

PENSIONOMICS 2025

MEASURING THE ECONOMIC
IMPACT OF DB PENSION
EXPENDITURES



NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON
Retirement Security

Reliable Research. Sensible Solutions.

By Ilana Boivie and Dan Doonan

January 2025

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Ilana Boivie is the Assistant Director of Strategic Resources for the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAM). An economist by training, she has over fifteen years' experience working on retirement, health care, and other compensation and benefit issues for working Americans. At the IAM, she conducts labor research and economic analysis regarding contract negotiations, legislative initiatives, and labor policy issues. She also currently serves on the PBGC Advisory Committee, representing employee organizations. Previously, Ilana was Director of 401(k) and Special Projects at the IAM National Pension Fund, one of the largest multiemployer benefit plans in the country. As Director of Programs for the National Institute on Retirement Security, she conducted original research and analysis of national retirement issues, especially regarding defined benefit pension plans. She frequently speaks on retirement and economic matters, and has testified before policymakers at the federal, state, and local levels. Ilana holds an M.A. in economics from New Mexico State University and a B.A. in English from Binghamton University, where she graduated Magna Cum Laude.

Dan Doonan is the executive director of the National Institute on Retirement Security. With the Board of Directors, Doonan leads the organization's strategic planning, retirement research and education initiatives. Doonan has more than 20 years of experience working on retirement issues from different vantage points including an analyst, consultant, trainer, and a plan trustee. He comes to NIRS after serving as a senior pension specialist with the National Education Association. Doonan began his career at the Department of Labor as a mathematical statistician. He then spent seven years performing actuarial analysis with Buck Consultants in the retirement practice. His experience also includes positions as a research director and labor economist. Doonan holds a B.S. in Mathematics from Elizabethtown College and is a member of the National Academy of Social Insurance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful for the comments, advice, and assistance provided by Tyler Bond, Kelly Kenneally, Alexander Measure, and Anthony Begnoche. The core methodology in this study was reviewed by experts in the 2009 and 2012 editions of this study. The views in this report and any errors or omissions are those of the authors alone.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Defined benefit (DB) pension benefits not only provide a secure source of income for many retired Americans, they also contribute substantially to local, state, and national economies. DB pensions play a vital role in sustaining consumer demand that ultimately supports millions of jobs.

Virtually every state and local economy across the country benefits from the spending of pension checks. For example, when a retired nurse residing in the state of Wisconsin receives a pension benefit payment, s/he spends the pension check on goods and services in the local community. S/he purchases food, clothing, and medicine at local stores, and may even make larger purchases like a car or laptop computer. These purchases, combined with those of other retirees with pensions, create a steady economic ripple effect. In short, pension spending supports the economy and supports jobs where retirees reside and spend their benefits. Pension expenditures may be especially vital to small or rural communities, where other steady sources of income may not be readily found if the local economy lacks diversity.

Additionally, reliable pension income can be especially important not only in providing retirees with peace of mind, but in stabilizing local economies during economic downturns. Retirees with DB pensions know they are receiving a steady check despite economic conditions. In contrast, retirees may be reluctant to spend out of their 401(k)-type accounts if their savings are negatively impacted by market downturns.¹ To the extent that DB pensions provide retirees with steady income available for spending regardless of fluctuations in the stock market, DB pensions may play a stabilizing role in the economy like Social Security.²

This study analyzes data on DB pension plans in both the public and private sectors to assess the overall national economic impact of benefits paid by these plans to retirees in 2022. For state and local government pension plans, we also analyze these impacts at the state level for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Because of methodological refinements, explained in the Technical Appendix, both the national and state level results are not directly comparable to those in previous versions of this study.

The economic gains attributable to DB pension expenditures are considerable. This study finds that, in 2022:

\$680.6 billion in pension benefits were paid to 26.3 million retired Americans, including:

- 371.6 billion paid to some 12.0 million retired employees of state and local government and their beneficiaries (typically surviving spouses);
- \$91.5 billion paid to some 2.7 million federal government beneficiaries;
- \$217.4 billion paid to some 11.5 million private sector beneficiaries, including:
 - \$51.8 billion paid out to 4.1 million beneficiaries of multi-employer pension plans, and
 - \$165.6 billion paid out to 7.4 million beneficiaries of single-employer pension plans.

Expenditures made out of those payments collectively supported:

- 7.1 million American jobs that paid \$466.2 billion in labor income;
- \$1.5 trillion in total economic output nationwide;
- \$871.0 billion in value added (GDP);
- \$224.3 billion in federal, state, and local tax revenue.

DB pension expenditures have large multiplier effects:

- Each dollar paid out in pension benefits supported \$2.28 in total economic output nationally.
- Each taxpayer dollar contributed to state and local pensions supported \$7.79 in total output nationally. This represents the leverage afforded by robust long-term investment returns and shared funding responsibility by employers and employees.

The largest employment impacts occurred in the food services, health care, and retail trade sectors.

INTRODUCTION: MEASURING THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF DB PENSIONS

Virtually every state and local economy across the country benefits from the spending of defined benefit (DB) pension payments. For example, when a retired nurse residing in the state of Wisconsin receives a pension benefit payment, s/he spends the pension check on goods and services in the local community. S/he purchases food, clothing, and medicine at local stores, and may even make larger purchases like a car or laptop computer. These purchases, combined with those of other retirees with pensions, create an economic ripple effect. In short, pension spending supports the economy and supports jobs where retirees reside and spend their benefits. Pension expenditures may be especially vital to small or rural communities, where other steady sources of income may not be readily found if the local economy lacks diversity.

Additionally, reliable pension income can be especially important not only providing retirees with peace of mind, but in stabilizing local economies during economic downturns. Retirees with DB pensions know they are receiving a steady check despite economic conditions. In contrast, retirees may be reluctant to spend out of their 401(k)-type accounts if their savings are negatively impacted by market downturns. To the extent that DB pensions provide retirees with steady income available for spending regardless of fluctuations in the stock market, DB pensions may play a stabilizing role in the economy like Social Security.³

The purpose of this study is to quantify the economic impact of DB pension payments in the U.S. and in each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia (hereafter referred to as “states”). Using the IMPLAN model, we estimate the employment, output, value added, and tax impacts of pension benefit expenditures at the national and state levels.

The remainder of this introduction provides a brief background on DB pensions and an overview of the methodology. Section I outlines the major types of economic impacts measured in this study. Section II presents national level findings. Section III outlines the state level impact analysis, and Section IV presents the state level findings.

Background: DB Pensions in the United States

Defined benefit (DB) pension plans have existed in the United States since the 19th century. In the private sector, the first DB pension plan was introduced in 1875 by the American Express Company.⁴ Over time, many private sector employers saw the value of offering DB pension coverage to their employees, as these benefits not only were quite valued by workers, but from a human resource management perspective, they also acted as an effective recruitment and retention tool.⁵ Although private sector DB plans have experienced a decline in recent decades (due in large part to a difficult regulatory environment),⁶ in 2023, 24 percent of full-time civilian employees still had access to DB pension coverage.⁷ Yet, coverage varies widely by unionization. Among unionized workers, 66 percent had access to a defined benefit pension, versus just 10 percent of the nonunion private industry workforce.⁸

In the public sector, Congress created the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) to provide a pension for civilian federal employees in 1920. In 1986, Congress implemented the new Federal Employee Retirement System (FERS), which includes Social Security, a DB annuity, and a 401(k)-type savings plan, called the Thrift Savings Plan.⁹ While many major municipalities offered pensions to police and firefighters and 21 states had pension plans covering teachers by the 1920s,¹⁰ state and local pension systems began to take root on a large scale during the Great Depression. When Social Security was established in 1935, the system left out state and local government workers, and many states acted to develop their own retirement systems for their employees. Between 1931 and 1950, nearly half of the large public employee pension plans existing today were established; 45 states had retirement systems in place by 1961.¹¹

In 2022, state and local pension plans in the United States collectively held total assets of \$5.4 trillion. They served 34.7 million Americans, including 14.9 million active participants, 7.9 million inactive members, and 12.0 million retirees and other beneficiaries receiving regular benefit

payments. Benefit payments in 2022 totaled \$371.6 billion, for an average benefit payment of \$2,586 per month, or \$31,031 per year.¹²

Federal pension plans currently serve 2.7 million active civilian employees. In 2022, federal plans paid out some \$91.5 billion in pension benefits to 2.7 million retirees and beneficiaries, for an average benefit of \$2,786 per month, or \$33,436 per year.¹³

Private sector pension plans covered over 33 million Americans,¹⁴ including 11.5 million retired Americans and other beneficiaries in 2022.¹⁵ With total plan assets of \$3.7 trillion in 2022,¹⁶ private DB pensions paid out some \$217.4 billion in pension benefits to retirees and beneficiaries.¹⁷ The average private sector pension benefit was \$1,570 per month, or \$18,840 per year.¹⁸

There are two major types of private sector pension plans: multiemployer plans and single employer plans. Single employer plans generally cover a single workforce at a single company. Multiemployer plans, also called “Taft-Hartley” plans, cover multiple employers, usually within the same industry and/or geographic region. They are jointly governed by management and the labor union(s) representing the participating workers.

In 2022, single employer plans provided some \$165.6 billion in benefits to 7.4 million retirees, for an average benefit of roughly \$22,259 per year, or \$1,855 per month. Multiemployer plans cover fewer workers, and tend to have less generous benefits. In 2022, some 4.1 million beneficiaries received benefits totaling \$51.8 billion, for an average benefit of \$12,635 per year, or \$1,053 per month.¹⁹ (See **Table 1.**)

DB plans are prefunded systems, which means that a retirement fund receives regular contributions for each employee during the course of that person’s career. This type of arrangement can be contrasted with “pay-as-you-go” systems like Social Security, whereby contributions of current employees are used to pay benefits for current retirees. Prefunded retirement systems have the advantage that investment earnings can do much of the work of paying for benefits. In such a system, the contributions made on behalf of current employees are invested, and these investment earnings compound over time. Over a span of decades, accumulation of investment earnings can be substantial, and in many cases pay the majority of the pension benefits.

In state and local government pension plans, typically both the employee and employer make contributions to the pension fund. Pension fund trustees have a fiduciary duty to ensure that the retirement fund is operating in the best interest of workers and retirees, and hire professional managers to oversee fund investments.²⁰ In this respect, public plans differ from private sector DB plans, which are generally funded solely by employers. In requiring that employees share the cost of their pension, public plans are similar to the approach adopted in 401(k) plans where private sector employees contribute to their accounts.

However, DB pensions are distinguishable from defined contribution (DC) plans, such as 401(k) plans, in that they provide broad-based coverage, secure money for retirement, a lifetime income, and special protections for spouses.²¹ Research shows that DB plans are more economically efficient than DC plans. Pensions can deliver the same level of retirement benefits at nearly half the cost of a DC plan.²²

Table 1: Public and Private Sector Pension Benefits, 2022


	State and Local	Federal	Private Sector		Total*
			Single Employer Plans	Multiemployer Plans	
Beneficiaries	12.0 million	2.7 million	7.4 million	4.1 million	26.3 million
Average Benefit	\$31,031	\$33,436	\$22,259	\$12,635	\$25,923
Total Benefits	\$371.6 billion	\$91.5 billion	\$165.6 billion	\$51.8 billion	\$680.6 billion

Note: Author’s analysis of the Annual Survey of Public Pensions, US OPM, U.S. Census Bureau, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and IRS Form 5500 data.

* Totals may not add up exactly due to rounding.

**Total average benefit represents a weighted average of public and private sector benefits.

Figure 1: Aggregate State and Local Pension Contributions by Source, 1993-2022



Note: Author's analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau

State and local pension fund receipts come from three sources: employer contributions, employee contributions, and earnings on investments. **Figure 1** shows that between 1993 and 2022, 29.2 percent of public pension fund receipts came from employer contributions, 11.9 percent from employee contributions, and 58.9 percent from investment earnings. Earnings on investments—not taxpayer contributions—have historically made up the bulk of pension fund receipts, even though this time period saw three very large market downturns. It should be noted that public pension reform in nearly every state since 2008 has relied heavily on increased employee contributions as a way to immediately reduce taxpayer costs.²³

Just as contributions from employees and employers have an expanded impact through the compounding of investment earnings over time, a similar dynamic occurs when retirees spend their pension checks. When a retiree receives a pension benefit, s/he spends it on goods and services in the local community. These expenditures have a “ripple effect” in the economy, as one person’s expenditures become another person’s income.

Measuring the National Economic Impact of DB Pension Plans

This study measures the economic impact of pension benefits paid by public and private pension plans nationally, as well as the economic effects of state and local plans within each

state economy. This analysis recognizes that expenditures have a “multiplier” effect in a regional or national economy. When money is spent at a local business to purchase, say, groceries, that initial purchase generates even more income. First, some of the money spent circulates back to the businesses that manufactured, transported, and otherwise contributed to the production of those goods. Second, the proprietors of these businesses and their employees will spend more money at other businesses, spurring another round of income generation. Thus, with each new round of spending, additional revenue is generated, sustaining jobs, incomes, total output, and tax revenue to the local community.

In addition, local economies benefit not only from pension spending by residents, but from pension checks spent in other localities. That is, the economic benefits generated by pension spending in one region “leak” to and are captured by other regions.

This analysis is focused on the expenditure effects of pension benefits, measuring the economic impacts that result when expenditures made by retirees ripple throughout the economy. Because pension benefits are permanent sources of income—in that they cannot be outlived—we would expect the economic impacts to be larger than those of temporary income increases.²⁴ For this reason, we would expect the economic impacts of pension benefit expenditures to be larger than those out of, for example, unemployment insurance benefit payments. It should also be noted that this study measures the gross economic impacts of pension benefit expenditures, rather than the net economic impacts. For a detailed explanation, see the Technical Appendix.

Because taxpayers and elected officials have an interest in gauging the ultimate economic impact of each tax dollar “invested” in a state or local pension plan, we calculate a proxy measurement of the total economic impact attributable to each dollar in pension contributions made by the taxpayer, called the “taxpayer investment factor.” Details follow.

Data and Methodology

The data used for our analysis comes primarily from two sources: the U.S. Census Bureau and IMPLAN. We used data for 2022, as it was the most recently available at the time of our analysis.


Data on state and local pension plans comes from the Census Bureau’s Annual Survey of Public Pensions, which is a representative sample of state and local DB pension plans in the United States.²⁵ This survey provides data on

revenues, expenditures, financial assets, and membership for state and local pension plans on a national basis and in each of the states. This year, we adjusted some of the Census's payment data for sampling issues. See the Technical Appendix for details. Federal pension data comes from the Congressional Research Service.²⁶ Data on private pension benefits comes from the Census Bureau and Bureau of Labor Statistics' Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC), which reports sources of household income, including pension and survivor income, by age.²⁷ We also utilize the Forms 5500 to break out multiemployer plans from single employer plans. See the Technical Appendix for details.

To measure the economic impacts of retiree expenditures made out of benefits paid by DB pension plans, the input-output modeling software, IMPLAN, was used. IMPLAN was first developed in the 1970s as part of a USDA Forest Service project to analyze the economic effects of local land management projects such as timber, mining, and recreation activities.²⁸ Since that time, IMPLAN has been used by industry and government analysts throughout the country to assess economic impacts of highly varied local community development projects. These studies include many recent economic impact studies of pension benefit payments from state retirement systems.²⁹

Between the time NIRS' original *Pensionomics* study was published in 2009³⁰ and the release of this report, IMPLAN has undergone several significant modeling changes. Due to these changes, results of the current study are not directly comparable to any of the prior *Pensionomics* studies, and the reader should avoid drawing conclusions based on such comparisons. That, along with fundamental changes to the US economy that occur each year, means the national and state-by-state level impacts are not directly comparable to those in the previous *Pensionomics* studies. Detailed information on our data and methodology and further discussion of these differences appear in the Technical Appendix.

The Multiplier Effect: How Spending Ripples Through the Economy, Supporting Jobs and Incomes in the Process



I. ECONOMIC IMPACT MEASUREMENTS

We analyze the economic impact of expenditures made by retirees out of their DB pension payments along four dimensions: employment and labor income, output, value added, and tax revenues. Each of these is described in detail below.

1. Employment and Labor Income Impact: When retirees spend their pension checks, their expenditures help to support jobs—at the local diner, hospital, or even at a factory somewhere across the country. When a retiree makes a purchase, the money spent translates into business revenues, jobs, and income. Using IMPLAN, we calculated the number of jobs supported by retirees’ expenditures. The employment impact constitutes an estimate of “annual average jobs” within a single year. We also present estimates of labor income supported by pension expenditures, which is a component of value added, as described below.

2. Output Impact: Total output includes the value of all goods and services produced in the economy. Using IMPLAN, we calculate the value of total output supported by retirees’ expenditures of DB pension benefits.

We also calculate a pension expenditure multiplier and taxpayer investment factor. The pension expenditure multiplier tells us the total economic impact attributable to each dollar in pension benefits paid to a retiree. (For example, a multiplier of 2.28 means that every \$1 paid to retirees in a local economy supports \$2.28 of total output in that region.) We calculate the pension expenditure multiplier by dividing the total output generated by the value of the “initial event” in the economy (in this case, the gross pension benefit). Expenditure multipliers usually lie between 1.0 and 3.0.

3. Value Added Impact: Value added is a net estimate of the creation of “new value” in the economy. Commonly referred to as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), it includes the value of employee compensation, profits, rents, and other aspects of production, but excludes the costs of purchased materials and services. IMPLAN calculates the value added attributable to DB pension benefit expenditures.

4. Tax Impact: Economic activity of all kinds—receiving pension income, earning wages, producing profits, selling goods and services—provides the basis for the tax revenues that are required to fund government services. To calculate the impact that pension payments have on tax revenues, we first estimate the amount of taxes paid by beneficiaries directly on their pension benefits. Then, using IMPLAN, we calculate estimates of taxes attributable to the economic activity that results when retirees spend their after-tax pension checks, and in all subsequent rounds of spending. This includes all corporate, property, and business taxes that are generated through each spending round. The newest version of IMPLAN separates out state and local tax revenues by subcounty general, subcounty special districts, county, and state tax receipts. We report all of these here, but we do not attempt to provide the same breakdown for the state and local tax withholdings from pension payments themselves.

II. RESULTS: NATIONAL ECONOMIC IMPACT OF DB PENSION PLANS

Our analysis indicates that DB pension benefits not only provide a secure source of income for many retired Americans, they also contribute substantially to the national economy. DB pensions play a vital role in sustaining consumer demand that, in turn, ultimately supports millions of jobs, and hundreds of billions of dollars in income, output, value added, and tax revenues.

Employment and Income

Our analysis shows that the \$680.6 billion in gross public and private pension benefits paid out in 2022 supported 7.1 million American jobs, as shown in **Table 2**. Of these jobs, nearly 3.9 million were supported by state and local pension benefit expenditures, and nearly 1 million by federal pension expenditures. In the private sector, single employer plans supported 1.7 million jobs, and multiemployer plans supported an additional 540,000 jobs. These jobs collectively paid out an estimated \$466.2 billion in labor income.

To put these employment impacts in perspective, the 7.1 million jobs supported by pensioners' expenditures exceed the number of jobs in the entire transportation and warehousing industry (roughly 5.5 million jobs in 2022), and nearly as many as in the construction industry (7.7 million).³¹

In addition, in 2022 the national unemployment rate was 3.6 percent. The entire civilian labor force in the country consisted of 164.3 million potential workers, of whom 6.0 million were unemployed. In light of these numbers, the

fact that DB pension expenditures supported 7.1 million jobs is significant, as it represents a full 4.3 percentage points in the national labor force.

Total Output

Our model further finds that the \$680.6 billion in public and private pension benefit payments in 2022 supported over \$1.5 trillion dollars in overall economic output in the national economy. In terms of benefit source, \$846.0 billion in economic activity stemmed from state and local pension benefit expenditures, \$208.4 billion from federal pension expenditures, \$377.0 billion from single employer pensions, and \$117.9 billion from multiemployer plans. See **Table 3**.

This \$1.5 trillion dollars in overall economic output is more than the total output contributed by the entire accommodation and food services industry, which generated \$1.49 trillion in total output in the national economy in 2022.³³

Value Added (GDP)

Retirees' expenditures of DB pension benefit payments supported \$871.0 billion in value added to the national economy in 2022, including \$475.6 billion supported by state and local pension benefits, \$117.2 billion by federal pension benefits, \$212.0 billion by single employer pensions, and \$66.3 billion by multiemployer pensions. See **Table 3**.

Table 2: DB Pensions Support 7.1 Million American Jobs That Pay \$466.2 Billion in Labor Income

		Employment	Labor Income
Governmental Plans	State and Local Government	3,880,233	\$254,573,526,928
	Federal Government	955,897	\$62,714,262,676
Private Sector Plans	Multiemployer	540,866	\$35,485,024,982
	Single Employer	1,729,251	\$113,452,331,243
Total Impact	All Plans	7,106,247	\$466,225,145,829

* Totals may not add up exactly due to rounding.

Table 3: DB Pensions Support \$1.5 Trillion in Economic Activity and \$871.0 Billion in Value Added

		Output	Value Added
Governmental Plans	State and Local Government	\$845,949,547,291	\$475,596,172,442
	Federal Government	\$208,399,917,932	\$117,163,255,921
Private Sector Plans	Multiemployer	\$117,916,977,390	\$66,293,389,827
	Single Employer	\$377,002,862,052	\$211,952,496,181
Total Impact	All Plans	\$1,549,269,304,665	\$871,005,314,371

* Totals may not add up exactly due to rounding.

This \$871.0 billion in value added is nearly as much as what was contributed by the entire transportation and warehousing industry, which generated \$880.5 billion in value added in 2022.³⁴

Tax Revenue

Our analysis finds that an estimated \$224.3 billion in total tax revenue was attributable to public and private pension benefits in 2022, including \$125.5 billion in federal tax revenue and \$98.8 billion in state and local tax revenue. (See **Tables 4 and 5**.)³⁵

Tax revenue comes from two major sources: taxes paid by beneficiaries directly on their pension benefits and taxes resulting from expenditures made in the local economy (for example, sales taxes resulting from a retail purchase). Of the total tax revenue supported, \$15.9 billion came from income taxes paid by beneficiaries on their benefits and \$208.4 billion from taxes resulting from the spending of net pension benefits.

To put these numbers in perspective, the total federal tax revenue attributable to pension benefit payments nearly paid for all federal Transportation spending in 2022 (\$131.0 billion).³⁶ The total state and local tax revenue is nearly what state and local governments collectively spent on health services in 2021 (\$100.3 billion).³⁷

Economic Impacts by Industry and Occupation

Table 6 breaks down the economic effects of public and private pension expenditures by the top 15 industry sectors affected. Nationally, the largest employment impacts were seen in the food service, health care, and retail trade sectors.

We break down the employment impacts by occupation categories as well. **Table 7** shows that Retail Service Workers showed the largest gains, with 370,468 total jobs, paying \$12.8 billion in compensation, at 488.9 million total hours worked in 2022.

Table 4: DB Pensions Support \$125.5 Billion in Federal Tax Revenue

	State and Local Pensions	Federal Pensions	Private Pensions		Total Federal Tax Revenue*
			Single Employer	Multiemployer	
Taxes Paid by Beneficiaries on Benefits	\$3.7 billion	\$915.5 million	\$518.0 million	\$1.7 billion	\$6.8 billion
Tax Revenue Resulting from Retiree Expenditures	\$16.0 billion	\$28.9 billion	\$9.0 billion	\$64.8 billion	\$118.7 billion
Total Federal Tax Revenue Impact	\$19.7 billion	\$29.8 billion	\$9.5 billion	\$66.5 billion	\$125.5 billion

* Totals may not add up exactly due to rounding.

Table 5: DB Pensions Support \$98.8 Billion in State and Local Tax Revenue

	State and Local Pensions	Federal Pensions	Private Pensions		Total Federal Tax Revenue*
			Multiemployer	Single Employer	
Taxes Paid by Beneficiaries on Benefits	\$5.0 billion	\$1.2 billion	\$697.5 million	\$2.2 billion	\$9.1 billion
Tax Revenue Resulting from Retiree Expenditures	\$12.1 billion	\$21.8 billion	\$6.8 billion	\$49.0 billion	\$89.7 billion
Total State and Local Tax Revenue Impact	\$17.1 billion	\$23.0 billion	\$7.5 billion	\$51.2 billion	\$98.8 billion

* Totals may not add up exactly due to rounding.

Table 6: Top Fifteen Industries by National Employment Impact

Industry	Total # Jobs Supported
Limited-service restaurants	342,057
Hospitals	335,783
Full-service restaurants	282,231
Other real estate	233,991
Offices of physicians	202,266
Employment services	175,975
Retail - Food and beverage stores	167,852
Retail - General merchandise stores	142,895
Individual and family services	132,150
Retail - Nonstore retailers	131,878
Nursing and community care facilities	130,339
All other food and drinking places	126,173
Tenant-occupied housing	123,728
Retail - Miscellaneous store retailers	116,323
Personal care services	110,838


Table 7: Top Fifteen Occupation Categories by National Employment Impact

Occupation Category	Wage and Salary Employment	Wage and Salary Income	Supplements to Wages and Salaries	Total Employee Compensation	Hours Worked
Retail Sales Workers	370,468	\$10,804,142,122	\$2,020,802,355	\$12,824,944,477	488,860,321
Food and Beverage Serving Workers	366,060	\$8,259,418,427	\$1,128,446,438	\$9,387,864,865	402,166,242
Material Moving Workers	336,873	\$13,611,406,036	\$2,541,921,077	\$16,153,327,114	543,983,150
Healthcare Diagnosing or Treating Practitioners	296,092	\$36,941,824,015	\$7,532,503,474	\$44,474,327,488	549,900,972
Home Health and Personal Care Aides; and Nursing Assistants, Orderlies, and Psychiatric Aides	246,134	\$7,112,027,186	\$1,432,245,494	\$8,544,272,680	388,024,199
Information and Record Clerks	207,952	\$9,876,730,974	\$1,743,777,424	\$11,620,508,397	341,510,531
Business Operations Specialists	194,770	\$19,736,946,609	\$3,342,744,812	\$23,079,691,421	379,365,215
Cooks and Food Preparation Workers	191,357	\$5,221,729,971	\$744,989,206	\$5,966,719,177	259,710,173
Motor Vehicle Operators	154,107	\$8,241,391,462	\$1,681,472,202	\$9,922,863,664	305,248,442
Health Technologists and Technicians	145,872	\$8,115,102,915	\$1,645,222,431	\$9,760,325,346	261,511,366
Building Cleaning and Pest Control Workers	134,644	\$4,375,718,906	\$740,756,371	\$5,116,475,277	213,874,260
Top Executives	131,346	\$20,178,080,650	\$3,440,560,881	\$23,618,641,531	285,370,606
Computer Occupations	119,688	\$16,877,416,343	\$2,653,736,319	\$19,531,152,662	235,702,895
Secretaries and Administrative Assistants	110,135	\$5,925,366,676	\$1,066,009,420	\$6,991,376,096	192,669,152
Financial Specialists	107,342	\$15,131,592,996	\$2,409,893,307	\$17,541,486,303	215,419,859

Figure 2: Economic Multipliers

The pension expenditure multiplier for 2022 in the U.S was 2.28, meaning every dollar paid out in DB pension benefits in that year generated \$2.28 of total output in the national economy.

Because DB pension plans are prefunded, only a small portion of the total pension payment in any given year is funded through employer or taxpayer dollars, as discussed previously. Therefore, for state and local plans, it may be helpful to calculate the total impact of state and local pension benefit expenditures that is attributable to the “taxpayer investment” in these plans. Because only 29 cents of every dollar paid out in pension benefits in 2022 was generated through taxpayer contributions (see **Figure 1**), the taxpayer investment factor is substantially higher than the expenditure multiplier. In 2022, of the \$371.6 billion paid out in state and local pension benefits, only \$108.5 billion was funded by taxpayer dollars. The total economic impact attributable to state and local pension benefits was \$845.9 billion. The taxpayer investment factor, then, was 7.79. That is, every taxpayer dollar contributed to state and local pension plans supported \$7.79 in national economic output.



*Caution should be used in interpreting this number. See the Technical Appendix for details.

III. MEASURING STATE-LEVEL ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF STATE AND LOCAL PENSION BENEFITS

Next, we consider the specific economic impacts of *state and local* pension benefit expenditures within each state, accounting for cross-state economic impacts and migration.

Federal and private pension plans are not included in the analysis because of data limitations.

The economic impacts and multipliers for individual states are collectively smaller than the national impacts and multipliers, because state economies are smaller and less diverse than the national economy as a whole.

The smaller and more homogeneous a local economy is, the smaller the economic multipliers will tend to be for that economy. This is because economic impact analysis, based on local production and purchasing patterns, accounts for economic benefits that leave the state. The economic benefit “lost” to other states or countries is called leakage.

However, because we are interested in assessing the economic impacts of state and local pension benefits nationally, i.e., across all states, we employ an approach that accounts for the fact that one state’s “loss” is often another state’s “gain.” We account for a significant share of the leakage caused by interstate commerce by utilizing a Multi-Regional Input-Output (MRIO) analysis for each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia.

For example, if a consumer in the state of Alabama purchases a new lawnmower, that purchase is broken down into its various components of production: the engineers and designers, the parts manufacturers, and the retail salesperson all receive a portion of the revenue from that sale. Because the lawnmower was purchased within Alabama, the portion of output due the retailer will certainly be added to Alabama’s total output. If the lawnmower was designed in Michigan and manufactured in Ohio, however, output from these services would not be included in Alabama’s total output, because they were not performed within the state of Alabama, but in those of Michigan and Ohio, respectively.

Because most individual state economies are not as diverse as the U.S. economy as a whole, the state-level multipliers resulting from this analysis—focused on measuring economic benefits at the state rather than national level—will be smaller than the national multipliers. However, whenever all of the services in any single transaction are performed by firms and workers in the U.S., they are accounted for in the national economic impacts.

In addition, we also adjust for net flows of retirees and their pension payments across state borders, drawing on Census data on migration patterns of older households. Retirees who live and therefore spend their income outside of their state of origin contribute to economic activity in their new state of residence.

Thus, each state’s total economic impacts consist of net in-state impacts (attributable to pension payment expenditures originating in the state) and net out-of-state impacts (attributable to pension expenditures originating from any of the other states). For more information, see the Technical Appendix.

IV. RESULTS: STATE-LEVEL IMPACT OF DB PENSION PLANS

While our model does not fully capture all of the state-level economic impact, the results show that every state gained substantial economic benefit from state and local DB pension payments.

The following series of charts and tables provide the key state-level results of the economic impact analysis. Not surprisingly, the state of California—with the largest economy of the 50 states—showed the largest employment, output, and value added impacts: 397,270 jobs that paid \$28.4 billion in labor income, \$89.6 billion in output, and \$54.1 billion in value added supported by state and local pension benefit expenditures. But even in smaller states, the impacts of state and local pension benefits are substantial.

Figure 4 presents the pension expenditure multipliers for each state. Pension expenditure multipliers vary somewhat by state, but generally speaking, larger states and those with more diverse economic bases will have larger multipliers than smaller states and those with a more homogeneous economic base. These multipliers account for the impact of pension expenditures originating both from within the state and those pension dollars that originate from another state but are spent within the state in question.

In 2022, the average state-level pension expenditure multiplier was 1.36, meaning that for every dollar paid out in pension benefits received by a state resident, \$1.36 in total output was supported within that state.³⁸

As is the case at the national level, the taxpayer investment factors for each state are much larger than the pension expenditure multipliers.


Because state and local pension plans are prefunded, only a small portion of the total pension payment in any given year is funded through taxpayer dollars. The total impact of state and local pension benefit expenditures that is attributable to the “taxpayer investment” in these plans is shown in **Figure 5**. In 2022, the average taxpayer investment factor was 4.88, meaning that for every dollar contributed by taxpayers in a single state, \$4.88 in total economic output was supported within that state, on average.

Note that caution should be used in interpreting the taxpayer investment factor for some states. See the Technical Appendix for details.

Table 8: Employment and Labor Income Impacts by State

	# Jobs	Labor Income		# Jobs	Labor Income
Alabama	27,150	\$1.35 b	Nebraska	10,849	\$583.44 m
Alaska	8,266	\$516.97 m	Nevada	26,862	\$1.52 b
Arizona	43,166	\$2.53 b	New Hampshire	7,070	\$484.61 m
Arkansas	16,273	\$794.87 m	New Jersey	83,236	\$5.95 b
California	397,270	\$28.38 b	New Mexico	16,990	\$842.58 m
Colorado	45,999	\$2.86 b	New York	225,964	\$17.01 b
Connecticut	39,784	\$2.84 b	North Carolina	48,148	\$2.73 b
Delaware	7,076	\$415.15 m	North Dakota	4,294	\$242.31 m
DC	3,214	\$291.92 m	Ohio	122,722	\$6.83 b
Florida	111,905	\$6.16 b	Oklahoma	24,626	\$1.26 b
Georgia	81,091	\$4.55 b	Oregon	43,326	\$2.68 b
Hawaii	14,067	\$839.29 m	Pennsylvania	108,359	\$6.88 b
Idaho	11,075	\$594.66 m	Rhode Island	10,363	\$625.84 m
Illinois	178,473	\$11.88 b	South Carolina	24,985	\$1.23 b
Indiana	21,088	\$1.24 b	South Dakota	5,165	\$298.37 m
Iowa	17,504	\$885.5 m	Tennessee	31,408	\$2 b
Kansas	15,750	\$856.66 m	Texas	175,350	\$10.24 b
Kentucky	33,556	\$1.84 b	Utah	16,824	\$898.79 m
Louisiana	36,629	\$1.83 b	Vermont	3,674	\$211.06 m
Maine	11,094	\$632.04 m	Virginia	46,158	\$2.6 b
Maryland	38,808	\$2.31 b	Washington	36,572	\$2.59 b
Massachusetts	57,750	\$4.41 b	West Virginia	9,613	\$494.9 m
Michigan	70,189	\$4.07 b	Wisconsin	49,285	\$2.82 b
Minnesota	42,499	\$2.73 b	Wyoming	4,650	\$206.67 m
Mississippi	21,543	\$936.57 m			
Missouri	45,673	\$2.53 b			
Montana	8,934	\$475.5 m			

Figure 3: Employment and Economic Output Impacts by State






Table 9: Total Output and Value Added Impacts, by State

	Output	Value Added		Output	Value Added
Alabama	\$4.8 b	\$2.7 b	Nebraska	\$2 b	\$1.1 b
Alaska	\$1.6 b	\$949.5 m	Nevada	\$5.2 b	\$3.2 b
Arizona	\$8.3 b	\$4.9 b	New Hampshire	\$1.4 b	\$866.7 m
Arkansas	\$2.9 b	\$1.6 b	New Jersey	\$17 b	\$10.6 b
California	\$86.9 b	\$54.1 b	New Mexico	\$3 b	\$1.7 b
Colorado	\$9.2 b	\$5.5 b	New York	\$48.6 b	\$32.3 b
Connecticut	\$8.1 b	\$5.2 b	North Carolina	\$8.9 b	\$5.2 b
Delaware	\$1.4 b	\$846.3 m	North Dakota	\$755.6 m	\$406.8 m
DC	\$724.6 m	\$501.6 m	Ohio	\$22.8 b	\$13.2 b
Florida	\$21 b	\$12.1 b	Oklahoma	\$4.5 b	\$2.4 b
Georgia	\$15.2 b	\$9 b	Oregon	\$8.1 b	\$4.9 b
Hawaii	\$2.8 b	\$1.7 b	Pennsylvania	\$20.3 b	\$11.9 b
Idaho	\$2 b	\$1.1 b	Rhode Island	\$1.9 b	\$1.2 b
Illinois	\$35.8 b	\$21.6 b	South Carolina	\$4.4 b	\$2.5 b
Indiana	\$3.8 b	\$2.2 b	South Dakota	\$918.9 m	\$519.3 m
Iowa	\$3 b	\$1.7 b	Tennessee	\$6 b	\$3.6 b
Kansas	\$2.9 b	\$1.6 b	Texas	\$34.3 b	\$19.5 b
Kentucky	\$6 b	\$3.3 b	Utah	\$3.3 b	\$1.9 b
Louisiana	\$6.3 b	\$3.6 b	Vermont	\$669.4 m	\$401.3 m
Maine	\$2.1 b	\$1.2 b	Virginia	\$8.8 b	\$5.3 b
Maryland	\$7.3 b	\$4.5 b	Washington	\$8.4 b	\$5.3 b
Massachusetts	\$12.2 b	\$7.8 b	West Virginia	\$1.6 b	\$913.5 m
Michigan	\$13 b	\$7.3 b	Wisconsin	\$9 b	\$5.2 b
Minnesota	\$8.4 b	\$4.9 b	Wyoming	\$796.6 m	\$431.2 m
Mississippi	\$3.6 b	\$1.9 b			
Missouri	\$8.3 b	\$4.7 b			
Montana	\$1.5 b	\$828.6 m			

Figure 4: Pension Expenditure Multipliers by State




Figure 5: Taxpayer Investment Factors by State




Table 10: Tax Impacts by State (in millions)

	Federal	State/Local	Total		Federal	State/Local	Total
Alabama	\$373.6	\$311.9	\$685.5	Nebraska	\$157.4	\$158.0	\$315.4
Alaska	\$133.6	\$65.7	\$199.4	Nevada	\$471.8	\$318.4	\$790.2
Arizona	\$703.4	\$580.5	\$1,283.9	New Hampshire	\$128.5	\$75.7	\$204.1
Arkansas	\$222.8	\$253.0	\$475.8	New Jersey	\$1,653.6	\$1,333.9	\$2,987.5
California	\$7,973.2	\$8,614.5	\$16,587.6	New Mexico	\$237.7	\$242.1	\$479.8
Colorado	\$793.2	\$648.4	\$1,441.6	New York	\$4,726.4	\$3,879.6	\$8,606.1
Connecticut	\$838.1	\$759.0	\$1,597.1	North Carolina	\$744.8	\$785.1	\$1,529.9
Delaware	\$110.5	\$92.2	\$202.6	North Dakota	\$60.5	\$28.5	\$89.0
DC	\$59.6	\$72.4	\$132.1	Ohio	\$1,804.2	\$1,648.1	\$3,452.3
Florida	\$1,852.1	\$1,191.6	\$3,043.7	Oklahoma	\$322.8	\$316.8	\$639.6
Georgia	\$1,240.3	\$893.8	\$2,134.1	Oregon	\$730.1	\$876.2	\$1,606.4
Hawaii	\$225.5	\$233.4	\$458.9	Pennsylvania	\$1,797.0	\$1,223.0	\$3,020.0
Idaho	\$165.7	\$196.8	\$362.5	Rhode Island	\$173.2	\$161.8	\$335.0
Illinois	\$3,107.6	\$2,593.3	\$5,700.9	South Carolina	\$355.1	\$345.1	\$700.3
Indiana	\$316.0	\$313.4	\$629.4	South Dakota	\$77.0	\$39.5	\$116.5
Iowa	\$241.8	\$294.4	\$536.2	Tennessee	\$513.7	\$370.3	\$884.0
Kansas	\$230.5	\$181.7	\$412.2	Texas	\$2,721.3	\$1,806.8	\$4,528.1
Kentucky	\$467.9	\$329.2	\$797.1	Utah	\$255.7	\$288.4	\$544.1
Louisiana	\$468.0	\$421.5	\$889.5	Vermont	\$59.8	\$62.7	\$122.5
Maine	\$172.9	\$131.4	\$304.3	Virginia	\$747.1	\$725.1	\$1,472.2
Maryland	\$649.6	\$557.0	\$1,206.6	Washington	\$770.7	\$632.1	\$1,402.8
Massachusetts	\$1,223.3	\$696.6	\$1,919.9	West Virginia	\$128.8	\$150.5	\$279.3
Michigan	\$1,097.6	\$827.5	\$1,925.1	Wisconsin	\$765.5	\$773.3	\$1,538.7
Minnesota	\$717.6	\$773.9	\$1,491.5	Wyoming	\$67.7	\$45.9	\$113.6
Mississippi	\$257.8	\$250.0	\$507.8				
Missouri	\$661.4	\$434.4	\$1,095.8				
Montana	\$129.0	\$110.4	\$239.4				

CONCLUSION

DB pension plans provide a critical source of reliable income for 26.3 million retired Americans. These plans are a cost effective way to provide secure lifetime income for retired Americans and their beneficiaries after a lifetime of work. Moreover, DB pension plans generate economic benefits that reach well beyond those who earned benefits during their working years.

Because pensions supply secure income to retirees, pensions provide local economies with stable sources of revenue. Retirees who spend their paychecks regularly in their local economies provide vital revenues to local businesses and income to local workers.

These economic gains are considerable. Nationwide, over \$1.5 trillion in total economic output resulted from DB pension expenditures in 2022. DB expenditures supported 7.1 million American jobs that paid \$466.2 billion in income in that year. Benefits paid by DB pensions supported \$224.3 billion in tax revenue at the local, state, and federal levels.

In supplying a stable source of income to retirees, DB pension plans support the national economy, as well as local economies throughout the country, with jobs, incomes, and tax revenue. Pension benefits play an important role in providing a stable, reliable source of income regardless of economic climate—not just for retired Americans, but also for the local economies in which their retirement checks are spent.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

DB Pension Data

State and local pension benefit payments were taken from the U.S. Census Bureau's Annual Survey of Public Pensions, which reports on state and local government-sponsored pension plans in the United States. The survey provides data on revenues, expenditures, financial assets, and membership in public employee retirement systems.³⁹ The Census Bureau aggregates plan level data up to the state-level, and these state-level estimates are based on a representative sample of retirement systems throughout the country, weighted for accuracy. We use data for fiscal year 2022, as that was the most recent data available. Additional adjustments were made to account for sampling issues in this year's data set by specifically researching benefit payments at individual systems in a small group of states.

Federal pension data used in this study comes from the U.S. Congressional Research Service.⁴⁰ Data on private pension benefits comes from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC), which reports sources of household income, including pension and survivor income.⁴¹ To separate out multiemployer plan and single employer plan benefits, we aggregate data on benefit payments from multiemployer plans from the Form 5500 data filings, and then subtract this from the total private plan data from the CPS to report the single employer payments.

Migration

Upon retirement, not all workers continue to reside in their home states. When a pension beneficiary moves out of state, the individual takes the pension payments, spending those pension checks in the new state of residence, rather than in the state where the pension payment originated. Since our state-level analysis relies on information on where pension benefits are spent, we need to account for the movement of retirees from one state to another. To estimate the net effects of retiree movement across state borders, we use data from the 2022 American Community Survey, which tabulates current state of residence and current residence one year before, by age.⁴² From this, we are able to calculate

the recent net migration patterns of people aged 65 and older. We assume that migration patterns for state and local government retirees mirror those of all other older Americans.

Disposable Income and Taxation

Before calculating the economic impacts of pension benefit expenditures, we must account for income taxes that are paid out of pension benefit payments, as retirees are not spending these tax withholdings in their local economy.

To calculate disposable income among retirees, we first subtract income taxes from gross pension payments. To estimate federal income taxes due from state and local pension income, we use data from the Congressional Budget Office on effective federal income tax rates for elderly households in the United States by income quintiles.⁴³ Effective tax rates are different from marginal tax rates in that effective tax rates account for tax deductions, credits, or other alterations that may change the total amount of the tax that individuals actually pay. This is useful to our purposes, because, since we are using aggregated sample data, we cannot assess actual individuals' federal tax liabilities. The effective tax rate allows us to more accurately estimate the taxes that pension beneficiaries actually pay to the federal government.

To calculate state and local tax rates, use the average nominal taxes paid by elder households from the National Bureau of Economic Research, based on their TaxSIM model.⁴⁴ We also use information from AARP and Kiplinger to account for any public pension exclusions a state may provide.⁴⁵ State income tax exclusions are important to consider, because many states offer full or partial income tax exclusions for pension benefits. About half the states either do not subject pension income to income tax, or offer sizeable tax breaks for such income. Because average marginal tax rates are higher than average effective tax rates, for the remaining states with small exclusions or no advantageous tax treatment, our calculations likely overestimate state income tax receipts, at the same time that they underestimate net pension income and resulting economic benefit.

Estimating taxes paid by pensioners requires assuming that beneficiaries are taxed by the state of residence, not the state of the pension's origin. This assumption is consistent with the treatment under federal law that was changed so that after 1995 states' rights to tax retirement income generated from work in the state by individuals who are no longer residents was eliminated for DB and other qualified retirement plans.⁴⁶ For example, a retiree moving from New York to Arizona would pay Arizona income taxes on her pension benefit, not New York taxes.

IMPLAN Modeling

This study uses IMPLAN, an input-output modeling software and data package, to estimate the economic impacts of benefits paid by DB pension plans. IMPLAN was first developed in the 1970s as a part of a USDA Forest Service project to analyze the economic effects of local land management projects such as timber, mining, and recreation activities. Since that time, IMPLAN has been used by industry and government analysts throughout the country to assess economic impacts of highly varied local community development projects; these studies include many recent economic impact studies of pension benefit payments. Because of differences in modeling and the data used, the results of our study may not be comparable with these other analyses. Thus, the reader should avoid drawing conclusions based on comparisons between our results and those of other studies.

IMPLAN is an input-output model that uses a matrix to represent the economy of a region in order to estimate the effect of events occurring in a single industry or institution on all other industries, as well as consumers, government, and foreign suppliers to the economy. IMPLAN uses a Social Accounting Matrix (SAM), which captures all the industry and institution transactions in the local area; subsections of a SAM describe various structures and functions of a local economy. The SAM describes a local economy in terms of the flow of dollars from purchasers to producers within a region, while also accounting for non-industrial transactions such as payment of taxes by businesses and households. This offers a better portrayal of the household income effect portion of local economic events than other models.

Between when NIRS' original *Pensionomics* study was published in 2009 and the release of subsequent updates to the report, IMPLAN has gone through many modeling and assumption changes. Due to these changes, along with fundamental changes to the US economy that occur each year, results of the current study are not directly comparable to those of any of the prior *Pensionomics* studies, and the reader should avoid drawing conclusions based on such

comparisons. For example, the reported national multiplier has increased since the last study, while multipliers at the state level are varied.

We input pension money as a "household income" impact, which takes into account different household income brackets, but not the differences between working-age households and retirees. For the purposes of *Pensionomics*, we assume that retiree households have different expenditure patterns in two ways: first, that they do not put aside any of this money for future savings, and second, that their effective tax rates are likely to be lower than working-age households, and therefore they will see less tax withholding.

We first calculate what we believe to be the more accurate level of disposable income for state and local retirees as described above. We then must remove IMPLAN's embedded assumptions about disposable income by finding the tax and savings rates within each state's Social Accounting Matrix. We divide the sum of these figures by the totals for each social account, and thereby obtain the percentage of taxation and savings that is assumed. We add this percentage of money back into the benefit payments for each state before inputting it into the IMPLAN model.

National and state-by-state IMPLAN data for 2022 were used, as this corresponded with the Census data on public pension payments, for which 2022 was the most recently available. However, the 2022 Census data set was not yet finalized at the time we ran the model. We made broad estimates based on previous data, and then each state's aggregated, in-state, disposable pension payments are entered into IMPLAN as direct payments to households. Then, once the models were run and the Census data was later finalized, we took a ratio of our estimates to the final data, for each state, and used that ratio to adjust the initial IMPLAN results. Because IMPLAN is a linear model, this process does not materially affect the results.

IMPLAN estimates household spending patterns by income class. The household income range used is based on the 2022 median household income among pension-receiving households age 65 and older, taken from the Current Population Survey ASEC.⁴⁷

Benefits that migrate out of state are assumed to be spent in the receiving state. Therefore, each state's economic impact includes out of state benefit payments in addition to benefits originating from pension systems in the state. Pension benefits, net of migration, are calculated based on the migration assumptions described above. Then estimated income taxes are subtracted to yield net after-tax pension

payments. These net payments are then entered into the IMPLAN model for that state.

However, not all the economic benefits stay in the same state in which pension dollars are originally spent. One state's "leakage" is another state's inflow, and since our analysis is concerned with measuring the economic impact of state and local pension benefits, regardless of where they were originally spent, we also need to account for the economic impacts of these benefits across state lines. We are able to account for the economic effects flowing out of one state and into another by utilizing a Multi-Regional Input-Output Analysis (MRIO). For example, to determine the economic impacts of \$1 million in Alabama's pension payments that may flow to the state of Alaska, we set up an MRIO analysis of Alabama's pension payments between Alabama and Alaska. Thus, we are able to recapture some of any single state's economic leakage due to interstate commerce. Additionally, the resulting economic activity in Alaska may spill over or leak into California, and so on and so forth.

However, the ability to capture leakage in IMPLAN through MRIO has technical limitations because the program cannot run a single model that analyzes the impact of one state on all the other states simultaneously. Rather, the number of states that can be linked for such analysis in any single instance is technically limited by the software and by computing power. This means that the states need to be divided among a number of batches comprising subnational groups, and that the flow of economic impact across this groups is lost. For this study, states were grouped into large economic regions for the purposes of MRIO analysis, but not aggregated, so that results could be identified for each and every state. This allowed us to capture more of the economic impact.

Gross Economic Impacts

This study measures the gross economic impacts of pension benefit expenditures only, rather than the net economic impacts. Pension payments are a form of deferred compensation, meaning that employees and employers contribute to the pension trust over the course of an employee's career as a portion of the employee's total compensation. Had that employee received that compensation in another form—for example, a slight increase in gross pay each month—s/he would have seen higher disposable income, and presumably would have spent a portion of that income in the local economy at that time. Accurately accounting for the net economic impacts of public pensions would require a dynamic model and data that spans several decades. Because of data limitations, this is not possible.

Although one might be tempted to simply deduct from a single year's gross benefit payments the total employee and employer contributions in that year to capture a net effect, such a measure will not be accurate. First, the contributions for any given year for active employees have no bearing on the benefits paid out in that year to retirees. Due to the nature of prefunded pension systems discussed earlier, older, more mature pension systems likely could be construed as having a larger economic impact than younger, less mature systems, simply because the older system will generally pay out more benefits per current worker. Yet this interpretation would be highly inaccurate, since the whole point of prefunding is that current workers do not pay the benefits of retirees, but pay into the system during the course of their career for their own retirement. Due to these limitations and possible misinterpretations, the analysis we present here assesses gross economic impacts, rather than net impacts.

Tax Revenue

To calculate total tax revenue attributable to state and local pension payments, income taxes paid by beneficiaries on benefit payments are added to taxes paid in all subsequent rounds of spending. For the former, the federal and state/local taxes are calculated as described above. For the latter, IMPLAN calculates all county, state, and federal tax revenues received from pension expenditures in the economy. Total tax revenue is the sum of these two types of tax receipts, calculated for both in-state and out-of-state benefits.

Multipliers

Multipliers are ratios that relate the overall economic effect to a single unit of any initial event. An output multiplier, for example, displays the total output generated for every dollar that is initially spent in the economy. We calculate a pension expenditure multiplier, which describes the impact on total output for each dollar of pension benefit. For example, a pension expenditure multiplier of 2.2 would mean that for every \$1 paid out in a pension benefit, \$2.20 of total economic output is supported. We calculated pension expenditure multipliers at the national level and for each of the states.

Pension expenditure multipliers are calculated by dividing the total output supported by retiree expenditures by total pension payments made in that year. (For the state-level multipliers, this includes pension payments originating within the state as well as outside of the state.)

Readers should note the following caveats when interpreting state-level pension expenditure multiplier results. First, because of the current technical limits of MRIO analysis, the share of leakage captured likely varies somewhat across states. Furthermore, the method we used to calculate the state-level economic multipliers is conservative in two ways. On the one hand, for states that sent out more economic benefit to other states than they received from pension spending in other states, we used the lower in-state economic impact in our calculations. This results in a state-level multiplier that is smaller than the multiplier that results from counting the full impact of that state's pension expenditures on the national economy. On the other hand, for states that received more economic benefit from pension spending in other states than they sent out, we excluded the surplus economic benefit from the multiplier calculation. Thus, the state-level multipliers published in this study are generally conservative.

We also calculate "taxpayer investment factors" at the national and state levels. This measurement is designed to capture a sense of "return on investment" for each dollar contributed in taxpayer contributions to state and local plans, following the methodology developed by Fountain and Waste. First, we proxy the proportion of benefits paid out in 2022 that were attributable to taxpayer contributions. We do this by calculating (both nationally and for each state), the proportion of total state and local pension plan revenues that are attributable to taxpayer contributions over the period 1993 through 2022. We then multiply this percentage by the benefits paid by state and local pension plans (again at the national or state level) in 2022. This becomes the denominator for our taxpayer contribution factor. The numerator is the total output supported by retiree expenditures in 2022. Put another way, the taxpayer investment factor is the benefit multiplier divided by the taxpayer contribution percentage.

Caution should be used in interpreting the taxpayer investment factor for some states, due to the way the Census Bureau reports taxpayer and employee contributions. Because the Census Bureau data reflects the taxable status of contributions only, but not the pre-tax salary reduction cost-sharing methods used in some states (Nevada, for example), employee contributions may be reported as taxpayer contributions. This will tend to overstate the proportion of pension benefits that are attributable to taxpayer contributions and understate the taxpayer investment factors we report.

Alternatively, to the extent that any particular pension fund has not received its full Annual Required Contribution between 1993 and 2022, the proportion of pension fund receipts attributable to the employer contribution may be understated. This will tend to understate the proportion of pension benefits attributable to taxpayer contributions and overstate the taxpayer investment factors we report.

ENDNOTES

1. T. Ghilarducci, J. Saad-Lessler, and E. Fisher, “The macroeconomic stabilization effects of Social Security and 401(k) plans,” *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, v36n1, pp. 237-51.
2. Ghilarducci, op cit.
3. Ghilarducci, op cit.
4. P.W. Seburn, 1991, “Evolution of employer-provided defined benefit pensions,” *Monthly Labor Review*, n114, pp. 16-23.
5. For a full discussion see I. Boivie and C. Weller, 2012, “How DB plans influence labor relations in the wake of the Great Recession,” in D.J.B. Mitchell, Ed., *Public Jobs and Political Agendas: The Public Sector in an Era of Economic Stress*, Labor and Employment Relations Association Research Volume, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
6. I. Boivie, 2011, “Who Killed the Private Sector DB Plan?,” National Institute on Retirement Security, Washington, DC., http://www.nirsonline.org/storage/nirs/documents/Who%20Killed%20DBs/final_who_killed_the_private_sector_db_plan.pdf
7. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2023, National Compensation Survey: Employee Benefits in the United States, “Retirement benefits: Access, participation, and take-up rates for defined benefit and defined contribution plans, March 2023,” <https://www.bls.gov/charts/employee-benefits/percent-access-participation-takeup-retirement-benefits.htm>
8. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2023, National Compensation Survey: Employee Benefits in the United States, “Retirement benefits: Access, participation, and take-up rates by bargaining status, March 2023,” <https://www.bls.gov/charts/employee-benefits/percent-access-participation-takeup-retirement-benefits-by-bargaining-status.htm>
9. For more information on FERS, see D. Oakley, 2012, “Origins of the Federal Retirement Systems and the Thrift Savings Plan,” National Institute on Retirement Security, Washington, DC.
10. R.L. Clark, L.A. Craig, and J.W. Wilson, 2003, *A History of Public State Pension in the United States*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA.
11. R.L. Clark, L.A. Craig, and N. Ahmed, 2008, “The Evolution of Public Sector Pension Plans in the United States,” Wharton Pension Research Council Working Paper WP 2008-16, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
12. U.S. Census Bureau, 2024, 2022 Annual Survey of Public Pensions, Washington, DC. [For a small number of states, data were individually looked up and tallied for plans where Census data were significantly different than past Census surveys due to sampling impacts.]. Annual average benefits are author’s calculations from tabulated data.
13. U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM), Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund Annual Report. FY Ended September 30, 2022. Total payments taken from chart “Statements of Changes in Net Assets Available for Benefits”, Total Annuities, for Total Fund 2022. <https://www.opm.gov/about-us/budget-performance/other-reports/2022-csrdf-annual-report.pdf>
14. Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC), 2022, “Fiscal Year 2022 Annual Report,” PBGC, Alexandria, VA, p. 2, <https://www.pbgc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/pbgc-annual-report-2022.pdf>
15. U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), 2023, Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement, “Source of Income in 2022-Number with Income and Mean Income of Specified Type in 2018 of People 15 Years Old and Over by Age, Race, and Hispanic Origin, and Sex,” BLS, Washington, DC. Total pension income from company or union retirement, 2022. <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/cps-pinc/pinc-08.2022.html#list-tab-1617411584>
16. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 2022, *Federal Reserve Statistical Release Z.1, Financial Accounts of the United States - Flow of Funds, Balance Sheets, and Integrated Macroeconomic Accounts - First Quarter 2022* Federal Reserve, Washington, DC, “Table L.118.b Private Pension Funds: Defined Benefit Plans.” <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/release/tables?rid=52&eid=804839&od=2022-01-01#>
17. Census Bureau and BLS, 2023, op cit.
18. Weighted average of average multiemployer and single employer benefit.
19. Author’s calculations from multiemployer plan 5500 data. Multiemployer data on gross benefit payments and total beneficiaries was aggregated, and then subtracted from the data on private sector plans from the Census and BLS.

20. Many studies have shown that professional investment managers achieve higher returns than individual, nonprofessional investors, including Watson Wyatt, 2008, “Defined benefit vs. 401(k) plans: Investment returns for 2003-2006,” *Insider* n18v5; C. Flynn and H. Lum, 2007, “DC Plans Underperformed DB Funds,” CEM Benchmarking, Toronto, ON; and Towers Watson, 2011, “DB vs. DC plan investment returns: The 2008-2009 update,” *Insider* n21v4.
21. B. Almeida, 2008, “Retirement Readiness: What Difference Does a Pension Make?,” National Institute on Retirement Security, Washington, DC.
22. D. Doonan & W. Forna, 2022. “A Better Bang for the Buck 3.0,” National Institute on Retirement Security, Washington, DC.
23. N. Rhee and D. Oakley, 2012 (Dec.), “On the Right Track? Public Pension Reforms in the Wake of the Financial Crisis,” National Institute on Retirement Security, Washington, DC.
24. For further explanation of the multiplying effects of different types of expenditures, see, for example, K.D. Hoover, 2012, *Applied Intermediate Macroeconomics*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
25. Census Bureau, 2023, op cit.
26. CRS, op cit.
27. Census Bureau and BLS, 2023, op cit.
28. USDA National Resources Conservation Service, 2008, IMPLAN Model, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.
29. Examples of recent pension benefit payment economic impact studies using IMPLAN software include studies commissioned by the California Public Employees Retirement System and the Public Employees’ Retirement Association of Colorado. Because of differences in data and methodology, the results of our study may not be comparable with these analyses. Readers should avoid drawing conclusions based on such comparisons.
30. B. Almeida, 2009, “Pensionomics: Measuring the Economic Impact of State & Local Pension Plans,” National Institute on Retirement Security, Washington, DC.
31. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), “Employment by Industry” BLS, Washington, DC, <https://www.bls.gov/charts/employment-situation/employment-levels-by-industry.htm>
32. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), 2023, “Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population, 1951 to date,” BLS, Washington, DC, <https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat01.htm>.
33. U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), 2024. “U.Gross Output by Industry,” Annual 2022 data used.
34. BEA, 2024. “Value Added by Industry,” Q1 2022 data used.
35. Both federal and state and local tax revenue is significantly higher in this iteration of Pensionomics than in the 2023 report. This is most likely due to the prior report being from the year 2020, in which Covid stimulus packages lowered both business and personal income taxes significantly for that year.
36. White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Historical Tables, “Table 3.2—Outlays by Function and Subfunction: 1962–2029,” OMB, Washington, DC. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/historical-tables/>
37. U.S. Census Bureau, 2023, Annual Survey of State Government Finances. State Government Finances: “State Government Finance Table: 2022.” U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC. <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2022/econ/state/historical-tables.html>
38. This is an unweighted average across states.
39. U.S. Census Bureau, 2021, op cit.
40. CRS, op cit.
41. Census Bureau and BLS, 2021, op cit.
42. U.S. Census Bureau, 2023, American Community Survey, “Table 1. State-to-State Migration Flows – 2022,” U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC. Data are 1-year estimates.
43. Tax Policy Center at the Urban Institute. Table T20-0038, Average Effective Federal Tax Rates - Elderly Tax Units, by Expanded Cash Income Level, 2022. Individual Income Tax Rate for Expanded Cash Income Level of \$40-\$50K.
44. National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), “State taxes for representative taxpayers through time.” <https://taxsim.nber.org/state-tax-rates> Effective tax rate is calculated as the nominal 2020 amounts for elder household units, by income level of \$50k, divided by \$50k in income.

45. J. Waggoner, 2022, "12 States that Won't Tax Your Retirement Distributions," AARP. <https://www.aarp.org/money/taxes/info-2020/states-that-dont-tax-retirement-distributions.html> and Kiplinger, 2022, "State-by-State Guide to Taxes on Retirees," <https://www.kiplinger.com/kiplinger-tools/retirement/t055-s001-state-by-state-guide-to-taxes-on-retirees/index.php>
46. 4 U.S.C. Section 114.
47. Census Bureau and BLS, 2021, op cit.
48. R. Fountain and R. Waste, 2007, "The Annual Economic Impacts of CalPERS Benefit Payments," Applied Research Center, California State University, Sacramento, CA.

WHO WE ARE & WHAT WE DO

Board of Directors

Kelly Fox, Board Chair & Division Chief, CalPERS
Investment Relations

Michael Hairston, Board Vice-Chair & Senior Pension
Specialist, National Education Association

Angela Miller-May, Board Secretary-Treasurer & Chief
Investment Officer, Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund

John Adler, Board Member & Chief ESG Officer, Bureau
of Asset Management, Office of the New York City
Comptroller

Dana Bilyeu, Board Member & Executive Director,
National Association of State Retirement Administrators

Alfred Campos, Board Member & Executive Director,
NRTA, AARP's Retired Educator Community

Katie Comstock, Board Member & Associate Partner, AON

R. Dean Kenderdine, Board Member & Executive Director,
National Council on Teacher Retirement

Hank H. Kim, Esq., Board Member & Executive Director
and Counsel, National Conference on Public Employee
Retirement Systems

Kevin Lindahl, Board Member & Executive Director, Fire
and Police Pension Association of Colorado

Jill Schurtz, Board Member & Executive Director and
Chief Investment Officer, Minnesota State Board of
Investment

Andrew Sherman, Board Member & Senior Vice President,
National Director of Public Sector Market, Segal

Staff and Consultants

Dan Doonan, Executive Director

Tyler Bond, Research Director

Margaret Rogers, Director of Communications
& Member Relations

Kelly Kenneally, Communications Consultant

Academic Advisory Board

Sylvia Allegretto, PhD, University of California, Berkeley

Brad M. Barber, PhD, University of California, Davis

Ron Gebhardtshauer, FSA, MAAA, Pennsylvania State
University

Teresa Ghilarducci, PhD, The New School for Social
Research

Jacob S. Hacker, PhD, Yale University

Regina T. Jefferson, JD, LL.M., Catholic University of
America

Jeffrey H. Keefe, PhD, Rutgers University

Eric Kingson, PhD, Syracuse University

Alica H. Munnell, PhD, Boston College

Christian E. Weller, PhD, University of Massachusetts
Boston

Our Mission

The National Institute on Retirement Security is a non-profit research and education organization established to contribute to informed policymaking by fostering a deep understanding of the value of retirement security to employees, employers, and the economy as a whole.

Our Vision

Through our activities, NIRS seeks to encourage the development of public policies that enhance retirement security in America. Our vision is one of a retirement system that simultaneously meets the needs of employers, employees, and the public interest. That is, one where:

- employers can offer affordable, high quality retirement benefits that help them achieve their human resources goals;
- employees can count on a secure source of retirement income that enables them to maintain a decent living standard after a lifetime of work; and
- the public interest is well-served by retirement systems that are managed in ways that promote fiscal responsibility, economic growth, and responsible stewardship of retirement assets.

Our Approach

- High-quality research that informs the public debate on retirement policy. The research program focuses on the role and value of defined benefit pension plans for employers, employees, and the public at large. We also conduct research on policy approaches and other innovative strategies to expand broad based retirement security.
- Education programs that disseminate our research findings broadly. NIRS disseminates its research findings to the public, policy makers, and the media by distributing reports, conducting briefings, and participating in conferences and other public forums.
- Outreach to partners and key stakeholders. By building partnerships with other experts in the field of retirement research and with stakeholders that support retirement security, we leverage the impact of our research and education efforts. Our outreach activities also improve the capacity of government agencies, non-profits, the private sector, and others working to promote and expand retirement security.

The National Institute on Retirement Security is a non-profit, non-partisan organization established to contribute to informed policy making by fostering a deep understanding of the value of retirement security to employees, employers, and the economy as a whole. NIRS works to fulfill this mission through research, education and outreach programs that are national in scope.



NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON
Retirement Security

Reliable Research. Sensible Solutions.

1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 500 | Washington, DC 20006

202-457-8190 | www.nirsonline.org

@NIRSONline