

# Counselor's Corner



## SLAT: Is It Possible to Have Access to Trust Assets Without Estate Inclusion?

**Situation:** Most gift tax exemption estate strategies require assets to be given away with no strings attached. Typically, the gift is given outright to children, grandchildren or an irrevocable trust for the benefit of heirs. Many high-net worth households look for opportunities to minimize their federal or state death tax exposure by transferring assets during their lifetime. However, even high-net worth couples can be reluctant to lose access to those assets for fear that circumstances may one day change.

If your married clients are concerned about losing access to gifted property, a strategy known as the Spousal Limited Access Trust, or Spousal Lifetime Access Trust (SLAT), may be appealing. It's important for financial advisors to understand this planning technique, as life insurance is typically purchased as part of the strategy. This Counselor's Corner will outline the primary planning and tax issues associated with implementing and administering a SLAT, as well as discuss the use of life insurance in the arrangement.

**Solution:** A SLAT is a lifetime irrevocable trust established by a donor spouse for the benefit of the beneficiary spouse, children, and potentially grandchildren. The trust document is written to allow for distributions to the beneficiary spouse, which can allow the donor spouse to indirectly benefit from the trust assets as well. While the trust is written to permit those distributions, it is best to put only those funds in the trust that a donor can reasonably expect to do without. A SLAT can function as a life insurance trust and acquire a single life policy on the donor's life or survivorship policy on both spouses.

The terms of a SLAT often give broad control to the beneficiary spouse, like those of a credit shelter trust. For example, the following provisions can be included:

- If the trust does not own a policy insuring the beneficiary spouse (i.e., a survivorship policy), the beneficiary spouse can be the trustee with the right to make distributions based on ascertainable standards of health, education, maintenance, and support (HEMS). Alternatively, if looking for the most flexibility and asset protection, an independent trustee may have absolute discretion to make distributions to trust beneficiaries. In both cases, the trust should provide that no distributions can be made to satisfy the donor's legal obligations of support during the donor's lifetime to reduce the risk of estate tax inclusion in the donor spouse's estate.
- The trust can direct that the beneficiary spouse receives a mandatory income interest.
- The beneficiary spouse can have a 5% or \$5,000.00 annual withdrawal power.
- The beneficiary spouse can have a limited power of appointment exercisable either at death or in life. In some states, this power can be broad enough to appoint the assets back to the donor spouse as one of many discretionary beneficiaries.

The transfer of assets by the donor spouse establishing the trust is considered a gift but is sheltered from gift tax

through use of some or all of the donor spouse's gift tax exemption. The assets transferred to the trust, along with their future appreciation, eventually pass to future generations without being included in either the donor spouse's or beneficiary spouse's estate for death tax purposes. In the current environment of uncertainty, SLATs can provide several benefits that are attractive for a range of clients from the modest estates needing life insurance to the ultra-high-net worth client requiring aggressive estate planning.

### **Primary Benefits of a SLAT**

While a SLAT is primarily considered a way to avoid transfer taxes while still retaining access to trust assets, the following are some of its other key benefits and features:

**Avoids Probate:** Assets in a SLAT avoid probate, which should reduce settlement costs and time delays because assets in the trust can be available for immediate post-death distribution.

**Later life planning:** Several safeguards can be included in SLATs to provide later life planning. For example, a SLAT can have a separate tax ID which can protect against identity theft risk. Naming a trust protector to act in a fiduciary capacity can provide an independent person to monitor the trustee performance.

**Asset protection:** A SLAT can be structured to provide asset protection from claims of creditors for assets transferred to the trust, assuming the transfer is not characterized as a fraudulent conveyance.

**Serve as an ILIT:** SLATs can function as an Irrevocable Life Insurance Trust.

**Reduces federal estate and state death tax:** Properly implemented and administered assets transferred along with their appreciation to the SLAT avoid both the donor and the beneficiary spouse's estate for estate tax purposes. SLATs are generally structured as grantor trusts for income tax purposes, thus the donor spouse is taxed on the trust income. This further reduces the couple's estate and permits the trust to effectively grow tax-free.

A SLAT may seem like a simple way to use a client's gift tax exemption while still providing a safety net in the event of an unforeseen need. However, there are some factors to consider before deciding if it's an appropriate option for your client's situation. For example, the law regarding the use of SLATs is still in development so there is a risk of estate inclusion, especially if proper care is not taken in its implementation and administration. Because the donor spouse's ability to benefit from the trust is indirect and afforded through the distributions received by the beneficiary spouse, practical considerations such as planning for the event of death or divorce should be addressed.

### **Major Drawback of SLATs**

The primary drawback of a SLAT is that the donor spouse's ability to benefit from the trust comes only through the beneficiary spouse's interest in the trust. If the beneficiary spouse dies before the donor spouse, or if there is a divorce, that access can be lost. For this reason, it is best to put only those funds in the trust that a donor can reasonably expect to do without. Additionally, advanced planning can address both concerns.

One option to address a potential predeceased beneficiary spouse would be life insurance coverage on the beneficiary spouse, payable to the donor or the donor's trust. Another option may be to grant the beneficiary spouse a limited testamentary power of appointment, with the donor spouse as one of many discretionary beneficiaries. However, use of this technique requires careful drafting to avoid access by the donor's creditors and/or pulling the trust back into the donor's estate.

To protect the trust against divorce, the SLAT could define "spouse" as the person to whom the donor is married to at the time, rather than naming a specific individual. In the event of a divorce, the ex-spouse would cease to be the beneficiary and a subsequent spouse would be able to benefit from the trust. However, this strategy only addresses the issue if the donor spouse remarries.

If the donor spouse does not remarry, or the beneficiary spouse predeceases the donor spouse, the trust could

include a provision granting an independent trustee or trust protector the ability to add the donor spouse as a beneficiary. If this provision is included in the SLAT, care must be taken to ensure that the donor is one of several beneficiaries, there is no implied understanding as to how the protector will exercise the power, and the trust situs is in a jurisdiction that authorizes self-settled asset protection trusts.

### **Life Insurance Considerations**

Life insurance enjoys many tax-favored benefits that make it an attractive asset for a SLAT. Specifically, policy values accumulate income tax-free during the life of the insured; Withdrawals from a life insurance policy are not taxable to the extent they do not exceed the cost basis of the policy; and loans of any amount permitted by the insurance carrier can be taken income tax-free. Because of the tax-favored treatment of withdrawals and loans from a life insurance policy, many strategies including SLATs promote the use of taking withdrawals equal to basis and then loans thereafter as a way to access policy cash. The practical effect of such a strategy is that the beneficiary spouse can to enjoy the policy cash value without income tax consequences. In contrast, investment assets such as stocks, bonds and mutual funds owned by a SLAT will result in taxation either at the high trust tax rates or to the donor spouse where the trust is a grantor trust.

In addition, life insurance death benefit is generally received income tax-free and in a properly maintained SLAT, estate tax-free. In contrast, investment assets owned by a SLAT do not get a “step-up in basis.” Consequently, after the death of the insured donor spouse, investment asset will be subject to income tax either at the high trust tax rates or the beneficiary spouse’s tax rate, depending on whether the earnings are retained in the trust or distributed to the spouse.

However, these life insurance tax benefits can be lost. Following are the most common ways to avoid losing the favorable tax treatment of life insurance.

***Avoid creating a MEC:*** One way the tax-favored treatment of life insurance can be lost is by paying too much premium during the first seven years of the contract (or in the 7-pay period after a material change), causing the policy to be classified as a Modified Endowment Contract (MEC). Death benefits from a MEC are still generally received income tax-free under IRC § 101(a), however lifetime distributions from a MEC are taxed differently than distributions from non-MEC policies. Common policy distributions include withdrawals, loans, and assignments. Distributions from a MEC are taxed as income to the extent of gain first and recovery of basis second. Furthermore, the portion of any distribution that is included in the policy owner’s gross income may be subject to a 10% tax penalty if the policy owner is under age 59½. If the SLAT is structured as a grantor trust, the carrier may treat the donor spouse as the policy owner for purposes of the determining whether the penalty applies. If it’s thought that policy cash values will be accessed to satisfy distributions from the SLAT, you will want to avoid creating a MEC.

***Avoid taking withdrawals in the first 15 years on a “cash rich” policy:*** As previously noted, a withdrawal from a life insurance policy is generally treated as a reduction of basis first and is not subject to tax until the amount withdrawn exceeds the investment in the contract/basis. However, a withdrawal in the first 15 years of a “cash rich policy” is treated as a distribution of gain first, taxable as ordinary income. So if the trustee of the SLAT desires to take withdrawals from a policy in the first 15-years, it is best to first check with the carrier to determine if gain will be taxable first under the cash rich rules. Assuming a policy is not a MEC, but the cash rich rules apply to make withdrawals taxable, please not that it is possible to borrow on a cash rich policy in the first 15-years and avoid income tax under the rule.

***Avoid having an incident of ownership causing estate inclusion of the death benefit:*** Inclusion of life insurance death benefit in the insured’s estate will occur if the insured holds any incidents of ownership in a policy on their life. Incidents of ownership encompass far more rights than actual policy ownership and can be attributed to the

insured indirectly such as a corporate owned policy where the insured is a majority owner, and where the insured is a trustee of a trust owned policy. Because ownership of a trust owned policy can be attributed to the insured in a SLAT with a single life policy, the donor spouse cannot be the trustee, as they are the insured, but it is possible for either the beneficiary spouse or adult children to be the trustee. Of course, where a beneficiary spouse is trustee, the powers over the trust property must be limited to avoid inclusion of the trust in the the estate.

When a survivorship life insurance policy is included in a SLAT, neither the donor or beneficiary spouse can be trustee as both are the insureds. In a survivorship SLAT situation, one of the insureds will be the donor spouse and the other will be the beneficiary spouse – this is typically the spouse with the longer life expectancy. There are several other ways that an improperly designed or administered SLAT can end up being included in the taxable estate of the donor or beneficiary spouse or subject to estate tax. This is just the primary scenario which directly involves life insurance; The others will be discussed under ‘Planning Considerations’.

***Manage policy distributions to avoid lapse:*** Taking withdrawals and loans from a policy can reduce the policy death benefit and cash value, and may cause the policy to lapse which can trigger income tax burdens. When accessing policy values to satisfy distributions in a SLAT, it is important to request inforce policy illustrations on an ongoing basis, so the policy can be managed to avoid unintended lapse. It should be noted that some policies have a built-in safety net, usually called an overloan protection rider. This rider essentially freezes the policy when loan balances exceed a certain threshold as a percentage of cash value to prevent policy lapse. If a policy includes this feature, it is important to know when and how to exercise the rider. Most of these riders require proactive action by the policy owner and require the insured to be a minimum specified age.

***Monitor policy performance to avoid policy lapse:*** When taking loans or withdrawals from a policy, it is not only important to avoid the tax landmines. You also need to make practical considerations, such as the impact that changes in crediting rates and loan assumptions can have on the long-term viability of the arrangement. For example, recently I saw an illustration where a mere decrease in crediting rate from 7.7% to 7.0% caused a policy with prior distributions to lapse at the insured’s age 83. Even more problematic was that the policy would not accept additional premiums because the policy used the GPT (Guideline Premium Test) life insurance definitional test with a maximum non-MEC premium funding structure. Unlike CVAT (Cash Value Accumulation Test), GPT limits the amount of premium that may be used to fund a policy. Unable to prevent the policy from lapse, significant phantom income would be recognized. Consequently, it’s fundamentally important to conduct ongoing policy performance reviews.

***Survivorship funding issue:*** When designing a SLAT with a survivorship policy funded by annual gifts from the donor spouse, consideration should be given to an alternative funding strategy in the event the donor spouse dies before premiums on the survivorship policy are fully paid. Otherwise, the SLAT may lack the funds it needs to maintain the policy. One strategy is to purchase a single life policy on the donor spouse or a first-to-die term rider. Another option would be for the donor spouse to bequeath additional funds to the SLAT to complete the funding of the policy.

***Understand potential issues associated with long-term care riders:*** More than 50% of the United States population will need long-term care at some point in their life, and so long-term care planning has become a subject of increased interest and conversation lately. With the recent development of long-term care and chronic illness riders on life insurance policies, it was only a matter of time before those riders would be added on policies owned by SLATs. Since the policy in a SLAT is on the donor spouse, the benefits are triggered because by the status of their health. This presents numerous tax questions, such as: Is the benefit still income tax free, and does the payment of benefit cause estate inclusion?

Unfortunately, there are no specific guidelines from the Internal Revenue Service regarding the tax effect of long-term care benefits for trust ownership. This is true whether the rider is classified as a reimbursement or an indemnity rider. Most commentators raise concerns about using a reimbursement style rider in a trust because bills for the long-term care of the insured are submitted to the insurance company by the policy-holding trust. The insurance company then pays the bill to the care provider for expenses incurred on behalf of the insured. This chain of events provides a direct monetary benefit from the trust to the insured and will likely cause estate inclusion.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, there is less concern with an indemnity-style rider because payment is not tied to expenses of the insured and the benefit is paid directly to the owner of the contract, which would be the trustee in the case of trust ownership. The payment is essentially an acceleration of death benefit.

### **Planning Considerations**

**Fund the trust using separate property:** When funding a SLAT, it is important that the donor spouse use only their separate assets. If any contributions to the trust are from the beneficiary spouse, the beneficiary spouse would be treated as grantor of the trust and their status as both grantor and beneficiary may cause inclusion of the trust property within the beneficiary spouse's taxable estate. Some commentators suggest that it is best to organize SLATs in DAPT (Domestic Asset Protection) states to protect against such slip-up. It is particularly important to take preventative measures to avoid contributing assets of the beneficiary spouse in community/marital property states where both spouses are considered to own half of all community property. This may be accomplished by partitioning assets for contributions to the trust.

**Avoid using split gift election when funding the SLAT:** Some have suggested that one spouse can make the entire gift by having the beneficiary spouse make a split gift election. Split gift is not allowed where the consenting spouse is a beneficiary of the trust, unless the beneficiary spouse's interest in the trust is ascertainable, severable and de minimus.

**One SLAT per couple is preferred to avoid "reciprocal trust doctrine" concerns:** Initially, it may appear that a greater benefit is attainable by establishing a SLAT for each spouse for the other's benefit. However, spouses making mutual trusts must proceed carefully to avoid running afoul of the reciprocal trust doctrine.<sup>2</sup> This doctrine applies to interrelated trusts that have substantially identical terms and are part of the same transaction or plan. This doctrine assumes that each spouse established a trust for his or her own benefit, thus resulting in estate inclusion for each spouse. If fiscally possible, it is preferable to establish only one SLAT per couple. But if the client wants two trusts, it is possible to avoid the reciprocal trust doctrine by making the two trusts sufficiently different.

**Estate concerns where SLAT beneficiary appoints trust asset for benefit of original donor spouse:** In trust situations which include provisions giving the beneficiaries the power to appoint trust assets back to original donor spouse, the IRS may seek to include the trust in the donor spouse's estate under either IRC §§ 2036 and 2038. This is especially likely if it can be established that there is an implied agreement that the beneficiary spouse would leave the trust back to the original donor spouse.

**Possibility trust may be subject to donor's creditors:** Despite the tax rules, the trust may be treated as a self-settled trust and is subject to the claims of the donor's creditors for state law purposes where the trust includes a provision giving the beneficiary spouse the power to appoint the trust assets back to the donor spouse. If the donor's creditors can reach the trust assets, that would cause estate inclusion in the donor spouse's estate. Therefore, it may be important for the beneficiary spouse to exercise the limited power to establish a new trust in a self-settled state.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Old Point National Bank v. Commissioner*, 39 B.T.A. 343 (1939). Where the right to receive disability, benefits was held to be an incident of ownership at least to the extent it reduced the amount of death benefit.

<sup>2</sup> *United States v. Grace*, 395 U.S. 316 (1969).

### **In Summary**

The SLAT can be a useful planning technique to help provide estate tax-free death benefit to heirs, while also providing indirect access to trust assets. However, the law is still in development. Consequently, clients and their advisors should consider the risks when determining whether a SLAT structure is appropriate for their needs.

---

*This material has been prepared to assist our licensed financial professionals and clients' advisors. It is designed to provide general information in regard to the subject matter covered. It should be used with the understanding that we are not rendering legal, accounting or tax advice. Such services must be provided by the client's own advisors. Accordingly, any information in this document cannot be used by any taxpayer for purposes of avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code.*

**Securities and Insurance Products:  
Not Insured by FDIC or Any Federal Government Agency. May Lose Value.  
Not a Deposit of or Guaranteed by Any Bank or Bank Affiliate.**

©2018 Diversified Brokerage Services, Inc.  
5501 Excelsior Blvd., Minneapolis, MN 55416-5153  
www.DBS-LifeMark.com

