1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP Vanessa Wells (Bar No. 121279) 855 Main Street, Suite 200 Redwood City, CA 94063 Telephone: (650) 463-4000 Facsimile: (650) 463-4199 vanessa.wells@hoganlovells.com Michael M. Maddigan (Bar No. 163450) Jordan D. Teti (Bar No. 284714) 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: (310) 785-4600 Facsimile: (310) 785-4601 michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com	
10	jordan.teti@hoganlovells.com	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Katherine B. Wellington (Massachusetts Bar No. 688577) 125 High Street, Suite 2010 Boston, MA 02110 Telephone: (617) 371-1000 Facsimile: (617) 371-1037 katherine.wellington@hoganlovells.com Attorneys for Applicant STATE FARM GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY BEFORE THE INSUR	ANCE COMMISSIONER
20	OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
21 22 23 24 25 26	In the Matter of the Rate Applications of STATE FARM GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY, Applicant.	File Nos. PA-2024-00011, PA-2024-00012, PA-2024-00013 STATE FARM GENERAL'S OPPOSITION TO CONSUMER WATCHDOG'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY AND FURTHER BRIEFING REGARDING RBC CALCULATIONS
27		
28		

State Farm General respectfully requests that the ALJ deny Consumer Watchdog's motion to exclude evidence to the extent it covers evidence of State Farm General's **RBC ratios**. State Farm General's RBC ratios were discussed by State Farm General's witness David Appel as part of his declaration and testimony in this interim rate hearing. CDI's witness Tina Shaw also discussed RBC ratios as part of her declaration, and State Farm General expects that RBC ratios will be further discussed by Ms. Shaw during her testimony at the interim rate hearing. State Farm General submits that it would be inappropriate to exclude this evidence for two reasons.

First, RBC ratios are publicly available information, and there is no basis to exclude this information under CIC § 739.8(a). Section 739.8(a) states:

All RBC Reports, to the extent the information within those reports is not required to be set forth in a publicly available annual statement schedule, and RBC Plans, including the results or report of any examination or analysis of an insurer performed pursuant to those plans, and any Corrective Order issued by the commissioner pursuant to examination or analysis, with respect to any domestic insurer or foreign insurer, that are filed with the commissioner constitute information that might be damaging to the insurer if made available to its competitors, and therefore shall be kept confidential by the commissioner.

(CIC § 739.8(a) [emphasis added].)

CIC § 739.8(a) refers specifically to "RBC Reports." The RBC ratio relied on by Mr. Appel and Ms. Shaw is not an "RBC Report." An RBC Report is defined as a "report" of the insurer's "RBC Levels ... in a form and containing such information as is required by the RBC Instructions." This is highly confidential information, as the statute recognizes, that "shall be kept confidential by the commissioner."

The RBC ratio relied on by Mr. Appel and Ms. Shaw, in contrast, *is a basic math calculation* that Mr. Appel and Ms. Shaw performed based on two numbers in State Farm General's publicly available annual statements. There is nothing confidential or protected about these numbers or the calculation. The two numbers used to calculate the RBC ratio are listed on lines 28 and 29 of the "Five-Year Historical Data" page of State Farm General's annual statements. The number on line 28 is the "Total adjusted capital." The number on line 29 is the

"Authorized control level risk-based capital." The RBC ratio is calculated by dividing the "Authorized control level risk-based capital" number by the "Total adjusted capital" number. (See IRH-SFG-103-11 [describing how to calculate RBC ratio].)

Mr. Appel calculated the RBC ratios described in his declaration and hearing testimony by reviewing State Farm General's annual reports, which are publicly available and which are in the record as exhibits. (*See* IRH-SFG-174-02 [lines 28 and 29 of Five-Year Historical Data page of State Farm General's 2024 Annual Statement]; IRH-SFG-174-04-05 [lines 28 and 29 of Five-Year Historical Data page of State Farm General's 2019 Annual Statement]; IRH-SFG-103-04, 12-14 [Declaration of David Appel].) It is our understanding that Ms. Shaw likewise calculated the RBC ratios in her declarations based on the same annual statement information, although this has not yet been confirmed through her hearing testimony. (*See* IRH-CDI-001-05-10 [Declaration of Teena Shaw].)

There is accordingly no basis to exclude the RBC ratios in Mr. Appel or Ms. Shaw's declarations or hearing testimony under CIC § 739.8(a). Indeed, the RBC ratios were calculated based on publicly available information that State Farm General was required to include in its annual statements, and which is accordingly exempt from the confidentiality obligations described in CIC § 739.8(a).

Second, there is no basis to exclude the RBC ratios under CIC § 739.8(c), which states:

It is the further judgment of the Legislature that the RBC Instructions, RBC Reports, Adjusted RBC Reports, RBC Plans, and Revised RBC Plans are intended solely for use by the commissioner in monitoring the solvency of insurers and the need for possible corrective action with respect to insurers, and shall not be used by the commissioner for ratemaking nor considered or introduced as evidence in any rate proceeding, nor used by the commissioner to calculate or derive any elements of an appropriate premium level or rate of return for any line of insurance that an insurer or any affiliate is authorized to write.

This provision does not apply to RBC ratios by its plain terms. An RBC Ratio is not an "RBC Report," as previously explained. CIC § 739.8(c) protects the highly confidential RBC Report from being "introduced as evidence in any rate proceeding"; it does not apply to the RBC ratio by

its plain text. Nor is the RBC ratio an "RBC Instruction," "Adjusted RBC Report," "RBC Plan," or "Revised RBC Plan."

An "RBC Instruction" is defined as "the RBC Report, including risk-based capital instructions adopted by the NAIC, and as the RBC Instructions may be amended by the NAIC from time to time in accordance with the procedures adopted by the NAIC." CIC § 739(i). An RBC ratio is not an RBC Report. Nor did Mr. Appel consult or rely on NAIC instructions. Instead, as Mr. Appel explained in his testimony, he calculated the RBC ratio by looking up two publicly available numbers in State Farm General's annual statements and dividing those two numbers to determine the RBC ratio. Ms. Shaw states that she consulted the NAIC Instructions, and State Farm General will allow CDI to address that issue. However, State Farm General does not believe that Ms. Shaw's RBC ratios should be excluded from evidence, because they are not covered by CIC § 739(c). Again, the RBC ratio is based on a very simple calculation from two publicly available numbers and is nowhere mentioned in the statute under discussion.

An "Adjusted RBC Report" is defined "as a Risk-Based Capital (RBC) report that has been adjusted by the commissioner in accordance with subdivision (b) or (c) of Section 739.2." CIC § 739(a). This provision does not apply, because the RBC ratio is not an RBC Report, nor has it been adjusted by the commissioner.

An "RBC Plan" "means a comprehensive financial plan containing the elements specified in subdivision (b) of Section 739.3. If the commissioner rejects the RBC Plan, and it is revised by the insurer, with or without the commissioner's recommendation, the plan shall be called the 'Revised RBC Plan.' "CIC § 739(k). The RBC ratio is not an "RBC Plan." It is not a comprehensive financial plan—it is a math calculation performed based on two numbers in State Farm General's annual statements. Nor has the RBC ratio an RBC Plan that has been revised by the insurer; it is thus not a Revised RBC Plan.

Consumer Watchdog cites legislative history, but this supports State Farm General's position, not Consumer Watchdog's. The summary of Senate Bill No. 1179, which was adopted as CIC § 739.8, applies to the "annual risk-based capital *report*"—not the ratio. (Declaration of

1	Ryan Mellino in Support of Consumer Watchdog's Motion to Exclude Testimony and Further		
2	Briefing Regarding RBC Calculations, Ex. B at 1.).		
3	In short, the RBC ratios discussed by Mr. Appel and Ms. Shaw are not described in CIC		
4	§ 739.8(a) or (c). There is thus no basis for excluding these RBC ratios from these proceedings.		
5	To be clear, State Farm General agrees that RBC reports, and other confidential RBC information,		
6	should <i>not</i> be admitted into evidence in this interim rate proceeding. However, CIC § 739.8 by its		
7	plain terms does not prevent the admission of publicly available information about <i>RBC ratios</i> into		
8	evidence in this proceeding.		
9	Dated: April 9, 2025		
10			
11	Respectfully submitted,		
12	HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP		
13			
14	<u>/s/ Jordan D. Teti</u> Michael M. Maddigan (Bar No. 163450)		
15	Jordan D. Teti (Bar No. 284714)		
16	1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, CA 90067		
	Telephone: (310) 785-4600		
17	Facsimile: (310) 785-4601		
18	michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com		
	jordan.teti@hoganlovells.com		
19	Vanessa Wells (Bar No. 121279)		
20	855 Main Street, Suite 200		
21	Redwood City, CA 94063		
21	Telephone: (650) 463-4000		
22	Facsimile: (650) 463-4199		
23	vanessa.wells@hoganlovells.com		
	Katherine B. Wellington (admitted in		
24	Massachusetts, Bar No. 688577)		
25	125 High Street, Suite 2010		
	Boston, MA 02110		
26	Telephone: (617) 371-1000 Facsimile: (617) 371-1037		
27	katherine.wellington@hoganlovells.com		
28	4		
۷٥	STATE EARM CENERAL'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EYELLIDE		

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SILICON VALLEY

Attorneys for State Farm General Insurance Company STATE FARM GENERAL'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY REGARDING RBC CALCULATIONS

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SILICON VALLEY