

Claims Committee Meeting Minutes

ACTION ITEM

New Contract

Contract Amendment

Other Committee Minutes

CONSENT ITEM

Contract Amendment

Existing Contract Extension

Existing Contract Additional Spend

Previous Board Approval _____

Other _____

Action Items: Items requiring detailed explanation to the Board. When a requested action item is a day-to-day operational item or unanimously passed through committee it may be moved forward to the board on the Consent Index.

Move forward as Consent: This Action item is a day-to-day operational item, unanimously passed through committee or qualifies to be moved forward on the Consent Index.

Consent Items: Items not requiring detailed explanation to the Board of Governors. Consent items are contract extensions, amendments or additional spending authorities for items previously approved by the Board.

Item Description	Claims Committee Meeting Minutes September 9, 2021
Purpose/Scope	Review of the September 9, 2021 Claims Committee Meeting Minutes to provide opportunity for corrections and historical accuracy.
Contract ID	N/A
Budgeted Item	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No – N/A
Procurement Method	N/A
Contract Amount	N/A
Contract Terms	N/A
Committee Recommendation	Staff recommends the review and approval of the September 9, 2021 Claims Committee Meeting minutes.
Contacts	Jay Adams, Chief Claims Officer

CITIZENS PROPERTY INSURANCE CORPORATION

MINUTES OF THE CLAIMS COMMITTEE MEETING Thursday, September 9, 2021

The Claims Committee of Citizens Property Insurance Corporation (Citizens) convened on Thursday, September 9, 2021, at 1:00 p.m. Eastern.

The following members of the Claims Committee were present:

Scott Thomas, Chairman
Jillian Hasner
Reynolds Henderson
Jon Palmquist
Jay Adams

1. Approval of Prior Meeting's Minutes (June 30, 2021)

Chairman Thomas: Thank you very much, then we'll call this meeting to order and get going to work through our agenda. I think it is pretty straightforward. Thanks to all the Members who are here today, thank you to Staff, and welcome if anyone is here as part of the public.

We will get started with the approval of our prior committee meeting's minutes from June 30, and the minutes are included in the materials. Unless there are no questions or corrections, I'll entertain a motion to approve.

A motion was made by Governor Henderson and seconded by Mr. Palmquist to approve the June 30, 2021 minutes. All were in favor. Motion carried.

2. Approval of Claims Committee Charter

Chairman Thomas: This is the Charter that sets forth basically what our duties and charge here is at the Claims Committee meeting. The Charter to be approved is included within the Minutes. I don't know if Jay had any comments on it, or if there any questions on it, or how we want to proceed with that.

Jay Adams: Staff had no recommendations for change. This is something that the Charter says needs to be done on an annual basis, to have the Committee reapprove it. We present that and give it to you to see if there are any changes or updates you'd like to make to it. Staff has made no recommendations at this point.

Chairman Thomas: Perfect, thanks. I'll take any comments or questions from anyone on the Committee, but otherwise I will entertain a motion to approve the Claims Committee Charter.

A motion was made by Governor Henderson and seconded by Mr. Palmquist to approve the Claims Committee Charter. All were in favor. Motion carried.

3. Strategic Update

Jay Adams: I would like to start my Strategic Update today by covering Citizen's progress with the implementation of Senate Bill 76. As a reminder, Senate Bill 76 went into effect

on July 1, 2021, and it has had a significant impact on claims with respects to the section of the bill that includes the pre-suit notice requirements. We were successful in implementing the system requirements needed to manage the overall pre-suit notice workflow and the reporting requirements to track the overall results of the Bill by the effective date of July 1. We were able to hire an Assistant Director to provide oversight to the team and we've hired one Manager and five Adjusters. We are attempting to hire a second Manager and seven additional Adjusters needed to handle the volume of the pre-suit notices. Citizens has received on average about 900 new lawsuits per month, for the first half of 2021. We anticipate that the volume of the pre-suit notices will increase to this level in the near future. As per the bill of requirements, a Citizens' policy must either be written as new business or renew on or after July 1, 2021, which was the effective date of the new bill for the pre-suit notice process to be required. Citizens is receiving a great number of pre-suit notices that are premature based on Senate Bill 76. However, we are handling these as requests by the Plaintiffs as attempts to resolve these claims prior to any suits being filed. The Bill allows for direct negotiation with the Plaintiff, invoking the appraisal clause within the policy, or continuing to hold on the original claims adjusting decision. As of August 30, 2021, Citizens had received 362 pre-suit notices with the following outcomes. 65 of the claims are still in process and there are being actively worked by the pre-suit notice unit team. Two claims were resolved by accepting the demand of the Plaintiff. Two claims are resolved by negotiating for an agreed settlement. 28 claims have been moved into the Appraisal process, which leaves the balance, and those were all denied claims by the original claims handling adjuster. And to date, those denials have been upheld by the pre-suit notice team. To date, Citizens has received in excess of 70% of all pre-suit notices on previously denied claims.

The pre-suit notice team reviews the applicable policy language against the adjusted claim and any new information received to determine if the denial is appropriate before responding.

The next update I like to briefly discuss is the E&Y action Plan status. As a reminder, the Board of Governors approved the E&Y action plan at the March 2021 Board of Governors meeting. For my update today, we will take our E&Y Action Plan and divided into two sections, one for actions that do not involve system changes and combine all remaining actions into the system changes themselves. For the non system changes we have had 14 action items and the status of these are as follows. We have five of those that are still in progress. We have eight that had been completed. We have one of those that are currently on hold. For the system changes we have 14 action items. The solicitation for the new matter management system was released on March 15, 2021. And those responses were due back May 10, 2021. Nine vendors responded, with negotiations beginning on June 9, 2021 and they are set to conclude by October 21, 2021. It is Claims' plan to bring the awarded vendor to the December Claims Committee and to the Board of Governors meeting for final approval. And I would like to thank you, Chairman for the opportunity to present, and that would conclude my presentation for today.

Chairman Thomas: Thank you very much, Mr. Adams any questions or follow up for Jay on his report from members of the Committee. I do not see any, so we are going to move on to the next item.

Jay Adams: Thank you.

Chairman Thomas: Thank you, I appreciate it.

4. Non-Litigated Claims Update

Craig Sakraida: Thank you, Chairman Thomas and Committee members. I want to give a brief update on several items in the non-litigated claims arena. First, I am going to touch on a couple of catastrophes that we've had this year that we've responded to. The first one being Tropical Storm Elsa back around the fourth of July. A small event utilizing existing resources to handle claims on a task model. They are mainly low severity claims involving roof leaks, with some isolated tree damage just with the amount of rain we've received in Florida. As of August 30, we've received 405 claims, with about 50% of them being from the Hillsborough, Fernando, Pasco, Pinellas area.

Next slide please. Tropical Storm Fred, another small event, where we utilized existing resources. Once again, low severity claims, mainly roof leaks with the storm. 93 Residential claims and one Commercial claim reported as of August 3. About 35% of the claims are from the Tampa Bay area and 23% from the Panhandle Big Bend region.

I wanted to briefly touch on the Champlain Towers tragedy. We worked with several different departments in our company with a customer outreach that started the day of the tragedy once a unit owner policy was identified. Our Customer Care team worked with policyholders' family members and Agents to assist those folks in filing claims. We paid applicable limits for coverage promptly and we still have a staff Large Loss Adjuster that handled the claim that's available for any questions from the policyholders or their representatives, as we move forward in this.

Next slide. One thing that continues to trend on an upward basis is our non-weather water claims, and you can see in this graph over the past year from July 2020 to July 2021 our non-weather water claims are on the increase. They increase 18% from July 2020 to July 2021, from 1,173 to 1,389. And last month, they increase to 1,433.

Next slide please. A couple things about our Managed Repair Program. We have had an increased acceptance rate for up to 80% for the Emergency Water Removal Services and 21% for participation in the full MRP Program. We've reinforced training with Adjusters with a formal program of presenting MRP, which helps them to explain the process to the policyholder or their representative more completely. We've done a lot more training with the onboarding of the new Adjusters, doing that on a quarterly basis and following up more frequently with the Firms. We've had a Contractor Connection town hall with the actual contractors to have them assist us in the program, and we've got a new MRP participation

dashboard which allows us to really focus on where we can increase the sales of the Program.

And then the last thing, I always mentioned this, we're ready. We have a great communication strategy with email, social media, as well as a dynamic CAT plan. Chairman that is my update and I will gladly entertain any questions or comments.

Chairman Thomas: Thank you very much. Any questions or comments from members of the Committee?

Jon Palmquist: Craig you mentioned a 18% increase of non weather water claims. Do you have a feeling for what's driving that?

Craig Sakraida: Well, I think there's a lot of drivers. A lot of these are manufactured water claims. Naturally our PIF count is increasing, so there is a correlation with that. And you know really, it's just a trend that we've seen over time that they keep increasing and as our PIF increases that that will increase also. You know, we keep an eye on it. We have a lot of staff dedicated to it, and I think there's a lot of factors that play into the increase in those claims being filed.

Jon Palmquist: All right, thank you.

Chairman Thomas: Anything else from members of the Committee. All right, Craig, I appreciate it. Thanks for the report.

Craig Sakraida: Thank you.

5. Litigated Claims Update

Elaina Paskalakis: Thank you, good afternoon, Chairman and Committee members. I'm going to have a rather brief update today as the information I'm going to provide is essentially largely unchanged from our last meeting. The update that I'm providing is on litigation through the end of July this year. As Jay had mentioned before in his opening statement, the average number of new lawsuits per month is right around 905 new lawsuits per month, which is a 54% increase compared to this time last year. That's consistent with my last report as well. The overall driver behind that is also what we're seeing with claims, which is the increase in the policy count. 99% of the new lawsuits involve Residential claims. Less than 2% involve Commercial or Liability claims. In terms of where the lawsuits are coming from, we continue with the Tri-County area, accounting for 85% of the new lawsuits. We are seeing that slightly trend down and it's not in raw numbers but in distribution, because we are seeing a slow creep up in new lawsuits from what we call the Central West region, which is largely the Tampa area and surrounding areas and counties around there. Catastrophe claims continue to be the leading cause of loss for new lawsuits, accounting for 53% of all the new lawsuits. AOB claims are 27% which is consistent with what we saw in 2020 and we think that it will level off after the impact of

the Statute. We think now that we've leveled off to this percentage and distribution of new suits. We did see almost a 15% to 20% decrease in AOB lawsuits from the impact of the Statute, but now like I say since 2020 it's been around this level. And then non-weather water claims account for about 23% of the new lawsuits, which is a little down about 7% as compared to 2020. But again, that's distribution not raw numbers and I think it's because we see the uptick in continued CAT claims. In 57% of the new lawsuits the insured was represented at the time they first reported the claim to Citizens. There was no dispute on the claim's adjustment prior to lawsuit in 39%, which is trending down. So, what that really means is we're starting to see that our insureds are communicating with us more prior to filing a lawsuit, not just we just we adjust the claim, we think everything's fine, we say tell us if there's an issue, we don't hear from them, and the next thing we see is a lawsuit. So, we're starting to get more communication.

In terms of timing of the lawsuits 41% of the new suits were served within six months of them first reporting the claim to Citizens. So, we're starting to see a trend that we're getting the lawsuits sooner. That was something that, historically, we would see lawsuits coming in much sooner after a CAT event than non-CAT events. Now we're seeing across the board that lawsuits are coming in a bit sooner than usual. In terms of our pending volume, we have just over 15,700 pending lawsuits. That's a 34% increase, and I think as compared to last year and I think that can be attributed not only to the increasing PIF but also keep in mind the COVID effect on the court system in which essentially the courts were shut down for over a year. We have started back to getting to trials and moving cases through it in that regard, but the courts were essentially shut down and so that drove our pending up a bit.

In terms of the distribution of the claims in the pending volume, catastrophe claims continue to be the leading cause of loss at 52%. AOB claims are down 4% to 27% and non-weather water claims are down 4% to 25% of the pending volume. And then the last thing I want to address is in terms of the subrogation and recovery results, I believe the addendum is in your packet behind tab Seven. Through the end of July, the Subrogation Recovery team has recovered in excess of \$1.2 million and over \$100,000 of those accounts for refunds that have been refunded to our policyholders. So with that, that concludes my presentation for today and I am happy to take any questions you may have.

Chairman Thomas: Thank you, Elaina. I have a quick question. How long is it going to be, a year or so, before we have a sufficient data set to really evaluate what the long-term effect of Senate Bill 76 is on our claims experience?

Elaina Paskalakis: I honestly believe it's going to be two to three years. I mean we'll start to have more certainly into 2022 but, given the fact that the statute applies to those policies issued or renewed after the date, I think it's really going to take us two to three years to have to truly understand the impact in litigation. We were already tracking those of course. We are getting lawsuits that are coming in under with the premature notices that Jay referenced. Now none of those lawsuits challenge the Statute in any way. But we're

tracking from there as well. Hopefully you know in the next nine to 12 months we'll start to get a really good idea and of where the challenges come, and you know start to round out what the impact of the Statute is for litigation.

Jay Adams: I think what's encouraging about Senate Bill 76 is that even though we're receiving premature notices we've had significant activity in that area. So, it's hopeful that you know the plaintiff attorneys are making efforts to try to settle these claims outside of litigation. We're averaging about 200 a month, thus far, and I definitely see that as an encouraging factor.

Chairman Thomas: What you're seeing is that the notices are not being treated as just a box to check off, but they're actually providing a forum for us to resolve these things short of case filing?

Jay Adams: So, the claims that were not previously denied, I believe we've taken some type of action to move those forward outside of litigation on 100% of them. The issue that we're having thus far is the majority of the claims that are being submitted to the pre-suit process are denials. 70% of them have been in the denial area. So at some point, that will likely change as well, and you know we're hopeful that we'll be able to have some pretty significant impact.

Chairman Thomas: Alright, thanks anything else from the Committee for Elaina.

Jon Palmquist: Do you track the reason for, for the example the cat litigation, you said its 53% of all new lawsuits. Do you track why that's in litigation? Is it scope, is it coverage?

Elaina Paskalakis: We do, and I don't have those figures at my fingertips, but I can certainly follow up and get them to you. But we do track that. We track not only scope, and you know kind of the big buckets, if is it a coverage denial, is it scope and pricing. We also track some more detailed granular information to truly understand what's coming.

Jon Palmquist: I think we've talked about in the past that you do re-inspections of your vendors on the CATs and I would be curious in if you've ever correlated the re-inspection results of your individual CAT/IA firm with the causes of litigation? Because to me the 53% seems kind of high if we don't know without understanding fully the reasons for the litigation. Have you ever looked at that at all?

Elaina Paskalakis: I will have to defer to Jay on that particular question.

Jay Adams: The first part of that is a lot of what is coming into litigation are catastrophe claims that are reported as new claims significantly after the date of loss. The Statute that we're working under right now is they had three years to report, so many of these claims are coming in significantly late, and if the insured is unable to document their loss back to the date of loss, and you know provide some type of evidence that is related to hurricane

damage, it's hard for Citizens to make a coverage decision. So, a lot of those come in and after our investigation is complete, we may have to issue a denial and many of those end up in litigation you know many months after the actual date of loss and many months after they've been reported to Citizens. As far as our vendors are concerned, so we do have a Quality Assurance program. We put Quality Assurance representatives in the field during the catastrophe. They're out there, they ride with these Independent Adjusters, they help train them, they're validating that they understand the best practices and our estimating guidelines. They do checks, then they go back, and they do re-inspections and make sure that that understanding is there if we run into issues with vendors. We do reach out to that vendor and either have those adjusters removed or have that adjusting firm go and do the necessary training to bring that adjuster up to speed. One major thing that we do in our catastrophe response is we try to provide significant information to the policyholder that when you submit your claim your claim is not complete. So we go out there, following the event we do our inspection, we have a 90 day statute, we have to meet by OIR standards once that inspection is complete, it could be 3, 6, 9 months before the contractor ever shows up to provide an estimate of the work. If the contractor does and the estimate is significantly different, it could be pricing issues, so the further we get away from the storm when we wrote the original estimate the price of goods and materials and labor typically go up. And what we try to do is advise our insured that that is likely to happen. We keep a team on board to handle reopen claims under this situation specifically for many years, post the event. And the idea is, we would like the customer to reach back out to Citizens because we're going to do everything we can to renegotiate what was paid on that claim, we will re-price the estimate using current pricing data and if our estimate is inaccurate, we will make whatever changes necessary so that we can settle that claim again with the insured and until all repairs are completed we again ask the policyholder to continue to reach out to Citizens for negotiation.

Jon Palmquist: Ok, thank you for the for the very thoughtful response. I appreciate it.

Jay Adams: Thank you.

Chairman Thomas: Perfect. Thank you,

6. Vendor Update

Chairman Thomas: Well, now move on to a vendor update from Greg Rowe which involves what, at least in the title at least, sounds the most interesting thing on the agenda, the Geospatial Insurance Consortium.

Greg Rowe: Thank you Mr. Chairman and Committee members. It is certainly a mouthful, but for this action item Citizens is seeking approval to contract with the aforementioned National Insurance Crime Bureau, known as the NICB, for membership into their Geospatial Insurance Consortium Program, known as the GIC. So, I'll refer to those as I go through this action item. But this membership is necessary as the utilization of the pre and post event aerial imagery provided by the GIC has become a critical component of

our catastrophe response plan. And, just to give you a brief history, Citizens has been a member of the NICB since the late 2000s and the imagery that they provide is critical in assessing and responding to damages caused by a hurricane, which is again critical to provide the level of service to our policyholders that they expect and deserve. So beginning in 2017 this post event imagery was provided on a temporary basis, and was extremely beneficial in helping Citizens expedite claims payments to impacted policyholders, as we could have an aerial view of what the property looked like immediately after the event. Additionally, the date stamps on these images have been critical to Joe Theobald and our SIU department as in the detection and investigation of fraud and especially with those claims that are reported months and even years after a storm event. So, we first upgraded to a paid and contractual GIC membership in April 2019 as we needed to have continued access to the imagery and aside from that archive access which we can look back at, this membership also includes future post event imagery and allows us to influence the timing and focus of any aerial imagery collection flight plans after the event. So, it gives us the ability to discuss with the GIC our policies in force and where we would like them to fly, if at all possible. So that current membership we have with them expires at the end of this year on December 31, 2021. On July 21, 2021 Citizens posted a public notice of the single source purchase and provided an opportunity for any vendor inquiry or comment. We had no public comment or vendor inquiry after that time and, secondly, it was posted on our external Citizens website and the State of Florida's vendor bid system, the VBS, for the 15 day statute statutory posting period. After a notice of award was posted for the 72 hours for our vendors, we didn't receive again any public protest, or any comments received on that. So at this point, we're seeking to approve membership again with the National Insurance Crime Bureau and membership into the Geospatial Insurance Consortium program to give us that pre and post event imagery for our catastrophe plans and for our SIU team. So, with that, Mr Chairman, are there any questions before I move to the recommendation?

Chairman Thomas: Greg I know it's in the agenda materials and we've all seen it, but I think as we are at public hearing, why don't you go ahead and address for us what the cost is on this in comparison to prior years so that we make sure that's ventilated for everyone.

Greg Rowe: Sure, so the cost for a three-year term would be not to exceed \$1,062,330, that did go up 7% from the prior term. And the reason for that is the cost for the program is based on our direct earned premium, so when we contracted with them back in 2019 our direct premium was \$923 million and moving into 2022 that 2020 reported premium has increased to \$996 million, so again with the increase in our policy in force count it did go up 7% from the prior agreement.

Chairman Thomas: Would I be correct, though, that the formula in essence for calculating that remains the same, it's simply our policy in force count that's making the change?

Greg Rowe: 100% correct thanks.

Chairman Thomas: Any other questions for Greg before we asked him to read the recommendation?

Governor Henderson: Is this the only, the one we've been going with, are they pretty much the ones that do this or are there other vendors out there, that may be competitive? Is this incremental increases, I get it we have more policies, but I'm just curious as to whether we have looked everywhere and gotten all the bids possible?

Greg Rowe: Yes, there are others. The biggest differences are the flight plans typically have a cost associated with them. So, depending upon the flight path that we need them to fly, other vendors will charge based on the mileage. So it's not a flat rate that we would pay, it would be based on whatever flight plans we may have, so if we had let's just say three or four hurricane events, the cost would be much, much higher than this flat rate we're paying. The other thing which is beneficial to this membership is the GIC members include other users, such as FEMA and the Red Cross and so they typically get first dibs they have a priority status for flying these areas post event. So it gets us in there much quicker we get the imagery quicker, which again just impacts, the policy holders and allows us to strategize our CAT plan that much faster.

Governor Henderson: Okay, thank you.

Jon Palmquist: Can you provide a little bit more color around how it helps you strategize your CAT plan and how it benefits Citizens and the policyholders?

Greg Rowe: Sure. So again, after an event, before this aerial imagery existed, if an area was hit extremely hard, we wouldn't really understand what the severity of that damage was. So, if someone's house was just completely blown off the slab, we still had to send adjusters into those areas and a lot of times in those areas people cannot get in, the government will not allow people in immediately following an event. So what we've seen with some of these larger events is that when we have that post event imagery we may not necessarily even need to send an adjuster out because if we can look at a property and see, like I said that that house has been blown off the slab and it's completely gone, the first call to that policyholder maybe even before they file a claim is us reaching out to them, which we've seen happen and saying we have aerial imagery, unfortunately, your house is a total loss and we're going to be sending you a check for policy limits. And what it also allows us to do is if we have any Emergency Operations Centers that need to go in, it allows us to see where the hardest hit areas are and where do we need to strategize our workforce as they're able to move in. So again, I think that the biggest proponent of it is out of the gate helping us understand where to go and then the back end which is really critical too that as claims come in, after you know, a year to three years after the date of loss, we can go back and see what the damage was immediately following that hurricane, and we can zoom in on a property. So if someone says I have, you know, a total loss on my roof, and I want to attribute it back two years ago, Joe Theobald and his team from an

SIU perspective can have access to those images and say we have imagery immediately following that event and the roof was fine and so if there's damage to the roof, now we need to look at that claim a little bit closer. So again, it helps us on the front end and helps us to turn fraud on the back end to have access to these images.

Jay Adams: Greg did an excellent job of explaining that. I'd like to put a little finer point on how it benefits the customer. So, during Hurricane Michael we had the GIC go out and they were able to fly the loss within 24 hours of the actual storm passing over the panhandle area. We then took that aerial imagery and we started at the beach for the hardest hit areas, and as Greg mentioned due to search and rescue of that area of the beaches were closed for probably seven to 10 days before adjusters, policyholders or anybody could get in. What we did is we assigned these properties to the Large Loss team to inspect using the aerial imagery. What we then did is any of them that there was nothing left on the lot but a slab, so one of the nice things about this GIC viewer is it shows you the before image on the left hand side of the screen and on the right hand side of the screen, it shows you the after image, so you can validate that there was a property there and then you can slide the image across and see that there's a concrete slab. What we did is then processed all of the Large Loss paperwork and claims handling investigative and information necessary. Then, we called in the claim, then contacted the policyholder and then what we told them was, we're going to send you a check for you know policy limits on your dwelling and we'll work with you on your contents, we will pay you the full policy limit on the additional living expense, where would you like to check sent? And that way, the policyholder did not have to go through any of that hassle or be concerned about what they were going to do. And the real benefit was these policyholders had the additional living expenses, so they could make arrangements of how they were going to survive, you know the coming days and weeks after the storm instead of waiting seven to 10 days for Citizens to get access to go look at that home. So, it's been a real game changer in the claims industry.

Greg Rowe: And even to go one more finer point and for the Committee members is that when we're able to do this and look at it in a remote standpoint, we don't incur the expense of an adjuster having to go out to that property down the road so that saves us money on the LAE portion of that loss.

Jon Palmquist: I was going to ask if you factored in any savings on this, but certainly the biggest benefit is the customer service and the ability to advance ALE payments or full pay loss payments if necessary. Excellent.

Jay Adams: Thank you.

Jon Palmquist: Thank you.

Chairman Thomas: Okay, thank you anything else for Greg or staff on the Geospatial Insurance Consortium. If not Greg, do you have a recommendation to read for us?

Greg Rowe: Yes, Mr Chairman, thank you. Staff proposes that the Claims Committee review and, if approved, recommend the Board of Governors authorize the Geospatial Insurance Consortium Program membership agreement with the National Insurance Crime Bureau for a term of three years for an amount, not to exceed \$1,062,330 as set forth in this action item, and authorize staff to take any appropriate or necessary action consistent with this action item. Thank you.

A motion was made by Governor Henderson and seconded Mr. Palmquist to approve and recommend Board approval of the Geospatial Insurance Consortium Program Membership Action Item. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Thomas: That action item was approved to be presented to the Board at our next board meeting, is that correct?

Greg Rowe: Yes.

Chairman Thomas: Just as you've seen, you know the Board takes a particular close look at some of these expenditures, so I would make sure, I know you will, but as you did today, be prepared as part of the presentation to explain the past good history we've had, the usefulness of the program, the alternatives to the extent they are there, and the cost issue. I think those will be the kinds of things that the Board as a whole will appreciate the benefit of.

7. Addendums

Chairman Thomas: I've scrolled down and lost my agenda, but I think that was the last of our agenda items. We do have some information in the agenda materials noted as an addendum relating to some Recovery Cases of Interest and SIU. Jay, I don't know if we had any particular presentation or anyone wanted to address that, or if that's for your edification.

Jay Adams: That is just informational.

8. New Business

Chairman Thomas: Okay, well that should complete our agenda items and would move us into new business. I don't have any new business, but I certainly appreciate everyone's time. If anyone has anything you want to bring up that qualifies as new business or simple commentary, I'm happy to entertain it.

Governor Henderson: I would just like to ask if Elaina could provide any of that micro information related to the claims that you kind of mentioned earlier, if she can provide that to the Committee via email later after this meeting that would be helpful.

Elaina Paskalakis: Sure, I'd be happy to do so¹.

Governor Henderson: Thank you very much.

Chairman Thomas: Thank you, Governor Henderson. Anything else? Well, I appreciate the efficiency, I appreciate everyone's attention with that.

A motion was made by Governor Henderson and seconded by Mr. Palmquist to adjourn. All were in favor. Motion carried.

[Meeting adjourned]

DRAFT

¹Information regarding the dispute drivers of CAT Litigation was distributed to the Claims Committee members via email on September 13, 2021.