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## EXHIBITS

## SECTION 1: BACKGROUND AND SCOPE

## Company Background

Opening in September 1916, Riverside Community College District ("RCCD") is the seventh oldest community college in California. RCCD is a three-college higher education system serving 1.4 million people living in Riverside County with enrollment exceeding 35,000 students. Colleges are located in the cities of Riverside, Moreno Valley, and Norco-three of the fastest growing areas in the county. Riverside Community College District is committed to excellence. Some 368 full-time faculty and 831 associated faculty, together with 703 professional and support staff, are involved in the continual development of programs to prepare a qualified workforce for the 21 century.

## Insurance Program Overview

RCCD self-insures its workers' compensation and general and employment practices liability exposures. The current SIR is $\$ 500,000$ for workers' compensation and $\$ 250,000$ for liability. York serves as RCCD's third party administrator for workers' compensation claims and Corvel currently handles the liability claims.

## Scope of Analysis

Riverside Community College District ("RCCD") has engaged Centric Actuarial Solutions, LLC ("Centric") to complete an independent actuarial analysis of its selfinsured workers' compensation and liability programs. In our analysis, we have performed the following:

- Estimated the ultimate loss and allocated loss adjustment expense (ALAE) reserves for workers' compensation and liability as of $6 / 30 / 2012$. The indicated loss and ALAE reserves are limited to RCCD's historical self-insured retentions.
- Forecasted expected ultimate losses and ALAE for the 2012-13 policy period for workers' compensation and liability.

A summary of our findings can be found in Section 5 of this report. The remainder of this document outlines important reliances and limitations associated with our work, rules for distributing the report, and a description of the methodology employed in our analysis.

## Purpose

It is our understanding that the estimates contained in this analysis will be used by RCCD for financial reporting and budgeting purposes.

## Acknowledgment of Qualifications

I, Dustin Gary, am a consulting actuary with Centric Actuarial Solutions. I am a Fellow of the Casualty Actuarial Society and a member of the American Academy of Actuaries. I meet the Qualification Standards of the American Academy of Actuaries to render the actuarial opinion contained herein.

## SECTION 2: RELIANCES AND LIMITATIONS

## Data

In preparing our analysis, we relied on data and other information supplied to us by RCCD. We have performed a general review of the reasonableness and consistency of the data, but have not audited or verified this information for accuracy. The results of our analysis are dependent upon the accuracy and completeness of the underlying data. Any discrepancies in the information provided to us should be reported immediately so that we can produce an amended report.

## Excess Insurance

We have assumed that insurance above RCCD's stated retentions is valid and collectible. We have made no effort to evaluate the financial condition of RCCD's excess insurers or their ability to pay claims. Liabilities may exist in addition to those outlined in this report for any recoveries which are not collectible.


#### Abstract

Assets We have not examined nor have we attempted to place a value on the assets underlying RCCD's loss reserves.


## Covered Claims

We have only provided estimates for the policy periods and lines of business identified in our analysis. Liabilities may exist in addition to those outlined in this report for prior policy periods or lines of business which we were not requested to review.

## Inherent Uncertainty

Any estimate of loss liabilities and future loss events is subject to considerable uncertainty. Although we have employed generally accepted actuarial techniques and methodologies in our analysis, actual loss results will undoubtedly vary from our estimates, perhaps significantly. There can be no guarantee that actual losses will not exceed the level indicated by our estimates.

The calculations and estimates contained in this report rely on the assumption that future loss activity will resemble events of the past after adjustments for changes in historical claim costs. Factors that influence the future cost of claims include inflation, legislative changes, claim settlement practices, litigation rates, and emergence of large losses. Changes in any of these factors contribute to the variability of actual results from their expected value. In performing our analysis, we have not anticipated any major changes to the legal, social, or economic environment nor have we made provisions for new types or classes of losses not represented in RCCD's historical loss experience.

## Industry Information

In certain cases, we have relied upon insurance industry benchmarks to supplement RCCD's own loss data. Assumptions regarding future loss development, payout patterns, loss rates, increased limits experience, frequency/severity trends and benefit level changes have been partially based on these industry benchmarks. An additional element of uncertainty is added due to the reliance on this information. We have made every effort to ensure that the benchmarks used in our analysis are based on the latest available industry data and provide a reasonable indication of RCCD's future loss experience.

## California En Banc Decisions

On February 3, 2009, the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board ("WCAB") issued two en banc decisions related to the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (PDRS). These are referred to collectively as the Ogilvie and Almaraz/Guzman decisions. The WCIRB believes the decisions impact claims in the following areas:

1) The average permanent disability ratings of current permanent disability claims, 2) The proportion of lost-time claims that will receive a permanent disability rating, 3) The frequency of indemnity claims, and 4) The level of frictional costs.

The cost impact of these decisions has, to a large extent, been reflected in the experience that has emerged through the valuation date of our study. We have not made any additional adjustments to our estimates for the impact of the WCAB decisions. We will revise our estimates, if necessary, in future actuarial studies if the actual loss experience develops differently than we have projected.

## Risk of Material Adverse Deviation

There are a variety of risk factors that may contribute to the variability of actual results from our estimates. First, workers' compensation and liability are long-tailed lines of insurance meaning that it may take several years, perhaps in excess of twenty, for all claims from a particular policy period to close. It is difficult, if not impossible, to predict the impact of medical inflation, legislative changes, and other factors that will influence the cost of claims this far into the future.

There has been a sudden spike in workers' compensation costs beginning with the 7/1/09 policy year. Prior to this time period, the losses as a rate to $\$ 100$ of payroll averaged well below $\$ 1.00$. The loss rates for each of the three most recent years have either already or are expected to develop past $\$ 1.00$ per $\$ 100$ of payroll. While frequency has remained relatively flat over the years, severity has seen a huge spike. In particular, there are several claims in excess of $\$ 100,000$ for the $7 / 1 / 09$ policy year. The sudden increase in claim severity makes it difficult to predict the ultimate losses for the more recent years as well as the forecast for the upcoming policy year.

There is considerable uncertainty associated with our estimates for general and employment practices liability because of the small volume of claims each year. Over the last several years, RCCD has averaged less than five claims per year. Several of the claims that have been reported, particularly those related to Employment Practices Liability, are large claims generally in excess of $\$ 250,000$. Many of these claims have few if any payments at this point in time. Our estimates could be subject to significant adverse deviation given the low frequency/high severity nature of these claims.

## SECTION 3: DISTRIBUTION AND USE

This report has been prepared for the use of RCCD management with the intended purpose of evaluating RCCD's liabilities and expected future losses. We understand that RCCD may wish to supply copies of the final report to management, auditors, and its excess insurers. We hereby grant permission for such distribution provided that the report is distributed in its entirety and RCCD makes the parties aware that we are available to answer any questions they may have. The report shall not be furnished in whole or in part to any other person without our prior written consent. Furthermore, Centric Actuarial Solutions, LLC does not intend to benefit any third party recipient of this report or create any legal duty to a third party.

## SECTION 4: DISCLOSURES

## Intended Measure of Estimates

The unpaid claim estimates contained in our analysis should be considered actuarial central estimates. An actuarial central estimate represents the expected value over the range of reasonably possible outcomes. In our report, the term "unpaid claim estimate" is defined as the amount necessary to settle 1) all remaining open claims, 2) claims that have occurred but not yet been reported, and 3) claims that may re-open in the future and require additional payments. Unless otherwise noted, our unpaid claim estimates do not contain a provision for items commonly found in retrospective rating insurance programs such as loss-based taxes, loss conversion charges, or contingent premiums.

## Reasonableness

We have compiled and reviewed various diagnostic measures to evaluate the reasonableness of our estimates and believe them to be valid based on the results of these tests. This information is available upon request.

## Terminology

By its strict definition, the term "reserve" refers to an amount booked in a financial statement, but as is common in the insurance industry, we often use this term as a substitute for "unpaid claim estimate". We may also use the words "liability" and "accrual" to mean "unpaid claim estimate". Incurred but Not Reported ("IBNR") reserves in the context of this report contain both development on known claims and a provision for late reported claims ("True IBNR").

## Recoverables

The estimates contained in our analysis are limited to RCCD's deductible or retention levels and are net of excess insurance and subrogation recoveries.

## Discounting

The estimates contained in our analysis are presented on a nominal basis.

## Loss Adjustment Expenses

Loss adjustment expenses ("LAE") are generally split between allocated loss adjustment expenses ("ALAE") and unallocated loss adjustment expenses ("ULAE"). ALAE includes expenses such as legal fees that can be assigned directly to a specific claim and usually are shown on the loss run along with medical and indemnity costs. We have grouped ALAE with losses in our analysis and our estimates contain a provision for unpaid ALAE amounts.

ULAE costs cannot readily be allocated to a specific claim file. These expenses include the salaries and overhead of a claims department, or in the case of a self insured organization, the amount paid to a TPA to administer claims. We have not estimated the liability for unpaid ULAE in our analysis.

## SECTION 5: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the estimated liability for unpaid claims by policy year.

Table 1

| Workers' Compensation <br> as of 6/30/2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Policy Year | Ultimate Loss <br> and ALAE | Paid Loss and <br> Inception | LLAE |
| $7 / 1 / 97$ | 650,000 | 553,199 | Liability |
| $7 / 1 / 98$ | 350,000 | 294,422 | 96,801 |
| $7 / 1 / 99$ | 800,000 | 718,982 | 55,578 |
| $7 / 1 / 00$ | 300,000 | 244,674 | 81,018 |
| $7 / 1 / 01$ | 800,000 | 691,456 | 55,326 |
| $7 / 1 / 02$ | 575,000 | 400,649 | 108,544 |
| $7 / 1 / 03$ | 750,000 | 639,755 | 174,351 |
| $7 / 1 / 04$ | 700,000 | 519,743 | 110,245 |
| $7 / 1 / 05$ | $1,000,000$ | 775,558 | 180,257 |
| $7 / 1 / 06$ | 450,000 | 297,925 | 224,442 |
| $7 / 1 / 07$ | 600,000 | 350,288 | 152,075 |
| $7 / 1 / 08$ | 200,000 | 110,548 | 249,712 |
| $7 / 1 / 09$ | $1,800,000$ | 810,735 | 89,452 |
| $7 / 1 / 10$ | $1,250,000$ | 393,565 | 989,265 |
| $7 / 1 / 11$ | $1,200,000$ | 109,283 | 856,435 |
|  |  |  | $1,090,717$ |
| $\mathbf{1 1 , 4 2 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 9 1 0 , 7 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 5 1 4 , 2 1 8}$ |  |

## Table 2

| General and Employment Practices Liability <br> as of $\mathbf{6 / 3 0 / 2 0 1 2}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Policy Year | Ultimate Loss | Paid Loss and | Loss and ALAE |
| Inception | and ALAE | ALAE | Liability |
| $7 / 1 / 06$ | 25,000 | 0 | 25,000 |
| $7 / 1 / 07$ | 78,440 | 78,440 | 0 |
| $7 / 1 / 08$ | 63,163 | 63,163 | 0 |
| $7 / 1 / 09$ | 400,000 | 113,997 | 286,003 |
| $7 / 1 / 10$ | 900,000 | 10,337 | 889,663 |
| $7 / 1 / 11$ | 400,000 | 0 | 400,000 |
|  |  |  |  |
| All Years | $\mathbf{1 , 8 6 6 , 6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 5 , 9 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 6 0 0 , 6 6 6}$ |

Table 3 displays forecasted ultimate losses and ALAE by line of business for the 2012 policy period. The results should be considered actuarial central estimates. We have estimated the exposures listed in the table for the upcoming policy year. Projected losses should be modified if the exposure estimates change.

## Table 3

## Expected Loss and ALAE for 7/1/2012-6/30/2013

| Line of Business | Loss Rate | Exposure | Losses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers' Compensation | $\$ 1.20$ | $103,000,000$ | $1,240,000$ |
| GL / EPLI | $\$ 0.50$ | $103,000,000$ | 500,000 |

Table 4 provides a range of reserve estimates as of $6 / 30 / 2012$. The range below is meant to be a measure of the reasonable range around the actuarial central estimate and each value within the range should be considered a reasonable value on a stand-alone basis. It is important to note that the range is narrower, perhaps considerably, than the range of possible outcomes and does not represent any sort of confidence level around the mean of the underlying statistical distribution.

Table 4

| Range for Unpaid Claim Liability <br> as of 6/30/2012 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Low Estimate |  |  |  |
| Workers' Contral Estimate | High Estimate |  |  |
| GL \& EPLI | $4,062,796$ | $4,514,218$ | $4,965,640$ |
| Total | $1,440,599$ | $1,600,666$ | $1,760,733$ |

## SECTION 6: ANALYSIS

## Loss Data

RCCD provided us with historical claim detail loss runs by policy year and by line of business. The loss information was valued as of 6/30/2012.

## Exposure Data

RCCD supplied historical and projected payroll which was used as the exposure base in our report.

## Loss Development Factors

For workers' compensation, we supplemented RCCD's historical loss development data with Industry benchmark data obtained from the WCIRB to determine the loss development factors used in our analysis. For general liability, we used insurance industry development patterns obtained from Schedule P data obtained from the NAIC.

## Methodology

An outline of the methodology used to estimate RCCD's retained loss reserves is found below. The section entitled Actuarial Techniques contains a detailed discussion of the actuarial procedures employed to estimate ultimate losses by policy year.

- Develop claim counts to an ultimate basis and review frequency by policy year.
- Develop a preliminary estimate of ultimate losses and calculate loss severities and loss rates by policy year.
- Review frequency, severity, and loss rates to determine annual trend percentages to apply to historical losses.
- Apply trend, benefit level, and other adjustment factors to losses to convert them into cost levels expected in the prospective policy term.
- Examine historical adjusted loss rates and select estimated loss rate for the prospective policy period.
- Apply Paid/Incurred Loss Development, Expected Loss, Paid/Incurred Bornhuetter-Ferguson and Frequency/Severity Methods to project estimates for ultimate retained losses in historical policy years.
- Review results of the various actuarial projection methods to select ultimate retained losses by policy year.
- Examine various diagnostic measures to evaluate reasonableness of selections.
- Subtract paid losses from the selected ultimate loss amounts to yield loss reserve estimates.


## Actuarial Techniques

Several different actuarial procedures have been applied to estimate the ultimate value of losses for each policy year. Each actuarial technique provides a measure of loss development, or the expected change in value of losses from the evaluation date to the point in which all claims have closed. The following reasons contribute to the growth in losses as a policy period ages:

- It is difficult for claims adjusters to accurately estimate the settlement value of a particular claim when it is first reported. The case reserve is constantly being adjusted up or down as additional information is learned about a claim. Generally, an upward trend in the aggregate value of a group of claims is observed as a policy period matures.
- Some claims may take several years to be reported. A significant portion of claims for some long-tail lines of insurance, such as general liability, are not reported until well after the end of a policy period.
- Specific claims re-open after initially being closed and may require additional loss payments.

A description of the actuarial methods used in this analysis can be found below.

## Incurred Loss Development Method

In this methodology, incurred losses for each policy period are multiplied by loss development factors (LDFs) to arrive at estimates for each period's ultimate loss value. The LDFs are ratios that measure the growth of a body of losses from an immature period to the point when all claims have closed. To calculate the LDFs used in this methodology, incurred losses are organized by policy year and displayed at multiple evaluation dates in the form of a loss triangle. The evaluation dates are usually in annual
increments and are used to determine the age of each policy period, or the length of time in months from the policy inception. Age-to-age LDFs are calculated for each period by dividing the incurred losses at a particular evaluation age by those from the evaluation age immediately preceding it. Cumulative LDFs are derived by multiplying successive age-to-age LDFs.

The Incurred Loss Development Method assumes that case reserve adequacy remains consistent over time. It also assumes that there have been no major changes in claim settlement rates.

## Paid Loss Development Method

This methodology is similar to the Incurred Loss Development Method except that the LDFs are calculated based on and applied to paid losses instead of incurred losses. The Paid Loss Development assumes that the relative speed at which claims are settled remains consistent over time. A disadvantage of this method is that it ignores any information provided by the case reserves in determining the ultimate settlement value of claims. An advantage of this method is that it is not distorted by unusual changes in case reserves.

## Expected Loss Method

This technique relies on historical loss experience to derive estimates for the ultimate loss value in a particular policy period. Unlike the methods above, this procedure does not rely on the loss experience for the policy period being estimated. The inherent assumption in this method is that the loss experience for the policy period being estimated will resemble the average experience of historical periods after adjustments are made for loss trends and exposure changes. This method works particularly well for immature policy periods with limited or sporadic loss activity.

## Paid/Incurred Bornhuetter-Ferguson Methods

These techniques blend the results of the loss development and expected loss methods. To calculate ultimate loss values using the Bornhuetter-Ferguson method, a weighted average of the results using the methods above is calculated according to the formula: B-F $=(1 / L D F) x($ Loss Development Method $)+(1-1 / L D F) x($ Expected Loss Method $)$. The Bornhuetter-Ferguson methodology can be applied to either paid or incurred losses.

## Frequency/Severity Method

This method begins with an estimate of the ultimate value for the severity, or average cost per claim, of a particular policy period. Once this figure has been determined, the ultimate claim count is calculated and the numbers are multiplied together to arrive at a forecast of the period's ultimate losses. To estimate the severity for a particular policy period, historical severity figures are examined and adjusted for anticipated changes in claim costs. Factors influencing the cost of claims include medical inflation, retention, and mix of claims by state and type.

## SECTION 7: GLOSSARY

Accident Date - The date at which an accident giving rise to a claim occurs.
Age - A measure of the relative maturity of a policy period. The age is determined by counting the number of months between the policy inception date and evaluation date.

Allocated Loss Adjustment Expense (ALAE) - Claim expenses, such as legal fees, that can be assigned to a specific claim.

Benefit Level Factor - A ratio applied to historical losses to adjust for legislative changes made to the workers' compensation system.

Case Reserve - The dollar amount, as estimated by the claims adjuster, necessary to settle an individual open claim.

Confidence Level - The probability that losses will not exceed stated estimates.
Discounted Value - The value of loss reserves or other loss estimates after reflection of the time value of money.

Evaluation Date - The "as-of" date, or date in which losses are valued on the loss run or other loss report.

Exposure - A relative measure of risk such as payroll, revenue, auto count, or bed count.
Frequency - The number of claims per some unit of exposure.
Incurred But Not Reported (IBNR) - Losses that have occurred, but have either not been reported or have not yet developed. IBNR can be used to describe claim counts or loss dollars.

Incurred Losses and ALAE - The sum of Paid Losses and ALAE plus Case Reserves for a group of claims. This number is a fixed amount as of a certain point in time.

Industry Data - Generic term used to describe miscellaneous insurance company statistics gathered and published by various organizations affiliated with the insurance industry.

Loss Development - The change in losses between two evaluation dates.
Loss Development Factor (LDF) - A ratio applied to paid or incurred losses as of a certain date to estimate their ultimate value.

Loss Rate - Ultimate loss dollars per some unit of exposure.
Paid Losses and ALAE - The dollar amount actually paid to claimants including partial payments on open claims and total payments on closed claims as of a particular date.

Pure Premium - See "Loss Rate".

Report Date - The date in which a claim is made.
Retroactive Date - For claims-made policies, the date at which a claim must have occurred on or after to be covered by the policy.

Severity - The average cost per claim.
Trend Factor - A ratio applied to historical losses to adjust for changes in claim cost levels between the historical and prospective periods.

Ultimate Losses and ALAE - The amount of dollars paid when all claims from a specific period have been settled. This value is the sum of paid losses, case reserves, and IBNR as of a particular date and could change over time.

Unallocated Loss Adjustment Expenses (ULAE) - Claim handling charges and other claim expenses not assigned to specific claims.
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Exhibits
Summary of Program Provisions .....  1
Summary of Historical Loss Data .....  2
Large Loss Listing .....  3
Paid Losses at Historical Retentions .....  4
Incurred Losses at Historical Retentions .....  5
Development of Preliminary Ultimate Losses .....  6
Development of Ultimate Claim Count .....  7
Development of Frequency Trend .....  8
Development of Severity Trend .....  9
Development of Forecasted Losses ..... 10
Calculation of Indicated Loss Reserves at 6/30/2012 ..... 11
Selection of Ultimate Losses and ALAE ..... 12
Paid Loss Development Method ..... 13
Incurred Loss Development Method ..... 14
Expected Loss Method ..... 15
Paid Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method ..... 16
Incurred Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method ..... 17
Frequency/Severity Method ..... 18
Paid Loss Development Triangle ..... 19
Incurred Loss Development Triangle ..... 20
Claim Count Development Triangle ..... 21

RCCD
Summary of Program Provisions Workers' Compensation

| Policy Inception | Per Occurrence Retention | Excess <br> Insurance | Claims Adjusting | ALAE | ULAE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/01/97 | \$250,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/98 | \$250,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/99 | \$250,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/00 | \$250,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/01 | \$250,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/02 | \$250,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/03 | \$250,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/04 | \$350,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/05 | \$350,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/06 | \$350,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/07 | \$350,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/08 | \$350,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/09 | \$350,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |
| 07/01/10 | \$350,000 |  | York | Included | N/A |

## RCCD

Summary of Historical Loss Data Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Evaluation Date | Open Claim Count | Closed Claim Count | Total Claim Count | $\begin{gathered} \text { Paid } \\ \text { Losses \& ALAE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Case <br> Reserves | Incurred Losses \& ALAE |
| 07/01/97 | 06/30/12 | 1 | 56 | 57 | 553,199 | 74,496 | 627,695 |
| 07/01/98 | 06/30/12 | 1 | 63 | 64 | 294,422 | 43,321 | 337,743 |
| 07/01/99 | 06/30/12 | 3 | 55 | 58 | 718,982 | 36,085 | 755,067 |
| 07/01/00 | 06/30/12 | 3 | 35 | 38 | 244,674 | 31,392 | 276,066 |
| 07/01/01 | 06/30/12 | 2 | 36 | 38 | 691,456 | 64,339 | 755,795 |
| 07/01/02 | 06/30/12 | 4 | 46 | 50 | 400,649 | 129,995 | 530,645 |
| 07/01/03 | 06/30/12 | 2 | 59 | 61 | 747,880 | 51,222 | 799,102 |
| 07/01/04 | 06/30/12 | 3 | 44 | 47 | 519,743 | 127,259 | 647,002 |
| 07/01/05 | 06/30/12 | 4 | 55 | 59 | 775,558 | 87,160 | 862,718 |
| 07/01/06 | 06/30/12 | 2 | 57 | 59 | 297,925 | 81,550 | 379,475 |
| 07/01/07 | 06/30/12 | 6 | 60 | 66 | 350,288 | 117,331 | 467,619 |
| 07/01/08 | 06/30/12 | 2 | 50 | 52 | 110,548 | 41,390 | 151,937 |
| 07/01/09 | 06/30/12 | 16 | 37 | 53 | 810,735 | 636,430 | 1,447,165 |
| 07/01/10 | 06/30/12 | 16 | 42 | 58 | 393,565 | 395,760 | 789,325 |
| 07/01/11 | 06/30/12 | 21 | 32 | 53 | 109,283 | 301,718 | 411,001 |

Data Source: Claim Summary Loss Runs Provided by RCCD. Incident only claims removed from claim count.

## RCCD

Claims > \$250,000 Incurred
Workers' Compensation

| $(1)$ |
| :---: |
| Claim Number |
| 0433000034 |
| 0633000042 |

(2)
Rame
RANGEL, SYLVIA
Plascencia, Grace
(3)

## Accident <br> Date

12/01/03
04/14/06
(4)

Policy
Year
07/01/03 07/01/05
(5)

Paid
Loss \& ALA Loss \& ALAE

358,125
246,227
(6)

## Case Reserves

10,852
54,903

Incurred Loss \& ALAE

368,978
301,129

RCCD

## Summary of Limited Paid Losses by Policy Year

Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

RCCD
Summary of Limited Incurred Losses by Policy Year Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Per Occurrence Retention | Unlimited Incurred | Excess Loss | Number of Excess Losses | Limited Incurred |
| 07/01/97 | 250,000 | 627,695 | 0 | 0 | 627,695 |
| 07/01/98 | 250,000 | 337,743 | 0 | 0 | 337,743 |
| 07/01/99 | 250,000 | 755,067 | 0 | 0 | 755,067 |
| 07/01/00 | 250,000 | 276,066 | 0 | 0 | 276,066 |
| 07/01/01 | 250,000 | 755,795 | 0 | 0 | 755,795 |
| 07/01/02 | 250,000 | 530,645 | 0 | 0 | 530,645 |
| 07/01/03 | 250,000 | 799,102 | 118,978 | 1 | 680,125 |
| 07/01/04 | 350,000 | 647,002 | 0 | 0 | 647,002 |
| 07/01/05 | 350,000 | 862,718 | 0 | 0 | 862,718 |
| 07/01/06 | 350,000 | 379,475 | 0 | 0 | 379,475 |
| 07/01/07 | 350,000 | 467,619 | 0 | 0 | 467,619 |
| 07/01/08 | 350,000 | 151,937 | 0 | 0 | 151,937 |
| 07/01/09 | 350,000 | 1,447,165 | 0 | 0 | 1,447,165 |
| 07/01/10 | 350,000 | 789,325 | 0 | 0 | 789,325 |
| 07/01/11 | 500,000 | 411,001 | 0 | 0 | 411,001 |

## Excess

Limited Incurred 627,695 755,067 276,066 530,645 680,125

862,718
379,475
467,619
1,447,165
411,001

RCCD
Development of Preliminary Ultimate Losses Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | $\begin{gathered} \text { Paid } \\ \text { Losses } \\ \$ 0-\$ 500,000 \end{gathered}$ | Incurred Losses $\$ 0-\$ 500,000$ | Evaluation Date | Age in Months | Paid <br> LDF | Incurred LDF | Paid Loss Development Method | Incurred Loss Development Method | Selected Ultimate Losses \$0 - \$500,000 |
| 07/01/01 | 691,456 | 755,795 | 06/30/12 | 132 | 1.166 | 1.069 | 806,364 | 807,601 | 806,982 |
| 07/01/02 | 400,649 | 530,645 | 06/30/12 | 120 | 1.189 | 1.082 | 476,356 | 574,163 | 525,260 |
| 07/01/03 | 747,880 | 799,102 | 06/30/12 | 108 | 1.220 | 1.100 | 912,683 | 879,266 | 895,974 |
| 07/01/04 | 519,743 | 647,002 | 06/30/12 | 96 | 1.246 | 1.120 | 647,466 | 724,789 | 686,128 |
| 07/01/05 | 775,558 | 862,718 | 06/30/12 | 84 | 1.314 | 1.163 | 1,019,176 | 1,002,929 | 1,011,053 |
| 07/01/06 | 297,925 | 379,475 | 06/30/12 | 72 | 1.393 | 1.221 | 415,000 | 463,461 | 439,231 |
| 07/01/07 | 350,288 | 467,619 | 06/30/12 | 60 | 1.463 | 1.295 | 512,336 | 605,379 | 558,858 |
| 07/01/08 | 110,548 | 151,937 | 06/30/12 | 48 | 1.638 | 1.379 | 181,092 | 209,484 | 195,288 |
| 07/01/09 | 810,735 | 1,447,165 | 06/30/12 | 36 | 1.867 | 1.517 | 1,514,023 | 2,194,805 | 1,854,414 |
| 07/01/10 | 393,565 | 789,325 | 06/30/12 | 24 | 2.614 | 1.896 | 1,028,959 | 1,496,385 | 1,262,672 |
| 07/01/11 | 109,283 | 411,001 | 06/30/12 | 12 | 6.712 | 3.497 | 733,494 | 1,437,120 | 1,085,307 |

Notes:
(2) From Exhibits 2 and 3
(3) From Exhibits 2 and 3
(6) From Exhibit 19
(7) From Exhibit 20
(8) $=(2) \times(6)$
(9) $=(3) \times(7)$
(10) Selection based on judgment using results of Methods in Columns (8) and (9)

RCCD
Development of Ultimate Claim Count
Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Evaluation Date | $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ \text { In Months } \end{gathered}$ | Total Claim Count | Claim Count LDF | Ultimate Claim Count |
| 07/01/01 | 06/30/12 | 132 | 38 | 1.000 | 38 |
| 07/01/02 | 06/30/12 | 120 | 50 | 1.000 | 50 |
| 07/01/03 | 06/30/12 | 108 | 61 | 1.000 | 61 |
| 07/01/04 | 06/30/12 | 96 | 47 | 1.000 | 47 |
| 07/01/05 | 06/30/12 | 84 | 59 | 1.000 | 59 |
| 07/01/06 | 06/30/12 | 72 | 59 | 1.000 | 59 |
| 07/01/07 | 06/30/12 | 60 | 66 | 1.000 | 66 |
| 07/01/08 | 06/30/12 | 48 | 52 | 1.000 | 52 |
| 07/01/09 | 06/30/12 | 36 | 53 | 1.000 | 53 |
| 07/01/10 | 06/30/12 | 24 | 58 | 1.000 | 58 |
| 07/01/11 | 06/30/12 | 12 | 53 | 1.095 | 58 |

(4) From Exhibit 2
(5) Based on Industry Information
(6) $=(4) \times(5)$

## RCCD

Development of Frequency Trend Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Payroll | Payroll <br> Trend <br> Factor | Trended Payroll | Ultimate Claim Count | Frequency per \$1M Payroll | Percentage Change |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/01 | \$94,886,966 | 1.384 | \$131,345,753 | 38 | 0.29 |  |
| 07/01/02 | \$97,733,575 | 1.344 | \$131,345,753 | 50 | 0.38 | 31.6\% |
| 07/01/03 | \$100,665,583 | 1.305 | \$131,345,753 | 61 | 0.46 | 22.0\% |
| 07/01/04 | \$103,685,550 | 1.267 | \$131,345,753 | 47 | 0.36 | -23.0\% |
| 07/01/05 | \$106,796,117 | 1.230 | \$131,345,753 | 59 | 0.45 | 25.5\% |
| 07/01/06 | \$110,000,000 | 1.194 | \$131,345,753 | 59 | 0.45 | 0.0\% |
| 07/01/07 | \$109,395,773 | 1.159 | \$126,819,683 | 66 | 0.52 | 15.9\% |
| 07/01/08 | \$116,511,097 | 1.126 | \$131,134,266 | 52 | 0.40 | -23.8\% |
| 07/01/09 | \$115,408,330 | 1.093 | \$126,109,799 | 53 | 0.42 | 6.0\% |
| 07/01/10 | \$113,836,468 | 1.061 | \$120,769,108 | 58 | 0.48 | 14.3\% |
| 07/01/11 | \$105,846,966 | 1.030 | \$109,022,375 | 58 | 0.53 | 10.8\% |
|  |  | Exponential Curve Fit to Historical Frequency--All: WCIRB Industry Frequency Trend: |  |  | 3.7\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | -2.5\% |  |
|  |  | Selected Frequency Trend: |  |  | 0.0\% |  |

Notes:
(2) Payroll provided by RCCD
(3) Payroll Trend of 3\% per year based on Industry Information
(4) $=(2) \times(3)$
(5) From Exhibit 7, Column 6
(6) $=(5) /(4) \times 1 \mathrm{M}$
(7) Year over Year Percentage Change

## RCCD

Development of Severity Trend
Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Selected Ultimate Losses \$0-\$500,000 | Benefit Level Factor | Adjusted Ultimate Losses \$0-\$500,000 | Ultimate Claim Count | $\begin{gathered} \text { Severity } \\ \$ 0-\$ 500,000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Percentage Change |
| 07/01/01 | 806,982 | 0.466 | 376,138 | 38 | 9,898 |  |
| 07/01/02 | 525,260 | 0.454 | 238,675 | 50 | 4,774 | -51.8\% |
| 07/01/03 | 895,974 | 0.561 | 502,922 | 61 | 8,245 | 72.7\% |
| 07/01/04 | 686,128 | 0.819 | 562,115 | 47 | 11,960 | 45.1\% |
| 07/01/05 | 1,011,053 | 0.978 | 988,355 | 59 | 16,752 | 40.1\% |
| 07/01/06 | 439,231 | 1.003 | 440,402 | 59 | 7,464 | -55.4\% |
| 07/01/07 | 558,858 | 1.006 | 562,453 | 66 | 8,522 | 14.2\% |
| 07/01/08 | 195,288 | 1.002 | 195,678 | 52 | 3,763 | -55.8\% |
| 07/01/09 | 1,854,414 | 1.001 | 1,855,341 | 53 | 35,006 | 830.3\% |
| 07/01/10 | 1,262,672 | 1.000 | 1,262,672 | 58 | 21,770 | -37.8\% |
| 07/01/11 | 1,085,307 | 1.000 | 1,085,307 | 58 | 18,712 | -14.0\% |
|  |  | Exponential Curve Fit to Historical Severity: |  |  | 8.9\% |  |
|  |  | WCIRB Industry Severity Trend: |  |  | 6.5\% |  |
|  |  | Selected Severity Trend: |  |  | 6.5\% |  |

Notes:
(2) From Exhibit 6, Column 10
(3) Benefit Level Factors based on NCCI Adjustments for California
(4) $=(2) \times(3)$
(5) $=$ From Exhibit 7, Column 6
(6) $=(4) /(5)$
(7) Year over Year Percentage Change

## RCCD

Development of Forecasted Losses for Upcoming Policy Year 2012-13 Workers' Compensation


## RCCD

Calculation of Indicated Loss Reserves
Workers' Compensation
as of 6/30/2012

| (1) | (2) | $(4)$ |  | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |

Notes:
(4) From Exhibit 12, Column 9
(5) From Exhibit 5, Column 6
(6) From Exhibit 4, Column 6
$(7)=(4)-(6)$
$(8)=(5)-(6)$
$(9)=(4)-(5)$

## RCCD

Selection of Ultimate Losses \& ALAE Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Incurred Losses at Historical Retentions | Paid Loss Development Method | Incurred Loss Development Method | Expected Loss Method | Paid B-F Method | Incurred B-F Method | Frequency/ Severity Method | Selected <br> Ultimate Losses \& ALAE |
| 07/01/97 | 627,695 | 591,339 | 651,944 |  |  |  |  | 650,000 |
| 07/01/98 | 337,743 | 320,958 | 352,776 |  |  |  |  | 350,000 |
| 07/01/99 | 755,067 | 807,688 | 793,295 |  |  |  |  | 800,000 |
| 07/01/00 | 276,066 | 280,693 | 292,401 |  |  |  |  | 300,000 |
| 07/01/01 | 755,795 | 806,364 | 807,601 |  |  |  |  | 800,000 |
| 07/01/02 | 530,645 | 476,356 | 574,163 |  |  |  |  | 575,000 |
| 07/01/03 | 680,125 | 780,731 | 748,353 |  |  |  |  | 750,000 |
| 07/01/04 | 647,002 | 647,466 | 724,789 |  |  |  |  | 700,000 |
| 07/01/05 | 862,718 | 1,019,176 | 1,002,929 |  |  |  |  | 1,000,000 |
| 07/01/06 | 379,475 | 415,000 | 463,461 | 1,077,315 | 601,845 | 574,700 |  | 450,000 |
| 07/01/07 | 467,619 | 512,336 | 605,379 | 1,103,658 | 699,368 | 718,768 |  | 600,000 |
| 07/01/08 | 151,937 | 181,092 | 209,484 | 1,220,762 | 586,093 | 487,286 |  | 200,000 |
| 07/01/09 | 1,447,165 | 1,514,023 | 2,194,805 | 1,252,173 | 1,392,389 | 1,873,706 |  | 1,800,000 |
| 07/01/10 | 789,325 | 1,028,959 | 1,496,385 | 1,277,726 | 1,182,576 | 1,393,066 | 699,311 | 1,250,000 |
| 07/01/11 | 411,001 | 733,494 | 1,437,120 | 1,228,421 | 1,154,682 | 1,288,107 | 744,766 | 1,200,000 |

(2) From Exhibit 5, Column 6
(3) From Exhibit 13, Column 7
(4) From Exhibit 14, Column 7
(5) From Exhibit 15, Column 8
(6) From Exhibit 16, Column 8
(7) From Exhibit 17, Column 8
(8) From Exhibit 18, Column 12
(9) Selection based on judgment using results of Methods in Columns (3) through (8)

## RCCD

Paid Loss Development Method
Workers' Compensation

(6) From Exhibit 19 $(7)=(5) \times(6)$.

## RCCD

Incurred Loss Development Method
Workers' Compensation

(4)
(6)

Ultimate Losses at Historical Retentions 651,944 352,776 793,295 807,601 574,163 748,353 1,002,929 605,379 209,484 1,496,385 1,437,120
(6) From Exhibit 20 $(7)=(5) \times(6)$.

## RCCD

Expected Loss Method
Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Retention | Initial Loss Rate | Limit Adjustment Factor | Detrend Factor | Expected Loss Rate | Payroll | Ultimate Losses at Historical Retentions |
| 07/01/06 | \$350,000 | 1.20 | 1.000 | 0.816 | 0.98 | \$110,000,000 | 1,077,315 |
| 07/01/07 | \$350,000 | 1.20 | 1.000 | 0.841 | 1.01 | \$109,395,773 | 1,103,658 |
| 07/01/08 | \$350,000 | 1.20 | 1.000 | 0.873 | 1.05 | \$116,511,097 | 1,220,762 |
| 07/01/09 | \$350,000 | 1.20 | 1.000 | 0.904 | 1.08 | \$115,408,330 | 1,252,173 |
| 07/01/10 | \$350,000 | 1.20 | 1.000 | 0.935 | 1.12 | \$113,836,468 | 1,277,726 |
| 07/01/11 | \$500,000 | 1.20 | 1.000 | 0.967 | 1.16 | \$105,846,966 | 1,228,421 |

Notes:
(3) From Exhibit 10
(4) Adjustment for Differences in Historical Retention vs. Forecast Retention
(5) Adjustment for Benefit Level, Frequency and Severity Trends
(6) $=(3) \times(4) \times(5)$
$(8)=(6) \times(7) / 100$

## RCCD

Paid Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| (6) |
| :--- |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Weight- } \\ \text { Expected } \\ \text { Loss } \\ \text { Method }\end{array}$ |
| $28.2 \%$ |
| $31.6 \%$ |
| $39.0 \%$ |
| $46.5 \%$ |
| $61.8 \%$ |
| $85.1 \%$ |

Weight-
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { Paid Loss } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Ultimate Losses } \\ \text { Development } \\ \text { at Historical }\end{array}\end{array}$ Retentions

601,845
699,368
586,093
1,182,576
1,154,682

Notes:
(3) From Exhibit 15, Column 8
(4) From Exhibit 13, Column 7
(6) $=1-[1 /(5)]$
(7) $=1 /(5)$
(8) $=[(3) \times(6)]+[(4) \times(7)]$

## RCCD

Incurred Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method Workers' Compensation

| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | (6) | (7) |  | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Notes:

(3) From Exhibit 15, Column 8
(4) From Exhibit 14, Column 7
(6) $=1-[1 /(5)]$
(7) $=1 /(5)$
(8) $=[(3) \times(6)]+[(4) \times(7)]$

RCCD
Frequency/Severity Method Workers' Compensation

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy |  | Initial Severity | Severity Trend | Severity7/1/2010 | Severity7/1/2011 |
| Inception | Retention | \$0-\$250,000 | Factor | Dollars | Dollars |
| 07/01/01 | \$250,000 | 9,898 | 1.999 | 16,382 | 17,447 |
| 07/01/02 | \$250,000 | 4,774 | 1.877 | 7,418 | 7,900 |
| 07/01/03 | \$250,000 | 8,245 | 1.763 | 12,030 | 12,812 |
| 07/01/04 | \$350,000 | 11,960 | 1.655 | 16,386 | 17,451 |
| 07/01/05 | \$350,000 | 16,752 | 1.554 | 21,551 | 22,951 |
| 07/01/06 | \$350,000 | 7,464 | 1.459 | 9,017 | 9,603 |
| 07/01/07 | \$350,000 | 8,522 | 1.370 | 9,666 | 10,294 |
| 07/01/08 | \$350,000 | 3,763 | 1.286 | 4,008 | 4,268 |
| 07/01/09 | \$350,000 | 35,006 | 1.208 | 35,006 | 37,282 |
| 07/01/10 | \$350,000 | ------ | 1.134 | ------ | ------ |
| 07/01/11 | \$500,000 | ------ | 1.065 | ------ | ------ |
|  |  |  | l-year Average: | 12,057 | 12,841 |
|  |  |  | 5-year Average: | 12,125 | 12,914 |
|  |  |  |  | $\underline{07 / 01 / 10}$ | 07/01/11 |
|  | (7) |  | lected Severity: | 12,057 | 12,841 |
|  | (8) |  | fit Level Factor: | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | (9) |  | ustment Factor: | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | (10) |  | dusted Severity: | 12,057 | 12,841 |
|  | (11) |  | te Claim Count: | 58 | 58 |
|  | (12) | Ultimate Losses | ical Retentions: | 699,311 | 744,766 |

(3) From Exhibit 9, Column 6
(8) From Exhibit 10, Column 6
(4) From Exhibit 10, Column 8
(9) Adjustment for Limit
(5) $=(3) \times[(4) /($ Severity Trend Factor for 2010) $]$
(6) $=(3) \times[(4) /($ Severity Trend Factor for 2011) $]$
(7) Selected from Averages
(10) $=(7) /(8) \times(9)$
(11) From Exhibit 7, Column 6
$(12)=(10) \times(11)$

Paid Loss Development Triangle
Limited to $\$ 500,000$

| Policy Inception | (12 | 24 | 36 | 48 | 60 | 72 | 84 | 96 | 108 | 120 | 132 | 144 | 156 | 168 | 180 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/01/97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 514,774 | 529,248 | 537,252 | 553,199 |
| 07/01/98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 252,412 | 264,391 | 271,651 | 294,422 |  |
| 07/01/99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 701,342 | 703,903 | 706,687 | 718,982 |  |  |
| 07/01/00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 232,584 | 238,145 | 244,674 | 244,674 |  |  |  |
| 07/01/01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 656,996 | 663,673 | 671,471 | 691,456 |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/02 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 367,620 | 380,173 | 382,124 | 400,649 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/03 |  |  |  |  |  | 615,622 | 662,102 | 723,336 | 747,880 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 |  |  |  |  | 455,247 | 473,906 | 490,315 | 519,743 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/05 |  |  |  | 610,196 | 710,698 | 745,581 | 775,558 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/06 |  |  | 230,278 | 263,096 | 283,273 | 297,925 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/07 |  | 251,807 | 304,762 | 318,047 | 350,288 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/08 | 61,023 | 92,290 | 107,178 | 110,548 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/09 | 182,954 | 540,047 | 810,735 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/10 | 121,566 | 393,565 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/11 | 109,283 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age-to-Age Loss Development Factors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy Inception | 12-24 | 24-36 | 36-48 | 48-60 | 60-72 | 72-84 | 84-96 | 96-108 | 108-120 | 120-132 | 132-144 | 144-156 | 156-168 | 168-180 | 180-Ult |
| 07/01/97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.028 | 1.015 | 1.030 |  |
| 07/01/98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.047 | 1.027 | 1.084 |  |  |
| 07/01/99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.004 | 1.004 | 1.017 |  |  |  |
| 07/01/00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.024 | 1.027 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.010 | 1.012 | 1.030 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/02 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.034 | 1.005 | 1.048 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/03 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.076 | 1.092 | 1.034 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 |  |  |  |  | 1.041 | 1.035 | 1.060 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/05 |  |  |  | 1.165 | 1.049 | 1.040 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/06 |  |  | 1.143 | 1.077 | 1.052 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/07 |  | 1.210 | 1.044 | 1.101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/08 | 1.512 | 1.161 | 1.031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/09 | 2.952 | 1.501 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/10 | 3.237 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Averages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-Year | 2.567 | 1.291 | 1.073 | 1.114 | 1.047 | 1.050 | 1.062 | 1.016 | 1.028 | 1.020 | 1.017 | 1.024 | 1.049 | 1.030 |  |
| 5-Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Industry | 2.661 | 1.501 | 1.257 | 1.141 | 1.094 | 1.066 | 1.048 | 1.025 | 1.025 | 1.019 | 1.016 | 1.018 | 1.012 | 1.010 | 1.069 |
| Selected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age-to-Age LDF | 2.567 | 1.400 | 1.140 | 1.120 | 1.050 | 1.060 | 1.055 | 1.021 | 1.026 | 1.020 | 1.017 | 1.021 | 1.030 | 1.020 |  |
| Cumulative LDF | 6.712 | 2.614 | 1.867 | 1.638 | 1.463 | 1.393 | 1.314 | 1.246 | 1.220 | 1.189 | 1.166 | 1.147 | 1.123 | 1.090 | 1.069 |

## RCCD

Incurred Loss Development Triangle
Workers' Compensation
Limited to $\$ 500,000$

| Policy Inception | 12 | 24 | 36 | 48 | 60 | 72 | 84 |  | 108 | 120 | 132 | 144 | 156 | 168 | 180 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/01/97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 589,550 | 594,550 | 594,557 | 627,695 |
| 07/01/98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 317,319 | 342,577 | 346,279 | 337,743 |  |
| 07/01/99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 718,483 | 743,104 | 753,639 | 755,067 |  |  |
| 07/01/00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 307,156 | 307,156 | 286,272 | 276,066 |  |  |  |
| 07/01/01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 745,472 | 742,808 | 743,119 | 755,795 |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/02 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 424,737 | 403,295 | 404,162 | 530,645 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/03 |  |  |  |  |  | 713,907 | 691,958 | 824,809 | 799,102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 |  |  |  |  | 578,956 | 614,740 | 586,302 | 647,002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/05 |  |  |  | 784,860 | 811,628 | 797,908 | 862,718 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/06 |  |  | 331,237 | 337,935 | 339,201 | 379,475 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/07 |  | 423,506 | 445,599 | 428,140 | 467,619 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/08 | 96,650 | 170,213 | 167,981 | 151,937 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/09 | 566,453 | 896,591 | 1,447,165 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/10 | 360,528 | 789,325 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/11 | 411,001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age-to-Age Loss Development Factors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy Inception | 12-24 | 24-36 | 36-48 | 48-60 | 60-72 | 72-84 | 84-96 | 96-108 | 108-120 | 120-132 | 132-144 | 144-156 | 156-168 | 168-180 | 180-UIt |
| 07/01/97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.008 | 1.000 | 1.056 |  |
| 07/01/98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.080 | 1.011 | 0.975 |  |  |
| 07/01/99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.034 | 1.014 | 1.002 |  |  |  |
| 07/01/00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 0.932 | 0.964 |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.996 | 1.000 | 1.017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/02 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 | 1.002 | 1.313 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/03 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.969 | 1.192 | 0.969 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 |  |  |  |  | 1.062 | 0.954 | 1.104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/05 |  |  |  | 1.034 | 0.983 | 1.081 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/06 |  |  | 1.020 | 1.004 | 1.119 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/07 |  | 1.052 | 0.961 | 1.092 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/08 | 1.761 | 0.987 | 0.904 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/09 | 1.583 | 1.614 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/10 | 2.189 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Averages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 -Year | 1.844 | 1.218 | 0.962 | 1.043 | 1.055 | 1.001 | 1.082 | 0.989 | 1.104 | 0.994 | 1.019 | 1.007 | 0.988 | 1.056 |  |
| 5-Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Industry | 1.730 | 1.274 | 1.132 | 1.086 | 1.065 | 1.051 | 1.038 | 1.018 | 1.017 | 1.013 | 1.009 | 1.008 | 1.006 | 1.006 | 1.039 |
| Selected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age-to-Age LDF | 1.844 | 1.250 | 1.100 | 1.065 | 1.060 | 1.051 | 1.038 | 1.018 | 1.017 | 1.013 | 1.009 | 1.008 | 1.006 | 1.006 |  |
| Cumulative LDF | 3.497 | 1.896 | 1.517 | 1.379 | 1.295 | 1.221 | 1.163 | 1.120 | 1.100 | 1.082 | 1.069 | 1.059 | 1.051 | 1.045 | 1.039 |

Reported Claim Count Triangle
Workers' Compensation
Excludes $\$ 0$ Claims

Months of Developmen

| Policy Inception | 12 | 24 | 36 | 48 | 60 | 72 | 84 | 96 | 108 | 120 | 132 | 144 | 156 | 168 | 180 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/01/97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| 07/01/98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |  |
| 07/01/99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 |  |  |
| 07/01/00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37 | 37 | 38 | 38 |  |  |  |
| 07/01/01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 38 | 38 | 38 | 38 |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/02 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 | 49 | 49 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/03 |  |  |  |  |  | 61 | 61 | 61 | 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 |  |  |  |  | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/05 |  |  |  | 58 | 58 | 58 | 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/06 |  |  | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/07 |  | 65 | 65 | 66 | 66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/08 | 44 | 52 | 52 | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/09 | 48 | 53 | 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/10 | 58 | 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/11 | 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Age-to-Age Loss Development Factors

| Policy Inception | 12-24 | 24-36 | 36-48 | 48-60 | 60-72 | 72-84 | 84-96 | 96-108 | 108-120 | 120-132 | 132-144 | 144-156 | 156-168 | 168-180 | 180-UIt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/01/97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| 07/01/98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |
| 07/01/99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |  |
| 07/01/00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.027 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/02 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.021 | 1.000 | 1.020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/03 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/05 |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/06 |  |  | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/07 |  | 1.000 | 1.015 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/08 | 1.182 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/09 | 1.104 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/10 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Averages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-Year | 1.095 | 1.000 | 1.005 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.006 | 1.007 | 1.000 | 1.007 | 1.009 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| 5-Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Industry | 1.059 | 1.010 | 1.002 | 1.002 | 1.001 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Selected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age-to-Age LDF | 1.095 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Cumulative LDF | 1.095 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## RCCD

Summary of Program Provisions General and Employment Practices Liability

| Policy Inception | Per Occurrence <br> Retention | Excess <br> Insurance | Claims <br> Adjusting |  | ALAE | ULAE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $07 / 01 / 06$ | $\$ 100,000$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $07 / 01 / 07$ | $\$ 100,000$ |  |  | Corvel | Included | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| $07 / 01 / 08$ | $\$ 100,000$ |  | Corvel | Included | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| $07 / 01 / 09$ | $\$ 100,000$ |  | Corvel | Included | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| $07 / 01 / 10$ | $\$ 250,000$ |  | Corvel | Included | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| $07 / 01 / 11$ | $\$ 250,000$ |  | Corvel | Included | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
|  |  |  | Corvel | Included | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |

## RCCD

Summary of Historical Loss Data General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |  | (6) |  | (7) | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |

Data Source: Claim Summary Loss Runs Provided by RCCD. Incident only claims removed from claim count.

RCCD
Claims > \$100,000 Incurred General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | $(2)$ | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Claim Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## RCCD

Summary of Limited Paid Losses by Policy Year General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Per Occurrence Retention | Unlimited Paid | Excess Loss | Number of Excess Losses | Limited Paid |
| 07/01/06 | 100,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07/01/07 | 100,000 | 78,440 | 0 | 0 | 78,440 |
| 07/01/08 | 100,000 | 63,163 | 0 | 0 | 63,163 |
| 07/01/09 | 100,000 | 153,382 | 39,385 | 1 | 113,997 |
| 07/01/10 | 250,000 | 10,337 | 0 | 0 | 10,337 |
| 07/01/11 | 250,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

RCCD
Summary of Limited Incurred Losses by Policy Year General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Per Occurrence Retention | Unlimited Incurred | Excess LOSS | Number of Excess Losses | Limited Incurred |
| 07/01/06 | 100,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 |
| 07/01/07 | 100,000 | 78,440 | 0 | 0 | 78,440 |
| 07/01/08 | 100,000 | 63,163 | 0 | 0 | 63,163 |
| 07/01/09 | 100,000 | 1,000,000 | 700,000 | 3 | 300,000 |
| 07/01/10 | 250,000 | 1,107,837 | 425,000 | 2 | 682,837 |
| 07/01/11 | 250,000 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 |

## RCCD

Development of Preliminary Ultimate Losses General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Paid | Incurred |  |  |  |  | Paid Loss | Incurred Loss | Selected |
| Policy | Losses | Losses | Evaluation | Age in | Paid | Incurred | Development | Development | Ultimate Losses |
| Inception | \$0-\$250,000 | \$0-\$250,000 | Date | Months | LDF | LDF | Method | Method | \$0-\$250,000 |
| 07/01/06 | 0 | 10,000 | 06/30/12 | 72 | 1.288 | 1.138 | 0 | 11,384 | 11,384 |
| 07/01/07 | 78,440 | 78,440 | 06/30/12 | 60 | 1.413 | 1.181 | 110,850 | 92,626 | 101,738 |
| 07/01/08 | 63,163 | 63,163 | 06/30/12 | 48 | 1.660 | 1.256 | 104,842 | 79,350 | 92,096 |
| 07/01/09 | 153,382 | 750,000 | 06/30/12 | 36 | 2.141 | 1.405 | 328,364 | 1,053,631 | 1,053,631 |
| 07/01/10 | 10,337 | 682,837 | 06/30/12 | 24 | 3.197 | 1.728 | 33,052 | 1,179,790 | 1,179,790 |
| 07/01/11 | 0 | 1,000 | 06/30/12 | 12 | 6.126 | 2.682 | 0 | 2,682 | 2,682 |

(2) From Exhibits 2 and 3
(3) From Exhibits 2 and 3
(6) From Industry Information
(7) From Industry Information
(8) $=(2) \times(6)$
(9) $=(3) \times(7)$
(10) Selection based on judgment using results of Methods in Columns (8) and (9)

## RCCD

Development of Forecasted Losses for Upcoming Policy Year 2012-13
General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Payroll | Payroll Trend Factor | Trended Payroll | Selected Ultimate Losses \$0 - \$250,000 | Frequency Trend Factor | Severity <br> Trend Factor | Trended Ultimate Losses \$0-\$250,000 | Loss Rate per \$100 of Payroll |
| 07/01/06 | 110,000,000 | 1.194 | 131,345,753 | 11,384 | 1.000 | 1.265 | 14,405 | 0.01 |
| 07/01/07 | 109,395,773 | 1.159 | 126,819,683 | 101,738 | 1.000 | 1.217 | 123,780 | 0.10 |
| 07/01/08 | 116,511,097 | 1.126 | 131,134,266 | 92,096 | 1.000 | 1.170 | 107,739 | 0.08 |
| 07/01/09 | 115,408,330 | 1.093 | 126,109,799 | 1,053,631 | 1.000 | 1.125 | 1,185,192 | 0.94 |
| 07/01/10 | 113,836,468 | 1.061 | 120,769,108 | 1,179,790 | 1.000 | 1.082 | 1,276,060 | 1.06 |
| 07/01/11 | 105,846,966 | 1.030 | 109,022,375 | 2,682 | 1.000 | 1.040 | 2,789 | 0.00 |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  | 7-Year Wtd Average: <br> 5-Year Wtd Average: <br> 3 -Year Wtd Average: |  | 0.36 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.44 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.69 |
|  | (2) From Exhibit 8, Column 2 |  |  |  | (10) |  | Selected: | 0.50 |
|  | (3) Payroll Trend of 3\% per year based on Industry Information$(4)=(2) \times(3)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (5) From Exhibit 6, Column 10 |  |  |  | (11) | Forecas | Payroll 2012-13: | \$103,044,365 |
|  | (6) $0.0 \%$ Trend per Year (from Industry Information) |  |  |  | (12) | Forecas | osses 2012-13: | 500,000 |
|  | (7) 4.0\% Trend per Year (from Industry Information) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (8) $=(5) \times(6) \times(7)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (9) $=(8) /(4) \times 100$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (10) Forecast Loss Rate selected from Historical Averages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (11) Provided by RCCD$(12)=(10) \times(11) / 100$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## RCCD

Calculation of Indicated Loss Reserves General and Employment Practices Liability as of $6 / 30 / 2012$

| (1) | (2) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Per Occurrence Retention | Ultimate Losses at Historical Retentions | Incurred Losses at Historical Retentions | Paid Losses at Historical Retentions | Indicated Loss \& ALAE Reserves | $\begin{gathered} \text { Limited } \\ \text { Case } \\ \text { Reserves } \end{gathered}$ | IBNR |
| 07/01/06 | 100,000 | 25,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 25,000 | 10,000 | 15,000 |
| 07/01/07 | 100,000 | 78,440 | 78,440 | 78,440 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07/01/08 | 100,000 | 63,163 | 63,163 | 63,163 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07/01/09 | 100,000 | 400,000 | 300,000 | 113,997 | 286,003 | 186,003 | 100,000 |
| 07/01/10 | 250,000 | 900,000 | 682,837 | 10,337 | 889,663 | 672,500 | 217,163 |
| 07/01/11 | 250,000 | 400,000 | 1,000 | 0 | 400,000 | 1,000 | 399,000 |
| Total |  | 1,866,603 | 1,135,440 | 265,937 | 1,600,666 | 869,503 | 731,163 |

## Notes:

(4) From Exhibit 12, Column 9.
(5) From Exhibit 5, Column 6
(6) From Exhibit 4, Column 6
$(7)=(4)-(6)$
$(8)=(5)-(6)$
$(9)=(4)-(5)$

## RCCD

Selection of Ultimate Losses \& ALAE General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

(2) From Exhibit 5, Column 6
(3) From Exhibit 13, Column 7
(4) From Exhibit 14, Column 7
(5) From Exhibit 15, Column 8
(6) From Exhibit 16, Column 8
(7) From Exhibit 17, Column 8
(8) From Exhibit 18, Column 12
(9) Selection based on judgment using results of Methods in Columns (3) through (8)

## RCCD

Paid Loss Development Method General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | $(5)$ | (6) | (7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |

(6) From Industry Information
(7) $=(5) \times(6)$.

## RCCD

Incurred Loss Development Method General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Retention | Evaluation Date | $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ \text { In Months } \end{gathered}$ | Incurred Losses at Historical Retentions | Incurred <br> LDF | Ultimate Losses at Historical Retentions |
| 07/01/06 | \$100,000 | 06/30/12 | 72 | 10,000 | 1.119 | 11,186 |
| 07/01/07 | \$100,000 | 06/30/12 | 60 | 78,440 | 1.155 | 90,600 |
| 07/01/08 | \$100,000 | 06/30/12 | 48 | 63,163 | 1.220 | 77,038 |
| 07/01/09 | \$100,000 | 06/30/12 | 36 | 300,000 | 1.347 | 404,102 |
| 07/01/10 | \$250,000 | 06/30/12 | 24 | 682,837 | 1.728 | 1,179,790 |
| 07/01/11 | \$250,000 | 06/30/12 | 12 | 1,000 | 2.682 | 2,682 |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## RCCD

Expected Loss Method General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

(3) From Exhibit 10
(4) Adjustment for Differences in Historical Retention vs. Forecast Retention
(5) Adjustment for Benefit Level, Frequency and Severity Trends
$(6)=(3) \times(4) \times(5)$
$(8)=(6) \times(7) / 100$

## RCCD

Paid Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Notes:
(3) From Exhibit 15, Column 8
(4) From Exhibit 13, Column 7
(6) $=1-[1 /(5)]$
(7) $=1 /(5)$
(8) $=[(3) \times(6)]+[(4) \times(7)]$

## RCCD

Incurred Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method General and Employment Practices Liability

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Policy Inception | Retention | Expected Loss Method | Incurred Loss Development Method | Incurred LDF | WeightExpected Loss Method | WeightIncurred Loss Development Method | Ultimate Losses at Historical Retentions |
| 07/01/06 | \$100,000 | 467,120 | 11,186 | 1.119 | 10.6\% | 89.4\% | 59,542 |
| 07/01/07 | \$100,000 | 469,064 | 90,600 | 1.155 | 13.4\% | 86.6\% | 141,394 |
| 07/01/08 | \$100,000 | 504,424 | 77,038 | 1.220 | 18.0\% | 82.0\% | 154,010 |
| 07/01/09 | \$100,000 | 504,500 | 404,102 | 1.347 | 25.8\% | 74.2\% | 429,966 |
| 07/01/10 | \$250,000 | 558,289 | 1,179,790 | 1.728 | 42.1\% | 57.9\% | 918,000 |
| 07/01/11 | \$250,000 | 524,146 | 2,682 | 2.682 | 62.7\% | 37.3\% | 329,713 |

Weight-
Incurred Loss Ultimate Losses at Historical Retentions


141,394 429,966 918,000 329,713

Notes:
(3) From Exhibit 15, Column 8
(4) From Exhibit 14, Column 7
(6) $=1-[1 /(5)]$
(7) $=1 /(5)$
(8) $=[(3) \times(6)]+[(4) \times(7)]$

