The Estate Planner

November/December 2015

Double whammy
IRD triggers both estate and income taxes

When to begin collecting Social Security depends on personal circumstances

Estate planning for disabled children
ABLE accounts vs. special needs trusts

Estate Planning Red Flag
You're lending money to a family member

Weston Hurd LLP
Attorneys at Law

Cleveland ▪ Columbus ▪ Beachwood

The Tower At Erieview
1301 East 9th Street, Suite 1900
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1862
tel 216.241.6602 • fax 216.621.8369

10 West Broad Street, Suite 2400
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3469
tel 614.280.0200 • fax 614.280.0204

24100 Chagrin Boulevard
Beachwood, Ohio 44122-5535
tel 216.241.6602 • fax 216.621.8369

www.westonhurd.com

Double whammy

IRD triggers both estate and income taxes

Whether you're planning your estate, or you're a beneficiary receiving an inheritance, don't overlook the potential tax consequences of income in respect of a decedent (IRD). IRD refers to income earned or accrued during life, but not received until after death. Common examples include unpaid salary, fees, commissions or bonuses, retirement income (from traditional IRAs and qualified retirement plans), deferred compensation, and accrued interest, dividends or rent.

IRD often results in double taxation: It's included in the deceased's taxable estate *and* it represents taxable income to the recipient — usually, the deceased's estate, spouse or other beneficiaries. Unlike other types of assets, IRD assets don't receive a stepped-up basis, which otherwise would eliminate income taxes. Fortunately, there are strategies you can use to minimize the impact.

Unintended consequences

Failure to recognize the significance of IRD can lead to unintended estate planning consequences. Consider this example:

Rick wishes to divide his estate equally between his two children, Jill and David. He leaves real estate worth $1 million to Jill and names David the beneficiary of his $1 million IRA. On the surface, it seems that Rick's children will receive equal inheritances. But unlike the real estate Jill receives, David's inheritance is reduced substantially by income taxes. That's because the IRA is an IRD asset, so David is subject to tax on each distribution he receives. Assuming he's in the 28% tax bracket, $280,000 of the IRA's $1 million value will go to the IRS.

Failure to recognize the significance of IRD can lead to unintended estate planning consequences.

Planning strategies

There are several strategies you or your beneficiaries can use to reduce or even eliminate IRD. They include:

Taking advantage of deductions. Beneficiaries shouldn't overlook the IRD deduction. To provide some relief from double taxation, the Internal Revenue Code allows recipients of IRD to claim an itemized deduction equal to the estate tax attributable to that income. (See "Calculating the IRD deduction" on page 3.)

In addition, beneficiaries are entitled to write off "deductions in respect of a decedent" (DRD), which includes IRD-related expenses they incur — such as

interest, investment advisory fees or broker commissions — that would have been deductible by the deceased had he or she paid them. To support these deductions, it's important to maintain thorough records of all relevant expenses.

Deferring the tax. Beneficiaries who receive IRAs or other retirement benefits may be able to defer income taxes by "stretching" distributions over their life expectancies rather than taking a lump sum.

Using IRD assets to fund charitable donations. Charities are tax-exempt entities, so they're not taxable on IRD. If you plan to make charitable donations, try to use IRD assets to fund them whenever possible, and leave other assets to your family members. For example, you might name a charity as beneficiary of your IRA or other retirement account.

If you don't want to leave the entire account to charity, you could place it in a trust for the benefit of both charitable and noncharitable beneficiaries. But work closely with your estate planning and tax advisors to be sure the trust is set up properly and doesn't inadvertently trigger accelerated taxation of IRD.

Converting an IRA to a Roth IRA. By converting a traditional IRA into a Roth IRA during your lifetime, you can spare your beneficiaries any IRD liability. (Qualified distributions from Roth IRAs are tax-free.) You'll need to pay income tax on the converted amount, but this strategy may be advantageous if your beneficiary is in a higher tax bracket than you or isn't entitled to an IRD deduction (because your estate pays no estate taxes or your beneficiary doesn't itemize).

Allocating IRD assets among your beneficiaries. What if you can't avoid leaving IRD assets to your noncharitable beneficiaries? You can minimize the impact by distributing those assets among your heirs and allocating more IRD to beneficiaries in lower tax brackets.

Calculating the IRD deduction

Recipients of income in respect of a decedent (IRD) are entitled to an itemized deduction equal to the amount of estate tax, if any, attributable to the IRD asset. The deduction is calculated by taking the amount of tax actually paid by the deceased estate and subtracting the tax it would have paid, had the IRD asset been excluded.

Suppose, for example, that Rick's estate is valued at $10.43 million. He dies in 2015, when the estate tax exemption is $5.43 million, leaving his $1 million IRA to his son, David. Rick's estate pays $2 million in estate taxes [($10.43 million - $5.43 million) × 40%]. Had the IRA been excluded, the estate's tax liability would have been $1.6 million [($9.43 million - $5.43 million) × 40%], so David is entitled to a $400,000 income tax deduction. This deduction may or may not offset David's IRD tax liability, depending on his overall tax situation. Be aware that, if David stretches IRA distributions over his life expectancy, the IRD deduction must also be spread over that period.

Pay attention to IRD

Between estate and income taxes, IRD can quickly devour wealth meant for your family. If you have, or expect to have, IRD assets, work with your advisor to implement strategies for minimizing their estate tax impact. ✤

When to begin collecting Social Security depends on personal circumstances

Determining when to begin collecting Social Security benefits depends on many individual factors — including the amount of your nest egg, how much you and your spouse will need to continue your desired lifestyle during retirement, and your overall estate planning goals. In other words, the right answer should be based on your individual circumstances.

Running the numbers

If you were born at any time between 1943 and 1954, your normal retirement age is 66. If you start receiving benefits at age 66, you're entitled to a full benefit based on a formula tied to your earnings history. Many people can maximize wealth accumulation by delaying Social Security benefits to normal retirement age or even later.

You can start your Social Security retirement benefits as early as age 62, but the benefit amount you receive will be less than your full retirement benefit amount. If you start your benefits early, they'll be reduced based on the number of months you receive benefits before you reach your full retirement age.

According to the Social Security Administration, if your full retirement age is 66, the reduction of your benefits at age 62 is 25%; at 63, it's 20%; at 64, it's 13.3%; and at 65, it's 6.7%.

If your full retirement age is older than 66 (that is, you were born after 1954), you can still start your retirement benefits at 62 but the reduction in your benefit amount will be greater, up to a maximum of 30% at age 62 for people born in 1960 or later.

Calculating your breakeven point

A useful tool for choosing the right starting age is to calculate your breakeven point. For example, Sue, who is retired, is about to turn 62. She's trying to decide between taking a reduced Social Security benefit right away or waiting until her normal retirement age of 66. Let's say Sue's full monthly benefit at 66 would be $2,000 and her reduced benefit at 62 would be $1,500.

Ignoring cost of living adjustments for simplicity, Sue's breakeven point is just before her 78th birthday. At that point, her total benefits will be about the same whether she starts at age 62 (192 months × $1,500 = $288,000) or at age 66 (144 months × $2,000 = $288,000). If Sue lives to at least 78, waiting until 66 to start collecting will provide her with greater lifetime benefits. If she doesn't reach that age, she's better off starting at 62.

Let's suppose that Sue's father and grandfather both lived to be 90. If Sue follows suit, she'll receive

$72,000 of additional Social Security benefits by waiting until her normal retirement age of 66.

After determining your breakeven point, the right choice for you depends on several factors, including your actuarial life expectancy, your health and your family history. Also, keep in mind that the above example doesn't consider potential earnings on Social Security benefits. If you plan to invest your benefits, you may need to adjust your breakeven point upward or downward, depending on your expected rate of return.

Do you plan to work past eligibility age?

If you plan to continue working after you become eligible for Social Security, you're likely better off delaying benefits at least until you reach your normal retirement age. If you start anytime before the year in which you reach your normal retirement age, your benefits will be reduced by $1 for every $2 you earn above a certain threshold ($15,720 in 2015).

After you reach your normal retirement age, you can continue working without reducing your Social Security benefits. But keep in mind that, if your income exceeds certain limits, a portion of your Social Security benefits will be taxable.

Seek your advisor's advice

Several factors must be considered when determining the ideal time to begin taking Social Security benefits. Your estate planning advisor can assess your circumstances and help you maximize the potential value of your Social Security benefits. ✤

Estate planning for disabled children

ABLE accounts vs. special needs trusts

For families with disabled children, financial planning can be a challenge. On the one hand, you want to provide the happiest, most comfortable life possible for your loved one. On the other hand, you don't want to jeopardize your child's eligibility for means-tested government benefits, such as Medicaid or Supplemental Security Income (SSI), especially after you're no longer around to provide for him or her.

For many years, the most effective solution to this problem has been to set up a special needs trust (SNT), which provides resources for the care of a disabled child while preserving his or her eligibility for government benefits. SNTs also offer some asset protection against creditors' claims.

Now, many families have another option: In 2014, the Achieving a Better Life Experience (ABLE) Act was signed into law. The act created Internal Revenue Code Section 529A, which authorizes the states to offer tax-advantaged savings accounts for the blind and severely disabled, similar to Sec. 529 college savings accounts.

ABLE accounts and SNTs have different sets of advantages and disadvantages, so it's important to compare the two options carefully.

How ABLE accounts work

The ABLE Act allows family members and others to make nondeductible cash contributions to

a qualified beneficiary's ABLE account, with total annual contributions limited to the federal gift tax annual exclusion amount (currently, $14,000). To qualify, a beneficiary must have become blind or disabled before age 26.

The account grows tax-free, and earnings may be withdrawn tax-free provided they're used to pay "qualified disability expenses." These include health care, education, housing, transportation, employment training, assistive technology, personal support services, financial management and legal expenses.

An ABLE account generally won't affect the beneficiary's eligibility for Medicaid and SSI — which limits a recipient's "countable assets" to $2,000 — with a couple of exceptions. First, distributions from an ABLE account used to pay housing expenses are countable assets. Second, if an ABLE account's balance grows beyond $100,000, the beneficiary's eligibility for SSI is suspended until the balance is brought below that threshold.

Comparison with SNTs

Here's a quick review of the relative advantages and disadvantages of ABLE accounts and SNTs:

Availability. Anyone can establish an SNT, but ABLE accounts are available only if your home state offers them, or contracts with another state to make them available. Also, as previously noted, ABLE account beneficiaries must become blind or disabled before age 26. There's no age limit for SNTs.

Qualified expenses. ABLE accounts may be used to pay only specified types of expenses. SNTs may be used for any expenses the government doesn't pay for, including "quality-of-life" expenses, such as travel, recreation, hobbies and entertainment.

Tax treatment. An ABLE account's earnings and qualified distributions are tax-free. An SNT's earnings are taxable.

Contribution limits. Annual contributions to ABLE accounts currently are limited to $14,000, and total contributions are effectively limited to $100,000 to avoid suspension of SSI benefits. There are no limits on contributions to SNTs, although contributions in excess of $14,000 per year may be subject to gift tax.

An ABLE account generally won't affect the beneficiary's eligibility for Medicaid and SSI.

Investments. Contributions to ABLE accounts are limited to cash, and the beneficiary (or his or her representative) may direct the investment of the account funds twice a year. With an SNT, you can contribute a variety of assets, including cash, stock or real estate. And the trustee — preferably an experienced professional fiduciary — has complete flexibility to direct the trust's investments.

Medicaid reimbursement. If an ABLE account beneficiary dies before the account assets have been

depleted, the balance must be used to reimburse the government for any Medicaid benefits the beneficiary received after the account was established. There's also a reimbursement requirement for SNTs. With either an ABLE account or an SNT, any remaining assets are distributed according to the terms of the account or the SNT.

Weigh your options

ABLE accounts offer tax advantages and are less expensive to administer. SNTs offer higher contribution limits and greater flexibility. Your estate planning advisor can help you determine which is best for your family: an ABLE account, an SNT, or one of each. ✤

Estate Planning Red Flag

You're lending money to a family member



When a family member is in financial need, your natural response may be to get out your checkbook and make a loan. But while an informal approach may feel comfortable, it pays to take steps to formalize the transaction. Why? For one thing, the IRS tends to view undocumented loans as disguised gifts. Depending on the amount in question and your tax situation, such a gift may use up some of your lifetime gift tax exemption or even trigger gift tax liability.

To avoid this result, prepare a written promissory note that spells out the loan's terms, including a fixed repayment schedule and a reasonable rate of interest. To help ensure that the IRS will treat the transaction as a bona fide loan, it's also important to make a genuine effort to collect and document your efforts in writing.

It's particularly important to charge reasonable interest. If you make a no-interest or low-interest loan to a family member (and it's not treated as a disguised gift), you'll be liable for income taxes on the "imputed interest" (with exceptions for certain small loans). Imputed interest is equal to the difference between the interest you collect from the borrower and the interest you would have collected at the applicable federal rate. In other words, you'll pay tax on interest that you didn't actually receive. What's more, imputed interest is treated as a taxable gift to the borrower.

Providing financial assistance to loved ones is a worthy endeavor. But before you write a check, do some planning to avoid unintended tax consequences.

Weston Hurd LLP
Attorneys at Law

Angela G. Carlin is the Co-Chair of Weston Hurd's Estate, Trust and Probate Practice Group. She focuses her practice on estate, trust and probate administration and litigation, and tax matters. Angela is the author of the Merrick-Rippner Probate Law publication which is the recognized authority in Ohio on probate law. She received the Nettie Cronise Lutes Award from the Ohio State Bar Association in 1996 as the Outstanding Woman Lawyer and for many years, she has been named as an *Ohio Super Lawyer* by Law & Politics, Inc. and a *Leading Lawyer* by Inside Business Magazine.

Karen A. Davey focuses her practice on estates, trust and probate administration. She also handles litigation in probate related matters, such as will contests, trust contests, and power-of-attorney disputes.

Jerrold L. Goldstein focuses his practice on estate planning, probate and corporate law. Jerry is also Co-Chair of Weston Hurd's Estate, Trust and Probate Practice Group. He represents clients in a wide variety of matters involving probate administration, probate litigation, estate and income tax compliance, wills and trusts, business formation, contract negotiations, and commercial real estate.

Rema A. Ina is an Associate with Weston Hurd LLP. She focuses her practice on matters involving employment, estate planning, insurance coverage and defense, and workers' compensation.

Gary W. Johnson advises clients on matters involving commercial litigation, business entities creation and maintenance, land use, construction law, zoning, estate planning and probate. Gary has been recognized as an *Ohio Super Lawyer* in the area of Business Litigation by Law & Politics, Inc.

Eugene (Gene) A. Kratus advises individuals in the areas of tax, business and estate planning and counsels privately-owned businesses and their owners on corporate, tax, mergers, acquisitions and business succession issues. His estate planning practice includes implementing various estate planning techniques, ranging from modest By-Pass Trusts to the implementation of sophisticated planning with family limited partnerships, family limited liability companies, charitable trusts and private foundations.

Ludgy A. LaRochelle is an Associate with Weston Hurd LLP. He counsels entrepreneurs, small businesses, and non-profit organizations, and individuals in matters involving commercial real estate, e-commerce and Internet law, employment, estate planning, intellectual property, mergers, acquisitions and divestitures, and regulatory compliance.

Samuel J. Lauricia III focuses his practice on tax planning, at both the Federal and state level, involving corporate, partnership, individual and gift tax issues, succession planning and general corporate transactions, contracts, mergers and acquisitions. Sam has been recognized as an *Ohio Rising Star* in the area of Taxation by Law & Politics, Inc.

Shawn W. Maestle is the Chair of Weston Hurd's Appellate section and a member of the firm's Litigation section. He focuses his practice in the areas of appellate, estate planning and probate litigation.

Teresa G. Santin is an Associate with Weston Hurd LLP. She focuses her practice on matters involving business, employment, estate planning, real estate, and white collar litigation.

Joseph B. Swartz focuses his practice on estate planning, estate administration, trust administration, and income tax for individuals, estates and trusts. Joe served as chair of the Ohio State Bar Association's Labor and Employment Law section for 2010-2012 and he has been recognized as an *Ohio Super Lawyer* for Labor and Employment by Law & Politics, Inc.

Carlin Comments

Does Ohio Recognize "Virtual Adoption"? – Part 3

By Angela G. Carlin

Ohio does recognize the doctrine of "equitable adoption," however the doctrine is usually invoked where a contract or agreement for adoption has been performed for the child's benefit. *Spiegel v. Flemming*, 181 F.Supp. 185(1960). The appellate court in *Boulger vs. Unknown Heirs*, 1983 Ohio App. Lexis 13562 1983 WL 3210, affirmed the trial court's judgment that the decedent's estate escheated to the State of Ohio when she died without lineal heirs. Decedent Nettie Robertson ("Nettie") was "reared" by the appellants' parents, but there was no evidence to conclusively prove that an adoption or agreement to adopt existed between the decedent and the appellants' parents. When the decedent's natural parents died during her early childhood, she was taken in and raised by John and Nannie Robertson. Years later the Robertson's took in and raised another child, Ed Poole, who later married and had three children. The Poole heirs claimed Nettie's intestate estate (when Nettie died without a Will) on the allegation that Ed Poole and Nettie were half-brother and sister. Another set of heirs claimed Nettie's intestate property through the bloodline as great-grandchildren of Nannie Robertson's grandparents, John and Dorcas Dunlap. The Dunlap heirs admit in their brief that there is no evidence of a statutory adoption of Nettie by John and Nannie Robertson.

Since there were no attempts of a statutory adoption nor evidence of a purported contract or agreement to adopt Nettie (nor was there evidence of an adoption of Ed Poole) there was no evidence to reverse the trial court's decision. *D.E. Morris Co. v. Foley Construction Co.*, 54 Ohio St. 2d 279, 376 N.E. 2d 578. Although the trial court also found the evidence insufficient in light of long established policy to avoid escheat if possible, the trial court still found insufficient evidence to support either the Poole's or Dunlap's claimed heirship. The appellate court refused to establish equitable adoption upon the facts in order to avoid an escheat of Nettie's estate to the State of Ohio.

In *York v. Nunley*, in 1992 (80 Ohio App 3d 697, 610 N.E. 2d 576) the Cuyahoga County Court of Appeals declined to expand the law of inheritance by adding a very limited and narrow application of "equitable adoption" where foster children had lived with the decedent for over 20 years, without having been, formally adopted. The decedent's Will did not provide for the foster children and they filed a will contest claiming that they were beneficiaries under her later Will which was now lost or destroyed, and no copies of this later Will was in evidence. The trial court dismissed the will contest and the appellate court affirmed the dismissal, because the foster children had no standing to challenge the Will as they were not "persons interested in the will" with a direct, immediate, and legally ascertainable pecuniary interest as required under R.C. 2107.71(A). The Court found that had the Will been set aside, and the estate passed under the laws of descent and distribution (applicable when there is no valid Will), the foster children would have received nothing.

In *In re Estate of Cummins* 61 Ohio Misc 2d 579, 580 N.E. 2d 866 (1991), the decedent, Rowena Cummins, had no children and was widowed for some time. The decedent devised her estate consisting of farm property in her Will to her "beloved friends," Clarence and Mary Agnes Knecht equally, who farmed decedent's property, and performed services to care for decedent, who in turn made generous monetary gifts to the Knecht family members. Clarence claimed that he was the foster child of the decedent and thus entitled to a value the farm property for estate tax purposes under the special valuation provisions of the former Ohio estate tax provision R.C. 5731.011(A)(2). In this case of first impression in Ohio, the appellate court held that Clarence was not a foster child placed in decedent's residence under the Ohio Administrative Code 5101:2-7-01 as decedent first met Clarence when he was 19 years old, and although there was a close relationship between the decedent and the Knecht family, the decedent characterized their relationship in her Will when she devised her farm to her "beloved friends," and not as a parent and child. Since Clarence was neither the natural child, the adopted child, the stepchild, nor the foster child of the decedent, his inheritance of the farm under Rowena's Will did not qualify for the special farm property value in former R.C. 5731.011. While in some jurisdictions, a relationship between a foster child and a foster parent has been held to be an "equitable adoption," this appellate court held that in Ohio adoption is "strictly statutory."

It appears that in Ohio, if there are facts as in *Sanders v. Riley*, the Georgia Supreme Court decision which include a written or oral agreement which may be proved by sufficient evidence, where a person agrees to adopt the child of another person as his own, accompanied by a virtual, though not a statutory adoption; acted upon by all concerned parties for many years; and which may be enforced in equity after the obligor's death, an Ohio Court may decree that the child is entitled to the obligor's property undisposed of by obligor's Will.

If you have any questions about the topic of virtual adoption, please contact your Weston Hurd lawyer.