August 14, 2020

The Honorable Anthony Portantino  
Chair, Senate Committee on Appropriations  
VIA EMAIL/POSITION LETTER PORTAL

Re: AB 2167 – Oppose

Dear Senator Portantino:

We write to respectfully re-register our strong opposition to AB 2167 and its companion bill SB 292. We can and must find a way to restore affordable and available home insurance options in California without giving insurers more freedom to continue to cherry pick risks in WUI areas, use unproven catastrophe rate models, pass along even more costs to their customers, and charge higher rates with less oversight.

The “more” in Governor Newsom’s 2019 “we must do more” signing message on AB 1816 must include establishing the statewide wildfire risk reduction standard and insurance reward program that’s desperately needed. A program that will accomplish our shared goal of incentivizing households to reduce their risk, which is a long-term way to help restore availability by increasing insurer willingness to insure homes and competition generally. AB 2167 does not properly advance that critical goal.

AB 2167 and its companion SB 292 are virtually guaranteed to substantially drive up the cost of home insurance throughout the state, (and even higher in WUI areas) with very few assurances of increased availability. The IMAP plan as designed by the bill’s supporters is not fully baked and seems destined to complicate and worsen, not improve the situation.

California homeowners are already being hit with annual premiums that are triple and more over what they had been paying, according to the results of a United Policyholders survey that has been underway since early 2019. 87% of survey respondents said the cost of their home insurance has increased. For some, annual premiums have jumped to as high as $10k.¹ Triple and quadruple

¹ See https://www.uphelp.org/sites/default/files/attachments/q9_california_home_insurance_availability_survey_8.3.20_1.pdf
annual premium increases are the reported norm with more to come as CDI approves the flood of requests coming in from insurers.

Allowing insurers to circumvent the current prior approval process, get full credit for their reinsurance purchases and overcome the Insurance Commissioner’s prohibition on using catastrophe models in setting rates gives them what they want, not what our state needs.

Given the economic impact higher rates have on homeowners and real estate transactions, especially in the WUI, rural and suburban areas, these concessions are not warranted, especially without the critical component of mitigation standards and insurance rewards to those who meet them.

Progress is already being made, and more balanced alternatives exist, to accomplish our shared objectives of reducing wildfire risk and stimulating competition in the home insurance marketplace without undermining our state regulator, harming consumers, and unnecessarily spending state funds:

First, Chairman Daly’s A.B. 1816, signed into law in late 2019, provided write-out credits to incentivize insurers to sell policies to homeowners currently insured through the California Fair Plan. Let’s give that bill a chance to work before we add another layer of complexity via an Insurance Market Action Plan (IMAP) AB 2167 seeks to establish. If an IMAP is still needed once the write-out credits are fully implemented, the California Department of Insurance has the authority and the expertise to establish one.

Second, even if insurers claims were true that their rates had been unfairly suppressed in the prior approval system, they are making up for that now. The California Department of Insurance is currently processing and granting scores of rate increase applications, and many Californians are already paying twice, three times, or more than what they had been paying for home insurance in prior years.

Insurers contend that the average premium for homeowners insurance is lower in California than most other states in the country, even though it is a catastrophe-prone state, and that their rates have been unfairly suppressed. Yet their profits tell a different story. California home insurance profits (8.3%) have averaged significantly higher than the national average (5.5%) over the past twenty-three-year period. Further, once insurers collect subrogation payments from utilities found at fault for some of the wildfires, their long-term average profits in California are predicted to return to double the national average.

Third, the Catastrophe Models that insurers want the freedom to use are very likely to aggravate the affordability problem as they did in Florida. “Due to the uncertainty associated

---

2 A common source of citation for this information is the National Association of Insurance Commissioners “Dwelling Fire, Homeowners Tenant and Condominium/Cooperative Unit Owner’s Insurance Report: Data for 2017” (2019).
3 Position Letter from J. Robert Hunter, Consumer Federation of America, to President pro Tempore Atkins, Speaker Rendon, and Senators re: Actuarial opinion concerning AB 2167 (Daly) and its impact on California homeowners insurance premiums (July 28, 2020).
4 Id.
with hurricane loss models and the wide variations between them, Florida established a Commission on Hurricane Loss Projection Methodology. A Under Florida law, any model utilized for the purpose of ratemaking must be a model deemed acceptable for use by the Commission. Allowing insurers to set rates by shifting from using verifiable historical data to using “black box” complex catastrophe predictive modeling remains controversial. B

Just last week the head of the National Hurricane Center told insurance regulators from all over the U.S. that his team’s prediction techniques are far superior to those of risk modelers whose projections have “bounced all over the place”. [“Hurricane Forecasting and Messaging: Sharing My Top Lessons Learned”, Ken Graham, Nat’l Hurricane Center, National Association of Insurance Commissioners Summer 2020 Meeting, Center for Insurance Policy Research Hurricanes & Resiliency Livestream session on 8/12/20]. Using predictive modeling, as opposed to using long-range historic data, is especially risky if implemented immediately following record disasters, such as the 2017 and 2018 Wildfires. These more recent events have the potential to skew models and predictions.

Fourth, Reinsurance rates are not regulated and prices often rise significantly after disasters. The harsh impact on consumers of passing these costs along was evidenced in Florida following the eight major hurricanes of 2004 and 2005. Premiums skyrocketed in large part due to reinsurance costs, which were often not actuarially sound. Moreover, the practice of insurers forming their own reinsurance companies and constructively selling insurance to themselves, unregulated, creates a clear opportunity for insurers to evade long standing and carefully implemented consumer protections.

Finally, instead of rushing to give insurers’ more rate increases, we should form a stakeholder and expert working group – no legislation needed – to identify the standards and risk reduction techniques that have already proved effective in preventing homes from being destroyed. Standards and techniques that firefighting agencies, CORE groups and Fire Safe Councils are using in WUI communities throughout our state. Standards that are explained in the Institute for Home and Business Safety’s “Wildfire Codes and Standards” November 2019 and that are being promoted by the California Fair Plan and responsible insurance companies. Under current law, insurers are free to recognize these risk reduction programs

---

5 https://www.floir.com/siteDocuments/CatastropheStressTestReport102015.pdf
7 Position Letter from J. Robert Hunter, Consumer Federation of America (“State Farm, the largest private insurer in Florida, increased its rates a formidable 66% during 2006 alone”, “the cost of reinsurance now constitutes 40-50% of the premium dollar” (citing Florida Office of Insurance Regulation (March 1, 2007). House Bill 1A, Presumed Rating Factors); “On average, the Herald-Tribune calculated, reinsurers charge five times more than the actuarial risk of loss”(citing the article “Sending Billions Overseas”)).
8 Id. (“One way insurers move money out of the regulated business is by forming their own reinsurance companies” (citing “How insurers make millions on the side”)).
and reward those who meet them. At least two insurers do, but not enough to spur action and not consistently.\(^\text{10}\)

AB 2167, along with companion bill SB 292, is just not the right approach. The IMAP plan is complicated, allows insurers to continue cherry picking in WUI regions and with recent amendments - no longer even sets up commission to set the necessary standards discussed above.

United Policyholders (“UP”) is a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization that informs, helps and speaks for individual and commercial insurance consumers in California and across the nation.

Through a Roadmap to Preparedness program and a “WRAP” initiative\(^\text{11}\), UP is coordinating with agents, brokers, the CA DOI and many partners to help households shop in the current home insurance marketplace to advance our goal of a statewide wildfire risk reduction and insurance reward program.

UP is funded by donations and grants and supported by volunteer labor. UP does not sell insurance or accept funding from insurance companies. At www.uphelp.org, UP offers guidance, information and resources to the public on a wide spectrum of insurance sales and claim matters. For the reasons listed above, UP respectfully opposes AB 2167.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Amy Bach,
Executive Director

---

\(^{10}\) See “Insurance discounts for USAA members in 11 states” (last visited July 29, 2020)

\(^{11}\) WRAP stands for “Wildfire Risk Reduction and Asset Protection”, www.uphelp.org/WRAP