One-Quarter of Taxpayers Own an IRA

by Paul Yakoboski, EBRI

Twenty-two percent of individuals (26.1 million) reporting income in 1995 owned an individual retirement account (IRA) (this includes both contributory IRAs and rollover IRAs), according to recently released 1995 data.¹ The average (mean) IRA balance (both contributory and rollover) was $46,762, but this figure is skewed by a relatively few large account balances; the median IRA balance for 1995 was $17,546 (table 1). Relatively few taxpayers are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of Tax Returns (thousands)</th>
<th>Number With an IRA (thousands)</th>
<th>Percentage With an IRA (%)</th>
<th>Average IRA Balance</th>
<th>Median IRA Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>31,541</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5,362</td>
<td>2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>12,706</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>10,525</td>
<td>5,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>12,643</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18,752</td>
<td>9,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>11,532</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26,686</td>
<td>13,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>10,162</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>37,890</td>
<td>16,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>7,940</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>46,107</td>
<td>24,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>6,339</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>64,828</td>
<td>19,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>5,198</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>72,455</td>
<td>28,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>4,669</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>85,142</td>
<td>30,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and older</td>
<td>9,636</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>69,216</td>
<td>28,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5,656</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>27,276</td>
<td>7,656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Individual Retirement Account Balances, by Age and Adjusted Gross Income, 1995

¹Individual retirement account.

Source: Tabulations of Internal Revenue Service dataset merging a sample of 1040 filings with corresponding information form filings. Tabulations provided by John Sabelhaus and David Weiner.
making an annual (nonrollover) contribution to their IRAs: In 1995, just 6.4 million individuals reporting income made a contribution to their IRAs. That works out to 5.4 percent of individuals (25 percent of IRA owners). Not surprisingly, both the average and median IRA contributions are $2,000 (table 2). Similar figures are not available for those making rollovers.

### IRA Contributions

The likelihood of making a (nonrollover) IRA contribution increases with income. Only 1 percent of those with an adjusted gross income (AGI) of less than $10,000 made an IRA contribution in 1995, compared with 17 percent of those with an AGI of $100,000 or more. While the average contribution amount increases with income, it is evident that most individuals contribute $2,000 when they contribute. This would lead one to believe that if the IRA contribution limit were increased (for example, as proposed in H.R. 2488, the omnibus 1999 tax bill which was vetoed by President Clinton), individuals who contribute would put more money into their IRAs on an annual basis. It is not readily apparent that such a limit increase would boost participation, but this could occur if it leads to more active marketing of IRAs by financial institutions.

The percentage of individuals reporting a (nonrollover) IRA contribution in 1995 increased from 2 percent among those under age 30 to 11 percent of those ages 60–64. It then fell to 9 percent for those ages 65–69 and to 2 percent for those age 70 and older. These findings are not surprising given that older individuals tend to be more focused on retirement and the need to save, and to have higher incomes that allow them to do so.

### IRA Balances

Not surprisingly, median and average IRA account balances (both contributory and rollover IRAs) tend to increase with individuals’ age and income. The median balance in 1995 was $5,110 for IRA owners in their early 30s. This rose to $37,019 for those ages 65–69 and then fell to $28,399 for those age 70 and older. The average balance in 1995 was $10,525 for IRA owners in their early 30s. This rose to $85,142 for those ages 65–69 and then fell to $69,216 for those age 70 and older.
Similarly, median and average account balances increase with individual income. Among IRA owners (both contributory and rollover) with an AGI of less than $10,000 in 1995, the median balance was $9,601 and the average balance was $27,017. These figures rose to $39,856 and $103,413, respectively, for IRA owners with a 1995 AGI of $100,000 or more.

While the contribution figures presented here are regular contributions (i.e., nonrollover contributions), account balances are the result of both regular and rollover contributions. In fact, the vast majority of dollars currently flowing into IRAs are the result of rollovers from employment-based retirement plans as opposed to regular annual contributions.2

**Implications**

IRAs are an integral part of the U.S. retirement income system, with current assets in excess of $2 trillion. The data indicate, however, that they are generally used as a vehicle to store retirement savings that have been accumulated elsewhere in the retirement income system. These savings can then continue to grow tax-deferred until individuals withdraw their funds. The classic examples are workers rolling money from a retirement plan at work into an IRA on job change or retirees rolling their accumulated funds from work-based savings plans into an IRA, from which they will withdraw the money during their retirement. Relatively few workers actively use IRAs to accumulate new savings.

This could change. The Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (P.L. 105-34) changed tax policy toward IRAs in several ways. The income limits on eligibility for traditional deductible IRAs were raised, a new “backloaded” (Roth) IRA was introduced, and allowable reasons for penalty-free withdrawal of funds before retirement were expanded.3 These changes will affect the IRA environment. Combined with aggressive marketing by financial institutions, they could lead to increased use of IRAs as savings vehicles.

**Endnotes**

1 These data are based on tabulations of a dataset created by the Internal Revenue Service that merges a sample of Form 1040 filings with the corresponding information form filings. Tabulations of the dataset were provided by John Sabelhaus and David Weiner.


3 For a detailed discussion of these changes, see Paul Yakoboski and Bill Pierron, “IRAs: A Whole New Ballgame,” EBRI Notes, no. 9 (Employee Benefit Research Institute, September 1997): 1–4.
data on sponsorship rates and self-insured health plans in private-sector establishments by firm size and other employer characteristics. The sponsorship rate refers to the percentage of private-sector establishments that offer health insurance, and the self-insurance rate is the percentage of private-sector establishments offering health insurance that self-insure at least one plan. (In self-insured plans, the employer pays for employees’ health care claims directly out of its own income or assets, rather than by purchasing a health insurance policy; the distinction is important under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974—ERISA—as self-insured plans are largely exempt from state health regulations and can provide uniformity of benefits for multi-state employers.)

Overall, according to MEPS-IC, 3.2 million (or 53.2 percent) of private-sector establishments in the United States offered health insurance to at least some of their employees in 1996 (table 3), and just over 900,000 (28.4 percent) of those establishments self-insured at least one plan (table 4). The sponsorship and self-insurance rates discussed in this paper affected almost 104 million workers in private-sector establishments in 1996.

Sponsorship Rates

Firm Size—Firm size was the establishment characteristic with the greatest influence on sponsorship rates. The MEPS-IC data show that 42.1 percent of small firms (fewer than 50 employees) offered insurance, while 93.8 percent of large firms (50 or more employees) offered it (table 3). In every category available in these data, large firms were more likely than small firms to offer health insurance.

Firm size was particularly influential among certain industries, ownership types, ages of firms, proportions of full-time employees, and proportions of low-wage employees. For example, although small establishments in agriculture, fishing, and forestry were 27 percent likely to offer health insurance, large establish-
ments in this industry were more than 80 percent likely to do so. In the ownership category, an unincorporated for-profit firm was 26.3 percent likely to offer insurance if it was small but 86.3 percent likely if it was large. Furthermore, even a young, large firm was more than 80 percent likely to offer insurance, while a small, young firm was 27 percent likely to do so. Size also is more important than full-time work status: 10 percent of small establishments with fewer than 25 percent full-time employees offered health insurance, while 80.5 percent of large establishments with fewer than 25 percent full-timers did. Among establishments with a majority of low-wage employees, 20.1 percent of the small firms offered health insurance, compared with 86.4 percent of the large firms. The highest sponsorship rates for small establishments were found in those with two or more locations (72.3 percent) and those with union employees (68.7 percent).

Type of Ownership—Previous research has shown that workers in nonprofit establishments are more likely to be covered by employment-based health insurance than workers in for-profit firms. The MEPS-IC data show that insurance was offered at almost two-thirds (63.3 percent) of for-profit, incorporated firms but at less than one-third (28.5 percent) of for-profit, unincorporated firms (table 3). Both large and small nonprofits were more likely to offer health insurance than the corresponding for-profits, either incorporated or unincorporated. Since incorporated for-profits were more likely than nonprofits to be large (28.5 percent versus 22.1 percent), and nonprofits were more likely than incorporated for-profits to be small (77.9 percent versus 71.5 percent), the relative weights assigned to each group resulted in sponsorship rates that were not directly comparable. While it appeared that, on the whole, incorporated for-profits were slightly more likely to offer health insurance, once firm size was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Percentage of U.S. Private-Sector Establishments That Offer Health Insurance and Self-Insure at Least One Plan, 1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, fishing, forestry</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, communications, utilities</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, real estate</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>32.6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit, incorporated</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit, unincorporated</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–9 years</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19 years</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more years</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi/Single Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more locations</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One location only</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Full-Time Employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 25%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%–49%</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%–74%</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% or more</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Presence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No union employees</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has union employees</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Low-Wage Employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% or more low-wage</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 50% low-wage</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, Center for Cost and Financing Studies, 1996 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey Insurance Component.

*Figure does not meet standard of reliability or precision.*
controlled for, nonprofits emerged as more likely to offer health insurance, in both size categories shown in these data.

Other Factors Influencing Sponsorship Rates—Independent of firm size, establishments in the manufacturing, mining, and wholesale industries were the most likely to offer health insurance (71.8 percent, 68.7 percent, and 67.7 percent, respectively), and establishments in agriculture, fishing and forestry were the least likely to offer it (28.6 percent) (table 3). Also, the age of a firm, whether it had multiple locations, the proportion of full-time employees, union presence, and the proportion of low-wage employees all showed certain effects on the likelihood of an establishment offering health insurance. Firms that were older were more likely to offer health insurance, as were firms with two or more locations, union employees, a high percentage of full-time employees or a low percentage of low-wage employees.

**Self-Insured Health Plans**

Firm Size—Just as the size of an establishment was related to sponsorship rates, size also was associated with rates of self-insurance. Of all U.S. private-sector establishments that offered health insurance, 28.4 percent self-insured at least one plan (table 4). However, 12.1 percent of firms with fewer than 100 employees self-insured, while almost three-fourths (72.9 percent) of firms with 500 or more employees did so. The rise in self-insurance rates with increased firm size is a trait that remained true for every characteristic reported in the data, and the rates varied significantly among other characteristics as well.

Industry Group—As an industry, agriculture, fishing, and forestry had the lowest rate of self-insurance (10.2 percent), while the mining industry had the highest (50.7 percent). The mining industry was very likely both to sponsor health insurance and to self-insure. Agriculture, fishing, and forestry, however, was the least likely industry group to do either.

Type of Ownership—An incorporated for-profit establishment was more likely to self-insure than an unincorporated for-profit or a nonprofit (31.1 percent, 14.0 percent, and 23.1 percent, respectively). In terms of ownership type, unincorporated for-profit firms were the least likely among all firms to self-insure, but among firms with 100–499 or 500 or more employees, they were more likely than nonprofits to self-insure.

Employee Characteristics—An establishment’s percentage of full-time employees had little influence on rates of self-insurance. Firms with 25 percent to 49 percent full-timers showed the highest self-insurance rate, at 36.1 percent. The most sizeable differences were found among firms with 100–499 employees: 12.7 percent of firms with fewer than 25 percent full-time employees self-insured, while 37.4 percent of those with 75 percent or more full-timers did so.

In general, establishments with union employees were more likely to self-insure than establishments with no union workers (34.8 percent and 19.6 percent, respectively). Among the firms with 500 or more employees, however, the rates of self-insurance were very similar: 62.5 percent for those with no union employees and 62.1 percent for those with union workers.

Establishments with 50 percent or more low-wage workers appeared to be more likely than others to self-insure (22.9 percent versus 18.1 percent). However, when size was controlled for, establishments with fewer than 50 percent low-wage workers in each size category were more likely to self-insure than those with 50 percent or more low-wage workers.

Other Establishment Characteristics—Overall, older establishments appeared to be more likely than younger ones to self-insure at least one plan if they offered health insurance. In the breakdowns by firm size, however, age of firm was shown to have little influence on the rates of self-insurance. Establishments with two or more locations were more likely to self-insure than
Conclusion

While employment-based health insurance is the most common form of health care coverage in the United States, sponsorship rates and self-insurance rates vary considerably, depending on several establishment characteristics. In particular, the size of an establishment influences these rates greatly, and other factors, such as industry, ownership, age of firm, multi/single location status, and employee characteristics each affect the rates in a certain way.

In order to offer health insurance or to self-insure, an establishment must have a certain level of resources available. Also, there must be an incentive for an establishment to offer health insurance at all (such as attracting skilled workers or maintaining a healthy work force), or to self-insure (such as limiting health care spending or avoiding much state regulation of employment-based health insurance). As illustrated by the MEPS-IC data, these incentives, or establishments’ responses to them, change as various characteristics change.

Endnotes

1 Hawaii is the only state requiring employers to provide a minimum level of health benefits to workers. However, coverage in Hawaii is not universal. For additional information, see Paul Fronstin, “Employment-Based Health Benefits: Who Is Offered Coverage vs. Who Takes It,” EBRI Issue Brief no. 213 (Employee Benefit Research Institute, September 1999).
4 Percentages obtained from MEPS-IC data not reprinted in this paper.
5 Few nationally representative comprehensive surveys of employers of all sizes have been conducted. The 1994 National Employer Health Insurance Survey sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the 1996 Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Employer Health Insurance Survey are the only other comprehensive surveys. Many other employer surveys have been conducted but are not comprehensive, as they are often limited to specific geographic regions or firm sizes.
6 See http://www.meps.ahrpr.gov/ for more complete data from the 1996 MEPS-IC.
and nature of tax-cut legislation scuttled the pension-related provisions this year. In all likelihood, the bigger issues—the future of Social Security and Medicare—are effectively off the table until the next president and Congress take office in 2001.

Managed Care Reform/Issues to Consider

UnitedHealthcare announced in early November that it will no longer require pre-authorization for routine medical treatment, allowing physicians to make most decisions about the type of care patients receive. The company says it expects to save $100 million a year by reducing the number of employees performing precertification reviews (this change does not apply to mental health benefits). The move is sure to put pressure on other insurers and managed care entities to follow suit. Nevertheless, it is unlikely this action will have much—if any—impact on the managed care reform debate in Congress. The House/Senate conference committee currently working to resolve differences between the two managed care bills passed by those chambers will not take action until next year at the earliest. If the panel is eventually able to report out a final version, it appears likely the bill would water down the expanded liability provisions approved in House-passed legislation (H.R. 2990). But if such a bill is passed by both chambers, it will almost surely draw a veto from President Clinton. Given the lack of consensus, managed care reform seems certain to be one of the hottest

Keeping on Track

The following items are listed to keep you up-to-date on issues that were not specifically addressed in Washington Update.

HHS to Issue Health Claim Rules—The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) plans to release several final rules and proposed rules for health plans before the end of the year. The final rules will deal with health claim transactions, code sets, and security standards. The proposed rules will deal with claim forms and national health plan identifiers. The regulations are mandated by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) and will affect all public and private health plans and health care providers. The rules and proposed rules are available on the Internet at aspe.hhs.gov/admsimp/

Cash Balance Update—The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) plans to publish guidance on cash balance conversions, but an IRS official recently told a Washington audience that the pension community should expect a slowdown in guidance projects because of the agency’s reorganization efforts. Cash balance plan guidance may be released before the end of the year. In early November, the Department of Labor’s (DOL) ERISA Advisory Council working group on hybrid retirement plans agreed to a set of findings and policy recommendations on cash balance conversion trends. The group recommended that the disclosure rules regarding cash balance plan conversions should be strengthened, but the panel did not endorse additional legislation on the issue. The panel also reiterated its pledge not to take a position on pending legal issues surrounding cash balance plan design and conversions.

IRS Names Carol Gold to Oversee Employee Plans Function—As part of the IRS reorganization program, the service will have a new Tax Exempt and Government Entities (TE/GE) Division. Carol Gold has been named to head the division’s Employee Plans, Exempt Organizations and Government Entities function. Gold, who is currently director of the Employee Plans Division, has held several positions in the current Employee Plans and Exempt Organizations organization during her 23 years with the IRS.

Boehner to Introduce Stock Option Bill—Rep. John Boehner (R-OH), chair of the House Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, is planning to introduce a bill that would create a new type of stock option for rank and file employees. Similar to the “incentive options” most often granted to key executives, the new option would defer any tax obligations on a stock until the shares are sold. The Wealth Through the Workplace Act (no bill number was available at this writing) would stipulate a number of criteria to create a “safe harbor” under ERISA for employers that offer the new options. Legislative action on the proposal is not possible until next year.
political issues in next year’s elections.

While most observers have focused on expanded liability for health plans under either state or federal law, another aspect of patients’ rights legislation deserves attention: mandatory external appeals. The codification of an appeals process, and its application at defined points in the medical treatment decision-making continuum, open up a whole new set of potential problems in the post-UnitedHealthcare environment.

In essence, if managed care reform legislation is enacted, would any health plan ever deny a claim, in the knowledge that this would automatically trigger the new appeals structure? It seems likely that no health plan, plan sponsor, or insurer would want to go through the potentially complicated and costly appeals process. Indeed, the open questions surrounding the appeals process (what constitutes a qualifying event to trigger the right to an appeal? When do the time limits governing the process actually take effect?) increase the likelihood that the courts ultimately will have to define “congressional intent” in any new patient protection law.

**Outlook:** Plan sponsors, insurers, and others with concerns regarding the managed care reform debate would be well-advised to focus on the implications of mandatory external appeals—and not just on expanded liability. To an extent (depending upon the nature of the plan in question), expanded liability is a risk that can be insured against and addressed by altering plan procedures. But a potentially Byzantine appeals process could add cost, create confusion, and interfere in medical decision making in ways that neither plan sponsors nor advocates of greater patients’ rights have examined.

**EBRI in Focus**

**Fall 1999 Policy Forum Held**

On Dec. 1, EBRI-ERF held its 47th policy forum, “The Next 25 Years of ERISA: The Future of Private Retirement Plans.” The daylong forum was held in Washington, DC, and featured panel discussions by a wide range of experts on ERISA’s objectives and the changing environment and risks to economic security in retirement; current developments in defined benefit and defined contribution plans; and the effects of technological and political changes.

Materials from the day’s events are available on the EBRI Web site by following the links at www.ebri.org/dec99agenda.htm. A book based on the proceedings will be published as soon as possible after the forum. For more information, contact Pam Ostuw at ostuw@ebri.org or at (202) 775-6315.

**EBRI Board of Trustees Meets**

The Board met Dec. 2 in Washington, DC, to review 1999 activities and plans for the year 2000. New findings from the EBRI/ICI Participant-Directed Retirement Plan Data Collection Project were presented, as were key findings from research in progress. Trustees reviewed the Choose to Save™ education program and plans for the Board’s 2000 Executive Forum.

**Annual Report Forthcoming:** EBRI will distribute its year 2000 annual report through EBRI Online early in the new year.
Women’s Survey Released
Data from the 1999 Women’s Retirement Confidence Survey were released Nov. 17 during the ASEC Partners’ meeting in Washington, DC. The survey showed that in some respects women have closed the retirement planning gap with men, but that significant differences remain in attitudes toward financial matters. The WRCS was cosponsored by EBRI, the American Savings Education Council (ASEC), and Mathew Greenwald & Associates. Materials are available on both the EBRI and ASEC Web sites (www.ebri.org and www.asec.org).
For more information about the survey, contact Pam Ostuw at ostuw@ebri.org or at (202) 775-6315.

ASEC Partners’ Meeting
ASEC’s Policy Board meeting was held Nov. 16 in Washington, DC, followed the next day by a Partners’ meeting. In addition to the release of the 1999 WRCS, the meeting provided updates on the U.S. Department of Labor’s Savings Education Campaign and implementation of the SAVER Act; the Choose to Save™ education program; the Social Security Administration’s new individual statements and retirement planning tool; the White House/National Economic Council’s plan to improve consumer financial education; and a panel of state treasurers speaking on leadership in savings and investment education.

Live Satellite Broadcast
ASEC helped produce a live national satellite broadcast on Nov. 10 to federal employees entitled, “Planning Ahead: Saving and Your Financial Future.” Broadcast panelists included representatives of several ASEC Partner institutions. ASEC also co-sponsored a Savings and Education Fair at the U.S. Department of Agriculture in conjunction with the broadcast.

EBRI Health Databook
The first edition of the EBRI Health Benefits Databook is now available. Cost of the Databook is $59.95 per copy plus shipping, although EBRI Members get a 55 percent discount. For more information, contact Publications at EBRI, (202) 775-9132, or by e-mail at willis@ebri.org.

The Health Benefits Databook is an indispensable resource that provides more than a hundred tables and charts, and has been carefully organized and tightly focused on the range of health issues to make it as user-friendly and relevant as possible. It also contains the latest data from the Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey. Appendices have been updated to include the most recent health-related legislation and data sources.

New Publications & Internet Sites
[Note: To order publications from the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), call (202) 512-1800; to order congressional publications published by GPO, call (202) 512-1808. To order U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) publications, call (202) 512-6000; to order from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), call (202) 226-2809.]
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Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc., (800) 529-9615.
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Mitchell, Olivia S., Robert J. Myers, and Howard Young. Prospects for Social Security Reform. $49.95. University of Pennsylvania Press, P.O. Box 4836, Hampden Station, Baltimore, MD 21211, (800) 445-9880, fax: (410) 516-6998.
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Documents Available on the Internet
1999 Annual Employer Health Benefits Survey
www.kff.org/content/1999/1538/
Employee Benefits in Medium and Large Private Establishments,
1997
stats.bls.gov/ebshome.htm
Health Insurance Coverage: 1998
www.census.gov/hhes/www/hlthin98.html
New Year 2000 Holiday Time Off Survey Results
Retiree Health Coverage: Recent Trends and Employer Perspectives on Future Benefits
www.kff.org/content/1999/1540/Retiree.pdf
Third Millennium Cash Balance Pension Plan Survey
www.thirdmil.org/publications/surveys.html

Internet Sites for Human Resource Professionals
Academy of Human Resource Development
www.ahrdr.org/
American Society for Training & Development
www.astd.org/
Human Resource Planning Society
www.hrps.org/
International Association for Human Resource Information Management
www.ihrim.org/
International Personnel Management Association
www.ipma-hr.org/
Society for Human Resource Management
www.shrm.org/

EBRI offers no endorsement of, and assumes no liability for, the currency, accuracy, or availability of any information on these sites.
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EBRI’s work advances knowledge and understanding of employee benefits and their importance to the nation’s economy among policymakers, the news media, and the public. It does this by conducting and publishing policy research, analysis, and special reports on employee benefits issues; holding educational briefings for EBRI members, congressional and federal agency staff, and the news media; and sponsoring public opinion surveys on employee benefit issues. The Employee Benefit Research Institute (EBRI-ERF) performs the charitable, educational, and scientific functions of the Institute. EBRI-ERF is a tax-exempt organization supported by contributions and grants. The American Savings Education Council (ASEC), part of EBRI-ERF, is a coalition of private- and public-sector institutions with the goal of making saving and retirement planning a vital concern of all Americans.

Our publications

EBRI Issue Briefs are monthly periodicals providing expert evaluations of employee benefit issues and trends, as well as critical analyses of employee benefit policies and proposals. EBRI Notes is a monthly periodical providing current information on a variety of employee benefit topics. EBRI’s Pension Investment Report provides detailed financial information on the universe of defined benefit, defined contribution, and 401(k) plans. EBRI Fundamentals of Employee Benefit Programs offers a straightforward, basic explanation of employee benefit programs in the private and public sectors. EBRI Databook on Employee Benefits is a statistical reference volume on employee benefit programs and work force related issues.

Subscription/orders

Contact EBRI Publications, (202) 659-0670; fax publication orders to (202) 775-6312. Subscriptions to EBRI Issue Briefs are included as part of EBRI membership, or as part of a $199 annual subscription to EBRI Notes and EBRI Issue Briefs. Individual copies are available with prepayment for $25 each (for printed copies) or for $7.50 (as an e-mailed electronic file) by calling EBRI or from www.ebri.org. Change of Address: EBRI, 2121 K Street, NW, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20037, (202) 775-9132; fax number, (202) 775-6312; e-mail: PublicationsSubscriptions@ebri.org. Membership Information: Inquiries regarding EBRI membership, ASEC partnership, and/or contributions to EBRI-ERF should be directed to EBRI President/ASEC Chairman Dallas Salisbury at the above address, (202) 659-0670; e-mail: salisbury@ebri.org

Editorial Board: Dallas L. Salisbury, publisher; Steve Blakely, managing editor; Cindy O’Connor, production and distribution. Any views expressed in this publication and those of the authors should not be ascribed to the officers, trustees, members, or other sponsors of the Employee Benefit Research Institute, the EBRI Education and Research Fund, or their staffs. Nothing herein is to be construed as an attempt to aid or hinder the adoption of any pending legislation, regulation, or interpretative rule, or as legal, accounting, actuarial, or other such professional advice.

EBRI Notes is registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. ISSN: 1085-4452  1085-4452/90  $ .50+.50

Could we send a friend or colleague a complimentary copy of EBRI Notes?

Send an issue to ____________________________________________
Organization ____________________________________________
Address ________________________________________________
City/ State/ ZIP _________________________________________
Your Name ______________________________________________
Mail to: EBRI, 2121 K Street, NW, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20037
or Fax to: (202) 775-6312

Did you read this as a pass-along? Stay ahead of employee benefit issues with your own subscription to EBRI Notes for only $49/ year electronically e-mailed to you or $99/ year printed and mailed. For more information about subscriptions, visit our Web site at www.ebri.org or complete the form below and return it to EBRI.

Name _________________________________________________
Organization ____________________________________________
Address ________________________________________________
City/ State/ ZIP _________________________________________
Mail to: EBRI, 2121 K Street, NW, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20037
or Fax to: (202) 775-6312