103,733 | 13 | $\mathbf{1 1 6 , 8 7 9}$ | 103,733 | 13 |

$\begin{array}{llllllll}\$ & \mathbf{1 , 7 6 1} & \$ & 2,649 & (34) & \$ & \mathbf{4 , 1 9 9} & \$\end{array} 4,825$
(13)

| $\mathbf{1 0 , 4 5 7}$ | 8,792 | 19 | $\mathbf{1 0 , 4 5 7}$ | 8,792 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ | 203 | $(13)$ | $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ | 203 |


| $\mathbf{1 0 , 6 3 3}$ | 8,995 | 18 | $\mathbf{1 0 , 6 3 3}$ | 8,995 | 18 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{1 1 , 9 0 7}$ | 10,554 | 13 | $\mathbf{1 1 , 9 0 7}$ | 10,554 | 13 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 , 1 5 2}$ | 11,832 | 37 | $\mathbf{1 6 , 1 5 2}$ | 11,832 | 37 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 1 1 \%}$ | $2.96 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{2 . 5 0 \%}$ | $2.68 \%$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2 . 7 5}$ | 3.89 |  | $\mathbf{3 . 2 6}$ | 3.53 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{4 . 8 9}$ | 3.34 |  | $\mathbf{4 . 8 9}$ | 3.34 |  |

5.26 5.26 4.41
$128 \quad 135 \quad 128 \quad 135$

Nonperforming loans to total loans
Nonperforming loans to total loans excluding purchased credit-impaired loans ${ }^{(b)}$
(a) Loans at fair value consist of prime
mortgages originated with the intent to sell that are accounted for at fair value and classified as trading assets on the Consolidated Balance Sheets. These loans totaled
$\$ 12.2$ billion
and
$\$ 11.3$ billion at June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively.
Average balances of these loans totaled
$\$ 12.5$ billion
and
$\$ 16.2$ billion for
the quarters ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively, and
$\$ 13.3$ billion
and
$\$ 14.9$ billion for the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively.
(b) Excludes purchased credit-impaired loans that were
$\begin{array}{lll}3.10 & 2.45 & 3.10\end{array}$
4.00
3.19
4.00
3.19
2.45

acquired as part
of the
Washington
Mutual
transaction.
These loans are accounted for on a pool basis, and the pools are considered to be performing.
(c) Certain of these loans are classified as trading assets on the Consolidated
Balance Sheets.
(d) At June 30, 2010 and 2009, nonperforming loans and assets exclude:
(1) mortgage loans insured by U.S. government agencies of $\$ 10.1$ billion and $\$ 4.2$ billion, respectively, that are 90 days
past due and accruing at the guaranteed reimbursement rate; (2) real estate owned insured by U.S. government agencies of $\$ 1.4$ billion and $\$ 508$ million, respectively; and (3) student loans that are 90 days past due and still accruing, which
are insured by
U.S. government
agencies under
the Federal
Family
Education Loan
Program
( FFELP ), of
$\$ 447$ million
and
$\$ 473$ million,
respectively.
These amounts
are excluded as
reimbursement
of insured
amounts is
proceeding
normally.
(e) Loans
held-for-sale
and loans
accounted for at
fair value were
excluded when
calculating the allowance coverage ratio and the net
charge-off rate.
(f) Excludes the impact of purchased credit-impaired loans that were acquired as part of the
Washington
Mutual
transaction.
These loans
were accounted
for at fair value on the acquisition date, which incorporated
management $s$ estimate, as of
that date, of credit losses
over the
remaining life of the portfolio. An
allowance for
loan losses of $\$ 2.8$ billion was recorded for these loans at June 30, 2010, which has also been excluded from applicable ratios. No allowance for loan losses was recorded for these loans at June 30, 2009. To date, no charge-offs have been recorded
for these loans.
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## RETAIL BANKING

Selected income statement data (in millions, except ratios)

Noninterest revenue

Total net revenue
Provision for credit losses
Noninterest expense
Income before income tax expense

Net income
Overhead ratio
Overhead ratio excluding core deposit intangibles ${ }^{(a)}$
(a) Retail Banking uses the overhead ratio (excluding the amortization of CDI), a non-GAAP
financial measure, to evaluate the underlying expense trends of the business. Including CDI amortization expense in the overhead ratio calculation would result in a higher overhead ratio in the earlier years and a lower overhead ratio in later
years. This method would therefore result

Three months ended June 30,
20102009 Change
\$1,684 \$1,803 (7)\%
2,712
4,396
168
2,633
$\mathbf{1 , 5 9 5}$
\$ 914
60\%
$58 \quad 55$


Six months ended June 30,
20102009 Change
\$3,386 $\quad \$ 3,521 \quad$ (4)\%

1
$\begin{array}{llll}(1) & \mathbf{3 , 1 6 4} & 3,031 & 4\end{array}$
(6) $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 8 1 2} \quad \$ 1,833$
(1)
$\mathbf{6 0 \%} \quad 58 \%$
$58 \quad 56$

```
in an improving
overhead ratio
over time, all
things
remaining
equal. The
non-GAAP ratio
excludes Retail
Banking s CDI
amortization
expense related
to prior
business
combination
transactions of
$69 million and
$82 million for
the quarters
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009,
respectively,
and
$139 million
and
$165 million for
the six months
ended June 30,
2 0 1 0 \text { and 2009,}
respectively.
```


## Quarterly results

Retail Banking reported net income of $\$ 914$ million, a decrease of $\$ 56$ million, or $6 \%$, compared with the prior year.
Net revenue was $\$ 4.4$ billion, down 3\% compared with the prior year. The decrease was driven by declining deposit-related fees and lower deposit balances, largely offset by a shift to wider-spread deposit products and higher debit card income.
The provision for credit losses was $\$ 168$ million, compared with $\$ 361$ million in the prior year. The prior-year provision reflected an increase in the Business Banking allowance for loan losses. Retail Banking net charge-offs were $\$ 168$ million ( $4.04 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 211$ million ( $4.70 \%$ net charge-off rate) in the prior year. Noninterest expense was $\$ 2.6$ billion, up $3 \%$ compared with the prior year, resulting from sales force increases.
Year-to-date results
Retail Banking reported net income of $\$ 1.8$ billion, relatively flat compared with the prior year.
Net revenue was $\$ 8.7$ billion, relatively flat compared with the prior year, with declining deposit-related fees and lower deposit balances, offset by a shift to wider-spread deposit products and higher debit card income.
The provision for credit losses was $\$ 359$ million, compared with $\$ 686$ million in the prior year. The prior-year provision reflected an increase in the Business Banking allowance for loan losses. Retail Banking net charge-offs were $\$ 359$ million ( $4.31 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 386$ million ( $4.28 \%$ net charge-off rate) in the prior year. Noninterest expense was $\$ 5.2$ billion, relatively flat compared with the prior year.
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Selected metrics
(in billions, except ratios and where otherwise noted)

Business metrics

Business banking origination volume
End-of-period loans owned
End-of-period deposits:
Checking
Savings
Time and other

Total end-of-period deposits
Average loans owned
Average deposits:
Checking
Savings
Time and other

Total average deposits
Deposit margin
Average assets

Credit data and quality statistics
(in millions, except ratio)
Net charge-offs
Net charge-off rate
Nonperforming assets

## Retail branch business metrics

Investment sales volume (in millions)

Number of:

| Branches | $\mathbf{5 , 1 5 9}$ | 5,203 | $(1)$ | $\mathbf{5 , 1 5 9}$ | 5,203 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ATMs | $\mathbf{1 5 , 6 5 4}$ | 14,144 | 11 | $\mathbf{1 5 , 6 5 4}$ | 14,144 |
| Personal bankers | $\mathbf{2 0 , 1 7 0}$ | 15,959 | 26 | $\mathbf{2 0 , 1 7 0}$ | 15,959 |
| Sales specialists | $\mathbf{6 , 7 8 5}$ | 5,485 | 24 | $\mathbf{6 , 7 8 5}$ | 5,485 |
| Active online customers (in |  |  |  |  | 26 |
| thousands) | $\mathbf{1 6 , 5 8 4}$ | 13,930 | 19 | $\mathbf{1 6 , 5 8 4}$ | 13,930 |
| Checking accounts (in thousands) | $\mathbf{2 6 , 3 5 1}$ | 25,252 | 4 | $\mathbf{2 6 , 3 5 1}$ | 25,252 |

MORTGAGE BANKING \& OTHER CONSUMER LENDING

Selected income statement data
(in millions, except ratio)

Three months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

| Noninterest revenue ${ }^{(a)}$ | \$1,256 | \$1,134 |  | \$2,274 | \$3,055 | (26)\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net interest income | 792 | 721 | 10 | 1,685 | 1,529 | 10 |
| Total net revenue | 2,048 | 1,855 | 10 | 3,959 | 4,584 | (14) |
| Provision for credit losses | 175 | 366 | (52) | 392 | 771 | (49) |
| Noninterest expense | 1,243 | 1,105 | 12 | 2,489 | 2,242 | 11 |
| Income before income tax expense | 630 | 384 | 64 | 1,078 | 1,571 | (31) |
| Net income ${ }^{(a)}$ | \$ 364 | \$ 235 | 55 | \$ 621 | \$ 965 | (36) |
| Overhead ratio | 61\% | 60\% |  | 63\% | 49\% |  |
| (a) Losses related to the repurchase of previously-sold loans are recorded as a reduction of production revenue. These losses totaled $\$ 667$ million and $\$ 255$ million for the quarters ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively, and $\$ 1.1$ billion and $\$ 475$ million for the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively. The losses resulted in a negative impact on net income of $\$ 388$ million and $\$ 157$ million for the quarters ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively, and |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\$ 640$ million and<br>$\$ 292$ million for the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively.<br>For further<br>discussion, see<br>Repurchase<br>liability on pages 58-60 and<br>Note 22 on<br>pages 170-174<br>of this Form<br>10-Q, and Note<br>31 on pages<br>230-234 of<br>JPMorgan<br>Chase s 2009<br>Annual Report.
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## Quarterly results

Mortgage Banking \& Other Consumer Lending reported net income of $\$ 364$ million, an increase of $\$ 129$ million, or $55 \%$, from the prior year. The increase was driven by higher noninterest revenue and a lower provision for credit losses, partially offset by higher noninterest expense.
Net revenue of $\$ 2.0$ billion was up by $\$ 193$ million, or $10 \%$, from the prior year, and includes Mortgage Banking revenue of $\$ 1.2$ billion, up by $\$ 62$ million, and Other Consumer Lending revenue (comprised of Auto and Student Lending) of $\$ 850$ million, up by $\$ 131$ million predominantly as a result of higher auto loan and lease balances. Mortgage Banking revenue includes $\$ 212$ million of net interest income, $\$ 886$ million of mortgage fees and related income and $\$ 100$ million of other noninterest revenue. Included in mortgage fees and related income is $\$ 9$ million of production revenue, compared with $\$ 284$ million in the prior year, reflecting higher repurchase losses in the current year and the impact of write-downs on the mortgage warehouse in the prior year. Repurchase losses were $\$ 667$ million, compared with $\$ 255$ million in the prior year. Also included is net mortgage servicing revenue of $\$ 877$ million, up by $\$ 354$ million from the prior year, which is comprised of operating revenue and MSR risk management revenue. Operating revenue of $\$ 566$ million was up by $\$ 124$ million as the improvement in other changes in MSR asset fair value was partially offset by lower loan servicing revenue as a result of lower third-party loans serviced. MSR risk management results were $\$ 311$ million, compared with $\$ 81$ million in the prior year. The provision for credit losses, predominantly related to the student and auto loan portfolios, was $\$ 175$ million, compared with $\$ 366$ million in the prior year. The prior-year provision reflected an increase in the allowance for loan losses for student and auto loans. Student loan and other net charge-offs were $\$ 150$ million ( $4.04 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 101$ million ( $2.79 \%$ net charge-off rate) in the prior year. Auto loan net charge-offs were $\$ 58$ million ( $0.49 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 146$ million ( $1.36 \%$ net charge-off rate) in the prior year. Noninterest expense was $\$ 1.2$ billion, up by $\$ 138$ million, or $12 \%$, from the prior year, driven by an increase in default-related expense.

## Year-to-date results

Mortgage Banking \& Other Consumer Lending reported net income of $\$ 621$ million, compared with $\$ 965$ million in the prior year. The decrease was driven by lower noninterest revenue and higher noninterest expense, partially offset by a lower provision for credit losses and higher net interest income.
Net revenue of $\$ 4.0$ billion was down by $\$ 625$ million, or $14 \%$, from the prior year, and includes Mortgage Banking revenue of $\$ 2.2$ billion, down by $\$ 955$ million, and Other Consumer Lending revenue (comprised of Auto and Student Lending) of $\$ 1.8$ billion, up by $\$ 330$ million predominantly as a result of higher auto loan and lease balances. Mortgage Banking revenue includes $\$ 428$ million of net interest income, $\$ 1.5$ billion of mortgage fees and related income and $\$ 191$ million of other noninterest revenue. Included in mortgage fees and related income is $\$ 10$ million of production revenue, compared with $\$ 765$ million in the prior year, reflecting higher repurchase losses in the current year and the impact of write-downs on the mortgage warehouse in the prior year. Repurchase losses were $\$ 1.1$ billion, compared with $\$ 475$ million in the prior year. Also included is net mortgage servicing revenue of $\$ 1.5$ billion, down by $\$ 144$ million from the prior year, which is comprised of operating revenue and MSR risk management revenue. Operating revenue of $\$ 1.1$ billion was up $\$ 477$ million as the improvement in other changes in MSR asset fair value was partially offset by lower loan servicing revenue as a result of lower third-party loans serviced. MSR risk management results were $\$ 463$ million, compared with $\$ 1.1$ billion in the prior year.
The provision for credit losses, predominantly related to the student and auto loan portfolios, was $\$ 392$ million, compared with $\$ 771$ million in the prior year. The prior-year provision reflected an increase in the allowance for loan losses for student and auto loans. Student loan and other net charge-offs were $\$ 214$ million ( $2.80 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 135$ million ( $1.84 \%$ net charge-off rate) in the prior year. Auto loan net charge-offs were $\$ 160$ million ( $0.68 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 320$ million ( $1.51 \%$ net charge-off rate) in the prior year. Noninterest expense was $\$ 2.5$ billion, up by $\$ 247$ million, or $11 \%$, from the prior year, driven by an increase in default-related expense.
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Selected metrics
(in billions, except ratios and where otherwise noted)

Three months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

| $\mathbf{\$ 4 7 . 5}$ | $\$ 42.9$ | $11 \%$ | $\mathbf{\$ 4 7 . 5}$ | $\$ 42.9$ | $11 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1 3 . 2}$ | 8.9 | 48 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 2}$ | 8.9 | 48 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 . 1}$ | 15.7 | $(4)$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 1}$ | 15.7 | $(4)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{7 5 . 8}$ | 67.5 | 12 | $\mathbf{7 5 . 8}$ | 67.5 | 12 |


| $\mathbf{\$ 4 7 . 5}$ | $\$ 43.1$ | 10 | $\mathbf{\$ 4 7 . 2}$ | $\$ 42.8$ | 10 |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{1 3 . 6}$ | 8.4 | 62 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0}$ | 8.0 | 63 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 . 7}$ | 16.8 | $(1)$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 6}$ | 17.2 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{7 7 . 8}$ | 68.3 | 14 | $\mathbf{7 7 . 8}$ | 68.0 | 14 |

$\begin{array}{lll}68.3 & 14 & 77.8\end{array}$
68.0

14

Credit data and quality statistics
(in millions, except ratios)
Net charge-offs:

| Auto loans | $\mathbf{\$ 5 8}$ | $\$ 146$ | $(60)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 6 0}$ | $\$ 320$ | $(50)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Mortgage | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 2 | NM | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 7 | 171 |
| Student loans and other | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ | 101 | 49 | $\mathbf{2 1 4}$ | 135 | 59 |
| Total net charge-offs | $\mathbf{2 2 1}$ | 249 | $(11)$ | $\mathbf{3 9 3}$ | 462 | $(15)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net charge-off rate: | $\mathbf{0 . 4 9 \%}$ | $1.36 \%$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 8 \%}$ | $1.51 \%$ |  |  |
| Auto loans | $\mathbf{0 . 3 9}$ | 0.10 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 0}$ | 0.19 |  |  |
| Mortgage | $\mathbf{4 . 0 4}$ | 2.79 | $\mathbf{2 . 8 0}$ | 1.84 |  |  |
| Student loans and other |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1 . 0 5}$ | 1.43 |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 . 1 7}$ | 1.52 |  |  |  |  |
| Total net charge-off rate ${ }^{(b)}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{1 . 4 2 \%}$ | $1.80 \%$ |  |  |

Origination volume:
Mortgage origination volume by channel
Retail
Wholesale ${ }^{(f)}$
Correspondent ${ }^{(f)}$
CNT (negotiated transactions)
Total mortgage origination volume
\$15.3 $\quad \$ 14.7 \quad 4 \quad \$ 26.7 \quad \$ 28.3$

| $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ | 0.7 | $(43)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8}$ | 2.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$14.7 \quad 21.9 \quad$ (33) $\quad 30.7 \quad 39.9 \quad$ (23)

| 1.8 | 3.8 | $(53)$ | 5.7 | 8.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Edgar Filing: J P MORGAN CHASE \& CO - Form 10-Q
Student loans
Auto
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrr}\text { \$ 0.1 } & \$ 0.4 & (75) & \text { \$ 1.7 } & \$ 2.1 & (19) \\ \mathbf{5 . 8} & 5.3 & 9 & \mathbf{1 2 . 1} & 10.9 & 11\end{array}$
31
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## Selected metrics

(in billions, except ratios and where otherwise noted)

Three months ended June 30, 20102009 Change 20102009 Change

Application volume:
Mortgage application volume by channel
Retail
Wholesale $(f)$
Correspondent $f(f)$
Total mortgage application volume

Average mortgage loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value ${ }^{(g)}$
Average assets
Third-party mortgage loans serviced (ending)
Third-party mortgage loans serviced (average)
MSR net carrying value (ending)
Ratio of MSR net carrying value (ending) to
third-party mortgage loans serviced (ending)

Supplemental mortgage fees and related income details
(in millions)

Production revenue ${ }^{(h)}$
Net mortgage servicing revenue:
Operating revenue:
Loan servicing revenue
Other changes in MSR asset fair value

Total operating revenue
Risk management:
Changes in MSR asset fair value due to inputs or assumptions in model
Derivative valuation adjustments and other

Total risk management
Total net mortgage servicing revenue
Mortgage fees and related income
Ratio of annualized loan servicing revenue to third-party mortgage loans serviced (average)
MSR revenue multiple ${ }^{(i)}$

| $\mathbf{1 , 1 8 6}$ | 1,279 | $(7)$ | $\mathbf{2 , 2 9 3}$ | 2,501 | $(8)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(\mathbf{6 2 0})$ | $(837)$ | 26 | $(\mathbf{1 , 2 2 5})$ | $(1,910)$ | 36 |

(a)

Predominantly
represents prime
loans
repurchased
from
Government
National
Mortgage
Association
( Ginnie Mae )
pools, which are
insured by U.S.
government
agencies. See
further
discussion of
loans
repurchased
from Ginnie Mae
pools in
Repurchase
liability on
pages 58-60 of
this Form 10-Q.
(b) Total average
loans owned
includes loans
held-for-sale of
$\$ 1.9$ billion and
$\$ 2.8$ billion for
the quarters
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009,
respectively, and
$\$ 2.4$ billion and
$\$ 2.9$ billion for
the six months
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009,
respectively.
These amounts
are excluded
when calculating
the net
charge-off rate.
(c) Excludes
mortgage loans
that are insured
by U.S.
government agencies of $\$ 10.9$ billion and
$\$ 5.1$ billion at
June 30, 2010
and 2009,
respectively.
These amounts
are excluded as
reimbursement
of insured
amounts is
proceeding
normally.
(d) Excludes loans
that are 30 days
past due and still
accruing, which are insured by U.S. government agencies under the FFELP, of $\$ 988$ million and $\$ 854$ million at
June 30, 2010 and 2009,
respectively.
These amounts
are excluded as
reimbursement
of insured
amounts is
proceeding
normally.
(e) At June 30, 2010 and 2009,
nonperforming loans and assets exclude:
(1) mortgage loans insured by U.S. government agencies of $\$ 10.1$ billion and $\$ 4.2$ billion, respectively, that are 90 days past due and accruing at the
guaranteed reimbursement rate; (2) real estate owned insured by U.S. government agencies of $\$ 1.4$ billion and $\$ 508$ million, respectively; and (3) student loans that are 90 days past due and still accruing, which are insured by U.S. government agencies under the FFELP, of $\$ 447$ million and $\$ 473$ million, respectively. These amounts are excluded as reimbursement of insured amounts is proceeding normally.
(f) Includes rural housing loans sourced through brokers and correspondents, which are underwritten under U.S. Department of Agriculture guidelines. Prior period amounts have been revised to conform with the current period presentation.
(g) Loans at fair value consist of prime mortgages originated with
the intent to sell
that are
accounted for at fair value and classified as trading assets on the Consolidated Balance Sheets.
Average
balances of these loans totaled $\$ 12.5$ billion and $\$ 16.2$ billion for the quarters ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively, and $\$ 13.3$ billion and $\$ 14.9$ billion for the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively.
(h) Losses related to the repurchase of previously-sold
loans are recorded as a reduction of production revenue. These losses totaled $\$ 667$ million and $\$ 255$ million for the quarters ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively, and $\$ 1.1$ billion and $\$ 475$ million for the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively. For further
discussion, see Repurchase liability on pages 58-60 and

Note 22 on
pages 170-174
of this Form
10-Q, and Note
31 on pages
230-234 of
JPMorgan
Chase s 2009
Annual Report.
(i) Represents the ratio of MSR net carrying value (ending) to third-party mortgage loans serviced (ending) divided by the ratio of annualized loan servicing revenue to third-party mortgage loans serviced (average).
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## REAL ESTATE PORTFOLIOS

Selected income statement data
(in millions, except ratios)
Noninterest revenue
Net interest income

Total net revenue
Provision for credit losses
Noninterest expense
Income/(loss) before income tax expense/(benefit)

Net income/(loss)
Overhead ratio

Three months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

| $\mathbf{\$} \mathbf{5 2}$ | $\$$ | 3 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1 , 3 1 3}$ | 1,590 | NM |
|  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 , 3 6 5}$ | 1,593 | $(14)$ |
| $\mathbf{1 , 3 7 2}$ | 3,119 | $(56)$ |
| $\mathbf{4 0 5}$ | 417 | $(3)$ |
| $\mathbf{( 4 1 2 )}$ | $(1,943)$ | 79 |
| $\mathbf{\$ ( 2 3 6 )}$ | $\$(1,190)$ | 80 |

Six months ended June 30, 2010
84
$\mathbf{2 , 8 0 9}$
$\mathbf{2 , 8 9 3} 3,367$
4,697 6,266
$824 \quad 871$
$(\mathbf{2 , 6 2 8}) \quad(3,770)$
30
$\$(\mathbf{1 , 5 2 2}) \quad \$(2,309)$

## Quarterly results

Real Estate Portfolios reported a net loss of $\$ 236$ million, compared with a net loss of $\$ 1.2$ billion in the prior year. The improvement was driven by a lower provision for credit losses, partially offset by lower net interest income. Net revenue was $\$ 1.4$ billion, down by $\$ 228$ million, or $14 \%$, from the prior year. The decrease was driven by a decline in net interest income as a result of lower loan balances, reflecting portfolio runoff.
The provision for credit losses was $\$ 1.4$ billion, compared with $\$ 3.1$ billion in the prior year. The current-quarter provision reflected improved delinquency trends and reduced net charge-offs, while the prior-year provision included an addition to the allowance for loan losses of $\$ 930$ million in the home equity and mortgage loan portfolios. (For further detail, see RFS discussion of the provision for credit losses.)
Noninterest expense was $\$ 405$ million, down by $\$ 12$ million, or $3 \%$, from the prior year, reflecting a decrease in foreclosed asset expense.

## Year-to-date results

Real Estate Portfolios reported a net loss of $\$ 1.5$ billion, compared with a net loss of $\$ 2.3$ billion in the prior year. The improvement was driven by a lower provision for credit losses, partially offset by lower net interest income. Net revenue was $\$ 2.9$ billion, down by $\$ 474$ million, or $14 \%$, from the prior year. The decrease was driven by a decline in net interest income as a result of lower loan balances, reflecting portfolio runoff.
The provision for credit losses was $\$ 4.7$ billion, compared with $\$ 6.3$ billion in the prior year. The provision reflected an addition to the allowance for loan losses for the purchased credit-impaired portfolio of $\$ 1.2$ billion as well as impacts of improved delinquency trends and reduced net charge-offs, while the prior-year provision included an addition to the allowance for loan losses of $\$ 2.3$ billion in the home equity and mortgage loan portfolios. (For further detail, see RFS discussion of the provision for credit losses.)
Noninterest expense was $\$ 824$ million, down by $\$ 47$ million, or $5 \%$, from the prior year, reflecting a decrease in foreclosed asset expense.

## Table of Contents

Selected metrics (in billions)

Loans excluding purchased credit-impaired loans ${ }^{(a)}$ End-of-period loans owned: Home equity
Prime mortgage
Subprime mortgage
Option ARMs
Other
Total end-of-period loans owned

Average loans owned:
Home equity
Prime mortgage
Subprime mortgage
Option ARMs
Other
Total average loans owned

Purchased credit-impaired loans ${ }^{(a)}$
End-of-period loans owned:
Home equity
Prime mortga
Subprime mortgage
Option ARMs
Total end-of-period loans owned

Average loans owned:
Home equity
Prime mortgage
Subprime mortgage
Option ARMs
Total average loans owned

Three months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, $2010 \quad 2009 \quad$ Change

| \$ 94.8 | $\$ 108.2$ | $(12) \%$ | $\$ \mathbf{9 4 . 8}$ | $\$ 108.2$ | $(12) \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4 4 . 6}$ | 53.2 | $(16)$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 6}$ | 53.2 | $(16)$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 . 6}$ | 13.8 | $(9)$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 6}$ | 13.8 | $(9)$ |
| $\mathbf{8 . 5}$ | 9.0 | $(6)$ | $\mathbf{8 . 5}$ | 9.0 | $(6)$ |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | 0.9 | 11 | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | 0.9 | 11 |

\$161.5 $\quad \$ 185.1 \quad$ (13) $\$ 161.5 \quad \$ 185.1$
(13)

| \$ 96.3 | $\$ 110.1$ | $(13)$ | $\mathbf{\$ ~ 9 7 . 9}$ | $\$ 111.7$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{4 5 . 7}$ | 54.9 | $(17)$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 8}$ | 56.4 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 . 1}$ | 14.3 | $(8)$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 4}$ | 14.6 |
| $\mathbf{8 . 6}$ | 9.1 | $(5)$ | $\mathbf{8 . 7}$ | 9.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | 0.9 | 11 | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | 0.9 |

(3)
11
\$164.7 \$189.3
(13) $\quad \$ 167.8 \quad \$ 192.6$
(13)

| $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 . 5}$ | $\$ 27.7$ | $(8)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 . 5}$ | $\$ 27.7$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{1 8 . 5}$ | 20.8 | $(11)$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 5}$ | 20.8 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 6}$ | 6.4 | $(13)$ | $\mathbf{5 . 6}$ | 6.4 |
| $\mathbf{2 7 . 3}$ | 30.5 | $(10)$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 3}$ | 30.5 |

\$ 76.9 $\quad \$ 85.4 \quad(10) \quad \$ 76.9 \quad \$ 85.4$
(10)

## Total Real Estate

## Portfolios

End-of-period loans owned:
Home equity
Prime mortgage
Subprime mortgage
Option ARMs
Other
Total end-of-period loans

| $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 0 . 3}$ | $\$ 135.9$ | $(11)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 0 . 3}$ | $\$ 135.9$ |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{6 3 . 1}$ | 74.0 | $(15)$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 1}$ | 74.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 . 2}$ | 20.2 | $(10)$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 2}$ | 20.2 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 . 8}$ | 39.5 | $(9)$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 8}$ | 39.5 |
| $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | 0.9 | 11 | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | 0.9 |


| owned | \$238.4 | \$270.5 | (12) | \$238.4 | \$270.5 | (12) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average loans owned: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Home equity | \$ 122.0 | \$138.1 | (12) | \$ 123.9 | \$139.9 | (11) |
| Prime mortgage | 64.5 | 75.9 | (15) | 65.9 | 77.7 | (15) |
| Subprime mortgage | 18.9 | 20.8 | (9) | 19.2 | 21.2 | (9) |
| Option ARMs | 36.3 | 40.1 | (9) | 36.9 | 40.2 | (8) |
| Other | 1.0 | 0.9 | 11 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 11 |
| Total average loans owned | \$242.7 | \$275.8 | (12) | \$246.9 | \$279.9 | (12) |
| Average assets | \$230.3 | \$269.5 | (15) | \$235.2 | \$274.7 | (14) |
| Home equity origination volume | 0.3 | 0.6 | (50) | 0.6 | 1.5 | (60) |

[^0]estimated lives
of the loan as
long as cash
flows are
reasonably
estimable, even
if the underlying
loans are
contractually
past due.
Included within Real Estate Portfolios are purchased credit-impaired loans that the Firm acquired in the Washington Mutual transaction. For purchased credit-impaired loans, the excess of the undiscounted gross cash flows initially expected to be collected over the fair value of the loans at the acquisition date is accreted into interest income at a level rate of return over the expected life of the loans. This is commonly referred to as the accretable yield. The estimate of gross cash flows expected to be collected is updated each reporting period based on updated assumptions. Probable decreases in expected loan principal cash flows require recognition of an allowance for loan losses; probable and significant increases in expected cash flows would first reverse any previously recorded allowance for loan losses with any remaining increases recognized over time through interest income.
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The net spread between the purchased credit-impaired loans and the related liabilities should be relatively constant over time, except for any basis risk or other residual interest rate risk that remains and changes in the accretable yield percentage (e.g., extended loan liquidation periods). As of June 30, 2010, the remaining weighted-average life of the purchased credit-impaired loan portfolio is expected to be 6.6 years. For further information, see Note 13, Purchased credit-impaired loans, on pages $149-150$ of this Form 10-Q. The loan balances are expected to decline more rapidly in the earlier years as the most troubled loans are liquidated, and more slowly thereafter as the remaining troubled borrowers have limited refinancing opportunities. Similarly, default and servicing expense are expected to be higher in the earlier years and decline over time as liquidations slow down.
To date the impact of the purchased credit-impaired loans on Real Estate Portfolios net income has been modestly negative. This is due to the current net spread of the portfolio, the provision for loan losses recognized subsequent to its acquisition, and the higher level of default and servicing expense associated with the portfolio. Over time, the Firm expects that this portfolio will contribute positively to net income.

Credit data and quality statistics (in millions, except ratios)

Net charge-offs excluding purchased credit-impaired loans ${ }^{(a)}$ :
Home equity
Prime mortgage
Subprime mortgage
Option ARMs
Other

## Total net charge-offs

Net charge-off rate excluding purchased credit-impaired loans ${ }^{(a)}$ :
Home equity

Prime mortgage
Subprime mortgage
Option ARMs
Other
Total net charge-off rate excluding purchased
credit-impaired loans
Net charge-off rate reported:
Home equity
Prime mortgage
Subprime mortgage
Option ARMs
Other
Total net charge-off rate reported

30+ day delinquency rate excluding purchased credit-impaired loans ${ }^{(b)}$ Allowance for loan losses

Three months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, $2010 \quad 2009$ Change

| $\$$ | $\mathbf{7 9 6}$ | $\$ 1,265$ | $(37) \%$ | $\$ \mathbf{1 , 9 2 2}$ | $\$ 2,363$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | 479 | $(48)$ | $\mathbf{7 0 4}$ | 786 |
|  | $\mathbf{2 8 2}$ | 410 | $(31)$ | $\mathbf{7 3 9}$ | 774 |
|  | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 15 | 47 | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | $19) \%$ |
|  | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 20 | 5 | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | 35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ 1,372 | $\$ 2,189$ | $(37)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 4 4 7}$ | $\$ 3,977$ | 6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

$3.32 \%$
2.20
4.61\%
11.50
$1.03 \quad 0.66$
$8.42 \quad 8.91$
3.34
4.64
4.14
4.16
$\left.\begin{array}{llll}\mathbf{2 . 6 2 \%} & 3.67 \% & \mathbf{3 . 1 3 \%} & 3.41 \% \\ \mathbf{1 . 5 6} & 2.53 & \mathbf{2 . 1 5} & 2.04 \\ \mathbf{5 . 9 8} & 7.91 & \mathbf{7 . 7 6} & 7.36 \\ \mathbf{0 . 2 4} & 0.15 & \mathbf{0 . 2 5} & 0.10 \\ \mathbf{8 . 4 2} & 8.91 & \mathbf{7 . 4 6} & 7.84 \\ & & & \\ \mathbf{2 . 2 7} & 3.18 & & \mathbf{2 . 8 2} \\ & & & 2.87 \\ & & & \\ \mathbf{6 . 8 8 \%} & 6.46 \% & & \mathbf{6 . 8 8 \%}\end{array}\right) 6.46 \%$
\$14,127
\$9,821
44
\$14,127
\$9,821
44

| Nonperforming assets ${ }^{(c)}$ | 10,121 | 9,085 | 11 | 10,121 | 9,085 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allowance for loan losses to ending loans retained | 5.93\% | 3.63\% |  | 5.93\% | 3.63\% |
| Allowance for loan losses to ending loans retained excluding purchased credit-impaired loans ${ }^{(a)}$ | 7.01 | 5.31 |  | 7.01 | 5.31 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) Excludes the impact of purchased credit-impaired loans that were acquired as part of the |  |  |  |  |  |
| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mutual |  |  |  |  | transaction. |
| These loans were accounted |  |  | were accounted |  |  |
| for at fair value |  |  |  |  |  |
| acquisition date, |  |  |  |  |  |
| incorporated |  |  |  |  |  |
| estimate, as of |  |  |  |  |  |
| that date, of credit losses |  |  | that date, of |  |  |
| over the |  |  |  |  |  |
| remaining life of |  |  |  |  |  |
| the portfolio. An |  |  |  |  |  |
| allowance for |  |  |  |  |  |
| loan losses of |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 2.8$ billion was |  |  |  |  |  |
| recorded for |  |  |  |  |  |
| these loans at |  |  |  |  |  |
| June 30, 2010, |  |  |  |  |  |
| which has also |  |  |  |  |  |
| been excluded |  |  |  |  |  |
| from the |  |  |  |  |  |
| applicable |  |  |  |  |  |
| ratios. No |  |  |  |  |  |
| allowance for |  |  |  |  |  |
| loan losses was |  |  |  |  |  |
| recorded for |  |  |  |  |  |
| these loans at |  |  |  |  |  |
| June 30, 2009. |  |  |  |  |  |
| To date, no |  |  |  |  |  |
| charge-offs have |  |  |  |  |  |
| been recorded |  |  |  |  |  |
| for these loans. |  |  |  |  |  |

(b) The delinquency rate for
purchased credit-impaired loans was $27.91 \%$ and 23.37\% at June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively.
(c) Excludes purchased credit-impaired loans that were acquired as part of the Washington
Mutual
transaction.
These loans are accounted for on a pool basis, and the pools are considered to be performing.
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## CARD SERVICES

For a discussion of the business profile of CS, see pages 64-66 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report and Introduction on page 6 of this Form 10-Q.
Effective January 1, 2010, the Firm adopted new consolidation guidance related to VIEs. Prior to the adoption of the new guidance, JPMorgan Chase used the concept of managed basis to evaluate the credit performance of its credit card loans, both loans on the balance sheet and loans that had been securitized. Managed results excluded the impact of credit card securitizations on total net revenue, the provision for credit losses, net charge-offs and loan receivables. Securitization did not change reported net income; however, it did affect the classification of items on the Consolidated Statements of Income and Consolidated Balance Sheet. As a result of the consolidation of the securitization trusts, reported and managed basis are equivalent for periods beginning after January 1, 2010. For further information, see Explanation and Reconciliation of the Firm s Use of Non-GAAP Financial Measures on pages $15-19$ of this Form 10-Q.

Selected income statement data-
managed basis ${ }^{(a)}$
(in millions, except ratios)
Three months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

| $\begin{gathered} \$ 908 \\ (47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \$ & 921 \\ & (364) \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 861 | 557 |
| 3,356 | 4,311 |
| 4,217 | 4,868 |
| 2,221 | 4,603 |

(1)\%

87
55
(22)
(13)
(52)

329
986
123

1,436
Income/(loss) before income tax expense/(benefit)
Income tax expense/(benefit)

Net income/(loss)

Memo: Net securitization income/(loss)
Financial ratios
Return on common equity
Overhead ratio

| NA | $\$(268)$ | NM | NA | $\$(448)$ | NM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{9 \%}$ | $(18) \%$ |  | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $(16) \%$ |  |
| $\mathbf{3 4}$ | 27 |  | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | 27 |  |

## (a)

## Effective

January 1,
2010, the Firm
adopted new
accounting
guidance
related to the
transfer of
financial assets
and the
consolidation of
VIEs. For
further details
regarding the
Firm s
application and
impact of the
new guidance,
see Note 15 on
pages 151-163
of this Form
10-Q.
NA: Not applicable

## Quarterly results

Net income was $\$ 343$ million, compared with a net loss of $\$ 672$ million in the prior year. The improved results were driven by a lower provision for credit losses, partially offset by lower net revenue.
End-of-period loans were $\$ 143.0$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 28.5$ billion, or $17 \%$, from the prior year. Average loans were $\$ 146.3$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 27.8$ billion, or $16 \%$, from the prior year. The declines in both end-of-period and average loans were due to the decline in lower yielding promotional balances and the Washington Mutual portfolio runoff.
Net revenue was $\$ 4.2$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 651$ million, or $13 \%$, from the prior year. Net interest income was $\$ 3.4$ billion, down by $\$ 955$ million, or $22 \%$. The decrease was driven by lower average loan balances, the impact of legislative changes and a decreased level of fees. These decreases were offset partially by lower revenue reversals associated with lower charge-offs. Noninterest revenue was $\$ 861$ million, an increase of $\$ 304$ million, or $55 \%$. The prior year included a write-down of securitization interests.
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The provision for credit losses was $\$ 2.2$ billion, compared with $\$ 4.6$ billion in the prior year. The current-quarter provision included a reduction of $\$ 1.5$ billion to the allowance for loan losses, reflecting reduced net charge-offs and lower estimated losses primarily related to improved delinquency trends as well as lower loan balances. The prior-year provision included an addition of $\$ 250$ million to the allowance for loan losses. The net charge-off rate was $10.20 \%$, up from $10.03 \%$ in the prior year. The 30-day delinquency rate was $4.96 \%$, down from $5.86 \%$ in the prior year. Excluding the Washington Mutual portfolio, the net charge-off rate was $9.02 \%$, up from $8.97 \%$ in the prior year; and the 30 -day delinquency rate was $4.48 \%$, down from $5.27 \%$ in the prior year.
Noninterest expense was $\$ 1.4$ billion, an increase of $\$ 103$ million, or $8 \%$, due to higher marketing expense.

## Year-to-date results

Net income was $\$ 40$ million, compared with a net loss of $\$ 1.2$ billion in the prior year. The improved results were driven by a lower provision for credit losses, partially offset by lower net revenue.
Average loans were $\$ 151.0$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 27.7$ billion, or $16 \%$, from the prior year due to the decline in lower yielding promotional balances and the Washington Mutual portfolio runoff.
Net revenue was $\$ 8.7$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 1.3$ billion, or $13 \%$, from the prior year. Net interest income was $\$ 7.0$ billion, down by $\$ 1.7$ billion, or $20 \%$. The decrease was driven by lower average loan balances, a decreased level of fees, and the impact of legislative changes. Noninterest revenue was $\$ 1.6$ billion, an increase of $\$ 415$ million, or $34 \%$, driven by a prior-year write-down of securitization interests.
The provision for credit losses was $\$ 5.7$ billion, compared with $\$ 9.3$ billion in the prior year. The current-year provision included a reduction of $\$ 2.5$ billion to the allowance for loan losses, reflecting lower estimated losses primarily related to improved delinquency trends as well as lower loan balances. The prior-year provision included an addition of $\$ 1.4$ billion to the allowance for loan losses. The net charge-off rate was $10.99 \%$, up from $8.85 \%$ in the prior year. Excluding the Washington Mutual portfolio, the net charge-off rate was $9.80 \%$, up from $7.90 \%$ in the prior year.
Noninterest expense was $\$ 2.8$ billion, an increase of $\$ 159$ million, or $6 \%$, due to higher marketing expense. Credit Card Legislation
In May 2009, the Credit Card Accountability, Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009 ( CARD Act ) was enacted. Management estimates that the total annualized reduction in net income from the CARD Act, including recent regulatory guidance that defines reasonable and proportional fees, could be approximately $\$ 750$ million. Results in the second quarter of 2010 reflect approximately $25 \%$ of the estimated quarterly impact of this reduction in net income. The most significant effects of the CARD Act include: (a) the inability to change the pricing of existing balances; (b) the allocation of customer payments above the minimum payment to the existing balance with the highest annual percentage rate (APR ); (c) the requirement that customers opt-in in order to receive, for a fee, overlimit protection that permits an authorized transaction over their credit limit; and (d) the requirement that statements must be mailed or delivered not later than 21 days before the payment due date. In addition, certain rules were finalized in June, including those limiting the amount of penalty fees that can be assessed and those that would require CS to review customer accounts for potential interest rate reductions in certain circumstances.
As a result of the CARD Act, CS has implemented certain changes to its business practices to manage its inability to price loans to customers at rates that are commensurate with their risk over time. These changes include:
(a) selectively increasing pricing; (b) reducing the volume and duration of low-rate promotional pricing offered to customers; and (c) reducing the amount of credit that is granted to certain new and existing customers.
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## Selected metrics

(in millions, except headcount, ratios and where otherwise noted)

Financial ratios ${ }^{(a)}$
Percentage of average outstandings:
Net interest income
Provision for credit losses
Noninterest revenue
Risk adjusted margin ${ }^{(b)}$
Noninterest expense
Pretax income/(loss) (ROO) $)^{(c)}$
Net income/(loss)

## Business metrics

Sales volume (in billions)
New accounts opened (in millions)
Open accounts (in millions)
Merchant acquiring business
Bank card volume (in billions)
Total transactions (in billions)
Selected balance sheet data (period-end)
Loans:
Loans on balance sheets
Securitized loans ${ }^{(a)}$

## Total loans

Equity
Selected balance sheet data (average)
Managed assets
Loans:
Loans on balance sheets
Securitized loans ${ }^{(a)}$
Total average loans
Equity
Headcount

Three months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

| $\mathbf{9 . 2 0 \%}$ | $9.93 \%$ | $\mathbf{9 . 4 1 \%}$ | $9.92 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6 . 0 9}$ | 10.60 | $\mathbf{7 . 6 6}$ | 10.44 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 3 6}$ | 1.28 | $\mathbf{2 . 1 6}$ | 1.36 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 4 7}$ | 0.61 | $\mathbf{3 . 9 1}$ | 0.84 |
| $\mathbf{3 . 9 4}$ | 3.07 | $\mathbf{3 . 7 9}$ | 3.02 |
| $\mathbf{1 . 5 4}$ | $(2.46)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 2}$ | $(2.19)$ |
| $\mathbf{0 . 9 4}$ | $(1.55)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5}$ | $(1.38)$ |


| \$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 1}$ | $\$$ | 74.0 | $6 \%$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 7 . 5}$ | $\$$ | 140.6 | $5 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 . 7}$ |  | 2.4 | 13 | $\mathbf{5 . 2}$ |  | 4.6 | 13 |
|  | $\mathbf{8 8 . 9}$ |  | 100.3 | $(11)$ | $\mathbf{8 8 . 9}$ |  | 100.3 | $(11)$ |


| $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7 . 1}$ | $\$$ | 101.4 | 15 | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 5 . 1}$ | $\$$ | 195.8 | 15 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{5 . 0}$ |  | 4.5 | 11 |  | $\mathbf{9 . 7}$ |  | 8.6 | 13 |


| $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 2 , 9 9 4}$ | $\$ 85,736$ | 67 | $\$ \mathbf{1 4 2 , 9 9 4}$ | $\$ 85,736$ | 67 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NA | 85,790 | NM | NA | 85,790 | NM |
| $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 2 , 9 9 4}$ | $\$ 171,526$ | $(17)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 2 , 9 9 4}$ | $\$ 171,526$ | $(17)$ |
| $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\$ 15,000$ |  | $\$ \mathbf{1 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\$ 15,000$ |  |


| $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 6 , 8 1 6}$ | $\$ 193,310$ | $(24)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 1 , 8 6 4}$ | $\$ 197,234$ | $(23)$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 6 , 3 0 2}$ | $\$ 89,692$ | 63 | $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 1 , 0 2 0}$ | $\$ 93,715$ | 61 |
| NA | 84,417 | NM | NA | 85,015 | NM |
| $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 6 , 3 0 2}$ | $\$ 174,109$ | $(16)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 1 , 0 2 0}$ | $\$ 178,730$ | $(16)$ |
| $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\$ 15,000$ |  | $\$ \mathbf{1 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\$ 15,000$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2 1 , 5 2 9}$ | 22,897 | $(6)$ | $\mathbf{2 1 , 5 2 9}$ | 22,897 | $(6)$ |
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Selected metrics
(in millions, except ratios)
Credit quality statistics ${ }^{(a)}$
Net charge-offs
Net charge-off rate ${ }^{(d)}$
Delinquency rates ${ }^{(a)(d)}$
30+ day
90+ day

Allowance for loan losses ${ }^{(a)(e)}$
Allowance for loan losses to period-end loans ${ }^{(a)(e)(f)}$

Key stats Washington
Mutual only
Loans
Average loans
Net interest income ${ }^{(g)}$
Risk adjusted margin ${ }^{(b)(g)}$
Net charge-off rate ${ }^{(h)}$
$30+$ day delinquency rate ${ }^{(h)}$
$90+$ day delinquency rate $^{(h)}$
Key stats excluding
Washington Mutual Loans
Average loans
Net interest income ${ }^{(g)}$
Risk adjusted margin ${ }^{(b)(g)}$
Net charge-off rate
30+ day delinquency rate
$90+$ day delinquency rate
(a) Effective

January 1,
2010, the Firm
adopted new
accounting
guidance
related to the
transfer of
financial assets
and the
consolidation of
VIEs. As a
result of the

Three months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

|  | 2010 |  | 2009 | Change |  | 2010 |  | 2009 | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,721 \\ & \mathbf{1 0 . 2 0 \%} \end{aligned}$ | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,353 \\ & 10.03 \% \end{aligned}$ | (15)\% | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{8 , 2 3 3} \\ & \mathbf{1 0 . 9 9 \%} \end{aligned}$ | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,846 \\ & 8.85 \% \end{aligned}$ | 5\% |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 4.96 \% \\ & 2.76 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5.86 \% \\ & 3.25 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4.96 \% \\ & 2.76 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5.86 \% \\ & 3.25 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| \$ | 14,524 | \$ | 8,839 | 64 | \$ | 14,524 | \$ | 8,839 | 64 |
|  | 10.16\% |  | 10.31\% |  |  | 10.16\% |  | 10.31\% |  |


| $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 , 6 1 5}$ | $\$ 23,093$ | $(32)$ | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 , 6 1 5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 6 , 4 5 5}$ | 24,418 | $(33)$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 5 2 5}$ | $\$ 23,093$ |
| $\mathbf{1 4 . 9 7 \%}$ | $17.90 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{1 5 . 0 2 \%}$ | $17.14 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 5 . 4 3}$ | $(3.89)$ |  | $\mathbf{8 . 5 9}$ | 0.49 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 . 5 3}$ | 19.17 |  | $\mathbf{2 1 . 9 7}$ | 16.75 |
| $\mathbf{8 . 8 6}$ | 11.98 |  | $\mathbf{8 . 8 6}$ | 11.98 |
| $\mathbf{5 . 1 7}$ | 6.85 |  | $\mathbf{5 . 1 7}$ | 6.85 |


| $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 7 , 3 7 9}$ | $\$ 148,433$ | $(14)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 7 , 3 7 9}$ | $\$ 148,433$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 2 9 , 8 4 7}$ | 149,691 | $(13)$ | $\mathbf{1 3 3 , 4 9 5}$ | 152,740 |
| $\mathbf{8 . 4 7 \%}$ | $8.63 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{8 . 6 7 \%}$ | $8.69 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 . 2 1}$ | 1.34 |  | $\mathbf{3 . 3 0}$ | 0.89 |
| $\mathbf{9 . 0 2}$ | 8.97 |  | $\mathbf{9 . 8 0}$ | 7.90 |
| $\mathbf{4 . 4 8}$ | 5.27 |  | $\mathbf{4 . 4 8}$ | 5.27 |
| $\mathbf{2 . 4 7}$ | 2.90 |  | $\mathbf{2 . 4 7}$ | 2.90 |

consolidation of
the credit card securitization trusts, reported and managed basis relating to credit card securitizations are equivalent
for periods
beginning after January 1, 2010. For
further details regarding the
Firm s application and impact of the new guidance, see Note 15 on pages 151-163 of this Form 10-Q.
(b) Represents total net revenue less provision for credit losses.
(c) Pretax return on average
managed outstandings.
(d) Results reflect the impact of purchase accounting adjustments related to the Washington
Mutual transaction and the consolidation of the WMMT in the second quarter of 2009.
Net charge-off rate for the three months
ended June 30,
2010, and
delinquency
rates for the
three and six
months ended
June 30, 2010
were not
affected.
(e) Based on loans
on the
Consolidated
Balance Sheets.
(f) Includes
$\$ 5.0$ billion of
loans at
June 30, 2009,
held by the
WMMT, which
were
consolidated
onto the CS
balance sheet at
fair value
during the second quarter of 2009. No
allowance for
loan losses was
recorded for
these loans as of
June 30, 2009.
Excluding these
loans, the
allowance for
loan losses to
period-end
loans would
have been
10.95\%.
(g) As a percentage
of average
managed
outstandings.
(h) Excludes the
impact of
purchase
accounting
adjustments
related to the
Washington
Mutual
transaction and
the
consolidation of
the WMMT in
the second
quarter of 2009.
NA: Not applicable.
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## Reconciliation from reported basis to managed basis

The financial information presented below reconciles reported basis and managed basis to disclose the effect of securitizations reported in 2009. Effective January 1, 2010, the Firm adopted new accounting guidance that amended the accounting for the transfer of financial assets and the consolidation of VIEs. As a result of the consolidation of the credit card securitization trusts, reported and managed basis relating to credit card securitizations are equivalent for periods beginning after January 1, 2010. For further details regarding the Firm s application and impact of the new guidance, see Note 15 on pages 151-163 of this Form 10-Q.

## (in millions, except ratios) Income statement data

Credit card income
Reported
Securitization adjustmen

Managed credit card
income

Net interest income
Reported
Securitization adjustmen
Managed net interest
income

Total net revenue
Reported
Securitization adjustments
Managed total net revenu
Provision for credit losses
Reported
Securitization adjustments

Managed provision for credit losses
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathbf{\$ , 2 2 1} & \$ & 2,939 \\ \mathbf{N A} & & 1,664\end{array}$
NA $\quad 1,664$
$\begin{array}{lll}\mathbf{\$} & \mathbf{2 , 2 2 1}\end{array}$
(52) $\quad \$ \mathbf{5 , 7 3 3} \quad \$ \quad 9,256$

Balance sheets average
balances
Total average assets
Reported
Securitization adjustments
(24) \$
$\begin{array}{lll}\mathbf{\$} & \mathbf{5 , 7 3 3} & \mathbf{8}, 128\end{array}$
3,128
(6)

NM

| NM | NA |  | 3,128 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $(52)$ | $\$$ | $\mathbf{5 , 7 3 3}$ | $\$$ | 9,256 |

Three months ended June 30,
$2010 \quad 2009 \quad$ Change
\$ 908
NA
\$ 908 \$ 921
(1) $\$ \mathbf{1 , 7 2 1}$
\$ 1,765
(2)
\$ 3,356
\$ 4,311
(22) $\$ \mathbf{7 , 0 4 5} \quad \$ 8,793$

| $\$$ | $\mathbf{3 , 3 5 6}$ | $\$$ | 2,353 | 43 | $\$$ | $\mathbf{7 , 0 4 5}$ | $\$ 4,831$ | 46 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NA |  | 1,958 | NM |  | NA |  | 3,962 | NM |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\$ \mathbf{3 , 3 5 6}$ | $\$$ | 4,311 | $(22)$ | $\$$ | $\mathbf{7 , 0 4 5}$ | $\$ 8,793$ | $(20)$ |  |  |


| $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 2 1 7}$ | $\$$ | 3,204 | 32 | $\mathbf{8 , 6 6 4}$ | $\$$ | 6,869 | 26 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NA |  | 1,664 | NM |  | NA |  | 3,128 | NM |
| $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 2 1 7}$ | $\$$ | 4,868 | $(13)$ | $\$$ | $\mathbf{8 , 6 6 4}$ | $\$$ | 9,997 | $(13)$ |



| Managed average assets | $\$ 146,816$ | $\$ 193,310$ | (24) | $\$ 151,864$ | $\$ 197,234$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Credit quality statistics

Net charge-offs

| Reported | $\$ \mathbf{3 , 7 2 1}$ | $\$$ | 2,689 | 38 | $\mathbf{8 , 2 3 3}$ | $\$$ | 4,718 | 75 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Securitization adjustments |  | NA |  | 1,664 | NM |  | NA |  | 3,128 | NM |
| Managed net charge-offs | $\$$ | $\mathbf{3 , 7 2 1}$ | $\$$ | 4,353 | $(15)$ | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 2 3 3}$ | $\$$ | 7,846 | 5 |


| Net charge-off rates |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Reported | $\mathbf{1 0 . 2 0 \%}$ | $12.03 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 9 9 \%}$ | $10.15 \%$ |
| Securitized | NA | 7.91 | NA | 7.42 |
| Managed net charge-off <br> rate | $\mathbf{1 0 . 2 0}$ | 10.03 | $\mathbf{1 0 . 9 9}$ | 8.85 |

NA: Not applicable
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COMMERCIAL BANKING
For a discussion of the business profile of CB, see pages 67-68 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report and Introduction on page 6 of this Form 10-Q.

Selected income statement data (in millions, except ratios)

Three months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

Revenue

| Lending- and deposit-related fees | \$ | 280 | \$ | 270 | 4\% | \$ 557 | \$ 533 | 5\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset management, administration and commissions |  | 36 |  | 36 |  | 73 | 70 | 4 |
| All other income ${ }^{(a)}$ |  | 230 |  | 152 | 51 | 416 | 277 | 50 |
| Noninterest revenue |  | 546 |  | 458 | 19 | 1,046 | 880 | 19 |
| Net interest income |  | 940 |  | 995 | (6) | 1,856 | 1,975 | (6) |
| Total net revenue ${ }^{(b)}$ |  | 1,486 |  | 1,453 | 2 | 2,902 | 2,855 | 2 |
| Provision for credit losses |  | (235) |  | 312 | NM | (21) | 605 | NM |
| Noninterest expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compensation expense |  | 196 |  | 197 | (1) | 402 | 397 | 1 |
| Noncompensation expense |  | 337 |  | 327 | 3 | 661 | 669 | (1) |
| Amortization of intangibles |  | 9 |  | 11 | (18) | 18 | 22 | (18) |
| Total noninterest expense |  | 542 |  | 535 | 1 | 1,081 | 1,088 | (1) |
| Income before income tax expense |  | 1,179 |  | 606 | 95 | 1,842 | 1,162 | 59 |
| Income tax expense |  | 486 |  | 238 | 104 | 759 | 456 | 66 |
| Net income | \$ | 693 | \$ | 368 | 88 | \$1,083 | \$ 706 | 53 |

## Revenue by product

Lending
Treasury services
Investment banking
Other
Total Commercial Banking
revenue

| revenue | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 4 8 6}$ | $\$ 1,453$ | 2 | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 9 0 2}$ | $\$ 2,855$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| IB revenue, gross $^{(c)}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 3 3}$ | $\$ 328$ | 2 | $\mathbf{\$} \mathbf{6 4 4}$ | $\$ 534$ |
| Revenue by client segment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Market Banking | $\mathbf{\$ 7 6 7}$ | $\$ 772$ | $(1)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 5 1 3}$ | $\$ 1,524$ |
| Commercial Term Lending | $\mathbf{2 3 7}$ | 224 | 6 | $\mathbf{4 6 6}$ | 452 |
| Mid-Corporate Banking | $\mathbf{2 8 5}$ | 305 | $(7)$ | $\mathbf{5 4 8}$ | 547 |


| $\$ \mathbf{6 4 9}$ | $\$ 684$ | $(5)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 0 7}$ | $\$ 1,349$ | $(3)$ |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6 6 5}$ | 679 | $(2)$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 0 3}$ | 1,325 | $(2)$ |
| $\mathbf{1 1 5}$ | 114 | 1 | $\mathbf{2 2 0}$ | 187 | 18 |
|  | $\mathbf{5 7}$ | $(24)$ | NM | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | $(6)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Real Estate Banking |  | 120 |  | 225 |  | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other | 72 | 32 | 125 | 150 | 92 | 63 |
| Total Commercial Banking revenue | \$1,486 | \$ 1,453 | 2 | \$2,902 | \$2,855 | 2 |
| Financial ratios |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Return on common equity | 35\% | 18\% |  | 27\% | 18\% |  |
| Overhead ratio | 36 | 37 |  | 37 | 38 |  |
| (a) Revenue from investment banking products sold to CB clients and commercial card fee revenue is included in all other income. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) Total net revenue included tax-equivalent adjustments from income tax credits related to equity investments in designated community development entities that provide loans to qualified businesses in low-income communities as well as tax-exempt income from municipal bond activity of $\$ 49$ million and $\$ 39$ million for the quarters ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively, and $\$ 94$ million |  |  |  |  |  |  |

and $\$ 74$ million
for year-to-date 2010 and 2009, respectively.
(c) Represents the total revenue
related to
investment
banking
products sold to CB clients.
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## Quarterly results

Net income was $\$ 693$ million, an increase of $\$ 325$ million, or $88 \%$, from the prior year. The increase was driven by a reduction in the provision for credit losses.
Net revenue was $\$ 1.5$ billion, relatively flat compared with the prior year. Net interest income was $\$ 940$ million, down by $\$ 55$ million, or $6 \%$, driven by spread compression on liability products and lower loan balances, predominantly offset by growth in liability balances and wider loan spreads. Noninterest revenue was $\$ 546$ million, an increase of $\$ 88$ million, or $19 \%$. The current quarter reflected gains on sales of loans and other real estate owned, and higher lending-related fees, while the prior year reflected markdowns on certain assets held at fair value.
Revenue from Middle Market Banking was $\$ 767$ million, a decrease of $\$ 5$ million, or $1 \%$, from the prior year. Revenue from Commercial Term Lending was $\$ 237$ million, an increase of $\$ 13$ million, or $6 \%$. Revenue from Mid-Corporate Banking was $\$ 285$ million, a decrease of $\$ 20$ million, or $7 \%$. Revenue from Real Estate Banking was $\$ 125$ million, an increase of $\$ 5$ million, or $4 \%$.
The provision for credit losses was a benefit of $\$ 235$ million, compared with an expense of $\$ 312$ million in the prior year. The current-quarter provision included a reduction of $\$ 413$ million to the allowance for credit losses, mainly due to refinements to credit loss estimates and improvement in the credit quality of the commercial and industrial portfolio. Net charge-offs were $\$ 176$ million ( $0.74 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 181$ million ( $0.67 \%$ net charge-off rate) in the prior year. Current-quarter net charge-offs were largely related to commercial real estate. The allowance for loan losses to end-of-period loans retained was $2.82 \%$, down from $2.87 \%$ in the prior year.
Nonperforming loans were $\$ 3.1$ billion, up by $\$ 1.0$ billion from the prior year, reflecting increases in nonperforming commercial real estate loans.
Noninterest expense was $\$ 542$ million, an increase of $\$ 7$ million, relatively flat compared with the prior year.

## Year-to-date results

Net income was $\$ 1.1$ billion, an increase of $\$ 377$ million, or $53 \%$, from the prior year. The increase was driven by a reduction in the provision for credit losses.
Net revenue was $\$ 2.9$ billion, relatively flat compared with the prior year. Net interest income was $\$ 1.9$ billion down by $\$ 119$ million, or $6 \%$, driven by spread compression on liability products and lower loan balances, but largely offset by growth in liability balances and wider loan spreads. Noninterest revenue was $\$ 1.0$ billion, an increase of $\$ 166$ million, or $19 \%$, from the prior year. The current year reflected gains on sales of loans and other real estate owned, higher lending-related fees and higher investment banking fees, while the prior year reflected markdowns on certain assets held at fair value.
Revenue from Middle Market Banking was $\$ 1.5$ billion, relatively flat with the prior year. Revenue from Commercial Term Lending was $\$ 466$ million, an increase of $\$ 14$ million, or $3 \%$. Mid-Corporate Banking revenue was $\$ 548$ million, flat compared with the prior year. Real Estate Banking revenue was $\$ 225$ million, a decrease of $\$ 15$ million, or 6\%.
The provision for credit losses was a benefit of $\$ 21$ million, compared with an expense of $\$ 605$ million in the prior year. The reduction was mainly due to refinements to credit loss estimates and improvement in the credit quality of the commercial and industrial portfolio. Net charge-offs were $\$ 405$ million ( $0.85 \%$ net charge-off rate), compared with $\$ 315$ million ( $0.57 \%$ net charge-off rate) in the prior year.
Noninterest expense was $\$ 1.1$ billion, relatively flat with the prior year.
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## Selected metrics

(in millions, except headcount and ratios)
Selected balance sheet data
(period-end):
Loans:
Loans retained
Loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value
Loans held-for-sale and loans at fair valu
Total loans
Equity
Selected balance sheet data (average):
Total assets
Loans:
Loans retained
Loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value

Total loans
Liability balances ${ }^{(a)}$
Equity
Average loans by client segment:
Middle Market Banking
Commercial Term Lending
Mid-Corporate Banking
Real Estate Banking
Other

Total Commercial Banking loans

## Headcount

Credit data and quality statistics:
Net charge-offs
Nonperforming loans:
Nonperforming loans retained ${ }^{(b)}$
Nonperforming loans held-for-sale and
loans at fair value

Total nonperforming loans
Nonperforming assets
Allowance for credit losses:
Allowance for loan losses
Allowance for lending-related
commitments

Three months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

| $\mathbf{\$ 9 5 , 0 9 0}$ | $\$ 105,556$ | $(10) \%$ | $\mathbf{\$ 9 5 , 0 9 0}$ | $\$ 105,556$ | $(10) \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{4 4 6}$ | 296 | 51 | $\mathbf{4 4 6}$ | 296 | 51 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{9 5 , 5 3 6}$ | 105,852 | $(10)$ | $\mathbf{9 5 , 5 3 6}$ | 105,852 | $(10)$ |
| $\mathbf{8 , 0 0 0}$ | 8,000 |  | $\mathbf{8 , 0 0 0}$ | 8,000 |  |


| $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 3 , 3 0 9}$ | $\$ 137,283$ | $(3)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 3 , 1 6 2}$ | $\$ 140,771$ | $(5)$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{9 5 , 5 2 1}$ | 108,750 | $(12)$ | $\mathbf{9 5 , 9 1 7}$ | 111,146 | $(14)$ |
| $\mathbf{3 9 1}$ | 288 | 36 | $\mathbf{3 4 4}$ | 292 | 18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{9 5 , 9 1 2}$ | 109,038 | $(12)$ | $\mathbf{9 6 , 2 6 1}$ | 111,438 | $(14)$ |
| $\mathbf{1 3 6 , 7 7 0}$ | 105,829 | 29 | $\mathbf{1 3 4 , 9 6 6}$ | 110,377 | 22 |
| $\mathbf{8 , 0 0 0}$ | 8,000 |  | $\mathbf{8 , 0 0 0}$ | 8,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{\$ 3 4 , 4 2 4}$ | $\$ 38,193$ | $(10)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 4 , 1 7 3}$ | $\$ 39,453$ | $(13)$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5 , 9 5 6}$ | 36,963 | $(3)$ | $\mathbf{3 6 , 0 0 6}$ | 36,889 | $(2)$ |
| $\mathbf{1 1 , 8 7 5}$ | 17,012 | $(30)$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 0 6 5}$ | 17,710 | $(32)$ |
| $\mathbf{9 , 8 1 4}$ | 12,347 | $(21)$ | $\mathbf{1 0 , 1 2 4}$ | 12,803 | $(21)$ |
| $\mathbf{3 , 8 4 3}$ | 4,523 | $(15)$ | $\mathbf{3 , 8 9 3}$ | 4,583 | $(15)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{\$ 9 5 , 9 1 2}$ | $\$ 109,038$ | $(12)$ | $\mathbf{\$ 9 6 , 2 6 1}$ | $\$ 111,438$ | $(14)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{4 , 8 0 8}$ | 4,228 | 14 | $\mathbf{4 , 8 0 8}$ | 4,228 | 14 |


| $\mathbf{\$ 1 7 6}$ | $\$$ | 181 | $(3)$ | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 5}$ | $\$$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{3 , 0 3 6}$ | 2,090 | 45 | $\mathbf{3 , 0 3 6}$ | 2,090 | 45 |  |
| $\mathbf{4 1}$ | 21 | 95 | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | 21 | 95 |  |
| $\mathbf{3 , 0 7 7}$ | 2,111 | 46 | $\mathbf{3 , 0 7 7}$ | 2,111 | 46 |  |
| $\mathbf{3 , 2 8 5}$ | 2,255 | 46 | $\mathbf{3 , 2 8 5}$ | 2,255 | 46 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 , 6 8 6}$ | 3,034 | $(11)$ | $\mathbf{2 , 6 8 6}$ | 3,034 | $(11)$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ | 272 | $(2)$ | $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ | 272 | $(2)$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2 , 9 5 3}$ | 3,306 | $(11)$ | $\mathbf{2 , 9 5 3}$ | 3,306 | $(11)$ |  |


| Net charge-off rate | 0.74\% | 0.67\% | 0.85\% | 0.57\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allowance for loan losses to period-end |  |  |  |  |
| loans retained | 2.82 | 2.87 | 2.82 | 2.87 |
| Allowance for loan losses to average loans retained | 2.81 | 2.79 | 2.80 | 2.73 |
| Allowance for loan losses to nonperforming loans retained | 88 | 145 | 88 | 145 |
| Nonperforming loans to period-end loans | 3.22 | 1.99 | 3.22 | 1.99 |
| Nonperforming loans to average loans | 3.21 | 1.94 | 3.20 | 1.89 |
| (a) Liability <br> balances <br> include <br> deposits, as well as deposits that are swept to on balance sheet liabilities (e.g., commercial paper, federal funds purchased, time deposits and securities loaned or sold under repurchase agreements) as part of customer cash management programs. |  |  |  |  |
| (b) Allowance for loan losses of $\$ 586$ million and $\$ 460$ million were held against nonperforming loans retained at June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively. |  |  |  |  |
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## TREASURY \& SECURITIES SERVICES

For a discussion of the business profile of TSS, see pages 56-57 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report and Introduction on page 6 of this Form 10-Q.

Selected income statement data (in millions, except headcount and ratios)

Three months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

Revenue
Lending- and deposit-related fees
Asset management, administration and
commissions
All other income
Noninterest revenue
Net interest income
Total net revenue
Provision for credit lo
Credit reimbursement
Noninterest expense

| Compensation expense | $\mathbf{6 9 7}$ | 618 | 13 | $\mathbf{1 , 3 5 4}$ | 1,247 | 9 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Noncompensation expense | $\mathbf{6 8 4}$ | 650 | 5 | $\mathbf{1 , 3 3 4}$ | 1,321 | 1 |  |
| Amortization of intangibles | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 20 | $(10)$ | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | 39 | $(8)$ |  |
| Total noninterest expense | $\mathbf{1 , 3 9 9}$ | 1,288 | 9 | $\mathbf{2 , 7 2 4}$ | 2,607 | 4 |  |
| Income before income tax expense |  | $\mathbf{4 6 8}$ | 587 | $(20)$ | $\mathbf{9 0 8}$ | 1,065 | $(15)$ |
| Income tax expense | $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ | 208 | $(15)$ | $\mathbf{3 3 7}$ | 378 | $(11)$ |  |
| Net income | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 2}$ | $\$$ | 379 | $(23)$ | $\$$ | $\mathbf{5 7 1}$ |
|  | $\$$ | 687 | $(17)$ |  |  |  |  |

## Revenue by business

| Treasury Services | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 6}$ | $\$$ | 934 | (1) | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 0 8}$ | $\$$ | 1,865 | (3) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Worldwide Securities Services |  | $\mathbf{9 5 5}$ |  | 966 | (1) |  | $\mathbf{1 , 8 2 9}$ |  | 1,856 | (1) |
| Total net revenue | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 8 1}$ | $\$$ | 1,900 | $(1)$ | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 6 3 7}$ | $\$$ | 3,721 | (2) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Financial ratios |  | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $30 \%$ |  |  | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ |  | $28 \%$ |  |  |
| Return on common equity | $\mathbf{7 4}$ | 68 |  |  | $\mathbf{7 5}$ | 70 |  |  |  |  |
| Overhead ratio | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | 31 |  |  | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | 29 |  |  |  |  |
| Pretax margin ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Selected balance sheet data
(period-end)

| Loans $^{(b)}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 4 , 5 1 3}$ | $\$ 17,929$ | 37 | $\mathbf{\$ 2 4 , 5 1 3}$ | $\$ 17,929$ | 37 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Equity | $\mathbf{6 , 5 0 0}$ | 5,000 | 30 | $\mathbf{6 , 5 0 0}$ | 5,000 | 30 |

Selected balance sheet data (average)

| Total assets | $\mathbf{\$ 4 2 , 8 6 8}$ | $\$ 35,520$ | 21 | $\mathbf{\$ 4 0 , 5 8 3}$ | $\$ 37,092$ | 9 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Loans $^{(b)}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 , 1 3 7}$ | 17,524 | 26 | $\mathbf{2 0 , 8 6 5}$ | 18,825 | 11 |
| Liability balances $^{(c)}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 6 , 6 9 0}$ | 234,163 | 5 | $\mathbf{2 4 7 , 2 9 4}$ | 255,208 | $(3)$ |
| Equity | $\mathbf{6 , 5 0 0}$ | 5,000 | 30 | $\mathbf{6 , 5 0 0}$ | 5,000 | 30 |
| Headcount | $\mathbf{2 7 , 9 4 3}$ | 27,252 | 3 | $\mathbf{2 7 , 9 4 3}$ | 27,252 | 3 |

(a) IB credit portfolio group manages certain exposures on behalf of clients shared with TSS. TSS reimburses IB for a portion of the total cost of managing the credit portfolio. IB recognizes
this credit
reimbursement as a component of noninterest revenue.
(b) Loan balances include
wholesale
overdrafts, commercial card and trade finance loans.
(c) Liability
balances
include
deposits, as well
as deposits that
are swept to
on-balance
sheet liabilities
(e.g.,
commercial
paper, federal
funds
purchased, time
deposits and securities

[^1]
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## Quarterly results

Net income was $\$ 292$ million, a decrease of $\$ 87$ million, or $23 \%$, from the prior year. These results reflected lower net revenue and higher noninterest expense.
Net revenue was $\$ 1.9$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 19$ million, or $1 \%$, from the prior year. Worldwide Securities Services net revenue was $\$ 955$ million, relatively flat compared with the prior year, as lower spreads in securities lending and the impact of lower volatility on foreign exchange were offset by higher market levels and net inflows of assets under custody. Similarly, TS net revenue was $\$ 926$ million, relatively flat as lower deposit spreads were offset by higher trade loan and card product volumes.
TSS generated firmwide net revenue of $\$ 2.6$ billion, including $\$ 1.7$ billion by TS; of that amount, $\$ 926$ million was recorded in TS, $\$ 665$ million in CB and $\$ 62$ million in other lines of business. The remaining $\$ 955$ million of firmwide net revenue was recorded in Worldwide Securities Services.
The provision for credit losses was a benefit of $\$ 16$ million, compared with a benefit of $\$ 5$ million in the prior year. Noninterest expense was $\$ 1.4$ billion, up $\$ 111$ million, or $9 \%$ from the prior year. The increase was driven by higher performance-based compensation and continued investment in new product platforms, primarily related to international expansion.

## Year-to-date results

Net income was $\$ 571$ million, a decrease of $\$ 116$ million, or $17 \%$, from the prior year. These results reflected lower net revenue and higher noninterest expense.
Net revenue was $\$ 3.6$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 84$ million, or $2 \%$ from the prior year. Worldwide Securities Services net revenue of $\$ 1.8$ billion was relatively flat as lower spreads in securities lending, the impact of lower volatility on foreign exchange and lower balances on liability products, were offset by the effects of higher market levels and net inflows of assets under custody. TS net revenue was $\$ 1.8$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 57$ million, or $3 \%$. The decrease primarily reflected lower deposit spreads, partially offset by higher trade loan and card product volumes. TSS generated firmwide net revenue of $\$ 5.1$ billion, including $\$ 3.2$ billion by TS; of that amount, $\$ 1.8$ billion was recorded in TS, $\$ 1.3$ billion in CB and $\$ 118$ million in other lines of business. The remaining $\$ 1.8$ billion of net revenue was recorded in Worldwide Securities Services.
The provision for credit losses was a benefit of $\$ 55$ million compared with a benefit of $\$ 11$ million in the prior year. Noninterest expense was $\$ 2.7$ billion, up $\$ 117$ million, or $4 \%$. The increase was driven by higher performance-based compensation as well as continued investment in new product platforms, primarily related to international expansion.
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| Allowance for loan losses to nonperforming loans | $\mathbf{3 4 3}$ | 107 | $\mathbf{3 4 3}$ | 107 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Nonperforming loans to period-end loans | $\mathbf{0 . 0 6}$ | 0.08 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 6}$ | 0.08 |
| Nonperforming loans to average loans | $\mathbf{0 . 0 6}$ | 0.08 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7}$ | 0.07 |

(a) TSS firmwide revenue
includes foreign
exchange
( $F X$ ) revenue
recorded in TSS
and $F X$ revenue
associated with
TSS customers
who are FX
customers of IB.
However, some
of the FX
revenue
associated with
TSS customers
who are FX
customers of IB
is not included
in TS and TSS
firmwide
revenue. The
total FX
revenue
generated was
$\$ 175$ million
and
$\$ 191$ million for
the three months
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009,
respectively,
and
$\$ 312$ million
and
$\$ 345$ million for
the six months
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009,
respectively.
(b) Firmwide
liability
balances
include liability
balances
recorded in $C B$.
(c) Overhead ratios have been calculated based on
firmwide revenue and
TSS and TS
expense,
respectively, including those allocated to certain other lines of business. FX revenue and expense recorded in IB for TSS-related FX activity are not included in this ratio.
(d) International electronic funds
transfer
includes
non-U.S. dollar
Automated
Clearing House
( ACH ) and
clearing
volume.
(e) Wholesale cards
issued and
outstanding
include U.S.
domestic
commercial,
stored value,
prepaid and
government
electronic
benefit card
products.
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## ASSET MANAGEMENT

For a discussion of the business profile of AM, see pages 71-73 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report and Introduction on page 6 of this Form 10-Q.

Selected income statement data (in millions, except ratios)

Three months ended June 30, 20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, $2010 \quad 2009$ Change

Revenue:
Asset management,


## Revenue by client segment

| Private Bank | \$ 695 | \$ 640 | 9 | \$1,393 | \$ 1,223 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail | 482 | 411 | 17 | 897 | 664 | 35 |
| Institutional | 433 | 487 | (11) | 999 | 947 | 5 |
| Private Wealth Management | 348 | 334 | 4 | 691 | 646 | 7 |
| JPMorgan Securities ${ }^{(a)}$ | 110 | 110 |  | 219 | 205 | 7 |
| Total net revenue | \$2,068 | \$ 1,982 | 4 | \$4,199 | \$3,685 | 14 |
| Financial ratios |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Return on common equity | 24\% | 20\% |  | 24\% | 17\% |  |
| Overhead ratio | 68 | 68 |  | 68 | 72 |  |
| Pretax margin ratio | 32 | 29 |  | 31 | 26 |  |

(a) JPMorgan
Securities was
formerly known as Bear Stearns
Private Client
Services prior to January 1, 2010.
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## Quarterly results

Net income was $\$ 391$ million, an increase of $\$ 39$ million, or $11 \%$, from the prior year. These results reflected higher net revenue and a lower provision for credit losses, partially offset by higher noninterest expense.
Net revenue was $\$ 2.1$ billion, an increase of $\$ 86$ million, or $4 \%$, from the prior year. Noninterest revenue was $\$ 1.7$ billion, up by $\$ 131$ million, or $8 \%$, due to the effects of higher market levels, net inflows to products with higher margins and higher performance fees, partially offset by lower quarterly valuations of seed capital investments. Net interest income was $\$ 369$ million, down by $\$ 45$ million, or $11 \%$, due to narrower deposit spreads, largely offset by higher deposit balances.
Revenue from the Private Bank was $\$ 695$ million, up $9 \%$ from the prior year. Revenue from Retail was $\$ 482$ million, up 17\%. Revenue from Institutional was $\$ 433$ million, down $11 \%$. Revenue from Private Wealth Management was $\$ 348$ million, up 4\%. Revenue from JPMorgan Securities was $\$ 110$ million, flat compared with the prior year. The provision for credit losses was $\$ 5$ million, compared with $\$ 59$ million in the prior year.
Noninterest expense was $\$ 1.4$ billion, an increase of $\$ 51$ million, or $4 \%$, from the prior year, reflecting higher headcount.

## Year-to-date results

Net income was $\$ 783$ million, an increase of $\$ 207$ million, or $36 \%$, from the prior year, due to higher net revenue and a lower provision for credit losses, partially offset by higher noninterest expense.
Net revenue was $\$ 4.2$ billion, an increase of $\$ 514$ million, or $14 \%$, from the prior year. Noninterest revenue was $\$ 3.5$ billion, an increase of $\$ 605$ million, or $21 \%$, due to the effects of higher market levels, higher placement fees, net inflows to products with higher margins and higher performance fees. Net interest income was $\$ 726$ million, down by $\$ 91$ million, or $11 \%$, from the prior year, due to narrower deposit spreads, partially offset by higher deposit balances. Revenue from the Private Bank was $\$ 1.4$ billion, up $14 \%$ from the prior year. Revenue from Institutional was $\$ 999$ million, up $5 \%$. Revenue from Retail was $\$ 897$ million, up $35 \%$. Revenue from Private Wealth Management was $\$ 691$ million, up 7\%. Revenue from JPMorgan Securities was $\$ 219$ million, up 7\%.
The provision for credit losses was $\$ 40$ million, compared with $\$ 92$ million in the prior year.
Noninterest expense was $\$ 2.8$ billion, an increase of $\$ 195$ million, or $7 \%$, from the prior year due to higher performance-based compensation and higher headcount.
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| Business metrics (in millions, except headcount, ratios, ranking data, and where otherwise noted) | Three months ended June 30, |  |  | Six months ended June 30, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2009 | Change | 2010 | 2009 | Change |
| Number of: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Client advisors | 2,055 | 1,838 | 12\% | 2,055 | 1,838 | 12\% |
| Retirement planning services participants (in thousands) | 1,653 | 1,595 | 4 | 1,653 | 1,595 | 4 |
| JPMorgan Securities brokers ${ }^{(a)}$ | 402 | 362 | 11 | 402 | 362 | 11 |
| \% of customer assets in 4 \& 5 Star |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Funds ${ }^{(b)}$ | 43\% | 45\% | (4) | 43\% | 45\% | (4) |
| $\%$ of AUM in $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ quartiles: ${ }^{(c)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 year | 58\% | 62\% | (6) | 58\% | 62\% | (6) |
| 3 years | 67\% | 69\% | (3) | 67\% | 69\% | (3) |
| 5 years | 78\% | 80\% | (3) | 78\% | 80\% | (3) |
| Selected balance sheet data (period-end) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans | \$38,744 | \$35,474 | 9 | \$38,744 | \$35,474 | 9 |
| Equity | 6,500 | 7,000 | (7) | 6,500 | 7,000 | (7) |
| Selected balance sheet data (average) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total assets | \$63,426 | \$59,334 | 7 | \$62,978 | \$58,783 | 7 |
| Loans | 37,407 | 34,292 | 9 | 37,007 | 34,438 | 7 |
| Deposits | 86,453 | 75,355 | 15 | 83,573 | 78,534 | 6 |
| Equity | 6,500 | 7,000 | (7) | 6,500 | 7,000 | (7) |
| Headcount | 16,019 | 14,840 | 8 | 16,019 | 14,840 | 8 |
| Credit data and quality statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net charge-offs | \$ 27 | \$ 46 | (41) | \$ 55 | \$ 65 | (15) |
| Nonperforming loans | 309 | 313 | (1) | 309 | 313 | (1) |
| Allowance for credit losses: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allowance for loan losses | 250 | 226 | 11 | 250 | 226 | 11 |
| Allowance for lending-related commitments | 3 | 4 | (25) | 3 | 4 | (25) |
| Total allowance for credit losses | 253 | 230 | 10 | 253 | 230 | 10 |
| Net charge-off rate | 0.29\% | 0.54\% |  | 0.30\% | 0.38\% |  |
| Allowance for loan losses to period-end |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| loans | 0.65 | 0.64 |  | 0.65 | 0.64 |  |
| Allowance for loan losses to average |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| loans | 0.67 | 0.66 |  | 0.68 | 0.66 |  |
| Allowance for loan losses to nonperforming loans | 81 | 72 |  | 81 | 72 |  |
| Nonperforming loans to period-end loans | 0.80 | 0.88 |  | 0.80 | 0.88 |  |

Nonperforming loans to average loans
0.83
0.91
0.83
0.91
(a) JPMorgan

Securities was
formerly known
as Bear Stearns
Private Client
Services prior to
January 1, 2010.
(b) Derived from

Morningstar for
the U.S., the
U.K.,

Luxembourg,
France, Hong
Kong and
Taiwan; and
Nomura for
Japan.
(c) Quartile
rankings
sourced from
Lipper for the U.S. and

Taiwan;
Morningstar for
the U.K.,
Luxembourg,
France and
Hong Kong;
and Nomura for
Japan.
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## Assets under supervision

Assets under supervision were $\$ 1.6$ trillion, an increase of $\$ 97$ billion, or $6 \%$, from the prior year. Assets under management were $\$ 1.2$ trillion, a decrease of $\$ 10$ billion, or $1 \%$, due to outflows in liquidity products, predominantly offset by inflows in fixed income and equity products and the effect of higher market levels. Custody, brokerage, administration and deposit balances were $\$ 479$ billion, up by $\$ 107$ billion, or $29 \%$, due to custody and brokerage inflows and the effect of higher market levels.

| ASSETS UNDER SUPERVISION ${ }^{(a)}$ (in billions) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| As of June 30, |  | 2010 |  | 2009 |
| Assets by asset class |  |  |  |  |
| Liquidity |  | 489 |  | 617 |
| Fixed income |  | 259 |  | 194 |
| Equities and multi-asset |  | 322 |  | 264 |
| Alternatives |  | 91 |  | 96 |
| Total assets under management |  | 1,161 |  | 1,171 |
| Custody/brokerage/administration/deposits |  | 479 |  | 372 |
| Total assets under supervision |  | 1,640 |  | 1,543 |
| Assets by client segment |  |  |  |  |
| Institutional |  | 634 |  | 697 |
| Private Bank |  | 177 |  | 179 |
| Retail |  | 269 |  | 216 |
| Private Wealth Management |  | 66 |  | 67 |
| JPMorgan Securities ${ }^{(b)}$ |  | 15 |  | 12 |
| Total assets under management |  | 1,161 |  | 1,171 |
| Institutional |  | 636 |  | 697 |
| Private Bank |  | 469 |  | 390 |
| Retail |  | 351 |  | 289 |
| Private Wealth Management |  | 130 |  | 123 |
| JPMorgan Securities ${ }^{(b)}$ |  | 54 |  | 44 |
| Total assets under supervision |  | 1,640 |  | 1,543 |
| Assets by geographic region |  |  |  |  |
| U.S./Canada |  | 791 |  | 814 |
| International |  | 370 |  | 357 |
| Total assets under management |  | 1,161 |  | 1,171 |
| U.S./Canada |  | 1,151 |  | 1,103 |

Assets by geographic region
U.S./Canada $\quad \$ 791 \quad \$ 814$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { International } & 370 & 357\end{array}$
\$ 1,151

| International |  |  | 489 |  | 440 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total assets under supervision |  |  | ,640 |  | ,543 |
| Mutual fund assets by asset class |  |  |  |  |  |
| Liquidity |  |  |  | \$ | 569 |
| Fixed income |  |  | 79 |  | 48 |
| Equities and multi-asset |  |  | 133 |  | 111 |
| Alternatives |  |  | 8 |  | 9 |
| Total mutual fund assets |  |  |  | \$ | 737 |
| (a) Excludes assets under management of American Century Companies, Inc., in which the Firm had a $42 \%$ ownership at both June 30, 2010 and 2009. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) JPMorgan <br> Securities was <br> formerly known <br> as Bear Stearns <br> Private Client <br> Services prior to <br> January 1, <br> 2010. |  |  |  |  |  |
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Assets under management rollforward
(in billions)

Beginning balance
Net asset flows:
Liquidity
Fixed income
Equities, multi-asset and alternatives
Market/performance/other impacts

Total assets under management

## Assets under supervision rollforward

| Beginning balance | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 7 0 7}$ | $\$ 1,464$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 7 0 1}$ | $\$ 1,496$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Net asset flows | $\mathbf{( 4 )}$ | $(9)$ | $\mathbf{( 1 4 )}$ | 16 |
| Market/performance/other impacts | $\mathbf{( 6 3 )}$ | 88 | $\mathbf{( 4 7 )}$ | 31 |
| Total assets under supervision | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 4 0}$ | $\$ 1,543$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 4 0}$ | $\$ 1,543$ |

CORPORATE / PRIVATE EQUITY
For a discussion of the business profile of Corporate/Private Equity, see pages 74-75 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.

Selected income statement data (in millions, except headcount)

Three months ended June 30,
20102009 Change

Six months ended June 30, 2010 2009 Change

Revenue

| Principal transactions | \$ (69) | \$ 1,243 | NM | \$ 478 | \$ (250) | NM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Securities gains | 990 | 366 | 170\% | 1,600 | 580 | 176\% |
| All other income | 182 | (209) | NM | 306 | (228) | NM |
| Noninterest revenue | 1,103 | 1,400 | (21) | 2,384 | 102 | NM |
| Net interest income | 747 | 865 | (14) | 1,823 | 1,854 | (2) |
| Total net revenue ${ }^{(a)}$ | 1,850 | 2,265 | (18) | 4,207 | 1,956 | 115 |
| Provision for credit losses | (2) | 9 | NM | 15 | 9 | 67 |
| Noninterest expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compensation expense | 770 | 655 | 18 | 1,245 | 1,296 | (4) |
| Noncompensation expense ${ }^{(b)}$ | 1,468 | 1,319 | 11 | 4,509 | 1,664 | 171 |
| Merger costs |  | 143 | NM |  | 348 | NM |
| Subtotal | 2,238 | 2,117 | 6 | 5,754 | 3,308 | 74 |
|  | $(1,192)$ | $(1,253)$ | 5 | $(2,372)$ | $(2,532)$ | 6 |

Net expense allocated to other businesses

| Total noninterest expense |  | 1,046 |  | 864 | 21 |  | 3,382 |  | 776 | 336 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income before income tax expense |  | 806 |  | 1,392 | (42) |  | 810 |  | 1,171 | (31) |
| Income tax expense/(benefit) ${ }^{(c)}$ |  | 153 |  | 584 | (74) |  | (71) |  | 625 | NM |
| Net income | \$ |  | \$ | 808 | (19) | \$ | 881 | \$ | 546 | 61 |
| Total net revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private equity | \$ | 48 | \$ | (1) | NM | \$ | 163 | \$ | (450) | NM |
| Corporate |  | 1,802 |  | 2,266 | (20) |  | 4,044 |  | 2,406 | 68 |
| Total net revenue | \$ | 1,850 | \$ | 2,265 | (18) | \$ | 4,207 | \$ | 1,956 | 115 |
| Net income/(loss) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private equity | \$ | 11 | \$ | (27) | NM | \$ | 66 | \$ | (307) | NM |
| Corporate ${ }^{(d)}$ |  | 642 |  | 835 | (23) |  | 815 |  | 853 | (4) |
| Total net income | \$ | 653 | \$ | 808 | (19) | \$ | 881 | \$ | 546 | 61 |
| Headcount |  | 9,482 |  | 1,522 | (9) |  | 9,482 |  | 1,522 | (9) |

[^2]respectively.
(b) The three and six months ended June 30, 2010, included litigation expense of $\$ 694$ million and $\$ 3.0$ billion, respectively.
The second quarter of 2009 included a \$675 million FDIC special assessment.
(c) The income tax expense in the first quarter of 2010 includes tax benefits recognized upon the resolution of tax audits.
(d) The 2009
periods included merger costs and the extraordinary gain related to the Washington Mutual transaction, as well as items related to the Bear Stearns merger, including merger costs, asset management liquidation costs and Bear Stearns Private Client Services (which was renamed to JPMorgan

## Securities

effective
January 2010)
broker retention expense.
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## Quarterly results

Net income was $\$ 653$ million, compared with net income of $\$ 808$ million in the prior year.
Private Equity net income was $\$ 11$ million, compared with a net loss of $\$ 27$ million in the prior year. Net revenue was $\$ 48$ million, an increase of $\$ 49$ million, driven by higher private equity gains from more favorable market conditions and underlying performance on certain portfolio investments. Noninterest expense was $\$ 32$ million, a decrease of $\$ 10$ million.
Corporate net income was $\$ 642$ million, compared with $\$ 835$ million in the prior year. Net revenue was $\$ 1.8$ billion, a decrease of $\$ 464$ million, reflecting lower trading revenue primarily from the absence of spread tightening and increases in asset prices experienced in the second quarter of 2009; the decrease was offset partially by higher securities gains, from the repositioning of the investment portfolio. Noninterest expense was $\$ 1.0$ billion, up from $\$ 822$ million in the prior year, largely due to higher litigation expense.

## Year-to-date results

Net income was $\$ 881$ million, compared with $\$ 546$ million in the prior year.
Private Equity net income was $\$ 66$ million, compared with a net loss of $\$ 307$ million in the prior year. Net revenue was $\$ 163$ million, an increase of $\$ 613$ million, driven by higher private equity gains from more favorable market conditions and underlying performance on certain portfolio investments. Noninterest expense was $\$ 62$ million, an increase of \$31 million.
Net income for Corporate was $\$ 815$ million compared with $\$ 853$ million. Net revenue was $\$ 4.0$ billion compared with $\$ 2.4$ billion reflecting elevated levels of securities gains from the investment portfolio. Noninterest expense was $\$ 3.3$ billion compared with $\$ 744$ million, reflecting an increase of litigation reserves. Prior year included a $\$ 675$ million FDIC special assessment.

## Treasury and Chief Investment Office ( CIO )

Selected income statement and Three months ended June 30, Six months ended June 30, balance sheet data

| (in millions) | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |  | 2009 |  | Change | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |  | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | Change

(a) Reflects
repositioning of
the Corporate
investment
securities
portfolio and
excludes
gains/losses on
securities used
to manage risk
associated with
MSRs.
For further information on the investment portfolio, see Note 3 and Note 11 on pages 110-124 and 139-144, respectively, of this Form 10-Q. For further information on CIO VaR and the Firm s earnings-at-risk, see the Market Risk Management section on pages 95-98 of this Form 10-Q.

| Three months ended June |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selected income statement and balance sheet data (in millions) | 2010 | $\begin{array}{r} 30, \\ 2009 \end{array}$ | Change | Six m $2010$ | ths ended 2009 | une 30 , Change |
| Private equity gains/(losses) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Realized gains | \$ 78 | \$ 25 | 212\% | \$ 191 | \$ 40 | 378\% |
| Unrealized gains/(losses) ${ }^{(a)}$ | (7) | 16 | NM | (82) | (393) | 79 |
| Total direct investments | 71 | 41 | 73 | 109 | (353) | NM |
| Third-party fund investments | 4 | (61) | NM | 102 | (129) | NM |
| Total private equity gains/(losses) ${ }^{(b)}$ | \$ 75 | \$ (20) | NM | \$ 211 | \$ (482) | NM |
|  | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Private equity portfolio information ${ }^{(c)}$ <br> Direct investments

| (in millions) | $\begin{gathered} \text { June 30, } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { December 31, } \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ |  | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Publicly held securities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carrying value | \$ | 873 | \$ | 762 | 15\% |
| Cost |  | 901 |  | 743 | 21 |
| Quoted public value |  | 974 |  | 791 | 23 |
| Privately held direct securities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carrying value |  | 5,464 |  | 5,104 | 7 |
| Cost |  | 6,507 |  | 5,959 | 9 |
| Third-party fund investments ${ }^{(d)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carrying value |  | 1,782 |  | 1,459 | 22 |
| Cost |  | 2,315 |  | 2,079 | 11 |
| Total private equity portfolio Carrying value | \$ | 8,119 | \$ | 7,325 | 11 |
| Total private equity portfolio Cost | \$ | 9,723 | \$ | 8,781 | 11 |
| (a) Unrealized gains/(losses) contain reversals of unrealized gains and losses that were recognized in prior periods and have now been realized. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) Included in principal transactions revenue in the Consolidated Statements of Income. |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) For more information on the Firm s policies regarding the valuation of the private equity portfolio, see |  |  |  |  |  |
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Note 3 on pages
110-124 of this
Form 10-Q.
(d) Unfunded
commitments to
third-party
private equity
funds were
$\$ 1.2$ billion and
$\$ 1.5$ billion at
June 30, 2010,
and
December 31,
2009,
respectively.
The carrying value of the private equity portfolio at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, was $\$ 8.1$ billion and $\$ 7.3$ billion, respectively. The increase in the portfolio during the first half of the year is primarily due to approximately $\$ 1.0$ billion in new and follow-on investments, partially offset by unrealized losses on markdowns. The portfolio represented $6.6 \%$ and $6.3 \%$ of the Firm s stockholders equity less goodwill at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively.

## BALANCE SHEET ANALYSIS

Selected Consolidated Balance Sheets data(in millions)
June 30, 2010
December 31, 2009

Assets

| Cash and due from banks | $\mathbf{3 2 , 8 0 6}$ | $\$$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Deposits with banks | $\mathbf{3 9 , 4 3 0}$ | 63,206 |
| Federal funds sold and securities purchased under resale agreements | $\mathbf{1 9 9 , 0 2 4}$ | 195,404 |
| Securities borrowed | $\mathbf{1 2 2 , 2 8 9}$ | 119,630 |
| Trading assets: |  |  |
| Debt and equity instruments | $\mathbf{3 1 7 , 2 9 3}$ | 330,918 |
| Derivative receivables | $\mathbf{8 0 , 2 1 5}$ | 80,210 |
| Securities | $\mathbf{3 1 2 , 0 1 3}$ | 360,390 |
| Loans | $\mathbf{6 9 9 , 4 8 3}$ | 633,458 |
| Allowance for loan losses | $\mathbf{3 5 , 8 3 6}$ | $(31,602)$ |
|  |  |  |
| Loans, net of allowance for loan losses | $\mathbf{6 6 3 , 6 4 7}$ | 601,856 |
| Accrued interest and accounts receivable | $\mathbf{6 1 , 2 9 5}$ | 67,427 |
| Premises and equipment | $\mathbf{1 1 , 2 6 7}$ | 11,118 |
| Goodwill | $\mathbf{4 8 , 3 2 0}$ | 48,357 |
| Mortgage servicing rights | $\mathbf{1 1 , 8 5 3}$ | 15,531 |
| Other intangible assets | $\mathbf{4 , 1 7 8}$ | 4,621 |
| Other assets | $\mathbf{1 1 0 , 3 8 9}$ | 107,091 |

Total assets $\quad \mathbf{\$ 2 , 0 1 4 , 0 1 9} \$ 2,031,989$

| Liabilities |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Deposits | $\mathbf{8 8 7 , 8 0 5}$ | $\$ 938,367$ |
| Federal funds purchased and securities loaned or sold under repurchase |  |  |
| agreements | $\mathbf{2 3 7 , 4 5 5}$ | 261,413 |
| Commercial paper | $\mathbf{4 1 , 0 8 2}$ | 41,794 |
| Other borrowed funds | $\mathbf{4 4 , 4 3 1}$ | 55,740 |
| Trading liabilities: | $\mathbf{7 4 , 7 4 5}$ | 64,946 |
| Debt and equity instruments | $\mathbf{6 0 , 1 3 7}$ | 60,125 |
| Derivative payables | $\mathbf{1 6 0 , 4 7 8}$ | 162,696 |
| Accounts payable and other liabilities | $\mathbf{8 8 , 1 4 8}$ | 15,225 |
| Beneficial interests issued by consolidated VIEs | $\mathbf{2 4 8 , 6 1 8}$ | 266,318 |
| Long-term debt |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 , 8 4 2 , 8 9 9}$ | $1,866,624$ |
| Total liabilities | $\mathbf{1 7 1 , 1 2 0}$ | 165,365 |
| Stockholders equity |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 0 1 4 , 0 1 9}$ | $\$ 2,031,989$ |
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## Consolidated Balance Sheets overview

Total assets were $\$ 2.0$ trillion, down modestly from December 31, 2009. Total assets decreased, primarily as a result of repositioning the Firm s securities portfolio in response to changes in the interest rate environment, and reducing deposits with banks as market stress gradually eased since the end of 2009. The decrease was partially offset by an increase in loans, primarily due to the January 1, 2010, adoption of new consolidation guidance related to VIEs. Total liabilities were $\$ 1.8$ trillion, down modestly. The decrease in liabilities was a result of customer deposits declining primarily due to lower short-term funding needs. Partially offsetting these liability decreases was an increase in beneficial interests issued by consolidated VIEs, which was also a result of the adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs.
Stockholders equity was $\$ 171.1$ billion, an increase of $\$ 5.8$ billion, or $3 \%$, from the prior year-end. Stockholders equity increased driven predominantly by growth in net income and a net increase in accumulated other
comprehensive income ( AOCI ); these were partially offset by the cumulative effect of a change in accounting principles as a result of the adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs.
The following is a discussion of the significant changes in the specific line captions of the Consolidated Balance Sheets from December 31, 2009. For a description of the specific line captions discussed below, see pages 76-78 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.
Deposits with banks; federal funds sold and securities purchased under resale agreements; securities borrowed Deposits with banks decreased, largely due to lower deposits with the Federal Reserve Bank and lower interbank lending, as market stress gradually eased since the end of 2009. Securities purchased under resale agreements increased, predominantly due to higher financing volume in IB, offset partially by a decline in Corporate due to a reduced level of funds to be invested on a short-term basis. For additional information on the Firm s Liquidity Risk Management, see pages 65-67 of this Form 10-Q.

## Trading assets and liabilities debt and equity instruments

Trading assets debt and equity instruments decreased, primarily reflecting lower client flows as a result of unfavorable financial markets in the second quarter of 2010. Trading liabilities debt and equity instruments increased, reflecting an increase in business activity in markets outside of the U.S. (mainly Asia Pacific) in the first quarter of 2010; this was partially offset by unfavorable financial markets in the second quarter of 2010. For additional information, refer to Note 3 on pages 110-124 of this Form 10-Q.

## Trading assets and liabilities derivative receivables and payables

Derivative receivables and payables were flat and reflected the effect of declining interest rates and increased levels of foreign exchange-rate volatility, offset by declining equity valuations and lower energy and base metal commodity prices. For additional information, refer to Derivative contracts on pages 75-77, and Note 3 and Note 5 on pages 110-124 and 128-136, respectively, of this Form 10-Q.

## Securities

Securities decreased, largely due to repositioning of the Firm s securities portfolio in response to changes in the interest rate environment and to rebalance issuer exposures. The repositioning reduced U.S. government agency securities and increased non-U.S. mortgage-backed securities. The adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs, which resulted in the elimination of retained available-for-sale ( AFS ) securities issued by Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts, also contributed to the decrease. For a more detailed discussion of the adoption of the new consolidation guidance, see Note 1 on pages 108-109 of this Form 10-Q. For additional information related to securities, refer to the Corporate/Private Equity segment on pages 51-53, and Note 3 and Note 11 on pages 110-124 and 139-144, respectively, of this Form 10-Q.

## Loans and allowance for loan losses

Loans increased as a result of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs that required the Firm to consolidate the assets and liabilities of its Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts, Firm-administered multi-seller conduits and certain other consumer securitization entities, primarily mortgage-related. Excluding the impact of the adoption of the new accounting guidance, loans decreased due to the Washington Mutual credit card portfolio runoff; the decline in lower-yielding promotional credit card balances; continued runoff of the residential real estate portfolios; net repayments and loan sales in IB; and net charge-offs. Client demand, in general, remains low.
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The allowance for loan losses increased, largely due to the impact of new consolidation guidance related to VIEs that required the Firm to consolidate the assets and liabilities of its Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts. Excluding the effect of the new consolidation guidance, the allowance decreased, as a result of reductions of $\$ 2.0$ billion and $\$ 1.2$ billion in the wholesale and consumer allowances, respectively. The wholesale allowance decreased, due primarily to net repayments, loan sales, refinements to credit loss estimates, and improvement in the credit quality of the commercial and industrial portfolio. The consumer allowance decreased, as a result of a $\$ 2.5$ billion reduction for CS, reflecting lower estimated losses, primarily related to improved delinquency trends, as well as lower levels of outstandings; these were partially offset by a $\$ 1.2$ billion increase in the first quarter in RFS related to further estimated deterioration in the Washington Mutual prime and option ARM purchased credit-impaired pools. For a more detailed discussion of the adoption of the new consolidated guidance, see Notes 1, 14 and 15 on pages 108-109, 150-151 and 151-163, respectively, of this Form 10-Q. For a more detailed discussion of the loan portfolio and the allowance for loan losses, refer to Credit Portfolio on pages 68-94 and Notes 3, 4, 13 and 14 on pages 110-124, 125-127, 145-150 and 150-151, respectively, of this Form 10-Q.

## Accrued interest and accounts receivable

Accrued interest and accounts receivable decreased, due to the elimination of retained securitization interests upon the adoption of the new consolidation guidance that resulted in the consolidation of Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts. This decrease was offset partially by higher customer receivables in IB s Prime Services business due to increased client activity. For a more detailed discussion of the adoption of the new consolidated guidance, see Notes 1 and 15 on pages 108-109 and 151-163, respectively, of this Form 10-Q.

## Mortgage servicing rights

MSRs decreased, primarily due to a significant decline in market interest rates during the first six months of 2010, as well as servicing portfolio runoff. The decrease was partially offset by an increase related to sales in RFS of originated loans for which servicing rights were retained. For additional information on MSRs, see Note 16 on pages 165-166 of this Form 10-Q.

## Other intangible assets

Other intangible assets decreased, primarily as a result of amortization expense. For additional information on other intangible assets, see Note 16 on pages 164-167 of this Form 10-Q.

## Deposits

Deposits decreased, reflecting a decline associated with wholesale funding activities due to the Firm s lower funding needs, and the continued normalization of TSS deposit levels from year-end inflows. These factors were offset partially by net inflows from existing customers and new business in AM, CB and RFS. For more information on deposits, refer to the RFS and AM segment discussions on pages 25-35 and 47-51, respectively; the Liquidity Risk Management discussion on pages 65-67; and Note 17 on page 167 of this Form 10-Q. For more information on wholesale liability balances, including deposits, refer to the CB and TSS segment discussions on pages 41-43 and 44-46, respectively, of this Form 10-Q.

## Federal funds purchased and securities loaned or sold under repurchase agreements

Securities sold under repurchase agreements decreased, largely as a result of a decline in funding requirements associated with lower AFS securities in Corporate and reduced short-term funding requirements in IB. For additional information on the Firm s Liquidity Risk Management, see pages 65-67 of this Form 10-Q.

## Commercial paper and other borrowed funds

Commercial paper and other borrowed funds, which includes advances from Federal Home Loan Banks ( FHLBs ), decreased due to lower funding requirements. For additional information on the Firm s Liquidity Risk Management and other borrowed funds, see pages 65-67, and Note 18 on page 167 of this Form 10-Q.

## Beneficial interests issued by consolidated VIEs

Beneficial interests issued by consolidated VIEs increased, predominantly due to the adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs, offset modestly by maturities of $\$ 13.2$ billion related to Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts. For additional information on Firm-administered VIEs and loan securitization trusts, see Note 15 on pages 151-163 of this Form 10-Q.
Long-term debt

## Edgar Filing: J P MORGAN CHASE \& CO - Form 10-Q

Long-term debt decreased, predominantly due to maturities and redemptions, partially offset by new issuances. For additional information on the Firm s long-term debt activities, see the Liquidity Risk Management discussion on pages 65-67 of this Form 10-Q.
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## Stockholders equity

Total stockholders equity increased, as a result of growth in net income for the first six months of 2010; a net increase in AOCI, due primarily to the narrowing of spreads on mortgage-backed securities and collateralized loan obligations, offset partially by declines in non-U.S. government debt securities and realization of gains due to portfolio repositioning; and net issuances under the Firm s employee stock-based compensation plans. The increase in stockholders equity was partially offset by the impact of the adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs that resulted in a reduction of $\$ 4.5$ billion, driven by the establishment of an allowance for loan losses of $\$ 7.5$ billion (pretax) related to receivables held in credit card securitization trusts that were consolidated at the adoption date. Also partially offsetting the increase were the purchase of the remaining interest in a consolidated subsidiary from noncontrolling shareholders; the declaration of cash dividends on preferred and common stock; and stock repurchases. For a more detailed discussion of the adoption of new consolidated guidance, see Notes 1 and 15 on pages 108-109 and 151-163, respectively, of this Form 10-Q.

## OFF-BALANCE SHEET ARRANGEMENTS AND CONTRACTUAL CASH OBLIGATIONS

JPMorgan Chase is involved with several types of off-balance sheet arrangements, including through special-purpose entities ( SPEs ), which are a type of VIE, and through lending-related financial instruments (e.g., commitments and guarantees). For further discussion of contractual cash obligations, see Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements and Contractual Cash Obligations on pages 78-81 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.

## Special-purpose entities

SPEs are the most common type of VIE, used in securitization transactions in order to isolate certain assets and distribute the cash flows from those assets to investors. As a result of new accounting guidance, certain VIEs were consolidated on to the Firm s Consolidated Balance Sheets effective January 1, 2010. Nevertheless, SPEs continue to be an important part of the financial markets, including the mortgage- and asset-backed securities and commercial paper markets, as they provide market liquidity by facilitating investors access to specific portfolios of assets and risks. The Firm holds capital, as deemed appropriate, against all SPE-related transactions and related exposures, such as derivative transactions and lending-related commitments and guarantees. For further information on the Firm s involvement with SPEs, see Note 1 on pages 108-109 and Note 15 on pages 151-163 of this Form 10-Q; and Note 1 on pages 142-143, Note 15 on pages 198-205 and Note 16 on pages 206-214 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.
The Firm has no commitments to issue its own stock to support any SPE transaction, and its policies require that transactions with SPEs be conducted at arm s length and reflect market pricing. Consistent with this policy, no JPMorgan Chase employee is permitted to invest in SPEs with which the Firm is involved where such investment would violate the Firm s Code of Conduct. These rules prohibit employees from self-dealing and acting on behalf of the Firm in transactions with which they or their family have any significant financial interest.
Implications of a credit rating downgrade to JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.
For certain liquidity commitments to SPEs, the Firm could be required to provide funding if the short-term credit rating of JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. were downgraded below specific levels, primarily P-1, A-1 and F1 for Moody Standard \& Poor s and Fitch, respectively. The aggregate amount of these liquidity commitments, to both consolidated and nonconsolidated SPEs, were $\$ 36.1$ billion and $\$ 34.2$ billion at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively. Alternatively, if JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. were downgraded, the Firm could be replaced by another liquidity provider in lieu of providing funding under the liquidity commitment or, in certain circumstances, the Firm could facilitate the sale or refinancing of the assets in the SPE in order to provide liquidity.
Special-purpose entities revenue
The following table summarizes certain revenue information related to consolidated and nonconsolidated VIEs with which the Firm has significant involvement. The revenue reported in the table below primarily represents contractual servicing and credit fee income (i.e., income from acting as administrator, structurer or liquidity provider). It does not include MTM gains and losses from changes in the fair value of trading positions (such as derivative transactions) entered into with VIEs. Those gains and losses are recorded in principal transactions revenue.

|  | Three months ended June 30, |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (in millions) | 2010 | 2009 | 2010 | 2009 |
| Multi-seller conduits | \$ 60 | \$ 136 | \$ 127 | \$ 256 |
| Investor intermediation | 12 | 8 | 25 | 14 |
| Other securitization entities ${ }^{(a)}$ | 544 | 617 | 1,088 | 1,254 |
| Total | \$ 616 | \$ 761 | \$1,240 | \$1,524 |
| (a) Excludes |  |  |  |  |
| servicing |  |  |  |  |
| revenue from |  |  |  |  |
| loans sold to |  |  |  |  |
| and securitized |  |  |  |  |
| by third parties. |  |  |  |  |
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## Loan modifications

The Firm modifies loans that it services, including loans that were sold to off-balance sheet SPEs, pursuant to the U.S. Treasury s Making Home Affordable ( MHA ) programs and the Firm s other loss-mitigation programs. For both the Firm s on-balance sheet loans and loans serviced for others, approximately 121,000 and 281,000 mortgage modifications had been offered to borrowers during the three and six months ended June 30, 2010, respectively; and more than 59,000 and 123,000 permanent mortgage modifications were approved during the three and six months ended June 30, 2010, respectively. See Consumer Credit Portfolio on pages 79-91 of this Form 10-Q for more details on these loan modifications.
Off-balance sheet lending-related financial instruments, guarantees and other commitments
JPMorgan Chase uses lending-related financial instruments (e.g., commitments and guarantees) to meet the financing needs of its customers. The contractual amount of these financial instruments represents the maximum possible credit risk should the counterparty draw upon the commitment or the Firm be required to fulfill its obligation under the guarantee, and the counterparty subsequently fail to perform according to the terms of the contract. These commitments and guarantees often expire without being drawn, and even higher proportions expire without a default. As a result, the total contractual amount of these instruments is not, in the Firm s view, representative of its actual future credit exposure or funding requirements. For further discussion of lending-related commitments and guarantees and the Firm s accounting for them, see Lending-related commitments on page 77 and Note 22 on pages 170-174 of this Form 10-Q; and Lending-related commitments on page 105 and Note 31 on pages 230-234 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.
The following table presents, as of June 30, 2010, the amounts by contractual maturity of off-balance sheet lending-related financial instruments, guarantees and other commitments. The amounts in the table for credit card and home equity lending-related commitments represent the total available credit for these products. The Firm has not experienced, and does not anticipate, that all available lines of credit for these products would be utilized at the same time. The Firm can reduce or cancel these lines of credit by providing the borrower prior notice or, in some cases, without notice as permitted by law. The table excludes certain commitments and guarantees that do not have a contractual maturity date (e.g., loan sale and securitization-related indemnifications). For further discussion, see discussion of repurchase liability below and Note 22 on pages 170-174 of this Form 10-Q, and Note 31 on pages 230-234 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.
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Off balance sheet lending-related financial instruments, guarantees and other commitments
$\left.\begin{array}{lcccccc} & & \text { Dec. 31, } \\ \text { June 30, 2010 } \\ \text { Due after } \\ 3 \text { years }\end{array}\right)$

Lending-related
Consumer:

| Home equity senior lien | \$ 436 | \$ | 2,214 | \$ 6,076 | \$ 9,594 | \$ 18,320 | \$ 19,246 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Home equity junior lien | 788 |  | 5,453 | 11,944 | 15,800 | 33,985 | 37,231 |
| Prime mortgage | 958 |  |  |  |  | 958 | 1,654 |
| Subprime mortgage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Option ARMs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Auto loans | 5,852 |  | 172 | 3 | 2 | 6,029 | 5,467 |
| Credit card | 550,442 |  |  |  |  | 550,442 | 569,113 |
| All other loans | 8,828 |  | 257 | 102 | 1,020 | 10,207 | 11,229 |
| Total consumer | \$567,304 | \$ | 8,096 | \$18,125 | \$ 26,416 | \$619,941 | \$643,940 |

Wholesale:
Other unfunded commitments to extend

| $\operatorname{credit~}^{(a)(b)}$ | 60,894 | 102,796 | 20,677 | 3,726 | 188,093 | 192,145 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asset purchase agreements ${ }^{(b)}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 22,685 |
| Standby letters of credit and other financial guarantees ${ }^{(a)(c)(d)}$ | 26,882 | 47,226 | 13,058 | 4,001 | 91,167 | 91,485 |
| Unused advised lines of credit | 34,192 | 4,441 | 82 | 201 | 38,916 | 35,673 |
| Other letters of $\operatorname{credit}^{(a)(d)}$ | 3,700 | 2,158 | 518 |  | 6,376 | 5,167 |
| Total wholesale | 125,668 | 156,621 | 34,335 | 7,928 | 324,552 | 347,155 |
| Total lending-related | \$692,972 | \$164,717 | \$52,460 | \$ 34,344 | \$944,493 | \$991,095 |

Other guarantees and commitments
Securities lending

| guarantees ${ }^{(e)}$ | \$161,514 | \$ |  | \$ | \$ | \$161,514 | \$ 170,777 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Derivatives qualifying as guarantees ${ }^{(f)}$ | 8,642 |  | 871 | 41,875 | 27,871 | 79,259 | 87,191 |
| Equity investment commitments ${ }^{(g)}$ | 1,231 |  | 15 | 30 | 931 | 2,207 | 2,374 |
|  | 670 |  |  |  |  | 670 | 670 |

Building purchase commitment ${ }^{(h)}$
(a) At June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, represents the contractual amount net of risk participations totaling $\$ 609$ million and $\$ 643$ million, respectively, for other unfunded commitments to extend credit; $\$ 23.4$ billion and $\$ 24.6$ billion, respectively, for standby letters of credit and other financial guarantees; and $\$ 828$ million and $\$ 690$ million, respectively, for other letters of credit. In regulatory filings with the Federal Reserve these commitments are shown gross of risk participations.
(b) Upon the adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs, $\$ 24.2$ billion of lending-related commitments between the Firm and
Firm-administered multi-seller conduits were eliminated upon consolidation. The decrease in lending-related
commitments was partially offset by the addition of $\$ 6.5$ billion of unfunded commitments directly between the multi-seller conduits and clients; these unfunded commitments of the consolidated conduits are now included as off-balance sheet lending-related commitments of the Firm.
(c) At June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, includes unissued standby letters of credit commitments of $\$ 39.4$ billion and $\$ 38.4$ billion, respectively.
(d) At June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, JPMorgan Chase held collateral relating to $\$ 34.7$ billion and $\$ 31.5$ billion, respectively, of standby letters of credit; and $\$ 2.7$ billion and $\$ 1.3$ billion, respectively, of other letters of credit.
(e) At June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, collateral held by the Firm in support of
securities lending
indemnification
agreements totaled $\$ 164.5$ billion and \$173.2 billion, respectively. Securities lending collateral comprises primarily cash and securities issued by governments that are members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development ( OECD ) and U.S. government agencies.
(f) Represents notional amounts of derivatives qualifying as guarantees.
(g) At June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, includes unfunded commitments to third-party private equity funds of $\$ 1.2$ billion and $\$ 1.5$ billion, respectively. Also includes unfunded commitments for other equity investments of $\$ 981$ million and $\$ 897$ million, respectively. These commitments include $\$ 1.2$ billion and $\$ 1.5$ billion, respectively, related to investments that are generally fair
valued at net asset
value as discussed
in Note 3 on pages
110-124 of this
Form 10-Q.
(h) For further
information refer
to Building
purchase
commitment in
Note 22 on page
174 of this
Form 10-Q.
Repurchase liability
The Firm conducts a significant portion of its loan sale and securitization activities with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac (the GSEs ). In connection with these and other securitization transactions, the Firm makes certain representations and warranties that the loans sold meet certain requirements (e.g., type of collateral, underwriting standards, validity of borrower representations in connection with the loan, primary mortgage insurance is in force for any mortgage loan with a loan-to-value ratio ( LTV ) greater than $80 \%$, use of the GSEs standard legal documentation). The Firm may be required to repurchase the loans and/or indemnify the GSEs or other purchasers against losses due to material breaches of these representations and warranties. For additional information about the Firm s loan sale and securitization-related indemnifications, including a description of how the Firm estimates its repurchase liability, see Note 22 on pages 170174 of this Form 10-Q, and Note 31 on pages 230234 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report. The repurchase liability recorded by the Firm is estimated based on several factors, including the level of current and estimated probable future repurchase demands made by purchasers, the ability of the Firm to cure the defects identified
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in the repurchase demands (considering the types of those defects), and the severity of loss upon repurchase or foreclosure.
The Firm estimates probable future repurchase demands in part by considering the time period over which the GSEs or other purchasers typically demand repurchase. Although the GSEs or other purchasers may demand repurchase at any time, the majority of repurchase demands have historically related to loans that became delinquent in the first 24 to 36 months following origination of the mortgage loan. Currently, repurchase demands predominantly relate to the 2006 to 2008 vintages. During the second quarter of 2010, the Firm experienced a slight increase in repurchase demands across most vintages, including its older vintages. The Firm has considered this development in estimating its repurchase liability. To date, demands against the 2009 vintage have not been significant. The Firm attributes the comparatively favorable performance of the 2009 vintage to the tightened underwriting and loan qualification standards that were implemented in 2007 and 2008.
The primary reasons for repurchase demands relate to documents missing from the mortgage file. Other factors that give rise to repurchase demands include alleged misrepresentations relating to: (i) credit quality and/or undisclosed debt of the borrower; (ii) income level and/or employment status of the borrower; and (iii) appraised value of collateral. Ineligibility of the borrower for the particular product and mortgage insurance rescissions are other reasons for repurchase demands. While the Firm has demonstrated an ability to more frequently cure certain defects (for example, missing documents) than others, the Firm has not observed a direct relationship between the type of defect that causes the breach of representations and warranties and the severity of the realized loss.
Beginning in 2009, the mortgage insurers have more frequently rescinded mortgage insurance coverage. Accordingly, rescission of mortgage insurance has become a more significant cause of repurchase demands from the GSEs. While the Firm actively reviews all rescission notices from mortgage insurers and appeals them when appropriate, there can be no assurance regarding the success of the Firm s appeals. The Firm had unresolved mortgage insurance rescission notices on loans with an unpaid principal balance of $\$ 1.7$ billion and $\$ 1.5$ billion at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively.
As soon as practicable after receiving a repurchase demand from one of the GSEs (whether due to mortgage insurance rescission or alleged breach of another representation and warranty), the Firm evaluates the request and takes appropriate actions based on the nature of the repurchase demand. Loan-level negotiations with the GSEs are typical and the Firm seeks to provide a final response to a repurchase demand within three to four months of the date of receipt. The unpaid principal balance of loans subject to unresolved repurchase demands received from the GSEs was $\$ 1.4$ billion and $\$ 1.3$ billion at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively. Because the GSEs may make repurchase demands based on mortgage insurance rescission notices that remain unresolved, certain loans are the subject of both unresolved mortgage insurance rescission notices and unresolved repurchase demands. This overlapping population included approximately $\$ 220$ million and $\$ 175$ million of unpaid principal balances at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively.
The estimated loss resulting from the unresolved mortgage insurance rescission notices and repurchase demands from GSEs, after consideration of the Firm s ability to cure the identified defects, is considered in the Firm s recorded repurchase liability. In addition the Firm s recorded repurchase liability considers projected future demands that have not been presented. However, the repurchase liability recorded by the Firm incorporates a number of estimates requiring management judgment, such as the amount of probable future demands from purchasers (which is in part dependent on the amount of rescissions by mortgage insurers), the ability of the Firm to cure identified defects, the severity of loss upon repurchase or foreclosure and recoveries from third parties. Estimating the repurchase liability is further complicated by limited and rapidly changing historical data and uncertainty surrounding numerous external factors, including: (i) economic factors (e.g., further declines in home prices and changes in borrower behavior may lead to increases in the number of defaults, the severity of losses, or both), and (ii) the level of future demands, which is dependent, in part, on actions taken by third parties, such as the GSEs and mortgage insurers. While the Firm uses the best information available to it in estimating its repurchase liability, the estimation process is inherently uncertain and requires the application of judgment. An assumed simultaneous $10 \%$ adverse change in the assumptions noted above would increase the repurchase liability as of June 30, 2010, by approximately $\$ 1.2$ billion. This estimate is based upon a hypothetical scenario and is intended to provide an indication of the impact on the estimated repurchase
liability of significant and simultaneous adverse changes in the key underlying assumptions. Actual changes in these assumptions may not occur at the same time or to the same degree, or improvement in one factor may offset deterioration in another.
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The following table summarizes the change in the repurchase liability for each of the periods presented.

|  | Three months ended June 30, |  |  | Six months ended June 30 , |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (in millions) | 2010 |  | 09 | 2010 | 2009 |
| Repurchase liability at beginning of period | \$ 1,982 | \$ | 662 | \$ 1,705 | \$ 1,093 |
| Realized losses ${ }^{(a)}$ | (317) |  | (173) | (563) | (887) ${ }^{(b)}$ |
| Provision for repurchase losses | 667 |  | 267 | 1,190 | 550 |
| Repurchase liability at end of period | \$ 2,332 | \$ | 756 | \$ 2,332 | \$ 756 |

(a) Includes
principal losses
and accrued
interest on
repurchased
loans,
make-whole
settlements,
settlements with
claimants, and
certain related
expenses.
(b) Primarily
related to the
Firm s
settlement of
claims for
certain loans
originated and
sold by
Washington
Mutual. The
unpaid principal
balance of loans
related to this
settlement is not
included in the
first table
below, which
summarizes the
unpaid principal
balance of
repurchased
loans.
The Firm also sells loans in securitization transactions with Ginnie Mae; these loans are typically insured by the Federal Housing Administration ( FHA ), Rural Housing Administration ( RHA ) and/or guaranteed by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs ( VA ). The Firm, in its role as servicer, may elect to repurchase delinquent loans
securitized by Ginnie Mae in accordance with guidelines prescribed by Ginnie Mae, FHA, RHA and VA. Substantially all amounts due under the terms of these loans continue to be insured and the reimbursement of insured amounts is proceeding normally. Accordingly, the Firm has not recorded any repurchase liability related to these loans.
The following table summarizes the total unpaid principal balance of repurchases for the periods indicated.

|  | Three months ended June 30, |  |  | Six months ended June 30 , |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left(\right.$ in millions) ${ }^{(a)}$ | 2010 |  | 09 | 2010 | 2009 |
| Ginnie Mae ${ }^{(b)}$ | \$ 3,230 | \$ | 55 | \$ 5,240 | \$ 2,114 |
| GSEs and other ${ }^{(c)}$ | 515 |  | 350 | 837 | 498 |
| Total | \$ 3,745 | \$ | 405 | \$ 6,077 | \$ 2,612 |

(a) Excludes
mortgage
insurers. While
the rescission of
mortgage
insurance may
result in a
breach of
representations
and warranties,
which may
trigger a
repurchase
demand, the
mortgage
insurers
themselves do
not present
repurchase
demands to the
Firm.
(b) In substantially
all cases, these
repurchases
represent the
Firm s
voluntary
repurchase of certain
delinquent loans
from loan pools
or packages as
permitted by
Ginnie Mae
guidelines (i.e., they do not
result from
repurchase
demands due to
breaches of
representations
and warranties).
In certain cases,
the Firm
repurchases
these delinquent
loans as it
continues to
service them
and/or manage
the foreclosure
process in
accordance with
applicable
requirements of
Ginnie Mae, the
FHA, RHA
and/or the VA.
(c) Predominantly
all of the
repurchases
related to GSEs.
In lieu of repurchasing loans, the Firm may reimburse the purchaser for a realized loss on a liquidated property. The Firm has recognized these make-whole settlements for the periods indicated.

|  | Three months ended June |  | Six months ended June |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (in millions) | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 30, | 2009 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 2009 |  |
| GSEs and other ${ }^{(a)}$ | $\$ 150$ | $\$$ | 69 | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 5 5}$ | $\$ 125$ |

(a) Predominantly
all of the
settlements
related to GSEs.
Nonperforming loans held-for-investment included $\$ 293$ million and $\$ 218$ million at June 30, 2010, and
December 31, 2009, respectively, of loans repurchased due to breaches of representations and warranties.
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT
The following discussion of JPMorgan Chase s capital management highlights developments since December 31, 2009, and should be read in conjunction with Capital Management on pages 82-85 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.
The Firm s capital management objectives are to hold capital sufficient to:
Cover all material risks underlying the Firm s business activities;
Maintain well-capitalized status under regulatory requirements;
Achieve debt rating targets;
Remain flexible to take advantage of future opportunities; and
Build and invest in businesses, even in a highly stressed environment.

## Regulatory capital

The Federal Reserve establishes capital requirements, including well-capitalized standards for the consolidated financial holding company. The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency ( OCC ) establishes similar capital requirements and standards for the Firm s national banks, including JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. and Chase Bank USA, N.A. As of June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, JPMorgan Chase and all of its banking subsidiaries were well-capitalized and met all capital requirements to which each was subject.
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The following table presents the risk-based capital ratios for JPMorgan Chase and its significant banking subsidiaries at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009.

| (in millions, except ratios) | JPMorgan Chase \& Co. ${ }^{(e)}$ |  |  |  | JPMorgan Chase Bank,$\text { N.A. }{ }^{(e)}$ |  |  |  | Chase Bank USA,$\text { N.A. }{ }^{(e)}$ |  |  |  | Well-Minimum capitalizedapital ratios ${ }^{(g)}$ ratios $^{(g)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | June 30, 2010 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dec. 31, } \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { June 30, } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dec. 31, } \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { June 30, } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dec. } 31, \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Regulatory capital |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tier $1^{(a)}$ | \$ | 137,077 | \$ | 132,971 | \$ | 97,549 | \$ | 96,372 | \$ | 11,584 |  | 15,534 |  |  |
| Total |  | 178,293 |  | 177,073 |  | 135,654 |  | 136,646 |  | 15,418 |  | 19,198 |  |  |
| Tier 1 common ${ }^{(b)}$ |  | 108,175 |  | 105,284 |  | 96,795 |  | 95,353 |  | 11,584 |  | 15,534 |  |  |
| Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Risk-weighted ${ }^{(c)}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 , 1 3 1 , 0 3 0}(f)$ |  | 1,198,006 |  | 928,740 |  | 1,011,995 |  | 125,282 |  | 114,693 |  |  |
| Adjusted average ${ }^{(d)}$ |  | 1,983,839 ${ }_{(f)}$ |  | 1,933,767 |  | 1,600,868 |  | 1,609,081 |  | 130,911 |  | 74,087 |  |  |
| Capital ratios |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tier $1 \operatorname{capital}^{(a)}$ |  | 12.1\% ${ }_{(f)}$ |  | 11.1\% |  | 10.5\% |  | 9.5\% |  | 9.2\% |  | 13.5\% | 6.0\% | 4.0\% |
| Total capital |  | 15.8 |  | 14.8 |  | 14.6 |  | 13.5 |  | 12.3 |  | 16.7 | 10.0 | 8.0 |
| Tier 1 leverage |  | 6.9 |  | 6.9 |  | 6.1 |  | 6.0 |  | 8.8 |  | 21.0 | $5.0_{(h)}$ | $3.0_{(i)}$ |
| Tier 1 common ${ }^{(b)}$ |  | 9.6 |  | 8.8 |  | 10.4 |  | 9.4 |  | 9.2 |  | 13.5 | NA | NA |
| (a) At June 30, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010, for |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JPMorgan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chase and |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JPMorgan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chase Bank, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N.A., trust |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| preferred |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| capital debt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| securities were |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$20.7 billion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$600 million, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| respectively. If |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| these securities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| were excluded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| from the |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| calculation at |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| June 30, 2010, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tier 1 capitalwould be |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$116.4 billion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| and |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\$ 96.9$ billion,
respectively, and the Tier 1 capital ratio would be $10.3 \%$ and $10.4 \%$, respectively. At June 30, 2010,
Chase Bank USA, N.A. had no trust preferred capital debt securities.
(b) Tier 1 common ratio is Tier 1 common divided by risk-weighted assets. Tier 1 common is defined as Tier 1 capital less elements of capital not in the form of common equity such as perpetual preferred stock, noncontrolling interests in subsidiaries and trust preferred capital debt securities. Tier 1 common, a non-GAAP financial measure, is used by banking regulators, investors and analysts to assess and compare the quality and composition of the Firm s capital with the capital of other
financial
services
companies. The
Firm uses Tier 1
common along
with the other
capital
measures to
assess and
monitor its
capital position.
(c) Includes
off-balance
sheet
risk-weighted
assets at
June 30, 2010,
of
$\$ 269.4$ billion,
\$261.2 billion
and $\$ 32$ million,
respectively, for
JPMorgan
Chase,
JPMorgan
Chase Bank,
N.A. and Chase
Bank USA, N.A., and at
December 31, 2009, of $\$ 367.4$ billion, $\$ 312.3$ billion and $\$ 49.9$ billion, respectively. Risk-weighted assets are calculated in accordance with U.S. federal regulatory capital
standards.
(d) Adjusted average assets, for purposes of calculating the leverage ratio,
include total
average assets
adjusted for
unrealized
gains/(losses)
on securities, less deductions
for disallowed goodwill and other intangible assets, investments in certain subsidiaries, and the total adjusted carrying value of nonfinancial equity investments that are subject to deductions from Tier 1 capital.
(e) Asset and capital amounts
for JPMorgan
Chase $s$
banking
subsidiaries
reflect
intercompany
transactions;
whereas the
respective
amounts for
JPMorgan
Chase reflect the elimination
of intercompany
transactions.
(f) Effective
January 1,
2010, the Firm
adopted new guidance that amended the accounting for the consolidation of
VIEs, which resulted in a decrease in the Tier 1 capital ratio of 34 basis points. See Note
15 on pages
151-163 of this
Form 10-Q for further
information.
(g) As defined by the regulations issued by the Federal Reserve, OCC and FDIC.
(h) Represents requirements for banking subsidiaries
pursuant to regulations issued under the FDIC Improvement Act. There is no Tier 1 leverage component in the definition of a well-capitalized bank holding company.
(i) The minimum
Tier 1 leverage ratio for bank holding companies and banks is $3 \%$ or 4\%, depending on factors specified in regulations issued by the Federal Reserve and $O C C$.
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Note: Rating agencies allow measures of capital to be adjusted upward for deferred tax liabilities, which have resulted from both nontaxable business combinations and from tax-deductible goodwill. The Firm had deferred tax liabilities resulting from nontaxable business combinations of $\$ 730$ million and $\$ 812$ million at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively. Additionally, the Firm had deferred tax liabilities resulting from tax-deductible goodwill of $\$ 1.9$ billion and $\$ 1.7$ billion at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively.
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A reconciliation of the Firm s Total stockholders equity to Tier 1 common, Tier 1 capital and Total qualifying capital is presented in the table below:

| Risk-based capital components and assets (in millions) |  | June 30, 2010 | $\begin{gathered} \text { December 31, } \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tier 1 capital |  |  |  |  |
| Tier 1 common: |  |  |  |  |
| Total stockholders equity | \$ | 171,120 | \$ | 165,365 |
| Less: Preferred stock |  | 8,152 |  | 8,152 |
| Common stockholders equity |  | 162,968 |  | 157,213 |
| Effect of certain items in accumulated other comprehensive income/(loss) excluded from Tier 1 common equity |  | $(2,444)$ |  | 75 |
| Less: Goodwill ${ }^{(a)}$ |  | 46,466 |  | 46,630 |
| Fair value DVA on derivative and structured note liabilities related to the |  |  |  |  |
| Firm s credit quality |  | 1,558 |  | 912 |
| Investments in certain subsidiaries and other |  | 1,050 |  | 802 |
| Other intangible assets |  | 3,275 |  | 3,660 |
| Tier 1 common |  | 108,175 |  | 105,284 |
| Preferred stock |  | 8,152 |  | 8,152 |
| Qualifying hybrid securities and noncontrolling interests ${ }^{(b)}$ |  | 20,750 |  | 19,535 |
| Total Tier 1 capital |  | 137,077 |  | 132,971 |
| Tier 2 capital |  |  |  |  |
| Long-term debt and other instruments qualifying as Tier 2 |  | 26,984 |  | 28,977 |
| Qualifying allowance for credit losses |  | 14,474 |  | 15,296 |
| Adjustment for investments in certain subsidiaries and other |  | (242) |  | (171) |
| Total Tier 2 capital |  | 41,216 |  | 44,102 |
| Total qualifying capital | \$ | 178,293 | \$ | 177,073 |
| Risk-weighted assets |  | 1,131,030 |  | ,198,006 |
| Total adjusted average assets |  | 1,983,839 |  | ,933,767 |
| (a) Goodwill is net of any associated deferred tax liabilities. |  |  |  |  |
| (b) Primarily includes trust preferred |  |  |  |  |

## capital debt

securities of
certain business
trusts.
The Firm s Tier 1 common was $\$ 108.2$ billion at June 30, 2010, compared with $\$ 105.3$ billion at December 31, 2009, an increase of $\$ 2.9$ billion. The increase was predominantly due to net income (adjusted for DVA) of $\$ 7.5$ billion and net issuances of common stock under the Firm s employee stock-based compensation plans of $\$ 1.7$ billion. The increase was partially offset by the $\$ 4.4$ billion cumulative effect adjustment to retained earnings that resulted from the Firm s adoption of new consolidation guidance related to VIEs; a $\$ 1.3$ billion reduction in common stockholders equity related to the purchase of the remaining interest in a consolidated subsidiary from noncontrolling shareholders; dividends on preferred and common stock outstanding; and repurchases of common stock. The Firm s Tier 1 capital was $\$ 137.1$ billion at June 30, 2010, compared with $\$ 133.0$ billion at December 31, 2009, an increase of $\$ 4.1$ billion. The increase in Tier 1 capital reflected the increase in Tier 1 common, and an issuance of trust preferred capital debt securities. Additional information regarding the Firm s capital ratios and the federal regulatory capital standards to which it is subject is presented in Note 29 on pages 228-229 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.

## Basel II and Basel III

The minimum risk-based capital requirements adopted by the U.S. federal banking agencies follow the Capital Accord of the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. In 2004, the Basel Committee published a revision to the Accord ( Basel II ). The goal of the new Basel II Framework is to provide more risk-sensitive regulatory capital calculations and promote enhanced risk management practices among large, internationally active banking organizations. U.S. banking regulators published a final Basel II rule in December 2007, which will require JPMorgan Chase to implement Basel II at the holding company level, as well as at certain of its key U.S. bank subsidiaries. Prior to full implementation of the new Basel II Framework, JPMorgan Chase will be required to complete a qualification period of four consecutive quarters during which it will need to demonstrate that it meets the requirements of the new rule to the satisfaction of its primary U.S. banking regulators. The U.S. implementation timetable consists of the qualification period, starting no later than April 1, 2010, followed by a minimum transition period of three years. During the transition period, Basel II risk-based capital requirements cannot fall below certain floors based on current ( Basel 1 ) regulations. JPMorgan Chase is currently in the qualification period and expects to be in compliance with all relevant Basel II rules within the established timelines. In addition, the Firm has adopted, and will continue to adopt, based on various established timelines, Basel II rules in certain non-U.S. jurisdictions, as required.
In addition to the Basel II Framework, the Basel Committee is developing further proposed revisions to the Capital Accord (Basel III). In July 2010, the committee revised a broad range of potential changes, including narrowing the
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definition of capital, increasing capital requirements for specific exposures, introducing short-term liquidity coverage and term funding standards, and establishing an international leverage ratio. If these revisions were adopted as currently proposed, the Firm estimates that they would, taken together with the changes already approved by the Basel Committee for calculating capital on trading assets and securitizations, result in a reduction in the Firm s Tier 1 common ratio ranging from approximately 100 to 200 basis points. This estimate of the potential reduction in the Tier 1 common ratio reflects the Firm s current understanding of the proposed revisions and their application to its businesses as currently conducted; accordingly, this estimate will evolve over time as the Firm s businesses change and the requirements are finalized. In addition, if these revisions were adopted as currently proposed, the Firm believes it would need to modify the current liquidity profile of its assets and liabilities to become more liquid in response to the proposed short-term liquidity coverage and term funding standards. The Firm will continue to monitor the ongoing rule-making process to assess both the timing and the impact of Basel III on its businesses and financial condition.
Broker-dealer regulatory capital
JPMorgan Chase s principal U.S. broker-dealer subsidiaries are J.P. Morgan Securities Inc. ( JPMorgan Securities ) and J.P. Morgan Clearing Corp. J.P. Morgan Clearing Corp. is a subsidiary of JPMorgan Securities and provides clearing and settlement services. JPMorgan Securities and J.P. Morgan Clearing Corp. are each subject to Rule 15c3-1 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the Net Capital Rule ). JPMorgan Securities and J.P. Morgan Clearing Corp. are also registered as futures commission merchants and subject to Rule 1.17 under the Commodity Futures Trading Commission ( CFTC ).
JPMorgan Securities and J.P. Morgan Clearing Corp. have elected to compute their minimum net capital requirements in accordance with the Alternative Net Capital Requirements of the Net Capital Rule. At June 30, 2010, JPMorgan Securities net capital, as defined by the Net Capital Rule, was $\$ 7.5$ billion, exceeding the minimum requirement by $\$ 7.0$ billion. J.P. Morgan Clearing Corp s net capital was $\$ 5.5$ billion, exceeding the minimum requirement by $\$ 3.9$ billion.
In addition to its net capital requirements, JPMorgan Securities is required to hold tentative net capital in excess of $\$ 1.0$ billion and is also required to notify the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC ) in the event that tentative net capital is less than $\$ 5.0$ billion, in accordance with the market and credit risk standards of Appendix E of the Net Capital Rule. As of June 30, 2010, JPMorgan Securities had tentative net capital in excess of the minimum and notification requirements.

## Economic risk capital

JPMorgan Chase assesses its capital adequacy relative to the risks underlying its business activities, using internal risk-assessment methodologies. The Firm measures economic capital based primarily on four risk factors: credit, market, operational and private equity risk.

## Economic risk capital

(in billions)
Credit risk
Market risk
Operational risk
Private equity risk

## Economic risk capital

Goodwill
Other ${ }^{(a)}$

\$ 48.1 15.6
7.5
6.0
77.2
48.3
33.6
\$159.1
Quarterly Averages 4Q09 2Q09
\$ 48.5
\$ 51.9
15.8
15.7
7.9
4.9
77.1
80.5
48.3
48.3
31.1
\$156.5
\$140.9
(a) Reflects
additional
capital
required, in the
meet its
regulatory and
debt rating
objectives.

## Line-of-business equity

Equity for a line of business represents the amount the Firm believes the business would require if it were operating independently, incorporating sufficient capital to address economic risk measures, regulatory capital requirements and capital levels for similarly rated peers. Capital is also allocated to each line of business for, among other things, goodwill and other intangibles associated with acquisitions effected by the line of business. ROE is measured and internal targets for expected returns are established as a key measure of a business segment s performance.
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Effective January 1, 2010, the Firm enhanced its line of business equity framework to better align equity assigned to each line of business with the changes anticipated to occur in the line of business and to reflect the competitive and regulatory landscape. The lines of business are now capitalized based on the Tier 1 common standard, rather than the Tier 1 capital standard.

## Line-of-business equity



## Capital actions

Stock repurchases
Under the stock repurchase program authorized by the Firm s Board of Directors, the Firm is authorized to repurchase up to $\$ 10.0$ billion of the Firm s common stock plus 88 million warrants issued in 2008 as part of the U.S. Treasury s Capital Purchase Program. During the second quarter of 2010, the Firm resumed common stock repurchases, repurchasing a total of 3 million shares for $\$ 135$ million at an average price of $\$ 38.73$ per share. The Firm s current share repurchase activity is intended to offset share count increases resulting from employee equity awards and is consistent with the Firm s goal of maintaining an appropriate share count. The Firm did not repurchase any of the warrants. As of June 30, 2010, $\$ 6.1$ billion of authorized repurchase capacity remained with respect to the common stock, and all of the authorized repurchase capacity remained with respect to the warrants. For a further discussion of the Firm s stock repurchase program, see Stock repurchases on page 85 of JPMorgan Chase 2009 Annual Report. The Firm has determined that it may, from time to time, enter into written trading plans under Rule 10b5-1 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to facilitate the repurchase of common stock and warrants in accordance with the repurchase program. A Rule 10b5-1 repurchase plan allows the Firm to repurchase its equity during periods when it would not otherwise be repurchasing common stock for example, during internal trading black-out periods. All purchases under a Rule 10b5-1 plan must be made according to a predefined plan established when the Firm is not
aware of material nonpublic information. For additional information regarding repurchases of the Firm s equity securities, see Part II, Item 2, Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds, on pages 197-198 of this Form 10-Q.

## RISK MANAGEMENT

Risk is an inherent part of JPMorgan Chase s business activities. The Firm s risk management framework and governance structure are intended to provide comprehensive controls and ongoing management of the major risks inherent in its business activities. In addition, this framework recognizes the diversity among the Firm s core businesses, which helps reduce the impact of volatility in any particular area on the Firm s operating results as a whole. There are eight major types of risk identified in the business activities of the Firm: liquidity, credit, market, interest rate, operational, legal and reputation, fiduciary, and private equity risk.
For further discussion of these risks, see Risk Management on pages 86-126 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report and the information below.

## Table of Contents

## LIQUIDITY RISK MANAGEMENT

The following discussion of JPMorgan Chase s liquidity risk management framework highlights developments since December 31, 2009, and should be read in conjunction with pages 88-92 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report. The ability to maintain surplus levels of liquidity through economic cycles is crucial to financial services companies, particularly during periods of adverse conditions. The Firm s funding strategy is intended to ensure liquidity and diversity of funding sources to meet actual and contingent liabilities through both normal and stress periods. JPMorgan Chase s primary sources of liquidity include a diversified $\$ 887.8$ billion deposit base and access to the equity capital markets and long-term unsecured and secured funding sources, including asset securitizations and borrowings from FHLBs. Additionally, JPMorgan Chase maintains large pools of highly-liquid unencumbered assets. The Firm actively monitors its available capacity in the wholesale funding markets across various geographic regions and in various currencies. The Firm s ability to generate funding from a broad range of sources in a variety of geographic locations is intended to enhance financial flexibility and limit funding concentration risk.
Management considers the Firm s liquidity position to be strong, based on its liquidity metrics as of June 30, 2010, and believes that the Firm s unsecured and secured funding capacity is sufficient to meet its on- and off-balance sheet obligations at that date.

## Liquidity monitoring

The Firm centralizes the management of global funding and liquidity risk within Corporate Treasury to maximize liquidity access, minimize funding costs and enhance global identification and coordination of liquidity risk. The Firm utilizes a variety of metrics to monitor and manage liquidity. One set of analyses used by the Firm relates to the timing of liquidity sources versus liquidity uses (e.g., funding gap analysis and parent holding company funding, which is discussed below). The second set of analyses focuses on ratios of funding and liquid collateral (e.g., measurements of the Firm s reliance on short-term unsecured funding as a percentage of total liabilities, as well as analyses of the relationship of short-term unsecured funding to highly-liquid assets, the deposit-to-loan ratio and other balance sheet measures). The Firm conducts a variety of stress tests intended to ensure that ample liquidity is available through stressed as well as normal market conditions.

## Parent holding company

In addition to monitoring liquidity on a firm-wide basis, the Firm also monitors liquidity for the parent holding company. This monitoring takes into consideration regulatory restrictions that limit the extent to which bank subsidiaries may extend credit to the parent holding company and other nonbank subsidiaries. Excess cash generated by parent holding company issuance activity is placed with both bank and nonbank subsidiaries in the form of deposits and advances. As discussed below, the Firm s liquidity management is also intended to ensure that those subsidiaries have the ability to generate replacement funding in the event the parent holding company requires repayment.
The Firm closely monitors the ability of the parent holding company to meet all of its obligations with liquid sources of cash or cash equivalents for an extended period of time without access to the unsecured funding markets. The Firm targets pre-funding of parent holding company obligations for at least 12 months; however, due to conservative liquidity management actions taken by the Firm in the current environment, the current pre-funding of such obligations is significantly greater than target.

## Liquidity reserves

In addition to the parent holding company, the Firm maintains a significant amount of liquidity, primarily at its bank subsidiaries, but also at its nonbank subsidiaries. Liquidity reserves at bank subsidiaries include cash on deposit with central banks as well as high-quality unencumbered securities which can be quickly converted to cash through repurchase agreements or sales. Liquidity reserves fluctuate over time, reflecting market conditions and balance sheet composition. The Firm expects its current liquidity reserves to decrease over time as the economic environment stabilizes and loan demand increases. Although the Firm does not consider it to be a primary means of contingent funding, the Firm also maintains access to secured funding capacity through overnight borrowings from the Federal Reserve and various central banks collateralized by pledging certain loan and securities portfolios.
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## Sources of funds

A key strength of the Firm is its diversified deposit franchise through the RFS, CB, TSS and AM lines of business, which provides a stable source of funding and decreases reliance on the wholesale markets. As of June 30, 2010, total deposits for the Firm were $\$ 887.8$ billion, compared with $\$ 938.4$ billion at December 31, 2009. A significant portion of the Firm s deposits are retail deposits ( $41 \%$ and $38 \%$ at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively), which are considered particularly stable as they are less sensitive to interest rate changes or market volatility. A significant portion of the Firm s wholesale deposits are also considered to be stable sources of funding due to the nature of the relationships from which they are generated, particularly customers operating service relationships with the Firm. As of June 30, 2010, the Firm s deposit-to-loan ratio was $127 \%$, compared with $148 \%$ at December 31, 2009. The decline in the Firm s deposit-to-loan ratio was partly due to an increase in loans resulting from the January 1, 2010, implementation of new consolidation accounting guidance related to VIEs. For further discussions of deposit and liability balance trends, see the discussion of the results for the Firm s business segments and the Balance Sheet Analysis on pages 21-51 and 53-56, respectively, of this Form 10-Q. For a more detailed discussion of the adoption of the new consolidation guidance, see Note 1 on pages 108-109 of this Form 10-Q.
The Firm s reliance on short-term unsecured funding sources such as commercial paper, federal funds and Eurodollars purchased, certificates of deposit, time deposits, and bank notes is limited. Total commercial paper liabilities for the Firm were $\$ 41.1$ billion as of June 30, 2010, compared with $\$ 41.8$ billion as of December 31, 2009. However, of those totals, $\$ 30.9$ billion and $\$ 28.7$ billion as of June 30, 2010 and December 31, 2009, respectively, originated from deposits that customers chose to sweep into commercial paper liabilities as a cash management product offered by the Firm. Therefore, commercial paper liabilities sourced from wholesale funding markets were $\$ 10.2$ billion as of June 30, 2010, compared with $\$ 13.1$ billion as of December 31, 2009.

## Issuance

During the three months ended June 30, 2010, the Firm issued $\$ 7.1$ billion of long-term debt, including $\$ 1.3$ billion of senior notes issued in the U.S. market, $\$ 1.5$ billion of trust preferred capital debt securities, and $\$ 4.3$ billion of IB structured notes. During the six months ended June 30, 2010, the Firm issued $\$ 18.0$ billion of long-term debt, including $\$ 6.9$ billion of senior notes issued in the U.S. market, $\$ 904$ million of senior notes issued in non-U.S. markets, $\$ 1.5$ billion of trust preferred capital debt securities, and $\$ 8.7$ billion of IB structured notes. In addition, in July 2010, the Firm issued $\$ 2.9$ billion of senior notes in the U.S. market. During the three and six months ended June 30, 2010, $\$ 16.2$ billion and $\$ 30.3$ billion of long-term debt matured or were redeemed, including $\$ 5.4$ billion and $\$ 12.8$ billion of IB structured notes. The maturities or redemptions in the first six months of 2010 were partially offset by the issuances during the period.

## Replacement capital covenants

In connection with the issuance of certain of its trust preferred capital debt securities and its noncumulative perpetual preferred stock, the Firm has entered into Replacement Capital Covenants ( RCCs ). These RCCs grant certain rights to the holders of covered debt, as defined in the RCCs, that prohibit the repayment, redemption or purchase of such trust preferred capital debt securities and noncumulative perpetual preferred stock except, with limited exceptions, to the extent that JPMorgan Chase has received, in each such case, specified amounts of proceeds from the sale of certain qualifying securities. Currently, the Firm s covered debt is its $5.875 \%$ Junior Subordinated Deferrable Interest Debentures, Series O, due in 2035. For more information regarding these covenants, reference is made to the respective RCCs (including any supplements thereto) entered into by the Firm in relation to such trust preferred capital debt securities and noncumulative perpetual preferred stock, which are available in filings made by the Firm with the SEC.

## Cash flows

Cash and due from banks was $\$ 32.8$ billion and $\$ 25.1$ billion at June 30,2010 and 2009, respectively; these balances increased by $\$ 6.6$ billion from December 31, 2009, and decreased by $\$ 1.8$ billion from December 31, 2008. The following discussion highlights the major activities and transactions that affected JPMorgan Chase s cash flows during the first six months of 2010 and 2009.
Cash flows from operating activities

JPMorgan Chase s operating assets and liabilities support the Firm s capital markets and lending activities, including the origination or purchase of loans initially designated as held-for-sale. Operating assets and liabilities can vary significantly in the normal course of business due to the amount and timing of cash flows, which are affected by client-driven activities, market conditions and trading strategies. Management believes cash flows from operations, available cash balances and the Firm s ability to generate cash through short- and long-term borrowings are sufficient to fund the Firm s operating liquidity needs.
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For the six months ended June 30, 2010, net cash provided by operating activities was $\$ 47.6$ billion, primarily driven by an increase in trading liabilities, reflecting an increase in business activity in markets outside of the U.S., mainly Asia Pacific, in the first quarter of 2010, partially offset by a decrease in trading assets driven by lower client flows as a result of unfavorable financial markets in the second quarter of 2010. Also, net cash generated from operating activities was higher than net income, largely as a result of adjustments for non-cash items such as the provision for credit losses, stock-based compensation, and depreciation and amortization. Proceeds from sales and paydowns of loans originated or purchased with an initial intent to sell were higher than cash used to acquire such loans. For the six months ended June 30, 2009, net cash provided by operating activities was $\$ 103.3$ billion, largely due to a net decline in trading activity reflecting the effect of the challenging capital markets environment. In addition, net cash generated from operating activities was higher than net income; this was also partially the result of 2009 s non-cash adjustments which are the same non-cash items as those mentioned above for 2010. Proceeds from sales, securitizations and paydowns of loans originated or purchased with an initial intent to sell were higher than cash used to acquire such loans, but the cash flows from these loan activities remained at a reduced level as a result of the continued volatility and stress in the markets.

## Cash flows from investing activities

The Firm s investing activities predominantly include originating loans to be held for investment, the AFS securities portfolio and other short-term interest-earning assets. For the six months ended June 30, 2010, net cash of $\$ 73.7$ billion was provided by investing activities. This resulted from a decrease in deposits with banks largely due to a decline in deposits placed with the Federal Reserve Bank and lower interbank lending as market stress has gradually eased since the end of 2009; a net decrease in the loan portfolio, driven by a decline in credit card loans due to the runoff of the Washington Mutual portfolio and decrease in lower-yielding promotional loans, continued runoff of the residential real estate portfolios, repayments and loan sales in IB; continued low client demand; and proceeds from sales and maturities of AFS securities used in the Firm s interest rate risk management activities being higher than cash used to acquire such securities.
For the six months ended June 30, 2009, net cash of $\$ 36.3$ billion was provided by investing activities. This was primarily due to a decrease in deposits with banks, as interbank lending and deposits with the Federal Reserve Bank declined relative to the elevated level at the end of 2008; a net decrease in the loan portfolio, reflecting declines across all businesses, including lower customer demand in the wholesale businesses, the seasonal decline in credit card receivables, credit card securitization activities, and paydowns; and a decrease in securities purchased under resale agreements, reflecting a lower volume of excess cash available for short-term investments. Largely offsetting these cash proceeds were net purchases of AFS securities to manage the Firm s exposure to a declining interest rate environment.

## Cash flows from financing activities

The Firm s financing activities primarily reflect cash flows related to raising customer deposits, and issuing long-term debt (including trust preferred capital debt securities) as well as preferred and common stock. In the first six months of 2010 net cash used in financing activities was $\$ 114.2$ billion. This resulted from a decline in deposits associated with wholesale funding activities reflecting the Firm s lower funding needs; a decline in TSS deposits reflecting the normalization of deposit levels, offset partially by net inflows from existing customers and new business in AM, CB and RFS; net repayment of long-term debt and trust preferred capital debt securities as new issuances were more than offset by repayments; payments of cash dividends; and repurchases of common stock. Additionally, cash was used as a result of a decline in securities loaned or sold under repurchase agreements largely due to reduced funding requirements associated with lower AFS securities in Corporate and reduced short-term funding requirements in IB; a decline in beneficial interests issued by consolidated VIEs due to maturities related to Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts; and a decline in other borrowed funds due to maturities of advances from FHLBs.
In the first six months of 2009, net cash used in financing activities was $\$ 141.2$ billion; this reflected a decline in wholesale deposits in TSS, compared with the elevated level during the latter part of 2008 due to heightened volatility and credit concerns in the markets at that time; a decline in other borrowings due to the absence of borrowings from the Federal Reserve under the Term Auction Facility program and net repayments of advances from FHLBs; the June 17, 2009, repayment in full of the $\$ 25.0$ billion principal amount of Series K preferred stock; and the payment of
cash dividends. Cash proceeds resulted from an increase in securities loaned or sold under repurchase agreements, partly attributable to favorable pricing and to financing the Firm s increased AFS securities portfolio; the issuance of $\$ 5.8$ billion of common stock; and a slight net increase in long-term debt, as issuances of FDIC-guaranteed debt as well as non-FDIC guaranteed debt in both the European and U.S. markets were offset by redemptions. There were no open-market stock repurchases during the first half of 2009.
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## Credit ratings

The cost and availability of financing are influenced by credit ratings. Reductions in credit ratings could have an adverse effect on the Firm s access to liquidity sources, increase the cost of funds, trigger additional collateral or funding requirements, and decrease the number of investors and counterparties willing to lend to the Firm.
Additionally, the Firm s funding requirements for VIEs and other third-party commitments may be adversely affected by a decline in credit ratings. For additional information on the impact of a credit-rating downgrade on the funding requirements for VIEs, and on derivatives and collateral agreements, see Special-purpose entities on pages 56-57, Ratings profile of derivative receivables marked to market ( MTM ) on page 76, and Note 5 on pages 128-136 of this Form 10-Q.
Critical factors in maintaining high credit ratings include a stable and diverse earnings stream, strong capital ratios, strong credit quality and risk management controls, diverse funding sources, and disciplined liquidity monitoring procedures.
Ratings from Moody s, S\&P and Fitch on JPMorgan Chase and its principal bank subsidiaries remained unchanged at June 30, 2010, from December 31, 2009. At June 30, 2010, Moody s and S\&P s outlook remained negative, while Fitch s outlook remained stable.
Several rating agencies have recently announced that they will be evaluating the effects of the financial regulatory reform legislation in order to determine the extent, if any, to which financial institutions, including the Firm, may be negatively impacted. There is no assurance the Firm s credit ratings will not be downgraded in the future as a result of any such reviews.

## CREDIT PORTFOLIO

The following table presents JPMorgan Chase s credit portfolio as of June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009. Total managed credit exposure of $\$ 1.7$ trillion at June 30, 2010, decreased by $\$ 59.1$ billion from December 31, 2009, reflecting decreases of $\$ 55.3$ billion in the consumer portfolio and $\$ 3.8$ billion in the wholesale portfolio. During the first six months of 2010, lending-related commitments decreased by $\$ 46.6$ billion, managed loans decreased by $\$ 18.6$ billion and receivables from customers increased by $\$ 7.2$ billion. The decrease in lending-related commitments was partially related to the January 1, 2010, adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs, which resulted in the elimination of $\$ 24.2$ billion of wholesale lending-related commitments between the Firm and its administrated multi-seller conduits upon consolidation. This decrease in lending-related commitments was partially offset by the addition of $\$ 6.5$ billion of unfunded commitments between the consolidated multi-seller conduits and their clients. The decrease in managed loans was primarily related to lower customer demand, net repayments, and loan sales, partially offset by the adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs. While overall portfolio exposure declined, the Firm provided and raised nearly $\$ 700$ billion in new and renewed credit and capital for consumers, corporations, small businesses, municipalities and not-for-profit organizations during the first half of the year.
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In the table below, reported loans include loans retained; loans held-for-sale (which are carried at the lower of cost or fair value, with changes in value recorded in noninterest revenue); and loans accounted for at fair value. Loans retained are presented net of unearned income, unamortized discounts and premiums, and net deferred loan costs. Nonperforming assets include nonaccrual loans and assets acquired in satisfaction of debt (primarily real estate owned). Nonaccrual loans are those for which the accrual of interest has been suspended in accordance with the Firm s accounting policies. For additional information on these loans, including the Firm s accounting policies, see Note 13 on pages 145-150 of this Form 10-Q, and Note 13 on pages 192-196 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.

(in millions, except ratios)

Total credit portfolio
Loans reported
Loans securitized(b)

Total managed loans

(a)
Effective
January l, 2010,
the Firm adopted
new consolidation
guidance related to
VIEs. Upon the
adoption of the
new guidance, the
Firm consolidated
its Firm-sponsored
credit card
securitization
trusts, its
Firm-administered
multi-seller
conduits and
certain other
consumer loan
securitization
entities, primarily
mortgage-related.
As a result, related
assets are now
primarily recorded
in loans or other
assets on the
Consolidated
Balance Sheet. As
a result of the
consolidation of
the credit card
securitization
trusts, reported
and managed basis
are equivalent for
periods beginning
after January l,
2010. For further
discussion, see

Three months ended June 30, Average annual net Net charge-offs charge-off rate $(g)(h)$ 20102009

20102009

Six months ended June 30,
Average annual net charge-off rate ${ }^{(g)(h)}$ 20102009

| $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 7 1 4}$ | $\$ 6,019$ | $\mathbf{3 . 2 8 \%}$ | $3.52 \%$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 , 6 2 4}$ | $\$ 10,415$ | $\mathbf{3 . 8 8 \%}$ | $3.01 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :--- |
| NA | 1,664 | NA | 7.91 | NA | 3,128 | NA | 7.42 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 7 1 4}$ | $\$ 7,683$ | $\mathbf{3 . 2 8 \%}$ | $4.00 \%$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 , 6 2 4}$ | $\$ 13,543$ | $\mathbf{3 . 8 8 \%}$ | $3.49 \%$ |

(a) Effective

January 1, 2010, the Firm adopted new consolidation guidance related to VIEs. Upon the adoption of the new guidance, the Firm consolidated its Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts, its Firm-administered multi-seller conduits and certain other consumer loan securitization entities, primarily mortgage-related. As a result, related assets are now primarily recorded in loans or other assets on the Consolidated Balance Sheet. As a result of the consolidation of the credit card securitization trusts, reported and managed basis are equivalent for periods beginning after January 1, 2010. For further discussion, see

Note 15 on pages
151-163 of this
Form 10-Q.
(b) Loans securitized are defined as loans that were sold to
nonconsolidated securitization trusts and were not included in reported loans. For further discussion of credit card securitizations, see Note 15 on pages 151-163 of this Form 10-Q.
(c) Represents margin loans to prime and retail brokerage customers, which are included in accrued interest and accounts receivable on the Consolidated
Balance Sheets.
(d) Represents the net notional amount of protection purchased and sold of single-name and portfolio credit derivatives used to manage both performing and non-performing credit exposures; these derivatives do not qualify for hedge accounting under U.S. GAAP.
For additional information, see Credit derivatives on pages 76-77 and Note 5 on
pages 128-136 of
this Form 10-Q.
(e) At June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, nonperforming loans and assets exclude:
(1) mortgage loans insured by U.S.
government agencies of $\$ 10.1$ billion and $\$ 9.0$ billion, respectively, that are 90 days past due and accruing at the guaranteed reimbursement rate; (2) real estate owned insured by U.S. government agencies of $\$ 1.4$ billion and $\$ 579$ million, respectively; and (3) student loans that are 90 days past due and still accruing, which are insured by U.S. government agencies under the FFELP, of $\$ 447$ million and $\$ 542$ million, respectively. These amounts are excluded as reimbursement of insured amounts is proceeding normally. In addition, the Firm s policy is generally to exempt credit card loans from being placed on nonaccrual status as permitted
by regulatory
guidance issued by
the Federal
Financial
Institutions
Examination
Council
( FFIEC ), credit
card loans are
charged off by the
end of the month in which the account becomes 180 days past due or within 60 days from receiving notification about a specified event
(e.g., bankruptcy of the borrower), whichever is earlier.
(f) Excludes consumer
purchased
credit-impaired
loans that were
acquired as part of the Washington
Mutual
transaction, which are accounted for on a pool basis.
Since each pool is
accounted for as a single asset with a single composite interest rate and an aggregate
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expectation ofcash flows, thepast due statusof the pools, orthat of
individual loans
within the pools,
is not
meaningful.
Because the
Firm is
recognizing
interest income
on each pool of
loans, they are
all considered
to be
performing.
(g) For the quarters
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009,
net charge-off
ratios were
calculated
using:
(1) average
retained loans
of $\$ 699.2$ billion
and
$\$ 685.4$ billion,
respectively;
(2) average
securitized
loans of zero
and
$\$ 84.4$ billion,
respectively;
and (3) average
managed loans
of $\$ 699.2$ billion
and
$\$ 769.8$ billion,
respectively.
For the
year-to-date
periods ended
June 30, 2010
and 2009, net
charge-offratios werecalculated
using:
(1) average
retained loans
of $\$ 708.8$ billion
and
$\$ 697.9$ billion;
(2) average
securitized
loans of zero
and
$\$ 85.0$ billion;
and (3) average
managed loans
of $\$ 708.8$ billion
and
$\$ 783.0$ billion.
(h) For the quarters
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009,
firmwide net
charge-off
ratios were
calculated
including
average
purchased
credit-impaired
loans of
$\$ 78.1$ billion
and
$\$ 86.7$ billion.
For the
year-to-date
periods ended
June 30, 2010,
and 2009, net
charge-off rates
were calculated
using average
purchased
credit-impaired
loans of
$\$ 79.2$ billion
and
$\$ 87.5$ billion,
respectively.
For the quarters

```
ended June 30,
2010 and 2009, excluding the impact of purchased credit-impaired loans, the total Firm s managed net charge-off rate would have been \(3.69 \%\) and \(4.51 \%\) respectively.
```


## WHOLESALE CREDIT PORTFOLIO

As of June 30, 2010, wholesale exposure (IB, CB, TSS and AM) decreased by $\$ 3.8$ billion from December 31, 2009. The overall decrease was primarily driven by a decrease of $\$ 22.6$ billion in lending-related commitments, partially offset by an increase of $\$ 12.7$ billion in loans. The decrease in lending-related commitments and the increase in loans were primarily related to the January 1, 2010, adoption of the new consolidation guidance related to VIEs which resulted in the elimination of $\$ 24.2$ billion of lending-related commitments between the Firm and its administrated multi-seller conduits upon consolidation. This decrease in lending-related commitments was partially offset by the addition of $\$ 6.5$ billion of unfunded commitments between the consolidated multi-seller conduits and their clients. Assets of the consolidated conduits included $\$ 15.1$ billion of wholesale loans at January 1, 2010. Excluding the effect of the new consolidation guidance, lending-related commitments and loans would have decreased by $\$ 4.9$ billion and $\$ 2.4$ billion, respectively, mainly due to net repayments and sales. Partly offsetting these decreases was an increase of $\$ 7.2$ billion in receivables from customers due to increased client activity in prime services.

|  | Credit exposure |  | Nonperforming assets ${ }^{(c)}$ |  | 90 days past due and still accruing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (in millions) | June 30, $2010$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dec. } 31, \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { June 30, } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dec. 31, } \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { June 30, } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dec. 31, } \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ |
| Loans retained | \$212,987 | \$200,077 | \$5,285 | \$6,559 | \$212 | \$332 |
| Loans held-for-sale | 1,477 | 2,734 | 255 | 234 |  |  |
| Loans at fair value | 2,362 | 1,364 | 120 | 111 |  |  |
| Loans reported | 216,826 | 204,175 | 5,660 | 6,904 | 212 | 332 |
| Derivative receivables | 80,215 | 80,210 | 315 | 529 |  |  |
| Receivables from customers ${ }^{(a)}$ | 22,966 | 15,745 |  |  |  |  |
| Interests in purchased receivables | 1,836 | 2,927 |  |  |  |  |
| Total wholesale credit-related assets | 321,843 | 303,057 | 5,975 | 7,433 | 212 | 332 |
| Lending-related commitments | 324,552 | 347,155 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total wholesale credit exposure | \$646,395 | \$650,212 | \$5,975 | \$7,433 | \$212 | \$332 |

Net credit derivative hedges notional ${ }^{(b)}$
Liquid securities collateral held against derivatives
(a) Represents margin loans to prime and retail brokerage customers, which are included in accrued interest and accounts receivable on the Consolidated Balance Sheets.
(b) Represents the amount of protection purchased and sold of single-name and portfolio credit derivatives used to manage both performing and nonperforming credit exposures; these derivatives do derivatives do
not qualify for hedge
accounting
under U.S.
GAAP. For
additional
information, see Credit derivatives on pages 76-77 and Note 5 on pages 128-136 of this Form 10-Q.
(c) Excludes assets acquired in loan

## net notional

| $\$(\mathbf{3 2 , 0 1 0})$ | $\$(48,376)$ | $\$(\mathbf{1 4 )}$ | $\$(139)$ | NA | NA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(\mathbf{1 9 , 2 7 6})$ | $(15,519)$ | NA | NA | NA | NA | acant

satisfactions.
For additional
information, see
the wholesale
nonperforming
assets by
business
segment table
on page 73 of
this Form 10-Q.
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The following table summarizes the maturity and ratings profiles of the wholesale portfolio as of June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009. The ratings scale is based on the Firm s internal risk ratings, which generally correspond to ratings as defined by S\&P and Moody s.
Wholesale credit exposure maturity and ratings profile


remaining contractual maturity. The
maturity profile
of derivative
receivables is
based on the
maturity profile
of average
exposure. For
further
discussion of average
exposure, see
Derivative
receivables
marked to
market on pages
102-103 of
JPMorgan
Chase s 2009
Annual Report.
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Wholesale credit exposure selected industry concentrations
The Firm focuses on the management and diversification of its industry concentrations, with particular attention paid to industries with actual or potential credit concerns.
Exposures deemed criticized generally represent a ratings profile similar to a rating of CCC+ / Caa1 and lower, as defined by S\&P and Moody s, respectively. The total criticized component of the portfolio, excluding loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value, decreased to $\$ 26.5$ billion at June 30, 2010, from $\$ 33.2$ billion at year-end 2009. The decrease was primarily related to net repayments and loan sales.

June 30, 2010
December 31, 2009
Total credit exposure Criticized exposure Total credit exposure Criticized exposure Credit $\%$ of criticized Credit $\%$ of criticized (in millions, except ratios) exposure ${ }^{(c)}$ portfolio Criticized portfolio exposure ${ }^{(c)}$ portfolio Criticized portfolio

| Top 25 industries ${ }^{(a)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Real estate | \$ 63,730 | 10\% | \$10,821 | 41\% | \$ 68,509 | 11\% | \$11,975 | 36\% |
| Banks and finance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| companies | 57,134 | 9 | 1,036 | 4 | 54,053 | 9 | 2,053 | 6 |
| Healthcare | 37,529 | 6 | 398 | 2 | 35,605 | 6 | 329 | 1 |
| State and municipal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asset managers | 29,134 | 5 | 660 | 2 | 24,920 | 4 | 680 | 2 |
| Consumer products | 26,882 | 4 | 608 | 2 | 27,004 | 4 | 515 | 2 |
| Utilities | 25,385 | 4 | 1,107 | 4 | 27,178 | 4 | 1,238 | 4 |
| Oil and gas | 22,928 | 4 | 405 | 2 | 23,322 | 4 | 386 | 1 |
| Retail and consumer services | 20,272 | 3 | 699 | 3 | 20,673 | 3 | 782 | 2 |
| Technology | 13,066 | 2 | 543 | 2 | 14,169 | 2 | 1,288 | 4 |
| Machinery and equipment manufacturing | 12,254 | 2 | 205 | 1 | 12,759 | 2 | 350 | 1 |
| Securities firms and |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metals/mining | 11,650 | 2 | 634 | 2 | 12,547 | 2 | 639 | 2 |
| Business services | 11,546 | 2 | 239 | 1 | 10,667 | 2 | 344 | 1 |
| Chemicals/plastics | 11,349 | 2 | 477 | 2 | 9,870 | 2 | 611 | 2 |
| Insurance | 11,329 | 2 | 481 | 2 | 13,421 | 2 | 599 | 2 |
| Central government | 11,181 | 2 |  |  | 9,557 | 1 |  |  |
| Telecom Services | 10,800 | 2 | 193 | 1 | 11,265 | 2 | 251 | 1 |
| Media | 10,535 | 2 | 1,579 | 6 | 12,379 | 2 | 1,692 | 5 |
| Building materials/construction | 10,106 | 2 | 1,154 | 4 | 10,448 | 2 | 1,399 | 4 |
| Holding companies | 9,784 | 2 | 104 |  | 16,018 | 3 | 110 |  |
| Automotive | 9,028 | 1 | 368 | 1 | 9,357 | 1 | 1,240 | 4 |
| Transportation | 8,608 | 1 | 515 | 2 | 9,749 | 1 | 588 | 2 |
| Agriculture/paper manufacturing | 7,530 | 1 | 312 | 1 | 5,801 | 1 | 500 | 2 |
| Leisure | 5,847 | 1 | 1,065 | 4 | 6,822 | 1 | 1,798 | 5 |
| All other ${ }^{(b)}$ | 134,299 | 22 | 2,678 | 10 | 135,791 | 22 | 3,205 | 10 |


| Subtotal | \$617,754 | 100\% | \$26,511 | 100\% | \$627,442 | 100\% | \$33,183 | 100\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value | 3,839 |  | 920 |  | 4,098 |  | 1,545 |  |
| Receivables from customers | 22,966 |  |  |  | 15,745 |  |  |  |
| Interest in purchased receivables | 1,836 |  |  |  | 2,927 |  |  |  |
| Total | \$646,395 |  | \$27,431 |  | \$650,212 |  | \$34,728 |  |
| (a) Rankings are based on exposure at June 30, 2010. The ranking to industries presented in the table as of December 31, 2009, are based on the rankings of the corresponding exposures at June 30, 2010, not the actual rankings of such exposure at December 31, 2009. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) For more information on exposures to SPEs included in all other, see Note 15 on pages 151-163 of this Form 10-Q. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) Credit exposure is net of risk participations and excludes the benefit of credit derivative hedges and collateral held against |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

derivative
receivables or
loans.
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The following table presents additional information on the wholesale real estate industry at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009.

and other real estate.
(b) Ratios were calculated using end-of-period retained loans of $\$ 53.4$ billion and
$\$ 57.2$ billion for
the periods ended June 30, 2010, and
December 31, 2009 ,
respectively.
(c) Net charge-offs
are presented for the six months ended
June 30, 2010.
(d) Prior periods
have been
reclassed to
conform to
current
presentation.
(e) Net charge-offs are presented for the twelve months ended December 31, 2009.

## Loans

The following table presents wholesale loans and nonperforming assets by business segment as of June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009.


| Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Banking | 95,090 | 446 | 95,536 | 3,077 |  | 207 | 1 | 3,285 |
| Treasury \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Securities Services | 24,513 |  | 24,513 | 14 |  |  |  | 14 |
| Asset Management | 38,744 |  | 38,744 | 309 |  | 3 | 25 | 337 |
| Corporate/Private |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Equity | 591 | 172 | 763 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | \$212,987 | \$ 3,839 | \$216,826 | \$5,660 ${ }_{(a)}$ | \$ 315 ${ }_{(b)}$ | \$ 361 | \$ 26 | \$ 6,362 |

December 31, 2009

loans represent
2.61\% and
3.38\% of total
wholesale loans
at June 30,
2010, and
December 31,
2009,
respectively.
(b) Nonperforming
derivatives
represent less
than $1.0 \%$ of the
total derivative
receivables net
of cash
collateral at
both June 30,
2010, and
December 31, 2009.
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In the normal course of business, the Firm provides loans to a variety of customers, from large corporate and institutional clients to high-net-worth individuals.
Retained wholesale loans were $\$ 213.0$ billion at June 30, 2010, compared with $\$ 200.1$ billion at December 31, 2009. The $\$ 12.9$ billion increase was primarily related to the January 1, 2010, adoption of new consolidation guidance related to VIEs. Upon adoption of the new guidance, $\$ 15.1$ billion of wholesale loans associated with Firm-administered multi-seller conduits were added to the Consolidated Balance Sheets. Excluding the effect of the adoption of the new consolidation guidance, loans decreased by $\$ 2.2$ billion. Loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value relate primarily to syndicated loans and loans transferred from the retained portfolio. Held-for-sale loans and loans carried at fair value were in aggregate $\$ 3.8$ billion and $\$ 4.1$ billion at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively.
The Firm actively manages wholesale credit exposure through sales of loans and lending-related commitments. During the first six months of 2010 the Firm sold $\$ 4.6$ billion of loans and commitments, recognizing gains of $\$ 31$ million. In the first six months of 2009, the Firm sold $\$ 879$ million of loans and commitments, recognizing net losses of $\$ 23$ million. These results include gains or losses on sales of nonperforming loans, if any, as discussed on pages 74-75 of this Form 10-Q. These activities are not related to the Firm s securitization activities. For further discussion of securitization activity, see Liquidity Risk Management and Note 15 on pages 65-67 and 151-163 respectively, of this Form 10-Q.
Nonperforming wholesale loans were $\$ 5.7$ billion at June 30, 2010, a decrease of $\$ 1.2$ billion from December 31, 2009, reflecting primarily net repayments and loan sales.
The following table presents the geographic distribution of wholesale loans and nonperforming loans as of June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009. The geographic distribution of the wholesale portfolio is determined based predominantly on the domicile of the borrower.
Loans and nonperforming loans, U.S. and Non-U.S.

## Wholesale

(in millions)

| U.S. | $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 5 , 7 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 6 9 9}$ | $\$ 149,085$ | $\$ 5,844$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non-U.S. | $\mathbf{6 1 , 0 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 1}$ | 55,090 | 1,060 |
| Ending balance | $\mathbf{\$ 2 1 6 , 8 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 6 6 0}$ | $\$ 204,175$ | $\$ 6,904$ |

The following table presents the change in the nonperforming loan portfolio during the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009.
Nonperforming loan activity
Wholesale
(in millions) $\quad$ Six months ended June 30,

| Total reductions | $\mathbf{5 , 3 9 4}$ | 2,483 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Net additions (reductions) | $\mathbf{( 1 , 2 4 4 )}$ | 3,580 |
| Ending balance | $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 6 6 0}$ | $\$ 5,962$ |
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The following table presents net charge-offs, which are defined as gross charge-offs less recoveries, for the three and six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009. A nonaccrual loan is charged off to the allowance for loan losses when it is highly certain that a loss has been realized; this determination considers many factors, including the prioritization of the Firm s claim in bankruptcy, expectations of the workout/restructuring of the loan, and valuation of the borrower s equity. The amounts in the table below do not include gains from sales of nonperforming loans.

## Net charge-offs

## Wholesale

(in millions, except ratios)
Loans reported
Average loans retaine
Net charge-offs
Average annual net charge-off rate

Three months ended June 30,
2010
$\begin{array}{rr}\mathbf{\$ 2 0 9 , 0 1 6} & \$ 229,105 \\ \mathbf{2 3 1} & 679 \\ \mathbf{0 . 4 4 \%} & 1.19 \%\end{array}$

Six months ended June 30,

| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 2009 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{\$ 2 0 9 , 0 1 6}$ | $\$ 229,105$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 1 0 , 3 0 0}$ | $\$ 233,871$ |
| $\mathbf{2 3 1}$ | 679 | $\mathbf{1 , 1 9 0}$ | 870 |
| $\mathbf{0 . 4 4 \%}$ | $1.19 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 . 1 4 \%}$ | $0.75 \%$ |

2009
\$233,871 0.75\%

## Derivatives

## Derivative contracts

In the normal course of business, the Firm uses derivative instruments to meet the needs of customers; to generate revenue through trading activities; to manage exposure to fluctuations in interest rates, currencies and other markets; and to manage the Firm s credit exposure. For further discussion of these contracts, see Notes 5 and 22 on pages 128-136 and 170-174 of this Form 10-Q and Notes 5 and 32 on pages 167-175 and 224-235 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.
The following table summarizes the net derivative receivables MTM for the periods presented.

## Derivative receivables marked to market

|  | June 30, | December 31, |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (in millions) | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 2009 |
| Interest rate $^{(a)}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 2 6 8}$ | $\$ 33,733$ |
| Credit derivatives $^{(a)}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 3 4 6}$ | 11,859 |
| Foreign exchange | $\mathbf{1 9 , 5 8 6}$ | 21,984 |
| Equity | $\mathbf{5 , 5 2 3}$ | 6,635 |
| Commodity | $\mathbf{4 , 4 9 2}$ | 5,999 |
|  |  |  |
| Total, net of cash collateral | $\mathbf{8 0 , 2 1 5}$ | 80,210 |
| Liquid securities collateral held against derivative receivables | $\mathbf{( 1 9 , 2 7 6 )}$ | $(15,519)$ |
| Total, net of all collateral | $\mathbf{\$ 6 0 , 9 3 9}$ | $\$ 64,691$ |

(a) In the first
quarter of 2010,
cash collateral
netting
reporting was
enhanced. Prior
periods have
been revised to

## conform to the

current
presentation.
The effect
resulted in an
increase to
interest rate
derivative
receivables, and
a corresponding
decrease to
credit derivative
receivables, of
$\$ 7.0$ billion as
of December 31, 2009.

The amounts of derivative receivables reported on the Consolidated Balance Sheets were $\$ 80.2$ billion at both June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009. These are the amounts of the MTM or fair value of the derivative contracts after giving effect to legally enforceable master netting agreements, cash collateral held by the Firm and CVA. These amounts reported on the Consolidated Balance Sheets represent the cost to the Firm to replace the contracts at current market rates should the counterparty default. Derivative receivables were flat and reflected the offsetting effect of declining interest rates and increased levels of foreign exchange-rate volatility, with declining equity valuations and lower energy and base metal commodity prices. However, in management $s$ view, the appropriate measure of current credit risk should also reflect additional liquid securities held as collateral by the Firm of $\$ 19.3$ billion and $\$ 15.5$ billion at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively, resulting in total exposure, net of all collateral, of $\$ 60.9$ billion and $\$ 64.7$ billion, respectively.
The Firm also holds additional collateral delivered by clients at the initiation of transactions, as well as collateral related to contracts that have a non-daily call frequency and collateral that the Firm has agreed to return but has not yet settled as of the reporting date. Though this collateral does not reduce the balances noted in the table above, it is available as security against potential exposure that could arise should the MTM of the client s derivative transactions move in the Firm s favor. As of June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, the Firm held $\$ 16.1$ billion and $\$ 16.9$ billion, respectively, of this additional collateral. The derivative receivables MTM, net of all collateral, also does not include other credit enhancements in the form of letters of credit. The following table summarizes the ratings profile of the Firm s derivative receivables MTM, net of all collateral, for the dates indicated.
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## Ratings profile of derivative receivables MTM

June 30, 2010

## Rating equivalent

(in millions, except ratios)
AAA/Aaa to AA-/Aa3
$\mathrm{A}+/ \mathrm{A} 1$ to $\mathrm{A}-/ \mathrm{A} 3$
$\mathrm{BBB}+/ \mathrm{Baa} 1$ to $\mathrm{BBB}-/ \mathrm{Baa} 3$
$\mathrm{BB}+/ \mathrm{Ba} 1$ to $\mathrm{B}-/ \mathrm{B} 3$
$\mathrm{CCC}+/ \mathrm{Caa} 1$ and below
Total

| June 30, 2010 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Exposure } \\ \text { net of } \\ \text { all } \\ \text { collateral }\end{array}$ |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}\% of exposure <br>

net of all <br>
collateral\end{array}\right]\)

December 31, 2009
Exposure net of $\quad \%$ of exposure all collateral
\$25,530 40\%
12,43219

9,34314

14,571 234
$100 \%$

The Firm actively pursues the use of collateral agreements to mitigate counterparty credit risk in derivatives. The percentage of the Firm s derivatives transactions subject to collateral agreements excluding foreign exchange spot trades, which are not typically covered by collateral agreements due to their short maturity was $97 \%$ as of June 30, 2010, up from $89 \%$ at December 31, 2009. The Firm posted $\$ 70.7$ billion and $\$ 56.7$ billion of collateral at June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively.
Certain derivative and collateral agreements include provisions that require the counterparty and/or the Firm, upon specified downgrades in the respective credit ratings of their legal entities, to post collateral for the benefit of the other party. At June 30, 2010, the impact of a single-notch and six-notch ratings downgrade to JPMorgan Chase \& Co., and its subsidiaries, primarily JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., would have required $\$ 1.5$ billion and $\$ 5.0$ billion, respectively, of additional collateral to be posted by the Firm. Certain derivative contracts also provide for termination of the contract, generally upon a downgrade to a specified rating of either the Firm or the counterparty, at the then-existing fair value of the derivative contracts.

## Credit derivatives

For a more detailed discussion of credit derivatives, including types of derivatives, see Note 5, Credit derivatives, on pages 135-136 of this Form 10-Q, and Credit derivatives on pages 103-104 and Note 5, Credit derivatives, on pages 173-175 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report. The following table presents the Firm s notional amounts of credit derivatives protection purchased and sold as of June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009.

## Credit derivative positions

| (in billions) | Notional amount |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dealer/client |  | Credit portfolio |  |  |
|  | Protection purchased ${ }^{(a)}$ | Protection sold | Protection purchased ${ }^{(a)(b)}$ | Protection sold |  |
| June 30, 2010 | \$2,666 | \$2,654 | \$32 | \$ | \$5,352 |
| December 31, 2009 | 2,997 | 2,947 | 49 | 1 | 5,994 |
| (a) Included \$2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| trillion and \$3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| trillion at |  |  |  |  |  |
| June 30, 2010, |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| December 31, |  |  |  |  |  |

2009,
respectively, of
notional
exposure where
the Firm had
protection sold
with identical
underlying
reference
instruments.
(b) Included
$\$ 8.5$ billion and
$\$ 19.7$ billion at
June 30, 2010,
and
December 31, 2009, respectively, that represented the notional amount for structured
portfolio
protection; the
Firm retains the
first risk of loss
on this portfolio.

## Dealer/client

For a further discussion of the dealer/client business related to credit protection, see Dealer/client business on page 104 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report. At June 30, 2010, the total notional amount of protection purchased and sold in the dealer/client business decreased by $\$ 624$ billion from year-end 2009, primarily as a result of continuing industry efforts to reduce offsetting trade activity.

## Credit portfolio activities

Use of single-name and portfolio credit derivatives
(in millions)
Credit derivatives used to manage:
Loans and lending-related commitments
Derivative receivables
Total protection purchased ${ }^{(a)}$
Total protection sold
Credit derivatives hedges notional
(a) Included
$\$ 8.5$ billion and
$\$ 19.7$ billion at June 30, 2010,
and
December 31, 2009 ,
respectively,
that represented
the notional
amount for
structured
portfolio
protection; the
Firm retains the first risk of loss on this portfolio.
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The credit derivatives used by JPMorgan Chase for credit portfolio management activities do not qualify for hedge accounting under U.S. GAAP; these derivatives are reported at fair value, with gains and losses recognized in principal transactions revenue. In contrast, the loans and lending-related commitments being risk-managed are accounted for on an accrual basis. This asymmetry in accounting treatment, between loans and lending-related commitments and the credit derivatives used in credit portfolio management activities, causes earnings volatility that is not representative, in the Firm s view, of the true changes in value of the Firm s overall credit exposure. The MTM value related to the Firm s credit derivatives used for managing credit exposure, as well as the MTM value related to the CVA (which reflects the credit quality of derivatives counterparty exposure), are included in the gains and losses realized on credit derivatives disclosed in the table below. These results can vary from period to period due to market conditions that affect specific positions in the portfolio. For a discussion of CVA related to derivative contracts, see Derivative receivables MTM on pages 102-103 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.

|  | Three months ended June |  | Six months ended June 30, |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (in millions) | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 30, | 2009 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 2009 |
| Hedges of lending-related commitments ${ }^{(a)}$ | $\$ \mathbf{6 0}$ | $\$(1,512)$ | $\mathbf{\$ ( \mathbf { 6 0 ) }}$ | $\$(2,064)$ |  |
| CVA and hedges of CVA $^{(a)}$ | $(\mathbf{2 8 9})$ | 1,196 | $\mathbf{( 2 9 0 )}$ | 1,319 |  |
| Net gains/(losses) | $\mathbf{\$ ( 2 2 9 )}$ | $\$(316)$ | $\$(\mathbf{3 5 0})$ | $\$(745)$ |  |

(a) These hedges do
not qualify for
hedge
accounting
under U.S.
GAAP.

## Lending-related commitments

JPMorgan Chase uses lending-related financial instruments, such as commitments and guarantees, to meet the financing needs of its customers. The contractual amount of these financial instruments represents the maximum possible credit risk should the counterparties draw down on these commitments or the Firm fulfills its obligation under these guarantees, and the counterparties subsequently fail to perform according to the terms of these contracts. Wholesale lending-related commitments were $\$ 324.6$ billion at June 30, 2010, compared with $\$ 347.2$ billion at December 31, 2009. The decrease reflected the January 1, 2010, adoption of new consolidation guidance related to VIEs. Upon adoption of the new consolidation guidance, $\$ 24.2$ billion of lending-related commitments between the Firm and its administered multi-seller conduits were eliminated in consolidation. This decrease in lending-related commitments was partially offset by the addition of $\$ 6.5$ billion of unfunded commitments between the consolidated multi-seller conduits and their clients.
In the Firm s view, the total contractual amount of these wholesale lending-related commitments is not representative of the Firm s actual credit risk exposure or funding requirements. In determining the amount of credit risk exposure the Firm has to wholesale lending-related commitments, which is used as the basis for allocating credit risk capital to these commitments, the Firm has established a loan-equivalent amount for each commitment; this amount represents the portion of the unused commitment or other contingent exposure that is expected, based on average portfolio historical experience, to become drawn upon in an event of a default by an obligor. The loan-equivalent amounts of the Firm s lending-related commitments were $\$ 166.7$ billion and $\$ 179.8$ billion as of June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, respectively.

## Country Exposure

The Firm s wholesale portfolio includes country risk exposures to both developed and emerging markets. The Firm seeks to diversify its country exposures, including its credit-related lending, trading and investment activities, whether
cross-border or locally funded.
Country exposure under the Firm s internal risk management approach is reported based on the country where the assets of the obligor, counterparty or guarantor are located. Exposure amounts, including resale agreements, are adjusted for collateral and for credit enhancements (e.g., guarantees and letters of credit) provided by third parties; outstandings supported by a guarantor located outside the country or backed by collateral held outside the country are assigned to the country of the enhancement provider. In addition, the effect of credit derivative hedges and other short credit or equity trading positions are reflected. Total exposure measures include activity with both government and private-sector entities in a country.
The Firm also reports country exposure for regulatory purposes following FFIEC guidelines, which are different from the Firm s internal risk management approach for measuring country exposure. For additional information on the FFIEC exposures, see Cross-border outstandings on page 264 of JPMorgan Chase s 2009 Annual Report.
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In recent months, several European countries, including Greece, Portugal, Spain, Italy and Ireland, have been subject to credit deterioration due to weaknesses in their economic and fiscal situations. The Firm is closely monitoring its exposures to these five countries. Aggregate net exposures to these five countries as measured under the Firm s internal approach was less than $\$ 20.0$ billion at June 30, 2010; no individual country represented a majority of the net exposure and sovereign exposure represented less than half the aggregate net exposure. The Firm currently believes its exposure to these five countries is modest relative to the Firm s overall risk exposures and is manageable given the size and types of exposures to each of the countries and the diversification of the aggregate exposure. The Firm continues to conduct business and support client activity in these countries and, therefore, the Firm s aggregate net exposures may vary over time.
As part of its ongoing country risk management process, the Firm monitors exposure to emerging market countries, and utilizes country stress tests to measure and manage the risk of extreme loss associated with a sovereign crisis. There is no common definition of emerging markets, but the Firm generally includes in its definition those countries whose sovereign debt ratings are equivalent to A+ or lower. The table below presents the Firm s exposure to its top ten emerging markets countries based on its internal measurement approach. The selection of countries is based solely on the Firm s largest total exposures by country and does not represent its view of any actual or potentially adverse credit conditions.
Top 10 emerging markets country exposure

| At June 30, 2010 (in billions) | Cross-border |  |  |  |  | Total exposure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lending ${ }^{(a)}$ | Trading ${ }^{(b)}$ | Other ${ }^{(c)}$ | Total | Local ${ }^{(d)}$ |  |
| South Korea | \$3.6 | \$ 1.5 | \$1.4 | \$6.5 | \$3.3 | \$9.8 |
| India | 2.1 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 7.2 | 0.7 | 7.9 |
| Brazil | 2.7 | (0.1) | 1.0 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 7.7 |
| China | 3.1 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 4.7 | 0.6 | 5.3 |
| Hong Kong | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 4.4 |  | 4.4 |
| Mexico | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 3.5 |  | 3.5 |
| Taiwan | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 3.4 |
| Malaysia | 0.2 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 3.1 |
| Chile | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |
| Turkey | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 1.9 |
| At December 31, 2009 | Cross-border |  |  |  |  | Total |
| (in billions) | Lending ${ }^{(a)}$ | Trading ${ }^{(b)}$ | Other ${ }^{(c)}$ | Total | Local ${ }^{(d)}$ | exposure |
| South Korea | \$2.7 | \$ 1.7 | \$1.3 | \$5.7 | \$3.3 | \$9.0 |
| India | 1.5 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 5.3 | 0.3 | 5.6 |
| Brazil | 1.8 | (0.5) | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 4.5 |
| China | 1.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |
| Taiwan | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 3.0 |
| Hong Kong | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 2.6 |  | 2.6 |
| Mexico | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 2.4 |  | 2.4 |
| Chile | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.9 |  | 1.9 |
| Malaysia | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 1.9 |
| South Africa | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.7 |  | 1.7 |

[^3]accrued interest
receivable,
interest-bearing
deposits with
banks,
acceptances, other monetary assets, issued letters of credit net of participations, and undrawn commitments to extend credit.
(b) Trading includes:
(1) issuer
exposure on cross-border debt and equity instruments, held both in trading and investment accounts and adjusted for the impact of issuer hedges, including credit derivatives; and (2) counterparty exposure on derivative and foreign exchange contracts, as well as security financing trades (resale agreements and securities borrowed).
(c) Other represents mainly local exposure funded cross-border, including capital investments in local entities.
(d)

Local exposure
is defined as
exposure to a country
denominated in
local currency
and booked
locally. Any
exposure not
meeting these
criteria is
defined as
cross-border
exposure.
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## CONSUMER CREDIT PORTFOLIO

JPMorgan Chase s consumer portfolio consists primarily of residential mortgages, home equity loans, credit cards, auto loans, student loans and business banking loans. Included within the portfolio are home equity loans and lines of credit secured by junior liens, and mortgage loans with interest-only payment options to predominantly prime borrowers, as well as certain payment-option loans acquired from Washington Mutual that may result in negative amortization. The Firm s primary focus is on serving the prime consumer credit market. The Firm has never originated option ARMs.
A substantial portion of the consumer loans acquired in the Washington Mutual transaction were identified as credit-impaired based on an analysis of high-risk characteristics, including product type, LTV ratios, FICO scores and delinquency status. These purchased credit-impaired loans are accounted for on a pool basis, and the pools are considered to be performing. At the time of the acquisition, these loans were recorded at fair value, including an estimate of losses that were expected to be incurred over the estimated remaining lives of the loan pools. Therefore, no allowance for loan losses was recorded for these loans as of the transaction date. As part of its ongoing assessment of these loans, management evaluates whether higher expected future credit losses for certain pools of the purchased credit-impaired portfolio would result in a decrease in expected future principal cash flows for these pools. No allowance was added in the second quarter of 2010. The total allowance for loan losses on the purchased credit-impaired portfolio added since the beginning of the third quarter of 2009 is $\$ 2.8$ billion.
The credit performance of the consumer portfolio across the entire product spectrum appears to have stabilized but remains under stress, as high unemployment and weak overall economic conditions continue to put pressure on the number of loans charged off, and weak housing prices continue to negatively affect the severity of loss recognized on real estate loans that default. Delinquencies and nonperforming loans remain elevated, but the delinquency trend is showing continued stability or improvement, with improvement continuing in early-stage delinquencies (30-89 days delinquent) across most products. Late-stage real estate delinquencies ( $150+$ days delinquent) remain elevated. The elevated level of these credit quality metrics is due, in part, to loss-mitigation activities currently being undertaken and elongated foreclosure processing timelines. Losses related to these loans continued to be recognized in accordance with the Firm s standard charge-off practices, but some delinquent loans that would have otherwise been foreclosed upon remain in the mortgage and home equity loan portfolios.
Since mid-2007, the Firm has taken actions to reduce risk exposure to consumer loans by tightening both underwriting and loan qualification standards, as well as eliminating certain products and channels for residential real estate lending. The tightening of underwriting criteria for auto loans has resulted in the reduction of both extended-term and high LTV financing. In addition, new originations of private student loans are limited to school-certified loans, the majority of which include a qualified co-borrower.
As a further action to reduce risk associated with lending-related commitments, the Firm has reduced or canceled certain lines of credit as permitted by law. For example, the Firm may reduce or close home equity lines of credit when there are significant decreases in the value of the underlying property or when there has been a demonstrable decline in the creditworthiness of the borrower. Also, the Firm typically closes credit card lines when the borrower is 60 days or more past due. Finally, certain inactive credit card lines have been closed, and a number of active credit card lines have been reduced for risk management purposes.
The following tables present managed consumer credit-related information (including RFS, CS and residential real estate loans reported in the Corporate/Private Equity segment) for the dates indicated. For further information about the Firm s nonaccrual and charge-off accounting policies, see Note 13 on pages 145-150 of this Form 10-Q.
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Consumer credit-related information

| (in millions, except ratios) | Credit exposure |  |  |  | Nonperforming loans ${ }^{(j)(k)}$ |  |  | 90 days or more past due and still accruing ${ }^{(k)}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { June } 30, \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cember 31, } \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { June 30, } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ecember } \\ & 31, \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { June 30, } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { December } \\ 31, \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ |
| Consumer loans excluding purchased credit-impaired |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| loans and loans held-for-sale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Home equity senior lief(f) | \$ | 25,856 | \$ | 27,376 | \$ 461 | \$ | 477 | \$ | \$ |
| Home equity junior liekf |  | 68,905 |  | 74,049 | 750 |  | 1,188 |  |  |
| Prime mortgage ${ }^{(c)}$ |  | 66,429 |  | 66,892 | 4,653 |  | 4,355 |  |  |
| Subprime mortgage ${ }^{(c)}$ |  | 12,597 |  | 12,526 | 3,115 |  | 3,248 |  |  |
| Option ARMs ${ }^{(c)}$ |  | 8,594 |  | 8,536 | 409 |  | 312 |  |  |
| Auto loans ${ }^{(c)(d)}$ |  | 47,548 |  | 46,031 | 155 |  | 177 |  |  |
| Credit card reported $($ (e)(f) |  | 142,994 |  | 78,786 | 3 |  | 3 | 3,952 | 3,481 |
| All other loans ${ }^{(c)}$ |  | 32,399 |  | 31,700 | 973 |  | 900 | 447 | 542 |
| Total consumer loans |  | 405,322 |  | 345,896 | 10,519 |  | 10,660 | 4,399 | 4,023 |
| Consumer loans purchased credit-impaired |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Home equity |  | 25,471 |  | 26,520 | NA |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Prime mortgage |  | 18,512 |  | 19,693 | NA |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Subprime mortgage |  | 5,662 |  | 5,993 | NA |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Option ARMs |  | 27,256 |  | 29,039 | NA |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Total consumer loans purchased credit-impaired |  | 76,901 |  | 81,245 | NA |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Total consumer loans retained |  | 482,223 |  | 427,141 | 10,519 |  | 10,660 | 4,399 | 4,023 |
| Loans held-for-sale |  | 434 |  | 2,142 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total consumer loans reported | Total consumer loans |  |  | 429,283 | 10,519 |  | 10,660 | 4,399 | 4,023 |
| Credit card securitize(d) (g) |  | NA |  | 84,626 | NA |  |  | NA | 2,385 |
| Total consumer loans managed ${ }^{(c)}$ |  | 482,657 |  | 513,909 | 10,519 |  | 10,660 | 4,399 | 6,408 |
| Total consumer loans managed excluding |  | 405,756 |  | 432,664 | 10,519 |  | 10,660 | 4,399 | 6,408 |

purchased credit-impaired loans ${ }^{(c)}$

| Consumer lending-related commitments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Home equity senior lieffi)( $h$ ) | 18,320 |  | 19,246 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Home equity junior lie(k) $($ ( $)$ | 33,985 |  | 37,231 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prime mortgage | 958 |  | 1,654 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subprime mortgage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Option ARMs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Auto loans | 6,029 |  | 5,467 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Credit $\operatorname{card}^{( }{ }^{(h)}$ | 550,442 |  | 569,113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All other loans | 10,207 |  | 11,229 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total lending-related commitments | 619,941 |  | 643,940 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total consumer credit portfolio | \$1,102,598 |  | 1,157,849 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Memo: Credit card managed ${ }^{(c)}$ | \$ 142,994 | \$ | 163,412 | \$ | 3 | \$ | 3 | \$3,952 | \$ 5,866 |
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security interest that is subordinate in rank to other liens.
(c) Effective

January 1, 2010, the Firm adopted new consolidation guidance related to VIEs. Upon the adoption of the new guidance, the Firm consolidated its
Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts and certain other consumer loan securitization entities, primarily mortgage-related. As a result, related receivables are now recorded as loans on the Consolidated Balance Sheet. As a result of the consolidation of the securitization trusts, reported and managed basis are equivalent for periods beginning after January 1, 2010. For further discussion, see Explanation and Reconciliation of the Firm s Use of Non-GAAP
Financial
Measures on pages 15-19 of this Form 10-Q.
(d)
Excluded
operatinglease-relatedassets of$\$ 3.4$ billion and$\$ 2.9$ billion atJune 30, 2010,
and December 31,2009, respectively.
(e) Includes
$\$ 1.0$ billion of
loans at
December 31,
2009, held by the
WMMT, which
were consolidated
onto the Firm s
Consolidated
Balance Sheets at
fair value duringthe second quarter
of 2009. Suchloans had beenfully repaid orcharged off as ofJune 30, 2010. SeeNote 15 on pages
198-205 of
JPMorgan
Chase s 2009Annual Report.
(f) Includes billed
finance chargesand fees net of an
allowance foruncollectibleamounts.
(g) Loans securitized
are defined as
loans that were
sold to
nonconsolidated
securitization
trusts and werenot included inreported loans.For a further
discussion of
credit card securitizations, see CS on pages 36-40 of this Form $10-Q$.
(h) The credit card and home equity lending-related commitments represent the total available lines of credit for these products. The
Firm has not experienced, and does not anticipate, that all available lines of credit would be used at the same time. For credit card commitments and home equity commitments (if certain conditions are met), the Firm can reduce or cancel these lines of credit by
providing the borrower prior notice or, in some cases, without notice as permitted by law.
(i) Charge-offs are not recorded on purchased credit-impaired loans until actual losses exceed estimated losses that were recorded as purchase accounting adjustments at the time of acquisition. To
date, no
charge-offs have
been recorded for these loans.
(j) At June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009,
nonperforming
loans exclude:
(1) mortgage loans insured by U.S. government agencies of $\$ 10.1$ billion and $\$ 9.0$ billion, respectively, that are 90 days past due and accruing at the guaranteed reimbursement rate; and
(2) student loans that are 90 days past due and still accruing, which are insured by U.S. government agencies under the FFELP, of $\$ 447$ million and $\$ 542$ million, respectively.
These amounts are excluded as reimbursement of insured amounts is proceeding normally. In addition, the Firm spolicy is generally to exempt credit card loans from being placed on
nonaccrual status as permitted by regulatory guidance. Under guidance issued by the FFIEC,
credit card loans
are charged off by
the end of the
month in which
the account
becomes 180 days
past due or within
60 days from
receiving
notification about
a specified event
(e.g., bankruptcy
of the borrower),
whichever is
earlier.
(k) Excludes
purchased
credit-impaired
loans that were
acquired as part
of the Washington
Mutual
transaction, which are accounted for on a pool basis.
Since each pool is
accounted for as a single asset with a single composite interest rate and an aggregate expectation of cash flows, the past due status of the pools, or that of individual loans within the pools, is not meaningful.
Because the Firm is recognizing interest income on each pool of loans, they are all considered to be performing.
(l) Average consumer loans held-for-sale and loans at fair value were
$\$ 1.9$ billion and $\$ 2.8$ billion for the quarters ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively, and $\$ 2.4$ billion and $\$ 2.9$ billion for year-to-date 2010 and 2009, respectively. These amounts were excluded when calculating the net charge-off rates.
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The following table presents consumer nonperforming assets by business segment as of June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009.
Consumer nonperforming assets

| (in millions) | June 30, 2010 <br> Assets acquired in loan satisfactions |  |  |  |  | December 31, 2009 Assets acquired in loan satisfactions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail Financial Services ${ }^{(a)(b)}$ | \$ 10,457 | \$1,207 | \$67 | \$ 11,731 | \$ 10,611 | \$1,154 | \$99 | \$ 11,864 |
| Card Services ${ }^{(a)}$ | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 |
| Corporate/Private Equity | 59 | 1 |  | 60 | 46 | 2 |  | 48 |
| Total | \$10,519 | \$1,208 | \$67 | \$ 11,794 | \$ 10,660 | \$1,156 | \$99 | \$ 11,915 |
| (a) At June 30, 2010, and December 31, 2009, nonperforming loans and assets excluded: (1) mortgage loans insured by U.S. government agencies of $\$ 10.1$ billion and $\$ 9.0$ billion, respectively, that are 90 days past due and accruing at the guaranteed reimbursement rate; (2) real estate owned insured by U.S. government agencies of $\$ 1.4$ billion and $\$ 579$ million, respectively; and (3) student loans that are 90 days past due |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

and still
accruing, which
are insured by
U.S. government
agencies under
the FFELP, of
$\$ 447$ million
and
$\$ 542$ million,
respectively.
These amounts
are excluded as
reimbursement
of insured
amounts is
proceeding
normally. In
addition, the
Firm spolicy is generally to exempt credit card loans from being placed on nonaccrual status as permitted by regulatory guidance. Under guidance issued by the FFIEC, credit card loans are charged off by the end of the month in which the account becomes 180 days past due or within 60 days from receiving notification about a specified event (e.g.,
bankruptcy of the borrower), whichever is earlier.

> Excludes
> purchased
> credit-impaired
> loans that were
> acquired as part
> of the
> Washington
> Mutual
> transaction,
> which are
> accounted for
> on a pool basis.
> Since each pool
> is accounted for
> as a single asset
> with a single
> composite
> interest rate and
> an aggregate
> expectation of cash flows, the past-due status
> of the pools, or
> that of
> individual loans
> within the pools,
> is not
> meaningful.
> Because the
> Firm is
> recognizing
> interest income
> on each pool of
> loans, they are
> all considered
> to be
> performing.

Effective January 1, 2010, the Firm adopted new guidance that amended the accounting for consolidation of VIEs. Upon adoption of the new guidance, the Firm consolidated its Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts and certain other consumer loan securitization entities. The following table summarizes the impact on consumer loans at adoption.
Reported loans
(in millions)
January 1, 2010
Prime mortgage \$ 1,477
Subprime mortgage $\quad 1,758$
Option ARMs 381
Auto loans 218
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Student loans } & 1,008\end{array}$
Credit $\operatorname{card}^{(a)} \quad 84,663$
(a) Represents the impact of
adoption of the
new
consolidation
standard related
to VIEs on
reported loans
for
Firm-sponsored credit card securitization trusts. As a
result of the
consolidation of
the
securitization
trusts, reported
and managed
basis are
equivalent for
periods
beginning after
January 1, 2010.
For further
discussion, see
Explanation and
Reconciliation
of the Firm s
Use of
Non-GAAP
Financial
Measures on
pages 15-19 of
this Form 10-Q.
Portfolio analysis


[^0]:    (a) Purchased credit-impaired loans represent loans acquired in the Washington Mutual transaction for which a deterioration in credit quality occurred between the origination date and JPMorgan
    Chase s acquisition date. These loans were initially recorded at fair value and accrete interest income over the

[^1]:    loaned or sold under
    repurchase
    agreements) as
    part of customer
    cash
    management
    programs.

[^2]:    (a) Total net revenue included tax-equivalent adjustments, predominantly due to tax-exempt income from municipal bond investments of $\$ 57$ million and $\$ 44$ million for the quarters ended June 30, 2010 and 2009, respectively, and \$105 million and $\$ 70$ million for the six months ended June 30, 2010 and 2009,

[^3]:    (a) Lending includes loans and

