

Commission Staff Report

January 12, 2017

COMMISSION MEETING DATE: January 19, 2017

SUBJECT: NCPA Major Insurance Renewals Update

AGENDA CATEGORY: Informational

FROM:	Rui Dai	METHOD OF SELECTION:
	Energy Risk Manager	N/A
Division:	Administrative Services	
Department:	Risk Management	

IMPACTED MEMBERS:				
All Members	\boxtimes	City of Lodi	City of Ukiah	
Alameda Municipal Power		City of Lompoc	Plumas-Sierra REC	
Bay Area Rapid Transit		City of Palo Alto	Port of Oakland	
City of Biggs		City of Redding	Truckee Donner PUD	
City of Gridley		City of Roseville	Other	
City of Healdsburg		City of Santa Clara	If other, please specify.	

NCPA Major Insurance Renewals Update January 19, 2017 Page 2

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Commission accept and file this report

BACKGROUND:

The Agency utilizes the insurance brokerage services of Aon Risk Solutions, San Francisco, California to market and place the Agency's insurance programs. Each insurance policy and the related insurance market conditions are reviewed prior to the renewal date and remarketed as required to qualified insurers experienced in underwriting the applicable insurance risk.

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the actual renewal results as compared to what has been recommended by the Committee on November 16, 2016.

NCPA Insurance Programs Renewal

Aon Risk Solutions, San Francisco rigorously marketed NCPA property and liability insurance program and successfully negotiated and bonded renewal quotes for both property and excess liability coverages. The annual property insurance premium for 2017 policy year renewal is \$1,414,592. This is a 20.80% below what was approved by the Committee in November and 10.37% below the premium of the expiring policy, given the fact that property insurable value increased by3.18%, and business interruption exposure increased by 40.09% (due to higher forecasted generation revenue) over the policy year 2016.

Excess liability coverage premium is expected to be \$556,921, for a policy limit \$80 million. This result represents a 2.12% decrease over what was approved by the committee in November and 1.84% decrease over the expiring policy premium. A detailed premium comparison is summarized in the table below.

			201	7 Renewal		%	20	17 Renewal		% Change	% Change
	201	6 Expiring		pproved	\$ Change	Change	20	Actual	\$ Change	-	vs Approved
Property Damage					Ŭ	Ŭ			Ū		
Property Damage &											
Terrorism	\$	1,550,023					\$	1,388,144			
Insurable Value	\$7	18,788,633	\$	741,619,733	\$ 22,831,100	3.18%	\$	741,619,733	\$ 22,831,100	3.18%	
Time Element		Included		Included				Included			
Taxes/Fees		28,276						26,448	\$ (1,828)		
BI Exposure		54,650,000		76,560,000		40.09%		76,560,000	\$ 21,910,000	40.09%	
Premium Total	\$	1,578,299	\$	1,786,000	\$ 207,701	13.16%	\$	1,414,592	\$ (163,707)	-10.37%	-20.80%
Casualty											
\$35mm Excess Liability	\$	312,727	\$	320,545		2.50%	\$	299,345	\$ (13,382)	-4.28%	-6.61%
Additional \$45 Liability		226,811		248,455		9.54%		230,001	\$ 3,190	1.41%	-7.43%
Terrorism		10,636						10,636			
Taxes/Fees		17,194						16,939	\$ (255)	-1.48%	
Premium Total	\$	567,368	\$	569,000	\$ 1,632	0.29%	\$	556,921	\$ (10,447)	-1.84%	-2.12%
Grand Total	\$	2,145,667	\$	2,355,000	\$ 209,333	9.76%	\$	1,971,513	\$ (174,154)	-8.12%	-16.28%

NCPA Property and Liability Insurance Results Summary

NCPA Major Insurance Renewals Update January 19, 2017 Page 3

FISCAL IMPACT:

NCPA insurance renewals have been accomplished within the Insurance Program budget. Total cost of the NCPA project insurance, including taxes and fees, is about \$1,971,513, 22.69% below FY17 budget of \$2.55 million for these two major programs. Funds are available in the 924-009-000-190-070-010 (property insurance) and 925-009-000-190-070-010 (Liability insurance) accounts to fund this program. Cost allocation will be based on generation entitlement share.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

This activity would not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect change in the physical environment and is therefore not a "project" for purposes of Section 21065 the California Environmental Quality Act. No environmental review is necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

RANDY S. HOWARD General Manager