

the FORECAST

A Newsletter of the National Association of Forensic Economics



Rotating Columns: pg 5
Features: pg 8

NAFE Events: pg 11-15

Pictures:
2015 SEA Meeting: pg 14
2016 ASSA Meeting:
throughout!

President's Letter

Larry Spizman, President, NAFE
larry.spizman@oswego.edu

The 2016 ASSA Conference

The 2016 ASSA meetings in San Francisco CA were a huge success. Kevin Cahill organized four sessions which were well attended with as many as 60 people per session. The presentations and discussions were excellent and the 30th Anniversary reception organized by Marc Weinstein was outstanding. Several awards were presented at our membership meeting. Ted Miller received the Ward Piette Research Prize and Beth Gunderson and Mike Nieswiadomy won the Past President's Service Award. The following were elected to the Board of Directors: Michael Nieswiadomy for President-elect, Gil Mathis for Southern Vice- President, and Scott Gilbert for At-Large Vice President.

I was honored to present an award to Jack Ward recognizing him as the "Founding Father" of NAFE, which he started 30 years ago. Nancy Eldredge was also recognized for 30 years of service to NAFE.

Southern Economic Association Meeting

The Southern Economic Association meetings were held in New Orleans. Frank Adams organized two NAFE sessions.

NAFE Winter Meeting

The recent winter meetings in Key West, Florida were a success. Art Eubank and David Schap put together a nice program.

Eastern Economic Association Meeting

Craig Allen is organizing four sessions at The Eastern Economic Association meetings which will be held in Washington DC February 26-28, 2016.

Western Economic Association Meeting

The 2016 Western Economic Association meetings will be held in Portland, Oregon on June 29-July 3, 2016. Bill Brandt is organizing the sessions. Contact Bill

bill@brandtforensiceconomics.com if you are interested in presenting, discussing or chairing a session.

International Meeting

The International Meeting will be held in Bucharest, Romania on May 23, 2016. Contact Jack Ward for information.

2017 ASSA Meeting

The 2017 ASSA annual meeting will be held on January 6-8, (Friday, Saturday, & Sunday) 2017 in Chicago, IL. Kevin Cahill and Scott Gilbert will be organizing the sessions. Contact Kevin cahillkc@bc.edu if you are interested in presenting, discussing or chairing a session.

Newsletter

As you can see, Lane Hudgins has done an excellent job on our first issue of *The Forecast*. •



National Association of
Forensic Economics, Inc.

Board of Directors

President
Lawrence Spizman
Spizman Economic Associates

Past President
Kurt V. Krueger
John Ward Economics

Vice Presidents

William G. Brandt
Brandt Forensic Economics

Gilbert Mathis
Murray State University

Craig Allen
Commonwealth Research Group

David Rosenbaum
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Scott Gilbert
Southern Illinois University

Dave Macpherson
Trinity University

Executive Director
Marc Weinstein
Team Economics

Editor, The Forecast
Lane Hudgins
Lane Hudgins Analysis

Production Editor
Nancy L. Eldredge

The Forecast – A Newsletter of the National Association of Forensic Economics is published four times per year. Please send comments, suggestions, and news items to the Production Editor, Nancy Eldredge, at the addresses above.

In This Issue

1 • *President's Letter*, Larry Spizman

Member News

- 3 • From the Executive Director
3 • FYI
4-5 • Things You Were Afraid to Ask
5 • Welcome New Members!
6 • The Forecast Plays 20 Questions

Rotating Columns

From the Trenches

7 • Constructively Engaged

And Now For Something Different

7-8 • Exerpt of Interview with Ted Miller

Features

Special Feature

8-9 • NAFE: A Personal Recollection

9-11 • Some Perils of Relying Solely
on W-2 Forms for Earnings History

Meeting & Regional Updates

11 • NAFE EVENTS

12 • Featured Meeting City

13-15 • Meeting Updates



P.O. Box 394
Mount Union, PA 17066



nancy@nafe.net



Tel: 866.370.6233
Fax: 814.542.3253



nafe.net

From the Executive Director

Mark Weinstein, Executive Director, NAFE

Below you will find the information contained in NAFE's financial statements dated December 18, 2015 as prepared by accountancy firm The Block Teitelman Group for the periods ending November 30, 2015 and 2014. Minutes from the January 2016 NAFE Board of Directors Meeting and Membership Meeting will be available in the May issue of *The Forecast*.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FORENSIC ECONOMICS, INC.
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
CASH BASIS - NOVEMBER 30, 2015 AND 2014

STATEMENTS OF ASSETS, LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

ASSETS

	2015	2014
Cash & Cash Equivalents	\$178,192	\$167,935
Travel Deposit	1,500	1,500
Total Assets	\$179,692	\$169,435

Liabilities & Net Assets

Payroll tax liabilities	\$ 1,555	\$ 892
Net Assets		
Unrestricted		
Undesignated	178,137	168,543
Total Net Assets	178,137	168,543
Total Liabilities & Net Assets	\$179,692	\$169,435

STATEMENTS OF REVENUES, EXPENSES & CHANGES IN NET ASSETS

	2015	2014
Revenues & Other Income		
Dues & subscriptions	\$144,837	\$131,024
Fees - papers, articles & back issues	3,343	5,645
Interest	435	368
Total Revenues & Other Income	\$148,615	\$137,037

Expenses

Accounting	\$ 4,700	\$ 2,850
Bank charges	2,716	2,716
Conferences	49,905	45,968
Database mangagement	19,619	19,355
Donations	50	50
Internet	600	600
Legal & Insurance	5,349	242
Newsletter	3,945	2,918
Payroll & related taxes	30,489	30,805
Publication	14,433	10,952
Subscriptions & miscellaneous	2,474	1,639
Supplies & mailing	1,972	2,463
Telephone & fax	2,638	1,853
Website development	131	2,862
Total Expenses	139,021	125,273
Change in Net Assets	9,594	11,764

Net Assets - Beginning	168,543	156,779
Net Assets - Ending	178,137	168,543

STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

	2015	2014
Cash Flows from Operating Activities		
Change in net assets	\$ 9,594	\$ 11,764
Adjustments to reconcile change in net assets to net cash provided by operating activities:		
Increase (decrease) in payroll tax liabilities	663	(1,283)
Net cash provided by operating activities	10,257	10,481
Cash & Cash Equivalents - Beginning	167,935	157,454
Cash & Cash Equivalents - Ending	\$178,192	\$167,935

FYI

An update to David Schap's *State Laws Project* has been recently posted to the NAFE website. This important update is remarkable in its scope. Including all U.S. States as well as Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, the *State Laws Project* itemizes case law governing four areas of particular interest to forensic economists: discounting, pre- and post-judgment interest, income taxes and treatment of inflation. A discussion of how to read the extensive table summarizing the cited cases, the sources reviewed for the update, and a history of the *State Laws Project* is presented in the *State Laws Project Description* available as a separate document accompanying the table. As David Schap states in the description, the online format will more readily lend itself to updating than would a printed version. As state laws regarding these issues continue to evolve, this very thorough review will continue to be a tremendous resource for all practicing forensic economists. •

-David Schap's State Laws Project can be found at the NAFE website www.NAFE.net by first logging in at the top of the home page then following the 'Member Produced Content' link that will appear at the bottom of the site navigation bar.



Things You Were Afraid to Ask

-This section of The Forecast will feature answers to member's questions. To kick things off I recently asked former NAFE Board Members the following:

1. Thinking back over the past 30 years, what advice would you give a younger you?

And/or

2. What was the best advice you received when you were starting out as a forensic economist?

This issue will focus on answers to the first question and the May issue will focus on answers to the second. Here goes.

Work very hard to keep client attorney numbers well-balanced between plaintiff and defense. My first testimony was for plaintiff with a big payoff; word-of-mouth brought me more plaintiff cases, and while I have tried very hard to go down the middle in assumptions, I still get 80% to 90% plaintiff cases. (Some FEs preserve balance by having firmly held views on two issues, one that favors plaintiffs and the other that favors defense; when the first issue looms large they are hired by plaintiffs, when the second looms large they are hired by defendants.)

-Ed Foster

Don't be afraid to get involved and attend meetings and NAFE sessions to stay up-to-date with the research. At meetings, talk to as many people as you can and you will see you're just as good as everyone else. Be confident.

-Marc Weinstein

I would advise an academic forensic economist to make 'forensics' one of his/her specialties. I was a labor economist and I was slow to realize all the research opportunities in the area of forensic economics. I published several times in the JFE, but I should have used the ideas and data in other journals also. I also should have proposed a course in forensic economics -- I presented seminars on forensic issues a couple of times to interested faculty and graduate students in my department, but I didn't develop the area.

I think the biggest issue for me was confidence in a deposition or courtroom setting. It took a long time to achieve confidence. The environment is very different from a classroom. I had to learn to live with very hostile questions. I was surprised at the level of economics ignorance coming from the questioners. And learning what to do when you have made a mistake was very difficult (totally different from the classroom). I had to learn that brevity was a virtue. I had to learn that repetition -- exact repetition -- to similar questions was very important. That is, overall, it was not the economic analysis that was hard. My academic training and reading JFE solved those problems. It was the sociological aspects of practice of forensic economics that were very difficult.

-David Ciscel

In response to #1: Never turn down a colleague when you are asked for help. I get twenty or more requests for help each year from my fellow forensic economists. I make it a point to do my best to help, such as answer questions on how I would approach a particular problem or to provide them with data sources.

This is good citizenship and good business practice. As a result I have many colleagues that will go out of their way to help me. I don't need help very often, but sometimes I need it badly, such as when a federal judge, during a Daubert hearing, gave me one hour to leave the courthouse, go to my office, get copies of seven articles that supported my analysis on various issues, and get back through security to the courtroom. These were background and not articles on which I specifically relied, so they were not in my produced file. I went to my car, called several other NAFE members, and by the time I got to my office, four of the seven articles had been emailed to me. We came up with the rest, and I was back in the courtroom in less than the time allotted. This would have been impossible without their help.

-Steph Horner

A piece of advice thinking back over 41 years: Ensure that the "make whole" objective of compensatory damages guides your decisions in specific cases, that your "make whole" methods and data sources are consistently applied, and that your only deviations from the "make whole" purpose occur when the relevant law requires it.

-Mike Brookshire

Rigorously edit your work with a sharp razor blade: every sentence in a report, every sentence at a deposition, every sentence at a trial. They will never be erased.

-Stan V. Smith

What advice would I give myself 30 years ago? Since I had no knowledge of this field in 1986 the best advice I could give myself would be to always remember to floss, take more accounting courses, and consider becoming a landscaper in case the whole economics thing doesn't work out.

-Lane Hudgins

Insist on retainers prior to submitting a report or testifying at a deposition or trial. In addition, do not take on assignments in areas such as commercial damages estimation or statistical analysis of discrimination unless you have sufficient background.

-Steve Shapiro

On trial testimony days, I wish I had known the equation:

$$X = .001WT$$

where X denotes amount of Xanax in mg. for FE to pop, W denotes FE's weight in lbs., and T denotes time in hours before testimony is scheduled to begin. Also, in the spirit of the accident reconstructionist who needed to refer to his "formula sheet," always remember the following conversions.

Formula Sheet

White (Oval) Pill = .25 mg.

Pink Pill = 2 Whites

Blue Pill = 2 Pinks

White (Rectangle) = 2 Blues

-Jim Ciecka

Welcome New Members!

The following is a list of new NAFE members for the period December 1, 2014 through December 31, 2015.

Advice for early-stage FEs (and some others) heading to court:

1. You are an advocate for opinions that are demonstrably based on your expertise. Nothing else.
2. You are the expert: you know more about your opinions and their basis than your client, the other side's attorney, the court, the jury, and, usually, the other side's expert. If not, make it so.
And...
3. As an economist, I recommend that all young FEs should find something else to do and – my bonus advice – all old FEs should retire.

-William Pearson

I would advise newcomers to the field to keep meticulous records: take notes on every phone call; maintain organized folders for each case; develop good business practices (follow-up letters/calls on late paying clients; track all expenses and revenues via a spreadsheet or QuickBooks; courteous attitude towards all; etc.). Most of all, keep up with the literature and ask questions when something is not crystal clear.

-Frank Tinari

Solid, independent work and opinions are the best way to build an expert practice.

-Rick Gaskins

Cross examination is where you succeed or fail as an expert witness. Keys to being a good witness are: (1) Answer only the question asked; (2) Do not become defensive when the cross examiner raises valid points that could be detrimental to the side who retained you; (3) Do not argue. You will lose credibility. The structure of the courtroom is not conducive for the witness to argue. You are there to answer questions, not ask them; (4) Tell the truth.

-Peter Formuzis

Regarding Question 1, I cannot think of anything I would have done differently if I could advise myself when I was starting out (closer to 40 years ago than 30). Well there is one thing: I would have apprenticed myself to Phil Eden's group even sooner rather than waiting a couple of years.

-Jim Rodgers

(Editor's note: Jim discusses Phil Eden and his association with this group in more detail in his answer to Question 2, which will appear in the May issue of *The Forecast*. Stay tuned for this and other answers!) •

Dr Oluyele Akin Akinkugbe, PHD, St. John's, NL, Canada

Mr Jeffrey B. Baresciano, CPA, Philadelphia, PA, United States

John R. Battle, CPA, CVA, CM&AA, La Luz, NM, United States

Andrew Brod, Greensboro, NC, United States

Jonathan D. Cramer, Harrisburg, PA, United States

Kevin Dougherty, Pittsburgh, PA, United States

Wim Driehuis, Apeldoorn, Netherlands

Mark O. Falkenhagen, Los Angeles, CA, United States

Scott W. Fausti, PHD, Brookings, SD, United States

Dr David Morris Frankel, Ankeny, IA, United States

Leslie Gillespie, Pace, FL, United States

Ms Erica Greulich, San Francisco, CA, United States

Dr Fredrick Holt, Arlington, VA, United States

David Hymel, New Orleans, LA, United States

Mr James Anthony Janos, Livingston, NJ, United States

John Levendis, New Orleans, LA, United States

Mr Gervase Macgregor, London, United Kingdom

Frank Maguire, Milwaukee, WI, United States

Ms Lari B Masten, MSA, CPA, ABV, CFFA, CVA, CFF, MS,
Highlands Ranch, CO, United States

Mark McKinnon, Gilbert, AZ, United States

Philip H. B. More, Rolling Hills Estates, CA, United States

James D Nalley, Des Moines, IA, United States

Dennis S. Neier, New York, NY, United States

David R Perry, CPA, Scottsdale, AZ, United States

Eric A. Purvis, Portland, ME, United States

Michelle Repman, Edinboro, PA, United States

Dr Rick Robinson, PHD, CRC, MBA, Macclenny, FL, United States

Megan Salehli, Philadelphia, PA, United States

David Sienko, River Falls, WI, United States

Dr David Michael Skanderson, PHD, Washington, DC, United States

Mr David Miguel Solis, Kirkland, WA, United States

Brent H. Taylor, Scottsdale, AZ, United States

Brooke Thomas, Columbia, SC, United States

Craig E. Tremp, MBA, Traverse City, MI, United States

Dr Laura D. Ullrich, Rock Hill, SC, United States

Paul F. White, Ph.D., Washington DC, United States



The Forecast Plays 20 Questions with Nancy Eldredge

-Nancy Eldredge, a true one and only, is NAFE's one and only employee. She was recognized at the January 2016 membership meeting for her 30 years of service with NAFE. Fortunately, Nancy agreed to answer a few questions for this issue of The Forecast so we can get to know a little more about her. Thank you Nancy for all that you do.

Where were you born and raised?
In the mountains: Born Lewistown, PA – raised Mount Union, PA

What did you want to be when you grew up? *Telephone operator*

Where did you go to school? *Capt. Jack Joint HS and Fairleigh Dickinson U.*

First job? *I was 10 when I began assembling pastry boxes at my father's bakery*

How long have you lived at your current address? *1937-1955 and 2004-present*

What is one word that describes you? *liberal*

What is your most marked characteristic?
I am curious about people/places/ things/situations

Which words or phrases do you most overuse? *"Whatever," "It is what it is." and a few unprintables*

When and where are you happiest?
Anywhere, anytime there is music, people, color

What trait do you most admire in others?
Sense of humor

If you could change one thing about yourself what would it be? *I'd be more of an extrovert*

What is your favorite hobby? *Slow dancing*

Early bird or night owl? *Both - with occasional success*

Beach, city or mountains? *Perfection would be mountains in the city*

Who are your favorite writers? *Philip Miller, Oscar Wilde, and Jonathan Franzen*

Favorite Movie? *Choose Me and Love Actually*

Favorite Indulgence? *Smoking & talking (ideally at the same time)*

Proudest Accomplishment? *Surviving & continuing a relationship with family (my soul mate poet, my daughter, and my four step-children)*

What is something you still want to learn?
How to relax more

If you were to die and come back as a person or thing, who or what would it be?
Artist of some sort

If you could say something to your younger self, what would it be?
Curb that romanticism!!

Any pet peeves? *Egomaniacs*

How did you first become involved in NAFE?
I chose a university job because it offered work on the JFE

What is your favorite thing about NAFE?
Its considerate and appreciative members

What is your favorite slogan?
It's what you learn after you know it all that counts (John Wooden) •

I would like to thank everyone for the generous gift presented to me at the 30th Anniversary Membership meeting. I am enjoying it already and am looking forward to the next 11 months of enjoyment! The extraordinary consideration I continue to receive from the NAFE is much appreciated.
-Nancy Eldredge

From the Trenches Constructively Engaged: Retention When Not Formally Engaged

Marc A. Weinstein,
Principal Team Economics, LLC
mweinstein@teameconomics.com
www.TeamEconomics.com/
MarcAWeinstein

Remember the old story when a man is discussing how unhappy he is in his marriage with a close friend, who happens to be an attorney, and the man hands him \$1 during the conversation. At that point, the man expects that the compensation will guarantee him confidentiality with

attorney-client privilege and the fact that he was discussing his marriage will at least disqualify the attorney from representing his spouse. As a Forensic Economist ("FE") or other damage professional, similar events often occur where you have been constructively engaged when you were not formally retained.

A typical engagement occurs when the attorney contacts you to discuss a matter but prior to any discussion, you determine if you have any potential conflicts with the parties involved in the case. Once it is determined that no conflicts exist, a formal engagement letter may be executed by and between you and your client. Now consider the situation when an attorney emails you documents on a case or sends a package in the mail without ever discussing the matter with you. Once you view the email or open the package which came in the mail, an argument can be made that you are at that moment engaged in the matter.

Once mailed, either emailed or via snail mail, the attorney often makes several assumptions about you as their expert. First, since you have the pertinent files on the matter

to date, or the relevant documents they want you to see, the attorney can name you as his damage expert in the pleadings. Second, the opposition can no longer engage you; if they have not done so already in the specific matter. And last, if the matter were to immediately resolve as a result of the attorney naming you as their damage expert, you will have not billed any hours working on the matter and the use of your name as the expert will have been gratis.

To prevent from being constructively engaged, FE's must be timely and diligent and immediately contact the attorney and make it clear that you are not engaged until the prospective client executes their typical engagement procedure. That may mean signing an engagement letter, submitting a required retainer, committing to funding payment for the particular case, or any combination thereof. Regardless of your specific retention procedures, FE's need to make it clear that any engagement cannot occur without first clearing potential conflicts of interest and a mutually agreed upon payment procedure should be committed to by the attorney client; similar to how they would expect to be retained. •

And Now For Something Completely Different... Excerpt of Interview with Ted Miller

-this rotating column features items of interest to NAFE members. Items can be closely or loosely related to forensic economics or economics in general, or (as in this issue) may feature the work of one of our members.

At the January NAFE membership meeting held in conjunction with the ASSA meeting in San Francisco, health economist Ted Miller was presented the 2016 John Ward and Michael Piette Research Prize for his paper "The Plausible Range for the Value of Life - Red Herrings Among the Mackerel" (Journal of Forensic Economics, Fall 1990). The Ward/Piette Research Prize recognizes the best of past research published in the *Journal of Forensic Economics* and the importance of this research to the profession.

Recently, Dr. Miller's work at the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation has led to his collaboration with *Mother Jones* and their investigation into the societal

cost of gun violence. The methodology Dr. Miller employed in this effort can be found in the May/June 2015 issue of *Mother Jones* and is available online at: <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/04/methodology-gun-violence-data-ted-miller>.

Dr. Miller was recently interviewed on National Public Radio regarding his work in this field. A reprint of highlights from this interview appears below with the permission of NPR.

Congratulations Dr. Miller on being the second recipient of the Ward/Piette Research Prize.

"Looking At Violence In America With A Financial Lens" by NPR Staff, December 15, 2015

Pain, grief and emotional loss follow mass shootings in America, and there are also other costs that add up to violence's financial toll. It's Ted Miller's job to crunch numbers on social ills like mass shootings. He's a health economist with the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation. For example, when then-U.S. Rep. Gabby Giffords was shot in a 2011 incident that left six people dead and 13 injured (including Giffords), her medical costs alone were well over \$500,000, Miller says. Each of the six deaths "was worth about \$7 million," he tells NPR's David Greene. "The way we look at that is we have interviews where people have been asked how much they would pay to reduce their chance of being killed or injured in a violent incident. People actually pay that. When you look at housing prices, we pay more for housing in safe neighborhoods."

Interview Highlights

On what goes into the calculations

We're looking at the value of a human life, not the cost of a human life. We look at the wage loss, we look at the household work loss, we look at the value people place on their pain and suffering, lost quality of life. Fatality is a lot cheaper, medically, than surviving. Makes a real difference if you have insurance. The Boston Marathon is interesting because people who were uninsured who were injured in that bombing, who were from Massachusetts, could even after the fact buy health insurance, whereas people who are not from Massachusetts couldn't.

On the difference, in medical cost terms, between dying and surviving

The pain, suffering, lost quality of life and lost wages are far larger if you die than if you live. Although some people will live as quadriplegics, some people will live with severe traumatic brain injury. There are people who, when you ask them, say that's a fate worse than death.

On serving the public health

I think of my numbers as giving people the numbers they need to save lives. Let me take the example of the cost of a bicycle helmet. I've looked at the savings from

bicycle helmets. That's resulted in laws being passed in some places. For a lot of legislatures, [it] builds a legislative case. When we say a child seat returns more in medical cost savings alone than the cost of the seat, that makes it easier to pass a law requiring kids to be in child seats going back to when we didn't have those laws.

On the financial cost of the shootings in San Bernardino, Calif.

Probably about \$125 million for San Bernardino. [The shooters left 14 people dead and 21 others wounded.] Perhaps more telling is the total cost of firearm injury is \$235 billion a year. So \$125 million is less than a day's firearm injuries on average.

©2015 National Public Radio, Inc. NPR news report titled "Looking At Violence In America With A Financial Lens" by NPR Staff was originally published on NPR.org on December 15, 2015, and is used with the permission of NPR. Any unauthorized duplication is strictly prohibited. These Interview Highlights are reprinted as found on the NPR web site and can be seen with Dr. Miller's full interview at: www.npr.org/2015/12/15/459673828/looking-at-violence-in-america-with-a-financial-lens. By granting permission to reprint these Interview Highlights NPR in no way endorses the National Association of Forensic Economics. •

NAFE- A Personal Recollection

By: Jack Ward

I was first introduced to forensic economics in the late seventies while working as a professor at the University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC). A local attorney asked me if I would calculate the economic loss suffered by the survivors of a man killed in an automobile collision. The request was accompanied by an offer to pay me \$900 (a magnificent sum at the time) for a report on damages and testimony at a trial.¹

As I embarked on the task I soon discovered that, other than a few bar journal papers, there was little literature available on calculating such damages and that the literature that did exist offered widely conflicting views on how to make such calculations. There were no organizations of forensic economists (FEs) and most economists doing forensic economic work were professors doing such work part-time. Because forensic economics was not, at that time, viewed as an academic field of research, most economics departments gave little credit for forensic economic consulting and some actively discouraged such work as a drain on energy that should have been directed to traditional academic research. There were several large consulting practices attached to major universities that did forensic economic work in high profile commercial disputes, but there was little communication between FEs around the nation in this pre-internet age. I also discovered that my economic training in microeconomic theory, human resource economics, and labor economics did not fully address the task at hand. I talked to several associates at other universities who had done similar assignments and found that they did not know much more than I did about making such projections of economic damages. So, to complete my task, I tied together a present value calculation based on the decedent's base earnings, run to a social security age of retirement, discounted using current bond yields, a ten year average growth rate in earnings for all workers, reduced by a historical average rate of unemployment and annual probabilities of death and an assumed self-consumption rate of a third. This was not rocket science. The attorney accepted my calculations and the case settled out of court. I was paid for my effort and I thought, "This is pretty easy". It wasn't easy and in subsequent cases I discovered that deposition examination, motions to exclude my testimony, and trials were stressful and demanding and my academic credentials did not buy me any slack in cross examination. I also found that the first forensic economic assignment for most academic economists was their last assignment. This was not an academic arena! I had to discover the rules of the legal arena and the standards of professional practice necessary to be a forensic economist.

In 1985 I volunteered to chair a session on "Economics in Litigation" at an Atlantic Economic Association meeting in Rome. I presented a paper on wage growth and discounting and John Adams presented a paper on valuing pensions in divorce. We had one other attendee beside my wife. Nevertheless, John and I enjoyed the exchange and comradery of discussing actual cases and agreed to exchange lists of names of other economists doing this kind of work and this began a series of chain letters with Tom Depperschmidt, Ralph Frasca, George Shieren and others that led to a prospective membership list and a proposal to create a National Association of Forensic Economists (later to become the National Association of Forensic Economics). Jerry Olson, my colleague at UMKC, and I incorporated the group in 1986 and an organizational meeting was held on December 26 at the ASSA/AEA meeting in New Orleans. That first meeting set the foundation for the future expansion of NAFE. NAFE

had a dynamic quality and was a forum for exchange of both academic and professional ideas in the practice of forensic economics. In that first meeting I clearly remember the enthusiasm of Mike Brookshire, Eli Schwartz, Bob Thornton, John Adams, Frank Slesnick, Barry BenZion, Frank Tinari and others who were to become our 153 charter members, and the realization we had a very unique group. Jerry Olson and I and our wives Jane and Pam smuggled up wine and beer and snacks to our first reception in our suite and associations became lifelong friendships in a few hours. Everyone had a story, a unique case, an idea for research, and another name to contact. Even more important, there was a desire to share, to help, and to build NAFE. The first issue of the Journal of Forensic Economics (JFE) was published in September of 1987 and by 1988 NAFE was sponsoring sessions at four regional meetings of economic associations in addition to the national ASSA meeting. Nancy Eldredge (our glue) became Production Editor of the JFE in 1989 and has held that position for over 25 years. In 1988-1989 the American Academy of Economic and Financial Experts (AAEFE) formed with the majority of members also members of NAFE.

Forensic Economics has become a full-fledged field of economics over the past 30 years and the quality of forensic economic analysis is far superior to what existed back then. We have produced an extensive literature through the JFE (and the Journal of Legal Economics of AAEFE) and a robust exchange of ideas through our meetings and internet list-servers. Jim Rodgers initiated a NAFE Winter meeting in the tropics in the late nineties and I started a NAFE International meeting in 2003. The NAFE International has now visited 13 countries and has engaged the participation of economists and attorneys from England, Ireland, Italy, Denmark, Hungary and Croatia. The membership of NAFE also changed since 1986 with fewer members being PhDs from

¹This paper is, in part, drawn from a chapter prepared for a forthcoming book, **Practicing Ethics in Economics and Public Policy** by Elizabeth Searing for Springer Press.

²Michael L. Brookshire, "A History of the National association of Forensic Economics, 1986-2001" *Legal Economic Review*, V.6, No. 1, 2003, pp 22-32, and James D. Rodgers and Marc A. Weinstein, "An Updated History of the National Association of Forensic Economics: 2002-2014", *Journal of Forensic Economics* Dec 2014, V 25, No. 2, December 2014, pp. 175-202

academic institutions. Increasingly, new FEs are CPAs or have MAs or MBAs. While the membership is generally aging, with a significant number of members in their sixties and seventies, members of NAFE have encouraged the participation of new entrants into the field and many opportunities exist to enter the field. A new generation of FEs is taking leadership of NAFE as reflected by the ages of members of our Board of Directors today. Our meetings coincide with all of the major academic meetings of economists and we encourage students and new PhDs to attend our sessions. The legal system has come to increasingly rely upon testimony by forensic economists on damages in complex commercial litigation, employment law and personal injury/death litigation. The field has risen to the challenges presented by the legal system by generating those techniques necessary to accurately calculate such damages and by adopting a code of professional practice and ethics.

Mike Brookshire, Jim Rodgers and Marc Weinstein have formally chronicled the history of NAFE², but I would like to add a few recollections of that history based on my own role in that history. NAFE, over the past thirty years has been a source of learning, research and friendships. I was fortunate to serve as the first President of NAFE and Editor of the JFE (and the JLE), which allowed me to observe the unique union of professional practice and academic research that characterizes NAFE. Our adoption of a Statement of Ethical Principles and Principles of Professional Practice made NAFE (and AAEFE) the only organizations of economists with formal codes of ethics. But, the real strength of NAFE has been its members. Members, like Eli Schwartz, John Adams, and Rubin Slesinger, our first three Past Presidents' Service Award winners have left us, along with Mike Piette, Jerry Olson, Tom Havrilesky, and Mel Wolfson. Their contributions to NAFE will be remembered.

I am indebted to those who have co-authored books and papers with me over the past thirty years – Bob Thornton, Mike Brookshire, Tom Ireland, Frank Slesnick, Kurt Krueger, Mike Piette, and Jerry Olson. I have enjoyed the opportunity to travel with Barry BenZion, Jim Rodgers, Steve Shapiro, Bob Bohm, Manny Smith, Art Eubank, Ed Foster and others around the world as part of our Winter and International meetings.

I took early retirement from UMKC in 2003 and I have entered into the emeritus stage of my life – emeritus professor, emeritus editor and emeritus ?. But FEs seem to live a long time and practice FE to advanced age. Ev Dillman, Jerry Martin, and Ed Foster are my role models and I, like them, look forward to the next 30 years of NAFE. •

Some Perils of Relying Solely on W-2 Forms for Earnings History

By Jennifer L. Polhemus¹

Forensic economists seeking written documentation of a plaintiff's historical annual earnings can investigate a variety of potential sources, including IRS W-2 forms, year-end paystubs, Social Security Statements, income tax returns, personnel files, employers' payroll printouts or employment tax returns, and, for larger employers, personalized total compensation statements.²

Since W-2 forms are widely understood as sources of annual earnings information, they may be the first records that attorneys seek and/or provide when attempting to document a worker's earnings history. However, reliance solely on W-2 forms can lead to significant understatement of wages. Employees may have elected to have portions of their pay deducted on a pre-tax basis, in order to fund benefits such as health insurance and flexible spending accounts (FSAs) for healthcare, dependent care, and public transit or parking expenses. For the most part, such amounts are not reflected on a worker's W-2 form, and could conceivably combine to exceed \$11,000 annually, as shown in the hypothetical illustration below.

Illustration: Voluntary Pre-Tax Deductions Not Reported on W-2 Forms

Employee's Contribution to	Est. Amount	Data Source for Estimate
Medical insurance	\$ 4,955	Kaiser Family Foundation's 2015 survey Ex. 6.4 ³
Dental insurance	630	ehealthinsurance lowest price family plan ⁴ for 2016
Vision insurance	454	VSP's lowest price family plan ⁵ for 2016
Health care FSA	2,550	2016 FSA maximum, per IRS Pub 15-B
Parking/transit FSA	3,060	2016 maximum, per IRS Pub 15-B
Total	\$ 11,649	

Health Insurance and W-2 Forms

Given the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and its reporting requirements, should the cost of health insurance always appear on W-2 forms, in Box 12 with the code DD? It depends. The ACA requires reporting of the total cost of employer-sponsored health coverage beginning with 2012 W-2s, but there are a few exceptions. Small employers – defined by the IRS for this purpose as those issuing 250 or fewer W-2 forms in the prior year – are exempt from the requirement, as part of what the IRS terms “transition relief⁶.” Also, if the employee separates from an employer and requests his W-2 before the end of the year, the employer is not required to report health care cost on the W-2.

What is included in the amount reported with code DD? At a minimum, it will be the total cost (employer and employee contributions combined) of *medical* insurance coverage. This is even in situations where the employer does not contribute to the premium costs, meaning that the presence of a DD code item should not by itself create a presumption of employer-paid medical coverage. Amounts reported with code DD *may* also include dental or vision plans, at the employer's option. For health care FSAs, the only portion to be included in the code DD amount is the employer's contribution, if any, and not the employee's payroll deduction amount. For a handy IRS chart indicating required and optional items for code DD, see the fourth item in the reference list below.

¹Consulting economist in Santa Monica, CA. Contact at jenniferpolhemus@verizon.net.

²Here and throughout, the worker is assumed to have been an employee, not self-employed. Also, “key employees” (in general, those with ownership or officers with annual pay exceeding \$170,000; see IRS Pub. 15-B) are not discussed in this article.

³National average for family coverage, employee contribution only. The survey uses the term “health insurance,” without defining it in the report or in the survey instrument. This author's correspondence with the study's co-author and review of the relevant survey questions suggests that the premium cost being reported for “health” insurance is indeed for major medical insurance, without consideration of a separate dental or vision plan.

⁴This is a rough proxy for the cost of coverage through an employer's group plan, assuming that a family of four people (parents age 40 and two children age 10) is covered in zip code 20500 (The White House) for the lowest premium policy found on ehealthinsurance.com (Dominion Dental Services), and that the employee pays 100% of the cost via payroll deduction.

⁵Same assumptions as footnote 4, but coverage provided by Vision Service Plan.

Benefits not to be included within the code DD amount include insurance coverage for long-term care, accident, or disability insurance; employee assistance or wellness programs (unless the employer charges a separate premium for such coverage under COBRA); worker's compensation premiums; automobile medical payment insurance; and amounts contributed by the employer to Archer medical spending accounts or health savings accounts (HSAs). In the event an employee changes coverage during the year (e.g., adds a spouse upon marriage), the W-2 reported cost is to include the combined cost paid for the different coverages in that year.

Flexible Spending Accounts

A few comments are in order regarding FSAs funded with pre-tax dollars. In cases where a health care FSA is funded entirely by the employee without contribution by the employer (these cases being the majority, in this author's experience), then the FSA will not be noted or coded as such on the W-2 form, although the pre-tax contributions will have reduced W-2 earnings. Note that health care FSAs are distinct from HSAs; HSA contributions by the employer (including amounts selected by the employee from a cafeteria plan), should appear in Box 12 with a W code. If the employee makes after-tax contributions to an HSA, then they are included in Box 1 as taxable earnings (and can be deducted on the personal tax return).

The situation for a dependent care FSA is different; total contributions to such plans are reported in Box 10 of the W-2, without distinction as to whether the funds were contributed by employer, employee, or both. For transit and parking expenditures, the illustration assumed that an FSA was used to fund those items. However, an employer without a transit or parking FSA plan may nonetheless offer pre-tax payroll deductions for those items, reducing W-2 earnings in the same way. Employee contributions to a transportation or parking plan may indicate a saved expense, rather than redirected wages, depending on the case circumstances.

Retirement Contributions

Retirement contributions from the *employee* appear in Box 12, with code D (401-K deferrals) and/or myriad other, less common codes.⁷ In general, these amounts are pre-tax contributions, included within Medicare wages (Box 5) and not within Box 1 wages.⁸

Although the W-2 form does not reveal the *employer's* retirement contribution directly, it may be helpful in identifying a worker's participation in some form of retirement plan or even in valuing the employer's contribution indirectly. The "retirement plan" checkbox in Box 13 can establish participation, but not monetary value and not necessarily eligibility. If the employee was eligible for the plan, but no contributions were added to the employee's account during that particular year, then the box need not be checked. "Retirement plan" for purposes of the checkbox can mean defined benefit, defined contribution, IRC section 403(a) and (b) annuity plans, and SIMPLE and SEP plans, as well as profit-sharing and stock bonus plans.⁹

A forensic economist may be able to impute the value of an employer's contribution to a defined contribution plan by using the employee's contribution and the plan details. For example, if W-2 Box 12 indicates \$3,000 with code D, and the matching formula is known to be 50 percent, then the employer's contribution could be projected as \$1,500. Notwithstanding this example, W-2 forms continue to offer few clues as to employer contribution, and thus relying solely on a W-2 form to document retirement-related fringe benefits is generally imprudent. For defined benefit plans, W-2s provide no information other than via the participation checkbox.

"Retirement plan" in this context means a qualified plan; those rare situations involving nonqualified plans will require further research. Less common forms of deferred compensation, such as stock options and nonqualified plans, deserve further study and are not addressed in this article.

Life Insurance and More

For employer-sponsored group term life insurance, the *employee's* contribution is deducted on an after-tax basis and will not appear separately on the W-2. Whether or not the *employer's* contribution appears on the W-2 is governed by two factors. First, if the face value of the

policy is \$50,000 or less, then no W-2 reporting is required. If life insurance coverage is more than \$50,000, then an amount should appear in Box 12 with code C. This amount does not include any employee contribution and is not precisely the employer's cost; rather, it is derived from an IRS table, based on age and policy amount. However, given the relatively low premiums for group term life insurance, and therefore the expected small magnitude of any potential difference from actual premium cost, relying on the dollar figure in Box C would appear to be reasonable. Naturally, cases involving executives with large policies may require additional information. Life insurance for a spouse or dependents is excluded from W-2 reporting and taxation as *de minimis* if the coverage is less than \$2,000.

Another class of payroll deductions may have some relevance in a lost earnings context, but does not appear on a W-2 form because such deductions are made on an after-tax basis, and thus do not affect taxable earnings reflected on the W-2 in Box 1, 3 or 5. Voluntary deductions for long-term care and disability insurance fall into this category, as do deductions (often involuntary) for union dues. Union dues may need to be subtracted from lost earnings as a saved expense, but they may or may not appear on the W-2, since employers are not required to report amounts withheld for union dues. If union dues are reported, they should be labeled as such and appear in Box 14, which is used primarily for information the employer wants to provide to the employee. Box 14 *may*, if the employer elects, contain information on the amount of health insurance premiums deducted from the employee's pay or even the amount of contributions made by the employer to a retirement plan, although this author has not been fortunate enough to see that in practice!

Garnishments for obligations such as child support and tax levies are also after-tax payroll deductions and will not appear on the W-2. If these are believed to have some relevance to economic loss or to a more complete picture of the plaintiff's financial life, detail can be obtained through paystubs, payroll records, or possibly the worker's personnel file.

Some fringe benefits may appear in Box 1 of the W-2 as taxable earnings. Examples include reimbursements made for employee

⁶The IRS has pledged to give at least six months' notice of a change to this exemption

⁷For the IRS Reference Guide for Box 12 Codes, see IRS, "2016 General Instructions," 28.

⁸Roth plans are relatively uncommon and thus are excluded here, but note that employee contributions will be taxable and thus included in Box 1 earnings (IRS, "Retirement Plans FAQs").

⁹For a helpful table explaining the Box 13 checkbox, see IRS "2016 General Instructions," 28. Note that 457(b) plans do not merit the "retirement plan" checkbox on their own; however, they generally are offered in conjunction with other deferred compensation that would fit the "retirement plan" designation.

¹⁰In principle, union dues are deductible by the employee as a miscellaneous expense on Form 1040 Schedule A; however, in reality, it is unlikely that union dues will be deducted due to the 2% floor for miscellaneous itemized deductions, and therefore tax preparers may elect not to note them at all.

¹¹See IRS, "Common Errors."

NAFE Events

Mark Your Calendars!

2016
 Eastern Economic Association
 Washington, D.C. –
 February 26-28, 2016

NAFE International Meeting
 Bucharest –
 May 23, 2016

Western Economic Association International
 Portland – J
 une 29-July 3, 2016

Missouri Valley Economic Association
 St. Louis –
 October 27-29, 2016
 (No NAFE Sessions Planned)

Southern Economic Association
 Washington, D.C. –
 November 19-21, 2016

2017
 American Economic Association – ASSA
 Chicago –
 January 6-8, 2017

business expenses under a nonaccountable plan, and dependent care benefits exceeding \$5,000. In the author's experience, such instances are rare and are not discussed here.

Concluding Remarks

The variety of fringe benefit options available can lead to employer confusion concerning reporting requirements, so much so that the IRS website contains a list of employers' most common errors.¹¹ The IRS notes, for example, that some employers improperly used code H in Box 12 to report health benefits, when code H is intended for elective deferrals to a tax-exempt organization's retirement plan; only 6 percent of employers using code H actually contributed to such a plan. The potential for reporting errors may signal analysts to apply an extra dose of scrutiny when interpreting Box 12 codes.

Social Security Earnings Statements and personal income tax returns suffer from the same understatement problems as those set forth above for W-2 forms. Cross-checking using multiple sources for earnings information can improve accuracy. Given increasing use of computerized accounting, even smaller employers may be able to provide a payroll printout, whether in-house using QuickBooks or similar software, or through their outside payroll service such as ADP, Paychex, or Intuit Payroll. Such printouts often will contain information about gross wages before elective payroll deductions, and may go back in time to when the worker first joined the employer, providing a complete earnings history. W-2 forms provided through some public employers, as well as by payroll services giant ADP, Inc., may contain an "Earnings Summary" section, on the same page as the official W-2 form, revealing additional details regarding voluntary and involuntary deductions from pay; this can obviate or greatly alleviate the potential for underreporting earnings that was illustrated at the beginning of this article.

As employers seek to improve worker satisfaction and retention, and provide a universe of benefit options that are valued by employees, we may see new and interesting forms of compensation as yet unknown. But for now, relying only on W-2 forms can provide a highly inaccurate picture of a worker's earnings. •

References

eHealth. "Compare the Best Dental Plans." Accessed January 8, 2016. <https://www.ehealthinsurance.com/dentalinsurance?allid=Goo44124>.

Internal Revenue Service. "2016 General Instructions for Forms W-2 and W-3." January 5, 2016. <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/iw2w3.pdf>.

----- . "Common Errors on Form W-2 Codes for Retirement Plans." Last modified September 10, 2015. <https://www.irs.gov/Retirement-Plans/Common-Errors-on-Form-W2-Codes-for-Retirement-Plans>.

----- . "Form W-2 Reporting of Employer-Sponsored Health Coverage." Last modified December 31, 2015. <https://www.irs.gov/Affordable-Care-Act/Form-W-2-Reporting-of-Employer-Sponsored-Health-Coverage>.

----- . "Publication 15-B, Employer's Tax Guide to Fringe Benefits for Use in 2016." <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p15b.pdf>.

----- . "Publication 503, Child and Dependent Care Expenses." Last modified December 2, 2015. <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p503.pdf>.

----- . "Retirement Plans FAQs on Designated Roth Accounts." Last modified October 23, 2015. <https://www.irs.gov/Retirement-Plans/Retirement-Plans-FAQs-on-Designated-Roth-Accounts>.

Internal Revenue Service Office of Federal, State and Local Governments. "Fringe Benefit Guide, Publication 5137." January 2014. <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p5137.pdf>.

Kaiser Family Foundation. 2015. "2015 Employer Health Benefits Survey." <http://files.kff.org/attachment/report-2015-employer-health-benefits-survey>.

Vision Service Plan. "VSP Direct." Accessed December 13, 2015. https://www.vspdirect.com/?utm_source=vsp_buy_now&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=vsp.



Location of Eastern - Washington D.C.

Please join NAFE in Washington, D.C.



-If you have been thinking of attending the NAFE sessions at the Eastern Economic Association Annual Conference, then you may want to consider these recommendations from Joe Rosenberg and Rick Holt. Both Joe and Rick will be participating in the NAFE sessions at this meeting, and it was wonderful to get their suggestions.

Starting with suggestions from Joe....Restaurants near the conference hotel – the Marriott Wardman Park:

- Petits Plats - 2653 Connecticut Ave. NW; (202) 518-0018 (casual French/Belgian dining - always delicious and pretty quiet)
- Afghan Grill - 2309 Calvert St. NW; (202) 234-5095 (good food)
- Lebanese Taverna - 2641 Connecticut Ave. NW; (202) 265-8681 (surprisingly good and chic)
- Open City Diner - 2331 Calvert St. NW; (202) 332-2331 (excellent food, but you need to reserve, have to wait a while, and it's noisy - but prices are reasonable for city. Note that this is also the restaurant where the NAFE Social Event will be held on Friday, February 26 at 6 PM)
- Café Sorriso - 2311 Calvert St. NW; (202) 803-2872 (good Italian)

A little further away in Cleveland Park (.9 mile or one stop north on Metro red line):

- Indique - 3512-14 Connecticut Ave. NW; (202) 244-6600 (good Indian)
- Coppi's - 3321 Connecticut Ave. NW; (202) 966-0770 (Italian, best to have a reservation)
- Nam-Viet - 3419 Connecticut Ave. NW; (202) 237-1015
- (Vietnamese)

Or, a 15-minute walk to the Adam Moran Neighborhood will lead you to even more good food and drink options. Consider these suggestions from Rick:

- Mintwood Place – 1813 Columbia Rd. NW; (202)234-6732 (considered one of Washingtonian Magazine's 100 Very Best Restaurants 2015, they can accommodate reservations for up to a party of 6)
- Cashinon's Eat Place – 1819 Columbia Rd. NW; (202)797-1819 (seasonal American cuisine with a daily-changing menu)
- Roofers Union – 2446 18th St. NW; (202)232-7663 (featuring craft beers, live music, classic American fare and “an inspired bar program” – according to their website)

As for things to do in D.C., the list is endless. Here is what Joe put together for us:

- As far as activities go, there is so much to do in DC it's hard to know where to start. The hotel is right near the National Zoo. The subway is right there to go downtown to visit any of the many Smithsonian Museums (all free, such as Air and Space, Natural History, American History, etc.). Of course there's the Kennedy Center for Fine Arts (definitely not free, and reservations needed). There are the National Archives (see the original Constitution, Declaration of Independence, among other noteworthy items) the Library of Congress, and the U.S. Congress (some people might actually want to visit there). Plus all of the monuments, beautiful at night.

And Rick had these additional suggestions:

- If the weather is bad – hop in a cab and see the Wonder exhibit at the Renwick – it is the hot topic now in DC - <http://americanart.si.edu/exhibitions/archive/2015/wonder/>.
- The Washington National Cathedral is only a 20 min walk from the hotel and also very nice.

After making your D.C. travel plans and restaurant reservations, please also check out the schedule of NAFE sessions featured in this issue. Enjoy! And many thanks to Joe and Rick. •



Meeting Updates

Winter Meeting

Recap – 2016 NAFE Winter Meeting in Key West

The 17th Annual NAFE Winter Meeting was held in Key West, Florida, on January 29th and 30th at the Sheraton Suites Key West Hotel.

Conference Attendees were: Fred Abraham, Charles Baum, Merle Dimbath, Art Eubank, Ed Foster, Rick Gaskins, Jeremy Hagler, Tom Ireland, Bob Minnehan, Roderick Moe, Jim Rodgers, David Schap, Gary Skoog, Frank Tinari, and Jack Ward.

Proposed topics to be discussed at the Winter Meeting were:

1. "Potential Estate Loss Calculation Error Using NDR," Fred Abraham;
2. "The Accuracy of Social Security Wage Projections," Charlie Baum;
3. "State of Illinois Pensions and Expected Lost Pension Benefits," Art Eubank;
4. "Life and Joint Life Annuities Update," (Updated to 2011 US Life Tables from the 2005 tables used in Foster, J. Legal Econ 16(2), April, 2010), Ed Foster;
5. "Practice Issues of the Self-Employed FE, Including Transition to Less than 'Full-Time' as the FE Matures," Rick Gaskins and Tom Ireland;
6. "Determining Reasonable Value and Proper Values for Medicare/ACA Based Life Care Plans," Tom Ireland;
7. "Asbestos Bankruptcy Trusts – a Second Path to Compensation for Asbestos Victims!" Bob Minnehan;
8. "Issues Regarding Fringe Benefits," Jim Rodgers;
9. "Accounting for Employer-Provided Workplace Accommodations in Personal Injury Cases," David Schap;
10. "Worklife Expectancy Chapter," Gary Skoog;
11. "Topics in Forensic Economics Needing More Research and Publication," Frank Tinari;
12. Panel Discussion, "Economic Ethics Issues in Preparing a Plaintiff or Defense Report," Jack Ward (with Panelists, Tom Ireland and Gary Skoog).

Plans were discussed for the 2017 Winter Meeting, which will be held on Friday and Saturday, January 27 and 28, 2017.

-Art Eubank and David Schap, Organizers

Eastern Meeting

Schedule of Sessions

Eastern Economic Association 42nd Annual Conference

Washington, DC – February 26-28, 2016

Hotel: Marriott Wardman Park

Conference & Hotel Information: www.quinnipiac.edu/eea/42nd-annual-conference/

Organized by Craig Allen, Vice President - Eastern Region (c.allen.fcas@gmail.com)

There will be four NAFE sessions held in conjunction with the Eastern Economic Association's annual meeting February 26-28 at the Marriott Wardman Park in Washington D.C. NAFE sessions will be Friday afternoon and Saturday with a Social Event Friday evening. The schedule is as follows:

Friday, February 26

Session I: 4:00 PM to 5:20 PM

100-Year Yield Curves

James A. Girola, U.S. Treasury Dept.,
james.girola@treasury.gov

Using TIPS to Discount to Present Value
Raymond Strangways, oldstrang@cox.net;
Bruce L. Rubin, brubin@odu.edu; Michael
Zugelder, mzugelde@odu.edu

Negative Net Discount Rates
Jerome Paige, Paige and Associates,
jpaige@paigeandassociates.com

Social Event: 6:00 PM - Open City Diner,
2331 Calvert Street NW, Washington D.C.

Saturday, February 27

Session II: 8:00 AM to 9:20 AM

Human Capital Foundations of Earning
Capacity: Becker and Mincer Revisited
Edward Heler, Heler Consultancy,
eheler@helersq.net

A Real Options Approach to Measuring Lost
Opportunities in the Employment Context
Hans R. Dutt, Stat Analytics, hansdutt.phd@gmail.com
Worklife by Occupation Physical Requirements
David I. Rosenbaum, University of Nebraska,
Lincoln, drosenbaum@unl.edu

Session III: 9:30 AM to 10:50 AM

Chair: Charles L. Betsey, Howard University, cbetsey2@aol.com

Valuation of Stock Options in Wrongful Termination Cases: A Review and Case Study of
Age Discrimination

Joseph I. Rosenberg, rosenberg123@gmail.com

Real Estate Litigation Topic

William H. Rogers, University of Missouri, St. Louis, rogerswil@umsl.edu

Medicare, Medicaid and Health Insurer Litigation re Drug Pricing

Fred Selck, Bates White, fred.selck@bateswhite.com

Session IV: 2:30 PM to 3:50 PM

TBA

-Craig Allen, Vice President – Eastern Region

International Meeting

Upcoming

13th Annual International Conference of the National Association of Forensic Economics
Bucharest, Romania – May 23, 2016

Hotel: Intercontinental Hotel, Bucharest

Meeting Information: Contact Jack Ward at JohnWardEconomics.com

Hotel Reservation Link: <https://aws.passkey.com/event/14086585/owner/11402317/home>

Organized by: Jack Ward, John Ward Economics

At the 9:30 am Saturday, February 27, 2016 NAFE session at the Eastern Economic Association meeting in Washington, DC, James Girola from the U.S. Treasury Department will be demonstrating new yield curve data.

The Treasury now produces a yield curve for

- Treasury Nominal Coupon Issues (TNC yield curve), which is derived from Treasury nominal notes and bonds;
- Treasury Real Coupon Issues (TRC yield curve), which is derived from Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities (TIPS); and,
- High Quality Market (HQM) Corporate Bonds.

The Treasury construct these 100-year yield curves from extended regressions on maturity ranges. The TNC and TRC are presented as par yields, spot yields, and as forward rates. To find more about these data, go to the Treasury Department's Internet site and click on the "Resource Center" then click on "Economic Policy" and then click on "Treasury Yield Curve" or "Corporate Bond Yield Curve Papers and Data." The data are provided as month-end values and are updated approximately the first week of each month for the previous month.

- Kurt V. Krueger



The 13th Annual NAFE International will be held this year at the Intercontinental Hotel in Bucharest, Romania on May 23rd, 2016. The registration fee is \$320/couple and \$220/single and includes meeting costs, lunches and dinner for the meeting. Space is limited. We have 16 signed-up and could add 1 or 2 more.

I have a link for reservations at the hotel now. They added breakfast and hotel cancellation is free up to May 1, 2016. Given the current Euro price (140€/night to 170€/night) this is a great deal. The hotel is also holding this fully refundable rate for two days before and after the meeting. Just follow the link to the reservation for NAFE and send your reservation deposit to me at JohnWardEconomics.com. Any problems, let me know.

-Jack Ward, Organizer

Western Meeting

Sessions Being Finalized

Please contact Bill Brandt immediately if you have a paper you would like to present Western Economic Association International 91st Annual Conference Portland, Oregon – June 29 - July 3, 2016

NAFE Sessions: July 1st & 2nd

Hotel: Hilton Portland & Executive Tower, Oregon

Conference Information: <http://www.weai.org/AC2016b>

Housing Link: <http://www.weai.org/2016HotelInfo>

Organized by William G. Brandt, Vice President – Western Region

Please join us for the 91st annual conference of the WEAI in Portland Oregon. Sessions are being finalized, and there is space for additional papers. Please let me know as soon as possible if you are interested in being part of this program. While the WEAI conference runs June 29 through July 3, please note that NAFE will be sponsoring sessions Friday, July 1 and Saturday, July 2. Additionally, a membership meeting and NAFE reception will be held Friday.

Check back next issue for a complete schedule of sessions and events. If you have any questions, or would like to present a paper, please contact Bill Brandt at bill@brandforensiceconomics.com. We look forward to seeing you in Portland.

-William Brandt, Vice President – Western Region

Midwestern Meeting

No NAFE Sessions Planned

Missouri Valley Economic Association 53rd Annual Meeting

St. Louis, Missouri - October 27-29, 2016

Conference Information: <http://mvea.net/>

Hotel: Hyatt Regency at the Arch

The 2016 Missouri Valley Economic Association (MVEA) meetings are in St Louis at the Hyatt Regency St. Louis at the Arch hotel on October 27th through 29th. Due to the proximity to the Southern meetings, the NAFE board thought we should consolidate and sponsor sessions at just one meeting this year. For 2016, it will be the Southern meetings in Washington D.C. While we will not be sponsoring a session at the MVEAs, we still hope to sponsor their President's Reception. Please plan to attend our sessions in D.C. and continue supporting the MVEA. See you there.

-David Rosenbaum, Vice President – Midwestern Region

Southern Meeting

Recap – NAFE in New Orleans

The two NAFE sessions held at the annual meeting of the Southern Economic Association in New Orleans, LA on November 22, 2015 included 3 papers and a panel discussion. The 12 attendees at the two sessions contributed to a lively Q&A and subsequent discussion of the topics presented. Many of those in attendance continued the discussions during lunch, dinner and over drinks in the bar area of the conference hotel.

-Frank Adams, Past Vice President – Southern Region

Photos: 1) Frank Adams presenting at the SEA, 2) Karen & David MacPherson with Larry Spizman, 3) Marc Weinstein & friend, 4) Frank Slesnick, Lane Hudgins, Michael Brookshire & Larry Spizman, 5) Larry Spizman, Frank Adams, Steve Shapiro, Marc Weinstein & Lane Hudgins, 6) Steve & Phyllis Shapiro



Next up for the Southern Region:

Call for Papers
 Southern Economic Association 86th Annual Meeting
 Washington DC - November 19-21, 2016
 Conference Information: <https://www.southerneconomic.org/conference/>
 Organized by Gil Mathis, Vice President
 – Southern Region (gil.mathis@murraystate.edu)

National Meeting

Recap – NAFE Sessions & 30th Anniversary Celebration in San Francisco

With four sessions, a Members Meeting honoring Nancy Eldredge, Ted Miller, Mike Nieswiadomy, Beth Gunderson, and Jack Ward for his foresight in founding the National Association of Forensic Economics, as well as a memorable 30th Anniversary reception, NAFE had a very successful ASSA meeting. Thanks to all presenters, discussants, and chairs for their time and effort.

It should also be noted that not only did Marc Weinstein do a fabulous job organizing the reception but he also introduced the NAFE-tini, as featured in some of the photographs seen both in this newsletter and at the NAFE.net website. And in case Jack Ward left any doubt as to how NAFE should be pronounced Marc also offered the following:

NAFE’s 30-Year Conundrum

(Presented January 3, 2016)

Naffy, Nayfee or Naff, nobody knows for sure,
 So today after 30 years, I suggest we settle the score.

And just to be clear and not overstep my bounds,
 I’m not suggesting we cover all controversial grounds.

We will not solve which method is correct,
 Since current or historical interest rates are not the subject.

Not even Nancy who has been here since the first day,
 Can tell you which way is the precise one to say.

Consumption, Hedonics, or even worklife statistics,
 This four letter acronym is quite cryptic.

Thus, according to Ward some 20 years ago,
 He submitted his poem as part of the show.

He said Naffy was daffy, which is silly yet safe,
 So today moving forward, I proclaim we are NAFE.

-Marc Weinstein, Executive Director, NAFE

Next up for the National Meeting: Call for Papers

Allied Social Science Associations – January 6-8, 2017
 Conference Information: https://www.aeaweb.org/Annual_Meeting/index.php
 Organized by Kevin Cahill, Past Vice President – At Large and
 Scott Gilbert, Vice President – At Large
 Contact: Kevin Cahill (cahillkc@bc.edu)

Meetings of Other Associations

American Academy of Economic & Financial Experts
 AAEFE 28th Annual Meeting
 Las Vegas, Nevada - March 17-19
 Hotel: New York New York Hotel and Casino
 Conference Information & Hotel Link: www.aaeefe.org/annual-meeting.

American Rehabilitation Economics Association
 AREA 2016 Annual Conference
 Philadelphia, PA – June 2-5, 2016
 Hotel: Wyndham Philadelphia Historic District
 Conference Information: www.a-r-e-a.org/
 Hotel Link: www.wyndham.com/groupevents2016/47153_AREA2016/main.wnt.

theFORECAST

Volume 30 • Issue 1 • February 2016

Journal of Forensic Economics

P.O. Box 394

Mount Union, PA 17066-0394

NON-PROFIT ORG
US POSTAGE
PAID
Harrisburg, PA
Permit #533

NAFE Events

Mark Your Calendars!
-meeting details inside

2016

Eastern Economic Association
Washington, D.C. – February 26-28, 2016

NAFE International Meeting
Bucharest – May 23, 2016

Western Economic Association International
Portland – June 29-July 3, 2016

Missouri Valley Economic Association
St. Louis – October 27-29, 2016
(No NAFE Sessions Planned)

Southern Economic Association
Washington, D.C. – November 19-21, 2016

2017

American Economic Association – ASSA
Chicago – January 6-8, 2017

