

"The Future of Replacement Rates"

Andrew G Biggs
American Enterprise Institute
andrew.biggs@aei.org

"Implications of the New Regulatory Order for Retirement System
Risk Management"

Pension Research Council and the Boettner Center for Pensions and
Retirement Research

April 30 and May 1, 2015

Background

- Replacement rates are rule-of-thumb for retirement planning and policy analysis
 - Compare retirement income (or Social Security benefit) to preretirement earnings
 - Must be simple and usable for policymakers and public
- VERY important how replacement rates are defined
 - Honest differences in methodology: "retirement crisis" versus manageable saving shortfalls
- Little attention until past several years
 - 2014: Social Security Trustees pulled replacement rates from annual report
- Two main areas of disagreement
 - Denominator: CPI or wage-indexed career earnings?
 - Whether to adjust for child-rearing costs

Defining the denominator

Wage-indexed average earnings

- Past earnings increased by ratio of average wage in year of retirement to average wage at time earned
- Increases measured pre-retirement earnings, lowers replacement rates
 - E.g., factoid that average Social Security replacement rate = 40% measured relative to wage-indexed earnings
- Reflects relative income, "Keeping up with Joneses" outlook: individuals wish to maintain their place in earnings distribution (Munnell 2014).

Inflation-indexed average earnings

- Past earnings indexed to growth of prices; compares purchasing power of retirement income to purchasing power of pre-retirement earnings
- Reflects simplified life cycle approach of maintaining consumption between work and retirement

Differences very important

■ E.g., CBO: average individual born in 1960s will receive Social Security replacement rate of 46% (vs wage-indexed earnings) or 58% (vs CPI indexed)

My take:

- Relative income approach too controversial assumption to embed without discussion
- CPI-indexed earnings more understandable; important for rule of thumb

Family size/composition adjustment

- How do children affect need to save for retirement?
 - Do parents save to maintain their own pre-retirement standard of living?
 - Or to maintain the *household's* pre-retirement standard of living?
 - W/ cost of raising child at ~\$250k, *plus college*, it makes big difference.
- Large effect on measured retirement income adequacy
 - Differences between Gale, Scholz and Seshadri (2009) and National Retirement Risk Index heavily driven by GSS's use of family-size adjustment
 - If NRRI included adjustment, 55% "at risk" in retirement falls to 18%
- Method
 - In any given year, respondent's earnings/benefit equal household total divided by number of adults equivalents
 - Adult equivalents = (A + PK)^F
- My take: Adjustment makes sense, but parameters deserve more research
 - I assume P & F = 0.7.

Illustrations

- Using Policy Simulation Group microsimulation models
 - U.S. population, projects Social Security and employer-sponsored pensions
 - Illustrate using 1940 birth cohort, measured at age 70
- Median household Social Security replacement rates:
 - Wage-indexed earnings, no family-size adjustment: 54%
 - CPI-indexed earnings, no family-size adjustment: 65%
 - CPI-indexed earnings, no family-size adjustment: 82%
- Median Social Security + pension replacement rates
 - CPI-indexed earnings, no family-size adjustment: 126%
 - 75% of households have replacement rates >85%
 - 90% have replacement rates >50%
 - Note: above figures do not include non-pension asset income, earnings, SSI, etc.

Conclusions

- How you define adequacy matters a lot
 - Probably more than differences in how models project incomes
- All "replacement rates" aren't the same
 - Often used interchangeably without regard to definition differences
- Most retirees will have retirement incomes higher than real average pre-retirement earnings
 - The question is, how much do they want? Would they accept lower pre-retirement standard of living to raise retirement income?
- More research needed!